

MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
AUGUST 18, 2011
6:30 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. Patrick Feeney Mr. David Stoffel Mr. Norman Brusk Mr. Anthony Rettke
Members Absent:	Mr. Lucas Haire
Others Present:	Mr. Matthew Hansen, Planning Administrator

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 21, 2011

Mr. Brusk: The next item is the approval of the minutes of July 21, 2011. Are there any changes, modifications, additions, deletions? (No response.) Not being any, they will stand approved as submitted.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Brusk: Are there any changes, amendments, additions, deletions?

Mr. Feeney: I believe it was printed in error. We have three items that are Unfinished Business that should be under New Business.

Mr. Brusk: You agree with that?

Mr. Hansen: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: Thus, we'll make that one change. Are there any other changes? (No response.) If not, we will approve the agenda as amended. That brings us to Unfinished Business. Actually, it's supposed to be New Business first.

Mr. Feeney: No, swearing in of speakers.

Mr. Brusk: Oh, swearing in of speakers, of course.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

(Mr. Brusk administers the oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Brusk: Is there any public comment? That is from anybody who's not speaking on issues. I don't see any big uproar out there so I assume that. The next item should have been New Business, is that correct? Okay, that would have been B.

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Brusk: And there is no New Business?

Mr. Feeney: There is no Unfinished Business.

Mr. Brusk: I'm sorry. There's no Unfinished Business.

Mr. Feeney: No Unfinished usually.

Mr. Brusk: Oh, okay. B is – boy, I got this screwed up. See, you should have taken this. There being no Unfinished Business, all the Items 1, 2 and 3 are now moved to C.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PLAN APPLICATION, 423 POSTWOODS DRIVE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, AR-2; OWNER'S NAME: NEW POST WOODS TOWNHOMES, LP; REQUESTING APPROVAL OF A COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PLAN. CONTACT: LARRY LAB WITH MORRISON SIGN COMPANY. (629-ZS).

Mr. Brusk: All right. Who is speaking on that? Would you please come forward, state your name and address and then we will have staff explain their findings and we'll go from there.

Mr. Larry Lab: Larry Lab with Morrison Sign Company. (speaking off mic)

Mr. Brusk: Thank you. Matt.

Mr. Hansen: The applicant is proposing to replace two ground signs that identify the development of Post Woods Apartments. The existing signs are located at Post Woods Drive here on the west end of the development and then at Trillium Lane on the east end. The signs are both identical with one minor change to this west sign. Both of them are 5 foot 8 inches tall, brick monument signs with approximately 18.22 square feet of sign area. This west sign has an additional changeable copy at the bottom of the development identification placard and that is 6.83 square feet. Like I said, they're brick monument signs and they have stone caps on top of the piers that flank either side of the name. Here's the location of the west sign at Post Woods Drive. It is set back approximately around 20 feet. It will be integrated into the existing landscape bed you

see here. This is a picture of the area across the street and then on the sidewalk looking towards the park. The other sign is located here. It is 10 feet from the right-of-way. It's the same sign except the changeable copy down at the bottom is not present. The old sign still remains at this location. You can see it's just a simple wood two-post ground sign. Here is an image looking down the sidewalk and then looking the other direction. Taking a look at how subdivision signs or residential identification signs are approved in the City, the BZBA can evaluate the number and the size of the signs. There is a maximum height of the sign, that it could be at 5 feet, and these signs proposed exceed that by 8 inches. The minimum front setback is 10 feet and the sign is set back approximately 10 feet. The west sign would also meet that code requirement. But the Board can also evaluate the appearance and the aesthetics of the sign to ensure that we have good harmony of identification signs within the City. Staff believes that these signs are a little large and bulky, given the residential character of the area and the lack of any other signage along Daugherty. We think the signs could be smaller in scale. The height of them needs to come down to meet the code requirements. Also, we do have some concern about the changeable copy. This is not really characteristic on our residential identification signs and if there needs to be some sort of contact information for leasing, that should be made permanent or a separate "For Lease" sign put in the ground adjacent to the entrance. So staff recommends, at this point, that we table the application until next month so that the applicant can further revise the design, get some input from the Board and come back with a proposal that both meets code and better fits the area.

Mr. Brusk: Would you prefer to discuss it now and then make that decision?

Mr. Lab: Can I get the Board's feedback now?

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, and I think that is acceptable. What is the purpose of the changeable signs? What would be the information that you would put on there?

Mr. Lab: The snipe?

Mr. Brusk: The changeable part.

Mr. Lab: It would be used to make announcements. It could even say rental office. It could be a directional arrow. Informative and as the sign company, all we were going to do was provide four places, two places to mount the snipe. Nothing to be make an issue about it, just want to let them know what the purpose is of having that available.

Mr. Brusk: What would our feelings be if that was blank and then they put overlay signs on occasionally? Because I think that would look a whole lot better than putting a ground sign to do the same thing and I don't think that would fall under the same definition of changeable sign as you have on Main Street and the problems we've had with them.

Mr. Lab: (speaking off mic)

Mr. Hansen: Well, we don't have the same regulations on Main Street as we do here.

Mr. Brusk: We don't have to live by that at all.

Mr. Hansen: No. Our concern is how they are going to construct that sign, if it's going to change all the time? Is it going to correspond with the sign up top or is it going to be made of a completely different – you know, it's something that we can't regulate because they're not going to come in and need to pull a permit—

Mr. Feeney: Each time they--

Mr. Hansen: --each time, yeah.

Mr. Brusk: On the other hand, would they need to come in for a permit to put a small sign saying "Pool Party?"

Mr. Hansen: No, but I mean—

Mr. Brusk: Theoretically, they would, but in reality they wouldn't.

Mr. Hansen: Right. And generally I don't think that's something that necessarily needs to be advertised to the community and upon a right-of-way. I think that could be handled internally within the development itself.

Mr. Brusk: And on the back side of the sign.

Mr. Hansen: Could be.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah.

Mr. Lab: It could state prices for use, one month's special, lot of things and I don't know of any way to ease the concern. My client is willing to spend a lot of money to erect monument signs to upgrade the apartments which they're already doing, so it's not like we're coming in here – so it's not like you're going to put a piece of cardboard and write "Car Wash" on it and stick it on there. I think here is what we're trying to is what they're going to put on there periodically is going to be (speaking off mic – inaudible).

Mr. Brusk: Right. What I would be objecting to would be the ones that have the – you change the letters and—

Mr. Hansen: Right, but—

Mr. Brusk: I think that's what we have been trying to avoid in the past and I think it applies even though the regulation may not quite apply but the aesthetic characteristic of that would apply here just as well, I would think. I would tend to say that I would be (a) I think we need to lower the sign. That would be my feeling. And secondly, I think if we could get some wording for the bottom I would be willing to vote for keeping a – with a changeable sign but not a – you know, change the wording of what that is but—

Mr. Lab: In our industry we call that bottom sign a snipe.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. But the bottom sign would have to be in the same as the above sign, the same characteristic. Does anyone else have any comments on this?

Mr. Rettke: Well, I think before I'd vote I'd want to see maybe a photograph of what this would look like, what that snipe signs would look like. And as far as the size again, obviously by code it has to come down but, for me, when I look at the sign that's out there now, I like that sign. It just looks residential. When I look at this all brick, it doesn't look to me like it fits a neighborhood, doesn't look like it fits a residential neighborhood to me. I'm just wondering, it's not like it's an area where it's a 50-mile-an-hour speed limit, people be flying by and they have to see this thing. Is there any way to reduce the size? You're basically going from 32 square feet to almost 70 square feet and I don't even know how well this thing would fit in the island that's even there. That's going to be—

Mr. Hansen: It's longer than the island that's there.

Mr. Lab: What I'd like to come out of here tonight, let's address the changeable sign issues. Okay. I think what's more important to my client, that we approve this or make sure we're on the right road to do this and always they can come back in a month or whatever and say, "Hey, can we put these on from time to time?" or whatever. That's something that I don't want to hold up, getting sign approval for these guys that are out of town rehabbing all those apartments. So I would just as soon not table the whole sign but table the part about snipe or size.

Mr. Hansen: I would rather not do that.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah.

Mr. Lab: You'd rather not do that?

Mr. Hansen: No, I'd rather see a whole package and not give partial approval. That's not something that's customary.

Mr. Feeney: I guess I'm still – what is a snipe?

Mr. Brusk: Where's the picture of the sign.

Mr. Lab: In this case it's a change sign but it – right there where it says—

Mr. Feeney: Yeah, but what is that and what's it going to look like?

Mr. Lab: That would be a piece of PVC or whatever material is acrylic. It would have to be, in our case, a feature on the bottom of the sign, put it up there and usually for short-term purposes. For instance, real estate signs they have real estate signs etc., etc. and then they have snipe because below it it says "Sold" or above it. And that's only on there temporarily. But it's a conditional little sign that's not permanent.

Mr. Feeney: It doesn't say anything? How—

Mr. Lab: What we are proposing to this is to have blank spots, that blank spot and all we have are two hooks in there and then to put up the promotions from time to time or whatever it may be.

Mr. Feeney: You would make a series of phrases for them like—

Mr. Lab: They haven't asked us to do that. They would probably do that after the fact.

Mr. Feeney: How would they do that, through you or—

Mr. Lab: Through me or they can go through anybody, say "Hey, we need--." They'd probably go through us since we've done the work but they can go to any—

Mr. Feeney: It wouldn't be something they'd take a Crayola or—

Mr. Lab: No. That's what I was saying. And the comfort zone there is they're spending all this money. They don't want "Car Wash" on a piece of cardboard and stick it in there. (speaking off mic – inaudible)

Mr. Feeney: Yeah.

Mr. Lab: Cause we even have, on the front page we have the size of each one of these stone brick monument signs. And some of them are oversized – one of them is over five feet

Mr. Feeney: Yeah, the—

Mr. Lab: But we're not disputing it. If it has to be 5 feet we can lower two bricks or three bricks, not an issue. If we lower the snipe you may have a problem of the landscape blocking the sign.

Mr. Brusk: You do have that kind of a problem potentially, but I assume that you'd want people to be able to read everything. I don't know. I would think that we could word that saying that the snipe has to be printed as opposed to – and designed in the same characteristic as the major sign. I wouldn't have any problem. I don't know whether you do or not.

Mr. Hansen: It's an extra enforcement that I would have to be on top of – and I don't know if—

Mr. Feeney: One thing I was looking here is that if you lower 8 inches and you keep your post width apartment sign at 2 foot 8, that 12-inch by snipe is going to be – there's not going to be room for it so—

Mr. Lab: I was just going to say, it's also going to be a moot point. They're not going to be able to do it if we lower it.

Mr. Hansen: Right. So—

Mr. Lab: So I think that solves the problem. By lowering it, there's going to be no place--

Mr. Feeney: For the snipe, yeah.

Mr. Brusk: And you would be acceptable? That would be acceptable?

Mr. Ferguson: It's not preferable but, we can remove the snipe if that is what the Board thinks.

Mr. Brusk: We can make the amendment now or—

Mr. Hansen: You can condition that approval, yeah.

Mr. Brusk: Are there any other questions? Anyone in the audience have any questions?

Mr. Stoffel: There's not an issue of the width then?

Mr. Hansen: There's no code requirement, no, but I still think it's – as staff, it's out of scale.

Mr. Ferguson: If you look at other signs in the area along the street, they are constructed of brick and about as long as this sign.

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah, but I think they're on a main thoroughfare as opposed to a residential side street that dead ends in essence. That's my – I mean, it's location, location, location as far as I'm concerned. They're apples and oranges.

Mr. Rettke: And the signage again, apparently there's no code as far as square footage but—

Mr. Hansen: No, but it's totally as approved by the Board.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah. So, to me, again I like the signage that's out there. It just looks warm. It looks neighborly. It just looks – and personally I think that a 12 ½ foot wide sign, 5 foot or 5 foot 8 regardless, just jumps out more than it has to. I'd personally like to see it cut down. What you got, 6 – even if you went down to at least 10 feet, to me I don't – I don't know. It just seems excessive to me for – like he was saying, a dead end subdivision that leads to a park. I don't know how much you guys would be willing to maybe compromise on that a little bit.

Mr. Ferguson: (speaking off mic)

Mr. Stoffel: Be about half opposed.

Mr. Lab: But actually, those piers are 2 foot 3 inches – so I can see where we knock 6 inches off each side and make them 8 inches. So yeah, if we drop them down between 7 and 8 inches—

Mr. Stoffel: It says 2 foot 6 inches.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah. You read the sign.

Mr. Lab: Yeah. 2, 3 is the column.

Mr. Stoffel: 2, 3 is the column?

Mr. Lab: So 2 by 3 is the column so that's 27 inches so if we went down to approximately 20 inches we would be 7, 14 inches. We could still probably have 14 inches to play with and make those columns still look appropriate. You can't make it any smaller than that so—

Mr. Brusk: Is that 6 foot 10 width for the actual sign, is that pretty – is that fairly standard in the industry as far as signage for an apartment?

Mr. Lab: Yeah. That's what we're looking – we're looking at say 3 by 7, about 21 square feet. Most communities are 32 square feet. We know we have to have to be at 5 feet, so we'll make that adjustment. Our designer then could make it proportionate to what it should be based on that and so I'm sitting here throwing out dimensions. I guess what we want to get accomplished tonight is we can make the changes that we want and move forward and not having to come back here next month.

Mr. Brusk: I personally don't have a problem with the sign at either width that we're talking about but if other people do, maybe we do need to—

Mr. Feeney: Well, the only thing I was thinking about, since we're going to lower it, it's going to be a short – that's why I was—

Mr. Lab: We would make it proportionate—

Mr. Feeney: --come in proportionate, yeah, just to make it look some type uniform. I like the sign myself.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah. I like the sign. I just think it's fairly large.

Mr. Feeney: So if we lower it to—

Mr. Brusk: So would it be acceptable to everyone if we – I'm going to make a-- I propose that we accept the comprehensive sign plan application with the following proviso: The sign be no larger than 5 feet. The – what is that called, the snipe?

Mr. Feeney: Snipe.

Mr. Brusk: The snipe would be eliminated and that it would be narrowed proportionately to the drop. Does that meet everybody's – if so, could I get a second?

Mr. Feeney: Well, is that something we want to—

Mr. Brusk: And then we can vote on this today.

Mr. Feeney: Since we're just saying a random number for narrowing—

Mr. Stoffel: Do we want to quantify that number to 11' wide?

Mr. Brusk: I don't think it would be fair to say it has to be 10 feet.

Mr. Feeney: As long as it's acceptable to Matt, something like that?

Mr. Brusk: Yeah.

Mr. Hansen: Subject to staff review and approval and if I don't find it acceptable, then I'll just bump it back to you guys.

Mr. Brusk: Okay. All right. Does that sound fair to you?

Mr. Hansen: Well, maybe I'll send it out and get a little feedback.

Mr. Feeney: Whatever you want to do. Whatever you feel—

Mr. Hansen: Yeah. When I get the revised drawings I'll just double-check.

Mr. Lab: Resize proportionate to 5 feet.

Mr. Brusk: Right.

Mr. Hansen: Right.

Mr. Lab: Like I said, we'll shorten it, make sure it is not too long and narrow, eliminate the snipe. Anything else?

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. And so I add also that one provision, the last provision, that it be acceptable to staff. Do we have a second on that?

Mr. Stoffel: I'll second.

(Mr. Hansen called the roll. Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Rettke voted "yes.")

2. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT APPLICATION, 6269 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, CC; PRESENT OWNERS' NAMES, MICHAEL A. GEORGE/DEBORAH F. GEORGE; REQUESTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR. CONTACT: CHAD CRNKOVICH (54-SE).

Mr. Brusk: Your name and address, please.

Mr. Crnkovich: My home address?

Mr. Brusk: Either your address or address of the business.

Mr. Crnkovich: Chad Crnkovich of Columbus Auto Wholesale LLC, 6269 East Main Street.

Mr. Brusk: Okay. You're going to need to speak up just a bit so he can get it recorded appropriately. Mr. Hansen, will you give us an overview?

Mr. Hansen: This parcel is located within the CC, Community Commerce district. Automotive repair is a Special Exception Use. Adjacent parcels are also zoned CC with a variety of uses, many of them also automotive-related. The unit that he is taking is the end unit here. It has always been an automotive repair facility and the adjacent units are also the same type of use.

Mr. Brusk: Was Beanie's there?

Mr. Hansen: This was the former Beanie's location.

Mr. Stoffel: Beanie's was next door wasn't it?

Mr. Brusk: Right. Next to Beanie's, yeah.

Mr. Hansen: Oh, Beanie's was next door, yeah. The hours of operation for the automotive repair will be Monday through Saturday, 10 A.M. to 7 P.M. There will be three employees on-site. The interior of this space can hold up to six vehicles and the applicant anticipates having up to 15 vehicles at one time for repair. The remaining of the vehicles will be stored in the front parking area and in the rear parking area. Staff visited the site and parking is not an issue to have those vehicles stored in the lot. We think that the Special Exception Use meets the standards as found in Section 1145.10 and we recommend approval.

Mr. Brusk: Are you going to do oil changes also?

Mr. Crnkovich: We're not going to advertise to the public that we do oil changes, but in the future we could expand to offer that service. But I have a stake in this property as a relative owns the property and I want to be sure to have a quality business so I can help attract other good businesses to the property.

Mr. Brusk: You could, yeah. I don't think that would make a major difference in approval here anyway. I don't think you would need to restrict it. It makes sense. Whatever is good business sense, glad to see that being used. Is the other business at the far ends being—

Mr. Crnkovich: At the far end of the site is Automotive Doctor's. Next to it is Car Care of Reynoldsburg and the space next to that—

Mr. Brusk: Right. It's still vacant.

Mr. Crnkovich: No it is being used by the business next door.

Mr. Brusk: Oh, it is now occupied? Good. Okay. Because that other one had the nice spaces for work. It'd be more ideal for that kind of business but—

Mr. Crnkovich: This space is not the most ideal to do work because it has the pit.

Mr. Brusk: Right. And the pit and you got – and that pit might be useful, easier than a lift.

Mr. Crnkovich: Yeah it can be useful in some situations.

Mr. Brusk: I have no – any further questions. Anyone else?

Mr. Stoffel: No. I think since the prior use was the same; like it's a technicality more than anything.

Mr. Brusk: Okay. Then I will—

Mr. Feeney: Pretty straightforward.

Mr. Brusk: I'll entertain a motion.

Mr. Rettke: I'll make a motion that we approve Item C2, Special Exception (54-SE).

Mr. Feeney: Second.

(Mr. Hansen called the roll. Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Rettke voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Stoffel voted "yes.")

Mr. Brusk: Good luck with that. Hope it goes real well.

3. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION, 2225 TAYLOR PARK DRIVE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT USE, RESIDENTIAL CARE; PROPOSED USE, RESIDENTIAL USE; PRESENT OWNER, METHODIST ELDERCARE SERVICES; CONTACT: CARRIE MYERS (26-MS).

Mr. Brusk: Can you state your name?

Ms. Myers: Carrie Myers with PH7 Architects.

Mr. Quackenbush: Brian Quackenbush. I'm with EMH&T.

Mr. Hansen: The applicant is proposing a major site plan approval for an addition to the Wesley Ridge Care Services. The addition is 43,209 square feet and that includes 25 beds of skilled nursing units. Also housed in that addition will be rehabilitation services as well as skilled nursing care. Here's an image of the site. The addition will be to the south of the existing six-story tower. They will be relocating 38 spaces including the service spaces here and then removing this entire covered space structure. Thirty-eight (38) spaces, as I said, will be relocated on the site on the drive, this Wesley Way Drive primarily and they will be adding 16 spaces to accommodate the employees and the demand for the addition.

Mr. Brusk: You said they're going to relocate those spaces?

Mr. Hansen: Correct. They're—

Mr. Brusk: How are they going to relocate them?

Mr. Hansen: They are going to be placed along Wesley Way and they'll be an extension to the parking down this way, so there's no net loss of spaces on the site.

Mr. Brusk: Okay. And that covered spaces, those parking spaces?

Mr. Hansen: These will all be removed to accommodate the addition.

Mr. Brusk: Those will be lost?

Mr. Hansen: Yes, but there's no requirement to replace them as covered spaces. Those were just covered per the programming of Wesley Ridge and I they've worked out an arrangement where they don't need to have those covered spaces.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. My only concern, and I'm not going to reject it for that by any means, is parking there is at a premium right now and to lose even one space when you're going to add how many new people living there and how many more people visiting there. It's going to be tight, but I imagine you still have some more land there. My guess is you're going to be coming back to us and saying, "Please, let's put up some more parking." It's going to be tight. I cannot see how it's not going to be. Right now they have meetings. I understand they're going to continue having meetings there, is that correct?

Ms. Myers: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: So those meetings on those days are overflow parking; park all the way almost to the drive that cuts into Main Street there.

Ms. Myers: Wesley Ridge is evaluating the master plan and there could be opportunities to expand parking on and adjacent parcel.

Mr. Brusk: And I imagine that McDonald's gets more cars in their lots that day, but that's beside the point. That's my only thought on that. I do know we approved some extra parking.

Mr. Hansen: We did approve extra parking between the business, yeah.

Mr. Brusk: And that, I think, is going to be useful but I think, just my comment, but it looks like you'll need more parking in the relative near future. Are you doing – besides rehab are you doing care, nursing home care? Has that been approved also? Is that part of this building or is that—

Ms. Myers: Yes, this addition will have twenty-five beds for skilled nursing care. There will also be rehabilitation services programmed for the addition.

Mr. Brusk: So where's the rehab going to be on the second floor or, I guess, first floor?

Ms. Myers: I'm not sure which floor is for the rehab.

Mr. Brusk: And then the nursing will be there?

Ms. Myers: I have a plan showing the internal layout here.

Mr. Quackenbush: I believe that the rehab is on the second floor.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. I'm glad to see that in this area. Wesley Ridge has a good reputation for the work that they're doing now. They haven't had the nursing to do this type of facility because of the amount of rooms allocated to them by each county, but my feeling is I don't see any problem. I think we've always been willing to cooperate with Wesley Ridge because they've always been willing to cooperate with our needs. Matt, do you see any problems with this?

Mr. Hansen: I just have five conditions of approval. One, that the 15-foot-wide property buffer is maintained along the east property line. That was previously being encroached by parking in the plan. I had suggested a connection and extension of the pedestrian walkway to the north along the Wesley Ridge Way parking and connecting that to the existing walk adjacent to the tower piece there; that screening is added around the generator and transformer subject to staff review and approval; that continuous evergreen plant materials added around the dumpster enclosure subject to staff review and approval; and that information is provided regarding the existing trees to preserve, so there's a big stand of trees that were preserved on the site here and that can count towards their interior lot landscape requirements. So if they just provide us some information to make that those credits match up, then we'll be okay.

Mr. Brusk: Where's this generator and transformer?

Mr. Hansen: The generator and transformer are located – it will be—
(speaking off mic)

Mr. Hansen: Behind the retention area.

Mr. Brusk: Oh, I see it. They're not shown on the drawing on the—

Mr. Quackenbush: We have a bigger copy that you can look at.

Mr. Brusk: I see the one on our drawing.

Mr. Quackenbush: I have a the copy right here—

Mr. Brusk: No, I don't think we'll need it.

Mr. Quackenbush: Okay. This updates plan addresses all the conditions

Mr. Feeney: Why don't you have him speak in that microphone there?

Mr. Quackenbush: We've addressed all the conditions. We extended the walk up as requested there. We're showing screening at least schematically for the generator and the transformer as well as the trash enclosure back there. We'll have to complete a final landscape plan subject to staff approval for that but, yeah, we've addressed all – and also I think we had some spaces that were encroaching into that 15-foot and we're showing screening. There's already a fence there on the top of that mound so, but for that parking, but that's the updated site plan that shows addressing all the conditions.

Mr. Hansen: They had planning to bring updated site plans addressing the conditions but I have not seen these plans yet.

Ms. Myers: I sent you the PDF's of the updated plans this morning.

Mr. Hansen: I actually never received those.

Ms. Myers: Oh, really?

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, I'm not sure what happened then.

Mr. Brusk: Those PDF's, huh?

Mr. Rettke: I didn't – before we didn't have the pre-existing conditions plan and I just noticed on the plan that we were given, I haven't taken the time to count the spaces nor will I, but on the original plan it didn't show the existing spaces along that drive that's running northwest to southeast. Are we making up all that with the addition? I know the numbers say that, but I'm having trouble seeing where those spaces are coming from?

Mr. Quackenbush: --existing conditions. We decided to show all the spaces that are there now so, for instance, there's 13 existing spaces here. There's eight spaces here and then we actually are adding two spaces along the side. I know it's kind of hard to tell but –

Mr. Stoffel: So you gain – 10 there.

Mr. Quackenbush: Yeah. There's 15 more _____ 23 spaces here total. And we removed two for the dumpster so we basically lengthened the parking along that side.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah. I'm sure you counted them. I would've counted them if I had before. I just wanted just to double-check to make sure you had.

Mr. Quackenbush: I counted them on the site to make sure.

Mr. Rettke: And the only suggestion I would have as far as the layout and, again, it's just a suggestion, is the parking that's on the southeast side of the very tip there as it's looping around, you know where you're coming up near that buffer? Those are kind of out-of-the-way spaces. Would it make any sense at all to add some more as you're going north along that drive where you added some and extended the sidewalk? Would it make any sense to add those spaces along there and maybe throw a couple in where you have that I-tooth, that little bucktooth down in the northwest corner? Because those spaces are kind of – it creates a grading and buffer problem, it's just.

Mr. Quackenbush: We need to look at that again and study that. There are some considerations where we need to have parking located near the entrances. But we can look at that again and see where we could possibly relocate those spaces to the north off the existing drive.

Mr. Brusk: Matt, we wouldn't have any really – any requirements when it comes to parking, or are they meeting—

Mr. Hansen: No. They are meeting – but we do have requirements. It's actually—

Mr. Brusk: Are they close to it?

Mr. Hansen: No, they meet it.

Mr. Brusk: Okay.

Mr. Hansen: It's one space per every eight beds plus one space for every employee at the largest shift.

Mr. Brusk: And that took into account that you have new beds coming, right? So you had to have those spaces?

Mr. Hansen: They do have to, yeah.

(speaking off mic)

Mr. Brusk: Matt, you're okay?

Mr. Feeney: What kind of—

Mr. Brusk: --come back to this.

Mr. Feeney: What kind of site lighting are you adding to this?

Mr. Quackenbush: We were actually just going to utilize the existing lighting that was there. Down at the southeast portion of the site there are a couple of lights already illuminating the drive. Much of the plan builds into the existing campus—

Mr. Feeney: I was just wondering because driveway lighting versus parking lot lighting is – you know, if you’re going to have all the parking that far away from the building, I would think you’d want to add a little bit more light down there just for – just for feeling safe, yeah, people walking around.

Mr. Quackenbush: Yeah that’s a good point. We can look at adding some additional lights for security.

Mr. Brusk: Any comments? (No response.) If not, I’ll entertain a motion on this. Be sure to add those five changes.

Mr. Feeney: What changes? Oh, his recommendations?

Mr. Brusk: Right. And they said that they’ve met all four of the five already and they’re planning on meeting the—

Mr. Hansen: Looks like it, yeah.

Mr. Brusk: We’ll just add it so it’s official.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah. That’s fine.

Mr. Brusk: Do I have a motion?

Mr. Feeney: Yeah. I’ll make a motion that we approve the major site plan (26-MS) with the five noted exceptions, that the 15-foot-wide property buffer is maintained along the east property line; that the pedestrian walkway adjacent to the east parking area is extended north towards the other spaces and connected with existing walkways; that screening is added around the generator and transformer subject to staff review and approval; and that it continues evergreen plants and materials added around the dumpster enclosure subject to staff review and approval; and 5) that information is provided regarding existing trees to be preserved on-site in order to determine required interior lot landscape requirements subject to staff review and approval.

Mr. Brusk: Do I have a second?

Mr. Rettke: Second.

(Mr. Hansen called the roll. Mr. Rettke voted “yes.” Mr. Feeney voted “yes.” Mr. Stoffel voted “yes.” Mr. Brusk voted “yes.”)

Mr. Brusk: Thank you very much. Be sure that you meet that condition.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Brusk: Okay. Is there any Other Business to come before the Board today?

Mr. Hansen: I have no Other Business.

E. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Norman Brusk, Chair

Matthew Hansen, Planning Administrator

This document was transcribed by:
Area East Secretarial Service
7668 Slate Ridge Blvd.
Reynoldsburg OH 43068