

MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
JUNE 19, 2014
6:30 P.M.

Chairman Stoffel: Well, what do you think, Justin?

Mr. Robbins: I say we give it a go. These are the three members that I know for certain were coming.

Mr. Stoffel: Okay.

Mr. Robbins: So we have a quorum with three but any motion that passes has to have all three of you approve it with no people sitting out or abstaining, to use the correct terminology.

Mr. Stoffel: All right. Well, let's go ahead and get started then

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. David Stoffel Mr. Rick Donovan Mr. Enfinger
Members Absent:	Ms. Libby Wallace Mr. Anthony Rettke Ms. Bonnie Armintrout
Others Present:	Mr. Justin Robbins

2. APPROVAL OF MINUES OF MAY 15, 2014

Mr. Stoffel: Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes of May 15th?

Mr. Robbins: There are none from staff.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Stoffel: Can we have approval of the agenda? Are there any additions or corrections to the agenda?

Mr. Donovan: I make a move that we approve them.

Mr. Stoffel: I'll second that we approve them.

Mr. Robbins: Okay.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Stoffel: If you are planning on speaking tonight, a couple of things. Would you make sure that before you leave that you do sign in and if you're planning on speaking would you please stand and we'll swear you in.

(Mr. Stoffel administers the oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Stoffel: Is there any Public Comment? (Being none, let's move into Unfinished Business. Justin, if you can read the first one, please.

A. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 8915 BROAD ST., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, CS; OWNER'S NAME, CHUCK WARNER-VOELKER-BETZ CO.; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1175.08, SECTION 1175.05, TABLE 1175.05 AND SECTION 1180.10 TO REDUCE THE REQUIRED MINIMUM RESIDENTIAL BUFFER SETBACK FROM SIXTY FEET (60'-0") TO A REQUESTED FIVE FEET (5'-0"), AND THE REQUIRED MINIMUM RESIDENTIAL BUFFER SETBACK FROM FIFTEEN FEET (15'-0") TO A REQUESTED FIVE FEET (5'-0"). CONTACT: MARK BUSH/REYNOLDSBURG DG, LLC. (#164596).

2. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 8915 BROAD ST., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, CS; OWNER'S NAME, CHUCK WARNER-VOELKER-BETZ CO.; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1175.07, TO EXPAND THE MAXIMUM DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE FROM THIRTY FEET (30'-0") TO A REQUESTED THIRTY-SIX FEET (36'-0"). CONTACT: MARK BUSH/REYNOLDSBURG DC, LLC. (#164629).

3. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 8915 BROAD ST., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, CS; OWNER'S NAME, CHUCK ARNER-VOELKER-BETZ CO.; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1175.06(a), TO REDUCE THE REQUIRED FRONT YARD SETBACK FROM FORTY FEET (40'-0") TO A REQUESTED FIVE FEET (5'-0"). CONTACT: MARK BUSH/REYNOLDSBURG DG, LLC, (#164630).

4. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 8915 BROAD ST., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, CS; OWNER'S NAME, CHUCK WARNER-VOELKER-BETZ CO.; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1179.03, TABLE 1179 TO REDUCE

THE REQUIRED MINIMUM OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES FROM FORTY-SIX (46) SPACES TO THIRTY (30) SPACES. CONTACT: MARK BUSH/ REYNOLDSBURG DG, LLC. (#164631).

5. MAJOR SITE PLAN APPLICATION, 8915 BROAD ST., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, CS; PRESENT USE, VACANT; PROPOSED USE, DOLLAR GENERAL RETAIL STORE; PRESENT OWNER, CHUCK WARNER – CHUCK WARNER & ASSOCIATES. CONTACT: MARK BUSH – REYNOLDSBURG DG, LLC. (#164595).

Mr. Robbins: Yes. I'm going to take this the same way that we did at the last meeting – microphones on. There are four variances and one major site plan for the same project and this is for 8915 Broad Street. I'm going to go ahead and just list off the application numbers and what the variance request is and then I'll go over what's changed since the last meeting and what the applicant has resubmitted and we'll go over staff recommendations as well.

So the first variance is for Application #164596 requesting a variance from Section 1175.08, Section 1175.05, Table 1175.05, and Section 1180.10 to reduce the required minimum residential buffer setback from 60' to a requested 5' and the required minimum residential buffer setback from 15' to a requested 5'. This was the original zoning variance request that has since been updated to 12½' would be the minimum that they are requesting.

The second variance is for Application #164629 requesting a variance from Section 1175.07 to expand the maximum driveway entrance from 30' to a requested 36'.

The next variance is Application #164630 requesting a variance from Section 1175.06(a) to reduce the required front yard setback from 40' to a requested 5'.

The last variance is Application #164631 requesting a variance from Section 1179.03 and Table 1179 to reduce the required minimum off-street parking spaces from 46 spaces to a requested 30 spaces.

In addition, the applicant has requested a major site plan review which is Application #164595. The approval of the site plan is basically contingent upon the passing of all of the variances which would be required for constructing the site as has been proposed on the site plan.

Starting again with the first variance. This is in regards to the rear setback of the site. Going back to the last Board meeting, the May BZBA meeting, several members of the Board had concerns along with staff regarding the reduction of the required buffer zone to the extent as proposed by the applicant. The Board voted to table the application allowing the applicant an opportunity to move the building forward on the site, increasing the distance from the residential property to the south. Upon completion

of the survey, the applicant discovered that portions of the right-of-way had already been dedicated as right-of-way, leaving much less distance on the site to move the building forward. The applicant has submitted a new site plan which you should see on your work stations there showing the mechanical equipment moved to the east of the building and the building moved forward on the site to a distance of 12½' from the rear property line. Again, staff has a lot of concern regarding the setback, primarily the side setback and the rear setback to the south of the property. Section 1175.08 states that all commercial uses are required to have a minimum rear side setback of 120' which can be reduced to 60' if acceptable landscaping and screening are provided as approved by the Design Review Board. Section 1180.10 states that any residential zone adjoining any commercial zone must have a required buffer zone of 15' adjacent to all common boundaries except street frontages and shall include one tree for each 40' of linear boundary or fraction thereof and a continuous 6' high planting hedge, fence, wall, earth mound or combination thereof. The buffer standards are intended to establish landscaping regulations that improve the aesthetic appearance of setback areas, common open spaces, public right-of-ways, and off-street vehicular parking areas. These are outlined in the staff report.

It's the recommendation of staff that the variance not be granted based on the following justifications as stated in Section 1147.05 and that's the standards for a variance. Section 1147.05(c) states that there exist a special circumstance or conditions fully described in the findings applicable to the land or structures which the variance is sought which are peculiar to such land or structures and which do not apply generally to land or structures in the area and which are such that the strict application of the provisions of this code would deprive the property owner of the reasonable use of such land or structures. There must be a deprivation of beneficial use of land as opposed to a mere loss in value as justifications for the variance. Section 1147.05(d) states that a hardship cannot be self-created. It is evident that the applicant can still maintain reasonable use of the property while meeting the side yard setback and rear setback requirement of the code. Though economic hardship is not grounds for a variance, reconfiguration of the property would allow full compliance with the zoning code without burdening the applicant economically. It's the finding of staff that any hardship sustained under the current configuration of the site would be self-inflicted and would not be sufficient grounds for a variance. Section 1147(e) states that the variance is necessary for the reasonable use of the land or building under variances granted to the minimum variance that will accomplish this purpose. The request of this variance is decreasing the minimum required rear setback by approximately 80% and staff finds that this is not the minimum variance that accomplishes a reasonable use of the land. Finally, letter I states that the variance is not a matter of convenience when other remedies are available within provisions of this code. Again, it's the finding of staff that according to Section 1147.05, it's our recommendation that the variance not be granted.

As far as running the meeting, I don't know if it's easiest to vote on the variances one at a time after the recommendations or if you want to do it all at once. It's pretty much up to the Board. I think it might be actually good to let the applicant come up and talk a little bit. I guess I answered my own question.

Mr. Stoffel: Why don't we let him talk a little bit first and then see what makes the best sense.

Mr. Robbins: Sure.

Mr. Stoffel: Would you state your name and address, please?

Mr. Alex Frazier: Alex Frazier of Hurley & Stewart at 2800 S. 11th Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Mr. Stoffel: Thank you.

Mr. Frazier: We're applying for a variance for the rear setback. We did some additional investigation into the ODOT right-of-way and discovered that the right-of-way line actually lies right here. It was thought that there might be some room to shift the site up because of (speaking off mic) --- _____ line. It's my understanding they couldn't find the title work until a little more digging at the state. They found the right-of-way line is actually right where we see right here, so we weren't able to shift the building north very much, like 7½' from the previous 5' separation at 12½'. So to accommodate that we moved the HVAC over to the east side of the building. We also added evergreen shrubbery along the south line to act as a secondary buffer and it's my understanding that in five or six years these will reach a height of 12' and then they'll keep going from there to a maximum height of 20. We have an in-house landscape architect that we consulted regarding that buffer, so it'll block out vision and you can see (speaking off mic) _____ that wall and will be good not only for sight, but for sound generated by the building.

Mr. Robbins: If you look at the monitors and the screen as well, this is the original submission that shows the right-of-way basically by bisecting the entrance throat, right above those arrows and then we switch to what's been resubmitted and it's a bit further south than had originally been thought.

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah. I just don't think I can budge on the rear yard setback. With that being residential I just – and it's a shame that the right-of-way wasn't completely investigated before you went to all that work, because I think had it been where we thought it might be, I think you could have made that work. But all that being said, I just – that setback is just too close for me with it being residential. And I don't – it would appear as though there's really – is there anything else you can do about it or--

Mr. Frazier: We—

Mr. Stoffel: That's the building that you have, correct? That's the building that must be there?

Mr. Frazier: Yes. Dollar General has a number of different prototypes that when we first get a site in and a piece of property we do like a 2D sketch of our proposed site and we go through a number of different options to figure out what's going to work the best as line of sight for potential customers, how can we fit our drive vehicle which is a WV67 full-size semi, as well as just implementing the right amount of parking spaces and helping the site flow the way they like to see it. They generally like to have parking in front of the building so it's easier for the guests to see where they have to go. So we did explore a number of different options, laying the site out differently and this is the best one we could come up with given the dimensions and property and the setbacks being that it's surrounded by road frontage on three sides.

Mr. Donovan: All your configurations, you think this is the most workable one?

Mr. Frazier: Yes. To make our – you know, to keep all those things in mind. To make the design vehicle work, to make the appearance of the building as you're running down – driving down Broad Street there. This is what we feel is the best and to just make the best use of the property for (speaking off mic)_____.

Mr. Stoffel: Does anyone have any other questions?

Mr. Robbins: This isn't so much as a question but a comment. However the Board votes I want to make sure that you're very clear on which section of the code that you are basing your approval or denial on for this, number one. Particularly Section 1147.05, so that's the variance test and all those different A through I or the test which must be passed in order to grant a variance

Mr. Stoffel: Depending on the vote on this, Justin, if it is a "no" vote, do we continue with the variance applications that follow and not review the major site plan?

Mr. Robbins: Unless the applicant withdraws those applications, I say we go ahead and do them.

Mr. Stoffel: Okay. And just so he knows that if only there only being three of us here it has to be unanimous "yes" for it to proceed.

Mr. Frazier: Okay.

Mr. Robbins: And again, all the variances are required in order to get the major site plan that's been proposed.

Mr. Enfinger: One other question for staff. So any of these variances that we do pass subsequent to anything, they do stick with this piece of property—

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Enfinger: Irrespective of this?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Stoffel: Well, I'll make a motion then that we approve Item A-1 Variance Application #164596.

Mr. Enfinger: I second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "no, based on variance request not complying with the intent of Section of 1147.05 c, d, e or i." Mr. Donovan voted "no, because of 1147.05 c, d, e, and i." Mr. Enfinger voted "no, and it doesn't meet the requirements as stated in 1147.05 d or 1147.05 letter e.")

Mr. Robbins: Now it's up to the applicant at this point. Would it be your choice to go through the rest of them?

Mr. Frazier: I think since the site plan was contingent on all four of them being passed, all four of the variances being accepted, I don't see the need to—

Mr. Robbins: Okay.

Mr. Frazier: --to go through the other three.

Mr. Robbins: You're welcome if you want to formally remove those from the agenda. That's an option. We can go through them as well. I think they'll be fairly quick if you're interested.

Mr. Frazier: Yeah. I guess you can go through them if it'll be quick.

Mr. Robbins: All right. We'll move on to the next one if it pleases the Board. Okay, number two. Again, this is Application #164629 requesting a variance from Section 1175.07 to expand the maximum driveway entry from 30' to requested 36'. Again, this was tabled at the last meeting. If the Board finds that a full enforcement of Section 1175.03 is causing an unnecessary hardship on the applicant, staff recommends the Board approve the variance as submitted for the reason stated in Section 1147.05(a), that the variance is in accord with the general purpose and intent of the regulations imposed by this code. Staff would like to present additional information to the Board that supports the recommended approval based on 1147.05(a) of the code in the Ohio Department of Transportation's Location and Design manual, Volume 1, Roadway Design, the standard width for commercial driveway is 35'. So the requested variance is basically keeping within what's recommended by the State of Ohio for this particular type of use.

Mr. Stoffel: Does the Board have any questions or concerns with that?

Mr. Donovan: No. We've already talked about this one before, the last time.

Mr. Stoffel: Well, I'll make a motion then that we approve Item A2, variance request #164629.

Mr. Robbins: Do we have a second?

Mr. Enfinger: Second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Donovan voted "yes." Mr. Enfinger voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: Number three, same property. 8915 East Broad, Application #164630, requesting a variance from Section 1175.06(a) to reduce the required front yard setback from 40' to a requested 5'. This goes back to the right-of-way basically changing position from what the applicant had originally thought. So you have about, I believe, 70 – let's see, about 35' to 40' from the known right-of-way which is shown on the updated drawings to the edge of the street, which is a bit more than you would typically see. I just want to reiterate to the Board that in full enforcement of the code you would basically have a front setback of 75' to 80' from the edge of the roadway. A newer survey provided by the applicant shows the right-of-way located farther from the roadway than previously thought. The current right-of-way is located approximately 40' from the roadway.

The intent of Section 1175.06 and 1175.07 is to improve Commercial Districts, landscaped areas and/or grass and landscape planting. Staff finds the proposed variance would leave approximately 45' of distance from the edge of the parking lot to the edge of the roadway. A full enforcement of the code would create a setback of approximately 75' from the roadway, creating a lot that would cause practical difficulties in developing. It's the recommendation of staff that the variance be granted based on the variance standards as outlined in Section 1147.05(d) as full enforcement of the code would create a hardship and practical difficulty in developing the site.

Mr. Stoffel: Is there any comment or question from the Board?

Mr. Donovan: I make a motion that we accept – is it A3?

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah.

Mr. Donovan: A3.

Mr. Stoffel: Item number 164630. I'll second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Donovan voted "yes." Mr. Enfinger voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: And number four, variance application #164631 requesting a variance from Table 1179 to reduce the required minimum off-street parking spaces from 46 spaces to a proposed 30 spaces. Bear with me for a second. Basically, the applicant is proposing 30 spaces which is 16 spaces less than required parking. It's the recommendation of staff that the variance be granted based on the following findings as stated in Section 1147.05 that the variance requested is necessary for the reasonable use of land and that a decrease in parking requirements would not be a variance with the intent of the code. The applicant has stated that the typical Dollar General will rarely, if ever, fill more than 30 parking spaces. Staff finds that a full enforcement of the code would cause an undue hardship on the applicant, leaving the site difficult to develop. Again, this is – I think it is a constrained site to some extent. I think full enforcement of a parking standard which is designed for peak capacity might be something that would cause loss of beneficial use of the land.

Mr. Stoffel: Does the Board have any question or comment?

Mr. Enfinger: No.

Mr. Stoffel: I'll make a motion then that we approve Item A4, Variance Application #164631.

Mr. Donovan: I second it.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Donovan voted "yes." Mr. Enfinger voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: And the last application is for the major site plan review, Application #164959. Again, I'll state that the site plan as submitted requires all four variances to be passed. Since there's only three out of the four that were submitted the site plan as it stands is not something that would be allowable by code. It's the recommendation of staff that the major site plan as proposed be denied.

Mr. Robbins: Are there any questions from the applicant or comments? (No comment.)

Mr. Stoffel: Do we need to vote on the denial of that?

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

Mr. Stoffel: Okay. I'll make a motion that we approve Item A5, major site plan, Application #164595.

Mr. Enfinger: I second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "no, based on the fact that it does not meet the criteria of having the previous – based on the fact that it did not have

variance Application #164596, Item A1 be approved.” Mr. Donovan voted “No, because of A1, Application 164596 being denied.” Mr. Enfinger voted “No, as a result of variance Application #164596 being denied.”)

Mr. Robbins: If you would like to – you or Jacob would like to give me a call tomorrow, we’ll have to check to see what forms of appeal are available for variances. That’s something I’ll have to check our code to see. Typically, at least with Special Exceptions of major site plans, I believe those can be appealed to Council but with variances. I’ll have to check and I can get back you on that. Okay?

Mr. Frazier: Um-um.

Mr. Robbins: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Frazier: Thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

Mr. Stoffel: Thank you. Have a safe trip. On to New Business.

B. NEW BUSINESS

1. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 7354 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, C; OWNER’S NAME, NADINE MCMENEMY;
REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1179, TABLE 1179 TO REDUCE THE ON-SITE PARKING FROM A REQUIRED THIRTY (30) SPACES TO A REQUESTED TWO (2) SPACES. CONTACT: DEREK MAKLEZOW (#164897).

Mr. Stoffel: Justin, can you read Item B1?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. Let me get my screen on the right page. Item B1 is 7354 East Main Street, Beer and Wine Café request for a variance, Application #164897. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street across from Lancaster Avenue. The existing zoning is CC, Community Commercial and it is within the Historic Overlay District. Applicant is requesting a variance from Section 1179 and Table 1179 to reduce the onsite parking from a required 30 spaces to a requested 2 spaces. Current use is vacant. Applicant is Derek Maklezow of 8292 Priestly Drive.

Properties to the west are zoned CS, Community Services and properties to the north, south and east are zoned CC, Community Commercial. The existing building footprint is approximately 2,927 square feet. The property was approved for new signage and exterior modifications by the Design Review Board on June 5, 2014. And for all of you who are familiar or not with this property, this is basically just to the east of where we are now, the old firehouse, I believe.

Just to give you an idea of the scope of work. The applicant is preparing to renovate the property to accommodate a new eating and drinking establishment. Applicant is proposing a number of exterior modifications for the renovation of the

building. One of the primary things that they are looking to do is to take the six parking spaces, the head-in parking spaces off of Main Street and turn this into an outdoor eating and drinking patio. One of the things that I do want to say is, as far as staff is concerned this is an existing building that is very unsafe. We have six head-in spaces that back out onto our busiest corridor in the City. This is not a situation that I think we want to continue. The problem with that is, in getting rid of those spaces, there's not a whole lot of space on-site left for parking. The applicant has proposed two additional handicap spaces to the rear and I do want to mention, and I think you all received a letter as well, that the City of Reynoldsburg and our Development Director, Dan Havner has stated that the City intends to take the lot to the west that is currently owned by the City and turn it into a parking lot. Now, this would be a shared parking lot that would be available for any business within the Historic District within walking distance. The applicant is proposing to use a mixture of on-street parking and, maybe he can speak of this a little bit, but possible shared use agreements to the back.

Just to go over the requirements, we have a requirement of one parking space per 100 square feet of floor area which at 2,927 square feet you're at 30 required spaces and they are proposing two spaces. The amount of proposed parking is less than the required amount by 28 spaces. If the Board finds full enforcement of Section 1175.03 is causing an unnecessary hardship on the applicant, staff recommends the Board approve the variance as submitted. The proposed extreme modifications are attempting to improve the safety and aesthetics of the site as well as follow the intent of the Historic Overlay District and preserve the character of the Historic District. Again, this is something that with the shared access in back, it greatly reduces the amount of land available on-site for parking and staff does find that this is a move in the right direction of the intent of the code and the intent of the Historic District.

Mr. Stoffel: Thank you. Your name and address, please.

Mr. Derek Maklezow: My name is Derek Maklezow. My address is 8292 Priestly Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

Mr. Stoffel: I have one question. The Helping Hands in the back, food pantry, are they affected at all by any of the parking or any of the renovation? Are you doing anything in the back?

Mr. Maklezow: Well, technically the building is mine—

Mr. Stoffel: Right.

Mr. Maklezow: --but, I mean, I'm not going to remove them.

Mr. Stoffel: That was my question.

Mr. Maklezow: No. I definitely would not do that. But basically, all the traffic that I've seen them do is once, maybe twice a week, and that's early in the morning so my patrons wouldn't be affected nor would they be affected.

Mr. Donovan: Excuse me, which building is this?

Mr. Maklezow: The old fire station.

Mr. Stoffel: That's the Helping Hands.

Mr. Donovan: Okay. I didn't know that was there. Now I know where to get some food.

Mr. Robbins: One of the things that I forgot to mention is that with the addition of the City lot, the businesses that are in the Historic District right now are primarily in operation during the day and this one would be primarily in operation, I assume, for lunch hour to some extent and then—

Mr. Maklezow: Correct.

Mr. Robbins: --at night. And it seems that those two peak hours, or those two peak periods of demand would be pretty much opposite of what the adjacent businesses within the City would see within the Historic District, excuse me.

Mr. Donovan: What hours of operation are you planning on?

Mr. Maklezow: It's going to be from 11:00 until 1:00 in the morning.

Mr. Donovan: Everyday or just—

Mr. Maklezow: Correct. Yes. And I assume that most of these businesses, they usually don't – they don't operate on Sunday, if at all on Saturday. And the building to the west, they just moved across the street so they're not even in there anymore, so.

Mr. Donovan: Okay.

Mr. Enfinger: Approximately how far will the new wall with the gate and the planters – how far off of the actual curb is that going to be?

Mr. Maklezow: It should – the whole – you'll have – the sidewalks will still stay there. It's not going to decrease the amount.

Mr. Donovan: What kind of façade are you going to have between you and the street?

Mr. Maklezow: It's going to be brick pillars and then wood planters.

Mr. Robbins: Do you guys have the renderings that you brought?

Mr. Maklezow: Yes. I don't have a nice easel but--

(Mr. Donovan and Mr. Maklezow speaking off mic)

Mr. Donovan: But that's a nice rendering. I mean, it is aesthetically pleasing to see that.

Mr. Maklezow: (Speaking off mic.)

Mr. Stoffel: I'm sorry. Could you go back to the podium so we make sure we get your comments on record?

Mr. Maklezow: Well, referring to the aesthetics, between the pillars will be the planter boxes and the planter boxes will actually act as our herbs, so the restaurant itself will be sustainable. We're going to be growing our own product.

Mr. Donovan: What kind of food are you going to offer there?

Mr. Maklezow: It's going to be paninis and bruschettas and meat boards and cheese boards, salads. Basically, no cook-to-temp-food, so we have no fryers, no deep fried foods.

Mr. Stoffel: Will there be any music? Live music or—

Mr. Maklezow: We haven't really entertained that. If there is, there might be something like on the patio acoustically, nothing live or amped up. It would be more a single—

Mr. Donovan: Yeah, cause you have a funeral home right across the street over there.

Mr. Maklezow: Yeah, no, no. We won't have bagpipes or anything like that going.

Mr. Enfinger: They'll get a nice view of the mural on the wall over there.

Mr. Maklezow: Exactly. Well, that's what we hope the customers sitting on our patio will enjoy. If there is any kind of music it will just be acoustic, something on Saturday or Sunday afternoon. There's no live events at night, no. We don't have plans for a stage.

Mr. Stoffel: Justin, do we have to approve the sign?

Mr. Robbins: No. The sign has already been approved through Design Review Board. As far as the wall sign is concerned, they technically front a street. There wasn't any room on the front façade to allow a wall sign and the Board did approve one for the eastern edge of the building. So there's only one wall sign and they have one single ground sign, a single pole. It keeps the existing structure and then replaces the actual board, is that correct?

Mr. Maklezow: I'm sorry, are you talking about the posted sign? Yeah, I mean in all reality we probably might not even have that. I might just have the one on the wall on the building.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. If you look at the elevation, the east elevation, you can see the sign as they've proposed it and there's a single wall sign that is right here on the building. This will be the sign that faces west on Main Street.

Mr. Donovan: I see you have the handicap spaces in the back there. On your picture here I don't see ramps or anything where those people could get access to that level up. It looks like it's a little higher than what the ground is.

Mr. Maklezow: We're proposing that we're allowing the handicapped, they're going to be on the lower level of the building. There's two sections and the lower level is providing the bathrooms and another area of seating and eating. They could come up the side if they wanted to go to the patio. It rolls up.

Mr. Stoffel: Well, as far as handicap accessibility to the top, they can access that from the street, so there's wheelchair accessibility to both levels. Does the Board have any other questions or comments?

Mr. Enfinger: Where do you have ideas to be able to park everyone. What are you expecting as far as peak clientele? How many people will be there, where will they be able to park?

Mr. Maklezow: Maximum occupancy? I'd like to have it full all the time. Eventually, and we're expecting when we actually open, it'll probably be in August, maybe the end of August, hopefully by then we will have a clear understanding of when this other parking lot's going to be developed as well. But I also last week spoke with the tenants that were next door that are now leaving, that space is available for us to park in too. And not noted on here, there's another parking spot right next to the donation place. There's one parking spot too that's not noted on there.

Mr. Donovan: There's off-street across the street from you too, behind Vick's Pizza.

Mr. Maklezow: So we feel there's ample amount of parking there. Granted, they might have to walk a little bit. And from Signal #9 on Main Street, you can almost

park another additional 10 cars as well. Then we think we're going to create about three more spots when we actually do our patio and block off that curb entrance. I don't have a total count, but hopefully, if everything goes good, everyone's full.

Mr. Enfinger: Each, cause there's an establishment on Main Street and Graham that has some significant parking issues and I just was curious if you had made some arrangements with some of the neighboring businesses. They seem to have a good problem in having a lot of people visiting, but it is a very busy area and it would be good to see – you know, to make sure that this has been thought of ahead of time and addressed and making sure that it's all lined up.

Mr. Stoffel: I think it's a great idea. This is just a curiosity question. Is any of this craft beer?

Mr. Maklezow: Yeah, we're actually going to be doing 30 beers on tap and 20 of them are going to be strictly from Ohio. It's a beer and wine café. We consider ourselves a wine bar with a beer problem. We're going to have about 40 different glasses of wine, reserve wine list as well. But, yeah, we're going to have 30 beers on tap and 20 of them are going to be Ohio brewed. We figure that's a good niche right there to keep a little Ohio pride.

Mr. Stoffel: Any other questions? (No response.) I'll make a motion that we approve Item B-1, Variance Application number 164897.

Mr. Donovan: I'll second it.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Donovan voted "yes." Mr. Enfinger voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: I can't recall whether or not there's a zoning certificate on file. It's been a little while. If there is one, that's something that I can approve very, very quickly. In addition, I would immediately contact the Building Department, which I'm pretty sure you already have.

C. OTHER BUSINESS – None

D. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

David Stoffel, Chair

Justin Robbins, Planning Administrator

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