

MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
May 17, 2007

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2007 MEETING

Mr. Kucera: Are there any changes, corrections, additions to the minutes of the April 19, 2007 meeting? (No response.) Hearing none, those will stand as approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Kucera: Are there any changes to the agenda? (No response.)

4. SWEARING OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Kucera: Anyone speaking tonight, please be sure to sign in if you haven't already. Anyone that wants to speak in front of the Board tonight, if you'll please stand and raise your right hand. (Mr. Kucera administered the oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Kucera: Is there any public comment on anything not on the agenda this evening? (No response.)

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Kucera: There is no Unfinished Business.

C. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Kucera: Would you read the first item, please?

1. VARIANCE APPLICATION; 7395 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1175.05 OF THE REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING AND ZONING CODE TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A ROOM ADDITION WITHIN THE REQUIRED SIDE YARD OF THE CC – COMMUNITY COMMERCE DISTRICT. CONTACT: ARTHUR J. OUELLETTE (11-ZV).

Mr. Arthur Ouellette: I'm Art Ouellette, the architect for this project.

Mr. Haire: If you basically want to go over what the proposed changes are.

Mr. Ouellette: I have here a building plan for the addition planned to illustrate how equipment will be set up to let you know why we need to build the way we do. Dr. Matheny's a dentist and he has a need to expand his business by a couple of chairs to kind of maximize the space he's got and become efficient. We looked at places where we could expand and we could either have expanded out the back of the building and lost parking, or expanded toward the side and we chose to go into expanding to the side. There's a minimum for efficiency for a width of an addition for 11.6 to get all our chairs in and have room to move around them and that 11.6 is what causes the addition to project into the building setback line.

Mr. Kucera: As I understand the information that was provided that this is actually behind an existing privacy fence?

Mr. Ouellette: Yes.

Mr. Kucera: Okay.

Mr. Haire: If you look at the photograph here, you can see the area with the white vinyl fence surrounding it, the proposed addition would be right in that area on the west side of the structure.

Mr. Ouellette: From the Main Street you would be able to see the roof of the addition.

Mr. Haire: That's basically where the addition would be coming out 11.6 from the current property and it would end up 5'1" from the property line or the fence.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any Board comment?

Mr. Feeney: I was wondering, is this a single story?

Mr. Ouellette: No, this is a two-story plus basement old house and the building beside it is about the same vintage and it's also a two-story converted houses that are now businesses.

Mr. Haire: The addition is one-story, though.

Mr. Ouellette: The addition is one-story, the building is two-story.

Mr. Brusk: The only concern I have is will there be enough space for fire department if required to get to either your building or the one next to it in the event of an emergency?

Mr. Ouellette: There's an alley, let me see--

Mr. Brusk: I'm talking between the two buildings?

Mr. Ouellette: Well, there will be five feet from our building to the property line, the fence, and then I believe its five feet clear from that same fence to the next—

Mr. Brusk: Would that fence be easily broken down by the Fire Department?

Mr. Ouellette: It's a vinyl fence in units, I guess.

Mr. Brusk: Okay. Yes, it looked a little closer than that and I was a little nervous about that.

Mr. Haire: Yes, I'd think it would be about ten feet total between the two houses.

Mr. Ouellette: I don't know how those vinyl fences come down?

Mr. Brusk: Probably pretty easy.

Mr. White: The proposed addition, is that going to be two-story as well?

Mr. Ouellette: One-story.

Mr. White: Okay.

Mr. Brusk: That's a beautiful house and they've done a wonderful job of rehabbing it.

Mr. Ouellette: I tried to match everything as much as I could to not take away from it.

Mr. Feeney: So I assume that the addition is going to match everything the way—

Mr. Ouellette: Yes, we're going to match that back roof pitch, the materials of that back roof so it will be kind of like a back porch being extended all the way around with the materials, the same wood siding, try to match the windows.

Mr. Haire: And that will go before the Design Review Board next month.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah. Okay.

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

Mr. Brusk: I move that we accept item C1, which is 11-ZV.

Mr. White: I second it.

Mr. Kucera: Call the roll, please.

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

2. VARIANCE APPLICATION; 1912 BALTIMORE-REYNOLDSBURG ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1181.03 (c) 1 OF THE REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING AND ZONING CODE TO ALLOW A SIGN ON THE WALL NOT PARALLEL TO A STREET. CONTACT: JERRY HETTERSCHIEDT (12ZV).

Mr. Jerry Hetterscheidt: Hello, my name is Jerry Hetterscheidt and I'm with Advanced Civil Design, representative for Kevin Jones who's constructing the Culver's Restaurant at 1912 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road. I'm here for a variance on the signage requirements for the zoning code. Right now the current zoning code allows that a sign can be put on the road frontage or access frontage for the linear footage of the building, match the square footage for that size of sign. Currently that's what Culver's has done. They've got a sign on the design for the front and the side where the access road is at and we're requesting one on the parking lot side. The frontage of the building with the side would allow for 138 square foot of signage. Culver's is not a very standout kind of a building. They are moderately decorated, so they are only using 39 square foot which is actually 28% of what's allowed for their signage. So they were requesting to put one on the -- take some of that signage and put it onto the parking lot side. That way this building is designed with basically two doors into the entrance. One on the drive-thru side, which is more or less just used for an exit and also to take food to the drive-thru and then there's the main entrance and that's where they want to put the sign is over the top of the main entrance to draw attention to where the main entrance is on the side. If you look at the picture over here, it shows the sign above the side door there. As you can see, there's no front door. This also allows for people that are driving along Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road to see the building and the sign. It's not blocked by any buildings on either side. I think that was something that

was submitted along with it to show that it gives a little visibility to the sign itself. The other reason for putting it over there is the access road, which is on this side over here, has a right-in, right-out only, so anybody that's coming along Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Rd. this way would see the sign that's existing there but wouldn't be able to turn in and would have to go down and turn around. Adding a sign on this side allows them to see it and drive into the parking lot itself. Plus, this kind of follows suit with the other buildings that are in that area. A couple of them have signs on the parking lot side also. The other ones that have signs are the Tire Discounter that has it on the parking lot side, there's a mattress firm, Sprint and Smokey Bones all have them on the opposite side from the access road or the road itself. So we're here to request a variance on the signage to put a sign on that side of the building. If you have any questions, I'm here to answer any questions for you.

Mr. Feeney: Is your request for both the north and south of the building?

Mr. Hettterscheidt: No, we're already allowed to have one on this side of the building, which is the north side, because it's got an access road on it.

Mr. Haire: This will be for the south side only. They are permitted a sign on the front and the side towards WesBanco.

Mr. Brusk: Luke, did those other places that he mentioned have to have variances to do that? I thought—

Mr. Haire: The mattress firm we granted a variance to and that was in exchange for them not putting a sign on the other building, on those two Slate Ridge buildings. We did an exchange for that and a variance was granted there. Cord Camera, a variance was denied. Fairfield Bank, a variance was denied. Tire Discounters was approved prior to my employment here, so I don't know how that was done. I haven't looked into it.

Mr. Kucera: I don't recall that coming up.

Mr. Brusk: I don't recall it coming up, either.

Mr. Hettterscheidt: Disregard what I said, then.

Mr. Haire: I know there's a sign on the side of the building facing the parking lot.

Mr. Brusk: That may be outside the variance, that's interesting. I don't think we've ever-- We don't disagree that it might be useful to you. We don't disagree that you have done a good job of keeping the amount of signage down. But, as precedent, we don't generally grant the extra signage because then it becomes standard and that's what we don't want to happen. So it's only under extraordinary circumstances, such as a major swap of something. At least that's my view on this.

Mr. Hetterscheidt: Okay. Is there a reason why you wouldn't grant it on the parking lot?

Mr. Brusk: We standardized the signs. Luke can probably do a better job of explaining it, but we have a standardized signage throughout the City that we wanted to make sure that's being followed. And whether that was the right thing to do, or could it have been done differently, it certainly could have. But once we did it, we wanted to maintain that standardization. Now you are going to have a monument sign, aren't you?

Mr. Hetterscheidt: Yes, we are.

Mr. Brusk: And that's usually the reason that we felt that we felt that there's plenty of signs usually with the building.

Mr. Hetterscheidt: Part of the reason for asking for the sign was to basically give a more visible right-of-way towards the front door. Obviously, when you're in the parking lot, you know where you're going to. But, like I said, it's pretty modest. It's not like it's standing out in your face.

Mr. White: Right. My guideline is to Code and if there is a requirement that you now have signs parallel to the street and you only have those for that purpose and you also have a monumental sign out there, I think that's sufficient to cover the signage. I was thinking, in your situation, instead of asking for additional signs that maybe you can increase the size of the two signs that are parallel to the streets. But then you threw me when you pointed out that there are two signs facing the southern direction -- I guess the northern direction of the street. That kind of threw me. I was not aware that we had granted that exception for that.

Mr. Hetterscheidt: Again, the northern one, it's kind of -- you've got the visibility but, obviously, you can't access it because of the right-in, right-out there when you're coming south on Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road. You see the sign, but you can't get to it. You have to go down, turn around and come back. The idea is to have the one on the south side so when you're going north, you can see it. It's a custard and burger joint. Custard is not something you sit at home and go, "Hey, I think I'll go get some custard." It's more of like a shopping mall sort of thing. You're walking along and you go towards the custard because it sounds like it's something good. That's why we wanted to put something on that side, because it's more of a instinctive--

Mr. Brusk: Is this custard like ice cream custard?

Mr. Hetterscheidt: Yes, and they have different flavors of the day every day. That's pretty much their big thing is their burger and their custard.

Mr. Feeney: Now you say you are going to have a monument sign. It's not on this drawing. Do you know where that's going to be? I'm just kind of curious.

Mr. Hetterscheidt: On the drawing that I showed you, it sets back up towards about the middle of the 40 foot building setback.

Mr. Haire: It's near the right-in, right-out. It shows on this drawing, I guess, in the bottom where it's kind of the landscape shrubs and things all around the bottom there.

Mr. Feeney: So it is going to be—

Mr. Haire: It's a 6' tall sign, 50 square feet. It's got a reader board on it, kind of rounded on the end, says Culver's.

Mr. Feeney: I think, in my opinion, that would catch my eye before something up on the building and sitting so far back if I was headed north. It's going to be right by the entrance too, so—

Mr. Brusk: For the northbounders.

Mr. Feeney: Yes. To me, when I'm driving along, something down here is going to catch my eye a lot more than something up there. And I think, also, there's going to be a lot of businesses coming in there and they're all starting to build now and signage can get out of hand if it gets—

Mr. Brusk: Yes, and we turned down two of the ones in your complex already and not only that, but in Taylor Square there's a Fifth Third Bank and they were kind of right there in the middle of the parking lot type of thing and we turned them down for the same reason. So it's precedent.

Mr. Hetterscheidt: I guess I was just kind of looking with Cord Camera, a lot of their parking is in the front so, they've got the sign already in the front there and what was the other one that was turned down?

Mr. Brusk: The bank at the corner.

Mr. Haire: Fairfield National Bank.

Mr. Brusk: Fairfield, that's right.

Mr. Hetterscheidt: And that one would have actually been blocked by another building I think, too.

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

Mr. Feeney: I'll make a motion to accept item C2, Variance 12-ZV.

Mr. Kucera: I'll second. Will you call the roll, please?

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. Kucera voted "no." Mr. Brusk voted "no." Mr. Feeney voted "no." Mr. White voted "no." Motion denied.)

Mr. Brusk: We are glad to see you moving in, though, and I'm looking forward to the opening of that restaurant.

3. VARIANCE APPLICATION; 8079 EAST BROAD STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1181.03 (c) 1 OF THE REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING AND ZONING CODE TO ALLOW A SIGN ON A WALL NOT PARALLEL TO A STREET. CONTACT: JOSHUA LYONS (13-ZV).

Mr. Brusk: Is this in that out section of the areas we've been looking at?

Mr. Haire: Basically this parcel is proposed for a National City Bank. It will be the first parcel east of Waggoner Road on Broad Street in front of The Shoppes at East Broad, kind of the wooded area. It will be the first parcel where that begins to clear, where it formerly began to clear, I guess it's all cleared now. So it will be kind of across from I believe where Max and Erma's is. It will be right in that area.

Mr. Josh Lyons: My name is Josh Lyons and I'm with GPD Group. We are the architects and the engineers for National City Bank. On behalf of National City Bank, I'd like to thank you for placing us on tonight's agenda. We are also seeking a variance for a wall sign on the side of the building not parallel to the street. I believe two things for this wall sign, it's mainly for the access ring road. If you're coming up the access ring road southeast bound, the monument sign that we have out front is a shared monument sign that the other out lot next to us and you would not be able to see that monument sign because our building is blocking that and you wouldn't see our main wall sign along East Broad Street. You would not know that that was actually a bank until you were already past the curb cut into the facility. Another item to note is that if we didn't have a wall sign on there the way the building is designed, I don't feel it would really be aesthetically pleasing to the community or to the bank as it would just be a large white panel with kind of nothing there. It would look kind of ugly. I'm here to answer any questions or comments.

Mr. Kucera: Do you have a larger site plan that would show the placement of this?

Mr. Lyons: I do not have that. I think—

Mr. Kucera: As I remember, this is part of that overall Lowe's shopping center thing and you mentioned that there's an access road.

Mr. Haire: The access road will run to the rear of this property and that will be the access road that runs in front of the entire strip center, I guess. The area to the west of this will be a reserve. It will be a wooded lot. There is a stream that kind of meanders through there. That will all be maintained and wooded.

Mr. Kucera: Again, as I remember, there's another monument sign down on the corner of Waggoner?

Mr. Haire: Yes, there will be a large monument sign there with a number of tenants on it.

Mr. Kucera: Do you have space on that sign, as well?

Mr. Lyons: No, we do not. We only have a space on the sign in the northeast corner of the parcel. It's a shared monument sign between our out lot and the adjacent out lot.

Mr. Kucera: I thought the big monument sign was also going to be a shared monument?

Mr. Haire: The big monument sign will be for in-line tenants that are in the shopping center.

Mr. Kucera: I see.

Mr. Haire: So back off of the road. The monument signs out front will be shared between -- there's nine out lots and I think that there's five monument signs, so each one of those would be shared between two and then one out lot would have it's own monument sign.

Mr. Kucera: Again, we have a dilemma here because yours is the first of probably about 12 out lots along the road there. I don't know how many there are.

Mr. Haire: There would be nine.

Mr. Feeney: I think there were nine originally.

Mr. Kucera: Nine out lots.

Mr. Haire: Yes, there will be nine.

Mr. Kucera: So we have a precedence problem here. And if we grant this, then each one of the future out lots will have the same request frankly. Is there—

Mr. Feeney: Again, is the monument sign going to be out front, out by the street and as you're coming down eastbound you're going to -- even if you had the sign on the building, you're not going to be able to turn in until you pass your neighbor and then turn in. So that monument sign is really going to do a better job than the sign on the side of the building.

Mr. Brusk: The difference here is that this monument sign is not an individual monument sign. Is it? Do you have one specific for your bank?

Mr. Lyons: No, it's shared between us and the other out lot.

Mr. Brusk: How many different names will be on that sign?

Mr. Lyons: Just two, the National City Bank and then there's a restaurant. I'm not sure what type of restaurant it is that will be on there with us.

Mr. Kucera: And the turn in isn't for a ways down the road, correct?

Mr. Haire: It's after the next parcel. So it will be this parcel, the one east of it and then there'll be another right-in, right-out there.

Mr. Brusk: If you're heading east and you pass the bank, there's no more entrances is there?

Mr. Haire: If you pass the bank, there'll be one more parcel and then there'll be a right-in entrance.

Mr. Feeney: Oh, there will be one more.

Mr. Brusk: The difference between this and the other sign one though is that this one is on Broad Street as opposed to our central part of Reynoldsburg, so we kind of treat this a little differently.

Mr. Feeney: Is Broad Street inside or outside Reynoldsburg? Where is the corporation limits? Is it on the south side of Broad?

Mr. Haire: None of Broad Street is maintained by Reynoldsburg. It's all the City of Columbus. So everything north of Broad and all of Broad Street itself are in Columbus.

Mr. White: I'm trying to identify where exactly this sign will go on the building and I have your diagram. I was wondering if you could actually-- So it's the part that's facing the parking lot?

Mr. Lyons: Right.

Mr. Brusk: Where's the sign he wants? Where you were pointing?

Mr. White: So my point on that is that sign is visible to people who have already come into the area and basically would see your building at that point in time, would they not?

Mr. Lyons: That's correct, but my main concern is that if they are on the access road when they pass our curb cut right in front of the parking lot, they're not going to know the bank's there and there's no identification. They are already going to be past the bank and have to turn all the way around to get back in.

Mr. Brusk: Will this sign be visible from Broad Street?

Mr. Feeney: I would think you'd want more of a sign on the east side more than the west side, because the west side is going to have all the trees. It's our understanding that they are going to keep the creek that goes through there and as many trees as the can.

Mr. Haire: If you look to the top left corner of this drawing, that's where that culvert goes underneath Broad Street and that's where the stream actually goes. So if you look on this drawing where that little finger of wooded area just above the star, that's that creek going under the road. So this will sit just to the east of that, of where the star is. I don't know how visible it will be from Broad Street because of the wooded area.

Mr. Feeney: it may not be visible there anyway and the monument sign is probably going to be your biggest draw again.

Mr. Kucera: You have kind of a point with the access road out there. What prevents from putting a monument sign in the median there out there at the entrance into the bank as opposed to one on the building.

Mr. Feeney: They come back around and they get back on that access road and they can see your sign on the back side.

Mr. Lyons: The location of the monument sign was all developer driven. We really didn't have a play in that location at all.

Mr. Brusk: The Limited still has their say on those type of things, even the back part don't they?

Mr. Haire: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: So that's why that's a problem. Makes sense, but it's a problem. My personal view is that we should look at this differently than we do the areas in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Kucera: It's still Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Brusk: It is Reynoldsburg, but it's not contiguous to the rest of our commercial at all. And they're competing with Columbus, which doesn't -- and I think that the shopping center so far has done a wonderful job of making ours look a whole lot better than anything else around there.

Mr. Kucera: Except that the—

Mr. Brusk: And I'm not sure that having a sign on the building is going to detract from the area, or that it's going to overload us with signs. He has, I think, an excellent point that on the access road they don't have a good indication that when you're driving there that—

Mr. Kucera: And the next guy is going to have the same problem.

Mr. Brusk: Yes, but I don't see a problem with that having those signs.

Mr. Kucera: The next guy down is going to have a sign facing Broad Street. He'll be allowed a sign facing to the east for the access road and then he'll come in and want a sign on his west side, so that the eastbound people can see him and the people on the access road can see him because his neighbor's got one.

Mr. White: Yes, we're creating a precedent.

Mr. Brusk: It would be a precedent, but I can see that we could use that type of precedent in this area. I wouldn't do it in the rest of Reynoldsburg, but I certainly don't —

Mr. Kucera: So every one of these stores here can have a sign on all three sides?

Mr. Brusk: That may be or maybe not. That's something to consider. Would that be a problem, number one, and, number two, if we did it, limit the size. I don't like the idea of that big of sign.

Mr. Lyons: Yes, certainly we were proposing two of the same size sign and our client, National City, is open to reducing that sign down significantly.

Mr. Brusk: I would think that the back sign would be limited to ½ or 1/3 of the size of that, because it's only purpose is to catch the people off of the access road. And you're right, the other people may have the same problem and I don't see that as

being a disaster. I wouldn't like to see huge signs, but I personally would not find that that offensive and I can distinguish this from our Reynoldsburg -- other stores and so on, because this is a whole different area.

Mr. White: I consider it to be a part of Reynoldsburg and should—

Mr. Kucera: I don't agree.

Mr. Feeney: Let me go back to the monument sign out on Broad Street and it's going to be a two client sign. Do we limit the size of that?

Mr. Haire: It's all been determined how large those will be. Each tenant gets a certain amount of space on there.

Male: So it's not going to be just a six foot tall sign?

Mr. Haire: I don't even think it was six feet, I don't know. You didn't submit that as part of your package, did you?

Mr. Lyons: No, I didn't. That was part of EMH&T's—

Mr. Haire: Right. It was already approved as part of the Comprehensive Sign Plan. I don't recall how large they were, but they're all going to be basically a brick sign with channel letters attached to them.

Mr. Lyons: When I spoke to them this week, the signs are 6' tall and 14' wide. The entire thing, I don't know how large the dimensions for each panel are.

Mr. Haire: Right and then there will be basically alternating, the tenant will be on the street side on one side of the sign and then there will on the interior side on the other side of the sign, so all of that has already been determined as well.

Mr. Feeney: So that matches the same size as like our Main Street signage?

Mr. Haire: It will be a little larger.

Mr. Feeney: Larger, okay.

Mr. Haire: What we have down here is six feet and 50 square feet. So most of them are 6 x 10, so they're on a one foot base with a 50 square foot sign on it.

Mr. Feeney: And, again, what was the sign going up on Broad Street? Six by what?

Mr. Haire: Six by 14 is what Josh just mentioned.

Mr. Kucera: One way to look at this might be to look at it as though this sign faces the access road, and that the next plot down will get a sign facing Broad Street and also facing an access road. And on the other side of that access road, then you will have a store that will have a sign facing Broad Street and facing the access road. So that here, in the sense that this is facing the access road to a degree, we could bend slightly and say, "Okay, it's not a direct parallel to the access road, but it's close."

Mr. Haire: Basically what the Code says is that a wall sign may be erected on a wall of a building which most nearly parallels the street, parking lot, or service drive as determined by the zoning officer. It includes parking lot in there as well for situations like the in-line strip mall to the rear of this. Their only frontage will be a parking lot. So in those situations we allow for signage to face the parking lot. We could allow for them to face an access road. If you give me that determination, then that's how the Board when it wants to interpret this Code, then we can follow that standard in this situation.

Mr. Brusk: Then we wouldn't need a variance.

Mr. Haire: Correct.

Mr. Brusk: So you're the one who has to determine it.

Mr. Haire: If you could grant the variance today, then I won't bring you any more in this particular center based on it's your determination that these face the access road.

Mr. Brusk: I see what you're saying.

Mr. Feeney: Yeah and the access road, I'm seeing what Tom's saying here, it's kind of going at an angle and half the building is facing the access road, if not -- I don't know how far that access road continues on. It could very well face the whole thing.

Mr. Kucera: Well the access road runs the length of the—

Mr. Feeney: Yes and it's angled up there and--

Mr. Haire: It basically angles separate from the way Broad Street angles and they kind of get wider as they go down.

Mr. Brusk: Again, personally I would grant this variance with or without that stipulation on it.

Mr. White: I have one question. If you're saying that we can actually -- or at least the Code provides that we can have signage facing the parking lot, does this not meet that requirement? The proposed sign is facing the parking lot.

Mr. Haire: In the past it's been the policy of past zoning administrators here that that would only be granted in situations where the only frontage a business had was on a parking lot. Exactly this situation of The Shoppes at East Broad, basically the strip mall in the back, their only frontage is a parking lot. So the only place they can have a sign is on a parking lot. So that's the only situation we've granted that type of sign permit in the past based on it facing a parking lot.

Mr. White: We do allow signage facing an access road?

Mr. Haire: Correct.

Mr. White: So, you're saying the building faces the access road more than not?

Mr. White: It's more than 50 degrees.

Mr. Brusk: But it's close. I would prefer to grant the variance on the need for visibility due to the fact that the access road doesn't give visibility to the entrance, with the stipulation that the sign be reduced in size by some factor that we agree on. That would be my personal. If we do it the other way, then the size of the sign is whatever is allowed, which would be what 50' or whatever it is.

Mr. Kucera: Well, we could also -- if we're going to interpret things the way they are, I'm sure that National City would work with us on the size of the sign. When I feel more comfortable making an interpretation that this—

Mr. Brusk: That the side of the building virtually faces—

Mr. Kucera: --that there would be no visibility from the access road and it's the access road that's the issue here.

Mr. Haire: But, in the future, you'd look at it facing the access road on the rear of the structure the majority of the time, depending on how the building faces.

Mr. Kucera: Right.

Mr. Brusk: But in this particular case we could say that it mostly does. And we're not talking about signs on the back also, are we?

Mr. Haire: Not in this case, no.

Mr. Kucera: That gives us some protection for future out lots.

Mr. Brusk: That one doesn't set a precedent, you're correct.

Mr. Feeney: I agree with Tom, the way I look at it when he brought up the access road, it really does come around there and the building faces it.

Mr. Brusk: And I looked at the access road as being a hardship since they can't see it from there. That's the difference. Mine would be a pure variance, but with a hardship, so that we're not doing it just willy-nilly, that there's a rationale for it. So—

Mr. Feeney: I agree with that.

Mr. Brusk: We can do it either way. My concern is that if we state that we feel that this access road -- that the building is parallel -- then, in the future there won't be a variance, but maybe the buildings really shouldn't have it then. This one, I think, needs it. Do you think that there would be a situation where there would be too much signs if we did it the one way versus the other?

Mr. Haire: It just depends on how the future buildings there lay out. Like with the current code the way I would interpret it now, they would be permitted a sign on the front and on the rear of the building. There wouldn't be signs on the sides. If they wanted to put signs on the side, which I imagine you'll get further requests in the future, that would be back in front of this Board again.

Mr. Kucera: And that's why I would like to go with a hardship on this as opposed to interpreting this as being along the access road so that the side would be automatically acceptable at the other buildings. At least we would be able to look at each one if we did it by granting a variance.

Mr. White: The way I see this, if we do allow this, we have three signs on the building and I don't know if we were -- what's needed is a smaller sign that's facing, I believe, Broad Street.

Mr. Brusk: East.

Mr. White: Oh that's facing east.

Mr. Kucera: The 3N sign.

Mr. White: Yes, the 3N sign.

Mr. Kucera: 3N or 4N sign.

Mr. White: Is that's facing east?

Mr. Lyons: I'm sorry, which sign are you referring to?

Mr. White: On your diagram, it's 3N.

Mr. Haire: 3N is the sign above the ATM machine.

Mr. White: Oh, okay.

Mr. Haire: Typically, we don't count that as a sign based on the size. It's more of a directional.

Mr. Feeney: I keep going back and forth on these things. I'm trying to list a good reason to grant it. I know that there's going to be a lot of trees, vision coming down Broad Street and, again, you're probably going to see the monument sign before you're ever going to see anything on the west side of that building.

Mr. Brusk: I don't think this is for either Broad Street at all. I think it's only for, am I right, that the reason for this sign is not for Broad Street, but it's for the access road. Is that correct?

Mr. Lyons: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: The problem that they have is that as they go along the access road, they see a building, but it doesn't have identification at that point, so they go past it. What they're asking is identification on that building that you see from the access road and that's different. So that's why I'm calling it a hardship insofar as without it they have a situation where cars could get into a problem where they have to make U-turns and cause problems in that regard.

Mr. White: I see.

Mr. Feeney: Then they aren't going to put a monument sign in that island between the parking lot and the access road, right? That's not an option?

Mr. Lyons: No.

Mr. Brusk: The Limited controls that whole thing. They might be able to do it, but they'd have to go through hell and high water to revise their signs that we've already gotten approved, because The Limited investigates real carefully and—

Mr. Kucera: And we shouldn't? We shouldn't be as particular as The Limited?

Mr. Brusk: No.

Mr. Kucera: I don't agree with that at all. I think we should be every bit as much as particular in interpreting our Code as The Limited is.

Mr. Brusk: I don't think so.

Mr. Kucera: Well, go up to Dublin. Dublin has done an excellent job with being very strict on their Code and it hasn't prevented a bit of development up there.

Mr. Brusk: Okay.

Mr. Kucera: If you're going to establish a Code, you follow it.

Mr. Brusk: I'll let you make the decision then.

Mr. Kucera: It's the Board's decision.

Mr. Brusk: Well, I mean you being the Board. But somebody has to come up with the, I'm coming up on one side, you're on the other, so we need to resolve that as far as how we're going to—

Mr. Feeney: My big problem is this first building. Now all of a sudden now we're asking for a variances. We have eight more lots yet to discuss and I hate to set a precedence and I don't see anything wrong with coming back also at a later date and put additional signs up if that's required, too. It's hard to take it down. It's easy to put another one up. Again, the monument sign is going to draw people in. I think a monument sign on the back side in that island and to an access road would do a lot better than a sign on the side of the building. I understand that people driving down the access road. Again, I think this one sign on the west side of the building is not going to help direct people coming in, because they're going to be coming in from headed west. But a monument sign in that little island between your driveway parking lot area and the access road, a small sign there saying National City, I think that would do a lot better directing people into your business. I know it's not part of this package, but that's something that I would consider.

Mr. Lyons: What would then be the setback for a monument sign? That would probably be somewhere in the asphalt pavement out there.

Mr. Haire: On the rear?

Mr. Lyons: Yes.

Mr. Haire: We wouldn't have a setback. It's not a public street.

Mr. Feeney: Lucas, would we control that signage as part of our signage or sense it's that far back is that part of -- do we control that at that point?

Mr. Haire: As far as permitting?

Mr. Feeney: Yes.

Mr. Haire: Yes.

Mr. Feeney: Okay.

Mr. White: So there is a possibility of putting a sign out there in the concrete area of the island as opposed to putting it on the wall?

Mr. Haire: Yes, I would think so.

Mr. White: I agree with that then. I think that would be a better modification than putting each sign up on the wall there. What your concern was is to direct the traffic once it gets into that area to your location and all you need is a sign there to show—

Mr. Lyons: That's correct. They will know already going westbound the bank's location, because they would have been notified from the monument sign along East Broad Street.

Mr. Feeney: Would that monument sign inside need a variance?

Mr. Haire: It shouldn't, depending on what size they want to do.

Mr. Kucera: I do have a concern about the architecture here and that side would look a little naked without some kind of a sign up there.

Mr. Lyons: That's what my earlier statement was that I just feel it would be ugly and aesthetically it wouldn't be pleasing. It would just be a white panel out there. Certainly we would be open to reducing the size of that sign.

Mr. Haire: The issue with the monument sign is we permit one monument sign per lot unless it's a corner lot. I was incorrect. You would not be permitted to do a monument sign in the rear without a variance.

Mr. Brusk: And that would be a horrible precedent to set, truthfully.

Mr. Haire: Correct.

Mr. Brusk: I'm going to jump in, if you don't mind, and make a motion.

Mr. Kucera: Well, we need to see if there's anymore Board comment? (No response.) Is there any public comment? (No response.)

Mr. White: I just want to make a comment that I do think this situation is very unique in that we don't have a parallel situation. It's not close to the access. I mean it's not parallel to the access road and it does create a unique concern. So I think this may well be a situation where there is some need created by the actual uniqueness of the lot figuration, so it may be some reason for allowing a variance for the situation. So I'm just expressing that.

Mr. Feeney: I think my thoughts earlier in the week when I was looking through this information was, well, this building is the closest building to Waggoner Road, so really the west side of the building faces Waggoner Road and there's nothing else there between this building and Waggoner Road, so somewhat theory that it would be allowed anyway, because it would be the corner lot so to speak. I was kind of leaning in favor of it simply because of that fact.

Mr. White: The reason I say it's unique is because apparently this is the first lot after the set of trees and that kind of prohibits anyone from seeing the building coming east on Broad Street. I think that given that, there may be some need to be able to locate the building in some way because of the unique lot configuration.

Mr. Brusk: Therefore, I move that we approve item C3, 13-ZV, granting the variance due to the hardship of not being able to spot it and I would like to put a stipulation that the sign be reduced by 50%. Do we have a second?

Mr. Feeney: I'll second that along with that this is the first lot adjacent to Waggoner Road and it is a very unique lot on this piece of property.

Mr. Kucera: Okay, if you'd call the roll, please.

(Mr. Haire called the roll. Mr. Brusk voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. White voted "Yes, but I don't want my vote to be interpreted as precedent for the future buildings in that area. It's only because of the uniqueness of the lot." Mr. Kucera stated, "Again, echoing the discussion on the particulars of this lot and it's location and visibility, I'm going to vote for it." Motion carries.)

4. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION; 8079 EAST BROAD STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT USE, VACANT LAND WITH TREE REMOVAL TAKING PLACE; PROPOSED USE OF LAND STRUCTURE, FREE-STANDING BANK WITH DRIVE-THRU FACILITY; PRESENT ZONING, CS – COMMUNITY SERVICES; PRESENT LESSEE'S NAME, BILL STEVENS. CONTACT NAME: JOSHUA LYONS – GPD GROUP (04-MS)

Mr. Lyons: Again, we are also here tonight seeking approval of major site plan for the National City Bank site. As you can see after you enter our site from the access drive, we have one-way traffic throughout the drive-thru with a dedicated by-pass lane and we have two-way circulation throughout the rest of the parking lot. We've met Code for the number of parking spaces. We've got 30 on our site and we've also got landscaping proposed in the islands throughout the parking lot and also around the perimeter of the building. Thank you.

Mr. Kucera: Will there be any, other than the signs, will there be any lighting on the building shining into the parking lot?

Mr. Lyons: No. There will be lighting on the interior of the entrance on the soffit to help illuminate that area because we find light posts to be aesthetically unpleasing, so we don't typically place them around the front of the site. You can see our light poles where they're located at on the site.

Mr. Kucera: And these are downlights as opposed to – they're dark skies compatible type of lights?

Mr. Lyons: The light poles on the site right now?

Mr. Kucera: Yes.

Mr. Lyons: Yes, they are horizontal and they just face down. Horizontal cut off fixtures.

Mr. Kucera: Yes.

Mr. Haire: I think that's all restricted as part of their zoning overlay when it was approved. The type of lights and then the height is restricted as well.

Mr. Haire: Was there a dumpster needed for this location?

Mr. Lyons: No, National City doesn't use a dumpster. They have a document bin. It's in a screened in enclosure on the back of the building where all their confidential papers go.

Mr. Feeney: The trees that you plan on planting out on Broad Street, what type of trees are they? Are they going to be dwarf trees?

Mr. Haire: They are on an approved street tree list for the City of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Feeney: They are? I just wondered if they were going to be 6' high trees and all these signs you're putting up here, nobody's going to see them.

Mr. Haire: And eventually they probably will get large. I don't know if they proposed some of the large, we have three categories: small, medium and large trees that they can plant and the spacing depends on what type you plant. I think anywhere from 25 up to 45 feet depending on if you do a small—

Mr. Lyons: The large trees along East Broad are Red Maple trees.

Mr. Haire: They'd be pretty large.

Mr. Feeney: You're going to hide the building eventually.

Mr. White: It's noted in the staffing report that there's no dumpster shown on this site. Are you planning to have a dumpster there?

Mr. Lyons: No, we just have a document bin for the employees where they put all their confidential papers. It's on the rear of the building in the screened enclosure.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any other Board comment? (No response.) Is there any public comment? (No response.) Can I have a motion?

Mr. White: I move that Item C4, Major Site Review application 04-MS be approved.

Male: I'll second.

Mr. Kucera: Can you call the role please?

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

5. VARIANCE APPLICATION; 1200 SOUTH WAGGONER ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1180.11 OF THE REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING AND ZONING CODE TO VARY FROM PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS. CONTACT: NIKKI ROSS (14-ZV).

Mr. Kucera: Why don't we go ahead and read item 6 as well.

6. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION; 1200 SOUTH WAGGONER ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: PRESENT USE, A3 CHURCH PROPOSED USE OF LAND STRUCTURE, A3 CHURCH; PRESENT ZONING, SPECIAL; PRESENT OWNER'S NAME, MESSIAH LUTHERAN CHURCH. CONTACT NAME: NIKKI ROSS (05-MS)

Mr. Kucera: And as I understand this, basically what we're doing is there was a proposed parking lot and we're reducing the size of that parking lot?

Mr. Haire: What happened in November of last year they came through and received approvals for the building expansion and parking lot expansion. I think that probably didn't fit into their budget, so they went back through and reassessed their needs at this time. Nikki can probably explain that better.

Ms. Nikki Ross: I'm Nikki Ross. I'm with Meacham & Apel Architects. I'm here tonight to talk to you about the Messiah Lutheran Church project. I'd also like to mention that Dave Dahnke is here. He's a representative of the church's building committee. We came through in November seeking major site plan approval, which we received with a much larger parking lot. I'd like to also mention at this time that we do

presently meet the required parking with the existing parking lot, but we were originally proposing to add more spaces. Once we started putting some numbers to the project, we found that to meet the goals of the church and to meet the budgetary needs of the church, we needed to scale back some of the site work and the parking lot was the major thing that we scaled back. So what we're doing tonight is we're requesting a variance so that we can add just 12 parking spaces along the back row and do that without the required parking islands that are typical of your Code.

Mr. Kucera: The parking lot as it exists was probably built before the Code with the island requirement?

Mr. Haire: Correct. This Code went into effect in January of 2004. My main concern was that if we allow this expansion and there's future expansion proposed, that the future expansion will also feel that a variance is -- basically it will set a precedent for them to ask for a variance on that as well, because they weren't required to include it in this area. And they are proposing a much larger expansion in the future.

Ms. Ross: I'd like to mention that that expansion is probably not going to happen for the next decade. It might be ten years out, maybe more. And this is a really unique condition in that the area to the north of our proposed 12 spaces, as well as the area to the south, both contain mature landscaping. And we would have to lose at least five trees on either end to take the extra square footage we would have to add the two interior islands. It's kind of a Catch-22 situation where you would lose at least five mature trees to gain two 2-inch caliper trees in your islands.

Mr. Kucera: Lucas, wouldn't that count towards the landscaping or not? The trees that they'd be removing.

Mr. Haire: Right, they would count towards -- I mean if they remove trees, they are required to replace them. But in this situation, the variance is basically for interior landscaped islands. And because those are on the exterior of the parking lot, they are basically surrounding the parking lot, those don't count towards the requirement. They require a certain amount of square footage based on the number of spaces. For every ten spaces, they are required 200 square feet of interior landscaping, whether that would be a landscaped island or some type of peninsula out in the middle there.

Mr. Kucera: Would those islands be able to be put in at a future date when you expand into the rest of the---

Ms. Ross: I believe that they would.

Mr. Haire: They're not shown on the proposal, so that's what had me concerned that there was no intention for them trying to meet the Code in the future either.

Mr. Brusk: But what if we approve this with the stipulation that (a) when they do the larger expansion that that no variance will be given and (b) they bring this up to the requirements. Is that a possibility? Based on what you're telling me, there's lots of green space around there, so we're not making it less acceptable visually. Or am I wrong?

Mr. Feeney: I think the thought of the Code is you have a huge mass of parking lot, asphalt, and you break it up with some trees.

Mr. Brusk: But we're talking about 12 parking places?

Ms. Ross: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: Which, you know, isn't going to make any difference in the short run on this. But, in the future, I would be concerned that the major expansion that they want to put in would need that. And, at that time, I would be looking at the area that they've just done as being part of that as to the requirements for the addition of vegetation.

Mr. White: I would be interested in adding a little bit more to that condition. Since the older parts of the parking lot have not met Code and if we were to allow the additions here, and looking forward to future additions, maybe we should consider a stipulation that we will grant this variance, but if you were to expand, then you would agree to add islands to the totality of the parking lot area.

Mr. Brusk: Would the church be willing to do that?

Ms. Ross: I believe the church would be willing to do that.

Mr. Brusk: That's even better than mine. I like that one.

Mr. Kucera: What's driving the 12 spaces?

Ms. Ross: You will note that the spaces from the existing plan -- I believe the proposed plan that you saw in November are now located perpendicular. We found that we could still maintain the proposed parking count that we had on the original plan if we did relocate them perpendicular. And so we only needed the 12 additional spaces in order to maintain the original parking that we had proposed in November.

Mr. Kucera: Is the square footage of the building, or the zoning code for the square footage or something, driving the number of parking spaces?

Mr. Haire: Yes, it's actually based on the number of seats in the main congregation hall. They need one space for every four seats and they're currently well above Code requirements. So even with the addition, they're still going to meet the

requirements for parking. They don't even need to add the 12 spaces, I don't believe, and they will still be within Code.

Ms. Ross: I believe Mr. Dahnke would like to interject something.

Mr. Dahnke: I didn't stand up to be sworn in and I'm representing the building. Is there a need to swear me in?

Mr. Kucera: (Administered the oath.)

Mr. Dahnke: My architect has made some declarations that maybe the church would not agree to. But let me say this, we've been working on this idea for three years in terms of the expansion that we have now. We did the master plan. I'm an architect as well, but I'm not an architect on this project, but I've been an architect now for 35 years. So what we wanted to do was also do a master plan looking ahead, because we don't want to undo, we don't want to spend money on (SIDE 2 of tape)-- So I think the issue here, and it was correctly stated, we wanted to make a larger parking lot but our budget when we came in, we're getting bids in next week as a matter of fact. So we'd like to continue to have 12 more spaces. We have three services right now and I think the spaces we have, we have enough overflow in between it makes it work. I think my only comment is the distance from -- the 12 parking spaces that we're talking about go right in here. The distance-- And we own this piece of ground up here and around to this house as well. This is a single-family home. We bought this property. We own all that. This homeowner owns the lot all the way back to this trailer park. This whole boundary is wooded all the way back. We have a major group of trees here. This distance from here to there is larger than a football field. So putting two trees here, I don't know -- I understand your precedent issues but I don't understand what that's really going to do for us. It's just a matter of it's going to be like when you're out in the country and you see that farmer's field with one oak tree in the middle of this acreage. I think that's what it's going to look like. We can do that. I just don't think it makes a lot of sense to put two trees in the middle of an area like that. I don't think I'll be here when the church wants to expand, but we think that's ten years out before we get there. Obviously I agree with you when that parking lot gets larger, it's a different situation. Again, we own most of the land to the north of that parcel.

Mr. Kucera: I find it interesting that your comments, almost word-for-word, echo the comments of someone at the previous Board meeting when we discussed this same issue about trees being stuck out in the middle of someplace and he'd run them over and they were stupid.

Mr. Dahnke: Well, the other thing on your islands, and I understand the reasons for islands on large parking lots, but it does also hinder you on snow removal, particularly on Sundays. We'll get a snow plow out there early Sunday morning and they do get in the way and they get destructed.

Mr. Feeney: So you don't need to add the 12 parking spots, but you just want to add the 12 parking spots?

Mr. Dahnke: Yes. Well we wanted to add more, but we decided to cut back and, plus, as she mentioned, realigning it picked up a few in terms of we realigned it 90 degrees in terms of where the aisles are.

Mr. Kucera: I kind of like Mr. White's suggestion that if we grant this variance, that with the next expansion that the entire parking lot would be considered.

Mr. Brusk: Would that be acceptable to the church?

Mr. Dahnke: I think so. We'll probably come back and ask you to undo that, but I certainly won't be around in ten years to do that.

Mr. Kucera: My concern here is that you already have this vast sea of asphalt that what the interior landscaping is intended to do is to break up the sea of asphalt that already exists.

Mr. Dahnke: What you don't understand though is that when you drive up there, and we have a pretty good size hill to get up there, you never see this. Obviously from 30,000 feet you're going to look at it that way.

Mr. Kucera: Oh, no, this I'm sorry, this has everything to do with global warming. You're reflecting off of that asphalt into the upper atmosphere which is heating the atmosphere. Absolutely, you're heating the atmosphere, creating global warming, the polar bears are dying along with the seals.

Mr. Haire: It is for heat dispersion as well on asphalt, basically. That's one of the requirements it was put in for. Run off heats causes degradation to streams, things like that, so that's one of the—

Ms. Ross: I'd like to mention in this case, if we were required to add the islands, we would have to cut away from some of the existing site that's already undisturbed in order to provide those islands.

Mr. Brusk: So you'd be trading.

Mr. Kucera: I don't understand that if I'm putting an island out in the middle of your asphalt.

Ms. Ross: Because we would be—

Mr. Haire: They would lose a space is what she's saying. To maintain those 12 spaces they'd have to pave somewhere else.

Mr. Dahnke: We'd lose some trees.

Mr. Kucera: I see.

Mr. White: But if you expanded the entire parking lot, wouldn't those just be covered by your expansion?

Ms. Ross: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?

Mr. White: By expanding your parking lot to accommodate the new improvement you're making, wouldn't you cover those spaces?

Ms. Ross: In the future?

Mr. White: Yes.

Ms. Ross: We would cover the spaces with islands?

Mr. White: I mean you would add the spaces you needed when you made the expansion.

Ms. Ross: Right.

Mr. White: So by reducing the spaces you have there now in existence by putting islands in those spaces when you expand, you would not lose any spaces you needed for the location would you?

Ms. Ross: In the future, we would be expanding spaces with the islands. Is that what you're—

Mr. White: Right. I'm saying you would be expanding and also you would be adding islands to the existing parking lot. And by expanding you would actually accommodate the additional parking spaces you needed.

Ms. Ross: Right. I understand what you're asking. Yes.

Mr. Feeney: I don't know where the trees would be. You say if you expand you're going to have to cut down trees?

Ms. Ross: Yes. Actually I do have a couple of photos if you'd like to see them. (Speaking off mike.) On this site plan I can show you, it's very hard to see since it's so dark in here. We have existing conditions to the north of the proposed 12 spaces where there are seven mature trees here that we're planning on keeping and then have six mature pine trees down here that we are proposing to keep. I also have these images-- I apologize because they are so small. You can see _____ on

the rear of the lot _____ mature trees _____. That would be what you'd be losing if you gained smaller, less mature, less dense landscape.

Mr. Feeney: What you were proposing anyway, you were taking out most of those trees to the---

Ms. Ross: No, those are remaining.

Mr. Haire: Those will remain with this expansion. In the future, they'll be removed.

Ms. Ross: That's right. But the future expansion is contingent upon whatever you decide this evening it sounds like.

Mr. Feeney: I still think the islands are a good thing. And you may be able to incorporate those in the parking plan, the existing mature trees for the future.

Mr. Kucera: Is there any additional Board comment? (No response.) Is there any public comment?

Mr. Haire: I'll just mention that there are two aspects to this variance request. The other is for basically landscaping to surround the parking area.

Mr. Kucera: Which, obviously, they don't need.

Mr. Haire: It's mostly covered, but I guess to the east they're not proposing any landscaping there, so that's the other aspect of this variance.

Mr. Brusk: And that's the one that you said you didn't see any problem?

Mr. Haire: Because it's already surrounded by a fence line all the way around it, so I don't feel it's probably necessary but—

Mr. Brusk: Right, certainly at this time.

M. Kucera: There's certainly a lot of open land behind it.

Mr. Haire: Correct.

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Kucera: I will move to accept agenda item C5, Variance 14-ZV, with the provision that future expansion will include interior parking in accordance with the Code if the parking lot is expanded to the size shown on the drawings before us tonight.

Mr. Brusk: I'll second that with the clarification that the landscaping requirement cover all of the current, as well as future parking lot area.

Mr. Kucera: I agree. Good point.

Mr. White: Let me just clarify. When you say the landscaping requirement, is that referring to the islands that are required?

Mr. Brusk: Yes. Yes. The interior landscaping.

Mr. Kucera: You're seconding it then.

Mr. Brusk: Yes.

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

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

Mr. Kucera: And then we have Agenda item 6 which is the Major Site Plan.

Mr. Haire: Item 6, there was some concerns brought forth by the Truro Township Fire Department in regards to this expansion. Basically their fire code requires 20 feet access drives. With an expansion this large, they had some major concerns about being able to access the rear of this building in the case of an emergency. The driveways currently proposed going into this site are fairly narrow. I think they were about 11 feet, 10 feet on the south driveway and 11 feet on the north driveway. They indicated in a letter that they provided that the hydrants are 620 feet away on the south drive, so they'd have to run a hose 620 feet from the hydrant basically up the driveway and that would prohibit them from accessing with any other equipment to go up that driveway. And they indicated that if the building were to be engulfed in flames that the smoke would prohibit them from accessing the northern driveway at all. So the south driveway would be the only access point. So there was some significant concerns from them from looking at this from an emergency perspective on accessing the building. And they do make mention of a preschool being located in the building, which was a significant concern of theirs as well.

Mr. Brusk: Has that been addressed?

Ms. Ross: It has been addressed and a couple of comments I'd like to make this evening. One is that there is a condition in the 2005 Ohio Fire Code, Section 102.1 Applicability, where the conditions constituted a distinct hazard to life or property in the opinion of the fire official, this might be valid for an existing condition. If a distinct hazard to life or property cannot be proven by fire officials by a preponderance of the evidence, the provisions of this code shall not apply to an existing building or condition. I'd like to mention that the preschool is actually at the front of the site where

they have direct egress options both north, south and all of them are south and west of the site. The drive aisle is narrow at the front and the existing building provides, I think 30 feet on one side clear between the property line and the edge of the building, and 20 feet on the north side between the property line and the edge of the building. In those cases once you get beyond that, you do have a wider condition that's existing that those trucks are able to get through. So I guess it would depend on where the hose and the fire truck that they are proposing are located on the site. It is a single story addition that we are making. The type of truck that they are probably basing their requirements on would be a ladder style truck that is large and meant for multi-story buildings. An interesting point was made that it would require quite a turning radius to even get onto the site that is not available to it. So it's quite a unique condition in that it would be very difficult for that type of equipment to even get onto the site, but then once it did and once it passed the building it would actually be clear for it to provide the fire extinguishing abilities that it has.

Mr. Brusk: The fact that it's wider at the back doesn't really help you very much when you can't get up to the—

Ms. Ross: I do have a site plan that I've just added some dimensions to if you guys would like to reference it.

Mr. Brusk: Have you talked with the Fire Department to determine what they would feel they would be comfortable with?

Ms. Ross: I have not. That's a good point, because the requirement is a 20 foot wide drive which would be very difficult to accommodate on both cases because we have a very steep existing grade to the south which is our wider option, which we have a 30 feet wide swatch of land between the property line and the building and the north side is 20 feet which is the lesser grade. The other point that is contingent – we had actually priced redoing the south drive, redoing the grade and making it a little easier for access and the pricing for that came in at over \$30,000. Let me hand out this site plan.

Mr. Brusk: I guess my concern is just that if the Fire Department is unhappy with it, I would be unhappy. And I would think that they probably would be able to work with you, because they obviously have similar type of—

Mr. Haire: The main thing that they were concerned with was just the expansion itself and the size of the expansion. They do inspections on all these structures and none of them meet the current code, but with an expansion of this size, they'd like it to get to meet that. I forwarded this letter on to Ms. Ross last week when I received it in the hopes that she could work with the Fire Department to try get something resolved.

Mr. Dahnke: This is the first that I've heard this today as a matter of fact. I've been out of town on business for a week and I think this just came up about a week or so ago.

Mr. Haire: Yes.

Mr. Dahnke: So I understand and I agree with you. I think we need to have a discussion with the Fire Chief, because we want to have a safe environment for the children and our constituencies. And this church is going to be used a lot during the week, too; not just on Sundays. But to point out on the north side this neck point here, we only have 20 feet at that point, so getting a 20 foot road in there would be difficult. So that's one discussion point. And on the south side, there's a fairly steep grade there and then our neighbors to the south, there's a fairly steep grade from the existing road that we have. I mean it elevates quite high and so we're going to have some sort of discussion. Because the cost of redoing the south side road in a 20 foot, we'll be in retaining walls and some other things, so we're talking about a significant amount of money at that point. So somehow we need to have some sort of discussion to see if there's another way to accommodate the issues that you mentioned.

Mr. Haire: Sure.

Mr. Feeney: I know my first thought you said -- and I don't know the _____ that well, but you own property to the north of you and I know it's a private residence, but you own behind them and then out to the street. One of the schools they built, I believe -- the Fire Department wanted back access and they put those pavers that they grow grass over so the Fire Department knows that they can drive their trucks through this part. And that might be an option just to have a -- because I believe it goes a certain flat out there, I don't know where your property is, but maybe just a fire access road.

Mr. Haire: I think it would probably be difficult from the north. It might be easier to go from the rear of the church from the mobile home park.

Mr. Feeney: Just have a fire access only.

Mr. Haire: Because the mobile home park road is right at the back edge of this property.

Mr. Brusk: So that's a possibility. You could put an emergency road or keep it with the pavers.

Mr. Dahnke: Are you talking from back here?

Mr. Haire: That may be an easier option.

Ms. Ross: (Speaking off microphone – inaudible.)

Mr. Haire: It would just be part of your Major Site Plan. I mean it depends on what you want to do with it. If you want to do a gravel base and then just let grass grow over it, or if you want to do some type of pavers, like pervious pavers that they make certain things for fire access roads.

Mr. Dahnke: That would be over 3,000 square feet of pavers.

Mr. Haire: Right. I don't know what the best options are. That's why I think that--

Mr. Dahnke: That's \$40,000 just to think about it.

Mr. Haire: Right. That's why you need to speak with the Fire Department on what would work best for you and for them.

Mr. Feeney: It might just be gravel compacted. I don't know. I think it's worth a conversation and you might have to change your Site Plan to accommodate that. I know your interest is, as much as ours, about the safety and everything.

Mr. Kucera: More on your end than our end.

Mr. Dahnke: It's a valid concern and we just learned about this a week ago.

Ms. Ross: Right and made it through one previous approval without discussion, so I'm curious that it's been brought up.

Mr. Haire: The other issue that came up is in regard to storm water here. There's still some significant issues with that. I gathered from the City's engineer today and he said that may require some changes on the Site Plan.

Mr. Kucera: Did you know about that?

Ms. Ross: There has been some questions brought up about that, but we haven't been able to proceed with any major discussions. That's something that, I think, is outside of this conversation this evening, though.

Mr. Haire: Well, if it requires changes to the Site Plan, that's why it's significant and he indicated that it may require changes to the Site Plan. I would probably suggest that we don't take action on this this evening.

Mr. Brusk: I agree. But what we're suggesting is that you (a) talk with the Fire Department between now and the next time we meet and (b) talk with the City Engineers, especially concerning that to insure that you don't have to make changes or, if you do have to make changes, that they are in there and then we can revote on it.

Mr. Dahnke: Can we rehearse the timing on some of these, how this needs to happen, because we are hoping to break ground in about three weeks.

Mr. Kucera: Well, we have had special meetings in the past.

Mr. Dahnke: All right. My understanding is meeting with the Fire Marshall and I'm not aware of the engineering issues. Was it storm water?

Ms. Ross: Yes.

Mr. Haire: Yes there's some storm water issues with this. I don't think three weeks is a realistic time frame to break ground, probably not to get your plans approved in three weeks. And especially not your plot redo utility, which is required before you break ground if you don't have storm water issues resolved yet.

Mr. Dahnke: Okay.

Mr. Kucera: I would move to table agenda item C6, Major Site Plan Review, 05-MS.

Mr. White: I second.

Mr. Kucera: Please call the roll.

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

Mr. Feeney: But we have had meetings if for some reason you-- that can happen.

Mr. Haire: If you can get everything resolved.

Mr. Kucera: If you get everything set, talk to Mr. Haire and we'll more than likely agree to hold some sort of a meeting, but it has to meet a certain publication doesn't it or not on a table?

Mr. Haire: Yes, a special needs.

Mr. Dahnke: Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. Kucera: Thank you.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Kucera: All right, is there any other business to come before the Board this evening? (No response.) Hearing none, I'll adjourn the Board meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at _____ p.m.

Thomas Kucera, Chair

Lucas Haire, Planning Administrator

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

