MEETING MINUTES

Planning Commission

November 2, 2021 – City Council Chambers with Webex Component

---

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. Jim Rauck, Mr. David Frea, Chair Julie Oyster, Mr. Larry Titus and Mr. Mike Linder. Other staff members present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Dash Logan, Development Planner; Terry Barr, Development Planner; Hannah White, Development Assistant; Jennifer Readler, Frost Brown Todd; Mike Boso, Chief Building and Zoning Official; Laura Scott, Planning and Zoning Coordinator and Tami Kelly, City Council Clerk.

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

New Items:

ITEM #1 – Chase Bank Solar Panels – Certificate of Appropriateness (Appeal) **PID #202110190061**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to install solar panels on the roof of the Chase Bank at 2161 Stringtown Road.

Mrs. Shields explained that a request for an administrative Certificate of Appropriateness was denied in May 2021 due to their visibility from surrounding properties and roadways, and the current application serves as the appeal to the denial per Chapter 1143.

Mrs. Shields went on to state that the panels are proposed on the east-, west- and south-facing roof sections of the building, would be black with light-grey racking, flush mounted to the roof and have anti-reflective coating that reduces glare. The applicant indicated that associated mechanicals including side-mounted building equipment would be located near existing equipment and would be screened with existing landscaping. The mechanicals are subject to the screening requirements outlines in Chapter 1136, which would be enforced if existing landscaping is not adequate to effectively screen the equipment.

Mrs. Shields added that in review of the application, it was brought to Staff's attention that a plan had previously been discussed to install a landscape feature at the corner of Stringtown Road and McDowell Road in association with the improvements to Stringtown Road in 2013. Noting that the site was originally developed prior to current landscape requirements and is deficient in current Code perimeter landscaping between the drive-thru and Stringtown Road, Staff has made the applicant aware of the desire to work together to add plantings in the area in the form of a landscape feature.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that in general, Staff is supportive of the proposed solar panels as they advance sustainability objectives noted in the GroveCity2050 Community Plan, and therefore recommended approval with the noted landscaping stipulation.

Mr. Todd Kenard, Chapel Electric Co., was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Frea confirmed with Staff that the stipulation was to help bring the landscaping requirements to code and then expressed gratitude towards the applicant for the investment in sustainability.

Mr. Titus asked the representative if ground-mounted solar panels were considered for this project, pointing out that landscaping could help conceal the panels whereas a roof install is highly visible.

Mr. Kenard answered that he was unable to speak to the consideration of the possibility of ground-mounted panels, that he represents the company hired for the installation of solar panels, and that similar panels are being installed at Chase Bank locations across the nation.

Mr. Rauck and Chair Oyster inquired about the visible cabling and depiction of the panels in the materials provided. Mr. Kenard informed Planning Commission that the panels would be to the same specs as submitted and that the cabling seen was conduit for the panels that would be installed.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Mr. Frea moved to recommend approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness, with the noted stipulation,

I. The applicant and/or property owner shall work with the City's Urban Forester to design a landscape feature at the corner of Stringtown Road and McDowell Road.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion, and the item was approved, 3-2. Mr. Titus and Mr. Linder voted "No".

ITEM #2 – T. Marzetti – Certificate of Appropriateness (Appeal) **PID #202110070059**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of a temporary office trailer at 5800 North Meadows Drive.

Mrs. Shields explained that a request for an administrative Certificate of Appropriateness was denied on the grounds of the proposed duration of the temporary structure, and that the current application serves as the appeal to the denial per Chapter 1143.

Mrs. Shields explained that materials state that the proposed 24' x 64' unit was being requested to allow for T. Marzetti to expand their quality and inventory departments to meet increased demand for products, while maintaining proper social distancing. The unit would be located on the east side of the building, adjacent to the existing employee entrance, and would not be visible from North Meadows Drive.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that Staff was supportive of the proposed temporary structure, as it would allow the company to expand while offering flexibility due to the ongoing pandemic, and therefore recommended approval with the noted stipulation regarding timing, as referenced in the applicant's materials.

Mr. Nicholas Louketis, T. Marzetti, was present to speak to the item and explained that the expected duration for the temporary structure was between a year and 18 months, and that due to the ongoing pandemic, an absolute time period was not available. However, the need for more space to be able to adhere to pandemic regulations was necessary.

Mr. Rauck asked what time duration was indicated on the administrative Certificate of Appropriateness application to which Staff answered that materials forwarded to the Development Department indicated a 12-18-month period, and that an administrative COA approval is limited to a six-month duration for a temporary structure.

Mr. Mike Boso indicated his belief that the submitted time duration was originally for five years.

Mr. Louketis answered that he did not recall five years being indicated on their application.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Mr. Rauck moved to recommend approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness, with the noted stipulation:

1. The Certificate of Appropriateness shall be valid for 18 months from the date of approval.

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

ITEM #3 – **Burris Garage – Certificate of Appropriateness** **PID #2021100220062**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new, two-story detached garage at 3847 Broadway, within the Historical Preservation Area (HPA), to replace the existing detached garage on site.

Mrs. Shields explained that due to the nature of the request and the previous underlying zoning, the project necessitated the site be rezoned to PUD to draft standards to ensure its compatibility with the area. The current COA request serves to review the building architecture within the HPA as well as zoning compliance.

Mrs. Shields went on to state that as reviewed during the Preliminary Development Plan, the structure would be two stories with a maximum peak height of 21 feet and 5 inches above the finished floor. The plans show a wall height of ten feet, which exceeds the maximum permitted wall height established in the zoning text of nine feet. However, the zoning text grants City Council the ability to approve deviations from the text. Staff is supportive of granting this deviation, as the overall height of the structure remains within the permitted height in the zoning text.

Mrs. Shields added that the garage is to be finished primarily in Hardie Plank with white trim and architectural shingles with all colors compatible to the HPA color palette.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that Staff believes the proposed structure would be in character with the area, and therefore recommended approval with the one deviation regarding wall height.

Ms. Kacie Waugh, Waugh Law, LLC, was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Frea wished to know if the overall wall height of the structure had increased.

Ms. Waugh informed Planning Commission that the overall height of the structure did not increase and that the internal wall height was mistakenly written as "9 Ft." in early plans but the true internal wall height was indeed 10 feet.

Hearing no further questions or discussions, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness, with the noted deviation:

I. A deviation shall be granted to exceed the maximum permitted wall height of 9' by 1' for a maximum wall height of 10'.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the item was approved, 4-1. Mr. Frea voted "No".

ITEM #4 – Kram-It Self Storage – Final Development Plan (Amendment) **PID #202110150060**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was proposing to amend the Final Development Plan to change the location of a building that was approved in 2010 for Kram-It Self Storage on Urbancrest Industrial Drive.

Mrs. Shields explained that the original Development Plan approved a Future Building in the location of the proposed amendment; however, because the new building configuration is slightly different from previously approved plans, a Development Plan amendment was warranted.

Mrs. Shields went on to state that the original building approved in 2010 was 10,960 square feet and served as an expansion of Building "B". The revised plan proposes a 6,300-square-foot building located behind the existing building, separated by a 30' drive aisle.

Mrs. Shields added that the proposed building would be finished in the same materials as existing structures, including brick and stone materials where visible from the road. Pavement access and fencing would enclose the site and match that which already exists on site.

Mrs. Shields explained that the applicant indicated 10 trees currently exist in the proposed work area and would be replanted. Submitted plans showing these replacement plantings also show the landscaping approved as part of the original Development Plan, some of which was not installed. All landscaping shown on the submitted plan would need to be installed with the proposed amendment, including any required landscaping not installed as part of the original Development Plan.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that Staff believes the proposed plan amendment is appropriate for the area and in line with the GroveCity2050 Community Plan Guiding Principles, and therefore recommended approval as submitted.

Mr. Brain Sweeney, J.H. Architects, was present to speak to the item.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval to City Council for the Final Development Plan Amendment, as submitted.

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

ITEM #5 – Communities at Plum Run PUD-R - Rezoning **PID #202109010056**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was proposing to rezone a 145.6-acre parcel from SF-1 (Single-Family) to PUD-R (Planned Unit Development-Residential) to permit a new residential subdivision on the parcel. A Preliminary Development Plan for the site was approved by City Council in June of 2021. The proposed zoning includes a PUD text to set the standards for site development based on feedback from the Preliminary Development Plan and to illustrated on the Final Development Plan.

Mrs. Shields explained that the site is surrounded by other single-family residential properties including the Scioto Meadows subdivision to the north, and Jackson Township properties to the east, west and south. The GroveCity2050 Future Land Use and Character Map recommends this site be used as Suburban Living-Low Intensity, which lists single-family housing as a primary recommended use.

Mrs. Shields went on to state that the proposed zoning text for the site notes standards for five subareas, four of which would be single-family homes and one designated for detached condos. A maximum of 397 units are permitted between all subareas, for a density not to exceed 2.75 dwelling units per acres. While this density is higher than that approved for Farmstead and Trail View Run, it is lower than that of Pinnacle Quarry, which is under the same Future Land Use category as the proposed site, while Farmstead and Trail View Run were under a different category which encouraged lower density.

Mrs. Shields added that the text established architectural standards for the site, including masonry requirements and the utilization of high-quality elements and materials including Hardi Plank. The text also states that homes will have four-sided architecture, which requires at least one element such as porches, faux shutters, dormers and bay windows on each elevation face.

Mrs. Shields explained that the proposed text also notes that an 8-foot-wide regional path would be constructed and dedicated for public use to provide recreational opportunity to the residents. The location of the path would be examined under the Development Plan.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that Staff believes the standards set by the zoning text can result in a high-quality development in line with the principles of GroveCity2050 Community Plan and the character of the area, and therefore recommended approval with the one stipulation clarifying that plan sheets with site layout are for illustrative purposes only and that final design of the site would be approved with the Development Plan.

Thomas Hart, Isaac Wiles Law Firm, was present to speak to the item and wished to add that the work with Staff continued in order to refine the subareas so that architectural standards were met, and high-quality standards were included.

Mr. Frea spoke to concerns he held regarding the item and proposed they be considered for additional stipulations:

- He felt that the lot sizes and the square footage of the homes were less than those of nearby Scioto Meadows and have long streets that lack character. He felt that the green spaces throughout the subdivision were small as well. He wished to propose that all lots of Subareas B and C meet the regulations of Subarea A.
- He felt that text regarding side-loaded garages ("accommodate sideloaded garages subject to customer selections") was a way for customers to opt out of a side-loaded garage and wished to strike the sentence from the text.
- He felt that traffic access and road configuration posed a problem for already heavy traffic and wished to stipulate in the zoning text that SR 104 access from Subarea A be removed and rerouted through Scioto Meadows.
- He felt that the SR 665 curve along the southeast corner of the development poses a traffic concern that was not adequately addressed by the traffic study conducted and wished to suggest that Open Space G be reserved for future modifications of SR 665.
- He felt that there were no obvious trail connectors through the development and suggested that a multi-use path be installed along the east side of SR 104, continuing east to then run north along SR 665, with the goal of providing access to the Scioto Grove Metro Park.

Mr. Hart spoke to Mr. Frea's concerns, explaining first that the intent behind design was to provide a full connection through the site but that safety and experience were taken into consideration by not designing to include a path along the major roadways where traffic intensity could pose safety issues. He added that final design with trail connection would be included with the future Development Plan.

Mr. Hart spoke to the traffic concerns by explaining that the traffic study did outline significant improvements required of the developer but it did not find unsafe conditions in terms of the curve along SR 665. He added that a request has been made to the Ohio Department of Transportation for written comments back upon a completed study.

Mr. Hart addressed the concerns of lot size by illustrating that Scioto Meadows is community design against older trends and requirements and that the lot size found in that development is one of the reasons there is almost no common open green space. He added that current design of the site in question reflects what is outlined in the GroveCity2050 Community Plan and reflects a growing trend of offering a variety of housing types for potential of affordability.

Mr. Hart presented a handout to Planning Commission and Staff illustrating different proposed development details against those of surrounding developments, explaining that the diversity in lot size and the amount of open green space is a way to accomplish livability and moderation of price points.

Mr. Hart spoke to the concern of side-loaded garages and explained that stipulating where customers need to spend their money is not something the developer would agree to.

Mr. Titus asked for clarification of price points of each subarea to which Mr. Hart explained that single-family homes would start in the $350,000 price range, and that would apply across most subareas.

Mr. Jim Hilz added that Subarea A homes would most likely start in the $400,000-$450,000 price range.

Mr. Rauck shared that the traffic study being incomplete was an issue for him and that he felt it would be helpful to see more times studied to reflect a broader range of traffic in the area.

Mr. Hart explained that the traffic study conducted by Pulte Homes was complete based on the requirements from traffic and city engineers and that it reflects a study of current traffic and future traffic based on growth the developed site would

pose. He went on to explain that further conversations with city engineers would be had to understand purpose behind choosing some locations to study over others.

Mr. Titus and Mr. Hart discussed that this item before Planning Commission was strictly to rezone the site to PUD-R, approving the text associated with the zoning and that design and future specifics of the site would be considered with a future Development Plan.

Mr. Frea spoke again to lot sizes and expressed that he was trying to raise development standards and wanted to reserve this property for the best development. He also wished to address concerns of the side-loaded garage, suggesting a text that stipulated “not less than percentage”.

Mr. Hart explained that they were confident that there would be residents that would want to have side loaded garages and that the developer would be willing to work with Staff to include more detail regarding the issue in the Development Plan.

Mr. Linder asked if the traffic study recommended any type of lowering of the speed limit in the area. Mr. Hart noted that this would require a Speed Study with ODOT, to which Mr. Hilz noted that Pulte had asked ODOT to consider the speed as part of their ongoing traffic study and put comments in writing to potentially reduce the speed and post speed limit signs in the area.

Hearing no further questions from Planning Commission, Chair Oyster opened the floor to the public.

Mr. Eric Alder, 675 London-Groveport Road (SR 665), expressed his concerns over the incomplete ODOT traffic study and that he has major concerns over safety with an increased amount of traffic in the area. He added that there has been multiple incidences of traffic accidents near his home, located on the SR 665 curve and felt that at this point, the project was not ready to move forward.

Mr. Hart wished to clarify at this point that the item in question was a land-use hearing, to approve the associated text. He explained that the developers did not come prepared to have a traffic impact study hearing but would entertain that concern by presenting an in-depth look at the traffic study of the area with the Development Plan.

Mr. Scott Comston, 7155 Jackson Pike (SR 104), stated his disagreement with the price point of affordable houses being in the $350,000-$450,000 price range and that it would just be adding more people and more traffic.

Mr. Hart responded that price points reflect a quality build taking into consideration the function of supply challenges, and that $350,000 is about average in today’s market.

A citizen from 890 London-Groveport Road spoke on the matter of traffic in the area, especially at her residence at the corner of SR 104 and SR 665.

Mr. Hart responded that improvements specified in the traffic study would help the traffic in the area, and that routing traffic through Scioto Meadows would not be the solution.

Hearing no further questions from the public, Chair Oyster asked for a motion on the item.

Mr. Titus moved to recommend the approval of the Rezoning to City Council, with the following stipulation:

I. Plan Sheets and exhibits showing site layout including roadway, lot and trail configuration are included for illustrative purposes. The final design of the site shall be approved with the Development Plan.

Mr. Frea asked if he could propose additional stipulations be added to the recommendation. Ms. Readler noted that if there is no second on the current motion, additional stipulations could be added.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion, and the item was not approved, with a vote of 2-3. Mr. Linder, Mr. Rauck and Mr. Frea voted “No”.

There being no additional discussion, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 2:35 pm.

Hannah White

Hannah White, Development Assistant

Julie Oyster

Julie Oyster, Chair