

West Jefferson Ohio Planning & Zoning Commission

28 East Main Street

Regular Meeting 6:30 PM

Wednesday, November 9, 2022

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order: Chairperson Hay called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Roll Call: Mrs. Paula Hay, Mr. Jimmy Little (arrived at 6:36 PM), Mrs. Sandy Boucher, Mr. James Graham, Mr. Roy VonAlmen (left at 6:50 PM due to health issues)

Absent for Roll Call:

Approval to accept October 5, 2022 minutes:

Chairperson Hay asked for a motion to approve the *corrected* minutes from the October meeting.

Motion by Mrs. Boucher to accept the minutes, seconded by Mr. Graham to approve the *corrected* minutes from the October 5 meeting.

VOTE YES: Mrs. Boucher, Mr. Graham, Mr. VonAlmen and Mrs. Hay

VOTE NO: none

Motion Carried

New Business:

Case # WJ22-0009 - Property address: Parcel #16-00001.000 - Request: is for recommendation to Council for site plan approval in a Planned Commerce District (PCD).

A motion was made by Mr. Graham and seconded by Mr. VonAlmen to remove the case from the table.

ALL IN FAVOR: Mr. Graham, Mr. VonAlmen, Mrs. Boucher and Mrs. Hay

Motion Carried

Case # WJ22-0009 - Property address: Parcel #16-00001.000 - Request: is for recommendation to Council for site plan approval in a Planned Commerce District (PCD).

Chairperson Hay explained the meeting process.

Public Hearing opened at 6:33 PM

Mr. Tom Hale stated that there have been many emails and meetings since the case was tabled last month. He said the emails he has been a part of, but the meetings he has not. There was a zoom meeting he was asked to attend, however when he tried to dial in he was not accepted. Mr. Hale explained that Planning Commission had

approved an amendment to an original site plan approval for an applicant on this parcel. The amendment then went to Council for approval. Since that time, Love's had made application for a portion of that land. It important to know that there has not been an application for a lot split. The issue at hand is the access to the parcel to the North.

Mr. Chad Bruner, Representing Love's Travel Stops & Country Stores, Inc. (Applicant), explained his project on the PowerPoint. Since the last meeting they have revised their landscaping. In the plan, they added a great number of trees. He said that it is almost 10 acres however the easement takes up about 2 acres. Mr. Bruner said that one of the variances they are asking for is the 100 feet spacing between trees. By following the code, they are required to have 36 trees. Their plan would be short 6 trees and about 48 shrubs out of the required 354 shrubs. They tried to make up for some of that with the interior planting. The other variance deals with the interior landscaping. The requirement is 5% of the paved area which would be 2700 square feet. They are proposing 8500 square feet which is 3 times the required amount. The shrubs will be the required evergreen shrubs.

Mr. Little asked what is the height of the screening shrubs?

Mr. Bruner said that the species was included in the packets. The majority will be 3 feet in height.

Mr. Little asked how many years before it would be screened from the road.

Kimberley Cooper, Project Manager of Love's Engineering Firm stated that they are meeting the minimum requirement of the code along the section of the public right-of way. Along the frontage there will chain link fencing. She said generally it takes a few years to fill and they have done this on other sites and never had any issues.

Mrs. Boucher asked if this screening will hide the trucks parking there?

Mr. Bruner pointed out that they did look across the road to try and match what was done there. The intent is to block the truck area from the streets. Mr. Bruner said he understood the comments from last time and wanted to make sure they addressed them.

Mr. James Ryan, (Exeter), stated he is the one that is contracting the land. Mr. Ryan said he is here to explain the access that would be granted to the adjacent parcel. He points out the roads that will be dedicated back to the Village were in yellow on the screen. He showed the access where they were proposing (in red). He did send this to Huntingtin and has not heard back.

Mr. Little asked if they would be building the roads?

Mr. Ryan said yes, they will be doing the infrastructure. He said the reason they moved it over was to give room for the trucks to get off of State Route 29.

Ms. Cooper explained the traffic study. She said that they have been back and forth with ODOT. They are proposing a dedicated left turn lane and a through right lane on Commerce Parkway. Ms. Cooper said that the traffic volume that they have now is about 400-425 vehicles so that is why they are proposing access to the adjacent property there.

Mr. Bruner said they could talk about the high-rise sign now. He stated that they do want to have visibility from I-70. Mr. Bruner explained they would like to have that visible ½ mile out. The sign they are proposing is at 200 feet high. He said it is not unusual for out there and not for Love's. It will be on the back side of the property.

Chairperson asked if it would be on-site?

Mr. Bruner said that in Ohio, it has to be on-site where they do business.

Mrs. Boucher asked if they were assuming the trees there would never get any taller?

Mr. Bruner replied and said they are assuming that they are mature and have been there for a long time.

Mrs. Boucher asked how many tall signs they will be putting up?

Mr. Bruner stated that they know this is asking a lot. So, what they will do is dress up the monument sign that would be more appealing than the typical gas station sign.

Mrs. Boucher said her concern was what if everyone wanted to put up a sign like that.

Mr. Bruner said he does understand that. But it is a highway business and needs to be seen. The other thing is that these signs are very expensive. That would discourage people from doing that. Not having this type of sign, they would see a 25% drop in their volume.

Chairperson Hay asked if it has to be 200 feet?

Mr. Bruner explained that you can float a balloon at different heights. He said that they can get an east bound read with a shorter sign but cannot get a read west bound.

Chairperson Hay asked if they could move the location of the sign?

Mr. Bruner said they tried that as well, but this location gave them the best read.

Mr. Graham said his concern was that this is at the edge of the municipality, but in 15 or 20 years it might not be the edge of town.

Mr. Bruner said that in this case with the current neighbors they have, it would not be out of place.

Mr. Bruner said hopefully everyone understands why they want to come here. He said that there is no other amenity like this in the area and believes they will be an asset.

Chairperson Hay said that she feels the concern is the height of the sign.

Mr. David Budge (Assistant Vice President WXZ) representing Huntington Bank, said he is not opposed to the development. Mr. Budge explained that he was at the last meeting and is concerned about the access to his proposal. At that time, it was tabled and he thought they would have conversation with Exeter and The Village. He said he hadn't seen any drawings and the drawing here tonight is the first time he has seen that proposal. He did

meet with ODOT and said they were pretty clear that they would not get a full cut access onto State Route 29. Mr. Budge said he has not seen any traffic studies either. He feels that would be an issue for the Village as well. He stated that their desire would be to have access closer to the light. Mr. Budge said it would be in everyone's interest to figure out how to handle that.

Mrs. Boucher clarified that they would rather have the access closer.

Mr. Budge said yes and that they just don't know. He doesn't believe that it has had traffic study yet.

Mr. Bruner said that again this is not a Love's issue. It is really between ODOT and Huntington. He feels that Exeter has demonstrated their willingness to work with Huntington. Mr. Bruner said they are ready to start and any continued delays will hurt that. He said he would like the board to just consider their petition.

Public Hearing closed at 7:22 PM

Mrs. Boucher clarified that we are here for the Love's case. Even with the other people here that is not what we are deciding tonight.

Chairperson Hay said yes that is what we are here for, Love's and their site plan approval.

Mr. Little pointed out that there is a lack of communication concerning the access.

Mr. Hale explained that this is strictly the site plan approval. He was told today that the access would have to be worked out before a lot split would be approved.

Case # WJ22-0009 - Property address: Parcel #16-00001.000 - Request: is for recommendation to Council for site plan approval in a Planned Commerce District (PCD) contingent upon the approval of the lot split.

A motion was made by Mr. Little and seconded by Mrs. Boucher to approve the recommendation to Council for site plan approval in a Planned Commerce District (PCD) contingent upon the approval of the lot split.

VOTE YES: Mr. Little, Mrs. Boucher and Mr. Graham

VOTE NO:

Motion Carried

Staff Comments: none

Meeting was adjourned by Mr. Little and seconded by Mrs. Boucher at 7:29 PM

VOTE YES: Mr. Little, Mrs. Boucher, Mr. Graham and Mrs. Hay

VOTE NO:

Motion Carried

Next Meeting: December 7, 2022

Chairperson:

Paula Hay
Mrs. Paula Hay

Date:

December 7, 2022

Respectfully submitted:
Kristie West, Staff
Department of Development

