



# City of Gahanna

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning Commission

200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

*James Mako, Chair  
John Hicks, Vice Chair  
Michael Greenberg  
Sarah Pollyea  
Thomas W. Shapaka  
Michael Suriano  
Michael Tamarkin*

*Sophia McGuire, Deputy Clerk of Council*

---

Wednesday, July 24, 2024

7:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers

---

#### A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL

*Gahanna Planning Commission met in regular session on July 24, 2024. The agenda for this meeting was published on July 20, 2024. Chair James Mako called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Michael Greenberg..*

**Present** 6 - Michael Greenberg, John Hicks, James Mako, Sarah Pollyea, Thomas W. Shapaka, and Michael Tamarkin

**Absent** 1 - Michael Suriano

#### B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - NONE

#### C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2024-0136 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes 6.26.2024

**A motion was made by Hicks, seconded by Greenberg, that the Minutes be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 6 - Greenberg, Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Shapaka and Tamarkin

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

#### D. SWEAR IN APPLICANTS & SPEAKERS

Assistant City Attorney Matt Roth administered an oath to those persons wishing to present testimony this evening.

#### E. APPLICATIONS - PUBLIC COMMENT

V-0016-2024

To consider a Variance Application to vary Section 1103.7(e) Large Lot Residential of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; for property located at 969 Crystal Cay; Parcel ID: 025-011513; Current Zoning R-1 - Large Lot Residential; Steve Beck, applicant.

City Planner Maddie Capka provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. Ms. Capka stated that the zoning district is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The neighborhood was developed in the mid to late 1990s, while the development to the north along Evelyn Lane was developed in 2015 and 2016. This request is for a variance to allow a deck in a front yard setback. The deck is located in what is typically considered a rear yard. The site has double frontage due to Evelyn Lane to the north. There are two "front yards," both of which have a 35-foot setback. The deck encroaches 15 feet into the 35-foot setback as measured from the north property line. It is located outside of easements on the site, which has been confirmed with Engineering. Capka shared a site plan showing the location of the deck and setback, noting that any deck constructed on the property would require a variance. The majority of the back yard is screened with existing trees and foliage and the deck would not be visible from Evelyn Lane. There is an existing deck that is approximately 20 years old. Capka shared images of the existing deck and a rendering of the anticipated deck.

The application was filed under the new zoning code that was effective May 1, 2024. The criteria used to evaluate the application are: the variance is not likely to result in substantial damage to the essential character of the neighborhood; the variance is not likely to result in damage to adjoining properties; the variance is not likely to affect the delivery of government services; the variance is not likely to result in environmental impacts greater than what is typical for other lots in the neighborhood; the variance is necessary for the economical use of the property, and such economical use of the property cannot be achieved through another method; and the variance is not likely to undermine the objectives of the Land Use Plan.

Staff recommends approval of the variance. The setbacks for the site are much larger than usual due to double frontage, creating special circumstances. There is a 37-to-49-foot buffer between the north property line and Evelyn Lane, which includes screening. If there was only one frontage, the rear yard setback would be ten feet and a variance would not be required.

Chair opened public comment at 7:07 p.m.

Mr. Beck stated his appreciation for Ms. Capka's presentation. He added that the footprint of the current deck is where the new deck will be

placed. The current deck is wood, around 20 years old, and is deteriorating. Beck stated the anticipated material of the new deck is a composite. He added that the distance between the deck and Evelyn Lane is 52 feet. There would not be restrictive access in terms of getting to Evelyn Lane. The frontage is now part of an easement that did not exist when the house was purchased. Mr. Beck offered to answer any questions the commission had.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:09 p.m.

Ms. Polleyea noted there was a survey from 1995. She wondered if there was a more recent survey. Mr. Beck replied the survey used was the one that was created when the house was built. He worked with the Engineering Department on this. Polleyea asked if the easements were plotted on the 1995 survey, and if there was anything new. Mr. Beck replied that there was nothing new, and confirmed easements were on the survey. He added that the house was built in 1997 and he moved into it in 1998.

Mr. Hicks asked what existed prior to the development of Evelyn Lane and wondered if Mr. Beck lost any property when the land was turned into Evelyn Lane. Mr. Beck replied he did not lose any land.

Mr. Greenberg wondered if there were any comments from neighbors. Clerk Hilts replied there were none received by Council Office.

Chair Mako asked Ms. Capka if the reason for two front yards was due to the development of Evelyn Lane, which Ms. Capka confirmed. He then asked what was considered the rear yard, to which Ms. Capka replied there was no rear yard.

**A motion was made by Hicks, seconded by Shapaka, that the Variance be Approved.**

**Discussion on the motion:**

Mr. Shapaka said he would be in favor of the variance due to the unique circumstances.

Ms. Polleyea agreed, adding that she would prefer to have seen an updated survey. However, given the circumstances and input from the Engineering

Department, she would be in favor.

Mr. Hicks stated that in his opinion, all criteria for meeting the variance have been met and these were unique circumstances. He would be in favor as well.

Mr. Greenberg and Chair Mako concurred with the other members.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes:** 6 - Greenberg, Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Shapaka and Tamarkin

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

V-0017-2024

To consider a Variance Application to vary Section 1103.09(e) Small Lot Residential; for property located at 541 Palace Ln; Parcel ID: 025-001481; Current Zoning R-3 - Small Lot Residential; Vsevolod Luchianov, applicant.

City Planner Maddie Capka provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The lot is zoned R-3, Small Lot Residential, which is in line with all of these surrounding properties. The applicant is requesting approval of two variances to allow a carport both to the front of a house and within a front yard setback. The zoning code requires that all accessory structures be located to the rear of the primary structure including carports. The carport is also fully within the 25-foot front yard setback and is only seven feet and nine inches from the front property line. The carport was installed prior to City approval and prior to applying for any permits or applications. This variance application was filed due to code enforcement action. There is a one car garage on the property and the applicant states that they wanted their second car to be covered as well, which is why the carport was installed. However, upon looking at the neighborhood, most houses in the neighborhood either have no garage or just a one car garage, which includes every single house along Palace Lane.

Capka shared a site plan and photo of the carport that was submitted by the applicant, showing the materials it is constructed of and the distance from the carport to the edge of the sidewalk. The carport is also anchored in place with concrete footers. There are two variances being requested. First is that code requires a 25-foot front yard setback for every property that is zoned R-3. The carport is only 7 feet 9 inches in from the front property line. Second, the zoning code requires that all accessory structures be located to the rear of the primary dwelling and the carport is located to the front of the primary dwelling. This application was also filed under the current zoning code and is subject to the same criteria as the same variance. The most applicable variance criteria in this situation is whether the variance is likely to result in substantial damage to the essential character of the neighborhood.

Staff recommends disapproval of both variances as submitted. The carport is not consistent with the neighborhood's character and is extremely visible from the right of way. The applicant states that since there is only a one car garage on site there are no alternative locations for a carport with the small lot size. The applicant states that the carport was installed to protect their electric vehicle from the elements. The carport must be removed if the variances are denied.

Chair opened public comment at 7:18 p.m.

Mr. Luchianov offered to address some points regarding his application. First, he stated it is not the only carport in the neighborhood. There is a carport on 362 Lincolnshire Road that was put up in 2017 and has not been removed. Lincolnshire is a main road and the carport is visible. It is also bolted into the ground. Mr. Luchianov stated this sets some precedence for carports in the area. He acknowledged his carport is visible from the right-of-way. Mr. Luchianov described the route that must be navigated to see the carport on Palace Lane, as Palace Lane is not a main artery. He added that the only individuals who regularly view it are his neighbors. He reached out to neighbors and provided statements from them.

He read the following statements from his neighbors:

"The carport appears to be well constructed and isn't a cause of concern for any other reason on my end. If approval is needed from neighbors, then I will give my approval for Seva's carport."

"As far as this carport, I know he installed it because of hail damage we experienced this past spring. He also wanted to keep the direct sunlight off his electric car battery. It does not bother me that he built it and uses it. I hope you allow him to keep the structure for his car."

Another neighbor did not provide a statement in writing but, per Mr. Luchianov, provided a verbal statement of approval.

As for necessity, Mr. Luchianov said the cover is also for the safety of the electric car's battery. The manufacturer states that the car battery temperature should not reach more than 131 degrees Fahrenheit. During a recent heat wave, the car battery temperature read 110 degrees Fahrenheit in the shade under the carport. He read additional text from the manufacturer, which stated that the battery may be drained from excessive cooling needs. Mr. Luchianov apologized for building the carport prior to obtaining necessary approvals, adding that as a new

homeowner he was not aware of the requirements. He also noted that he did intend to move from the home at some point in the future and offered to remove the carport when he leaves.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:24 p.m.

Mr. Shapaka asked how many cars Mr. Luchianov owns. Mr. Luchianov replied he owns two. A second one is in a state of repair in the garage. Mr. Shapaka asked how deep the footings of the carport are and whether there was some type of anchor. Mr. Luchianov stated they are three feet deep, 12 inches in diameter, and is installed with 5.5-inch 3/8 concrete lags. There are metal posts hammered in that concrete has been poured on. Mr. Shapaka asked Mr. Luchianov if he was confident it would pass building department approval, which Mr. Luchianov confirmed. Mr. Shapaka inquired as to whether Mr. Luchianov had a timeframe for when he would move out of the house. Mr. Luchianov replied that he hopes to move out in approximately 1-1.5 years.

Ms. Pollyea asked Mr. Luchianov to share information on the chain of events surrounding his purchase of an electric vehicle and carport installation. Mr. Luchianov stated his vehicle was purchased in the winter. It was parked in the driveway until spring, when there were storms that caused hail damage to the car. Upon further research, he learned shade is necessary for electric vehicles. He opted for a carport rather than a cloth that can cover the vehicle during storms. Ms. Pollyea asked if he knew of the restrictions on electric vehicle storage prior to purchasing it. Mr. Luchianov was not aware of the storage requirements. Ms. Pollyea asked about the drivability of the second vehicle in the garage, and wondered if Mr. Luchianov had considered alternative storage options for the vehicle. Mr. Luchianov said he had considered that, but hoped it to be able to work on it and use the vehicle.

Mr. Hicks noted the size and layout of the lot, and remarked it did not appear there was room for expansion. The front yard setback goes right up to the building. He wondered if street parking was permitted, and Mr. Luchianov confirmed that one side of the street can be used for parking. Mr. Hicks asked Mr. Luchianov of his intent with sharing images of other carports in the neighborhood. Mr. Luchianov intended to share that there are other carports in the area. Mr. Hicks asked if there were any other features on the carport, such as charging ports, to which Mr. Luchianov replied there are not. Mr. Hicks asked Assistant City Attorney Roth if the variance stays with the land if it is granted, Mr. Roth replied that he believes it does.

Mr. Greenberg asked Mr. Roth if restrictions could be applied to the variance so that when the applicant moves, it could come down. The consensus was that time limitations can not be put on a variance in the way that they can be put on other types of applications.

Mr. Mako asked Mr. Luchianov what his investment was on the carport. Mr. Luchianov replied that the carport cost \$2,400, and around \$80-100 in additional hardware and concrete. The time investment was approximately three weeks during his off time.

Ms. Polyea asked what the approximate purchase price of his vehicle was. Mr. Luchianov replied it was approximately \$38,000 used.

**A motion was made by Polyea, seconded by Tamarkin, that the Variance be Approved.**

**Discussion on the motion:**

Mr. Shapaka expressed his concern of setting a dangerous precedent if this application is approved.

Ms. Polyea also shared that she would not be in favor of the application. She stated her appreciation for the applicant sharing the information with the group; however, she felt that the arguments were not compelling. She felt there were other options that could have been considered prior to installing the carport.

Mr. Hicks did not believe the variance criteria had been met.

Mr. Greenberg voiced his concerns about setting a precedent.

Mr. Tamarkin stated that zoning codes exist for a reason, and he felt a precedent would be set for structures in the front yard. He felt it was important to stay consistent in the future, and that approving the variance may set a precedent for requests including decks and hot tubs in the front yard.

Mr. Mako also felt the requirements for a variance were not met. He feels it would be out of character for the area, despite the example of another existing carport.

**The motion failed by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 0

**No:** 6 - Greenberg, Hicks, Mako, Polyea, Shapaka and Tamarkin

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

## Sheetz Tech Center

### CU-0003-2024

To consider a Conditional Use Application for property located at 530 Tech Center Dr.; Parcel ID: 025-013767; Current Zoning SCPD; Sheetz Tech Center; D.W. Routte, applicant.

In accordance with Planning Commission Rules Section 7.4.1.1., if there is more than one application on the same project, they may be discussed as one.

City Planner Maddie Capka provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. Ms. Capka provided a zoning map of the area, showing the location just east of Hamilton Road and just south of Interstate 270. The applications were filed under the previous zoning code that was in effect prior to May 1, 2024, and the zoning district at that time was Select Commercial Plan District (SCPD). This project includes applications for a Final Development Plan, Design Review, Conditional Use, and Variance for a Sheetz gas station and quick service restaurant. Gasoline service stations are a conditional use within SCPD. The site is now zoned General Commercial (GC) under the new zoning code that went into effect May 1, 2024, and gas stations are also a conditional use in that district. The 2.99-acre site is currently undeveloped and located on the north side of Tech Center Drive. The parcel is not yet created but it will be through a separate Final Plat application that is currently under staff review.

The proposal includes a 6,100 ft restaurant and retail building with an attached drive thru. The exterior of the building is brick veneer with a stone base and red and brown roof. The roof of the fuel pumps will match the existing building. There are six total fuel pumps that service 12 vehicles at a time. All parking on the site is located to the front and side of the building, and the fuel pumps are also in the front. Zoning code requires 34 parking spaces for this site and 49 are proposed. Ms. Capka provided a site plan that was submitted by the applicant. Tech Center Drive is visible to the south and there will be a public loop road around the entire exterior of the site. The loop road will be created through the Final Plat application.

Ms. Capka shared information about the landscaping proposed at the site. Due to the size of the parking lot, approximately 3,600 feet of landscaping is required, and 3,800 feet is proposed. There is also a requirement to plant 37 trees, and that requirement is met. Gahanna City Code Chapter 914 requires some additional caliper inches of trees on top of the 37. It requires 84 caliper inches in this case and 85 are

provided since there is a right-of-way on each side of this property. There must be a three-foot-high screen for the parking lot on every side, and this requirement is met as well.

Ms. Capka shared elevations of the exterior of the building. The north elevation is what is considered the front of the building. The fuel pump elevation shows the materials that match the primary structure. All of the materials and designs are consistent with other Sheetz locations.

Ms. Capka provided Conditional Use criteria that must be met in order for the application to be approved. They are: the use is a conditional use in the district; the development is in accord with appropriate plans for the area; the development will not have undesirable effects on the area; and the development will be in keeping with the existing land use character. Staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use as submitted because the Conditional Use criteria has been met. The use is appropriate for the area due to its close proximity to both Hamilton Road and I-270. The area is primarily commercial and medical with one multi-family site which is currently under development. The Land Use Plan designates this area as Mixed Use which recommends a complimentary blend of uses. Staff believes that a gas station and quick service restaurant complement the existing and proposed surrounding uses.

There is one variance required with this application and it is for the requirement that all dumpsters must be located to the rear of the main structure. The lot has frontage on a street along every property line, so each yard is considered a front yard. There is no rear yard to place the dumpster in, so this variance would be required no matter what.

Ms. Capka provided the Design Review criteria. She provided the standard criteria for every Design Review application, and since the site is zoned Commercial it also falls within Design Review District 3. This designation contains some additional recommendations. The applicable recommendations include the following: entrances and exits shall be well-decorated and landscaped; earth mounding and trees are recommended to reduce noise; a generous use of vegetation is encouraged; and the preferred building materials are brick, stone, cement, decorative aluminum, and wood.

Ms. Capka provided the standard Final Development Plan criteria. Staff recommends approval of the Design Review, Final Development Plan, and Variance applications as submitted, as staff believes that all criteria have been met. Additionally, the recommendations for Design Review District 3 have also been met, since the Landscape Plan exceeds or

meets all Landscaping requirements, and the entire site is screened by three-foot-high landscaping. Finally, only one Variance is requested, and this Variance would be necessary regardless of the use or site layout.

Chair opened public comment at 7:45 p.m.

Chris Ingram, 52 E. Gay Street, Columbus. Mr. Ingram introduced himself as an attorney with Vorys Law Firm, representing the applicant. Mr. Ingram provided a brief history of the Sheetz projects to the Commission. This is the third site in the city of Gahanna that the applicant has sought to use for a quick service restaurant and fuel center. The previous application sites were on Morse Road and Granville Street. In both instances the applicant was instructed to find an alternative site. An appeal was filed after the Commission did not approve the Granville site project; however, the applicant withdrew that appeal and focused their efforts on the Tech Center site. They believe it is an ideal site for a Sheetz quick service restaurant and fuel center. The site is located at 530 Tech Center Drive near the Crescent Central Park Development.

Mr. Ingram stated there are four applications that staff recommended and that satisfy all the criteria in the code, with one exception due to the site not having a rear yard. The staff report concluded that the conditional use criteria are easily satisfied for the proposed use of the site. The site's close proximity to Interstate 270 and Hamilton Road, along with the surrounding planned mix of primarily commercial and medical uses, make it an ideal location for a quick service restaurant and fuel center. One Variance is requested, and that is prompted by the fact that all four sides of the property will be surrounded by public roads. There is no real rear yard to place the refuse containers. The refuse containers will be a brick wall with natural landscaping and vegetation to fully buffer the receptacles.

Ingram stated that the Final Development Plan also satisfies the development standards and is entirely consistent with the plans for the area. The plan exceeds the parking requirements. Forty-nine spaces are provided while only 34 are required. Regarding landscaping, 3,600 square feet are required and 3,800 are provided in the application.

Regarding screening requirements, the entire parking lot is screened with three feet of shrubs and other natural features. Ingram added that the development is consistent with the planned mix of uses for this area. Additionally, the LUP calls for a mix of uses and Ingram believed this project complements the mix nicely. He also stated that the staff report correctly concluded that the elements requisite for the Final Development Plan are satisfied.

He stated that the Design Review application was very intentional in planning and designing this project to satisfy the Design Review District 3 requirements. He felt the Planning Commission was familiar with the Sheetz design by this point, adding that the team worked very hard to ensure that the plans satisfy the applicable requirements. City staff and the administration support the project, and he hoped the Commission would as well.

Patricia Kovacs, 527 Haversham Dr. Ms. Kovacs attended to thank Sheetz for choosing this site for their project and felt it was an appropriate location. She asked the Clerk to share on the screen the landscaping plan that was proposed. She drew the Commission's attention to bike lanes that exist on both sides of Tech Center Drive. This location is where bike lanes transition to side paths. Because the site is situated on an incline, she expressed concern about traffic entering and exiting the site, where the side path intersects. She also expressed interest in having the side path moved either west or east to avoid the Sheetz site, but acknowledged this is likely a City consideration rather than a decision that could be made by Sheetz. She also shared there would be another side path on Hamilton Road that will cross I-270 and come to Tech Center Drive and Pizzurro Park. She wished that the side path could be on the south side, where the park property is, for the safety of the cyclists.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:57 p.m.

Mr. Shapaka asked a question to the site engineer. He wondered if the extra curb cut on Tech Center Drive was necessary. Mr. Andrew Gardner, 6628 Burbank Place, Westerville, introduced himself as the Civil Engineer on the project. Mr. Gardner shared that the two curb cuts facing south are part of the public loop road that is planned as part of the overall development plan for the area. They are part of a larger Casto project that Sheetz does not have much influence on. Mr. Gardner also pointed out the three access points to the site. Mr. Shapaka directed a question to Mr. Mike Casale. He wondered why this site is only 6,300 square feet. Mr. Casale stated that the only size larger than this is used for diesel size, which has larger restrooms.

Ms. Pollyea asked Mr. Casale how this particular location was chosen. He stated that parking, availability, zoning, and a landlord willing to work with them were the reasons for choosing this site.

Mr. Greenberg asked Mr. Casale whether a garbage truck can access the dumpster without difficulty. Mr. Casale confirmed, noting truck routing

is carefully planned. Mr. Greenberg confirmed that there are three exits: one each to the north, west, and east. Mr. Casale added that the expectation is for customers to use all three. However, two are larger and will need to be accessed by Sheetz trucks for fuel and store deliveries. Greenberg wondered if, like the multiple standard building sizes previously mentioned, there are also multiple numbers of pumps. Mr. Casale said that six pumps are standard and in some cases they are double the depth. There are also sites with seven or eight.

Mr. Tamarkin asked Mr. Casale if a seven or eight pump setup could be accommodated at this site if there was a need for it. Mr. Casale replied that while it might be able to be done, it probably would not be done. Mr. Tamarkin asked if there would be a gate in front of the dumpster, or if it would be open. Mr. Casale stated that, like any of their other stores, the dumpster would be surrounded by masonry with faux wood doors. Mr. Tamarkin noted there is one variance filed for the dumpster and wondered if there would be a signage variance in the future. Mr. Casale felt he doubted there would be one. Mr. Tamarkin noted that with fast food restaurants there are typically more signs than permitted in code. He also wondered if there would be a monument sign and where, if so. The monument sign was noted on the site plan near the main drive and Tech Center Drive, on the bottom right corner on the site plan shown. Mr. Tamarkin and Mr. Casale noted that the streets are the responsibility of the developer, not Sheetz.

Chair Mako wondered if the existing bike path would be impacted by this development. Mr. Casale noted the bike plan is being built as part of the Tech Center improvements and other developments. Chair Mako noted that part of the development plan, there is a plan to install bike racks. Mr. Casale confirmed. Chair Mako wondered if the brick color would be similar to that of the other developments in the area. Mr. Casale expressed his uncertainty of what other developments would look like. However, the materials used on this site are standard for all Sheetz locations. Chair Mako asked if, in Mr. Casale's opinion, the size would be similar to the Sheetz on Steltzer Road near the Columbus airport. Mr. Casale said it would be nearly identical. Chair Mako asked if there was a floodplain on this area. Mr. Gardner shared that there had been some floodplain, but this is being remediated.

Mr. Hicks returned his comments to access points. He wondered if there would be any restrictions on which direction customers could access the facility. Mr. Gardner noted that one access point on the east is right in, right out, and left in.

Mr. Greenberg asked if there would be sandwich board signs or

electronic signs at the drive thru. Emily Wheeler, Skilken Gold, 4270 Morse Road, said that the company has not yet completed its full sign package yet. She noted their awareness of the new zoning code and expressed an understanding that any additional variances would need to come back to Planning Commission. Mr. Casale shared that the menu board is a static board and the drive thru order board is a touch screen.

Ms. Pollyea asked Mr. Ingram if there is a signed LOI (Letter of Intent) and whether the project is contingent upon Planning Commission's approval. Mr. Ingram was not aware of whether there was an LOI with the landlord. Mr. Casale said there is an agreement to lease with the landlord, pending all necessary approvals, including Planning Commission's and Engineering Department's. When asked if he was permitted to share any of the terms, Mr. Casale replied that he did not have the terms available.

**A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Greenberg, that the Conditional Use be Approved.**

**Discussion on the motion:**

Mr. Shapaka stated his support of the Conditional Use. He felt it was appropriate for this location.

Ms. Pollyea agreed with Mr. Shapaka's comments. She also felt the community approved of this location more than others that had come before Planning Commission.

Mr. Hicks commented on all four applications at once. He welcomed Mr. Ingram and Mr. Putnam back to chambers for this discussion, noting that previous discussions had been more difficult. This one was different. He thanked them for giving Gahanna a chance and finding a mutually beneficial location for Sheetz. He felt the withdrawal of the appeal for the previous application was a show of good faith, and stated this location is much more ideal. The variance is minor. The development plan and design review look very similar to other Sheetz locations. Overall, he expressed his support.

Mr. Greenberg also stated his support for the application, and appreciated the applicants' work in finding a suitable location.

Mr. Tamarkin agreed. He felt that the relationship with Sheetz was more contentious with the first two applications. However, with this site, he intended to support all four applications. He expressed his appreciation for Vorys Law Firm, Sheetz, Skilken Gold, and Mr. Canini. He felt that the community and city support these applications.

Chair Mako echoed previous sentiments. He stated this is a good site for Sheetz and thanked the applicants for their work through the process.

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 6 - Greenberg, Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Shapaka and Tamarkin

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

V-0018-2024

To consider a Variance Application to vary Section 1167.18(c)(1) Screening Requirements; for property located at 530 Tech Center Dr., Parcel ID: 025-013767; Current Zoning SCPD; Sheetz Tech Center; D.W. Routte, applicant.

**A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Shapaka, that the Variance be Approved.**

**Mr. Shapaka noted that, regarding the Variance request, the dumpster enclosure on this site will be aesthetically pleasing and complimentary to the building.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 6 - Greenberg, Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Shapaka and Tamarkin

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

FDP-0006-2024

To consider a Final Development Plan Application for property located at 530 Tech Center Drive; Parcel ID: 025-013767; Current Zoning SCPD; Sheetz Tech Center; D.W. Routte, applicant.

**A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Greenberg, that the Final Development Plan be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 6 - Greenberg, Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Shapaka and Tamarkin

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

DR-0010-2024

To consider a Design Review Application for site plan, landscaping, and building design for proposed 2.90 acres at 530 Tech Center Dr.; Parcel ID: 025-013767; Current Zoning SCPD; Sheetz Tech Center; D.W. Routte, applicant.

**A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Greenberg, that the Design Review be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 6 - Greenberg, Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Shapaka and Tamarkin

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE**

**G. NEW BUSINESS - NONE**

**H. OFFICIAL REPORTS**

**Director of Planning**

City Planner Maddie Capka shared that zoning code changes were being drafted, which would be in front of Planning Commission in the next couple of months.

**I. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS - NONE****J. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT - NONE****K. ADJOURNMENT**

*There being no further business before Planning Commission, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:18 p.m.*

---

Jessica Hilts  
Clerk

*APPROVED by the Planning Commission, this  
day of 2024.*

---

James Mako