

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, June 26, 2002

7:00 PM

City Hall

Planning Commission

*Richard A. Peck, Chair
Jane Turley, Vice Chair
Cynthia G. Canter
Candace Greenblott
P. Frank O'Hare
Donald R. Shepherd
Othelda A. Spencer
Tanya M. Word, Deputy Clerk of Council*

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 South Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio on Wednesday, June 26, 2002. The agenda for this meeting was published on June . Chair Richard A. Peck called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission member, Candace Greenbolt.

Members Absent: Jane Turley

Members Present: Richard Peck, P. Frank O'Hare and Candace Greenblott

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 22, 2002

A motion was made, seconded by Greenblott, to approve the minutes of May 22, 2002. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 12, 2002

A motion was made to approve the minutes of June 12, 2002. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley

D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA - None

E. APPLICATIONS:

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

V-0017-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1143.08 - Yard Requirements; for property located at 690 Affirmed Court; to allow a fence in a no-build zone; by Charles & Sherry Breitenbach, applicants. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/6/02). (Public Hearing held on 6/12/02 and 6/26/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:05 P.M.

Charles Breitenbach, 690 Affirmed Court, stated that he would like to reiterate to the Planning Commission that making any modifications to the fence and property would result in a hardship to my wife and I; the fence was erected 11 years ago; would like for this Planning Commission to approve this variance.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:06 P.M.

Greenblott stated that as a Planning Commission member, I am charged with upholding

the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; have looked at this particular application with careful consideration; am first and foremost dedicated to upholding the integrity of the no-build zone; however, in this case I am going to support this application for the following reasons: (1) the applicant purchased this property with a deed which read "no encroachments"; found this to be the special circumstance applying to the this land per Section 1131.03(a) of the City of Gahanna Codified Ordinances; (2) the applicant has been in good faith and has put much time and money into the landscaping of this property; therefore I find the granting of this variance necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; (3) further there is a strong sentiment by their neighbors' for keeping the fence and preserving the mature landscaping; for this reason I find that granting this variance will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injuries to property or improvements in such neighborhood.

Peck stated that he concurs with Greenblott; will be supporting this application; has been out to the property and looked at the property from every possible angle in terms of what is visible from the street; granting this variance will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injuries to property or improvements in such neighborhood.

A motion was made by Greenblott that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

No	1	O'Hare
Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley
Yes	2	Chairman Peck and Greenblott

V-0019-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1143.08(d) - Yard Requirements; for property located at 703 Turcotte Court; to allow for a six foot privacy fence in a no-build zone; by Debra & Jeffrey Hollenbach, applicants. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/6/02). (Public Hearing held on 6/12/02 and 6/26/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:10 P.M.

Debra Hollenbach, 703 Turcotte Court; stated she is here to ask for erection of a privacy fence in our backyard; our neighbors have a pit bill that is chained up in their backyard 24/7; while we have seldom seen the dog unchained, it is creating stress and reluctance for our family to use our own backyard; we have a 10 year old son and several of his friends are not permitted to come over and play in our yard due to parental fear of this animal; the fence that we are requesting is a 6 ft. tall privacy fence along 48-50 linear feet of our backyard; the fence will begin at the edge of the wooded area and extend to the end of their backyard; this fence will allow children to play in our backyard without the pit bull seeing them and potentially become agitated at their activities of throwing balls and playing; in the event the dog leaves, passes, or whatever, we will take the fence down.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:12 P.M.

Greenblott asked is the dog being cared for in this hot weather. Hollenbach stated the dog is fed and given water; we have a dog, and we don't let our dog out in this type of weather; there is a dog house against their house; there is no shade for the dog Canter

asked is the dog restrained to a chain or leash. Hollenbach replied the dog is on some type of a chain, has not gotten close enough to see if it's a chain, rope, or leash; but does get on his hind legs and stand up. Canter confirmed that there is significant landscape in your yard that does obstruct some of the view, and that the fence is only for this partial enclosure. Hollenbach replied that is correct; actually we will have to move some of that landscaping to erect the fence. Canter asked can you erect the fence on your side of the landscaping so that you won't lose the natural buffer. Hollenbach replied that we might be able to do that; really not sure. Canter asked how long is the fence portion that you are going to put up. Hollenbach replied 50 linear feet.

O'Hare commented that the Commission received a memorandum dated June 16, 2002 from Charlie Henderson, Animal Warden for the City of Gahanna Police Department that discusses the pit bull dog is loose in the backyard; personally find it quite disturbing what our Animal Warden is saying about this animal; based on the memorandum, I will support this variance application.

Shepherd commented that he will support this application; under oath the owner stated that he would remove the dog immediately; the Animal Warden went out and the owners said the animal would not be removed; in complete support of the variance application.

Peck stated that according to our Animal Warden, this animal is not compliant with State law, State law requires pit bulls to have licenses which show proof of financial responsibility for the owner because these are dangerous animals; find this to be a special circumstance; the granting of the variance will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injuries to property or improvements in such neighborhood; believe that the granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; moving the fence inside the no-build zone would deprive the owners of any use in the backyard given the fact that the lot is a lot wider than it is deep.

Hollenbach commented that at the last Public Hearing the owner of the dog indicated that he would remove the dog and he didn't; I have agreed that in the event that the dog is removed; my husband and I would gladly take down the fence; asked is there any kind of time frame; just concerned that the neighbors remove the dog, we take down the fence, and the neighbors bring the dog back. Peck replied that it is an enforcement issue; you will want to speak with the Zoning Administrator.

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

- Yes** **3** Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
- Absent** **1** Vice Chairman Turley

V-0020-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1143.08(d) - Yard Requirements; for property located at 1054 Cannonade Court; to allow a fence in a no-build zone; by Dr. Joel & Rev. Amy Wood, applicants. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/20/02). (Public Hearing held on 6/26/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:18 P.M.

Joel Wood, 1054 Cannonade Court, stated that he and his wife purchased this house this past January; we are the second homeowners since the fence was built in 1990; we have been unsuccessful in contacting the homeowner who built the fence so that we can receive a copy of the permit; we do have a record that the permit was obtained, which was provided by the City of Gahanna; we are asking that Planning Commission grant us

the variance to keep the existing fence because of our son Joshua who is 3 years old and has autism, a disorder characterized by difficulties with communication and understanding of danger; he requires the physical boundary this fence provides in order to play within a safe space; understand that this is a variance; should my wife & I move from this residence, we will take down the fence upon moving to comply with the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:20 P.M.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

O'Hare asked do you understand that your fence is in an easement area. Wood replied yes I do understand that. O'Hare asked the Engineering Department if they had a problem with this. Komlanc stated that with respect to any utilities that are back there, it would be more along the lines of Warner Communications or perhaps if AEP had any facilities back there; they do not pose any immediate danger to that easement; the Engineering Department does request that within the gated area, those utilities do have a right to get back there should they need to do any routine maintenance; the homeowner would be responsible for any repair to the fence should any damage be done to the fence by utility personnel; this is typically what we do on a fence permit that's requested within an easement. O'Hare commented that he is concerned about this for two reasons: (1) if the utility company had a problem, they would need access to get back there to repair whatever the problem was; (2) a lot of times when problems arise with utilities and as you can very well imagine when temperatures are 22 degrees below zero or pouring down rain, it is not the nicest of sunny days; from my experience with working with utility companies, something to this effect, they take their front-end loader, knock down the fence, and go in and do the repair; then the owner calls the utility company to file a complaint about damage to their fence; the utility company will tell you that you built your fence in an easement area; would you be willing to assume all damages that might be or could be incurred with utility repair(s). Wood replied yes I am willing to assume all damages.

Peck commented that we have an opinion from the City Attorney, Tom Weber; he indicates that even if the fence was granted in error, the City should honor the permit because the person did come in and did get a permit and it was granted even if it was wrong; yes it was the City's error not the homeowners; also find a special circumstance applying to the use referred to in this application; Dr. Wood has testified about the special needs of his son; it is very clear from his testimony that this property would not have been purchased under those circumstances with autism had the backyard not been fully enclosed; will support this variance application because the granting of this variance application will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of person residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injuries to property or improvements in such neighborhood; the granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights.

A motion was made by O'Hare with the stipulation that access to all utilities will be maintained and the applicant will hold harmless the City and those utilities for any damages to his fence during any type of utility repair. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Yes** **3** Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
- Absent** **1** Vice Chairman Turley

CU-0003-2002

To consider a Conditional Use application for a double lane drive-thru pharmacy; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:26 P.M.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, stated we have fairly quickly submitted a revised plan due to the fact that the previous plan was not an approvable plan; essentially the new revised plan takes Walgreens from the center of the site and flips Walgreens with Bob Evans and Tumbleweed; Bob Evans is now moved to the corner; not sure candidly whether this is going to be approvable from the standpoint of our tenants; however, in an effort to try and move this process forward, brought the new revised plan to the Commission; know that we have some time between now and the next workshop; should know more between now and then acceptability from the tenants; the new plans will require some minor tweaking of the package that is before you today; we are off a space or two with reference to a couple of the parking lots that would be applicable for each of the various uses; we also may have some lot coverage issues that are off by a couple of percents over the 75% which is necessitated.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:29 P.M.

Peck stated that the Commission discussed this application packet briefly in Committee of the Whole; we are trying to find a way to streamline the files; we have talked about so many different things; we need to just focus on one set of drawings or a cleaner set of plans. Dugger remarked that would not be a problem to get the Commission a clean set of revised plans; the only substantive change that I see is the Walgreens building will be flip flopped in terms of where its entrance would be; my understanding is that the architecture for Tumbleweed, Bob Evans, and the Retail would be the same as it was in prior submittals.

Chair stated that this application packet will be heard in workshop in July 17th at 6:45 P.M.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

FDP-0004-2002

To consider a Final Development Plan for Gahanna Properties, L.L.C. to be located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., by Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 3/21/02). (Public Hearing held on 3/27/02, 6/12/02, 6/26/02).

See discussion on previous application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

V-0007-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Sections 1165.10(a) - On-Premises Wall Signs (Number Permitted; Purpose); to increase the number of wall signs on the primary and secondary frontage from one to five; to add a directional sign on the east elevation; 1165.10(b) - On-Premises Wall Signs (Permitted Display Surface); 1153.04(c)(7) - CC-2 Community Commercial Modified District; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Walgreen's by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 03/21/02). (Public Hearing held on 3/27/02, 6/12/02, 6/26/02).

See discussion on previous application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

- DR-0019-2002** To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Walgreen's by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.
See discussion on previous application.
Discussed
- V-0008-2002** To consider a variance application to vary Sections 1165.10 - On-Premises Wall Signs; to increase the total number of wall signs for more than one sign; 1163.02(a) - Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Required (Schedule of Parking Spaces); to allow less than the minimum number of parking spaces required; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Bob Evans Farms, Inc. by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 3/21/02). (Public Hearing held on 3/27/02, 6/12/02, 6/26/02, and 7/24/02).
See discussion on previous application.
Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing
- DR-0020-2002** To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Site Development; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Bob Evans by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.
See discussion on previous application.
Discussed
- V-0015-2002** To consider a variance application to vary Sections 1165.10(a) - On-Premises Wall Signs; (Variance to increase wall signs on primary (Hamilton) and secondary (Giant Eagle Drive) frontage to two; Primary wall is Hamilton; secondary is Morse; 1163.02(a) - Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Required; for property located at Morse & Hamilton Roads (Lot D); to allow two wall signs; to allow less than the minimum number of parking spaces; Tumbleweed Southwest Grill by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., by Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 5/16/02). (Public Hearing held on 5/22/02, 6/12/02, 6/26/02, and 7/24/02).
See discussion on previous application.
Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing
- DR-0032-2002** To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads (Lot D); Tumbleweed Southwest Grill by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.
See discussion on previous application.
Discussed
- DR-0018-2002** To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for a strip center; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.
See discussion on previous application.
Discussed
- SWP-0002-2002** To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 8.963 of acres; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.
See discussion on previous application.
Discussed
- Z-0009-2002** To consider a zoning application on 21.353 acres of newly annexed property located East of Hamilton Road and South of Morse Road; contiguous to The Woods at

Shagbark; requested zoning of L-AR; The Stonehenge Company, Mo Dioun by Smith & Hale, Glen A. Dugger, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:32 P.M.

Glen Dugger, 37 W. Broad Street, stated that this property is located on what is known as Shagbark Road; Shagbark Road is basically a two lane drive onto Hamilton Road; Morse Road is further to the north; I originally zoned 17 acres for the Stonehenge Company which encompassed an area that has been dedicated to the City of Gahanna plus two acres which is now a portion of Giant Eagle; at the time that happened, everybody made clear to the property owner of Stonehenge that they would have to come back in and rezone the entire property because the property as originally zoned was tied to a site plan; so the application is for the original acreage, except for the two acres that were transferred to Giant Eagle plus the two acres previously conveyed to the City of Gahanna; in addition we have added in the two properties that were owned by Mr. Senett and Mrs. Lepper; basically we would like to incorporate the portion that has been annexed to the City into the Shagbark Condominiums; have submitted plans which are consistent with what was previously approved for that portion of the site, which has already been developed; this would enable the continuation of the condominium project up on the east side of the pocket city park and the ravine preservation area for Shagbark by the Stonehenge Company; the significant concerns about architecture, access, tree preservation have been incorporated and extended as a part of this development; this development has been very well accepted in the market place; Stonehenge has a project that will be a real asset to the City of Gahanna; in addition, we have received the staff comments from the City concerning some access issues, which we will work with staff to resolve; primarily concerning access for residents to the west as well as access to the rear (Giant Eagle Blvd); access to Hamilton Road has a termination provision in it that the access will be changed and be adjusted at such time when there are more than 25 units constructed within this project; we are fast approaching that time.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Closed Public Hearing at 7:39 P.M.

Chair advised that this application will heard in workshop on July 17th at 6:15 P.M.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

CU-0005-2002

To consider a Conditional Use application to allow a drive thru window; for property located at 1050 Beecher Crossing N; by Canini & Pellecchia, Inc., Larry Canini, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:30 P.M.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street; stated he did the original zoning on this property; this is a revision in order to accommodate some access issues; asked if the Commission had any questions.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:45 P.M.

A motion was made that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley

FDP-0009-2002

To consider a Final Development Plan for Crossing Center; to allow for retail usage; for property located at 1050 Beecher Crossing N.; by Canini & Pellecchia, Inc., Larry Canini, applicant. (Public Hearing Advertised in RFE on 6/6/02). (Public Hearing held on 6/12/02, 6/26/02).

Peck thanked the applicant for the extensive work that he has done with the Engineering Department to coordinate the proper access for this site.

A motion was made that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley
Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0038-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 1050 Beecher Crossing N; by Canini & Pellecchia, Larry Canini, applicant.

Spencer thanked the applicant for taking into consideration the design comments from the Commission and including them in the design.

A motion was made that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

DR-0033-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 471 Morrison Road, Suite K; Revealty by Larry Schottenstein; Sign-A-Rama, Steve Thomson, applicant.

D'Ambrosio stated that the applicant appeared before the Planning Commission in workshop this evening before the meeting; was able to answer questions from the Commission; request that you approve this application this evening; the Department of Development is also looking into citing the sign company that erected the sign without approval.

Canter commented that she requested that this sign be brought before the Planning Commission because the Commission had not approved it; it's not the best sign that we've ever done; nor is it the worst; the Commission has got to find a way to stop these signs from going up without being approved; we probably could have gotten a better sign if the applicant would have come to us before hand; will support this application.

A motion was made that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley

DR-0034-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 133 N. Hamilton Road; Wedding Gown Specialist by Advanced Screen Printing, Ken & Cindi Schillig, applicants.

D'Ambrosio stated that this applicant appeared before you last week in workshop with changes; requesting that you approve this application tonight.

Greenblott commented that we are approving choice 3 of 3.

Peck thanked the applicant for working with the Commission; this applicant was another business that was caught in bind by a sign company that went ahead and put a sign up without going through proper channels.

A motion was made by Greenblott that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley
Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott

G. NEW BUSINESS:

DR-0039-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 471A Morrison Road; Jordan's Pub by Hanover Signs, Rob Pearson, applicant.

Rob Pearson, 1771 Progress Ave, stated that Jordan's Pub is looking to replace the existing sign with a new sign face; the word PUB is in vinyl letters; basically we are switching places with the signs; the second thing is the Jordan's Pub sign is an existing sign with cut out letters; just adding PUB which will be in vinyl letters; during the day it will be very clear; at night Jordan's will show up and PUB will not.

A motion was made, seconded by O'Hare, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley
Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0040-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 184 West Johnstown Road; by The Hanawalt Co., Inc., Ed Hanawalt, applicant.

Ed Hanawalt, 184 W. Johnstown Road; here tonight to request the Commission to approve my application; would like to make a change in the roof color; received the sample of the burgundy and didn't like it; the new color will be a bronze/brown color; the door is actually going to stay; the main door will stay exactly where it is shown on the plan.

Canter stated that she appreciated the applicant doing this. Hanawalt asked will he have to come back for the signage on the roof. Peck said yes.

A motion was made by O'Hare, seconded by Greenblott, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
Absent	1	Vice Chairman Turley

DR-0041-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 240 S. Hamilton Road; Speedway Gas Station by Myers & Watters, Henry Lancaster, applicant.

D'Ambrosio stated that we are requesting that this application be approved; staff believes this is an enhancement to the site.

A motion was made that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
------------	----------	--------------------------------------

Absent **1** Vice Chairman Turley

DR-0042-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 943 Johnstown Road; Vision Care by Daryl Designs, Daryl Cheney, applicant.

Darryl Cheney, stated that Vision Care is currently at the shopping center at 941 Johnstown Road; they are moving next door; the sign has been approved by the landlord and meets the sign criteria; however, this particular portion of the shopping center was not in the design review package; sign will be white face with bronze return; it is individual illuminated letters with neon inside. Canter asked is there a way you can match the size of the Sandel sign or the State Farm sign. Cheney replied they currently have an 18 inch sign in optical; so what we did was just give them the same size that they had; Sandel is 18 inches or over; the sign criteria states the minimum graphic height for signage is 18 inches, and the maximum is 20 inches. Spencer asked on the submittal there is a background color around it. Cheney stated is just to show the white lettering on paper.

A motion was made that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Absent **1** Vice Chairman Turley

Yes **3** Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0043-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 358C Hamilton Road; Ania by Moore Signs, Steve Moore, applicant.

Steve Moore, Moore Signs, 6060 Westerville Road, Westerville, OH, stated he is here representing Ania & Friends; they are in the process of moving into the Hunter's Ridge Shopping Center; our proposal is to use the existing sign band and add letters to the existing sign band; illuminated sign face; backlit, plexiglass.

Greenblott remarked that it is either Hair & Nail or Hairs & Nails, but it is not Hair & Nails. Moore replied he did not know. Canter commented that Hair is collective. Greenblott stated that nails does not sound correct. Canter asked are you calling it an adjective. Greenblott said yes; hesitate to allow a sign to go up that is grammatically irritating. Moore asked is the sign grammatically irritating or is it grammatically incorrect. Greenblott replied both; it is Hair & Nail Boothique. Moore commented that he is not the one who can decide what the business is called; the client is the one who named the business. Greenblott asked can you take this back to your client and let them know that the Commission would like the verbiage Hair & Nail Boothique. Spencer stated that he concerned about the balance of the sign; think that it is a little busy; looks almost like it is two signs. Moore commented that the design of Ania and Friends is their basic logo that they have; hair and nails is the secondary message describing what they are; there are only two different fonts. Greenblott asked would your client consider giving us a different layout; seems to me if friends could match Ania utilizing the same font. Spencer commented that it would tie it together a lot better. Moore remarked that if those two fonts were the same, it would really look bad; the word "friends" is a nice clean block letter font that reads quickly and easily. Greenblott remarked that she disagrees; didn't think it read easy and quick; the spacing is too far; think this is a sign that takes a little bit of work to read. Moore replied that could be the point, it makes you work to read it. Greenblott stated that if I have to work this hard to read a sign, I'm not going in. Moore commented I don't think you would go in if it said "nails" either". Greenblott said that is probably true. Moore commented that he did not design the logo. Canter asked where else is this logo been utilized. Moore replied on their website, business cards, and letterhead. Canter asked so they have no other business that has this signage on it that you are aware of. Greenblott asked do you think you can take the Commission's concerns back to the owner; because if we were to vote on this tonight,

don't think it would be a favorable outcome. Moore replied yes he will take the concerns of Planning Commission back to the owner. Greenblott asked can you come to workshop with a new set of plans. Peck stated that the next workshop is July 17th; asked can you come at 6:45 P.M. on the July 10th right before the Public Hearing. Moore replied yes. Peck stated the main concerns are: the balance of Ania and Friends and the word nail.

Chair advised that this application will be discussed on July 10th at 6:45 P.M. before the regular Public Hearing.

Discussed

SWP-0007-2002

To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 5.503 of acres; for property located at 955 N. Hamilton Road; by Gahanna Places, Ltd.; Gary Cheses, applicant.

Gary Cheses, 136 Granville Street, Managing Partner of Gahanna Place, Ltd., stated he is requesting a lot split for property we are developing at 955 N. Hamilton Road. Canter asked are all the cross over access easements in place. Cheses replied yes. Peck asked are the lots the same size as at the Colonial Office building. Cheses remarked yes; north and south they are each a little over two acres; it splits out the front building from the back building which was parcel one, which the Commission approved several weeks ago. Canter asked what is the occupancy as of now. Cheses replied the front building is fully leased; the back building we just sold this past Tuesday; we just need to be concerned about the two acres on each side.

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

- Yes** **3** Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
- Absent** **1** Vice Chairman Turley

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Committee of the Whole - No Report

Gahanna Jefferson Joint Committee - Canter - No Report

Creekside Development Team - Greenblott.

Greenblott stated that the Team met today; tentatively for Phase II plans should be done by August allowing for September for bids to go and get them to Council; hoping to start the project in October; next meeting will be July 17th at which time we will be picking surfaces out for Phase II; on the Mill House update, they might be starting demolition as early as July 9th; talked a little bit about Phase III and what we may see; overall had a good meeting; our meetings are going up to two a month.

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

City Attorney.

King stated that he will not be here on July 10th.

City Engineer - No Report

Department of Development - No Report

Chair.

Peck announced there will be no workshop on next Wednesday, July 3rd; have a safe 4th of July.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS.

SWP-0008-2002 To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 0.0132 acres; for property located at 546 Meadowsweet Place (Lot 53); Ridenour Road Development Co., George Parker, applicant. (Approved Administratively by Zoning Administrator, Bonnie Gard on 6/20/02).

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

L. ADJOURNMENT - 8:23 P.M.

TANYA M. WORD
Deputy Clerk of Council

Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Planning Commission, this
day of 2012.*

Chair Signature