



Northland Community Council  
Development Committee

Report

August 27, 2025 6:00 PM  
Columbus Metropolitan Library/Rooms 1 & 2  
5590 Karl Road (43229)

**Meeting Called to Order: 6:00 pm by co-chairs Dave Paul and Bill Logan**

Members represented:

*Voting: (16):* Albany Park (APHA), Asherton Grove (AGCA), Blendon Chase (BCCA), Clinton Estates (CECA), Devonshire (DCA), Elevate Northland (EN), Forest Park (FPCA), Karmel/Woodward Park (KWPCA), Lee/Ulry (LUCA), Maize Morse Tri-Area (MMTACA), Lee/Ulry (LUCA), Northland Alliance (NA), Northland Area Business Association (NABA), Preston Commons (PCHA), Rolling Ridge (RRSHA), Salem (SCA), Sharon Woods (SWCA).

**Case #1**

---

Application #BZA25-083 (BZA variances from §34 E.20.030(J)(2) to permit a 6' metal tube fence exceeding the 48" height limit around the perimeter of the site; §34 G.20.050 to reduce vision clearance from 10'x10' to 3'x10' at various locations; §34 E.20.030(A)(3)(b) to allow an accessory building to be located between a building and a public street; §34 E.20.090 to increase the maximum side street setback from 15' to 87'; and §34 G.20.040(A)(3) to increase the maximum headlight screening height from 48" to 6').

Smedley

Chris Fleming/Korda *representing*  
Ohio Department of Taxation  
4485 Northland Ridge Blvd, 43224 (PID 010-270389)

- *The Committee approved (12-4) a motion (by KWPCA/FPCA) to **RECOMMEND DISAPPROVAL** of the application.<sup>1</sup>*

**Case #2**

---

Application #BZA25-092 (BZA variance from §3321.21 *Building lines* to reduce the side building setback from 25' to 15' to permit construction of an expanded garage space; and from §3321.05(A)(2) *Vision clearance* to legitimize an existing fence taller than 2.5' in height and of 100% opacity located in a required side yard.)

Trimmer

Kelsey Durbin  
(Residence) 5628 Breshly Wy, 43081 (PID 010-235159)

- *The Committee approved (14-2) a motion (by APHA/PCHA) to **TABLE** the application.<sup>2</sup>*

**Case #3**

---

Application #BZA25-093 (BZA variance from §3312.49 *Required parking* Table 3 to increase maximum permitted # of parking spaces for this 2156 SF building and use from 11 (1 per 200 SF) to 15 (1 per 145 SF).)

Smedley

Steve Fox/V3 Companies *representing*  
Northwest Bank

5756 N Hamilton Rd, 43230 (PID 545-316161)

- *The Committee approved (16-0) a motion (by APHA/PCHA) to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** of the application.*
-

**Executive Session**

7:45 pm

**Meeting Adjourned**

8:00 pm

---

<sup>1</sup> The Committee understood the intent of the application and the reasoning for installation of 6 foot-tall security fencing at the site. However, a) the applicant's representative acknowledged that the supplied site plan contains major errors, including depicting the installation of fencing along the eastern parcel boundary adjacent to Northland Ridge Boulevard, which is not proposed; and b) the application does not properly address the requirement of Title 34 G.20.040(A)(1) that "headlight screening must be provided between all parking areas and adjacent streets, open spaces and Residential Zoning Districts within 80 feet." While City staff apparently suggested that the fence itself be considered "headlight screening" and therefore that variance from G.20.040(A)(3) be sought to increase the maximum height of "screening" from 48 inches to 6 feet, the fencing material proposed (which the Committee otherwise found acceptable) cannot serve alone as headlight screening under the Code because the fencing alone does not meet the requirements of G.20.040(A)(1)(a), and its opacity is approx. 16%, substantially less than the 75% required under the Code. The representative indicated that the applicant would be willing to consider installation of landscape shrubs adjacent to the proposed fencing, as specifically called for in G.20.040(A)(1), but none is depicted on the existing site plan, nor was any landscaping plan provided.

<sup>2</sup> The Committee found that there were potential technical and structural issues associated with the applicant's proposal to expand the garage structure, and that the hand-drawn exhibits provided were inadequate to address them. In its review of the Duncan Factors, the Committee did not feel that the applicant's assertions in the current application successfully justified the variances requested. The applicant was encouraged to consult with Building Services and with a professional architect and/or engineer to confirm the feasibility of the proposed expansion, and to consider readily available (and potentially less costly) alternatives not requiring Code variance, such as a detached shed located in the back yard of the property.