



# 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, April 23, 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 April 23, 2025. The agenda for this meeting was published on April 18, 2025. Chair John Hicks called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Sarah Pollyea.*

**Present** 7 - John Hicks, James Mako, Sarah Pollyea, Michael Suriano, Michael Tamarkin, Thomas W. Shapaka, and Michael Greenberg

#### B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - None

#### C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2025-0091](#)

Planning Commission meeting minutes 4.9.2025

**A motion was made by Greenberg, seconded by Pollyea, that the Minutes be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 7 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano, Tamarkin, 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

[V-0011-2025](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary Chapter 1103.07(e) - Large Lot Residential of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; for

property located at 3590 Clotts Road; Parcel ID 025-003899; Current Zoning R-1 - Large Lot Residential; Matt Toddy, applicant.

City Planner Maddie Capka provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation for details. The application is for a Variance at 3590 Clotts Road. The zoning map shows that the subject property, as well as most of the neighboring properties, are all zoned R-1, Large Lot Residential. The applicant is requesting approval of a variance to allow an addition within a side yard setback. The standard setback for all property zoned R-1 is 15 feet from the side property line. The proposed addition is 11 feet and 2 inches in from the south property line, so it encroaches by about 4 feet. The addition would be attached to the rear of the house and is in line with the existing house, which is also 11 feet 2 inches from the property line. The addition would not be encroaching any further than the existing house already does. All other setback requirements are met. Under the former zoning code this property was zoned SF-3 which had a side yard setback of 7.5 feet. At that time, a variance would not have been required.

Capka provided a site plan of part of the property showing the existing home in gray, with the addition outlined in purple. On the site plan, a yellow line on the right side shows the southernmost boundary for both the home and the addition. She then shared elevations of the addition. The addition is shorter than the existing home and is located to the rear. Capka shared a street view image of the home from July 2024. Because the addition is shorter than the home, as well as being located to the rear of the home, it is not visible from the right-of-way.

There is one variance requested with this application. It is for Chapter 1103.07(e), which states that the principal structure must be at least 15 feet from the side property line. Capka shared the standard variance criteria that must be met for the application to be approved.

Standard Variance Criteria:

- 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 result 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
- Determination of 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.

The application under review was submitted after January 2025, making the current zoning requirements applicable. The current zoning code includes changes from the zoning code that was applicable before January of 2025. The two final criteria in the list of Standard Variance Criteria, are part of the updated zoning code, and applicable to the application under review. Most houses in the area are also closer than 15 feet to their respective side property lines, and there is also a privacy fence between the addition and the southern property.

Chair Hicks opened public comment at 7:06 p.m.

Applicant Matt Toddy introduced himself to the Commission as the Architect of Record. He reiterated that in prior code, the Variance Application was not necessary. He noted they were careful to keep the plans for the addition in line with the existing structure and it will not be visible from the right-of-way. Mr. Toddy made himself available for questions from the Commission.

Chair Hicks closed public comment at 7:07 p.m.

Mr. Greenberg asked Mr. Toddy if the materials being used for the addition are the same as the original residence. Mr. Toddy stated the materials are designed to match the existing home, which includes white siding and white trim. The shingles will match the existing roofing. Mr. Greenberg asked the Clerk if there were any comments from neighbors. Deputy Clerk McGuire reported there was no feedback received.

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

**Yes:** 7 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano, Tamarkin, Shapaka and Greenberg

[V-0012-2025](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary Chapter 1103.07(e) - Large Lot Residential of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; for property located at 95 Price Road; Parcel ID 025-001040; Current

Zoning R-1 - Large Lot Residential; Mark Bisang, applicant.

City Planner Maddie Capka provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation for details. The applicant is requesting approval of a variance to allow an addition within a side yard setback. Similar to the previous application, the addition is 807 square feet and would be attached to both the side and the rear of the existing house. Side yard setbacks for properties zoned R-1 are 15 feet and this addition is only 10 feet 1 inch from the west property line. The applicant stated that this location was chosen based on the layout of the existing house, and in order to shift the addition out of the side yard setback they would have to relocate the existing kitchen. This property was also zoned SF-3 under the former zoning code and had the same side yard setback of 7 and 1/2 feet. All other zoning code requirements are met.

Capka shared a site plan showing the entire property, which is just under one acre. She then provided a more detailed plan of the addition and home, showing that the majority of the addition is to the rear of the house. Some of it is to the side of the property. Capka provided elevations of the proposed addition, with the addition outlined in orange. The addition is shorter than the existing house. Capka also provided a street view image of the property. The majority of the addition would not be visible from the right-of-way.

There is one variance associated with this application, which is for chapter 1103.07(e), which states the principal structure must be at least 15 feet from the side property line and the addition encroaches about 5 feet into the setback. She shared the variance criteria.

Standard Variance Criteria:

- 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 result 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

- Determination of 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 the variance as submitted. The applicant stated in their application that the closest neighbor to the west does not object to the addition. The addition would also be compliant with the former zoning code and is minor in nature.

Chair Hicks opened public comment at 7:12 p.m.

Eric Jaburek, 548 Empire Drive North introduced himself. He explained that his father-in-law is the applicant, and the home is the home that he grew up in. Mr. Jaburek and his family planned to move into the home. He elaborated that his father-in-law's father built the home in the 1950s, and they are excited to continue raising the family in the same home. The design created by the architect maintains as much of the original character of the home as possible, while also making updates for the possibility of long-term care if the families choose to combine households.

Chair Hicks closed public comment at 7:13 p.m.

Mr. Greenberg asked if the materials being used are the same as the existing structure. Mr. Jaburek said that the siding and roofing would likely need replaced, and it would all be uniform. Mr. Greenberg then asked Deputy Clerk McGuire if there was any communication from neighbors. Ms. McGuire stated there was not.

Mr. Mako directed a question to the administration. He noted both variances from the evening are from the same section of Gahanna Code. He wondered if there was an issue with the re-write of this section. Director Blackford stated there may have been more properties than intended included in the R-1 zoning designation with the code re-write of 2024. Staff is looking at how to remedy this so there are fewer variances.

Ms. Pollyea asked if the additional space included something like an owner's suite so that the family can all live under one roof. Mr. Jaburek said that was the intention, and there would be accommodations such as an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) shower and attached bath.

**A motion was made by Mako, seconded by Shapaka, that the Variance be**

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

**Yes:** 7 - Hicks, Mako, Pollyea, Suriano, Tamarkin, Shapaka and Greenberg

**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None**

**G. NEW BUSINESS - None**

**H. OFFICIAL REPORTS**

**Director of Planning**

Director of Planning: Director Blackford stated there may be a One Church application at the next meeting on May 14, 2025. Later in May, there will likely be three development projects in front of the Planning Commission. Two are in the Crescent at Central Park area, along Tech Center Drive and Hamilton Road. A third is an industrial project on Tech Center Drive.

**Council Liaison**

Ms. Pollyea recalled the Our Gahanna strategic plan. The plan is moving into its second phase, which is community engagement. Pollyea outlined some events happening in early May, such as a senior lunch, a small business networking opportunity, and a young professionals event. Information is available on the Our Gahanna website.

**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 7:20 p.m.*