

MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
JUNE 21, 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. Aaron Domini

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 17, 2012

Chairman Stoffel: Can we get an approval for the minutes from the May 17, 2012 meeting? Are there any additions or corrections to this?

Mr. Domini: No.

Mr. Stoffel: None being said, let's approve those.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Stoffel: Are there any additions or corrections to our agenda for tonight?

Mr. Domini: Yes. Item number 4, applicant has requested that we hold that item. Apparently there are some issues of some leasing and they may be back, they may not be, but they will not be here tonight.

Mr. Stoffel: Okay. Any other?

Mr. Domini: Somebody actually is here to speak on it. Somebody called, said they're going to pull it, but I guess they're here so let's leave Item B4 on.

(someone speaking off mic)

Mr. Domini: Just like that.

3. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

(Mr. Stoffel administers the oath.)

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Stoffel: Is there any public comment here before we get started on the agenda? (No response.) None? Okay.

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. VARIANCE APPLICATION , 6895 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1181.02(c), TABLE 1181 TO ALLOW TWO SIGNS FOR ONE LOT FRONTAGE. CONTACT: SIGN VISION CO. INC. (105-ZV).

Mr. Stoffel: And who's going to speak on this? If you would come to the podium please and state your name and address. And I will say for everyone here tonight, because we have a quorum here tonight, we will all have to agree on your variance application or your request or else it could be turned down; but you can defer it to next month or, if you are turned down, you can always go to Council and seek their approval. But so you know, you will need everyone that's here tonight approval on your item. And you can wait until after we discuss it if you want to decide for us to go ahead and vote on it. Okay? So, name please and address?

Mr. Jim Gray: Jim Gray, 987 Claycraft Road, Columbus.

Mr. Stoffel: Does anyone on the Board have any questions?

Mr. Brusk: Aaron usually gives a report.

Mr. Domini: That's okay. Mr. Chairman, this was here before us, I think, last month and I'm sorry, it was not before us last month but this did go before the Design Review Board and, at that time, the applicant had two signs. For those of you who aren't familiar with this, this is behind GP Johnson Realty and there are two ground signs out front and the applicant was requesting an additional ground sign to the rear which, essentially, created two ground signs for the street frontage, which we only allow one. As you can see here, the building is to rear with the blue dot on it and so, basically, the ground sign they're proposing in front of the building is essentially – I would almost identify as a multi-tenant way finding sign.

Mr. Brusk: Where would it be put?

Mr. Domini: They're proposing to put it right here.

Mr. Brusk: Oh, right.

Mr. Domini: So if you see that tree here where my cursor is.

Mr. Brusk: Yes.

Mr. Domini: And then that is the sign which, I believe, you have in your packet.

Mr. Brusk: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: On my review, this is somewhat of a unique situation. It's almost essentially that this sits on a flag lot and they essentially really don't have much frontage, so I almost would classify this as a multi-tenant directional sign but our code is not specific, so we asked them to come before the Board.

Mr. Brusk: Actually I'd prefer this than to have another sign up front or changing the sign up front.

Mr. Domini: They did change the sign up-- Sorry, Mr. Brusk. They did change the sign out front.

Mr. Brusk: Okay.

Mr. Domini: They got approval for a face change. But they're almost using that as an address sign so the 6895 is pretty large on the sign and it has the name of the primary user which is the CPA, not the other tenants in the building.

Mr. Brusk: I don't see any problem, especially since it's not on the street and you really can't see it from the street.

Mr. Stoffel: Any other comments?

Mr. Feeney: No. I think it's pretty straightforward.

Mr. Stoffel: Can I get a motion then to approve?

Mr. Brusk: So moved. I move that Item B1, 105-ZV be accepted.

Mr. Feeney: I'll second.

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

2. COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PLAN APPLICATION, 2067 CREEKVIEW COURT, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: PRESENT ZONING, AR-3; OWNER'S NAME, WALLICK COMPANIES; REQUESTING APPROVAL OF A COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PACKAGE. CONTACT: LARRY LAB (696-ZS).

Mr. Stoffel: Whoever is going to speak on that, can you please come forward? No one here? All right. Well, we'll move to Item—

(someone speaking off mic)

Mr. Stoffel: That's Item variance number 696-ZS. Oh, you're here?

Mr. Lab: Yeah. We didn't have an agenda showing what B2 was.

Mr. Stoffel: Sorry.

Mr. Domini: So I'll read this for the record, Mr. Chairman. (Mr. Domini reads Item B2). I asked the applicant to kind of introduce this application. It's a little unique, but I'll chime in and add some value at the back end, but I think he can probably explain what the request is better than I can at this time.

Mr. Larry Lab: Larry Lab, Morrison Signs, 2757 Scioto Parkway in Columbus. What this is, Stoney Creek Apartments wanted to upgrade their signage and probably the two signs of main importance are the one on 256 and it's a low level sign right now and wide and we're now proposing a much more attractive internally illuminated, double-faced sign. It meets all the height requirements, basically going in the same location as the present sign. We will move it as close as possible to the right-of-way towards 256 and then the other sign is when you turn off 256 behind the shopping center. They presently have a sign there that also identifies Stoney Creek Apartments, sits in a mulch bed and replace that and, once again, putting it in the same spot except moving it closer to the right-of-way where it's much more visible by traffic. The others are basically on property signs as directionals.

Mr. Feeney: How big is the existing sign?

Mr. Lab: The existing sign is like 4 feet by 7 feet. It sits back, it's low-rise and sort of blends into the brush, etc.

Mr. Domini: Mr. Chairman, I do have a question for the applicant. Are you proposing any base to this monument sign or how do you propose for it to be?

Mr. Lab: That sits only 5 feet high. We'll be taking that all the way. What you're seeing is that is at ground level.

Mr. Domini: Do you have any landscaping proposed with the sign and you say it's internally illuminated?

Mr. Lab: The first sign, the double-faced sign is internally illuminated and it would be the same landscaping as they presently have, which is a mulch bed. I didn't know I was going to show that tonight, but I do have that here.

Mr. Brusk: Is that this picture?

Mr. Lab: Yes. That's one of the two signs.

Mr. Brusk: Is that one—

Mr. Lab: That's the sign – let's see which one you have there. That one, I believe as a matter of fact, to answer that, that is the sign, is 6 feet by 8 feet 4 inches. It was wide, 8 feet by – and then the sign itself is 3 feet high, 8 feet wide and that's in that mulch bed. And this would be the non-illuminated one and we'd just move that forward in that mulch bed and then there should be another sign very similar to that under the pine tree in a mulch bed, which we would do the same.

Mr. Brusk: (speaking off mic)

Mr. Lab: That would be—

Mr. Brusk: (speaking off mic)

Mr. Lab: Yes, that one right there. No, that is not it. That sign's not—

Mr. Brusk: (speaking off mic)

Mr. Lab: Maybe I don't have – that's the one on 256.

Mr. Brusk: I'm totally confused as to where the signs go and what do they look like?

Mr. Lab: Well, both signs would look like the one that you had right here.

Mr. Brusk: Okay.

Mr. Lab: Both of them look like that.

Mr. Domini: If I may, Mr. Chairman. The two signs that you see on the top are identical. One, as shown on the site plan, will be on 256. The other, which is shown as Item 1. The other is shown as number 2 on the plan, which will be in front of the other existing residential there.

Mr. Brusk: These are the ones that are replacing these? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Lab: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: These are going to be the sign?

Mr. Lab: Yes. The first one is the double-faced sign and that one is right on 256 where they presently have – or there by the pine tree in a mulch bed and being replaced with this sign.

Mr. Feeney: I've got – on the sign that's going on 256—

Mr. Lab: Yes.

Mr. Feeney: --this one here, this one's getting replaced and this one has some landscaping around it and the sign is raised above the landscaping, so what's the landscaping going to look like? Are you taking it out or--

Mr. Lab: Well, they're just going to have it mulched there, is what they said.

Mr. Feeney: So all the shrubs and bushes are being removed from the mulch?

Mr. Lab: Well, they might – if they have it there, it will not be to intrude upon the sign. It could be on the – so it doesn't cut the visibility of the sign, let's put it that way. It won't be in front of the verbiage.

Mr. Feeney: Okay.

Mr. Stoffel: Those shrubs almost have to come out.

Mr. Feeney: Yeah.

Mr. Brusk: They said something to the effect that they are going to move the sign closer to the road, but I don't know whether that encroaches on anything. Is there any problem on that, Aaron?

Mr. Domini: Yeah. That was going to be one of my comments is that the dimensions are not shown on the plan. We require a minimum of 10 foot setback from the right-of-way.

Mr. Lab: Right.

Mr. Domini: And if you're going to move it closer to the road, that would intuitively make me think that you want to expand the bed a little bit. Otherwise, it's going to be off center in the bed which is not going to look right.

Mr. Lab: Right. Go ahead. She's the property manager.

Mr. Stoffel: Could you come up to the podium and give us your name and address, please?

Ms. Debra Young: Debra Young, 2089 Stancrest Road, Dublin, Ohio. I am the community manager. I'm in charge of doing the landscaping after the sign goes in. We're going to take the existing landscape completely – take away everything, the stone, everything. We have four trees that have died over the years that will be taken down, clear it out, put as much grass in as we can to make that area just pretty rolling hill kind of, in front of – or beneath the sign or around the sign. The only thing that they wanted to put in is some shrubs, maybe multi-colored shrub, low-lying because there is no water out front there. There's no access to water, so there's not a lot I can do. Does that help?

Mr. Brusk: It would've been nice to have that up front. I was totally confused by the pictures—

Ms. Young: Sure. I think we just—

Mr. Lab: They just finalized that.

Mr. Brusk: Is this a 5 by 6? That's the size of the sign?

Mr. Lab: Actually it's 5 by 4 because—

Mr. Stoffel: There's a discrepancy with what we have and on the screen here we have—

Mr. Lab: I thought that because I was – when I was contacted by the City they said that we had to have them. I thought that you had gotten a copy. So it's the same sign only 5 foot in height because that's what they requested.

Mr. Brusk: By 4 feet across?

Mr. Lab: Yes.

Mr. Domini: I believe I have the new submission, a 5 by 4, which is on the screen.

Mr. Lab: Yeah. But they didn't have the hard copies, I guess.

Mr. Brusk: And that's the total size of the sign? It's not the 8 foot sign like you had before?

Mr. Lab: No. That's what it's – this is what we had to – they wanted a more vertical sign. We maxed out the height and then to keep it in proportion, 4 foot in width.

Mr. Brusk: Aaron, is there any problem with it being internally lit? Do we have any restrictions on that?

Mr. Domini: No, we don't. My bigger concern is making sure that in the final sign plan, which I will have to approve, it will have to show dimensions and setback at least 10 feet. I almost prefer for it to sit in its current location. I don't think you have much room to plant—

Mr. Lab: Yeah. There could be a – I measured it. That'd be a foot or something on the one on 256. I think we have more room on that bed, because that's sitting way back, the one as you enter the property.

Mr. Feeney: But it has to be 10 feet.

Mr. Lab: Oh, yeah. Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. Brusk: You're not asking for a variance for putting it outside that?

Mr. Lab: No. We will keep it within the 10 feet, absolutely.

Mr. Stoffel: How would it be mounted. I mean, would there be a foundation. Will there be – how will it be grounded?

Mr. Lab: Yeah. There would be a foundation. We've put a pole in and we'll dig a foundation, cement, the whole thing and it would meet the proper building codes.

Mr. Feeney: Well, I like the sign. I think it looks very nice compared to what's out there, that's for sure. You've got to make sure it's in the right location and we don't have any of that information. I mean, you say you're going to put it there which I'm sure you will, but I think we're supposed to have a plan view of where the signs are going to go with the dimensions on it too, aren't we?

Mr. Domini: We should have the dimensions on this drawing. This drawing is to scale, but the setback and exact location of the signs, not dimensioned.

Mr. Brusk: It's almost impossible to read these.

Mr. Lab: Yeah. That's all we had to work with, was that.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah.

Mr. Feeney: I don't even see the sign one.

Mr. Brusk: We really prefer to be able to have something that we can look at and critique, knowing what we're critiquing. In this case, we just haven't had that.

Mr. Lab: Right. Well, other than it's going in virtually the exact locations they're presently positioned in and those signs are well within 10 feet.

Mr. Brusk: Aaron, will you be able to double-check that in the approval stage, the final approval?

Mr. Domini: We're going to issue the sign permit. I should have actually asked the applicant to submit a more complete plan, so I apologize to the Board for that. But when the sign application is submitted I will ensure that it's setback a minimum of 10 feet. I would also ask as a condition that the applicant submits a landscape plan for our review--

Mr. Feeney: Yeah.

Mr. Domini: --that details the slab which you're going to put it on and landscaping palette--

Mr. Lab: That's fine.

Mr. Domini: --because I'm not comfortable approving this without understanding what the new mounding looks like and the plant material.

Mr. Feeney: I agree with that. And we can approve it based on as long as you -- we can approve the signage as long as he meets your approvals, too?

Mr. Domini: Yeah.

Mr. Feeney: Can we move this forward? Will that work?

Mr. Stoffel: Does anyone have any other comments? (No response.)
Would anyone like to make a motion?

Mr. Feeney: I make a motion that we accept application 103-ZV variance request for signage with the conditions that they provide all the proper plan view of the location of the sign and the landscaping plan that goes with it.

Mr. Brusk: Right. Except you gave the wrong number.

Mr. Feeney: I did?

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. 696-ZS.

Mr. Feeney: Okay. I correct myself.

Mr. Domini: The condition sounds good.

Mr. Feeney: 696-ZS, I'm sorry.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. I'll second.

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

Mr. Brusk: If you do this another time, we would really appreciate a more comprehensive picture of what you're proposing. Not a photograph type picture, but an overall picture.

Mr. Lab: Okay. Thank you.

3. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6140-6156 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1127.06 TO PERMIT A LOT WHICH DOES NOT ABUT A DEDICATED STREET. CONTACT: SEAN CULLEN (102-ZV).

Mr. Stoffel: Is there someone here to speak on this? Could you give us your name and address, please?

Mr. Bill Dargusch: Bill Dargusch, 2120 E. Broad Street, Columbus.

Mr. Domini: I can give the Board some overview of this application. There's a lot of moving parts to this one. This application has been before Council; not for the variance, but for a zoning change from CS to AR-3 and, for point of reference, this is located – this drawing is not up to date, but it's the parcel behind the Dunkin' Donuts and the Las Margaritas. You can see in your – this is a very – they submitted a very complete application. Essentially they're trying to break off the back lot and the applicant's vision is to create this lot and use it for multi-family housing which is being developed by Creative Housing Solutions which develops housing for those with disabilities. Council has heard the rezoning once and has recommended it be – it's had its first reading—

Mr. Brusk: (Speaking off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: No.

Mr. Brusk: (Speaking off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: I will point out, and as you can see in this application, the drawing elevation for the building is quite nice. And they are able to meet all of our new multi-family standards. The two, maybe three of which are most significant, are the traditional natural materials that are being used in the construction, no more than four units per building and they meet the open space requirement of 35%. So a very interesting application. I was here when we made that zoning code change and it's nice to see something come through that actually meets that test. I think that Council was favorable to moving this along. I'm not going to speak for them, but the discussion and the presentation I gave to them was that essentially as Zone CS, this parcel really has no – or the rear of this parcel has no value, has no visibility, probably will never be used for commercial because of that, and we're not going to see office developed here for quite sometime. So I didn't have any objections from the staff's perspective on the rezoning. On the creating the lot without street frontage, that's not something we generally do, so that's something that the Board needs to consider. There is some paperwork in here – or in their original rezoning submittal, that they have sewer easements in the works, so that's good to see and they meet all of our other standards. So I think we just need to consider this as an overall project because it'll come back before you again when the major site comes.

Mr. Brusk: The question I have is, the driveway that would run alongside where the Dunkin' Donuts is?

Mr. Domini: Yeah. And their site—

Mr. Brusk: Be access to the building?

Mr. Domini: Yeah. In their site plan they have a two-way drive. It think it was a 24 foot drive aisle.

Mr. Brusk: And it meets all the requirements for the fire department to be able to get to multi dwelling?

Mr. Domini: 24 foot drive aisle is sufficient for a fire access.

Mr. Dargusch: We have extra room back there.

Mr. Brusk: One of the nice things about this is Creative Housing is well needed in this community, so I'm glad to see it and I'm glad to see that it's being located where it's not in conflict with other operations. Is it going to have only one person per unit or two persons per unit?

Mr. Dargusch: I'll let Christy answer that.

Ms. Christy Buenconsejo: Christy Buenconsejo with Creative Housing, 2233 City Gate, Columbus, Ohio. Yes, they are four independent living apartments per building, total of eight. There'll be one individual per apartment.

Mr. Brusk: Plus staff if necessary, I assume?

Ms. Buenconsejo: Yes. Anywhere between – we have some individuals that could need an hour of help a week and some that – eight to 16 hours.

Mr. Brusk: My brother was in Creative Housing.

Ms. Buenconsejo: Yes. And that'll vary.

Mr. Brusk: It's very helpful to the families. It saved our sanity.

Ms. Buenconsejo: One of the things about this location is we did a survey over the past couple years of all the families of the individuals that are served and Reynoldsburg was the spot. We had actually been looking for a couple years for some sites and the City actually helped bring us together. Seeing the – I don't want to use the word dilemma, but like Aaron said, out in that back lot as far as commercial use, isn't really going to get a good use and they kind of brought us together and we're hoping we can make it happen.

Mr. Brusk: Aaron, do you see any problems?

Mr. Domini: You know the issue that I think you will see when the major site plan is submitted is tree preservation. There was a tree preservation ordinance and Christy even talked about that and then the buffering to the adjacent residential I think will be the biggest points in discussion, so that might be something we start talking about sooner than later. I could just see that potentially being a sticking point. We don't require that you maintain all the trees, but we do require that you replace some caliper and then we'll -- when we see that major site plan, be sure that we have added a buffer to that residential to the north.

Mr. Brusk: Looks like that would be a way to preserve the trees too, with that buffer possibly. It's hard to tell from that picture.

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah. It'd be interesting to see the site plan. Does anyone have any other questions or concerns from the Board?

Mr. Feeney: No. I think it's very thorough.

Mr. Stoffel: Someone like to make a motion?

Mr. Brusk: I guess I'll move that we accept Item C3, 102-ZV.

Mr. Stoffel: I'll second.

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

4. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT, 6161 RADEKIN ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; CURRENT ZONING, CC; REQUESTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR A CHILDCARE FACILITY. DOT WILSON (64-SE).

Mr. Brione Prince: Brione Prince, Columbus, Ohio, 1925 Berkdale Drive. Of course, I'm not Dot Wilson.

Mr. Domini: Mr. Chairman, I'm not fully prepared to present this application because I was told it was pulled, so I don't have any information in the Power Point or anything like that. I'll be happy to answer questions, but I'd ask that the applicant present this one to the best of their ability.

Mr. Prince: What we have, there's actually a childcare that's already in the facility. She's not able to fill up the childcare and there's time dilemmas as far as it being closer to the bus line, closer to Livingston Avenue, and a lot of the parents weren't able to physically get their children before they actually get off work and she closes at 6:00. Therefore, we were trying to put – it's pretty much a childcare within a childcare. It just has later hours. There's two different doors and there'll be a way to link both of the buildings together. So that was initially the issue. We wanted to make sure that it was something that we could do. So it's initially a business within a business. Through Ohio Job & Family Services, if we were going to go under a different name, because we were going to be open later, we would have to have a different name and licensing number, therefore, of course, we would have to go before your committee.

Mr. Feeney: So are you saying this is an existing childcare that you're just changing the operation of?

Mr. Prince: Essentially it used to be two buildings and then they combined the buildings, so there's two different entrances and pretty much we're going to split it down the middle and on one side will be one childcare that's open a lot later than the other side; therefore we'll have two different companies within the same building, it'll just be split down the middle.

Mr. Feeney: But there's an existing childcare there now?

Mr. Prince: There's an existing childcare there.

Mr. Feeney: So you're just adding a second business.

Mr. Prince: That is correct.

Mr. Brusk: But you're not changing the building?

Mr. Prince: We're not doing any changes to the building.

Mr. Stoffel: Does the existing childcare occupying the two areas currently?

Mr. Prince: Currently they're just using one side. The other side is ready to go and has no usage at all.

Mr. Feeney: Will both childcares use the same outside play area?

Mr. Prince: Initially we'll use the same outside play area, but until we have a landscaper and someone come and look at it, we're going to use – once they go through there and kind of figure out exactly how we can work that, we're going to use two different play areas as well.

Mr. Brusk: Aaron, can you show us on the computer what building we're looking at? (Aaron shows building.)

Mr. Stoffel: Aaron, do you know, with the additional childcare, is that sufficient parking for this site?

Mr. Domini: That's a good question.

Mr. Prince: There's a lot of parking. It's the only building right there on that lot. It may seem a little confusing, but it's actually the white building and the brown building next to it.

Mr. Domini: We actually don't have, because our code is so old, a specific standard for childcare, believe it or not, for parking. We have adult daycares, residential care, schools, probably that would be the closest match which just says "as determined by BZBA, but not less than one space for each five seats in the main assembly room." You can see how old that quote is. But we don't have a specific standard for that.

Mr. Brusk: How many new children will this bring in?

Mr. Prince: Essentially through the evening close to 40 due to the fact that there's only an occupancy of 39-40 through the whole building due to the sprinkler system in the code. But she'll be closing at six and we'll be open until 12, that leaves that room for another 30-40 children as well.

Mr. Brusk: So you'll have almost around the clock.

Mr. Prince: Yes. The only break that we'll have is between the hours of 12 and 6:30 in the morning when she opens.

Mr. Brusk: You'll be open until 12 o'clock at night?

Mr. Prince: Correct and then—

Mr. Brusk: Okay, what happens at 6 o'clock in the evening when you open the second part? Is the first part empty by that time?

Mr. Prince: Yes. They are actually closed. Through Ohio Job & Family Services, when you actually close, your center has to be closed and your occupancy has to be closed down as far – unless there's people there cleaning, but we'll still be within the guidelines as far as building occupancy.

Mr. Brusk: So you'll not have overlap then?

Mr. Prince: Correct, we will not have any overlap.

Mr. Domini: I know we typically don't get involved with permitting of childcare facilities. We really look at safety and access and that kind of thing, but with that many children, 1500 square feet seems like a tight fit, just my personal—

Mr. Feeney: Does it meet the state's requirements?

Mr. Prince: As far as the code, it's 3 square feet per every child, but due to the fact that we haven't been licensed through Ohio Job & Family Services, we wouldn't know how many children we would be allotted due to the fact that this is the first process we have to take to even see if we'd be able to do so, because right now we're at the beginning stages. So if you guys did grant that, then we'd have to go before Ohio Job & Family Services and they would have to come in and measure the square feet, see exactly how much space we have and then let us know what our license capacity would be.

Mr. Brusk: It would only be on half the building, correct?

Mr. Prince: It would only be on half the building, that is correct. So right now the total amount for the whole building is 39 unless there's a sprinkler system put in. If a sprinkler system would be put in through Ohio Job & Family Services, that building could possibly get, I believe, up to 70 children, but that's if you combine both of them. Right now they're going by it being one whole building.

Mr. Feeney: So the state controls the number of children?

Mr. Brusk: So I guess you wouldn't have to prove (inaudible).

Mr. Feeney: I just want to make sure it's a safe location. It's right off the main drag, so it doesn't have a lot of traffic. This doesn't show the outside playground area on it. This photo is probably older than the outside playground area.

Mr. Prince: The outside playground would be the brown building, on the back left end, it would be to the very back.

Mr. Feeney: Obviously it's a daycare now, it's operational. Do we know if we've gotten any complaints from the surrounding neighborhood or anything like that?

Mr. Domini: I've been absent so long that I'm not up to speed on that stuff. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Prince: If you'd like me to make it a little more clear as far as the occupancy goes, the way that it's set up – of course we come before the committee, but no set numbers will be set until Ohio Job & Family Services and the Fire Marshall comes out. The Fire Marshall will come out and let us know our total occupancy for that side and then Ohio Job & Family Services will let us know their occupancy for the children, so it does differ a little.

Mr. Brusk: Which half of the building is going to be for the new part?

Mr. Prince: It would actually be the right half, the way we're looking at it now, so it would be the white part of the building?

Mr. Brusk: Just the white part?

Mr. Prince: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: What's there now?

Mr. Prince: It's a fully functional childcare on that side.

Mr. Brusk: Will that affect their capability of keeping the same amount of children, because now they'll have that much less space, am I correct?

Mr. Prince: That is correct. It's currently not being used at all now. It will affect their occupancy, because they will now split it, but that space, as of right now, is not being occupied or used, it is to be sublet.

Mr. Stoffel: I don't see a problem. We're just giving the go ahead to pursue and that number, that occupancy total and whatnot will be determined by the State Board and, like you said, the Fire Marshall, so I don't have any problem with that. Any other comment? Would someone like to make a motion?

Mr. Feeney: I'll make a motion to accept item B4, 64-SE.

Mr. Brusk: I'll second.

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

5. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6321 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1195.10 TO ALLOW PARKING TO BE SITED BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND A PRIMARY STREET. CONTACT: MATT MITCHLER (103-ZV).

6. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6321 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1195.05(a) TO ALLOW THE BUILDING TO BE SET BACK FROM THE REQUIRED BUILD-TO LINE. CONTACT: MATT MITCHLER (104-ZV).

7. MAJOR SITE PLAN APPLICATION, 6321 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT USE, VACANT GAS STATION, PROPOSED USE, FAST FOOD RESTAURANT; PRESENT OWNER, CHARLEY'S PHILLY STEAKS. CONTACT: MATT MITCHLER (30-MS).

Mr. Domini: I'll give the Board a little bit of introduction while the applicant's setting up. I think the contact information has changed. The contact at that firm I don't believe is our primary contact anymore, but they can speak to that issue. I've had some preliminary meetings with this applicant per their request and I believe this goes back to Mr. Hansen when he worked here. He started working with this applicant as well. Obviously there are a number of issues here with our overlay but, to the best of my knowledge, we haven't seen a corner lot proposed for development like this in the overlay; which, in my opinion, the way the overlay was written, makes it somewhat difficult for certain sites, especially this size on a corner. So I met with this applicant with the Safety Service Director and I asked the Safety Service Director to come because of some concerns regarding access and ingress-egress from the site, because it's very close to the light at Brice. I've worked with the applicant to try to come up with some solutions and, obviously, I informed the applicant that the Board has the final determination how you want to rule, but I did give some objective opinion how I thought the site could be arranged. The best solution is difficult; not to say it's not doable, but it's difficult. So there are a number of steps that were taken to try to come as close to the code as possible. I also worked with the applicant

and expressed my interest in making sure that the streetscape's maintained and improved to our standard and that type of thing. So I do have some history here. I know this is a very professional applicant, so I'm going to ask that they give their presentation. I'm glad to chime in and discuss the code, but I don't see any need for me to go through their proposal in detail.

Mr. Stoffel: Thanks, Aaron. Would you give us your name and address, please?

Mr. Edward Feher: I'm with Clavin-Feher Architects. We're at 2 Miranova Place, Columbus, Ohio 43215. We also have Joe Holbrook here. He's with Charley's, 2500 Farmers, Columbus, Ohio; and then Steve Brown, BRH Civil Engineering Group. He's our site engineer and all three of us will probably speak to you about the project. We'll start out with an overview on it and I'll also give you new packets so that if you want to follow along, because I believe what you have on the screen will be a couple weeks old and we've worked long and hard with Aaron to try to get to where we're at now. We went through probably 20 schemes. We went through about 12 in the past 10 days. So let me distribute these to you.

Mr. Steve Brown: Steve Brown, BRH Group and it's 444 South Front, Columbus.

Mr. Feher: (Mr. Feher distributing packets, speaking off mic – inaudible. Mr. Feher is explaining how the building will be sited on the lot, where the patio is, where the drive-up window is, where the kitchen is, the dumpster location, parking, where the traffic patterns are, etc.)

Mr. Brusk: How many employees will you have at one time?

Mr. Holbrook: We probably will average about 12 employees, depends on the time of the day.

Mr. Brusk: But at any one time, how many are you going to have?

Mr. Holbrook: Twelve.

Mr. Brusk: That takes up most of your parking, your employees.

Mr. Holbrook: We thought we met the code for the required spaces.

Mr. Brusk: (Off mic – inaudible)

Mr. Holbrook: Currently approximately 40% of our patrons are drive-thru.

Mr. Stoffel: That leaves you with 13, they have 25 total.

Mr. Brusk: You might want to get with Kmart to see if they'll let you park some of your employees there.

Mr. Holbrook: We also have a lot of our employees who commute via bus.

Mr. Brusk: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: What was the total square feet? Was it 2400? We have a 1-100, so they actually exceed our parking requirement.

Mr. Feher: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Brusk: I think you've got plenty of parking in Kmart for employees. You won't get customers walking from down there, but you'll be able to leave space.

Mr. Feher: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Stoffel: What is to keep people coming off Brice Road, taking a quick left and trying to shoot up through that one way-- Yeah, what's to prevent that? Will there be signage?

Mr. Feher: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: The concern that staff had was the left out onto Main going westbound, cause there's really only one stacking space. You'd have to cut across three lanes, if you weren't turning left, and get into the other lane. We don't have a safe distance to make that move, so on Main we'd ask that we have a right out.

Mr. Brusk: A left out was what I was going to propose – right in, right out. Well, would they have a left in from there? The question I was going to ask you, Aaron, was when that was a gas station, was there any problem with the left in on Main? I don't believe—

Mr. Domini: That hasn't been a gas station in my time.

Mr. Feher: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Brusk: I'm sure you need a right out. There's no question on the right out. On a right in, I'd like Aaron to possible check out with the police department whether that's a problem, a left in.

Mr. Domini: I've never had a problem with the left in, just the left out.

Mr. Holbrook: One of the things we looked at when we were working on this as far as flow of traffic with the access through Kmart and then to Brice Road, studied it myself, when – if we have an individual that stops that is going westbound on Main Street, we're taking them into the direction to get on Brice Road, get into the left turn lane at the light and turn left at Main. We're not concerned about them pulling out and taking a left, so the right only's fine. With a turn lane for the left in, I feel comfortable because safety is a concern for us also.

Mr. Domini: Essentially the Kmart parking lot is functioning as a frontage road, so anybody who's done this is not going to try to make that left out. They're going to travel down through that parking lot to the shared access and go out to the next curb cut if they know what they're doing.

Mr. Brusk: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: If you're going onto Main Street. If you're trying to make a left out onto Brice, you'd come down through the parking lot south. This was interesting because the drive-thru on a corner at this location is a pretty good highest and best use given the nature of this corridor. I don't like to say that too often as a planner, but I'm sensitive to how long this site's been here. The applicant pointed to the other drive-thrus. The difference being with these you can easily pull the building up, get a curb cut here and a curb cut out and that would allow you to have the circulation that you're looking for with the drive-thru and still meet the code. Same with this one over here, especially if you have a fully functioning ingress-egress, which they don't because they're so close to the light. So even with one curb cut you can make that work. So there is a challenge with this site. If it's going to be used for any type of eating and drinking establishment that has a drive-thru, that would be a challenge. In my opinion if the Board– I'm very sensitive to setting a precedent with this, but I think because it's a corner lot and they've made every attempt to meet the code-- When we started this, if you look back at the plan they had two drive aisles coming in front of the building, so we got rid of one, pulled it down to one. The other suggestion which was made that landscaping bump-out in front of the building, which makes the building feel like it's even farther out. The other changes were actually one that we discussed which was the brick pavers behind the existing monument sign. Instead of wrapping the pedestrian through the parking lot, keeping them up in that landscape zone, safe out of traffic when they come around, then they have access to the site. It also complements the streetscape. So there are a number of things that we talked through to try to get this as close to the intent of the code as possible and the applicant did take all those suggestions, short of getting rid of the drive-thru, which is not something that works for them.

Mr. Holbrook: I'd like to speak towards the value of this site for us and being in the community. I'm not sure how familiar you are with Charley's. It

started at OSU campus in 1989 and we have approximately 460 stores throughout the United States and we just did a deal in Egypt today, so we're all over the country. Also this is our – we have freestanding drive-thru facilities. This is our first prototype with _____. We've been in the community for a long time. We're on the north side of Columbus. We're going to be here for a long time. This is a very important site to us. We wouldn't want to do anything that would take away from what Reynoldsburg's tried to achieve with the streetscape.

Mr. Feher: Basically what we've done is we've made a compromise to say we'll improve the streetscape, and literally it's a huge improvement because one of the things we haven't been able to do is get along Brice Road and we need that. We need it desperately. This adds to what we've got, the aesthetics that we need. The fact that we can't quite do what we need, I think is well offset by what we are doing instead and in place of. (Inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: It pains me to say that. It really does. I'm a realist as well.

Mr. Feher: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Brusk: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Holbrook: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: There will have to be a detailed development agreement too, because essentially I believe we will take over the maintenance of the pavers and the other street scaping which I don't think is a huge burden to the City given what the applicant's doing to install it, but if you note on the plans they're showing that in the right-of-way. So we'll have to get the Safety Service Department to sign off on that too.

Mr. Feeney: I was going to ask a little bit more of exactly what you're going to do on the corner. It looks like you're going to add an additional brick walkway there behind the wall.

Mr. Feher: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Brusk: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Feher: (Off mic – inaudible.) In your packet there is an L1 landscape plan-- (off mic – inaudible). Aaron, since it's a major site plan review, I assume you want to see the elevation of the building. What we've (off mic – inaudible). So the west elevation faces Brice Road and I pointed out before there's a very large glass dining room and you can see a piece of the brick kitchen behind. This is only a portion of the site. (Inaudible – off mic.) While I have that up, I'll show you the _____ materials. This is not the exact brick but it's very similar.

This is the brick. The glazing that we're going to be using, we're trying the hardest to use a clear Low-E glass that's an ____ glass, and we feel we can meet our energy requirements by using Low-E and keep it as clear as possible so you can see in. It's a simple palette and this is the metal cladding around the windows and any metal trim on the building will be what we call a dark toxic bronze. Then there's an accent panel which you're going to see that supports the red and the logo along the pedestrian entrance. It also clads with the drive-thru window. So those are the (inaudible – off mic). We'll be coming back, I believe, to the Design Review with a full sign package. This top elevation represents the _____ elevation. What you're seeing here is the red wall that comes out to greet you as a patron. That's a metal cladding. The kitchen – the back of the kitchen is all brick. The dumpster enclosure will be the same brick that we're using on the building. The east elevation along the _____ property line, _____ kitchen, we have a drive-thru window and there will be brick clad on that as well. You are seeing some branding on the wall brackets going on the brick. Joe, what is that material?

Mr. Holbrook: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Leher: It is painted, okay.

Mr. Brusk: Is there a problem with the amount of painting?

Mr. Domini: The only thought I have, I don't know how this plays out, is if the Design Review Board considers that signage or not. It doesn't appear to me to be advertising the name of the business, so I think it's just part of the brand, but we can discuss that at the Design Review Board.

Mr. Holbrook: (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: Can you talk about the patio? I'm looking at the north elevation, just trying to understand how that fits in.

Mr. Leher: The patio essentially has a flat roof covering the patio area.

Mr. Domini: So it's behind the mason wall with those 100% USDA Choice brand?

Mr. Leher: (Off mic – inaudible.) From Main Street you're looking down the narrow end of the covered patio or porch. The porch will have four coats-- This red wall comes out to the end of the porch and patio, so it's a covered entry when you walk up to the door. This is somewhat driven site specific. Some locations may have a partial covered patio, but we elected to do a fully covered patio in this location mainly because of the west orientation of the building. The shading of the glass (off mic – inaudible). Does that help?

Mr. Brusk: That helps a lot.

Mr. Leher: I know it's a lot to digest and you didn't have quite all this detail earlier.

Mr. Feeney: I know it's a really compact site and it is, like Norm was saying earlier, it's kind of the opening to Brice Road and I think using that continuing our theme -- Main Street theme, if you take it down Brice Road, I think that's going to help us. It's a plus for us. I like the building. I like the design. It's modern, new, clean. I think the traffic flow's probably about as good as you're going to get on a site like that. I like it. It was a nice presentation.

Mr. Brusk: Yes. We thank you very much for the amount of effort.

Mr. Domini: I think this -- this is tough for me, especially authoring the overlay about four years ago now. The scale of the building, the connections, I think overall it helps us meet the intent and embraces the street, creates the street front, all the things we wanted it to do with a little forgiveness from the build-to line. So I'm comfortable recommending approval, because I don't think we're going to see this on any other corner in the corridor and I hate to see this lot sit vacant, not that that can be a reason for us granting the variance. I think the hardship is that for that type of eating and drinking establishment there's a hardship based on the standards and the size of that lot. So I want to be clear about that, because I don't want to get an application 12 months from now saying, "Well, we granted it for Charley's," because I don't think we have any other lots in the corridor like this.

Mr. Brusk: There may be one or two and, again, that may be the answer for another lot that's in this position.

Mr. Domini: This sets the bar for granting a variance, it does. And one of the requests that I made to them was the streetscaping which is a huge help to us.

Mr. Brusk: Well, they more than compensated plus the fact that the amount of landscaping takes away from the problem that you have for not having the building close. So, by that, it's an offset that seems reasonable to me and I have no problem with it.

Mr. Stoffel: By the way, the strongest drink they have is lemonade.

Male: Well, too, if you look at the setback build lines, especially right up there by the corner landscaping, I mean that goes into the wall. I mean it goes to the current landscaped wall if I'm looking at that correctly.

Mr. Domini: No.

Mr. Stoffel: The build to lines?

Mr. Domini: That's not the landscape wall, that's the pavers as they're proposing it. Oh, I'm sorry, you are right.

Mr. Stoffel: So we wouldn't want them going there anyway. And to me, quite honestly, I agree with you with the intent, but, to me, I'm more okay with it being back off a little bit for a couple reasons. It's on the corner and it's kind of opened up and the fact that if that whole corner's treated right with landscaping and stuff, it just opens it up and I think that can really look good. I think it will be good.

Mr. Brusk: With McDonald's having redone theirs, it's re-establishing that corner and that whole area. It's not just the corner. Now we're moving down and that's sometimes a good cascade.

Mr. Stoffel: And I think, again, since that wall, the way it comes out so much, if it were forced up against that north build to line, I don't think it would look that good on this corner. So I kind of like it.

Mr. Feeney: Well, I'm comfortable too, cause every lot's individual and I don't know that we're setting a bar that if you did it for him, you've got to do it for me. I think each lot, each situation's separate and independent, or at least that's the way I look at it, try to anyway. I think this is a good fit.

Mr. Domini: I have to point something out and this is a little bit of a curve ball, but I don't think it's going to really slow you down. Because the previous application I had, a variance, a lot split, a rezoning on the major site plan and on this one I had two variances and a major site plan. We forgot a step. But the attitude I'm getting from the Board, I don't think it's going to slow you down, and that is you're going to have to get a Special Exception Use Permit to operate as an eating and drinking establishment and we missed that. So will just be something we have to do to follow up and if it's okay with the Board, if we're okay with this, would it be okay if the applicant's absent from that meeting?

Mr. Brusk: We would be, I think, quite comfortable because, I think, based on – we haven't voted yet, but assuming we vote yes, which I'm pretty sure is happening, we would have voted yes on that without any question, so you can bring it forward so it's all part of it.

Mr. Domini: I don't want you to incur that cost with your team to have to come back. We'll have to move the paperwork through and you'll have to pay the fee which is – I forget what it's up to now.

Mr. Brusk: I think it's \$400.

Mr. Domini: And that will be the last piece that comes before this Board. I apologize for that, but we had a lot of moving parts. I was more focused on the site design than I was the use.

Mr. Brusk: Is that a special exemption request you're asking for?

Mr. Domini: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: It was \$250 on the previous one.

Mr. Domini: That's what we require – it's basically like our conditional use or special exception. That stays with the applicant, the variance stays with the site, so that will be something you'll have to do. I can coordinate that with the team.

(Man speaking off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Domini: No, because special exceptions come before this Board, so this will come back before the Board next month. You'll still go before Design Review on the 5th.

Mr. Brusk: If worse came to worse, if we had to, we would do a special on that.

Mr. Domini: And you'll get the special exception long before you get your plot grade utility plan done, so it's not going to slow you down.

Mr. Brusk: I move that we accept -- well, I guess we'll do them one at a time – we accept variance application B5 (103-ZV).

Mr. Stoffel: I'll second.

Mr. Domini: On one of these I would like a condition that there's a right out only on Main. I don't know which one you want to put it on, but probably the major site plan.

(Mr. Domini called the roll on B5. Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes.")

Mr. Stoffel: I'll make a motion that we approve Item B6 (104-ZV).

Mr. Feeney: I'll second.

(Mr. Domini called the roll on B6. Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Stoffel voted "yes.")

Mr. Brusk: I move that we accept the major site plan application with the requirement that the Main Street exit is a right only. That's Item 30-MS.

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

C. OTHER BUSINESS

1. DISCUSSION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE DISCUSSION,
1537 TRURO AVE., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING AR-1;
PROPOSED USE, GREENHOUSE STORAGE AREA. CONTACT: BRIAN
KOCHER 861-5700.

Mr. Domini: If I could have put you first on the agenda, I would have. I can move things around, but I usually don't move Other Business before New Business. I talked to Mr. Kocher regarding some additional storage for their greenhouse and before I told him anything, I said, "It would probably be best to come to the Board and see what your reaction is," before he files any permits or spends money or his time going down a path that you guys might not see acceptable. So I said, "Let's come talk about it in Other Business and see where you're at with this request." I'll pull up the site for you to look at.

Mr. Brian Kocher: My name's Brian Kocher. I'm with Fisher's Gardens, 1540 Truro Avenue in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Domini: Tell us a little bit about what we talked about on the phone, what your needs are.

Mr. Kocher: Well, the story is this: That property at 1537 has been vacant for, I believe, seven years. There was a duplex located there that had a gas leak and it exploded and they subsequently tore it down, demolished it. The owner sold it to the current owner who contacted me and is interested in selling the property. I told her I was at least initially interested, but I have a whole lot of questions for the City of Reynoldsburg about what is an acceptable use, what can I or can't I do before I spend any money. So that triggered my call and here I am today. So what I would like to do, and you tell me whether it's acceptable or not, I'm in need of additional storage, so a pole type building of some sort there and, quite possibly – and really I'd like to add additional greenhouse space. That would be not retail space, but production growing space, because it is on the other side of the street, so it would be impractical as a retail type of endeavor.

Mr. Brusk: What's the building next to there?

Mr. Kocher: To the north there is a residence and the two lots to the south are both vacant. There's one lot there that the old locker plant used to be there if you go back that far. I don't, but it was an ice freezer where the folks in

Reynoldsburg got their ice and stored their meat apparently is what I'm told, and the foundation's still there.

Mr. Domini: This is the parcel right there, this vacant one.

Mr. Kocher: And I'm concerned about the neighbors too. I want to be a good neighbor. The residence that's directly to the north, I've talked to Mr. Detty, because the current property owner asked him also if he was interested in purchasing it and he said no. I asked him what he thought about my ideas and he indicated to me that he'd be pretty happy with that rather than have – I guess the devil you know is better than the devil you don't know in some instances. So I feel good at least about the adjacent neighbor is okay with it. I haven't asked everybody on the street yet.

Mr. Feeney: It's zoned residential.

Mr. Brusk: Would he have to have a zoning change?

Mr. Domini: Well, one of the things that I wanted the Board to provide an interpretation on is what would you consider that use. Would you consider it outdoor storage or would we consider it something else? Plant cultivation is allowed only in the S1 Special District, so that could be a rezoning. I'm trying to get the GIS to work and it's not cooperating.

Mr. Feeney: Is that lot in the Historical area?

Mr. Domini: In the overlay? I don't think it is, no. See, the red line is the overlay.

Mr. Feeney: So the lot doesn't go all the way back to the creek?

Mr. Kocher: No.

Mr. Domini: Interestingly enough, if it was rezoned, it would be contiguous to another S1 district which is across the creek. So it's not good practice to spot zone, but, in this case, it would be contiguous and compatible with that use.

Mr. Kocher: There's a piece that the City owns behind it. That's my understanding.

Mr. Domini: Yeah and I'm trying to get the zoning to work but I guess what I'm saying is that with that zoning—

Mr. Kocher: They call it "The Alley" off the Franklin County Auditor's website and my understanding is the City owns that piece.

Mr. Brusk: I really wouldn't have a problem as long as the _____, you know, a pole barn can look really nice and a pole barn could look like, you know, and that wouldn't be acceptable.

Mr. Feeney: So are you thinking about maybe building a greenhouse over there?

Mr. Kocher: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: And a greenhouse, again, as long as it's built nicely. The only time they look bad is in hail storms.

Mr. Domini: This parcel here is owned by the City. I believe this one is, too.

Mr. Brusk: What's the City plan on doing with it?

Mr. Domini: I don't know, maybe they'd sell it.

Mr. Kocher: Yeah, and if it rains hard, it's probably all under water.

Mr. Brusk: So I guess we'd call it outside storage. Is that a problem with the zoning.

Mr. Domini: Special Exception Use in all district is outdoor storage.

Mr. Brusk: That would be my first thought, what about yours? Do you think that would—

Mr. Domini: Well, we also have plant cultivation defined, so it just depends on what—

Mr. Brusk: Well, I would think that plant cultivation would not include the greenhouse type of cultivation would it, or would it?

Mr. Domini: I felt generally supportive of this, otherwise I wouldn't have asked him to come before this Board.

Mr. Brusk: I think we could probably work with you on this as long as, number one, you've got something planned that'll meet the aesthetics of the community; two, that you don't have any nearby neighbors that say wait a minute; and, three, that we figure out what we can call it. I'm sure we can figure out something.

Mr. Domini: I just looked up the definition and their definition's pretty clear that nursery stock is plant cultivation. "The production of crops, fruit trees, nursery stock, truck garden products or similar plant material outside of

structures such as greenhouses.” Outside of structures such as greenhouses. So if you’re in a greenhouse—

Mr. Brusk: They don’t say what that falls under. Plant cultivation, I think that falls more into storage.

Mr. Domini: I don’t know.

Mr. Kocher: So are you saying you’d have to rezone it?

Mr. Brusk: If it’s outside storage, would we have to rezone or just get special use?

Mr. Domini: It’s a permitted use in the S1 zone. It’s permitted, but they’re not in an S1.

Mr. Stoffel: But Aaron was saying that that property is contiguous to an S1 zone.

Mr. Brusk: It’s not exactly. It’s almost contiguous.

Mr. Domini: Well, if I could get the GIS to work, we could see.

Mr. Brusk: Because this area right here is City owned, then this is the S1. So if you could buy the City’s property—

Mr. Domini: Mr. Brusk, how do you think Council would look at this application, considering the applicant?

Mr. Brusk: My guess, and I could ask when I’m there, but my guess is that they shouldn’t be adverse to that.

Mr. Feeney: It’s a long time Reynoldsburg business. How long is that—

Mr. Kocher: Since 1988.

Mr. Feeney: So it’s a long time operation, this greenhouse.

Mr. Brusk: But that doesn’t cut a whole lot of ice with Council, but I could ask if you would prefer me to do that just to see if there’d be any adverse comments from the group.

Mr. Domini: Well, if you feel that this is – that they have a greenhouse and they’re storing plant material in the greenhouse and you consider it outdoor storage, they don’t need a rezoning.

Mr. Brusk: And that’s what I think that we could call it. I don’t see why we couldn’t, rather than go through the extra step of having it rezoned.

Mr. Domini: We consider it outdoor storage when we give the special use permits for other things similar to this nature.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, I would think so, and that one we would only have to have a Special Use Permit, but we wouldn't have to have rezoning or variance or anything.

Mr. Domini: Well, cause outdoor storage is a Special Exception in all districts.

Mr. Brusk: I would go that way rather than go through Council, cause Council's going to have their hands full right now.

Mr. Domini: Well, they're going to see the Special Exception anyway.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, but that won't bother them. There's a huge difference between giving a zoning change and going along with Special Exception. And a greenhouse, you've got one there already on the other side of the street. I always thought greenhouses were neat.

Mr. Domini: My only advice would be to really talk to those neighbors and make sure they're not going to come to the meeting and object. If they're generally supportive, I think we could entertain that application.

Mr. Brusk: I would think we could and I think we should be able to do it then as a Special Exception Use.

Mr. Feeney: I think so.

Mr. Domini: And that would be something you want to get in your hand before you purchase the property, of course.

Mr. Kocher: Okay. So how's that process work?

Mr. Domini: Talk to myself or Justin who's sitting here and we'll get you the application and walk you through the process. You'll come back before the Board and we'll do just what we did tonight, probably provide a little bit more detail about what you're going to do there. If the Board is favorable, they'll make a recommendation to approve it which will go to Council. Council will review it as well and then will give it three readings.

Mr. Brusk: I don't think Council would have any huge objection to that.

Mr. Domini: I think their concern would be the neighbors. If you get letters in support from them—

Mr. Brusk: If you had letters of support, that goes a long way.

Mr. Domini: Well, if you want to proceed give us a call and we can walk you through it. It's pretty painless and that's a guarantee if you do want to purchase the property you have it in your hand.

D. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

David Stoffel, Chair

Aaron Domini, Planning Adminis.

This document was transcribed by:

Area East Secretarial Service, 7668 Slate Ridge Blvd., Reynoldsburg OH 43068