

From: [Tom Cartwright](#)
To: [Robert Priestas](#)
Cc: [Michael Blackford](#); [Kayla Holbrook](#); gdugger@smithandhale.com; jsugar@arshot.com; [CouncilStaff](#); [Kelly Wicker](#)
Subject: Re: 1041 Hamilton Road project
Date: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 1:11:07 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image018.png](#)
[image030.png](#)
[image031.png](#)
[image032.png](#)
[image033.png](#)
[image034.png](#)
[image035.png](#)
[image037.png](#)
[image038.png](#)
[image040.png](#)
[image041.png](#)
[image042.png](#)

Robert
Thanks for your responses.
Best
Tom

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 24, 2018, at 1:06 PM, Robert Priestas <Robert.Priestas@gahanna.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. Cartwright,

Please see below for a few additional responses.

Have a good day,

Rob

ROBERT S. PRIESTAS, P.E.

Director of Engineering
Department of Public Service and Engineering



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.
Gahanna, Ohio 43230
614.342.4055
614.342.4155(fax)

robert.priestas@gahanna.gov
www.gahanna.gov



<image005.png>



<image014.png> <image016.png>



Twitter@CityOfGahanna

From: Michael Blackford
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 11:58 AM
To: Kayla Holbrook <Kayla.Holbrook@gahanna.gov>; tom cartwright <thcartwright@gmail.com>; gdugger@smithandhale.com; jsugar@arshot.com; CouncilStaff <councilstaff@gahanna.gov>
Cc: Kelly Wicker <Kelly.Wicker@gahanna.gov>; Robert Priestas <Robert.Priestas@gahanna.gov>
Subject: RE: 1041 Hamilton Road project

Mr. Cartwright,

Below are a few responses to some of the questions you have raised. See you tomorrow night.

MICHAEL BLACKFORD, AICP

Deputy Director
Department of Planning & Development

<IMAGE029.JPG>
CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.
Gahanna, Ohio 43230
614-342-4029
614-342-4129 (fax)
michael.blackford@gahanna.gov
www.Gahanna.gov



From: Kayla Holbrook
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 4:05 PM
To: tom cartwright <thcartwright@gmail.com>; gdugger@smithandhale.com; jsugar@arshot.com; CouncilStaff <councilstaff@gahanna.gov>
Cc: Michael Blackford <Michael.Blackford@gahanna.gov>; Kelly Wicker <Kelly.Wicker@gahanna.gov>; Robert Priestas <Robert.Priestas@gahanna.gov>
Subject: RE: 1041 Hamilton Road project

Mr. Cartwright. I received your email and forwarded it to our City Engineer and Deputy Director of Planning & Development.

I will also forward to Council and Planning Commission per your request.

KAYLA HOLBROOK

Deputy Clerk of Council
Council Office



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.

Gahanna, Ohio 43230

614.342.4090 (x 4093)

kayla.holbrook@gahanna.gov

www.gahanna.gov



<image039.png>



From: tom cartwright [<mailto:thcartwright@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 8:07 AM

To: gdugger@smithandhale.com; jsugar@arshot.com; CouncilStaff

<councilstaff@gahanna.gov>

Subject: Re: 1041 Hamilton Road project

One additional question which relates to question 2 below.

13. Please show specific renderings or detailed descriptions of any landscape buffer along Beecher which is essentially a residential street. Include committed set back and tree preservation as well as any other landscape and visual buffer plans.

On Apr 18, 2018, at 8:12 PM, tom cartwright
<thcartwright@gmail.com> wrote:

To all,

I am an adjacent homeowner and I wanted to send some of the questions prior to the meeting on Wed. 25 April. I would appreciate responses as possible in advance, or at a minimum at the meeting. I recognize the timeline may be short, but with 7 days notice for us it is the quickest I could review. And I may have more questions at the meeting as I take additional time to review in more detail. I have noted who I believe the accountable party is for the specific question, but please weigh in on additional items as appropriate.

I would appreciate acknowledgment of receipt of this email.

1. Please provide a arial satellite view with the development superimposed as is typically standard with most real estate developments. The satellite view that is included in the Trans documentation is completely inaccurate in that the development shading basically extends to our back porch which means it significantly encroaches on our legal property. Please provide a corrected copy via the prior request. - **Developer**

2. Please provide additional detail including renderings of the entire development with landscaping details. What is included seems inadequate to understand the visual appeal of the development and

there is very little description of such in the text.

And be specific about what the back of the West building will look like since it is adjacent to residential property- **Developer**

3. I assume there will be no approval without a commitment as to the actual design and lot layout. The text and renderings here leave far too much discretion to the developer as to the actual design, lot layout, and aesthetics.

Is that correct that a final committed design, lot layout, and material plan will be required before final approval?

It seems like this is even more important since the developer is seeking a variance with respect to the required design – **City The renderings are provided within the Design Review application. The applicant has provided renderings for two of the three buildings. The third building for which there is no rendering will require an additional Design Review application and approval/denial by the Planning Commission.**

- Is there a better design including facade materials and architectural design? - **Developer**

NB What is rendered herein strikes me as a standard steel and glass basic strip center, especially the building to the West which looks odd to be of a different (cheaper) design than the other building.

4. The site plan shows 3 buildings, yet the renderings show only 2 buildings.

What is the third building?

It's design?

It appears like it could be a fast food pad, so I very much want to understand the plan.

The Parking calculations do not square with the square footage in the buildings. The parking calculations show 2 calculation methods but both with 24.8k ft. I think one is the 3rd building at 6k because it is 1 space / 50 sq ft and so it seems that must be the restaurant? Is this right and the drawing wrong?

If the details are not known/disclosed, how could this be a final plan and subject to approval? - **City/Developer**

5. With regard to economic viability test, how many tenants are secured and what square footage is committed of the total square footage?

Who are the tenants that are committed?

What is the estimated rent/sq ft and how does that compare to the proximate market

There is already a significant amount of vacant space in the area so more would be a blight on this neighborhood.

- **Developer**

6. On the site plan Lot 5 is Cartwright. It is wrong on the plan.

7. Site Plan: Please describe how close the West building is to the ravine drop off and how will it be constructed so as not to damage the preservation zone. Describe better the landscaping that will hide the back of that building? How tall will it be and how dense to hide the 26 foot high building? What is the element on the drawing directly to the North of the West building? The West building seems to impinge on the top of the ravine at it's South end. Please explain. - **Developer**

8. There seems to be a massive amount of stark parking and very little landscaping for aesthetic appeal and given the woods that now exists there. That seems to be driven by the required parking restaurants which is substantially higher per sq ft. and which is estimated at 24k sq ft. Yet no restaurant is shown or discussed. Can you explain? - Developer

- and did the City consider eliminating or reducing restaurant in the development to reduce the vast parking plain which is clearly out of context in this neighborhood. – **City Restaurant is an allowed use by the zoning. City staff cannot legally eliminate the use of a restaurant. The appropriateness of that particular use should have occurred when the property was rezoned (1990).**

9. With regard to the section on parks, Just what exactly does “protection of a select number of surveyed trees along the property’s frontage on Hamilton Road.” mean. Please be specific with respect to a rendering or estimation in % of what would be retained.

- the same question for “best construction practices to safeguard against damaging any trees located within the preservation easement.” - **Developer/City**

The text here is pretty vague and commits to nothing. Given the current habitat and the strict requirements of a preservation zone this should be more specific and detailed before any final approval.

10. With respect to the stream, there is no detail on what or how preservation of the conservation easement with effected. And, if the permits and approvals have been secured, or will be secured prior to final approval. All the response says is that comments “are noted.” Will the City require detail and compliance before this project can move ahead?

And what will that mean?

Will the public be able to view this at a hearing before approval given the environmental impacts?- **City The FDP does not show work in the preservation zone, or in the stream. All project permits will be the responsibility of the developer and will be required to be provided as part of the final engineering plan review. These documents will not be presented in public hearing.**

11. Since the ingress and egress from Hamilton will only be a right in and right out, all left in and left out traffic will beed to use Beecher. To ensure traffic does not turn into the neighborhood rather than just signs can you include channeling to eliminate that possibility? – **City**

Signage will be posted to indicate “no outlet” to discourage motorists from making a left turn into the neighborhood thinking that they can exit via some alternate route.

12. There is no mention of what external signage will look like at the street, especially the neighborhood street Beecher, or on the buildings. Since this is a neighborhood environment code may not be acceptable. What is the plan?

Will it be presented to the public before approval? - **City/Developer**

Signage is not a part of this request. Signage is typically an administrative approval, however, multi-tenant buildings are required to file a master sign plan. The sign plan will be required to go to Planning Commission for review and approval/denial. This process is very similar to the Design Review process.

I may have additional questions as I have more time to review the material and as you respond to my questions. I would appreciate responses prior to the meeting if possible and if it would be easier to discuss please let me know and we can set up a meeting prior to the hearing, It will need to be by phone as I will be in Boston Monday and Tuesday.

Mr Dugger, I placed a call to your office today and left a voice mail and I will phone you tomorrow to touch base.