



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

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

Krystal Gonchar, Deputy Clerk of Council

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

7:00 PM

Teleconference Meeting

*** Members of the public who wish to attend may call 614-342-4465. You may submit comments by email to planningcommission@gahanna.gov, up to one hour prior to the start of the meeting.**

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

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session via teleconference meeting, on Wednesday, July 22, 2020. The agenda for this meeting was published on July 15, 2020. Chair Michael Suriano called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA: None.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2020-118](#)

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for July 8, 2020.

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

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

A motion was made by Greenberg, seconded by Shapaka, to suspend rules

7.4.4 & 7.4.5 of the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[V-013-2020](#)

To consider a Variance application to vary section 1143.08(b) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, to allow for a shed installation on property located at 114 Jahn Drive; Parcel ID No. 025-000379; Current zoning SF-3; Shonee Turner, applicant.

City Planner Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached presentation labeled *Staff Presentation*. Stated that the home is not parallel with the roadway, so that takes up much of the backyard space; this is a difficult yard to place a shed; there was an existing shed located in the proposed location. Reviewed criteria for granting a variance. Would recommend conditioning the variance to have 1' setback from the property line. Are at least 12 instances where sheds are located in the same area; found no variances on file. Properties to north and south have sheds in the same area. Recommends approval with condition.

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

Applicant: reiterated that the house is at an angle and would put the shed somewhere else if they could without it being in the middle of the backyard. With no basement and no place to add a garage, the only place for storage is a shed.

Ms. Bates, lives in the same area as the Turners; had a variance for shed at her property; these houses are packed in; the house positions make it difficult to manage storage. Hoping the city will grant the applicant's variance.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:17 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Shapaka asked if there's an existing fence on the east property line. Applicant said yes. Shapaka asked if she would put the shed as close to the fence as possible. Applicant said she would be happy to move away 2' from the property line. Shapaka asked if the 12x12 unit is movable; is there a foundation. Applicant said it has a prefab flooring but no cement; no slab.

Greenberg said he would support moving it 2' off the property line; when things are right up on property lines could lead to issues in the future with neighbors. Asked if there are color requirements. Blackford said no requirements to aesthetics.

A motion was made by Tamarkin, seconded by Wester, that the Variance be Approved.

Discussion on the motion: Suriano stated that he is in support of the variance due to the location of the house; is a hardship to the resident, and consistency of the shed placement for surrounding homes.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[CU-002-2020](#)

To consider a Conditional Use application to allow for an oil change facility on property located off North Hamilton Road; Parcel ID No. 027-000116; Current zoning CC-2; Valvoline - Ground Up Dev LLC; Tim Reardon, applicant.

Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached presentation labeled *Staff Presentation*. Stated this is a low traffic generating use; would likely need variances for parking in the future for any development. If CU is approved, a site plan is required through a Final Development Plan application; other design aspects will be reviewed in the future. Site plan provided is for informational purposes only, and not the final site plan. Reviewed criteria for granting Conditional Uses. Staff recommends approval. When talking about CU requirements, the more uses in the area, the more it lends itself to the 4th condition: is in line with what's in the area. CU may be conditioned per zoning code.

Chair opened the public comment at 7:33 p.m.

Applicant; addressed the letters received by the clerk. Will discuss aesthetics, impact to and access to surrounding neighborhood; would accommodate by screening with fence and landscaping to soften that look; do have the intent to improve the site. Regarding property to east; developer is in control of that as well; no plans on board now; agreed that it could only be residential development in the future; for way finding, the sign will move farther south; can only put a sign on their own property, but will put it as far south as possible. For comments about Firestone bring nearby, Valvoline is less intense of a use. Valvoline is a \$100m company and they evaluate sites for best use. Regarding stormwater, those will be discussed with engineers in the future; process is part of the FDP plan.

Clerk: we received two emails from residents at the Woods at Shagbark, George Mrus, and Bill Miller; those emails have been attached to the application file to be a part of the record and were sent to the applicant ahead of time. Can the applicant, Tim Reardon, confirm receipt of those emails? Applicant confirmed.

Chair closed the public comment at 7: 38 pm. and called for questions from the Commission.

Chair noted that there was a lot of information around potentials for the site but tonight we are voting on the Conditional Use and not anything regarding a FDP, Design Review, etc.; please focus comments and questions on the CU.

Wester said he looked at this and regarding the comment that we are only voting on the CU and not for site plan and location of elements; asked if that's correct. Chair said can ask comments if informative, don't want to limit questions but try to focus discussion around CU. Wester said this is a good use for this property; Valvoline is a quality neighbor; low traffic compared to a bank or any other business where more traffic would come in and out; low noise generator. No questions.

Tamarkin asked about the easement in the back of the property. Asked if this property is owned by the same people as the owners of easement. Applicant said it is a mixed group but Jack Williams is an owner of both. Through-easement is only way to get to the traffic light. Applicant said when reviewing residential portion to the east, there is an access on Shagbark, even though it is private. Tamarkin asked if it will be up to the home owners if they don't mind being land locked; believes is a good use of property because it's a small parcel with 3 frontages; is tough to develop. Applicant said he looked at the site for Wright Patterson bank and couldn't get the traffic to work, they moved to Max n Erma's former location instead. Tamarkin commented that he thinks there will need to be significant landscaping on the Shagbark side of property; private road accesses high end homes, they should be shielded from this type of development. Applicant said the dumpster could be moved more south to add even more landscaping and physical fencing for those property owners.

Shapaka egress that the use fits the site. Will hold comments when it comes to variances in the future. Told owner the 20' easement to get to the residents seems like a treat. When coming back, would like to know how that will be addressed in the future. Will continue to get questions from Shagbark residents until that is resolved.

Hicks said when we had a workshop for another client, recalls discussion from former city attorney; asked are there any restrictions about the drive stub as it relates to the parcel. Blackford said that will be looked at during the FDP because access gets analyzed during that process; previous city engineers have looked into that access road; through research there was never concrete documentation that the access would connect 3

properties to the north and could only go north.

Burba said her questions have been answered; believes this is the best use for this property that we have seen so far. Looks forward to seeing final plans.

Greenberg commented that this is a good use for property but if he had property in Shagbark, would not be thrilled to drive by Valvoline every night when coming home from work; hoping landscape design will have significant screening; would need that for support in the future. Applicant said it seems everyone's concern seems to be the same about shielding; if a 6' fence along the shagbark property line would help, they would be in favor. Chair said is speculative until we get to FDP.

Chair echoed comments about screening. Would be more agreeable to have a natural screening versus fence, except for around dumpster. When looking at site from Google Earth, looks as though property to the east has curb cut off Shagbark Rd.; not paved. Applicant said that is correct; for the single family home.

Wester said for the residential development to the east, how will we capture that it will be limited to 6 units. Is that a way of getting property developed to get up to the light. Who owns the signal at the drive, city or developers? If putting easement for traffic, how to document in the CU or does that even have to be documented? In the past have had cross access discussed as part of applications. Would we be granting up front like a utility easement?

Blackford said he is nearly certain the signal is owned by the city, based off discussions from across the street with Fresh Thyme development. Those easements get looked at as part of a future application. Property to the east is designated estate residential 2. Would be a future rezoning, overlay rezoning can restrict amount of development density, but again those are future applications. Condition that increased landscape would be approved? Matt said that is not appropriate for the CU. That would go in the future.

A motion was made by Wester, seconded by Burba, that the Conditional Use be Approved.

Discussion on the motion: Hicks stated that the applicant has heard a lot from the Commission tonight; keep those comments in mind going forward; will be voting in support.

Suriano stated that he is in support of the application; is appropriate given the context of the area; is looking forward to seeing the Final Development Plan.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

365 Agler Rd.- Tim Hortons

[FDP-004-2020](#)

To consider a Final Development Plan application for construction of a new building, for property located at 365 Agler Road; Parcel ID No. 025-001038-00; Current zoning CC; Tim Hortons; Mark W. Antonetz, applicant.

City Planner Michael Blackford provided a summary of the Final Development Plan, Variance, and Design Review applications; see attached presentation labeled *Staff Presentation*. Lighting code that was recently approved is not in effect for another 30 days after passage, asking for a variance request to lighting. Half foot candle light is not secure for parking. Staff recommends approval but commission can still require lower growth evergreens for slight screening from St. Rt. 62. Reviewed criteria for granting approvals of FDP, Variance, and Design Reviews; Land Use Plan recommends increased streetscape and landscaping.

Chair opened the public comment at 8:08 pm.

Applicant: thanked the commission for considering their application; thanked Blackford and Ms. Wicker for their patience in reviewing this application, which was submitted in March; happy to be presenting tonight; out of the 1,000+ locations of Tim Hortons, they have selected a half dozen sites to introduce this new prototype and they chose this location in Gahanna. Reviewed staff comments and have no exceptions or comments to considerations. Open to working with landscape architect to work with community to meet their needs.

Chair closed the public comment at 8:11 p.m. and called for questions from the Commission.

Wester asked about the stormwater; the city engineer made a comment about discharge to ODOT (Ohio Department of Transportation ROW (right of way)); site plan shows 8" pvc pipe, asked if whole parking lot drains to ODOT ROW. Applicant said it's worth noting that they are removing the parking along south end of existing site. Reducing impervious areas. Proposing significantly smaller footprint; anticipate stormwater will be significantly less than what's there currently; prepared to design stormwater system that fits code; outlets will be in their current location. Wester asked if city engineer is aware. Applicant said they have submitted what's required and unsure where the review process stands with the city engineer. Will use current discharge location.

Tamarkin asked if removing parking, and adding greenery, important that it not just be grass because this is a gateway into Gahanna from off the highway; would encourage to ensure the landscaping is tactful without blocking their sign. Applicant said that makes sense. Removing asphalt, and recognize this is in a prominent location and have a licensed landscape architect firm who can sit down and create a plan that satisfies the city.

Shapaka said his concerns were addressed.

Hicks said we discussed our desire for a buffer zone. Is it the will of the Commission to request a modification to prevent this coming back to a commission meeting, to allow for administrative approval. Blackford said that would work to have a specific condition to the variance; have done this similarly in the past.

Greenberg would support Hicks suggestion. Can see a beautiful sidewalk in the foreground; are they required to install one. Applicant said the survey includes a sidewalk and ADA crosswalk at Agler. Blackford confirmed. Greenberg asked about Stygler. Blackford said there's not one there; has been reviewed by engineering team and there were no comments requesting anything additional.

Suriano asked on the recommendation, regarding landscaping, there was a comment about low growing evergreens or perennials in lieu of large trees. Is there anything adverse to large trees, why are those not appropriate? Blackford said he was merely trying to provide alternatives. Code says 1 tree per 30 ft. just trying to recognize that on a corner lot, visibility is important, and large trees could obstruct views of signs. Applicant added that there's currently an existing hedgerow facing St. Rt. 62. Continuing the hedgerow along the pavement would help. Suriano asked about elevations in the presentation, what is the yellow line demarking? Shapaka said he is reading as a neon strip. Suriano asked if we will see the bulb. Applicant said it's a LED strip and the bulb is not exposed.

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

Discussion on the motion: Suriano stated that he is in favor of the applications; they are consistent with the area and will be an improvement.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

V-014-2020

To consider a Variance application to vary sections 1163.06(a) - parking lot lighting requirements and 1167.20(b)(7) property perimeter requirements, of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at 365 Agler Road; Parcel ID No. 025-001038-00; Current zoning CC; Tim Hortons; Chad Brown, applicant.

See discussion above, under file FDP-004-2020.

A motion was made by Hicks, seconded by Shapaka, that the Variance be Approved with the condition that the variance to section 1167.20(b)(7) include a requirement for a landscape buffer zone, to be administratively approved by city staff.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

DR-015-2020

To consider a Design Review application for a site plan, landscaping plan, building design, and demolition for the construction of a new building, for property located at 365 Agler Road; Parcel ID No. 025-001038-00; Current zoning CC; Tim Hortons; Mark W. Antonetz, applicant.

See discussion above under file FDP-004-2020.

A motion was made by Hicks, seconded by Greenberg, that the Design Review be Approved.

Discussion on the motion: Suriano stated that he's excited to see the updates and improvements.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

G. NEW BUSINESS: None.

H. OFFICIAL REPORTS

Assistant City Attorney

No report.

Planning & Development

No report.

Council Liaison

Shapaka said the lighting code changes were approved by council this week.

CIC Liaison

Hicks said the July meeting was held yesterday morning and the Supporting Gahanna Together small business program continues to move forward; stay tuned for an announcement from the city and CIC.

Chair

No report.

I. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS: None.**J. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT**

No additional comments.

K. ADJOURNMENT

By Greenberg at 8:31 p.m.