CITY OF GROVE CITY, OHIO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING **October 2, 2012**

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m.

Chair Holt began the meeting with a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken with the following members present: Mr. Marv Holt, Chair, Mr. Gary Leasure, and Mr. Chuck Boso. Mr. Mike Linder and Mr. Dan Havener were excused from the meeting. Others present: Kim Dooley, Planning/GIS Specialist; Kyle Rauch, Planning & Development Officer; Jennifer Readler, Ice Miller; Ryan Andrews, EMH&T; Bill Vedra, Assistant Deputy Administrator; Mike Boso, Chief Building Official; Capt. Jeff Pearson, Police Department; Lt. Tammy Greene, Jackson Twp. Fire; Tami Kelly, Clerk of Council; and Molly Frasher, Secretary.

Chair Holt noted a quorum was present and requested the approval of the September 4th meeting minutes be postponed to the next regular meeting.

Item #1 – Long Term Care Nursing Facility - Development Plan **(PID #201207300034)**

The applicant is proposing to construct a new 99-bed skilled care nursing facility on 9.66 acres of land at the southeast corner of Buckeye Parkway and an extension of Blue Star Drive. The site of the proposed development is zoned PUD-R; however there is no zoning text associated with this PUD and permitted uses revert to those outlined in section 1135.14. The applicant has requested that the proposed skilled nursing care facility be considered for the site as an "other use as approved by the Planning Commission."

The proposed facility will be located off an extension of Blue Star Drive, which the applicant has indicated will be developed concurrently by Rockford Homes as the proposed site is developed. The proposed development will require a plat be submitted to create a unique parcel for the proposed nursing care facility as well as to dedicate the shown extension of Blue Star Drive to the city as a public roadway. Two 24' curb cuts off the proposed Blue Star Drive will access the site and a 24' wide drive will provide access around the structure and to parking on the north, east, and south sides of the building. The proposed structure is single story, approximately 22' in height, and approximately 66,485 square feet in area. The exterior of the building is proposed to be finished in a combination of stone and siding in earth tones.

Ms. Dooley stated that staff does not feel that the proposed skilled nursing care facility will be detrimental to present and potential surrounding uses. Although the area proposed for development was originally identified for single-family homes on the approved development plan for Meadow Grove Estates in 2003, she stated that staff feels the applicant has taken appropriate measures including increased setbacks and appropriate landscaping to ensure this structure will not negatively affect the character of the area. The proposed development will also be utilizing similar building materials as required of single family structures in the area and has designed the structure with architectural elements to break up the mass of the structure to be more appropriate in a residential area.

Mr. Chris Inverso, representative of the applicant and project superintendent, was present and spoke to the item. He stated this would be a one-year project from start to finish. Mr. Leasure asked how many units would be inside the structure. Mr. Inverso responded that it was a 99 bed facility that would employ roughly 100 people including sixty licensed nurses and State Tested Nurse Aides (STNA's). He continued that there were 105 similar facilities around Ohio that Mr. Inverso maintains; Darby Glenn in Hilliard was the closest to Grove City with several facilities in Columbus.

Chair Holt asked Lt. Green if the fire department had any issues with radius turns and access to the facility; she had no issues to report.

Chair Holt stated that the applicant would need to submit a plat to create the unique parcel for the development as shown on the proposed plans. Mr. Jim Lambright stated that he understood and would submit the plat. Chair Holt noted that he would like that to be included as a stipulation.

1. The applicant shall submit a plat application to the development department.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Leasure motioned to recommend approval of the development plan to City Council with the noted stipulation; Mr. Boso seconded and the vote was unanimous.

Item #2 – Texas Roadhouse – Lot Split **(PID# 201208010038)**

The applicant is requesting to split 0.883 acres and 1.785 acres from an existing 4.665 acre parcel (parcel 040-005958). for a Texas Roadhouse and a future retail structure. The remainder parcel is the current site of the Bob Evans restaurant on Stringtown Road and the proposed lots would front Parkway Centre Drive. According to the approved development plan for Texas Roadhouse, the site would be developed so that the restaurant and retail center would share a common wall and the uses would utilize the same parking area. Variances were granted by the BZA on August 27, 2012 to eliminate the parking and building setbacks along the shared lot line of the two proposed lots. The applicant has submitted access easements, granting access across the properties in questions, including the remainder (Bob Evans) parcel and across the parking lot of the proposed Texas Roadhouse.

The applicant, Adam Fischer, was present and spoke to the item. Mr. Leasure inquired if the access with Drury Inn had been resolved and Mr. Fischer replied it had not. Mr. Boso asked if Mr. Fischer was ok with putting the access in later and Mr. Fischer replied it was fine with a later date, and that they were waiting to hear if Drury Inn wants to do it now.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Leasure motioned to approve the lot split, Mr. Boso seconded and the vote was unanimously approved.

Item #3 – 3827 Broadway – Method of Zoning Change **(PID # 201208270039)**

The applicant is requesting approval to rezone 3827 Broadway (parcel 040-000640) from C-1 to C-2 in order to offer martial arts and self-defense instruction on the site. The site is adjacent to properties zoned C-1 to the north, R-2 to the west, and PSO to the south across Burr Oak and east across Broadway. Similar cases of C-2 properties bordered by office and residential districts can be found less than 400 feet south of the proposed site on Broadway, as well as on Broadway south of Kingston Avenue; therefore Ms. Dooley stated that staff does not believe the proposed rezoning is inappropriate for the site or the area.

The applicant, Benjamin Dunigan, and Dave Freetage, were present to speak to the item. There were no comments or questions.

Mr. Leasure motioned to recommend the method of zoning change for approval to City Council, Mr. Boso seconded and the vote was unanimous.

Item #4 – GCKA Murfin Fields - Development Plan **(PID #201208270040)**

The applicant is proposing to construct a new building at Murfin Fields for offices and meeting areas as well as a covered concession area and handicap accessible indoor restrooms. The construction of the proposed concession building will only affect the portion of the site directly adjacent to the east of the existing courtyard. Other site improvements include the extension of public utilities to service the structure. An 8” sanitary line is proposed to be extended along the southern portion of the property. Plans show a 6’ chain link fence with slats to screen the ground mounted mechanicals on the north side of the structure. Ms. Dooley stated that staff is not supportive of the use of chain link fencing for screening, and recommended that the mechanicals be screened with either a landscape hedge or a solid wall made of the same material as the main structure with supplemental landscaping. She also recommended that Note “D” on the submitted site plan be removed, as the note pertains to rooftop mechanicals and other submitted materials state that all mechanicals will be ground mounted.

The proposed structure will be 3,777 square feet, with an additional 1,623 square feet covered in a canopy. The building will be 12’ in height and finished in split face block in two colors, “buff” and “aspen cream”. The building will have a green metal roof with glass block windows to provide natural light and added security to the facility. No additional parking is proposed with this development plan; however a new sidewalk is proposed to connect the existing parking lot and courtyard to provide access to the proposed building.

The following stipulations were noted:

1. Ground mounted mechanicals shall be screened with a continuous 100% opaque landscape hedge, solid fence, or wall utilizing materials to match the main structure. If a fence or wall is utilized, supplemental landscaping shall be installed around the perimeter, per section 1136.08.

2. Note "D" shall be removed from the Site Plan cover page, as all mechanicals are ground mounted.

3. All exterior lighting shall be cut off type fixtures.

Paul McKnight was present and spoke to the item. Mr. McKnight stated that they had concerns over the recommended stipulation #1, related to landscaping around the service structures. He stated that vandalism is a problem on the site and they have found that the only deterrent is chain-link fencing with potentially a chain link top to keep kids out. They are concerned that hedges will allow kids to get in behind them so no one can see them. Mr. McKnight noted that the screening would be a fair distance from residential areas. He stated that they wanted to install a green chain link fence, but are proposing the slats to screen the mechanicals in order to comply with Code.

Chair Holt questioned why the applicant could not install a block wall to screen the mechanicals. Mr. McKnight stated that the block wall would have to be built out a certain maintenance distance from the mechanicals and that would create a larger structure. A block wall would also require footers and a foundation. Mr. Leasure clarified that if they installed chain-link, they would also install a chain-link top to keep the kids out. Mr. McKnight stated that was correct.

Chair Holt asked if it would be possible to install the chain-link fence but install landscaping to sufficiently screen the fencing. Mr. McKnight stated that the plan was to have the sidewalk go around the structure and around the chain-link so that people can walk all the way around the structure without walking in the grass. Mr. Rauch asked if wooden privacy slats could be attached to the fence instead of the metal slats. Mr. McKnight said that the wood slats would be another item for vandalism and could be torn off. He reiterated that their preferred choice was to use green chain-link fence because it would be an upgrade from standard chain-link and that it would match the accent color already used on the structure. Mr. McKnight further stated that it was their preference that the mechanicals are not fully screened so that no one could hide and vandalize the structures.

Mr. Boso stated that he respected the views of staff, but that in this case, with the multi-family units to the north and the distance between the proposed units and the residential area, it would be difficult to see them. He stated that he did not have a problem with the proposed fencing – slats or no slats.

Ms. Readler stated that staff's recommended stipulation regarding screening is a Code requirement and that typically Code variances would require approval from the BZA. She stated that the Commission does not have the authority to deviate from Code and this would have to be considered by the BZA. Mr. Rauch stated that the Commission could make a recommendation that BZA approve the chain-link fence screening deviation, as a supportive measure. Mr. Boso asked if the fencing could be approved by the Commission with the proposed slats. Mr. Rauch stated that Code requires a "solid fence." Mr. Boso stated that the slats should be okay and that the Commission can approve the fencing with the slats, but that if they wanted to go to BZA for a variance they could do so.

Being no further discussion, Mr. Boso motioned to recommend approval of the development plan with the stipulations as noted. Mr. Leasure seconded and the vote was unanimous.

Having no further business, Chair Holt adjourned the meeting at 1:58 p.m.

____
Molly Frasher, Secretary

____
Marv Holt, Chair