

MINUTES

REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS JUNE 19, 2008

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. Duane White Mr. Christopher Long Mr. Norman Brusk Mr. Patrick Feeney
Members Absent:	Mr. Lucas Haire
Also Present:	Aaron Domini, Planning Administrator

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 15, 2008 MEETING

Chairman Feeney: Item A2 is approval of the minutes. Does anybody have any changes, additions or deletions to the minutes? (No response.) Hearing none, we'll accept the minutes as they stand.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Feeney: Any changes to the agenda?

Mr. Domini: Yes, we have Special Exception Permit Extensions for 6300 E. Livingston Avenue, which was added to the agenda. I believe you were made aware of that through email and correspondence.

Mr. Brusk: It shows on here.

Mr. Domini: --the original public notice. Note that that's on here.

Mr. Feeney: Okay, great. We'll accept the agenda as written.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Feeney: Is there anyone that would like to speak in front of us tonight? The first thing is when you come up, if you'll sign in at the sign-in table up here and, then, the second thing, if everybody will stand and raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. (Mr. Feeney administers oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Feeney: Is there any public comment? Anyone who would like to say anything other than based on what's on the agenda tonight? (No response.)

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. SPECIAL EXCEPTION EXTENSION; 6300 E. LIVINGSTON AVE., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REQUEST TO EXTEND THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT PER ORDINANCE 105-07 PASSED DECEMBER 2007.

Mr. Domini: Originally this was passed in 2007, became active in January 2008. This is the Special Exception to run the storage facility at the former Big Bear site. The understanding is that the applicant is doing some other diligence work in the interim, exploring other options to use that site, but would not like to use their Special Exception. So they're requesting the extension through November 2008, which would be November 17th, an additional four months, to continue doing some diligence in the interim to explore other options. That pretty much sums up this request. What's been discussed internally is that there are some other things that may happen here that may be more favorable to the City, so I think it would be in our best interest to continue that extension for them, as there may be other opportunities for a better use of that site other than storage.

Mr. Feeney: So they're just asking for a four month extension, is that standard?

Mr. Domini: They're asking through November 2008 and I think we should just extend it an additional six months, because that is the length of the Special Exception Permit, so it wouldn't do anything out of the ordinary. That's just the time that they indicated they needed, but to be consistent, I think we should just extend it for six months beyond the expiration of July 17.

Mr. White: I recall this coming before us, I think, back in December. My impression was is that they were going to build a storage facility as well as a retail facility in the same location. Now we're being told that the real hold-up is that they want to dedicate it entirely to retail. Is that—

Mr. Domini: That could be a possible scenario. In which case the entire site could be reconfigured. That building, perhaps, could be removed and a whole new set of retail structures could be erected. So I think that the applicant is exploring every avenue to find the best use for that site. In the interim they're finding a demand for potential interest in the site for storage may not be the highest and best use for the site.

Mr. White: I would not oppose the extension. I'm just concerned that the applicant is not here and we don't have the criteria-- Oh, they are here? Okay. If they're here, that's fine. I was just concerned that they had not expressed their reasons for extending the time and they're asking for a full six months, which is the maximum period of time and I just wanted to have some explanation for that.

Mr. Feeney: I need to swear you in real quick. (Mr. Feeney administers oath.)

Mr. Jeff Stavroff: My name's Jeff Stavroff, the owner of 6300 E. Livingston Avenue. We have been-- When we first got involved in this project, our fall-back was to do storage and we thought it was a great site for storage, still do think it's a great site for storage. Over the last three to six months, we've had some increase in activity to re-tenant this building for large, big box retailers, and we've been negotiating, or talking with these tenants over the really last 60 days, and just wanted to still give that a shot as we are still going through our design phase to convert that to interior self-storage, which we are moving forward on in conjunction with talking with these tenants. We do not want to hold on any longer than November 1st to get started and pull permits to start doing the construction for the interior self-storage. So, with that being said, we are asking if we can get an extension from our original Special Exception.

Mr. Long: Mr. Stavroff, so theoretically you're working two avenues to occupy the old Big Bear on Livingston Avenue? The self-storage or for big box retail?

Mr. Stavroff: That's correct.

Mr. Long: If we had talked -- your extension wanting to go to November, and we were able to go ahead and extend it six months, does that improve our capability of a possibility with the large box store?

Mr. Stavroff: Yeah, it does. It helps -- I mean I think we still want to be able to get the right use for this building. If we fall out with our negotiations, or are unable to re-tenant that building with a big box retailer, then that will have us ready to go and be able to pull a permit to get started on construction November 1st. So we then could be open in the first quarter of 2009 for the alternative use.

Mr. Long: Okay.

Mr. Brusk: Is there any other explorations that you're doing besides those two?

Mr. Stavroff: Yeah, we are. We've been in negotiations with adjoining landowners to possibly do a complete redevelopment, but--

Mr. Brusk: And that is still somewhere in there?

Mr. Stavroff: Yeah, that's exactly right. We're really trying to do what's best for that site and for the City, and we've really been working on this pretty hard now. With

the activity that has just really come up, we want to make sure that there's no one out there that we can't re-tenant this building with. But, on the flip side, we want to put this building and this property use for the City and that's kind of why we're asking for that extension time. So then we can be ready, have permit in hand November 1, if nothing happens.

Mr. Feeney: Are there any public questions, comments? (No response.) Any other comments? (No response.) If not, I'll entertain a motion.

Mr. Brusk: I move that we grant this exception for Item C1.

Mr. Feeney: I'll second.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Long voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Motion carries.)

2. VARIANCE APPLICATION: 1719 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM TABLE 1181 OF THE REYNOLDSBURG ZONING CODE TO CONSTRUCT A MONUMENT SIGN GREATER THAN FIFTY (50) SQUARE FEET. CONTACT: TAD LAMB (32-ZV).

Mr. Domini: Table 1181 is basically the sign table that indicates what types of signs are permitted and the size in terms of square footage or linear feet depending on the type of sign, and also the setbacks for the sign. The Type A sign is dictated by the setback from the right-of-way, which I believe is 10'. This applicant is requesting a Type A ground sign, but it's greater than 50 square feet. It's closer to 100 square feet. Existing on the site is a 20' tall pole sign, approximately 80 square feet. Again, the applicant's requesting the variance to construct a ground sign that's approximately 100 square feet, with a 10' setback from the right-of-way. This is an existing location along Brice Road. It's the Astor Center. This traffic indicates the new sign location. It will actually extend somewhat into the parking area on the site. Here's images of the existing pole sign on the site. It's obviously somewhat of a dated sign for that center and we don't permit these types of pole signs anymore, so we'll be removing a non-conforming sign. This is an image of the proposed sign which will say "Brice Center," and the applicant has worked with us to match the character of the streetscape along Main Street that is planned to extend down Brice Road in the future. So the color and texture of that brick is closely matching what you see on Main Street.

I think what's important in considering this application is that this applicant is permitted three ground signs, because they have frontage on three different sides for the site.

Mr. Brusk: Could you show that picture?

Mr. Domini: Radekin, Astor and Brice. So they could potentially construct three ground signs at the site. What they're proposing is one. Certainly something you may

want to consider in approval is some type of condition that there won't be future ground signs at this location, because you're permitting higher square footage for this ground sign. So that may be something you want to keep in the back of your mind. Other than that, we have everything from the applicant and have presented it to you in your packet of information.

Mr. Tad Lamb: The only thing we'd add is that we feel this is a good solution to satisfy everybody, to help identify more tenants in the center, get the sign down to conform to the existing regulations now. We think it looks really good. It's probably a good idea to say that this will be the only free-standing sign on the property, that we'll not be asking for a second or a third in the future.

Mr. Brusk: And this meets the beautification program signage in looks, is that correct? Slightly different style.

Mr. Domini: I know that Luke originally worked with the applicant on the sign, so he'd probably be more familiar with that, but the applicant did work closely with Mr. Haire on that. I did not work with the applicant on the design.

Mr. Brusk: I believe most of our have the L-shaped base and then the sign sitting on that, but this would be too big for that, obviously.

Mr. Lamb: We've already been to Design Review a couple months ago and they unanimously approved the design.

Mr. Brusk: It's my feeling that this is a good compromise. I never have a real objection to one sign versus three, especially given a little extra space because of giving up of the other 100 square feet.

Mr. Lamb: And we're bringing the old sign down.

Mr. Brusk: That's what I'm thrilled about.

Mr. White: I see on the application, you have a picture here and there's a sign there. Is that someone else's sign?

Mr. Lamb: I don't understand the question yet.

Mr. White: I'm asking – I don't know if you have – we have an application here and there's a photograph. In the lower part I see a sign that says "29-something," an advertising sign. I'm wondering if that's your sign.

Mr. Lamb: I don't believe it's on the applicant's property.

Mr. Feeney: Is it in your photographs too, Aaron? Those are a little clearer than what we have here.

Mr. White: You don't have any other signs?

Mr. Lamb: No.

Mr. Brusk: That's not yours? If it is, will you take that one down, too?

Mr. White: One other question, with regard to the modification to the parking lot, you said the sign's going to come in a little bit. Is it going to obstruct the traffic in the parking lot in any way?

Mr. Lamb: It's only going to come out about 5'. We think we're clear and the Design Review Board thought that we'd be fine, also.

Mr. Long: How many tenants do you have in that property?

Mr. Lamb: Ten – sometimes 8, sometimes 10.

Mr. Long: So the sign that you're going to be putting up won't accommodate all of the tenants?

Mr. Lamb: Not necessarily, but that's the landlord's call.

Mr. Brusk: I would also want to restrict it to just four names maximum on the sign. Would that be a problem?

Mr. Lamb: There was some consideration that they could be four names on one side and maybe four different names on the other.

Mr. Brusk: That would not be a problem.

Mr. Lamb: Okay.

Mr. Brusk: But what would be a problem are real small—

Mr. Lamb: Yeah, I know. I totally agree with that. No, four is fine. You can't read them anyway if you get that small. They're useless.

Mr. White: What kind of illumination are you using for the sign?

Mr. Lamb: It's a standard, internally illuminated and I would imagine it would be on a timer to go off at a certain time at night, maybe 11:00 or midnight, although this is not a high residential area, it still probably would not burn all night.

Mr. Feeney: Do we have any other questions from the Board? Comments? (No response.) You're just asking for a sign that's 6" higher than what's supposed to be and

not quite twice as big. You're just asking for one sign versus three signs that you could put up there, and taking down an old sign that is dated.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Mr. Feeney: Okay. Well, I'll accept a motion.

Mr. White: I move that Item C3, variance application 32-ZV be approved with the condition that there be no other ground signs be placed in that location.

Mr. Brusk: And, secondly, that only four names per side on the sign.

Mr. Long: Second.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Long voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Motion carries.)

3. VARIANCE APPLICATION; 7364 WARWICK AVE., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1171.06(3)(C) OF THE REYNOLDSBURG ZONING CODE TO CONSTRUCT A GARAGE WITHIN FIFTEEN (15) FEET OF THE PRIMARY STRUCTURE. CONTACT: CHRIS BATT (33-ZV).

Mr. Domini: It's a pretty straightforward request. The applicant has a site that's currently zoned R-3 single family. It has one dwelling on the site and a single car driveway. The applicant wants to put a garage on the property and, due to some environmental conditions being trees on site, he's trying to locate the garage closer to the dwelling than permitted in an effort to save those trees. The applicant will talk about that in a moment. I have some images of the existing site and the existing structure here for you. You can see the one-car driveway there and then you have the tree that's located close to the property line that is, I think, of concern to the applicant as well as some pretty significant trees in the rear yard that line the back of the property. Those are approximate locations of those trees on the site. Staff's concern is that many of the properties in this neighborhood are configured similar to this and have similar constraints, so granting variances to locate a garage within that setback may set a precedent which you may be getting a lot more of these requests from similar property owners who, in the past, may have had a concern that they cannot erect a structure because of the conditions and the zoning code. So I'd be hesitant to grant the applicant the variance without some serious consideration and some conditions that you may put on this application, because certainly we get daily in the office applicants that come in that are wanting to build secondary structures on the site that are limited by our setbacks, in this case 15' from the primary structure, 6' from the rear property line, and 8' from the side property line. So, with that, applicant, if you'd like to come and address the Board.

(Mr. Feeney administers the oath to the applicant.)

Mr. Feeney: What I was looking at is can this garage fit on the site-- The first question I have, I guess, is can the garage fit on the site, meeting all of the setbacks?

Mr. Domini: Yes, it could, but not without the removal of some of the existing trees. We did some quick analysis in the office and there's approximately 37' between the rear of the house and the rear of the property line. Applying the 15' setback from the primary structure and then the setback from the rear property line leaves you 16'. So it would be tight, but it could be done, but not without the removal of those trees and the applicant would be restricted by the length of the garage. This image is of that neighborhood and I tried to indicate that there are a number of other dwellings that have detached garages, so it's not uncharacteristic of this neighborhood. I think some of these maybe non-conforming that have been built in the past, so could be grandfathered in. The blue star, the purple star there is the applicant's house. So it's not out of character of the neighborhood, I guess, is what I'm trying to show you.

Mr. White: If this garage were attached in some way to the house, it would not be an accessory-- Have you explored that option:

Mr. Chris Batt: I believe we talked about that a little bit. Like if I did an attached garage directly like on the side of the house, which you can't really see in this picture, there's another tree and I would have to say it's like plumb in the middle of my -- that tree right there in the bottom left corner, that's probably like right on my property line. That would have to be removed and I don't know the zoning law off the top of my head, but I don't think it would be in compliance, because my property line is very close right there to where the garage would be almost on his side. I mean, I don't even know if it would be wide enough to put the garage door on to tell you the truth, with it being on the property line, cause that's what I was initially looking into doing.

Mr. Brusk: What about in the back and have a side load garage? Is that a possibility?

Mr. Batt: To where it would be more like the middle of the back yard?

Mr. Brusk: It would be -- well, probably over a little bit on the back. Where your patio shows.

Mr. Batt: I was about to say pardon my drawing, I'm not a professional at this at all, but, yeah, I really don't know. I was initially thinking because the patio should be long enough, like I don't know-- What we were going to do this year really is just lay the foundation. We weren't even building the garage this year, but I didn't want to lay the foundation and not be able to build the garage. Like I said, I don't know much about this. My dad, who's been doing construction for years, is really taking charge of the project. He just wanted me to get all the paperwork done. I don't know if like a part of the foundation could be a part of that back patio. I don't think it would be deep enough. I know with foundations you have to have them so deep before they could be a part of it. I don't know if that's exactly what you were trying to say either.

Mr. Domini: I think what the question would be, given the way the rear of your house is configured, with utilities and windows and such, where your patio is now you could do an attached garage and have a side entry. So, in other words, where you've drawn the garage in there, you'd rotate it—

Mr. Batt: So it would actually just be attached on the back of the house?

Mr. Domini: Exactly.

Mr. Batt: Well, like I said, my question is would that patio be acceptable as part of the foundation?

Mr. Brusk: You'd have to check that.

Mr. Domini: You'd have to put in a new foundation.

Mr. Batt: Like that would have to be all dug up? I believe there is a drainage line running under that patio. I'd have to get that double-checked. I actually had a plumber out, I would say about two years ago, and he wanted us to install an access point for the drain, so it would be easier for him to work on it, cause he actually had to do it from inside the house in one of the closets. He said the only way that would be possible is to dig up that patio and, if we did that, that drainage line would probably have to be moved in some way, which behind the trees like the one near the little shed, there is sewage line and it goes from the house all the way there, and that would probably have to be dug up all the way from the house to there and replaced, because for how deep you have to put a foundation, it would probably run into that drain line. That's the only thing I could see, that would be the issue, I mean other than ripping up the patio and laying down a new foundation. I mean I wouldn't have a problem with having the garage there. I'd just have to look into it. I was more or less trying to get this done with as least damage to the yard, mainly the trees, and the most economically possible for me.

Mr. Brusk: What do you think the distance is going to be between the garage and the house?

Mr. Batt: I would probably say almost near the end of the patio, at least two-thirds down from the patio. Like this drawing isn't a very good – it's actually going to be moved back a little more. The driveway is going to be extended a little bit more to where it would probably be about 6-7' down from the house, but it would be running pretty much along that patio.

Mr. Domini: I guess the Board might – in order to make some type of determination, would want to know how far exactly from the house you want it.

Mr. Batt: How I had it measured out, I had 6' from the house along the patio, like from the back corner of the house.

Mr. Feeney: It looks as though you were going to have an attached garage.

Mr. Batt: I apologize for that.

Mr. Feeney: Do you have the size of the garage that you wanted to build?

Mr. Batt: It's the smallest, a 16 x 20. We were just going to buy a kit from 84 Lumber. It's the smallest one-car garage they have. Sixteen foot wide, 20' deep. It would just be closer to my property. I believe it's still within the zoning laws to my neighbor's property or property line with that 16', so it wouldn't be any closer to the neighbor's property line. It's not out of the zoning law with that, it's just closer to my house than it should be.

Mr. Feeney: So if you put it in and meet all the codes, you have to take down at least one tree?

Mr. Batt: Actually we wouldn't have to take down the tree. We were trying to avoid that. I had two tree companies come out and I did want them to at least prune it, because our power line is actually coming in close to that area as well. So to make clearance for the garage and for the power lines in the future, they were going to take down three of the larger branches and just do routine trimming. They said the tree was in good health, it just hasn't been maintained over the years. I noticed over the past couple years it was starting to drop more dead branches and stuff like that, but they said that's just because it hasn't been pruned and maintained to where it just can't get enough nutrients from the soil where it's at; but if it was maintained properly, then it should be able to stay. They both said that there was really no reason for the tree to go.

Mr. Feeney: Even if you meet all the codes, you don't have to take the tree down?

Mr. Batt: Well, one thing this picture doesn't show, even if I got rid of that tree, right where that tree line is, I want to say it's called an easement. I'm not exactly sure, but I would say at least the back 5' all along my property slopes straight down, so I think it would make it difficult to build on that as well.

Mr. Domini: The accessory structure is a storm water drainage – I'm sorry, I think it's a sanitary sewer. But, at any rate, the way the applicant is configuring this now it would be 6' from the house, 20' with the garage which would be 26', so there would be approximately 9' remaining.

Mr. White: I assume that we're considering -- at least he was considering having it attached to the house, so that would eliminate the 6' distance from the house to the garage.

Mr. Batt: I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

Mr. White: Well, what I understood you to say is that there would be a 6' difference between the garage and the house. But I was assuming we were looking at possibly having it attached to the house.

Mr. Domini: That was one scenario. I'm kind of running towards the scenario-- The attached garage would be a completely different scenario, but it's an option that the applicant has.

Mr. Brusk: That could be done without a variance, could it not?

Mr. Domini: Could be. I'm not sure if it would work for the applicant. My concern is that if the intent is to save the trees, putting a concrete pad for that garage back there is going to compact that root ball. It's already having trouble getting nutrients, that's going to exacerbate that problem, which may make it difficult for that tree to survive beyond the conditions it's currently growing in.

Mr. Brusk: I don't mean to be argumentative, but it would seem to me that putting the pad close to the house would be a lot less of a hit against those trees than putting the garage where he intends to, which would make it closer to the tree line.

Mr. Domini: Well, the grow zone for that tree is pretty large.

Mr. Brusk: I guess I'm saying it would be closer with the garage as he proposes it than a pad that would be next to the house.

Mr. Domini: It was 6' from the house, then 20' from the garage is 26', which takes you pretty close to that tree.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, it would be pretty close to the tree.

Mr. White: If the applicant is willing to consider an alternate route to what he has proposed in this application, mainly to attach the garage to the house, we would not have to consider this application. Basically he could withdraw it and come up with a different plan, it would not require a variance.

Mr. Batt: So the only way I could really attach a house is have it straight on the back of my house, like where the patio would be, correct? I mean because I don't think it would really work right next to the house. I mean that's where I would ideally like an attached garage, but it would pretty much be right on the property line, so I don't think that would work. So it would have to be basically right where the patio is.

Mr. Domini: If you look at that image in the bottom left, you could -- well, you would need 8'. If you attach it to the house just square off the house there, you would

need 8' to your property line, which you probably wouldn't get, if your property line is where that tree is. If you put it in the back and made it kind of square with the side of the house, you could probably get the turning radius to turn in to do a side entry would be one option. In that you're kind of restricted, because you need that width on the side if you were going to attach the garage directly on the side. I guess one option may be for you to ask the applicant to explore that alternative and table his variance request while he does some exploration to see if, in fact, he can do that.

Mr. Feeney: I would like to do that, because I know you mentioned you were just going to put the foundation in, so it's not that you need a garage for this winter. I think you have some options. I think you have room to put the garage in detached and still meet all the codes and have as big a garage as you want. You might have to take down a tree, but that might be better than coming up with a smaller garage and something that you don't want. So I think you have some options here and we can table this. But if you come back and you don't need variances, then you don't need to come back next month with your options and you can probably proceed. Is that correct?

Mr. Domini: Yeah. If you want to come in and see the survey of your property, we'd be happy to pencil some things out for you and see if we can make something work. This way the Board's not closing your application, but just giving you the opportunity to do some more digging. If it turns out that we can't make it work, you can come back and then we can present all the information we have done in the meantime.

Mr. Feeney: I think that's probably your best option right there.

Mr. Batt: Okay.

Mr. Feeney: So you request that we table this for at least a month and maybe you'll come back before that with some options?

Mr. Batt: Sure.

Mr. Feeney: So do we request a table? Make a motion?

Mr. White: I move Item C3, Variance application 33-ZV be tabled until the next meeting.

Mr. Long: I'll second.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Long voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. White voted "yes." Motion carries.)

4. VARIANCE APPLICATION; 2412 TAYLOR PARK, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1175.06(a) OF THE REYNOLDSBURG ZONING CODE FOR A REDUCTION IN FRONT YARD SETBACK (SHOULD BE REAR YARD). CONTACT; JASON ZADEH (35-ZV).

Mr. Domini: I'll briefly give a presentation for you and then turn it over to the applicant. Before I get into it, I will say we've been in close communication in the last couple weeks, Mr. Binkley with EMH&T and myself and Mr. Haire, prior to his moving into the other position. So we have been working with the applicant more so than we would other applicants because, given the importance of this site in the City and the scale of the development. Currently the property is zoned CS, Community Service. It's vacant. It's being graded at the same time as the Target site. This building is oriented on the site so the front of the building faces Lancaster Avenue or 256. Access to this parcel will be off of Taylor Park Drive after the extension is completed. I believe that extension is scheduled to be completed by August, somewhere in there. Again, the applicant is requesting a variance for the rear yard setback of 30'. The front yard setback for this site is 40' and there are no issues there. Just to give you an idea of what the other setbacks on the site are, there's a 20' parking area on the site which the applicant meets. Some images of the site – these were taken at the end of last week. As you can see, there's a lot of earthmoving happening there. The top left picture is taken – oriented towards the south. The top right is looking towards 256, as well as the one on the bottom. This is an aerial view of the site. I just put the site plan in there where that's going to sit. Obviously it's not to scale, but it's the approximate location. The parcel to the right is Logan's Steakhouse that you may be familiar with. This is a proposed site plan that the application forwarded on to me today, so this is very current. This is a color rendering that's a little bit different than what you have in your packets, but also very similar.

What I'd like to note that may be shown on this drawing and some of the other ones is that in the future they are proposing an ATM drive-thru, but that's not a part of the application today. That may be something that the applicant comes back in the future and wants to put in, but I think they're planning for that space now.

Mr. Brusk: Target would be up in the upper left corner of that picture?

Mr. Domini: That large sea of parking is where Target would be. It would be oriented towards the – I guess that would be towards the west. Then back – the other parcel is HH Gregg and the Lifeway Christian Bookstore is going in there.

Mr. Brusk: HH Gregg would be sort of in the middle above where we're looking.

Mr. Domini: Staff has talked with the applicant about some alternative configurations and the applicant's been very receptive to that and has done some work to explore and illustrate both the staff and for you how things could be reconfigured. I think the applicant feels that's least desirable. They are losing parking by reconfiguring the building facing towards Taylor Park Drive. The reason that option was explored was to try to meet the setback for the rear yard. So they have been receptive to explore alternatives to date, but the concern is, I believe, and I'll let the applicant speak, that the loss of parking is significant enough that that's something that I don't think they want to explore much further. But that is a reconfiguration where the front of the building is now

facing Taylor Park Drive as opposed to Lancaster Avenue and that would meet the setbacks. But, here again, you'd have to grant a variance for the parking, because it doesn't meet the parking standard. I think this site will require 53 spaces.

Staff's recommendation is that you work with the applicant to explore all opportunities here. We want the applicant to be able to do something creative here and provide the City with some new retail space. There are a number of options that we can look at. Absolutely denying the variance is probably the least favorable. We can obviously approve the variance, we can approve it with some conditions, some of which I may present to you tonight, or work on an alternative configuration.

One idea I had that I wanted to throw out there to both the applicant and the Board is that there could be opportunity to grant them a variance in the front yard, to move everything forward to Lancaster Avenue and give them some encroachment there. They could keep the configuration, but it would also give them some more distance to Taylor Park Drive than they currently have. So I think currently, given the nature of this site, from the size of retail that's trying to go in there, there are a certain number of limitations that will probably have to be discussed tonight. So, with that, I'll turn it over to the applicant.

Mr. Josh Binkley: Thank you. I'm Josh Binkley with EMH&T here with Mr. Jason Zadeh, Northstar Realty who is the developer. We're coming before you tonight – we've got a project here that's obviously kind of at the gateway to the City of Reynoldsburg and the client's very excited to be a part of the Target, the new center that's going in there, which would be on the western side of the property. Given the property – as you can see here, it's kind of a unique shape in how it kind of – I look at it as a piece of pie, if you will. So in order to try to make this site work, we're proposing to reduce the rear yard setback from 30' to 0'. That allows us to move the building closer towards Taylor Park Drive, which would then allow us to take the front of the building, which hopefully we'll be coming before Design Review Board next month, and siting it and setting it, and fronting everything towards 256. That's really the goal here. As Aaron has said, we have kind of been back and forth, entertaining the idea of what it would look like if we tried to make it work within the setbacks, and there is a big issue with parking. What happens to the parking, it kind of gets disbursed and is now on the side of the building as opposed to in the front. Not only that, 256 is the main thoroughfare out there and that's the thoroughfare that commuters are driving. That's the thoroughfare that tenants are going to want to be presented towards. If I could real quick, I'd like to hand out (speaking off mike – inaudible).

It kind of has a really nice presentation when you're driving down 256 with all of the businesses currently facing. What I've got here is I just kind of broke it up, you know, starting from the south looking north along the west side of the road, and then again from the south looking north on the east side of the road, just to try to show the look and the flavor. I think that as prominent as this location is, I think siting the building with the back toward 256, I just don't think it's desirable – not only not desirable, again from a leasing perspective, trying to get tenants excited about this, it's very difficult. I

think once the Design Review Board reviews the elevations, I think they will be pleased. These are items that have gone in front of Target as well. We've had to get their blessing. I think they're excited as well for this development. I really think that with the grades that are out there, the proximation with the Logan's Steakhouse and the rest of the presentation along 256, I think a variance in this case makes sense.

Mr. Brusk: The entrance to your property is just off of the, quote, unquote, proposed Taylor Park Drive, right? That extension?

Mr. Binkley: Correct.

Mr. Brusk: My thoughts are that, in effect, it's not really a drive that's there anymore. It's part of the parking lot that Target has. And I'm wondering if you could work with Target to move the green space down a little bit and allow that parking – the drive to be up a little bit so that you don't have to get a variance. In other words, reconfigure the – but that would be Target's deal and not yours. Or, even so, I don't see any problem with a setback into a parking lot and that's really what you're asking for, even though it's a road, it's not really at that point.

Mr. Feeney: It's a dedicated right-of-way.

Mr. Brusk: It's a right-of-way—

Mr. Feeney: Or is it?

Mr. Brusk: Not at that point. At that point, it's really the parking lot.

Mr. Binkley: I mean we kind of looked at it just as any other shopping center that has an out lot, and there's even a picture at the rear here of Smokey Bones, for instance, across the street. You know, they have the rear of their building right up against the kind of service drive. I really don't look at that as a road. Now, granted, that might be a different scenario, where it's not a technical property line, but it's the same situation. You're at the rear of the center. It's not a main thoroughfare. It's not a publicly dedicated right-of-way at that point.

Mr. Brusk: The only thing I would want to make sure is that you don't have constrictions to get into the lot or not. I would tend to agree that in this particular case granting the variance is not the same as granting – worrying about a property that you're moving up closer to the road where it really is the road, you know, the existing Taylor Park Drive, you know, further over to the north of that where the existing Taylor Park Drive is. That's real road there. Where you're at, that's not real road anymore. You're really parking lot.

Mr. White: I see that extension as being a very busy place when Target's located there. There's going to be traffic going to Target and it will become like a road. You were mentioning the steakhouse, I think there's an _____ back there. I don't

think that would be servicing as much as this location right here with traffic going to Target.

Mr. Binkley: Well, with Taylor Park Drive, knowing Target and the commuters that they draw, I think even on a max holiday you're probably talking 5,000 cars per day, where out on 256 you have 40,000 vehicles. There's also pictures in here as well of the rear of Logan's and the rear of IDG and, again, we're just trying to do the most – I guess the best looking presentation for the community. In our minds that would be facing 256, with the front towards 256.

Mr. Brusk: Again, my feeling is the best solution might very well be just to reconfigure the entry into Target a little bit so that it's less of a concern, maybe moving those islands up a little bit.

Mr. Zadeh: Jason Zadeh with Northstar Realty. First, my partner can't be here, but I'm appreciative of your time. Staff has, frankly, been wonderful to work with. We've not done business in your community yet and we're excited. We've been near. We've had projects in Pickerington and we developed the Target project across from your Lowe's on Broad Street, so we've been on your fringes, but we're glad to be here and we're certainly excited at the prospect of working on, really, what may be one of the key pieces entering into your community.

With respect to Target, having worked with Target now for going on 10 years, if I was able to get them to acquiescence on that, and I'm not trying to avoid work, that would be akin to moving a boulder in some ways. It would most likely become cost prohibitive, because they would look to us not only to permit it, to construct it, to do it 24/7 seven days a week so they don't miss their grand opening. And it probably, from an economic perspective, would make this project unfeasible. What we have done with respect to points of entry, and what you may not see on there, in working with Target, we did have a full curb cut at the northernmost point of ingress and egress into the project. We worked with Target to make that a right out only. The tendency, in our experience, for the customer would be the first moment they come to an ability to make a right, in this particular case into the parking field, they're going to take it. In this particular case, they really have two at minimum, potentially three, to make their move into the Target parking field. So we tried to make a full movement for ingress or the point of entry at the southernmost point, which would be the last option for them. That was the strategy relative to points of ingress.

(Gentleman speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Male: That's all been approved and they've already scheduled that construction, so I almost feel like that should be off the table, because—

(Gentleman speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Mr. Zadeh: I think a little bit of a backdrop is due. When we approach a site such as this, we go through all these exercises and, in fact, we have constructed multiple shopping centers locally here. An example would be in Hilliard at Truman and Cemetery Road, if any of you are familiar with that trade area. We developed the Staples and all the contiguous shopping centers. In that particular case, we made the decision to turn the building, because we wanted it to communicate to the front. We worked very hard to make a four-sided architecture presentation. We think we did that. Unfortunately we came to the conclusion that it's a tremendous challenge. It always still looks, in some way, shape or form, no matter how you landscape it, like the back of the building. So we always try to not focus that, make it a more subdued presentation. That would be one piece. Secondly, we also have determined, based on tenancy, where do we want to really communicate? In this particular case, 256 and I-70 are of vital importance to us. This has become a regional trade area. If you drive I-70, which I've done countless times and at all hours of the day and night looking at the site, it's a beacon. It not only translates to your community, it translates on a regional nature. You can see it clear as day from I-70. So the orientation of the building to the street, we thought not only – retailers aside, the leasing, I can push those matters. Just from an aesthetic perspective and how it presents itself, we thought this was the best approach. We worked with staff and we did apply some of their methodology long before we came into the process, so I wanted to show that.

Mr. Feeney: My question was about delivery of goods and you also mentioned the back of the building, no matter how you do it, is always a back of a building. My concern is about deliveries and the workers out there smoking in the back is always kind of a – I know it's not going to be on 256, but have you thought about that?

Mr. Zadeh: We have. We've had discussions with staff. We have done projects that don't necessarily have a loading area, that have front or side loading. And through the lease process we can manage some of that. Ultimately someone gets angry because a delivery truck shows up right when the mattress store wants to sell – it happens, but you can manage around it. In this particular case, what we did was we addressed a loading dock. The building's – ultimately we designed a four-sided architecture, very handsome colors. We've moved the utilities that you'd traditionally find on the back of a building, moved them all to the side, which are going to be screened with landscaping. That we came to the table with and it was also pushed on us heavily by Target. With respect to the loading, by making that a right out only and in conjunction with the landscaping, causes the movement of the trucks to go all the way up, not make a left in, come around, pull in – they will be limited to small beds – pull in, back out, take a right out. And Target was comfortable with it. They thought it was a manageable plan and we work very hard in our lease documents to try to control the timing of deliveries, because from 10 to 9 we need our retailers doing business. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Feeney: Yes, it did, thank you. The other question I had, it looks like the dumpster is going to be out by 256. Is that-- It looks like on your piece of property it would be the northeast corner.

Mr. Zadeh: Site plans, even with Josh's wonderful colors, don't necessarily paint the picture. There will be landscaping around it. We have, from an architectural perspective, I asked the members of our team to take the best pieces from Target, which are many, and create a four-sided architecture. The dumpster will match identically the material used throughout the building and it will be one material. So a combination of landscaping and that will completely screen the dumpsters.

Mr. White: Looking at the possibilities, actually pretty much the way you have it configured facing 256, have you ever considered possibly moving the building maybe northeast into the property a little more—

Mr. Binkley: There's a conservation easement. It doesn't show up on this plan, but it does show up – see that line? We're very, very close, especially what would be the northwest corner, that dashed line is a conservation easement (speaking off mike – inaudible) and there is a grade transition that we need to be cognizant of. That existing tree growth that you see (off mike – inaudible) quite thick and that's why staff and Target were really more than acceptable to moving the utilities to the side of the building (off mike – inaudible).

Mr. Long: Aaron, the berm between Route 256 and the proposed property here where the entrance ramp goes up onto 70 westbound, how high is that?

Mr. Domini: I guess I would defer to Josh on that one, because it seems like daily there's work going on up there.

Mr. Long: My question is, you talk about visibility from 256, by the time you've hit that area there, you're in a high speed zone. I'm hoping people aren't looking for local shops. Then also, depending on the height of the berm, they're going to have a tough time from the level of Route 256 seeing something off on the right hand side anyway.

Mr. Binkley: At this point on 256 when you're driving across – there's a picture in the packet that I gave you that was taken from Olive Garden, and you can see that the level of the out lot as it's been graded currently is pretty much the same level as 256 at that point. You are correct, there is a berm that's down closer toward the freeway that kind of curves up. Our intentions with the grading has been to elevate the site as much as we can obviously for visibility, and driving down there today, when you're stopped trying to make a left onto the 70 ramp, it is very visible.

Mr. Long: I'm considering more southbound traffic heading down 256 that are on the same side of the road as the property.

Mr. Binkley: Again, Target's not my project, I can't really speak to Target.

Mr. Zadeh: I think the grade the way it's – you can see in the bottom picture, it's either almost even with or a little bit above grade on 256 so that this parcel's almost kind of been plateaued a little bit. Before there was a berm where you would have trouble seeing the building, which has been kind of removed. So now you have a flat place that's almost plateaued a little bit from the drainage ditch there, maybe at or a little bit above the grade of 256.

Mr. Binkley: We're trying to get the building elevated and the grading of the parking lot, rather than _____, kind of doing a nice gradual grade transition so you'll have a nice view of it from 256.

Mr. Zadeh: I guess one option, Josh, we haven't talked about, but it could be something the Board would be interested in and I don't think it would necessarily change a lot, but what you'd have to do would be to allow you to get some more relief there from the building and the Target parking lot, would be to let you encroach into the front yard. Then you could continue kind of the landscaping that you see at Logan's. You could do some more screening with the Logan there, but basically, you wouldn't have to reconfigure anything. You would just kind of pick up what you have and move it to the, I guess, building encroach into that parking setback and the building would encroach there as well.

Mr. Binkley: Are you suggesting to try to get the whole 30'? Because currently we're on the 20' parking setback with our pavement as you see it.

Mr. Zadeh: Right. So you would get a variance for that.

Mr. Binkley: What about signage? Because at some point there—

Mr. Zadeh: That would be a condition that we'd have to make. The only reason I threw that out there was because I think it could give us more relief between the building and the Target parking lot. We might be able to do some more landscaping with the loading area, as well as the area between the back access walkway. I throw that option out there because I think it might provide a better streetscape, because it's more about this drive here as you're coming across the back of the building. I think it would be the least amount of work for you.

Mr. Binkley: The one issue that we have to be cognizant of is that is ODOT right-of-way. So any grading, as we start approaching their right-of-way, any grade transitions that we would need to try to make up in order to match the grades – the base for the road at Taylor Road Drive is in. I couldn't really say.

I think there would be an opportunity to take – if the 20 came down to, say, 15 or possibly even 10, we could get a little bit more green strip in there that would allow for some landscaping but, again, I think pushing the entire thing all the way forward, I want to be very, very careful not to get into ODOT right-of-way, which it would still require a variance, because there still wouldn't be a way to get the full 30' from the rear setback.

Mr. Feeney: I don't mind that idea to push it forward, because there's going to be so much green space between 256 and the property line, which is the fence – the white picket fence. If you'd move your building forward, we're going to have plenty of green space in there anyway between the road, and the ramp, and this property, that will allow some additional screening, maybe even better delivery in the back of the building.

(Male speaking off mike – inaudible.) I offer it up there as a suggestion to provide some additional relief to Taylor Park Drive. It may mean that you have to get two variances instead of one, but it's a subjective opinion whether or not that's a better plan than what we have here. I guess that's up to the Board to make that determination.

Mr. Feeney: I would think that, you know, we're eliminating a little bit of green space where there's a whole bunch of green space anyway, and we're going to add it in the back which is going to help some screening and help the appearance of their building, I think also as people come in there. I think it would just be a little bit better package.

Mr. Zadeh: We would be amenable to that. It has always been our spirit and desire, working within the constraints of sort of a trapezoidal site, to do as much along the back – we understand that cars will be moving, and Target, having dealt with them in the past, it's a fight not worth fighting with them. You know, you just sort of come and put your best foot forward. So we would be amenable to doing that.

(Male speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Mr. Feeney: We could modify the variance to allow whatever we wanted really, so we could do that tonight. I don't know if you need to do engineering work, though.

(Mr. Binkley speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Mr. Feeney: But we would be adding that 10 to the rear.

Mr. Binkley: Any further than that, I would not want to agree to, because, again, I want to make sure that the ODOT right-of-way – that's a whole different animal to try to stay out of.

(Conversations off mike – inaudible.)

Mr. Feeney: I think we can leave it a little bit open.

Mr. White: That additional space there, are you planning to put more plants in that area, that extra space? Is that your plan?

Mr. Feeney: Is there any other Board comments, questions? Is everybody clear where we are right now? (No response.) Okay. Okay, at that point I'll accept a motion to try to figure out where we're at on the changes. Aaron, do you have— Basically what we want to do is move the building forward 10' – a maximum of 10'.

Mr. Domini: How about between 8 and 10? A minimum of 8, a maximum of 10', with the intent of getting 10, but that way we'd have 2' there.

(Male speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Male: It could be in a situation like we just saw with the former applicant who had that Brice Road sign where he actually lost a parking space because it encroached on the parking area and they landscaped around the sign. And the applicant, as proposed, has, I think, an additional 10 spaces more than what's required, so we wouldn't have any issues with not meeting the parking requirements.

Mr. White: One consideration when the motion's formed, is that you're going to later come with a proposal for a drive-thru. Would the movement of the building forward prohibit the drive-thru?

Mr. Binkley: I don't think that would be a problem for them to get that in there. In fact, it might give them even more room.

Mr. Feeney: Okay, so we want to make a motion to modify the variance—

Mr. Brusk: I think what we ought to say is that we'll approve the variance with the following conditions: One is that they get at least 8' – move the building 8' forward to allow 8' of rear – up to 10'.

(Male speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Mr. Feeney: So it's at 40' now? Is that where it's at now?

(Male speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Mr. Feeney: Is that a problem, Aaron?

Mr. Domini: No, you might create a scenario where you could put the dumpster back in the loading screen as well.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, that that's a possibility, sure.

Mr. Binkley: So the dumpster would be permitted within the 40' setback.

Mr. Feeney: So we're amending the setback variance to instead of saying 40' to say 10'. Is that what we're saying?

Mr. Domini: We're saying we're going to allow the applicant to encroach into the front yard setback a maximum of 10'.

Mr. Brusik: Between 8 and 10, a minimum of 8, remember? Otherwise they could say 1' and then we haven't really gained anything.

Mr. White: My concern was, you know, the front doesn't concern me as much as the back.

Mr. Brusik: Well, no, but anything that they'd move to the front is added to the back. So if you only move it a foot in the front, you're only adding a foot to the back. That's why you need the 8' minimum.

Mr. White: My only point was – my real concern is with the back end, that there be some space there. The front seems like it's taken care of.

Mr. Brusik: That's where the minimum comes in. The minimum of 8' movement means that the back has a minimum of 8' added setback.

Mr. Feeney: The intent is to move the entire site, not to extend the building 8' longer.

Mr. Domini: Josh, do you know what the distance is between the access walk in the rear and the parking lot now—

Mr. Binkley: To Taylor Park Drive?

Mr. Domini: That green strip there.

Mr. Binkley: The green belt, I want to say is 2'.

Mr. Domini: So we could end up with 10-12.

Mr. Feeney: Right, which would make it pretty nice.

Male: The dumpster going beyond that original 40' would be acceptable as well?

Male: Yes. I'd be more than happy to work with that.

Mr. Brusik: So what we're considering is to grant the variance for encroachment into the rear yard as the applicant has submitted this application for. In addition, considering granting the variance for encroachment into the front yard a minimum of 8 and up to 10', and to allow the encroachment of the dumpster into the front yard.

Mr. White: One additional question. This application, I think we had a restriction of back space I think was 33 – we have 40' in the front, back space is 30. Could we say that the back space would have to be at least a minimum amount, just to make sure there is a space there?

Mr. Feeney: I think what we were trying to say is if we move this 8' forward, then there has to be 8' in the back.

Mr. White: I think we at least want to have a back space there so that we can feel comfortable that it's going to be there. I just want to make sure we have a back space.

Mr. Feeney: I'll make a motion for variance 35-ZV with the following changes: That there's a front yard setback of 20' – we'll allow encroachment a minimum of 8' and up to 10', and in the rear yard setback, whatever encroachment is in the front is added to the rear setback as landscaping or nonbuildable space. And we're also allowing the dumpster to be placed in the front yard setback.

Mr. Brusk: I'll second that one.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Long voted "yes." Motion carries.)

5. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION, 2412 TAYLOR PARK, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT USE, VACANT; PROPOSED USE, RESTAURANT/RETAIL; PRESENT ZONING, COMMUNITY SERVICE (CS); PRESENT OWNER TARGET CORPORATION. CONTACT NAME: JASON ZADEH (19-MS).

Mr. Feeney: I think we pretty much talked about the site plan.

Mr. Binkley: The only thing I just wanted to point out again was in Northstar's discussions with Target, it was to come to the conclusion of changing the full access cut that is there near the culvert to a right out to help traffic flow; then, obviously, the ATM usage.

Mr. Long: Your site lighting, is that matching Target's lighting or is this going to be a different type of system? Everything's matching? Okay.

Mr. Domini: Initially we weren't going to review the application with the ATM as part of the application simply because your packets went out, but the applicant wanted to make that change. We told the applicant that they'd have to wait till the next meeting because you had your materials and we didn't want to make any changes. But if you're comfortable with that configuration and you could approve that, it's going to be a Special Exception to the code. We don't just permit drive-thrus. So we'd have to go through the process of getting a Special Exception permit for that use.

Mr. Brusk: Doesn't that have to be published before we can vote on it?

Mr. Domini: Yes. We're not going to approve the use, but you can today approve it as part of the site plan and the future use.

Mr. Feeney: Okay, but they'll still have to come back and ask for it and it has to be published, but we can approve the site plan with the drive-thru.

Mr. Domini: In other words, you're not going to be reviewing the site plan, you'll be the site plan you've already approved.

Mr. Feeney: So if this whole site gets moved forward, the drive-thru, does that work better?

Mr. Zadeh: I don't see an issue at all with that. The ATM is kind of located where it is just based on where the setbacks kind of intersect. There shouldn't be an issue at all with that.

Mr. Brusk: By moving that forward, it shouldn't change the curb cut, should it for entry off of Taylor Park?

Mr. Domini: No, those would remain where they're at. The one thing it may allow us to do is introduce maybe a landscape peninsula.

Mr. White: I would be interested in knowing the traffic flow there, given the reduced space and how cars are going to come through that drive-thru and how they would get out. I'm not clear on that.

(Male speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Mr. White: Okay, so they wouldn't go through the main part of the parking lot.

Mr. Feeney: I know we've talked a little bit about the monument sign and this is kind of the entranceway into Reynoldsburg and I was wondering what type of signage – what it's going to look like, what you have planned there. The drawings we have you have a lot of signage on the building. I'm sure every tenant's going to want their own sign, but monument sign, I was wondering what that is.

Mr. Zadeh: To code, maximum height of 10' or 50 square feet. We currently are contemplating a base out of the same material as the building and we have submitted something with what I thought were – they were different colors and Target came back and asked us to match the sign in ways as sort of a miniature monument to the two pylons that are existing, so there will be white poles, blue cap and then internally backlit face, all white. It will look like a mini-version of the pylon without the sort of "peak" on it.

See how there's a blue cap, then the white portion says "Taylor Park," then the top part that has the peak? If you were to scrape off the whole top of it with the first blue cap and bring it down to 10' and put a brick base on it, that will be the sign.

Mr. Long: Aaron, on a property such as this, how many monument signs are they going to be entitled to along the green space on 256? A single one?

Mr. Domini: Technically they can have one per street frontage. They have two street frontages, so they can have two monument signs on Taylor Park Drive and 256.

Mr. Feeney: But the other monument sign would have to be on Taylor Park. They can't put them both on 256?

Mr. Domini: The way that site's configured, it would be really difficult to get a monument sign in there because of the 10' setback.

Mr. Long: If I may, the underlying operating document between ourselves and the big box limits all users on their out parcels to one sign. So we're constrained by an internal agreement.

Mr. White: So could we actually have that commitment that you do not desire – will not put a sign out there on the Taylor Drive area, a monument sign.

Mr. Zadeh: Directional signage we would seek, but monument, no.

Mr. White: What kind of lighting are you going to have on the building or in the area itself.

Mr. Zadeh: Well, the parking lot lighting is the smaller version of that which Target has.

(Male speaking off mike – inaudible.)

Mr. Feeney: Are there any more questions regarding the site plan? (No response.) With that, I'll accept a motion that we accept the major site plan with the provisions for a drive-thru—

Mr. Brusk: And a right turn on the west entrance.

Mr. Feeney: Do you want to make a motion?

Mr. Brusk: Well, you just did. I'll second it.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. White voted "yes." Mr. Long voted "yes." Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Motion carries.)

D. OTHER BUSINESS – None

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at _____ p.m.

Patrick Feeney, Chair

Aaron, Domini, Planning Administrator

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