



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

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

Sophia McGuire, Deputy Clerk of Council

Wednesday, June 11, 2025

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 June 11, 2025. The agenda for this meeting was published on June 6, 2025. Chair John Hicks called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Sarah Pollyea.

Present 5 - John Hicks, James Mako, Sarah Pollyea, Michael Suriano, and Michael Tamarkin

Absent 2 - Thomas W. Shapaka, and Michael Greenberg

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2025-0121](#)

Planning Commission meeting minutes 5.14.2025

A motion was made by Mako, seconded by Suriano, that the Minutes be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and 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

Gahanna Logistics Center

[DP-0003-2025](#)

To consider a Development Plan Application for property located at Tech Center Drive, Parcel ID 027-000110; Current Zoning IM - Innovation & Manufacturing; Gahanna Logistics Center; Marc Meyers, 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 Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation for details. Director Blackford explained that the property is zoned IM - Innovation and Manufacturing. He shared a zoning map of the IM District, which was indicated in purple. There is an overlay for the site, which was indicated on the screen in black. The overlay is called the Central Park overlay, and much of the Central Park area is subject to the overlay. The property is 10 acres and is comprised of two separate parcels. One parcel has a '025-' parcel identification prefix, indicating Mifflin Township, while the other has a '027-' prefix, indicating Jefferson Township. Blackford then explained this is a relevant detail, because two different parcels of two different taxing designations cannot be combined. The reason for the variance involving section 1109 of code is due to the inability for the parcels to be combined. He explained the overlay is similar to a planned unit development, or PUD, which is a type of standalone zoning ordinance. Blackford explained that the overlay covers many uses that Planning staff review for, such as setbacks, building design, and landscaping. However, some elements are not covered under the overlay, such as signage, which would be covered under the zoning code.

Director Blackford elaborated on other nearby properties that are subject to the overlay, such as Burns & Scalo, ADB Safegate, and The Peak at Edison. Nearby Jefferson Township properties include some residential sites as well as industrial outdoor storage. Blackford explained there is also a city-owned conservation area. He provided a zoning map of the area and noted in green that some of the conservation area abuts the properties, and the overlay allows for some reduced setbacks.

The project is one building of 141,000 square feet. About 7,500 square feet is office space and 133,000 square feet is warehouse space. It is similar in use to both the Burns & Scalo and ADB Safegate projects, though it has a smaller office component. Office, warehousing, and manufacturing are uses allowed by right in the IM zoning classification

and the overlay. The building is 38 feet tall and one story, which is similar to the ADB Safegate building in height and size. The zoning classification permits up to 65 feet in height. There are 118 car parking spaces, five semi trailer parking spaces, and 25 loading docks. There is no outside storage. Director Blackford noted that Burns & Scalo and ADB Safegate had outside storage components to their projects.

Director Blackford shared the site plan and showed the two access points proposed, including the primary truck access. He pointed out the 25 loading docks that are in the rear of the site, and are not visible from the right-of-way. He also made note of where the conservation and residential areas are, noting there will be changes to the topography. The loading docks and truck parking will be strategically positioned so as not to be visible from adjacent properties or any road access points.

Director Blackford stated the applicant worked with staff to add some additional architectural elements and to utilize certain colors, in an effort to be compatible with Burns & Scalo and ADB Safegate. He stated the primary building material is pre-cast concrete with aluminum and glass. The landscape plan shows a significant amount of preserved trees to the rear of the site, which will remain undeveloped. Director Blackford shared a plan for foundation plantings that are proposed, as the Central Park overlay requires building foundation planting. Though there is a significant amount of vegetation along the building, all requirements still cannot be met, so a variance is requested. The variance would permit the applicant to plant additional trees in the parking area.

Director Blackford provided a summary of the variances. Five are requested for the Central Park overlay, four of which are frequently requested. The first is for setbacks. The overlay requires 30 feet, and a 20-foot setback is requested. Twenty feet would be permitted with the current zoning code. The second variance is for the drive width. A width of 30 feet is allowed by the overlay, but 38 feet is requested. Blackford described this variance as a bit unusual, and noted it is on the rear of the site to allow for safe truck movement. The engineering department reviewed the request and did not have any issues. The third variance is regarding building appearance. The facade is required to have 50% brick or stone. This is a common variance request. A fourth variance is regarding roofing. The request is to not screen mechanical equipment. The equipment will not be visible from the surrounding area, and the applicant would like to forgo the screening. The final Central Park Overlay variance is for landscaping and screening, which is related to the foundation plantings previously discussed.

There are two variances requested from the zoning code. The first is for Electric Vehicle (EV) parking spaces. Conduit will be installed for 5 spaces, which can be built out when tenants move in. Finally, a setback variance is requested. This is for the parcels that are in two different jurisdictions, and code states that uses and structures must be located on the same parcel. However, the parcels cannot meet the zoning code because the parcels cannot be combined.

Blackford shared the Variance criteria. They 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 results 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
- The variance is not likely to undermine the objectives of the land use plan
- Whether the variance is substantial and is the minimum necessary to make possible the reasonable use of land or structures
- The practical difficulty could be eliminated by some other method, even if the solution is less convenient or more costly to achieve.

He then shared the Development Plan criteria. They are:

- The development meets the applicable development standards of the zoning ordinance
- It is in accord with appropriate plans for the area
- It would not have undesirable effects on the surrounding area
- It would be in keeping with the existing land use character and physical development potential of the area.

Director Blackford shared images of ADB Safegate and Burns & Scalo, comparing them to features of the proposed Gahanna Logistics Center. He then shared renderings of each facade. Staff recommends approval. The use and design is consistent with development trends, land use plan, and zoning code. The requested variances are similar to other approvals. Approval does not appear to create an undesirable condition, and approval promotes the goals of the land use plan.

Chair Hicks opened public comment at 7:20 p.m.

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 800 Walton Parkway, introduced himself as a land use entitlement and zoning lawyer, representing Velocis Industrial Gahanna, LP. He stated the application is for a speculative development that is an investment of over 19 million dollars. The developer likes the prospect of attracting businesses and tenants, proximity to the highway system, and feels the project would fit well within the area. Mr. Underhill noted there are challenges with the site, such as sloping to the rear of the property. He felt the positioning of the building due to site constraints, along with the needs for parking and loading, have been balanced well with the proposed plan. The design has also been informed by subsurface studies, which have indicated shallow rock in some places on the site. There are also existing public utility easements that are near the rear of the site, which also pushed the structure near the front of the site. There is also an existing public trail along the east side of the site. He stated an effort was made to minimize the number of variances, but some are unavoidable due to topography and elements outside their control.

Ryan O'Leary, KBC Development, Hinsdale, IL, introduced himself. Mr. O'Leary expressed excitement about the project, and appreciation for the Commission's consideration. He said KBC is a developer of industrial real estate, and described other projects he assisted with developing in Central Ohio. He said the Columbus industrial market remains strong, while somewhat overbuilt on large scale projects, but that there is a tight vacancy rate on smaller companies that prefer to lease. The building is designed for up to one large user of 140,000 square feet, or down to three smaller users divided into space of 40,000 square feet. He stated that the majority of deals that have occurred in Columbus recently range in size from 40,000 to 150,000 square feet, and there is continued demand for the type of space proposed.

Chair Hicks closed public comment at 7:26 p.m.

Mr. Tamarkin noted there were 25 loading docks in the back of the building, and only five overflow spaces. He wondered if that was a sufficient number of spaces. Mr. Tamarkin noted there is another project in town that does not have sufficient spaces, and trucks line up on the street, which causes aggravation for police, neighbors, and others involved. Mr. O'Leary provided some additional context, noting that there was initially additional parking. However, a sanitary sewer line was

installed on the northern part of the site, and the building needed to be rotated. He stated they consulted with the Planning Department to do so. He felt the users of the space would be production users, with some distribution users. However, he did not believe the distribution users would not be high truck count users. He felt there was ample dock space, adding that trailers could utilize unused dock space. He added that the area would be fully screened from the street. Mr. Tamarkin felt 25 docks was excessive for a 140,000 square foot building, but that five overflow spaces was potentially small. The applicant noted that the request is for the ability to put 25 docks spaces in, but the building's occupants may not require that many docks. Mr. Tamarkin shifted to the existing trail on the east side of the property, and asked whether it wrapped all the way around on Tech Center. Mr. O'Leary said there is a trail, and two access points will be added. The trail is in a public easement and there is a 10-foot landscaping buffer from the easement to the site's proposed parking curb. Mr. Tamarkin asked about the reduction in plantings. Marc Meyers, ARCO Murray, introduced himself. He stated that because of the amount of trees preserved in the back of the site, they are technically not required to provide trees in the front. However, they did not feel that was right, and felt it would be aesthetically pleasing to have trees in landscape islands in the parking lot. There will be some foundation plantings as well, where there is open space. Mr. Tamarkin noted EV conduit will be installed. Mr. O'Leary said sometimes there are specific tenant requests regarding EV spaces, and wanted to wait to secure tenants to determine what type of charging stations to install.

Mr. Mako confirmed with Director Blackford that the use is permitted by right. He asked the applicant if the west-side truck access drive was sufficient at 30 feet for truck access. Mr. O'Leary felt it was, adding that they have worked with civil engineers to ensure maneuverability. Mr. Mako asked the applicant to expand on the retaining wall proposed for the west side. Mr. Meyers explained that the conservation area owned by the city is a centerline of a gulley, which is the lowest spot on the site. They need to meet the grade and are still determining whether to install a jersey barrier or highway guardrail. A wall about 15-16 high will be concrete cast in place. Mr. Mako asked if there would be signage associated with the building. Mr. O'Leary explained code applicable to signage would be followed. They wanted to wait to determine tenants before installing signs, as tenants usually prefer their own logos. There would likely be a ground/monument sign near the access points. Mr. Mako inquired about the multi-use path, and wondered if they were committed to the improvements. Mr. Meyers explained that a portion of the path needed to be straightened out and regraded. He said the

engineering department requested that they maintain the multi-use path integrity for continuity.

Ms. Pollyea inquired as to the speculative nature of the property, and why the developer did not wait to proceed with the applications until an end user was secured. Mr. O'Leary expressed confidence in his company's ability to secure tenants. He said there are not many groups that build sites like this on their own, or have the capacity to plan and invest in their development. Their goal is to find the tenants that need to move in quickly. Ms. Pollyea wondered what type of market dynamics were identified by the applicant to lead them to this type of building design. Mr. O'Leary explained that while they designed a flexible space, they hoped to find one tenant to lease all 140,000 square feet to. However, the building is designed with flexibility to accommodate smaller tenants. Additionally, there is a market in the Columbus area for this size of project. He again expressed confidence in their ability to secure tenants, considering the proximity to the airport, highway access, and other features of the area. Pollyea asked if there had been research into the specificity of the potential tenants. Mr. O'Leary said soft marketing had been done, but it could not be publicly shared, as all approvals have not been acquired. He could not say with certainty what it would be. The site would be listed with local brokerage firms. Pollyea asked how close the parking lot would be to the trail. O'Leary stated it would be 10 feet at the closest, and some landscaping trees and shrubs would be placed in the area. Pollyea inquired about security on the site. Mr. O'Leary stated security is generally left up to the tenants depending on what type of business they are in.

A motion was made by Mako, seconded by Suriano, that the Development Plan be Approved.

Discussion on the motion:

Mr. Suriano stated he would be in favor of the application. He did not feel the variances affected the area negatively, and the use is allowed by right.

Mr. Tamarkin concurred. He felt the building looked appropriate and would be a nice addition to the area.

Mr. Mako felt the reason for the site being left undeveloped to now was due to the topography and location. He felt much thought had been put into the design, and stated he would be in support of it.

Ms. Pollyea said her biggest concern was the speculative nature of the project. However, it met all criteria and she had no concern about the variances.

Chair Hicks felt the Development Plan criteria had been met and was supportive of the project.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and Greenberg

[V-0015-2025](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary sections 4(C)(1)(a) Site Planning, 5(A)(3) Building Appearance, 5(B)(1)(a) Roofing, 5(B)(2)(e) Roofing, 6(A)(1) Landscaping and Screening, and 4(F)(1) Site Planning of the Central Park Overlay; and to vary Sections 1109.02(a)/(b) Setbacks and Structure Placement and 1109.01(j) Parking, Access, and Circulation of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; for property located at Tech Center Drive; Parcel ID 027-000110; Current Zoning IM - Innovation & Manufacturing; Gahanna Logistics Center; Marc Meyers, applicant.

A motion was made by Mako, seconded by Suriano, that the Variance be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and Greenberg

The Crescent Retail

[DP-0004-2025](#)

To consider a Development Plan Application for property located at Tech Center Drive; Parcel ID 025-014183; Current Zoning GC - General Commercial; The Crescent Retail; Carter Bean, 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 for details. This project is on Tech Center Drive and is part of the Crescent development area. It is located just north of Tech Center and just east of Hamilton Road. The project includes a Major Development Plan and Variance for two new multi-tenant retail and restaurant buildings. The site includes two buildings, one of which is 10,000 square feet and one of which is around 6,500 square feet. Between the two buildings, there's a total of eight tenant spaces with two drive-throughs- one on each building- and two patio areas. The primary materials for the buildings are burgundy and gray brick with metal accents. The materials are consistent with the nearby Sheetz that is

currently under construction, as well as the medical office building development that is the subject of another application. There are a total of 127 parking spaces on the site, which exceeds code requirements by one space. The project also includes six EV charging spaces, which is the exact amount that the zoning code requires.

Capka shared the landscape plan that was submitted by the applicant. For this project, the zoning code requires around 3,800 square feet of landscaping within and around the parking lot. Code requirements have been met in the plan. All tree planting requirements have also been met. There will be 38 parking lot trees and an additional 102 caliper inches of trees to meet the requirements in Chapter 914 of city code. The site is a bit unique since it has two frontages. One frontage is along Crescent Circle and one is along Hamilton Road. Therefore, the parking lot screening is required around almost the entire parking lot, and has been provided through landscaping. There is also a sidewalk that connects the two buildings to the Crescent Circle frontage.

Capka provided a more in-depth site plan, showing the two retail buildings in purple. Patio areas were shown in between the buildings. She also noted the dumpster locations, for which there is a variance application. Two drive-thru areas were shown in yellow and six EV parking spaces were shown in green. Capka shared renderings of the development. She noted the site has access from Crescent Circle but not from Hamilton Road. Capka then reviewed the materials that were submitted.

Capka listed the three variances included with the project. The first is for citywide design standards. Zoning code states that the ground floor primary facade of a commercial building must be at least 25% transparent glass, which is a new requirement that went into effect with the zoning code update in May of 2024. Capka stated there are four primary facades on the site since there are two frontages and two buildings. They are between 3.4% and 25.4% glass. One facade out of the four meets the code requirement, and the other three do not. The next requirement is that parking areas must be located to the rear of the primary building. Since there are two frontages on this site, this requirement is impossible to meet, and no matter where the parking was located on site a variance would still be required. The final variance request is that dumpsters must be located to the rear of the primary building and meet parking setbacks. The setbacks are met, but once again due to the frontages on the site, it's impossible to locate the dumpster to the rear because there is no rear yard.

Capka then shared the variance criteria that must be met for the variances to be approved. They 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 results 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
- The variance is not likely to undermine the objectives of the land use plan
- Whether the variance is substantial and is the minimum necessary to make possible the reasonable use of land or structures
- The practical difficulty could be eliminated by some other method, even if the solution is less convenient or more costly to achieve.

Staff recommended approval of all three variances as submitted. The applicant states that the main reason that the 25% glass requirement is difficult to meet is due to the new energy code requirements that went into effect in 2024. Because there are four primary facades on the site, it's difficult to meet the 25% requirement on all four of them. The site also has two frontages, making it impossible to locate parking and dumpsters to the rear. However, the parking lot is adequately screened from the right-of-way, and the dumpster screening requirements exceed what code requires since there is a dumpster enclosure and landscaping around the enclosure.

Capka shared the Major Development Plan criteria. They are:

- The development meets the applicable development standards of the zoning ordinance
- It is in accord with appropriate plans for the area
- It would not have undesirable effects on the surrounding area
- It would be in keeping with the existing land use character and physical development potential of the area.

Staff recommended approval of the major development plan. Staff believes that the application meets all of the criteria. The use is permitted by right and is consistent with the zoning code as well as the surrounding

area, which is primarily commercial. The building design also matches the proposed medical office building development as well as the Sheetz, and all landscaping and setback requirements are met.

Chair opened public comment at 7:57 p.m.

Larry Canini, Canini & Associates, 3841 Mann Road, Blacklick, greeted the Commission. Mr. Canini also introduced Carter Bean, of Carter Bean Architects. Mr. Canini explained that Mr. Bean was instrumental in blending the project with the surrounding area. Mr. Canini recalled the medical and apartment projects that his firm has been involved with in the area. The proposed retail space will provide services for the employees and residential community. The goal was to design something that attracts users and is functional. All potential users were considered, and Mr. Canini expressed hope that a balance of food services and general services would occupy the site, noting the inclusion of drive-through and patios concept layouts. He noted an initial commitment has been a local dentist. He said it has been softly marketed, but sought approval from Planning Commission first.

Mr. Bean introduced himself and offered to provide insight into the variance request for window transparency. Because of the way the site is laid out, obtaining the required transparency on all sides of the building posed a difficulty. Tenant spaces will have a back and front of house. Parking was distributed appropriately for each building. He stated that the south building backs up to Hamilton Road, and therefore it would not be as desirable to have the required transparency in the back of house. He explained that on the building positioned to the north, the west facade will be the entrance side, while the east is intended to be the back of houses, requiring less transparency. He noted that the variance request is a "worst case scenario" request. The first committed tenant space may have more transparency than planned. They are asking for the most extreme amount, and what is actually installed may differ, and may have more transparency.

Chair Hicks closed the public comment at 8:03 p.m.

Mr. Suriano described similar front-of-house and back-of-house challenges at the Rocky Fork restaurant and retail spaces on Hamilton Road. He wondered if Mr. Bean would explain which side was front, and which was back. Mr. Bean explained that for the larger building to the south, the front of house is east, and with the smaller northern building, the front of house is west.

Mr. Tamarkin expressed curiosity as to why the buildings are in the center of the parcel rather than pushed to the back, and wondered if it was a consideration to push the buildings back while putting the parking on the Crescent Loop side. Mr. Canini felt it had better presence and circulation to place it in the center and allow traffic to flow around it. He also preferred to not have a large parking field, and instead spread the parking out. The tenant has more flexibility to place their entrance on the Hamilton Road side or the Crescent Loop side. There is a pedestrian passthrough, which makes the entrances accessible no matter where someone parks. Mr. Tamarkin wondered where deliveries would go. Mr. Canini felt there was balanced parking on both sides, and there would be enough parking spaces for delivery drivers to utilize spaces for their deliveries. Mr. Canini also explained that the plan to have four restaurants is speculation, and there may be fewer that commit. Prospective tenants are concerned about whether there will be enough traffic to the area. Mr. Canini felt that Tech Center would eventually become a more heavily travelled road and food service would be necessary.

Mr. Mako wondered about the placement of dumpsters. Mr. Bean said they would be masonry to match the building finish and landscaped to adhere to code. Mr. Mako asked about internal circulation on the northeast access point. He wondered if people entering the drive-thru would loop around the restaurant on the north side, then pull into the drive-thru. He felt the turn would be tight. Mr. Bean said it is dimensionally sound. Mr. Mako wondered if the stub streets to the north would be for future sites. Mr. Canini confirmed that the stub streets would lead to the remaining acreage that are planned for future use. Mr. Mako also clarified that the site would be connected to the residential site to the east. Mr. Canini confirmed, noting that there is already a leisure trail on Tech Center drive, which the development will connect to. A signal will be installed at Crescent Place, and the intention is to have a walkway to connect to Pizzuro Park.

Mr. Hicks asked if there was direct access to the site from Hamilton Road. Mr. Canini replied there was not direct automotive access and there is no sidewalk or trail on Hamilton Road, so there is no pedestrian access either. He noted that he did inquire about creating access when the project first started, but per the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT), curb cuts cannot be placed within a certain distance of a highway ramp.

A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Suriano, that the Development

Plan be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and Greenberg

[V-0016-2025](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary sections 1107.01(g) City Wide Design Standards, 1109.01(a)(1) Parking, Access, and Circulation, and 1109.02(e) Setbacks and Structure Placement of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; for property located at Tech Center Drive; Parcel ID 025-014183; Current Zoning GC - General Commercial; The Crescent Retail; Carter Bean, applicant.

A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Suriano, that the Variance be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and Greenberg

The Crescent Medical Office Building

[DP-0005-2025](#)

To consider a Development Plan Application for property located at Tech Center Drive; Parcel ID 025-014183; Current Zoning GC - General Commercial; Crescent MOB; Larry Canini, 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 for details. The project is located just northeast of the previous project. The project includes a Major Development Plan and Variance applications for a new medical office building. The building is approximately 11,900 square feet and is a one-story building located on a 1.4-acre site. The primary materials for the building are the exact same as the Crescent retail building. The are burgundy and gray brick with metal accents. Code requires a total of 35 parking spaces for the medical use, and 49 are provided.

Capka shared a site plan showing the medical office building. This site also has double frontage, though in a slightly different way from the last application. Due to the double frontage and the unique shape of the site it was difficult to orient the site to meet all code requirements. Therefore, a few variances are being sought. One of the variances is for the dumpster location which is highlighted on the site plan. The dumpster required a variance because the proposed location is to the front of the building.

Capka provided the submitted landscape plan. Because the building is smaller than the retail project, less landscaping was required at about 1,200 square feet. The applicant is providing 3,300 square feet of parking lot landscaping. All the tree planting requirements are met with 12 parking lot trees and an additional 46 caliber inches. The parking area is screened by hedges similar to those used for the retail building along both Crescent Circle and Crescent Place. To meet code requirements, there are sidewalks that connect to both frontages. Capka shared elevations of the building, which also depicted the materials, which are the same as the retail building. Additionally, the entrances to the buildings are very similar. Capka noted that the south and east sides would be considered the front elevations for the building.

Capka again shared the rendering depicting the overall area, showing where the medical office building is located in relation to the retail building. The rendering on the bottom of the screen would be the primary view off of Crescent Circle. There are three variances requested with the application. They are the same variances from the previous application. The first one is that the ground floor primary facade must be at least 25% transparent glass. The proposal includes two primary facades, one of which is 18.1% the other is 19.4% transparent. The parking areas must be located to the rear of the primary building. In this case, the parking area is located entirely to the front of the building. Finally, dumpsters must be located to the rear of the primary building and this dumpster is located in the front parking lot.

Ms. Capka shared variance criteria. They 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 results 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
- The variance is not likely to undermine the objectives of the land use plan
- Whether the variance is substantial and is the minimum necessary to make possible the reasonable use of land or structures
- The practical difficulty could be eliminated by some other method,

even if the solution is less convenient or more costly to achieve.

Staff recommended approval of all three variances as submitted. The applicant states that it's difficult to meet the 25% glass requirement. The site does have two frontages as well that make it difficult to locate parking to the rear of the building, and the parking lot fully meets screening requirements from both rights-of-way. Additionally, the dumpster screening requirements are exceeded in the same way that they were for the retail application. There is a dumpster enclosure and landscaping surrounding the enclosure.

Capka provided the Major Development Plan criteria. They are:

- The development meets the applicable development standards of the zoning ordinance
- It is in accord with appropriate plans for the area
- It would not have undesirable effects on the surrounding area
- It would be in keeping with the existing land use character and physical development potential of the area.

Staff also recommended approval of the Major Development Plan. The application meets the Development Plan criteria, and the use is very consistent with code in the surrounding area. Additionally, there are several medical office buildings in the area and more will be added. The building design matches the proposed retail development exactly, and it is compatible with the brick color, or the brick material used for the Sheetz building. All landscaping and setback requirements are met.

Chair Hicks opened public comment at 8:25 p.m.

Mr. Canini noted the medical office building is another exciting project for the Crescent development. Three practices are committed, accounting for 85% of the buildings. Two practices have previously been involved with the Crescent locations on Buckles Court, and a third is expanding from a practice downtown. Mr. Canini explained that partners are given the opportunity to own the building as well, citing this as a positive experience for all involved. He stated is about 2,000 square feet remaining in the building, and there is another prospective partner. He expected the space to be fully committed to by the time the building breaks ground. He emphasized the effort to create connectivity of the buildings by utilizing the same color brick for these buildings that was

used on the Orthopedic One site.

Chair Hicks closed public comment at 8:29 p.m.

Ms. Pollyea asked whether the committed partners had a financial stake in the project. Mr. Canini confirmed that the partners will become part of an LLC that owns a percent of the building. Mr. Canini keeps a small interest and acts as property manager.

A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Suriano, that the Development Plan be Approved.

Mr. Tamarkin shared a personal anecdote that a friend of his is a partner in one of the Crescent facilities, and appreciates the opportunity and experience.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and Greenberg

[V-0017-2025](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary Sections 1107.01(g) City Wide Design Standards; 1109.01(a)(1) Parking, Access, and Circulation; and 1109.02(e) Setbacks and Structure Placement of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; for property located on Tech Center Drive; Parcel ID 025-014183; Current Zoning GC - General Commercial; Crescent MOB; Larry Canini, applicant.

A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Suriano, that the Variance be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and Greenberg

The Crescent Retail Master Sign Plan

[MSP-0001-2025](#)

To consider a Master Sign Plan Application for property located at Tech Center Drive, Parcel ID 025-014183; Current Zoning GC - General Commercial; The Crescent Retail; Carter Bean, applicant.

This Master Sign Plan application is associated with the Crescent Retail Development Plan and Variance Applications. The site contains two multi-tenant retail and restaurant buildings with eight tenants. The Master Sign Plan will allow for larger signage than standard code requirements. It includes 18 wall signs and two monument signs. Two to three wall signs per tenant due to frontage on Crescent Circle and Hamilton Road allow for visibility for tenants on both frontages. The MSP also permits one monument sign on

Hamilton Road and one on Crescent Circle, both of which would be two feet tall with a masonry base to match the building materials.

Capka shared renderings, showing the view from Crescent Circle (east) and Hamilton Road (west). She shared highlights of the MSP. If a tenant occupies multiple spaces, they can only have the amount of signage allowed for one tenant space. Awning/canopy and electronic signs are prohibited. All tenants must utilize the same sign panel/cabinet design. All will match Sherwin Williams "Gauntlet Grey," which is the same as the Crescent medical office building development. All wall signs will be internally and/or halo illuminated. Tenants have the option to install projecting signs in lieu of a wall sign.

Capka compared the zoning code requirements for signs and the master sign plan requirements. In the zoning code, there are specific requirements for wall signs located on buildings that have more than one tenant that vary from the standard wall sign requirements. um Those are 50% of storefront width for length and a height of 30 inches. There are no area requirements. In comparison, the MSP limits tenants to 11 feet through 13 feet and 4 inches based on which tenant space they are located in, and a height of 44 inches. All the wall signs on the site are 41 square feet except for two that are 49 square feet. The total area of all wall signs on the site is 754 square feet. In the standard zoning code, the site would be limited to a total of 400 square feet for all signage on the lot. There are a total of 18 signs and most tenants are allowed two. Two of the tenants are allowed three signs. There is an option to also have two monument signs on the site. The monument signs are limited to a smaller area than what's in the standard zoning code. They would have a length of eight feet and be eight feet tall measured from grade, and an area of 50 square feet. This is 30 square feet smaller than the zoning code. Capka shared plans and elevations showing where signs could be placed.

Capka shared Master Sign Plan criteria. They are:

- The proposed signs meet the applicable development standards of this Zoning Ordinance, unless variances are bine requested
- The proposed signs are sited and scaled appropriately to create a cohesive character for the multi-tenant building or multi-building development
- The proposed signs are not in conflict with public streets, open spaces, public or private utilities, or rights-of-way
- The proposed signs would not have undesirable effects on the surrounding area.

Staff recommends approval of the MSP. Staff believes that the master sign plan meets all the criteria and all applicable code requirements, and it encourages consistent signage not only on this site but also with the medical office.

building site. Staff believes that the wall signage is in scale with the building size. There is also a little bit of creativity allowed through the possibility of projecting signs. Finally, the maximum monument sign area is less than the

standard code requirements.

Chair opened public comment at 8:40 p.m.

Carter Bean again introduced himself. He hoped that by seeing the graphics and elevations, the Commission members understood the goal wasn't to maximize signage. The signs will be consistent regardless of tenant size. He felt the number of signs would be smaller than proposed, as some tenants would occupy multiple spaces. The cabinets serve as wireways for the letters and logos that will go on the building faces.

Chair closed public comment at 8:42 p.m.

Mr. Suriano asked if a tenant took up multiple spaces, would one of the sections simply be blank. Mr. Bean confirmed, adding that the cabinet would not be installed.

Mr. Tamarkin asked if a tenant could have a lit sign, which Mr. Bean confirmed. Electric signs would not be permitted. If a tenant wanted a sign that exceeded the cabinet, it would have to fit the sign within the cabinet.

Ms. Pollyea asked how the applicant would handle a sign that would not fit within the cabinet. Mr. Canini stated that it may require the tenant to seek Planning Commission approval if it could not be accommodated in any other way. He added that monument signs are an option and could be reserved for a tenant that requires more visibility.

Mr. Hicks asked what a projecting sign is. Mr. Bean explained that the language in the MSP allows tenants to trade square footage of their wall sign to install a vertically oriented projecting sign to create more three-dimensional texture and visual interest.

Mr. Tamarkin asked Mr. Canini if he might be back to Planning Commission at another time for drive thru signage. Mr. Canini said they are currently working on such things as order board signage and directional signage. The tenant will determine this. Ms. Capka said that menu board signage no longer requires a permit, so a Variance would not be needed for menu boards.

A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Suriano, that the Master Sign Plan be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and Greenberg

The Crescent Medical Office Building Master Sign Plan

[MSP-0002-2025](#) To consider a Master Sign Plan Application for property located at Tech

Center Drive; Parcel ID 025-014183; Current Zoning GC - General Commercial; Crescent MOB; Larry Canini, applicant.

This Master Sign Plan is associated with the Crescent Medical Office Building. The site contains one multi-tenant medical office building. The master sign plan allows for larger signage than the standard code requirements. The medical office building master sign plan is a bit smaller, only including six wall signs and no monument signs. Most tenants are permitted one wall sign except for the end tenants, which would be permitted two wall signs.

Capka shared a rendering of the site with the locations of all tenant signs outlined in red. She shared highlights from the MSP. Awning/canopy and electronic signs are all prohibited. The sign cabinets utilize the same colors as the retail building. They will all be internally and/or halo illuminated. These requirements are similar to what would be at the Crescent Retail Building.

Capka shared a table comparing the zoning code requirements and the MSP requirements. The master sign plan has a length of eight feet for the wall signs and a height of four feet which comes out to 32 square feet for each tenant sign. The total amount of signage is 192 square feet. The standard zoning code would allow this site to have up to 307 square feet of total signage. There are six total signs, one sign per tenant, except for the two end tenants who are permitted an additional sign.

Capka shared elevations with sign positions highlighted in red.

Staff recommends approval of the master sign plan. It meets all criteria and applicable code requirements. The master sign plan also encourages consistent signage on the site and the adjacent sites. Also, the wall signage is in scale with the building sign and the signs included with this master sign plan are a bit smaller than the retail building.

Chair opened public comment at 8:50 p.m.

Larry Canini noted the desire to be consistent with the retail buildings and added that they decided against monument sign due to its proximity to the Crescent Loop.

Chair closed public comment at 8:51 p.m.

A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Suriano, that the Master Sign Plan be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano and Tamarkin

Absent: 2 - Shapaka and Greenberg

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. NEW BUSINESS - None

H. OFFICIAL REPORTS

Director of Planning

Director of Planning Michael Blackford shared there would be one or two items at the next meeting on June 25. Additionally, there would be a department update presented to City Council in the coming weeks. Afterward, it would also be presented to Planning Commission.

Council Liaison

Ms. Pollyea stated that the Gahanna Logistics Center project was before City Council to request a tax abatement at the most recent Council Committee of the Whole meeting. She encouraged those interested to watch City Council meetings in the coming weeks to track the discussion and decision on the abatement.

She added that there is a video fly-through of the public space of the new Civic Center that is available on the City's YouTube page.

I. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS - None

J. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT - None

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.