

Harrison Township Zoning Commission
May 7, 2024

Members present: Christine Johnson, Laney McLaughlin, Gerald Arnott, Brad Sager, Tracy Kelley, and Douglas Williams. Absent: Gerald Saffo
Also present: Valerie Hans- Zoning Inspector, and Vickie Noble- Zoning Secretary

Guests: David McKee

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Christine Johnson with all standing for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Laney McLaughlin moved to approve the minutes from April 23, 2024. Tracy Kelley seconded. The motion passed with unanimous ayes.

An Architectural Standards Review Application was received from PTV 1378, LLC for a Dollar General Store to be constructed at Ephriam Drive SW and Columbus Rd. SW.

The application was submitted to Garmann Miller for review.

April 26, 2024

Valerie Hans Harrison Township Zoning Department 6750 Outville Road Pataskala, OH 43062
Re: Architectural Standards Review – DG Market at Ephriam Drive SW and Columbus Road SW
Ms. Hans,

I have completed a review of the above-mentioned project based on Article 26 Architectural Standards for Non-Residential Buildings of your Zoning Code. I have noted my comments for each standard below. Please note that the east and west elevation views on the submitted elevation drawings appear to be mislabeled. My comments refer to the elevations by direction as understood from the submitted site plan.

A. Ornamentation: The documents submitted indicate that the primary entry elevation (west) has cornice and water-table ornamentation, as well as projections and changes in color. The south elevation has these same features only for the first twenty feet from the southwest corner; the balance of the south elevation has color changes to metal siding that mimic the water-table and projections, but no other ornamentation. There is no ornamentation on either the east or north elevations. The massing of proposed building differs from the massing of buildings on adjacent residential properties. From the submitted site plan, the west and south elevations will be visible from the street; north and east elevations will be visible from adjacent residential properties.

B. Façade Massing:

1. Offsets Required: The entry façade (west) is more than 60' wide (80' wide)

and requires offset(s) – an offset is indicated, centered on the entry storefront that meets the requirements of this provision.

2. Exterior & Colors:

a. Required materials of natural appearance (60%): The east elevation fully consists of materials that may mimic natural stucco and stone (which appears to be painted). Other elevations are fully composed of painted, “corrugated steel” panels which may not appear “natural.”

b. Exterior Colors: Colors indicated are primarily earth-tones. No bright colors are indicated on the building (although signage over the entry may incorporate a percentage of a bright color).

3. Roof Line Changes: Roof lines are primarily flat or low sloped with a parapet, except at the north elevation which has no parapet. The parapet at the entry projection is appropriately elevated to enhance the massing.

C. Roofs

1. Flat Roofs: Roof lines are primarily flat or low-sloped and concealed by a parapet, except at the north elevation which has no parapet. At the north ends of the east and west parapets, there is no return/extension, and so the parapet ends appear as “false walls.”

2. Pitched, Asymmetric, or Dynamic Roofs: - not applicable.

3. Roof Penetrations & Equipment: Rooftop mechanical equipment is noted on the submitted drawings on the north elevation. There is no parapet on this elevation, and no additional screening is noted. It appears that this mechanical equipment will be visible from the adjacent PUD/residential properties.

D. Entrances

1. Entrance Design: The primary entry in the west elevations exhibits the following characteristics identified in this provision and is therefore in compliance:

a. Canopies above entrance.

b. Entry projection(s).

c. Raised corniced parapet(s) above entrance.

d. Display windows adjacent to entrance.

E. Mechanical Equipment: Submitted drawings indicate rooftop mechanical equipment that is screened by the parapet wall on three sides, but no parapet or screening is indicated on the north side, likely making this equipment visible from the adjacent PUD/residential properties.

F. Mechanical Equipment Screening: As noted in item E above.

G. Truck Docks: None indicated on submitted documents.

H. Service Doors & Overhead Doors: No overhead doors are indicated on the documents. The service doors indicated appear to be below the size that would require screening.

I. Dumpster/Trash & Recycling Containers: Dumpsters are indicated on the site plan at the east end of the north façade. These dumpsters will likely be visible from the adjacent residential properties to the north unless appropriately screened. No screening is indicated at the dumpsters. A “landscape buffer” is indicated along the north edge of the property, approximately thirty feet north of the dumpsters. However, no information is indicated on the makeup of the landscaping material to determine if this buffer will meet all the requirements of Article 10.17. An estimated ten-foot-wide existing landscape buffer is indicated at the east edge of the property – the compliance of the existing material with the requirements of Article 10.17 will need to be confirmed by field observation. No screening buffer is indicated on the west (Ephriam Drive), or south (S.R. 16) property lines, both of which have residential property on the opposite side of the public way.

J. Windows: There are no windows indicated on the drawings other than display storefront windows at the main entry. The location and installation of these windows appears unlikely to cause glare onto adjoining properties or rights-of-way. My opinion, based on review of the submitted materials, is that the proposed DG Market at Ephriam Drive SW and Columbus Road SW is not in compliance with Article 26 - See items A, B(2.a), C, E, F, and I above.

Respectfully, J. Ted Musielewicz, AIA Associate Principal

Ms. Johnson asked Ms. Hans to give her feedback on the Architect’s recommendation. Ms. Hans went over each point from the Architect’s report. She added that the proposed project has submitted a traffic study to TRC.

There were no representatives present for the applicant.

The board went over the points that showed noncompliance with Article 26.

Ms. McLaughlin moved to recommend denial of the application and recommend the applicant revise the application to comply with Article 26 and resubmit the revised application. Ms. Kelley seconded. The motion passed with a unanimous aye vote.

The board was given information on the rezoning application for the Beechwood Trails Pool and Park. The Trustees have scheduled a public hearing for June 3, 2024.

At 7:47 pm Ms. McLaughlin moved to adjourn. Ms. Kelley seconded. The motion passed with unanimous ayes.

Respectfully submitted

Vickie Noble, Zoning Secretary

Christine Johnson, Chair