



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, May 13, 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 via teleconference for regular session on Wednesday, May 13, 2020. The agenda for this meeting was published on May 8, 2020. Chair Michael Suriano called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA: None.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2020-077](#)

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for April 22, 2020.

A motion was made by Greenberg, seconded by Wester, 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

Chair Suriano stated that due to the nature of this remote meeting, public comments were accepted via email up to one hour before the start of the meeting. For practical purposes, requested that a motion be made to suspend the public comment portion of the meeting. Clerk informed the Chair that no comments were submitted, for any of the applications.

Assistant City Attorney Matt Roth, administered an oath to the applicants and their designees.

A motion was made by Shapaka, seconded by Wester, 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

E. APPLICATIONS - PUBLIC COMMENT

[DR-008-2020](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for a building design, for property located at 817 N. Hamilton Rd.; Parcel ID No. 025-00-1918; current zoning RID; One Church; David Domine, applicant.

City Planner Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application (presentation attached in the file, titled *Administration Presentation*); have seen 3 separate applications from One Church through the last few years, most recently for signage. There was a parking lot addition in 2017. Tonight we are here to discuss the revision of the main entrance of the building; request is more for internal modifications, but external needs approval. The 2nd component is regarding a 2017 Design Review; there was recently a site inspection; building had minor deviations from what was approved for the design review; this is a cleanup application. This building sits far back from the roadway. Main entrance is obstructed from the roadway. City Code is not specific to materials and colors. We are in the process of revising code. Certain materials are preferred. No specific color pallet. Main change for what was approved was sidewalks; code does not have language for sidewalks in parking area. Was reviewed for ADA compliance. No staff issues for either component of this request. Engineering, Building and Police departments looked at it; the PD provides services to the church for traffic purposes, were no issues created by parking change. Staff recommends approval.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:12 p.m. There were no additional comments. Chair closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m., and called for questions from the commission.

Tamarkin: asked if the One Church sign is new or added as part of this project. Blackford said he remembers in 2018, a variance was approved to allow for a larger monument sign out by the roadway; this request does not approve that sign specifically. That would be a different application.

Shapaka: asked if the added parking lot used to be a grassy area. Blackford confirmed; may have been a small building on there as well;

said a 2017 DR approval allowed for new parking area.

Suriano: asked in reference to materials, sees proposed façade, trying to determine from image if there's an aluminum threshold over the entry. Blackford said looking at pg. 6 of the application, majority of façade is glass.

A motion was made by Hicks, seconded by Shapaka, that the Design Review be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[DR-009-2020](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for a landscape plan, for property located at 670 Morrison Road; Parcel ID No. 025-011077; Current zoning OCT; John Leonard, applicant.

Blackford provided a summary of the application (see attached file labeled *Administration Presentation*); said the landscape is at its lifespan, needs a replanting; staff looks at the planting requirements of the zoning designation; not a lot of planting requirements; look at what the applicant is wanting to plant. City forester analyzes that. Applicant did a fantastic job of working with forester. Showed excellent images of what will be replaced. We also try to preserve mature trees. Applicant did preserve honey locust and blue spruce.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:22 p.m. No additional comments. Chair closed the public hearing at 7:22 p.m., and called for questions from the commission. There were no questions.

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

Discussion on the motion: Shapaka thanked the applicant for coming before the commission; stated the depth will be a great improvement on the design; will be voting in favor. Suriano echoed those comments and will also be voting in favor.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[CU-001-2020](#)

To consider a Conditional Use Application to allow for retail of fresh fruit & vegetables, for property located at 380 Agler Road; Parcel ID No. 025-013757; Current zoning CC; Witten Produce Patch; Julie Witten, applicant.

Blackford provided a summary of the application (see attached file labeled *Administration Presentation*); have seen this request before.

Reviewed criteria for granting conditional uses; code says outdoor seasonal sales can be done with CU, if wanting to exceed 90 days. Allows for limited amount of seasonal sales, but limited to number of events and consecutive days, hence the need for a CU in this case. Land Use plan does not get into seasonal uses. We have had approvals in the past so staff is unaware of any negatives issues associated with the use. Supports the use. This is located in an underutilized shopping center. No grocery stores in that part of the city. Gives those residents opportunity to purchase fresh fruit and vegetables. The applicant requested a 5 year timeframe for the CU approval.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:29 p.m.

Angie Negie; here for applicant Julie Witten; said it has been a joy to be a part of the community for so many years; thanked the commission for their consideration.

Chair closed the public hearing at 7:30 p.m. and called for questions from the commission.

Wester: commented that the fire district mentioned that a permit needs to be issued by them; asked if the operator has applied for that.

Negie said she received something from the maker of the tent, which said specifications were met. Wester said the applicant still needs to get the permit from the fire district; will support this, just wants to ensure that the applicant is in good standing with the fire dept. Blackford said comments from fire district are informational at this stage, but the Building division will follow up with those. The fire department looks for the statement from the tent manufacturer. Fire Department still completes an inspection when the tent is erected.

Tamarkin: said they have been a good tenant there for 5 years; considering COVID19, people feel comfortable shopping in outdoor farmers market type of environment; compliments the neighborhood and Gahanna.

Shapaka: asked about the Agler roadway improvement plan, will any of that happen in 5 years that will affect this project. Blackford said he does not believe road improvements will occur there in the next 5 years. Planning for the improvements, yes, but not construction.

Greenberg: asked if there's some magic to the 5 year use permit; is

there something that requires that in the code, or they just want the 5 years. Blackford said nothing in code specific to 5 years. This use had a 5 year timeframe and they just proposed another 5; up to the commission to determine.

Burba said she believes this has been there for 19 years; was Smith's farmer market before Witten; thinks they have always had 5 years.

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

Discussion on the motion: Suriano stated that he agrees with Tamarkin's comments about the seasonal shopping options, and the importance of having healthy food within reach of residents; the nearest grocery stores are not easily accessible to pedestrians; this is a good option for them.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[V-008-2020](#)

To consider a Variance application, to vary section 1145.06 (yard requirements), of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at 869 Pinnacle Point Place; Parcel ID No. 025-001984; current zoning MR-1; Doug Maddy, applicant.

Blackford provided a summary of the application (see attached file labeled *Administration Presentation*); noted that there's a clearing in construction going on there. As buyers come in, the need arises for a deviation from the code. There are 2 lots up for discussion. Lot 29 & 30 need rear yard setback variances because the buyers would like a screened-in porch. Porches are elevated too. Staff looks for feasible alternatives to variances. Once you go above the ground, you have a wall and roof where setbacks are measured too. There are no other alternatives to this variance, other than to deny the screened-in porch. Staff looks at negatives to approving. The property these lots abut were included in the Pinnacle Point rezoning; is a unique case that the neighboring property is controlled by the same owner; we see no negative impacts. Pointed out that zoning code does require additional buffering when developing commercial next to residential. Adjacent piece of property is zoned commercial and will have to provide buffering as part of their zoning. Is only a small encroachment. Reviewed criteria for approval. Staff supports request. Wants to see the success of this development.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

David Hodge, attorney for the applicant, said there was a typo in the description for lot 29; the encroachment is 6 ft., not 5 ft.

Chair closed the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Tamarkin: said on lot 29, design was tucked into the building, appears it is now on the exterior which makes the unit larger; unit 31 looks like it has a patio too and looks like it also encroaches; was that previously approved or not to scale; asked if he's envisioning this wrong.

Doug Maddy, applicant, said he used 2 different unit designs when placing house locations; was going to use one unit on lot 31, but decided to go with a different unit plan, in which the porch is inset, like lot 30; is no encroachment from lot 31.

A motion was made by Wester, seconded by Shapaka, that the Variance be Approved, with the correction to the application/statements that Lot 29 has an encroachment of 6' and Lot 30 has an encroachment of 8'.

Discussion on the motion: Shapaka stated that he walked the property with George Parker; stated the overlook in the back of the property is appropriate; this is a good addition to their property; ravine will hide most of the addition; will be voting in support. Suriano echoed those comments and will be in support as well.

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

Blackford said for the next meeting, we will have a cell tower application and maybe some code changes; said teleconference is working, but asked if we want to keep with phone calls or move to teams meeting so we can have screen sharing for the commission members. Suriano said

he is open to changing the format, as long as members are able to participate.

Council Liaison

No report.

CIC Liaison

No report.

Chair

No report.

I. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS: None.

J. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT

Greenberg said Suriano did a nice job as chair. Suriano thanked everyone for being patient and succinct on the calls.

K. ADJOURNMENT

By Wester at 8:04 p.m.