

MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG BOARD OF ZONING
AND BUILDING APPEALS
APRIL 19, 2012
6:30 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. David Stoffel Mr. Patrick Feeney Mr. Anthony Rettke Mr. Matthew Hanson
Members Absent:	Mr. Norman Brusk
Others Present:	Mr. Aaron Domini, Planning Administrator

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 15, 2012

Chairman Rettke: Any changes or corrections to the minutes of March 15, 2012?

Mr. Domini: Yes. There are two changes to Items B5 and 6. Have the Board note that those are now noted as transfers. I don't think the original agenda indicated they were transfer Special Exceptions, but we've changed the agenda to reflect that change.

Mr. Hansen: That's a change for the agenda.

Mr. Rettke: The agenda.

Mr. Hansen: He asked for the change for the minutes.

Mr. Domini: Oh, I'm sorry. No.

Mr. Rettke: No changes to the minutes (No response.) Hearing none, approve the minutes as submitted.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Rettke: Any changes to the agenda?

Mr. Domini: Yes, two changes as indicated to B5 and 6.

Mr. Rettke: B5 and 6. Go ahead and approve the agenda with those changes being mentioned.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

(Mr. Rettke administers the oath.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Rettke: Is there any public comment? (No response.)

B. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Rettke: Hearing no public comment, we'll move on to Item B, Unfinished Business. Could you read, well, I don't know that we need to read it necessarily.

Mr. Domini: I don't think so.

1. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6294 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1195.11(c) TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM SETBACK FOR A GROUND SIGN FROM TEN (10) FEET TO FOUR (4) FEET, SIX (6) INCHES. CONTACT: JOSH ALLEN (93-0ZV).

2. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6294 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1195.05(a) TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM PERMITTED DEVIATION OF THE TWENTY (20) FOOT BUILD-TO LINE REQUIREMENT FROM 50% OF THE BUILDING WIDTH TO 100% OF THE WIDTH. CONTACT: JOSH ALLEN (94-ZV).

3. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6294 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE TABLE 1175.05 TO REDUCE THE SIDEYARD FROM A MINIMUM OF TWENTY (20) FEET TO TEN (10) FEET. CONTACT: JOSH ALLEN (95-ZV).

4. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6294 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1180.11(b) TO ELIMINATE THE PERIMETER LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENT FOR PORTIONS OF A PARKING AREA. CONTACT: JOSH ALLEN (96-ZV).

5. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6294 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1195.07(a) TO PERMIT A BUILDING THAT IS NOT ORIENTED PARALLEL TO A PRIMARY STREET. CONTACT: JOSH ALLEN (97-ZV).

6. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 6294 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM ZONING CODE SECTION 1195.10(b) TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES LOCATED AT THE SIDE OF A

BUILDING FROM A MAXIMUM OF 50% TO 92.5%. CONTACT: JOSH ALLEN (98-ZV).

7. VARIANCE SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION, 6294 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT USE, VACANT; PROPOSED USE, RETAIL STORE; PRESENT OWNER, STOR-ALL WINCHESTER ROAD, LLC; CONTACT; JOSH ALLEN (28-MS).

Mr. Rettke: Can those wishing to speak on Items B1 through B7 come forward? We can pick up where we left off, I guess.

Mr. Spies: B or A?

Mr. Rettke: Well, we've got two A's.

(speaking off mic)

Mr. Rettke: Yeah.

Mr. Spies: Okay.

Mr. Rettke: Family Dollar, yeah.

Mr. Doug Spies: My name is Doug Spies with Core Resources from Cincinnati, Ohio. I don't know, do we want to recap a little bit and explain where we're at?

Mr. Rettke: Did you resubmit anything or make any changes?

Mr. Spies: We did. At the last meeting we spent some extensive amount of time talking about the site planning and came to what seemed to be an agreement that with additional landscaping and screening of the parking area the site plan seemed to be acceptable. We did do that. I'm not sure of the pages that you have. You can see around the perimeter of all the parking area and the perimeter of the building, we've fully, I'll call it landscaped, but intend to plant bushes, shrubs and trees as indicated on the site plan and if you scroll through some of the renderings you can see that the renderings, as they are, if you look on the lower left, the site wall is included and we are also screening that. The top left, if you look, the view from the street you can see that the site walls that are existing we'll screen but, in addition to that, we planted the entire parking area behind to help also screen the vehicles from view from the street in walking or driving. The two views on the right kind of show the overall plantings and tree development that we would like to see. We did try to break up the facades with taller evergreen type trees that will grow in height and keep the – kind of break up the long façade of the building which is, I understood from our last meeting was a major concern as people are driving back and forth on Main Street. So that was the extent of the changes that were submitted for the project.

Mr. Domini: Just so the Board knows, the staff report indicates those changes. Then what you're looking at here is the site plan that was resubmitted by the applicant and if the Board would like to see on the screen, too, I've also put in the original site plan that was submitted so I can flip back and forth if those are needed.

Mr. Stoffel: Do you have any concerns since you weren't here last time?

Mr. Feeney: No, I think everything was talked about pretty thoroughly reading through the minutes. Yeah, you do miss something not being here and I apologize for that. I missed the last month, but no, I didn't. I know we didn't get a staff recommendation. At least I didn't get one this time.

Mr. Domini: I referenced the former staff report, those recommendations that were in there.

Mr. Feeney: Okay.

Mr. Domini: I didn't make any new staff recommendations. I referred to the former staff report.

Mr. Stoffel: They're still applicable, your objections and -- that is self-inflicted and—

Mr. Domini: I think the changes that the applicant made reflect some of the concerns of the Board, but I think the Board follows the standards as set forth in 1147. I still feel like there's some hardship that was self-created, so that's the opinion of staff. Obviously it's up for the Board to make that interpretation.

Mr. Stoffel: And one thing I saw on the slides, The Grand Tour, so to speak, is going to retain the retention pond? When you do the lot split, The Grand Tour is going to keep the retention pond area? It was a couple of slides—

(speaking off mic)

Mr. Spies: Yeah, that was—

Mr. Stoffel: That's an old one, then?

Mr. Spies: An old one, yeah.

Mr. Stoffel: This is not applicable?

Mr. Spies: Well, the width of the property is applicable--

Mr. Stoffel: This is but the depth—

Mr. Spies: Right.

Mr. Stoffel: --will go back to the property line because that's what I thought we had talked about last time but that kind of caught my eye. Dave, do you have anything?

Mr. Rettke: I just had a couple of questions. We had talked before about the detention in the rear. You know, it slopes from back to front.

Mr. Spies: Right.

Mr. Rettke: Did you have a chance to look at that?

Mr. Spies: As far as what we've designed?

Mr. Rettke: Yes. Will that detention area work in the back?

Mr. Spies: Yes, it will.

Mr. Rettke: Well, okay. Another question I had. Is there any utility, air conditioning units, heating units, anything outside the building that we're not seeing that needs to be screened?

Mr. Spies: In this case, these will be rooftop mounted units, so they'd be behind the parapet wall.

Mr. Rettke: Will they? Okay.

Mr. Domini: I think the overlay requires those to be screened.

Mr. Rettke: And the one other thing. In reference, when we were talking about the possibility of it being parallel to the street, we'd talked about that drive width is now 27 feet. Had that been looked at to decrease that and, you know, if you decrease that width you could turn the building a little bit and still make that work and still get your dumpster in the back. Was that looked at?

Mr. Spies: What we did test our drive width is against the delivery truck that Family Dollar uses. Their standard truck is a 75-foot 18-wheeler and in order to make the turn and the width the 27 feet, if we go below that then we have to remove parking area because the truck path would encroach on the parking stalls and they come at all hours of the day, so we really have to maintain that. I guess I'm curious if you would entertain kind of an architectural gesture to the front of the building that's not changing the structure of the building, but can we maybe suggest a planter in the front that acknowledges the being parallel to the street so that it's not the physical interior of the building, but might be an architectural feature that pays homage to the angle of the street versus tilting and rotating the building. I think what you'll see, and the reason we

brought this exhibit along, is the properties that are currently on Main Street primarily are parallel with the sides of the property lines and that's true to almost all of them.

(speaking off mic)

Mr. Rettke: Did you have anything, Mr. Hansen?

Mr. Hansen: I just wanted to confirm that the hatched area shown as parking easement 10 spaces, we're not – that's outside of the site area that we're reviewing at the moment. Or is that included in the major site plan?

Mr. Feeney: Well, they're going to be planting trees there now.

Mr. Hansen: Right. I guess I want to be clear that we're not – if that's supposed to be future development on the other side of the line, I think that should be subject to review with the next development if this were to be approved.

Mr. Feeney: Well, it's a good point. Is the – on this plan here, is the green line the property line?

Mr. Spies: It is, yes.

Mr. Feeney: So you're planting is outside the property line?

Mr. Spies: Right. We've been able to get a planting agreement, I'd guess you'd call it. The existing property owner said, "Yeah, sure, he can plant a row of bushes there for the time being and then—"

Mr. Feeney: But how are you going to control that? It's not on your property.

Mr. Spies: Apartment easement – I mean, we'll have a maintenance agreement to maintain the plantings.

Mr. Domini: To be clear to the Board, the lot's not split at this time.

Mr. Feeney: Right.

Mr. Domini: This is one parcel. That's the proposed property line.

Mr. Feeney: The proposed.

Mr. Rettke: And that was one of the contentions of staff that it's self-inflicted because the lot line hasn't been graded yet, if I understand correctly.

Mr. Feeney: I kind of hesitate. I mean, the tree – the planting I like just going around the parking lot, but the parking lot -- part of it's own adjacent potential property

that may or may not happen and then the plantings are going to be on somebody else's property. I know that you're in agreement, but I don't know -- yeah, you build the building and he gets pissed and tears out all the plants.

Mr. Stoffel: We would have a legal easement to maintain and have the temporary plantings as part of our—

Mr. Rettke: That would probably be part of that additional parking, right?

Mr. Spies: Yeah.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah, an el-shaped piece that comes out.

Mr. Feeney: So the shaded area that shows parking easement, is there going to be parking in that shaded area?

Mr. Spies: In the future, what -- it's really just access to whatever future parking might occur.

Mr. Feeney: For you or for the adjacent property?

Mr. Spies: For Family Dollar, yeah.

Mr. Rettke: Yeah. They would use that as well.

Mr. Stoffel: I guess that -- I don't know if we discussed this the last time either. We probably did, but we show that drive easement that goes to the west across that green property line. That parking that's shown there, is that parking that you will retain beyond once the lot's split and the other owners, will you retain that parking for your count?

Mr. Spies: What we show here currently?

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah.

Mr. Spies: And that's not hatched, is your question?

Mr. Stoffel: Right.

Mr. Spies: There are two spaces toward the front and I'll call it the front, I guess southwest, right before that little planting island, that would be the cross access, the cross property connection. We would take those two spaces away and then, again, that's part of the reason for—

Mr. Stoffel: No, I'm referring to the northwest corner where it t-bones up and goes west, those parking -- you will retain those?

Mr. Spies: Yes. Right. That's my understanding, yes.

Mr. Rettke: So they'll have to work around if that other site's being developed, basically?

Mr. Spies: Yeah.

Mr. Feeney: It just seems like a lot of those – it'd be nice to have the parcels already developed and it's a done deal instead of well, this is the area.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah. I think that's what we were struggling with, is we didn't have a good picture of how both sides would function together through a comprehensive planning process. And you kind of get that a little bit on that exhibit, the second page that they provided, but it doesn't look like it's been fully vetted out. But I can see where the other access would come in on the other parcel, some sort of building pad in place. I guess if we're approving these variances, it's kind of the direction that we're going to end up heading--

Mr. Rettke: Going with the opposite.

Mr. Hansen: --with the other parcel.

Mr. Feeney: Yeah. We're given them a lot of things already.

Mr. Hansen: Well, my question is do we want this to be the outcome for the development – I'm just--

Mr. Feeney: It is--

Mr. Hansen: --and I'm still struggling with it.

Mr. Feeney: It's one of the first parcels coming in to Reynoldsburg on the west side. It's a great piece of land, I think, and I don't have a problem with the store and actually the way the building's positioned is all right, too, but there are too many "iffies". And we're granting these variances and it's all going to – I don't know. Usually it's like it's either this way or that way and we're – you know, we've got some – this is going to be the property line but this is a different property line and this property line—

Mr. Domini: The sketch that was submitted regarding – I guess it'd be Exhibit A as it's labeled in the packet. The way you start to portray the overall master plan for the site, with that future parking area and then the conceptual building pad that you have in there.

Mr. Spies: And, again, this is a parcel that we have no control over. I mean, we don't, which is why we didn't do a master plan.

Mr. Domini: I understand.

Mr. Spies: That exhibit was an example a long time ago.

Mr. Domini: I understand.

Mr. Spies: Okay.

Mr. Domini: My comment would be though, that the condition which you're creating and gets somewhat demonstrated in this exhibit, we end up with one, two, three, four rows of parking and two drive aisles and then the parking across the back. And it's kind of creating the condition which the overlay purposely tried to address, which is this large expanse of parking kind of out front, in front of the buildings and the way the parking's arranged across the back the overlay states that parking – that 50% should be to the rear and that's still somewhat questionable. But overall, if that condition happens and this future building comes and puts parking to the side and we end up with that many rows of parking kind of in the middle, we're kind of creating that large expanse of parking which the overlay purposely tried to address. So that would be one of my concerns and I would almost offer up the alternative as opposed to a future parking area you create it as a no-parking area and you kind of forced that other building pad to come over to that side of the lot and it kind of breaks up the parking, brings the building back up to the street which is really the intent of the overlay. So I'd almost – I'm trying to flip the model on the head just to put a discussion for the Board if that makes any sense.

Mr. Stoffel: Well, I guess I'm interested in why that driveway easement, you need it in the southwest. Couldn't you extend that drive toward the back and continue the 90° parking throughout and I believe you'd still have room for your detention back there. You wouldn't even have to get that driveway easement up there in the southwest. You could pick up that additional parking I think fairly easy just glancing at it.

Mr. Spies: We would have to certainly run a calculation on the engineering. We did do an engineered layout of the detention area and that, in essence, if you recall from our previous submittal.

Mr. Stoffel: I think from the previous submittal you just – I think you kind of stated that that was just something graphically shown in there that was nothing more than a borrow pit in the past.

Mr. Spies: I mean, that's what currently exists. Part of the issue is turning the truck around because otherwise the 18-wheeler has to do a backing move out onto Main Street to get out and we certainly don't want that.

Mr. Stoffel: No, we don't want that.

(discussion off mic)

Mr. Feeney: Yeah, I guess I'm – the shaded area, I don't want to approve to allow parking in that area because like you just bought up, we're going to open this up, okay, you've got parking, now you've got another parking lot and then we don't know what the other property's going to be. I'd rather eliminate that as a potential parking lot at all. I don't know how we could do that.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah. I don't want to have that included in this decision considering that it's on the other site.

Mr. Spies: If I could make a statement. The way our easement – this easement reads was that if there is any parking in that we have the right to use it in common with the adjacent owner. That's all it says. It doesn't say there will be parking there and when the adjacent owner comes in for his development plans, if you guys don't want parking there then don't approve parking there. But we can't restrict this guy's – this adjacent parcel tonight, because we want to do all the other part.

Mr. Feeney: We don't want to grant it either, so, yeah.

Mr. Spies: Yeah. I mean, when he comes in you can say, "No parking there." We're comfortable with that.

Mr. Feeney: And then we're approving the major site plan and that's all inclusive in the major site plan, so as long as that's earmarked that the adjacent parcel. But even though we're agreeing to the parking in the back, there are so many "iffies" here. We've got to rewrite this thing to vote on it, I think. We have to approve parking on your adjacent property in the back, not in the front. So why did you include the shaded area? Why is that?

Mr. Spies: Well, we just – when we were originally talking to the guy we just said if there is parking there, there does end up being parking there, we just want our people because it is close to the door and some of our people, if they were parking there, might park there and we just want him not to tow our customers. So we said if there's parking there we want to be able to use it. We're not counting those spaces in the code requirements or anything like that. It was just kind of an afterthought.

Mr. Feeney: And then the parking in the back that's not on your property, is that part of your count, too?

Mr. Spies: Yes, that is. That would be developed exactly the way you see it on the site plan.

Mr. Feeney: So how do we approve somebody else's property?

Mr. Spies: Well, we've got a permanent legal easement to put that drive and parking there. That can be subject to review by the City attorney to make sure we can't lose it.

Mr. Hansen: Another reason that was indicated to me was that that parking was placed there in order to add additional spaces that were to the rear of the building in order to meet our overlay requirement.

Mr. Domini: I don't have as much concern with the shared access agreements that the applicant's going to have to work out. Yeah, I think focusing on the intent of the code is of paramount importance and they can work out the shared access and maintenance agreements. I know that sometimes in the past there's been some issue with that because properties change hands and agreements don't always hold true, so I understand your point. You want to make sure the plan can stand on its own.

Mr. Feeney: If we approve the major site plan then are we approving allowing potential parking there? That's – because you are allowing parking on those neighbors to count for him, so—

Mr. Domini: You're approving the parking in the back?

Mr. Spies: Yeah.

Mr. Domini: But not the hatch parking?

Mr. Spies: Right.

Mr. Feeney: We'll just, because we do have to approve the major site plan and this is a major site plan, so we're approving stuff on somebody else's property. You know what I'm saying? It's just kind of a, do we have the—

Mr. Domini: But it's one property.

Mr. Feeney: Pardon me?

Mr. Domini: But it's still one property.

Mr. Hansen: It's still one property.

Mr. : Well, it still is now.

Mr. Rettke: That's where it works in your favor, so, you know, since it's not split it's still on one property; but, since it's not split, we're inflicting a self-inflicting hardship.

Mr. Feeney: Yeah.

Mr. Stoffel: Well, when they develop that other site where it's going to be a lot more difficult for them because we're going to want that green space and we're going to want some things that-- We're going to have these same questions come up and—

Mr. Feeney: Okay. I guess I don't have any more questions.

Mr. Hansen: I don't have any other questions.

Mr. Rettke: Can we get a motion on it?

Mr. Domini: Is the Board going to make a motion on each item?

Mr. Stoffel: I would.

Mr. Feeney: Yeah. I make a motion on Item B1, variance application 93-ZV.

Mr. Hansen: I'll second.

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

Mr. Domini: Is there a motion on Item B2?

Mr. Stoffel: I'll make a motion we approve Item B2, variance application 94-ZV.

Mr. Feeney: I'll second.

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

Mr. Domini: Is there a motion on B3?

Mr. Feeney: I'll make a motion on B3, variance 95-ZV.

Mr. Domini: Is there a second?

Mr. Stoffel: I'll second it.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Hansen voted "no." Mr. Stoffel voted "no." Mr. Feeney voted "no." Mr. Rettke voted "no.")

Mr. Domini: Item B4.

Mr. Hansen: That one – I think we need to clarify that. I don't think this variance is applicable anymore because they met the requirement.

Mr. Rettke: They met the requirement. What's the reason?

Mr. Domini: Good point.

Mr. Hansen: So we can strike this one from the agenda.

Mr. Rettke: C4 has been met – or B4 has been met. I move that we approve Item B5, 97-ZV.

Mr. Stoffel: I'll second.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Stoffel voted "no." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Rettke voted "yes." Mr. Hansen voted "no.")

Mr. Domini: Item B6.

Mr. Hansen: I'll move that we approve variance application 98-ZV.

Mr. Rettke: Second.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Rettke voted "yes." Mr. Hansen voted "no." Mr. Stoffel voted "no.")

Mr. Domini: And Item B7.

Mr. Feeney: I'll make a motion to accept Item B7, major site plan review.

Mr. Hansen: I'll second.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Rettke states, "Well, since we didn't pass the other ones, I'll have to say "no." Mr. Hansen voted "no." Mr. Stoffel voted "no." Mr. Feeney voted "no.")

Mr. Domini: So the applicant – the variance – obviously a number of the variances did not pass, the major site plan did not pass and there's provisions in the code for you to appeal to Council. I believe the acting Development Director can talk to you about how to do that following the meeting.

Mr. Spies: I guess I'm curious based on our last meeting that the discussion about the 10-foot setback variance to the side of the building was generally agreed to. Even in our preliminary early discussions with Matt on the phone, we had talked about the 10 feet next to the storage area as being something that would be approved. Certainly that was a non-official meeting, so I understand, but I guess I'd like to understand why the 10-foot of side yard setback versus 20 feet, how does 20 feet enhance the plan that we currently show versus 10?

Mr. Stoffel: To me, I think again that the lot line, the lot split lot line is a self-created thing, which also again speaks to the parallel building. With the 27-foot drive aisle like we talked last time, if you're saying that's needed that's cool and all, but that lot line that's being established isn't real. I mean, that can – for me, that's not enough reason to grant that from 20 to 10 just based on that, because I can tell that that lot line was established with the intent of receiving the 10-foot variance. That's what it appears to me.

Mr. Spies: It's what we were allowed. We did share the purchase agreement with you. That's what was in the purchase agreement. Certainly the – I mean, you're suggesting that only thing that could go on this site is a large scale retail store.

Mr. Stoffel: On what, the overall site?

Mr. Spies: Um-um.

Mr. Stoffel: No.

Mr. Spies: I mean I'm open to suggestions on how else we can change the site plan and still meet the needs of the store.

Mr. Hansen: I guess that's – that's not our purview and we are trying to meet the means of how development interacts with our overlay guidelines. So if your store cannot function within our guidelines, then maybe this isn't the appropriate site.

Mr. Domini: Your first two variances did pass, so if you can work the site and still meet the other pieces of the code, I believe he's allowed to reapply in a certain timeframe. I don't know what that is off the top of my head again, but there's a timeframe you can reapply for your site plan or you can appeal.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, there is. We can discuss that later.

Mr. Domini: Yeah, but those are the options.

Mr. Spies: And why were the parking spaces located at the side versus the rear not approved? Why do you not agree with our assessment of the parking?

Mr. Hansen: I personally do not believe it met the definition of "to the rear."

Mr. Spies: So—

Mr. Hansen: To the rear of the building.

Mr. Spies: What's your definite of "to the rear?"

Mr. Hansen: The way that our overlay guidelines state is that parking should be to the rear of the building and it was the intent when we were establishing those standards is that parking would be hidden behind building and structures and not be exposed to the right-of-way.

Mr. Spies: But that's not what your code says. It says to have parking behind the building. It only dictates a number of spaces to be 50% to the side of the building. The number of spaces behind the building is not determined. So, we do have parking behind the building and we have parking to the side of the building. If you want to suggest that a plane of the building redefines whether it's to the side or behind, then I would say we divide it into quadrants and that space that makes the t-bone is not either behind or to the side. It is in a different quadrant.

Mr. Domini: The building rear, as defined by the code, is the wall or plane opposite the primary building footage. So the wall opposite the primary frontage and the primary frontage is the frontage that faces the primary street.

Mr. Spies: But he's making the same equivalent argument that the plane of the building and the extension of that plane determines what is in front, to the side or to the rear of the building, correct?

Mr. Domini: That's the Board's job to make the interpretation.

Mr. Spies: But there's no number of parking spaces required in your code to be behind the building, only that 50% of the parking be to the side of the building.

Mr. Hansen: No more than 50%.

Mr. Spies: Okay, and that's what we've done.

Mr. Hansen: Well, I guess we interpreted it otherwise.

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah. I would suggest, as I said before, you can retain that drive access to the north and still extend your parking or, excuse me, drive access to the west and extend your parking to the north and, to me, that would be more behind the building and makes more sense as far as the development of the future lot, whenever that happens. And I still think you could get your detention area in there. I'd personally like to see that looked at.

Mr. Spies: So you would rather we reduce the number of parking spaces or try to reconfigure it so it—

Mr. Stoffel: I don't think you'd necessarily reduce. I don't think it would.

Mr. Hansen: Well, they're over-parked now from what is required, so they could reduce.

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah, 16 are required, is what he's saying.

Mr. Feeney: So they have overparked? They'd have more parking spots than they need just so they can work with that.

Mr. Domini: The overlay allows you to reduce the parking spaces by up to 50%.

Mr. Hansen: And the other spaces were added in order to meet the requirement that the 50% be behind the building.

Mr. Feeney: Okay, the parking spots were added to increase the percentage.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah.

Mr. Domini: Do you have any other questions? Can we move on?

Mr. Spies: I have a question regarding the front façade of the building.

Mr. Feeney: Are you looking to skew the entire building?

Mr. Spies: I brought up the possibility of acknowledging the street front with an architecture feature that wouldn't necessarily modify the configuration of the store itself. Would you entertain that?

Mr. Feeney: I think we'd entertain anything you want to bring back.

Mr. Stoffel: I didn't have a problem with it. Everything down there doesn't match, so I think I kind of agree with him. It would not be consistent with what's there.

Mr. Hansen: I guess my thought was that the building doesn't necessarily need to be skewed, but that one façade.

Mr. Feeney: I'd like to see that. And this is just a thought. If you are heavy on parking, what's the possibility of maybe eliminating some of those westerly stacked parking spaces and add what we know will be established landscaping along there?

Mr. Spies: So the nine spaces to the west of the green property line? Is that—

Mr. Feeney: Yeah, it's just a thought. I mean I'd like to know there's some landscaping there that's going to be there. You know what I'm saying? It will make it a lot easier to deal with the other property when that happens.

Mr. Hansen: So are you suggesting that we effectively narrow the site? By eliminating those nine spaces, we're gaining that much more on the other site to work with.

Mr. Feeney: Either narrowing your site or whatever your count is and eliminating five or six – whatever spaces to provide some kind of buffer between the two.

Mr. Spies: So the drive, the t-bone, I like that, to the west of the property line could stay, but the parking to the north of that drive can go away?

Mr. Feeney: No. I'm referring to the parking that butts in to your westerly property line. The nine spaces.

(Speaking off mic)

Mr. Spies: Remove those?

Mr. Feeney: Just a thought. I mean you could do something with maybe your property line to – if you don't need those.

Mr. Spies: Well, again, we're driving our customers further from the door and I think we had the discussion that when the parking is more than 100 feet away, that's when you traditionally experience a Wal-Mart or K-Mart or superstore, a large-scale store.

Mr. Hansen: Essentially we would want to see building there in place of those parking. So then we're starting to get back to the intent of the code.

Mr. Spies: A building in place of the parking?

Mr. Hansen: I'm foreseeing that we would be having building inch closer to your building and that we're narrowing the gap between your building and the adjacent building, because we wouldn't have parking there anymore.

Mr. Stoffel: We wouldn't necessarily have to mirror the other lot. We could pick up and lay back down at the next building to reduce that big cluster in the middle.

Mr. Hansen: And maybe then we could start orienting something—

Mr. Feeney: Are you saying flop the building to the parking and the parking to the building?

Mr. Hansen: Yeah. Then we could get a building that's parallel to the street instead.

Mr. Feeney: Well, I'm not sure.

Mr. Stoffel: I'm not sure on that one either.

Mr. Rettke: It's hard to visualize.

Mr. Hansen: Something like that.

Mr. Spies: I mean you're really critical to the Family Dollar operations and the success of the store is parking at the front door. If it's not available, the customers won't stop and then the store will go out of business.

Mr. Feeney: That's a whole new look.

Mr. Hansen: It's a different thing. And then if we can get some sort of visualization on how the entire parcel would work, then I'd be more apt to grant the necessary variances to have a building.

Mr. Feeney: And they can work with you in the process.

Mr. Hansen: Right. And if you're saying that's not Family Dollar's model, then—

Mr. Feeney: Anything else?

Mr. Domini: Just to be clear, the code states that within 30 days you can appeal to Council. Just contact the Clerk of Council and indicate if you wish to appeal and then see what they can do in that process.

Mr. Feeney: Then it will go through council instead of us.

Mr. Domini: Then you would just be appealing those decisions that the Board voted no on.

Mr. Spies: Okay, thank you.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT APPLICATION, 1623 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, CC; PRESENT OWNER'S NAME, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, BIG WALNUT #3261; REQUESTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR CHURCH SERVICES. CONTACT: PASTOR JEFFREY MORLOCK (59-SE).

Mr. Rettke: Can you state your name and address, please, for the record?

Mr. Jeffrey Morlock: Yeah, Jeff Morlock, 1133 Virginia Drive, Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Rettke: Is there anything you'd like to express to the Board?

Mr. Morlock: Just there are two – to my knowledge there are at least two other churches within about a quarter or half mile toward the Livingston end of – or part of

Brice Road in strip malls and so we are in a place – Fraternal Order of Eagles has plenty of parking and a room that has the fire code for 200 people. I don't think we will affect traffic patterns that much on a Sunday – given that it's a Sunday morning as well.

Mr. Rettke: And this is only from May to August?

Mr. Morlock: Hopefully not that long.

Mr. Rettke: That was another— Well, I'll ask that question at the end. We're looking for weekly space but Reynoldsburg, it's been tough for us to find a weekly space to rent.

Mr. Rettke: You're looking for a single building rather than a storefront?

Mr. Morlock: Well, we're looking – ideally we'd like to have a school, but that's another story. I guess one of my questions is if we would come back to you again, do we need to reapply, get another Exception kind of thing?

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, if it's a different location, you'll have to reapply.

Mr. Morlock: Okay.

Mr. Rettke: And if you go past August they would have to reapply, wouldn't they, because it just states May through August?

Mr. Hansen: Yes, from what was submitted.

Mr. Domini: You could've done that though.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, we can—

(several people talking)

Mr. Rettke: That was my only concern when I first read it, like May to August. Okay, what's going on here?

Mr. Morlock: Yeah, we're just temporary and we're only once a month right now. We're not there every week. They don't have it available every week.

Mr. Rettke: Any other questions?

Mr. Feeney: I assume in August you're moving on to another location—

Mr. Morlock: Hopefully sooner. Yeah, as soon as possible. We have a couple leads. That's why I asked if we need to do this whole thing over again.

Mr. Feeney: Yeah. It's location oriented.

Mr. Morlock: And I realize that some places need a Special Permit. Are schools one of the places that do or don't? I forget what we talked about.

Mr. Hansen: It is in a district where you can locate, yeah, without a Special Exception.

Mr. Morlock: Okay.

Mr. Hansen: If you want to request amending your application to a timeframe later than August, just in case, I think that would be a wise thing to do.

Mr. Domini: You can amend your application.

Mr. Morlock: We have to be somewhere weekly before that. I guess we can do that.

Mr. Rettke: It's just as a precaution. That would be my recommendation.

Mr. Morlock: Okay. Yeah.

Mr. Hansen: So you don't have to come back in case it is August.

Mr. Morlock: Okay. We can stay until the end of the year. The other issue is they don't – right now they have the Sundays that we're looking for available, but they have other people coming in there, so the likelihood is we're not going to be – I don't think we're going to be – we can't be there really beyond that, but we can stay until the end of the year and I guess that would be safe, if that's okay with you.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, sure. That's—

Mr. Morlock: That'll keep us from being in possibly December 31st. That sounds good.

Mr. Stoffel: I'll make a motion that we approve Item C1 Special Exception 59-SE.

Mr. Feeney: As amended.

Mr. Stoffel: As amended.

Mr. Hansen: As amended by the—

Mr. Rettke: By the applicant.

Mr. Hansen: --by the applicant.

Mr. Stoffel: By the applicant.

Mr. Feeney: I'll second.

(Mr. Hansen voted "yes." Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Rettke voted "yes.")

Mr. Morlock: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Feeney: Thank you.

Mr. Rettke: See, we can be easy to deal with I think.

2. COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PLAN APPLICATION, 735 MARLAN AE., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, AR-3A; OWNER'S NAME, REYNOLDSBURG EAGLES POINT LLC; REQUESTING APPROVAL OF A COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PACKAGE. CONTACT: JOHN MORRISON (676-ZS).

Mr. Rettke: Are both of you going to testify?

Mr. Morrison: He's just my project manager if we have any technical questions.

Mr. Rettke: Can you both state your name and address, please?

Mr. John Morrison: John Morrison, 6471 Limpkin Drive, Gahanna, Ohio 4230.

Mr. Domini: If I may say a few comments to the Board? After reviewing the application, I had some questions for the applicant, but it looks like there's some conflict with the code that I think can probably be worked out. Number one is a question about the materials and the durability of the materials and I kind of included some language in here from Section 1181 of the code which I underlined for you. Then the other comment was in regard to the sign height. Table 1181 states that the subdivision sign maximum height is 5' and I believe, as submitted, the sign and the base is 8' total. That's something I want to draw to the Board's attention. Then I have a couple images in here if you want to reference the site or the sign.

Mr. Hansen: Can you describe how this sign is made?

Mr. Morrison: Yes and, actually, I have a handout here if you'd like me to pass it out that kind of breaks down the material itself and how durable it really is. Basically the easiest way to think about it is like rhino lighting for your truck. It's got the foam interior core, but the covering is actually with that material right here that I can pass out for you that will explain how strong it is once it's actually hardened and that's why it is a very strong sign. I'll pass that out.

Mr. Hansen: So let's say if your grounds maintenance crew runs into the sign with the lawnmower, is that going to cave in?

Mr. Morrison: It doesn't chip or dent. It will – they have a video if you would like to see that on the internet where basically you can take and you can hit it, but the foam composite on the inside gives it so it has a little bit of play so it doesn't actually chip or break. It just kind of goes in and then it'll pop back out. So it does that give, but it doesn't chip. I mean you can hit it. You can run into it. As you can see the pressure test on the front here. In Florida a lot of our properties are using it. They even built houses out of the outside of it.

Mr. Stoffel: I was going to ask you if that's the same material they build houses out of.

Mr. Morrison: That is correct.

Mr. Hansen: What is the finish of the sign? Is it glossy? Is it matte?

Mr. Morrison: It's bubbly, very similar to like a stucco look.

Mr. Stoffel: So it's not glossy?

Mr. Morrison: No, no, no.

Mr. Hansen: I just had some concern, because I was driving around looking at other signs we approved in the area. We approved the nice brick sign that was at the Postwoods and across the street on the opposite corner of the driveway into the development there's a stone sign. I had a little bit of concern that this sign might be out of character because it does look less natural because it's not made out of brick, or stone, or wood.

Mr. Morrison: It does look very – it's very tan looking. It does look very natural looking and then it would be illuminated with the lights and, obviously the text wouldn't be, but kind of a stony kind of look when it's all together.

Mr. Stoffel: So it's externally illuminated?

Mr. Morrison: Yes. Yes. It'll have lights on it, correct.

Mr. Rettke: Was there colored pictures?

Mr. Morrison: Probably not, because we did have to Xerox the copies, do they were all black and white.

Mr. Domini: Were you going to landscape the sign?

Mr. Morrison: Yes, we are.

Mr. Domini: Was that indicated in the package?

Mr. Morrison: I do not believe that was indicated in the package other than the bottom base that was previously mentioned which we are willing to get rid of to be able to pass this to get down to that height.

Mr. Feeney: So the total size would be 8' high?

Mr. Morrison: With the base. With the base on it that it sits on and is secured and everything like that.

Mr. Domini: Can you do it just on a concrete pad?

Mr. Morrison: We can definitely do that and then obviously put the landscaping right next to it and everything. That would dress it up. We are acceptable to do that.

Mr. Hansen: And you don't have a color sample of it?

Mr. Morrison: I don't, because I don't have internet access on this right here, but I would be able to—

Mr. Hansen: We have internet access. I'm a little concerned that it's going to be some sort of weird pink-tan color.

Mr. Morrison: No, I totally understand. We're willing to paint the color if you don't like what the actual – what we're looking at right here.

(Pulling up internet site and talking off mic.)

Mr. Morrison: So that same color right there is what it's going to be. Obviously not the backing that's in the center there, but around the outside edge. Once again, that's not our design. We're just looking for color right now.

Mr. Rettke: So the text and the logo's going to be the same?

Mr. Morrison: Yes. It's going to be a green.

Mr. Stoffel: So will it be completely white except for the color that we see here on the color rendering?

Mr. Morrison: Yes, except for the lettering and the tree looking item. The text part is the only part that will be color. The rest of it's going to be kind of that white beige-y color that you're seeing right now.

Mr. Rettke: The inset's not going to be a different shade?

Mr. Morrison: It'll be white from what I understand.

Mr. Rettke: So there'll be some contrast between the background?

Mr. Morrison: Exactly. Because, obviously, we want to bring the name and everything out.

Mr. Hansen: Is this sign really going to be 4' thick? That's what's indicated on the site plan.

Mr. Morrison: It's about 18" thick. That was probably the base.

Mr. Rettke: And you're fine with removing the extra 3' of stone.

Mr. Morrison: If that'll gain us access, we are willing to do that to make it through. We can adjust.

Mr. Rettke: Is that going to cause issues with sight from the road? I can't remember what that contour looks like out there.

Mr. Morrison: It's actually slightly down from where the road is anyway. That was kind of the reason we wanted it so we could get the sign up and you could clearly see and read the whole thing. We'll probably have to make the lettering just a little bit higher on there. If we could just get a foot, that will put it up high enough that we can actually see it without a problem.

Mr. Hansen: What is it 5' maximum height? I think you can actually see the sign quite fine. The area's pretty open on that corner.

Mr. Morrison: It does have that dip about 2' down from the road.

Mr. Hansen: I don't have any concern.

Mr. Rettke: Is there any existing sign there now?

Mr. Morrison: It's from the previous owner. It's pretty rickety. It's about to go. That's why we wanted to upgrade it to what we would typically do when we take over a property.

Mr. Rettke: Does it fall within the allowable square footage then as well?

Mr. Hansen: For comprehensive sign plans, the area of the sign is approved per the BZBA, so there's no set maximum. What is the area of the sign?

Mr. Rettke: Well, it's 12' wide.

Mr. Domini: The total area of the sign is 17.5 square feet. That's what it says right there on the application.

Mr. Hansen: Oh, that would exclude the posts and the base, just the actual physical—

Mr. Feeney: Overall they're saying about 60. If we approve this, do we approve the colors too?

Mr. Hansen: Do you have a specific name to that color? We can just approve it conditionally with that tan color.

Mr. Morrison: To us it doesn't matter, cause we'll match it whatever you guys — obviously it's going to be like a green and a white and I believe it's like a yellow brown that we typically use for that, but we're not married to any colors as long as it's not cost prohibitive.

Mr. Feeney: I think we can approve it and then let staff approve the colors. I don't have a problem doing that. Usually we take a look at colored pictures of what it's going to look like.

Mr. Morrison: I understand and I'm sorry that I didn't bring that with me.

Mr. Stoffel: What's the structure? Is it brick or stucco?

Mr. Morrison: Oh, for the apartment buildings around there? They're going to be brick with vinyl siding.

Mr. Hansen: It's a tan vinyl siding, a little yellowish.

Mr. Morrison: Yeah, they've been repainted. It used to be kind of yellowy, now it's more of a brown looking and it looks much better.

Mr. Hansen: I move that we approve the sign with the condition that staff review the color scheme and if there's any concern it would return to the Board for additional review and approval and condition that there's no base.

Mr. Morrison: Not even one foot or anything?

Mr. Hansen: No, because you're going to hit your 5' maximum on your sign and we can't grant — you don't have a variance request in to do that.

Mr. Feeney: I'll second all that.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Rettke voted “yes.” Mr. Hansen voted “yes.” Mr. Stoffel voted “yes.” Mr. Feeney voted “yes.”)

3. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION, 8139 EAST BROAD STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, CS; PRESENT USE, VACANT OUTLOT; PROPOSED USE, RETAIL STORE; PRESENT OWNER, LRC BROAD INVESTORS LLC; CONTACT: TIRE DISCOUNTERS – DAVID WILSON (29-MS)

Mr. Domini: While the applicant’s coming up, I review the site plan with staff and I don’t think we had any real concerns other than some additional landscaping per the requirements of the code, unless the Board finds other changes they’d like to see as well.

Mr. Tom Warner: Good evening. My name’s Tom Warner. I’m with Advanced Civil Design. I represent David Wilson with Tire Discounters. Our firm put together the site plan application and reading through the staff report, it seemed like the only item of discussion was the landscaping along the east side of the property. I brought a site plan. Our landscape architect has already addressed the situation on the east side where they wanted hedgerow screening for the parking spaces, so that has been addressed. I think all the other items are pretty well – you know, this piece of property was pretty well suited for an outlot development. The storm water management’s already taken care of off site. All the utilities are there. Essentially it’s running off the service drive. It’s really designed to handle outlot development. We do have a sign located at the northeast corner of the property and per the restrictions, we’re to share that sign with the future development to the east and those details will be addressed further on. Staff’s been real good to work with getting us kind of lined up on our submittal and I’m just here to answer any questions if there are any from the Board.

Mr. Feeney: I really didn’t see anything glaring other than staff’s recommendations. Anybody else have any comments?

Mr. Rettke: I didn’t either. I thought it was well put together and there weren’t a lot of questions.

Mr. Hansen: This was split before they came in.

Mr. Warner: I don’t think it’s official yet. We ran off of a site plan and a survey that EMH&T had provided. They applied for the lot split application, but I’m not sure that it’s actually been recorded, but we’ve followed that guideline.

Mr. Rettke: And this is not adjacent to the bank, right? This is one lot over.

Mr. Warner: Right. We’re one lot removed, or east of the bank by another parcel. Heard rumors about what’s going in between us, but I haven’t seen anything officially in front of Reynoldsburg, so I’ll keep that to myself.

Mr. Rettke: I move that we approve Item C3, 29-MS with the revised site plan showing the landscaping will meet staff's concerns.

Mr. Hansen: I will second.

(Mr. Domini called the roll: Mr. Feeney voted "yes." Mr. Rettke voted "yes." Mr. Hansen voted "yes." Mr. Stoffel abstained.)

4. VARIANCE APPLICATION, 675 KELTONCREST DRIVE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; ZONING DISTRICT, R-3; REQUESTING A VARIANCE FROM TABLE 1175.03 TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK FROM THIRTY (30) FEET TO TWENTY-SIX (26) FEET. CONTACT: SHAWN C. BROWN (99-ZV).

Mr. Rettke: Could you state your name for the record, please?

Mr. Shawn Brown: Shawn Christopher Brown, 675 Keltoncrest Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068.

Mr. Hansen: We have a classic case for a variance here with the odd-shaped lot, so I'm in full support. I think it meets all the standards for a variance.

Mr. Feeney: I agree. I looked at it and I think what you're adding is going to be nice.

Mr. Rettke: And you're going to go through the City for all the permits and everything like that?

Mr. Brown: Yeah. I initially went for a permit request and when they told me-- I think I actually worked with you and he said, "Hey, there's a 30'—"

Mr. Hansen: I already submitted that old application back and they're reviewing it now, so you're in line already.

Mr. Brown: Also, do I need to put-- So it's already going through the permit process?

Mr. Hansen: Yeah. It hasn't changed has it?

Mr. Brown: No, it's exactly the same.

Mr. Domini: What additional permit are you requesting?

Mr. Hansen: Building permit.

Mr. Stoffel: I'll make a motion that we approve Item C4, variance application 99-ZV.

(Mr. Domini called the roll: Mr. Hansen voted “yes.” Mr. Stoffel voted “yes.” Mr. Feeney voted “yes.” Mr. Rettke voted “yes.”)

5. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT APPLICATION, 493 LANCASTER AVE., REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONING, NC; PRESENT OWNER'S NAME, TAI C. WONG & LINDA WONG; REQUESTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TRANSFER FOR A DAYCARE. CONTACT: LAURIE WASHINGTON (60-SE).

Mr. Rettke: Would you like to brief us on the staff report?

Mr. Domini: I didn't have too many questions on this application. The only question that typically comes up with these Special Exceptions for daycares is, from my experience, on the outdoor play areas, if that exists, how that looks, how it functions. But, generally, I think this is a pretty straightforward application.

Mr. Rettke: Would you please state your name and address for the record, please?

Ms. Laurie Washington: Hi, my name is – good evening. My name is Laurie Washington of 6459 Blackhorse Street, Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Stoffel: I have a question and I'm sure it's nothing, but the business, Miss Pat Clark's Building Blocks, when you said they downsized, are they're not there at all now?

Ms. Washington: She's on – she had as many as four units and she's down to two.

Mr. Stoffel: Okay.

Ms. Washington: And she, you know, she's downsizing continually. She's getting ready to retire, so, bless her heart, sweet as can be.

Mr. Stoffel: Oh, okay – this – yeah.

Mr. Domini: And there's been a daycare here.

Mr. Stoffel: This is where the convenience store—

Mr. Hansen: For a number of years, yeah. And is there an outdoor play area?

Ms. Washington: Yes, there is, in the back.

Mr. Hansen: And you're going to be utilizing that same space?

Ms. Washington: As well, um-um.

Mr. Hansen: You're going to be sharing it?

Ms. Washington: Yes, well, she's not using it too much. She doesn't have that many children.

Mr. Hansen: Okay.

Ms. Washington: But we'll be using it as well as going to the park nearby.

Mr. Domini: I think you can see it on the aerial there. It's the triangle in the back.

Mr. Hansen: Okay, I see now.

(inaudible)

Mr. Stoffel: Oh, yeah.

Mr. Domini: Back here.

Mr. Stoffel: I knew there was one back there but—

Mr. Rettke: I don't have any thing else.

Mr. Feeney: No, I didn't have any questions either. I mean, it's pretty self-explanatory and I always get a little confused on this site plan because it's across two sheets, so I finally figured it out.

Mr. Stoffel: Yeah, I was a little confused, too.

Ms. Washington: Imagine what it did to me.

Mr. Rettke: And he's a registered engineer, too.

Mr. Stoffel: I move that we approve Item C5, 60-SE.

Mr. Feeney: I'll second.

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

Ms. Rettke: Thank you.

Ms. Washington: Thank you.

6. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT APPLICATION, 1286-1290 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; PRESENT ZONINIG, CC; PRESENT OWNER'S NAME, DANIEL ESSIEN; REQUESTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TRANSFER FOR A DAYCARE. CONTACT: CAPITAL ROYAL CHILDCARE & LEARNING CENTER (61-SE).

Mr. Domini: I believe this has been a daycare as well in the past. Is this the end cap? Mr. Hansen, is this the end cap?

Mr. Hansen: It is. This was the former location of the Romake Bilingual Preschool and we approved a Special Exception use permit for them to move across the street.

Mr. Feeney: Right.

Mr. Rettke: And consolidate.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah.

Mr. Domini: Except, if you look at your screen where my cursor is on this end cap, that's where it's going.

Mr. Hansen: No.

Mr. Domini: No?

Mr. Hansen: It's on the other side, the other, I guess—

Mr. Rettke: Towards K-Mart?

Mr. Hansen: Towards K-Mart, yeah.

Mr. Domini: This end cap?

Mr. Hansen: Yeah.

Mr. Domini: Wasn't there one at the other end cap, too, at one time?

Mr. Feeney: Yes.

Mr. Stoffel: They were both hers, weren't they?

Mr. Domini: Okay.

Mr. Feeney: So there was a facility there and you're just taking over, is that?

Mr. Essien: Yes, sir.

Mr. Feeney: Is that a playground area in the back?

Mr. Essien: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hansen: Do you know how – do you have an anticipated number of children then?

Mr. Essien: 95 capacity.

Mr. Feeney: I remember when we approved one of those a long time ago. We approved one of those units and we were concerned about the trucks that came around there, and we requested some big parking blocks or something. Are they still out there for the playground area.

Mr. Essien: Yes, they do have some guard, like bollard, right behind the play area so that trucks can't get into the play area.

Mr. Feeney: Okay. We were concerned about that. I didn't know if it's still there or not.

Mr. Rettke: Can you state your name and address for the record? I apologize. I got out of hand.

Mr. Daniel Essien: Daniel Essien, 5872 Sunset Ridge, Galloway, Ohio 43119.

Mr. Rettke: And we're not changing anything at all. You're just going to use it as is and continue what she had started under a different name?

Mr. Essien: Yes, sir.

Mr. Domini: 23 hours, seven days a week.

Mr. Hansen: Oh, this is, yeah.

Mr. Stoffel: No, I missed that one.

Mr. Domini: Page three, top of page three .

Mr. Rettke: That presents no problem for the City?

Mr. Domini: No. I think the only concern we'd have on anything like that would be traffic, but off-peak hours.

Mr. Hansen: Right.

Mr. Stoffel: Is there – when the children are there at nighttime, will they be playing in the back and is there sufficient lighting back there in the play area for that?

Mr. Essien: There is sufficient lighting, but they will not be playing at night--

Mr. Stoffel: Okay.

Mr. Essien: --in the back.

Mr. Hansen: And, if I remember correctly, speaking with the previous operator – she said that this was a very secure location. They have a number of locking doors in order to prevent anybody from entering the building that's unwanted.

Mr. Essien: That's correct.

Mr. Hansen: I have no issues with the hours of operation even though they've changed slightly from the previous user.

Mr. Feeney: It did seem like a lot of hours, but I know there's a need for that, too, so.

Mr. Hansen: We have one other 24-hour daycare in the city and that's over on Birchview.

Mr. Rettke: Behind Home Depot.

Mr. Stoffel: Behind Home Depot.

Mr. Hansen: Right.

Mr. Rettke: They opened that one.

Mr. Hansen: They are.

Mr. Feeney: Oh, that's right.

Mr. Hansen: They're 24 hours.

Mr. Rettke: And there was a lighting issue with that one. What was the square footage on that again, on the unit?

Mr. Essien: 9,075, I believe.

Mr. Hansen: I move for approval of application 61-SE.

Mr. Feeney: I'll second that.

(Mr. Rettke voted "yes." Mr. Hansen voted "yes." Mr. Stoffel voted "yes." Mr. Feeney voted "yes.")

The meeting was adjourned at 7:53 o'clock.

Anthony Rettke, Chair

Aaron Domini, Planning Administrator

This document was transcribed by:
Area East Secretarial Service
7668 Slate Ridge Blvd.
Reynoldsburg OH 40368