

MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
AUGUST 16, 2012
6:30 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. David Stoffel Mr. Norman Brusk Mr. Patrick Feeney
Members Absent:	Mr. Anthony Rettke
Others Present:	Mr. Justin Robbins

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 19, 2012

Chairman Stoffel: Do we have any comment on the meeting from last month? (No response.) None? Approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Stoffel: Are there any additions or corrections to the Agenda? (No response.) All right.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Stoffel: If you are planning on speaking tonight, would you please stand and raise your right hand? (Mr. Stoffel administers oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 8167 EAST BROAD STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1180.11(B) TO ELIMINATE THE REQUIRED 10' LANDSCAPE BUFFER ALONG THE SIDE BOUNDARY OF THE PARKING LOT. CONTACT: JEFF KAUERZ (106-ZV).

2. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION, 1867 EAST BROAD STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT USE, VACANT; PROPOSED

USE, RETAIL – AUTOZONE; PRESENT OWNER, LRC BROAD INVESTORS, LLC; CONTACT: JEFF KAUERZ (33-MS).

Mr. Robbins: The first item on the agenda is 8167 East Broad Street. We have one project we're dealing with. There's a major site plan review and a variance request. So if the Board is okay with it, we can go through the major site plan and then discuss the variance afterwards. I think the agenda has it flipped around.

The property is located on an out parcel to the north of the Lowe's development on East Broad Street to the east of Waggoner Road. Applicant is requesting a major site plan review for a proposed commercial retail structure within the CS (Community Services) district. The property is a .975 acre undeveloped parcel. The property to the east is currently undeveloped and the property to the west is currently a Chase Bank. All surrounding properties are zoned CS (Community Services). Applicant is proposing the property be developed as an Autozone parts retailer. Staff did a review of the project. The applicant has submitted a complete application. The lot, like I said, is .975 acres, roughly 42,000 square feet. The building is 6,446 square feet, the lot coverage of 15.1%. The applicant has shown preliminary placement of all the utilities on the site, access of storm drainage exists on the site, and the applicant is proposing to tie into the existing system. The proposed storm drainage will empty into an existing detention basin within the development site. Parking ingress and egress is primarily through the access road from behind with connections to both adjacent properties as well. Part of the application is the variance and they are requesting-- If I can get a little ahead of myself, on the western side of the property a relief from the 10' landscaping requirement abutting the parking lot.

So the site is on the screen right here, the red star. We have the original submission that the applicant gave us with the parking on the left-hand side, there are 10 spaces and they have that directly on the property line. I did talk with the applicant and said that staff was initially not in support of granting the variance for numerous reasons. I believe he did make some corrections to the site plan and I think he will have that to show us tonight as well. I have it on the screen, so apparently when that comes up we can talk about that a little later. The parking for the proposed use are 33 required spaces. With the initial site plan they had 45 on the plan and the elimination of the 10 to the western edge would bring that down to about 35 spaces. So staff had no issues with the site plan aside from the parking on the western edge and staff is also requesting that we get more plantings on the eastern edge of the property as well, some more trees and shrubbery along the edge of the building and probably along the back as well.

I don't know if the applicant had a presentation, or do you just want to cover anything that I missed?

Mr. Trey Guyton: I'm Trey Guyton with Prism Engineering. I've been doing the work for the proposed Autozone. I'm not sure how the process worked. I was hoping there was somebody else in front of me so I could see how this worked before I stood up here, but I guess that's not going to happen.

I think we covered everything pretty well. The staff obviously did not support the variance. I think everything else was pretty well in line, other than about the variance. The biggest problem – they try to get as many parking spaces on there as they possibly can, of course, retail space trying to get as many customers in as they possibly can. That's the main goal of all the parking spaces. Other than that, it's right up to the property line. We tried to pull it away from the property line as much as we can, but there wasn't a whole lot of room and to be able to get the drainage on the east side of the property, we had to leave some room on that side to get our drainage in and provide some landscaping on that side to try to justify placing the parking and the 10' side yard on the west side.

Mr. Brusk: Justin, on the west side where they want the variance, what's there right now? Is that the bank?

Mr. Robbins: Yes, it's a Chase Bank.

Mr. Brusk: And how wide is their landscaping, out of curiosity?

Mr. Robbins: It appears to be about 10'.

Mr. Brusk: Okay, not bigger than the 10'.

Mr. Robbins: To my knowledge, no.

Mr. Brusk: So, in effect, the code really calls for 20' of landscaping between buildings.

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Brusk: Our reason, as I see it, for being a stickler on that is not that yours would look bad or look good or whatever, but it sets a precedent and that's what we don't want to do. If we do it here, then that kind of reduces it. Where you're located is different than the heart of Reynoldsburg where we think it's even more important but, again, we don't want some new business to say, "Why should we have to meet it when Autozone didn't meet it?" So that's the rationale on that.

Mr. Stoffel: Justin, did you say that they had made a modification? Can we look at that?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. I can show that right now. I had spoke with the applicant before the meeting—

Mr. Guyton: I have a hard copy as well.

Mr. Stoffel: And what parking does that leave you with?

Mr. Guyton: We reduced it by 10 spaces, so we would be-- I forget how many spaces we had originally. We reduced it 10 spaces, which still puts us over and above the requirements.

Mr. Robbins: The original proposed had 45, the elimination of 10 spaces should leave 35 spaces.

Mr. Stoffel: I think you mentioned in your report, Justin, if they went parallel they could pick some up and still maintain the 10'. Is that correct?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, I believe there's enough space for 4, maybe 5 spaces in there, so that would be an elimination of 6 spaces from the original proposal.

Mr. Guyton: I spoke with Justin about it and what I told him, I said I needed to talk to the client about it. The original layout was theirs with the parking up to the property line. I needed to speak with them about it before we made any adjustments to see how they wanted to handle it and they said, "If it's not going to work, let's just remove those 10 spaces and leave it at that." They weren't worried about adding any parallel parking. Sometimes that would make it a little more difficult to maneuver.

Mr. Stoffel: And those could be added later if you needed to adjust it. Of course later, if you had an issue, then it would possibly show the hardship but, right now, I'm in favor of what we have on the screen here with the additional green space. Were you going to do landscaping then?

Mr. Guyton: Yes. This all happened yesterday afternoon when I was talking to Justin, so what we planned on doing-- What is it the Design Review Board? That we're going to submit for as well and I talked with Justin, I said, "I don't want to submit something that's not correct and then resubmit and keep doing things." I want to make sure what we submit can get approved, so I can put the right thing on the set of plans. So yesterday we did this and when we put it on there I said, "Let's wait on the landscaping so I can get what we need on there, make sure everything's right and then we'll get it all up and submit with our next package. But, yes, we will landscape on that side, on the west side according to code."

Mr. Brusk: Do we have any questions on the site plan itself? I didn't see anything.

Mr. Feeney: The signage meets all the requirements. I like the idea of eliminating the parking spaces for now. You said you were going to put more planting on the west side of the building?

Mr. Guyton: Yes.

Mr. Feeney: I think the west elevation is pretty-- There's nothing to it, is there?

Mr. Guyton: It's pretty plain other than the front.

Mr. Feeney: So which is your east wall? You're going to have some more—

Mr. Guyton: We're going to put some more shrubs on that side and put some more shrubs on the west – actually on both sides.

Mr. Brusk: Your original called for more on the east side and now you've agreed to do the west side to code.

Mr. Stoffel: I think the site plan looks good.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, I didn't see anything that raised any issues with me, same with you, Justin?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct. I do want to interject as well, in regards to the variance, I think we should also keep in mind to use the language that's in the Staff Report when not allowing a variance.

Mr. Brusk: Well, are we not going to allow the variance, or approve the variance as amended?

Mr. Feeney: There's no variance.

Mr. Robbins: There's no variance. They removed the parking.

Mr. Brusk: We need to explain that, I think, on the record, that we have reviewed it, that the client has withdrawn that because they decided to meet the requirements.

Mr. Stoffel: Do we need to vote on the major site plan first, then? So can we get a motion?

Mr. Brusk: I so move that we accept the major site plan, Item C2, 33-MS.

Mr. Feeney: I'll second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll: Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes.")

Mr. Stoffel: Concerning Item C1, zoning variance, from the discussion with the Board and the applicant, the applicant has decided to remove the parking which would have required the variance, so Item C1 is withdrawn.

D. OTHER BUSINESS – None

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:48 p.m.

David Stoffel, Chair

Aaron Domini, Acting Planning
Administrator

Justin Robbins, Assistant Planning
Administrator

This document was transcribed by:
Area East Secretarial Service
7668 Slate Ridge Blvd.
Reynoldsburg OH 43068
614-864-2840