

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT REPORT
JUNE 2017

CODE ENFORCEMENT REPORT

Report attached.

HISTORIC DOWNTOWN ADVISORY COMMISSION

No meeting held.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

June 14, 2017 – Minutes attached.

SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

Applicant: Ford & Associates Architects/Dr. Khaksarfard
Location: SE corner of West Olentangy Street and Murphy Parkway
Zoning: (PC) Planned Commercial District
Request: To review a proposal to construct a retail center on 1.51 acres.

- *Reviewed and recommendations/comments provided.*
- *Submission of a Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan approved.*

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Applicant: Rudy Risinger/Frame Makers of Powell
Location: 84 West Olentangy Street
Zoning: (DB) Downtown Business District
Request: To review a proposal to demolish an existing garage and construct a new garage in its place.

- *Reviewed and request sent to the Historical Downtown Advisory Commission (HDAC) for review with the condition request returns to P&Z Commission.*

AMENDMENT TO AN APPROVED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Applicant: Reserve at Scioto Glen LLC
Location: Steitz Road and Home Road
Zoning: (PR) Planned Residence District
Request: To review changes to a Final Development Plan.

- *Reviewed and approved with conditions.*

PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Applicant: DJCF Holdings LLC
Location: 18 – 36 Grace Drive
Existing Zoning: (PC) Planned Commercial District
Request: To review a proposal to construct a 3,000 SF building on an existing site to be used as warehouse and retail space for a brewery.

- *Reviewed and approved with conditions.*

COMBINED PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Applicant: Beatz Studio
Location: 80 Clairedan Drive
Existing Zoning: (PC) Planned Commercial District
Request: To review a proposal to construct a dance studio on 1.18 acres.

- *Request tabled per applicant's request.*

AMENDMENT TO AN APPROVED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Applicant: Verona LLC
Location: 3676 Verona Phase I
Zoning: (PR) Planned Residence District
Request: To review changes to a Final Development Plan.

- *Reviewed and approved.*

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

June 28, 2017 – Minutes attached.

COMBINED PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Applicant: Beatz Studio
Location: 80 Clairedan Drive
Existing Zoning: (PC) Planned Commercial District
Request: To review a proposal to construct a dance studio on 1.18 acres.

- *Request reviewed and tabled.*

CARDINAL SELF-STORAGE SIGN

Approved under Other Commission Business.

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

No meeting held.

May Code Enforcement Report

Date	Violation Description	Address	Name	Phone	Notes	Resolved Date
5/9/2017	Temporary Sign		La Petite Academy	740.881.1234	Removed Temporary Sign	5/9/2017
5/9/2017	Temporary Sign		i9 Sports Basketball	614.441.8845	Removed Temporary Sign	5/9/2017
5/9/2017	Temporary Sign		College Hunks Haulir	740.362.4244	Removed Temporary Sign	5/9/2017
5/9/2017	Temporary Sign		Diploma Mulch	614.290.9687	Removed Temporary Sign	5/9/2017
5/19/2017	Temporary Sign	8736 Moreland St,	Powe Thai Orchid		Spoke with owner- recommended removal	5/19/2017
5/5/2017	Inoperable Car on Lot	951 Retreat Lane			Reminder about Powell Inoperable Vehicle Policy	
5/5/2017	Inoperable Car on Lot	510 Retreat Lane			Reminder about Powell Inoperable Vehicle Policy	5/8/2017
5/5/2017	Mow Order	642 Eagle Ridge			General Mowing Reminder	
5/5/2017	Mow Order	45 Clairedan Dr			General Mowing Reminder	
5/5/2017	Mow Order	3895 Stoneridge			General Mowing Reminder	
5/5/2017	Mow Order	1014 Vine St			General Mowing Reminder	



City of Powell, Ohio

Planning & Zoning Commission

Donald Emerick, Chairman

Ed Cooper, Vice Chairman

Shawn Boysko

Trent Hartranft

Joe Jester

Bill Little

Chris Meyers, AIA, Architectural Advisor

MEETING MINUTES

June 14, 2017

A meeting of the Powell Planning & Zoning Commission was called to order by Chairman Don Emerick on Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. Commissioners present included Shawn Boysko, Ed Cooper, Trent Hartranft, Joe Jester and Bill Little. Also present were Dave Betz, Development Director; Rocky Kambo, GIS/Planner; Chris Meyers, Architectural Advisor; Leilani Napier, Planning & Zoning Clerk and interested parties.

STAFF ITEMS

Mr. Kambo advised the Commission of the following:

- Item 9 on the Agenda, a Combined Preliminary & Final Development Plan for Beatz Studio, has asked for their request to be tabled. The applicant would like to be placed on the June 28, 2017 Agenda. Mr. Betz asked the Commission who could be present for a June 28th meeting. Chairman Emerick said he would not be able to attend. All other Commission members said they could attend.
- The Code Diagnostic Committee is continually meeting, working on final revisions.
- The Conservation District Code change heard at the April 12th P&Z meeting will be coming back to the P&Z Commission. They are adding a map to the text which was reviewed before. This change requires another public hearing.

HEARING OF VISITORS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Chairman Emerick opened the public comment session. Hearing none, he closed the public comment session.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to approve the minutes of May 10, 2017. Commissioner Boysko seconded the motion. By unanimous consent the minutes were approved. Commissioner Cooper abstained.

SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

Applicant: Ford & Associates Architects/Dr. Khaksarfard
Location: SE corner of West Olentangy Street and Murphy Parkway
Existing Zoning: (DB) Downtown Business District
Request: To review a proposal to construct a retail center on 1.51 acres.

Mark Ford, Ford & Associates, 1500 West First Ave., Columbus, said they are the Architects for the project. The site is on the southeast corner of Murphy Parkway and Olentangy Street. The site is opposite a project his company did about ten years ago. The new site is a little narrower. There is a common access easement to the adjacent veterinarian office to the east. His client has asked them to use the project on the west side of Murphy Parkway as a springboard for planning. There will be a different owner but he likes the building on the west side. Staff wants parking to the rear with the building pushed up towards Olentangy Street. The existing building on the west has a negative space feature; a patio for The Old Bag of Nails. The new project will have a solid corner with a tower. They don't want the two sites to completely match. Architecturally, they will be creating a very similar style. Store fronts will be provided on all four sides of the building to create 4-sided architecture. They will use a combination of stone, brick and lap siding. The parking is continued off of the veterinarian office's parking. There is an existing curb-cut. Their client is trying to get as much square footage on the site as possible. The use will be all retail. Parking will be sufficient if the building is all retail. He doesn't want to use spandrel glass. They are providing the sidewalk connectivity on both frontages. He is looking for feedback on how much they should pair the two sites; the existing west site and the new site.

Mr. Kambo reviewed the Staff Report (Exhibit 1).

PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

The request is for approximately 14,000 SF of retail space. There is no restaurant space proposed. The plan has 43 parking spaces. Code requires 40 parking spaces so they have 3 extra spaces. Staff is hoping the applicant can enter into a shared parking agreement with the veterinarian office to the east.

STAFF COMMENTS

Staff is very pleased with the location, use, scale and the design of the proposal. The plans almost mirror the development across the street to the west. The site will create a feature into Murphy Parkway and will be a transition into the downtown core. Staff would like to see the applicant create a little more of a pedestrian connection; maybe a seating area. Staff defers to the Architectural Advisor for design suggestions.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY

This proposal continues the downtown charm and creates a synergy, extending the downtown to the west. This site's parking, especially if they can obtain a shared parking agreement, will allow people to park and walk to numerous businesses. This will lessen traffic. The site will contribute to the service needs and economic well-being of the community. The commercial uses will be a net positive in regards to tax revenue. This area is considered a mixed-use area and this proposal is consistent with the use.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff does recommend the applicant submit a Preliminary Development Plan.

Mr. Betz said the site is a part of the Murphy Park zoning. The proposed layout is following the guidelines and rules established within the Murphy Park zoning.

Chris Meyers, Architectural Advisor, said the Sketch Plan submittal is done very well and is better than a lot of Final Development Plans. Referencing the existing building across the street is great. This gives us a visual of how the existing building configuration has performed over time and it sets the tone for retail row. A certain degree of character and quality is established. The plans show a building which is compatible to the existing building across the street but not an exact replica. The tower versus the open, void space is interesting. Murphy Parkway has become a prominent thoroughfare so the view when coming from the south is very important. Look at how the architecture of the building could come out and absorb or envelop the trash and transformer area and not just use a landscape screen. You might consider an out building or carriage house type of building. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic along Olentangy Street. Having an L-shaped building up to the corner fights the pedestrian-friendly concept. He hopes the street side of the 2-sided retail façade does as well as the interior face of the building, which is going to be the physical entry side for people in a car. There may be an opportunity to create a pass-through at the corner to create a walk route, to allow pedestrians on the main walkway to walk to both sides of the building. It might help to highlight the feature of the corner tower. From a retail perspective, it gives you more square footage of store front and could be a passage through the building. He was glad to hear the comments about spandrel windows. You never really know what is going to get packed into a store front. It is important to think about the 2-sided retail in limited square footage. You might consider elevating the scale or size of the roof feature of the tower; give it a much deeper overhang. You might be able to incorporate down lighting onto the façade. The rest of the building could be illuminated with wall sconces. The illumination of the tower could enhance it. He is assuming the 3 windows shown in the drawing are looking into a false space. Mr. Ford said correct. Mr. Meyers said a glowing tower would be a nice feature. Mr. Meyers suggested matching the materials of the new building to the existing building across the street or to completely oppose it. The stone selection could be the same and the color selections could be totally different. If the buildings are meant to complement each other, one key element, possibly the stone and/or shingles, should be a dead on match. We have seen the attention to detail with all of the applicant's previous work. Attention to small details and the quality of materials is really all that is needed. Think about how to make the building more pedestrian-friendly. Mr. Ford said he was thinking of opening the tower piece up so people could walk under it and give the west side of the building a covered walk area. Mr. Meyers said this would turn the prominent store fronts to the road and not to the back parking area. If it isn't possible to put a tunnel in the building so people can walk through, it would be great to come up with a better way to engage the pedestrians. Mr. Ford said he likes the idea of creating a covered walkway. Mr. Meyers said he would like to see where electric meters and panels, items such as this, will be placed. The plan is a great start.

Chairman Emerick opened this item to public comment.

Tom Ritchie, Part-Owner, Best Friends Veterinarian, said the applicant is doing a very nice job with this project. He asked if the tower on the corner is within height requirements. Mr. Betz said the height is fine. Mr. Ritchie asked if a

restaurant would go in, would there be a different parking requirement. Mr. Betz said yes there would be different parking requirements but the owner is going to restrict restaurant space.

Mr. Betz said Dr. Ritchie's partner asked about the road striping on Murphy Parkway. Right now there is no special striping for left turning into the far driveway on Murphy Parkway. Would the Commission like the applicant to provide a traffic study to see if special striping is needed? The City Engineer thinks it is fine the way it is. Commissioner Hartranft asked what the distance is. Mr. Betz said the distance is short. There won't be a lot of stacking. Commissioner Little said he thinks the volume of traffic heading north and turning left onto Powell Road will be much more significant. Commissioner Hartranft asked how many cars heading south could stack up there. Could cars stack up out onto Olentangy? Mr. Betz said there would have to be quite a situation to cause cars to stack up onto Olentangy. Mr. Ritchie said his concern has been that people don't know what to do with the yellow line. He thinks this is going to create a problem so he asked it to be looked into. If a person is in the yellow stripe area and there is an accident, is the person in the yellow stripe area at fault? Commissioner Hartranft asked if the striping could be changed. Mr. Betz said a traffic engineer could look at it. Mr. Betz said we will do that.

Hearing no further public comments, Chairman Emerick closed the public comment session and opened the floor for comments and questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Cooper said he didn't have any questions. The applicant has a good start. He likes Mr. Meyers' comments about sort of mirroring the building across the street. He likes the tower as opposed to a patio, especially if there aren't going to be any restaurants. He isn't too concerned about the striping on the road but he wouldn't have a problem if a traffic study was done. He uses the road all of the time and he doesn't think there is going to be a problem. He likes the idea of having a pedestrian-friendly structure on the west side of the building. Being pedestrian-friendly will benefit the businesses and the public. He looks forward to seeing the Preliminary Development Plan.

Commissioner Jester said he likes the building. It is nice and compliments the section. He asked how people get to the building next door. Mr. Betz said there are 2 ways to enter; from Murphy Parkway or from Powell Road. There is a right-in/right-out situation on Powell Road. Commissioner Jester said he was mainly thinking about people coming from the east. Mr. Betz said people coming from the east would have to turn left onto Murphy Parkway and then turn left into lot.

Commissioner Boysko said he strongly agrees with Mr. Meyers' comments. The applicant has identified the real challenge of 2-sided architecture/2-sided retail spaces. It will be a challenge to make the spaces look active without putting in spandrel glass, making the space look vacant. He likes the idea of a cut-through or pass-through. It is a great way to bring people through from the street. If people aren't going to the front of the building off of the street, do you need a stronger connection around the building and into the back. He sees a challenge with trying to create a flexible space but also giving the retailers enough of an identity, with a stronger entrance, without a lot of repetition. Mr. Ford said the signage and store front color give identity. Everything is set up on 20' modules, which is a standard leasing module. In a center this small, we didn't try to create a bunch of store fronts. There is a lot of repetition. Commissioner Boysko said this is the challenge. You have so much repetition you wonder where the entrance to the store is. Drawings even show entrances on the side of the building when in actuality you will probably never have an entrance there. Mr. Ford said those are the egress doors. Commissioner Boysko said there are just so many doors and so much repetition there might be an opportunity to put in windows to break up the repetition. The architecture is beautiful, the detailing is great and the massing is appropriate. What if you carved out the tower on the corner to allow a deeper inset? Mr. Ford said if the west side of the building has a walkway, maybe the tower could shift over and be the start of a canopy area on the west side. Inside the tower could present a store front opportunity. Commissioner Boysko said it would be a great way to activate the west side of the building. You would need to create a stronger connection between the back parking lot and side of the building. People would be going around the dumpster enclosure. He noticed the site is up on a hill a bit. The grades are probably going to drop 5' or 10' from the front to the back. The building across the street seems to be below the road. He assumes there will be a similar condition with the new building, it will sit below the road. Mr. Ford said yes. Commissioner Boysko said all in all the plan is a beautiful start.

Commissioner Hartranft said he likes where the plan is at. It is a good use of the space. He asked if there will be a restriction in regards to restaurant spaces. Mr. Betz said yes, in the text. Commissioner Hartranft asked how tall the cupola on Auto Assets is. Mr. Betz said about the same height the new tower would be, both fit within Code. Commissioner Hartranft wanted to make sure the 2 are going to be about the same height. He likes the plan.

Commissioner Little thanked the applicant for coming before P&Z. He remembers working with him on the existing center. The City got a good product and he is convinced the same will happen with this project. He agrees with

all comments made previously. He views this area as making a strong statement you are leaving the Township and entering the City of Powell. It is the gateway intersection. He is a proponent of extending this gateway across and connecting to Sawmill Parkway. This is a real important intersection and a real good opportunity to say a person is out of the Sawmill Parkway big box area and you are moving into the City. The 4-sided architecture is important. He encouraged the applicant to work with Best Friends Veterinarian to get a shared parking agreement. With the center going in across the street, the area can become a real nice retail destination. Having shared parking prevents people from having to move their car. They can park and walk. It will minimize traffic. The signage should be consistent with The Old Bag of Nails property, from a design standpoint and not from an artistic standpoint. Colors could be different but style should be consistent. He looks forward to moving forward with this project.

Chairman Emerick said he wishes all Sketch Plans were as detailed and complete as this one is. He thinks all comments have already been made. He appreciates the efforts and looks forward to a Preliminary Development Plan.

Mr. Ford said his client has asked if they could submit a combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan. Mr. Betz said Staff wouldn't have a problem with the plans being combined, knowing who is doing the work and the level of detail which will be put into the project. Chairman Emerick said he feels the same. Commissioner Little said he was going to recommend the same. Commissioner Cooper said he is normally hesitant to suggest a combination of plans but in this particular case he has no problem with combining. Commissioner Boysko said the risk you take is the request could be tabled if the plan isn't developed enough or there could be a list of conditions. Mr. Ford said he understood.

Commissioner Little moved to allow for the submission of a combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan for a proposal to construct a retail center on 1.51 acres, for the property located at the SE corner of West Olentangy Street and Murphy Parkway as represented by Ford & Associates Architect.

Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion.

Vote: Y 6 N 0

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Applicant:	Rudy Risinger/Frame Makers of Powell
Location:	84 West Olentangy Street
Existing Zoning:	(DB) Downtown Business District
Request:	To review a proposal to demolish an existing garage and construct a new garage in its place.

Rudy Risinger, R&R Construction, 1710 Lynnbrook Ct., Orient, said they want to knock down the existing garage at 84 West Olentangy Street and install a new garage/shop. The garage will be 36' by 24'. The existing garage has seen better days. The finishes will consist of ½" plywood and board and batten. The site is a double lot. There is plenty of room to be able to accommodate the size of the new garage/shop. The old garage is sitting on both of the lots. We are proposing moving the new garage left so it sits on one lot. There will be a nice even flow from the back parking lot. The house will be done in Phase 2. The house and garage will be the same color. There is an existing paved parking area in the back. The parking area should be enough for the amount of customers the business will get at one time. They are able to put in a couple ADA parking spaces if needed. The owner is doing everything he can to fix up the site. They will use a 3500 series Pella windows. Mr. Risinger showed the Commission samples of the color schemes. The garage will have dimensional shingles which will match the house.

Mr. Betz reviewed the Staff Report (Exhibit 1).

The site plan isn't real detailed and it needs to be. A lot is missing from the drawings. The main issue they want covered tonight is the appropriateness of removing the existing garage, building a new one and then what the new garage should be like. We have to be careful when we look at the removal of structures within the Historic District. This is an accessory structure so we have a little leeway. We need to look at the condition of the existing structure, what could be done with the existing structure to improve upon it and can the old structure be expanded if the owner needs more room. The existing structure has wafer board doors which are rotted out on the bottom. It is unclear when the structure was originally built. He searched the Auditor's website and he thinks it was built in the 1920's to 1940's. A fish scale siding was utilized, which is normally used for trim and not siding. The structure does have a foundation. The owner is planning on using the new building as a workshop for the frame shop, to keep the cutting outside of the show room in the house. The Commission needs to determine whether the existing structure is architecturally compatible to the Historical District. The existing structure does have one thing going against it; the structure straddles the property line between 2 lots. Although the 2 lots are owned by the same

owner, at some point in time one lot might be transferred to another person. The porch on the existing home also encroaches over the property line. This could present issues if someone wanted to buy one of the lots. The owner is trying to solve part of the problem by moving the garage/shop in the first phase. This needs to be taken into account when making a decision on this request. Currently, the garage doors face the alley, there is parking along the back and there is a man door facing the sidewalk. If handicap parking is put in, they will need to provide a handicap accessible route to the garage/shop and the house. There are provisions in the Building Code which allow exceptions. The owner would need to work with the Building Department on this. The proposal drawings provided show the garage door facing away from the alley and doesn't show any windows. There is no trim detail. Roof pitches are low with very minimal overhangs. The existing garage has larger overhangs. Commissioner Little asked if the door will be on the east or west side. Mr. Betz said the overhead door will face the north per the plans. Mr. Risinger said it should be facing the south. Mr. Betz said the proposal is confusing. Mr. Risinger said he is getting confused. The overhang door should be on the north.

Dave Weterstroem, 84 W. Olentangy Street, said the man door will be on the west side of the building. Commissioner Little asked if the traditional garage door will be on the south. Mr. Weterstroem said the garage door will be on the north side facing the alley. Mr. Betz said the site plan is reversed.

Mr. Betz said a lot of detail has been left off of the plans which need to be included. The site plan needs to be amended. He would like Mr. Meyers to provide the architectural suggestions. The Architectural Guidelines do set forth requirements for accessory buildings. The accessory building should be compatible with the main building it serves in massing, materials and color scheme. The accessory building should be subservient to the building it is serving and needs to harmonize with the main building. There needs to be windows in the garage/shop. Staff feels more work needs to be done on the design of the garage/shop to ensure it fits in with the Historical District. The problem with the lot line needs to be fixed but is this enough to say it is OK to tear down the exiting garage?

Chris Meyers, Architectural Advisor, asked Mr. Risinger if he is working with an architect. Mr. Risinger said he is working with an engineer who does drawings. Mr. Meyers said the site is located in the Historic District. There is a guidebook which walks you through, from foundation to roof, everything which needs to be considered in regards to creating components of architecture within the Historic District. The guidebook is available online or Staff can get you a copy. There are a lot of different options. The guidelines allow new construction to occur, allow changes to usefulness of a building to occur and there is a lot of variety on how to approach things. The guidelines are set up to preserve the character of the Historic District but they don't tie your hands to only one thing you can do. A lot more detail is necessary in the drawings to convey what you are trying to accomplish. More detail is needed for the site plan, for what is being proposed and for documentation of the existing buildings. He participates with the Downtown Historic Advisory Commission (HDAC) and he thinks the applicant will have a real hard time just knocking down the exiting building. HDAC is going to want to fix, repair or restore the existing building to maintain the historical pieces. You need to provide the opportunity to evaluate, whether through photography or people walking over to see, the existing building. If it is determined it is not feasible or suitable for the use you are after to maintain the existing building, HDAC will most likely recommend emulating the existing building. The building actually has some appeal. Mr. Meyers asked if the new building will be a wood shop. Mr. Weterstroem said yes. Mr. Meyers asked if vehicles will be parking in the building also. Mr. Weterstroem said no. Mr. Meyers asked if there might be a possibility to have 2 garages. Leave the old one, repair and restore it; then build a new garage next to the old on the opposite side of the walk path. When you take down a 400 SF garage and build a 900 SF garage, you will have a building as big as some of the houses. You have to keep height, size, scale and massing in mind in the residential Historic District, which is a little village. It will be a challenge getting approval from HDAC to put in a building which looks like any other building you can find in any rural backyard. Mr. Betz said P&Z has the authority to ask HDAC for advice. Mr. Meyers said further design is necessary, you need to be aware of, look through the Historic guidelines and adhere to the guidelines. Everyone in decision-making positions will point to the guidelines. It is what they want. He doesn't see much of what he knows is in the guidelines right now. It might be worth considering restoring or repairing the existing building and using it for a storage building and a new building as the shop. He thinks details and insight into what will be done with the house, since this is a phased project, needs to be provided. Giving an insight on the overall project will be important. The buildings will tie into one another. Mr. Betz asked if it would be possible to add on to the existing garage and have a 2 part garage. Mr. Meyers said absolutely. The building in the photo doesn't look like it is ready to be condemned. Mr. Risinger said the inside is definitely bad. Mr. Meyers said there might be parts which could be repaired. Mr. Risinger said Mr. Meyers would change his mind if he saw the inside. It is actually dangerous inside. Mr. Meyers said OK. Repairs are usually less expensive. You might consider showing the different options. Mr. Risinger said he tried to find out information on the existing garage. He doesn't know if there are other resources he can look into. He tried to find out when the garage was built and if it is the original structure. He doesn't think the building is the original structure. Mr. Meyers said it looks late 1940's but he doesn't think the chronological history is really valid. The issue really is where the structure is located; it is in a part of town which is protected. Even though the building seems unrepairable, there

is still a story line which can be used to create a new design. Architecturally, the proposal doesn't fit the site, doesn't fit the Historic District, doesn't fit the existing house and there is no reference to the existing garage. These types of things are the precedents and requirements. It's more than just matching a paint color. The items listed in the guidebook will jump out at you when you look at it. Your first step needs to be going through the guidebook.

Chairman Emerick opened this item to public comment. Hearing no public comments, Chairman Emerick closed the public comment session and opened the floor for comments and questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Hartranft said this is a unique request. But when you think about it, it really isn't unique. We have an old garage and the contractor says it is unsafe. He understands the Historic District guidelines but he wouldn't have a problem tearing the existing garage down if the new garage met the Historic District guidelines. The safety of the building is an issue. If a kid were to get inside and get hurt, it would be a hazard. If the Commission needs to decide whether it is appropriate to tear the existing building down, he doesn't have a problem with it. He does have a problem with the current plans. They need to meet the Historic guidelines.

Commissioner Little said he is sensing we may need to table this request so the plan becomes more of a Sketch Plan type of request. He asked if the existing building straddles a lot line. Mr. Betz said yes. They can't find a survey in the files but it is clear the building straddles the lot line. Commissioner Little said if he were the property owner this issue is an important issue to resolve. You might want to sell the lot to the left. He would pursue this. Commissioner Little asked Mr. Betz what would happen if Mr. Risinger proposed to build the garage which is currently there, what would he be told. Mr. Betz said the garage doors would have to be changed and the detailing of the trim might need a little work. The house itself does have some special trim on the outside. Mr. Weterstroem said the area Mr. Betz is referring to is asphalt roofing shingles. Mr. Betz said it fooled him. Commissioner Little said he agrees with Commissioner Hartranft. The property owner probably wants to resolve the property line issue. If a replacement building is the route the applicant wants to go, it needs to be more in line with the Historic District architectural guidelines. He is in the same boat. Solve the property line issue. He trusts the contractor's judgment the existing building is not safe. This leaves one to believe it may be better to start over. Let's start over and follow the Historic guidelines.

Commissioner Boysko said he agreed with the comments made. It is probably appropriate to consider a new building in a new location. There is still some development which is needed with the plans. Not just with the building, but consider the site, how the building sits on the site, the new walkway, how the overhead door is integrated with the parking lot, whether an overhead door is valid, consider the building relationship to the site and the access to the front of the house.

Commissioner Jester said he thinks it is appropriate to table the request. Mr. Meyers and Mr. Betz made some excellent comments. It would be wise to listen to what they said. You have an awful lot of work to do before coming back before P&Z. He recommends the request be tabled.

Commissioner Cooper said he doesn't have additional comments. He would prefer the request go before HDAC so P&Z can hear their ideas and opinions.

Chairman Emerick said he agrees with Commissioner Cooper. It would be wise to get recommendations from HDAC. There is more information and detail needed before any decision is made. Mr. Meyers made a number of valid comments. If the building is in real bad shape, he isn't opposed to taking it down. A replacement building would have to meet Historic District guidelines. The property line problem needs to be solved. The garage is part of the property line problem. The house porch is a second part of the property line problem. Mr. Betz said it sounds like the Commission would be fine with taking the existing building down, pending HDAC review. Chairman Emerick said this is the general consensus.

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to send the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a proposal to allow for the demolition of an existing garage and the construction of a new garage in its place, for the property located at 84 W. Olentangy Street as represented by Rudy Risinger/Frame Makers of Powell to the Historical Downtown Advisory Commission (HDAC) for review, subject to the following condition(s):

1. That the Certificate of Appropriateness shall return to the Planning & Zoning Commission for final approval after review by the Historical Downtown Advisory Commission (HDAC).

Commissioner Boysko seconded the motion.

VOTE: Y 6 N 0

AMENDMENT TO AN APPROVED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Applicant: Reserve at Scioto Glen LLC
Location: Steitz Road and Home Road
Existing Zoning: (PR) Planned Residence District
Request: To review changes to a Final Development Plan.

Todd Faris, Faris Planning and Design, 243 N. 5th Street, Columbus, said when the final plat was designed for this section, there is a 20' shared drainage easement for the 5 lots with red stripes on the drawings. This precludes these homes from being able to have a 3 car garage. There has been a significant amount of interest in having 3 car garages in this development. MI Homes handpicked a few lots they think are appropriate to reduce the side yard setback, on one side, by 2' to accommodate the building footprint they would like to build. In essence, the lots will go from having an 8' setback on the blue side to a 6' setback. They are also increasing the setback between the buildings, from 8' to 10' because of the easement. They will still have 16' of separation or side yard on these lots. It has just been offset to accommodate the easement. The request also includes Lot 3606, to have the rear yard changed from a 30' setback to 20' setback. He did some investigation into the configuration of this lot. Since the Preliminary Development Plan which was approved by P&Z, the radius of the roadway has changed slightly. This made the building footprint not fit on the lot. MI Homes has provided a footprint which can be built on the lot which will have the least impact to accommodate the lot but they need the rear yard setback adjustment.

Mr. Kambo reviewed the Staff Report (Exhibit 1).

This request doesn't have to go back through City Council since the change isn't substantial. P&Z can make the decision. Overall, Staff doesn't have an issue with the request. The overall intent or character of the development isn't substantially changing. Lot 3606 was always intended to have a house built on it. The overall distances are staying the same even though the side yard setbacks are changing. Staff does recommend approval of the Amendment. Once the changes are made, Staff would like to receive a complete, updated package for City records.

Chris Meyers, Architectural Advisor, asked if the changes allow the houses to be any closer to each other. Mr. Betz said the houses on Lot 3629 and Lot 3628 will be 14' apart rather than 16' apart. Mr. Meyers asked if MI is the builder. Mr. Betz said yes. Mr. Meyers said he is pretty sure Building Code mandates a fire rated construction less than 5' off the property line. Mr. Betz said yes.

Chairman Emerick opened this item to public comment. Hearing no public comments, Chairman Emerick closed the public comment session and opened the floor for comments and questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Cooper, Commissioner Jester, Commissioner Boysko and Commissioner Little said they have no problem with the request.

Commissioner Hartranft asked if Lot 3624 through Lot 3628 are going to have 3 car garages. If Lot 3629 and Lot 3630 are going to be changed, why wouldn't the whole row just be changed? Mr. Faris said MI would love that. Mr. Betz said permits have already been issued for some of those lots. They sat down with the applicant and looked at what permits have already been issued and the lots in this request are the lots which are left. Commissioner Hartranft asked if the houses already there don't have 3 car garages. Mr. Betz said there are no houses on the colored lots. They want to build houses with 3 car garages. Commissioner Hartranft said he is asking about the lots which aren't colored. Mr. Betz said some of the lots not colored do have 3 car garages because there was no easement which restricted the setback. The easements in the red color are restricting the setbacks on either side, creating the possibility of only 2 car garages. Commissioner Hartranft asked what the purpose of the easement was in the original request. Mr. Betz said there is storm sewer there. Mr. Kambo said there is a 20' drainage easement. Mr. Betz said the storm sewer goes over to the right and in between the lots and drains to the street. Commissioner Hartranft asked if this is going to encroach onto this drainage easement. Mr. Betz said no. The setback is being reduced to the blue side, not in the easement. We are reducing to one side, not the other side. Mr. Kambo said the easement is basically being shifted. Mr. Faris said currently the setbacks are 8' on each side of the lot. There will end up being 10' on the easement side and 6' on the non-easement side. This accommodates the same home, we just have to shift the easement. Mr. Betz said if the easement weren't there, the setback would be 8' and they would have the 2' to work with. These are the only lots being affected. Commissioner Hartranft asked if this was the result of a lack of planning when they first did the plans. Mr. Betz said it is more the demand for houses with 3 car garages. Commissioner Hartranft said the builder can get creative with garages; they can build tandem garages. Mr. Betz said the models offered don't offer tandem garages. They would have to re-design their models. Commissioner Hartranft said OK, let's just move on.

Chairman Emerick said he didn't have any questions.

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to approve an Amendment to an approved Final Development Plan for a proposal to allow the side yard and the rear yard setback to be reduced for the property located at Steitz Road and Home Road as represented by Reserve at Scioto Glen LLC, subject to the following condition(s):

1. That the Final Development Plan shall be amended to allow the side yard setback on Lot 3629 (7792 Bachman Drive), Lot 3630 (7806 Bachman Drive), Lot 3636 (4778 Hunters Bend Court), Lot 3644 (4759 Hunters Bend Court) and Lot 3646 (4715 Hunters Bend), to be 6' versus 8' on one side only, to allow the construction of homes with 3 car garages. The existing drainage easements shall be maintained, and
2. That the Final Development Plan shall be amended to allow the rear yard setback on Lot 3606 (7772 Foxhound Drive) to be 20' versus 30', to allow the construction of a home on this lot.

Commissioner Boysko seconded the motion.

VOTE: Y 6 N 0

PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Applicant: DJCF Holdings LLC
Location: 18 – 36 Grace Drive
Existing Zoning: (PC) Planned Commercial District
Request: To review a proposal to construct an addition to an existing building to be used as a nano-brewery with a pub.

Matt Franz, DJCF Holdings, 20 Grace Drive, said they are back with a Preliminary Development Plan. They would like to build a 3,000 SF space on the east corner of their property; 1,500 SF of warehouse and 1,500 SF of retail space on the front portion. A current tenant is potentially going to expand into the space with a brewery in the back and a tap room or brew pub in the front portion. He has worked with the City and had the site surveyed to make sure they are OK with storm drainage. There is a collection area between his property and the Post Office. They might need to dig down in the pit a little bit. This would work to their advantage. They could use the soil where they plan on putting a patio. They will be removing some trees. They received comments/concerns from residents regarding sound. The trees are in bad shape. They have an agreement with Claire Jolliff to be able to plant trees on her property. There is already mature trees and a fence between his property and the residents behind. They plan on putting in a significant amount of landscaping towards the front portion where the patio will be. There were comments made about Grace Drive becoming more and more travelled. He wants to make sure everything looks good coming from both the west and the south. Mr. Franz said he really likes how the renderings show the food truck up against the patio so people don't have to leave the inside of the business. People can order from the patio. They will adjust their parking; make sure the asphalt has lines which would allow the food truck to park there and not impede the traffic flow. The renderings start to sell the idea they can put something on Grace Drive which has some character. He wants to put money and energy into the front 1,500 SF. The back warehouse space will be a little less exciting. He took the comments about windows and the patrons being able to see the brewing process to heart. The tenant will probably end up having tours to take people through the brewing area. They resolved the parking concern. Their parking during the day is very limited. They don't need a lot of parking during the day. The business is a night time establishment. They did get a shared parking agreement with the pre-school to the west. If they have special events in the evening, they will have overflow parking. The plaza across the street doesn't restrict their parking. We will re-pave and re-stripe the entire parking lot.

Mr. Kambo reviewed the Staff Report (Exhibit 1).

The Sketch Plan came before P&Z on May 10th. The proposal is the same. We now have a complete Preliminary Development Plan package. The site plan architecture has been refined. The 3D renderings are great. A shared parking agreement with Big Hearts Little Hands has been provided. An agreement from the neighbor to the east to allow trees to be planted has been provided. The proposed use is already present. The business is expanding. The brewery has been present for a long time and we haven't heard any complaints about the business. We don't foresee complaints in the future. Staff is happy with the size and scale of the proposal. The businesses around the proposed business have inverse operating hours. The parking agreement is fantastic. Gallo's Tap Room has been doing very well. Now we will activate another corner of the area and there can be an interplay of bars and restaurants which will bring people to the downtown core. An extension of our downtown core is happening to the north. Staff is very cognizant of the residents who live behind the plaza. The space which could have a potential to be loud is as far south as possible. The space will be shielded by the building and any additional landscaping which will be planted. The residents will have a walkable amenity. They can walk and have a beer, get some food, meet their neighbors. Staff hopes the residents see this as a benefit. Traffic circulation is fine on site. Grace Drive isn't very heavily traveled and can handle the increased traffic. The municipality is going to have

to vacate the right-of-way and do some back-end level work to ensure the area is rounded out and the developer has access to the space. The proposal is in line with the Comprehensive Plan. The tax base will be increased and amenities to the residents will be increased. The City Engineer is happy with the concept of the catch basin at this point. Staff is very pleased with the cooperation from the applicant. Everything asked of the applicant in the last meeting has been taken care of. Kudos to the applicant and all of the businesses nearby for working together. Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Chris Meyers, Architectural Advisor, said the comments he has pertain to the details. He was glad to see the conceptual approaches of what the interior would look like. It is really attractive. He likes the idea of what he calls an honest building; it uses the structure and the bones of the building as part of the aesthetic and décor. When you look at how detailed the interior of the building is, he is hoping the exterior will start picking up some cues from the interior. The exterior is trailing behind a little bit. Pay attention to the durability of the materials used in the north portion of the building around the loading doors. Forklifts can move in and out of the tap room so think about framings of doors rather than just sticking a bollard out front. He noticed a skylight feature in one of the interior renderings. You might consider a pop up window over the bar area to bring in some lighting up high and enhance the exterior roof by adding a roof element. The rest of the exterior simplicity is fine. The nature of the tenant lends itself to a pretty simple, basic, straight forward building with some nice attention to detail. He understands the ease and convenience of having the food truck where it is located in the renderings but you were talking about the perception of how you will see the space coming through Grace Drive from either direction, and the food truck will block the patio. You might want to think about shifting the food truck north a little bit so the corner is opened up. A lot of effort is being put into creating an identity by having great activity out on the patio and the food truck blocks it. Mr. Meyers suggested going downtown to see Pins. Mr. Franz said his landscaper mentioned Pins and that is where he came up with the lighting idea. Mr. Meyers told Mr. Kambo he just e-mailed some pictures off the internet of Pins (Exhibit 1B). He isn't suggesting to match Pins exactly but use it as an example. An aluminum rail could be put in; it would be a low cost detail. People are your best marketing. The more you can have people sitting at or leaning on a rail might help. Pins used big massive pieces of I-beams for their lighting. You don't need to exactly match this but it could be a neat design feature which starts to tie in the character of the interior. Mr. Franz said their next renderings will fine tune these types of things. Mr. Meyers said his point is to really think about the details to enhance the business. Mr. Meyers said as part of the Final Development Plan, it would be great to see some material samples. The place is going to be very cool. The way to get it to be exceptionally well done is really in the little details.

Chairman Emerick opened this item to public comment. Hearing no public comments, Chairman Emerick closed the public comment session and opened the floor for comments and questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Hartranft thanked the applicant for coming back before the Commission. He really likes the concept and idea. The renderings do bring the concept to life. He would take to heart everything Mr. Meyers said. He has been to Pins and it is a really nice place to go and hang out. He fully supports the development.

Commissioner Little said he agrees with Commissioner Hartranft's comments. He has one thought to keep in mind if this location becomes a destination spot; the Post Office will outgrow their facility. Mr. Betz said the Post Office just renewed their lease for 10 more years. Commissioner Little said regardless, if trees are going to be planted on the north side and if down the road there is a logical place to connect the two sites, you might not want to plant trees in this area. If 10 years from now the Post Office moves and your space becomes a restaurant, you can have a good flow of shared parking. Mr. Franz said the grade on the portion of the site where the pine trees are is pretty significant. He doesn't know if there would ever be the ability to connect the sites. Mr. Betz said the storm drainage is there also so it could only be a walkway. Commissioner Little said the proposal is great. He is all about supporting successful local businesses. He looks forward to the Final Development Plan.

Commissioner Boysko said he agrees with the comments from the Commission and with Mr. Meyers' comments. Mr. Meyers nailed it when he mentioned the food truck blocking the patio. Moving the food truck north would be good. You might want to move it further north so you can pull the people traffic through your space. The patio is going to be a great activator. Drawing people through your space would be a great activator. The food truck also hinders accessibility to the patio. Mr. Franz said he didn't know if patrons could enter an establishment which sells alcohol without going through the front door. Mr. Betz said they can. When you get your liquor permit, include the patio and porch area as a part of your permit diagram. People would be able to walk to the food truck and not have to put their beer down. Commissioner Boysko asked how valid the need for a food truck is if you have kitchen area. Mr. Franz said he is pushing for a small kitchen area, knowing this tenant might not be there forever and he wants any tenant to be able to use the area. The food truck concept is what this tenant wants right now. The food trucks aren't there every day; just Friday and Saturday right now. Having a kitchen area keeps options open for future tenants but this tenant won't have food service aside from food trucks. Commissioner Boysko said

it looks like the renderings for the patio are a little further along than the site plan and building elevations. Mr. Franz said they have things to work out yet. Commissioner Boysko said he wants to make sure the site plan matches up to the patio. Mr. Franz said they will work with everyone on this. Commissioner Boysko asked if there is an opportunity to move the building further south. Mr. Kambo said the site plan has the building further back but the renderings have the building up as far as possible. The site plan needs to match. Mr. Betz said they will work on this during the Final Development Plan to determine how far south the building can go. Commissioner Boysko asked if the right-of-way is going to follow the curve of the road. Mr. Betz said yes. Commissioner Boysko asked how you establish the setback. Mr. Betz said they will establish the setback the same as the curve. It is 25'. Commissioner Boysko said he was asking about the placement of the building on the site because when you push the building so far south the building is no longer facing the street, the corner is. The patio could start to bridge the gap between the curved road and the façade. Mr. Kambo said they could potentially curve the front end of the patio. Commissioner Boysko said he was thinking of a stronger edge along the street. Mr. Franz said maybe they don't do a rectangle patio. They could create a circular portion. Commissioner Boysko said all in all it is a great concept and idea.

Commissioner Jester asked what kind of lights will be on the patio, will they be downward lights? Mr. Franz said there will be sconce lights to the left and right of the glass garage door. The only other exterior lighting would be the line bulbs. Mr. Betz said the patio lights are like the lights at Local Roots. Commissioner Jester said he is thinking about the cars which travel on Grace Drive and there will be light bulbs hanging there. Mr. Kambo said the lights are dimmer, not very bright. The lights wouldn't cause much concern to a driver. Commissioner Jester said he would like to see how it would look. The lights seem a little high. Mr. Franz said it is a new trend which has become very popular. They have the same type of lights at Pins. Mr. Betz said the lights aren't going to be very bright. Commissioner Little said The Old Bag of Nails uses the same kind of lights. Mr. Betz said Liberty Tavern uses the lights too. Commissioner Jester said he didn't want to beat the topic up, you might want to take another look at the lights.

Commissioner Cooper said there isn't much he can add. He would like to emphasize the comments about the food truck and moving it further north.

Chairman Emerick asked what the hours of operation will be. Mr. Franz said they are open Wednesday through Sunday, normally 5:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Sundays they close earlier. Chairman Emerick said he was particularly concerned about how late they are open at night. We need to be concerned about noise coming from the patio and affecting the residents nearby. Sound always travels further at night. We will want to see details on the sign.

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to approve the Preliminary Development Plan for a proposal to construct an addition to an existing building to be used as a nano-brewery with a pub, for the property located at 18 – 36 Grace Drive as represented by DJCF Holdings LLC, subject to the following condition(s):

1. That the City Engineer shall approve in concept the proposed engineering aspects of the plan at the Final Development Plan, and
2. That the architectural details shall be worked out for the Final Development Plan submittal, and
3. That the final lighting plan shall be submitted in the Final Development Plan review, and
4. That the final landscaping plan shall be finalized and included in the Final Development Plan review, and
5. That the final signage plan shall be finalized and included in the Final Development Plan.

Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion.

VOTE: Y 6 N 0

COMBINED PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Applicant: Beatz Studio
Location: 80 Clairedan Drive
Existing Zoning: (PC) Planned Commercial District
Request: To review a proposal to construct a dance studio on 1.18 acres.

Chairman Emerick reminded the Commission the applicant has asked for the request to be tabled to a future meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to table the Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan for a proposal to construct a dance studio on 1.18 acres, for the property located at 80 Clairedan Drive as represented by Beatz Studio, to be rescheduled for review at a later meeting.

Commissioner Boysko seconded the motion.

VOTE: Y 6 N 0

AMENDMENT TO AN APPROVED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Applicant: Verona LLC
Location: 3676 Verona Phase I
Existing Zoning: (PR) Planned Residence District
Request: To review changes to a Final Development Plan.

Steve Jones, 148 W. Schrock Rd., Westerville, said he is the Residential Design Manager at Romanelli and Hughes. They have a condition where a house was improperly staked. The error wasn't found until after the siding material was being put on. Foundation, framing and roofing has been completed. The next building has begun construction and they have a 5' side yard instead of a 6' side yard as required in the development text. We are asking for an exception on this one lot, to allow a 5' side yard.

Mr. Betz reviewed the Staff Report (Exhibit 1).

There are two options which can be taken. The request can go to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) for a variance. We chose the option of going to the Planning & Zoning Commission for the Amendment because it is quicker. The builder has the opportunity to close on the property prior to a meeting could be scheduled with BZA. It is OK for P&Z to take action on this request. The smaller setback will require the overhang area to be a fire rated material which the developer is using. We see this type of error once every 4 or 5 years. There is nothing which can be done except tear the house down, which isn't a good idea. Staff recommends approval with the condition the developer file the appropriate paperwork necessary with the County Recorder so future owners don't have problems with encroachment issues.

Chris Meyers, Architectural Advisor, had no comments.

Chairman Emerick opened this item to public comment. Hearing no public comments, Chairman Emerick closed the public comment session and opened the floor for comments and questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Cooper said he had no problem approving the Amendment. He asked if the fire rating material needs to be mentioned. Mr. Betz said the Building Commissioner has already taken care of this.

There were no other comments or concerns.

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to approve an Amendment to an approved Final Development Plan for a proposal to reduce the side yard setback for Lot 3676 from 6' to 5', for the property located at 3676 Verona (Phase I) as represented by Verona LLC.

Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion.

VOTE: Y 6 N 0

OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS

No further business.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Chairman Emerick moved at 9:24 p.m. to adjourn the meeting. The Commission seconded the motion. By unanimous consent, the meeting was adjourned.


DATE MINUTES APPROVED: June 28, 2017

Donald Emerick
Chairman

Date

Leilani Napier
Planning & Zoning Clerk

Date



City of Powell, Ohio

Planning & Zoning Commission

Donald Emerick, Chairman

Ed Cooper, Vice Chairman

Shawn Boysko

Trent Hartranft

Joe Jester

Bill Little

Chris Meyers, AIA, Architectural Advisor

MEETING MINUTES

June 28, 2017

A meeting of the Powell Planning & Zoning Commission was called to order by Vice Chairman Ed Cooper on Wednesday, June 28, 2017 at 7:02 p.m. Commissioners present included Trent Hartranft, Joe Jester and Bill Little. Also present were Dave Betz, Development Director; Chris Meyers, Architectural Advisor; Leilani Napier, Planning & Zoning Clerk and interested parties. Shawn Boysko and Donald Emerick were absent.

STAFF ITEMS

No Staff items.

HEARING OF VISITORS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Vice Chairman Cooper opened the public comment session. Hearing none, he closed the public comment session.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to approve the minutes of June 14, 2017. Commissioner Jester seconded the motion. By unanimous consent the minutes were approved.

COMBINED PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Applicant: Beatz Studio
Location: 80 Clairedan Drive
Existing Zoning: (PC) Planned Commercial District
Request: To review a proposal to construct a dance studio on 1.18 acres.

Chris Winkle, Gandee Heydinger Group, 642 Brooksedge Blvd., Westerville, said he is representing Beatz Studio. He has Mike Felice with him, who is the owner of Beatz Studio. He apologized for the last minute change which resulted in their request being tabled at the June 14th P&Z meeting; requiring a special meeting. They rushed into the concept plan presented before. He misrepresented what the business is for. We said the dance studio was for little kids when in fact it will be for adults; an exercise studio for Zumba and exercise classes. Conversation took place at the last meeting about having a drop-off area. Kids won't be dropped off since the facility is for adults but they did stripe off an area in the back to be used as a turn-around area. This will provide better traffic flow. They asked to be tabled so they could look at the building elevations more. The previous plans showed gabled roofs. They went to the site and looked at the surrounding buildings. Almost all of the surrounding buildings have hipped roofs. The new plans now show hipped roofs. They decided to add entrance features which are similar to the surrounding buildings. They added a couple windows on the side elevation. They extended the stone across the façade. They now show rectangle windows as opposed to square. The client would like a grey building. Mr. Winkle had material boards to show the Commission. They will be using a light grey stone on the bottom of the façade; grey roof shingles; white window trim, eave spouts and flashing; with a dark grey building. They will use board and batten on the front with metal on the rear portion. Commissioner Jester asked if the back of the building will be metal. Mr. Winkle said yes, dark grey. Commissioner Little asked if the applicant was still thinking of expanding the building. Mr. Winkle said correct. Commissioner Little asked Mr. Winkle to identify where the expansion would be. Mr. Winkle said the Wolfe Commerce Park regulations only allows buildings to be a maximum of 150' long. The plan shows where the expansion would go. The building would be 150' if the expansion is done. Commissioner Little asked if the expansion would go on the north side of the building. Mr. Winkle said yes.

Mr. Betz reviewed the Staff Report (Exhibit 1).

Staff reviewed all of the submitted plans. The plans propose the use of metal siding in the back of the building. The property across the street from the site is a (PI) Planned Industrial District. The context of the buildings in Wolfe Park are all single-story buildings, office/warehouse use, with brick facades. On Seldom Seen Road there is a different context because the lots are larger. The gymnastics studio needed higher space for the equipment. Staff worked hard with the gymnastics studio to use natural materials on the front of the building. There are different contexts within the area. The Wolfe Commerce Park started in the 1980's, when the City was experiencing its first growth. There are hipped roofs and front gabled porch areas in the area. This is why the applicant added the porch element to their plan. The roof lines have been changed considerably since the Sketch Plan. Staff is fine with the site items, the lighting plan, the landscaping plan and the storm water detention, which is in the back now. Staff thinks the complete change to hipped roofs has gone a little too far. Hardly any roof is seen now which adds more viewing dimensions to the sides of the buildings. More stone has been added to the building sides, the bottoms of porch columns and to the door area in the back. Staff feels the change in the roof was an over-reaction to comments. Staff likes the front gabled roof. Adding the porch elements was a good addition. Staff would like Chris Meyers to comment on the building plans.

Chris Meyers, Architectural Advisor, said these meetings don't usually get into the interior layout but it will help answer some questions to understand the interior. The parking and entry drive are on the west side. The porch feature is on the south side. Being an adult fitness type of use, he is assuming people won't walk all the way around to the south elevation to enter the building, when parking is on the west. How is the interior layout going to work with the parking condition?

Michael Felice, 6521 Old Ironside Ln., Delaware, said they will be leasing out a training area to a personal trainer. It isn't an open gym, but by contract only. The trainer may personally train 2 – 5 people each session. The front entrance is on the south, facing the street. Mr. Meyers said a lot of attention is given to the interior plans where the foyer is, the restrooms are and the waiting room is. It is going to be human nature to use the west entry as the main entrance to enter due to the parking being on the west side. Mr. Felice said he knows it appears this way. They want another entrance on the west into the dance hall. His wife holds a lot of charity events and they want a separate entrance for these people so they don't have to enter through the front lobby. The front lobby is where people will walk in with their kids. The area on the plan designated waiting room is actually a child watch area. It is mislabeled. Mr. Meyers said people will very likely enter on the west side. Mr. Felice said it is a possibility, unless they secure the door and have some type of signage. They want the west entry to be for special events only. The garage door entry is placed where it is so they can load and unload tables for events. Mr. Meyers said this makes sense.

Mr. Meyers said as a group exercise space, the space will be considered an assembly use type of building. The dance hall area, based on the dimensions and square footage, will carry a real high occupancy load. Check with your architect on egress size, number of doors required and locations of doors.

Mr. Meyers said a lot of conversation took place at the Sketch Plan review about compatibility within the Wolfe Commerce Park. Compatibility doesn't just necessarily mean match of materials. He sat down with Staff and they read through the guidelines and requirements for the Wolfe Commerce Park. The development guidelines do allow brick, stone and masonry units. It really isn't a matter of not being allowed to use stone. The look and feel of the building should be considered. He appreciates the effort on the applicant's part to go look around at the neighboring buildings. The height and scale of the proposed building with a hipped roof creates a disproportionate façade. A hipped roof is compatible with the neighboring buildings but the context for this building is different. He actually thinks the gabled roof allows the scale of the building to transition nicely. The roof line is lower and in alignment with the rest of the neighboring buildings where the training room, the waiting area and the foyer are. If the front portion or the street side of the building had a hipped roof and the bigger volume of roof is gabled, you end up with a building which is a little more compatible to neighboring buildings in scale and massing. The future addition could transition back down to a hipped roof. The hipped roof plan is at a 4/12 slope; it goes up 4' for every 12' in length. Most hipped roofs in the area are at a 6/12 slope. The roof design in the first plans were at a 6/12 slope and he thought this was better. The taller walls allow for a 6/12 slope. The thoroughness on the site engineering and the detail is exactly what we look for in a Final Development Plan. There is a note on the possible future addition part of the plan saying 70 by 60 addition. There is no design showing what a future addition would look like. When you add a 70 by 60 addition onto an existing 60' wall, the wall gets really long. If the length were decreased to even 58 it would help the scale of the building. You would have to come back before P&Z for any type of addition and it would be reviewed then but you should think about this as you develop any future plans. The entry porch is a great way to understand where the front door is. The porch appears to have a metal roof. Mr. Winkle said yes, the roof can be negotiated. The architect put a metal roof on since it was on before. It could be shingles. Mr. Meyers said metal is OK if everyone likes metal. He is leaning towards metal. Mr. Winkle said a metal roof breaks up the big roof. Mr. Meyers said when you have a big building with a lot of roof, material makes a

difference. Wolfe Commerce Park is a little unique, there is a lot of brick. A material which strays from what the compatible materials are is really going to stand out. This may be good for business but to stay within the context of the surrounding buildings there is a lot of brick which would look nice on this building. The building plans look like the building will be a pole barn type of construction. Pole barns by their nature tend to move a little more with the wind. The treatment of a synthetic stone application, which is glued onto the side of the building, will be very important or it will crack. There are thin brick options which go on just like the proposed stone. The brick usually isn't more expensive than stone. Mr. Felice said he was told differently. He was told the cost difference is substantial. Mr. Meyers said a true, masonry, load bearing brick is more expensive but not a thin brick panel which is glued on. Mr. Felice said he is open to brick if he can find a brick which doesn't cost more. Mr. Meyers said surrounding business owners think brick is important. The Wolfe Commerce requirements don't mandate brick. We are only suggesting you consider brick. He likes the dark grey finish. The dark grey finish would go well with a deep red brick. The bigger volume area, the dance hall area, could be dark grey and you could consider having the board and batten area be a lighter tone like a light grey or a white tone, to tie in compatibility and to affect the scale perception of the building. A play in color will affect the scale and different colors don't cost more. The architectural details aren't up to par with what we normally see in a Final Development Plan. More notations on the elevations, more product samples, more specifications, details on the windows would help. More information on materials, sizing and location are needed. Think about signage; where will signage be, will signage be illuminated. Mr. Felice asked if there are any requirements. Mr. Meyers said there are signage guidelines as part of the Wolfe Commerce Park guidelines and the City of Powell also has some guidelines. Exterior lighting needs to be shown; location and specifications provided. You might consider accents of a metal roof. We will look for the dimensions of the columns and trim work. The gauge of the metal siding is listed as .014. This gauge is used on lower grade storage facilities or maintenance type building. Using this gauge on a pole barn type of building will allow wiggling. A thinner gauge metal panel, especially on high walls, will twist and you will see oil canning. The dark grey finish will draw more heat. Speak to your architect about elevating the gauge of the metal material. You need to specify what the material of the board and batten will be. We recommend a Hardi-panel with a Hardi-batten. We look for a ¾ minimum depth. Smart Trim and Hardi-Trim make a really thin batten which will be wiggly and won't hold up well. Mr. Meyers said he sat down with Mr. Betz and scribbled down an idea of a building elevation (Exhibit 1A). He used the first elevations as an under-lay. He was thinking there might be more prominence in the west entry. The garage door and transom window are the same. He went back to a gable roofline. Natural lighting from the west side would be a great interior affect so he proposed another window. He created an area which replicates the garage door on the opposite side which could be a panel for signage or some type of façade treatment. The effort was to take the big wall, which is wide and tall, and break it up for scale. The porch element is gabled rather than hipped. A little bit of reference to the surrounding neighbors has been created but there isn't an exact replication. If there is brick, great, or if there is stone at least we are proportionately modifying the building to be a little more compatible in scale. We don't have hard rules saying you can't do this or you can only do that. These are suggestions on how to create architecture which will fit with what is going on around the building but allows you to stand out as an individual. They only had time to scribble one elevation. We are willing to meet with your architect and talk through everything and help the process.

Mr. Betz said Staff feels further discussions need to happen. Staff recommends tabling the request. P&Z will have another meeting on July 12th. We recommend the applicant think about some changes, have their architect meet with Mr. Meyers and then put together their final elevations and come back July 12th. The site plan is fine.

Vice Chairman Cooper opened this item to public comment.

Claire Jolliff, Wolfe Commerce Park, said she met with everyone; Nick Cua, Brad Eades and Kent Fowler. The key word is continuity. We are mostly concerned you don't come down Clairedan Drive and say "oh, what's that?" She agrees the covenants and restrictions were written in the late 1980's/early 1990's and things have changed a little bit. As neighbors we are concerned the new building is consistent with other buildings in the area. Nick Cua has some strong views about the metal on the side of the building. He has to look at the west side of the new building. Mr. Cua just doesn't want the building to look like a barn. She likes the comments about changing the stone to brick. When you look at all of the buildings on Clairedan Drive it is a brick thing. She doesn't know of any other building with stone. Mr. Betz said there is a building with a mix of stone and brick. Commissioner Little said he thinks there is a building with stone. Ms. Jolliff said brick would help add to the continuity. Breaking up the roofline with metal is probably going to send up some bells and whistles with Mr. Cua. His main concern is not looking at metal. Mr. Meyers asked if metal was allowed in the covenants. Ms. Jolliff said a certain percentage is allowed. She likes the porch idea because most buildings do have a porch look. She isn't sure putting metal over the porch will add to the continuity. Most of the porches are shingled. Mr. Meyers is on the right track regarding breaking up the west elevation. If the future addition is put on, there will be a lot of metal. Mr. Felice said the addition wouldn't be metal. It will complement the front of the building. Mr. Betz said plans for the addition should be put in the plan as text or as a note on the plan. Mr. Winkle said if they put it in the plan and it is approved, that's what they have

to go with. Ms. Jolliff said more detail will let everyone know what is going to be built. We are all in favor of the site plan. Welcome to the neighborhood is the feeling she is getting from everyone. We want to see Wolfe Park finished out. We are just concerned about the amount of metal and how massive the building will look. The key word is continuity.

Hearing no further public comments, Vice Chairman Cooper closed the public comment session and opened the floor for comments and questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Jester said he agrees, there are a lot of issues which need to be looked at.

Commissioner Little said he agrees with what has already been said in regards to listening to the neighbors and trying to keep the continuity of the street. It is fairly consistent but some variety is good. We have a unique situation. This same body approved the gymnastics facility behind this building and we approved metal so we are in conflict. The concept goes back to Clairedan being a street in itself and therefore leaning towards the consistency of the buildings on Clairedan as opposed to the larger building on the outer lot. We should allow the affective use of metal wherever appropriate, however, minimize the noticeable variation from the buildings on the street. The applicant needs to work with Mr. Meyers.

Commissioner Hartranft said he agrees with most of the comments made. The thing which is bugging him is we are asking the applicant to take in regulations which are 20+ years old, designs have changed and we all wouldn't want to live in a neighborhood which has 20 year old style houses. We need to embrace some of the changes and new concepts of building designs. He understands being a good neighbor is important but if the plans fit within the Wolfe Commerce regulations he is supportive. Take the comments which have been made tonight into account but he is open for something else too.

Vice Chairman Cooper said he didn't have anything further to add. He wants to emphasize he isn't a big fan of the metal either. He wouldn't go as far as to say you absolutely can't use any metal. This is a detail for your architect to work out with Mr. Meyers and Staff. If we can table the request tonight and have more detailed drawings, the request can move forward.

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to table the combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan for a proposal to construct a dance studio on 1.18 acres, for the property located at 80 Clairedan Drive as represented by Beatz Studio, to be rescheduled for review at a later meeting.

Commissioner Hartranft seconded the motion.

VOTE: Y 4 N 0 (Boysko & Emerick absent)

OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS

Mr. Betz said the property owners adjacent to the Cardinal Self-Storage facility have decided not to participate with the Cardinal Self-Storage sign. A design of the proposed sign was provided to the Commission (Exhibit 1B). Commissioner Little asked what will happen to the old sign which shows the other property owners. Mr. Betz said the old sign will be taken down. The new proposed sign will take the place of the old sign. Commissioner Hartranft asked Mr. Betz to show the old sign. Mr. Betz said the old sign is on the Germain property. Some of the businesses showing on the old sign are no longer in existence. Commissioner Little asked if the City requires the other businesses to have a sign. Mr. Betz said no, there is no indication in the original approvals that a sign is required. He looked at the Ordinance and old minutes. He looked for a recorded agreement. City Council has re-authorized and is OK with the new sign being put up. Mr. Betz said the P&Z Commission listed a condition stating the sign had to come back before P&Z so a motion will be needed. The sign meets size and location requirements. Commissioner Hartranft asked if there will be landscaping. Mr. Betz said the drawing shows landscaping going in around the sign. Commissioner Hartranft asked if the sign will be internally illuminated. Mr. Betz said the sign will be internally illuminated; the white will be opaque and the red letters will be shiny. Commissioner Hartranft asked how bright the lighting will be. Mr. Betz said the sign won't be too bright; within requirements.

MOTION: Commissioner Little moved to approve the signage plan for Cardinal Self-Storage, to be placed on the northeast corner of West Olentangy Street and Industrial Park Place.

Commissioner Jester seconded the motion.

VOTE: Y 4 N 0 (Boysko & Emerick absent)

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Vice Chairman Cooper moved at 7:58 p.m. to adjourn the meeting. The Commission seconded the motion. By unanimous consent, the meeting was adjourned.

DATE MINUTES APPROVED:

Ed Cooper
Vice Chairman

Date

Leilani Napier
Planning & Zoning Clerk

Date

DRAFT