MEETING MINUTES
Planning Commission

March 2, 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, and Mr. Mike Linder. Mr. Larry Titus was absent. Other staff members present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Dash Logan, Development Planner; Jimmy Hoppel, Development Planner; Hannah White, Development Assistant; Chuck Boso, City Administrator; Jennifer Readler, Frost Brown Todd; Tammy Green, Fire Safety Inspector; Tami Kelly, City Council Clerk; Kevin Koesters, Service Superintendent; Mike Boso, Chief Building Inspector; Cindi Fitzpatrick, Service Director; Laura Scott, Planning and Zoning Coordinator; and Nick Mill, EMH&T.

Chair Oyster noticed a quorum was present and asked for approval of the February 2, 2021 Planning Commission minutes. Mr. Frea moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Linder seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved 4-0.

New Items:

ITEM #1 – Broadway Professional Village – Lot Split (0.180 Acres) **PID #202101270005**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the proposal was a request to split 0.180 acres from a disjointed 4.866-acre parcel on Farm Bank Way, within the Broadway Professional Village development.

Mrs. Shields went on to explain that the Broadway Professional Village was originally approved in 2005, and divided into separate properties through two condominium plats in 2005 and 2008, placing the developed portions onto their own lots. She explained that if Planning Commission approved the split, it could then be finalized with Franklin County.

Mrs. Shields stated that the split was one of two lot splits being reviewed, as part of the applicant's efforts to clean up the disjointed site and place the non-contiguous portions of the parcel onto their own lots, leaving a remaining 4.5 acres at the northern portion of the site. She expressed that the proposed lot splits conformed to the approved zoning text for the area, which does not have a minimum lot size, and explained that the proposed

split would not inhibit future roadway extensions as shown on the approved Thoroughfare Map, and therefore, Staff was recommending approval as submitted.

Mr. Eric Morgan, Khor-Royer-Griffith, was present to speak to the item.

Hearing no questions or discussion from either Planning Commission or the public, Mr. Linder moved to approve of the Lot Split, as submitted.

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

ITEM #2 – Broadway Professional Village – Lot Split (0.182 Acres) **PID #202101270006**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She explained that the proposal was a request to split the other land-locked non-contiguous section of the 4.866-acre parcel on Farm Bank Way, within the Broadway Professional Village Park.

Mrs. Shields stated that the 0.182-acre portion, as with the previous split, was currently undeveloped, and that the property owner's intent is to sell the parcels and has indicated to Staff that they would be drafting and recording an access easement across the shared drives through the office condominium development, to ensure all parcels have continual access.

Mrs. Shields explained that like the other proposed split, Staff was supportive of the split as it is a continued effort to fix a separated, atypical property left over from the previous condominium plats and therefore, Staff was recommending approval as submitted.

Mr. Eric Morgan, Khor-Royer-Griffith, was present to speak to the item.

Hearing no questions or discussion from either Planning Commission or the public, Mr. Linder moved to approve of the Lot Split, as submitted.

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

ITEM #3 – Imagine Café – Rezoning **PID #202101260004**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was requesting approval to rezone 3553 Grove City Road from Light Industrial to Retail Commercial, in order to open a café and coffee shop on the property. She explained that property is currently for sale and has been the site of an animal boarding business.

Mrs. Shields informed Planning Commission that the proposed rezoning was on schedule to have it's second reading, for approval, by City Council at their April 19th meeting. She discussed the proposed use of a café and coffee shop being permitted under the C-2 (Commercial) zoning, but as noted on accompanying slides, the applicant had been made aware of several property issues, and depending on the scope of proposed improvements, can either be approved administratively through the Building Division or a Development Plan.

Mrs. Shields stated that Staff was supportive of the proposed rezoning, as the property has been operated commercially and is located adjacent to the Town Center commercial area, keeping it in character with the surrounding area and zoning on adjacent properties, and therefore, was recommended for approval to City Council as submitted.

Ms. Vanessa Dimitropoulos, the prospective business owner, was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Frea raised a question concerning a curb cut stipulation illustrated in the materials, and asked if Staff had resolved those concerns.

Mrs. Shields answered by explaining that the curb cuts were apart of an ongoing conversation with the applicant, concerning the entire scope of improvements required on the site. She explained that it was a matter being considered but resolution at this point was not a requirement for approval.

Mr. Frea expressed gratitude for the clarification.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of Rezoning from (IND-1) (Industrial) to C-2 (Commercial) at 3553 Grove City Road, as submitted.

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

ITEM #4 – Gibby's Auto Exchange – Special Use Permit **PID #202101250010**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was requesting approval of a Special Use Permit to allow the sale of wholesale automobiles at 3422 Mill Street.

Mrs. Shields explained that a Special Use Permit for this same use and business was approved for this location in 2020, however, a stipulation was added at City Council that the approval be effective for only one year to allow for reevaluation of the use. She added that the proposed Special Use Permit application is a request to continue to operate the business out of the same location.

Mrs. Shields went on to say that the applicant has indicated no changes in business operation since the Special Use Permit approval in 2020. She explained that hours of operation would remain primarily by appointment, with open hours on Saturdays between 9am and 2pm. She described all operations as being indoors, and that vehicles are not stored outside.

Mrs. Shields noted that the business continues to operate under the same frame by which it was found to be appropriate one year ago, and seeing as no complaints or issues have been brought to the City's attention, Staff believes the applicant has demonstrated the manner of operation complies with the previously approved stipulation; prohibiting outdoor storage of vehicles, parts, supplies, tools and materials, and does not pose any negative impacts to the surrounding area.

Mrs. Shields concluded by saying that after review and consideration, the Development Department recommends Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council for the Special Use Permit, with the stipulation noted (and was set with the approval in 2020) that the outdoor storage of vehicles, vehicular parts. Related supplies, tools and materials shall be prohibited.

Mr. Rick Gibson, Gibby's Auto Exchange, 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 Special Use Permit for Gibby's Auto Exchange with the one stipulation noted:

1. Outdoor storage of vehicles, vehicular parts, related supplies, tools and materials shall be prohibited.

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

ITEM #5 – Moo Moo Express Car Wash – Special Use Permit **PID #202012020061**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings, stating that the application was to allow for a car wash facility on London-Groveport Road, on the parcel west of the Huntington Bank. She went on to explain that the application was being reviewed concurrently with a Development Plan application which would review the carwash building and associated site improvements, whereas the Special Use Permit application is a review of appropriateness of the use of a car wash on the site.

Mrs. Shields illustrated facility access by highlighting an extension of the southern private drive behind CVS and the Goddard School, which would be extended to the western edge of the carwash site. She stated that the existing private drive, acting as the southern leg of the signalized intersection at London-Groveport Road, would also be extended to connect to this southern drive and provide an additional point of access.

Mrs. Shields went on to explain that materials show stacking lanes accommodating 47 vehicles before backing onto the southern access drive, and 72 vehicles before impacting any adjacent property. She stated that the illustrated capacity far exceeds the stacking of the previously proposed and denied car wash on the same site, which showed stacking for 33 vehicles, and the existing stacking capacity on the Stringtown Road Moo Moo Car Wash, which can accommodate 28 cars before backing to the road.

Mrs. Shields shared that the applicant had also stated that, when necessary, sandwich boards will be used to display wait times and ensure any traffic impacts on the adjacent property are minimized. She also stated that a third order kiosk was introduced strictly for VIP customers, where no payment will be processed, to help reduce stacking.

Mrs. Shields explained that due to the configuration of the site and resulting stacking capacity, Staff believed the proposed car wash can operate without negatively impacting adjacent properties or public roadways. She also stated that the proposed use would provide a service to the community while extending private drives to improve circulation in the area, and therefore, Staff recommended Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Special Use Permit with the one stipulation; that no speakers for music be used on the site.

Mr. Jeff Giliger, Moo Moo Express Car Wash LLC, was present to speak to the item. He wished to add that when music is playing at a moderate level, it often helps to reduce the noise from individual vehicles, but that if it was an agreeable stipulation to Planning Commission then it would not be contested.

Mr. Frea expressed concern relating to the lot size and if it is large enough to accommodate a carwash and the cars that would stack on the private access roads. He added that the junction between the southern and western access roads could be a point of hazard when many cars are in line. He went on to use other carwashes as an

example of what may happen with many vehicles are in line, where cars are backed up to main thoroughfares instead of a private road.

Mr. Gilger asked Mr. Frea if he found the road running East-West on the rear portion of the site to be acceptable for overflow.

Mr. Frea answered that he had not thought that through and was approaching the project with the hope of keeping all busines traffic within the property itself. He also brought up concern of potential road closure issues, as it may be more difficult to enforce closure of a private road.

Chair Oyster expressed concern relating to vehicle access from London-Groveport Road, and if business traffic would impact accessibility to Huntington Bank.

Mr. Gilger responded by explaining that signage would be provided at the entry point, to maintain maneuverability to and from adjacent businesses. He added that carwash staff would monitor the traffic and reiterated that busy days presenting that much traffic would only be 5-10 days total. Mr. Gilger went on to explain that demand resulting in significant car-stacking is a rarity for the business.

Mr. Frea added that he envisioned similar traffic issues at both access points, concerned with access to adjacent businesses and vehicle maneuverability throughout the proposed site. He added that outside of the stacking issues he saw, the overall orientation of the site was agreeable and that a carwash would be a well-placed in that area.

Chair Oyster agreed with the overall sentiment and asked if their were other questions/concerns.

Mr. Frea proposed a stipulation recommendation and Legal was questioned as to how best present a stipulation pertaining to vehicle stacking.

Ms. Readler informed Planning Commission that a motion would have to be made to add a stipulation and then a vote would be taken, then the motion on the overall Special Use Permit application would take place.

Mr. Frea then made a motion to add a stipulation, prohibiting the stacking of vehicles on the private drives.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion and the motion was then denied 3-1.

Chair Oyster added that she wanted to mention her reason for denial of the stipulation was due to her disagreement in prohibiting vehicle stacking on the southerly drive. She then asked if there were any other motions before the motion for the Special Use Permit.

Hearing no further questions, Mr. Linder made a motion to recommend approval for Moo Moo Car Wash Express Special Use Permit, with one stipulation:

1. Speakers projecting music or other noise shall not be used on the site.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the item was approved 3-1.

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings, explaining that the application was a Development Plan associated with the previously discussed use of a carwash on the London-Groveport Road site, adjacent to the Huntington Bank.

Mrs. Shields went on to state that, as previously presented, the Special Use Permit reviewed the appropriateness of the use, while the proposed Development Plan is to examine the built character of the site i.e., the building architecture and site improvements. She went on to explain that a Development Plan was previously approved on the site in 2006, which included the private drive off London-Groveport Road and the Huntington Bank, as well as three additional commercial buildings.

Mrs. Shields stated that the proposed Development Plan would utilize the western two quadrants of the site and preserve the southeast quadrant for future commercial development off the shared drive that would be extended with the proposed plan. She stated that the shared drive would terminate at a drive across the southern portion of the site, which as discussed, would act as an extension of the existing drive behind CVS and the Goddard School. She explained that the proposed carwash facility would be accessed off of this southern drive.

Mrs. Shields explained that stacking lanes are proposed around the perimeter, with pay kiosks between the structure and London-Groveport Road. She stated that vehicles would enter the building from the north and exit to the south, and that two bail-out lanes, each having a stamped-brick finish, would connect the stacking lanes to the vacuum area. She stated that there would be 20 vacuum stalls and that four (4) employee parking spaces are proposed.

Mrs. Shields went over the proposal of building appearance, stating that the proposed building would be 3,900-square-feet in area, and while only one story, would have the appearance of a 1 ½ story structure through architectural features, which would include a gable roof and dormers. She added that the building would have a brick water table, with Hardie board and batten siding used on the remainder, and asphalt shingles. She stated that the west elevation would also feature three decorative barn doors, which would be fixed open, revealing storefront style windows, while the decorative barn doors on the east would remain closed.

Mrs. Shields added that other accessory structures on the site would utilize similar materials, including the pay kiosks with masonry bases, wrapped in board and batten siding.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that Staff believes the proposed plan would result in a high-quality development, utilizing appropriate materials and improving connectivity in the area, as well as leaving an additional opportunity for development in the southeast portion of the site. She stated that after review and consideration, the Development Department recommended Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Development Plan, as submitted.

Mr. Gilger, Moo Moo Express Car Wash LLC, was present to speak to the item and added that the company was excited to expand and serve more of the community and welcomed questions of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Rauck questioned a handicapped parking space location, wondering if the first spot to the North was the best location for that accommodation.

Mr. Gilger answered that the position of the handicapped parking space was to accommodate office connectivity, and that positioning fell in line with ADA compliance with the entrance with the office facility.

Mr. Rauck thanked Mr. Gilger for the clarification.

Chair Oyster addressed the vehicle stacking concern, specifically in front of the of the Huntington Bank drive, wondering if a stipulation would be agreeable to prohibit cars from blocking that drive.

Mr. Gilger answered by illustrating a note relative to signage at that particular location that would directly address that concern in the event of vehicle stacking.

Mrs. Shields clarified that even though that specific note was not shown on the slides, it was submitted with materials for the item and it was a point that the applicant would be agreeable to.

Mr. Rauck then asked what the average turn time of wash process was; for one vehicle to go completely through the car wash.

Mr. Gilger answered that that after the payment process is completed the washing process takes approximately three (3) minutes to complete. He added that the chain speed of the facility can be adjusted to accommodate busier days and that the max capacity is about 100 vehicles an hour.

Mr. Rauck pointed out that the vehicle stacking concern may alleviate itself, illustrating that if the 70th vehicle in line realizes that the wait is a considerable amount of time, they may ultimately opt out of getting the car wash.

There being no further questions or discussion, Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of Moo Moo Express Car Wash Development Plan, as submitted.

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

ITEM #7 – Beulah Park Subarea G – Development Plan **PID #202008050043**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was requesting a Development Plan to establish 82 multifamily townhomes within Beulah Park.

Mrs. Shields explained that the location and standards for Subarea G were established previously with the Preliminary Development Plan and zoning text for Beulah Park. She added that the proposed Development Plan had been reviewed for compliance against these standards. She stated that if Planning Commission were to act on the application, the project would be on schedule to be reviewed by City Council on March 15, then final engineering and building plans could begin to undergo review.

Mrs. Shields went on to illustrate that Subarea G is separated into three (3) distinct sections as shown on the site plan; one (1) section off Beulah Park Drive, across from the central open space, one (1) off Elm Street, and the largest section being between West Water Run and the historic Beulah subdivision.

Mrs. Shields stated that one (1) new roadway, Street M, is proposed to provide access to those buildings that do not have access of an existing or approved future roadway. She added that a portion of Street M will be installed where an existing alley runs behind lots fronting Grant Avenue; however, this road would be widened to 26-feet and improved to current public roadway standards.

Mrs. Shields explained that generally, buildings are oriented towards either open space or a public roadway; however, due to the unique layout of the site, some buildings would be oriented perpendicularly to the street.

She said that Building 16, located at the corner of Cleveland and Curtis, is within a few feet of the path along West Water Run and that in order to provide clear separation, Staff was recommending better separation to be installed; either by increasing the building setback from the path or by installing appropriate landscaping to create better separation.

Mrs. Shields described two (2) primary building proposed for the subarea: 3-story townhomes, which would be located along Beulah Drive, and 2-story townhomes, which would be used for the remainder of the site and would include buildings with 4, 6, and 8 units. She stated that the applicant submitted elevations for each of the models, showcasing a variety of high-quality materials being utilized including brick, stone, and horizontal and vertical board and batten siding. She added that materials showed elevations meet the requirement of the zoning text, specifically that public-facing elevations have a minimum of 30% masonry finish.

Mrs. Shields stated that landscape details were submitted for the various building types that showed a variety of landscaping is proposed around structures. She said that in locations where the subarea backs to single-family homes (the units along Elm Street that back to Beulah Subarea D), two rows of evergreen trees are proposed for screening. She added that materials state seed to be used with Penn Mulch, but that in order to be consistent with treatment in the remainder of the Beulah Park development, sod should be installed along all public roadways.

Mrs. Shields concluded by saying that Staff believed the proposed development is in line with approved zoning text for Beulah Park, which included standards to ensure an appropriate transition between the historic Beulah subdivision to the new development. She added that the development would utilize high-quality materials and provide new connections in the trail network, and therefore, Staff recommended Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval with the two stipulations noted regarding clear separation between the path and Building 16 and installing sod along public roadways.

Rebecca Mott, Plank Law Firm, was present to speak to the item, along with architect Craig Murdick, and engineer Mike Reeves.

Ms. Mott wished to add that they were agreeable to landscaping installments to provide separation between the West Water Run path and Building 16. She wished to clarify the proposal of sod, asking if Staff was just referring to street M.

Mrs. Shields clarified, saying that the proposal of sod would apply to all public roadways, so that any disturbed area along Elm Street and Beulah Park Drive would also be covered.

Mrs. Mott stated that they would like to forego the second stipulation, relating to sod installment, and use grass seed instead.

Mrs. Shields answered by explaining that the stipulation was a method to be consistent with other approved Development Plans in the area.

Ms. Mott invited Mr. Murdick and Mr. Reeves to speak to the stipulation concern.

Mr. Murdick stated that he did not have any comments or commitments to the issue.

Ms. Mott stated that she was not aware of a commitment to use sod on the other public right-of-way areas of Beulah development. She again invited Mr. Reeves to explain any information he may have as to a commitment of sod in the other subareas along public right-of-ways.

Mr. Reeves could not recall a specific commitment. He explained that a reason for not supporting sod in the public right-of-ways is to avoid having to install the sod multiple times due to construction phases of this type of development. He explained that in a project like this, vegetation should be installed after vertical construction is finished, to best preserve the landscaping efforts near the right-of-ways.

Mrs. Shields established background of the stipulation, explaining that original plans included a note stating that sod would be used on the site. She said that the City then asked for clarification as to where sod would be used, but then the response received was that the developer chose not install sod at all. Mrs. Shields, saying that it felt like a step backwards, explained that the added stipulation was an attempt for calcification and typical of all new developments along public roadways.

Ms. Mott answered that she did believe a previous plan stated "seed and/or sod would be utilized", and the plans then clarified the intent to use seed only. She felt that Mr. Reeves made an agreeable point, in that it has the potential to be costly to sod the public right-of-ways and then destroy it with further inevitable construction. She stated that if the developer could use seed they would ensure that it was visually appealing, and reiterated her desire to not include the 2nd stipulation regarding sod.

Mr. Rauck then made a comment relating to the site plan readability, explaining that an overlay of the Development Plan over a current depiction of the site would be better understood. He stated that seeing this Development Plan over a dated illustration of the site did not help the review of how this particular development interphases with other ongoing development on the site. He said that this a concern for this project and all development plans that come forth.

Mrs. Shields agreed that was something to work on, to increase understanding of the site details. She explained that the possibility of working with the IT Department for drone pictures would help and that currently, aerials are received from the City of Columbus or Franklin County, and those are generally updated every two years.

Mr. Rauck agreed that attention to that aspect in the future would be appreciated.

Mr. Frea asked Staff if parking at the site was considered minimal, adequate, or generous for the development.

Mrs. Shields answered by explaining that the parking provided meets requirements in the Beulah Park Zoning Text, and that although no visitor parking is included, that when garage, driveway, and on-street parking are all considered, the proposed parking is adequate. She added that due to the nature of the development, parking was considered while keeping in mind the capacity of the site and the character of the area, trying to integrate it as closely as possible with the historic subdivision.

Mr. Frea added vehicle parking and parks seemed to be things we do not build enough of when developing apartments and townhomes. He explained that he wanted to comfortable with that aspect in relation to this development.

There being no further questions or discussion, Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of Beulah Park Subarea G Development Plan, with the following stipulations:

1. Plans shall be revised to create better separation between Building 16 and the shared use path. Separation shall be achieved either through increasing the building setback from the path, or by installing appropriate landscaping.
2. Sod shall be installed along public roadways.

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

There being no additional discussion, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 2:28 pm.

Hannah White, Secretary

Julie Oyster, Chair