MEETING MINUTES

Planning Commission

April 6, 2021 – 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: Mr. David Frea, Chair Julie Oyster, Mr. Jim Rauck, Mr. Mike Linder and Mr. Larry Titus. Other staff members present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Dash Logan, Development Planner; Hannah White, Development Assistant; Brittany Seebach, Development Secretary; Chuck Boso, City Administrator; Jennifer Readler, Frost Brown Todd; Tami Kelly, City Council Clerk; Kevin Koesters, Service Superintendent; Mike Boso, Chief Building Inspector; Laura Scott, Planning and Zoning Coordinator; and Nick Mill, EMH&T.

Chair Oyster noticed a quorum was present and asked for approval of the March 2, 2021 Planning Commission minutes. Mr. Linder moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Frea seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved 5-0.

Due to technical issues the representative for Item #1- Buskirk Law Solar Project, was not available at the time the item was called. Planning Commission agreed to amend the agenda order, moving Item #1 to the end.

New Items:

ITEM #2 – 3105 Park Street - Certificate of Appropriateness **PID #202103030012**

Mr. Logan presented the Development Department's findings. He stated that the proposal was a request to allow for an addition to the home at 3105 Park Street, located within the Historic Preservation Area (HPA).

Mr. Logan explained that an initial application to the Building Division was considered, and after discussion with Staff, it was determined that the addition would require approval from Planning Commission and City Council. He stated that once approved by City Council, all necessary permits would need to be obtained through the Building Division.

Mr. Logan went on to illustrate the physical aspects of the addition, explaining that the addition would be on the southeast corner of the existing structure, one story in height and 280 square feet. He stated that the addition would be finished in white vinyl siding and blue shakes.

Mr. Logan added that the applicant was also seeking approval to paint the existing home using the same colors as the proposed addition; blue painted shakes and white trim, giving the property a uniform appearance in character with the expectations of the Historical Preservation Area.

Mr. Logan explained that to accommodate the addition a section of the existing chain link fencing would be removed. He pointed out that as a chain link fence does not conform with the intended character of the Historic Preservation Area, and given the site's prominent location at the intersection of Park Street and Haughn Road (across from the Grant-Sawyer Home), Staff believes that the existing fence should be replaced with a decorative fence.

Mr. Logan suggested a white vinyl fence installation, based on comparable fences in the area and to be compatible with the white paint proposed on the addition and trim of the home.

Mr. Logan recommended Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council, with the two stipulations noted.

Mr. Josh Burton, Property Owner, was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Burton asked for the first stipulation to be repeated and then went on to address the second, explaining that he had requested requirement material of the fence replacement and if there was any kind of grant program available to utilize, as a fence replacement was not in the original project budget and not brought to their attention until later in the process.

Mrs. Shields informed Mr. Burton that the Town Center Commercial Revitalization grant the main Town Center grant program and that the City did not currently offer a residential program that this property would be eligible for. She did explain that the property would be eligible for a Community Reinvestment Area tax incentive, where improvements to the property would count towards a property tax abatement.

Mrs. Shields went on to say that although fencing requirement specifics were not provided, examples of decorative fencing that would be code compliant were offered to help give the applicant an idea of expectations in order to help guide the consideration of fencing options.

Mr. Burton then expressed concern over the 42-inch height maximum requirement.

Mrs. Shields answered that this is a code requirement.

Mrs. Oyster asked to clarify if removing the chain-link fence and not replacing the fence was an option.

Mrs. Shields answered that Staff felt that since a portion of the existing fence was being removed for the project that it would be an appropriate time to bring the fence into compliance. She added that legal counsel may need to be solicited to determine if the second stipulation was required since the fence line was not being extended.

Mr. Burton again expressed concern over the 42-inch height requirement, explaining that he believed the number to be the minimum, not the maximum height requirement. He expressed concern over the safety of the family's children and pets and questioned the purpose of a fence that could easily be jumped/climbed over.

Mrs. Shields answered that the stipulation would be consistent with what past HPA fencing approvals outlined.

Mr. Burton asked for a date for those approvals and again expressed concern of a fence height that would not give their corner lot privacy or safety, in his opinion.

Mrs. Shields explained that per code, the height max is 42 inches. She went on to present examples of related applications; an application in 2018 for a chain-link fence that was recommended by staff to be a decorative fence of white vinyl, of the same height requirement of 42 inches, and a second application from early 2021 of an improvement project on Park Street where City Council introduced a stipulation to bring the fence to code compliance.

Mr. Burton explained that a 42-inch fence stipulation was not a stipulation that he would support at this time and it would have to be looked at more closely, as he believed it to be an unsafe height.

Mr. Rauck asked Staff if Planning Commission had grounds to rule on entire fence replacement if there was only a portion of the existing fence being disturbed, throughout the project completion.

Mr. Rauch answered by explaining that the stipulation was presented as a request to the applicant to gauge if he would be willing to replace the fence to be more compliant with HPA code.

Mr. Rauck clarified that it was more of an "ask" instead of a stipulation; that if it was undisturbed then it should be allowed to stay in place.

Mr. Rauch answered that that was correct.

Hearing no further questions or discussion from either Planning Commission or the public, Mr. Rauck moved to recommend approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness, with the following stipulation:

1. All necessary permits shall be obtained through the Building Division prior to construction.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion, and the item was approved, 5-0.

ITEM #3 – Meadow Grove Estates North Section 6B - Plat **PID #202103030013**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was requesting approval of a Plat for Section 6B of Meadow Grove Estates North, located on 10 acres, east of Buckeye Parkway.

Mrs. Shields informed Planning Commission that the proposed Plat would continue to create the right-of-way, easements and lots as shown on the approved Development Plan for Meadow Grove Estates North, approved in 2006 and more recently approved construction plans for the area.

Mrs. Shields stated that Section 6B contains 27 single-family home lots and the extension of two existing roadways: Silverlawn Drive and Carlisle Drive. She added that right-of-way for a new roadway (Timber Heights Lane) would also be created with the plan. Mrs. Shields went on to explain that the proposed lots meet with R-1 standards as required in the development standards text and are configured as shown on the approved development plan; therefore, Staff was recommending Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council, as submitted.

Mr. Corey Theuerkauf, Rockford Homes, was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Rauck asked if the retention was going into the two existing ponds south of the area in question.

Mr. Theuerkauf confirmed that drainage path.

Mr. Rauck brought up that there may be an issue of that drainage system going across Mr. Hays property south of the site, near Borror Road.

Mr. Theuerkauf informed Mr. Rauck that the developers had met with Mr. Hays and the adjacent property owner over the past Summer (2020) and worked to alleviate their concerns. He explained that an underground drainage tile was installed at the site outlet and tied into the storm catch basin that was installed and improved through the Borror Road Improvement Plan, and that there is no overland as it stands.

Mr. Rauck explained that he had made visits to Mr. Hays lot in the last couple years but had not been to the lot recently and was pleased with the update Mr. Theuerkauf shared.

Mr. Theuerkauf added that re-grading and re-seeding had taken place already, and that there was a small area still left to be re-seeded but expected completion of that task in the next few weeks.

Mr. Rauck expressed his appreciation of the follow-up regarding the matter.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval of the Plat, as submitted.

Mr. Frea seconded the motion, and the item was approved 5-0.

ITEM #4 – Farmstead Subarea H (Phase 1) - Plat **PID #202103050018**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was requesting approval of a Plat for Farmstead Subarea H-Phase 1, located at the southwest corner of Hawthorne Parkway and Jackson Pike.

Mrs. Shields explained that Subarea H has a separate development plan with development text different from the remainder of the Farmstead development and was approved in 2020. She stated that the Plat would formalize the lots, right-of-way, easements and reserves shown on the Development Plan. She added that similar to the previous Plat, after Planning Commission's recommendation today, the Plat would have it's second reading for City Council approval on May 3rd.

Mrs. Shields went on to explain that Phase 1 contains the first 23 single-family home lots in the northernmost portion of the subarea. She stated that each lot meets the minimum requirements from the approved development text, being at least 50 feet in width and 6,000 square feet in area. She added that Honey Farm Way was proposed to be extended south of Hawthorne Parkway as the main street through the Subarea, and one new roadway (Honeycomb Lane) will be created.

Mrs. Shields stated that three reserves are proposed and would total just over 1.5 acres, each to be owned and maintained by the Farmstead HOA. She stated that Reserve H-B borders the subarea along the north and east sides and includes an easement for a multi-use path along Jackson Pike and Hawthorne Parkway.

Mrs. Shields went on to say that the configuration of lots, roadways and reserves all match the layout as approved on the Development Plan and Final Engineering Plans, and therefore recommended approval to City Council as submitted.

Mr. Troy Cameron, Grand Communities, LLC, was present to speak to the item.

Hearing no questions from either Planning Commission or the public, Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of the Plat, as submitted.

Mr. Titus seconded the motion, and the item was approved 5-0.

ITEM #5 – ARC Industries Active Treatment Facility - Use Approval **PID #202103030014**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings, stating that the applicant was requesting a Use Approval for 3705 Marlane Drive in order to operate an adult day services and vocational rehabilitation business for adults with developmental and intellectual disabilities.

Mrs. Shields explained that the PUD-I zoning was set in 1998, with the Gateway to the City PUD-I. She stated that the proposed use falls under SIC codes 8322 and 8331, which are not identified in any zoning district in the City. She said that the PUD-I zoning for the site does not outline permitted uses, therefore uses revert to those noted in 1135.14, which does note permitting other uses approved by Planning Commission. She explained that best avenue for this type of request is the Use Approval application.

Mrs. Shields went on to say that the facility would have approximately 45 employees and serve 75 clients. She stated that per the submitted materials, the 'adult day services' provided would be to enhance client skills, independence, and community involvement; and that the vocational habilitation services are focused on learning and work experience including volunteer opportunities and skills building.

Mrs. Shields illustrated business operations by explaining hours of operation as Monday through Friday from 8:00 am until 5:00 pm, with drop off occurring between 8:45 am and 9:15 am and departure between 2:00 pm and 2:30pm, both done with ARC Industry vans that pick up and drop off clients.

Mrs. Shields stated that very limited improvements to the site will be required for the use at the location, including potential widening of sidewalks to accommodate client's mobility needs. She added that the applicant had indicated their agreement to replacing any landscaping disturbed as part of these improvements.

Mrs. Shields explained that the GroveCity2050 Future Land Use and Character Map recommended the site to be used as Tech Flex, which includes offices as a primary recommended use and institutional uses as a secondary recommended use.

Mrs. Shields informed Planning Commission that Staff believed the proposed uses to be in character with the surrounding area, which include a variety of office and service-oriented uses including a Mt. Carmel medical clinic, the Healthcare Logistics office, and the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and therefore recommended Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council, as submitted.

Mr. Frea informed Planning Commission that he would be abstaining from the item, as he is the owner of property directly across the street from the property in question.

Hearing no questions from either Planning Commission or the public, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval of the Plat, as submitted.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion, and the item was approved 4-0.

ITEM #6 – 2950 London-Groveport Road - Rezoning **PID #202103030015**

Mr. Logan presented the Development Department's findings, explaining that the applicant was requesting to rezone 0.48 acres at 2950 London-Groveport Road from R-1 (Residential) to C-2 (Commercial).

Mr. Logan explained that no development was currently proposed for the parcel, and that the application was submitted to secure commercial zoning on site as a result of the property owner's concern of uncertainty with respect to the City's proposed zoning code rewrite. Mr. Logan added that future development on the site would be required to go through the Development Plan process.

Mr. Logan noted that the C-2 rezoning request for the parcel would create a site where any development on the resulting property would not have safe access to London-Groveport Road. He explained that Staff presented the applicant with several options, all of which included combining the site with the adjacent property to the west, to be rezoned together, as they are owned by the same entity.

Mr. Logan stated that the applicant provided a completed Lot Combination form signed by Franklin County, combing the neighboring parcels and alleviating Staff concerns of access to the parcel upon development. He added that the combination of parcels would result in a property with a split zoning, as the western portion would retain the existing PUD-C zoning. Noting this, Mr. Logan explained that development standards would need to be carefully reviewed with future development to ensure cohesive development with proper access management across the site.

Mr. Logan explained that Staff is supportive of commercial uses on this site, as the C-2 zoning aligns with the future land use identified in the GroveCity2050 community plan and matches that of area properties, and therefore, Staff recommended Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council as submitted.

Mr. Mike Shannon, Underhill &Hodge, LLC, was present to speak to the item and expressed thanks to Staff and Planning Commission for their time and explained that it was their sole intent to establish base commercial rights and come back in future once they able to market the property as commercial.

Mr. Linder posed a question of which zoning would take precedence, should a development come to exist on both, now combined, parcels.

Mrs. Shields answered that the lots had been combined through Franklin County to ensure that access point concerns were alleviated. She explained that the parcel was now one continuous lot, with a split zoning of C-2 and PUD-C.

Mrs. Shields went on to explain that if the site does develop further and did not choose to incorporate a new PUD-C zoning through the entire combined lot that there may be some variation in setback requirements, and requirements would need to be examined closely with any future Development Plan for site.

Mr. Frea wished to clarify where the access point would be located on the parcel.

Mrs. Shields illustrated that had the site in question remained an individual parcel the access drive would've been difficult to place, given spacing requirements related to the nearby intersection. She stated that the combination of lots was ultimately to alleviate the access drive concern, making sure that a drive would be integrated off of North Meadows Drive and an extension of the private access drive utilized by the nearby Waffle House restaurant and Tire Discounters.

There being no further questions or discussion, Mr. Frea moved to recommend approval, as submitted.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion, and the item was approved 5-0.

ITEM #7 – Wright-Patt Grove City - Special Use Permit **PID #202101070001**

Mr. Logan presented the Development Department's findings, explaining that the applicant was requesting approval of drive-thru teller machines for the proposed Wright-Patt Credit Union on Stringtown Road, located on the outlot in front of the former Kmart building. He stated that the Special Use Permit application was being reviewed concurrently with a Development Plan application, which would address the associated site improvements, whereas the Special Use Permit application would address the appropriateness of drive-thru machines on the site.

Mr. Logan informed Planning Commission that three kiosks total were proposed, and two kiosks would have the same hours of operation as the building, 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., while the remaining kiosk would be available for customer use 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He pointed out that each drive-thru lane showed a stacking capacity of three cars, however, plans show potential for additional stacking capacity through the parking lot drive aisles. He explained that Wright-Patt had indicated in application materials that the shown stacking capacity is greater than is typically included at their other Central Ohio locations.

Mr. Logan stated that the site had been designed for safe access and circulation, included directional markings and signage, and incorporated a bypass lane to maintain circulation should the drive-thru lanes stack past the capacity shown in site plans.

Mr. Logan concluded by illustrating the area's several other drive-thru businesses and added that Staff believed the proposed use as appropriate for the area, and therefore, recommended Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council as submitted.

Andrew Navarro, OHM Advisors, was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Rauck asked if the drive apron closest to Stringtown Road was an 'in' or 'out' drive, or both.

Mr. Navarro answered that the apron in question was an 'out' only, to suit the concerns brought forth by Staff over traffic issues and potential vehicle stacking at the site. He added that the northeast apron was designed as a full access drive.

Mr. Rauck wished to clarify that appropriate signage would be displayed to make sure the drives were used as intended.

There being no further questions or discussion, Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of Special Use Permit, as submitted.

Mr. Titus seconded the motion, and the item was approved 5-0.

ITEM #8 – Wright-Patt Grove City – Development Plan **PID #202103020011**

Mr. Logan presented the Development Department's findings, illustrating the proposal as the Development Plan associated with the previously discussed Wright-Patt Credit Union on Stringtown Road. He went on to explain that the Special Use Permit reviews the appropriateness of the use, while the Development Plan examines the built character of the site, including the building architecture and site improvements.

Mr. Logan went on to explain that the proposed credit union would be located at 2400 Stringtown Road, on the outlot in front of Kmart. He stated that the proposed improvements include a new building, three drive-thru teller machines, and parking lot. He explained that the site would be accessed from the private drive to the east, on the former Kmart site, which connects to a signalized intersection with Stringtown Road.

Mr. Logan informed Planning Commission that the lot split creating this particular parcel included a stipulation that an access easement needed to be formalized prior to development plan approval, and that the applicant had indicated the easement was in the process of being drafted. He went on to explain that the easement would need to be finalized between the two parcels to ensure that the site would have continued use of the drive aisle.

Mr. Logan explained that one full-service access point was being proposed to be located near the northeast corner of the site, aligning with a drive aisle on the redevelopment Kmart parking lot. He added that a right-out-only exit was also being proposed to the south.

Mr. Logan described the proposed building as being one-story, totaling 2,805 square feet, brick and stone veneer finishing, with eifs and metal accents, all creating a high-quality appearance. He added that the canopy over the drive-thru would utilize identical materials.

Mr. Logan concluded by stating that Staff believes the proposed plan would result in a high-quality development that would utilize appropriate materials in character with the surrounding area, and therefore, recommended Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Development Plan, with the stipulation noted.

Andrea Navarro, OHM Advisors, was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Frea asked the maximum vehicle stacking capacity.

Mr. Navarro answered that each of the three teller locations would be able to stack three vehicles. He added that each teller was a full-service banking system, offering virtual services through each kiosk, and that the sacking capacity at this proposed site would be greater than that at any other Wright-Patt Credit Union location

Mr. Linder then raised the question of visibility throughout the parking lot, noticing landscaping details along turning points for vehicles.

Mrs. Shields answered that she was unsure of canopy size and specific details of the landscaping in question, but assured Mr. Linder that the Urban Forester would be consulted to make sure that there would not be any line-of-sight issues within the site.

There being no further questions or discussion, Mr. Frea moved to recommend approval of the Development Plan, with the one stipulation:

1. An access easement over the adjacent drive aisle to the east on the former Kmart site shall be finalized and recorded with Franklin County.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the item was approved 5-0.

ITEM #1 – Buskirk Law Solar Project- Certificate of Appropriateness **PID #202103030016**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She informed Planning Commission that the applicant was requesting approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to install roof-mounted solar panels on the rear portion of the roof at 4178 Broadway, located in the Historical Preservation Area.

Mrs. Shields went on to explain that the application originally was submitted to the Building Division, who deemed the proposed panels a significant project, thus requiring approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness through City Council. She stated that the application was on track to be reviewed by City Council on April 19, 2021.

Mrs. Shields illustrated the project by explaining that that proposed panels will be located on the upper rear and lower rear roof and would total approximately 360 square feet across the 32 panels. She informed Planning Commission of a site visit that confirmed the panels would not be easily visible from Broadway.

Mrs. Shields stated that a utility box would be installed on the south side of the building and would be placed in with the building's other utility boxes.

Mrs. Shields concluded by explaining that Staff was supportive of the proposed solar panels as the Historical Preservation Area Color Palette does allow for darker tones including the dark grey 'gunpowder' color. She stated that the request meets Land Use Objective 6 of the GroveCity2050 Community Plan that encourages sustainable efforts, and therefore, recommended Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council as submitted.

Jake Trubiano, American Dream Solar and Window Inc., was present to speak to the item and added that the project managers worked to ensure that the panels would be installed in a location that would minimize visibility from the street and sidewalk, and that the aesthetic intention of the Historical Preservation Area were kept in mind throughout the design process.

Mr. Titus inquired about the age of the existing roof.

Mr. Trubiano answered that the property owner was replacing the roof prior to panel installation, and that the panels themselves have a 25-year warranty.

Mr. Rauck then asked about the process of the project approval, questioning if other properties outside of the Historical Preservation Area would have to go through the Planning Commission and City Council process as well.

Mr. Rauch answered that as the process stands, an application is submitted to the Building Division, and if the Building Division deems the project as significant, then it proceeds through the Development Department and ushered through the Planning Commission and City Council process.

Mr. Frea inquired about the size of the utility box being installed for the solar panels.

Mr. Trubiano answered that the box would be approximately 14 inches by 16-18 inches, white in color, and located right next to the existing AEP meter.

Mr. Frea thanked Mr. Trubiano for his answer and then commend he and the property owner for the nature of the project.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Frea moved to recommend approval of Buskirk Law Project, as submitted.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion, and the item was approved 5-0.

There being no additional discussion, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 2:20 pm.

Hannah White, Development Assistant

Julie Oyster

Julie Oyster, Chair