



2. Stipulation #3 of CR-50-04 shall be revised to be more in conformance with Code Section 1145.16; which requires signage to be uniform within multi-use shopping centers.

Chair Holt requested clarification that this application before them was straight zoning. Mr. Rauch responded that is correct it is zoned C-2. Chair Holt stated that under normal conditions the signage application would be addressed by the Building Division. Mr. Rauch agreed and stated that typically if an applicant wants to vary from the Code, they would go before the Board of Zoning Appeals, but because this is a Council stipulation, the Development Plan must be amended by Council action.

Mr. Pat McNeill, Mr. Bob Wolfe, and Mr. Brian Eversman were present and spoke to this item. Mr. Eversman stated that the changes requested by staff do not conform to the business model proposed by Zanzis. Zanzis business model is similar to that of Little Caesars, with a better quality pizza, where the lion's share of the pizzas served are already prepared. However a custom pizza can be ordered with a 4-6 minute time frame to prepare, cook, box and serve. They have in operation other stores that have the same requested speaker and menu board. Mr. McNeill stated that the customer will be parked to wait for their custom order, if necessary. It is a very quick process. To not have the speaker box and menu board would slow down this business model.

Mr. Leasure requested clarification where they would go after placing their order at the window? Mr. Eversman responded that is why they need the speaker box and menu board for this business model. The speaker box and menu board would allow time for the order to be prepared from the time the customer places the order to the time they arrive at the window.

Chair Holt stated he was concerned that after two cars are in the drive thru, the traffic will back up if someone has to wait six minutes. People will not want to wait and will try to go around the stacking area, but with only one lane of two way traffic, they could be facing traffic oncoming traffic.

Mr. McNeill responded that the six minute wait is not a static number; it can be up to 4-6 minutes depending on the persons order. If the person is at the window, they will be parked to keep the line moving. The line does not stop.

Mr. Eversman stated that when a customer pulls up to the menu board, they place their order, move on to the window, and get their pizza and pay. They are at the window for less then 30 seconds.

Mr. Leasure questioned how we can make this feasible for this business. Mr. Rauch stated that most drive thrus are currently designed to wrap around the building to wrap the parking as well, which allows a higher capacity of cars in the drive thru lane. This project is going against the grain because it can only utilize half the building and is pushing traffic out to the western portion of the site. In reference to Wedgewood Pizza they were amenable to having a pick-up window only, call ahead, no ordering at the window and can stack four cars.

Mr. Havener stated that it appears they have more than the required parking spaces and suggested removing some of the parking spaces to allow for two lanes of traffic in addition to the drive thru lane. Mr. Rauch stated that may force patrons to park behind the building and may affect the other businesses in the area. The patrons would need a way to get from the back to the front of the building. Mr. Linder suggested adding a sidewalk.

Mr. Honsey questioned why they were requesting approval for a temporary pedestal menu board and speaker. Mr. McNeill stated they were holding off on the illuminated case to buy one that integrates with the "POS" system.

Mr. Havener stated it might be possible to have six parallel parking spots and suggested the applicant work with staff to accommodate applicant's needs and stay within city requirements.

Chair Holt agreed that the applicant should work with staff regarding the island. Mr. Havener agreed that the entire area needs to be relooked at and applicant should work through the issues with staff.

Mr. McNeill stated that the tone of this discussion is that there is a problem and he doesn't feel there is. He stated that the plan will work fine. In his business experience it will flow fine and there won't be a problem.

Mr. Leasure asked the applicant if he meant it would work fine with the proposed modifications. Mr. McNeill responded "No, it will work fine as submitted, there are no design flaws and for the record I feel it would work fine, just peachy". Mr. Rauch stated that staff does not hold the same opinion.

Chair Holt stated that once you get more than four cars stacked, there is a problem. Mr. McNeill responded that not all of their business is drive thru. Chair Holt stated he understood that, but all you need is one car that has to wait six minutes and now there are three cars waiting behind them and it will cause a problem. Mr. Honsey further stated that it could be a busy Friday night and you are out of the pre-made so customers have to wait. Mr. Havener requested clarification that those customers would be asked to park. Mr. McNeill stated that if a customer requests a "BYO" build your own pizza, that causes the line to slow down or stop they would ask them to park depending on the flow. Chair Holt stated that he has seen McDonalds do that by asking the customer to pull forward, but their site accommodates that without interfering with the rest of the flow. Mr. McNeill stated that would be the exact same thing they would do. Chair Holt did not agree. Mr. Honsey asked if they would reserve parking spots for drive thru overflow. Mr. McNeill said sure, they have one store in particular that has two spots reserved with a pole and a sign with the logo. It varies greatly market-to-market, but it's not a problem and flows fine. They can actually prepare a pizza faster than Wendy's can prepare a chicken sandwich. A Wendy's chicken sandwich takes 7 minutes just for cook time.

Mr. Leasure stated that it would be better to have the order placed sooner than at the window and then they could have it brought to the parked car, if necessary.

Mr. McNeill agreed and stated "it would be a worser scenario to have the order placed at the window".

Mr. Rauch clarified that staff's recommendation was to have this as a pick up window only, absolutely no ordering at the window, no ordering in the drive thru at all, strictly a call ahead, pick up window only.

Mr. Eversman explained this is a different business model than a traditional Donatos. Zanzis is more of a fast food type of pizza; they count on more transactions at a lower price. The average ticket is about 1/3 of what it would be at Donatos. It's similar to a Little Caesars, not many people call ahead to a Little Caesars to preorder their pizza. They just know the business model.

Mr. Rauch stated that staff's position with the site constraints that are there today, to make this business model work, it would have to be a call ahead, to make the traffic flow work on the site.

Chair Holt asked if customers could park and walk in to place an order. Mr. McNeill stated yes and less than half of their business is drive thru total and the highest would be about fifty percent, somewhere between 30-50 percent. Women with kids or people with pets in their car prefer to use a window as opposed to a single person. A lot of single people prefer to park and walk in, that is their preference. Some will say it's faster or it's just their preference.

Mr. Leasure requested again that staff try to work with the applicant. Mr. Rauch indicated they would, but it would depend on how much the applicant was willing to reconfigure the site. Mr. Leasure agreed that it would be great if a compromise could be reached.

Mr. Rauch suggested configuring the drive thru to the back of the site. Mr. McNeill did not agree that would work. Mr. Eversman said he did not mind that possibility at all. Mr. Havener stated it would be the applicant's best opportunity to meet with staff to come to an agreement. Mr. Rauch stated they were willing to sit down with the applicant to work something out, but they think it needs to be changed from what is currently being proposed.

Chair Holt stated that he was of the opinion that if the applicant requested a motion and vote right now, that he would probably get this turned down. Mr. McNeill responded, "Let's find out".

Mr. Rauch requested to discuss the sign issue prior to a motion and vote. Chair Holt stated the sign could be discussed and indicated that today all of the signs are consistent across that shopping center; green with white lettering, but the sign being requested today is not consistent. It is a big yellow sign with orange lettering. Chair Holt indicated that if this sign was allowed, the other tenants would ask for a similar sign and it would destroy the look of the center. He would not support that sign and would not support changing the resolution that was approved a few years ago to accommodate one tenant. Mr. Eversman stated this location has a competitive disadvantage as it is the only center on Broadway between I-270 and Southwest Boulevard that has similar color signage on the building, and similar color signage, with no logos on the monument sign. Chair Holt responded that had been agreed to when the center was built and those other locations already existed. Mr. Havener didn't have a problem with them incorporating the oval shape of the sign, but it would have to be white and green. Mr. McNeill said he could not change the colors because the logo is registered. Ms. Readler disagreed and stated it could be changed, there were no legal restrictions requiring the use of the registered color. Mr. Honsey stated that Wendy's was a good example as they changed the colors to match the requirements in Dave Thomas' home town of Worthington. Mr. McNeill stated you could have multiple registrations, but he did not. Mr. Eversman stated that when this building was approved, they were given the impression that future developments would also have to conform to the same guidelines, but that has not been the case with Turnberry Center, Anchor Center and UDF. Mr. Rauch stated that the Anchor Center was developed prior to the change in City Code. Mr. Havener stated that it would be up to the City to come to terms with the developer to work on this issue.

Chair Holt requested a motion to postpone this item to allow staff and the applicant to meet and come to an agreement on the outstanding issues of the parking, signage and speaker. Mr. Eversman stated that the revisions to the resolution that the City is proposing do not help them. Mr. Rauch stated this item could be addressed at the July 27, Planning Commission meeting. Chair Holt offered to schedule a special meeting of Planning Commission to address these items. Mr. McNeill asked if they had the right to ask for a vote today and whatever the recommendation is, would be forwarded to council. Mr. Honsey responded yes. Mr. Eversman did not feel that spending more time with staff would be productive and felt they have already compromised on their plan. Mr. Rauch did not agree. Chair Holt asked if the applicant was amenable to changing the sign to have a green background and white lettering. Mr. McNeill responded "no sir, we are not." Mr. Leasure said that could be voted down right now.

Chair Holt again requested a motion. Mr. McNeill stated this has been exhausting and they have worked on this for a very long time. Chair Holt asked the applicant if they wanted to postpone this item to work with staff or have a vote. Mr. McNeill and Mr. Eversman both agreed to have a vote.

Mr. Havener made a motion for approval of Item #2 The Shoppes on Broadway Development Plan Amendment as presented with stipulations; seconded by Mr. Honsey. Mr. Honsey noted that he is confused regarding the discussion that parking could be amended to improve the circulation, but we ended up where there is no desire to amend the parking area. Mr. McNeill interrupted, but Mr. Honsey stated this was not discussion period and he was simply making a comment between Commission Members. Chair Holt agreed and called for a vote:

Chair Holt – No; Mr. Linder – No; Mr. Havener – No; Mr. Honsey asked for clarification - the motion is for staff's recommendation of approval, so a "no" vote means we are not recommending it for approval to City Council even if they comply with the stipulations; therefore Mr. Honsey voted yes because he agrees with the plan if they comply with staff's stipulations; Mr. Leasure – Yes.

Ms. Readler clarified that this vote means that Planning Commission is not recommending approval of this item to City Council even if they agree to the stipulations. The recommendation to Council is "no". Ms. Kelly questioned if this is what the Commission wanted. Chair Holt responded "not really". Mr. Honsey stated that after this meeting, if the applicant decides to comply with staff's recommendations, that a "no" vote means even if they are going to meet staff's recommendations, you are not for it. Chair Holt agreed. However, Mr. Honsey stated that what he heard from Commission Members was that if the applicant met staff's recommendations they would vote for it and that's why he voted yes. Chair Holt stated he would like to change his vote.

Ms. Readler stated that a Motion for Reconsideration could be made by a person on the prevailing side of the motion. Chair Holt asked if there was a Motion for Reconsideration. Mr. Havener made a Motion for Reconsideration, there was no second on the motion. Therefore the original motion would stand as is.

**The original motion to approve as presented with the stipulations did not pass and will be forwarded to Council with a recommendation to not approve the application.**

**ITEM #3      Zanzis Pizza – Special Use Permit – Drive Thru  
3467 Broadway**

**(Project ID# 201005250026)**

**Applicant: Bob Wolfe, 7179 Lakebrook Blvd, Columbus, Ohio 43253**

The applicant is requesting approval to install a drive-thru pick-up window on the south side of the existing retail center. The business will operate from 11 a.m. to 10 p.m., seven days a week to accommodate call-ahead pick-up or orders placed at the drive-thru from a limited menu of prepared products. As proposed the drive-thru appears to accommodate three (3) automobiles before interfering with the site's internal circulation.

Mr. Pat McNeill, Mr. Bob Wolfe, and Mr. Brian Eversman were present and spoke to this item.

Chair Holt noted the following stipulations:

1. The proposed drive-thru shall be restricted to call-ahead orders only and utilized as a pick-up window.
2. The proposed drive-thru shall not incorporate the use of a menu board, speaker box or any provisions to allow on-site ordering from the drive-thru facility.

Mr. Honsey made a motion that the Zanzis Pizza – Special Use Permit – Drive Thru be recommended for approval to City Council with the stipulations as noted by the Chair; no second was made. Chair Holt stated this would go to City Council without a recommendation. Ms. Readler stated that another motion could be made in the negative, to recommend disapproval to City Council. Chair Holt asked for any other motions.

Mr. Linder made a motion of disapproval only because he does not agree with the City's position. Mr. Leasure clarified that if it fails, the window and speaker and all that fails too, so a "no" vote would be that. Ms. Readler stated that if you are giving a negative recommendation, their plans would go forward and City Council would look at it with the negative recommendation. A "no" vote is "no" to everything.

Ms. Kelly stated that if the motion is in the negative and Commission Members agree, they would need to vote “yes” to have the motion passed. Mr. Linder asked what to do if they want to give the Special Use Permit, but do not agree with the recommendations of staff. Ms. Readler stated Planning Commission can make a recommendation with their own stipulations, they do not have to agree with or use the stipulations recommended by staff or have any stipulations at all.

Mr. Linder made a motion that the Zanzis Pizza – Special Use Permit – Drive Thru be recommended for approval to City Council without stipulations. Mr. Leasure clarified this motion means that if it passes, the application goes to Council as submitted with the speaker box and menu board. Mr. Leasure seconded the motion. Mr. Honsey commented that a yes vote would mean you feel that without any changes to the original application, traffic could be accommodated on the site. Mr. Linder – yes; Mr. Havener – yes; Mr. Honsey – no; Mr. Leasure – yes; Chair Holt – no.

**The motion passed and will be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation to approve the application as submitted.**

Mr. Honsey asked what the implications would be if Council approved the Special Use Permit, but not the Development Plan Amendment. Ms. Readler stated they would not be able to use the Special Use Permit without an approved amendment to the Development Plan. Chair Holt stated they needed to come back to the Development Department and work on the design.

Ms. Kelly confirmed that the applicant would not be able to utilize the Special Use Permit without an approved amendment to the Development Plan.

Chair Holt stated this is an unusual situation to deny a Development Plan Amendment, but approve a Special Use Permit.

Ms. Kelly stated that Council may ask the Applicant to postpone the Development Plan Amendment application to allow it to be voted on at the same time as the Special Use Permit application.

Mr. Eversman asked if they could start construction during the 30 day waiting period. Mr. Honsey cautioned him that it would be at his own risk and he would not suggest that he do that.

Ms. Kelly asked for clarification, that as far as the majority of the Planning Commission is concerned, do they accept the configuration of the plan presented? Mr. Honsey stated the Development Plan Amendment was voted down, but the Special Use Permit was voted up without stipulations. Mr. Linder confirmed that it is allowing the drive-thru window, but not the configuration.

Planning Commission members all agreed that their issue is with the configuration and the applicant should work with staff to configure a proper drive thru.

**ITEM #4 Telhio Credit Union – Development Plan  
Outlot 43 – Parkway Centre East**

**(Project ID# 201006070028)**

**Applicant: Hans Gucker, Advanced Civil Design, 422 Beecher Road, Gahanna, Ohio 43230**

The applicant is proposing to construct a single-story 2,864 square-foot structure that is 23.8 feet in height, with a brick and stone finish, which will be accessed by two curb cuts off of the existing access drive within Parkway Centre East. A total of twenty-six (26) parking spaces are proposed, including two handicap-accessible spaces. The applicant is requesting one 46 square foot monument sign that is nine feet in height and two wall signs that are 44.47 square feet each that will be internally illuminated and will

match the existing character of Parkway Centre. Proposed lighting will also match the existing Parkway Centre lighting.

Mr. Rauch stated that the only stipulation is to install the proposed gas lamp-type fixture within the monument sign landscape area adjacent Buckeye Parkway.

Mr. Hans Gucker, Ms. Karen Daniels, Mr. Bill Bily and Mr. Rick Greve were present and spoke to this item.

Chair Holt agreed that the only stipulation is as follows:

1. Applicant shall install the proposed gas lamp-type fixture within the monument sign landscape area adjacent to Buckeye Parkway.

Mr. Gucker stated he understood and agreed to comply with the stipulation.

**Mr. Honsey made a motion that the Telhio Credit Union – Development Plan be recommended for approval to City Council with the stipulation as noted by the Chair; seconded by Mr. Leasure. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**ITEM #5      Telhio Credit Union – Special Use Permit – Drive Thru      (Project ID# 201006070029)**  
**Outlot 43 – Parkway Centre East**

**Applicant: Hans Gucker, Advanced Civil Design, 422 Beecher Road, Gahanna, Ohio 43230**

The applicant is proposing to install a drive-thru facility on the south side of their proposed structure that will extend approximately 32 feet from the building and will include three drive-thru lanes, with an additional escape lane around the drive-thru. “Do Not Enter” signs will be posted on either side of the one-way exit aisle. The lobby and drive-thru will operate from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. Friday, and 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. Saturdays, and employ between six (6) and eight (8) persons.

Mr. Hans Gucker, Ms. Karen Daniels, Mr. Bill Bily and Mr. Rick Greve were present and spoke to this item.

Chair Holt noted that there were no stipulations associated with this item.

**Mr. Leasure made a motion that the Telhio Credit Union – Special Use Permit – Drive Thru be recommended for approval to City Council as submitted; seconded by Mr. Linder. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**ITEM #6      Retro Cave Comics & More – Certificate of Appropriateness (HPA Sign)**  
**3915 Broadway      (Project ID# 201006250030)**

The applicant is seeking approval for a window sign that will display the business name and address, utilizing royal blue lettering. The submitted materials do not display the proposed dimensions of the sign; however the window it will be installed in is approximately 43 square feet in area – 8.5 feet wide by 5.08 feet in height. Mr. Rauch stated staff would accept the requested “royal blue” lettering as it equated to the “welcoming blue” color on the historic color chart.

Mr. Bill Rex was present and spoke to this item. Mr. Havener stated that the proposed size of the letter and font choice of the sign may make it hard to read. Mr. Rex agreed and stated he would choose the font and size of letters that would be the easiest to read while staying within the size requirements.

Chair Holt noted the following stipulations:

1. Window sign shall not exceed 10 square feet in area.
2. Color shall match the “Welcoming Blue” color on the historic color chart

**Mr. Linder made a motion that Retro Cave Comics & More – Certificate of Appropriateness (HPA Sign) be recommended for approval to City Council with the stipulations as noted by the Chair; seconded by Mr. Havener. The motion was unanimously approved.**

Mr. Rauch requested clarification for the status of the next regular Planning Commission meeting. Staff will be at a conference during the next scheduled meeting. Planning Commission members agreed to cancel the July 13, 2010 regular Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Leasure made a motion to move any agenda items from the July 13, 2010 meeting to the July 27, 2010 regular Planning Commission meeting; seconded by Mr. Honsey – all members agreed.

Discussed required size of submissions distributed to Members. Mr. Rauch stated that staff would still receive full size copies, but questioned if Members would always want a full size copy as well. Mr. Honsey stated that it would be a matter of judgment as to when full size plans would be needed by Planning Commission Members. Other members agreed.

Having no further business, Chair Holt adjourned the meeting at 3:17 p.m.

---

Jennifer Uhrin, Secretary

---

Marv Holt, Chair