



**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
December 5, 2024**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Furst, Barnhart, Benner, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk

ABSENT: Alabi

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Board - Regular Meeting - 11/07/2024

Minutes stand approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers sworn in by Mr. Furst.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

App# 2024-0630; 2467 Taylor Square Dr.; Kush Patel for 256 Hotel Group, LLC; Variance

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Patel explained that this is a Marriott branded property and their standards are fairly strict. They require a 1:1 parking space to room ratio. This is why they asked for the island variance.

Mr. Furst told the applicant that they are not allowed to grant preferences.

The applicant did point out that on the north end of the property there's a retention system that was built for the overall development. They could potentially add islands there, but no trees would be allowed due to the depth restriction. The detention for all the surrounding parcels is on this one site, making it unique to this parcel.

Mr. Furst asked the applicant if any other remedies were available. The applicant said that the idea of the islands is to add additional landscaping. They are willing to add additional trees to the site.

Mr. Patel asked to table the variance request for the number of islands.

Mr. Benner: Based on the applicants request, I move that we table this until the January 16th, 2025 meeting.

Ms. Kleckley: I second.

RESULT:	Tabled - Request for reduced islands
MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Kleckley
AYES:	Brusk, Furst, Ward, Benner, Kleckley, Barnhart

The drive width and perimeter landscaping variance is still being discussed.

Mr. Brusk: Based on the lack of questions, I move that we accept both of these variances.

Ms. Barnhart: I second.

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Brusk
SECONDER:	Barnhart
AYES:	Ward, Brusk, Kleckley, Barnhart, Benner, Furst

App# 2024-0629; 2467 Taylor Square Dr.; Kush Patel for 256 Hotel Group, LLC; Conditional Use

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.



A conditional use cannot be granted without meeting all the zoning code standards. Since a variance was tabled, Mr. Furst asked if the applicant would like to table this conditional use.

Mr. Fox asked for clarification on how the process worked if there were to resolve the variance with staff. He feels that the conditional use should be approved, and the variance can be worked out with staff.

Mr. Benner asked if the applicant had reviewed with Marriott regarding the parking islands and the applicant wasn't aware of the staff's denial until today.

With the brand requirements and the city requirements, Mr. Benner is not comfortable approving the conditional use with outstanding variances.

Mr. Furst: I move that we table this application to our January 16th, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Benner: I second.

RESULT:	Tabled until January 16th, 2025
MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Benner
AYES:	Barnhart, Brusk, Ward, Kleckley, Benner, Furst

App# 2024-0807; 7295 E. Main St.; Nancy Dickerson for Reynoldsburg Animal Hospital; Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Tonne is here responding to a code violation for not having the dumpster enclosed.

Mr. Furst: It is clear to me that your application meets the standards. I move that we approve this application as submitted.

Ms. Barnhart: I second.

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Barnhart
AYES:	Ward, Kleckley, Benner, Brusk, Barnhart, Furst

App# 2024-0780; 2829 Taylor Rd.; Branham Sign Co., Inc for Bath and Body Works; Variance

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Butsko explained that during the renovation the side wall sign was removed in error. Their main concern is the safety of the consumers. As cars come from the west, this sign is visible, allowing drivers to see there's another store and to help consumers safely cross the road. Additionally, the previous sign was seven years old and was due for maintenance.

Mr. Furst asked if there had been any safety accidents or collisions in front of this store. The sign has been there since 2016, and they believe that the sign aided in the lack of reported accidents.

Mr. Furst has concerns that the board has denied previous signs that do not face a public entrance.

Ms. Buathier read the code regarding wall signs.

Mr. Benner believes granting this variance would set a precedent that would allow special treatment for the applicant. Mr. Brusk agrees.

Ms Barnhart asked if the Famous Footwear on the other end had two signs. It does have two signs, but is legal non-conforming. Ms. Barnhart asked if we identify a timeframe to replace signage in our code. We don't have a defined timeframe. However, the applicant was made aware when they submitted both signs that they would need a variance for the side sign, and they withdrew their request for the variance at that time. The applicant claims that due to the time constraints of the project they just wanted to get the signs approved as quickly as possible. Ms. Buathier explained that all applicants are told not to remove the sign because once the sign is removed they lose their legal non-conformity.

Mr. Furst is not confident that the applicant meets the requirements of this application.

Mr. Brusk asked Mr. Shook whether it was for the benefit of the board to motion in a positive or negative way. Mr. Shook did not have a microphone, so his response is inaudible.

Mr. Benner: I move that we deny this variance based on the parameters of 1105.03C 7.1.

Mr. Brusk: I second.

RESULT: Approved

MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Brusk
AYES:	Furst, Ward, Kleckley, Brusk, Benner
NAYS:	Barnhart

**App# 2024-0713; 2793 Taylor Rd.; Ben Dariano of WD Partners for Walmart;
Variance**

Ms. Meeks read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Lorenz is speaking for the applicant. He does concur with all the staff's recommendations for approval. He does ask that the board consider signs 10-15 as directional. These are in place currently, and this is like a replacement. They are OK with signs 5, 6 and 9 being removed. The applicant verified these are all new signs and not replacements because the building will be getting fresh paint as well. Staff left it up for the board to decide if 10-15 are considered to be directional. If they are not directional, they will need a variance.

Mr. Shook spoke, but didn't have a microphone, so it was inaudible.

Ms. Buathier read the definition of directional from the code to the board.

Ms. Barnhart asked about the previous application at Bob's Furniture.

Mr. Furst asked Mr. Brusk to clarify why he believes these can be considered directional signs. Enter, exit, etc. are saying how or where to enter, and he feels that is all that the tires sign is saying, come here for tires.

Mr. Benner read the last part of the definition that says the sign shall not include any business information other than the business logo. Not tires, not anything else.

Ms. Barnhart sees this as being more of a convenience. She is thinking of other businesses in Reynoldsburg where they are not able to label the bays. She is afraid this will set a precedent for other auto businesses in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Benner expressed that the board is bound by the code. We are in a place where the code is a law, and we can't go against that just because these businesses want to rebrand.

Mr. Lorenz: This is a department store where people go to specific entrances for specific products. When you take the application and apply it that way, these are directional signs.

Ms. Barnhart is thankful that businesses are rebranding and updating. Unfortunately, we don't have concessions for that in the code.

Mr. Brusk doesn't think a sign saying "tires" is business information when it is where you go in to get the tires.

Mr. Furst asked the applicant to address how the variance factors are met specifically to the hardship and uniqueness of the site.

Under the code, this building would be allowed round 1,275 ft of signage. This location has multiple entrances with multiple destinations. It is way finding and safety in the parking lot. The massing of the building required a larger sign and direction. The applicant states this variance request is the minimum amount necessary for the building.

The building is uniquely large in the district. It is 200,000 sq ft. The smaller signs would be completely disproportionate to the massing and the scale of the building. Mr. Lorenz believes the smaller signs would present a safety concern. The traffic patterns on the site have been changed, and it has created a cross-over. Customers need to be able to identify which section they need to park in to get the items they need.

The board discussed sign 1 (Walmart) - The building frontages is over 600 ft long. The code permits two wall signs that parallel the main road to have up to 2x the amount of building frontage. They are allowed around 1200 sq ft. of signage. This sign is not that large.

Mr. Furst: Based on discussion, I'm satisfied that the factors in 1109.11D are met. I move that we accept the recommendation.

Ms. Barnhart: I'll second.

RESULT:	Sign 1 was approved
MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Barnhart
AYES:	Ward, Kleckley, Brusk, Benner, Furst, Barnhart

Signs 2 and 3.

Mr. Furst: I would suggest the same considerations as sign one be considered. I move that we accept staff's recommendation 2.

Mr. Benner: I second.

RESULT:	Sign 2 and 3 approved
----------------	-----------------------

MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Barnhart
AYES:	Barnhart, Furst, Benner, Brusk, Kleckley, Ward

Sign 4 and 8, staff recommendation #3 - Pickup signs

The precedent has been set previously for other buildings in this district for pickup signs. Staff doesn't consider these to be directional signs, therefore a variance is requested for the number of signs. Mr. Brusk and Mr. Benner consider these to be directional signs, but our code does not state that. The board would like to review directional signs in 2025 code updates.

Mr. Benner: I make a motion that we approve the sign variance for signs 4 and 8. As recommended in the staff report,

Mr. Brusk: I second.

RESULT:	Signs 4 and 8 approved
MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Brusk
AYES:	Ward, Kleckley, Brusk, Benner, Furst, Barnhart

Signs 5,6,9,10,11,12,13,14,15, staff's recommendation number 4.

Mr. Brusk would like to consider these directional signs.

Mr. Lorenz asked to withdraw the request for signs 5,6,9.
Signs 10-15 are being considered. These are the signs over the auto garage entrances.

Mr. Shook had discussion, but it was inaudible.

Mr. Brusk: I make a motion for signs 10-15 to be considered directional signs.

Ms. Ward: I second.

RESULT:	Denied that these are directional signs 10-15
MOVER:	Brusk
SECONDER:	Ward
AYES:	Brusk, Ward
NAYS:	Barnhart, Benner, Kleckley, Furst



Mr. Furst: I do not think these meet the variance factors.

Ms. Barnhart clarified whether the applicant could reface the current signs. Ms. Buathier explained the legal non-conforming standards.

Mr. Lorenz asked for the fourth item to be tabled until January 16th, 2025. He will work with staff and talk to the clients.

Mr. Furst: The applicant has requests up to table until the January 16th, 2025 meeting. I so move.

Mr. Benner: I second.

RESULT:	Tabled until January 16th, 2025
MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Benner
AYES:	Brusk, Kleckley, Furst, Ward, Benner, Barnhart

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Planning and Zoning Administrator

Chairman