

# **City of Gahanna**

*200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, April 28, 2010**

**Commission may caucus prior to regular meeting**

**7:00 PM**

**City Hall**

## **Planning Commission**

*David K. Andrews*

*Anthony Penn*

*Jennifer Price*

*Kristin Rosan*

*Donald R. Shepherd*

*David B. Thom*

*Robert Westwood*

*Stacey L. Bashore, Deputy Clerk of Council*

**IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO HAVE A COURT REPORTER PRESENT, AT THE APPLICANT'S EXPENSE, IF THEY WISH TO HAVE A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING. COUNCIL OFFICE SHOULD BE ADVISED IN ADVANCE IF A COURT REPORTER IS GOING TO BE PRESENT.**

**A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL.**

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 200 S. Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio, on Wednesday, April 28, 2010. The agenda for this meeting was published on April 23, 2010. Chair David K. Andrews called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Commission member Kristin Rosan.

**Members Present:** Anthony L. Penn, David K. Andrews, Jennifer T. Price, Kristin E. Rosan, Donald R. Shepherd and Robert C. Westwood

**Members Absent:** David B. Thom

---

**B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA.**

There were none.

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 14, 2010**

A motion was made by Shepherd, seconded by Price, to approve the Minutes of the April 14, 2010 meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes            6        Penn, Chair Andrews, Price, Rosan, Shepherd and Westwood**

**Absent        1        Thom**

**D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA.**

**E. APPLICATIONS:**

Chair stated the Public Hearing Rules that would govern all public hearings this evening. Assistant City Attorney Ray King administered an oath to those persons wishing to present testimony this evening.

**V-0004-2010**

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1155.07(c) of the codified ordinances of the City of Gahanna; to vary screening requirements to allow a non opaque fence; current zoning O.C.T.-Office Commerce Technology; for property located at 1525 Blatt Road; Dennis Day, applicant. (Advertised in the RFE on 4/8/2010 and re-advertised in the Columbus Dispatch on 4/24/10.)

Chair stated this item would be heard in Workshop prior to the Regular meeting on May 12, 2010 at 6:30 p.m.

**Postponed to Date Certain to Planning Commission**

**PWSF-0002-2010**

To consider a Personal Wireless Service Facility application to allow co-location on an existing tower; for property located at 4328 N. Hamilton Rd.; Clear Wireless, LLC, applicant. (Advertised in the RFE on 4/15/10 and 4/22/10)

Huffman said application is as stated by chair; located in north central Gahanna at the rear of the property; parcel located at 4328 N. Hamilton road; showed the shadow of the existing tower as it stands right now; closer aerial shows existing tower; located in

community commercial; does have a fall zone; brought back because this parcel was originally in Jefferson Township and there were no records on it.

Katherine Topping, 12249 Mowery Lehman Road; Logan, Ohio; stated she was representing Clear Wire; we own the tower; can answer any questions.

Chair asked for any opponents. There were none.

Price asked about landscape screening and whether it is required under new Code; doesn't appear to have any landscape screening now; wasn't sure if the Code triggered landscaping since new equipment is being added. King stated there really is no change to the tower, they are just adding a couple of pieces of equipment to the tower; as far as the base don't know what Jefferson Township required. Topping stated there will be new equipment going in at the base of the tower; currently there is no landscape screening at the base of the tower; we would be glad to install screening to offset it; we want to bring it into compliance and are willing to agree to it now. Huffman stated that we can work with the applicant after the vote to come up with appropriate landscaping. Rosan stated she appreciated the applicant's willingness to work with us on the landscaping; can work with Zoning on the specifics of the landscaping. Sherwood referred to section 1181.20 of the City's Codified ordinances regarding landscaping screening.

**A motion was made by Westwood, seconded by Rosan, that this matter be Approved with the condition that the owner provide landscape screening around the base of the tower. The motion carried by the following vote:**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>6</b>	Penn, Chair Andrews, Price, Rosan, Shepherd and Westwood
------------	----------	--

<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Thom
---------------	----------	------

#### **FDP-0002-2010**

To consider a Final Development Plan for a storage building at Academy Park; for property located at 1201 Cherry Bottom Rd.; by City of Gahanna, applicant.  
(Advertised in RFE 4/22/10)

Huffman stated the application is as stated by Chair; northwestern section of the City; it is located in SF 2 zoning; Parks does not have a separate zoning from residential; going to be replacing existing basket ball courts; showed renderings of proposed buildings; change of location is due to flood plain; making sure it is not in an existing flood plain.

Troy Euton, 200 S. Hamilton Road; stated this is a proposed structure at Academy Park; will provide storage for Gahanna Jr. league sports; before you is phase 1 of 2; at future date when funding permits we hope to add on to the south elevation; that will provide restrooms and concession stand; once it is complete the old structure would be removed and area would be restored; trying to keep it as near to the ball diamonds for reasonable access for concessions.

Chair asked for any opponents. Larry Kobel, 383 Coldwell Ct; stated his property is up against park; structure is not immediately near the ball diamonds; have talked to several of the neighbors on Coldwell Ct.; trying to represent their views; ironic that this is exactly what was proposed 8 years ago to the week; almost the exact same building as in 2002; did not see anything about phase 2 in this proposal; this is new info to me; that will absolutely fire up the neighborhood; they will definitely not be happy about a potential phase 2; read news story from May 2002 about proposal being defeated; rendering is the same building with the same materials; 1/3 of the building is labeled as open space; not sure what that space would be used for; that is in addition to storage space that is 1130 square feet; garage is 850 square foot which seems big for a garage;

what will be there and what is the use for it; less than 25% of the building will be used for storage and yet is being called a storage facility; this is too big with too much undesignated space; proposed an indoor batting cage 8 years ago but we don't see that now; one room is listed as an office; want to know who will be using that office; will there be staffing during the day; some of the neighbors are worried about where the basketball courts will move to; something that needs to be addressed; not everything is accurately portrayed; distance from the surrounding fire department is off; only bring that up to ask how complete are these plans; wondering about insurance and how well security will be handled on the building; will there be exterior lights on a timer; don't necessarily want exterior lights; 8 years ago 38 people signed a petition against the exact same building; if you pull the plan from 8 years ago there are a couple of walls that have been moved; it wasn't deemed adequate then and isn't now; these 38 people were opposed 8 years ago and we were told they had to build it because they were afraid of terrorists; we are citizens of this community and if this is truly for storage then build less and use it for storage; it is just too much and too big; there have been cases of vandalism and if you build it they will come.

Chair asked for rebuttal. Euton stated he could address some of the concerns; the open space referred to would be used for sign ups and meetings by Jr. League sports; it is called a storage building because that is the primary function; the different rooms are used for the different age groups because that is how they store the equipment; there are several yard barns around Academy Park that would no longer be necessary if this building is built; relative to the distance to the fire departments we gathered that information from the Auditor's department; we have not discussed exterior lighting except with doorways; fields are already lighted; phase 2 is a future phase to help clean up the park to make it more professional and more attractive. Penn asked about the office space. Euton stated the office space would be used by the Jr. League Sports; no City staff; that office space would be utilized to conduct administrative business; banking and accounting and updating rosters; currently they are in the Service Department garage; they don't have employees because it is staffed by volunteers; have different roles and this facility would provide functional administrative space. Penn asked what the square footage was for the open space. Euton stated it was 1130 sq. ft. Price asked if this was similar to the sports storage facility at Headley Park. Euton stated that the function would be the same as Headley Park; administrative duties as well as a place to store equipment; would use the open space for sign ups and uniform sales. Price clarified that the existing building will stay until the restrooms and concession stand could be added to this building once funding is available. Rosan asked about a landscaping plan. Euton stated that the elevation shows some shrubs; but a formal landscape plan has not been developed. Rosan stated according to the application landscaping calculations have been checked off as being met. Euton apologized and didn't know why that is checked. Shepherd stated he didn't see anything specific. Euton stated that he would work with Gard on it; had been out of the process up until this point. Shepherd stated we would require that from any other applicant; we need complete information; asked about the concern for breaking and entering; do we have any problems with that at Headley Park. Euton stated in the four years since the Headley Building has been built it has been broken into once and restrooms have been vandalized a couple of times; have installed security cameras and lights there. Shepherd asked would this building have cameras too. Euton stated it would be our intent to add cameras; it is matter of funding; about 70% of our buildings have them with remote capability. Westwood asked if the parking lot had lights. Euton stated that 2 or 3 of the fields are lit but the parking lot is not. Westwood asked how late is the park open. Euton stated we don't allow them to play past 10:00 p.m.; their schedule is to end at dusk; so I don't know for sure how much they use the lighting. Westwood asked who maintains the property. Euton stated the league maintains the infields and City maintains

outfields; league has their own equipment for the fields which is being stored in our Service facility; this building would allow them to move their equipment to the park. Westwood asked how far the Service facility is from the park. Euton stated it is 3 to 4 miles from the park. Westwood asked Mr. Kobel how many people signed the petition and how many of those people are living there now. Mr. Kobel stated 38 people signed it in 2002, but some of the people have changed; however the building hasn't changed and it was deemed unacceptable in 2002; not sure what makes it acceptable now; neighbors feel this is too big. Westwood asked how far Mr. Kobel's property was from the building. Mr. Kobel stated he went out and looked to see what he would be able to see; can see basketball courts from back porch; not sure how far it is; also think it would be important for this Commission to communicate with the neighbors about the phases; we are not getting a full impact of what is being planned; needs to be played out in writing; nobody has ever complained about the little buildings, we are complaining about the big building. Westwood asked if the dotted areas on the floor plan were for shelving. Euton stated that it is; everything is stored by age group; very organized. Rosan asked about a covered area that was mentioned in a preliminary meeting. Euton stated that since then the league has worked with architects and addressed it by phase one and phase two. Rosan asked for a copy of what was provided previously so we can have a fresh understanding of what is now being proposed. King clarified that the only thing before the Commission is Phase 1; any additional phases would have to come back for approval.

RECOMMENDATION: To be heard in workshop at 6:15 on May 12, 2010 prior to Regular Meeting

**Postponed to Date Certain to Planning Commission**

**DR-0005-2010**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Site Plan, Landscaping and Building Design for property located at 1201 Cherrybottom Rd., (Academy Park); City of Gahanna, applicant.

See above discussion.

**Postponed to Date Certain to Planning Commission**

**SWP-0001-2010**

To consider A Subdivision Without Plat to allow for the split of a 36.034 acre parcel and a 7.369 acre parcel for the purchase of property for road and parkland; property located at 940 S. Hamilton Road; City of Gahanna, Karl Wetherholt; applicant.

Wetherholt stated this is a request for a lot split from the existing Buckles Tract between Hamilton Road and I-270; provides the land for the Tech Center Drive extension; trying to get that ready; dedicates to the City 36 acres of parkland in flood plain area; this is property dedication for Tech Center Drive; required to be done in order to meet federal highway requirements and ODOT requirements so project can be completed; it can be put into construction this time next year.

**A motion was made by Price, seconded by Shepherd, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Absent            1        Thom**

**Yes                6        Penn, Chair Andrews, Price, Rosan, Shepherd and Westwood**

**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

**G. NEW BUSINESS:**

**DR-0006-2010**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Site Plan and Building Design for property located at 210-258 Granville Street; Leatherbuck, LLC, James Riley, applicant.

Huffman said this application is as stated by Chair; properties located on Granville just west of Hamilton Road; it does consist of 3 buildings running east to west; Community Commercial zoning; do get into Olde Gahanna to the west; showed existing buildings as they are today; part of the application has to do with parking removal of this drive lane and extending parking; parking left to picture; next couple of slides are existing with what is being proposed.

James Riley 858 City Park Avenue; Columbus, OH stated his client purchased this property which includes Coaches; gave me a photo of a building on Sawmill Road and asked me to make it look like this; will be using cultured stone; taking off blue mansard; replacing with field stone and brick and increasing height; making signage more sophisticated with channel letters; found out that the stone is cheaper than the brick so we will be decreasing the brick and increasing the stone; materials will be opposite of what is shown. Shepherd asked what part of that would be on Coaches. Riley stated we are replacing the stucco with stone. Riley reviewed the materials with the Commission.

Shepherd asked what type of awnings would be used; see the colors but don't see any details. Riley stated they would be sloped down; showed the Commission a photo of what they would look like. Shepherd asked about a light that was installed that is shining out toward the street; put up by the tavern. Riley stated there is one on each corner of the building. Shepherd stated we have certain guidelines for lighting; looks like someone just put them up and they were never approved. Rosan asked about a landscaping plan for Granville Street; did Development look at that plan to make it more consistent. Huffman stated he believed that plan stopped at Shull Avenue, but he would confirm. Riley stated they have taken out some of the old trees and replaced them with new ones; drive thru pavement has been removed and resodded. Rosan said there are already some positive improvements; other question is has a parking analysis been done; what is the parking that is necessary for these buildings with the idea whether or not to remove some of the parking right on Granville Street with parking in the rear; part of the problem with parking close to Granville is there is not a lot of land; adding parking to rear; maybe could accomplish something. Huffman stated we did speak with applicant about expanding patio; not sure if that parking scenario was ever discussed; in regard to parking along Granville Street are you asking to take out parking and have it sodded. Rosan stated in front of the building and to right; there appears to be a lot of parking in the rear of the building; not sure whether or not there is adequate parking; maybe something can be done. Huffman stated we can do parking calculations; do believe that what we will find if this end cap would be a restaurant use that parking would be below the requirements; we will study that. Andrews asked for clarification on what changes would be to Coaches. Riley stated we will be applying stone; Coaches is working to make a 3 season covered enclosed patio; we will interface our stone work with what they are doing; that is not part of this application. Huffman stated that the owner of Coaches would have to come forward if they chose to do something like that. Shepherd asked if they were working on the patio now. Riley stated he did not get the impression it was that quick; we will give them plenty of room to complete their project. Shepherd clarified that they would have to come back. Shepherd asked Wetherholt if the drive between the west building and Coaches would be better served as a right in right out only; put signage there. Wetherholt stated it would be better; it fits the typical access management plan. Riley stated they would be supportive of that idea; no reason to have anybody coming out and going left; think that would improve traffic flow. Shepherd asked about pine trees behind Coaches. Riley stated they will either be removed or trimmed. Rosan asked applicant to bring any landscaping plans for the site to the next meeting; start looking at the City's Vision plan. Huffman stated that the Olde Gahanna Vision Plan does incorporate this area but it doesn't address landscaping. Shepherd asked to see what the awnings will look like on the elevations.

RECOMMENDATION: To be discussed in Workshop on Wednesday, May 5, 2010 at 6:30 p.m.

**Postponed to Date Certain to Planning Commission**

## **H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **Olde Gahanna Visioning Committee**

Huffman stated the consultant is working on the codified aspects of it; the written part in the Code takes awhile to assemble.

### **Hamilton Road Corridor Committee**

Westwood stated the open house last Thursday had a good turnout. Huffman stated 62 people signed in but it is thought that attendance was higher than what signed in.

## **I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:**

### **City Attorney.**

No report.

### **City Engineer.**

No report.

### **Department of Development.**

No report.

### **Chair.**

No report.

## **J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS.**

There were none.

## **K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.**

There were no comments.

## **L. ADJOURNMENT.**

Adjourned at 8:19 p.m.; Motion by Westwood.

## **M. POSTPONED APPLICATIONS:**

---

**Stacey Bashore**  
**Deputy Clerk of Council**

*APPROVED by the Planning Commission, this  
day of 2010.*

---

**David K. Andrews**  
Chair