

Harrison Township Zoning Commission
September 17, 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

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Christine Johnson with all standing for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Tracy Kelley moved to approve the minutes from September 3, 2024. Gerald Arnott seconded. The motion passed with unanimous ayes.

An Architectural Standards Review Application was received from Penntex Ventures for a DG Market located at Ephriam Drive SW and Columbus Rd. SW

The application was submitted to Garmann Miller for review.

September 17, 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 – 2nd Submission

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.

A. Ornamentation: The documents submitted indicate that the primary entry elevation (west) and has cornice and water-table ornamentation, projections and changes in color. The south elevation (visible on Broad Street) has cornice and water-table ornamentation, and changes in color. The north elevation has water-table ornamentation and changes in color. The east elevation) has cornice ornamentation and changes in color. The massing of proposed building differs from the massing of buildings on adjacent residential properties to the north, west, and south.

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 elevations materials that *may* mimic natural stucco and stone (which appears to be painted).

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/low-sloped metal, 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 and screened on the north side by what appears to be corrugated metal panels. The site/landscape plan shows an unidentified element that appears to be ground mounted mechanical equipment near the northeast building corner. This equipment will be visible from the residential properties to the north – no screening is indicated for this equipment.

F. Mechanical Equipment Screening: The corrugated metal panels screening the north side of the rooftop equipment are not consistent with other building materials.

G. Truck Docks: None indicated on submitted documents.

H. Service Doors & Overhead Doors: No overhead doors are indicated in 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 elevation. These dumpsters will likely be visible from the adjacent residential properties to the north unless appropriately screened. While the letter submitted with the application refers to “a natural wood dumpster enclosure,” no enclosure is noted on the site/landscape plan. Trees/shrubs (arborvitae) are indicated on the north and east sides of the dumpster. However, it is not clear that the proposed spacing (6-foot tall spaced at 5’) will meet the 70% opaque requirement of Article 10.17. A “privacy fence” (note 4 on the landscape plan) is indicated along the north side of the property that may provide screening, however, no details on this fence are provided to determine if it meets the requirements of Article 10.17. An estimated ten-footwide 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. Partial screening is indicated on the west (Ephriam Drive) in the form of evergreen trees/shrubs, however, the spacing indicated (6-foot tall shrubs spaced at 20’) does not appear to meet the 70% opaque requirement of Article 10.17. Screening is indicated along the south (S.R.16) property line in the form of the privacy fence note and evergreen trees/shrubs at 20’ spacing. However, no details are given for the fencing, and the trees/shrubs spaced at 20’ which do not appear to meet the 70% opaque requirement of Article 10.17.

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 (massing), E, F, and I above.

Respectfully, J. Ted Musielewicz, AIA Associate Principal

The board reviewed and discussed the Architect's comments. They also reviewed the proposed plans submitted for the DG Market building.

Brad Sager moved to recommend denial of the application based on the Garmann Miller review. Tracy Kelley seconded. Motion passed with unanimous ayes.

The board worked on proposed revisions to the Zoning Resolution. Previous revision suggestions for Animal Husbandry and Kennels were discussed. Proposed revisions were compared to ORC requirements. It was requested that legal opinions be found in order to proceed. Ms. Hans will get information.

At 8:45 pm Ms. Kelley moved to adjourn. Ms. McLaughlin seconded. The motion passed with unanimous ayes.

Respectfully submitted

Vickie Noble, Zoning Secretary

Christine Johnson, Chair