CITY OF GROVE CITY, OHIO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING **December 8, 2015**

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

Chairman Leasure began the meeting with a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was taken and the following members were present: Mr. Gary Leasure, Chair, Mr. Chuck Boso, Mr. Roby Schottke, Mr. Mike Linder and Ms. Julie Oyster. Others present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Planning & GIS Supervisor; Victoria Proehl, Community Development Manager, Stephen Smith, Frost Brown Todd; Cindi Fitzpatrick, Service Superintendent; Lt. Tammy Green, Jackson Township Fire Department; Mike Boso, Chief Building Official; Laura Scott, Planning and Zoning Coordinator; Tami Kelly, Clerk of Council; Michele Boni, Planning Intern; and Mary Havener, Development Assistant.

Chairman Leasure noted a quorum was present. The minutes from the November 3, 2015 regular meeting were unanimously approved.

Chairman Leasure stated that representatives of Item #3 on the agenda, 3927-3937 Front Street | Rezoning, is requesting postponement to the January 5, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. He asked for a motion to accept the postponements. Mr. Linder moved to postpone the item, Mr. Schottke seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

ITEM #1 – Scioto Meadows (Ashwood Glen) – Development Plan **(PID #201506010039)**

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings.The applicant is requesting approval of a development plan for Scioto Meadows (Ashwood Glen), a 52 unit multi-family residential development proposed at 6524 Jackson Pike. The site is located on the undeveloped portion of the Village at Scioto Meadows condominium development, originally approved by City Council in March 1999.

The site will be accessed from existing roadways in the Village at Scioto Meadows condominium development, Lakeview Drive West, Lakeview Drive East, and Pondview Drive. Lakeview Drive North was partially installed by the original developer and is proposed to be finished with this development to provide connectivity through the site.

Proposed units will be accessed from a combination of front-loaded (32 units) and rear-loaded (20 units) garages. Buildings are generally oriented towards Lakeview Drive North and Lakeview Drive East, with some units accessed from rear-loaded garages off Pondview Drive. The leasing office and mail kiosk are proposed at the entrance to the site, off West River Road. Staff has concerns on the potential impacts and compatibility of permitting a new building orientation and pattern on the existing/neighboring units. Originally units were approved with rear loaded garages whereas the proposed configuration would employ front loaded units. In order to closer match the character of the surrounding development, and to be consistent with previously approved plans, Staff believes that all garages should be located in the rear of the structures.

The applicant has submitted an agreement between the neighboring Village at Scioto Meadows Condominium Association, signed by the Association's Board Members and Redwood Acquisitions. The letter indicates support of the proposed development, and includes project details such as site layout and building architecture, as well as maintenance and utility responsibilities, a copy of which was in your packet.

A total of ten (10) buildings are proposed, ranging from 2 to 10 units per building. Most buildings have an approximate maximum building height of 19'10" above grade. The roof pitch and maximum height on the three-unit and four-unit buildings at the Lakeview Drive East entrance of the development and the three-unit building on the western portion of the development (Building A) have been raised to 25'5". This was done in order to give the appearance of a one and a half story structure in an attempt to better match the character of area development, which is composed of two-story structures.

Although the materials selected are similar to those utilized in the Village at Scioto Meadows development to the south, staff does not believe the one-story structures and the front-loaded garages are in character with structures in the existing condo development. There are large expanses of protruding front-loaded garages, specifically along Lakeview Drive North and Lakeview Drive East, which staff does not believe is compatible with the existing development, which includes buildings approximately 80 feet wide. Staff has recommended all units be rear-loaded with an increase height to give the appearance of two-story structures in order to better tie in the character of original development. The applicant has increased the height of the two-end structures adjacent to the existing condo complex, but has not reconfigured all units to rear-loaded. Also, a ten-unit building is proposed, which exceeds the Code maximum requirement of eight (8) units. Additionally, the labeling on the elevations do not match the correct buildings on the Development Plan.

Landscaping is proposed on the site for both decorative and functional purposes and includes deciduous and evergreen trees, shrubs, and perennials and ornamental grasses. Landscaping is also provided for each residential structure and around the proposed mailbox gazebo, however, Staff is has requested additional landscaping around the actual gazebo and the Leasing Office. We also need details on the plantings around most of the elevations.

Per 1101.09(b), based on the number of units proposed, 2.3 acres of open space is required and provided within the development. The applicant has provided a plan sheet indicating the location of this open space (Sheet C001), which surrounds the development on the east, north and west boundaries. A large area on the northeast corner of the site has also been dedicated to open space and includes a sidewalk and gazebo. This proposed open space is adjacent to the city's Scioto Meadows Park. A sidewalk is proposed to be installed between the two proposed open spaces for easier access to the public park for residents. Although plans show the development provides 2.3 acres of open space, Staff does not believe its location and function meets the intent of Code Chapter 1101. The previously approved Development Plan for this site included community open space in the center of the development in the general location of Building J. Staff recommended that Building D be removed from the plans to make the open space more open to the community and usable by all area residents (as previously approved) instead of located behind a structure; however, the applicant did not incorporate this into the plans.

Per Section 1135.14 Planning Commission is charged with reviewing and evaluating the Final Development Plan applications by applying the eight (8) findings as listed in the Staff Report and the requested development plan would allow the development of a 52 unit multi-family residential development. Due to the incompatible layout and architectural design of the site with neighboring developments and the previously approved plans and the deviation from the Zoning Code, Staff does not feel the development plan is appropriate as submitted.

Therefore, after review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of disapproval to City Council for the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Jack Reynolds, Attorney with Smith and Hale and Mr. James Frey, Redwood Acquisitions were present to speak to the item. Mr. Reynolds stated that he and various representatives have been working with Staff to alleviate some of the concerns that have been mentioned, however, there are some items that have not been able to be worked out and he is in disagreement with some of the recommendations that Staff presented. He stated that the property was a 23-acre site that was approved and started developing in 1999. They are currently looking at the back 7.6 acres which was approved for 60 units and have reduced it to 52 units. He continued to discuss the various costs associated with this property and the losses that have occurred due to lack of development and the fact that little has been done on the property for the past 16 years.

He continued to state that the benefits of having Redwood Communities step in and develop this property. Redwood has met with the Condo Association of the neighboring community and has developed an agreement with them in relation to creating a residential community next to them that will enable them to comfortably coexist. The agreement that was reached allows for maintenance of some of the infrastructure that is currently in place. Due to this agreement, the Association dues that are currently being made by the condominium owners next to the proposed development will decrease since they will be offset by maintenance that Redwood will be providing. He stated that there were representatives of the condo association board in attendance that will be testifying to these agreements and the benefits that this new community will provide. Mr. Reynolds reiterated that they are here to amend the original proposal that was presented in 1999. He stated that Redwood Communities does not produce two-story units with rear-loading garages. They have a model that is a one-story front loaded unit. There are a couple of units with rear-loaded garages due to the layout of the property.

With this new proposed development, there are eight (8) fewer units than were originally proposed in 1999 and there are 2.3 acres of green space located in a more appropriate area next to the existing park. In negotiations with the existing condo association, they have attempted to match their materials and colors to be more cohesive. They also feel that the units themselves are superior in quality with a value of approximately $140,000 per unit.

At this time, Mr. James Frey asked to speak to the item. Mr. Frey presented general information about Redwood Communities and additional information which included a copy of the proposed lease agreement, specific Redwood demographic information, and videos detailing the Redwood communities and testimonials. Referring to the lease agreement, Mr. Schottke asked Mr. Frey if Redwood does the screening of applicants requesting residency. Mr. Frey stated that they use an outside company.

Mr. Reynolds, in response to an inquiry from Chair Leasure, again stated that they disagree with Staff's recommendations due to the fact that they do not feel it is necessary to "mirror" the existing condominiums. Redwood is unique and operates as its own community and shouldn't be forced to look like the other complex.

Chair Leasure asked if there is access for the residents of Scioto Meadows to enter the Redwood Development. Mr. Reynolds responded that they do. Chair Leasure asked the widths of the streets. Mr. Reynolds responded that they were 26' on the main drive and 28' on the curve.

Mr. Frey made the comment that when they met with Scioto Meadows HOA, one of the resident's objectives was that residents of the proposed development not go onto the property. Consequently, they are planning to put up a fence along the property. They also agreed that they would co-maintain the main street coming into the property.

At this time, Chair Leasure asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak to the item. Ms. Crystal Stevenson, Scioto Meadows Condo Association board member, asked to speak. She stated that she and the other board members have met with Mr. Frey on several occasions and are in agreement with Redwood Communities. They do not want Redwood to look like the current Scioto Meadows development because they do not want residents from Redwood thinking they are able to utilize the amenities that the Village at Scioto Meadows currently has. If the units look different, there will be more differentiation separating the two areas. She also stated that Scioto Meadows has many different looks, including one, two and possibly three story homes. Because of the layout of these homes, some residents look out their front directly into someone else's garage.

Ms. Stevenson said that for the past several years, the residents have been maintaining the access roads around the property and by entering into an agreement with Redwood to share in the maintenance costs; it will take a burden off of the current residents.

Mr. Schottke stated his concern that the rear of some of the buildings appear to look like barracks. Other than a few sliding doors and windows, there are no distinguishing factors. He asked if it would be possible to redesign the units or to move the road to the other side of the units and make the current location of the street into a green space. Mr. Frye responded that they would not be able to accomplish this due to existing utility work. Mr. Schottke expressed that he had no problems with the interiors, however, he specifically did not like the back of Buildings B and C, and from the front, all he is seeing are garages.

Mr. Schottke stated to Mr. Frey that he would be happy to postpone this item if they could determine a way to redesign Buildings B and C to be more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Frey stated that it might be possible to stagger the units within the buildings. Again, Mr. Schottke suggested that they postpone until they are able to return with revised design plans.

Mr. Rauch gave a brief summarization to the meeting from Staff's perspective. He stated that this is a 7.6 acre site designed to be developed in one phase, as one product and one community. With this development, Staff is not looking to have exact matches; however, they would like compatible communities – compatible building orientation, compatible building design and adequate amount of open space. The applicant said they provided 2.3 acres of open space, however, the open space is basically the entire back yards of the perimeter of the site, so it's not really usable open space. Mr. Rauch stated that Staff has been consistent with their comments to Redwood regarding this proposed development plan and he would appreciate any insight from Planning Commission in order to come to some type of resolution.

Mr. Schottke acknowledged that a development would be better than what is currently there. Mr. Frey stated that he will send the Development Department some type of design changes that might be closer to what the City would be agreeable to.

Chair Leasure asked if anyone else in the audience would like to speak to the item. Ms. Sharon Engle, board member with Village of Scioto Meadows asked to speak. She reiterated that she and the entire board are very anxious to have someone develop the property for both property value reasons and in having Redwood share some of their maintenance fees.

Chair Leasure asked if the Fire Department had any problems with the project. Ms. Green stated that they did not, however, she stated that residents would be unable to park on the street.

Mr. Rauch requested that the application be withdrawn and resubmitted when they have developed new plans for the Committee to review. Mr. Reynolds asked if the item could be tabled until the next Planning Commission meeting. The Committee agreed to this plan of action.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Schottke moved that the Development Plan be tabled until the January 5, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Linder seconded and the motion was approved with the roll being called as follows: Mr. Schottke - yes; Mr. Linder – yes; Chair Leasure – No; Mr. Boso – Yes; Ms. Oyster – Yes.

ITEM #2 – Jimmy Johns Sandwiches – Special Use Permit (Drive-Thru) (PID #201509280069)

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings. The applicant is requesting approval of a special use permit to operate a single-window drive-thru for the Jimmy Johns at 3041 Turnberry Court in the Turnberry Retail Center. The drive-thru window will be located on the north side of the structure with the drive-thru lane wrapping around the rear (east side) of the building.

The Development Plan for the Turnberry Retail Center was approved by City Council in February 2007, and showed a drive-thru window in its current location on the north side of the structure. A special use permit was also approved in 2007 for a drive-thru for Starbucks at the current location of Jimmy Johns. Impero Coffee replaced Starbucks in the tenant space in 2011 but also vacated the space. According to section 1135.09(b)(12), approval of a special use permit shall become null and void if the activity for which the special use permit was approved for ceases for a period of six (6) months.

The proposed drive-thru for Jimmy John's would operate in the same manner as the previously approved special use permit on the site, utilizing the existing pick-up window on the north side of the structure and the order kiosk at the rear (east side) of the structure. The drive-thru has the ability to stack six (6) cars between the pick-up window and order kiosk and two (2) additional cars before the order kiosk within the drive-thru lane. The approved development plan for the Turnberry Retail Center included a 2' wide curb between the drive-thru lane and the access drive around the site on the north side of site. Striping was also shown on plans to demarcate the drive-thru lane on the east side of the structure. These improvements were not installed. In order to create safer circulation on the site, staff recommends a 4' wide curbed landscape island be installed on the north side of the drive-thru lane and pavement markings be added along the remainder of the drive-thru lane to separate it from the drive aisle. The applicant should work with the Urban Forester to select landscaping appropriate for this landscape island. All pavement markings should be white to match existing striping.

Staff also recommends the menu board be finished with a brick base to match the primary structure. Landscaping should be installed around the base of the menu board and speaker. Additionally, the existing bollards around the speaker and menu board should be painted black.

After review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Special Use Permit with the stipulations as listed in the Staff Report.

Mr. William Patel, partner for this Jimmy Johns Sandwich Shop, was present to speak to the item. He stated that the restaurant opened in September and they plan on adding the pavement markings as soon as the weather is appropriate. He also stated that he was unaware that the bollards were required to be black, but they will change that as well. He stated that the menu board was in existence from prior owners of the site.

Mr. Linder asked the City if the drawing is depicting a 4' curb. Ms. Proehl stated that the site plan that Staff was using was the original from 2007 since no new additional site plans were provided and it shows a 2' curb. Ms. Shields stated that the drive-thru lane is 40' wide between the building and the edge of the pavement. Staff's intent is for a 24' wide drive aisle with 12' for the drive-thru lane and 4' for landscaping to separate the two.

Chair Leasure asked Mr. Patel if he agreed with the stipulations. Mr. Patel stated that all items should be able to be addressed as weather permits.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit to City Council with the following five (5) stipulations noted in the Staff Report:

1. A 4' wide landscape island shall be installed on the north side of the drive-thru lane to separate the drive-thru lane from the primary drive aisle. The applicant shall work with the Urban Forester to select appropriate landscaping within this landscape island.

2. Pavement markings shall be added to identify the drive-thru lane on the east side of the structure. All markings shall be white.

3. The menu board shall be placed on a brick base matching the brick on the primary structure.

4. Landscaping shall be installed around the base of the menu board and speaker.

5. The existing red bollards shall be painted black.

Mr. Schottke seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

ITEM #4 – Buckeye Parkway Retail – Special Use Permit (Outdoor Seating) (PID #201510260080)

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings. The applicant is proposing to install an outdoor seating area for the Buckeye Parkway multi-tenant commercial structure at 4145 Buckeye Parkway. The seating area will be located at the northeast corner of the building, flush with the adjacent sidewalk around the structure, and will be 396 square feet in area. A 36" decorative fence will border the seating area with bollards placed to protect the seating area from the adjacent parking spaces and drive aisle. Bollards will have a decorative finish and match those located throughout the Parkway Centre development. Materials indicate the fence and patio furniture will be dark bronze in color to match the storefront finish on the structure. The seating area will be approximately 100' from Buckeye Parkway and will not infringe into the sidewalk around the structure or the sidewalk accessing the adjacent parking spaces. The seating area will be open from 10am to 10pm. No additional lighting is proposed within the seating area; however 2-3 speakers are proposed for the area.

Approximately six (6) tables with 24 seats and umbrellas are proposed for the tables, and materials state that umbrellas will not display any signage. Materials indicate additional landscaping will be added to the patio area in the form of landscape planters, but this landscaping is not shown on plans. Staff recommends the plans be updated to reflect the location of proposed planters, and that the applicant work with the Urban Forester to select appropriate plantings for the planters.

After review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Special Use Permit with the stipulations noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Tommy Wang, property owner, was present to speak to the item. Mr. Wang stated that they are proposing a patio for the prospective tenant of the property.

Mr. Linder asked if there would be adequate parking on the site with the addition of this patio. Ms. Shields stated that it would only utilize two (2) parking spaces. Mr. Linder stated that he is not a proponent for placing seating in a parking lot. He asked if this area would be level with the sidewalk or a drop-down area in the parking lot and whether it would be concrete or asphalt. Mr. Wang stated that the patio would be concrete above the parking lot. Ms. Proehl stated that it would be six (6) inches high and match the sidewalk. Ms. Oyster asked if a vehicle heading south on Buckeye Parkway and turning into the drive would have adequate time to see if a vehicle is exiting out of the drive. Ms. Shields stated that the drive aisle location has already been relocated as part of the Development Plan for the property.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Schottke moved to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit to City Council with the following two (2) stipulations noted in the Staff Report:

1. Plans shall be updated to show the location of proposed planters.

2. The applicant shall work with the Urban Forester to select appropriate plantings for the landscape planters.

Ms. Oyster seconded and the motion was approved with the roll being called as follows: Mr. Schottke - yes; Mr. Linder – No; Chair Leasure – Yes; Mr. Boso – Yes; Ms. Oyster – Yes.

ITEM #5 – Home Road – Rezoning R-1 to IND-1 (PID #201511020082)

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings. The applicant is proposing to rezone two properties (040-008688, 040-008689), approximately 7.4 acres in size, located north of Home Road from R-1, Residential District to IND-1, Light Industrial District.

The site is currently in contract to be purchased by the Kirk Williams Company, which plans to expand its operation from their site directly adjacent to the west. The western parcel to be rezoned (040-008688) is currently wooded and undeveloped, and the eastern parcel (040-008689) currently contains a single family home. The site has roughly 540± feet of frontage along Home Road.

To the east are single-family homes zoned R-1, Residential District and in Jackson Township. To the south are multi-family developments zoned PUD-R and D-1. To the west is industrial development in the IND-1 and to the north is Interstate 270.

The requested IND-1 will allow the expansion of the Kirk Williams Company on an approximate 7.3 acre site. Staff feels the proposed rezoning is appropriate based on the proximity of other parcels zoned for compatible development and its location off of Home Road, noting that the development will be required to comply with all screening standards and other Code requirements to reduce any negative impacts on adjacent properties. These items will be reviewed and enforced with the submittal of a development plan for the site.

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

Ms. Laura Comek, Applicant for the project and J.K. Williams, Kirk Williams Company, were present to speak to the item. Ms. Comek stated that the Kirk Williams Company acquired the single family home parcel several years ago. The middle parcel was recently put on the market and there is a limited amount of time to have the property rezoned. The benefit to having this property rezoned is that it will enable them to have a nice sized site for development, although they currently have no specific plans for this property.

Mr. Linder asked why there wouldn't be a planned unit zoning on this property. Mr. Rauch stated that it is strictly up to the applicant but we do not have anything in place that specifically states we need a PUD-I in order to rezone the property. Mr. Williams stated that they have been talking to the current owner for approximately 40 years and he has now decided that he would like to sell. The Kirk Williams Company has deadlines in their contract that there will be monetary penalties if the property is not closed by a certain date.

Mr. Schottke asked Mr. Williams if they have had any conversations with the neighbors around the property. Mr. Williams stated that he had not. Mr. Schottke stated that it would be beneficial for him to do so in order to keep them apprised of possible future development. Mr. Boso stated that the neighbors would be receiving notification of the zoning changes. Mr. Schottke asked Mr. Williams how many employees he currently has. Mr. Williams stated they employ approximately 55-60 employees. Mr. Schottke asked if they decide to expand if that would increase the number of employees. Mr. Williams said that this might potentially result in an expansion of employees. The current building is approximately 40 years old and in need of extra space and upgrades. There is a potential that they could put up an office area which would result in adding a few employees and adding additional production space at a later date. Mr. Schottke encouraged Mr. Williams to continue adding employees.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Schottke moved to recommend approval of the Rezoning to City Council as submitted. Ms. Oyster seconded and the vote was unanimously approved.

ITEM #6 – 3448 Park Street – Lot Split **(PID #201511160083)**

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings. The applicant is proposing to split 3448 Park Street, approximately 0.19 acres, into two parcels, 0.099 acres and 0.091 acres in size, with one proposed split.

The 0.099 acre lot will be purchased by the City of Grove City to be used as public parking for surrounding developments, with the funds appropriated for the purchase and related expenses by City Council on November 2, 2015. The remaining 0.091 acres of land will remain privately owned and operated. After review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission approve the lot split as submitted.

Eric Meininger, EMH&T was present to speak to the item.

Being no discussion, Ms. Oyster moved to approve the Lot Split as submitted. Mr. Linder seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

ITEM #7 – 3454 & 3460 Park Street **(PID #201511160083)**

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings. The applicant is proposing to split the rear 0.201 acres from 3454 & 3460 Park Street. The area to be split will be purchased by the City of Grove City to be used as public parking for surrounding developments, with the funds appropriated for the purchase and related expenses by City Council on November 2, 2015. The remaining 0.197 acres of land will remain privately owned and operated. After review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission approve the lot split as submitted.

Mr. Eric Meininger, EMH&T was present to speak to the item.

Being no discussion, Mr. Schottke moved to approve the Lot Split as submitted. Mr. Linder seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

ITEM #8 – 4895 Hoover Road – Lot Split **(PID #201511170085)**

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings. The applicant is proposing to split 0.358 acres from the 19.5 acre site at 4895 Hoover Road, the future site of The Courtyards on Hoover development.

The 0.358 acre lot will be dedicated to the City of Grove City to be utilized as a public park for residents, as identified in the Development Plan for the Courtyards on Hoover.

After review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission approve the lot split as submitted.

For clarification purposes, Mr. Rauch stated that the Courtyards at Hoover development plan has a reserve area for a parkette as well as a corridor for a bike path. This Lot Split will allow them to dedicate the 0.358 acre parkette to the City so it can be combined with the reserve to the west to make a larger park area. Mr. Schottke asked if the City would be purchasing this piece of land and Mr. Rauch stated that no, it will be dedicated to the City.

Being no further discussion, Ms. Oyster moved to approve the Lot Split as submitted. Mr. Schottke seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

ITEM #9 – Derby Square – Certificate of Appropriateness **(PID #201511230086)**

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings. The applicant is requesting an appeal for a denied Certificate of Appropriateness Application by the Chief Building and Zoning Official for an "attended donation Pod" for the Derby Square shopping center, located at 2161-2263 Stringtown Road. The original request was submitted to the Building Division in October, and was denied based on appropriateness and compatibility of surrounding development. With the same initial application, the applicant was approved for one standard collection bin.

The proposed attended donation Pod will be 7.5' wide x 16' long x 8' high with a footprint of 120 square feet. Materials indicate the Pod is a free-standing portable structure which is off loaded from a trailer as a whole unit and does not require any assembly or construction on site nor any utilities requiring connections or hookups. The Pod will have a roll up door at one end, and materials indicate the side panels will include lettering and imaging of a variety of colors. The Pod would be located adjacent to the previously approved donation bin, at the northwest corner of the parking lot behind Once Upon a Child, along Parkmead Drive, and will occupy one parking space.

Additionally, it should be noted that the City is currently drafting legislation to ban all new collection bins within the city limits. The proposed Pod would not be permitted under the proposed legislation.

After review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of disapproval to City Council for the Certificate of Appropriateness Appeal as submitted.

Mr. Charles Grimmett, Savers Inc. was present to speak to the item. He gave a brief explanation on the background of the type of donation pod that he is requesting be approved, explaining its use for recycled goods and the fact that it would be staffed daily with an attendant. He expressed that they want to work with the City to meet the City's needs and expectations.

Chair Leasure asked if Savers Inc. had a good maintenance program for maintaining the units. Mr. Grimmett stated that if there is an issue with the pod, they will respond immediately and can usually have someone there within 3 – 4 hours.

Mr. Schottke asked Mr. Grimmett if there was a reason the exterior of the pod was designed the way it is. Mr. Grimmett responded that they are looking for a design that is consistent and gives a visual to people that see it. Mr. Schottke also asked about possible landscaping and whether or not they might be able to place some planter boxes around the unit to screen it from the street. Mr. Grimmett stated that donation pods are items of convenience and they would like them visible so people are aware of their existence.

Mr. Schottke asked if Mr. Grimmett had talked to COTA about placing the unit behind the ride-along so it would not be sitting right out on the street across from an apartment complex. Mr. Grimmett stated that they had originally gotten denied by the City stating that pods were not permitted in Grove City, so his purpose is to work with the City to write code that is works with the City's needs. They would just like time to prove their model. He feels they can show great positive impact as they offer a great value and service.

Mr. Schottke asked where the City is in terms of the new legislation regarding pods in Grove City. Mr. Stephen Smith, Frost, Brown and Todd, stated that he has drafted the legislation and it is still in the process of being refined. He anticipates it will be on City Council's agenda sometime early in the year for their consideration.

Mr. Boso asked Mr. Grimmett if this was a "for profit" corporation. Mr. Grimmett responded that they are.

Ms. Oyster commented that she is all for organizations that help people, however, she feels that this unit in this particular location is somewhat of an eyesore to people driving by as well as surrounding businesses. Since we set high levels that our businesses are required to adhere to it doesn't seem appropriate to place the unit right by them. However, perhaps there might be another location which isn't so close to businesses and the residential areas. Mr. Grimmett responded that they simply try to place the units in areas which make it convenient to those that wish to utilize the service.

Mr. Smith stated that this application is before the Commission because it had been denied based on the location. The Planning Commission's responsibility is to evaluate this request based on the location for which it is being asked to locate. If this appeal is denied, the applicant can certainly work with Staff to determine a more acceptable location that might not be in the proximity of residential areas or business such as the ones located in this area.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Schottke moved to recommend the Certificate of Appropriateness to City Council as submitted. Ms. Oyster seconded. Roll was taken as follows: Mr. Schottke – No; Ms. Oyster – No; Mr. Boso – No; Chair Leasure – No; Mr. Linder – No and the motion was denied.

ITEM #10 – 3464 Park Street – Lot Split **(PID #201512010087)**

Ms. Proehl presented the Development Department's findings. The applicant is proposing to divide an existing approximate 0.21 acre site located at 3464 Park Street into two parcels, 0.114 acres and 0.096 acres in size, with one proposed split.

The 0.114 acre lot will be purchased by the City of Grove City to be used as public parking for surrounding developments, with the funds appropriated for the purchase and related expenses by City Council on November 2, 2015. The remaining 0.096 acres of land will remain privately owned and operated.

After review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission approve the Lot Split as submitted.

Mr. Erik Meininger, EMH&T was present to speak to the item.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Oyster moved to approve the Lot Split as submitted. Ms. Oyster seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Other Business –

Mr. Roby Schottke submitted his letter of resignation to the Planning Commission as he will begin serving on City Council effective January, 2016.

Having no further business, Chair Leasure adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Mary Havener, Secretary

Gary Leasure, Chairman