



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Michael Greenberg, Chair
Michael Tamarkin, Vice Chair
Bobbie Burba
John Hicks
Thomas Shapaka
Michael Suriano
Thomas J. Wester

Pam Ripley, Deputy Clerk of Council

Wednesday, September 22, 2021

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 September 22, 2021. The agenda for this meeting was published on September 16, 2021. Chair Greenberg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Suriano.

Present 7 - Thom Shapaka, Michael Greenberg, John Hicks, Michael Tamarkin, Bobbie Burba, Michael Suriano, and Thomas J. Wester

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - NONE

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2021-0174](#)

Planning Commission Minutes 8-25-2021

Motion made by Hicks, seconded by Wester, that the Minutes from August 25, 2021 be approved.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

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-0032-2021](#)

To consider a variance application to vary Chapter 1151.15(q)(4) of the

Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for a shed installation for property located at 235 Dellfield Lane.; Parcel ID: 025-005025; Current Zoning PUD, Charles E. Fitzwater, applicant.

Zach Cohen, Planning & Zoning Administrator provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The variance request is to allow a shed in the side yard of the property. The request is the result of a code enforcement violation from July 27, 2021 for installing a shed without a permit. Staff is in support of the variance.

Chair opened public comment at 7:05 p.m.

Applicant Charles Fitzwater is available for comment.

No public comments.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:06 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Shapaka stated he would like to see some screening, landscape or fencing so it is not so visible from the front. Shapaka is not in favor of the variance, it needs to be about three (3) feet from the house, the color needs to be complementary to the house. Fitzwater stated the color complements the house. There are plans to add some lemon grass or something for screening. Shapaka asked if there were any comments from the neighbors. Fitzwater stated one neighbor commented it looks nice.

Motion made by Burba, seconded by Wester, that the Variance be approved.

Discussion on the language; Shapaka is not in favor as it sits now. He stated tat the intent that the Commission is looking for in the future of changing the zoning would help this situation greatly. Adding some screening and moving it away from the house.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

No: 1 - Shapaka

[V-0033-2021](#)

To consider a variance application to vary Chapter 1143.09 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for a garage addition for property located at 333 Carpenter Road; Parcel ID: 025-000216; Current Zoning SF-3, Scott Wesley, applicant.

Zach Cohen, Planning & Zoning Administrator provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The variance is to exceed

the allowable garage size. The applicant would like to retain the existing 624 sq. ft. garage and construct an attached 576 sq. ft. garage to the side of the dwelling, totaling 1,200 sq. ft. SF-3 zoning requires that the garage area shall not exceed 1/3 of the total floor area of the dwelling. The intent of the existing garage is for equipment and tools needed to maintain the lot. Owner plans to add new overhead doors, siding, and roofing to match the renovated dwelling. Staff recommends approval of the variance.

Chair opened public comment at 7:15 p.m.

Applicant Scott Wesley stated that the intent is to have the garage with roofing, siding and overhead garage doors that match the remodeled house and new garage.

No public comments.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:16 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Tamarkin asked if the garage will be used for tools and not for cars. Wesley confirmed the old garage will not be used for cars.

Hicks stated the lot is zoned SF-3 and if the zoning for the property was ER1 or ER2 it would fit that lot size. Hicks asked Cohen if there were similar restrictions if it were and ER1 or ER2 property. Cohen would need to review that property's zoning requirements. Hicks stated that the building size in the lot is not excessive and it does fit.

Suriano asked to confirm that the intent of the old garage is to have it match the new exterior finishes on the house. Wesley confirmed that is correct.

Motion made by Suriano, seconded by Shapaka, that the Variance be approved.

Discussion on the motion language: Suriano is in favor of the project, the scale relative to the lot size is appropriate, the images of the renovation are consistent with the surrounding area, and the added garage at 576 sq. ft. compared to the expanded house at 1782 sq. ft. is much closer to the one-third total square footage.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

[V-0034-2021](#)

To consider a variance application to vary Chapter 1163.05(a) of the

Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for a driveway for property located at 123 Nob Hill Drive North; Parcel ID No. 025-003810; Current zoning SF-2; Adam Solomon, applicant.

Zach Cohen, Planning & Zoning Administrator provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The variance is to allow chip seal to be used as a driveway surface. Code requires that driveways shall be hard surfaced with asphaltic cement, concrete, brick, or a combination thereof. There was a resident complaint that resulted in a Code Enforcement violation issued on August 3, 2021 for installing a driveway surface that is not compliant with code requirements. The application notes that the previous driveway material of concrete and brick needed repairs which would have resulted in significant cost due to the size of the driveway. Staff has concerns on the durability of chip seal which can quickly deteriorate compared to other approved surface materials. When chip seal deteriorates, the stones can track onto the sidewalk, creating a safety concern. Staff received a letter from the HOA stating their opposition for the chip seal driveway, citing safety concerns.

Chair opened public comment at 7:22 p.m.

Applicant Adam Solomon stated that they did quite a bit of estimating. Due to the size of the driveway it is about \$40,000 for concrete, \$25,000 for black asphalt. While getting estimates they saw similar driveways of chip seal in the city. Chip seal is more affordable. The original brick and concrete driveway are underneath an asphalted layer with the chip seal on top. Solomon stated the letter from the HOA talks about a gravel driveway; it is not a gravel driveway; it is chip seal which is different. Solomon said that in his opinion from a safety perspective it is not over the main walkway. Solomon stated he will maintain the driveway like he maintains the rest of his yard. There is the option to add a sealant over the chip seal; it is a bit shiny and glossy.

No public comment.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:26 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Hicks asked if due to the cost of replacing the driveway was it considered changing the shape or dimensions of the driveway. Solomon stated the driveway is very long and changing would not have saved much money.

Shapaka asked if the asphalt layer is three quarters inch thickness and if it was rolled. Solomon is not sure of the thickness and it was rolled.

Suriano asked Roth if there is any weight in terms of what is deeded or appropriated to the property for the HOA that would have more jurisdiction than this commission. Roth stated if there were deed restrictions at the time the neighborhood was plated that would be up to the HOA to enforce and is not an issue for the commission. Roth stated it is his understanding that this is a violation of city code and the city could pursue criminal charges if it's being violated.

Tamarkin stated that in a true chip seal, the stones are imbedded into the blacktop and there should not be any loose stones. In the pictures shown there are a lot of loose stones. The HOA is concerned about the loose stones.

Wester stated that a true chip seal is just as Tamarkin stated, it is very messy and sloppy process. You lay a layer of tar down, then a layer of chip stone. It then depends on traffic to work the stone into the asphalt. Wester stated he is wondering why if you put an asphalt cap down why wasn't it kept an asphalt driveway as opposed to putting the chip and seal over the asphalt. Solomon stated he believes the asphalt they laid down is not the typical driveway, nice and smooth. It was there to level it, then roll it.

Greenberg asked when the driveway was installed. Solomon stated it has been in place for approximately nine months.

Suriano stated that in the previous iteration of the driveway it looks like the sidewalk is in typical condition where you have a sidewalk right-of-way, that sidewalk trench comes across the driveway and continues to the other side. Does the concrete sidewalk get interrupted by the new driveway? Solomon stated that the city redid the streets and put in a concrete apron.

Shapaka asked Roth about a test case; this has been sitting there for nine months and it is kind of holding its own. Maybe we can look at it again in the spring and if it is not holding up then we can make a motion. Does the person making the motion have the leeway to make it a kind of test case? Roth stated if he was asking to put a condition on a variance. Shapaka, yes, a timeline variance. Roth stated he doesn't know the answer, but his inclination is no because this is a variance from code. Once it's done, it's done.

Motion made by Suriano, seconded by Hicks, that the Variance be approved.

Discussion on the motion: Wester stated he is not in support of the variance.

Suriano is empathetic as a homeowner as to the cost. This is an extraordinary case of forgiveness versus permission. He thinks this commission is understanding of conditions where variances are fitting. In terms of a code violation it's egregious and he wishes that the applicant had talked to the City to understand what is needed for permitting and what is permitted by code prior to doing the work. Suriano also questions the durability and longevity of the driveway. Suriano is not in support of the variance. Greenberg stated as a past president of a Civic Association he has a lot of empathy for the residents that have concerns that were in the correspondence.

The applicant had questions after the variance was denied. Zach Cohen will follow up with the applicant.

The motion failed with the following vote:

Yes: 0

No: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

[V-0035-2021](#)

To consider a variance application to vary Chapter 1165.08, 1165.09(a) (4) and 1165.04(a)(16) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for a sign for property located at 260 S. Hamilton Road.; Parcel ID No. 025-005129; Burger King; Current Zoning PUD, Mike Bizjak, applicant.

Zach Cohen, Planning & Zoning Administrator provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The variance request is for multiple variances and is all part of a re branding by Burger King. The signage re branding is a reduction in overall sign area from 271 sq. ft. to 254 sq. ft. The proposed monument-style sign will be 12 ft. tall and 44.5 sq. ft. with landscaping around it. Staff has concerns on the size of the proposed LED display which may be distracting for drivers and create a safety concern. Code requires certain colors of the electronic portions of signs which are limited to amber, white, or similar color with the background color being limited to black. The applicant is proposing basically all the colors as part of the signs. Section 1165.09(4) allows Planning Commission to impose restrictions on the location, size, colors, or other relevant factors on signage. Proposed is two drive-thru signs that include two ordering signs and two menu boards, building signs and a new monument sign in front of the building. Zoning code lacks clear regulations for drive-thru signage and that they are most applicable to monument-style signs.

Chair opened public comment at 7:51 p.m.

Applicant Mike Bizjak stated that large number of the variance requests are due to a lack of clear provisions for the drive- thru elements in city code. The overall site has gone through a rebranding renovation. The reason for the monument sign height is for enough clearance for the landscaping requirement and the new ADA ramp and is consistent with

the signs at McDonald's and Taco Bell on Hamilton Road. The size of the LED screen is code conforming considering an 80 sq. ft. allowable monument sign; it is less than 33% of 80 sq. ft.

No public comment.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:55 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Hicks stated the improvements to the site have been very nice. Hicks has no issue with the drive- thru signs and there is precedent for approving those menu signs. Hicks asked what is in the monument sign that it needs to change every eight seconds; what would be shown there. Bizjak stated that various deals are offered throughout the day.

Suriano concurs with Hicks, given some precedent on the menu signs he has no issue with those. As far as scale and setback of the monument sign it is in line with others in the area. He does have concerns of colors of the LED lights. Previously approved electronic signs have been limited to one color; an amber or white on a black background. If the graphic is any indication of a full spectrum LED, he is not in favor of that. It needs to be much simpler and subdued that changes less often.

Wester concurs with what has been said, especially with the changing LED sign; this commission has worked to limit that and believes that it would be a distraction to traffic. He can recall the exact limits put on the signs, but they are not allowed to change every eight seconds and the colors were limited.

Tamarkin stated there are two other LED signs on Hamilton Road, one at the high school, it does change and is one color, the one at McDonald's is one color and was changing rapidly. The requested monument sign would be a little different than anything else on Hamilton Road, being full color, almost television quality, which is very different than a ticker type sign like the other two in the area. Bizjak stated the pictures show what they would like to do. However, they understand what the requirements are. The eight seconds were derived from what the state requires and what they deem safe for any LED screens. Bizjak stated they would like to change the sign more than once a day which is the current requirement. They would like to change it every minute or so. They would be open to having a simple monochrome board.

Shapaka stated that if the slope of the ADA ramp was changed to 1 - 30 there is no requirement for a railing. Aesthetically it would be a little bit better for the site.

Hicks stated that he would not want to vote no on the entire variance application just for one component that he is not in favor of. If there is a motion to amend the application to eliminate or reduce or modify the LED sign on the monument that would be something the commission could debate separately.

Greenberg asked Roth which would come first the amendment or the variance? Roth stated that since there is not a motion for the variance as applied for you could do an amendment at this point and once amended you could move for a vote on it. The situation the last time was the motion and the second had been made already before we came upon the amendment.

Suriano asked Roth if a condition can be put upon a variance. Roth explained the process for doing so.

The applicant requested clarification on the variance code. Hicks reiterated the request to the variance to the code. Blackford confirmed and reiterated the request. Blackford asked the commission what would be acceptable for the monument sign.

Greenberg poled the members; Hicks would make a recommendation to amend the application to prohibit electronic signs on the monument sign. Wester agrees. Tamarkin doesn't have a problem with the size or setback, however, believes the message sign should change once a minute and not every eight seconds and should be limited in color and tone and not a television. Shapaka would like to see it changing once every two minutes and limit the colors to two and it is not to be a television. The image presented is what is throwing everybody off. Shapaka asked the applicant the intent of the sign. Bizjak stated the capability of the displays can show graphics; if the commission is limiting it to text only and two colors that can be done. Suriano stated his only issue with the monument sign is if it is limited to two colors and changing anywhere from one to five minutes. Burba stated the sign changing once every minute or two is acceptable and would keep the colors the same. Greenberg agrees with the sign changing one to two minutes and with two colors. Hicks asked if the colors should be specified. Blackford stated that it is specified in code however it is one of the variance requests and staff would prefer the commission to be specific regarding the colors of the monument sign on Hamilton Road.

Motion made by Hicks, seconded by Tamarkin to amend the whole application

to add the condition that the monument sign on Hamilton Road be subject to the color provisions of code 1165.09(a)(4) and that the text change no more frequently than every one minute.

Discussion on the motion; Blackford stated just to be clear that the monument sign can only be what is in code; white, amber, or similar color and can change no more frequently than every minute. Bizjak asked that the colors blue, or green can't be used? Suriano stated he prefers the colors stated in code are acceptable. Hicks would prefer no sign and the sign at Peace Lutheran and McDonald's was denied, appealed, and overturned. This is a better compromise than denying an application all together.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

Motion made by Hicks, seconded by Tamarkin, to approve variance application V-0035-2021 as amended.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

RECESS

Recess at 8:30 p.m. back in session at 8:37 p.m.

SWEARING IN APPLICANTS & SPEAKERS

Greenberg stated that some of the applicants were not sworn in.

Roth swore in those additional applicants.

THE EVERETT APARTMENTS

[V-0036-2021](#)

To consider a variance application to vary Chapter 1163.08(h) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at 307 and 319 West Johnstown Road; Parcel ID No. 025-000849; Current Zoning MFRD; The Everett Apartments; Mitch Rubin, applicant.

In accordance with Planning Commission Rules Section 7.4.1.1., if there is more than one application on the same project, they may be discussed as one.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the applications; see attached staff presentation. In 2020 the property was rezoned from CC to MFRD and a conditional use and variance were

approved. These applications are a similar layout, and appearance, and same density as before. The variance request is to reduce the minimum landscape separation between parking aisles from 10' to six-foot and to eliminate the three-foot screening. The dog park area will be at the front of the property. Staff believe that redevelopment of the site is vital and hopefully will be a catalyst for future development on West Johnstown Road. Staff recommends approval.

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

Applicant David Hodge, attorney for the applicant. The variance request is one that has been seen before. The application before the commission is a vast improvement of the property and aesthetically superior to anything on any adjacent properties. Architect George Berardi stated that they see the project to be the catalyst for the neighborhood and for other properties to be developed. They feel they have accommodated all the comments effectively and structurally to change the character of the building from when it was first presented to the commission. There is a combination of various siding materials being used on the buildings and other texture elements.

Greenberg shared a letter was received from a resident regarding the project. The following questions were asked; is it going to be made public to Gahanna residents that there is a dog park there or is it just for the residents of the complex. Hodge stated that city code creates an obligation to make the dog park available to the public. Greenberg asked if there will be signage and hours posted. Hodge replied yes. Greenberg asked if the city has any liability with the dog park. Roth stated that the city has very little liability with any kind of park. Greenberg asked the last question; the drawings of the plantings are very tall. What is the specification, are they meeting the code? Hodge stated they are meeting code.

Chair closed the public comment at 9:01 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Shapaka stated that image is everything; when you show a nice tall building and nice tall trees in front of it, they should be shown on the plan correctly to make the relation between the two. The building is very pleasing to look at, the mixture of the materials is good. Shapaka stated that the way he is reading the variance is that there is 10' to the six-foot island and there is no vegetation between it; however, he would expect to see vegetation on the ends. Mitch Rubin, applicant stated the intent is that there are trees planted as well to meet the landscape requirement.

There are trees planted within the island and they are trying to get rid of the small planters. Shapaka asked if there is a fence around the detention basin. Rubin stated there is a six-foot privacy fence along the east, west, and south side of the property. The basin is going to be a very shallow slope. It is a bio-retention basin and will not be a wet pond. Shapaka stated it looks like there is a light head lighting that area up and if there is a code that requires it be kept lit. Rubin stated the intent is that residents will use that area to walk their pets at night and would like to have some lighting in that back area of the lot.

Tamarkin asked Rubin for clarification that three sides of the property will be fenced. Rubin stated that is correct as a requirement of code.

Motion made by Shapaka, seconded by Suriano, that the Variance be approved.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

[FDP-0009-2021](#)

To consider a Final Development Plan Application for property located at 307-319 West Johnstown Road; Parcel ID No. 025-000849; Current Zoning MFRD; The Everett Apartments; Mitch Rubin, applicant.

Chair opened public comment at 9:02 p.m.

No public comment

Chair closed the public comment at 9:02 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission. No questions.

Motion made by Shapaka, Seconded by Suriano, that the Final Development Plan be approved.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

[DR-0024-2021](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for a site plan, landscaping plan, and building design for property located at 307 and 319 West Johnstown Road; Parcel ID No. 025-000849; Current Zoning MFRD; The Everett Apartments; Mitch Rubin, applicant.

Chair opened the public comment at 9:03 p.m.

No Public comment

Chair closed the public comment at 9:03 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission. No questions.

Motion made by Shapaka, seconded by Suriano, that the Design Review be approved.

Discussion on the motion: Suriano stated that on the topic of the vinyl, looking at the imagery and the elevations, believes it is an appropriate amount and given the context of the other materials that are on the project there is a good bit of variation with regard to the palette. Suriano is in favor. Shapaka is in favor of the Design Review.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

CRESCENT WOODS APARTMENTS

[V-0037-2021](#)

To consider a variance application to vary Chapters 1165.08(a)(b)(10), 1167.20(b)(2), and 1167.20(b)(7) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at Tech Center Drive; Parcel ID No. 025-013767; Current Zoning SCPD; Crescent Woods Apartments; Kolby Turnock, applicant.

In accordance with Planning Commission Rules Section 7.4.1.1., if there is more than one application on the same project, they may be discussed as one.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the applications; see attached staff presentation. This project was discussed and rezoned from SCPD to L-MFRD. The scope of the project has been reduced, similar density. They had a variance for recreation and instead of a dog park they are donating land to the City to the south of the property. These applications look similar in appearance with 240 units on 14.4 acres, with 16.6 units per acre. A Preliminary and Final Plat for Crescent Blvd. will be brought to the Commission in the future. There is a variance request to eliminate the buffering and screening along the eastern border of the property adjacent to the commercial zone and variance request for signage. Staff recommends approval.

Chair opened the public comment at 9:17 p.m.

Applicant Larry Canini is available for questions.

No Public comment.

Chair closed the public comment at 9:32 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Hicks stated that when the project was previously brought before the commission some questioned the best use of this parcel and Canini had indicated that businesses would come if we fixed the multi-family housing problem the city has. Hicks asked Canini to share what has transpired since. Canini stated that to the east of the site in Buckles Court North the first project was Walnut Creek Wellness Center which came about prior to this multi-use project. During the rezoning of the project support letters from some of the doctors within the Walnut Creek Medical Center mentioned there is a need for their staff and others that work in the business campus to provide nearby housing and a mixed-use of live, work, play concept. At the ribbon cutting of the medical center it was announced that the next project is a 25,000 sq. ft. major office building coming with the merging of two large podiatry groups in Central Ohio. Multiple offices will merge into this location as well as a vascular surgeon. Also, Ohio Gastro will be doing an approximately 40,000 sq. ft. building in Buckles Court North. There are other businesses in the works. Canini stated it's imperative that there is residential housing in the area. This will help promote and move the rest of the live-work concept in bringing some retail uses. There have been conversations with a couple of retail developers and will be meeting with hotel developers. Hicks stated that the vision is playing out and sees the cascading effect.

Tamarkin asked if the sign will be a backlit neon type of sign or be a solid sign lit with a spotlight. Canini stated that the sign shown in the application is not one that he was aware of and as the architectural review director he will not be approving the sign as it looks. He said they are here to talk about the opportunity to put a sign there. The ultimate design will need to come back before the commission. Currently as you travel southbound or northbound on Hamilton Road just north of Tech Center Drive there are two double wide, double-sided static billboards on the east side of the road. Those billboards are more eyesores than the Crescent sign along the freeway. The preference and goals are to remove those billboards. One needs to be removed regardless; it will probably fall where the regional detention basin will be. They are working with the sign company to relocate or remove them and build a totally new unit on I-270 along the freeway within the medical campus. The goal for the project as well as a benefit to the City is a sign at the corner of Tech Center and Hamilton Road. This is the north entry point or the south exit

point of Gahanna. They would like to work with the tenants and the city to advertise on the sign similar to the way Easton is marketed. The request is to have an opportunity to be able to have a permanent sign where they are asking for it to be able to market their product, the apartments. They are not asking for any digital sign. Everything else in the mixed component of product hotels, retail, gas will have frontage on Hamilton or Tech Center and will have the ability to have signage on their building or canopies. Because the apartments are tucked back in it will be surrounded by retail and hotels. They need to have the opportunity to have a monument sign.

Motion made by Wester, seconded by Burba, that the Variance be approved.

Discussion on the motion: Shapaka is in favor of the variance.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

[FDP-0010-2021](#)

To consider a Final Development Plan Application for property located on Tech Center Dr.; Parcel ID No. 025-013767; Current Zoning LMFRD; Crescent Woods Apartments; Brent Sobczak, applicant.

Chair opened the public comment at 9:34 p.m.

Applicant Larry Canini is available for comment.

No Public comment.

Chair closed the public comment at 9:35 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Shapaka asked if the detention basin in the south west corner will come into play in this development. Canini stated they are working with staff and currently doing calculations on what they assume to be the uses of the 41 acres, hotel, retail, etc. They are trying to create a regional basin at the intersection of Tech Center and Hamilton Road. They do not want each piece that gets development to have a little ditch or detention basin in the parking lot or rear yard. A portion of the land and Tech Center drive is in the flood plain. They are working with FEMA to get that portion of Tech Center removed from the flood plain. There will be a mass excavation plan and create one basin called a regional basin that will serve all 41 acres.

Motion made by Wester, seconded by Burba, that the Final Development Plan be approved.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

[DR-0025-2021](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for a site plan, landscaping, and building design for property located on Tech Center Dr.; Parcel ID No. 025-013767; Current Zoning LMFRD; Crescent Woods Apartments; Brent Sobczak applicant.

Chair opened the public comment at 9:37 p.m.

Applicant Larry Canini is impressed with the design plan.

No Public comment.

Chair closed the public comment at 9:39 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Greenberg asked about the soundproofing and the apartments because residents will not be happy. They will be implementing glass related to the window insulation factors and such to mitigate it.

Shapaka stated regarding the sound, no matter what, there must be sound quality otherwise the quality of living will be low for the residents. Design wise the buildings look great. Canini stated that currently there is a medical building that has been open for just about a year now. They are the ones that deal with the daily plane flights and it doesn't bother them or affect their clients' opinions of where the building is.

Motion made by Wester, seconded by Suriano, that the Variance be approved.

Discussion on the motion: Suriano stated that as part of the design review his comments are concurrent with the last application in moderation and relative to the land use plan and natural materials the vinyl in this location, in addition to the other materials is appropriate and believes it will look nice.

Burba is glad to finally have this complete and Gahanna is lucky to have the project.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

ALDER PARK APARTMENTS[V-0038-2021](#)

To consider a variance application to vary Chapters 1151.15(q)(2), 1163.02(a) and 1167.20 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of

Gahanna, for property located at the SW Corner of Morrison Road and Waterbury Court; Parcel ID No. 025-004718; Current zoning PUD; Alder Park Apartments; Jared Smith, applicant.

In accordance with Planning Commission Rules Section 7.4.1.1., if there is more than one application on the same project, they may be discussed as one.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the applications; see attached staff presentation. No rezoning is necessary for this application due to being zoned PUD, multi-family is permitted. The variance requests are to reduce the minimum unit size from 700 sq. ft. to 600 sq. ft. Similar variances have been granted. Reduce parking and reduce buffer between office/commercial properties from 15' to 8'. A lot of times PUD encourage mixtures of uses in proximity and don't always have buffering between those uses. The Economic Development Strategy and Land Use Plan both identified a need for new residential. The Economic Development Strategy said over the next 10 years the city could easily absorb up to 600 apartments. Prior to tonight zero apartments have been approved since that strategy was approved. Housing is vital to support and create jobs. Staff recommends approval.

Chair opened the public comment at 9:53 p.m.

Applicant David Hodge attorney for the applicant. Hodge thanked Blackford for the thorough staff report and agrees with all the analysis. This is a great project and developer. The architecture is like the other projects presented. The one bedroom 600 sq. ft. is a comfortable unit. In terms of the parking the current code at two per unit especially for one and two-bedroom units is just totally and completely suburban in nature and out of context with current parking requirements in surrounding cities for this type of development. In terms of the perimeter the site plan has more than adequate buffering with the garages and landscape buffering along the south. This is a great use of the property. The project is in a TIF district and his office did an analysis and it is about \$3M that will come to the city over the course of 30 years in the TIF that already exists.

No Public comment.

Chair closed the public comment at 9:57 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Burba requested the rental rates for the apartments. Jared Smith, Preferred Living stated he anticipates the rents will start at about \$1,100 on the one bedroom and \$1,600 - \$1,700 on the two-bedrooms. A

project just completed on North Hamilton Road and St. Rt. 161 rents for a one-bedroom is \$1,200 and two-bedroom is up to \$1,750.

Motion made by Tamarkin, seconded by Wester, that the Variance be approved.

Discussion on the motion: Hicks stated it is refreshing that there is a multi-family that does not have a rezoning request attached. The area supports this type of project. Hicks is in support of the project. Suriano is also in support of the project and regarding the variances thinks that the 1.87 could be reduced out of some of the other projects they see. It is suburban.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

[FDP-0011-2021](#)

To consider a Final Development Plan Application for property located at the SW Corner of Morison Road and Waterbury Court; Parcel ID No. 025-004718; Current Zoning PUD; Alder Park Apartments; Jared Smith, applicant.

Chair opened the public comment at 10:00 p.m.

No Public comment.

Chair closed the public comment at 10:00 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Shapaka stated there is no retention basin, are the using the parking lot to accomplish that so there is not run off. Tom Warner, Advanced Civil Design stated that on the development plans there are underground storage chambers. All the storm water will be routed into a series of chambers. Water quality and storm water detention volumes will both be accommodated; the system is robust because of the green. If this was redevelopment there might not be as much; but in this case, there is quite a bit of underground storage. There will be a combination of parking lot detention with these subterranean chambers. The chambers are EPA approved and they have discussed the use of the chambers with the city engineer. They will meet and exceed city code.

Motion made by Tamarkin, seconded by Burba, that the Final Development Plan be approved.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

[DR-0026-2021](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for a site plan, landscaping, and building design for property located on the SW Corner of Morrison

Road and Waterbury Court; Parcel ID No. 025-004718; Current Zoning PUD; Alder Park Apartments; Jared Smith, applicant.

Chair opened the public comment at 10:04 p.m.

No Public comment.

Chair closed the public comment at 10:04 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission. No questions from the Commission.

Motion made by Tamarkin, seconded by Wester, that the Design Review be approved.

Tamarkin welcomed the developer to Gahanna and believes it is a nice project that is almost in the middle of the city that has been vacant for a very long time.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Shapaka, Greenberg, Hicks, Tamarkin, Burba, Suriano and Wester

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE

G. NEW BUSINESS - NONE

H. OFFICIAL REPORTS

Assistant City Attorney - None

Director of Planning - None

Council Liaison

Shapaka asked Mayor Jadwin for clarification on the reading for the sidewalk program; was it a second reading or emergency. Mayor Jadwin stated that it was presented as an emergency and while the ordinance passed there were not enough votes to pass the emergency provision. The Mayor has been authorized to enter into contract without the emergency provision, which means there is a 30-day window until she can sign the contract. Shapaka asked if it was for a specific area or just anywhere. Mayor Jadwin stated it was for the proposed 2021 Sidewalk Maintenance Program that had defined streets and sections. There was a list of streets that were included. They were roads that were part of a Federal Highway Administration complaint that the city was working through. The program area was adopted by Council that

evening and the city was looking into entering into a contract with EMH&T to implement and administer the sidewalk program which was approved, but again, will not be able to go into effect for another 30 days. Shapaka asked if the public has the ability to get on the website and see if their street is affected. Mayor Jadwin stated that it was just approved on Monday and it will be made available on the website.

CIC Liaison

Hick stated CIC met on September 21, 2021.

Chair

I. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS

J. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT

Mayor Jadwin thanked the members of the Commission for this evening and she appreciates the Commissions professionalism at every meeting, especially tonight. It was a very full agenda and the commissions patience, diligence and preparedness coming into this meeting is exemplary and she sincerely extends her thanks to each one of the members.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:09 p.m.