



# City of Gahanna

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning Commission

Office of the Clerk of Council  
200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

*Jennifer Tisone Price, Chair*

*David B. Thom, Vice Chair*

*David K. Andrews*

*Joe Keehner*

*Kristin Rosan*

*Donald R. Shepherd*

*Thomas J. Wester*

*Donna L. Jernigan, Sr. Deputy Clerk of Council*

---

Wednesday, July 11, 2012

7:00 PM

City Hall

---

**Commission may caucus prior to Regular Meeting**

**IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO HAVE A COURT REPORTER PRESENT, AT THE APPLICANT'S EXPENSE, IF THEY WISH TO HAVE A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING. COUNCIL OFFICE SHOULD BE ADVISED IN ADVANCE IF A COURT REPORTER IS GOING TO BE PRESENT.**

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

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 200 S. Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio on Wednesday, July 11, 2012. Chair Jennifer Price called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Commission member David Andrews. The agenda for this meeting was published on July 6, 2012.

**Present** 5 - Jennifer Tisone Price, David K. Andrews, David B. Thom, Donald R. Shepherd, and Joe Keehner

**Present** 5 - Jennifer Tisone Price, David K. Andrews, David B. Thom, Donald R. Shepherd, and Joe Keehner

**B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA.**

There were none.

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 27, 2012**

**A motion was made by Shepherd, seconded by Rosan. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 7 - Price, Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd, Wester and Keehner

**Yes:** 7 - Price, Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd, Wester and Keehner

**D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA.**

There were none.

## E. APPLICATIONS:

Chair stated Public Hearing Rules that would govern all public hearings this evening. Assistant City Attorney Tom Weber administered an oath to those persons wishing to present testimony this evening.

### [V-0012-2012](#)

Steve Rechniteer; 1640 Harmon Avenue, Columbus; reviewed presentation with the Commission. (COPIES AVAILABLE IN COUNCIL OFFICE)

Chair asked for any opponents. There were none.

Andrews asked if the sign would match the stucco on the buildings. Rechniteer stated it would be the same color as the existing buildings; should be compatible with associated buildings. Andrews clarified that there would be landscaping according to Code. Chair stated she appreciated the presentation of surrounding signs; a lot of the signs that were referenced were older; signs that have gone up in the last 5 to 8 years have been much shorter; have concerns with overall height. Rechniteer stated even though they are old, they still meet code; don't know about change in copy height and graphic area. Shepherd clarified that the caps on the signs would match the building and the sign background would be white. Shepherd asked what the base would be made from and whether it was easy to maintain. Rechniteer stated it would be aluminum. Shepherd thanked the applicant for working with the Commission on the height; will be an upgrade to that area; believe that nicer signs bring better tenants. Price asked about the colors on the sign matching the building. Rechniteer stated we have full paint matching capabilities. Shepherd asked about the font size on the signs; seems to be out of proportion. Rechniteer stated he didn't have exact size of the letters; as a designer I feel it is an appropriate amount of white space; stated that tenant panels will come and go over time. Price stated that could be something that is worked out between the owner and Development Dept; possibly reduce the font size by 10%; doesn't have to be part of the application; please work with the Development Dept. on plants that are hardy and will thrive in that area.

Keehner stated he appreciated the applicant's valiant attempt to find a compromise; the height is better; will be voting yes. Price stated she will supporting the application; had some strong concerns with it; think the new proposal is an improvement while still addressing the concerns of the owners and tenants; all three parcels will have a unified look.

**A motion was made by Shepherd, seconded by Rosan, that this matter be Approved subject to the drawings dated 7/2/12 submitted this evening. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 7 - Price, Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd, Wester and Keehner

**Yes:** 7 - Price, Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd, Wester and Keehner

### [CU-0013-2012](#)

Chair stated this application was postponed to July 25, 2012 per the applicant's request.

### [CU-0014-2012](#)

Gard reviewed the application with the Commission.

Jon Kenimer 326 James Road; Gahanna; thanked the commission; we have been servicing grades 6 through 12 in this facility since 2006; anyone is welcome to come and visit us; we started thinking about expanding earlier in the school year; wanted to add younger grades to our program; trying to find a facility to purchase; considered the option of using our existing building as it stands; would only allow 10 more kids; our principal had concern that it could negatively impact education of our kids; hope to find a building soon; need a temporary space; we don't want it to take as long as two years; want to cover ourselves in case we decide to build.

Chair asked for any opponents.

Shepherd asked does this change parking requirements. Kenimer stated this will be located behind the building and will not take up existing parking. Gard stated there is ample parking; low student numbers. Wester stated he was a little leery about it being temporary; seems some of these grow into permanent structures; concerned with the two year time frame; can that be limited. Kenimer stated he understood the concern; and it is not ideal for us to have them at all; wanted to give us a band aid; concerned about building occupancy load; made offers on two properties; we are actively looking for property; school is starting next month; thought the two years would give us time if we decided to build. Thom stated we have had quite a few of these over the years that are school related; had to do with need for temporary space; typical that we grant it for 2 years; not unheard of. Rosan clarified that these would be one story modulars; asked about Fire Department comments. Kenimer stated the modular would be close to the public road; would be able to get to it from there. Gard stated that they will work closely with the Fire Department and Building. Rosan stated she thought the building was going to be on the asphalt pad; concerned that it will be a little more behind the building. Kenimer stated you have my commitment; we will be happy to work with everyone. Thom asked what the size of the modular would be. Kenimer stated it would be 38 feet long by 24 feet wide. Keehner stated that the letter from the Fire Dept. suggests fire resistant walls and that 24 inches may be too wide. Kenimer stated there is nothing magic about those numbers; we can work with the fire department and will work with the Building Department. Thom clarified that if we approve this for two years and you have to come back we may not approve it again. Andrews asked the neighbors how they felt about the modulars. John and Myrna Parsley 211 Rivers Edge Way; stated they were the landlords of the neighboring property; they have been very good neighbors; we don't want to stop them from what they are trying to do. Price clarified that these would be used for the start of school in August; asked how many students are enrolled. Kenimer stated altogether we have 20 to 30 students; 10 are enrolled for grade 3 to 5. Price clarified if these trailers are not approved the students will have to be accommodated in the existing structure. Price asked what is the school's long term goal; is there any other property in Gahanna you can utilize. Kenimer stated we want to stay in the area; looked in Pataskala and Westerville; prefer to find an existing building we can use; committed to having what we need for our students; open to suggestions. Price stated she was uncomfortable with the situation; too many gray areas; concerned that you may come back in two years and not have something; usually we have construction plans for a new building when modular classrooms are being used; shows it is serving a true temporary need. Kenimer stated we have made the commitment to add these additional students; we would like more space; are going to move; we have already made two offers on other buildings and may go back to the one; we don't want to be in these for two years; seemed to be the least obtrusive place to put them. Price asked do you own any other property that could equip a larger school. Kenimer stated we do have property on Ridenour; looking to sell that; lot of our members moved to the east side of Gahanna; it is our intention to sell that property.

Keehner stated he would be supporting the application; appreciate the applicant working with the neighbors. Rosan stated she would be supporting the application; commendable on being a good neighbor; hope you stay in Gahanna. Thom stated he would support this ; this is typical of what we have approved in the past. Andrews stated he would not be supporting the application; too many gray areas; when we have approved them there were already plans for down the road; also surprised you are waiting until now; poor planning at the end of a school year. Wester stated he would not be supporting this either; agreed with his colleagues; gray areas; want the long terms plans; too indeterminate; people have to make some decisions. Shepherd stated he would not support; usually make an exception when a business has set plans; surprised that a school wouldn't plan for the future.

**A motion was made by Thom, seconded by Rosan, that this matter be Approved for a period of two years. The motion failed by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 3 - Rosan, Thom and Keehner

**No:** 4 - Price, Andrews, Shepherd and Wester

**Yes:** 3 - Rosan, Thom and Keehner

**No:** 4 - Price, Andrews, Shepherd and Wester

#### **F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

##### [DR-0019-2012](#)

Gard reviewed the application with the Commission.

Jove Domatovski, 953 E. Johnstown; stated at the time when we were last here, Bob Westwood told us to use cheaper materials; located in the back near dumpsters; spent more money inside; made patio cheaper with same measurements; our landlord approved it; we thought this was approved; wasn't in minutes; everything else is the same with the exception of using teak wood. Andrews asked how the Development Dept. felt about the change. Gard stated it was not a concern to zoning other than we need the built environment to match what was approved; need to have accurate information on it. Keehner stated this doesn't have a huge visual impact. Price asked about visibility; is that a public safety concern. Mike Matalka, 2175 Ridenour Court stated even with the teak wood you would not be able to see in the patio the way it was designed.

**A motion was made by Rosan, seconded by Thom, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 7 - Price, Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd, Wester and Keehner

**Yes:** 7 - Price, Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd, Wester and Keehner

#### **G. NEW BUSINESS:**

#### **H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

##### **Hamilton Road Corridor Committee -Andrews**

No report.

**I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:**

**City Attorney.**

No report.

**City Engineer.**

No report.

**Department of Development.**

No report.

**Chair.**

No report.

**J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS.**

There were none.

**K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.**

No comments.

**L. ADJOURNMENT.**

Adjourned at 8:29 p.m.; Motion by Andrews.

**M. POSTPONED APPLICATIONS:**