

# **City of Gahanna**

*200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, June 28, 2000**

**7:00 PM**

**City Hall**

## **Planning Commission**

*David B. Thom, Chairman  
Candace Greenblott, Vice Chairman  
Cynthia G. Canter, Commission Member  
Paul J. Mullin, Commission Member  
Richard A. Peck, Commission Member  
Phillip B. Smith, Commission Member  
Jane Turley, Commission Member  
Isobel L. Sherwood, Clerk*

**Members Present:** Phillip B. Smith, Paul J. Mullin, Richard Peck, Cynthia G. Canter and David B. Thom

---

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

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, 200 South Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio, on Wednesday, June 28, 2000. The agenda for this meeting was published on June 23, 2000. Chair David B. Thom called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission Member Greenblott.

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

Chair added Z-0010-2000 to the agenda under Applications and following DR-00382000.

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None.**

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

Nick Hogan, 1040 Venetian Way, stated he had tremendous respect for Planning Commission; agree with 98% of your decisions; are some disturbing facts with the way Council is acting; namely they are bypassing Planning Commission and going against Charter with regard to the development of Creekside; only reason the Loop Study came to you was that I demanded it be done; for the record, I am in favor of development of Creekside; just may disagree on how its accomplished; there is no approved plan in existence today for approval of Creekside; have spent \$2 million purchasing two pieces of property; have not received a cost benefit analysis on this yet; where you come into play is that there was a memo from the Development Director in Council packet and Planning Commission was not copied stating that Council was being asked by Development and by the CIC to approve the Creekside Concept Plan; when it came before us Monday night every member said to put it on for introduction, don't bring it back to committee, and have it on consent agenda for 2nd reading; questioned status of Planning Commission's recommendation; Weber concurred that we should refer to you; when that was said, Angelou stated you could approve it tonight and we'd have it for passage on next meeting; this project is being greased; it is going through too quickly; ask you to refer to 11.03 of the Charter which is your powers and duties; City Council is acting as a Planning Commission and it is inappropriate; this plan should be before you; 11.04 of the Charter talks about mandatory referral; if not done then plan would be null and void and not in effect; don't know what it will take but maybe Peck going to City Attorney and requiring Council to follow the Charter; I want concept plan but also want Public Hearings which aren't going to be held; Peck had a problem with the previous plan; this is just phase 1 of the original huge plan; once they move to phase 2 you have the original plan; you have the power and the duty to make sure you review all these plans; will make a request of Council to let you have 180 days to review; Charter calls for 90 days; want you to review it; Charter calls for it and I won't allow any more plans to be approved by Council until you look at them; one other point; Thom was at CIC in June and there was no mention of this; was no action by CIC to recommend to Council for passage; no mention at May meeting either; don't know how it could be recommended without formal action; you have duty to review all plans; is not your fault they are not coming; hopefully it will be sent to you; will be requesting the ordinance for adoption of the Creekside Plan is removed from the agenda; will ask for referral to Planning Commission; know you will do what is best for the City.

White stated this was taken to Council; they refer plans back; they asked for plan to be put in different format; am currently working with Groves on that; will be postponed if I don't have the revisions on Thursday; 2 members of this Commission are on as liaisons so Planning Commission has not been omitted from the process.

**E. APPLICATIONS:**

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

**FDP-0009-2000**

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of a warehouse building; for property located at 715 Science Blvd; John Ingwersen by Columbus Consulting, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Chair asked for proponents. There were none. Chair asked for opponents. There were none. Chair stated applicant has requested postponement.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Chair assigned to workshop on July 5 at 6:15 p.m.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**DR-0037-2000**

Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a warehouse building.

See discussion on previous application.

**Discussed**

**FDP-0010-2000**

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of an office building; for property at Taylor Station Road and Cross Pointe Road, Crossroads Commerce Center; Donald Kenney by Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Richard Fisher, Collaborative Design, 5880 Sawmill Road, Dublin, stated he needed to present a new landscaping plan along with example of glazing for the building; we have provided both of those items.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Greenblott stated it was her understanding after speaking with the Assistant City Engineer that applicant would widen entrance to an access of 36' in width; widening to the east to allow for 1 inbound and 2 outbound lanes. Applicant stated they had agreed to do that.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:22 p.m.

**A motion was made, seconded by Canter, to approve conditioned upon the widening to the east of the access drive to 36' accommodating 1 inbound and 2 outbound lanes.. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes        5        Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom**

**DR-0038-2000**

Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of an office building.

Greenblott stated she had looked at landscaping plan and felt it was inadequate; need to add more landscaping; feel we need to triple the number of trees shown, using a combination of deciduous and evergreen. Canter noted she was more concerned with the Taylor Station frontage; want that tripled. Applicant stated they would agree to that; will triple the trees on three sides. Greenblott stated she found the blue glazing to be acceptable.

**A motion was made to approve DR-0038-2000 with the understanding that applicant will triple the number of trees shown on the plans specifically on three sides excluding Cross Pointe Road.. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes        5        Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom**

**Z-0010-2000**

To consider a zoning change application to rezone 32.952 acres from ER-1 to L-AR, Limited Overlay Apartment Residential; for property located at 5099-5145 Morse Road; Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., by Glen Dugger, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, OH 43215, stated he was present representing the applicant who is the contract purchaser; couple of issues we wanted to cover that were loose issues coming out of workshop; understand there is an additional question on open space; feel it would be appropriate to continue to discuss at workshop; can get some of the other issues out of the way; were asked at workshop if the density of condominiums was similar to Polo Club development to the west; checked those numbers; our density is 5.75 units per acre and Polo Club taken on a whole is 5.72; essentially identical from density standpoint; have been engaged in a whole continuous discussion with Vic Stanson for quite a good length of time; been working with him on developmental issues that are of question and concern to him; most of those questions are technical design and engineering issues; have a two page letter agreement with him that specify all the things we are going to do; have provided that to Stanson and he has given us in return a letter of support; will get them to you at next meeting; met with Condo Assoc. and have answered their questions; they are not opposed to this project although they are not able to say they are in support; intended at request of staff to make a minor change to accommodate a point Mullin raised in workshop last week about the Riva Ridge connector; have a design for that which is an overlay to take the center connection and show how we would provide a back way in; have done a design study and incorporated it into final development plan; will go further in workshop next week; final point was the conditional use application; have filed a conditional use application but have been advised by staff it is not necessary; in Limited Overlay for those provisions that would be conditional uses, if mentioned in text then no conditional use is necessary; if not specified in text then a conditional use would be necessary; we would have needed two conditional uses; one because 4 buildings exceed two story which requires a conditional use; also the apartments and the age restricted units exceed 8 units per building which also requires a conditional use; have addressed and resolved that issue by inserting those provisions in text; that is a text amendment we need to make to completely put in lock step; do have some open issues concerning the open space dedication; discuss with you at workshop next week; fairly long history of open space dedication and preservation amongst newly developed properties - Villas at White Oak, Greens at Clarenton, condos at Harrison Pond; staff has indicated to us that it can be provided for in open space dedication; is perfectly acceptable to us; come back to workshop; were a couple of other text amendments handed to me tonight; will look at those between now and workshop; happy to answer any questions.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m.

Chair assigned to workshop on July 5 at 6:15 p.m.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**V-0014-2000**

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1167.18c(1), Screening of Trash Containers or Receptacles, to permit dumpster in front of building, 184 W. Johnstown Road; Ed Hanawalt, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:37 p.m.

Ed Hanawalt, 184 West Johnstown Road, stated he was requesting a variance to put dumpster in front of his building; no other location on lot will work.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:38 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Smith stated he felt there were special circumstances on this location that would render it inaccessible; is a special circumstance to continue to enjoy his property rights; can support only because of the special circumstances.

**A motion was made by Mullin to approve V-0014-2000 to permit a trash dumpster to be place din front of building at 184 West Johnstown Road, with the stipulation that should minimum acceptable access to the rear of said property be acquired or otherwise made available to allow the dumpster to be relocated to the rear of said property, then this variance approval shall become null, void, and of no further effect.. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes      5      Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom**

**HOP-0002-2000**

To consider a Home Occupation Permit to allow for a mail order candle and supply business thru Internet; 463 Old Mill Drive, Herbert Schaeffer, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m.

Patti Schaeffer, 463 Old Mill Drive, stated this was a side business; work for a law firm during the day; make candles and soaps and teach candlemaking for the wonderment of aroma therapy.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Thom asked if this was a mail order business. Schaeffer stated she does make some candles for resale; and do some supply; teach candle making; have other partners and we all do some out of our houses; may be a little coming and going picking up things.

Peck stated he was a little confused; is this a mail order business. Schaeffer stated she does make some candles; have a wholesale account to supply Fado's at Easton as well as one other store in Grandview area; rest of it is mail order supply; we sell the supplies, box them up and go to post office and ship.

Canter questioned the teaching of classes in home. Schaeffer stated it was an e-mail list and people ask questions and I answer; are more of a cyber class. In response to question on the volume of supplies kept on hand for manufacturing aspect, Schaeffer stated she has little bowls of dye and fragrant oils and miscellaneous other supplies;

keep about 400 lbs of wax at a time; is a non toxic mineral oil base wax with a 400 degree flash point.

Canter stated they had received a letter from Fire Department that stated both Fire Prevention Officers have concerns; feel it is dangerous and flammable although they did not see location of business, they assumed basement is being used which creates a further hazard in an emergency for access purposes; as a use group, they felt this is a business, not a hobby and creates a moderate hazard; felt with volume they should not be in a house and a residential neighborhood. Schaeffer stated she had not seen the letter; only 10% of business involves the pouring of candles; rest is shipping to candle makers; may make one candle and post on Internet with instructions and then people purchase the kits.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:45 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Peck noted Section 1177.05 of the code which governs our actions in this regard; noted we can place conditions; are required to deny if criteria are not met; had some concerns reviewing the application; don't have a concern with the cyber classes and those aspects; if this did not involve manufacture of goods and shipping of supplies, would feel better about it; if everything was done on the computer and that required the home occupation permit, would have no problem with it but there are aspects that trouble me; concerned with valid concerns raised by the Division of Fire; understand you have not seen that; even if we could get an answer with regard to flash point and manufacturing candles at this residence, believe it would still involve a heating process; code requires me not to support this application in its current form.

Mullin stated he did concur with Peck with respect to concerns from the Fire Department; find it difficult to go against their concerns when there is a concern on life, health, safety and welfare.

Thom concurred stated he did not have a problem with classes; do have a problem with manufacturing; are safety issues; also doing mail order; is the potential for a lot of traffic generation.

Schaeffer stated she could supply a materials safety sheet to the Fire Department.

right to appeal to BZA. must be filed within 20 days;

**A motion was made by Peck, seconded by Canter, that this matter be Approved. The motion failed by the following vote:**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>No</b>	<b>5</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

Chair stated the applicant had the right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days; contact Clerk's office for further information.

**V-0015-2000**

To consider a variance application to vary SEction 1145.06(a), Yard Requirements, to allow a reduction in the front yard setback; for proeprty located at 411 Banbury Drive; Ohio Energy Contractors, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:55 p.m.

Tim Madison, 502 S. Third St., Columbus, stated he was with Ohio Energy Contractors; Richard and Mona Stone are homeowners and are also present; requesting a 4' variance from front yard setback to put in a 10' x 25' 3 season room; feel there are special circumstances that do exist here; property sits back further on street than neighbors to the north and to the south; this addition to the property would bring it more in conformity with surrounding properties even though we are asking for a 4' variance; is a 3 season glass and screen enclosed room.

Smith questioned why put this addition on the front; appears to be ample room in the back. Madison stated the home sits back and the front of the home needs improvement; they are not happy with the appearance; felt this was a way to improve the appearance from the front.

Richard Stone, 411 Banbury Drive, stated the original plan was a room; price was beyond our reach; this is just a porch with a roof, on a concrete slab; just wanted a porch to sit and visit with people; didn't want to go to some building concept for seniors but have a little retirement home to ourselves; wanted to put a swing and some chairs out on the porch and look at the neighborhood; feel it would enhance the area; there is no corrugated roof and lumber; want it to look nice; this was presented to us and felt it was superior to others patio enclosures we had seen; talked to my neighbors and they had no problems with the request; did not think we were infringing on the line; didn't survey but line of porch would line up with other homes; room was considered initially but can't afford.

Mona Stone, 411 Banbury, stated if they were not allowed the size they want, would be willing to go along with a smaller size; willing to drop back from distance; just want, in our old age, to sit on the porch and enjoy ourselves.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Mullin asked what a temo roof was. Madison replied it was a premanufactured roof; did make a mistake; this is not an enclosed room; just a porch; have drawings here; can't give you technical specifications; Temo is a national manufacturer of sun rooms and roofing systems; Temo is the manufacturer. Mullin asked about material. Madison stated he believe it was a shingled roof; don't have specifications.

Thom stated the encroachment would be 4'; requesting a 10' x 25' porch; code says they could have a 6' x 25' porch; Mrs. Stone says they wouldn't have objection to doing smaller; why not just drop back to 6'.

Stone stated they wanted the roof lines to match; didn't want to take away from look of house; from roof down comes to 25'; that's why we figured 10' to match the roof line; is a premanufactured roof; they put together; he's demonstrated and it wouldn't dent or anything like that. Thom asked if this roof went up would it match the front of the house totally; reiterated they can stay in setback by going to a 6' x 25' porch instead of a 10' x 25' porch; would be acceptable by code and would not need our approval. Stone stated that he did not think the smaller porch would be as visually pleasing.

Peck stated if neighbors are on building setback line, and we approve this, the porch would be 4' in front of the neighbors as opposed to being 6' behind them; have concern about going over that building setback because the area was developed with smaller lots; an encroachment on that front setback line would be more noticeable than on some other lots. Canter stated she did not believe a hardship had been shown.

Madison stated that 6' is a narrow area for a porch. Mullin noted it was not our concern as to what they build within the setback area; if construction was at or behind the established building setback it would be perfectly legal and within code and would not require any action of this Commission. Madison stated he believed it would be a special circumstance to bring the home into conformity with other homes in the area; are no opponents here; feel it would be an improvement .

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:06 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Peck stated he understands the request and am empathetic to a request to improve the home and character of the neighborhood; is a lot of merit to this plan; but do have concern; am not convinced that the adjacent property owners would not be harmed; if by granting this variance it would merely bring their property in line with adjacent property owners, everyone else to north and south would have had to get a variance; otherwise they would also be encroaching; don't believe that's the case; would like to work with them to achieve their goals; but by and large don't believe special circumstances exist to warrant going 4' into setback; can't support.

Canter stated that special circumstances in Section 1131.03 have not been met; don't believe lining up buildings or porches with neighbor qualifies for special circumstances; if not built according to setback lines that 's something the City needs to investigate; don't believe this variance is necessary to enjoy substantial property rights; they can build a porch within the setback and enjoy substantial property rights.

Thom stated he would concur with some comments made; can see no hardship that 10' is needed when 6' would suffice; setting further back by adding porch and granting variance sets a precedent for neighbors that would want to add on and encroach into front yard setback; will not support.

**A motion was made by Smith that this matter be Approved. The motion failed by the following vote:**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>No</b>	<b>5</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

Chair stated the applicant had the right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days; contact Clerk's office for further information.

**V-0016-2000**

To consider a recommendation to Council on a variance application to vary Section 1105.10(c), Development of Land Within Plat; to allow construction of a building prior to completion and dedication of required improvements; for property located in Crossroads Commerce Center; Donald R. Kenney, applicant. RECOMMENDED in a 6-1 vote on June 28, 2000.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 8:10 p.m.

Ronald Davis, 341 S. 3rd St., Columbus, stated he was an attorney representing Donald Kenney; attempting to start construction on lots 3 and 5; wish to access those lots by way of an undedicated street; wish to use another means of access for construction purposes; have contract with buyer for one lot; closing date is long past; client stands to lose favorable financing; the longer we delay we run into building problems; don't see



that there are any problems created by making the request; need a building permit to begin and code requires that streets be constructed and accepted prior to issuing of building permit; occupancy of the buildings will not happen until everything is complete.

Sadicka White, Director of Development, stated this request is for lots 3 and 5 only; have concurrence with Tom Weber regarding this applicant's request ; code says a building permit can't be issued unless all improvements and infrastructure has been accepted by Council; anticipate this action around the end of August; been working with one of the tenants for lot 5 which is Ometek who is an existing business; will be consolidating and expanding at same time; have 4 smaller buildings in industrial area; building an 87,000 s.f. warehouse office building with immediate capability of expanding an additional 43,000 s.f. and plans to increase to 150 to 200 employees from 120 employees in next 3 to 5 years; this is what TIZ was planned to do; retain and expand; is underwritten by a TIF mechanism; City captures that revenue stream; also helps us to secure the fact that infrastructure will be completed; fail safe because we capture that income stream; only pay it back as improvements are there; window between completion and time frame to go through Planning Commission and Council is fairly short but applicant needs to start developing; construction easement from Blatt Blvd. will be provided so they will have access and not disrupt the continued construction of the road; under Section 1103.02 City Council, after a recommendation by Planning Commission, can grant this variance; part of this whole development was the extension of our eastern sewer; has been some issues related to acquiring all those easements; do have alternative plan proposed by engineering; intricacies of TIF agreement and getting infrastructure in place has precluded them from being able to develop; have provided a letter on behalf of applicant that should a variance be granted to allow them to get building permits, they would not hold City liable for that should we be unable to complete the sewer liens, water lines, or streets prior to completion of the building, and understand that this just allows them to begin to build; asking Planning Commission for a positive recommendation.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:18 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Canter stated that although hardship was not sufficient in prior case, feel this variance application does have special circumstances as to the use referred to and is necessary for enjoyment of substantial property rights; don't enter into lightly; this is only the second time asked in my tenure.

Peck stated that in reading Section 1105.10(c) read that section purpose to be competing interest and different fingers of the pie; street projects are underway; sewer, water and gas then go in; all interrelated and yet operate independently; believe this is unique and special in that center is being developed by one entity; TIF is being captured; bonds are underwritten by owner; purpose of Section 1105.10 is to prevent development and possible occupancy before the nuts and bolts are crossed; series of competing interests and independent interests; believe that in this case the risk of every incentive for these people to be together is there as he is on hook for whole thing; special circumstances exist; can support.

Mullin stated he didn't agree that special circumstances exist; precipitated because City has been unable to provide sanitary sewer service to the site which would allow developer to proceed with construction of the street and right of way improvements and

get the necessary acceptance and dedication taken care of under the requirements of the subdivision ordinance; have a difficult time supporting a variance for development of this type when the cause of the variance is the City itself; something would be extremely hesitant to consider this if the application was made by a private developer for reasons that seem just as compelling to him as City has put forth; need to follow what code says; put here for good reason - to assure that property and utility services are provided to buildings on a timely and complete basis; unfortunate we don't have at this point in time but can't support a variance of this type.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**A motion was made by Canter to recommend to Council the approval of V-0016-2000 conditioned upon the acceptance of the developer's letter absolving the City of harm.**

. The motion carried by the following vote:

<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom
<b>No</b>	<b>1</b>	Mullin

**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

**DR-0039-2000**

Certificate of Appropriateness for Sign installed without permit M & S Inc.; 345 Granville Street; Debbie Smith by Frank Zura/Sign-a-Rama.

Frank Zura, 64 Granville Street, stated he was operator of Sign-A-Rama; did review with owner discussion in workshop last week; certain requests were asked of me; has no problem with landscaping; no problem with painting of the aluminium slats to match sign; last issue to either remove the channel letters on wall for Judy's or have slats taken off sign she was rather opposed to as Judy's wall signage had been approved and code allows both signs; requesting you give consideration to that.

In response to question from Thom, White stated applicant has right to both signs as code is written; applicant is willing to paint the wall and make sure letters have been aligned and coordination with what you may feel looks better.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Peck stated he appreciated Zura spending the extra time; now understand that when it came back it was brought up as a starting point for further discussion; wish that I had realized that at beginning of the process; unfortunately our earlier discussions took on needlessly confrontational tone; appreciate you being willing to work with us within the limitations of the sign code; subject to conditions stipulated can support; also appreciate Debbie Smith's willingness to work with current tenant.

**Discussed**

**A motion was made, seconded by Canter, to approve DR-39-2000 conditioned upon the changing of the background so it matches from top to bottom and keeping the stripes in between and the addition of 50 s.f. of landscaping.. The motion carried by the following vote:**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>5</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom
------------	----------	---

**DR-0036-2000**

Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a free standing, single face sign mounted to existing fence; property located at the corner of Cherry Bottom Road and Cherry Way Drive; Charles Penzone by The New Albany Company.

D'Ambrosio stated that applicant had called and requested postponement in order to take

to workshop; stated he was working on different designs based on discussion at workshop last week.

Chair assigned this item to workshop on 7:00 p.m. on July 5.

**Discussed**

**G. NEW BUSINESS:**

**DR-0041-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for expansion of parking; for property located at 825 Taylor Road; Wolfking, Inc., applicant.

James Rudy, 444 S. Front St., stated they were proposing, as shown on the site plan, adding some additional paving to rear loading dock to allow for some staging area when they load trucks; will be in the southwest corner; some parking spaces get taken up for loading; trying to free up parking they currently have; will be screened all around that paved area which is indicated upon the final page of the drawing; before and after pictures of wall were submitted; will match existing split face block on building and fence will be continued up to meet that screen wall;

Greenblott asked if they would be willing to consider adding some landscaping to soften that brick wall. Rudy stated he believed they would be willing to do so; have a photo that shows the addition of some landscaping; Mullin asked what will be staged in that area. Jan Kuhlmann, 1246 Poppy Hills Drive, Blacklick, stated he was President of Wolfking; problem is that we are growing out of our location; ran out of parking first; since we moved in 5 years ago now have more than 50 employees and don't have enough parking; in the back we load food processing equipment onto trucks and use parking spaces that are back there; proposing to put this area up so we can get out of parking lot and into the staging area instead; believe you will recognize we want to keep this a good looking facility; spent money after road improvements were done; will put in landscaping so new wall doesn't look out of place; equipment is staged in that area that is loaded onto trucks.

**Discussed**

**A motion was made by Smith, seconded by Mullin, to approve DR-0041-2000 subject to addition of landscaping around the wall on both sides of the wall surrounding the staging area.. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes 5** Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

**DR-0042-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 119 N. Stygler Road; Gahanna Soccer Association, applicant.

Rick Neuberger, 500 Agler Road, stated this is a non profit organization; since 1984 over 1800 kids and adults have been allowed the opportunity to play; is an all volunteer organization; 25% of our operation is this with other 75% run out of my house; are obtaining an office space in Royal Plaza Shopping Center; existing sign face on wall; this is a replacement face. In response to question from Smith, Neuberger stated the blue was the standard royal blue used by the organization.

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

**Yes 5** Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

**DR-0043-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 690 Morrison Road; Plaza Tapatia of Columbus, Inc., applicant.

Richard Monroe, Sign Lite, stated that Tapatia operates Casa Fiesta also; proposing at this address a sign replacement; is a modern building and would like to attract attention

from the freeway and from Morrison Road; with the setback, am proposing open face channel letters to the colors and specifications you should have drawings of; the western wall consists of 2' channel letters with red neon and green neon on hat; red neon on letters; does light up at night.

Greenblott stated this is a modern building; does it have to have cactus and sombrero. Monroe stated they could be dropped. Canter asked if applicant had even seen the Cafe 55 sign that was originally on the building; Cafe 55 was a great sign. Greenblott asked if we still had pictures of the sign. Canter stated the sign was not quite this bright although it did have red in it; was a deeper red. Turley asked if these were corporate colors. Monroe stated they are the standard colors used by this corporation. Greenblott stated that losing the cactus and sombrero would benefit the sign. Mullin agreed. Turley questioned if there was any change to background. Monroe stated that everything else remains the same; will be installed to national electric code and UL specifications; building facade is brushed aluminum so no painting is involved. In response to question from Turley, Monroe stated it is a 63" dimension; should have a scale drawing; largest lettering is 24". Canter asked if there was any way to remotely make it look like the Cafe 55 sign. Monroe stated this is the basic sign they use; felt the block style letter was more readable than the script style used by Cafe 55.

**Discussed**

**A motion was made by Mullin to approve DR-0043-2000 conditioned upon the sign simply being the name of the business, Plaza Tapatia, and Restaurante Mexicano with no images of sombreros, cacti, or other national symbols appearing.. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes            5        Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom**

**DR-0044-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for building renovation; for property located at 110 N. Hamilton Road; McDonald's Restaurants, applicant.

Pam DeDent, Baker & Hosteleter, 65 State St., Columbus stated she was an attorney for McDonalds; asking for approval for exterior changes to color scheme to restaurant at 100 N. Hamilton; Ray Risska is here to answer any questions you may have.

Ray Risska, McDonald's, 2 Easton Oval, Suite 200, Columbus, stated that the corporation is relaunching their brand; increasing service and improving food quality; adopted this standard look 2 months ago; came to Development Department with a small rendering and asked for their input; nobody really cared for it; at that point started looking at different facilities that were newer but seem to be a standardization; Bob Evans has their red roof and corporate look trademark building; Big Boy also has the corporate roof and canopy with a cupola; Rite Aid is a brick building but uses their corporate blue; same thing with Boston Market; they have a brick facade but it is their corporate look. Greenblott noted it is a corporate look but with modifications to suit the Planning Commission. Risska stated they went back and looked at what had been approved and what the Commission is looking for; we have kept all the brick in this proposal when our original plan was to paint it white. Greenblott asked if there was a site they could visit to see this new corporate look; something similar to this building. Risska stated there was one in Reynoldsburg that has been converted but is not quite the same as this location; it does have a similar roof line that would be the same; would like to paint this roof at this time with a plan to redevelop this site in 3 to 4 years; to put metal roof on now would be extremely expensive. Risska continued that Reynoldsburg location is at Main and Brice; believe we just painted one in Clintonville at Weber and High; Hamilton and Fairway in Whitehall was an old brown brick building; this is a starting point as to what is similar; that roof with our brick. Thom asked if all McDonald's restaurants will be converting. Risska stated they would be, including the

franchisees but excluding the Classic restaurants. Peck stated there is a location on Maxtown Road that is brand new; is more appropriate and shows what they can do with redevelopment. Peck stated that Shell Oil was in a while ago on signage with a change to convert to a world wide recognition; do have a certain empathy but McDonald's at Maxtown and Rt. 3 doesn't look anything like any of these buildings. In response to question, Risska stated they did believe they will have a sales increase due to this corporate image. Turley stated this location was slightly different; is a subdued complex of office buildings. Greenblott stated Turley had a good point; this is a more subdued area as it is surrounded by offices; would like to see something a little more subdued.

Thom stated this would be discussed in workshop next week; gives Commission a chance to see some of the ones that have been painted; if you can come up with a list of any others, let us know; possibly come to some agreement next week and put on for July 12. Peck stated this was a good starting point; feel current location could use sprucing up; feel we can work with you to accomplish that; move closer towards subduing or some differences that would make this more unique. In response to question, Risska stated roof will still look like shingles; won't be a flat roof. In response to question from Thom, Risska stated the playland will continue and fence will be painted.

**Discussed**

**FP-0004-2000**

To consider a final plat application for 15.963 acres known as The Greens at Clarenton, Section 1, Part 2; EMH&T, applicant.

Mark Ward, EMH&T, 170 Mill St., stated this final plat is for M/I and Greens at Clarenton; is 46 lots on 15 acres; was previously approved and plat expired; could not get it recorded in time; hooks into Harrison Pond Section 10, Part 2; happy to answer any questions. Canter asked if this was 100% identical; just the formality of reapproving. Ward stated that was correct.

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

Yes        5        Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

**H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**CIC**

Thom stated he attended his first CIC meeting the day before Creekside Festival; presentation of proposed Creekside Concept; some members saw it at Creekside reception the next night; heard Hogan earlier tonight speak to the issue of where it goes next; at that particular meeting there was no discussion as to what direction the concept was going to head or any proposal put forward; CIC made recommendation to take to Council; he is correct in reading of April and May minutes that the issue was not addressed; next meeting is July 10 at 8:00 a.m. at Heartland Bank.

**Creekside Development Team**

Greenblott stated the plan had been shown at the dinner; went into a little more detail; they presented the conceptual plan and that was it.

D'Ambrosio stated it has never been the intent to exclude Planning Commission; have had several plans up to this point; have not been happy with detail; need to get to point where we are happy with what we can present.

**I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:**

**Chair - Special Sign Committee**

Thom stated that at quarterly meeting talked about a special sign committee; will meet on workshop evenings during our workshops; would be to review and recommend possible revisions or additions to sign code; will assign Smith and Turley to that committee to serve along with Development Department representatives; need to get started on that as quickly as possible.

**J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS: None.**

**K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.**

Turley stated she will be meeting with the Creekside Design Review Committee for our first meeting.

**L. ADJOURNMENT: 9:10 p.m.**

Motion by Smith, seconded by Turley.

\_\_\_\_\_  
ISOBEL L. SHERWOOD, CMC/AAE  
Clerk of Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC**  
Clerk of Council

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair Signature