

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 22, 2019

7:00 PM

Planning and Zoning Commission

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

Call To Order

Time In: 6:55pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

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

Yes: 5 – Vasko, Christensen, Wildenthaler, Caulk & Richey

Excused: 1 – Donahue

Approval of Minutes

March 11, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Mike Vasko, that the March 21, 2019 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Vasko, Christensen, Wildenthaler, Caulk & Richey

April 8, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Mark Caulk, that the April 8, 2019 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Vasko, Christensen, Wildenthaler, Caulk & Richey

May 13, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler, that the May 13, 2019 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Vasko, Christensen, Wildenthaler, Caulk & Richey

Public Comment

Public Oath

Public Hearings

FS-19-001

Property Owner: Grand Communities, LLC
 Applicant: Keith Smith – Civil & Environmental Consultants, LLC
 Location: PID 184-001008
 Request: Final Subdivision Application for The Gardens of Villages at Westchester Section 13, Phase 1.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Grand Communities, LLC for property located at PID 184-001008. The applicant is requesting approval for a Final Subdivision Plat for the Gardens of Villages at Westchester Section 13, Phase 1.

Staff discussed that the subject parcel is zoned Planned Unit District and is subject to the Villages at Westchester development text and ordinances passed by City Council. Planning and Zoning Commission previously reviewed the final development plan for Section 13 back in January and February 2017. The plan for Section 13 calls for 46 Single Family Homes within two phases. Phase 1 is being requested for approval at this time with 20 lots that will have primary access from Lithopolis Road. Section 13, Phase 1 will also include two reserve areas and a new wet detention pond north of lots 822-830.

The Villages at Westchester subdivision currently has 47 lots available out of the 705 platted single family lots. The asphalt for Section 13 is to be done this week and the applicant will start working on punch list items prior to City Council releasing the plat. Staff is recommending that the applicant's request for Final Subdivision Plat #FS-19-001 be approved as presented and recommended to City Council for adoption.

Mr. Caulk asked staff about the utility easements on the plans. Staff indicated that the easements being referred too are for storm water flood routing and pipe to take the site drainage to the pond they are constructing.

A motion was made by Joe Wildenthaler, seconded by Brad Richey that Final Subdivision Application #FS-19-001 be approved and recommended to City Council for adoption.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Vasko, Christensen, Wildenthaler, Caulk & Richey

VA-19-004

Property Owner: Winchester Office Park LLC

Applicant: Deno Duros

Location: Winchester Office Park, 6345 Winchester Blvd.

Request: Variance to Chapter 1189.08(b)(1) and 1189.08(b)(3) to allow for a complex identification sign that is larger than code.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Deno Duros for the Winchester Office Park located at 6345 - 6365 Winchester Blvd. The applicant is requesting a variance approval from Sections 1189.08(b)(1) and (b)(3) to allow for a complex identification sign to be larger than what zoning allows.

Staff discussed that the site consists of two multi-tenant commercial office buildings that are constructed to sit on the 25 foot build-to line of Winchester Blvd. The final layout for this office complex will have two identical multi-tenant

office buildings constructed to the rear of the site. The applicant is requesting to install a complex identification sign near the access drive for the current and future building tenants. The proposed sign is located 25 feet from the right-of-way line and features 10 tenant panels. The proposed sign will sit on a brick base and will be 15 feet tall at 106 square feet.

Staff discussed that if the sign was moved back to be in compliance for its height it would have to be 28 feet from the right-of-way. If the sign was moved back to be in compliance for its overall size it would have to be 38 feet from the right-of-way. Staff discussed further that the sign is within two to three feet of the 27 foot utility easement that runs in front of the site. Staff is comfortable with the sign in this location and if it was pushed back any further it would be behind the building line of the first office building. The applicant has designed this sign for the future expansion of Winchester Blvd with the possible Bixby Road interchange concept.

Staff recommends variance application #VA-19-004 be approved as presented. This site is unique in that it is a multi-tenant office complex that approximately 50% of the complex does not have direct road frontage. The signage that is being requested will allow for major tenant identification for all buildings and helps with wayfinding to the access drive into the complex. Additionally, the site features a 27 foot utility easement in the front of the building. This easement further restricts signage location as signs cannot be constructed close to utility lines.

Mr. Vasko commented that he is having trouble with this application as all of the applicants justifications were known at the time of designing the site plans. The applicant was aware of the utility easements and built-to line restrictions when the site was designed. There was no pre planning to allow for a monument sign to fit with the original design. The sign is not just a little bigger it is a lot bigger at the proposed location. With more development on the way this should have been an item that was thought about ahead of time. Not just by the applicant but by staff and the P&Z commission.

Mr. Wildenthaler asked staff if the applicant has discussed internal signage inside the complex. Staff indicated that the buildings were approved with a specific style wall sign and that the wall signs can be on every elevation above each entry door. The wall signs will be the tenant identification within the complex.

Mr. Caulk asked if there was an overall signage plan proposed for the complex. Staff indicated there was not. The applicant just agreed to a specific sign type on the exterior walls to be over the doors. Caulk asked if the city can regulate signage within the interior of the development. Staff affirmed that any signage

outside the buildings will have to follow the specific signage type agreed upon for the buildings.

Mr. Vasko commented that the proposed placement of the sign seems it will be blocked from the west by the building and or landscaping. Staff commented that was a concern from the applicant and the original drawing the applicant proposed had the sign centered between the two utility lines within the easement. However, that location would not work so staff advised that it be moved back. Staff noted that the wide utility easement in front of this site is unique as the storm water for the shopping center to the east drains this direction to the ditch.

Mr. Caulk asked about the sign being constructed in the easement and if that is typical. Staff indicated that we try to avoid it as much as possible but in this case it was allowed.

Mr. Vasko discussed his concerns of having the sign within the utility easement and if the sign is damaged during utility work how the city would handle that.

Mr. Vasko asked staff if there were any other alternatives discussed with the applicant. Staff discussed that the other option would be to do a lot split across the frontage and have two complex identification signs, one shown here and one on the west end of the complex. This would allow for two signs to be constructed without a variance but the second sign would not be visible until the road is extended and that is anticipating that the applicant is going to want a second access drive in the future.

Mr. Wildenthaler commented that the sign could be placed in a location where it does not require a variance now and when the road is extended in the future the applicant could then request for the variance to move it.

The commission discussed moving the sign to be out of the utility easement with staff. Staff discussed the size the sign could be if it was relocated to several locations on the property.

Mr. Vasko discussed reducing the height of the tenant panels to reduce the overall height of the sign to get the height in compliance. Getting the height of the sign smaller would also decrease the overall size of the sign and would decrease the value of the variance request. Staff discussed the proposed modifications with the commission.

Mr. Christensen invited the applicant up to speak.

Mr. Bogenrife discussed that this site is unique in that there is a build-to line instead of a setback and there is a large utility easement in the front of the building that dictates the building location. Mr. Bogenrife discussed the wall signage for the complex to the commission.

Mr. Caulk asked the applicant if the current tenants have a signage plan. The applicant indicated that there is no current sign plan but the thought is a half building tenant gets a wall panel and anything smaller gets vinyl on the window glass.

Staff discussed with the commission further the size of the sign being requested and different scenarios of where it moves and what the sign code allows without a variance.

Mr. Vasko asked staff if the Complex Identification sign sets a size per tenant panel. Staff indicated that code just states that a complex identification sign needs to identify at least two tenants in the same building. Vasko commented he would be comfortable with the sign being decreased by 2.5 feet, or 6 inches per tenant panel which would result in a sign that is within height for the setback and only 6 sq. ft. over in size.

Mr. Bogenrife commented that with a monument sign that requires push-thru letters the letters have to be bigger or else you cannot get them to stand off the sign. A flat sign with flat vinyl can be much smaller but the sign code requires dimension so the sign gets naturally larger.

Mr. Duros discussed that when the development was planned signage was not discussed or even a thought from either end. The buildings look great and fit great and when signage came along at the very end the challenges were discovered. The property owner discussed he is a major advocate to getting the Bixby Road interchange approved and talks with the state often on adding it to the budget.

Mr. Duros added he is not opposed to cutting the height of the sign so it is in compliance. The signage on the street gets them to the complex. Once they get into the parking area there is no concern on finding your way around.

Mr. Duros stated that he does not have any concerns with some easement being drafted by the city stating he is liable for removing the sign and replacing the sign if the easement needs worked on at his expense.

Mr. Richey asked the property owner how deep the sewer is. The applicant indicated it is very deep and they had to go under it for the water line and ran into ground water issues with dewatering.

The commission and the applicant discuss the signage style and the tenant types for the building.

Mr. Christensen asked about relocating the sign to the east side of the access drive. Staff indicated that the east end of the access drive is on the adjacent parcel.

Mr. Wildenthaler confirmed with Vasko his recommendation to reduce the size of the sign by 2.5 feet.

Mr. Richey commented that if the utilities are deeper than 10 feet the walls of the hole need to be shored up and they will need the entire width of the easement. If the owner is willing to sign a letter saying that they are responsible for the sign within the easement then there is less concern.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for Public Hearing.

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Vasko, Christensen, Wildenthaler, Caulk & Richey

A motion was made by Mike Vasko, seconded by Brad Richey that Variance Application #VA-19-004 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The sign be reduced by 2.5 feet in height, eliminating the variance from Chapter 1189.08(b)(3).**
- 2. The sign be a maximum size of 84 square feet.**
- 3. The property owner enters into a legal agreement with the city to assume all financial and safety responsibility for the sign to be constructed within the utility easement.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Vasko, Christensen, Wildenthaler, Caulk & Richey

Old Business

New Business

Staff let the commission know the pending agenda items for the June 10 P&Z Meeting.

Adjournment

Time Out: 7:59 pm

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

Yes: 5 – Vasko, Christensen, Wildenthaler, Caulk & Richey

Date

Bill Christensen - Chairman

Joe Donahue - Secretary