

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
STAFF REPORT  
JANUARY 9, 2002**

**SKETCH PLAN REVIEW (Combined Review with the Historic District Commission)**

**Applicant:** Powell Realty  
**Location:** 50 South Liberty Street  
**Zoning:** OPPCR, Old Powell Planned Commercial/Residential  
**Request:** Review of Sketch Plan for Residential, Commercial, and Office Use Development on 3.82 acres just South of Delaware County Bank

This application has changed significantly since both the Historic District Commission and the Planning and Zoning Commission last reviewed it. After meeting with both Commissions regarding the original sketch plan, the applicant was left with a conflicting opinion. While both Commissions had a consensus for the single-family style condominiums, the Historic District Commission did not favor the street-facing garages provided for with the single-family style. Also, the property owner to the east, Vince Margello, has expressed an interest in either a development agreement or a sale of the property. However, to date no agreement has been reached.

Keeping the same number of residential units on the original 3.82 acres (19), the applicant attempted to remove a majority of the garages from the street by converting the single-family units to three unit buildings and incorporating long drives between buildings leading to side load garages. This still left front a front load garage on each unit, creating a somewhat awkward style of building. It also significantly reduced the central open space area and left several units facing the backs and sides of other units.

Following several meetings with Staff, the applicant is proposing the current sketch plan. This application removes all of the garages from the street by incorporating alleys to feed the garages. It increases the open space area by removing the building from the open space and adding the units to other buildings. This design also prevents most units from facing the side or rear of any other building, a couple will need to face the side of another. However, it does require the use of multi-unit buildings. Using the same site layout with single family units would likely result in the loss of 5 units.

Staff feels this site plan is more efficient than the previous proposals and awards the opportunity of creating a neo-traditional style development. However, there are still areas for improvement.

The site is proposed to have two access points off of Liberty Street, both are new curb cuts. Should the Margello property be made of part of this plan, an access point would be provided at Olentangy Street.

It appears 46 parking spaces are provided for the commercial portion of the site, although additional parking is available on the residential loop street. The applicant will need to meet the landscaping requirements for parking bays (parking strip at rear of commercial buildings). Nine spaces are shown to be cut into the side yard of the southern residential buildings; Staff recommends the applicant attempt to move those spaces elsewhere and maintain the side yard, or convert them to parallel.

Circulation within the site has the potential to be problematic, especially if the addition of the Margello property and the access point at Olentangy Street becomes reality. Left turns from Olentangy Street will soon be prohibited at the Four Corners. This development could be used as a cut-through. It is important to reduce the attractiveness of a potential cut-through by using a variety of one-ways and no outlet alleys; but at the same time it is important to preserve the efficiency off on-site circulation. Without the Margello property the circulation as submitted is needed to access all points. Although not shown, it is believed the southern Liberty Street access point is one-way in and the north is one-way out. Should the Margello property become available,

Staff will need to re-evaluate the traffic circulation, including eliminating the residential loop and connecting it to the Olentangy Street connector.

With the addition of the one-way residential loop, which has on-street parking, it is no longer necessary to have rear driveways for parking. Staff recommends the buildings and garages be pushed back to five feet from the edge of the alley pavement (or a sufficient distance to provide a turning radius into the garage) and subsequently adjust the loop to increase the amount of open space. Staff questions the need for the loop street, especially as it consumes open space and requires tree removal, however the applicant has stated it is amenity they would rather have. Pushing the buildings back will reclaim a portion of the open space lost by including it.

The building layout has changed significantly. Instead of single-family buildings the applicant is proposing 4-unit buildings. Staff recommends these be reduced to a combination of 2 and 3-unit structures. The building code requires a minimum 6 feet of separation between buildings without having to construct a firewall. Staff recommends the applicant use the minimum, where necessary, to facilitate the use of 2 and 3-unit buildings. Staff also recommends the building behind the Village Green Condos be turned to face east.

As was the case in the previous plans, the most pressing issue with this development is that of stormwater retention. Although not required for a Sketch Plan, the plans do not delineate any area for stormwater retention. With the Margello site included the likely location is along the property line with Bartholomew Run. Without it, the only open area is the heavily wooded open space. Tree replacement cost schedules could make this area cost prohibitive for stormwater retention. The other options involve losing units or attempting to store the stormwater on the paved areas.

A sketch of a typical 4 unit building is included. Although these details can be addressed further at the Historic District Commission, some important items should be pointed out. The front elevation shows the side of a very long gable running the length of the building. This should be broken more. Also, the third unit from the left seems awkward and lacks the character of the other units. Walkout front balconies are not typical of the Powell Historic District. Staff feels a two and three unit building will be better facilitate the design principles of the District.

Staff feels this application has come a long way since first submitted and recommends the applicant submit a Preliminary Development Plan subject to the above comments.

#### **SUBDIVISION PLAT**

**Applicant:** T&R Properties, Powell Place Section 4  
**Location:** NW Corner of Village Park Drive and Seldom Seen Road  
**Zoning:** PR, Planned Residence District  
**Request:** Approval of Subdivision Plat for Powell Place Section 4

The applicant is requesting approval of the subdivision plat for Powell Place Section 4. The site is 7.753 acres of which 4.712 acres is open space. Dedication of the open space is not required. Lots range in size from 0.246 to 0.701 acre. The plat conforms with the Final Development Plan and Zoning Map Amendment for the property. Staff recommends approval of the subdivision plat with the following conditions:

1. That the Village Engineer approves all addresses and easements as required.
2. That the property owner be responsible for payment of all property taxes for the parcel being dedicated for the entire year in which the deed is recorded together with all prior years and any agricultural lands recoupment.
3. That all development standards and deed restrictions and covenants be the same as those in Powell Place Phase 3 and be reviewed by Staff.
4. That this development shall become part of the Powell Place Homeowners Association.

## **AMENDMENT TO FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**Applicant:** Shepherd of Peace Lutheran Church  
**Location:** 520 Village Park Drive  
**Zoning:** PC, Planned Commercial District  
**Request:** Approval of an Amendment to an Approved Final Development Plan for a Proposed School Addition, Expansion of Parking Area, and Delineation of Future Expansion

The site is currently used as a church. The applicant is seeking to amend the Final Development Plan to allow for the addition of a 4,077 sq. ft. school, associated parking, and future school expansion. This proposed addition is larger than the future addition delineated on the approved plans (2,479 sq. ft.). Other future expansion areas, consistent with the approved plan and shown on this proposal, are to the west (2,490 sq. ft.) and north (788 sq. ft.). The amendment also includes a large future expansion to the east (approx. 4,150 sq. ft.).

This parking lot, with this expansion, has reached the maximum parking capacity. Although there are three additional areas defined as future expansion, each expansion will need to be reviewed independently to determine the need for additional parking. It is possible that any more expansions could require the need for additional land for parking.

Although there is a large existing parking lot that is used on limited but regular basis, the required additional parking for this school addition is estimated at 14 spaces (4 per classroom and 1 per non-teaching employee). The applicant has provided 18 additional spaces.

The Engineering Department has stated there appears to be sufficient stormwater retention for the area, however engineering plans need to be submitted.

Staff has estimated the total coverage of the addition and parking lot expansion to be 9,955 sq. ft. This equates to a required tree planting schedule of 14 caliper inches. Staff recommends some plantings be used to screen the parking area from Seldom Seen Road and other placed in front of addition along Seldom Seen Road. The applicant must also landscape around 70% of the addition foundation.

Architecturally the addition is to match the existing style and materials of the church. The entire addition is to be finished with stucco. Staff recommends either a stone (to match existing stone treatment) wainscoting or a stone finish (grade to eave) be placed on the north and south elevations between the break in the window placement (between third and fourth windows), or a combination of both. This will provide some texture to the appearance of the addition.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions,

1. The size amount, in square feet, be provided where all future expansions are identified.
2. A stone treatment be added to the addition and reviewed by Staff.
3. A landscape plan be submitted and reviewed by Staff.

## **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**Applicant:** AVALONE SWIM CLUB  
(ASK WATER SPORTS)  
**Location:** Murphy Property Commercial, West Olentangy street, West of Murphy Parkway  
**Zoning:** PC, Planned Commercial District  
**Request:** Review of Roof Material as Required per Conditions of Approved Final Development Plan

The Commission approved the Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan for this site on December 12, 2001. Among other items, the applicant was required to return to the Planning and Zoning Commission to review and receive approval for the roof material. Although the other items are not ready to be discussed, the applicant has requested to return in an attempt to settle the roof material issue. The Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan is currently being

heard by City Council. Staff would like to make a recommendation on behalf of the Planning and Zoning Commission to City Council regarding the roof material issue.

The applicant is proposing to use a metal roof as requested by the Commission. However, the applicant is requesting to use metal on the first story portion of the building rather than the second story. The coverage area of the first story portion is smaller and therefore more in line with the applicant's budget. Also, the applicant has stated the first story portion would be more visible. Staff would like to defer its recommendation to Emil Slavik, Architectural Advisor for the Planning and Zoning Commission, as to the appropriateness of this proposal.

#### **ZONING MAP AMENDMENT/SKETCH PLAN REVIEW**

**Applicant:** Church of Latter Day Saints  
**Location:** East Side of Liberty Street between Ashmoore Drive and Liberty Ridge Avenue  
**Present Zoning:** FR, Farm Residential (Liberty Township Zoning)  
**Proposed Zoning:** PR, Planned Residence District  
**Request:** Review of Sketch Plan for Proposed 16,868 sq. ft. Church on 5.01 Acres and Proposed Zoning Map Amendment

Currently, the 5 acre site sits vacant along Liberty Street between the Liberty Ridge and Ashmoore subdivisions. The applicant is proposing to construct a 12,868 sq. ft. church with associated offices and classroom space. A 4,000 sq. ft. future rear expansion is identified on the plans making the possible future size 16,868 sq. ft.

Entrance to the site is provided via two points off North Liberty Street. The applicant was requested by Staff to align the northern entrance with the centerline of Clairedan Drive, which has been done.

Circulation within the site is a simple two-way loop around the church. The applicant has provided 113 parking spaces with a future expansion of 36 spaces identified. The required parking is 104 spaces calculated by one space per 45 square feet of assembly area, which is estimated at 4,640 sq. ft. Parking spaces are shown at 9' x 20'. Staff recommends the length be reduced to 19'. This will lessen the paved areas and increase the green space.

The required setback from the centerline of Liberty Street is 130 feet, which has been met. However, the applicant is required to add a white split rail fence along Liberty Street behind the concrete sidewalk. The building meets the required side and rear setbacks. Section 1145.13 of the Planning and Zoning Code requires a 40 feet setback for any non-residential use or building from any residential property line. This may be reduced to 20 feet with an evergreen screening. The applicant has met the 20 feet minimum but will need to increase the screening along the residential lots where the parking areas are located. Additionally, the development was shifted slightly north to accommodate the alignment with Clairedan Drive. Staff recommends the development be moved 12.5 feet south to allow for the maximum buffer along both Liberty Ridge and Ashmoore subdivisions. This will create a more acute bend in the north entrance but will not create any negative impacts on slow moving traffic.

Architecturally, the building is largely brick with what appears to be stucco. There are several projections that break the large mass of the building. The spire is exempted from the height regulations and the building is estimated at the maximum 35 feet. Staff has no major concerns with the architecture of the building at this time. More detailed information will be provided at the next meeting for this application. There are two buildings believed to be similar to this one in the central Ohio area; London and Canal Winchester.

The rear portion of the property is expected to be remain vacant, unless parking expansion is warranted or should the church decide to use the area as a recreation field or install playground equipment.

Staff recommends the applicant submit a Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan subject to the above comments.

#### **FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**Applicant:** Ruhl Properties, Inc.  
**Location:** East Side of Village Park Drive, South of Wolf Commerce Park  
**Zoning:** PI, Planned Industrial District  
**Request:** Approval of Final Development Plan for Four (4) 9,000 sq. ft. Office/Warehouse Buildings on 4.148 Acres

The Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) was reviewed at September 9, 2001 meeting; a copy of those minutes are included in the packet. The preliminary plan was approved with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant submit a landscape plan with the final development plan.
2. That the Planning and Zoning Commission review the Deed Restrictions on this property that deal with use issues, specifically prohibiting the use of a *Dynamo* or similar testing device.
3. That there be no exterior testing of engines.
4. That the facility use be restricted to storage or repair of personal vehicles.
5. That the final development plan include landscape islands as approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
6. That a lighting plan be submitted and approved by Staff.
7. That the setbacks are acceptable as submitted.
8. That architectural details be reviewed with the final development plan.
9. That "Option B" or similar not be permitted.
10. That a traffic flow pattern be approved by Staff.

The applicant has met conditions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9. Staff has several concerns regarding the proposed development.

Perhaps the most pressing concern is the ability to achieve turning movements conducive to docking a tractor-trailer. The conditions of the PDP required the applicant to submit turning movements to Staff. As of the time of this report, Staff has not received such information.

The applicant stated in the last meeting the tractor-trailers would be docking by pulling past the docking areas and then backing; no 180 degree turns, which need 110 feet of diameter, were required. Even with this type of movement, it appears difficult to reach the dock on the east side of building 3 and the west side of building 1, especially if a vehicle is occupying the parking spaces adjacent to those docks. The same is true for accessing and exiting the overhead doors of buildings 2 and 4. Staff recommends the applicant submit a turning movement analysis, identifying the standard utilized, for all buildings and docking areas.

In a related matter, there was discussion at the previous meeting regarding a landscape island to be placed between buildings 1 and 3. This could be done by switching the locations of the dumpster pads and dock area. Although this may create somewhat of a conflict with the overhead doors, there is 43 feet of clearance from the nearest edge of the overhead door to the back of the dock. The building owner will be in more control of this space than the parking spaces he or she is being asked to negotiate a tractor-trailer around. Staff recommends the applicant investigate the opportunity to place a landscape bay between buildings 1 and 3, adjacent to the main drive aisle.

Staff recommends the two southern most parking spaces on the east side of building 2 be eliminated and the dumpster located at the entrance be moved to the end of that aisle. Eliminating these two spaces for this building, which has 2-3 more spaces than other buildings, will remove the dumpster from being seen on Village Park Drive and preserve a 14 inch Hickory.

Also, on the east side of building 2, the parking aisle tapers to the northeast. There is no need for this taper and Staff recommends the aisle be parallel to the building.

The main drive aisle is dimensioned as being 25 feet then tapering to 24 feet. Between buildings 1 and 2 the drive aisle scales to 19 feet and 20 feet between buildings 3 and 4. The parking aisle on the west side of building 4 scales to 17'-6". This needs to be corrected. Parking spaces are shown at 10 x 20 feet. Staff recommends these be reduced to 9 x 19 feet, the minimum required. This will create 2 additional feet for the drive aisle.

Although it appears the applicant has reduced the north setback from 24 feet in the PDP to 19'-4" with this plan, the dimension scales to 24 feet. This needs to be clarified. Staff recommends the setback be maintained at 24 feet as this is already a 26 feet divergence from the required 50 yard side setback.

A landscaping plan was submitted as required. The text of the plan states that the required plantings (1145.30) are not applicable as the total remaining trees exceed the requirement. This is incorrect. The required plantings are simply that – required. With any development the Planning and Zoning Code requires trees to be planted based on amount of area the development consumes. For this development, the required plantings are 75 caliper inches. The applicant still needs to plant 74 caliper inches. Also, in the previous meeting, it was stated by the Commission that they did not want white pines used as plantings. The applicant has used 63 white pines in the landscape plan. Staff recommends Austrian pines and Spruces be used in their place.

The design of the buildings has changed significantly. The Commission ruled out the use of Option B and requested the buildings be modified to incorporate more gable and characteristics similar to Wolf Commerce Park. Although a gable has been added, a large majority of the building is under a flat roof. Also, the exterior of the building is concrete block and dryvit. Staff recommends the buildings be made to incorporate more gable, replace the dryvit with stucco, and incorporate elements of wood, brick, stone, or rough-split block. These materials are required by Section 1143.17(b)(7) on facades that face a residential zone or residence. The development text needs to be amended to reflect these changes.

Also, it is unclear which building the elevations reflect or if this is an example of what might be constructed. Each building will need approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission. No material or color samples were submitted.

Finally, a lighting plan has not been submitted although one has been described. Staff recommends the mounting poles not exceed the height of the midpoint between the ridge and eave line of the buildings (approximately 18 feet). Staff recommends a lighting plan be submitted, complete with photometrics, and approved by Staff.

Staff recommends approval of this Final Development Plan with the following conditions,

1. That the facility use be restricted to storage or repair of personal vehicles.
2. A lighting plan showing no lighting spill onto the residential property to the south be submitted and approved by Staff.
3. That a traffic movement analysis showing the turning movements, with the standard identified, of an appropriate size tractor-trailer be submitted and approved by Staff.
4. A landscape island be shown between buildings 1 and 3.
5. The two southern parking spaces on the east side of building 2 be eliminated and the dumpster be moved to the end of that parking aisle.
6. Each building be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
7. That more gables be incorporated into the buildings.
8. The dryvit be replaced with stucco and the elevations facing the south be made to meet the Section 1143.17(b)(7) of the Planning and Zoning Code.

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**

DATE: 01/09/02

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

PAGE 1 OF 2

1. Those who wish to address the Commission about an item on the agenda should indicate their item number in the far right column.
2. Those who wish to address an item not on the agenda should indicate the topic in the "Citizen's Comments" column.
3. Those who have addressed the Commission previously *still need to sign in!*
4. Applicants or those speaking on behalf of an applicant: *Please present a business card to the Clerk.*

	NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE	CITIZEN COMMENTS	AGENDA ITEMS
1.	BRUCE THOMPSON	34 LIBERTY RIDGE AVE	431-9359		ITEM 10
2.	Pam Thompson	34 Liberty Ridge Ave	431-9359		ITEM 10
3.	George Mitchell	327 Whetston Dr	848-9678		
4.	Sonny & Lori Randall	102 Liberty Ridge Ave	846-2469		
5.	ROSS WICKERT	GREENHILL PROP.	246-8945		
6.	Jerry D Goodson	7956 Stutz Rd	740/ 881-5738		
7.	JOHN WOODS	88 LIBERTY RIDGE			
8.	Chris Hojan	This Week	841-0777		
9.	Chad Howard	214 Sierrawoods Ct	851-1332		
10.	Jan Fitz	44 Charming Ln	881-0900		
11.	Ali Razi	624 Village Park	740-881-0155		
12.	BOB CARPENTER	772 BOVEE	881-5305		
13.	Marilyn Carpenter	"	"		
14.	Fletcher Chambers	842 Bovee	881-0205		
15.	Jim Fulleras	721 Pilcher	846-7872		

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**

DATE: 01/09/02

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

PAGE 1 OF 2

1. Those who wish to address the Commission about an item on the agenda should indicate their item number in the far right column.
2. Those who wish to address an item not on the agenda should indicate the topic in the "Citizen's Comments" column.
3. Those who have addressed the Commission previously *still need to sign in!*
4. Applicants or those speaking on behalf of an applicant: *Please present a business card to the Clerk.*

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE	CITIZEN COMMENTS	AGENDA ITEMS
1. Bob Stein	Suburban News	410-1375		
2. Garrett Berkam	447 Ridge View Pl	430-0048	Beautiful Building	Church of LD Saints
3. Carol Kena	ASK SCUBA	889-2822		
4. Michael Karpinski	86 Hidden River	549-0575		
5. Gary Bell	461 Roy Lane	848-6384	GOOD JOB!	LD'S church
6. Sonia Waugh	475 Ridgeview	781-1672		Proposed building - Church of LD Saints
7. Mike Campbell	435 Liberty Ridge	841-7550		
8. Scott Geris	495 Ridge View Pl	985-6323		Church of LD Saints
9. Ed Remond <sup>CHERYL</sup> <sub>PREMO</sub>	58 LIBERTY RIDGE	880-0123		#10
10. Janie & Tony Hella	27 Liberty Ridge Ave	431-2102		#10
11. William H Canfield	488 Wooten Ct S	885-0812		
12. Jim Hankin	35 N. FOURTH ST. <sup>4325</sup>	221-3707		
13. Michael Marchiondo	450 Keisel Ct	841-0951		Church
14. Julius Gandy	65 BETTENDORF Cir	846-1673		PROPOSAL BLSC Church of Latter Day Saints
15. Mare Ward	68 Liberty Ridge	816-1570		Church of LD saints