



MEETING MINUTES

Planning Commission

Tuesday, June 2, 2020 – Virtual Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

Chair Oyster asked for a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was taken, and the following members were present: Chair Julie Oyster, Mr. Larry Titus and Mr. Jim Rauck. Dr. John Dubos and Mr. Mike Linder were absent. Other staff members present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Kendra Spergel, Development Planner; Jimmy Hoppel, Development Planner; Jennifer Readler, Frost Brown Todd; Dash Logan, Development Intern; Mary Havener, Development Assistant; Todd Hurley, Information Systems Director; Tammy Green, JTFD; Cindi Fitzpatrick, Service Director; Kevin Koesters, Public Service Superintendent; Mike Boso, Chief Building Official and Tami Kelly, Clerk of Council.

Organizational Items:

Chair Oyster noted a quorum was present and asked for approval of the May 5, 2020, Planning Commission minutes. Mr. Titus moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved 3-0.

Chair Oyster also noted that the applicant for item #8, Silco Fire and Security, requested to postpone their Development Plan until the July 7 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Titus moved to approve this request and Mr. Rauck seconded the motion. It was approved by a vote of 3-0.

New Items:

ITEM #1 – Beulah Park (Subarea C) – Rezoning (Zoning Text Amendment)

PID #202004200017

Mr. Hoppel presented the Development Department's findings. He stated that this proposal is for a text amendment to the zoning text for Beulah Park. This application is being heard today by Planning Commission and is slated to be heard by City Council on June 15 and July 20. Upon approval, it will be subject to a 30-day effective period.

He continued to state that the text amendment (which was shown on the screen), shows the modifications being proposed. Currently, the text requires all homes fronting streets B and C, within Subarea C of Beulah Park, to be two stories. The text modification would add language that would allow for up to 30% of those

homes to be permitted to be 1.5 stories. This would be limited to a maximum of 30% of the homes. The applicant has stated that they would like to increase the variety of homes available for this street frontage.

Mr. Hoppel continued to state that streets B and C, with Subarea C fronting properties, will face and be across the street from the public park and open space.

The applicant provided character images of what these homes could look like; however, they are only character images, not proposed models. The homes being built will be custom and will be under review by the Architectural Review Board.

After reviewing the proposal against the GroveCity2050 Guiding Principles criteria that have all been met, staff recommends approval of the Rezoning Text Amendment as submitted.

Mr. Hoppel stated that the applicant, Ms. Rebecca Mott, Plank Law Firm, was unable to enter the virtual meeting, however, she submitted the following statement:

The purpose of the Rezoning request is merely to amend the zoning text article 5, Section C.2.c.v. to permit a mix of 1.5-story homes and two-story homes in Subarea C for homes fronting streets B and C. We can limit and have, by the language proposed, that 1.5-story homes will be no more than 30% of the mix on streets B and C. Sample home styles have been provided to Planning staff showing what a typical 1.5 story home would look like.

Mr. Rauck asked where the garage entries were located. Mr. Hoppel stated that he believed they have a rear entry. Mr. Rauck asked if there were any stand-alone separate garage on an alley. Ms. Shields stated that the zoning text for this subarea requires that all homes be accessed off of rear alleys for homes fronting on open space, which are the homes being affected by this text amendment. Mr. Rauck asked if this means detached or attached garages. Mr. Rauch responded that the zoning text does not specify, so it could be either attached or detached.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval of the Rezoning to City Council as submitted. Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and it was approved 3-0.

ITEM #2 – Brookpark Middle School – Rezoning (SF-1 to SD-1)

PID #202005280026

Mr. Hoppel presented the Development Department's findings. He stated that the applicant is proposing the rezoning of a 2-acre parcel located at 4300 Grove City Road, from SF-1 to SD-1. SD-1 zoning is a special district zoning type utilized for school properties within the City. This is one parcel of several that will be utilized for the future Brookpark Middle School site.

The application is being heard today by Planning Commission and is slated to be heard by City Council on June 15 and July 20. Upon approval, it will be subject to a 30-day effective period.

Mr. Hoppel presented a slide that showed the current zoning of the subject parcel and the zoning of the surrounding area which is primarily residential. The areas that do not identify a zoning area are outside of Grove City limits and are a part of Jackson Township. He explained that the on the right of the displayed map was a "future land-use" map which recommends future land use for this parcel and much of the surrounding area of the future school site to be Edge Living. This includes institutional uses such as schools as a recommended secondary use.

After reviewing the proposal against the GroveCity2050 Guiding Principles criteria that have all been met, staff recommends approval of the Rezoning as submitted.

Mr. Dave Jolliff, Schorr Architects, was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Rauck asked if this parcel would have a curb-cut onto Grove City Road. Mr. Hoppel stated that based on the Development Plan, there is no indication of curb cuts on Grove City Road.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Rauck moved to recommend approval of the Rezoning to City Council as submitted. Mr. Titus seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

ITEM #3 – Brookpark Middle School – Development Plan

PID #202004290021

Mr. Hoppel presented the Development Department's findings. He stated that the applicant is proposing the development of an approximately 117,000-square-foot middle school, with associated parking, recreational fields, landscaping and other site improvements. The site is located near the intersection of Demorest Road and Grove City Road.

A slide was displayed showing the process for the development of the site. As there are several parcels within the site boundaries of this project, the current status of each parcel varies, but the City is working to resolve any outstanding issues. The project will be subject to final engineering and building permits in the future.

The building, which is centrally located in the northern section of the site plan, is a 117,00-square-foot middle school, which is proposed to be mainly two-stories. There are two entries proposed onto the site. One will be from a future street in Subarea D of Beulah Park to the north and one from Demorest Road on the western side of the site.

There will be two main parking lots to the east and west of the building with a small parking area to the south of the building with approximately eight spaces for staff. Based on typical parking requirements, 324 parking spaces would be required; however, staff is supportive of a deviation to permit 199 spaces. Considering the use of the site, and that students are not of legal driving age, student parking will not need to be considered. The spaces shown on the plans show a discrepancy between 180 square foot spaces and 171 square foot spaces, but staff has verified with the applicant that they intend all parking spaces, excluding bus parking spaces to be 9 x 20, which will be 180 square feet.

Also, five-foot sidewalks are included on the site on the frontage of Demorest Road, Grove City Road and the future roadway to the north (Subarea D).

There is a dumpster to the south of the building. Plans show the dumpster enclosure without a gate. Staff is supportive of a gate deviation based on the orientation which is away from the view of the public right-of-way.

There are also recreational fields on the site which include fencing. On the western side of the site there is a baseball field and on the southern side is a football field with a track around it. Also, on the eastern side of the track are proposed bleachers and a press box.

Chain link fencing for the recreational fields has been proposed between 4 and 8 feet tall. Staff recommends that the 8-foot fence be reduced to 6 feet. Staff believes this will be more visually appealing and will eliminate the need for a variance or any associated deviations.

There is a sign located south of the Demorest Road driveway entrance. One sign has been proposed; however, the detail has not been provided and will be subject to review by the Building Department. Through discussions with the applicant, it is not expected that any variances will be required for the sign.

Running east and west through the site is a stream in which a proposed track is proposed to be built over. A culvert has been proposed with head-walls on both sides to permit the stream to continue to flow through the site.

On the eastern side of the site, there is a wet basin being proposed to deal with stormwater. Additionally, there are storage chambers around the football field for stormwater. During the review process concerns related to stormwater and flooding in the general area were brought up. These concerns will be addressed with the Site Improvement Plan as needed, to ensure that this development will not exacerbate any existing issues.

Staff is requesting that in addition to the site plans provided, the applicant provide photometric and fire truck maneuverability plans for approval by staff.

A general landscape plan was provided; however, the applicant was not able to provide a revised plan with requested details prior to the resubmittal of this project. The applicant has indicated that they fully intend to meet all Code requirements or find acceptable alternatives. These plans will be submitted for review and approval during the Site Improvement Plan process, and Staff is recommending that these plans be subject to approval by the Development Department and Urban Forester.

Mr. Hoppel displayed a slide indicating the existing tree stands to be preserved. There is additional screening on the northern portion of the site, on both the eastern and western property lines. Staff is also recommending that the western screening be continued down to help further screen the William Thomas property, which is the property just north of the baseball field.

The parking islands each have one tree which meets code. The wet basin has 11 trees, meeting requirements based on its lineal perimeter.

The Grove City Urban Forester and the Regional Forester with the State of Ohio have identified an important historical tree within the middle school site plan. Mr. Hoppel displayed a slide showing the approximate location of the tree on the future school site. The span of the tree currently appears to overlap a proposed grass peninsula and a portion of the driveway. Based on the review by the Urban Foresters, this tree is potentially the oldest in Grove City (over 200 years old) and is expected to be older than the formation of Ohio as a state in 1803. Saving this tree provides historic preservation and fiscal value to the City as outlined in the letter provided by the Regional Forester. Saving this tree could alter the driveway and parking configuration. The applicant has indicated that they intend to adjust plans to be able to save the tree. This may require the shifting of the adjacent parking lot and driveway section, which would require the 30-foot parking setback to be reduced to 20 feet. Staff is supportive of this change. The portion of the driveway fork would also be tighter to the outfield of the baseball field, similar to the rest of the driveway.

Mr. Hoppel proceeded to show a slide of the various elevations of the building. He stated that the building is proposed to have some sections that will exceed the 35-foot maximum allowed by code. The tallest portion of the building is proposed to be 37'4". Staff is supportive of this height and recommends that an approved variance for the height be obtained.

The building is primarily constructed of brick, precast concrete, glass and aluminum window panels, translucent wall panels metal roofing, trim gutters, etc. This design is intended to be similar to other schools in Grove City.

A material board was displayed showing samples of the materials to be utilized on the site. It also displayed an image of the Bolton Crossing Elementary School on Holt Road which utilizes some of the materials in built form.

After reviewing the proposal against the Grove City 2050 Guiding Principles criteria that have been met or can be met, staff recommends approval of the Development Plan with the three deviations and seven stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Dave Jolliff, Schorr Architects and Ms. Megan Cyr, Kleingers Group, were present to answer any questions.

In regards to the deviations and stipulations, Mr. Jolliff responded that they do not have any issues with the discrepancies. He also said they are willing to work with the City to abide by them.

Mr. Rauck asked if the athletic field and track would have lights for nighttime events. Mr. Hoppel stated that there would be no lighting for the recreational fields.

Mr. Rauck asked if the same screening that is being done on the other residential properties up to the northwest can be created where the property abuts to the west on the backside where there are approximately four properties. Mr. Hoppel stated that staff discussed that with the applicant and he feels they are open to providing something. This is included within stipulation #7 (to work with our staff and the Urban Forester to meet all of the landscaping and screening requirements). He continued to state that there is some concern that mounding with trees could create an issue for the track and football field, as it would have the appearance of being down in a bowl. Screening has been considered and is something that will be worked out. It will be reviewed further during the Site Improvement Plan.

Mr. Rauck stated that he thinks all residential properties that join or abut the site should have the same quality and quantity of screening.

Mr. Rauch took this opportunity to thank the school district for working with the City because this is a very important project, for both the City and school district. These plans are being reviewed concurrently with engineering because of the timing. There have been several issues, especially concerning the stormwater, and the school district has been extremely accommodating in allowing us to capture additional storage and screening from the Town Center and also working with the City on the culvert issue. Mr. Rauch asked Ms. Cyr if she had any comments.

Ms. Cyr echoed the same sentiment. The City has been working with the school's schedule as they are working to get them open in time for students. Working together helps the process. If there are things they can do to help, they will accommodate however they can to make this a great project for everyone.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval of the Development Plan to City Council with the three deviations and seven stipulations as noted in the Staff Report:

- 1) The approval of this plan is subject to the future approval of all necessary rezonings, annexations or actions associated with consolidating the property that have not been approved at this time being resolved.

- 2) A variance shall be obtained for the height of the building to exceed the maximum 35 feet permitted by Code by 2'4" for a maximum height of 37'4".
- 3) The eight-foot chain link fence sections around the track shall be reduced in height to six feet.
- 4) A photometric plan shall be submitted that meets the 0.5 footcandle requirement for all vehicular and pedestrian areas and reflects the approved site configuration.
- 5) The applicant shall work with Staff to determine what stormwater or flood studies may be warranted and that resulting infrastructure and site design changes be approved during the Site Improvement Plan (construction plan) process.
- 6) The applicant shall provide acceptable fire truck maneuverability plans.
- 7) The applicant shall work with the Development Department Staff and the Urban Forester to meet all landscaping and screening requirements, or find an acceptable alternative. Final landscaping plans and associated details shall be provided during the Site Improvement Plan review process for approval.
- 8) A deviation shall be granted to permit a reduction in required parking spaces from 324 to 199.
- 9) A deviation shall be granted from Section 1136.08 for the dumpster enclosure to not have gates on the front.
- 10) A deviation shall be granted to reduce the parking setback to 20 feet from the west property line if the western bus parking lot needs to be shifted north in order to save the historic White Oak tree.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and it was approved 3-0.

ITEM #4 – Kmart Redevelopment – Development Plan

PID #202004200018

Mr. Hoppel presented the Development Department's findings. He stated that the applicant is proposing the redevelopment of the former Kmart site. The redevelopment would include interior and exterior renovations and updates to the building, parking lot updates and other site improvements. Planning Commission is reviewing the Development Plan, and it is planned to be heard by City Council on June 15 for final approval, after which it will go to final engineering and building permits.

The current zoning of the property is C-2, Commercial, which matches the existing and proposed use of the site. The future land use plan suggests this area be a Mixed-Use employment center. Staff has worked with the applicant and has provided recommendations to create a more mixed-use environment and cohesiveness with the residential site to the east.

The existing site is a little over 8.5 acres. The existing 78,000-square-foot Kmart is located there with a 0.63-acre outparcel out front. The proposal is to renovate the building to include three tenants, a major renovation to the front façade and minor additions and modifications to the rest of the exterior, such as an addition to square off and add a loading dock to the northwest corner of the building. They are also proposing to expand the outparcel to be 0.961 acres, which would expand the current area by about 85 feet to the north, which would better align with the drive aisle. It would also expand the outparcel a few feet to go into the drive aisles to the east.

There will also be a parking lot resurfacing and reconfiguration. Currently, the parking lot has many angled drive aisles with no parking peninsulas or islands. This site plan shows various peninsulas and parking islands throughout the site, most of which meet code. Staff recommends that white pavement markings be utilized and noted on plans and traffic signs on-site include black metal poles. The applicant has indicated that the dumpsters for the site will be located inside the building, so there are no enclosures or screening that needs to be considered.

Mr. Hoppel displayed a slide identified where parking peninsulas with trees shall be included to meet code requirements.

391 parking spaces are required by Code; however, staff is supportive of a deviation for less. Parking space size is 171 square feet and staff is supportive of this deviation for less.

Crosswalk and pedestrian areas are also included in the site plan. Mr. Hoppel presented a slide outlining these areas. He stated that to help enhance the mixed-use and pedestrian experience, staff recommends adding a relaxing sitting area with benches in the spots that have been identified by the City. Potted plants or some other design choices could also be incorporated. In regards to the crosswalks, some are shown on the adjacent property. Staff recommends an easement be obtained to add that improvement to the adjacent property.

Due to the desire to provide mixed-use and connected aspects to the project, and due to the reduction in parking, staff also recommends a bike rack be incorporated near the entrance of each tenant space to encourage bicycle trips and potentially reduce car travel to the site.

After review of the Photometric plan, Staff determined that it meets the minimum 0.5 foot-candle requirement and is supportive of the lighting fixtures which are black and decorative.

As far as the landscaping goes, existing tree stands along the northern and western property lines of the site will be preserved and trees are included in all parking islands/peninsulas. The building and perimeter landscaping include trees, shrubs and other plantings that have been reviewed by the Urban Forester. There are 36" screening shrubs along the eastern parking aisle. The other parking spaces that face off-site are screened by existing trees and brush along the drainage way that is being preserved.

The frontage along Stringtown Road required eight trees. Four will be provided with the development, two of which are existing and being saved, and four will be provided at the time of the outparcel development.

A sign location has been provided and a landscaping bed will be around the base. This will be located by the eastern driveway in the southeast corner of the site, adjacent to Stringtown Road. The specifics on the sign have not yet been submitted and will go through the Building Division. The site is limited in the amount of landscaping that can be provided due to portions of the site and property lines being paved for drive aisles. The Urban Forester has reviewed these plans and is supportive of what has been provided.

Mr. Hoppel displayed another slide showing the elevations for all four sides of the building. He stated that the eastern and western sides of the building and the rear will primarily be constructed of existing brick and new brick for the additions. The brick will be painted in a charcoal black. The front of the building is proposed to have a new and modern appearance which staff is generally supportive of and believes will be an improvement to the existing condition of the building.

The Aldi tenant space is proposed to have a slanted roof with a 1:12 slope to contribute to the modern look. The materials proposed are a combination of brick, cedar-like cement board, metallic EIFS and glass and aluminum storefront windows and doors. Staff is recommending that the cedar-like cement board be replaced with a brick of similar color, as shown on the elevation plans. Various quality of brick option alternatives are included in the plans; however, staff recommends a full brick be utilized compared to a brick veneer.

The other two unnamed tenant spaces in the middle and the right side of the space include champaign, tan or light brown metallic EIFS, stippled EIFS, a charcoal black brick watertable and stippled EIFS above portions of the water table.

After discussion with the applicant, staff is supportive of the general design and materials choice but recommends that the metallic EIFS color be changed to a gray and charcoal metallic EIFS to better fit with the charcoal brick on the building as well as colors incorporated in the area, specifically the apartments to the east. Staff also recommends the stippled EIFS siding be modified to be cohesive with the new color palette as well.

Due to the changes being proposed by staff, as well as some clarity issues with the materials provided, staff recommends that a new southern elevation plan for all three tenant spaces be provided along with an updated material board identifying the specific materials and colors selected.

After reviewing the proposal against the GroveCity2050 guiding Principles criteria that have all been met or can be met, staff recommends approval of the Development Plan with two deviations and 10 stipulations. An additional stipulation is being recommended regarding the two landscaping peninsulas that are required to be added to the northwest and northeast corners of the parking lot. Discussion on this part of the site plan had been provided in the content of your report, but this stipulation was missing from the recommendation in the report.

Mr. Jeff Gregg, Fairway Realty, Mr. Matthew Dicken, Kramer Engineers and Mr. Jake Johnson, M + A Architects, were present to speak to the item. Mr. Gregg proceeded to state that there has been discussion about why they have chosen to go the direction they have vs. a mixed-use development. He stated that they have owned this property for a couple of years and have been planning for this for quite some time. They have explored many different uses for the site. He stated that his business partner for the site, Mr. Mark Catalano of Fairway Realty, is building the apartments just to the east and that has been a successful project. They explored various uses for the site; however, part of the underwriting process in evaluating is demand in the marketplace. They found that with medical-use, demand in the marketplace is fairly limited. It takes quite a bit of time to get medical deals done. As far as apartments go, they did consider building 100 plus or minus units in the rear of the property, and from an economic perspective, the economics don't work. Consequently, they feel like they've delivered a very modern, nice-looking project. The Aldi side of the project is very forward-looking and modern. It looks good aesthetically. They've tried to incorporate in as much greenspace (landscaping) as possible and they have tried to be very cognizant of the City's request to make good connectivity with not only the site next door (the apartments) but also the walkway to and from Stringtown Road to make it more of a quasi town center. They are trying to move full-steam ahead despite the economy with the pandemic; however, they'd like to try to get it done in a timely fashion.

Mr. Gregg stated, that in response to staff's analysis, as far as material boards go, they will work with the City as requested. In addition, the cedar board being replaced with brick on the Aldi side of the building, full brick vs. brick veneer and changing the color of the EIFS, they have no problems. He continued to state that they will work with the City as best as they can.

Mr. Rauck asked what the widths of the parking spaces will be with the new reconfiguration of the parking lot. Mr. Hoppel responded that the width of the parking spaces will be nine feet and the length will be 19 feet.

Mr. Rauck next asked if he was correct in assuming that the cart storage would be behind the bollards and in front of the glass doors under the overhang. Mr. Gregg stated that this is correct.

Mr. Rauch asked Mr. Gregg if he is agreeable to all 12 of the deviations and stipulations. Mr. Gregg said he has no problem with the landscaping peninsulas. As far as the poles have black metal – that is no problem. Benches being added to the front of the retail center – no issues there. In regards to the decorative metal bike racks, Mr. Gregg asked if it was necessary to have one in front of each tenant space, or if there be a central bike rack. He doesn't feel there will be enough bike traffic to support three separate racks. Mr. Rauch responded that one central bike rack would be acceptable; however, Planning Commission will be the recommending body. Mr. Gregg continued to state that he and the owner of the apartments to the east, Mr. Mark Catalano, have already discussed easements across the two property lines for the crosswalks, so that will be put in place. M+A Architects will provide updated elevations of all tenant spaces, as well as a material board. He mentioned that he will need to discuss the cement board request with Aldi, but doesn't feel that this will be a problem. He stated that there are no issues with changing the colors on the EIFS panels. Ultimately, Mr. Gregg stated that he has no issues with the stipulations and they will work with the City as best as they can. He would, however, like to limit the bike racks to one or two as opposed to one for each tenant space.

There being no additional discussion, Mr. Rauck moved to recommend approval of the Development Plan to City Council with the two deviations and 10 stipulations as noted, with #8 being changed to state that the applicant shall work with the City to determine the number of bike racks and the location.

- 1) A deviation shall be granted to permit a reduced parking space size of 171 square feet.
- 2) A deviation shall be granted permitting a reduction in the number of parking spaces required from 391 to 373.
- 3) The applicant shall replace the tan and brown colored metallic EIFS panels with grey and/or charcoal colored metallic EIFS panels, and the tan stippled EIFS shall be replaced with a color that is cohesive with the modified color palette.
- 4) The applicant shall utilize the full brick option ('Belden' Option #3 on submitted material detail sheet) for the front façade of Aldi.
- 5) The cement board proposed on the Aldi elevation shall be replaced with brick in a similar color to that proposed for the cement board.
- 6) The applicant shall provide an updated southern elevation plan for all three tenant spaces as well as a material board identifying the specific materials and colors selected, for staff approval.
- 7) The applicant shall coordinate with the owner of the residential development adjacent to the east to obtain easements for improvements on the adjacent site shown on plans, including crosswalks.
- 8) Decorative black metal bike racks shall be placed near the entrance to each tenant space and the applicant shall work with the City to determine the best location and number of bike racks for the proposed development.
- 9) Benches shall be added to the sidewalk in front of the retail center, particularly at the widened eastern sidewalk bump-out.
- 10) All poles with traffic or parking signage shall be black metal.
- 11) All pavement markings shall be white.
- 12) Two landscaping peninsulas shall be added to the parking lot in the northwest and northeast corner of the site, as identified by staff.

Mr. Titus seconded the motion, and it was approved 3-0.

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a certificate of appropriateness for 3946 Broadway for the Grove City Brewing Company in order to install a wall sign exceeding the maximum permitted for each property in the Historical Preservation Area (HPA).

An Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness was submitted to the Building Division for review; however, when something in the HPA does not meet Code requirements, a Certificate of Appropriateness through Planning Commission and City Council is required to appeal the Building Division's decision. The COA is tentatively on the agenda for the June 15 City Council meeting and if approved the applicant can proceed forward with their sign.

The business is located in the Historical Preservation Area (HPA) which restricts each property to a maximum of 25 square feet of signage depending on the frontage of the property. This property is permitted the maximum square footage based on the parcels associated with the business' Broadway frontage as well as portions of the building and parking lot fronting or facing secondary roadways (Columbus Street and Cleveland Avenue).

The proposed wall sign will be 30 square feet in size and be placed over the main entrance to the business. The property also has an existing projecting sign for Plum Run Winery totaling 18.5 square feet. While the signs add up to 48.5 square feet for the property, staff is supportive of the proposed sign since it will be in scale with the building and will make the primary entrance more visible due to its placement which is further away from Broadway (setback approximately 60 feet from the roadway, while most other buildings in the Town Center off of Broadway are setback approximately 27 feet). Staff is also supportive of the deviation to the HPA Sign Code requirements since the building contains two tenants, and staff has recently supported additional sign square footage for other multi-tenant buildings including Mill Street Market, which was approved for 125 square feet of signage. Section 1138.04(e) states that "sign size and shape shall also respond to the existing proportions of period structures," and staff believes that the proposed wall sign is in scale with the size of the building and will not overtake the building's frontage.

The proposed sign will be metal, with a black background and white lettering. These colors are permitted to be used on buildings and signage in the HPA. The sign is also proposed to be externally lit from existing gooseneck lighting fixtures above the entrance to the brewery. While the metal material of the sign is not typically supported in the Historic Town Center because it is a more contemporary material, staff believes that it is appropriate since other signs in Town Center, including the site's projecting sign, are metal and there are other more contemporary signs nearby, including the internally lit Local Cantina wall sign and Broadway Station Apartments projecting sign.

Therefore, after review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted.

Ms. Jodi Burroughs, Plum Run Winery LLC, was present to answer any questions.

There being no questions or discussion, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness to City Council as submitted. Mr. Rauck seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a plat for Trail View Run Phase 1 including the first 14.8 acres of the site and connections with Borror Road and Coggan Drive.

The Rezoning and Development Plan for the development were approved in 2018 and since that time the site has changed developers from Harmony Development Group, to Pulte Homes, to now Westport Homes who will be officially developing the site. The construction plans have been approved, and the plat is one of the final steps prior to the construction of the site. The plat is tentatively on the agendas for the June 15 and July 6 City Council meetings.

A total of 37 single-family home lots are included as part of the proposed Plat, all fronting onto Trail View Crossing except for one lot that will front on Wynnewood Drive. Each lot is proposed to be at least 70 feet in width and a minimum of 8,400 square feet in size, as per the minimum requirement in the approved zoning text for lots in Subarea A. The plat contains the intersection of Borror Road and Trail View Crossing, one of the development's main roadways. The plat also contains the entirety of Trail View Crossing, the connection with Coggan Drive into Grant Run Estates and the first portion of Wynnewood Drive. The lots and roadways match the approved zoning text and the Final Development Plan.

Four reserve areas are proposed totaling 3.595 acres. Two of the reserves, Reserves A and B, are proposed at the northern portion of the site and will be owned by the City and maintained by the Homeowners Association (HOA) and be used for stormwater management and open space. Reserve C and Reserve D will be located in the rear of lots 57 through 59 and 60 through 65 respectively, to provide a 20-foot Tree Preservation between the Trail View Run development and the existing Grant Run Estates. The approved zoning text states that this area can either be deeded to the residents or kept on the Trail View Run property as a Tree Preservation Area. Maintenance, as per good horticultural practices, including the clearing of plant material, is permitted in this area and will be the responsibility of the HOA, which will own and maintain the reserve. The previous developer, Harmony Development Group, had discussed with residents in Grant Run Estates about possibly deeding those 20-feet if everyone on the street agreed to have it done. The developer of the site has since changed and Westport Homes will be developing the site. It is staff's understanding that not all of the property owners agreed to have the Tree Preservation Area site be deeded. Additionally, staff has concerns about deeding the site over to the Grant Run residents and had recommended Harmony remove that option during the Preliminary Development Plan review due to the difficult coordination of splitting each portion to each homeowner and requiring them to pay property taxes on an area only permitted for preservation. As previously stated, the approved zoning text permits either deeding the area to adjacent lots or keeping the 20-foot area on the site as a Tree Preservation Area. Staff believes the proposed Reserves C and D, owned and maintained by the HOA, is the most appropriate manner to formalize the Tree Preservation Area required in the approved zoning text for the development.

Staff has recommendations for revisions to the notes on the plat to remain consistent with what has been proposed and to address concerns from residents in the adjacent Grant Run Estates subdivision regarding what

is permitted for removal within the Tree Preservation Zones (Reserves C and D). These revisions will need to be made on the plat prior to the City Council meeting.

Therefore after review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Plat as submitted.

Mr. Terry Andrews, Westport Homes, was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Rauck asked if the drainage from the drainage easements flow into Grant Run. Mr. Andrews stated that they have drainage going a couple of ways. Some of it goes north and south and then there is a tributary to the center of the site. Probably about a third is a tributary stream to the north and then there is one to the south. Mr. Rauck asked if the one to the south, goes into Grant Run after it crosses the Trail View Run property line. Mr. Andrews responded that there is a retention basin and then a release area to the stream. Mr. Rauck asked if the stream touches this property and Mr. Andrews said that it does. He stated that Grant Run goes through the south end of the property.

Ms. Candace Kleinschmidt, 5972 Grant Run Estates, asked to speak to the item. Ms. Kleinschmidt asked the 20-foot "no disturb zone" is directly behind her home and she is concerned about the removal of any of the brush. The language refers to not removing any of the brush unless determined by the Urban Forester. If it is determined by the Urban Forester that some must be removed, she will lose her current privacy, and 90% of the back of her property has brush. She continued to state that in a letter from the City of Grove City, dated May 21, 2020, to Alex Benson, CESO, Inc., in paragraph 1, letter C, showed by owned and maintained by the Trail View Run HOA. However, in paragraph four, it says to please update this to state that it is owned by the City and maintained by the HOA. She asked for clarification as to who is going to own the property. Ms. Spergel stated that the other two reserves, located in the front of the property, are the ones that will be owned by the City and maintained by the HOA. The two 20-foot tree preservation areas are to be owned and maintained by the HOA. The revised version of the Plat provides further clarification of ownership. Ms. Kleinschmidt reiterated that she is very much against the removal of the brush. If some of the brush is removed, she would like something else put in to replace it.

Ms. Kleinschmidt continued that Ms. Spergel mentioned that the original developer and the residents of Grant Run Estates discussed having the 20-foot area deeded to them. She stated that the people of Grant Run did not want this and not everyone agreed. For the record, Ms. Kleinschmidt wanted to state that she was never approached or asked if she wanted this. If she had been asked, she would have stated that she did want to own it.

Mr. Rauch asked to address some of these comments. He stated that they would like to see the HOA maintain this area because Staff doesn't know what the previous developers agreed to. To be fair and safe for all of the area residents, the tree preserve should be maintained by the HOA. This area will be a no-disturbance zone, so if there is a desire to plant pine trees, the way the text is written right now, this wouldn't be permitted. We would like to strike a balance between protecting and allowing for some flexibility of the Urban Forester to go in and address certain circumstances that may arise.

Ms. Jennifer Readler, Frost Brown Todd, and legal counsel for the City, responded. She stated that the goal with these revisions is to give some sort of flexibility because there could be circumstances that require that

area to be attended to, however, it will need to have the City's approval. By putting it in the Plat, it will be fully enforceable by the City

Ms. Kleinschmidt stated that she wants to make sure that there is wording in the document that will protect the residents as much as possible.

Ms. Spergel added that this is not the final version of the revisions and it is the intention of Staff to have it finalized before the item goes before City Council on June 15. Once finalized, it will be on the City's website so that it can be viewed by the public.

Mr. Rauch stated that if Planning Commission is okay with the general intent of what is being shown on the screen, he is comfortable that the City's legal counsel will button up the details of the language between what it is today and what moves forward to Council.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval of the Plat to City Council as submitted. Mr. Rauck seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

ITEM #7 – Trail View Run (Phase 2) – Plat

PID #202004290024

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a plat for Phase 2 of Trail View Run. This section is approximately 9.8 acres in size and contains the extension of Hemetite Drive. It contains lots in Subareas A, the fee simple single-family lots, and Subarea B, the cottage homes.

Phase 2 is located adjacent and to the south of Phase 1.

The Phase 2 plat is one of the final steps prior to officially creating the lots and beginning construction on the site. The plat is tentatively on the agendas for the June 15 and July 6 City Council meetings and will be reviewed concurrently with Phase 1.

The proposed Plat contains 13 fee-simple single-family lots in Subarea A and 10 detached condominium lots in Subarea B. As per the approved zoning text, lots in Subarea A are required to be at least 70 feet in width and a minimum of 8,400 square feet in size, and lots in Subarea B are required to be at least 50 feet in width and at least 120 feet in depth. Two roadway extensions are proposed on the Plat as well; the second portion of Wynnewood Drive and the extension of Hemetite Drive from the neighboring Grant Run Estates neighborhood. Each lot and roadway meets the requirements of the approved zoning text and meets the approved Final Development Plan.

Six reserve areas are proposed totaling 4.038 acres of the site. Reserves E and G are located in the center of the development and contain the existing electrical easement running through the south part of the City. These two reserves will be owned by the City and maintained by the Trail View Run Homeowner's Association (HOA) for stormwater management and open space. Reserve I, adjacent to Lot 77, will contain the parking lot for the future city park and will be owned and maintained by the City. The developer has indicated that the remainder of the park will be platted as part of Phase 3. Reserve J contains the first portion of a private roadway (a portion of Hemetite Drive) which will be owned and maintained by the HOA.

Reserves H and F, will be located in the rear of lots 66 through 74 and 75 respectively, to provide

a 20 foot Tree Preservation between the Trail View Run development and the existing Grant Run Estates. The approved zoning text states that this area can either be deeded to the residents or kept on the Trail View Run property as a Tree Preservation Area. Due to this phase having the same outstanding issues as Phase 1, staff is supportive of the area becoming a reserve, maintained and owned by the HOA.

As with Phase 1, staff has recommended revisions to Note H of the plat to address concerns of residents in Grant Run Estates regarding what is permitted for removal in the 20 foot Tree Preservation Areas (Reserves F and H). These changes will need to be completed prior to meeting before City Council.

Therefore after review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Plat as submitted.

Mr. Terry Andrews, Westport Homes, was present to answer any questions. Mr. Andrews stated that he met with Mrs. Kleinschmidt late Monday afternoon and walked her property, including behind her home. He noticed several 2" trees directly behind her home that will be maintained and saved. He mentioned he has one concern related to the brush. On the east edge of the reserve, there is a pretty heavy wild brush. He believes there should be a small area on the east side in case someone needs to walk or maintain the area. It will be very difficult to maneuver if all the brush is maintained. Mr. Andrews asked for the opportunity to meet with City staff to walk the properties to look at the brush. Ms. Spergel stated that the City could walk the area with Mr. Andrews.

Ms. Carol Cox, 1453 Hemetite Drive, asked to speak to the item. She stated that her property also abuts up to the 20' no disturb zone. She believes this shrub is a type of Honeysuckle and while it can be big, it is what gives them their privacy. Once the shrubs are taken out, their privacy will be gone. She would like to see the wording be made more specific. Ms. Oyster mentioned that this was discussed and the language will be cleaned up before the Plat goes before City Council. Ms. Cox reiterated that if the area is cleaned up, something needs to be put in its place. She also stated her concern related to the control being with an Urban Forester.

In regards to the conversation related to the ownership of the preserve, she feels it would be better to be owned by an HOA. She feels it is disturbing that they were not notified that Grant Run was not getting the land. She spoke with Karl Billisits in 2018. At that time, she asked him if everyone was signed up, and he indicated that the only problem might be a rental property. She called the rental company last week and as far as they could tell, no one contacted them. Mr. Rauch responded that it's important that the HOA owns it rather than individual property owners because if the property was transferred to Grant Run homeowners, the safeguard would be lesser for the future residents of Trail View Run. To be fair to both the future and existing residents, the best move would be to place it in a reserve and controlled by an HOA. Related to the concerns of an Urban Forester, Staff is referring to a position within the City of Grove City. This can also be clarified further within the language.

Ms. Cox also stated that her home is on the end of Hemetite and it gets very windy and on trash day, much of it blows into their brush. Since no one has ownership yet, she and her husband go in and pick it up. She would like to know if an HOA would keep up with that. Mr. Andrews responded that once this area is turned over to the HOA, they would be managing and maintaining that reserve area.

Mr. Andrews also clarified that they do not want to remove the honeysuckle either. His concern is the very east edge, you would need room to walk through if maintenance was needed to be done. He has no issue with leaving the rest. Ms. Cox stated that she is fine as long as privacy is maintained.

Ms. Kleinschmidt, 5972 Grant Run Estates, asked to speak to the item. Her question was to Mr. Andrews related to the walkway he would like to put in. The 20' privacy was originally 25' and they were never informed of that. This is 5' that has been taken out. She would not be happy if more is taken out. Mr. Andrews stated that he is not talking about putting a physical walkway in, its just room for someone to get back in there if needed. She said she would be happy to walk the area with Mr. Andrews. He said he would contact her.

Mr. Rauck asked if the City had a definition of a "do not disturb" area. Mr. Rauch responded that the "do not disturb" zone would be set by the definition or language contained within the Plat. There is no uniform definition.

Mr. Rauck stated that if his understanding is correct, his reason for trimming back the east side of this area would be so that he doesn't have to walk across private property to access the full length of the area. Mr. Andrews stated that this was correct. Mr. Rauck asked if fencing was an approved use. Ms. Spergel stated that they are. She also stated that there are easements in the back of those properties which would not permit fencing. Mr. Rauck asked how wide the drainage easement was that goes through. Ms. Spergel stated that it is 20' and sits in front and to the east of the "do not disturb" zone. Mr. Rauch added that the easements do not overlap. There is an offset within them. Mr. Rauck asked if the drainage easement is on the lots in this new Plat. Ms. Spergel stated they were. Mr. Rauck questioned if someone wanted to put in a full fence into the easement, would they have to come to the City for special approval. Ms. Spergel responded that they would go through the Building Division, but development in a drainage easement is not encouraged.

Mr. Roby Schottke, City Councilman, asked to speak to the item. He stated that they continue to have issues with these screening zones in other developments. Most urban foresters define honeysuckle as an invasive species. Consequently, that gives you the most screening between these types of developments. Secondly, to the developer, the information here needs to be in the deed restrictions. The problems occur when the individual homes are sold to someone else and those owners start cutting into the brush. Both the salespeople and the site foreman need to know this information so it can be conveyed to the homeowners so they don't go cutting into the brush. Mr. Andrews responded that the language will be in the deed restrictions and it can be added to the sales contracts.

Mr. Rauck asked who owns the drainage easement that runs north and south. Ms. Spergel stated that it is on the individual property owner's property; however, the City can go in to do things if needed. They're typically just meant to allow for the flow of water. There's not necessarily any type of pipe. To clarify, Mr. Rauch added that according to the Plat, the easements are granted to the City of Grove City. The City has the right to maintain, if necessary. Mr. Rauck asked how much the easement and "do not disturb" zone overlap. Ms. Spergel stated that they do not overlap.

Mr. Andrews reiterated that he would be happy to walk the site with City staff and neighbors. Ms. Kleinschmidt requested to be at this walk-through. Mr. Rauch stated that the Development Department would coordinate this meeting. He also wanted to clarify that this is a Plat application strictly to establish lots, right-of-ways and reserve areas. With respect to the drainage issues, they should be brought to the attention of the Service Department.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Rauck moved to recommend approval of the Plat to City Council, noting that conversation had been held related to the 20' "do not disturb" zone and that it should be worked out with the neighbors. Mr. Titus seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

New Business:

The following two items were presented for informational purposes only, as they relate to changes that have occurred since being approved by Planning Commission.

Item #1 – Park Square Daycare – Special Use Permit

Ms. Shields gave an overview of the item, stating that this item received a recommendation of approval at the May 5, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, and that staff was contacted by the applicant after Planning Commission with a request to modify the recommended materials. The proposed changes were presented to City Council at the June 1, 2020 meeting and included proposed changes to bollards, fencing and curbing. Ms. Shields stated that City Council postponed the item to allow Planning Commission the opportunity to be made aware of the changes and provide feedback. Ms. Oyster stated that she had no concern with the proposed changes. Mr. Rauck asked for clarification on the size of the bollards. Ms. Shields stated that while the decorative cap originally proposed at Planning Commission is no longer proposed, the bollards will remain impact-resistant, 6" steel bollards filled with concrete.

Item #2 – Schoedinger Funeral Home – Development Plan

Ms. Shields gave an overview of the item, stating that this item was approved in December 2018 and since that time the applicant has made minor modifications to the project including changes to the pond and parking lot size. Staff does not believe that the proposed changes warrant a full development plan amendment, but wanted to make Planning Commission aware of the changes and have the opportunity to provide input. Mr. Rauck asked for clarification on area on-street parking and the loss of parking spaces on the site. Ms. Shields stated that there is no on-street parking on Hoover Road but that Kingston Avenue allows on-street parking further west of the intersection with Hoover Road, and that the proposal would reduce the parking spaces on the site from 165 to 144 spaces. She further clarified that this conforms to the approved zoning text for the site, which requires 97 spaces.

Having no additional items, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.



Mary Havener, Secretary



Julie Oyster, Chair