

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 2, 2006

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Mr. John Brandt
Mr. Brad Wilson
Mrs. Marlene Wirth
Mr. David Wall
Mr. Charles McGrath
Mr. Lucas Haire

Others Present:

2. DISCUSSION OF MINUTES OF MAY 2005

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4. SWEARING OF SPEAKERS

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. REZONING: EAST BROAD STREET BETWEEN ANNETTE DR. AND SUMMIT RIDGE DR. (LOTS, 3, 4, 5, AND 6 OF SUMMIT RIDGE HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION); PRESENT ZONING, UNZONED; PRESENT OWNERS NAME VOELKER-BELZ CO.; PROPOSED ZONING, CS – COMMUNITY SERVICES (WITH LIMITATION TEXT); PROPOSED USE, NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL CENTER; APPLICANT: VOELKER-BELZ CO. (4271-PL)

Chairman Wilson: Do you have someone here to speak to us tonight?

Mr. Haire: If I could actually start out with a quick presentation, I think it might help speed things along and it might help with the public as well.

Mr. Wilson: Very good, sir. We're not really accustomed to that excellent thing but go right ahead. We're here to watch.

Mr. Haire: Like you mentioned, this is a proposed Broad Street rezoning. It's located between Annette Drive and Summit Ridge. It consists of four platted lots in the

Summit Ridge Heights subdivision totaling 1.07 acres. It's proposed to go to CS, which is the Community Service District, from an unzoned district. When this was annexed into the City it was never zoned. Currently properties that are unzoned in the City fall under the R-1 zoning category, which would be single family residences on large lots. The current use of the property is vacant. The proposed use is a 9,000 square foot neighborhood commercial center with 59 parking spaces. This is the proposed location of the rezoning. It's outlined in white with a star in the center. As you can see, it is four vacant parcels with some wooded area or some brush area to the south side of it that acts as a buffer between that and the houses currently – the areas that are in red are the zoning districts in Reynoldsburg. As you can see, the Circle K gas station and the property surrounding that are zoned CC, which is Community Commerce, which is the Commercial District and The Limited property is actually what you see in the bottom corner that says R-I on it. You can see the proximity of the Taylor Road and Broad Street intersection here, the green text on there is the zoning districts of Pataskala, R-20 is a residential district in Pataskala, and across the street is GB, or General Business. Like I said, the applicant's proposed a 9,000 square foot retail center. There's a 15' building and parking setback on the rear and a 6' high board fence and 8 deciduous trees to act as a buffer from the residential district. That's what they've shown in the proposed plan.

The proposed access points are as far from Broad Street as possible to limit the impact of turn movements and stacking. The applicant will likely have to apply for a Variance for the front setback for parking, as it currently is required to be 40'. What they're showing is a 15' setback from the right-of-way so that'll probably have to be altered on the plan or they'll have to request a Variance once we get to that point. This is the proposed site plan. As you can see, the access points to the south. They will have a buffer along the front there, a buffer in the rear as well as the fence and the parking layout. This is the current site. This is looking east. As you can see, there's a business to the east of this, Sub-Aquatics. I'm not particularly sure what they do or sell there, if it's pools, or what they do, but there is businesses surrounding this. This is looking west and, as you can see, the Taylor Road-Broad Street intersection there, the Circle K gas station. This is looking north. There is another small retail center there and, looking to the south, you can see the proximity of the residential properties to this property. And with that, I can leave it to the Board.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, sir. Well done. Okay, we have a gentleman from Smith & Hale to talk to us.

Mr. Hodge: My name's David Hodge. I'm an attorney with Smith & Hale, 77 W. Broad Street, Columbus 43215. What I'd like to do is go through some of the materials that I've prepared for the presentation. I don't intend to bore you. Some of this stuff is going to be the same information that Lucas just described in the staff report, and hopefully a little bit more information there too related to some of the adjacent property owners' comments at the Council Public Hearing.

The property is currently unzoned. It does defer upon annexation when it's not zoned into the R-1 zoning district. It is just over an acre. It is 1.07 acres and is four undeveloped lots in the Summit Ridge Heights subdivision. The rezoning request is from the unzoned designation to the Reynoldsburg classification of CS, Community Services, which is the most comparable zoning designation in the City of Reynoldsburg to the GB zoning designation, which is what it was in Lima Township before being annexed into the City of Columbus. It is located on the south side of East Broad Street in Licking County. It's east of Taylor Road. As you can see there, the Taylor Road location with Circle K convenience store-gas station there at the intersection. The proposal was to accommodate commercial use of the property. We have a site plan which shows a small retail building approximately 9,000 square feet. It is a conceptual site plan. It's really largely for the purpose to show what we're talking about with the access issues off of Annette Drive and Summit Ridge Drive to the east. Not committing to the site plan, we think that a good use of it would be a retail center, which would be something comparable to what they have across East Broad Street. The difference in what's across East Broad Street and what this site would be is that that is in the GB, General Business designation and it permits bars and a number of uses which certainly would not be appropriate in this location due to the proximity to the residential uses.

This is a peninsula of the City of Reynoldsburg and we are really surrounded on all sides except for to the immediate west by the City of Pataskala. The City of Pataskala has a TCOD, Transportation Corridor Overlay District, which requires property owners adjacent to East Broad Street, as well as some other rights-of-way, and within a quarter mile of the right-of-way to go through a process. In the City of Pataskala, you have to go to their Planning Commission and justify your access onto the roadway. So, we are, along with this zoning, we are working through that process in the City of Pataskala and intend to file that application later this month and visit with their Planning Commission in early December.

It's a pretty intense process in the City of Pataskala. You have to provide them with a traffic study which is done within parameters as determined between traffic engineers. The reason – on this site plan, what we've done is we've – we currently show the access as far south on both Annette and Summit to the east and west as we can. And what we're trying to do with that is to minimize potential conflict with through traffic on East Broad Street. And we understand from some of the neighbors that they live due south of there and that that is a potential burden on their properties. We are certainly amenable to relocating our access onto the site, moving that northward a little bit. You know, in a perfect world, we would have full service onto East Broad Street, but the reality though in the development process is that the City of Pataskala, in their TCOD, they just won't give us that. I mean, this site would be served best -- from the property owners perspective, this site would be served best with a full service access on and off of East Broad Street. We just can't do that. You know, we're serving two masters here. We're working with the City of Reynoldsburg on this rezoning and then we have to go work with the City of Pataskala on the access issue. So we understand that concern of the neighbors to the south and we intend to take a look at that. I think what we'll probably do is provide a couple of different scenarios to the City of Pataskala. If we can

get a full access onto East Broad Street, great, that's the route we'll take. It's unlikely that'll happen, but certainly we can accommodate moving both of those access points to the north, to move them away from the adjacent property owners.

The other thing that we've done along the south property, and this is in the limitation text that was submitted, is along the south property line there will be a 6', board-on-board fence to serve as a buffer from this commercial use to those residential users. In addition to that, there's a landscaping section – it's also shown on the site plan, but there's a landscaping section in the limitation text which makes reference to the preservation of existing healthy trees when we can incorporate that. This is actually an aerial photograph with our lots overlaid and if you take a look here at this aerial, this dark area does represent a tree row along that south property line, so it actually should work very well. We can just incorporate some of those existing trees back in that area along with the six foot board-on-board fence that we're proposing.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Hodge?

Mr. Hodge: Yes, sir.

Mr. Wilson: Just to break in a minute, what's the distance between the lot line, that fence, and those trees back there? Are we talking 15', 20', 10', 30'?

Mr. Hodge: From the lot line and the location of the trees or the fence?

Mr. Wilson: Well, to the fence and then the trees will be there someplace.

Mr. Hodge: Right. And I think what our text says is that the fence is to be located within the setback, so it's not – it's not the hard and fast. It's not determined at this point. We can either get closer to the property line or father away, and the tree row is actually along the property line. I think it comes up onto the site 20' or so.

For signage, what we – if you take a look at the text and also the site plan, what we currently show is one monument sign on East Broad Street located -- centrally located on the site which would serve to identify the center. It would say something to the effect of Voelker-Warner Center or just whatever the development name would be and then each of the individual tenant's spaces would also likely have some wall signage to identify their use.

In compliance with your rezoning application requirements, there was utility information submitted by our civil engineer, EMH&T, regarding storm drainage. It's a flat site with drainage to the north, draining to the north onto East Broad Street. Drainage to the south is currently on the residential users to the south. Under the City of Reynoldsburg regulations and also the State of Ohio regulations, you cannot increase storm water flow offsite. You have to store that onsite and if it's to be released, it has to be released at a pre-development rate, so as we work through this process, as this site is engineered, we will comply with the City of Reynoldsburg and the State of Ohio

requirements as far as our storm drainage is concerned. It can be done either by some ponding in the lot or underground storage and then with timed releases at the pre-development rate. Sanitary sewer – there is a 10” line which is along the south side of East Broad Street, along the north of our tract. It’s not a City of Reynoldsburg utility; it’s Southwest Licking. There would have to be some – we can easily tap into that, but it would take some cooperation between the City of Reynoldsburg and Southwest Licking Sewer & Water District. It’s something that’s been done before. I know the Circle K took a look at extending City of Reynoldsburg utilities to that site, but they took their utilities from the same place. Water – there’s a 16” water line – same place, north of the site, southeast Broad Street -- it’s a City of Columbus utility. Again, there’d have to be some cooperation among the two municipalities, which I think is something that happens with relative frequency. And then also private utilities – there are some poles on both the north and south side of East Broad Street for phone and other private utilities.

What we’ve done, as we’ve worked through this process, we – you know, you always – the first question you ask yourself is what’s this property zoned. In the City of Reynoldsburg, it’s unzoned, either that or it defers into the annexation R-1 zoning designation. The current zoning on the property, though, is lingering from the Lima Township prior to its consolidation with the City of Pataskala and it’s a GB, General Business zoning designation, which is really – it’s not a good zoning. It’s a very general commercial zoning which permits, you know, adult uses, pool halls, bars, and lots of uses that certainly are not appropriate on such close proximity to residential users. So what we did is we submitted a limitation text which would become part of the zoning legislation that City Council would adopt. These are rules above and beyond the zoning that we intend to live by. They’re sort of like a self-imposed restriction on how you can use the property and landscaping and everything that you have to do on the property. So that’s in the zoning text which, hopefully, was distributed to everybody.

I’d like to just take a couple more minutes and hopefully try to address some of the concerns that some of the Summit Ridge Heights residents raised in the Council Public Hearing and it’s related to traffic. I think I touched on this previously. There was a traffic analysis done for this development. There’s also traffic engineers currently in the process of putting together a traffic study to submit to the City of Pataskala for the TCOD process. We’re not married to where these accesses are shown on this site plan and we will certainly move those north on the site or either take the full curb cut off of East Broad Street if we can. We want to be a good neighbor. We want this to be a commercial development that is used by that Summit Ridge Heights neighborhood. We see that. Not only will we pick up customers off of East Broad Street, but we also want this to serve that neighborhood.

As to property values, as I mentioned, this property has a GB zoning designation on it and you have to ask yourself, “What can this be used for?” And certainly it’s platted lots, but it’s East Broad Street and it’s east of Taylor Road and it’s certainly not an appropriate – not appropriate for residential use. Nobody’s going to build four houses on those lots off of East Broad Street and, even if they did want to do that, they

wouldn't be able to access their lot in all likelihood, because they wouldn't be able to take access off of East Broad Street. We're happy to work with the adjacent property owners. We think we have a good plan to buffer this from those residents and we think it's a good development. We think it's the right zoning on the property and we'd be happy to answer any of your questions as best we can.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, sir. First question – and I've not dealt with Pataskala in these situations, but what would stop them from granting access off of Broad Street to this development? It's logical to me that that's – you know, everything else is off of Broad Street. Of course, that may be the problem but--

Mr. Hodge: And it would certainly serve the site best if we could get on and off of East Broad Street. What they would say is that a full service curb cut in that location with such close proximity to both Annette and to Summit would be – would create too much of a conflict with both of those streets, because there could potentially be cars stacked going both north and south. We would certainly love to have it and we'll ask for it, but we don't think it'd be granted.

Mr. Haire: I don't feel that it'd be granted either just because of the proximity of those two intersections. Typically, when you're putting a new access point onto a State Route, you're required to do a deceleration lane or a left turn lane in this location. I just don't think with the Taylor Road left turn lane being there already and with the intersection, you don't have room to put the right decel lane in, so it's not going to be possible for them to get an access permit to put in a full access point there.

Mr. McGrath: Is it possible to get a right turn only lane out of that – front of that property? That would possibly cut down some of the intrusion into the neighborhood.

Mr. Hodge: Sure. And that's something we will take a look at.

Mr. Wilson: And I also would suggest that the people have a concern about this, Mr. Vance and Mr. Carmichael, please attend that meeting. They have a Planning Commission just like we do. It's the same -- kind of the same format. They need to hear what you're saying and they also need to hear that the developer's more than willing to do that. So, and they've got to support what they're going to say to you and I've seen the traffic study. It's not a huge number of trips we're talking about, because we're only talking about 9,000 square feet. There's going to be about, what, three-tenants in there maybe?

Mr. Hodge: Probably three. It could actually—

Mr. Wilson: It might even be two—

Mr. Hodge: --be two depending on the size of the space.

Mr. Wilson: Yeah.

Mr. Hodge: It could be two. I think it could even go as high as five possibly.

Mr. Wilson: Okay. But those are things that should be brought up to them from your concern also, so I would encourage you to do that.

Mr. Hodge: And just for Mr. Vance and Mr. Carmichael, that is a process just like we are in here tonight. It does require notification. I think it's 200' from the subject property so you will receive notice, time, date, location of that meeting as well.

Mr. Wilson: And I will share with you – I've only got one – well, we may have two copies of the zoning text that also talks about--

Mr. Haire: I already gave it to them.

Mr. Wilson: You gave it to them? You're good. Thank you. So you've got that text to look at which talks about uses and what can't be used there and the landscaping and things like that that need to be addressed. Okay. Commissioners, do you have any questions about this at this point? Mr. Brandt?

Mr. Brandt: Yes, sir, Mr. Hodge, two questions. One – my concern would be, and while it's not relative to specifically this hearing but it could possibly be addressed in the text – location with respect to dumpsters. We've had that with a couple of other commercial developments where they abutted joining neighborhoods and it seems, for what infinite wisdom, the dumpster dumpers come at 4 A.M. in the morning. Having been woken up a couple of times myself by them, I find it to be a – one wonders why, but if there could be something worked out as you go through the process, realizing you don't know your full tenant base yet, that that be considered, because if there's an access in the back there, either delivery trucks or – we had one other development where a refrigerated delivery truck showed up at 4 A.M. in the morning. And they leave refrigerated delivery trucks running and, consequently, that's caused a number of years of heartburn for a lot of folks.

Mr. Hodge: And that's a great point and a good question and it's something that, believe it or not, comes up all the time in what we do and, so we have some language that we can add to the text which makes it a requirement that the property owner or the developer request that their private refuse or recycling or service trucks service the property during normal business hours, and we're happy to add that to the text.

Mr. Brandt: One other point – I reviewed your list of prohibited uses. I'm wondering whether you'd be willing to commit, at this point-- There's a use further out on Broad Street there of a beer drive-thru and I think at this location, given the tightness of it, that that type use might not fit in at all, because I see the traffic at the other one and that would totally blow your traffic numbers apart. Now, of course, maybe if you put one in it'd split the business two of them and it wouldn't be as much traffic, but I think

that might be a use that you may want to discuss with your clients to see if they'd be willing to consider—

Mr. Hodge: And we will do that.

Mr. Brandt: --deleting that. But other than that, that's all I have. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson: So, Mr. Hodge, are we to assume that on the first point that you will include that dumpster delivery during business hours into the text?

Mr. Hodge: We will do that.

Mr. Wilson: Great. Okay. Anything else from anybody here? (No response.) Public comment? You have a -- you've heard, but Mr. Vance, if you'd like to comment on that, or Mr. Carmichael, either one of you, or anyone else. I'm sorry, I'm not -- was just referring to those two people.

Mr. Joseph Carmichael: Again, I'm Joseph Carmichael and I reside at 49 South Summit Ridge. Our house sits just south of Sub-Aquatics. The more I listen to this, the more concerns I have. Again, I appreciate the attorney's comments about moving the access forward. The issue for me now is the fact that it appears that we're going to be punished because Pataskala won't grant you what you're asking for. It seems that Summit Ridge Heights now must pay the penalty because you can't get access off of Broad Street. That's a great concern for me because it says to me something is wrong in that picture. Something's wrong in that picture. It's a business that he proposes to have. You asked if there would be two. I heard it grow from two to five. That's a lot of traffic coming through there. Not only are we talking about the traffic of the persons who will make use and be a consumer on that property, but we're talking about all the delivery trucks that will have to come through there to maintain those businesses. That's a lot of traffic. When I leave my house now, sometimes I sit at that corner for five minutes trying to get out onto Broad Street. Not just to say how old I am, but I'm up there now. When we moved there 30 some years ago, I can shoot up to that corner, wait a few seconds, and be out onto Broad Street. You can't do that now. There's a lot of traffic there. And it just seems to me that I'm asking you, as a commission, to consider the fact that there is going to be a lot of traffic there. Not only are we talking about cars, but we're talking about delivery trucks that will have to use that road. Again, I point out, as I said earlier, that street is a very narrow street. You're probably familiar with it. You're doing good when you can get a car -- one car pass the other on that road, and the same holds true for Annette. So I am not opposed to business because, obviously, all these years I always considered that to be a commercial lot. But when you start talking about going from two to five businesses, that's a lot of traffic there and I think you have to be concerned about that. Again, I've mentioned earlier, the issue about children. You know, we have seen a lot of change in that neighborhood. We were a part of Lima Township, now we're a part of Pataskala, and then I get a notice to come here to Reynoldsburg because it's Reynoldsburg property. I guess we're loved by everybody in that little nitch that we're in there. And so we have the problems about

trying to get through Pataskala's Commission versus this one and it says to me that we should be considering the people as well as the businesses in terms of what we do there. That lot has set -- I've been there for 30 some years; it's sat empty all those years. And for one thing, I've really worried and wondered why the great interest in that particular lot right now when you have all of Licking County, which is the largest county in the state -- why we've been worried about that piece of land right there all of a sudden. I don't know and maybe I'm not as great a businessman as maybe I should be, but it's a concern that I have. I see kids up and down those streets, because there is no place for them to play. They go up and down on bicycles and skateboards and you have to be very careful there. I now have visions of trucks turning those corners, whipping down as far south as we can get to get in, not only to make use of the businesses, but also to maintain them with a lot of delivery trucks, and so forth. I, for one, feel that you should oppose having five businesses in that small area. One point-- A little bit more than a acre is not a lot of land to be maintaining five businesses on it. And I can see what's happened across the street right in front of Belts Warner Blvd. and there's been a lot of problems there, and now I have visions of those problems coming across the road now and presenting a lot of trouble. Again, I don't feel that we should be punished because you can't get access to Broad Street. I think somebody should look at that and be very concerned about that and take that into consideration, and I thank you very much.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Carmichael. And to your point, the process is one that's a little bit complicated with this piece of property, obviously. And they will move -- you should move to Pataskala to see what their issues are and -- but as you heard, the developer is willing to move that those turn-ins just as far north to allow, you know, just enough to get off of Broad Street.

Mr. Carmichael: I didn't hear that, sir. I heard him say, "Just a little bit, coming north just a little bit." That's not much and my concern is coming off of Summit Ridge and Annette. Those are residential streets. They were designed as residential streets and they should be treated that way.

Mr. Wilson: Well, that -- there, again, that goes back to Pataskala, so it's a difficult issue. But they have that whole same process to go through and you -- we encourage you to do it.

Mr. Carmichael: And that's why I'm suggesting that the access should be off of Broad Street. It's a commercial lot and the access should be off of Broad Street. Summit Ridge and Annette are residential streets and they ought to be treated that way.

Mr. Wilson: I don't think you'll find any argument with this group--

Mr. Carmichael: In that case--

Mr. Wilson: --nor will you find it with the developer.

Mr. Carmichael: Then, in that case, I won't have to worry about access, right?

Mr. Wilson: I can't say that, sir, because I can't speak for the City of Pataskala. It's not under our jurisdiction to determine that. It is Pataskala's.

Mr. Carmichael: But it's under your jurisdiction to determine whether the access can be off of Annette and Summit Ridge.

Mr. Wilson: Actually, no, it isn't. The access is there, but those streets are in Pataskala also. They're mandating that it comes in that direction.

Mr. Carmichael: In terms of that particular area right there, those four lots, you can determine, and it's within your prerogative to determine where the access is to those four lots.

Mr. Haire: Actually, the one section of Annette Drive is a city street – is a City of Reynoldsburg street. There's a small strip of Annette Drive that the City controls and maintains.

Mr. Wilson: How—

Mr. Haire: Just the length of this lot.

Mr. Wilson: Just the length of this lot?

Mr. Haire: Correct. The white boundary – that section is actually within the City of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Wilson: On Annette?

Mr. Haire: Annette Drive. Correct.

Mr. Wilson: But not on the other street?

Mr. Haire: No.

Mr. Wilson: Yeah. And the right turn exit is a good suggestion to get the traffic out of there and I don't know whether that's going to fly anymore with Pataskala than an entrance, but – we – yeah – it's duly noted in these minutes. And the process here is that this gets recommended to City Council of the City of Reynoldsburg. We don't say yea or nay. We give them our recommendation and that's heard three times at the City Council meetings and there's – again, we'd encourage you to be there and to express your views on that and they are the people who ultimately say, "This is going to be the way it's going to be." And they also can stipulate in the overlay where those entrances are if they happen to end up being off of the two streets.

Mr. Carmichael: Yeah. The Council would go with your recommendations. I would assume that that's why we had this meeting now, right?

Mr. Wilson: Well, we're dealing primarily with zoning here and the use of the property. The technicalities of how do you get into it and out of it, who owns what – is really addressed legally at Council and so we're looking more at, "Is that an appropriate use for the property," and trying to fit that into the whole scheme of things, so that's really what we do. The technicalities of it in plot grade utility, as Mr. Clemens said in the Public Hearing, really a function of City Council, and those—

Mr. Carmichael: I heard Council earlier bouncing this to your meeting because—

Mr. Wilson: Well, because we're here. And so part of our process is to evaluate the presentation of what is this use going to be, is that an appropriate use for that piece of property. As to how it gets accessed and how it is treated, that isn't under our purview at this point. We certainly--

Mr. Carmichael: Whose is it?

Mr. Wilson: Well, in this case it sounds like it's Pataskala's. It's Pataskala's purview as to how they're going – how they handle that. Now, that's not to say that we're going to stand back and say, "Well, you know, we don't have anything to do with it," but in our function here—

Mr. Carmichael: But it's a part of the plan here that you're considering.

Mr. Wilson: Accept it's not in drawing – it's not drawn on there. It's a – that's a concept, not a—

Mr. Carmichael: --and it's listed here in this as access is one of the issues here that's in this document.

Mr. Wilson: Access is an issue, there is no question. And that needs to be worked out not only with Reynoldsburg City Council, but more predominantly with Pataskala City Council, because they are the grantors of that access. And they are the only grantors of that access. We can't access it. We can't tell you – tell them that's going to happen that way. We don't have that control. They do, strangely enough. And I know it's a weird situation and I can understand your frustration. What will go into our Minutes here is all this discussion. That's a piece of public record and this is the process that we go through to allow people to talk to us and to submit their views and put them in writing and put them under oath, so that package translates into --(TAPE CHANGE) --discussion at City Council. I don't think I answered you very well.

Mr. Carmichael: You didn't.

Mr. Wilson: But I—

Mr. Carmichael: I heard you, but you didn't answer me.

Mr. Wilson: But I can't, because this isn't even a plot grade utility plan. This is a concept drawing that says, "We're going to put a 9,000 square foot building there someplace and work through that." That's the concept drawing there and that's what we've got right now and nothing is settled.

Mr. Carmichael: The access is a major issue.

Mr. Wilson: Absolutely.

Mr. Carmichael: And traffic is a major issue. And I don't see how you would entertain anything there without considering those issues.

Mr. Wilson: Well, we are going to consider those issues.

Mr. Carmichael: The main _____ to make recommendation.

Mr. Wilson: Well, we have looked at the traffic study and heard what the—

Mr. Carmichael: I've lived with that traffic everyday, right there.

Mr. Wilson: I understand that, and that should be in the traffic study. That delay that you see, and they do this in peak periods, should be there. So, again, yeah, I don't sit there, you do.

Mr. Carmichael: Um-um.

Mr. Wilson: And there's no question about that, but that should be in the process. And, at this point, I can't give you anymore than that because we're not in complete control here.

Mr. Carmichael: Thank you.

Mr. Wilson: Yes, sir.

Mr. Greg Vance: Again, my name is Greg Vance. I reside at 45 Annette Drive, adjacent to the property in question. My wife and I are sitting here talking about some of these things. You mentioned the water drainage and they're talking about the idea that we'd have to have a parking lot. That water drainage -- as it is, we have wet spots sitting in the front of our property. What's that going to do to the rest of that? The road access, again, Mr. Carmichael has mentioned as well, would be -- many children we have there, small children riding their bicycles or skateboards. We also have some seniors there, but why should they have to worry about being able to walk up and down the street where they live and being hit by a car, or a truck, or whatever? The traffic

there – I have to come out and turn left out of Annette Drive every morning to go to work. It's a real pain to get out. You have to watch, and watch, and watch, and finally get your chance to come out. And if you got two or three people behind – you know, you're two or three people behind and you're trying to turn left to go to work, how hard is that going to be to get me out – you know, get me out to go to work? Will I have to leave another half hour earlier because I got to turn left out of my street? We already got a ton of traffic at Broad and Taylor and I'm sure you're aware of that. If you've been at that area at anytime of the day, there's a ton of traffic there. I think there's a duplicate effort with putting another business there. I mean, we've got strip malls a mile away. We've got strip mall basically, you know, little strip shops across the street. We've got them a mile east of us. Why do we have to keep duplicating the same thing when they're all within a mile either way of us? Also, the noise levels – we've had people come by and, you know, just, "How can you live in this? This a hundred decibel noise level out here?" This is going to add to the noise level. What about the lighting they're talking about putting up twenty-eight feet (28') in the air? You know, putting 28' in the air, that's higher than everybody's houses around here, or most of the houses around there. Now, we're going to have light shining into our houses all night long. Maybe Council ought to think about the idea of possibly just purchasing this property themselves and making it a park for these children to play in, giving them some place to play, other than in the street. I'm not saying that's something that has to be done, but this would keep them out of the street, keep them away from any traffic, and they'd have a place to be able to-- An acre is a decent playground, rather than having other business there. Maybe Council should consider that, and doing that kind of thing for this area. I realize that we're dealing with Reynoldsburg, Pataskala, and all this, you know, all intertwined with each other and I'm sure that's quite a thrill for all of you to have to deal with. And I will make the same recommendation in the Pataskala meeting. I will be going there. I think I need to be there. You know, we've already got added – we've got a lot of stress for all the noise pollution there and everything anyway. To put a park there or something would at least give some relief to that, not adding to any of the noise pollution that we already have. It would also make it something where you wouldn't have to have access necessarily. The kids can walk down the street to the park. They can ride their bicycle to the park. It's something I think we ought to, you know, that maybe they ought to consider rather than trying to put another business in -- that we're duplicating the same type of businesses anyway.

Mr. McGrath: Okay. One point you brought up-- Excuse me, Mr. Vance. One point you brought up was the lighting. There is another committee – in fact, they meet tonight but they won't be meeting on this, but eventually the lighting will come before the Planning Commission. I'm sorry, excuse me, the Design Review as far as the type of lights and everything. And, generally speaking, we speak to them about whether or not they're shaded lights so they don't reflect completely on the other property. Having had a CVS move across the street from me, I understand the point you're making there because it kept waking us up in the middle of the night. Back then they shut off their lights at midnight. Now they're open all night long. At any rate, then we would find out about a shut-off time and everything. We might not be able to dictate to them what they do along those lines but, by the same token, we approve and disapprove things.

Mr. Vance: Yeah. I work as mechanic during the day. I come home I work on my car and my family's cars, but at 10 o'clock I shut off whatever I've got. I don't keep my lights on. I don't keep my compressor running, anything, because I have neighbors around. They need to go to sleep. They need the rest. And I shouldn't be bothering them after 10 o'clock at night. Here we're talking about a business that may well be open, you know, depending on what of business goes in there. We're talking something that might be open until 11, 12, 2 o'clock in the morning. We've got the Circle K right across the street from us that is open 24/7. They have lights on all night long. I mean, it's bad enough, you know, those lights being around as bright as they are without more lights being added, and more traffic being added, and more noise being added, and more business being added.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Vance, you made a couple of points. The water drainage from that parking lot is going to be contained and it has to be contained and you heard Mr. Hodge – you actually heard him say this, but they'll either put it in the storm sewers or they'll put a detention underground so that they can't release it any faster. In other words, you just can't hit and wash onto your property. It must act just like as though it's raining in that wooded area, so they have to hold it back. So there won't be any additional speed to that water. Now, it's also a flat piece of ground.

Mr. Vance: _____ground here.

Mr. Wilson: Yeah. It's also a flat piece of ground. It's going to puddle on your side with no flow from anybody else, just what comes down. That could be part of the problem, but they have a legal responsibility to design that and they'll have the guidance of Reynoldsburg to make sure that is designed to catch that water, not put it onto your property or anybody else's property, but to contain it and release it.

Mr. Vance: I understand that.

Mr. Wilson: _____ do that.

Mr. Vance: And I did hear them talk about the idea of possibly going with underground containment, whatever. I don't know if you spend a lot of time around that area. With all the rain that we've had within a street on Taylor Road -- if you go north of Broad on Taylor Road, I mean -- and they don't have a lot of parking lots there. They just got their little streets and Taylor Road going. I mean, they saturate—

Mr. Wilson: No question.

Mr. Vance: --that area and everything from the streets comes right down Taylor Road and floods their -- floods the corner lots, floods the lots across the street from Taylor Road even with the storm sewers there. With the kind of rain that we've been getting here in the past couple years, I mean, doesn't matter what you're going to do to

try to contain the water or drain it off of blacktop, it's going to get to a point where it can't handle it all and it's going to go somewhere else.

Mr. Wilson: Well, there's no question. What they're responsible for handling is what falls on that blacktop, whatever falls from—

Mr. Vance: I understand.

Mr. Wilson: --every place else, you know, they don't have responsibility for it. Your comment about business and duplicate business it may hold validity. I guess you'd, as a business person, look at it and say, "Well, if there's that much duplication, why is this company going to put money, invest money into that spot to do that." They must think there's something that goes in there that makes sense and we don't know exactly what it is and don't know how many places there're going to be, but I don't suggest that you'll see the same stores in that spot that you do a mile down the road because you're -- to your point, you're correct. There's no reason for that. What's going in there, I don't even think they have an idea, but I think they're providing some different program to that. And if they didn't, then there'd be nobody in it. It would sit there vacant.

Mr. Vance: Let me ask you this then. If they're going to put different businesses in there, if the businesses, types that are going to go in there do not survive, then it becomes a vacant building again, then what's going to happen with that?

Mr. Wilson: I couldn't tell you that, but I suspect--

Mr. Vance: Exactly.

Mr. Wilson: I suspect that they don't expect that to happen, because they have a responsibility to get their money back out of that. They're not doing this for charity. They're doing it for profit. So I would suggest that they'll be there looking for tenants who'll be there for a long time and do that. But, to your point, what happens? We see it all the time.

Mr. Vance: Right.

Mr. Wilson: Things go in and out. If it's a well-done process, which it sounds like it's going to be, then it'll attract the right kind of business and they'll stay there. And if they don't, someone else will move in and pick up on the program. It would be great to have a park there, but the City doesn't own it and we don't own it and you don't own it, and there's a person -- a company that says that it could be a business. And from a park's standpoint, there's nothing we can do about that.

Mr. Vance: Well, maybe the City of Reynoldsburg ought to buy it. And maybe the City of Pataskala should buy it and turn it into a park. You know, I mean—

Mr. Wilson: That's certainly something that you can suggest to both cities--

Mr. Vance: I will.

Mr. Wilson: --and see what they come back with. All right, thank you.

Mr. Vance: Thank you.

Mr. Wilson: Anyone else would like to speak on this topic? (No response.)
Seeing no one jump up, any further questions or comments from the Planning Commission?

Mr. Brandt: My only comment would be, with respect to the traffic, I realize they've provided some traffic numbers but -- and I share the same concern near where I live. However, I think Mr. Hodge and his experts can pretty definitively state that traffic will be local traffic. It's not going to be a development of the nature that somebody's going to drive from the west side of Columbus to come here. I don't see any -- nothing disparaging about the development, but I don't see it having an anchor tenant that's going to draw a lot of new traffic. It's kind of like the police force. Every time the neighbors start getting irritated -- to have the police enforce speeding in the neighborhood streets, 95% of the tickets they write are the people that live right around the neighborhood. So, consequently, I'm sure there'll be traffic generation or traffic in and out, but as generating a plethora of new traffic, I personally don't see that happening. He may be able to comment to that.

Mr. Hodge: I think you're exactly right. I don't think it's going to be a destination location that's going to draw a bunch of people from -- we think it's going to be people who live in the area that use this neighborhood commercial center.

Mr. Wilson: All right. Hearing no other comments, motion -- accept the motion for approval?

Mrs. Wirth: So moved.

Mr. Brandt: Second.

Mr. Wilson: It's been moved and seconded.

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. Wilson voted "yes." Mr. Wall voted "yes." Mrs. Wirth voted "yes." Mr. McGrath voted "yes." Mr. Brandt voted "yes.") Motion carries.

Mr. Wilson: Now, as we've said, this just goes on to City Council and there are three hearings on that. You need to attend those. Talk to your Councilman and explore whatever ways you can mitigate this to however you can help it be best for you. And there is a Design Review, as Mr. McGrath has said, and they design in lighting and approve that, which sticks. It's not just a suggestion. When they say that this is the way

it's going to be, then that's the way it's going to be. So those are all things that you can be involved with and listen to and we'll get notification— They'll get notification of Design Review, will they not?

Mr. Haire: No. There's no property owner notification on that.

Mr. Wilson: Okay.

Mrs. Vance: Well, how can you find out when it's going to happen?

Mr. Wilson: The Council hearings will be on the Council agenda at—

Mrs. Vance: And how do I get that?

Mr. Wilson: --but Pataskala, I can't answer that.

Mrs. Vance: I know but just—

Mr. Haire: If you just want to give me a call and request that I can mail you out an agenda when that comes on.

Mrs. Vance: And you're with?

Mr. Wilson: He's here in the building. Lucas, give them your telephone number.

Mr. Haire: It's 322-6829.

Mrs. Vance: Thank you.

Mr. Brandt: And you can also touch base with Mr. Hodge. He's more than willing – he works with the neighborhood groups on these issues.

Mr. Wilson: All right.

Mr. Hodge: I gave him my card.

Mr. McGrath: I know he did. I was just saying—

D. OTHER BUSINESS – None

E: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at _____.

Brad Wilson, Chair

Lucas Haire, Planning Adm.

This document prepared by:
Area East Secretarial Service
7668 Slate Ridge Blvd.
Reynoldsburg OH 43068