



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Michael Tamarkin, Chair
Thomas Shapaka, Vice Chair
Michael Greenberg
John Hicks
James Mako
Michael Suriano
Thomas J. Wester

Pam Ripley, Deputy Clerk of Council

Wednesday, June 22, 2022

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 22, 2022. The agenda for this meeting was published on June 17, 2022. Chair Michael Tamarkin called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Suriano.

Mayor Laurie Jadwin administered the Oath of Office to James Mako.

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

Absent 1 - Michael Greenberg

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA

Chair Tamarkin postponed the Woodside Green Park applications; DR-0010-2022 and V-0018-2022 until July 13, 2022.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2022-0181](#)

Planning Commission minutes 6.8.2022

Motion was made by Wester, seconded by Shapaka, that the Minutes from June 8, 2022 be approved.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Tamarkin, Suriano, Wester and Shapaka

Absent: 1 - Greenberg

Abstain: 2 - Hicks and Mako

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**Woodside Green Park**

[DR-0010-2022](#) To consider a Design Review Application for a site plan for property located at 213 Camrose Ct.; Parcel ID: 025-006520; Current Zoning PUD; Woodside Green Park; Alan Little, applicant.

Postponed to July 13, 2022.

[V-0018-2022](#) To consider a Variance Application to vary Chapter 1163.08(h) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at 213 Camrose Ct.; Parcel ID No. 025-006520; Woodside Green Park; Current Zoning PUD; Alan Little, applicant.

Postponed to July 13, 2022.

Eastgate Commercial Park

[FDP-0004-2022](#) To consider a Final Development Plan Application for property located at 611-659 Eastgate Parkway; Parcel ID: 027-000146; Current Zoning OCT; Eastgate Commercial Park - Phase 2; Robert Leveck, applicant.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. The request is for approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) and Design Review (DR) to construct one 18,200 sq. ft. and two 8,500 sq. ft. flex industrial buildings. Site has been approved and constructed in phases with roughly 70,000 sq. ft. of buildings of the same type. An FDP and DR for this section of property was approved in June 2021 to construct four 8,500 sq. ft. buildings. Planning Commission is required to review and approve alterations. The proposed alterations are to replace two 8,500 sq. ft. buildings at the rear of the property with one large 18,200 sq. ft. building. The rear buildings were approved at 35 feet from the rear property line and 45 feet from the side (north) property line whereas the new building will be 30 feet from the rear property line and 25 feet from side property line. The addition and revised layout of parking spaces from the approved 31 spaces to the proposed 63 spaces. They are proposing a metal roof in charcoal gray. The walls are a metal tan. It is consistent with the other projects in the area. Design review criteria is whether it is compatible with existing structures, does it contribute to the improvement of the design of the district, does it contribute to the economic and community vitality of the

district and does it maintain, protect, and enhance physical surrounds. Final development plan criteria is whether the plan meets applicable development standards. Is it in accord with appropriate plans for the area? Would it not have undesirable effects on the area and is it consistent with land use character and development of the area? Staff recommends approval. The use is permitted by the zoning district and land use plan. The plan is consistent with FDP and DR criteria. The proposed alterations meet all requirements of the zoning code, no variances required. Staff recommends approval of the applications.

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

Applicant Robert LeVeck was not in attendance.

No comments from the public.

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

Questions from the Commission: Wester asked what the impact of this development on traffic in the area is. Blackford said this project was approved a year ago and the square footage is essentially the same. It's about a thousand to two thousand square feet additional. That would not trigger any additional traffic impact analysis. The analysis that was done previously a year ago would be the same for this request since it's essentially the same use. The corridor in that area has seen several studies by the city and county. He believes there are some things in the works on how to improve access and circulation in that area.

Mako asked why from two building to one building. Was it driven by market forces or just trying to make the site look better? Blackford said he believes it was market forces.

Tamarkin asked if it will it be a multi-tenant building? Blackford said he is not sure. He thinks most of the buildings are built to have flexibility to accommodate several tenants. Tamarkin asked if the top rendering will be facing into the project and on the inside will be all the garage doors. Blackford said the rendering is the east elevation and would be towards Eastgate. He doesn't believe it is going to be overly visible due to the slope.

Mayor Jadwin said that the Economic Development team is working on several leads for the property. There have been inquires due to the announcement of Intel. Jadwin believes it is market driven.

Motion was made by Hicks, seconded by Suriano, that the Final Development Plan be approved.

Discussion on the motion: Suriano is in favor of the FDP. The building adjustments on the site have minimal impact in terms of the original plan.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Suriano, Wester, Shapaka and Mako

No: 1 - Tamarkin

Absent: 1 - Greenberg

[DR-0011-2022](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for a site plan for property located at 611-659 Eastgate Parkway; Parcel ID: 027-000146; Current Zoning OCT; Eastgate Commercial Park - Phase 2; Robert Leveck, 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.

The application was discussed under FDP-0004-2022. See attached staff presentation.

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

Discussion on the motion: Tamarkin said the only reason he is voting no is because he thinks the applicant should be in attendance to answer the Commissions questions.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Hicks, Suriano, Wester, Shapaka and Mako

No: 1 - Tamarkin

Absent: 1 - Greenberg

Crescent at Central Park - Section 2

[FP-0001-2022](#)

To recommend to Council a Final Plat Application for the Crescent at Central Park Section 2; consisting of 4 lots and Reserves "B" and "C" located on Buckles Court North; Parcel ID: 025-013773; Current Zoning Select Commercial Planned District (SCPD); Larry Canini, applicant.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the application; see attached staff presentation. This Final Plat is for 13 acres zoned Select Commercial Planned District (SCPD). It meets the minimum qualifications for lot size and frontage. There are four lots and two reserves, Reserve B and Reserve C. Reserve A was from the plat in 2018. Two lots previously created through subdivision without plat process. A subdivision without plat process limits the number of lots created to four; and it doesn't allow for expansion of roadways through the subdivision without plat process. In this case there is a small extension of a roadway and they already made two lots and they are adding four lots which triggers the final plat process. There was

a preliminary plat approved in 2017. They are requesting a waiver to onsite storm water quantity control. The waiver requires a recommendation from the City Engineer and Planning Commission and then forwarded to City Council. The applicant has worked extensively on the project. The City Engineer doesn't have any concerns with this property with the waiver. It will discharge directly into the Big Walnut Creek. A couple of administrations ago there was an agreement with the City and the property owner that they could directly discharge. So, there is already an agreement allowing it. As part of the Final Plat process they must request it from Planning Commission. Reserve B is a retention storm water basin. Reserve C is an easement area reserved for signage. Staff recommends approval. It is consistent with code and no variances are required.

Chair opened public comment at 7:25 p.m.

Applicant Larry Canini 5071 Forest Drive, New Albany. This is Phase II of the Crescent at Central Park for the Buckles Court area. It has turned into more of a medical corridor than anything. Even though the SCPD allowed for various uses they were able to secure Walnut Creek Medical which is on the corner and Walnut Creek Surgery Center which is a sister building to the Wellness Center. There is a lot of interest from the medical community. The vision was not to get too committed on lot sizes. With the first lot done it leaves the area open along the freeway. They can design the sites to the specific needs of the users. The lot sizes fit the footprint of their users. Each of the lots along the freeway, lot one, two, and three have commitments on all of them. Lots one and three will be coming before the Commission later. This Final Plat is for lot two. Lot four will be another building that they will bring forward later. The area is turning in to a regional type medical campus.

No comments from the public.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:29 p.m.

No questions from the Commission.

Motion was made by Shapaka, seconded by Hicks, that the Final Plat be Recommended to Council for Approval.

Motion carried with the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Greenberg

Crescent at Central Park - Lot 2

[DR-0012-2022](#)

To consider a Design Review Application for a building design for property located at Crescent at Central Park - Lot 2; Parcel ID: 025-013773; Current Zoning Select Commercial Planned District (SCPD); Bob Elliot, applicant.

Director of Planning Michael Blackford provided a summary of the applications; see attached staff presentation. There are three applications before the Commission. The site is 3.8 acres, two story 47,000 sq. ft. medical building. Brick veneer is the main exterior material. Zoned as SCPD does allow for a variety of commercial uses. Almost all medical uses are permitted which is great for trying to develop a medical campus. This use is allowed by right. From a zoning standpoint it is like the uses that are already out there on the two lots that are open and developed under construction. Code allows for Planning Commission to approve the final development plan, design review and variance but the final plan must be approved prior to issuing any permits or approvals for construction. These applications do not authorize construction. This is a typical lot layout. The buildings are white with some black trim and is consistent with other applications Planning Commission has approved. The renderings do show signage. Signage typically is an administrative approval. With multi-tenant buildings there would be a master sign plan. The Commission will see a master sign plan at a future date. There are a few variances requested. They are the typical kind of variances for this type of development. They are requesting a parking setback on the south property line. Code requires a 10-foot-wide tree island and landscaping between every two rows of parking, a 15-foot-wide buffer and landscaping adjacent to the freeway and parking lot landscaping. Blackford believes the applicant's reasoning for the variance is that there is a sizable slope that goes down towards I-270 and planting in that area likely wouldn't be successful. The City Forester reviewed the request and did not have any objection to not planting in that area. Also, it is very important that these businesses have visibility from the freeway. The Design Review Application includes some very detailed landscape plans. There are a whole bunch of tree plantings in the landscape area. Technically, these plantings have two major planting requirements: there is parking lot landscaping and then there is Chapter 914 which says that based off the amount of impervious service you have to plant trees. In looking at the site layout there is not a lot of area green space and the area adjacent to I-270 is sloped. There are several trees planted on the layout and those are to meet the Chapter 914 requirements. There are no variances to Chapter 914. If a variance is needed it is to Chapter 11, which is zoning code. There is really no room to plant the trees. There are a number of trees being planted. So, from a built environment standpoint, if the variance is granted, Blackford believes it's going to be very similar to some of the pictures they have seen. It will look similar as far as the type and amount of vegetation. Staff has no objections to the variances. The use is allowed by right, consistent with uses of surrounding properties. Similar variances have been granted before with the exception being the freeway buffer and landscaping variances. The variances do not appear to create negative impacts. It's consistent with the Land Use Plan for medical uses in the area. Staff recommends approval of all three applications.

Chair opened public comment at 7:41p.m.

Applicant Larry Canini representing the project. Canini shared that there are three different disciplines of medical uses committed: primary care, vascular surgeons, and a merger of podiatry practices. The podiatry group as well as

the vascular surgeons are committed in an ownership position in the building. One of the things that they are striving for is to secure ownership interest for the doctors, so they are not just coming in as tenants. They are committing financially long term. It is critical in the community to have them establish a practice and be owners in the building. The primary care group is a national group that is consolidating all their Columbus offices. They are not interested in being an owner; they are interested in being a long-term tenant.

No comments from the public.

Chair closed the public comment at 7:44 p.m.

Questions from the Commission: Shapaka asked if the variance for the landscaping is because of the surface draining or to get parking. Canini said it is primarily the parking. When you have a 47,000 sq. ft. building with three tenants, they are all concerned about parking and signage. Shapaka asked if there is a fence. Canini said there is a chain-link fence. He is not sure if ODOT put in the fence when I-270 was built or if it was constructed when Tech Center Drive was built. The fence will stay because they need it as a safety measure due to the drop off. They will be cleaning up all the underbrush off the fence. Beyond the fence as you go down the slope there was already a major planting of trees by ODOT. They met with ODOT before putting in the first section of road and ODOT allowed some of the trees to be removed because they were dead, and some were growing into each other.

Canini commented that regarding the SCPD Zoning, there is no sign category within that. The previous building, they did were internal, and Blackford showed the pictures of the two existing buildings. The larger building has signage on the front left-hand corner as well as a ground monument sign out on the road that list the tenants. On the Walnut Creek Surgery Center, you can see their decorative logo. There is no monument sign in front of that building because the building is so visible, and the logo was so pronounced they didn't see the need. As they move into these freeway sites and move into these buildings with multiple tenants, they would appreciate some input from Planning Commission. With this being their first submission of a lot along I-270 and more to come. The opportunity to have the tenant signage specific to that tenants practice that is facing the freeway and also mirroring the same image on the front of the building eliminates the need for a ground monument, and will keep a consistency both front and back of that building. They have the opportunity to market to the freeway. This was critical in getting the commitments. He would like the Commission to think about it. He does not think that they can ask for that approval tonight, but is not sure legislatively how that works, they want to know if they are on the right path. If so, they will make the sign package for all the buildings. Blackford said that there is a separate application for a Master Sign Plan that would be required and there are certain elements that must be discussed. They have the option of doing it for either lot 2 or the entirety of the eastern half of the Crescent. So, it will be the same folks abiding by those same standards. Part of the text would have to describe exactly what's the width of those letters or the height and things like that. The Design Review, Master Sign Plan is fairly straight forward and there is a lot of flexibility, but that also means there is a lot of

input from Planning Commission if this is not the route or the vision that the Commission wants to see.

Suriano asked Canini if the primary material on the building is painted brick. Canini said there is some consideration to a real brick but a lot of what you see in white brick is just a typical red brick that is painted. They have not made that decision yet. Canini showed a photo of the New Albany Ballet building to show what it can look like when you mix a site with red and white brick buildings. This is kind of what they will be doing with the two existing buildings, a mix of stone and brick with black accents and awnings. Suriano said he doesn't mind the variety relative to the other buildings or context and thinks it can work as either shown in the image with the contrasting colors, not making it homogenous across the campus. They can work together architecturally. Relative to the signage the Commission typically reviews size and square footage and how it is lit. He thinks all those will have an impact on how it is viewed from the highway. Given how it is scaled on the building, it seems appropriate. Obviously with each tenant there is a different logo type and branding in so much as the method of application and coloration could be consistent and is probably preferable. Canini said branding is important to these practices. The signs would be backlit, which is important when you talk about single lettering and this kind of design. They are just wanting to get a sense that this being their first building on the freeway side, they are happy, the tenants and practices are happy, they can begin to guide the other folks to follow this and therefore they can come in with the sign package for the balance of the site. They are looking for some feedback.

Hicks said that they have reviewed and approved Master Sign Plans for Stone Ridge and Royal Plaza in recent memory. He recalls that since this is such a unique area that they did consider and approve some advertising billboards. Hicks would be in support of that coming back to the Commission and does not see any issue with that considering everything else that's been said.

Shapaka said that a year ago they were talking about a sign along the interstate for the other parcel. Is that sign still in play? Canini said that the previous approval was for the multi-family project. They have recently submitted the infrastructure plans for the street, storm, and everything to the City Engineering Department for review. There are two static billboards along Hamilton Road. They had approached the billboard company about converting those signs to digital, a more attractive, and more professional look. They became aware that the billboard further north at the on-ramp to I-270, ODOT would like to see that one moved. Canini is considering moving it to the freeway portion which is on the plat. That is what the 20-foot strip would be. It is a strip of land that would be owned by the Crescent, but it provides the access easement to get to the post and the billboard once it is erected. Shapaka said the building would have that monument sign, the highway sign next to it in addition to the signage. He likes the wayfinding as you are driving along the interstate and you see it pulling into the lot. That and the sign might be just a little excessive. Shapaka asked if all the tenants will be marked on it or is it just for the multi-family. Canini said it would only be related to the medical buildings they are talking about now. They will be taking two static billboards turning them into digital and separating them. One out on

Hamilton Road on the 41-acre mixed use, and one would move up to I-270 in the medical campus. As you see them now, they are right on top of each other. Shapaka asked if the painted brick color could be changed in the future. Canini said that he has never seen that happen. Shapaka asked if there was a parapet around the roof line. Canini said there is a three to four-foot parapet. They will add additional screening above the parapet if necessary.

Tamarkin is in favor of a Master Sign Plan for the future buildings. He assumes a variance might be needed if some of these signs will be larger than code allows. Tamarkin asked if they anticipated needing a wayfinding sign at the entrance to the court. Are the buildings visible enough that if you are looking for the podiatrist you will be able to find the correct building? Canini said that the Wellness Center has eight tenants currently. They have a ground monument sign at the top of the hill. They want to get a package that they can convey to all the users and say this is what has been approved and this is what we can allow.

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

Discussion on the motion: Shapaka is in favor. He likes the overall look of the building and Mr. Canini always does good work and is very conscious about what's going on. Suriano is in support, relative to the size of the building and for future buildings the ways that the massing has been addressed with some of the volumes both supporting multi-tenant versus single tenant and also just as a way to break up the volumes is appreciated

Motion carried with the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Greenberg

[FDP-0005-2022](#)

To consider a Final Development Plan Application for a medical office building, parking and utilities for property located at Buckles Court North - Lot 2; Parcel ID: 025-013773; Current Zoning Select Commercial Planned District (SCPD); Crescent at Central Park - Lot 2 project; Bob Elliot, 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.

The application was discussed under DR-0012-2022. See attached staff presentation.

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

Discussion on the motion: Wester is in support of this, he thinks Mr. Canini does a great job on his projects. This is a great project for the city. Tamarkin said it is a great project for the city and the medical buildings are what we are looking for.

Motion carried with the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Greenberg

[V-0019-2022](#)

To consider a Variance Application to vary Chapter 1151.04(b)(14) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna, for property located at Buckles Court North - Lot 2; Parcel ID: 025-013773; Current Zoning Select Commercial Planned District (SCPD); Crescent at Central Park - Lot 2 project; Bob Elliot, 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.

The application was discussed under DR-0012-2022. See attached staff presentation.

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

Discussion on the motion: Suriano is in support, it is appropriate relative to the variances outlined. Those are negligible when you think about efficiency the parking and some of the setbacks and the rationale behind them.

Motion carried with the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Greenberg

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE

G. NEW BUSINESS - NONE

H. OFFICIAL REPORTS

Assistant City Attorney - none

Director of Planning

[2022-0189](#)

Director of Planning Update 6.22.2022

Director of Planning Blackford thanked Mr. Mako for joining the Commission. Blackford updated the Commission on some of the projects under review and the construction activities within the City. There are many applications in review. There are four different school projects in review, the three middle schools and the high school. There are a couple of commercial projects and residential projects also in review. One project recently submitted is the vacant property off Morse and Johnstown Road area, a Sheetz gas station is proposed. There is another proposed project on Lot One at the Crescent to the south that is in review. Blackford shared photos of development within the city, High Bank Distillery, the library, Alder Park Apartments, ADB Safe Gate and the stage at Edison Brewery Company. The construction on these projects are going very quickly. See attached Director of Planning Update.

Tamarkin asked about the building at the driving range at the Golf Depot that was previously denied by the Commission. They have never come back. Blackford said the applicant is re-looking at what the space could look like. They have not re-submitted applications. Blackford believes the food truck part of the final development plan that was looked at last year is off the table. Blackford believes they still want to do the accessory building and parking. They are working out a few details. He anticipates them resubmitting a design review application at some point.

Council Liaison

Blackford said that Council appointed Mr. Mako to Planning Commission. Blackford will be giving a presentation to Council on the Rental Registration Program and how it is going.

Chair

Tamarkin asked the Mayor for updates.

Mayor Jadwin shared that on June 9, 2022 there was a Town Hall regarding Creekside Redevelopment strategy. It was very well engaged with about 20 residents in person, and several during the streaming on the City's YouTube channel. There was great conversation and good questions were raised from the public that was in attendance. This is the beginning of the conversation; this is not a one and done conversation. This will be an ongoing conversation that is evolving and will continue to evolve as the city continues to solicit community input. There is an online survey that has over a thousand responses thus far. It will remain available until the end of June. A lot of what was seen in the presentation was a video that was done by M & A Architects that included statistics from the survey. It is enlightening in terms of what the community wants regarding Creekside and how they want to see that development. The Crescent at Central Park continues to evolve. It really is becoming a medical destination throughout the community and there are more buildings to come. Director Blackford touched on some of the projects underway. There are many more to come. The city is being strategic in how

it is approaching development projects. The city is receiving inquiries all the time. There have been three or four international site visits with companies looking for industrial space in addition to those who are related to Intel supplies. Gahanna is on their radar and Development Director Strum met with some executives from Intel a couple weeks ago and took them on a tour of Gahanna. He showed them the housing developments that are underway, the quality of life in Gahanna. They loved Creekside. The city will be strategic around its development. We are not a community that has acres and acres of land available, so we have to make sure the development that we bring here fits the needs, and it builds upon what we have and sets us up for success for future generations. Mayor Jadwin welcomed Mr. Mako to the Commission.

I. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS - NONE

J. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT

Mako is glad to be here and looks forward to doing great work on the Commission.

Hicks welcomed Mr. Mako to the board and said that his predecessor was an outstanding lady that would be missed, but with Mako's background he is very excited to be working with him. Hicks shared some feedback on the appointment process. He will reach out to Council President Renner regarding his feedback. This is no reflection on Mr. Mako, because he thinks with his background, he is the most qualified. He wanted to share that for the record. He knows this was an unusual appointment and the clock was ticking and there was a timeline. As the Commission members are out in the community vetting potential candidates, he personally shared the opportunity and encouraged applicants to apply online. The feedback he received from applicants is that they never heard anything. He would like to suggest whether it is the Council themselves or the Clerk of Council that when an application is received as a courtesy acknowledging that the application was received. We don't want to discourage people from not applying in the future.

Wester welcomed Mr. Mako and looks forward to working with him.

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.