

# **City of Gahanna**

*200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, May 10, 2000**

**Commission Members meet in Committee of the Whole at 6:00 p.m.**

**7:00 PM**

**City Hall**

## **Planning Commission**

*David B. Thom, Chairman  
Candace Greenblott, Vice Chairman  
Cynthia G. Canter, Commission Member  
Paul J. Mullin, Commission Member  
Richard A. Peck, Commission Member  
Phillip B. Smith, Commission Member  
Jane Turley, Commission Member  
Isobel L. Sherwood, Clerk*

**Members Absent:** Cynthia G. Canter

**Members Present:** Phillip B. Smith, Paul J. Mullin, Richard Peck and David B. Thom

---

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

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building, 200 South Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio on Wednesday, May 12, 2000. The agenda for this meeting was published on May 5, 2000. Chair David B. Thom called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Deputy Clerk of Council Sherwood.

**B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA: None**

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

MOTION by Smith, seconded by Peck, to approve the minutes of the April 12, 2000 meeting. ROLL CALL: Voting yes: Smith, Peck, Greenblott, Turley, Mullin, Thom. Motion carried.

MOTION by Mullin, seconded by Peck, to approve the minutes of the April 26, 2000 meeting. ROLL CALL: Voting yes: Mullin, Peck, Thom, Greenblott, Turley, Smith. Motion carried.

**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.

**Z-0001-2000**

Amended ZC-01-00 To consider an initial zoning application to zone 3.7+/- acres recently annexed as L-SO, Limited Overlay Suburban Office; and to rezone 8.7 acres zoned AR to L-CC, Limited Overlay Community Commercial; for 3.7 acres located at 5071 Shagbark Road and 8.7 acres located off Beecher Road; Canini & Pellicchia, Inc., Landowner by Glen A. Dugger, applicant.

Chair opened Public hearing at 7:08 p.m.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, stated he was present representing the applicant; are four sub areas; concern was expressed about the use package for Subarea B; to address partially some of the questions that were raised by Turley, the types of retail uses that could occur were limited by changing the text so that any retail uses of that would be conditional uses and meet the conditional use provisions of code; if we did have retail use there would be an appropriate flavor and texture and a mechanism to apply to receive approval of this board; those are changes to the text which was revised and provided to you last week; glad to answer any other questions; know we didn't go as far as Turley asked but felt this was an appropriate place to apply the conditional use provisions because of its size and massing; is of an internal nature to the triangle.

Mullin questioned why cut off light fixtures were being employed; those are usually shoe box fixtures for exterior lighting; why not continuing with motif established along Beecher and in the office park; are fixtures that exist now considered cut off type

fixtures. Dugger stated he did not recall; that's a typical provision that we are asked to commit to; however, with the close mixing of different uses, and if the desire is to adopt the standard parking lot lighting as the office park to the west, feel that is a perfectly appropriate idea; no reason for spelling out; was just a standard provision; as I recall that street lighting specification was done as part of the final development plan for the office park. Mullin stated he was not sure you can get cut off in the pole design proposed; am more concerned in ending up with the mundane shoe box fixtures which would be out of character with the area. Dugger stated it was a good point and will strike that provision of the text as it applies to subarea A and B; leave lighting decision to final development plan process; don't know why it was drafted that way; don't recall why we felt it was important to say that; willing to strike it.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Turley stated she appreciated changes made in application since last workshop; there is a coordinated sign package and the 3.9 acre parcel for retail will be by the conditional use process; in my opinion this retail as a conditional use should be included to expand all community commercial parcels; there are some low impact that would be suitable but some are not; refer to Section 1133.03 on Planning Commission considerations for approval of zoning changes; need to look at adjacent land use; to the sides and rear of this proposal is either SO or AR; Schoedinger is community commercial with a conditional use; was carefully evaluated for its impact; also Schoedinger is partially accessed by US 62 and doesn't rely on Beecher; access and traffic flow are second concern; Beecher should already be 3 lane and only a turn lane is being proposed; already has considerable pedestrian traffic even with sidewalks partially completed; safety is a big consideration; is essential that Beecher flow freely to allow rapid ingress and egress; for these reasons can't support this application in its current form.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**A motion was made, seconded by Smith, to recommend ZC-01-2000 to Council for approval with revision to the text to delete reference to lighting standards in any of the subareas. The motion carried by the following vote:**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

**Z-0005-2000**

ZC-05-00 To consider a zoning application to rezone 2.484 acres as L-SO, Limited Overlay Suburban Office and 6.299 acres as L-AR, Limited Overlay Apartment Residential; for 8.94 acres currently zoned ER-1; property located at 4417 Johnstown Road; Canini & Pellicchia, Inc., contingent purchaser by Glen A. Dugger, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, stated this application is the twin of the previous one; all comments are equally applicable. Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**A motion was made, seconded by Smith, to recommend ZC-05-2000 to Council for approval with revision to the text to delete reference to lighting standards in any of the subareas. The**

**motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes**      **4**      Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom  
**Absent**    **1**      Canter

**A motion was made, seconded by Smith, to recommend to council payment of fees in lieu of park land in accordance with the recommendation of Council and the Parks & Recreation director for the portion of this application being proposed as AR. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes**      **4**      Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom  
**Absent**    **1**      Canter

**FDP-0004-2000**

To consider a Final Development Plan for property known as The Woods at Shagbark and located at 5050, 5079, 5101 Shagbark Road; to allow construction of a condominium complex; The Stonehenge Company, by Glen Dugger, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:22 p.m.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio stated that at workshop last week indicated that buildings 12 and 13 were deemed problematic by some commission members; looked at that placement and the possibility of opening up the vista down Beem ditch; have been able to do that; are able at this point to tell you that based on site considerations and easements, those two buildings can be moved further to the west to clear up those vistas; to discuss how that works requesting it go back to workshop so we can have a more appropriate discussion.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:23 p.m

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**DR-0025-2000**

Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of The Woods at Sharbark.

See discussion on previous application.

**Discussed**

**FDP-0002-2000**

FDP-02-00 To consider a final development plan to allow the construction of 3 buildings for property located at 960, 988 and 1020 Claycraft Road; John Ingwersen, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 3/02/00)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:24 p.m.

Chair stated these items would be postponed to May 24 as Board of Zoning and Building Appeals has not met yet. Chair asked for proponents. There were none. Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:25 p.m.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**DR-0013-2000**

DR-13-00 Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of 3 office buildings.

See discussion on previous application.

**Discussed**

**CU-0008-2000**

To consider a conditional use application to allow a vehicle reconditioning shop in a Community Commercial district; for property located at 187 West Johnstown Road; Fred Bichsel, applicant. (Public Hearing)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:26 p.m.

Fred Bichsel, 398 Gary Lee Drive, stated he was requesting a conditional use for an auto reconditioning shop; included a lot of information in the standard application including the history of the building; given you a list back to 1970; have 5 different buildings clustered back there; intent was to use entire building; never expected growth like this in Gahanna; this was once the largest commercial building in Gahanna; once you build a building for a specific use it is difficult to market for something else; rear part especially is limited to very few uses; do apologize for not understanding about auto body shop; felt that was wrecked cars. Thom asked exactly what is usage; felt it was glorified auto body; exactly what they are doing. Bichsel stated there were 8 cars there today; 7 left same day; do work for dealers and rental car agencies; little dents seem to be the average damage; fill it with Bondo and sand it down; do outside on site of client but work done at this site never includes any welding or hammering; no wrecked cars; saw one car in there couldn't figure out what was wrong; if a car is wrecked they can't handle it; do quite a few cars per day; also have shop on west side. In response to question, Bichsel stated they do not store cars outside; that was a part of the lease; no outside storage. Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Greenblott stated Zoning Division has received complaints; do you know nature of those complaints. Bichsel stated one was about the employees cars; Mr. Hall made the complaint; that's been settled; there is an easement down there; don't know of any others.

Peck asked for clarification on cars repaired on site. Bichsel stated they do no work outside on site; they will go to customer's location and work on them outside; but not outside on this site; have a mobile unit; there is no spray work, no sanding, nothing outside at our site; is some done inside building; ventilation system installed by Advanced Development; filter system was installed also; very clean operation.

In response to question from Greenblott, D'Ambrosio stated she knew there were complaints but did not have specifics with her.

Mullin stated that one concern is that this is a conditional use application; in and of itself it sounds fairly reasonable; do have a concern that if this is approved are we in effect approving something that could go far beyond the activities that are being discussed in this application such as could it be construed for a full blown body shop.

King questioned if vehicle reconditioning was actually defined; answer is no; category says automotive services except repair; could exclude care of automobiles; not turning this into an auto body shop; don't know that automobile services are defined in code.

Peck stated that to echo Mullin's concerns; adopting these specifications from SIC question as to whether this fits under 753 or 754; is a repair; is not replacing a water pump but as a lay person feel this is a very scaled back version of a body shop; is not cutting off fenders and frame straightening, etc; had work like this done; where it falls in interpretation of the code whether in 753 or 754; by approving a very limited use are we opening up a much broader category.

Thom stated he questioned this in conjunction with the West Gahanna Plan; discourages auto uses in that given area; as I recall approximately 2 years ago we denied an application for a body shop in this same building; to me this is still an auto body shop;

do have some concerns on setting a precedent.

Greenblott stated that Building Department has expressed concerns that this business does not have paint booth and building rating to meet code.

Bichsel stated that the insurance company had checked building as to exhaust fans, etc. and had no problems; won't allow a full fledged body shop; understand that is out of the questions; can't afford to have the noise or the wrecked cars; for me is a financial issue; need to support the building and repairs; trying to improve; don't believe we have ruined anybody's property in the area; don't want to harm anyone's value including our own.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:42 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Greenblott stated she can't support based on Section 1169.03 2&3 which I find not to be supported; do not feel that this use is in accordance with plans for the area; and automotive is to be discouraged on the West Gahanna plan; also states it will not have undesirable effects; do not agree; am greatly bothered that Building Department questions the safety of this type of operation; can't support.

Thom stated that a couple of years ago denied an auto body in same area; according to West Gahanna plan we should discourage automotive uses and have grave concerns that by approving we would be setting a precedent especially in regard to the one we denied a couple of years ago; feel definition of auto body repair and reconditioning is a fine line.

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

<b>Yes</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>No</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

Chair advised applicant of his right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days; contact Clerk's office for further information.

**FP-0003-2000**

To consider a final plat for the Crossroads Commerce Center/Exxcel Contract Management, Inc., applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:41 p.m.

John LeFauve; Exxcel Contract Management, 250 East Broad St., stated he had submitted for Triangle Real Estate Services for review and approval a final plat showing the development in the area of Taylor and Taylor Station; finalization of preliminary plat previously submitted and approved.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Mullin asked if the plan was identical to the preliminary plat. LeFeuve stated the new plat distributed today had some updates to the instrument readings; county courthouse readings transferred title from Kenney Family Partnership; no plot lines have changed. Mullin asked if the subdivision plan has been laid out by the applicant in the manner he

chooses to do so; as such can expect zoning issues will be complied with in forthcoming development. LeFeuve agreed.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:43 p.m.

**A motion was made by Smith that this matter be Recommended for Approval to Council. The motion carried by the following vote:**

<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter
<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom

**FDP-0005-2000**

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of an office warehouse facility; for property known as Parcel #5 of the Crossroads Commerce Center located south and east of Taylor and Taylor Station Roads; Donald Kenney by Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 5/04/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:45 p.m.

Dallas Marson and Dick Fisher, Collaborative Design, 5880 Sawmill Road, Dublin, stated they were present to represent Triangle Real Estate Services; here to present parcel #5 as part of the plat you just approved; is a 120,000 s.f. facility on this property; will contain office space and warehousing; believe everything submitted to date meets your zoning requirements as to parking, landscaping, etc.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:47 p.m.

Chair stated this item would be discussed at 6:30 p.m. on Mary 17 in workshop.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**DR-0019-2000**

Certificate of Appropriateness for Parcel #5 of Crossroads Commerce Center; to allow construction of an office warehouse facility; Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

**Discussed**

**FDP-0006-2000**

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of an office warehouse facility; for property known as Parcel #2 of the Crossroads Commerce Center located south and east of Taylor and Taylor Station Roads; Donald Kenny by Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 5/04/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:48 p.m.

Dallas Marson, Collaborative Design, 5880 Sawmill Road, stated that building #2 is in same development; approximately 66,000 s.f. of a combination of office and warehouse; meets all zoning requirements.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Mullin asked how many acres are in total development packet. Fisher replied there was a total of 50 acres. Mullin stated that in looking at these first two would not like to think we are looking at 50 acres of mauve; am not ready for that; might want to take a look at the exterior building palette between now and workshop.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:51 p.m.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop at 6:45 p.m. on May 17.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**DR-0026-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Parcel #2 of Crossroads Commerce Center; to allow construction of an office warehouse facility; Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

**Discussed**

**V-0012-2000**

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1151.16(d) (Old PUD Code) to allow a shed within a rear yard setback area and within an easement area; for property located at 573 Landover Place; Donald J. Nucerino, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 5/04/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:53 p.m.

Donald J. Nucerino, 573 Landover Place, stated he was applying for a variance for a shed that is in rear easement; purchased the property 3 years ago; at the time of the purchase, the survey showed no code violations; this situation was unknown to me; am using shed for various items including storage for maintenance supplies on the above ground pool; when this was brought to my attention, was told to move it, lose it, or apply for variance; with situation of yard and above ground pool there is no place to move it; if you don't grant this variance will not be able to move it; can sit on my deck and see several sheds in view that I feel are in violation; in speaking with the Zoning Office, some if not all were grandfathered; shed is being used and if I have to remove it completely, it will entail repairing the fence because the previous owner did not put a fence behind the shed; will mismatch shed or need to replace entire fence; would be difficult to do at this time; there is a 6' privacy fence currently existing; purchased the home in this condition.

Turley reference photo submitted and asked if shed could be moved forward. Nucerino stated there was also a side easement to take into consideration; on the other side of pool would have to sit smack in the middle of the yard so don't think it would be an option; needs to be 5' from side and 10' from rear; there is a large tree in that area of the yard; shed is not on a slab.

Chair asked for opponents. Robert Russell, 566 Rocky Fork Ct., stated he had built the fence and moved it in 4" off his property line; shed was installed so that it pushed my fence over another 4" to 6"; is bending my fence; hate to give up more ground; this storage shed isn't anchored down; couldn't be too hard to move; would like to get it back away from my fence; when I built the fence it had to go to code and got permit and had it inspected; we followed the code and feel that everybody should have to follow it; am only interested in getting it back away from my fence; feel the shed is about 8" on my property. Thom asked if the shed was moved forward towards the house, would Russell have any objection. Russell stated if the shed was moved anywhere from 8" to 1 foot he would not object; don't want it on my property; don't think that's asking too much; fence was put installed in 1979 and shed has been there about 5 years; started objecting when it was installed; been arguing for 5 years now; Booth last June gave them 90 days; then gave him more time; that's OK but will be another year next month; that's plenty of time; will help him move it if necessary.

Chair asked for rebuttal. Nucerino stated he first became aware of this situation in a letter from Booth on March 23; appreciate Russell's concerns; will be glad to move it



back 8" to 1 foot; this was my first indication of a problem; to move this shed 1 foot or so would not be a hardship; would not object.

In response to question from Mullin, D'Ambrosio stated the easement is a sanitary sewer easement.

Peck noted that Landmark Survey Group, Inc. had been paid for a survey by the applicant. Nucerino stated that survey was paid by mortgage service at time of closing by them; don't know if they checked the auditor's records. Peck stated he sees the stamp where a registered surveyor stated this is accurate and this appears not to be the case; whether it is or not it is in a utility easement; does that obligate city in any way if we needed to get to that sanitary sewer tonight. King stated that was a risk the homeowner takes. Nucerino stated he would not contest; in an easement may lose shed anyway. Thom asked if the variance was still needed if the shed was moved in 1' from current location. D'Ambrosio stated that it is a 10' variance from the rear property line. Dave asked Russell if moving 1' was acceptable to him. Russell stated he just wanted it away from his fence and off his property.

Was stated that fence is in 8" to 10" from property line; moving 1' from fence would put the shed right on property line; still staying with the 10' variance.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Peck stated that in looking at this we are dealing with an old section of code; look at Section 1131.03 as to requirements for approval and am inclined on balance to find special circumstances in that combination of factors; is an existing shed and although it doesn't mean it should be permitted to remain if there was something wrong; at same time see that it was not intentionally done by current landowner; doesn't seem to be an element; would be an expense to remedy the inherited property condition made by a previous owner; may be an issue to the existing use; provided the shed is moved away from neighbor and fact that these yards are fully enclosed so it doesn't impact on site lines to form an open area. on balance can support.

Turley stated that in all fairness to all neighbors in the area that complied with zoning ordinance don't think we can grant this variance; especially over sewer easement without special compelling circumstances; shed can be moved as it is not on a slab; feel it should be brought into compliance.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**A motion was made to approve V-0012-2000 with the condition that the shed be moved a minimum of 12" to the east from current placement. The motion failed by the following vote:**

- Yes**      2      Peck and Chairman Thom
- No**        2      Smith and Mullin
- Absent**    1      Canter

Chair advised applicant of his right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days; contact Clerk's office for further information.

**V-0013-2000**

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1137.08(b), Yard Requirements, to allow a barn higher than that allowed by the code; for property located at 4400 Shull Road; Rick & Mary Ann Amari, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 5/5/2000)

D'Ambrosio stated she had spoken with the Amari's and apologized for our mistake and they were very willing to leave. Thom stated this application was determined to not need a variance; has been withdrawn.

**Withdrawn**

**A motion was made by Mullin, seconded by Smith, to recommend to Council the return of a fee of \$75.00 for a variance application that was not needed.. The motion carried by the following vote:**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

**DR-0018-2000**

DR-18-00 Certificate of Appropriateness; 104 Mill Street, Bryon Carley by Danny Popp, Architect, applicant.

Danny Popp, 855 E. Cooke Road, stated he was available to answer any questions; had a good design review meeting last week; feel everything was ironed out; glad to answer any questions.

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

<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

**G. NEW BUSINESS:**

**DR-0024-2000**

Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; Creative Image Photography by John Cafaro.

John Cafaro, stated he was the owner of Creative Image; have moved into storefront at Hunters Ridge shopping center; replace sign that was there from previous tenant. Turley asked if the background will match the background of the existing. Cafaro stated he assumed it would; is the company that landlord said I had to use. Mullin noted that the City does need to follow up on the Hallmark matter.

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

<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

**DR-0028-2000**

Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; 345-B Granville St., Judy's As Good As New SHop by Hill Sign Co., applicant.

Judy Williams, 1242 Brookcliff, stated she was the owner of As Good as New II in Gahanna and original shop in Bexley; here because I was told to be; looking for building sign and directory sign.

Peck questioned if Hill Sign Co. was employed because she had dealt with them before or were you directed to them; are they a licensed sign contractor in Gahanna.

D'Ambrosio stated that Williams did building signage herself; directory sign was done by others and is on the agenda later this evening; Hill Sign Co. just makes signs; they do not install.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Greenblott stated she would like to welcome Williams to Gahanna and saying that let you know that I am really tough on signs; want to see you thrive here; would not have gone along with this sign; bothers me that text is crooked on Judy's and would have asked you to come up with another example for us to vote on; for that reason will not support; doesn't please my eye; not an example of the type of signage I would like to see; can't support this sign. Williams stated it is the exact same as Columbus Bridal was. Greenblott stated that when change is made we take advantage of the situation to correct what has been displeasing us.

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

<b>No</b>	<b>1</b>	Peck
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter
<b>Yes</b>	<b>3</b>	Smith, Mullin and Chairman Thom

**DR-0029-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage for property located at 850 Morrison Road; The Premium Group, Inc. by Buckeye Sign Services, applicant.

Mark Robinette, 4654 Winery Way, Gahanna, stated he was an employee of Premium Group; Premium Group is a malpractice liability insurance company with main offices in Cleveland; had an office in this area; change the signage at this office space from previous tenant. In response to question from Peck, Robinette stated this sign is not up. Mullin stated that what you have done with signage superimposed over an existing photo, gives an unfortunate image; can this signage be laid out so that it doesn't extend beyond the jams of the door and door windows; looks lopsided. Robinette stated that it could be done.

**Discussed**

**A motion was made, seconded by Mullin, to approve subject to the condition that the signage does not extend beyond the outside door jamb or the window frame at the corner of the building. The motion carried by the following vote:**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

**DR-0030-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 80-4 N. Hamilton Road; Pilates Italia Studio by Signs by Tomorrow, applicant.

Bruce Guercio, stated he was the owner of Pilates; have shops in Dublin, German Village and Gahanna; here to get approval of the signage for the street sign as well as the windows; did not receive notification as it was sent to the sign company so am not totally prepared; have sample of the material and pms color; for the brown; 08 is the pms color; this is the street sign of Gahanna Square; Ohio Specialty Shops was the previous company; slipped out the panel and replaced it with the same color. Turley stated she has not seen the sign at night; does it light up or is it opaque; does it match background. Guercio stated it was not exactly the same shade of brown; is darker; not as opaque; in daytime you can tell it is a little different. Turley asked if the panel over the store will be covered. Guercio stated that piece will come down and will cover the electrical with

a blank panel.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Mullin stated it is his understanding that this has been installed. Guercio stated it is up; was not aware that I needed this permit; landlord did not inform me; business neighbors didn't say anything; have not had to do this in other communities; used same sign company for German Village location; understand they are licensed now but was not at the time.

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

<b>No</b>	<b>3</b>	Smith, Mullin and Peck
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter
<b>Yes</b>	<b>1</b>	Chairman Thom

Chair advised applicant of his right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days; contact Clerk's office for further information.

**DR-0031-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 345 Granville Street; M&S< Inc., by Sign A Rama, applicant.

Frank Zura, Sign A Rama, 64 Granville St., stated that the sign that has been changed did not get a Certificate of Appropriateness for; originally started out as a brown sign with light almond color letters; was going to be the same; certain requests over time by the owner evolved; 3 different businesses are located in there; made comment to owner that I didn't think it would be a problem; take 100% responsibility for this; at subsequent times owner changed from dark brown to gold; reversed the colors; have had hands smacked and willing to take responsibility this time.

Greenblott stated originally there were no tenant panels in that sign; made decision that was OK also. Zura stated that originally owner told me that there was signage made instead of separate panels to do vinyl lettering and put on bottom; assumed and took responsibility for aluminum panels which make it easier to change out the signs; made that assumption and was wrong; started out to be same sign but changed dramatically through the process.

Greenblott stated that Zura should know better than to put a sign up without coming before us; to make a decision to put tenant panels on when you have sat through debate enough times to hear we struggle with tenant panels and what to do with increasing number of businesses; can't support this; has to come a time where we put our foot down; very serious about signage in Gahanna; take it as a slap in the face you would erect a sign without coming before us. Zura stated there was no malice; owner and I talked about replacing a sign the same as the other only smaller; that progressed and changed over time; in all fairness plead true ignorance; was not aware you don't like tenant panels; took the assumption that if there was a bottom panel not being used; it could be opened up and available to put vinyl or painted; felts you would like the panels better; that's my fault; nothing to do with Debbie Smith; all I can say is that it got out of hand; appreciate what you are saying and understand.

Turley noted guidelines for tenant panels; does this meet those; was it discussed in staff review. D'Ambrosio stated she was not aware of guidelines for tenant panels.

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

<b>Yes</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>No</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

Chair advised applicant of his right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days; contact Clerk's office for further information.

**Z-0006-2000**

Z-0006-2000 To consider an initial zoning for 0.882 acres at 4240 N. Hamilton Road; pursuant to Section 1133.08 of the Codified Ordinances; Maria E. and William D. Van Huffel, landowners.

Clerk stated this property was annexed several months ago along with Hamilton Road right of way; neglected to zone the property at that time; is a code mandated zoning of SF-1; will be a non conforming use of the dental office at this site.

A motion was made by Peck, seconded by Smith, that this matter be Recommended to Council for Approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

**SWP-0006-2000**

To consider a subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 3.546 acres out of a 21.537 acre parcel to allow a sale of land; 18.225 acres to be purchased by the City of Gahanna.

Jennifer D'Ambrosio, Deputy Director of Development, stated they were requesting approval of this application; made application for rezoning today which will be heard at the June 14 meeting; rezoning is to rezone the 3.5 acres to ER-2 as they will no long meet the ER-1 zoning requirement of 5 acres; this lot split enables us to finalize the property purchase of the balance of this site.

Mullin stated that is was amazing in this City that things do get accomplished; Price Road is a shining example of that; this is something that should have been done 10 years ago and wasn't for a variety of reasons.

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

<b>Yes</b>	<b>4</b>	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Canter

**H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**Committee of the Whole**

Chair stated that the quarterly meeting has been set for May 31 at 6:00 p.m.; please have agenda items to Clerk by Friday.

**I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:**

**Director of Development.**

Creekside festival is June 17th ; will be receiving an invitation to dedication ceremony; will be dedicating island on that day.

**J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS: None**

**K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.**

Smith stated that new issue of Zoning Journal on Promises Kept Promises Broken is excellent; note that there are 200 Lustron houses left in the US and we have preserved one; Columbus was in there 4 or 5 different times.

Greenblott stated she would like to know the nature of complaints when something has come to us through that venue; would like to have them noted in the staff comments.

**L. ADJOURNMENT: 8:44 p.m. - Motion by Smith, seconded by Turley.**

\*

\_\_\_\_\_  
ISOBEL L. SHERWOOD, CMC  
Deputy Clerk of Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC**  
**Clerk of Council**

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair Signature