

MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
SEPTEMBER 18, 2014
6:30 P.M.

A CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Mr. David Stoffel
Ms. Libby Wallace
Mr. Aaron Enfinger
Mr. Anthony Rettke
Ms. Bonnie Armintrout

Members Absent: Mr. Rick Donovan

Others Present: Ms. Megan Moeller

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 2014

Chairman Rettke: Are there any changes to the minutes of August 21, 2014? (No response.) Hearing none, they'll be approved as submitted.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rettke: Are there any changes, additions or corrections to the Agenda?

Ms. Moeller: None from staff.

Mr. Rettke: We'll approve the agenda as submitted.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

(Mr. Rettke administers the oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Rettke: Is there any Public Comment? (No response.) Having no public comment, we'll move on to Unfinished Business.

A UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

B. NEW BUSINESS

1. **VARIANCE APPLICATION, 1024 TIFFANY DRIVE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO;** PRESENT ZONING, R-3; OWNERS' NAMES, DENNIS AND KIMBERLY COLE; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM TABLE 1175.03 TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM REQUIRED SIDE YARD SETBACK FROM EIGHT FEET (8' 0") TO A REQUESTED SIX FEET (6' 0"). CONTACT: DENNIS COLE. (166251)

Ms. Moeller: The property is located on the north side of Tiffany Drive, east of Matterhorn Drive. The existing zoning is R-3 which is Single Family Residence. The current use is a single family dwelling. Applicant is proposed to request a variance for Table 1175.03 to reduce the minimum required side yard setback from 8' to a requested 6' to install a garage addition with a roof. The proposed garage addition measures 28' x 18' and is proposed to be attached to the east side of the dwelling. This is the applicant's submission. The garage is going to be right here and it's going to be roughly 15' away from the existing – I believe it's a shed, and be 20' at the north end and 6' at the south end, roughly 30' from the rear.

So just some existing site and context. The lot is located on the curve of Tiffany Drive. The existing footprint of the dwelling is approximately 1800 square feet and there's also an existing garage at this portion, at the west side, with a garage door that's facing east.

So to the review and recommendations: The irregular shape of the property creates a side setback that is not parallel with the east side of the dwelling, prohibiting the proposed garage addition to meet the side setback at the south end. As I was saying, it's not parallel to the garage, so the front – the north end would be correct and be within the setback, but the south would not be. In addition, the applicant is requesting a variance to construct a garage with additional space to accommodate wheelchair access in and out of a vehicle. So, for these reasons, staff finds that the setback reduction is a reasonable request. If the Board finds that the full enforcement of Section 1175.03 is causing an unnecessary hardship on the application, staff recommends the Board approve the variance as submitted.

Mr. Rettke: Is the applicant present? If you guys could come on up and state your name and address for the record, the Board might have some questions for you.

Mrs. Kim Cole: Dennis and Kim Cole, 1024 Tiffany Drive.

Mr. Rettke: Thank you. Are there any concerns, questions, comments? (No response.) Well, hearing none, I would move to approve Item B1, Variance Application for 1024 Tiffany Drive, #166251.

Ms. Wallace: I'll second.

(Ms. Moeller called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Ms. Wallace voted "yes." Mr. Rettke voted "yes." Ms. Armintrout voted "yes.")

Ms. Moeller: Just, as you know, you're going to have to get a zoning certificate from us and that's just kind of the final okay through Zoning and Planning that you can follow through. So we'll get that approved within the next couple of days. But then, also, you're probably going to have to get a building permit, so I'm sure you've been in contact with the Building Department.

2. **SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT, 1361 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO;** PRESENT ZONING, CC; PRESENT OWNER'S NAME, BOB KENNEDY; REQUESTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR AN EATING AND DRINKING ESTABLISHMENT. CONTACT: ELY CORTEZ (#166576)

Ms. Moeller: This is for 1361 Brice Road. The application number is 166576, for a Special Exception Use Permit. The property is located on the west side of Brice Road south of East Main Street. The existing zoning is CC, which is Community Commercial and it is within the Community Commercial Overlay District. The current use is vacant. The applicant is requesting a Special Exception Use Permit to operate an eating and drinking establishment within the Community Commercial Overlay District. They are proposed to serve Mexican and Salvadorian food. The restaurant is proposed to have a total of four employees at max. The proposed hours of operation are going to be Monday through Thursday 10 a.m. to 9 p.m. and Friday through Sunday 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Just some existing site and context. All adjacent properties are zoned CC. Properties to the west are not within Reynoldsburg's jurisdiction, so all this stuff behind here is not. The proposed space of operation was previously a restaurant and the adjacent businesses include eating and drinking, a childcare, a salon and business service.

Just a little background on the parking requirements. I think there's 90 spaces on the property and based off of the requirements for an eating and drinking establishment that's there, they would need 23 spaces; and for the business and personal services, based on their square footage requirements, they would need 30. So with the space requirements for the proposed use, they would need about 16 spaces. So it would be a total 69 of 90 spaces, so the proposed eating and drinking establishment would not exceed the number of existing parking spaces provided. I did have a question for the applicant. I don't really

remember if we spoke about this, but if there is going to be drinking, that's kind of something I wanted to ask and I think maybe the Board should inquire. So I'll just finish my presentation.

It is the recommendation of staff that the Special Exception Use be permitted as requested. The application has met all conditions outlined in Section 1145.09 of the zoning code to allow the Special Use of the existing space. The proposed restaurant is keeping within the character of the surrounding businesses and properties and will not negatively affect the operation of adjacent businesses and properties. The proposed use will not adversely affect the health, morals, welfare of the community as a whole. So it is the judgment of staff that the operation of El Loco within this district is keeping within the desired character set forth within the zoning code and does not represent a burden to nearby property owners or the community as a whole.

Mr. Rettke: Go ahead and state your name and address for the record, please.

Mr. Jason Cortez: Jason Cortez, my home address is 3735 Moor Ridge Lane in Canal Winchester.

Mr. Rettke: We'll go ahead and proceed with the question staff had, is there going to be alcohol served?

Mr. Cortez: At this time we don't anticipate any alcohol sales. We've had previous restaurants before with no alcohol and everything's been just fine.

Ms. Moeller: From City's point of view, we don't really have a problem with drinking, it's just if you were to be open in the late hours of the night. That's when we kind of have some heartburn over it. So that's why I wanted to bring it up.

Mr. Cortez: No, we don't plan on having alcohol.

Mr. Rettke: Can staff clarify which unit this one was?

Ms. Moeller: Yeah, it's right in the middle. It's replacing a pizza shop.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah, Alatoby's. And do you propose to do any alternations to the facility or use it as is?

Mr. Cortez: Yeah, as is. Everything is set up already. A lot of the equipment is already left in there, too, so we're just basically coming in and starting up.

Mr. Rettke: Throwing down some new paint and a sign—

Mr. Cortez: No, it's painted pretty nice. We just plan on leaving it like that. We are going to put a sign.

Mr. Rettke: Are there any concerns with staff over signage?

Ms. Moeller: No, not really. We'll get to that when we come to it. You'll have to go through another Design Review Board for that. We'll talk.

Mr. Rettke: Well, personally, since there was a restaurant there and the facilities are there, I don't see a major problem with it. Any other questions, concerns, comments?

Ms. Armintrout: Do you have any other restaurants?

Mr. Cortez: No. We actually closed down our last one about six months ago. It was on Hamilton Road in Whitehall.

Mr. Rettke: Same type of restaurant?

Mr. Cortez: Yeah, same thing. We were there probably five years.

Mr. Rettke: For the record we'll state that Mr. Enfinger arrived. Any other questions, concerns, comments? (No response.)

Mr. Stoffel: I'll make a motion that we approve Item B1, Special Exception Use Permit #166576.

Mr. Rettke: Second.

(Ms. Moeller called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Ms. Wallace voted "yes." Mr. Enfinger voted "yes." Mr. Rettke voted "yes." Ms. Armintrout voted "yes.")

Mr. Rettke: Congratulations and best of luck with your endeavor.

Ms. Moeller: I believe you have a zoning certificate submitted already. I would recommend contacting the Building Department, cause I think they're going to have a couple permits you may need, but it shouldn't be too complicated.

3. **SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT, 1756 AND 1762 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO;** PRESENT ZONING, CC; PRESENT OWNER'S NAME, IMPALA CAPITOL, LLC; REQUESTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR A CHURCH. CONTACT: PASTOR CHARLIE M. DAVIS, JR. (#166565).

Ms. Moeller: This is for 1756 and 1762 Brice Road. The application number is 166565 for a Special Exception Use Permit. The property is located on

the east side of Brice Road, north of East Livingston Avenue. The existing zoning is CC, Community Commercial and is within the Community Commercial Overlay District. The current use is vacant. The applicant is requesting a Special Exception Use Permit to operate a church organization within a CC District. Applicant proposes to occupy up to 25 people and they are proposed to operate from 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Sundays.

Just some existing site and context: The property is located within the overlay district as I said, and the properties to the north are zoned AR-3, multi-family residences, and the properties to the east, west and south are zoned CC. I do want to mention, too, I believe it was back in maybe May or June, there was a church that had proposed to go into this space and I believe the Board denied it, but they appealed to Council and Council had approved it. So one of the code stipulations is that no application with the same use and at the same location can be filed and submitted within a calendar year. But we think, in this situation, because they were approved by Council, this is something that we think is a reasonable submission and an application that can be reviewed by this Board. So I just kind of wanted to give that as a background.

Mr. Stoffel: Wasn't that across the street?

Mr. Rettke: There was one there—

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah, but the one that I think was turned down and went to Council, wasn't that there by that drive-thru.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah. It wasn't the same unit, but it was the same building, but the church never opened.

Ms. Moeller: Yeah. I don't really know what ended up happening. I don't know if they just decided not to operate.

Mr. Enfinger: So this is the same exact facility?

Ms. Moeller: Correct.

Ms. Wallace: So that church is not going to be there?

Ms. Moeller: No. So kind of to address originally what was addressed before for parking and circulation, there are currently 89 parking spaces on the property. Based off of the requirement for square footage for each use, the existing retail store or business service establishment, based on the square footage requirements, it would be about 65 spaces that are necessary. For personal and professional services based off of theirs, it would be – excuse me, eating and drinking is the other current establishment and their parking spaces would be 16, so it comes up to about 81 spaces. For places of worship such as

this proposed use, their requirement is one for each seat in the main worship space, so they would be required to have 25 parking spaces. So the proposed church organization requires one parking space and would be occupying up to 25 people which will require 25 parking spaces. The parking standards for the existing businesses don't provide available parking for the proposed church organization, but I think that will be something that the Board will look at based on the day that they are going to be operating and the time they'll be operating. It's not necessarily during the week or during busy hours of the day. So that's kind of something to look at. So the staff would like the Board to consider the application of materials and make a determination regarding the proposed use and whether it meets the Special Exception requirements outlined in Section 1145.09.

Mr. Rettke: If we could have the applicant please come forward and state your name and address for the record.

Charlie and Kelly Davis: Charlie and Kelly Davis, address is 319 Haystack Avenue, Pataskala OH 43062.

Mr. Rettke: Thank you, sir. Are there any questions, concerns or comments by the Board?

Mr. Stoffel: I was reading on your Focus, you said you wanted to be the industry leader in what you do and operate the business professionally and efficiently. What's the industry?

Mr. Davis: Well, the industry would just simply those who are around us, those who are part of us. We are part of a movement, but we fellowship outside of another location.

Mr. Stoffel: Where is that location?

Mr. Davis: They are located on the north side of town.

Mr. Stoffel: And when you say "operate the business professionally and efficiently," you just mean the way you guys do it up there. I was reading that and I'm thinking, "It's a church, what industry? Are they going to start a little LLC on the side or something?"

Mrs. Davis: No, we don't have time for that

Mr. Rettke: Do you ever envision that-- The biggest question I have is up to 25 people. Do you envision that being larger or have you worked with anybody to see what that site would accommodate?

Mr. Davis: Haven't worked with anyone to see what the site would accommodate, however I think, if possible, it would be within walking distance of

the apartment complex there, so they wouldn't need parking. If they would come, that would be great.

Mr. Rettke: Since staff jogged our memory, that was one of the concerns was the layout – the layout he provided was minimal. The amount he was forecasting to put in there, we believed didn't meet fire code and there were some strong concerns about that. I think that was the major reason we passed over that one. That's my only real concern. Twenty-five people, I could see that potentially being larger, but the site looks like it could accommodate many, many more.

Mr. Davis: It does look like it could accommodate more. I don't know what the capacity would be.

Mr. Stoffel: That's two storefronts, correct?

Ms. Moeller: Yes.

Mr. Stoffel: Did it have a dividing wall between them?

Mr. Davis: Wide open.

Mr. Stoffel: Just two doors with two separate storefronts that are all one big open space.

Mr. Davis: 4800 square feet wide open.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah, that's quite a bit for 25 people.

Ms. Wallace: The hours – would it just be that one day a week, 10:30 to noon on Sundays?

Mr. Davis: Yes.

Ms. Wallace: Cause I think the other businesses in there are a barbershop and then the market is freestanding out towards the front, correct?

Ms. Moeller: Correct.

Ms. Wallace: At that day and time, I think parking, for me, wouldn't be an issue. I mean the strip mall's pretty much empty otherwise.

Mr. Stoffel: Are you planning any kind of outreach events there since you're going to be ministering to whoever comes? But if the apartments are right there, could you see yourself doing stuff during the week to involve yourself with that, or are you looking at this right now as strictly a Sunday worship?

Mr. Davis: Yeah, just Sunday worship.

Ms. Moeller: I think we had spoken about maybe in the future possibly having events, but that can be handled through staff.

Mr. Davis: At this point, no; later, a couple years maybe. I guess we could come back again.

Mr. Rettke: Now the layout you submitted, is that pretty much existing? I imagine the platform's not there, but you're not going to build restrooms, or the office?

Mr. Davis: There's nothing needs to be built. It will stay wide open. The platform is there.

Ms. Wallace: So essentially it's move-in ready? You just need to bring in your chairs?

Mr. Davis: The chairs are there.

Ms. Armintrout: Did you say you have another church somewhere?

Mr. Davis: Well, affiliate-- Well, what this call is "covering," in a sense of you have someone that you're accountable to. So I am accountable, whatever I do and say, to another congregation which is on the north side of town.

Mr. Stoffel: You're like a seed church?

Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Rettke: Any other concerns, questions, comments?

Mr. Enfinger: I always have a little bit of a difficult time when it comes to this type of Special Exemption Use. It doesn't fit within the intended character of the district. It's a retail center. Where that kind of thing happens, it's just one of those things to me that in the event the facilities are very affordable and the rent is pretty low, we see a lot of Special Exemption Use Permit requests and we've seen a lot of these in the past and I'm always apprehensive about allowing them. I'm a minority in that point, but when I cast my vote, you'll understand why.

Mr. Rettke: And this question's probably towards staff. Is that accurate saying that there's only a barbershop in that building?

Ms. Moeller: I think there's a barbershop and a restaurant, at least to my knowledge from what I remember.

Mr. Rettke: I was going to say I thought that's where we approved not Cajun, but Jamacian—

Ms. Moeller: Yeah, I think there's one restaurant still there.

Mr. Rettke: I know we approved something going in at G, I thought, G or H.

Ms. Wallace: I'm thinking that that restaurant wasn't going to be open on Sunday mornings, if it's the one that the young man brought the menus in for. I think he didn't have afternoon hours on Sunday or something or they were later.

Mr. Rettke: I share the same sentiments as Mr. Enfinger on these original retail uses going to alternative uses that just don't conform. I do struggle with that as well. It's a tough call for us, putting something in where it wasn't designed to fit. I don't want to have him out there all by himself stating that. It's hard on me, too. Sometimes it's a judgment and you regret it later when you say yes or not, and it is tough. Any other questions, concerns, comments?

Mr. Stoffel: I struggle with this as well, but I also see the need for this kind of ministry, business, whatever you want to call it, in this area in particular and that's where my struggle lies. To me I have to balance between what it's supposed to be and what I perceive as the betterment of the community in which we're serving that we're trying to make this decision. That's where my difficulty comes in. I'd love to see that strip full of great retail, but it doesn't happen. When we do have someone who's willing to invest, even if it's inexpensive real estate right now, make an investment in the community in that way, I'm encourage by that. So that's kind of where I'm at.

Mr. Enfinger: Let me expound a little bit more and maybe give you a little bit more of an understanding. What happens is that whenever there is an area like this and it's a retail area and the other facilities are in that area are not being used in that capacity, that's kind of a disincentive for other businesses to move in and that's my point. So I thought I'd like to clarify that for you guys. Because ultimately we have to take a long view of things in a Zoning Board like this that we look for, like Mr. Stoffel said, the betterment of the community and sometimes that is having to say no so that that way when the turnaround happens, it's ready and it's open to be what it's supposed to be and then it's encouraging to other types of retail businesses to move in. So that's my struggle with that and it is difficult because you want them full. You want every storefront and every vacancy to be filled, but you have to be careful, because do you say are we solving the problem by just filling it with a Special Exemption or are we exacerbating the problem and making it more unlikely that other retail businesses would find it attractive to say, "I think my business can do good here, so I'm going to move it here." So that's where my stance is and I wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Rettke: Well said both Mr. Enfinger and Mr. Stoffel. Question for staff: As with the nature of this Special Exception Use, this stays with the applicant, non-transferrable, so on and so forth, right?

Ms. Moeller: Yes, right. It is with the person who runs the business. If they were to leave and another church would want to go in there, they would have to go through the same process that these folks are going through.

Mr. Rettke: Any other questions, concerns, comments? (No response.) With that being said, I'll move for approval of Item B3, Special Exception Use Permit, 1756 and 1762 Brice Road, #166565.

Ms. Wallace: I'll second.

(Ms. Moeller called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "no." Ms. Wallace voted "yes." Mr. Enfinger voted "no." Mr. Rettke voted "This is where I said I struggle. I apologize for the delay. I'll say 'yes' and I want to clarify that. Again, I struggle with non-conforming use to what it was intended on, but as I look through the standards and requirements, I don't see that it's going to be a big issue unless this thing grows to be something larger than the 25, maybe 30. When we start looking outside those numbers, I'd like to see another place acquired.") Voting interrupted.

Ms. Moeller: Just as a follow-up, we actually have six-month reviews for Special Exceptions just to kind of see where they're at in six months. So that's kind of something we can monitor and just sort of see. It's just for our purposes, for our recordkeeping kind of thing.

(Ms. Moeller continues roll call for voting on Item B3. Ms. Armintrout voted "I'm going to say no.")

Ms. Moeller: Okay, so it is a three to two vote for no. So this didn't pass through the Board. However you can appeal to Council within 30 days with a written request and they'll kind of step through the process with you. I believe they will read it at their next scheduled meeting. I think that's the process afterward, but I'll have you contact them. April Beggerow is the Clerk of Council, so she can kind of step you through the process through that and then we'll kind of go from there.

Mrs. Davis: Are we allowed to ask why she said no?

Mr. Rettke: Actually, for the record, she should – all the no's should have stated their objection.)

Ms. Armintrout: I think the purpose, like I, "The proposed use shall be harmony with the existing character of the area." I agree with the others for the retail.

Mr. Enfinger: I'm sorry. When we do say no, we are supposed to cite the specific code that we feel you guys are not meeting. So it slipped my mind and I apologize. I was letting her finish and then I was going to, for the record, add it in. Under Code 1145.09, Item I, which states, "The proposed use shall be in harmony with the existing or intended character of the district and nearby affected districts and shall not change the essential character of the districts." So I don't feel that you guys meet that – I don't feel like this business meets that requirement and I also think, as far as "J" is concerned, "The proposed use shall not adversely affect the adjacent properties," and, like I stated before, I think it does have an impact on the adjacent properties.

Mrs. Davis: Can I ask a question? Right across the street from there there's a Crossroads Church and then when you go down by Odd Lots, right around the corner almost – there's a church there, same type of what we were trying to do, same thing. So is it because there's too many in a row? I don't know, but that particular area, more than a dress shop or a retail store that the people around there can't afford, I think they need a church. It makes me sad.

Mr. Davis: To add to that, I understand the retail harmony of it, but presently it's been empty for so long and to your point in saying that the rent is inexpensive, it's expensive for me. So it's not inexpensive.

Mr. Enfinger: I understand that, but it almost, by you stating the fact that there are several of them in that area-- Okay, so there's two existing and potentially would be three in that same general area, it kind of proves my point that we have too much Special Exemption, so it's no longer Special Exemption, it's the norm at that point and that's not what that district is supposed to be. So it kind of, in saying that, and we've turned down daycares for this exact reason. We've turned down a number of things that aren't the type of businesses that fit within this district because, if we didn't it would be full of Special Exemption Use and there would be no hope for it ever to recover as a retail industry and a retail district. The past is no precedent for this. We don't set precedent with anything like that. So as far as currently and the way that this is interpreted, this is the judgment of the Board.

Mr. Stoffel: I apologize for not stating my reason for saying no. Also it was 1145.09, Item I. Part of the reason I forgot to even say it, was because that was really hard for me to say no, because it's really hard for me to say no. I agree with Mr. Enfinger to a certain degree about how it would possibly adversely affect businesses wanting to come in that offer retail opportunities and the exchange of services so-to-speak, which a church really doesn't, but from a spiritual standpoint and from a -- it's really hard for me. I'm just telling you, that's the hardest vote I've had here.

Mr. Rettke: Well, one of the things I struggled with is that is a significant size anchor corner that's more appealing to a lot more businesses than the 1200 square feet in my opinion. So to take that off the market or take it away, that kind of hurts that strip mall and that's one of the things I struggled with too on my yes. Did it meet the character? Saying it's empty, if you look at that perspective, there is no character obviously with just the barbershop, so you'd be bringing a character to it. Again, we always get it thrown in our face and that's not a negative, but people will say, "Well, there's one here, there's one here, there's one here." That's where the dynamic of the Board or rules of Council come into play. You know, we see it with signs wanting to go along Main Street. Well, you have to have this sign; well, that guy doesn't have it; well, they said in '07 here's the sign you have to use." We just haven't been fortunate enough to have another business enter into that and have to put out a sign. So when you're looking at dynamics across the city, it's a tough call. I struggled with it. That's why I took so long. I struggled with it-- Even before we meet you, we get the Staff Report about 5 days ahead of time in the packet and I usually read through them, and read through them and then go back over them and maybe sit in my office and say, "Hmm, what am I going to do?" It could be one little thing, but the good part for you, there's always recourse and that's Council. You can go present your argument to them.

Mr. Davis: Well, the reason why we are here is the fact that apparently there was someone in there prior and they didn't come through you guys. They didn't come through the Board. They didn't do the right channel, they didn't go through the right channels and I see it as a complete blessing and miracle, because when I talked to the landlord I was trying to communicate that things that needed to be fixed. Well, they go in for 30 days and fix everything that needs to be fixed and leave everything there to be left and all I do need is just paperwork to come. I just see it as a miracle and that was my way of pursuing what God has called me to do. I do recognize and understand your position, respect your votes and your concerns, but you will find out that you will have no problem with us. We're there for the right reasons. I wanted to say that before the vote, but not knowing if that would charge your hearts and thoughts, but, nevertheless, you did your job. We just ask -- I don't know if you can reconsider or if we need to appeal.

Mrs. Davis: I'm confused on how a church could be in there for 30 days before and they fixed it all and then they're out because they had a revival on that same spot for 30 days and now they're gone and they left everything. So I'm confused on why it was okay for them to be there but not okay for us.

Mr. Rettke: Well, they didn't come through us—

Ms. Moeller: So they shouldn't have been there.

Mr. Enfinger: And the last one that was in that facility, it did get turned down by this Board and they appealed to Council and Council overturned our decision.

Ms. Wallace: Have you looked anyplace else in Reynoldsburg?

Mr. Davis: Sure. We've been looking quite some time.

Mrs. Davis: And the interesting thing is, we've looked a lot of places and our time is – we both work full time as well – but a lot of the retail places you go to are just like Mr. Enfinger, like are empty spaces, been empty for 2-3 years, and the landlords are not getting any kind of rent in. I mean think about it: Would you rather have the space empty hoping that somebody comes in and maybe puts a bar in there because it's low income and it's what it is, or at least bring the community together and bring people into a space so that maybe after we're there, we're there for, you know, if we get up to 40-50 people, we're gone, but at least people are coming into your community. Right now you've got an empty building. Nobody's coming. So when we travel around Reynoldsburg and try to find a spot, it's retail, it's retail, it's retail. So they would rather pay their own rent instead of having us willing to do something with the space, willing to bring people in, willing to better your community and because it's not a bar, it's not a business. That's what you're going to get over there. You're going to get a bar, because you're got a barbershop here and you've got the little Jamaican thing down there and then you've got an empty drive-thru down there that's busted up. So we're trying to do something good. We're not trying to hinder your growth and your business aspect of it, but I think, if I was a landlord, I'd rather get somebody in there that's at least doing something to bring people together, bring them in and better your community instead of waiting for the right person to come in and put a dress shop in there that nobody in that neighborhood can afford.

Mr. Rettke: Those are all good points to bring up with the Council.

Ms. Moeller: We'll forward the minutes to them as soon as we get them transcribed, so they'll be able to read the previous minutes and the concerns. Your next step – I think you'll get a letter, but I can also email you if you would like. I can give you April Beggerow's number and she'll be able to tell you the date and time and let you know what the next steps are.

Mr. Rettke: Usually it takes about a week to get the minutes transcribed. Once they do that, then Council picks it up at the next meeting. So you can appeal within a 30-day limit, I think. This all needs to be clarified through her in that email or letter.

C. OTHER BUSINESS – None.

D. ADJOURNMENT

Having no Other Business, I'll move for adjournment at 7:17 p.m.

Anthony Rettke, Chair

Megan Moeller, Planning Adm.

This document was transcribed by:
Area East Secretarial Service
8363 Schott Road
Westerville OH 43081
Phone: 614-313-3351