

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, August 14, 2002

7:00 PM

City Hall

Planning Commission

Richard A. Peck, Chair

Jane Turley, Vice Chair

Cynthia G. Canter

Candace Greenblott

P. Frank O'Hare

Donald R. Shepherd

Othelda A. Spencer

Tanya M. Word, Deputy Clerk of Council

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 South Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio on Wednesday, August 14, 2002. The agenda for this meeting was published on August 8, 2002. Chair Richard A. Peck called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission member Jane Turley.

Members Present: Richard Peck, Jane Turley, P. Frank O'Hare and Candace Greenblott

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 24, 2002

A motion was made by Greenblott to approve the minutes of the July 24, 2002 Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA - None

E. APPLICATIONS:

Chairman stated 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.

Z-0004-2002

To consider a zoning application on 2.7 acres of newly annexed property located at 4479 Johnstown Road; requested zoning of AR; Contemporary Construction Services, by Donald T. Plank, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:04 P.M.

Mark Herman, 4443 Johnstown Road; stated that we are requesting rezoning of this property as part of the greater rezoning that has already taken place; the reason for this one property being later than the rest was due to an annexation issue which has been completed and approved.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:06 P.M.

Peck stated for the record the Commission has reviewed the entire project of which this is a parcel of; the proposed zoning is consistent with the planning in the surrounding area; will be supporting this application.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Turley that this matter be Recommended to Council for Approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

V-0025-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1171.04(a)(6)(A) - Fence Standards; for property located at 818 Hensel Woods Road; for to allow decorative fence to be located more than halfway between the building line and row; by Joseph J. Ruane, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 8/8/02). (Public Hearing held on 8/14/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:07 P.M.

Joseph Ruane, 818 Hensel Woods Road; stated that he had a landscaping company come out because he is in the process of doing a beautification project in the backyard; we wanted to have a fence originally because we were concerned about speeding problems and the children in our neighborhood; the landscaping company surveyed the land; told us we have a perfect spot to place the fence because it follows the natural tree line; follows the contour of the land, and it would really make the project look beautiful; unfortunately the Zoning Administrator checked the line and it was off by 6.5 ft.; to move the fence in only 6.5 ft. as the picture demonstrates effectively, cuts the yard in half and makes the intended play area that we are going to have for our children practically unusable; we think that the purpose of zoning is to maintain the aesthetic integrity of the neighborhood; all of our neighbors have stopped by and said that they would be happy to come down and support the application; to move the fence in, we would need to clear another area of the yard which is a natural wooded area; we would really prefer not to do that because we don't want to destroy the natural wooded area; finally when the shrubs that are installed there have matured they will totally conceal the fence so there will be nothing even visible along that line.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Turley asked what would be the special circumstance that would apply to this property. Ruane replied along with special circumstances, indicated that it would in some way alter the use of the property; to move the fence into the zoned area eliminates the play area for children making the use of the yard ineffective; we would have to clear another area of the property; what's not shown there is the other area which includes the patio and a large mulched area. Turley explained that the Planning Commission's job is not to decide if we like the zoning code as it is or not, but to look at each application and see if there is a special circumstance that applies to this property that would not apply to your neighbor next door (in a court of law) if they also wanted to do the same thing; one of the key things that this Commission takes into consideration is if there are special circumstances that apply to the land. O'Hare asked could you elaborate a little more on the safety concern. Ruane replied that we actually had the Gahanna Police do a survey on our street; our backyard is along Venetian Way which has been identified as a speeding zone; the police have been out twice and placed a radar device in place because there was a major problem with the use of the thoroughfare; people were driving over the speed limit; our yard where the children do play is adjacent to that area; with the recent events of children being taken from their backyards, believe it is important for us to have a fence for the safety of the children. Canter commented with that argument in mind, wouldn't it make more sense to move the fence back in 6 ft. to keep them further away from the traffic and probing eyes & hands. Ruane stated once the shrubs are fully mature they would be another deterrent. Canter stated that she drove by the property so that she could get the view from the stop sign; part of the reason why we don't allow fences on the corner lot is for site triangle; there is a certain amount of angle at the stop sign as you are pulling out of Hensel Woods onto Venetian Way; there could be possible obstruction of the site triangle at that stop sign; this is part of the reason why the Code does not allow fencing in the side yard areas; the Commission has been very strict with this particular code; this is also part of the reason we don't let the fencing encroach into the side yard setback; because it does affect the public welfare and safety for everyone. Ruane commented that he is aware of these issues; however, if you drove up Venetian Way, the yard is set back quite a bit from the corner, such that the house is the obstruction from looking around the corner. O'Hare stated that the issue raised earlier was speeding; so that means speeding cars out of control; how many cars have been in your backyard due to speeding. Ruane commented that he could not

account for any cars in his backyard.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:15 P.M.

Turley stated that she will not be able to support this application; don't see any special circumstances that are related to this property; the speeding problem; think there are speeding problems along a lot of the main roads in this neighborhood; this is not unusual; a lot of the homes in this area share the speeding problem. Canter stated that she will not be able to support this application; don't feel that it meets the requirements of Section 1131.03(a)(b)(c); we have not been able to identify special circumstances; section b states that the granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; the homeowner will still have substantial use and enjoyment of the property; section c states that the granting of the application will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood; still have concerns about the site triangle, therefore will not be able to support this variance application.

A motion was made by Greenblott, seconded by O'Hare, that this matter be Approved. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yes	0	
No	4	Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

Chair advised applicant of his right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days. Contact the Clerk of Council's office for further information.

V-0026-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1165.08 - Prohibitions; for property located at the entrance to the Academy Ridge Subdivision; to allow one (1) sign within the right-of-way; Academy Ridge Comm.Assoc.by David Itkoff, applicant. (Public Hearing held by Planning Commission on 8/14/02 and 10/23/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:17 P.M.

David Itkoff, 983 Ridge Crest Drive, stated he is a trustee for the Academy Ridge Civic Association; also the representative and chairman of the sign committee for this project; coming to the Planning Commission this evening to present a project we have been working on for awhile; something where we can get permanent signage that can be moved with the idea that the Hamilton Road widening project as well as Beecher Road is supposed to occur in 2004; regardless of the timing, this is something we could have as far as signage; the signage would be something that could be moved when this project is started; we have a type of Lakeshore Blue Slab stone picked out; very similar to some other things that have been done and approved here in Gahanna; one sign would be placed on the present sign site that we now have that is basically a temporary sign that is still there only because when everybody moved into the area, the developers did tell us that they would provide permanent signage; however, they finished building out the area and did not provide permanent signage; so this project is something that the association has taken upon ourselves to develop; we also plan to put one in the other area which would be the southwest corner; we are applying for this variance so that we can be within the easement of the variance and not on anyone else's property; this is the purpose for the variance; in regards to the Design Review; the design is a Lakeshore Blue Vein

type of slab stone, which is very similar to what is being used in some other communities; will be sandblasted on the surface with an indentation and a black printed type of lettering as shown in the drawing, with a moderate type of graphic design on the surface to signify a rich type (i.e. a little group of trees); there will be appropriate landscaping pending on how it's laid out once it's placed; most of the landscaping is already in place on the southwest corner; the one on the southwest corner might be scaled down just slightly from what we're asking for; it all depends on the final slab choice; what the supplier has available; and what we order; on the other corner, we plan to put the stone right above where the little wall is; basically we are trying to do something that is pleasing to the area.

Chair asked for Opponents.

Dan Schoedinger, Attorney at 52 E. Gay Street, representative for Academy Development Limited Partnership, which is the owner of the property at the southwest corner at Beecher & Hamilton; stated we have some real concerns about this project; first the drawing that you have been provided actually shows one of these two signs on our property as opposed to in the right-of-way; secondly, don't believe that this particular application meets any of the requirements of Section 1131.03; don't believe there are any special circumstances involved here that you don't find with many other subdivisions that don't have frontage on the main road; think providing the signage here for this subdivision if that were done, there would be no reason not to do it at the corner of Rocky Fork and Hamilton Road for apartment complexes or subdivisions that are east down Rocky Fork Blvd.; this is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; don't believe there is any property right for anyone to put a sign out in front of or on someone else's property, this has been recognized in the staff comments; the staff pointed out in their report previously where the Commission has refused to grant these off premises graphics even in situations where the property owners whose property they were going to go on were agreeable to them; concerned about the public welfare; if it is going to sit in the present right-of-way as opposed to on our property, the right-of-way between the curb and the right-of-way line is pretty narrow; this would provide a significant obstruction to view; second of all in regards to injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood, this is our primary concern; what the Commission would be doing by granting this variance would be allowing someone to put a sign in a very important location to our property and to the future development of the property; we would respectfully request that you decline to approve this variance.

Chair asked for Rebuttal.

Itkoff stated when he undertook this project, he tried to walk along each step of the way so that he wouldn't be stepping on anyone's toes or property; I was told specifically that we wanted to be in the variance and in the easement and not on anyone's property; if the drawing that was provided puts us on there, there is supposed to be an easement there of which I thought we would be within; that's the variance that we were asking for; was not aware that we were going to be on someone else's property; had someone from the Zoning Department help me fill out the paperwork and look at the maps, etc.; was not told that we would be on someone else's property; when we drew in the area where that would be, it was assumed that what is already there is in the easement; we were not planning to put it on either of the properties on the southwest side or the northwest side.

O'Hare commented that you were not going to put it on any private property; so you would just be setting this rock on property; who is this property owned by. Itkoff replied that we were told the City. O'Hare stated you just said that the property is not owned by anyone; so let's clear the ownership matter up; the property is owned by somebody, it is

owned by the citizens of Gahanna. Itkoff stated that is correct. O'Hare commented when it's inside the right-of-way and it's that near a road, you've said this is a stone (which looks very nice), and you've given it about 40 sq.ft.; just looking at the stone it looks like it weighs about 400-500 lbs. Itkoff stated that it depends upon the thickness or the denseness of the mass. O'Hare replied so you are sitting this stone in very close proximity to a heavily travelled way in which vehicles are going about 45 m.p.h.; therefore if a vehicle comes off of that roadway and hits that stone, there is going to be an accident; how is your association going to hold us (the citizens of Gahanna) harmless from the damages caused from that accident. Itkoff replied that he really didn't know what to answer or how to answer; not knowledgeable enough to give a proper answer; was only going by a community area that has a stone very similar to this; speaking about Sycamore Mill. O'Hare asked is the stone on their property. Itkoff said he did not know. Greenblott stated that at the point and time when the stone was originally placed, it was sitting on the property of Sycamore Mill. Itkoff said it looked like this location in relation to the street in similarity. O'Hare stated for the word similar, not really happy with that word because we are talking about property lines and property law; therefore we've had a private owner say "I don't want it on my private property"; now we are hearing let's put it on public property; if someone hits it, then what happens.

Canter asked D'Ambrosio when this application was filled out, do you have any record or are you aware of the conversation with Itkoff. D'Ambrosio replied that she is aware that Gard worked with Itkoff in filling out the application and that he was instructed to speak with the Engineering Department; Komlanc can probably give some insight regarding that conversation and where the right-of-way is; everyone has a right to make application; don't discourage their due process; but as a staff we do not support this application for two reasons; (1) the actual right-of-way is too narrow and too close to the street; Komlanc can attest to this issue; (2) we also feel this is an off premise sign and we have not supported off premise signs in the past; we have not supported them for commercial businesses; one example is City Barbecue located on Johnstown Road; they had permission from a private property owner to put a sign along 62; we did not support that because the code says that should not have off premise signs. Canter asked is the placement of the signs currently in the right-of-the way or out of the right-of-way. D'Ambrosio stated what is on the screen right now is not in right-of-way; that is on private property; assuming what happened is that there is another drawing in your packets which is proposed future right-of-way; we have not yet purchased that, but when we do acquire it for the right-of-way for the widening of Hamilton Road, then those signs would be in the proposed right-of-way after it's acquired, if the process goes through. Canter stated so in understanding, we are going to talk about the proposed right-of-way in a minute; the signs as submitted and proposed are sitting or at least one of them is sitting on Schoedinger client's property; as we are speaking the representative of the property is speaking in opposition to the sign.

Tom Komlanc, City of Gahanna, Assistant City Engineer, stated the present right-of-way on Beecher Road is 60'; believe the pavement width on Beecher Road at the intersection is approximately 32 ft. wide which accommodates for an additional 12 to 14 ft. from the pavement to the actual right-of-way line; given the fact that there is open drainage ditch area, there would be a major concern with regards to the clear zone having the stones or signage placed that close within the right-of-way; concurs with O'Hare's concern with regard to the City's liability; we also had concern with the location on the private property, given the fact that it is in a location for a proposed right-of-way take; we would not want to be responsible for any cost associated with removing and replacing the signs at the time of construction. Peck asked Komlanc in regard to the narrow section on the southwest corner is that the existing unpaved portion of the right-of-way. Komlanc responded that the shaded section is a temporary right-of-way for construction

for grading purposes during the process of construction; going closer to Hamilton Road on the east side that would be the existing right-of-way line; within that location there is not a permanent take, it's just that the intersection proper on the west side is going to require a permanent take. Peck asked so of the two lines, the larger dotted line would be where the right-of-way is. Komlanc replied yes it would be the larger dashes. Peck confirmed with Komlanc that the expansion of the right-of-way is only proposed for the north of Beecher Road. Komlanc replied that is correct; the plans that we have right now indicate a property line which is actually the right-of-way; then there is a T going through the line that is shaded, this is indicating temporary; within our plan review with the consultant we indicated that this would have to be a total take as opposed to temporary because there are sections of the proposed pavement that would be within that; due to the fact there is a hold-up with the City of Columbus, a 48 inch water line on Hamilton Road; the right-of-way has not been cleared in regard to the final right-of-way take, so we are waiting on the consultant and Columbus' decision on how they are going to proceed.

Itkoff stated that no one informed him of this previous information prior to the meeting tonight; the copy of the drawing that I brought the Planning Commission was an original copy; was told that was how Beecher is presently; the one I'm seeing now, I've never seen before; done a lot of research from the Engineering Department of different proposed ways this was going to be; one time it was going to be taking part off of the north side of our part of Beecher in our living area, another part was that they were going to take a little bit off the south side; was aware that there would be new right-of-ways constructed; did not come here to propose let's okay it for future right-of-ways or variances, because I was going for the present; thought where our sign is presently was in the easement or the right-of-way; that was the main idea for having a sign in that same location; it would be something different; have been told that the present sign is an awful looking sign; the Commission has been looking many times for us to do something; so naturally we were trying to find some direction that we could go that can be moved; we have already made arrangements for this to be moved at the proper time at no expense to the City; the company that we are working with have the equipment to move the stone; was not of the concern that the City has; agree with the concern of the City; would imagine where Sycamore Mill is, where our present sign is, and various other areas that are close to the road buffered by some trees or shrubs; those are liabilities also; imagine some of those in other areas belong to the property owners; would like to have known a little more of what was and is actually going on.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:42 P.M.

Canter stated that she actually believes that the applicant, in good faith, made application that he thought would be acceptable; the applicant has been presented with information that he did not have before; perhaps this application should either be postponed or sent to workshop to allow the applicant to go back to the Academy Ridge Community Association and say that he did not realize that we are on private property; thought we were in the right-of-way; this would allow the applicant to revise his application so that the Association is not spending money foolishly; if he was given information by the City that he feels now was incorrect or unclear. Peck commented that it has been our practice that if a matter needs to be workshopped or at the request of a Commission member, if we are not prepared to vote on it, then we would certainly accommodate that request; asked the applicant if he felt taking the application to workshop would clear up some of the issues that have been raised this evening. Itkoff replied personally I have spent a lot of time on this project; having a lot of time to run around and do research is not something that falls into my everyday routine; my times are free generally after 5:00 P.M. or 7:00 P.M. and at that time most places are closed;

unless the Commission would be willing to help us through this, really don't know what else we can do. Greenblott commented to the applicant it appears that the only way this is going to work is if you move the stones back onto your property; asked is there a place that you could place the stones that would legally be on your property. Itkoff replied I guess the only place probably would be on the property owners of the first homes that are in the Academy Ridge area which is well within our property; probably would not serve as any help for anybody coming to the area other than telling them what street; we would probably lose the identity of Academy Ridge as it is unless the Commission or Council would be willing when the project is finished to allow some kind of sign on the street light pole that is currently there; the pole is owned by the City; would be willing to meet with the Commission in a workshop session. Greenblott asked would you be willing to speak to the property owners about the placement of the rocks in their yard. Itkoff stated that he has already pursued their interest with this; they have signed statements stating that they are willing to back our project whichever way it goes. Peck stated for clarification you are referring to the property owners in Academy Ridge not OSU. Itkoff said that is correct.

Chair advised that this application will be taken to workshop on 8/21/02 at 6:15 P.M.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

DR-0049-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at the entrance to the Academy Ridge Subdivision; Academy Ridge Comm. Assoc. by Coffman Stone Company, L.L.C., David A. Itkoff, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

S-0002-2002

To consider the Land Use Plan update; to make recommendation to Council for adoption of said plan.

D'Ambrosio said the plan has been updated and would ask for recommendation to send it on to Council tonight; Jefferson Township has seen the plan; you do have addendum to page 21.

Tom Liszkay, 457 Tresham Road, said he has been a resident since 1987; urge you to take the Land Use Plan back to drawing board will name specific reasons why he is asking this; Page 9, Mixed Use, certainly is a broad definition blended multi-family residential; office, commercial and neighborhood retail uses; definition covers any type of use; could put in any kind of use. Page 16, he would like to see Figure 4 taken out; picture of a house being bull dozed; do we really want that impression in our Land Use Plan; showing a single family home being torn down. Liszkay also addressed Hamilton Road house numbers 337 to 559 and said this is in the center of the Heartland Plan; could be redeveloped into office or multi-family; in the center of established residential neighborhoods; need to go back to where you were with the Heartland Plan; send back to the consultant.

D'Ambrosio said we certainly welcome the comments and Development does not have a problem taking this back to workshop; we can look at the Heartland Plan and double check. Greenblott said we did not allow commercial in the Heartland Plan, so that we could look at all applications as they come in; provide people right to sell their property, but look at plans on an individual basis.

Peck said the Land Use Plan will be scheduled for workshop it at 6:30 p.m.

Discussed

G. NEW BUSINESS:

FP-0003-2002

To amend FP-0002-2001 to allow development of Eastgate Industrial Center; Eastgate Industrial Center; by Jim Russell, applicant.

A motion was made, seconded by Vice Chairman Turley, D'Ambrosio said she is speaking on behalf of the applicant, the time of filing the plat expired and we want to try one more time for approval; would request recommendation to Council.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

A motion was made, seconded by Vice Chairman Turley, to recommend FP-0003-2002 to Council. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

SWP-0010-2002

To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 0.493 of acres; for property located on 738 Harrison Pond (Lot 330) - The Park at Harrison Pond "The Villages at Rocky Fork, Section 10, Part 2; EMH&T, Jeff Miller, applicant.

Jeff Miller stated that he is here to represent the lot split; essentially this lot was one of the larger lots in this subdivision; the split meets all the zoning requirements as far as frontage, depth, and square footage; more than exceeds those; this lot was originally sub-divided; it was the original home of the owner of the grounds when it was sub-divided; through their contract with the developer they were able to keep their home until such time they weren't around anymore; the lot is owned by the developer.

Chair asked for Opponents.

Melinda Umstead, 1235 Fareharm Drive, Lot 77, stated that her home is directly behind the lot where Sally Lewis currently lives; the people who live right beside her could not attend tonight, so you will find in an envelope their written statement and concerns; we picked out our lot in 2000 before it was even developed back there; we were shown all the literature; it was described that it would be The Greens at Clarenton and The Park at Harrison Pond; there was going to be some wooded area in between both of those subdivisions to divide us; as it is right now, the woods belong on Lewis's property; however, they were described to us as being the division part; there are also woods on the other side described the same way; those were already taken out by mistake, and they had to go back through M/I and correct that problem. We want to make sure that everything that was told to us as a community and neighbors is represented and you just don't go ahead and divide that land. We all paid premium prices for our land because of the mature aspect of our community; all the large trees and wildlife around it; great woods behind us; hate to see that taken away.

Cindy Hohenstein, 1237 Fareharm Drive, Lot 78, said they purchased their lot for the privacy of trees in the area; all wooded area owned by the City; were told that that is all an easement; that our property went 10 feet into the trees, and the rest of that was an easement so therefore it would stay as a mature tree area. Greenblott said you remember being told that it was owned by the City. Hohenstein said an easement. When they showed us the picture of the whole Greens at Clarenton they said all of the trees were a reserve owned by the City. Hohenstein said that the covenant says that lots cannot be split, and read from the covenant.

Ray Schaefer, 1239 Fairharm Drive, lot 79, said his property backs up to the property; was told he would want to develop his lot here because the other development is already developed and so no one is going to divide up any of the other properties and the woods will always be there; the trees; all he wanted to add; surprised that it was going to be divided and the trees taken down and replaced with a house.

Miller said the lot is still owned, and has always been owned, by HM/I Properties, they bought the land from Sally Lewis and allowed her to live on the property; couple points of clarification; if you have the EMH&T drawing for the lot split on the east side of the proposed split there is a 20' easement there. Peck said so according to this drawing there would be a 20' easement from lots 77, 78 and 79 into the proposed new lot. Miller said on the other side of their lots there is a lot line and then there is a 20' easement; all utilities are in so there is no reason that anyone can go inside that 20' easement for building unless they would get a variance. Miller said they could clear it but there are restrictions in the deed restrictions. O'Hare said there are restrictions in the covenants and you are asking us to change those. Miller said he thinks we need to get a legal opinion on that because that lot has not been sold, that is still owned by the subdivider. O'Hare said what he is reading says being lots number 327 thru 354 inclusive.

Peck said usually a lot split is not controversial; not have a whole lot of discretion if it meets zoning requirements; ask King to review; City generally does not get involved in deed restrictions; covenants; make sure everything is in order before we vote; will send to workshop 6:45 p.m.

Discussed

DR-0048-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at Olde Ridenour & Rivers Edge Way; by Signcom, Bruce Sommerfelt, applicant.

Jim Hartley, Signcom, said he is requesting approval of the sign for Rivers Edge. O'Hare asked if there was any lighting involved; Hartley said he does not foresee any; indirect landscape lighting would be all. O'Hare said the cable system is distracting; Hartley said they can take the guide wire off; may have to add a gusset in the corner but it would be unobtrusive. Turley also said it would look better without the guide wire.

Approved

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Turley, seconded by Greenblott, to approve DR-0048-2002 with elimination of the guide wire. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0050-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 560 OffiCenter Place; LCSi by Sign-A-Rama, Franklin P. Zura, applicant.

Frank Zura, Sign-A-Rama, said they are requesting sign face changes only; monument sign is currently at 560 Officenter Place, which would be the independent building basically right at the front of Morrison Road; already landscaped with approximately 145' of landscaping, and the only change that we are making is taking out the existing blank faces and putting in LCSi, Liberty Communication Services, Inc.

Canter said the current face is white; and Zura said yes and the current facings that are in there are aluminum blanks that we put in; old existing faces were taken out and he believes the old faces were also white; Grange, and they were white and blue also. Peck said that sign is out of character with the rest of the area; is there an improvement that we can make there to make it blend in better with the surrounding area. Zura said the

only other thing that we could do would be to change the color of the actual box itself and turn it to the same blue that the LCSi colors are.

Turley said a lot of the signs along I-270 have a bronze kind of background; would there be any way that this could be inserted into a bronze background; right next to it is the OffiCenter sign that is bronze; some way to make it blend; nice sign if the bronze background brought in. Zura said the sign is surrounded by brick on the bottom and also on the sides; framework off white or beige and is supposed to match the building behind; actually a little darker than what you see in the picture; they are adamant about using their logo. Turley said maybe it could be inset into a bronze background somehow; just come up with some way for this to harmonize with the sign that it is so close; which is an attractive sign; upgrade this a little bit. Zura said if we did that and we went to a duonotic bronze; if we stay in tune with everything else, we should paint the framework duonotic bronze or it will not look right; it can be done; major cost involved because we have very little room to get into some of the areas to paint it because of all the shrubbery; tell me what you want; cabinet needs to be painted too.

Zura will go to applicant and come back with some alternatives and then come back to workshop.

Discussed

DR-0051-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 100 Granville Street; Milanos Italian Food Express by Sign-A-Rama, Franklin P. Zura, applicant.

Frank Zura, Sign-A-Rama, said the signage being presented is via the new owner of the mall; putting in a food express; consequently, we are allowed to have according the Gahanna code, one lit sign which he has expressed that he would like to have and one facing east on Granville Street; currently Metro Market sign is there; we will be taking that sign down and we are requesting that we will be able to put this sign up in its place; if you notice in the picture, you see a lot of plywood; Milano's is planning to do a complete renovation next year. Peck asked if Milano's bought the building from the Pizza Plus people. Zura replied yes he did. Greenblott asked what is the color of the building facade. Zura stated that it is actually grey and maroon. Turley asked if Milano's is just going to occupy this one space. Zura said yes, just the one space where Metro Market was; there will be seating for 14; of course Italian food will be served; express carryout and catering; opens tomorrow; sign is 30" x 8 foot.

Approved

A motion was made to approve DR-51-2002, Milano's Italian Food Express. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0052-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 765 Hamilton Road; America's Urgent Care by Columbus Sign Company, Richard Mickalson, applicant.

Chuck Knapp, 1875 Tamarack Circle, Columbus, OH, stated he is here tonight to represent America's Urgent Care; the proposed signage revision will add the new logo to four signs at the site; on the four-sided kiosk on the corner of Hamilton and Johnstown Road, the new sign panel will be added to the lower kiosk on all four sides.

Spencer asked if there are four existing signs. Mickalson replied yes these are four

existing signs on the property now; they want to alter them to include America's Urgent Care name. Spencer asked if the existing urgent care sign was individual letters. Mickalson said yes. Spencer asked what would be the feasibility of achieving that for the proposed new building sign. Mickalson said it would not be a problem to produce this type of sign. Knapp stated that about 1 out of 5 patients come to the Gahanna facility our results show because of the location of the signage. Peck commented if we could retain the letters and keep the graphics the way you have proposed them, could support that. Greenblott replied that the Commission would need to see a sample as to how that would look because it is larger and do not want it spread across the entire building. Turley added how about if we said something like not to exceed the size of the existing sign. Peck stated that the only problem with that is that they are putting more words in. Greenblott asked are these replacement signs. Mickalson replied yes; on the monument sign, the upper kiosk face remains the same; existing address numbers remain un-changed; the background color matches the existing pylon. Turley asked is that the same material that is there now or is it carved out. Knapp replied that the material is aluminium; we would be applying a face to the face of the existing panel.

Chair advised that this application will be taken to workshop on 8/21/02.

Discussed

DR-0053-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 77 Mill Street; Julie Lyle Portrait Design by Color Text Inc., Shawn Bourk, applicant.

Julie Lyle stated there have been some changes in the actual sign; we will now be using Sherwin Paint; the Redwood which is now the PMS 1945 will change to Sundried Tomato which is SW2915 which is a dark burgundy; the actual redwood painted lettering that says portrait design would actually be a muslin which is a cream base; the cream that shows on the sign will actually be a riverway which is a little more muted or darker than what you actually see; the lamps will be black. Canter asked how does the burgundy look up against the brick. Lyle replied that the walls inside are painted burgundy; don't think it will clash with the burgundy. Canter asked the applicant to send a copy of the revisions to the City for the file.

A motion was made by O'Hare, seconded by Greenblott, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0054-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 82 Granville Street; Gahanna Grill by Sign-A-Rama, Franklin P. Zura, applicant.

Chair advised per the request of the Zoning Administrator, Bonnie Gard, this application has been postponed until the August 28th meeting.

Postponed to Date Certain to Planning Commission

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Committee of the Whole

Gahanna Jefferson Joint Committee - Canter.

Canter stated that we discussed agreements with the City and the Township for garage facility contracts; the renovation of the dispatching center at the police department is completed; operation will be up on October 1st; it is open for touring if anyone is interested in seeing the center; this is by appointment only; Wetherholt was in attendance and presented almost 18 roadway improvement topics; it was very extensive; is going to

effect the school; and of course they are not very happy about it; Jefferson Township did the same thing; they had four road closings and renovations; Fire Department has started using foam; foam uses 5% of the water; causing less damage to homes and businesses; Mifflin Township is going to do the walk thru of the schools before school starts; both Townships asked that shelter be provided to the EMT people that serve during Holiday Lights and Creekside Days, etc.; regarding the schools, there will be a new scoreboard; they are going to sell advertising on the scoreboard.

Creekside Development Team - Greenblott.

Greenblott stated that they changed the building; they changed the tower to a structure (a covered mill house); thinks it looks good.

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

City Attorney.

King stated to Peck that he was correct when he stated in reference to the SWP, that the City does not normally get involved enforcing deed restrictions; this lot split probably violates their deed restrictions. Turley said so they have legal recourse, just not with us. King replied that is correct,

City Engineer - No Report

Department of Development.

D'Ambrosio stated that she will be getting married in 17 days.

Chair.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS.

Chair advised that the Planning Commission has received a letter from an attorney on behalf of Mr. Worlin; this letter has been referred to the City Attorney for appropriate response.

SWP-0009-2002

To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 0.917 acres; for property located on 4680 N. Hamilton Road; Continental Real Estate, Sean Cullen, applicant. Approved Administratively on July 25, 2002 by Zoning Administrator, Bonnie Gard.

Clerk advised that this application was administratively approved on July 25, 2002.

Approved

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

L. ADJOURNMENT - 9:03 P.M.

DONNA L. JERNIGAN, CMC
Deputy Clerk of Council

Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Planning Commission, this
day of 2012.*

Chair Signature