

**MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
JULY 19, 2007**

A: CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. John Brandt Mr. Duane White Mr. Thomas Kucera Mr. Norman Brusk Mr. Patrick Feeney
Others Present:	Mr. Lucas Haire, Planning Administrator

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kucera: Are there any comments, additions, corrections to the minutes of the June 21st meeting? (No response.) Hearing none, those will stand as approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Kucera: Are there any changes to the agenda this evening?

Mr. Haire: There is. There's one additional item that I added, which was added as Item C5. I passed out a new agenda as well, which is Major Site Plan Review Application for 1636 Graham Road.

Mr. Kucera: All right.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Kucera: Has everyone that intends to speak tonight, I assume that they've signed in. If you have not signed in, if you could sing in before you leave. Anyone wishing to speak tonight, if you could stand or swearing in, raise your right hand. (Administered oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Kucera: Is there any public comment on any items not on the agenda this evening? (No response.) Hearing none, we'll go to Unfinished Business.

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. VARIANCE APPLICATION; 1898 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1181.03 (C) 1 OF THE REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING AND ZONING CODE TO ALLOW SIGNS ON WALLS NOT PARALLEL TO A STREET. CONTACT: DINA CHENEY (17-ZV).

Mr. Terry Quinn: I'm not Dina, but she left me hanging two months in a row, so I thought I'd better get here tonight and at least address this issue.

Mr. Kucera: If you'd introduce yourself.

Mr. Quinn: I'm Terry Quinn and I'm the owner of the property and also a development agent for Subway and that's one of the things that we're doing in this building. The request of the variance is for Subway signage.

Mr. Kucera: Okay.

Mr. Quinn: The building is being split down the middle and there's a back entrance being added, so we wanted to put signs over that entrance so that we didn't confuse customers of which business they were going to. Then the side signage was, hopefully, to get people coming I guess north off the freeway to see us, because the front sign is going to be cut in half. Subway is going to have a much smaller place on that. So we were hoping to get signage on the side to catch people's eyes coming off Brice Road going to the north.

Mr. Haire: Let me cut the lights so you guys can see this.

Mr. Kucera: If you would please.

Mr. Haire: This area is looking north up Brice Road from, I guess, it's the Popeye's parking lot I'm in. This is the new façade they're putting on. There was a wall -- the original design intent was for that to be a wall with signage on it. The Design Review Board has approved the signage there. Although no other businesses within this area have signs on the south side, the south face of the building and last year a similar request from the Waffle House was denied by the Board.

Mr. Kucera: You will have a monument sign out front? Is that correct?

Mr. Quinn: There is a monument sign outside on the front.

Mr. Haire: They're just going to reface the current sign that's there. I think it now says Tailgaters and then it has a reader board, so that will be two new faces where the reader board will be replaced with a tenant panel and then the Tailgaters will be replaced by a Subway panel.

Mr. Quinn: Right. It's just not a very big size and, of course, a sign on the front of the building is almost worthless, because you're already there by the time you'd

ever see it. Maybe somebody coming up Livingston, going east on Livingston you might be able to see it. We thought the side was actually more important than the front. And the back's important just to let people know that's an entry point, because there is a drive-thru that goes along the front.

Mr. Brandt: Did you say this is going to be divided into two different businesses?

Mr. Quinn: Yes. It's about a 4,100 square foot building and the Subway's got about half of that, per se, on the south side. They get the drive-thru and the south of the building there's a back entry for Subway. I don't contemplate a back entry for the other side. I'm figuring that they can do with the two, there are actually two entry points on the north side of the building.

Mr. White: Would there be signs for the other business?

Mr. Quinn: Yes.

Mr. White: On the south side?

Mr. Quinn: And I don't have a tenant yet, so at this point I don't know what that would entail.

Mr. White: Would the signs be on the south side of the building as well?

Mr. Quinn: No. No, just the Subway on the south side.

Mr. Brandt: What's the likelihood of the other tenant coming in and wanting signage on there as well?

Mr. Quinn: Probably on the north side, that might be an option. But there's a lot of trees that block that, too. Actually, there's trees that block the south side, too. I just drove it tonight to just kind of see whether I should even be asking for a variance, because if I can't see anything from the south side-- I suppose in the winter when the tree's leaves are gone you could see it. I was hoping to catch people all the way down to the Freeway, but that's not going to happen. You can't really see the building until about Channingway.

Mr. Haire: Yes. Eastgreen.

Mr. Brandt: It's actually looking pretty nice from what it was. So—

Mr. Quinn: Yes, it's getting better all the time and we keep working with -- we've got problems now with drainage and I'm trying to figure out how to get the drainage so there's not a big pond behind the building because the whole, everything

slopes down and there's no sewer system here. So it's been a challenge. We keep working at it to get it as good as we can.

Mr. Haire: The sign on the rear, to the rear of this building is a retail strip center where the Odd Lots is and the two businesses down, the Popeye's, they have a sign on the rear of the building. But, like I said, no other business has signs on the south side.

Mr. Brusk: Does that require a variance for the back, also?

Mr. Haire: It should have, but I didn't see where any was granted. I don't know how long that business has been there.

Mr. Brusk: Okay but for this particular business it would be required for the back?

Mr. Haire: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: I think we discussed that earlier that that probably would not be a major problem for us. The side is still the one that's the issue.

Mr. Feeney: My thought, too, there are several type businesses similar to this type of operation and they don't have signage. If we start granting this, it's just going to snowball and we're trying to improve the look of Brice Road. But then, again, I don't have a problem with the sign on the back, because that is a heavily trafficked driveway through there. Especially if we have not granted one to the Waffle House, so we kind of set a precedent there.

Mr. Quinn: I can understand the political parts. I will take what I can get.

Mr. Brandt: You said the one on the front didn't do any good until they hit the front of the place. Take the one off the front and put it on the side.

Mr. Quinn: Yeah, sometimes we would rather have one on the side and none on the front. But if you don't want to give a variance to the one on the side, then I've just got to do the front. That's the only option I'll have.

Mr. Brandt: Well, I'm just throwing that out as a thought for an option.

Mr. Brusk: That's interesting.

Mr. Brandt: Because if you're coming north—

Mr. Brusk: Mr. Haire, what's your opinion of that?

Mr. Haire: To do one on the side rather than the front?

Mr. Brusk: Do one on the side instead of the front. Would that be problematic?

Mr. Haire: That's up to you. I mean it goes against the Code the same, but there's less signage there but traffic going southbound they won't see the sign. They'll have the monument sign in the front.

Mr. Brusk: I tend to think that would be a reasonable compromise.

Mr. White: What's the compromise? That he have a sign on the south side and not a sign on the front?

Mr. Brusk: Yes.

Mr. White: But then that kind of deviates from all the other business along that line.

Mr. Brusk: But it probably is the only one where that would be applicable. I don't think Waffle House would have agreed to that for their particular needs.

Mr. Brandt: I think his façade is a little different too.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah.

Mr. Brandt: It lends itself more to something of that nature than possibly those other buildings did. And it really hasn't been -- that's probably been one of the more difficult or challenging properties along there for re-tenanting down through there.

Mr. Brusk: And staying in business.

Mr. Feeney: Well, it does kind of sit out toward the front and you always have signs in the windows, so I think it will catch people's eye.

Mr. Brusk: Well, you'd have the monument sign in front?

Mr. Quinn: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: So everyone would know it's a Subway.

Mr. Quinn: Hopefully.

Mr. Brusk: And then on the side. I can understand your rationale for wanting that. I don't know whether the rest of the group would go with John's idea or not.

Mr. Kucera: I have a problem with precedent.

Mr. Quinn: I can understand that issue. But the back seems okay?

Mr. Kucera: I don't think we have a problem with the back.

Mr. Brandt: I just looked at it from a square footage perspective. If he drops one off the front, as we know, some are -- depending on the franchise or their demands of front, front, front and if he's willing to pass on the front, I mean the square footage on the building is kind of what we're after.

Mr. Brusk: The key to worrying about precedent is how do you differentiate this between this situation and other situations? To my mind, I can mentally justify that change and I would be in favor of that, I believe.

Mr. White: I feel that once we do that, once we break the other precedent, we are going to have other vendors requesting the same and we're going to split hairs on their request as to whether it justifies _____ peculiar to their location. And I think we should probably be consistent at this point in time _____ line.

Mr. Kucera: I agree with that as well.

Mr. Quinn: I understand. I'm okay with the back sign and we'll just put up a front sign and we'll do with what we can.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any public comment on this issue? (No response.)
Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion.

Mr. Brusk: I move that we accept variance application 1898 Brice Road, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Item 17-ZV with the modification that we're not talking about the south side sign, only the rear sign.

Mr. Brandt: I'll second.

Mr. Kucera: Can you call the roll, please?

Mr. White: I have a question before I vote. The modification of the motion is that the application did not include the side sign?

Mr. Brusk: That's correct.

Mr. White: So the side sign would not be approved when we approve this?

Mr. Brusk: Exactly. What we'd approve is the back sign.

Mr. Haire: Just the variance for the rear sign only.

Mr. White: Okay.

Mr. Brusk: Well that sounds even better. Can I change mine to read that way?

Mr. Haire: It's understood.

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Kucera voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Brandt, "I support whatever motion Mr. Brusk made." Motion carries.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. VARIANCE APPLICATION; 180 ROYAL FARM EAST, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1175.03 OF THE REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING AND ZONING CODE TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A DECK WITHIN THE REQUIRED 30 FEET REAR YARD OF THE R-3 DISTRICT. CONTACT: Bob Quayle (19-ZV).

Mr. Kucera: Yes, sir, if you'd introduce yourself.

Mr. Bob Quayle: I'm Bob Quayle. I'm with Clear Choice Building and Renovations. I represent the owner in regards to a variance to construct a rear deck on the property that would encroach the 30' rear setback zoning regulation.

Mr. Haire: Basically, with this request, what they are proposing is a deck that would encroach about 9' approximately into the 30 foot rear yard requirement. The deck in one portion is 14' out from the house and in another portion it's 18' out. So it's about a 14' x 16' deck on the rear. There are other decks in the area. There's one that's been granted a variance in the past two lots to the north which is the top house, you can only see the very piece of it. That's a deck that's within 30'. And then the house to the rear of this house, I guess to the bottom rear, that house has a deck that I can't find any record of being built. So it was likely built without permits, but it also encroaches within the 30' rear yard.

Mr. Kucera: Do you have any idea how much encroachment those two decks have? Is it--

Mr. Haire: The one to the north would be about 20 feet, so it would be very similar to the size of this one. The one to the south is about 22 or 23' from the rear lot line, so they're similar, two or three feet difference.

Mr. Quayle: We did take into consideration the encroachment of the rear yard space. This deck, if you came out level from the house like some of the other ones built there, would be at about four steps from grade. So what we did was put a step at the door and then a step down onto the deck to hold the deck down at about 14" off of grade, so that when the flower boxes and the rails and the benches are all done, that if you're standing in your yard, you'll be able to look over the deck in courtesy to the neighbors. We realize that it is an encroachment to the rear setback, but it's going to

be built of timbertech with is a really high quality deck product and we felt that it would be an enhancement if you look at the other decks that are out there. We really took into consideration the Code by lowering the level that would be out in the encroached area and then the quality of the material. So—

Mr. Haire: If you look at this area, it looks like a patio or something was started there and not completed, but this is kind of the view from the rear corner of this lot that shows you the encroachment of the other deck. It's pretty wooded throughout that area along the rear yards.

Mr. Brusk: The yards look particularly shallow, the back yards, is that correct?

Mr. Quayle: This is one of the deeper houses. When you look at the picture it does set closer. His particular house, it has a larger rear footprint, so it is actually closer than some of the other houses to the rear property line.

Mr. Haire: The property just to the south, the deck that is built there is right at the building line, right at 30 feet.

Mr. White: The one that you identify as a south house, is that right there on Kings Mill Drive at the intersection of Royal Farm.

Mr. Haire: This house is right at 30 feet, this deck is at the building line. This deck encroaches on that 30 foot rear yard and that's the one that was built likely without a permit.

Mr. White: Okay. I went by there and I think there's a house around the corner of Royal Farm and Kings Meadow, I think their deck appeared to be around 15, excuse me, 10 to 12 feet.

Mr. Quayle: It's really close. I know the particular house. It sits right on the corner.

Mr. Haire: The corner is a different situation, because the corner lots have no rear yard. They have two side yards and two fronts. So they're allowed to be within 8 feet of the property line on a corner lot.

Mr. White: My concern, I should express, is that I'm an advocate for green space and the more green space I think is better. I just wonder 18 feet, is there any consideration to modifying that a few feet?

Mr. Quayle: When you -- the 18 foot area is mainly when you come to the, it would make the deck only to be able to be nine feet wide. If it was built all in the setback area the deck could only be nine feet out from the back of the house, because the house is closer to the rear yard as it is. With umbrellas and a table and to be able to comfortably entertain on it, we looked at options of trying to build it because we

wanted to build this early this spring and then ran into the problem with the setback. That was one of the reasons that we tried to get it lower to the ground using the timbertech which is a really high quality, nice looking product, incorporating flower boxes, trying to not block the visual view of the neighbors. If you're standing, you're going to really be able to see over this to see yards beyond.

Mr. Feeney: This deck is just like the ones up from the ground, isn't it? Is that what I'm reading here?

Mr. Quayle: Right, 14", right. It would be one step and then you'd step onto the deck. That's correct. We tried to hold it down lower. A lot of the other decks in the area that encroach into the rear yard setback are three and four feet off the ground, right level at the doors. So we were trying to get it down so to work both directions. So if somebody comes out, they will be able to see over the top of this, it's built out of a high-quality material. I know that it does take up green space and I do understand that argument. But to put \$10,000 into a deck and not be able to have a comfortable deck that they can at least have a cookout on with all of their family there, it would be—

Mr. Kucera: This deck is probably larger than any room in the house, however. It's very large. A 9 x 16 living room is a pretty good size living room. If you lopped—

Mr. Quayle: Well, it's got cut corners.

Mr. Kucera: --split the difference and—

Mr. Quayle: It's got cut corners to kind of help with the design to give it a little more creative design. It's actually -- there's a two foot -- it's actually 12 x 16, the actual square area. There's some other area back towards the house. The actual real square now, you know there are some areas that are, I guess, 14 x 16 is the square area with less to cut corners on the 45.

Mr. Kucera: Is there a reason why the deck couldn't be moved, I don't know which direction it would be, so it's behind the part of the house where you have the 18 foot dimension. Then you could reduce the deck and still have a sizable deck, I'm talking 9 feet.

Mr. Quayle: We gain a little corner where the door comes out. I mean I guess you're talking about cutting it back to what size?

Mr. Kucera: I'm just asking if there was any consideration to reducing the size of the deck at all to cut back the encroachment. Repositioning it or--

Mr. Quayle: Well, with no encroachment, the deck could only be nine feet. It really wouldn't be worth building. I don't know what you're talking about cutting it back to, whether you're talking about two feet or I mean I—

Mr. White: I'm not sure how you arrived at the nine feet. I looked at the diagram here and it shows 18 feet out one side and 14 feet out the other side with a smaller part of it.

Mr. Haire: The encroachment they have is nine feet into there, so 18 if they cut off the nine feet so it was right at 30, you'd be a 9 foot deck on one side and a 5 foot on the other.

Mr. Quayle: Right. You've got five feet on the side of the house where it comes out, where the fireplace and the family room juts out. You only have five feet to the 30 feet line. I mean you can't—

Mr. White: Right, right. What I'm suggesting is that if you were to come back some way from the 30 feet setback, say come back three or four feet, you would still have a deck. If you came back four feet, you'll still have a deck with one part 14 feet out and the other part you'd have 10 feet out. Can you do some modification like that?

Mr. Quayle: Well, it ends up long and narrow, so I'm not sure if it ends up as functionally useable as they would desire, I guess, in comparison to the other decks in the area that are, you know, we're just trying to do it right and come get a variance, not build it without permits, so I'm not—

Mr. White: I'm kind of familiar with the area and I know there are some decks out there that are 15 feet that apparently are accommodatable for people in that area.

Mr. Quayle: Right. Well, there's a lot of other ones though that are within 20 feet or 21 feet of the line as well. You're dealing with only three or four houses. If you go around this whole neighborhood, there's 15 decks or so.

Mr. White: In the neighborhood, it's kind of different at different locations.

Mr. Quayle: Well, I know the corner houses aren't based on the Zoning Code, but, I mean, there's a lot of other decks in the area besides just the ones right there close.

Mr. White: What I'm saying is that in this particular part of the subdivision or area, the lots are smaller. On the other side of Kings Mill Lane there are wooded areas there and the decks may be comparable to the area that's available to them. But looking at this area it's kind of small and the question is, is the deck accommodatable for that particular area that you're proposing.

Mr. Quayle: Right.

Mr. Brusk: I think one of the things you haven't addressed is why the deck can't move up this direction, starting closer to the end of the house? Is there a problem there?

Mr. Quayle: There's nine feet to the line in that area is what it boils down to, because at 18 feet we're nine feet encroaching the 30 foot setback . So, really even in that area, you only have nine feet.

Mr. Bruski: Well, I appreciate that, but you could then if you had moved it that direction, you'd have a much larger area that would be square part if you know what I mean. You'd have less of a small area. And then if you cut a few feet off of that it might be amenable to that without losing functionality, without losing the look of it.

Mr. Quayle: Well, I guess the \$64 question is how much are you going to let me encroach? Where are we going here? Can I get eight feet, can I get six feet?

Mr. Kucera: I guess I'd turn that question around, okay and ask the question--

Mr. Quayle: Well, I mean we want—

Mr. Kucera: Excuse me, sir.

Mr. Quayle: Go ahead.

Mr. Kucera: Turn that question around and ask was there any consideration to designing a deck that would have minimum encroachment? And I don't see anything here and I don't hear you discussing any of the things that were investigated. If this were moved out, if the one side of the deck were moved out, it would appear to be to the south. There's 18 feet across the back of the house, so now you'd have an 18 x 14 foot deck, which seems to be a good size deck. You could move the grill area, flip that over so that it's tucked in here where you have the bench, so that would take care of some of the lost space and some things like that. I guess I'm just asking the question, did anybody even try to live within, come up with a design that would live within the zoning that is a known thing.

Mr. Quayle: Well, no, I think that we did. I think that the deck became long and narrow was the way we felt. So we really thought that the deck was going to enhance the rear yard, not take away. So, yes, we looked at moving the deck towards the full end of the house. We only had nine feet within the setbacks to work with, so we had to go for a variance. I don't think that, I guess 16 feet out and shift it that direction that would put us 23 feet, 7 feet off the rear?

Mr. Kucera: Yeah, if you came out five foot, you made it 16 feet out from the house. All right?

Mr. Quayle: Yes.

Mr. Kucera: I'm trying to do the math in my head here and I'm not coming up too well. If you came out 14 feet, then that would be a less encroachment and so it would be a 14 x 18 deck, which isn't that much different than a 16 x 18 deck.

Mr. Brandt: I think it's kind of like the compromise. Instead of 9 feet, we're asking for five foot encroachment.

Mr. Kucera: Yeah, 4 foot or 5 foot. I'm just asking if anybody even considered it and apparently not.

Mr. Quayle: No, we did consider trying to go within the confines of the Code. So I guess we figured if we were going to ask for the variance, we would ask for it the way we wanted it. But I think if we could get a five foot encroachment, we could come up with a design that we could probably live with, if that's something the Board would consider.

Mr. Feeney: I think those backyards aren't very big at all and I think and again it's, the Codes are there for a reason, for a variety of reasons, but we also like to find a happy medium for everybody too, if at all possible.

Mr. Quayle: Right.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any other Board comment?

Mr. White: I don't know, is that something you would consider, or you client would consider to possibly modify the deck?

Mr. Quayle: Right, I can modify the request to ask for a five foot encroachment instead of a nine foot, if that's something that would appease the Board. I mean I'll have to do a redesign for the Building Department as far as the structure is concerned, but if we get the variance I can live within that confine. That would enable us to—

Mr. White: Well, just carrying that one step farther, would you consider maybe coming back maybe putting this on--

Mr. Brusk: Would he have to?

Mr. Kucera: We could do the motion such that we allow—

Mr. Quayle: We've already waited almost 2 ½ months to build a deck that we wanted for Memorial Day, so anything that the Board can do.

Mr. Brusk: I don't see any reason that we would have to.

Mr. Quayle: If I can get a five foot encroachment to the rear yard setback for the deck, I'll come up with a new design with the owners that hopefully will work for them and then I'll have to redesign the structure for the Building Department that we had submitted to the Building Department for the structure but—

Mr. Brusk: I think you'll probably end up with about the same square footage moving it a little bit.

Mr. Brandt: Are you going to maintain the same height level approximately? Will you still be able to?

Mr. Quayle: Yes, we wanted to keep it down. That way you come out the door - I mean we were trying to get it down low so that we weren't -- if somebody walked out in their yard, they don't want to be looking at a deck that's right up here at their eye level that blocks their view. That was our whole purpose—well, number one, using a Timbertech product which is outrageously expensive, but just a gorgeous product -- with incorporating flower boxes. We were really trying to appease what was going to be there truthfully, but get what the owner needed too to have their whole family over, you know kids, grandkids and whatever and be able to be outside and enjoy it. So if we could make a motion then for a five foot encroachment, we can probably--

Mr. Brusk: That would give you 15 by whatever length you put.

Mr. Quayle: We'll probably build the whole length of that deeper area. This is one of the deepest houses. Truly it is. I mean when you look at these other houses, they're all forward from where their house is. There might be a couple of other ones that are that deep, but the house structure itself does have a deep footprint.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any other Board comment? (No response.) Is there any public comment? (No response.) If not, I will move to accept agenda item C1, request for variance (19-ZV) with the change that we will allow a five foot encroachment on the rear setback line.

Mr. White: I second.

Mr. Kucera: Please call the roll.

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. Kucera voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Brandt voted "yes." Mr. White voted "yes." Motion carries.)

Mr. Quayle: Thank you.

2. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT APPLICATION; 6748 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT OWNER, REYNOLDSBURG MAIN ARC LLC ANCHOR COMPANIES; PRESENT ZONING, COMMUNITY COMMERCE; EXISTING USE, COMMERCIAL (RESTAURANTS/RETAIL/OFFICES/CAR WASH);

PROPOSED USE, AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR. CONTACT PERSON: JOHN GRAUDUSS (07-SE).

Mr. John Gauduss: Good evening, my name is John Gauduss. I am an architect and I represent the owner, the Anchor Company, who owns the property. The three car washes that are to the left of the aerial photograph, the owner wishes to modify the use of two of the car wash bays for other uses that, for him, are compatible with the shape and placement of car washes. The one use that doesn't fit into your zoning category is a lubrication station. Luke called it an automotive repair and that's not what a lubrication is. Your current Zoning Code does not verbally identify a lubrication station as such or an oil change. Oil and lubrication is just like buying gasoline. It is not a repair. It's something that is continually added to a automobile and the service, in many cases, with the way filling stations are done today, that service isn't available to the customer to be able to have a lube at the same time he comes in for gas. Luke said he would help me explain this a little bit better from his point of view. We looked in the book and tried to identify what a lube station would be and it's just not there. So the request is to allow one of the bays to be a lube station operated by the gasoline dealer.

Mr. Haire: With a Special Exception, as it's stated, it's based on the application itself. So as it's stated, it's stated as an oil lubrication, so that's all that would be permitted there. It wouldn't be permitted to be automotive repair. But just as our Code classifies it, the text classifies it as automotive repair.

Mr. Brusk: What about our lube stations that we now have? Did they all have to go through Special Exception to become accepted.

Mr. Haire: This is the first one I've had since I've been here. I don't know what the ones that were done in the past. We have a number of automotive repair and drive-thrus and things of that nature.

Mr. Brusk: I'm just worried that some dogs will get all oily if they get into the wrong bay, that's the only problem.

Mr. Kucera: I've got a couple of questions. Number one, would you be parking vehicles on the lot while you're waiting? Would it be the type of thing where people would drop their car off and then pick them up at night?

Mr. Gauduss: You know, I really don't know. But for all the drive-thru car-wash bays, they actually had stacked parking spaces behind the approach to the car wash.

Mr. Kucera: Yes, a car wash you're talking about something that moves in/moves out in 15 minutes or 20 minutes something like that.

Mr. Gauduss: Yes, I don't think a lube takes very long. It wouldn't be like--

Mr. Kucera: That's why I asked the question the way I asked it. Would you be having people drop their cars off, park them there and then come pick them up later or is it--

Mr. Gauduss: The question from me to the owner never came up that way. I honestly don't know.

Mr. Kucera: Okay.

Mr. Gauduss: We did propose on the Site Plan that the three doors that you see there, the one in the middle which is permitted by Code for a personal use, is going to be a dog wash.

Mr. Kucera: I have a question regarding that, too.

Mr. Gauduss: Right and so on both sides, the front and the back side of that portion of the car wash, we would add two parking spaces onto each side. So four spaces total are added then to the site, and that would be a very logical way to do that is to park the cars there. But I think the intent was that when you are getting gas or you make an appointment to be there, then that is for the lube.

Mr. Kucera: Okay. Regarding the dog wash station, do you intend on having dogs kenneled there during the day?

Mr. Gauduss: No. The dog wash is a very popular thing elsewhere. I've not actually seen one, but I've seen the equipment that is used and it's intended for people who are taking their dog for a walk to be able to stop in if the dog's with them.

Mr. Brusk: The owners do the washing. Is that correct?

Mr. Gauduss: Yes. That's washing the dog. No, it's not like a kennel that you drop the dogs off.

Mr. Kucera: I'm just clarifying because I don't—

Mr. Gauduss: It's a vending machine type of apparatus that you take your personal dog in there, give him a bath, dry him off and put him back in the car, take him home.

Mr. Brandt: It's a doggie laundromat.

Mr. Gauduss: I'm sorry.

Mr. Brandt: It's kind of a doggie laundromat.

Mr. Grauduss: Yes.

Mr. Brandt: There's one up on Sunbury Road. I saw the sign. I thought it was a joke. I went back there and that's what it was. It was a car wash that they'd taken one bay off of Sunbury and Rt. 161 and turned it into the doggie wash.

Mr. Grauduss: That's right and people actually do like those. There's a lot of them out west, I guess. The trend is moving this way.

Mr. Brusk: If you've got a big dog it's a lot easier. It's hard to go in the tub.

Mr. Grauduss: A big dog is really great for this.

Mr. Kucera: And the hours of operation for that are 5:00 a.m. to midnight?

Mr. Grauduss: It's the same as the filling station, so that when it closes everything else closes. That's how it's been for the car wash and everything else.

Mr. Kucera: The present hours of operation of the—

Mr. Grauduss: The filling station are what were listed in the application.

Mr. Kucera: --are 5:00 a.m. to midnight?

Mr. Grauduss: Yes.

Mr. Haire: I would say that's one of staff's concerns is regarding the hours of operation. The other concern is the proposed operator of this site. I've tried to make contact numerous times over the last few months and there's somewhat of a communication barrier and I know that contributes to it. But U-Hauls are placed on this site, which are not permitted for automotive sales, or leasing, or rental. And I've tried to let the operators know that they had a zoning violation. When I couldn't get through to them, I notified the owner, who's also been uncooperative in resolving that.

Mr. Grauduss: Well, I haven't been made aware of it. I'm the architect and applicant for that. Luke did mention to me about the truck rental and when I made the application, at that time I talked to the owner and he had already told him, because he had received a letter from Reynoldsburg, that that was not permitted. The tenant, who is the station operator, was told that he wasn't allowed to operate that business of renting the trucks and we were told that that would be stopped. It apparently was for a while, but we've seen the trailers back there again. My owner, it's not my client's fault that this has happened, it's the operator's; but we may have to have the operator either be evicted or told not to do this.

Mr. Kucera: Who's going to own and operate the dog wash and the—

Mr. Grauduss: Well, it was supposed to be the manager or the operator of the filling station. But the owner of the property, the Anchor Company, is asking for the permission to allow to convert two of the car washes to that.

Mr. Kucera: I guess I'm of the opinion that I'm very tempted to table this until the owner, Anchor, shows up here and makes explanation about how they -- if they can't control the present tenant, I don't know how they're going to control these tenants. I guess I'd like to have them appear here before us. I'm suggesting that.

Mr. Brusk: I tend to agree with you.

Mr. Grauduss: There's so much I can do. I'm asking for permission of an architectural thing, but it's your power to do that and all I can be is the messenger in this case.

Mr. Kucera: We understand that.

Mr. Brusk: The last thing we want to do is approve a change and then not get cooperation on anything.

Mr. Grauduss: Right.

Mr. Brandt: I'd hate to see 14 cars sitting down there every day in line waiting for people to pick them up and drop them off for oil changes and when Luke contacts them, nobody responds. So I think we need to firm this up.

Mr. Haire: I thought it was resolved. The U-Hauls disappeared for about three weeks, a month, and then reappeared.

Mr. Brusk: That's even worse than them not getting—

Mr. Haire: I thought it had been resolved when I contacted the lessees, the first time and I thought they understood that and then they reappeared, so that's when I decided to get in touch with the owner of the building, who ultimately is responsible for whoever leases the property to them.

Mr. Grauduss: Tonight was the first that I heard that they had brought the trailers back.

Mr. Brandt: Yes, I was down there, I think Monday, to buy a losing lottery ticket and there was at least one or two down there Monday.

Mr. Haire: There's a few in the front and then there's a few in the rear.

Mr. Brandt: But probably what was most offensive was they've got room in the back, we all know that, the queuing lanes for the car wash, but they had them lined up out front. It looked like the devil.

Mr. Haire: It's more advertising.

Mr. Brandt: I understand that concept.

Mr. White: Currently, does the car wash operate till 12 midnight?

Mr. Gauduss: Well, yes, until they lock it up. When the filling station is closed and locked and the lights are turned off, that's when all of that is turned off. I don't know if it's actually used. I don't know who washes their car at midnight, but it's an automatic car wash. You drive in, you put in your money, there's no attendant necessary. Even for the dog wash there's no attendant necessary, but someone needs to watch to make sure that no one leaves the water running, or how it's done. It's also very much like an automated machine, where you put coins into the machine that gives you then the soap, dispenses soap and water and etc.

Mr. White: The reason I asked that is that there are apartments behind the filling station there and I just wondered if there had ever been any complaints about the noise or the operation of the car wash.

Mr. Gauduss: I don't see how there would be. The building is quite some distance from the fence in the back. The fence is proper the way it's built against the apartments. You can't even see the apartment buildings from the back if you face the other direction.

Mr. Kucera: In converting this, I assume that proper oil separators, and oil containment and all that stuff would be—

Mr. Gauduss: I'm quite surprised when I was looking at the people that sell the equipment at how well packaged it is. There is a mechanical room that's off to the right behind the other building that contains all the equipment, and then the pipelines and all that. Actually the car wash equipment requires a lot more stuff, so to speak, to be in there, pumps and drums of liquids and what not, so a lot of that comes out and the lube station is somewhat simpler, but, again, it is drums of oil and pumping devices and etc.

Mr. Kucera: And who's going to run that or manage that? That's not automatic, the lube station?

Mr. Gauduss: The lube station, no, that's why there's to be a reasonable extension of a gas station. And it's not repairs. It doesn't require a mechanic as such, but some knowledge of how you lube an automobile.

Mr. Kucera: Okay.

Mr. White: Would you have to increase the size of your personnel staff because of the—

Mr. Gauduss: We asked them that question, because that's part of this application. You really need to know. And they have four people that operate the station and they felt that they could very well do it within that, because it would be a standard part of the operation that doesn't actually extend their demands on the personnel because so much of the gas station is self -operating. Each customer pays for his gas and pumps it himself, you don't even go out there.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any other Board comment?

Mr. Brusk: I tend to agree with you that we should table this for that specifically to find out about the compliance with current zoning and whether or not we're going to get the cooperation and communication that we need.

Mr. Haire: Yes, actually in a call that I made to the building owner, I indicated that they could add the automobile leasing or rental with this Special Exception application. It's permitted as a Special Exception, and I got no response. I haven't gotten a response from phone calls.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any public comment on this issue? (No response.) Hearing none, I will move to table this item until the owner of the property can come in and make some explanation on what's happening on it.

Mr. Gauduss: I am sure since I can face him, then he'll be there.

Mr. Kucera: All right. And so that would be my motion that we table it until such time that the property owners appear or a representative of the property owners appear.

Mr. Brusk: I second that.

Mr. Kucera: Would you call the roll, please?

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. Brusk voted 'yes.' Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Brandt voted "yes." Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Kucera voted "yes.")

Mr. Kucera: And I guess I would encourage the owner that maybe the owner encourage the present operator to attend with him, because it looks like we have questions of both of them. I would encourage that the owner bring the current lessee or operator with them with they appear.

Mr. Gauduss: Sure. Understood.

3. TRANSFER OF SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT; 6493 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: PRESENT ZONING, CC-COMMUNITY COMMERCIE; PRESENT OWNER, COUGHLIN/RICKETS PROPERTIES LTD.; TRANSFER FROM, MOTHERLAND GRILL TO CROWN SPORTS LOUNGE. CONTACT NAME: BRADLEY K. RUCKER (08-SE).

Mr. Gene Johnson: Good evening, gentlemen. This is Brad Rucker, who is the contractor, who is completely renovating this building. I'll just take a minute and give you a little history. Most of you remember that this was--

Mr. Haire: Mr. Johnson, just introduce yourself.

Mr. Johnson: Gene Johnson

Mr. Rucker: --that this was a Chinese Restaurant for a whole bunch of years. I don't know how long they were a tenant. They have now re-located to the old KFC next the Fire House. And there was a Motherland Grill, who was also a tenant in there and now we're in the present situation. I have encouraged the owners to recognize, and they have recognized, that this building is tired and it's ready to get really souped up and they're dumping a couple hundred grand into it. It has been totally gutted out on the inside, all new everything, A/C, wiring, plumbing the whole bit. I am kind of tickled to see the sports bar. I kind of like to see a classy sports bar. I think every community can stand one of those. Part of this renovation will also include all new blacktop, totally new parking lot. They will be presenting to the Design Review Board here probably next month, their plans for the exteriors and all that and it will be absolutely like a new building in terms of appearance. You have the paperwork. It is about a 3500 square foot building. John, we're contemplating hiring you as the general manager if you'd take early out here.

Mr. Brandt: Looks like from the write-up though that I won't be able to maintain the number of pool tables that they are requesting or thinking about.

Mr. Johnson: I just heard about that. I had kind of forgotten about that. What is our rule on that?

Mr. Haire: The issue with that is we have a Code that was approved and written in 1968, which is not part of the Zoning Code; it's part of the Chapter 7-11, I think it is, which requires any applicants that have more than one pool table to get a pool hall permit from the Chief of Police. Part of that requirement—

Mr. Kucera: We've had that happen here before.

Mr. Johnson: Have you?

Mr. Kucera: Oh, yeah.

Mr. Haire: Part of the pool hall requirement is that they are not permitted to serve alcoholic beverages. This being a sports lounge, I assume that they will want to serve alcoholic beverages there.

Mr. Johnson: Oh, yeah.

Mr. Haire: And so to resolve this at this point, we'll need to reduce the number of pool tables to one, so that they don't require a pool hall permit.

Mr. Johnson: Well, we can do that. Do we happen to know, Luke, whether O'Tooles, which is a similar concept, not a sports bar per se, but it does have a couple of tables, did they—

Mr. Haire: There's been no pool hall permits recently issued except for the one on Brice Road that we looked at last year. To my knowledge, and this is from an article that was written in The Dispatch, there are a number of businesses in town that have more than one pool table, because this came up at Council recently.

Mr. Johnson: I kind of thought that was the case.

Mr. Haire: So to my knowledge there's been no pool hall permits granted and it's not been enforced by the Police Department.

Mr. Johnson: Well, we don't need to sneak anything in, so if that's what's required, we'll do what we have to do.

Mr. Haire: But since we are aware of that regulation now, we need to make sure that it's enforced.

Mr. Johnson: Absolutely, not a problem.

Mr. Kucera: Let me just understand, that's actually not—

Mr. Haire: That's not under our purview.

Mr. Kucera: --under our purview here--

Mr. Brusk: We can't do anything about it.

Mr. Haire: But we shouldn't approve anything that goes against the City's codes.

Mr. Johnson: If it's required that the Police Department approve it, then we'll submit to them and see what takes place and comply with whatever agreement is made.

Mr. Brusk: Well, the problem is that if you do get it, you can't serve alcohol, which would kind of defeat the purpose of a sports bar.

Mr. Johnson: I see, so you're saying that no matter what—

Mr. Brusk: The way it is written now, my understanding is that there may be ordinances being contemplated about that, but I'm not sure. You might want to approach Council people to see if there is anything happening.

Mr. Johnson: So in other words, the other place I mentioned, the O'Tooles place is not in compliance with the rules?

Mr. Brusk: That's right.

Mr. Johnson: Because they serve alcohol.

Mr. Brusk: Whatever happens on that would be between the Police Department and the Administration and I don't know what's going on there.

Mr. Johnson: We'll deal with it.

Mr. Brusk: But you could plan for the future that it may be revised.

Mr. Johnson: Do you know offhand has that been something—

Mr. Brusk: It was just mentioned in passing in Council and that's about all—

Mr. Haire: It was brought up recently. The Spot Family Fun and Billiards Club on Brice Road had requested a -- there was a review of their Special Exception that was granted to allow them to have a pool hall and they requested that they be permitted to serve alcohol. And I know that was discussed recently at City Council meetings.

Mr. Brusk: And they were turned down for that because of this issue and then there was discussion at that point whether or not there would be an ordinance to change it, but nothing came from it that I know of.

Mr. Haire: This isn't the only facility. There's another facility that's getting their plans submitted on Rt. 256 and I just asked them to remove pool tables from their plans as well.

Mr. Johnson: Well okay. We're going to comply. We're going to do whatever we have to do obviously because we will be serving alcohol there. And if we have just one table, then I'll go on record now as challenging Mr. Brandt to the best two out of three, eight ball. Do you accept the challenge?

Mr. Brandt: Oh, most certainly.

Mr. Haire: This site's also proposing an outdoor patio area on the west side of the building and that will be a fenced patio area. Is it proposed for a six feet privacy fence? Or eight feet?

Mr. Rucker: Six feet.

Mr. Haire: So a six feet high privacy fence surrounding that area.

Mr. Brusk: Will it look like the one on Rt. 256, where they have that patio?

Mr. Haire: I don't know which one you're referring to? The one in the strip plaza there up front?

Mr. Brusk: Yes

Mr. White: Isn't that open?

Mr. Haire: It will probably be similar to the one that's kind of across the street, what is it Jillie's or the one there along Main Street that's near the Chinese Restaurant and they have a fence in area along the side.

Mr. Brusk: My only question. I vaguely remember when we went through this with the previous site, there were problems with parking. Has that been resolved or will that be resolved? Will there be enough parking places?

Mr. Johnson: There's a bunch of parking there. I don't think we have any compliance problem there do we, Luke?

Mr. Haire: No, what's currently drawn on the site plan shows 61 parking spaces on the site. With this building it's one space for each 100', so there's, what, 3,500 sq. ft.?

Mr. Rucker: Yeah.

Mr. Haire: So they're well above that. The occupancy load for the building is approximately 150 people.

Mr. Brandt: That issue came up when there was a proposal to put another bar right next door and they—

Mr. Haire: And they talked about doing a night club where the occupancy load was more like 300 people rather than the 150 and that's why it became an issue with the Motherland Grill.

Mr. Johnson: I hope we always encourage our local retail establishments to do some sort of outdoor stuff. When you visit Easton and you see how successful it is and all those locations, it's important that we have that ability to have outdoor—

Mr. Brusk: Is the exterior going to be remodeled?

Mr. Johnson: I'm sorry.

Mr. Brusk: The exterior going to be remodeled?

Mr. Johnson: Totally. Yeah.

Mr. Brandt: Two coats of paint instead of one.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah. Two coats instead of one and you can pick the colors. No, we'll make our presentation to the Design Review and it'll be architecturally inspired and it will look like a new building. It's as much as a couple hundred thousand can do, so.

Mr. Kucera: On the outdoor patio, will there be music out there? Will there be bands playing out there?

Mr. Johnson: I don't know that there's any plans for that at all. I wouldn't think so.

Mr. Kucera: Then I guess I'd like to – either we clarify it tonight or clarify it that, you know-- I don't what the requirements would be for if you're going to have an outside band or you're going to have outside speakers and music.

Mr. Rucker: Well, it's an important point. I don't know what's planned but certainly whatever rules are enforced, we would certainly comply with them.

Mr. Johnson: Do we have noise ordinances on that kind of thing?

Mr. Haire: I'm not sure if we actually have a noise ordinance. I know we have public disturbance and things like that, of that nature. With this site, that area is right next to the entrance to the R.A. Long Plaza, so there's a row of pine trees that kind of screens the whole area and it's next to an automotive parts store and you have the industrial in the rear. The closest residences are apartments that are quite a ways back from the setback beside the R.A. Long Plaza. I don't foresee it being an issue, but you're right, if they have a live band out there it probably would be a noise issue.

Mr. Johnson: I need to make it clear, too. This is not a tenant situation. This is an owner of the real estate who will be owning the sports bar.

Mr. Kucera: All I'm looking for is just a statement of, "this is what we plan to do."

Mr. White: The applications, excuse me, right now is just for the transfer of the Special Exception as it exists.

Mr. Haire: Right. It's a transfer of the Special Exception, being that the Motherland Grill had a Special Exception to operate an eating and drinking establishment.

Mr. White: But if there's going to be modifications of the building, will they not have to come back before this Board for a special site?

Mr. Johnson: We're not doing any modification of the building other than completing gutting out the inside. There's no—

Mr. White: Well, you're adding – well, you're proposing the outside patio.

Mr. Rucker: Oh, I see. Okay.

Mr. White: And you indicated there may be some modifications to the outside, I thought.

Mr. Johnson: Well, does that – does the fencing tend to qualify as the modifying of the—

Mr. White: I'm wondering. That's what I'm questioning is it – will it come back before us?

Mr. Haire: Typically a fence wouldn't – we wouldn't take that to a major site plan review.

Mr. White: Okay.

Mr. Kucera: All right. Is there any other Board comment?

Mr. Brandt: Just as a matter of disclosure, Mr. Johnson and I did have a brief, brief conversation of about a minute and a half about this for the Board's information.

Mr. Johnson: Actually I think you'll appreciate it. It'll be a very nice facility. Certainly better than it's been for the last 20 years thank goodness.

Mr. Brusk: I liked it with the red dragons on the—

Mr. Kucera: It was Mexican before that, wasn't it?

Mr. Brusk: It was all different things.

Mr. Johnson: What was the first – remember when it was, years and years ago, it was the place with the red velvet curtains that could be pulled across from the seating and you could get real private?

Mr. Kucera: Yeah.

Mr. Johnson: That's probably 30 years ago or something. What was the name of that place? I was trying to think of it today.

Mr. Kucera: Yeah. It's too long. I can't remember that long ago. All right. Is there any public comment on this issue? (No response.) Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion.

Mr. Brusk: I move that we accept the transfer of the Motherland's Special Exception Use Permit, Item C3 (08-SE).

Mr. Brandt: I'll second.

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. Brandt voted "yes." Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Kucera voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Motion carries.)

Mr. Rucker: Thank you.

4. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION; 1885 BALTIMORE-REYNOLDSBURG ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT USE, VACANT LOT; PROPOSED USE OF LAND STRUCTURE, TIM HORTONS RESTAURANT WITH DRIVE THRU WINDOW; PRESENT ZONING, CC-COMMUNITY COMMERCE. CONTACT NAME: SEAN ESSINGER (07-MS).

Mr. Haire: With this application-- I didn't get a chance to prepare a staff report since I was out of town, but this site was approved late last year, October or November of last year, for a three tenant retail space with a coffee shop that had a special exception for a coffee use and for a drive-thru. Since that time they have proposed a similar type coffee use with drive-thru, so the Special Exceptions, there's no need to grant those again. They still apply to the site. However, they will need to change, because they have changed the layout of the lot and things like that. They need to re-approval of a Site Plan.

Mr. Kucera: Yes, sir, if you'd introduce yourself.

Mr. Sean Essenger: My name is Sean Essinger and I'm from Tim Horton's corporate office.

Mr. Kucera: I might compliment you on the completeness of your application.

Mr. Essenger: Thank you.

Mr. Kucera: Nice and complete, makes it easy to look at.

Mr. Haire: The one item that was missing from the application that was passed out to this evening is a landscape plan which I just received today. So I haven't had a chance to fully review that to see if it complies with the Zoning Code. The one issue that I did notice are that street trees are required and those have not been included. They've included trees along the front, however, they're not street trees. They're not between the sidewalk and the road where they're required to be and they're not on the approved list of street trees that the City of Reynoldsburg has, so that will need to be amended. It appears that there is enough parking lot landscaping to comply with the Code, but they don't give me any numbers on the landscape plan that show that it complies with the Code, so I'll need to ensure that it does.

Mr. Brusk: Would there be any trouble getting those numbers and if they are slightly under—

Mr. Haire: It appears that it will comply. I just haven't had a chance to look at it and figure out the square footages, because I just got it this afternoon.

Mr. Brandt: If we approve this then, can we do a pending the compliance—

Mr. Haire: Compliance with the landscape plan? Yes.

Mr. Essinger: We'll be happy to comply, too.

Mr. Kucera: Linden plain trees aren't on the approved list?

Mr. Haire: No, they aren't on the approved list.

Mr. Kucera: Oh, yeah.

Mr. Haire: They need to be moved closer to the street.

Mr. Kucera: What?

Mr. Haire: They need to be moved closer to the street, as well.

Mr. Kucera: I like Linden plain trees.

Mr. Haire: You need to talk to Council then about getting it amended and adding them on there.

Mr. Essinger: There were two items that were requested at the Design Review Board that we're happy to comply with as well. They asked for a brick dumpster enclosure and our cooler/freezer on the back of the building typically has an aluminum

finish that is painted to match the same color as the fascia on the front where the signage goes. They asked if that could be brick, either a brick fence. And actually what we are going to end up doing is just taking the brick all the way up to the roofline, so they will be completely enclosed as part of the building.

Mr. Kucera: And the signage, there's no variance required for the signage, it would appear? The building's at an odd angle to the street, so we are going to have signs on the front and the side.

Mr. Haire: Right. Basically this Site Plan came in and I asked them to completely reconfigure the site.

Mr. Kucera: Okay.

Mr. Haire: And now the layout -- I just didn't feel that a variance would be necessary since-- There is a service road, which we consider a street in this case, so they'd be permitted more signage than is on the plan with the angles of the building. The way they originally had this laid out, the building was long ways and the drive-thru was on the front of the building and I kind of asked them to flip it around and get the drive-thru off the front, so you didn't have the drive-thru traffic queuing up along Rt. 256. So they changed it on the Site Plan completely and I feel that the way the angle is that they'd still be within the parameters of parallel to a street.

Mr. Kucera: Okay.

Mr. Brusk: Is that empty now?

Mr. Brandt: Yes, it's an empty lot.

Mr. Brusk: Between Dyanni and—

Mr. Kucera: I remember approving the coffee shop and the—

Mr. Brandt: Actually we're quite pleased to see Tim Horton's come forward.

Mr. Kucera: Yep. Now, you won't close the one on Main Street, will you?

Mr. Essinger: No.

Mr. Kucera: That's the one I use. There have been a couple of things that have closed on Main Street to move over there. All right. Are there any questions from the Board? (No response.)

Mr. Feeney: Pretty thorough.

Mr. Brandt: How soon do you expect to get started?

Mr. Essinger: Depending on the building permits, we'd like to be, I believe, its right after Labor Day, I believe.

Mr. Brandt: How long will it take you, 90 days or so?

Mr. Haire: To get their plot grade utility and their building permits approved, it will be right after Labor Day probably.

Mr. Brandt: Oh. I meant to build it.

Mr. Essinger: Our build time is about 72 days from putting a shovel in the ground and coffee out the door.

Mr. Brandt: Very good.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any public comment on this issue? (No response.)
Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion.

Mr. Feeney: I'll make a motion that we approve Item C4 Major Site Plan Review (07-MS).

Mr. White: I second.

Mr. Haire: Can we add in the condition that the trees and things comply with the Landscape Code?

Mr. Feeney: As long as the trees meet the Landscape Code.

Mr. Haire: Is amended to comply with the Code. Thank you.

Mr. White: I second it again.

Mr. Kucera: If you would call the roll, please?

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Kucera voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Brandt voted "yes." Motion carries.)

Mr. Kucera: Thank you.

5. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION; 1636 GRAHAM ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT USE, VACANT LOT; PROPOSED USE OF LAND STRUCTURE, PARKING LOT; PRESENT ZONING, R2 – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE. CONTACT NAME: ROB AMIET (08-MS).

Mr. Rob Amiet: My name is Rob Amiet and I'm Chairman of Trustees at the Reynoldsburg United Methodist Church and we're requesting an expansion of our current parking lot.

Mr. Haire: The church has acquired a number of the residential properties to the south of their existing site on Graham Road. Have the houses been removed?

Mr. Amiet: They are gone.

Mr. Haire: I thought I noticed that they were gone. The houses that were previously on the lots have now been demolished, so they are now vacant lots. The church is proposing to expand the parking lot to the south, adding additional parking that will be screened all the way around. Currently the site is somewhat wooded. I mean it's treed, so there'll be a number of trees removed. They'll be replacing those trees as shown on the landscaping plan. How many parking spaces are you picking up here?

Mr. Amiet: 166.

Mr. Haire: 166 spaces will be added.

Mr. Kucera: I was a little lost as to where the fence goes exactly.

Mr. Haire: The fence will go along the property to the south that's shown as the Linda and James Barry property. So it will be just along that property line to shield that. Our Code requires any parking areas to be located at least 50 feet from a residential property. With this application, they've reduced that to 28 feet. We allow for a reduction by half if it's screened with either landscape screening or a fence. So they've included both.

Mr. Kucera: Does the fence go along the back of the property?

Mr. Haire: It's just along the southern property line, I guess, and then the other area is a detention basin so they're within the 50 foot requirement from that point.

Mr. Kucera: I see.

Mr. Haire: And then they own the property to the rear of there that goes all the way down to Palmer Road. The church owns that property as well.

Mr. Kucera: Oh, okay.

Mr. Brusk: Where's Palmer on this map?

Mr. Brandt: South.

Mr. Haire: It doesn't show on the map. The property is shown at the bottom that says Reynoldsburg United Methodist Church parcel number 060. That property goes down and fronts on Palmer Road.

Mr. Brandt: Is that the Wilson property?

Mr. Haire: Yes.

Mr. Kucera: And I assume that there's connecting with the storm drain system and the storm drainage system is adequate and—

Mr. Haire: Yes. Like I said, there's a new basin that's being proposed here as well to handle the storm water. So they're going to tie in.

Mr. Brusk: I assume that the landscaping meets your approval?

Mr. Haire: They have included the landscaping that meets the Code requirements.

Mr. Kucera: What about lighting?

Mr. Haire: They show a picture of the existing lighting; you have two pole posts it looks like? One on the east and one on the west side of the lot. It looks like there are two light poles proposed. It doesn't appear that -- I mean they're located far enough away from any other property lines. It doesn't appear that they'll have any visually impacts on those properties.

Mr. Kucera: Okay. I'm interested, I'm a dark sky person, so are they going to be down lighting?

Mr. Haire: Our Code requires them to be down lighting, so we can ensure that those are down lit. They don't give us a height. It says no scale, so they don't give us a height of the proposed lights.

Mr. Kucera: They look like a typically street light.

Mr. Brandt: The one on the north end backs up to their property any how, so that's far enough away from everybody but essentially them. The one on the east end would appear to be quite a bit of distance from the property to the east of them and they don't show any on the south end.

Mr. Haire: Right.

Mr. Kucera: This is an addition of how many parking spaces?

Mr. Haire: 166 spaces.

Mr. Kucera: Has there been any consideration given to a traffic study for the traffic here and whether the -- I don't know whether you have an officer there to direct traffic on Sundays or signalization might be required?

Mr. Amiet: We already have off-duty police officers on Sunday both up at St. Pius, which contributes to the traffic on Graham Road, and in front of our church.

Mr. Haire: There are two points of entry. There's a point of entry to the rear as well that allows for traffic to go out, I guess, two ways.

Mr. Brusk: Do you supply the officer at the five-way intersection too?

Mr. Amiet: There has been one there in the past. I believe—

Mr. Brusk: There always is when you let out, sometimes to the detriment of the drivers.

Mr. Haire: Is there any anticipation that the parking will be increased beyond this when and if a new structure is built on the site?

Mr. Amiet: I don't believe so.

Mr. Brusk: Right now you almost have to take a bus from the end of the parking lot.

Mr. Amiet: I'm sorry?

Mr. Brusk: I say you almost have to take a bus now from the end of the parking lot to where the building is.

Mr. Amiet: That's exactly—

Mr. White: Do you plan to have any greenery or vegetation or-

Mr. Amiet: I'm sorry?

Mr. White: In the parking lot itself, do you plan to have any kind of plants or anything like that—green spaces?

Mr. Amiet: Yes, I believe you'll find those on the drawing. We've been through Design Review Board and they've approved all of the landscaping.

Mr. Haire: What's required within the island area is a 3,320 square feet and what they're proposing is 3,345, so they're above the requirements and then they'll be surrounded by landscape barriers and existing vegetation on three sides.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any other Board comment? (No response.) Is there any public comment? (No response.) Then I'll entertain a motion.

Mr. Brusk: I move that we accept the Major Site Plan Review application for Item C5 (08-MS).

Mr. Brusk: Second.

Mr. Kucera: Call the roll, please.

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. Kucera voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Brandt voted "yes." Mr. White voted "yes." Motion carries.)

D. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Kucera: Is there any other business to come before the Board this evening?

Mr. Haire: The only other item I'd like to discuss, and if you read over the minutes, Mr. Kucera, you're the only one who missed the last meeting, is that you were nominated to serve on a Design Review Committee discussing the design regulations which we had the joint meeting earlier between Planning, the Zoning Board and the Design Review Board. I didn't tell you about this before hand, because I missed the last Design Review Board meeting, so they chose not to discuss when they're going to have meetings and when they are going to get started. So I don't have those details of when the meetings will be held. It will likely be a Thursday evening. If you'd be willing to do that or if you want to discuss someone else that might be willing to do that. What we've talked about is doing one meeting a month and it's something that we'd like to keep fairly short, somewhere between the area of six to nine meetings is what we think we'll need.

Mr. Brandt: And possibly if you find it too frustrating one of us could take your place.

Mr. Haire: There will be nine members that serve on the committee.

Mr. Kucera: I would be interested in pursuing it.

Mr. Brandt: Good.

Mr. Kucera: However, I want double my current salary.

Mr. Haire: We can do that. But I'll keep you updated when I get further information.

Mr. Kucera: All right. In that case, I'll adjourn the meeting.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Thomas Kucera, Chair

Lucas Haire, Planning Administrator

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