



Northland Community Council  
Development Committee  
**Report**

February 6, 2025 6:00 PM  
Columbus Metropolitan Library  
5590 Karl Road (43229)

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

Members represented:

*Voting: (15):* Albany Park (APHA), Asherton Grove (AGCA), Clinton Estates (CECA), Devonshire (DCA), Elevate Northland (EN), Forest Park (FPCA), Karmel/Woodward Park (KWPCA), Lee/Ulry (LUCA), Little Turtle (LTCA), Maize Morse Tri-Area (MMTACA), Northland Alliance (NA), Northland Area Business Association (NABA), Salem (SCA), Sharon Woods (SWCA), Westerwood (WRA).

- 
- Case #1** Application #CV24-143 (Request to expand use of the site from a Type B to Type A in-home daycare) Johnson  
Mervat Khalil/Amin Husein  
(Residence) 5012 Sugar Plum St, 43230 (PID 600-172308)
- *The Committee approved (14-1) a motion (by EN, second by SCA) to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** of the application.*
- 
- Case #2** Application #CV24-150 (Revision of prior site plan approved under CV14-051 to maintain curb cut onto Cleveland Avenue that was to be abandoned, and variance from §3312.49 to reduce required parking from 13 to 12 spaces. *NCC conditionally supported CV14-051 in February 2015. CE Notices 23470-02403, 25470-01325*) Rose  
Jeanne Cabral, Architect representing  
Oscar Martinez/El Grullense LLC  
(El Grullense Mexican Restaurant) 4989 Cleveland Ave, 43231 (PID 600-183744)
- *The Committee approved (15-0) a motion (by NA) to **TABLE** the application.<sup>1</sup>*
- 
- Case #3** Application #BZA24-158 (Variances from §3321.05, §3321.07, and §3312.30 to maintain a 22' x 16' driveway constructed within the front building setback without terminating in a legal parking space, and having done so without a certificate of zoning clearance. *CE Notice 24470-07997*) Trimmer  
Jason Nguyen/Hien Mai  
(Residence) 1277 Thurell Rd, 43229 (PID 010-129307)
- *The Committee approved (14-0 w/ 1 abstention) a motion (by KWPCA, second by FPCA) to **RECOMMEND DISAPPROVAL** of the application.<sup>2</sup>*
- 
- Case #4** Application #BZA24-178 (Variance from §3321.05 to maintain a 6' tall wood panel fence of >25% opacity on a corner lot which extends past the setback into a required yard having vehicular access to a street, and which obstructs the clear vision area. *CE Notice 24470-08284*) Trimmer  
Carla Powell  
(Residence) 2388 Halkirk St S, 43229 (PID 600-146156)
- *The Committee approved (15-0) a motion (by FPCA, second by SCA) to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** of the application.*
-

**Executive Session**

7:55 pm

**Meeting Adjourned**

8:30 pm

---

<sup>1</sup> The applicant indicated that they did not intend to use the existing drive-through window in the south elevation which the existing illegal curb cut served as an exit from the site, which precipitated the issue resulting in CV14-051. Consequently, the applicant indicated that they intended to modify the site plan to remove the drive-through lane on the south portion of the parcel, possibly replacing it with an outdoor patio or greenspace, and to remove and/or block the south curb cut. The Committee informally endorsed that solution, but as the modified site plan was not yet available for review, the applicant agreed to a tabling until a time when the new CV incorporating the modified plan can be reviewed and it, along with the included parking variance, will be voted upon.

<sup>2</sup> The Committee found that when a previous owner of the property constructed a detached 2-car garage to the rear of the main structure and a driveway along the western property line to serve it, they relinquished the right to also maintain and use a driveway in the eastern portion of the front setback that previously served an attached 1-car garage that was replaced with interior living space. Therefore, the current owner of the property could not be inferred to possess that right, despite the corresponding curb cut and apron not having been removed. The Committee also found that the now-reconstructed 16' x 22' paved surface in the eastern front setback is not typical of the district in which the parcel is located, despite a neighboring property having a similar feature, and that allowing it to remain would create an undesirable precedent in the district.