

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 10, 2020

7:00 PM

Planning and Zoning Commission

*Bill Christensen - Chairman
Michael Vasko - Vice Chairman
Joe Donahue - Secretary
Brad Richey
Joe Wildenthaler
Mark Caulk
Kevin Serna*

Call To Order

Time In: 7:00pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Brad Richey that Joe Wildenthaler be excused.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Caulk, Donahue, Richey, Serna & Christensen

Excused: 2 – Wildenthaler & Vasko

Approval of Minutes

January 13, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made Brad Richey, seconded by Mark Caulk, that the December January 13, 2020 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Caulk, Donahue, Richey, Serna & Christensen

Public Comment

Julie Cecutti spoke to the commission in regards to a project underway at 18 West Waterloo Street. Rumors were heard that Town Hall was going to be demolished for future development. Mrs. Cecutti noted that she did not feel that the current redevelopment on the old Marathon site fit into context with the Old Town Plan or the character of the area. Rumors are also heard that adjacent property in the corridor may be redeveloped and that any redevelopment should be carefully considered.

Mrs. Cecutti discussed that she had no idea the project was going to happen until the previous home was being demolished and there was no attempt to notify adjacent property owners about the process and gain public input.

Concerns were brought up over the access to the rear parking behind the building and the possible change of the traffic flow along the alley behind the site, as it would affect how she pulls in and out of her garage.

Public Oath

Public Hearings

VA-20-001

Property Owner: Winchester Office Park LLC
 Applicant: Deno Duros
 Location: PID 184-003366 (1.27 acres in the Winchester Office Park.)
 Request: Variance to Chapter 1185.03 to reduce the minimum number of parking spaces.

Mr. Moore presented the application for the Winchester Office Park for Parcel 184-003366. The applicant is requesting approval to reduce the minimum number of parking spaces required on the lot. Staff discussed that this site is three separate buildings that share a central parking lot. The total lot will have 117 parking spaces and the zoning code requires 153 spaces based on the 30,500 sq. ft. of the building floor area.

Staff discussed that the applicant originally designed the site with four 7,000 sq. ft. buildings with the same total number of parking spaces. By the time they reached approvals for building #4 they would need to request the parking variance. Since the original approval in 2017 the property owner has redesigned the 3rd building to be larger to accommodate a potential end user that did not need as much parking. While the variance was still necessary the appearance of the variance need perceived larger.

Staff discussed that the applicant owns the adjacent property and does have the ability to add additional parking if the need arises from a tenant demand.

Staff recommends that the variance application VA-20-001 be approved as presented. The applicant has developed a multi-unit office complex with a shared central parking lot. The parking lot was designed to fit the final built-out needs. The applicant controls the 2 acre parcel next door and could potentially add an additional phase of buildings, which could further increase the size of the lot if found necessary.

Mr. Caulk asked the applicant what the plans were for the parking if they have a different user in the future that requires additional parking. Shawn Bogenrife representing the property owner noted that currently the uses in the spaces are not very parking intensive. If a more parking intensive user looks at the space in the future there is the current ability to add additional parking to the east. Mr. Caulk asked the applicant why they want reduced parking. Staff indicated that the parking code in Canal Winchester is parking intensive. It requires 1 parking space per every 200 sq. ft. of office. The original plan for the complex build out with phase 1 had the same parking layout and intensity. The developer programed the site to fix the parking needed based on real world layouts and felt it was not necessary to overpark the site and to maximize on building layouts.

Mr. Caulk asked staff what kind of commitment can be provided that if more parking is needed it will be provided on the adjacent property. Staff indicated that if the variance is granted there is no commitment to add future parking necessary. The land owner will fix parking issues they have because it will affect leasing of the space.

Mr. Serna asked staff if the variance approval would apply for the adjacent

property where future building expansion could occur. Staff indicated that the variance only applies to this subject property and not any future expansion of property.

Mr. Richey asked staff about other parking variances in town. Staff discussed the two most recent parking variances that were granted were for the OPUS site across the street from the subject property and for the Northpoint Development on Bixby Road. Both of those projects were industrial sites. There is not any strictly office development in the city to compare this site too as most of the office space is in the shopping center as an in-line tenant or in Old Town where there are no parking requirements. Staff also discussed that unrelated to this application staff is researching new parking codes and trends to update the Canal Winchester Zoning.

Mr. Caulk asked staff about parking within Canal Pointe and if there are any office components out there. Staff indicated that currently there is only one building that was built for office space and they have multi-tenant space in the building.

Mr. Haire commented that communities are starting to take a look at what value parking brings and how to not overpark a site.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for the Public Hearing.

A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Brad Richey that this Public Hearing be closed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Caulk, Donahue, Richey, Serna & Christensen

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Donahue that Variance Application #VA-20-001 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Caulk, Donahue, Richey, Serna & Christensen

SDP-19-011

Property Owner: Winchester Office Park LLC

Applicant: Deno Duros

Location: PID 184-003366 (1.27 acres in the Winchester Office Park.)

Request: Site Development Plan for a 16,500 speculative office building.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Deno Duros for property located at 6355 Winchester Blvd, for Phase 3 of the Winchester Office Park. The applicant

is requesting approval for a 16,500 sq. ft. speculative office building towards the rear of the site.

The subject property consists of 2.68 acres zoned General Commercial and Planned Commercial District located south of Winchester Blvd. To the north consists of Winchester Office Park phases 1 and 2. Property to the east is a 1.69 acre parcel with Primrose Daycare zoned Planned Commercial District. Property to the south consists of the development site for Fairfield Inn on 2.28 acres zoned General Commercial. Property to the west is 13 acres of undeveloped land zoned General Commercial.

The site will be accessed from Winchester Blvd off a shared access drive for both the Winchester Office Park complex and the Fairfield Inn Hotel. The applicant received approval for Phase 1 in November 2017 and Phase 2 in November of 2018 which approved the two 7,000 sq. ft. office buildings to the north of the site. Phase 3 is proposed to add a third building at 16,500 sq. ft. to the rear of the site. With the final building the shared parking lot will be completed with an additional 47 spaces, putting the total number of parking spaces at 117. A pedestrian access sidewalk connecting the front door and side door to a sidewalk along Winchester Blvd. has been provided.

Phases 1 and 2 of the site construction installed all necessary utility lines and stormwater system for the entire build out of the project.

The proposed landscaping plan shows the planting schedule for Phase 3. This plan calls for heavily landscape beds around the building and trees in the landscape islands. The applicant is showing 24 trees on site, meeting the landscape requirements for building and parking.

The applicant has provided a site lighting plan that meets the standards in chapter 1199.06. Decorative light fixtures and poles have been provided. The proposed pole height is 16 feet, the code states that parking lots with over 30 parking spaces shall allow pole heights up to thirty feet in height. The photometric plan for the parking lot also meets the requirements of Chapter 1199.06.

The applicant has submitted that the building will have wall signage available on the north elevation. The north elevation will have the availability for up to three (3) signage locations above the entryways at 38 sq. ft. per entry. The applicant has also submitted to staff the internal signage requirements for the buildings so that all phasing's have consistent signage.

The applicant has provided elevations of the proposed 16,500 sq. ft. building for Phase 3. This building will match the previously approved buildings in Phase 1 &

2 and meets all of the applicable development requirements. The rear of the building has been slightly modified from Phases 1 and 2 to include a well on the roof to house the mechanical equipment and a variation of brick and fiber cement siding on the rear elevation.

Mr. Richey asked staff if the mechanical screening wall and its requirements for seeing the rooftop units. Staff indicated that the wall on the plans is a placeholder and the actual screening wall height will be determined by the HVAC equipment.

Mr. Bogenrife commented that the intention with the rooftop units is that they will be distributed towards the center of the building so screening them should not be an issue.

Mr. Caulk asked if the wall behind the rooftop units will be a white TPO material. Mr. Bogenrife stated that he was thinking an EPDM so it would be a darker material and blend in with the shingles.

Mr. Richey commented that he is concerned about the ground accessed ladder with the hotel directly behind the site. Staff indicated that the building code will require it to be gated.

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Kevin Serna that Site Development Plan SDP-19-011 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Caulk, Donahue, Richey, Serna & Christensen

FDP-20-001

Property Owner: Meijer Stores Limited Partnership

Applicant: Leesman Engineering and Associates

Location: PID 042-0389000

Request: Final Development Plan for a 6,620 sq. ft. Shooters Sports Grill

Mr. Moore presented the application for Leesman Engineering for a Final Development Plan for Outlot 3 of the Meijer development. The applicant is requesting approval for new 6,620 sq. ft. Shooters Sports Grill.

Staff discussed the subject property is zoned Planned Industrial District and is subject to the Meijer Outparcel Development Pattern Book that was approved by City Council with ORD-74-06 on September 5, 2006. The outparcel development pattern book set a standard for building orientation and design, site layout, landscaping standards and signage regulations. The development was designed with the intent of all buildings to face outwardly and not internally

to the development with a cohesive architectural design and enhanced landscape requirements.

The building being proposed for outlot 3 is a standalone restaurant consisting of approximately 6,620 sq. ft. The restaurant is positioned to face both Diley Road and to the North with dual entryways. The facility also features an 890 sq. ft. patio on the front of the building facing Diley Road.

The subject site is accessed from Road 'B' of the Meijer development with a single curb cut internal to the development. The site plan shows a total of 84 parking spaces to be provided on the north and east ends of the proposed building. The proposed building has entry features facing both Diley Road to the east and the main parking lot to the north. A 5 foot concrete walk connecting the building to the existing asphalt multi-use path along Diley Road and a 5 foot concrete sidewalk around the east and north of the site is provided.

Sanitary service is provided to the east with an existing 8" public main to serve the development. Water service will be obtained by a new 8" public main being installed as part of the Pediatric Associates project to the south. Stormwater is handled with a regional onsite detention system. Violet Township Fire Department reviewed the plans and recommends that the FDC location shown be relocated south of the electric transformers so it is parallel with the private hydrant in the adjacent parking island.

Staff discussed that the outparcel development pattern book discusses that all service areas, storage areas and refuse enclosures shall be screened from all roads, and screened from adjacent sites and be constructed with decorative construction materials on all four sides. The dumpster enclosure provided in the plans meets this requirement. The electric transformer on the west side of the building needs to be screened to meet the development standards. Staff recommends that the transformer be relocated to be behind the 3 arborvitae located to the south of the transformer.

The Meijer outparcel development pattern book discusses specific landscape standards for the parking area, building, and screening purposes. The proposed site plan meets the landscape requirements in the number of trees required along with screening the parking lot. The building is required to provide a minimum planting width of 3 feet adjacent to the building with multi-stemmed ornamental trees, shrubs, perennial flowers and ground cover, consisting of no less than 40% of the building perimeter. The building perimeter landscaping meets this requirement.

The proposed lighting plan features nine parking lot lights that are proposed to be a max 16 foot tall with a decorative bell shaped fixture. The proposed lighting meets the specs of the outparcel development book.

The Meijer outparcel development pattern book requires that similar colors, materials and textures of the buildings need to match that of the Meijer store. Details and features on the Meijer building should be incorporated to the smaller scale of the outparcel developments. All sides of the buildings shall express a consistent architectural detail and character. All buildings are required to be traditional and natural in appearance such as brick, precast stone, wood and glass. No less than 60% of each façade shall be brick or stone. The proposed building is comprised of brick, stone and Eifs and meets the 60% brick requirement. The street frontage of the building walls shall be no less than 40% window glass. The applicant is proposing 46.3% window glass on the Diley Road elevation.

The development text has specific signage restrictions for the outparcels. The applicants signage drawings show metal individual mounted letters that are back-lit on the oval backing of the sign meeting the requirements for the wall signage.

Staff has worked with the applicant on ensuring that the plans meet the development text for the site and is recommending that Final Development Plan FDP-20-001 be approved with the following conditions:

1. The electric transformer be screened on three sides by the arborvitae shown on the plan.
2. The FDC be relocated per Violet Township Fire Dept. recommendation.

Mike Chandler with Leesman Engineering stated that they are the designers for project and they consent with the staff recommendation comments and are confident they can get them addressed.

Mr. Christensen asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Mark Caulk that Final Development Plan #FDP-20-001 be approved with the following conditions and recommend to City Council for Approval:

1. **The electric transformer be screened on three sides by the arborvitae shown on the plan.**
2. **The FDC be relocated per Violet Township Fire Dept. recommendation.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Caulk, Richey, Serna & Christensen

Abstain: 1 - Donahue

ZM-20-001

Property Owner: Winchester Office Park LLC

Applicant: Deno Duros

Location: PID 184-003366 (1.27 acres in the Winchester Office Park.)

Request: Rezone a portion of the property from General Commercial to Planned Commercial District.

Mr. Haire presented the application for Deno Duros for property located at Parcel ID 184-003366. The applicant is requesting approval to rezone a portion of the property from General Commercial to Planned Commercial District.

The subject site is the same as the previously requested Site Development Plan for the 16,500 sq. ft. office building in the Winchester Office Park. The applicant is requesting that 1.279 acres of this site be rezoned from General Commercial to Planned Commercial District to be incorporated into the adjacent PCD district for Winchester Investment Corporation. The piece to be rezoned would encompass an area 155 feet by 358 feet.

Staff discussed that the Winchester Investment Corp PCD was adopted by ORD 112-96. When looking at the site, properties to the east are part of the existing Planned Commercial District which covers +/- 30 acres from Gender Road to this subject property. The Fairfield Inn to the south of this site is zoned General Commercial. To the north is the OPUS industrial project zoned Limited Manufacturing. To the west is undeveloped ground zoned General Commercial.

Staff shared a site plan for the area proposed to be rezoned. The area includes the previously approved 16,500 sq. ft. office building and parking for that building. When looking at a rezoning application there are a number of criteria that need to be considered. The first being the compatibility to adjacent land uses. Due to the adjacent land uses consisting of a school, professional office buildings and a hotel, the proposed rezoning would be permitted since it encompasses the same zoning categories. The Planned Commercial Development text permits all uses that are within the Neighborhood Commercial, General Commercial, and Suburban Office Districts.

The second criteria is looking at the relationship of traffic and utility services. A traffic study was initially done when this site and the industrial parcel were being proposed for development. That traffic study took into account 28,000 sq. ft. of office space. Mr. Haire discussed that the proposed use for this building is a school so it should generate less traffic in peak hours than office space. The traffic study did show there would be some delay factors in the build condition in 2030. The city is already evaluating what improvements to be made to decrease the impacts of development during traffic peak times.

The existing PCD allows for uses permitted within the Suburban Office zoning district. The SO district allows for schools as permitted uses. The proposed

tenant for this building is a company called Skilled Learning Center. This user is currently located on Franklin Street behind the library branch in the modular trailers. This school serves special needs students and this project would allow for them to expand their operation in Canal Winchester. This use is not permitted within the General Commercial zoning district so the proposal is to incorporate this site to the adjacent property zoning to allow the proposed use.

Staff feels that this project allows for the long-term flexibility in the space. It currently allows for an existing user to remain and grow in the community and allows for multiple business types to occupy this space in the future if necessary.

Staff is recommending that Planning and Zoning Commission recommend approval of the proposed rezoning of 1.279-acre parcel from General Commercial to Planned Commercial District with the development text adopted by Ordinance 112-96.

Mr. Christensen asked the applicant if they had any comments.

Mr. Bogenrife commented that they are excited to move a business already in the community to a new location.

Mr. Christensen asked the applicant if the user is taking the entire building. Mr. Bogenrife affirmed and commented that with the proposed user they would have an excess of parking from what is needed on the site.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for the Public Hearing.

A motion was made by Joe Donahue seconded by Brad Richey that this Public Hearing be closed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Caulk, Donahue, Richey, Serna & Christensen

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Kevin Serna that Zoning Map Amendment #ZM-20-001 be recommended to City Council for adoption.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Caulk, Donahue, Richey, Serna & Christensen

Old Business

New Business

Mr. Haire addressed Mrs. Cecutti's comments from the beginning of the meeting noting that there is zero truth to the rumor that Town Hall would be demolished with the move to the new building. With the relocation of the Public Assembly portion of this building to the McDorman rehab Town Hall will be rehabbed to another use but will stay under the ownership of the city.

Mrs. Cecutti asked staff about the two residential homes purchased by the developer on West Waterloo Street. Mr. Haire responded saying that if you study the Old Town Plan the public recommended to add more commercial and mixed-use buildings in the area. The only way to achieve that goal is to remove some existing structures. That plan identified West Waterloo Street as the best opportunity for future redevelopment given the converted residential homes to business space, which is not using the property to its highest and best use. Several properties along West Waterloo including those two homes are specifically not shown on the Old Town Plan as they provide opportunity for future redevelopment potential. Mrs. Cecutti asked if the information shown in the Old Town Plan is set in stone. Staff indicated that any redevelopment is subject to all of the approval processes by both Landmarks Commission and Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Haire address the question in regards to access along the alley behind this property noting that the intention is to recommend it be change to one-way traffic. This is something that is approved by City Council. Other traffic changes are also being evaluated in the downtown area to remove the conflict of West Waterloo, Elm Street, Washington Street and Groveport Road intersections.

Mr. Haire stated that in regards to the building architecture it all went through two public processes. The first was with the Landmarks Commission and the second with Planning and Zoning Commission. There were no variances required with the project so there is no public notification requirement for projects that meet zoning standards. Staff suggested that Mrs. Cecutti sign up on the city website to receive notifications for P&Z and Landmarks meetings.

Adjournment

Time Out: 7:59 pm

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

Yes: 5 – Caulk, Donahue, Richey, Serna & Christensen

Date

Bill Christensen - Chairman

Joe Donahue - Secretary