



# City of Gahanna

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning Commission

200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

*Michael Tamarkin, Chair*  
*Thomas Shapaka, Vice Chair*  
*Michael Greenberg*  
*John Hicks*  
*James Mako*  
*Michael Suriano*  
*Thomas J. Wester*

*Pam Ripley, Deputy Clerk of Council*

---

Wednesday, July 13, 2022

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 13, 2022. The agenda for this meeting was published on July 8, 2022. Chair Michael Tamarkin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Mr. Mako.

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

**Absent** 1 - Michael Suriano

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

#### **C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

[2022-0193](#)

Planning Commission minutes 6.22.2022

**A motion was made that the Minutes from the June 22, 2022 meeting be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 5 - Hicks, Tamarkin, Wester, Shapaka and Mako

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

**Abstain:** 1 - Greenberg

#### **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-0020-2022](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary Chapter 1153.01(a) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at 535 Office Center Place; Parcel ID: 025-009488; Current Zoning SO, NVA - Vet Clinic; Sean Boucher, applicant.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The variance is to allow for a vet clinic to operate on the property zoned Suburban Office. Many types of medical uses are allowed by right or conditional use. Vet services are classified under "Agriculture, Forestry, and Fishing". Previous use of building was medical. The applicant would be occupying the entire building. The only exterior improvement would be a fenced area for pets. Staff is in support of the variance.

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

Applicant Jeff Brown, 37 W. Broad St., Ste. 460, Columbus, Ohio, Attorney for the applicant. Brown shared this is an existing Gahanna business located at 610 Morrison Road. Their business is growing and they need more room.

Clerk confirmed there were no comments from the public.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:08 p.m.

Questions from the Commission: Mako asked if there will be any pet boarding. Brown said they do have overnight stays for animals that need it and ancillary boarding for those that need it related to medical treatment.

Tamarkin asked Blackford if the fence will need to come before the Commission. Blackford said they can submit for a fence permit and if it meets code it will be an administrative review.

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

**Discussion on the motion: Hicks is in support of the variance and feels it fits in the area. He appreciates Mako's question; we do not want a kennel in this location, but if it is ancillary to a medical procedure, he doesn't have a problem with that.**

**Shapaka is in favor of the variance, especially since they are taking over the entire building.**

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

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

[V-0021-2022](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary Chapter 1151.15(q)(4) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at 617 Fawndale Place; Parcel ID: 025-004127; Current Zoning PUD, Rob

Hicks, applicant.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. This request is to allow two detached accessory structures in the front yard on a corner lot. In PUD zoning an accessory structure is required to be located to the rear of the dwelling. There are two structures on the property. One is to store lawn equipment and the other is a playhouse structure. Both extend into the front yard by approximately eight feet. Blackford shared images (attached) of the structures from the road. The variance approval criteria are special conditions of property, building or use. Is it necessary for preservation of property rights? Will it not adversely affect surrounding properties. Staff is not in support of the request. This request is a result of a code enforcement violation in early 2022 for installing the structures without permits. One of the structures was built without a permit and one was built incorrectly with a permit. A shed application was approved in 2020 in a compliant location to the rear of the house. It cannot be approved because it was built in the front. Due to it being a corner lot, there are two rear yards which appear to provide sufficient space to install the structures in compliant locations.

Chair opened public comment at 7:13 p.m.

Applicant Rob Hicks shared that there is a shed in his yard that takes up a lot of space. It is in the area where the yard is flat. He placed the play structure where it is located so that it would not be right against his house blocking a window. The mower roof for the riding mower was placed in its location because if he put it on the other side of his house it would be about five feet from the neighbor's porch door. He stores his lawnmower and grass clippings there. He doesn't want to keep the clippings right outside of his neighbor's back door in case it would smell. Mr. Hicks didn't realize that even though part of the yard is inside his fence that it was his front yard. He thought it was all considered his back yard and thought it was okay to put it there.

Clerk confirmed there were no comments from the public.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:18 p.m.

Questions from the Commission: Commission member Hicks stated for the record and confirmed with the applicant that they are not related, and he does not have a conflict with the application. Commission member Hicks asked if there is a shed and two additional accessory structures. Applicant Hicks said that was correct. Commission member Hicks asked the applicant to walk through what the structures are used for. Applicant Hicks shared one is a playhouse for his granddaughter which he stopped working on as soon as he received the notice. Eventually he would like to add a sandbox, climbing wall and some swings. It currently has some small toys under it. The other structure is where he keeps his mower and yard equipment. Behind the mower, he keeps bags of grass clippings until yard waste day. Commission member Hicks asked how the structures were built, are there concrete footers? Applicant Hicks said they are four-by-four posts in concrete. Applicant Hicks said he was told he didn't need a building permit, so he went

ahead and built them, and then he found out that it is part of his front yard, which he didn't realize.

Shapaka directed his comment to the applicant; if this doesn't go well here tonight, is there anything the applicant can offer to hide by color additional landscaping? It is stark how it sits on the front of the house. He knows it is the side but being a corner lot, the applicant does have a condition and a responsibility to keep up the appearance and the fort-like characteristic of it is not characteristic for the neighborhood. Does the applicant have any ideas of what he could do to help hide it or lessen it? Applicant Hick said he could plant trees in front of it. Shapaka asked if he was not averse to putting some trees or some thick shrubbery in front it to help define it better. Applicant Hicks said he would not be against that at all. Shapaka asked if the applicant would be inclined to paint the red roof a different color. Applicant Hicks said he could paint the roof. Shapaka asked about possible painting the fence a more complementary color. Shapaka asked if there is a gate on the side being shown in the pictures. Applicant Hicks said there are two gates: one on each side of the playhouse that are about eight feet wide. Shapaka asked if some landscaping was done, would they be blocked? Applicant Hicks said the gate is not directly in front of the roof and trees can be put in there. Shapaka asked the applicant if he had any idea how much it would cost to flip the design to the other side. Applicant Hicks said that is where his yard slopes down and it would take a lot of dirt to get the land flat enough. It drops about five feet down in that corner of the yard. Shapaka asked how long the structure has been up. Applicant Hicks said it has been up since winter.

Greenberg asked if there were any public comments. Clerk confirmed no public comments were received. Greenberg asked if there was any way to lower the structures so that they would be below the fence line. Applicant Hicks said the fence is six foot, and you would have to duck to get under them. Greenberg asked how tall are the structures? Applicant Hicks said the playhouse is 12 feet and the mower roof is at eight feet. His shed is beside the playhouse and he wanted to match the same roof line as the shed so it wouldn't look out of place. Greenberg said that it is the applicant's position that there is no place to move either of the structures onto his property that would make sense and be in compliance. Applicant Hicks said he could move the mower roof, but it would be right next to his neighbor's backyard, which he would rather do without than to upset his neighbor.

Mako asked for a point of clarification on the permit or lack of permit, the applicant stated they said you did not need a permit. Mako asked who "they" are. Applicant Hicks said it was Mike Frey from the City. Mr. Blackford said that a building permit is not needed, but a zoning permit is needed. There were building permits applied for in 2020 because the shed was supposed to be 200 square feet. If it is under 200 square feet, it is a zoning permit and not a building permit. There were permits required, but a building permit was not required. Applicant Hicks said the shed and the roof are two different structures. They are not connected and were not applied for in 2020. Blackford said that these are required to have a permit and a permit was filed after the code enforcement violation. Applicant Hicks asked Blackford to repeat; permitting is required, a zoning permit is required. Applicant Hicks

said that's because he didn't realize it was in his front yard. He thought it was in his back yard and was fine. Applicant Hicks stated he believes he applied for a zoning permit. He was told he needed to apply for a variance. Blackford said that there is a permit that is submitted and under review and staff is unable to approve it until the variance gets approved or whatever that looks like.

Tamarkin asked if the permit was for one of the structures. Blackford said there is a permit for one structure, that is all that was submitted and there are two structures. Tamarkin said there are really three structures with the shed. Blackford said the shed doesn't show up on the site plan submitted on this request. The two structures are all we see. There isn't a shed on this property according to the site plan that was submitted. Applicant Hicks said he got a permit for his shed. Before he got his shed, he did put in a permit to build it onto the back of his house, that is probably what Mr. Blackford is talking about. That permit was denied. Applicant Hicks told them to forget about that permit and then he thought he would go ahead and buy a shed. That was the easiest way to do it. He then applied for the shed and it was approved.

Wester asked Mr. Blackford how this came to the attention of the City. Blackford said it was spotted by Code Enforcement. Wester asked it was for what? Blackford said that it was clear to Code Enforcement that the structures were unpermitted just by driving by. They are not consistent with the rules. He believes the zoning certificate, which is a permit for these structures, was applied for afterwards.

Tamarkin said the shed was applied for and asked if the shed has a red metal roof. Applicant Hicks said it does. Tamarkin said when you drive by there is a lot of red roof in the back. Some of it is the 120 square foot play area, and some of it is a 200 square foot shed. Applicant Hicks stated yes. Tamarkin said from the road it looks like one very large structure. Applicant Hicks stated it is not connected. Tamarkin said that it is not connected and somewhere in there is a break. In the picture, you can't see it, but if you were a little to the left or right you really see a lot of red roof. Tamarkin asked if the crack is the shed to the right of the play area, and they are not connected but separated by an inch. Applicant Hicks said yes. Tamarkin said the play area is against the fence and the shed is a little bit into the yard. The shed would be technically in the backyard and the play area is not. The thing looks very large. Tamarkin stated there is a six-foot fence and a 12-foot structure; he asked Blackford if there is code on it. If he gets approved for a shed, can he build it as high as he wants? Blackford said 15-feet is allowed, and the height is compliant with code for unattached accessory structures. Tamarkin asked if the roof was removed, if this was not approved, the shed is compliant. Blackford said the shed is compliant and placed consistent with the permit in the rear yard. The roof and the other structure are what the issue is. Tamarkin asked if the part of the structure would be an add-on or part of the six-foot fence (the wood that looks like an a-frame). Applicant Hicks said it is separated. Tamarkin asked how would staff review it? Blackford said it is a unique situation, and he is not 100 percent certain, but he would say it looks to be by a building code definition that it is attached and is really in addition to

the shed which probably really doesn't run afoul of any accessory size limitations or height. But because it is all attached, it is like one structure in the eyes of a building code. The whole entire thing would now not meet code because a portion doesn't. It is relatively easy to rectify that because the shed is compliant with code. Applicant Hicks said that according to Mike Frey, as long as it is not supported by the shed and it is separated, it is fine. Blackford said that may be because they are talking about very nuance things with state code that he is not an expert in, and this is a unique situation. Regardless, permitting was required. He has filed a permit and is going down the correct permitting path. Applicant Hicks said that the permit Blackford is talking about has been squashed. It was an addition to his house. Blackford said he did do some research and he knows that there was originally going to be an addition to the house. Then there was a shed permit, and then after the code enforcement violation in January 2022, there was a zoning permit file for one of these two structures. Applicant Hicks asked if this was when he applied for the variance and if that was the zoning permit. Blackford said the variance is a separate application. The comments from staff were that they cannot approve this because it encroaches into the front yard and you need a variance. That is why there is a request for a variance. Tamarkin asked if there are restrictions on the square footage of a shed. Blackford said there are roundabout square footages, and it varies based off zoning. He is not sure what it is off the top of his head; it is usually the height and the square footage. It is maybe 30 percent of the gross over all structure and is probably not running into that issue. Blackford believes it's just strictly a placement challenge.

Shapaka said the image shown on the left in the attached staff presentation; there is a shed to the right of the opening, and it is compliant with an a-frame. Applicant Hicks said that looking at the picture and the dark line in the roof to the right is the shed. Shapaka said the shed was originally built in compliance and lined up with the house. Then the applicant elected to carry the a-frame out to create a little covered play area to the front of the property. Shapaka said the image could be greatly reduced if it was a shed roof and it would go up and hit the a-frame. If the shed was there, it should have a side on it. It would be a little more visually pleasing and massing. The massing looks odd because the gable was brought out. Applicant Hicks said the climbing wall he was going to build was going to go on one side of it. He was not going to enclose both sides of it, but he could come up with something. Shapaka said the image shown with the massing and bringing the gable to the front is creating a lot of the issue. If that roof was the portion of the flat roof it would be more aesthetically favorable for him. He is looking on how they can get this through and fixed without ripping it all out. Applicant Hicks said he could put in trees to hide it. He doesn't think he could lower it.

Wester asked if there is a homeowner's association in the neighborhood. Applicant Hicks said there is not.

Member Hicks asked as a follow-up to his previous question, how the structure was affixed to the ground. The applicant said that the posts were sunk in concrete. In the pictures submitted, the left-handed picture doesn't look like the poles against the fence do anything but sit on the ground.

Applicant Hicks said the poles are three feet into the ground. Member Hicks asked about the shed foundation. Applicant Hicks said it is sitting on block that is sitting on four-by-six runners. Member Hicks said the accessory structure has four-by-six poles that are sunk into the ground. Applicant Hicks said they are four-by-four poles.

Tamarkin asked the Committee if they wanted to split the play area separate from the lawn mower area or if they wanted to vote on it all as one. There has not been a lot of discussion on the lawn mower area. Member Hicks said his feeling is the same on both.

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

**Discussion on the motion: Wester said that he is not in support and said that some neighborhoods have homeowners' associations to enforce for uniformity. Others where the homeowners' association is either defunct or inactive depend upon the City code for uniformity. The code in this case is reasonable, and he believes the city would work with the applicant to come up with solutions. Shapaka doesn't mind the encroachment to the variance and that he can use the property because he has two sides. Shapaka is not in favor of this variance because of the images shown. If he came back with something that was mono pitched on the left-and side instead of the gable and some landscaping ideas. Shapaka can't support it as it sits currently. Tamarkin agrees with his colleagues, there is too much red roof. It looks like a park picnic shelter in the backyard. It is a huge a-frame roof in a backyard painted red. It is too much for the area and the aesthetics of the area. Going back to the approval criteria of a variance; will it adversely affect the surrounding properties? He struggles with that and thinks it does. The neighbors were notified of the meeting and are not here. They don't have a problem with it, but neighbors will change over the years and it is just too big, too much for the space. Member Hicks said he doesn't feel that the criteria for granting a variance has been met for this application. He will also be voting no. Mako is also going to be voting no on this. He has a problem with this and doesn't think the aesthetics flow within the neighborhood. He deals with variances in his day job, and he is also very critical going forward about granting variances. Greenberg is not in support and hopes that the applicant can come back with a plan that would be more acceptable to the City and the Commission.**

Applicant Hicks asked how long he would have to come up with a plan. Blackford said that code enforcement has timelines and they would be willing to work with the applicant to allow some additional time if work is being done to get a revised plan.

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

**Yes:** 0

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

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

Morse Rd.; Parcel ID: 025-011233; Current Zoning SO; Labcorp; Tim Stephenson, applicant.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The conditional use request is for patient specimen collection. The specimens are processed offsite. In Suburban Office (SO) zoning it is allowed by right if the specimen collection was done by a doctor. No exterior improvements are proposed. There are four criteria for approval of a conditional use. Is it a conditional use of zone district and are the zoning standards met? This is a conditional use of SO. There are no variances, and it is a built environment already; it's occupying an existing space. Is it in accord with appropriate plans for the area? It is in accord with the plans and accord with zoning and the uses in the building. Will the request have undesirable effects on surrounding area? Staff does not believe it will have any undesirable effects on the area. Is the proposed development consistent with development of the area? It is consistent with the area. Staff recommends approval of the application.

Chair opened public comment at 7:52 p.m.

Applicant Tim Stephenson, Labcorp, Regional Manager shared that the orders and collections that are taking place are given from a medical clinician. They are not doing any testing on site. Everything is collected and sent to another facility.

Public Comment: Leo McCann 1261 Amberlea Drive West, Gahanna. McCann is the President of the Amberlea Village Condo Association which is directly south of the building. McCann asked the hours of operation. Stephenson said the facility will operate Monday - Friday 7:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m., Saturday 8 a.m. - 12 p.m. McCann asked if the collection of the specimens take place during the hours of operation or after the hours of operation? Stephenson said collection is during the hours of operation.

Clerk confirmed there were no comments received from the public.  
Chair closed the public comment at 7:56 p.m.

Questions from the Commission: Hicks asked if the office is being relocated from another location. Stephenson said the current location on Johnstown Road in Gahanna is being relocated to this building.

Shapaka asked if the collections will be stored overnight or is everything is processed and out of the building and no waste. Stephenson said everything will be picked up and transported to their facility in Dublin. Shapaka envisions things coming and going, nothing being put into a dumpster. Stephenson said if there is anything, they must comply by medical waste pickup, nothing gets left.

Mako asked what the collection times are, one time a day or multiple times through the day. Stephenson said it is throughout the day when they are open to the public.



A motion was made by Wester, seconded by Hicks, that the Conditional Use be Approved.

Discussion on the motion: Hicks commented that this is an existing company in Gahanna that is relocating and staying in Gahanna. This is a good business to have for the city and it is appropriate for the area. In his opinion it is not going to have an undesirable effect so it does meet the criteria for granting a conditional use and he is in support.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Hicks, Tamarkin, Wester, Greenberg, Shapaka and Mako

Absent: 1 - Suriano

### Woodside Green Parking Lot Project

#### [V-0018-2022](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary Chapter 1163.08(h) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at 213 Camrose Ct.; Parcel ID No. 025-006520; Woodside Green Park; Current Zoning PUD; Alan Little, 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.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The request is for parking and landscaping alterations in the Woodside Green Park parking lot. The lot will be restriped, adding additional parking spaces, and removing the landscape islands. It is a park, and there is a lot of landscape around. The PUD zoning district has Design Review guidelines. The guidelines state that Planning Commission may wish to concentrate on more open space and buffer zones between differing land uses and shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The variance code requires a 10-foot landscaped island between two rows of parking. Currently, it does not exist but is required due to extent of alterations. The variance request applies to a small portion of the property. This is a park, and there are a lot of trees in the area. Staff doesn't believe that it would have any adverse effect on any property owners. Lights will not be shining into anyone's home if the landscaping is not in place. The proposed alterations are consistent with design review criteria. It does not appear to negatively affect surrounding properties. The proposals meet all other zoning code requirements. Variances for not providing the 10-foot landscaped island have been approved for other projects. Staff recommends approval of both applications.

Chair opened public comment at 8:02 p.m.

Applicant Alan Little, Parks & Recreation Department is available for questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Edward Tweed 214 Camrose Ct. Gahanna. Regarding the proposed changes, Mr. Tweed thanked them that they were not taking away from the nature beauty of the area. Mr. Tweed said that if there is any property on the street that is more impacted by the overcrowding, it is his property because they are right next to the park. It only occurs a couple weeks a year and a couple hours per week. He doesn't know if someone has complained and isn't sure if it's necessary. He thinks the city should know that this is a temporary situation, a few hours per week and the rest of the time there is maybe two or three cars in the parking lot.

Andrea Baily Tweed 214 Camrose Ct. Gahanna. Mrs. Tweed is also speaking for her neighbor who lives at 215 Camrose Ct. and who is unable to attend this evening. For the general outlay they have no problems. Some of the concerns she would like to discuss, and it may not be directly affected with that is the amount of traffic that comes up and down this street on a regular basis. There are no guards, no closures to the park. There are traffic and people in and out of the park all hours of the night. There are no gates to stop it. They say the park closes at dark, but it doesn't. Unfortunately, Mrs. Tweed and her neighbor picks up trash and garbage debris that is left. Their concerns are more for the security factor.

Tamarkin asked Little if he would like to respond and stated that the Commission is here to approve the applications submitted and has nothing to do with the operations. Little said in response to some of the stormwater concerns, they have moved the dumpster out of the floodway. Some of the parking spots being gained are recovering where the dumpster was. The department worked closely with the previous City Engineer John Moorehead with the floodway use permit to make sure that no issues would be created. They are replacing at grade. There is no fill or excavation. Everything has passed the engineer's review. The only islands removed were trees through attrition. The outline of the parking lot is not changing. They are recovering some of the parking spots towards the nature playground. The rest of the spots will be gained through the removal of those parking lot islands. Mr. Little can't address the traffic concerns. None of the other parks have gates, except for Pizzurro Park and that is so the traffic can be controlled when there are flood conditions.

Clerk confirmed there were no comments from the public.

Chair closed the public comment at 8:07 p.m.

Questions from the Commission: Shapaka asked how the site drains. Little replied towards the creek. Downhill, there are no active storm water structures. It has been sheet drained through the years. Between the parking lot and the pond, a rain garden was created. There is a swale that is fed by the rain garden, so there is some treatment before it goes into the pond. There is a stormwater overflow that goes out into the Big Walnut Creek. Shapaka asked how the runoff gets out of the cul-de-sac? Little believes there are storm water structures in the court. The park doesn't experience water coming from Camrose Ct. into the park. Mrs. Tweed commented that on both sides of the street there are storm drains that do fill. Mrs. Tweed

worked with FEMA in the mitigation and flood department, so that is really the only reason she is addressing this. At the end of the park, people put in their canoes and swim. When there is three or four days of rain, it is guaranteed the park will close. The water does not drain. It backs up into the park and the walkway. It is impassible for days during that time. Shapaka thanked Mrs. Tweed for her comments and asked when the park is crowded do people park in the cul-de-sac? Mrs. Tweed said they park in the cul-de-sac, up and down the street and on Ridenour Road, but those few parking spaces are not going to change the traffic. Shapaka asked who came up with the 79 parking spaces. Little said it was essentially trying to optimize the existing footprint without encroaching on any of the green space. A safety issue was resolved when creating the natural playground between the parking lot and the creek. They did not want to extend the parking lot towards any of the residential structures. Shapaka asked if people were parking in the area where the new spots are being added. Little said yes. One part was used as a turn around and they have gotten rid of where the dumpster was. The area close to the nature playground has room for ingress and egress to add the spots. Shapaka asked if there is currently a center island with a tree in it in the parking lot. Little said there are three separate ones of varying shapes, and two of them do not have trees in them. The trees have died. The one tree needs removed. They were leaving the bookends to help with ingress and egress and traffic safety. They have left the island on the very ends of the outer parking lanes. The center islands themselves have been removed. Shapaka asked if there is a compromise in the discussion that instead of having the trees in between the two rows, take the last four spaces of the center island and put a couple healthy trees there. There are 130 feet coming across the parking lot, not that it is a huge heat source, but if there was shading in there that would help the people that are parking there, and it helps the view of hiding some of that. Adding those trees, does it dramatically change the accessibility of using the park? Little doesn't think that it will change it dramatically at all, and as the Parks Department they are willing to add trees anywhere. The goal is to get people into the park and enjoying nature. Shapaka said it would also help with any of the runoff that would come to the creek. Little said that a traffic lane was re-aligned towards the portages so that it does get some treatment before it goes in instead of straight down the concrete. The access to the blue way will still be maintained for park users.

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

**Discussion on the motion: Hicks shared that the commission has historically granted these variances and sees no reason not to in this case. Mako said he is in the park weekly and appreciates the residents coming out. He has seen the two or three times a year when people are parked on the cul-de-sac. He is in favor of the applications and feels it is a positive thing for the park. He is strongly in favor. Tamarkin followed up on Mr. Hicks comment that the commission has consistently given variances to the center isles and feel they are a trip hazard, people walk through them, and there is no reason to have them in code. He thinks that the code will change in time.**

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

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

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

[DR-0010-2022](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for a site plan for property located at 213 Camrose Ct.; Parcel ID: 025-006520; Current Zoning PUD; Woodside Green Park; Alan Little, 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.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. DR-0010-2022 was discussed under V-0018-2022.

**A motion was made by Hicks, seconded by Wester, that the Design Review be Approved.**

**Discussion on the motion: Shapaka said on the overall design he believes that four of the spaces can be done away with and put some trees in. He will not be in favor of this design.**

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

**Yes:** 5 - Hicks, Tamarkin, Wester, Greenberg and Mako

**No:** 1 - Shapaka

**Absent:** 1 - Suriano

**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE**

**G. NEW BUSINESS - NONE**

**H. OFFICIAL REPORTS**

**Assistant City Attorney - none**

**Director of Planning**

Blackford shared that the next agenda will be a light one.

**Council Liaison**

Blackford shared that the final plat with the storm water waiver for the Crescent at Central Park Section 2 was before City Council at Committee of the Whole and will move forward on the agenda for a vote.

**Chair**

Tamarkin asked Mayor Jadwin for an update.

Mayor Jadwin said the Parks Department is working on the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. A survey is posted online and was mailed to random residents. The survey is critical in guiding policy and identify projects, and programming for the next decade.

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

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.