

Yerkes, owner of property to the south, to potentially share the existing dumpster. If this is the case, a dumpster would not be located on the applicant's property. Mr. Leasure questioned how refuse would be handled if they shared with adjacent property. Mr. Rauch stated that Mr. Yerkes, owner of the former pharmacy to the south, would not be utilizing the existing dumpster to its capacity with the future office use of the building, therefore it would have the capacity to handle refuse from the applicant's property. If an agreement is not reached, the applicant would install a trash enclosure at the rear of the property, shown on plans.

Mr. Havener stated that there was a conflict between the extent of fence shown on the building elevations and the plan sheets. The extent of the brick on the south elevation was also questioned and whether or not the brick would extend to the start of fence. Ms. Dennison stated that, originally, the dumpster was to be located directly behind the structure where existing meters and other service structures are located and this is the reason for the larger extent of the fence on the elevations. After discussions with staff, the applicant chose to move the dumpster to the rear of the property in the parking area. Ms. Dennison stated that the brick will wrap around the structure and will not extend to the fence. Mr. Havener stated that he felt the fencing was too long if the trash enclosure would not be in that space. Mr. Rauch stated that staff would work with the applicant on this issue.

Mr. Leasure questioned the alleyway between the applicant's structure and the structure to the south. Mr. Rauch clarified that this is not an actual alleyway and is part of the applicant's private property.

Mr. Havener questioned lighting along the pedestrian walkway and the responsibility of lighting within this area. Mr. Honsey stated that the City would be responsible for keeping the walkway lit. Mr. Honsey also stated that this would be part of a Town Center lighting and infrastructure update detailing lighting options to ensure pedestrian safety accessing the rear parking area. Ms. Dennison stated that new lighting fixtures are proposed along the south elevation, within the seating area.

Chair Holt noted that one set of plans show a different seating arrangement and Mr. Havener questioned the child play area. Ms. Dennison stated that the child play area is no longer being considered. Mr. Honsey stated that the Commission should be very clear in recommending a certain set of plans, seeing that the two plans vary. Ms. Dooley clarified that the plans showing the child play area are older plans that have been included in the packets with a note showing how the applicant addressed previous staff concerns in creating the revised plans. The revised plans do not include the child play area.

Mr. Honsey asked Mr. Rauch if the City had acquired the easement across the south of the property shown on plans. Mr. Rauch stated that they are still in discussion and have not acquired the easement. Mr. Honsey asked if it was appropriate to stipulate that the south-most ten feet be dedicated to the City or to stipulate the land remain open for a pedestrian walkway. Ms. Readler stated that requiring dedication of property should be attributable to the development proposed. Mr. Honsey stated that the development of this property does not create the need for pedestrian improvements so it would not be a fair burden to place on the applicant.

Mr. Havener questioned whether the thin brick will be extended around the northeast corner of the structure. Ms. Dennison stated that she did not believe that the brick would be extended the entire length between buildings but that the brick will be wrapped around the building everywhere, pending access.

Chair Holt noted the following stipulations:

1. Curbing shall be utilized around the perimeter of the landscape bed adjacent to the dumpster if a dumpster is placed on the property.
2. The applicant shall work with the Urban Forester in the selection of landscaping for the site.

ITEM #4 Buckeye Beverage Bay –Special Use Permit (Drive Thru) (Project ID# 201012270051)
4170 McDowell Rd, Grove City, Ohio 43123

Applicant: Robin B. Ranft, 194 Cherrytree Lane, Commercial Point, OH 43116

The applicant is proposing to operate a car wash and beer and wine drive thru at 4170 McDowell Road. The site was the previous site of a car wash and two oil change bays as well as a small office area. The applicant is proposing to continue to operate the car wash but close the center bay in order to install a cooler for the storage of beverages. The remaining bay will be the site of the proposed drive thru. There will be no outdoor storage or sales on the site. The building has access to five (5) parking spaces which will be used by the employees.

Mr. Ranft was present and spoke to the item.

Mr. Leasure clarified with Mr. Ranft that he will be closing the lubrication part of the previous use.

Chair Holt asked if the existing car wash equipment would remain. Mr. Ranft confirmed that the equipment will not be changed.

Mr. Leasure asked if there would be problems or conflict with the proposed drive thru if customers pull over in front of the wash. Mr. Ranft stated that an employee would be available to clean cars so customers don't have to get out of their vehicle.

Mr. Honsey made a motion that the Buckeye Beverage Bay – Special Use Permit be recommended for approval to City Council; seconded by Mr. Leasure. The motion was unanimously approved.

Having no further business, Chair Holt adjourned the meeting at 2:07 p.m.

Kimberly Dooley, Secretary

Marv Holt, Chair