

# Canal Winchester

*Town Hall  
10 North High Street  
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



## Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 8, 2018

7:00 PM

## Planning and Zoning Commission

*Bill Christensen – Chairman  
Michael Vasko – Vice Chairman  
Joe Donahue – Secretary  
Brad Richey  
June Konold  
Joe Wildenthaler  
Mark Caulk*

Call To Order

*Time In: 7:00pm*

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

Approval of Minutes

December 11, 2017 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by Joe Wildenthaler, seconded by Mike Vasko, that the December 11, 2017 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 5** – Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, and Vasko

**Abstain: 2** – Richey & Konold

Executive Session

**A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Brad Richey to adjourn for Executive Session.**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

Time Out: 7:01pm

Time In: 7:03pm

Election of Officers 2018

**A motion was made by Mike Vasko, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler, to appoint Bill Christensen as Chairman. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

**A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by June Konold, to appoint Mike Vasko as Vice Chairman. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

**A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Mike Vasko, to appoint Joe Donahue as Secretary. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

Public Comment

Public Oath

Public Hearings

Mr. Christensen announced that the applicant for items ZM-17-007 and PDP-17-003 requested that these applications be moved from a Public Hearing to New Business to be a discussion item only.

**A motion was made by Mike Vasko, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler, to move applications ZM-17-007 and PDP-17-003 from Public Hearing applications to New Business.**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

**FDP-17-004**

Property Owner: Eastside Properties / Westlinks Inc.

Applicant: Grand Communities, Ltd.

Location: 13.8 Acres located along the northwest corner of Lithopolis Road and Gender Road. (PID 184-001055 through 184-001008 and part of 184-002102)

Request: Approval for a Final Development Plan for Section 15 of The Villages at Westchester to construct 46 new residential lots.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Grand Communities for 13.8 acres located along the northwest corner of Lithopolis Road and Gender Road. The applicant is requesting approval for a Final Development Plan FDP-17-004 for Section 15 of the Villages at Westchester subdivision, which will contain 46 new home sites. This phase of the Westchester subdivision was planned to replace the previously platted Walnut Brook Estates subdivision, which was platted in 1968. The Walnut Brook Estates subdivision created 72 lots, some of which are now the lots which front Gender road and Lithopolis Road in the area. Staff discussed that in order for the applicant to plat Section 15, they will need to vacate the current Walnut Brook Estates Plat and Plat the proposed section 15 after.

Staff presented the application to the commission and discussed that the Villages at Westchester subdivision is guided by development text and conditions from Ordinances 59-90, 81-91, 17-01 and 40-02. The proposal for Section 15 follows the Preliminary Development Plan text for all of the standards set in place for the subdivision. Staff discussed that throughout the development of the Villages at Westchester since 1990, the phases have been constructed in different orders from the original approved plan. This change has resulted in 13 total phases to the community, with the proposed being the final phase. Staff recommends that Section 15 be renumbered to Section 13 for platting purposes, so that the subdivision is platted in numerical order.

Mr. Moore discussed the utility plan for the subdivision with the commission. The applicant is proposing water lines to come off existing connection at Gender Road, and to establish a new sanitary line that will connect to the existing lift station which is on site. Staff recommends that the sanitary line be extended both on the east and south connections so that they both may serve future development to the east of Gender Road and South of Lithopolis Road. The connection to Lithopolis Road is also being recommended to be oversized to accommodate future offsite development to the south.

The Preliminary Development Phasing Plan for the Villages at Westchester dated April 20, 1990 notes that Section 15 is to be comprised of 46 single family lots. The Final Development Plan for Section 15 contains 46 lots. The applicant is proposing that the access to Gender Road be a right/in, right/out only due to the profile of Gender Road not meeting the visual spacing requirements. The access on Lithopolis Road will be a full access.

With the site clearing the applicant will be removing a total of 192 major trees. As part of the tree replacement plan, the applicant has identified to plant 107 new trees on site at the rear of the lots and within reserve areas, along with the commitment to plant 2 trees per lot developed, totaling in 199 new trees planted by the developer.

The applicant has submitted elevations of the homes that are to be constructed in this section. This home style falls in Fischer Homes Patio Home Collection. They consist of ranch style homes ranging in size from 1,500 sq. ft. to 1,966+ sq. ft. Mr. Moore discussed the current development of Section 12 Sections 1-2 with the commission and noted that about half of that section is completed and there are only two house styles under construction, one 5 level split and one ranch unit. Staff commented that those two units have many face styles available to them, but it appears that the patio homes only have 2 face styles and there is concern that this section would develop in a similar pattern where the entire development is monotonous and looks visually the same. Staff recommends that the applicant alternate the model styles submitted so that each style does not comprise of more than 20% of the entire development, providing a diversity of housing options, which would result in a maximum of 9 homes of each style.

Staff recommends that Final Development Plan for Section 15 of the Villages at Westchester be approved with the following conditions:

1. This phase of Villages at Westchester be renumbered from Section 15 to Section 13.
2. The sanitary line be extended from lot 867 to stub with a manhole along Gender Road right-of-way to serve future development on the east side of Gender Road.
3. The sanitary line south to Lithopolis Road be oversized to accommodate future off-site development.
4. The applicant alternate the model of homes in the subdivision so that no more than 20% of each style be constructed. (I.E. 9 homes max of each of the following: Edenton, Amelia, Kiawah, Wilmington, Maxwell, and Winthrop.)

Mr. Caulk asked what are the sizes of the sanitary lines. Mr. Haire indicated that the sanitary line going east is an 8" line and the sanitary line heading south is being requested to be a 21" line.

Mr. Christensen asked if this is a recommendation to City Council. Mr. Haire indicated that this is a Final Development Plan and the Preliminary Plan was approved in 1991.

Mr. Wildenthaler asked if the access off Lithopolis Road was a right-in/right-out. Mr. Moore indicated that the Lithopolis Road access point will be full access. Currently at that location is an easement for the city to access the existing lift station by the golf course.

Mr. Vasko made a motion to approve application FDP-17-004 with the staff recommendations.

Mr. Moore stated that the applicant is present if there is anything they would like to add to the discussion.

Jason Wisniewski discussed the staff recommendations to the commission and indicated that Fischer Homes is comfortable with conditions 1-3 and clarified with staff that the sanitary line being oversized would be compensated by the city. Mr. Haire indicated that the city would contribute to oversize the sanitary line.

Mr. Wisniewski discussed staff recommendation #4 and stated that Fischer Homes feels this is putting too much restriction on the home buyer and could limit sales in the subdivision. Fischer has their own anti-monotony guidelines to help solve the potential issue staff is discussing. Mr. Wisniewski discussed the internal guidelines that Fischer homes has in place to regulate development.

Mr. Haire discussed that while this subdivision does not have to meet the current standards, and new development would have to allow a break within a model of home within two lots on each side and across the street.

Mr. Moore asked the applicant if there was any compromise to limit the number of any one home style. Mr. Wisniewski discussed that he believes the Fischer internal guidelines would accomplish what staff is requesting.

Mr. Vasko asked the applicant to come back in February with the guidelines submitted for approval. The applicant affirmed.

**A motion was made by Mike Vasko, seconded by Brad Richey, that Final Development Plan FDP-17-004 be approved with staff recommendations #1-3 and table condition #4 for the February meeting so that the applicant can present their preferred recommended language to the commission.**

1. This phase of Villages at Westchester be renumbered from Section 15 to Section 13.
2. The sanitary line be extended from lot 867 to stub with a manhole along Gender Road right-of-way to serve future development on the east side of Gender Road.
3. The sanitary line south to Lithopolis Road be oversized to accommodate future off-site development.
4. The applicant alternate the model of homes in the subdivision so that no more than 20% of each style be constructed. (I.E. 9 homes max of each of the following: Edenton, Amelia, Kiawah, Wilmington, Maxwell, and Winthrop.)

**This motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

**CU-17-006**

Property Owner: Jay Jala Hospitality LLC

Applicant: Steven Fox

Location: PID 184-003304 (2.045 acres east of Aldi)

Request: Conditional Use from Section 1167.03(e) to allow for a Conditional Use Permit for a 62,000 sq. ft. 93 room Hampton Inn Hotel.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Steven Fox for property located at Parcel ID 184-003304, which consists of 2.045 acres located east of the Aldi property. The applicant is requesting a conditional use from Section 1167.03(e) of the zoning code to allow a 62,000 sq. ft. 93 room Hampton Inn Hotel on property zoned General Commercial.

Staff presented the application to the commission and noted that the property meets the 2 acre minimum site size for the conditional use application to construct a hotel/motel. The building that is being proposed has a footprint of 15,656 sq. ft. on the ground floor. The entire hotel consists of +/- 62,000 sq. ft. over four floors. The hotel area will also consist of a lobby, breakfast area, meeting room, fitness center, and indoor swimming pool. All rooms will be accessed via internal corridors. The hotel will feature 93 rooms across all four floors. This hotel will require a variance to exceed the maximum 40 feet / 3 story maximum building height.

There are 114 parking spaces provided with this site plan that will be constructed on all 4 sides of the building. The parking layout for the proposed hotel will require a variance for parking to be located in front of the building and more than 50% of the parking located to the sides of the building.

Staff discussed the conditional use criteria of approval with the commission. This hotel will provide an additional 93 hotel rooms to Canal Winchester that will collect bed tax and will aid in the attraction of the city's local and national

tourism events. The applicant has shown with the submitted application materials that they can meet the criteria for approval of a conditional use permit as stated in Section 1145.03. Staff recommends that conditional use #CU-17-006 be approved as presented.

Mr. Vasko asked staff about the West Waterloo Street right-of-way stub and asked if it has been abandoned. Mr. Haire indicated it is not currently abandoned but the city is in the process of doing so. The parking in this area will require a right-of-way use permit, which will be discussed during the Site Development Plan application.

Mr. Vasko asked if the West Waterloo Street stub was going to be reconnected. Mr. Haire indicated that the stub was removed due to issues with traffic congestion at the stop sign by BP so it is not likely it will ever be reconnected.

Mr. Vasko asked where the limits of the abandonment would occur. Staff indicated at the stop sign in front of Aldi.

Mr. Vasko asked staff if we have any other structures in Canal Winchester that is 50 feet tall. Mr. Haire indicated we do not.

Steve Fox representing the applicant indicated that they are looking forward to expanding their presence in Canal Winchester.

Mr. Richey commented on the Best Western down the street and stated that maintenance and upkeep is a problem and that is not a hotel he would recommend to anyone. Having a second hotel with the same ownership is a concern. Mr. Haire indicated the owner of the Best Western is one of many partners in this hotel deal and they will not be the lead or managing partner with the Hampton Inn.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for Public Hearing.

**A motion was made by Mike Vasko, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler, that this Public Hearing be closed. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

**A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Brad Richey, that this Conditional Use permit be approved as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

**VA-17-018**

Property Owner: Jay Jala Hospitality LLC  
Applicant: Steven Fox  
Location: PID 184-003304 (2.045 acres east of Aldi)  
Request: Variance to section Chapter 1167.04(b)(1) to construct a 55.3 foot tall, 4 story hotel.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Steven Fox for property located at Parcel ID 184-003304. The applicant is requesting a variance from Chapter 1167.04(b)(1) to construct a 55.3 foot tall, 4 story hotel. Staff discussed with the commission that the proposed building will feature 93 hotel rooms across 4 floors. The highest point of the hotel is a parapet wall/accent feature that is 55.3 feet tall. The majority of the hotel is at a maximum 48.8 feet tall.

Staff discussed that Section 1167.04(b)(1) of the zoning code regulates buildings in the General Commercial district at a maximum 40 feet tall with no more than three (3) stories in height.

Mr. Moore presented the criteria for approval to the commission and indicated that to get the hotel to fit on site, the applicant had to construct the building vertically, rather than horizontally. The intent of the General Commercial zoning code was written with typical big box development and commercial outparcel development in mind. These types of uses typically do not need a building to exceed 3 stories or 40 feet in height, while modern hotel development does. Staff feels that the proposal will bring an attractive modern hotel to the developed shopping, dining, and entertainment district.

Staff discussed that the Hilton Brand has design standards that require the building to be the four story height. This standard helps ensure a consistent design theme and experience for the guests with little deviation permitted. This site is the only site in the Gender Road corridor that would be approved by the Hilton brand for hotel development due to visibility and surrounding land uses.

The applicant has shown with the submitted application materials that they can meet the criteria for approval of a variance as stated in Section 1147.03. Staff recommends that variance #VA-17-018 be approved as presented.

Steven Fox discussed with the commission that the size of the site resulted on the 4 story building and the Hilton brand requires a certain number of rooms.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for Public Hearing.

**A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Mike Vasko, that this Public Hearing be closed. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold



**A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler, that Variance application VA-17-018 be approved as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Richey & Konold

**No: 1** – Vasko

**VA-17-019**

Property Owner: Jay Jala Hospitality LLC

Applicant: Steven Fox

Location: PID 184-003304 (2.045 acres east of Aldi)

Request: Variance to section Chapter 1199.03(d) to construct a building that does not comply with the 40% glass requirement between the height of two (2) feet and ten (10) feet on the elevation facing the primary street.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Steven Fox for property located at Parcel ID 184-003304. The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 1199.03(d) of the commercial development standards to have the south elevation not comply with the 40% window glass requirement between the height of two (2) feet and ten (10) feet on elevation facing the primary street.

Staff presented the application to the commission and noted that the south elevation is the elevation being discussed for the variance request. Due to the orientation of the building, this elevation is not the main entryway that would typically be discussed during this type of application. This elevation on the hotel is at the end of a corridor where the on the first floor the mechanical room and stairwell is located.

Staff discussed that this section of the Commercial Development standards was written to regulate big box and small commercial outparcel development to promote a pedestrian friendly environment with buildings up close to the sidewalk and window glass to allow view inside. Hotel development however, was not the primary goal when this section of the code was written. While, hotel development does have window glass on hotel rooms, they are typically oriented and positioned in a way for the guest to look out and not so much for a guest to view inside. Staff discussed while the east and west elevations have much more window glass than the south, it still requires the variance.

Mr. Moore discussed that this variance was discussed with the applicant and staff asked for the south elevation to be broken up in a manner where the lack of window glass was not noticed. The applicant modified the landscape plan to break up the wall with several Emerald Green Arborvitae on the south elevation. Staff is comfortable with the addition and recommends that the arborvitae are installed at a minimum of 5' in height.

Due to the orientation of the building, the applicant could not get the elevation with the most window glass facing West Waterloo Street. The applicant has

indicated that they are willing to install oversized landscaping in this area to compensate for the lack of window glass. Staff recommends that variance VA-17-019 be approved with the condition that the arborvitae on the south elevation are installed at a minimum 5' height.

Steven Fox discussed with the commission that they have no issues with the additional landscaping added to the south elevation.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for Public Hearing.

**A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Mike Vasko that this Public Hearing be closed. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

Mr. Vasko discussed that he feels that while Canal Winchester could use a new hotel he does not believe that this is the correct site for the hotel based on the number of variances required and the justification that the context of the site requires the variances. Mr. Christensen commented that the zoning code is written for storefronts and restaurants in mind and not a hotel. Mr. Vasko affirms he understands that.

**A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Mark Caulk that Variance application VA-17-019 be approved as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Richey & Konold

**No: 1** – Vasko

**VA-17-020**

Property Owner: Jay Jala Hospitality LLC

Applicant: Steven Fox

Location: PID 184-003304 (2.045 acres east of Aldi)

Request: Variance to section Chapter 1199.03(c) to allow building elevations to be below the 80% natural material requirement, as required per the Commercial Development Standards.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Steven Fox for property located at Parcel ID 184-003304. The applicant is requesting a variance to section 1199.03(c) of the commercial development standards to allow building elevations to be below the 80% natural material requirement.

Staff discussed that the hotel will consist of 7 different materials on the exterior elevations. These materials are comprised of two (2) different brick colors, one (1) ledgerstone type, one (1) fiber cement panel type, and three (3) different EIFS accent colors. The building is comprised of a taller center portion with two shorter "wings" that span north and south. The center of the building is made primarily of fiber cement paneling with an accent of the ledge stone. The two

wings are comprised of the two tones of brick on the larger east and west elevations, and EIFS on the north and south. All of the windows on the building will feature a two tone EIFS trim that will be inset in the wall plane for architectural diversity. Mr. Moore indicated that the larger elevations (east and west) meet the 80% natural material requirements, while the north and south do not.

Section 1199.03(c) of the Zoning Code, which regulates building design, states: "Materials. All exterior walls shall be comprised of eighty (80) percent natural material with brick or stone as the predominant material. Other natural materials may also be incorporated into the building's exterior design. Use of "Newer" materials is subject to approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Stucco, drivit and like materials may be used as accents provided the total square footage of accent material does not exceed twenty (20) percent of the gross exterior building wall square footage."

Staff discussed that the proposed hotel building has a large building massing. This scale of a building has been allowed in the past to deviate from the 80% "brick" frontage where appropriate. The architect has designed this building to have some accent EIFS on the ends of the building while the longer elevations have higher percentages of natural material. Due to the scale of the building, the applicant has designed the hotel with multiple materials to break apart the building massing. Due to this the north and south elevation do not meet the 80% natural material requirement.

During initial discussion of the Hampton Inn on this site there was zero (0) brick provided and the building entirely comprised of EIFS with minor fiber cement paneling near the entrance. The applicant has since revised their prototype to come closer to Canal Winchester's standards with a large amount of brick on all of the elevations. Staff recommends that the variance application #VA-17-020 be approved as presented.

Steven Fox commented that the architecture of the building was modified to match the corridor with more brick on the elevations.

Mr. Caulk asked what the finish of EIFS was on the building. Kenny Leckrone representing the architect indicated that it is the standard popcorn 'sandpaper' finish. Mr. Caulk asked if there will be a control joint pattern in the eifs wall. Mr. Leckrone indicated he is not sure on control joint location but there should be no pattern on the walls.

Mr. Richey commented on the north and south floating wall units and suggested that a thin brick or other material be used to get the achieved look while meeting the natural material standards. Richey added he does not like that the variance requests mainly talk about the orientation of the building and then that side of the building that does face the street is not as finished as the rest of the hotel. Rickey encouraged that the north and south elevation meet the Canal Winchester standards.

Mr. Leckrone commented that if the eifs is going to be an issue for approval then they request that this variance application be tabled so that the owner of the building can be present next month to discuss the application with the commission. Mr. Richey commented he does not mind eifs as an accent feature but being on the two main elevations causes concern.

Mr. Fox indicated that while they are requesting the application to be tabled, they would still like to have a discussion on the application.

Mr. Donahue indicated he does not have an issue with the prototype.

Mrs. Konold stated that she understands that Hilton may have their own standards but that does not mean that Canal Winchester should have to vary from their own standards. It sounds like getting the building to meet the city standards are feasible. Mr. Leckrone commented that it is feasible however, there are financial impacts on making the changes.

Mr. Moore shared with the commission a slide from the future site development plan application. This slide shows that staff is going to suggest that a majority of the yellow brick on the building be changed to the red brick to match the rest of the corridor. This would result as the yellow brick as an accent color to the red brick.

Mr. Haire indicated that the staff recommendation is to help with building massing. The red Patriot Brick is what is used in the corridor and staff felt it should be used more on this building. Due to the scale of the building, the primary elevations are the east and west, not the north and south.

Mrs. Konold asked if the applicant has seen the recommended changes. Mr. Leckrone stated that the ownership has no issues with the change to primary red brick.

Mrs. Konold asked staff if the west elevation will match the east. Staff affirmed that the recommendation will apply to the west elevation as well. The intent of the rendering is to have the building be primarily the patriot brick and have the yellow brick as an accent.

Mr. Wildenthaler asked if there would be issues with changing the brick to match staff's rendering. The applicant affirmed that can switch the brick color with no issues.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for Public Hearing.

**A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler to close the Public Hearing. This motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7 - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold**

Mr. Richey discussed tabling the variance application to the next meeting so that the applicant can have an opportunity to meet the Canal Winchester Standards.

**A motion was made by Brad Richey, Seconded by June Konold to table the Variance Application VA-17-020 to the February agenda. This motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

**VA-17-021**

Property Owner: Jay Jala Hospitality LLC

Applicant: Steven Fox

Location: PID 184-003304 (2.045 acres east of Aldi)

Request: Variance to section Chapter 1199.05(a) to allow parking in front of the principal building and more than 50% of the parking located on the side of the principal building.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Steven Fox for property located at Parcel ID 184-003304. The applicant is requesting approval for a variance from Chapter 1199.05(a) of the commercial development standards to allow parking in front of the principal building and more than 50% of the parking located on the side of the building.

The proposed hotel is located on the north side of West Waterloo Street, adjacent to the recently constructed Aldi grocery store. The proposed building has a footprint of 15,656 sq. ft. on the ground floor. The entire hotel consists of +/- 62,000 sq. ft. over four floors. The hotel area will also consist of a lobby, breakfast area, meeting room, fitness center, and indoor swimming pool. All rooms will be accessed via internal corridors. The hotel will feature 93 rooms across all four floors. There are 114 parking spaces provided with this site plan that will be constructed on all 3 sides of the building.

Staff discussed that due to the size of the site, the parking needed to be located on three sides of the building. The parking in front of the building will require a right-of-way permit to allow the surface parking but staff is in the process of abandoning the property so that the applicant can acquire it. Due to this unique nature, the building cannot be pushed towards West Waterloo to allow more parking behind the structure.

This parking layout is typical of hotel development so that people can park their vehicles within sight of their hotel rooms. Additionally, the Fire Departments requires an access drive on all four sides of the building due to its size so that applicant has oriented the parking accordingly.

Staff recommends that Variance #VA-17-021 be approved as presented. The applicant has designed a facility with a functional parking lot layout that works for the site and provides a usable 360 degree fire lane access.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for Public Hearing.

**A motion was made by Mike Vasko, seconded by Brad Richey, that this Public Hearing be closed. This motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Vasko, Richey & Konold

**A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by June Konold, that Variance Application VA-17-021 be approved as presented. This motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Richey & Konold

**No: 1** – Vasko

**SDP-17-011**

Property Owner: Jay Jala Hospitality LLC

Applicant: Steven Fox

Location: PID 184-003304 (2.045 acres east of Aldi)

Request: Site Development Plan approval for a +/- 62,000 sq. ft. Hampton Inn Hotel with associated site uses.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Steven Fox for property located at Parcel ID 184-003304. The applicant is requesting approval for Site Development plan SDP-17-011 to approve a 62,000 sq. ft. Hampton Inn Hotel with the associated site uses. The proposed hotel will feature 93 rooms across 4 floors.

The subject property has a front build-to-line at 25 feet. The commercial development standards, code section 1199.04(a)(1) allows a variation from the build-to line of 0 feet to 15 feet. The proposed plan shows that the building will be located 28 feet away from the right-of-way. The proposed building also meets the side and rear setbacks per code.

The site will be accessed from West Waterloo Street from a new curb cut adjacent to Fifth Third Bank. The applicant has indicated that they will restripe West Waterloo Street to allow for a new left turn lane into the site. A pedestrian access sidewalk connecting the front door to a sidewalk along West Waterloo Street has been provided, along with a connection to the sidewalk stub at the end of the Aldi site.

The parking lot as provided has 20 parking spaces located in front of the building and the rest of the parking is located to both sides of the building. Chapter 1199.05 of the Commercial Development Standards states, that the parking shall be located to the rear or side of the principle building with no more than 50% of the parking to the side of the building. The site layout as provided does not meet this standard with 18% of the parking located in

front of the building and 82% of the parking located to the side of the building. The location of the parking lot will require a variance.

Sanitary sewer service is available from a new manhole that Aldi had installed at the front of the site, connecting to an existing public line along West Waterloo Street. The applicant is also going to tie Fifth Third Bank to the sanitary system, as the bank is currently operating out of a leech field on the proposed hotel site. Water service is available through a public water line along the south side of West Waterloo Street stub. A private storm sewer system will be created on site that will lead to underground detention under the proposed parking lot.

The proposed landscaping plan shows some shrubs and landscaping on three sides of the building, in addition to trees planted around the perimeter of the parking lot. The number of trees planted within the site meets code standards for the size of the building and the number of parking spaces. The only area in which this site does not meet the landscaping requirement is for the 10 parking spaces in front of the building facing West Waterloo Street. Chapter 1191.02(c) requires that off-street parking be screened from the public right-of-way with a solid masonry wall or wood fence, or dense planting of evergreen shrubs not less than four (4) feet in height. Staff recommends that landscaping be added in this area to screen the parking from existing Waterloo Street right-of-way per Chapter 1191.02(c).

The applicant has provided a site lighting plan that meets the standards in code section 1199.06. The decorative light fixtures and poles are proposed at 30 feet tall on top of a 30 inch concrete base. Due to Chapter 1199.06 regulating maximum height of a parking light pole at 30 feet, staff recommends that the concrete base for the light pole be flush with the ground.

The applicant is not requesting any signage at this time, and is only showing conceptual signage locations. Staff recommends that future signage which complies with the zoning code be approved administratively.

The applicant has provided elevations of the proposed 93 room Hampton Inn Hotel. The Commercial Development Standards require that exterior walls be composed of 80% natural materials with brick or stone as the predominant material. The south and north elevations proposed do not meet this requirement and require a variance.

The Commercial Development Standards require the building to have four sided architecture. The standards also require that for every 100 ft. of elevation width, each side and rear elevation must have 2 design elements and the front must have 3 design elements. Each elevation meets the

requirements for the number of design elements. The combination of materials across the building that meets these standards are the of variety building materials (2 different tones of brick, 3 colors of EIFS, fiber cement panels, and ledgestone entryway), front canopy station, floating EIFS wall systems and the variation in wall heights. The standards also require that the building have articulation with frontage that exceeds 50 feet and offsets to the wall plane which the building meets this requirement.

Chapter 1167.04 (b)(1) of the General Commercial standards state that, "No building shall exceed forty (40) feet in height, nor more than three (3) stories in height." The proposed Hampton Inn is four (4) stories and 55.31 feet tall to the tallest parapet wall. The main portion of the hotel has a maximum height of 48.8 feet. The height of the proposed building requires a variance.

The mechanical equipment on the roof is noted to be screened on all four sides and the parapet wall returns (back side) are noted to be constructed with matching EIFS.

This facility has entrances on all four sides of the building, with the main loading/unloading zone on the east elevation. This area meets the Commercial Development Standards in Chapter 1199.03, which requires an entryway to be located on the front of the building facing the primary right-of-way.

Staff has worked with the applicant on multiple revisions to the plans and recommends that the application for a Site Development Plan #SDP-17-011 be approved with the following conditions.

1. A variance is obtained for Chapter 1199.05 of the Commercial Development Standards for 18% of the parking located in front of the building and 82% of the parking located to the side of the building.
2. A variance be obtained for Chapter 1167.04(b)(1) of the General Commercial District standards for a building that exceeds forty (40) feet in height, and more than three (3) stories in height.
3. A variance be obtained for Chapter 1199.03(d) to allow the elevation facing West Waterloo Street to have below the 40% glass requirement between two (2) feet and ten (10) feet in height.
4. A variance be obtained for Chapter 1199.03(c) to allow the north and south elevations to be below the 80% natural material required.
5. The applicant must submit signage plans for administrative approval.
6. Landscaping be added in front of the 10 parking spaces south of the building to screen the parking from the right-of-way per Chapter 1191.02(c).



7. The concrete bases for the parking lot light poles be flush with the ground (remove the 30 inch exposed concrete base) so the light poles do not exceed the maximum 30-foot height.
8. Restriping of West Waterloo Street to allow for a left turn lane into the site with the design approved by the technical review group.
9. A right-of-way permit is issued to allow for the parking in front of the building to be located within the former West Waterloo Street right-of-way.
10. The exterior brick be modified per staff example, so that the red brick (Hanson Patriot) is the primary brick on the building to match the rest of the corridor.

Mr. Donahue asked staff what is the process for the right-of-way use permit and its permit expiring every 5 years. Mr. Haire indicated that the risk is if we need to sue the right-of-way the city has the first right to use the right-of-way. The main issue would be if there were structures on top of the surface that needed to be removed. In this case the only being placed in the right-of-way would be pavement for parking, sidewalk and nothing else. The idea with this specific property is to vacate the right-of-way in the long run. The city does not want to continue to maintain the street stub to nowhere.

Steven Fox commented that they agree with the staff recommendations but had a question if there is not a necessity for any one of the variances does the recommendation need to be worded differently. Mr. Haire asked if the applicant was referring to the tabled variance and if they can meet the 80% natural material requirement do they need to come back to Planning and Zoning. The applicant affirmed. Mr. Haire indicated that would be up to the commission if they wanted to review the new north and south elevations prior to approval.

Mr. Richey commented the variance request would just go away if they met the 80%.

Mr. Caulk indicated he would like to see updated elevations regardless if a variances is needed or not.

Mr. Richey asked what the material of the mechanical wall screening and parapet screens are. Staff indicated the mechanicals would be the typical louvered slats and the interior of the parapet walls would be designed in the same finish as the exterior to remove the typical white rubber roof look.

Mr. Haire indicated that the hope is they won't be visible, but we would like to make sure they are screened in case it is visible.

Mr. Donahue verified that staff recommendation #4 can be a conditional approval but the commission still would like to review any changes to the north and south elevation. Mr. Vasko affirmed.

**A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler, that Site Development Plan SDP-17-011 be approved with the following conditions:**

- 1. A variance is obtained for Chapter 1199.05 of the Commercial Development Standards for 18% of the parking located in front of the building and 82% of the parking located to the side of the building. (VA-17-021)**
- 2. A variance be obtained for Chapter 1167.04(b)(1) of the General Commercial District standards for a building that exceeds forty (40) feet in height, and more than three (3) stories in height. (VA-17-018)**
- 3. A variance be obtained for Chapter 1199.03(d) to allow the elevation facing West Waterloo Street to have below the 40% glass requirement between two (2) feet and ten (10) feet in height. (VA-17-019)**
- 4. A variance be obtained for Chapter 1199.03(c) to allow the north and south elevations to be below the 80% natural material required. (VA-17-020)**
  - Condition #4 as stated above was not approved at the January 8, 2018 meeting. The north and south elevations still need to be reviewed by P&Z and Staff to see if a variance is needed at the February 12, 2018 P&Z Meeting.**
- 5. The applicant must submit signage plans for administrative approval.**
- 6. Landscaping be added in front of the 10 parking spaces south of the building to screen the parking from the right-of-way per Chapter 1191.02(c).**
- 7. The concrete bases for the parking lot light poles be flush with the ground (remove the 30 inch exposed concrete base) so the light poles do not exceed the maximum 30-foot height.**
- 8. Restriping of West Waterloo Street to allow for a left turn lane into the site with the design approved by the technical review group.**
- 9. A right-of-way permit is issued to allow for the parking in front of the building to be located within the former West Waterloo Street right-of-way.**
- 10. The exterior brick be modified per staff example, so that the red brick (Hanson Patriot) is the primary brick on the building to match the rest of the corridor.**

Old BusinessNew Business

Mr. Moore briefly discussed the items that were moved to new business and introduced the two applications to the commission. Staff noted that this application was moved from a Public Hearing to New Business at the request of the applicant so that they can get preliminary feedback on the subdivision proposal prior to a full submittal. The applicant would like to give a presentation this evening and get feedback from the commission on items to change prior to full submittal.

Jack Mautino Division President with Westport Homes spoke to the commission about the proposed subdivision. The proposal is a PRD on a 79 acre site. The proposed development would consist of 129 traditional single family lots in one sub area and 65 age targeted lifestyle single family lots in the other sub area. Mr. Mautino explained that Westport has designed the subdivision to meet a more mature demographic that wants to stay in their current community and works with the current demand of single family home buyers. Mr. Mautino explained that the subdivision comprises of different housing options to provide a variety of home styles for different buyers. This style in the neighborhood would create less competition and help to not overload the market with the same type of product.

Mr. Mautino stated that out of the 79.5 acre site, 64.8 acres is being developed, excluding the right-of-way. 21 acres of open space is be retained on site. This would result in more than 33% open space being retained, current code requires 20%.

Subarea 1 would consist of 129 traditional single family homes with a minimum lot area at 8,500 sq. ft. and a minimum frontage at the building line at 65 feet. Setbacks would include 25 foot front and rear setbacks with 8 foot side yard setbacks. Overall size homes would start with 1,400 sq. ft. ranch homes and 1,800 sq. ft. two-story homes. This particular product would be similar to what is currently being constructed in Canal Cove.

Subarea 2 would consist of the 65 lifestyle single family homes. Minimum lot area is 6,250 sq. ft. with a minimum frontage at building line at 55 feet. Setbacks would be 25 foot front and rear with 5 foot side yard setbacks.

A Home Owners Association would be established to maintain the community and its open space. Playground equipment and walking trails would be constructed in Reserve C along with bike paths in Reserves A, B and C. An 8 foot bike path would be provided along Hayes and Oregon Road as well. All wetlands

and stream corridor protection zones would be placed in a conservation easement or similar to help protect them.

The lifestyle homes would have all lawn maintenance handled by the HOA. The lifestyle units would be restricted to have no fencing or accessory structures outside patios.

Mr. Mautino explained that is an overview of the plan and asked if there were any questions prior to reviewing the architecture.

Mr. Donahue asked the developer what is attractive about this specific piece of 79 acres. Mr. Mautino explained that asides from the location this site seems to be the next logical location where development is to occur. Access to the business district and freeway and utilities is a big attraction as well.

Mr. Christensen asked the applicant if the property is in Canal Winchester Schools. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Wildenthaler commented that he noticed that the minimum setbacks and lot coverage is a deviation from the current standards. The proposed lot coverage is going from 30% to 35% and this code standard in particular is something that has proven to be a challenge to get people to understand and to allow a specific community to deviate from that standard is an issue. Mr. Mautino commented that the active adult home buyer has different goals when purchasing a new home and maintaining a large home site is not one of them. In the spirit of the PRD making the home sites smaller and increasing the amount of open space is more attractive to home buyers today.

Mr. Wildenthaler asked the applicant if the homes are similar to Canal Cove. Mr. Mautino affirmed.

Mr. Mautino commented he believes the traditional single family homes will start at \$315,000 and work their way up to \$375,000 and the lifestyle series would start at \$265,000 range and work up to \$295,000. The style of homes would be consistent with the offerings Westport is providing in Canal Cove and what Fischer Homes is providing in The Village at Westchester. In Canal Cove the average sales price is \$310,000 and Fischer Homes average sales price is \$386,000. All of the homes would include the same elements council approved with the updated standards for Canal Cove; including architectural garage doors, stone or brick accents to be limited to 20%, concrete driveways, covered porches, and the hardi-plank front facades to match Canal Cove.

Mr. Mautino discussed he has no issue agreeing to the no duplication standards, chimney requirements, four sided architecture standards set forth in the residential design standards.

Mr. Haire informed the commission that the idea behind moving the application to new business was so the commission could provide feedback. Any feedback provided would be appreciated.

Mr. Richey commented that he has issues with deviating from setback standards set in the current code and communities. Mr. Mautino commented that the one area that can easily be accommodated would be to cap the lot coverage at 30%.

Mr. Wildenthaler asked the applicant if Westport Homes did the development at Wagnals Run. Mr. Mautino indicated Westport Finished the development but Dominion homes started the development. Westport just purchased the engineering plans completed by Dominion and finished out the subdivision.

Mr. Wildenthaler discussed he has heard about issues in both that subdivision and Canal Cove with substandard materials being used during construction and causing issues with coming in and painting joists and preventing other toxic materials. Mr. Mautino provided a lengthy response on Weyerhaeuser and their flak jacket product that Westport Homes among hundreds of other builders used when purchasing construction material from them. Mr. Mautino also discussed remediation techniques as well as solutions that Weyerhaeuser and Westport Homes has provided for customers. Mr. Wildenthaler thanked the applicant for his very detailed response.

Mr. Donahue asked the applicant about the traffic study and the potential impacts on the surrounding roadways. Jeff Strung with EMHT stated he is not familiar with the specifics of the traffic study but based on the analysis of the volume of the roadways there are no improvements necessary. Mr. Strung explained he can provide a more clear answer when they come back at the next meeting and have the traffic engineer at that meeting to answer specific questions.

Mr. Wildenthaler discussed his concerns with the roundabout and the impacts with the middle school bus traffic. Talking with the traffic engineer would be important. Mr. Strung affirmed they would bring him to the next meeting.

Mr. Christensen asked if there were any more comments.

Mr. Moore asked the commission if there were any comments in regards to the architecture.

Mr. Donahue indicated conceptually at this time he has no comments and would like to see where this project leads in the following months or years. This project on one level seems to be similar to Canal Cove in terms of the products offered.

Mr. Wildenthaler asked the applicant if the architecture is the same as what is offered in Canal Cove. Mr. Mautino indicated yes the architecture is the same.

Mr. Mautino asked for comments from the commission in regards to future common mailbox units that the post office is now making a requirement unlike the common standalone mailbox. Mr. Haire elaborated that this is a requirement not only in the state of Ohio but across the country. The post office no longer wants to be in the business of door-to-door delivery in subdivisions and they want to have gang style units where there are up to 30 plus mailbox slots. This includes the new phases of the Villages at Westchester and Canal Cove. The city does not want these in the right-of-way because then they become a liability for the public traveling in the right-of-way. Currently the city has no standards for these types of mailbox units because it is a new requirement.

Mr. Donahue commented that those mailbox units can be in a common area maintained by the Home Owners Association.

Mr. Vasko asked what the Post Office requirements are. Mr. Mautino explained that they require access to it. They will go down as small as a 12 gang box with two package slots. They make recommendations where they are up to 30 units with public parking.

Mr. Vasko asked if these are designed to be like a McDonald's drive-thru where you pull up and reach from your car window or you have to park and walk to the unit. Mr. Mautino indicated that the opening of the mailbox needs to face the sidewalk for ADA accessibility.

Mr. Wildenthaler asked the applicant if they were to design the gang mailbox in this development where would they do it. Mr. Mautino provided examples with the current subdivision layout and possible locations.

Mr. Donahue asked if the common mailbox is a deterrent from customers moving into new subdivisions. Mr. Mautino explained like any change it is met with emotion and resistance.

Mr. Christensen thanked the applicant for the introduction to the project.

Mr. Moore indicated the only other new business he would like to make is a quick introduction to P&Z new commission member Mark Caulk.

Adjournment

*Time Out: 9:59pm*

**A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Mike Vasko, that this Meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 7** – Richey, Wildenthaler, Donahue, Christensen, Caulk, Konold and Vasko

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Bill Christensen - Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_

Joe Donahue - Secretary