

**MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
JULY 17, 2008
6:30 P.M.**

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. Lucas Haire Mr. Duane White Mr. Chris Long Mr. Norman Brusk Mr. Patrick Feeney
Others Present:	Mr. Aaron Domini, Planning Administrator

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Approved as submitted.
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Approved as submitted.
4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS (Mr. White administers oath.)
5. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION, 13885 REYNOLDSBURG BALTIMORE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: PRESENT USE, SHELL FUEL STATION/MCDONALD'S'S; PROPOSED USE, ADDITIONAL ENGRESS AND EGRESS ONTO TAYLOR PARK DRIVE; PRESENT ZONING, COMMUNITY SERVICE (CS); PRESENT OWNER, THALES N. PAVLATOS MD, TRUSTEE OF MERCY ANESTHESIOLOGIST INC. PENSION PLAN. CONTACT NAME: DAVID WARREN (20-MS).

Mr. Domini: The applicant's proposing to reconfigure the access to the site and, if I may, I'll just run through quickly the presentation. This came to our attention when the owner of McDonald's called the Development Department with concerns for the access at McDonald's as it was being changed due to the Taylor Park extension. At that time, myself and Mr. Miller, the City Engineer, met with the owner out on the site to discuss the issues at hand.

It appeared at the time the extension was approved, there was some communication with McDonald's but, for whatever reason, perhaps that information didn't make it through the chain of command, so to speak. So there are some concerns now about how access will be reconfigured on Taylor Park Drive. We have worked with the applicant and EMH&T on a redesign and the drawing that you have before you has been reviewed by myself and Mr. Miller, City Engineer. We're supportive of improving the traffic flow on the site and improving the alignment along the drive-thru which has been shifted a little bit as a result of the Taylor Park Drive extension. Mr. Miller is not supportive of the egress closer to the light, due to safety concerns and traffic management. Both the entrances on Taylor Park Drive, the in and the outs need to be clearly marked per his recommendation, which includes both signage and striping of the pavement, so those are the recommendations from the City engineer.

You all have before you the drawing which is the one projected on the screen. Here are a couple of aeriels showing the current access. So you'd have two off of Route 256 and then one access off the side. That image on the left is probably the most clear, showing the current configuration. And then this is the reconfiguration as proposed. You can see there's a right-out only on Taylor Park Drive closest to the light, and then they're proposing adding another access and moving the existing one over to have an in and an out at the McDonald's and Shell station. This is to improve the flow of traffic in and out of the drive-thru. They do a lot of drive-thru business at this McDonald's and have two drive-thru lanes. So the way it was reconfigured at the time Taylor Park Drive was approved -- the extension was approved, there was some concern that may have hindered the flow of traffic through the drive-thru, so that's why we're seeing this here today. I would now like to turn it over the applicant Mr. White.

Mr. White: Is there anyone present here to speak to this application or site review? Would you please sign in if you did not already.

Mr. David Warren: My name is Dave Warren of McDonald's Corporation. My title is Area Construction Manager. When I signed in, I signed in with my email address. I'm not sure if you email the Minutes or-- That would be great if you could email them. Yeah, I apologize we're at this point as far as challenging or wanting to revisit the approved site plan, but it -- we're actually a sublessee of a piece of property that Shell has leased, so we're kind of far down the chain. So I'm not sure how we ended up at this point and it's not the first time it's happened to us, but even when we owned the properties. But what we're proposing--

--(talking off mike) _____ when the site plan was proposed _____ single the entrance out of _____. This entrance -- this single can be ingress, egress and the _____ at the site was McDonald's and both the _____ the drive-thru, so the drive-thru and the _____ so when all the traffic is coming in here, they try to circulate around this drive, traffic coming in this way, this would be really difficult. This would really be a big problem. So that's really the reason we're proposing the splitting entrance here and to resolve the problems. Splitting the entrances and circulation through the back. Currently, I want to talk about

_____ the site _____ all the traffic into the site from 256. There are right-ins and right-outs all along 256 going south so everybody going northbound would turn left at the light and come into the site. So, in fact, at the end of the day, this actually improves our circulation a little bit. Shell not as much. As of now customers would come in this way currently if you went to the drive-thru and then circulate back out, you could either circulate it back over to here at the light or they could go right out southbound on 256. The reason we're asking for the right-in, right-out – excuse me – right out onto Taylor Park Drive is, as I was showing, you come in here and you're circulating several times before you go out. You currently come in and circulate once and back off the site. If we eliminate this, probably 25 to 30 percent of the cars will exit the drive-thru coming this way and turn left at the light. So it's probably not a major use versus having the cars, when they exit the drive-thru and come out like this, go out and turn at the light, rather than just circulate the site. This eliminates a little bit of the flow, that right-out. (talking on mike now) I just started talking without—

Mr. White: May I interrupt? Just for the record, Mr. Feeney is present now, so I will turn the meeting over to Mr. Feeney.

Mr. Feeney: I apologize. I got hung up in traffic and I was worried that there wasn't going to be enough people here. I couldn't get hold of anybody so I just thought, "Well, I'm better late than never," so I apologize for that.

Mr. Warren: That's pretty much it in a nutshell. What we're asking for is splitting the proposed single ingress/egress into an ingress/egress, splitting them and then requesting the right-out onto Taylor Park.

Mr. Brusk: On the current entry, are you making that a smaller egress than the current egress/ingress that's there now?

Mr. Warren: Yeah, we would curb it and curve it to the point to where no one could turn left.

Mr. Brusk: Now, how many cars -- out of that 11 spaces that you have on there, how often is that used? Currently, I see that thing filled most of the time, those parking places, more—

Mr. Warren: (Off mike) Yeah, currently the radius comes right to the parking area.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah.

Mr. Warren: So we've actually improved that situation. It'll be nice. They're going to move this further away from Taylor Park Drive. This comes right to the beginning of the left turn lane _____. Typically you can make it thru the drive thru in about 50 seconds, 55 seconds to go through at least that is what corporate tells us. So I'll say more like closer to once every minute and a half out

of our drive-thru so it's not a release of ten cars at one time. It would be unusual to have even three cars stacked up there. So it's not a situation where you release a large volume of cars. They're staggered as people pick up their food and leave. Then you would mix in the exiting guests off the lot. People filling at the gas pumps is 3-4 minutes, so it's not a large hit of traffic at one time.

Mr. Brusk: Unless he keeps the gas price down lower than across the street.

Mr. Feeney: I think as long as I can if I'm going to spend 75 bucks, I'd like to stand there for as long as I can.

Mr. Haire: Have you looked at the sight line entries there? That's heavily wooded, that parcel to the rear that's not under your control. So that is my main concern there, well, one of many concerns with that right-out is the sight line issues that you'll have with cars coming around that corner and you're going to have a significant volume of traffic there on that collector street. So that's one of my concerns. I don't know if that's been considered at this point.

Mr. Warren: (speaking off mike - inaudible)

Mr. Haire: Is Shell going to volunteer that as well, because that's a pretty good trade.

Mr. Warren: That's not that valuable. Yeah, so, it's the right-in – we could stay in here all night but arguing the right in. If that's our only holdup, we can get out of here quick.

Mr. Haire: Well, that was just the first of my concerns. The other concern is when you have a driveway that's one-in and one-out, why are they 25' wide? That's designed for two lanes of traffic, 25'.

Mr. Warren: Lucas, there's several ways to skin that cat. We originally looked at it. We went down as far as a 22' drive to make sure truck maneuverability worked and that, you're correct, there was a larger flare. I guess at this design the radiuses are not as large, but to make the maneuverability work you do need a wide throat, so it's six of one, half a dozen of the other. The minimum distance that we ever were able to get down to was 22' width though. It was something we considered as part of the evaluation of the drives, though. I think with the current access being off the north side of the project now it's a much wider throat which allows for that opportunity of the semis to come in and maneuver through there. Obviously, with the elimination of that or making that a right-out, depending on what the decision is, that needs to be considered on the other access points coming through. There is an opportunity to narrow it and it would need to have some evaluation of the radii, but I guess it's six of one, half a dozen of the other. And if it's signed properly and I think, you know, there's ways to do that. I know McDonald's has their branding signs that they use on a lot of their stores. I think that would be effective. There are other traditional traffic signs that could be used. I

guess that, to me, is more of the minutia and certainly something I could work out with Jim how we want to do that to make everyone feel more comfortable. But to answer your original question, yes, that was looked at as far as the throat width.

Mr. Long: Can I see the drawing that you have on the back of that one which was the original plan that you guys didn't like and changed?

Mr. Warren: (speaking off mike - inaudible)

Mr. Long: Okay. In comparison to the new one that we currently have now, what you theoretically had was an in and out on the right hand single direction in and out. Correct? If you move that little-- Turn the drawing back around. If we made that the left hand entryway up at the top, we made that in and out, that clears what you were concerned about with people going around and around and around the building attempting to get out of there. See, they would come in around to the other side, and they're going to have to do that anyway, because I'm assuming that's going to be one ways between the setback and your drive-thrus, correct? In the back?

Mr. Warren: Correct.

Mr. Long: Okay. They would still have to go around the building, they exit their drive-thru.

Mr. Warren: (inaudible – off mike)

Mr. Long: Yes.

Mr. Haire: With less access points you have less congestion. And when that property develops to the north there's issues with this many access points and left turns and conflict points with left turns out of both sites.

Mr. Warren: Well, yeah, let me address that, because I think on that property which originally it was called Out Lot Two, there are no access points allowed on Taylor Park Drive. They have to exit and enter on a driveway associated with the service drive that would be on the north side of the Staples, H.H. Gregg store. So their connection point to Taylor Park Road is actually on that roadway and not through any direct drive location.

Mr. Haire: And is that through a deed restriction?

Mr. Warren: That's in your zoning requirements.

Mr. Haire: It's in our zoning requirements that you can't have access on Taylor Park?

Mr. Warren: Well, you know, unfortunately this drawing doesn't show—
(inaudible – speaking off mike).

Mr. Haire: So, is Target willing to deed when they deed us that right-of-way, to limit that access in the deed?

Mr. Warren: (speaking off mike)

Mr. Haire: So, that's-- to me that doesn't make any difference. You're saying that we don't have access there because we do. At this point it's not restricted anywhere.

Mr. Warren: I'll verify that. I'm pretty sure that that was something that was restricted, but if that's an issue then, you know, I can't speak for Target on that respect. I mean, that-- I'm fairly certain that there was no access granted at Taylor Park Drive. That was something we considered as part of the engineering anyway, so.

Mr. White: I also have concerns with the little cut-out on the north side. That would probably create congestion there trying to pull into the traffic, given that there will probably be several cars, you know, waiting for the light to change and then you have a back up into your, off your filling station area into that Sunoco, you know – excuse me, Shell, off into that area. It just seems that would create a problem.

Mr. Warren: Unfortunately, from a technical perspective, it's very difficult to argue for or against right-in, right-outs. There's no benefit or no set formula set forth by ODOT for right-in, right-outs. They're strictly just for access. So, from a technical perspective, it's difficult to argue for or against it. But I think what Dave was trying to hint at for you there was that it's more of the onsite circulation and the benefits of that and that impacts to the signal area. I think it would be a challenge as a motorist to make a left turn to go northbound on State Route 256 from that drive. It certainly would create some traffic conflicts. I can't argue against that. But what it does allow for is maybe a little bit smoother access for someone at the fuel station parked at the fuel pumps to be able to get out, gain access to the signal and either head eastbound across 256 to the development across the street or, obviously, gain access to the southbound.

Mr. White: One other question I have or at least a comment I have, when the gables come out going to the west there where the two cutouts are, they have a choice and they can either turn right or they can turn left and still exit that area, do they not?

Mr. Warren: Well, I think that was the thought process from looking at the site circulation with that was that a vehicle coming around the store heading westbound to go past the drive-thru towards that access point would head directly to that drive, in lieu of conflicting with any traffic that might be coming around from the access point on the south end? And by going and gaining access on that north end, you would have the opportunity to stack a little bit there without causing any maneuvering issues at one

access point? I think the opportunity with two access points allows for vehicles to have less of a conflict at one access point there. Now, granted, there is some concern with Taylor Park Drive, but I think the distance there between driveways would allow for some distance for any maneuvering into the site without any terrible conflicts.

Mr. Feeney: Again, I apologize for getting here late. I don't have a problem with the ingress and egress on the west side of your property, but the north side -- and it has a lot to do with I just don't think you're going to get the visual as people come around that corner and people trying to get out, especially since you don't have control of that one piece of property that could be anything there. And also I was wondering about your vegetation plan for on your property. I just think there could be some potential for accidents at that exit. I would prefer the two exits and then the two curb cuts on the west property versus the one on the north. I just think that, to me, it always looks like a potential problem when you come around that curve.

Mr. Warren: Are you talking about the vegetation on the wedge piece?

Mr. Feeney: Yeah, your piece or wedge or, you know, and it's a short -- I mean you're right at the end of the curve and I don't think you can get too much farther away without causing problems to the intersection. That was my take on it when I looked at this earlier at home and it is—

Mr. : (Speaking off mike - inaudible)

Mr. Feeney: That was my only concern. I've had that before in a couple of other situations where we had that corner, you're trying to exit right at the end of the corner and that's my -- that was my only concern when I looked at the reviewed plan. Any questions, comments or anybody want to make recommendations? (No response.) I think the consensus are, it sounds like everybody has the opinion that you have a lot of exits and entrances and I think if we could work on that, you know-- I know you mentioned something about you wanted to give up this for that and so forth and so on, but my opinion is that exit on the north is the one I'd like to give up and I think the flow east and west would be -- you'd have access to two traffic lights and you'd have plenty of visual. It seems like it would work good. Anybody else has opinion on any of that?

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, I tend to agree that as it is now, it's very convenient to have that north exit that's currently there. I use that quite often. But I do see problems when you have a heavy traffic flow coming in there. I also have a question about the access to Wesley Ridge, not going to Wesley Ridge, but coming from Wesley Ridge. How difficult would that be for them to get onto to the road without any potential danger there?

Mr. Warren: (speaking off mike)

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. Currently that's the main road.

Mr. Warren: (speaking off mike)

Mr. Brusk: You keep turning this thing in different directions. I get confused.

Mr. Haire: That's the one you're talking about?

Mr. Brusk: Yeah.

Mr. Warren: (speaking off mike)

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. My concern is on the new one, you know, the proposed one.

Mr. Haire: It hasn't moved very much.

Mr. Brusk: It hasn't, but coming in you now are going to come into a heavily traffic road both directions, which may be a problem. Is there anything to address that? Has Wesley Ridge been upset with that? Would they be upset with that or did they agree to it?

Mr. Warren: No. I think-- I don't know that I can explain the history with any level of accuracy other than the fact this discussion was heard probably 15, 18 months ago—

Mr. Haire: For a long period of time it's gone on and they're well aware that their access is being relocated. When they built Wesley Ridge, they were aware that at some point that roadway would go through.

Mr. Brusk: Okay.

Mr. Warren: And to Elford's credit, the site PC, they have been quite involved in informing them at any time an impact might occur as far as traffic, you know, if they're trying to locate utilities or whatever and make sure they coordinate with those folks and as well as the retail center there just to the north of Taylor Park Drive or the future Taylor Park Drive with that driveway access for Wesley Ridge right now. There was a phasing plan that was done as part of the construction. It's in the street documents that were circulated as part of the original discussion so all parties would have an understanding of how, during construction, they would be impacted and obviously they're in the midst of construction now, the first phase.

Mr. Haire: I'd like to re-visit Mr. Long's point about the driveway on the west, eliminating that out and making the other driveway an in and out. I think that just makes more sense all the way around to have one access point.

Mr. Long: That also moves--

Mr. : It's like what they've got there.

Mr. Warren: (speaking off mike)

Mr. Brusk: Yes, it is.

Mr. : Right.

Mr. Brusk: Currently it's a pinch point. You have two SUVs in there and you can't get around it sometimes.

Mr. Haire: What if you located one driveway in the middle where you have the two proposed?

Mr. Warren: Where are you referencing?

Mr. Haire: In the middle of the two that you have proposed. You could put one driveway and combine those two into one.

Mr. Warren: I think you need to be cautious of the fact of what the stacking distance would be for vehicles there. If you slide in the middle you're going to have a lot of vehicles using the drive-thru and gaining access. I think that would become a very congested area. To your point about the one access drive on the south, the one hesitation I would have in regards to that, it's very similar to sliding a single access point to the drive-thru. A vehicle coming around from the north side of the building heading south and wanting to make a right turn out, I think the potential of some conflicting issues there with the drive-thrus there, understanding your concern about that being a single access, my suggestion is, and I think this leads back to what you're original question was at the beginning of the conversation was the width of the throats and indications of a potential for use of full access on both entrances. I guess I would offer, is it possible to go back and evaluate how wide we can make those? I don't know that we can go down much further than below 22, but it's certainly something we could look at so we can maintain dual accesses. I think it would be easier to narrow the north one to a more of a one-way width, because of the truck maneuverability. I mean, gaining access to the signal is a big issue for a truck, so either you would have to require some understanding of what McDonald's and Shell's, for that matter, truck maneuvering and where they come from to service the site. But, ideally, if they're coming from the north, they would access Taylor Park Drive and the turning movement would be in on the south one and you could squeeze the throat down a little bit more. If they're coming from the south on 70, I think the initial reaction would be that the driver would access the drive in between Logan's and the IDG and the right turn movements, that's where you would end up requiring having a wider throat to allow for the truck to access. But then the exit could narrow the throat down?

Mr. Long: Unless he's making a right onto Taylor Park Drive out of that egress there, because then he's in the same pinch point as well. He's taking the tight turn.

Mr. Warren: Right. But the one benefit you would have is the ability to swing a little wider because of the width of Taylor Park Drive it's a, I believe, a 36' width road. So you would have that opportunity to maneuver.

Mr. Long: Then, we're into the same boat as other people have brought up, is that that whole corner there is a blind corner. So you have a driver who's going to be exiting out of the Taylor Park Drive making a left, has to swing out into oncoming traffic and can't see what's coming around the corner.

Mr. Warren: Well, it's a three-lane road and at that particular point is a two-way left turn lane, which is the lanes where you can make left turns in any direction. I would think that a driver exiting going northbound would have the opportunity to – particularly anything coming southbound should be in their drive lane up to a point at or just beyond the northern access point.

Mr. Long: I carry a CDL. You can't guarantee me a driver's not going to swing out into opposing traffic.

Mr. Warren: Well, no, I can never guarantee that, but it should allow for that opportunity with the way those drives are spaced. I think that you can never be able to out-maneuver the driver with your engineering. We try to anticipate every scenario and I understand your concern with the visibility on that from the wedge piece, but the unfortunate thing is if you narrow it down to the single access point and a semi needs to make a maneuver out from the single access point on the south access, they're going to have to swing wider because he's not going to have the ability to make that u-turn; where if he had a straight shot up and make a left or right turn it's a less of a maneuver for a truck heading straight to that drive. Where a single access point on the south end, the driver would have to make a significant u-turn, consume a better portion of that drive and then also swing out into Taylor Park Drive, out into the area where you mentioned you had a concern.

Mr. Brusk: The big trucks, I guess that's probably the biggest problem is how they would interact with it. Big trucks coming from the south heading north would enter the site from Taylor Station Drive on the north side of the building first and come around and then make a left turn in? Or do you foresee them making the left turn earlier and then making a right turn in? Which would be the more likely scenario?

Mr. Haire: Probably earlier because they'll have a left turn arrow there, I would imagine.

Mr. Brusk: Coming in up here.

Mr. Haire: No, I'd imagine they'd come in down the Staples – H.H. Gregg entrance.

Mr. Brusk: Further south?

Mr. Haire: Correct. Yes.

Mr. Brusk: So they'd come in the south entrance and then come around?

Mr. Warren: They would come in the south--

Mr. Brusk: Right.

Mr. Warren: (Speaking off mike – inaudible)

Mr. Brusk: That's where they're going to be, yeah.

Mr. Warren: (Off mike – inaudible)

Mr. Brusk: They could not make it – with the current setup they couldn't come or go up that access with people in the drive-thru.

Mr. Warren: (Off mike – inaudible)

Mr. Brusk: I can barely make it with my car.

Mr. Feeney: So, Lucas, you're still concerned about the width of the entrance exit that you think people are going to try to go both ways?

Mr. Haire: Yeah.

Mr. Brusk: I tend to agree with their plan, that they do need a little bit wider space to let those trucks be able to make turns.

Mr. Warren: Well, I guess what I would offer is we could set up some geometrics for the turns in there and work with Jim Miller on those widths if that's a concern.

Mr. Haire: My concern is when the parcels on the north develops. You have too many left hand conflicts, because you have people making left turns out of both sites and then it becomes an issue. The more drivers you have, the more opportunity you have for accidents obviously.

Mr. Long: Are you talking about the property to the west, or you said north?

Mr. Haire: Oh, yeah. I'm sorry, on the west.

Mr. Long: Okay.

Mr. Haire: Yeah.

Mr. Brusk: I know. We'll put up those spikes and they go the wrong way, it blows your tires.

Mr. Haire: I guess I'll propose a motion that we approve the site plan with the conditions that the right-out access on the north is eliminated and that the driveways be no wider than 22'.

Mr. Long: I'll second.

Mr. Brusk: Do you want to put a little caveat in the event that our engineer believes that 22 is too narrow?

Mr. Haire: I'd rather not.

Mr. Brusk: You'd rather not.

Mr. Domini: Do you also want to add the condition on signing entrance and exits and stripping of the pavement with arrows?

Mr. Long: The signage being at the proper exit and entrance signs and things like that because we don't have that here.

Mr. Haire: I imagine they'd be on there, yes. Yeah, we can add that condition that they be signed appropriately.

Mr. Brusk: Despite my reservations, I'll second your motion.

Mr. Long: It was already second.

Mr. Haire: Mr. Long seconded.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Long voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Haire voted "yes." Motion passed.)

Mr. Feeney: Thank you very much.

D. OTHER BUSINESS - None

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at _____ p.m.

Patrick Feeney, Chair

Aaron Domini, Planning Administrator

This document transcribed by:
Area East Secretarial Service
7668 Slate Ridge Blvd.
Reynoldsburg OH 40368