



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

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

Sophia McGuire, Deputy Clerk of Council

Wednesday, June 26, 2024

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 26, 2024. The agenda for this meeting was published on June 21, 2024. Chair James Mako called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by John Hicks.

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

Absent 1 - Sarah Pollyea

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2024-0125](#)

Planning Commission Minutes 6.12.2024

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

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

Absent: 1 - Pollyea

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

[DR-0009-2024](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for site plan and landscaping for .53 of 15 acres at 817 N. Hamilton Rd.; Parcel ID: 025-001918; Current Zoning RID; One Church; David Domine, 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. Capka introduced the applications as both being for One Church. Both applications were submitted prior to the zoning code change that went into effect on May 1, 2024. The property is zoned Restricted Institutional District (RID) and is located on the west side of North Hamilton Road. Capka shared a brief history of development on the site. In June 2017 a Design Review application was approved for 233 new parking spaces. Minor modifications were approved to the lot in 2020, which did not change the number of parking spaces. In April 2023, a Design Review application was approved for a new parking lot and landscaping in the northeast corner of the lot, bringing the total number of parking spaces to the current amount of 561, not including the gravel lot. There was a condition to add additional screening to the north property line. In October 2023 a gravel lot was installed without approval. Applications were filed due to Code Enforcement action. In May 2024, a Design Review was approved for building modifications only. Currently, there are Final Development Plan, Design Review, and Variance applications under review for building addition and parking lot modifications.

The applicant is requesting approval for Design Review and Variance applications for a temporary gravel parking lot. Zoning code, both current and previous, does not permit gravel lots anywhere in the city. Therefore, a variance is required. The lot is 23,022 square feet with 60-70 parking spaces. It is located 21 feet from the front of the property line along Hamilton Road, so a setback variance is required. The applicant states the lot is for overflow parking for Sunday service. The lot was originally going to be removed in summer 2024 when construction began on the new addition, but removal has been pushed back to fall 2024 by the applicant.

Capka provided a site plan showing the lot approved in 2023, the lot approved in 2017, and the location of the gravel lot. The gravel lot is in the southeast corner of the property. It encroaches 15 feet into the 36-foot front yard setback but is located out of the side yard setback.

Capka shared photos of the parking lot, noting that visibility is increased because it is set higher than the area the church sits on. Screening is

minimal and includes four trees. There are five specific variances. The first is that the parking lot must be at least 36 feet from the right of way. The gravel lot is 21 feet from the right of way. Second, all parking lots must be hard-surfaced with asphalt, cement, or a similar material. Gravel is not considered a hard surface. Third, parking lots must provide adequate lighting. There is no lighting for this parking lot. The applicant states it is only used during the day and therefore lighting is not necessary. Fourth, which is six total variances consolidated into one because of their similarities, is regarding interior landscaping requirements. Parking lots must be screened from the right-of-way, include interior landscaping, and have one tree per 100 square feet of interior landscaping. There is no landscaping included with these applications due to the temporary nature of the lot. The final variance requested pertains to screening requirements. Code states that parking lots adjacent to residential areas must have a six-foot tall continuous screen of at least 80% opacity. Here, there is no screening provided between the parking lot and the residential lot to the south. There is some existing mature foliage, but it does not reach 80% opacity.

Design Review criteria include the following: compatibility with existing structures; contributes to the improvement of the design of the district; contributes to the economic and community vitality of the district; and maintains, protects, and enhances physical surroundings. Criteria for Variance approval include the following: there are special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use; the granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; and the granting of the application will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood.

Staff recommends disapproval of the Design Review. There are no other gravel lots in the immediate area and it is visible from Hamilton Road due to lack of screening. It encroaches 15' into the front yard setback. Most approved gravel lots were in industrial areas, and most were approved as temporary lots. Multiple temporary lots were not removed and exist years past the approved timeline. It is difficult to enforce timelines. If approved, Planning Commission may add conditions for a strict timeline and/or screening. Capka also noted that Planning Commission added a condition for the application approved in April of 2023 that has not yet been met. The condition was for screening along the north property line. The City received a complaint from a resident. Code Enforcement visited the site with the City Forester and noted that most required landscaping had not been installed. A notice of violation was issued. One Church is working with City staff to remedy the violation.

Staff also recommends disapproval of the parking lot setback variance and that all parking lots must be hard surfaced. If the Design Review is approved, staff recommends approval for the parking lot lighting, interior landscaping requirements, and screening variances. The latter are typical of gravel lots, especially ones that are temporary.

Chair opened public comment at 7:14 p.m.

Greg Ford, One Church Pastor, shared an apology with the Commission for conducting some of their projects out of the typical sequence that is required. He expressed that One Church attempts to conduct themselves in a positive manner. He added that this week is their “Love Thy Neighbor” week, in which 250 people are working on nine community service projects in the area. They do not want to create frustration through issues such as traffic flow. They hope to be a blessing in the community. Ford shared there are 70-80 vehicles that park in the gravel lot, which equates to about 100 people who would otherwise be parking across the street and walking to the church. There are people who park on the grass and there have been cars that have been towed. The plantings in the northeast lot were decided upon in conjunction with the residents at Castle Pines. He noted that, despite some missteps, One Church has tried to be an excellent partner in the community. He asked for leniency from the Commission. There are many projects in the queue right now to meet the need for expansion of the church. The gravel lot is intended to be very temporary. It has been proven that people will continue to come to services. He again implored Planning Commission to work with the church on these issues.

David Domine, One Church Expansion Director, 128 Academy Woods Drive. Mr. Domine thanked Ms. Capka for her presentation. He understands the mistake that was made when installing the parking lot. He provided a presentation to share additional information. Mr. Domine highlighted the special circumstances of this project, which include the temporary nature due to anticipated excavation upon approval of another construction project. He noted that the gravel parking lot keeps attendees from parking across the street and keeps the area safer when it is wet. He noted the site will be completely changed when the upcoming construction project begins, adding that there is a sense of urgency from the church. He shared a future site plan, which is currently under review by the City and will come forward to Planning Commission at a later date.

Laura Newman, 795 Cherry Wood Place. Ms. Newman stated that she lives in a cul-de-sac that is behind the One Church site. She has lived in her home for 26 years and her children attended Evangel Christian Academy, which became Gahanna Christian Academy. She stated that

in 2005 there was a fundraiser for one million dollars to construct a new preschool. She dedicated over 200 hours of her time to volunteer her graphic design skills for the program. Her concern related to a pond that will be moved during the construction process. She also expressed concern for wildlife that may be impacted if the pond is moved.

Sandy Haines, 285 Eastchester Court. Ms. Haines stated that her home also borders One Church. She had questions regarding the plan. She wondered if the new plans for the site had been approved yet and, if not, why there is an assumption of approval.

Christy Nelson, 406 Castle Pines Drive. Ms. Nelson stated that Castle Pines is adjacent to the new parking lot that was added in 2023. Ms. Nelson provided a graphic with the Commission; see file attachments. Since a new parking lot is being proposed on the south end, she wanted to share the community's concerns caused by the construction of the north end parking lot. The north parking lot is set back about 25 feet from Castle Pines Drive, which is a street off Hamilton Road. The property line is closer and about 15 feet from the north edge. She questioned if Hamilton Road and Castle Pines Road have different setback requirements and if the current 15-foot setback is within requirements. The second issue she brought up was related to landscaping. She stated the landscaping on the north edge is about 240 feet in length and the west edge is about 125 feet. Most of the trees have been planted by the Castle Pines association during the years they have been there. One Church has added some arborvitae, and she acknowledged meeting with church personnel regarding landscaping. The concern lies in the amount of coverage there is. She stated One Church has added about 15 arborvitae along the long edge and 10 along the short edge. Additionally, there are some trees with a trunk and crown at the top, which will not provide a barrier between One Church and Castle Pines. She expressed the community's concern that over time there will not be sufficient insulation from the pedestrian and parking traffic generated by One Church. Additionally, the lot is used for church recreation activities which add to the sound level and congestion.

The Chair provided an opportunity for the applicant to communicate with the residents. Mr. Domine thanked the residents for their effort to speak their concerns. First, he stated there are remedies being installed as of that day. Initially, there was an effort to cooperate with Castle Pines to put trees where the association wanted them. As a result, the approved plan was not entirely followed, which resulted in a violation. The approved plan is now being installed as written. He expressed their desire to cooperate with neighbors. To acknowledge comments about the setbacks, he noted that the north lot was installed correctly. There is a 15' side setback

because that is the requirement for a side setback. The plans were approved by Engineering as well as Planning.

Chair Mako closed public comment at 7:28 p.m.

Mr. Shapaka asked Ms. Newman to return to the podium and restate her comment so that clarification could be provided. While viewing the presentation provided by Mr. Domine, Ms. Newman noted that the white roof on the south portion of the plan shows a white roof. Her street is just south of that building. She can see the parking lot from her home. She wondered if the pond will be moved in the future site plan. Mr. Domine confirmed, adding that the plan is under review and has not yet been approved. He shared with Ms. Newman that the pond is proposed to be moved to the site of the parking lot that Ms. Newman sees. Ms. Newman asked if the pond is used for drainage. Mr. Domine informed her that it is used for stormwater drainage. It was initially intended for recreation but that is no longer its purpose. Ms. Newman shared her concerns about flooding. She stated there is drainage from that area that impacts her landscaping. Mr. Domine said that the entire site is redesigned with the new plans and will work more effectively. Ms. Newman expressed hope that it will drain to the creek and wondered if the woods will be impacted. Mr. Domine confirmed the creek is that outlet, and that there is an anticipated 15-foot setback proposed. If approved, some of the wooded area would be removed to accommodate the setback.

Mr. Shapaka expressed his surprise that there was gravel so close to Hamilton Road and wondered how the setback was decided upon. Mr. Domine said that it was an arbitrary distance, adding that they inadvertently dumped extra gravel on the site and had measured 35 feet from Hamilton Road rather than the right-of-way. He stated the decision was irresponsible. Mr. Shapaka asked if the proposed parking lot meets setback requirements, which Mr. Domine confirmed. Mr. Shapaka inquired about the timeline for the installment of the parking lot. Mr. Domine stated that it is in the hands of the city because it is undergoing review. A best-case scenario is that it will begin in 11 weeks but could extend longer. He reiterated that they feel a sense of urgency and any delay will not be caused by the church.

Mr. Hicks reminded attendees that some of the questions and issues raised thus far focused on future applications, rather than the application being discussed at present. Mr. Hicks wondered if it was a reasonable assumption that people would continue to park on the lot even if there was no gravel there. Domine confirmed it would be difficult to control where churchgoers park. Mr. Hicks wonder if people park across the street at present, even with the additional lot. Mr. Domine stated that

some do, and it can be difficult to control where people park. Mr. Hicks asked if Mr. Domine is open to a timeline restriction on this variance application. Mr. Domine confirmed, adding that they are open to a partial approval as well, such as a change to the setback. Any of these options are preferred to not having any lot there.

Mr. Greenberg asked what the organization would do to ensure it is on the same page as the city. Mr. Domine expressed that as time has gone on, he has a better understanding of how important it is to follow the approved plans. That is what they intend to do moving forward. He stated this instance was a bad judgment call. Mr. Greenberg asked if Mr. Domine could suggest a date at which point the lot could be removed. Mr. Domine reiterated that he cannot control when the approvals are made.

Mr. Suriano directed a question to the administration. He wondered if, in the instance people continue to park on grass if the gravel lot is removed, it is a violation of code. City Planner Capka confirmed that it would be a violation, and a citation would be issued through Code Enforcement. Suriano wondered if the area of the gravel lot would be used for layout space during the construction process. Mr. Domine outlined the sequence. First, the parking lot would be excavated and leveled. Then, the auditorium would be built, followed by paving. He added that all elements, including drainage, would be implemented before the lighting and paving.

Mr. Tamarkin clarified with Mr. Domine where on the proposed plan the auditorium is located. The auditorium will be in the green space between an existing building and the gravel parking lot. The parking lot will then be paved. Mr. Tamarkin noted this could be one to two years away. Mr. Domine said the excavation will happen immediately, which closes the gravel lot. The lot will be used to store construction materials and then paved. As far as timing goes, the removal of the parking lot depends on how quickly the approvals are made. In order to accomplish the proposed changes, the back of the site also changes significantly. Tamarkin remarked on how many parking spaces will be lost during construction. Domine stated that 126 parking spaces will be unusable during construction. If the approval is delayed into winter, the construction may be delayed into spring. Domine added that the contractors are lined up.

Chair Mako asked if the natural conditions of the site are driving the need for these changes. Mr. Domine confirmed, noting that high attendance turnout is the primary factor. He stated there is an urgency to give guests a place to park. Mr. Mako asked where the offsite parking is. Mr. Domine

replied that they can park at Heartland Bank and the nearby OSU medical center. They strongly urge their guests to use the shuttle to cross Hamilton Road.

Mr. Shapaka asked Director Blackford how long it takes an application to move through the City's approvals. Director Blackford shared that the time depends on the complexity of the project and quality of the applications. A typical timeframe for Planning Commission applications can be two to three months. However, this is dependent upon the applicant and their representatives' responsiveness. Sometimes applications can take years. Mr. Shapaka asked why a Design Review application was necessary for the project. Director Blackford stated that the prior code required it, however, it was removed from the new code that went into effect May 1, 2024. Shapaka asked if the variances for lighting and grass were necessary, even though the gravel lot is temporary. Director Blackford confirmed.

Mr. Shapaka inquired with Mr. Roth about the requirements for amending the application for a motion to approve. Mr. Roth said the preference is for the mover to state the amendment first. Mr. Hicks asked if the Commission is permitted to put a time limit on the variance. Mr. Roth said this is permissible, while noting that enforcement may be an issue. Mr. Shapaka acknowledged this could be a six-month process. Mr. Tamarkin asked if it could be a contingent upon approval of the project. Mr. Roth noted the possibility that the project is not approved. Director Blackford added that the same condition also needs to be added to the Design Review.

Mr. Suriano asked if a Design Review application and Final Development Plan at a later date for the parking lot itself in the event the auditorium is not approved. Director Blackford confirmed.

Mr. Greenberg wondered if there would be dust control measures in place for the gravel lot. Mr. Domine replied that they have not noticed dust but would be willing to explore options to control it. Of all the three services on a Sunday, there might be around 120 cars that use the lot. Greenberg noted that there are environmental agencies that use calculations to measure the dust and determine if it is causing a problem. Domine said they use an agency to measure dust and can ask for their assistance on this project.

A motion was made by Shapaka, seconded by Hicks, that the Design Review be Approved with an amendment that the application expires December 31, 2024.

Discussion on the motion

:

Hicks stated this is not something that would normally be approved if permission had been asked for instead of forgiveness. Due to the limited time frame, he supports the application. Mr. Greenberg and Mr. Suriano echoed their support with the amended timeline.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Pollyea

[V-0015-2024](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary sections 1154.03(a)(7), 1163.05(a), 1163.06(a), 1163.08(b-g), and 1167.18(b)(1) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; for property located at 817 N. Hamilton Rd.; Parcel ID 025-001918; Current Zoning RID; One Church; David Domine, applicant.

A motion was made by Shapaka, seconded by Hicks, that the Variance be Approved with an amendment that the application expires December 31, 2024. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Pollyea

[Z-0001-2024](#)

To recommend approval to Council, a Zoning Application for 2.58 +/- acres of property located at 5061 Shagbark Rd; parcel ID 027-000117; Current Zoning ER (formerly ER-2); Proposed Zoning L-R-4 (formerly L-MFRD); HC Shagbark Real Estate LLC; Christopher Cristoff, applicant.

City Planner Maddie Capka provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. Ms. Capka shared that the application is for a rezoning and was initially filed under the previous zoning. The site is located just east of Hamilton Road behind the Autozone and Firestone sites, and just west of the Woods at Shagbark neighborhood. Because the code changed while the application was under review, this application is a bit different than other rezonings. The site is essentially being rezoned from Estate Residential to Large Multifamily Residential. ER-2 is the former zoning, which is now ER. They have the same development standards. The same can be said for MFRD and L-R-4. The site is proposed to be rezoned with a limited overlay, which will require it to be used as residential only and will not include other uses such as childcare and nursing homes. The applicant is proposing 14 townhomes on 2.5 acres, which is fairly low density. In the previous zoning code, when a site was rezoned to multifamily residential, the owner had to dedicate land to the city or pay fees in lieu of the dedication. The Parks & Recreation Board recommends that this project follow the fees-in-lieu guidelines. No variances are required at this time.

Capka provided a location map that showed housing density of surrounding areas. There are many neighborhoods in the area that have similar characteristics and density as the one proposed. The conceptual site plan offered setbacks that were all greater than what code requires. There are also buffering requirements that can be met with landscaping, fencing, or mounding. This plan shows a buffering zone that exceeds requirements. A conceptual elevation was shared. Although it will not be reviewed today, Capka wished to provide extra context to Planning Commission. As mentioned, there is a limited overlay text introduced with the rezoning. The overlay text only permits residential use, and no other uses that are typically conditionally permitted. Additionally, the overlay states that the site will be developed substantially similar to the conceptual site plan, which will be reviewed with future applications.

The Land Use Plan, which was adopted in 2019 and is not a regulatory document, designates the site as "Professional Office." The LUP recommends a use for this site that is more intense than what is proposed in the rezoning application. The LUP also mentions that Gahanna needs more diverse housing options.

If approval is recommended to City Council, Council we vote on the Rezoning application. Then, a Major Development Plan application will be required prior to site development. A Conditional Use is not required for the proposed use, and the Major Development Plan will only require Planning Commission approval. If the Rezoning application is not recommended, it will not go to City Council for approval.

The rezoning criteria are as follows. Consistency with the goals of the Land Use Plan, physical compatibility of property with allowed uses, availability of site elsewhere already zoned for proposed use, compatibility of all potential uses allowed in proposed zoning, capacity of infrastructure, and apparent demand for permitted uses.

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning application. They believe all criteria have been met. The use is limited to residential only through the overlay text. The 14 units at 5.42 dwelling units per acre will not have a major impact. Multifamily is appropriate for the area and aligns with adjacent land uses. Office uses, recommended in the LUP, would generate higher traffic and have more negative impacts. Multifamily housing is in high demand and staff is not aware of other sites zoned R-4 that are available for development. Finally, the current site layout does not require any variances.

Chair opened public comment at 8:07 p.m.

Matthew Cull, attorney for the applicant, introduced himself. He appreciated Ms. Capka's presentation. He feels the proposed rezoning is reasonable and the best use for the parcel. The goal is not to maximize profit like in other developments. According to Cull, it meets all six criteria.

Cynthia Hite, 1168 Shagbark Road. Ms. Hite commented on the trees near her property at the Woods at Shagbark. The wooded area is one of the reasons she and her husband moved to that development. She directed comments toward the applicant, requesting that the trees be left where they are during development, so that both sites have a buffer. She also wondered what the average cost of the units would be.

Bill Miller, 1198 Sanctuary Place. Mr. Miller stated he is present with Bruce Brown, who is a neighbor at Shagbark. Generally, they approve of the zoning change with some reservations. He referenced a packet that he handed out to the Commission; see file attachments. The community at Shagbark has concerns about density, quality, environment, security, economic effects on the Woods at Shagbark and property values. Referencing exhibit A in the packet, he provided an easement for the Woods at Shagbark and Valvoline. Exhibit B highlights the slopes on the site. The southern portion of the slope has been cleared, but the eastern portion contains much of the vegetation on the site. In Exhibit C, the easily buildable area is about 9/10 of an acre of the 2.5 total acres due to the extreme slopes on the site. Finally, there are two access points to the site. One is the Shagbark Woods access point, and the other is the Valvoline access point. Both of those are in a different location from the proposed plan. Exhibit E shows that the Valvoline easement conflicts with one of the building sites. Four units are on a steep slope that will be difficult and expensive to build upon. Miller recommended that the location of the buildings be limited to the flat site area, and to decrease the number of units to fit comfortably and attractively within the available site area. He also recommended keeping much of the environment as natural as possible, minimize erosion, and provide an attractive atmosphere for potential buyers. Additionally, he asked the requested overlay provided in the packet be adopted.

Bruce Brown, 1211 Shagbark Road. Mr. Brown shared 15 overlay restrictions mentioned in Mr. Miller's comments. First, the maximum number of single-family residences allowed on the site should be limited to the physical restraints of the access points and slopes. The buildings shall be sited to avoid disruption or degradation of steep slopes. Removal of tree vegetation on steep slopes should be prevented to avoid erosion. A tree survey of large caliper should be done to show what trees to include in the final development plan. Maximum height of two stories.

The only access points through the sites shall be through the existing curb cut from the south side of Shagbark Road and through the access easement on the south side of the Valvoline site. All roads and driveways on the site shall have concrete curbs. At least two visitors parking spots shall be designated on the site. Garages shall be double width. Exterior materials shall consist of horizontal siding, stucco, or imitation limestone. Exterior materials shall have muted colors such as off-white or light beige to harmonize with surrounding properties. If single family residences are to be sold and deeded as separate residences, a homeowner's organization shall be established within the deeds to ensure maintenance of appearance standards. Owners are responsible for any damage caused by the construction traffic or as a result of use of Shagbark Road by the residents or visitors, including but not limited to gates, pavement, curbs, fences, plantings and gardens, sprinkler systems, electrical conduits, and lights. The Woods at Shagbark Condominium Association is responsible for the roads, and the owners of the new development shall reimburse the Shagbark Condominium Association for any damages caused and shall contribute do the ongoing maintenance of the road. Residents and visitors shall not be allowed to walk past the Shagbark Condo security gate. The stormwater detention system shall be designed in a way to be unobtrusive to the site. Roadways shall be designed to allow passage to trucks including fire engines.

Elias Nduati 4530 N. Hamilton Road. Mr. Nduati wondered whether there will be access for vehicles going south on North Hamilton Road from the property.

Mr. Hicks noted, for the applicant's rebuttal, that many of the questions and comments posed did not relate specifically to the rezoning application. Therefore, the applicant was not obligated to respond to specific questions.

Mr. Cull agreed. He said he received a copy of the packet that was distributed and would review the items in it.

Mr. Shapaka asked how high the property can be built. Capka replied that with the overlay text, it is limited to a certain number of units per building. With the language in the overlay text, they cannot significantly alter the stories and density. It will be similar to what was presented in the conceptual site plan.

Mr. Hicks felt the questions posed by the public were very valid for a Final Development Plan or Design review, and encouraged residents to return when future applications for this site are discussed. The Rezoning

application is what is currently being considered. Historically, the concern has been the pivot from what is discussed during the rezoning application and then what is eventually proposed for the site. However, he feels the overlay sufficiently covers this. Hicks asked Mr. Cull how the Valvoline easement will be used for this site. Cull replied that the easement is a private easement, and there is a draft modification to the easement that would limit it to one way. This was a compromise with the Valvoline owner. There will also be slight changes on the exact location on future plans that are presented. Hicks expressed that this will be a point of concern of his when future applications come forward. His concern is the future flow of traffic through Valvoline. There is access through the parcel from Vista Drive and Stubb Road. He wondered how this would be used for traffic in and out of the parcel. Cull understands that this is currently a two-way easement, which would be limited to one way in the current draft. Hicks stated this will not impact his feelings on the rezoning, but when future applications for the site come forward he will be interested in the easement issue.

Greenberg echoed Hicks' concerns regarding how traffic would impact the Woods at Shagbark residents. Mr. Greenberg then asked Director Blackford if the LUP is adjusted if the rezoning happens. Director Blackford confirmed, adding that it would be updated when there is a refresh of the LUP. When the site was designated Professional Office, he had concerns about traffic accommodations. Eventually the LUP will be updated if the Rezoning is approved.

Mr. Tamarkin also had concerns about the traffic, which he felt were related to how it is zoned. Shagbark is a right-in, right-out only property. There is a private access road that goes to a light near Giant Eagle. He noted that Shagbark is gated and residents of the new property would not have access to the private road to turn left onto Hamilton Road. He noted there is a counterclockwise rotation around the Valvoline building, so there will not be a way for residents to go south on Hamilton Road without making an illegal U-turn or going to Giant Eagle and turning around. Mr. Cull replied that the one-way can be switched to moving out. Mr. Tamarkin noted issues with adjacent properties selling due to there being no left turn onto Hamilton Road.

Mr. Mako directed a question to Director Blackford. He wondered if Shagbark Road will be a publicly dedicated right-of-way. Blackford replied that it is a private road. He added that it was researched by staff. Shagbark is private, this site has access and the rights to access it. Mr. Cull added that 50 years of easements were compiled that collectively showed there is an easement there. Mr. Mako asked if the easement for Valvoline had been recorded. Mr. Cull confirmed, while adding that the

amendment to the easement has not yet been recorded.

A motion was made by Greenberg, seconded by Suriano, that the Zoning be Recommended to Council for Approval.

Discussion on the motion:

Mr. Shapaka said he'll be in favor of the rezoning, however there are strict limitations that will need to be processed moving forward. Mr. Hicks added he is also in favor of the application. One reason is that the ER zoning designation is not useful for that area. Multi-family makes sense, even though the LUP recommends something different. This is a less intense use than what the LUP recommends. He is not in favor of putting Design Review or Final Development Plan restrictions in a rezoning overlay. That had been done in the past and problems arose.

Mr. Greenberg stated he will be in support of the application and expressed interest in seeing the future plans that come to the commission.

Mr. Suriano concurred that he is in favor. He agreed with Hicks that he is not in favor of the overlays on rezoning applications. He noted the housing shortage in Gahanna and felt the rezoning is compatible with nearby properties.

Mr. Tamarkin agreed that ER is an outdated zoning for this location. An office is not suitable for the site due to issues with the ingress and egress. Multifamily is a good option and is probably the best use for that land.

Chair Mako also expressed his support for the project. He hoped the commission provided good feedback for the project moving forward.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Pollyea

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE

G. NEW BUSINESS - NONE

H. OFFICIAL REPORTS

Director of Planning

Director Blackford noted there would be no agenda items for July 10, 2024.

I. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS - NONE

J. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT

Mr. Hicks expressed his appreciation for residents that came out to speak and encouraged their participation when future related applications were on the agenda.

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.