



**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
April 17, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Benner called the meeting to order and directed staff to call the roll.

ROLL CALL

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

ABSENT: Furst

Mr. Benner made a motion to excuse the absence of Mr. Furst. Second by Mr. Brusk. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stans approved.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers for the evening sworn in by Mr. Benner.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**6008-6014 E. Livingston Avenue; Zoning Code Violation/Cease and Desist;
Appeal**

Ms. Buathier did not present the case to the board. Instead, Ms. Buathier explained that Mr. John Gleason, the applicant's representative, requests that the item be tabled. the applicant's representative present at the meeting is request applicant's representative is here.

Mr. Gleason stated that he wished to table the agenda item until the results of the April 28th City Council meeting's hearing on an appeal to the Planning and Zoning Board's decision to deny the project's drive aisle width variance was heard.

Mr. Meyer stated that staff did not object to tabling the item.

Ms. Andrade noted for the record that the cease-and-desist notice was still in effect that a business could not be operating at the site.

Mr. Benner made a motion to table the item until the May 1, 2025 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting.

RESULT:	Table (6-0)
MOVER:	Keith Benner
SECONDER:	Anita Ward
AYES:	Barnhart, Benner, Alabi, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	None

App# 2025-0091; 2213 Belltree Drive; Danielle Kamgang for Danny Residence Care; Conditional Use

Mr. Benner stated that he would recuse himself from this agenda item. Mr. Benner then left the dais and moved the public seating area of City Council Chambers.

Mr. Brusk moved that Ms. Kleckley be voted as Board Chair Pro Temp.

Ms. Kleckley stated that she thought Ms. Barnhart would be the Board Member stepping in for Mr. Benner.

Mr. Brusk stated that he was supportive of Ms. Barnhart as Board Chair Pro Temp.

Mr. Meyer advised Mr. Brusk that he would need to amend his motion.

Mr. Brusk amended his motion and moved that Ms. Barnhart acts as Board Chair Pro Temp.

RESULT:	Approve (5-0)
MOVER:	Norman Brusk
SECONDER:	Teresa Alabi
AYES:	Barnhart, Alabi, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	None

Mr. Meyer noted that the motion passed and that the meeting is now being run by Board Chair Pro Temp Barnhart.

Ms. Buathier read a summary of the staff report into the record.

Mr. Brusk: I do have a comment to staff. I do believe that the wording, can you go back to that just for a second, the wording that no more than one to five related person is kind of confusing. It should either read that up to that one to five related people will be permitted, or no more than five, either, either one would be acceptable. To me. Is there any problem with that?

Mr. Meyer: I believe we want the unrelated persons component in there, because that is part of the definition. So, we would not want to touch the unrelated i don't have an opinion on the you're wanting to change it from one to five to no more than five. I don't have an issue. I don't know if that matters legally. I don't know if our Assistant City Attorney has any issue with that language. Phoenix, would you go back? Thank you.

Ms. Andrade: No, I believe so according to the law, and I think you guys are doing up to five as specific just that's what Reynoldsburg wants, because according to the law, it could be three to 16 unrelated adults, they just have to have the minimums of at least one or two unrelated with mental illness or with the residential state supplement program payments. But, technically, it could be three to 16. But I think in accordance to what we want from Reynoldsburg is we want one to five, so I don't think that. So, my answer is, I don't think legally, there's no issue with that. You guys can word it as proposed.

Mr. Brusk: It is just wording. It is only technical. It says no more than one to five. That's confusing. No more than one, no more than two, no more than three, no more than four. So, my feeling is, either get rid of the no more and say that one to five related unrelated persons be permitted, or no more than five. Either one is fine, otherwise you have a potential problem up the road. If somebody gets really technical.

Ms. Andrade: And just to answer that question, whichever one of those two that you go with would be legally sound,

Mr. Meyer: And from a staff perspective, I think we would just say that no more than five unrelated persons would be sufficient. So, if we get to the point where someone would deem it appropriate to make a motion, staff would have no issue with that. I don't know if the applicant is here. Do you know? Yes?

Ms. Buathier: Yes, the applicant is here. And then after that, we do have people signed up for public comment.

Ms. Barnhart: If the applicant can come forward and present his case, we are eagerly awaiting to hear as you approach, if you could please state your name and address for the record.



Mr. Kamgang: My name is Romea Kamgang and I'm Danielle Kamgang's husband. And, the address is 2213 Belltree Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, 43068. Thank you.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay, and you can go ahead and present. Present your case.

Mr. Kamgang: Yeah, my wife decided to open what we know is a class two residential adult care facility under the umbrella of the Ohio Department of Mental Health. Usually what happens is you have no more than five people, according to my experience, unrelated, most of the time with stable mental health illness or any type of adults are receiving some type of government help. So, we purchased the house in September and during when we started to apply for the license, we were told that we would need to have a zoning certificate before the license before starting the process licensing. Based on our experience with other friends who had the same type of facility, we were not even aware that at one point the zoning certificate would come under this type of scrutiny. That's why, like, the last time we had a hearing, my wife did not even, you know, bother to come. So, I'm here. I can answer, you know, any concern that the people living in the same area may have. And, you know, and I can just promise that, you know, we're going to be doing everything following the law and also ensuring that we maintain the safety and the peace in that area or the city. Okay.

Ms. Barnhart: Thank you. I'm going to ask the board that we hold questions from the board for right now, and we'll go ahead and hear public comment, and then we will ask you to return to the podium so that we can ask some questions.

Ms. Buathier: The first person listed is, I think, Devon Brothers. Thank you.

Mr. Devon Brothers: Good evening, members of the Reynoldsburg zoning board. My name is Devin Brothers and I live at 2179 Leah Lane, right here in this community. I'm back to ask you to deny the conditional use permit for a class two residential care facility at 2213 Belltree Drive proposed as Danny residence care facility. I see the applicant is here today, and while I respect their intent for mental health care, dislocation steps from a junior high school and in a neighborhood with little kids is wrong, I am also worried about their follow through on permits and licensing, and their current fence is a security risk and needs addressing. Safety is my top concern. This house is too close to Junior High School, where students walk daily, and we've got toddlers playing in the yards all around, including mine. The plan for up to five adults with mental illness, managed by just two staff who'd come and go, not always there, though available. 24/7, mental health can shift fast, and that spotty staffing leaves gaps. A small issue could affect our kids before help arrives. Plus our backyard fence isn't a privacy fence, it's a security risk, letting

residents, letting residents or outsiders see or move through too easily a property, a proper privacy fence is a must to protect our kids, and they haven't addressed this. This is a family neighborhood, not a facility zone. They claim no extra traffic or noise, but staff deliveries, but staff deliveries and cars will add up more than a typical home that's a hazard for kids on bikes or crossing streets near school, it changes our community safety and quiet feel. Parents like me won't relax and with a care facility nearby, and families might not buy homes here, hurting our property values. Parents like I'm sorry. I've read about group, group homes and incidents elsewhere, and even if rare, the risk feels real. The applicants absent last meeting makes me question their commitment. They mentioned O, M, H, A, S, licensing, but how do we know they'll secure the permits before opening? There are no shows you just that they might skip steps and that that's a deal breaker near our kids, their fixes, cameras, a hotline, screen don't prevent problems. They react. We need guarantees, not hopes, especially with that flimsy offense. Mental health care belongs elsewhere, not by a school. The Fair Housing Act ensures access, but zoning protects our residential character, keep our students and little ones safe, and if you consider this demand, a privacy fence and proof of licensing first, thank you for your time.

Ms. Buathier: Yes. Um, Mr. Chairman, just as a reminder, we are keeping comments to three minutes a person. Hannah Backer Brothers, I'm sorry if I butchered your name.

Ms. Hannah Brothers: Good evening. My name is Hannah Laubach, or brothers and I live at 2179, Leah Lane. I currently work in mental health, and I wanted to reiterate some of the things mentioned in the last meeting. I absolutely empathize that there is a shortage of group homes or these types of residences in Franklin County. However, I do not believe our neighborhood is the proper place for one. We are within walking distance of not one but two schools and numerous bus stops. As we do have a multitude of families with children in our neighborhood, I know that. I know what facilities can label as stable, but mental illness is not set. It fluctuates. There will always be a chance for decompensation, and there are always elopement or flight risks. Throughout many years in mental health, I have also seen people that have had thoughts to or did indeed commit offenses but were never charged. Therefore, how can we stop them from being approved for this particular residence? The short answer is, we can't. There are too many risk factors involved at this location, so I respectfully ask that the committee to deny this request. Thank you.

Ms. Buathier: I'm guessing I'm sorry. Sean Mitchell, and if I get through the list and I did not call your name, please come up. I have two more after this.

Ms. Sean Mitchell: Good evening. My name is Sean D Mitchell. I live at 6438



Cherroy Drive. My property backs up to the 2213 Belltree residence. I have lived at 6438 Cherroy Drive, a residential area with single family homes. I have lived in the home for over 20 years, and I've never had any problems or issues while living there. My children attended Reynoldsburg schools and graduated from both of the high schools. Our area already has sexual offenders in the neighborhood and in close proximity to our homes and within close and illegal distance of the Baldwin Road Junior High, Reynoldsburg high and the daycare – I get the offender alerts on my phone. Why is Reynoldsburg allowing multiple mental health patients, slash individuals, to occupy single family residences, to be run as a business? Reynoldsburg city employees and residents, we must do better in who and what we allow in our community. I am a tax paying resident. I expect more from our city and our city representatives. Who in Reynoldsburg will be responsible for the oversight and maintenance of this resident slash business at 2213 Belltree – the homeowner or the city? Communication is the key to a success for our community. Will we hear from the owners as to what to expect if this establishment is approved? I am happy to see that they are here today, and I probably will have some questions For him, personally. Thank you.

Ms. Buathier: Janae Lee.

Ms. Janae Lee: Hello. My name is Janae Lee. I live at 6364 Cherroy Drive. I've lived there for 28 years, my whole life, basically. And, I'm also a licensed social worker in the state of Ohio. My research is also on housing quality and housing neighborhoods. I thought it was really important for me to come to this meeting, not only because I've lived there, but I've also seen changes with this neighborhood, and specifically this side of Reynoldsburg, which seems to be disinvested in as being the closest to the City of Columbus, saying that as a social worker, I really do understand the need for mental health facilities. But, at the same time, I also recognize the need that people are looking for safe, quality housing, which means that they want to feel safe in their neighborhood, not only for their kids, but also for general walks. We want to know our neighbors. There have been a lot of houses and a lot of turnover. In this neighborhood, specifically with this house, and knowing that this house was just bought in September, there hasn't been a lot of ability for the neighbors to really get to know what will be there. It is really important to me, as I see the waves of children come and go. Me being one of those seeing the kids go up and down the street a lot of times, parents are not really aware of what their children are doing up and down the street. But they feel safe with allowing their children to do that. So, I would prefer and suggest that this placement of this facility not be in this neighborhood, so that we can maintain not only our sense of security, but also help build community within our neighborhood, helping people feel safe and feel like their neighborhood is not is quality and that they're not being overlooked with other parts of Reynoldsburg, thank you.

Ms. Buathier: Renee Lee.

Ms. Renee Lee: Hello. My name is Renee Lee. I live I live at 6364 Cherroy Drive. I've lived in this neighborhood for 28 years, and I recommend that this facility not be approved, because, as has been said, there's children we personally, I walk on Belltree. I walk my dogs, and I have seen this neighborhood change from what it was when I first moved. And, it does feel like we are overlooked, and this feels like you're just putting something there, like we don't matter. And, I wish that you would consider the families and how we want our neighborhood to be safe and welcoming that other people would move in. Thank you.

Ms. Buathier: We do not have anyone else listed, but if there is anyone else that would like to speak, please come up to the podium.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay with no other public comment. If the applicant could come forward again. Thank you. And if you would like to respond to some of the concerns questions that folks had that would be very helpful.

Mr. Kamgang: Yes, I want to start, please. What's your name? Sir. Okay. I mean, I definitely understand your concern. I have, we have about we have five properties in that area.

My wife, younger sister, live in that area. So, my kids, they spend most of the weekend in that area. I have one of my best friends that lives over in Birchview with kids. So, that's just to say that I'm not considering, we are not considering that area as a dumping area. And, so we really love that area. And, when we are looking for a house, you know, we consider that that was the best place, for what we want to do. Now regarding safety, according to the research, it established that with mental illness, there's more danger when there's instability. And, when I'm talking about instability here, I'm referring to housing ensuring that they have their basic need met, and also ensuring that they are in a situation where they can actually take, you know, follow their treatment. So, we are not doing that because we want to bring trouble in the community. And to the contrary, we view that community as a safe place and the spirit behind the law governing the residential adult care facility was to, you know, because having them in the community basically allowed them, you know, to stick with their treatment and stay stable. So we, don't really think that by having them in a house where they won't worry about anything, you know, it's going to foster their level of stability and therefore ensuring that they're safe. Right? And, also we decide who live over there. We are not forced to accept anybody, and we vet the people. We will make sure that anybody that lives over there is a good match for the community. I also have the impression that, the impression that there is a sometimes misunderstanding of mental health. Maybe somebody's here, you know, on depression medication, that's mental health. A lot of those guys actually

work. They have a life. They have a life. And if you we go through the crime, I mean the crime history, you'll notice that most of the dangerous people with mental health are those who are homeless, those who are not taken care of. So, I think that residential care facility you're just trying to... You know, I don't know how to put it, but the intention is not to destroy the community. The intention is not to bring unsafety into the community, because in that area, my kids are very frequent in that area. So, what's your name, please? What's your name, and can you repeat a comment, please? Uh huh. Can you repeat the comment? Yes?

Ms. Barnhart: Yes, we've already this. I we've already surpassed the public comment portion, and so right now is just more of your time to be able to present and make your case. Yeah.

Mr. Kamgang: So yeah. Regarding the house that somebody mentioned, the house value actually of one residential care facility, I believe on Birchview and I believe it's been over there for about five years. And, if you look the trend of the houses in the housing market in that area, I don't think that it's going down. And, I know somebody mentioned about a resident that I believe stabbed another resident. I actually made some research. I did some research about that, and he used to live in that residence of Birchview. And the owner, the owner, first of all, he was not. He was never somebody was supposed to be out of the community, because he was not stable at all. The owner, at that time, was new in the business, and she did not know how to vet and when she called the facility, they just say, hey, we need him out as soon as possible. That's how he ended up over there. She one day came and noticed something strange. She called the case manager. She called the family. That's when the family told her that, no, he cannot come to my place because he has a history of stabbing. So, once she heard that, she called net care to come and get him. So that's how he was removed from that facility, and transferred. He went to the, I believe he went to an institution, and from there, he was released into the community. That was a mistake, because if there you are not stable, and in our case, if I know that anybody has any history of violence, he cannot be in that area because that area is so quiet, that area is too is too safe for those type of problems.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay, so board members, do you have any questions for this applicant? I'll let you guys go first.

Ms. Albi: Thank you. Yes. My first question, you mentioned you own four or five properties in this neighborhood.

Mr. Kamgang: Yes.

Ms. Alabi: Do you operate this type of business in any of those properties?

Mr. Kamgang: No, they are all renters.

Do you operate this type of business anywhere else in the city?

Mr. Kamgang: I currently work with friends that operate two facilities in Columbus.

Ms. Albi: So, you and your wife. Your wife is the owner, correct?

Mr. Kamgang: Yes.

Ms. Albi: New in this business?

Mr. Kamgang: Yes.

Ms. Albi: Okay, and my other question is, I saw the wording for the facility being provided as housing for stable mental illness. Is that, in terms of their stable mental illness, is that types of mental illness or the stability of their actual mental health at the time that they're living in the home?

Mr. Kamgang: Those are definitely people that you know with mental illness that are deemed to be safe and live in the community.

Ms. Albi: And those people are being vetted by you and your wife?

Mr. Kamgang: First of all, you know, the facility, whoever is their provider, because they cannot be released in the community without the consent of their doctor. So, it is based on that. We ask if we would accept this or that person to be in our facility.

Ms. Albi: And my last question is, where are you in the process of getting your license for this property?

Mr. Kamgang: So, right now, we start with the board certification, because one of the most essential steps in the licenses process is to have the zoning certification. Thank you.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, this is Norman Brusk. This is your wife associated with any other of these homes?

Mr. Kamgang: No.

Mr. Brusk: It is the only one that you...

Mr. Kamgang: Yes.

Mr. Brusk: Yes. And who is the how do you get the clientele? Where do they come from? And do they go through any major organization?

Mr. Kamgang: Maryhaven is for example, is one of the places. So, most of the time when somebody is in crisis, they will go to those places. And, you know, stay over there for a while, get stable, sometimes be moved into transitional housing. Before, you know, looking for those types of facilities.

Mr. Brusk: Have you... have you had any problems in the past with, with your friends, operations and so on? Talk about it.

Mr. Kamgang: Yeah, I mean, I've mentioned the issue history, because the one where it was say that a resident stabbed another of my friends. He was originally in one of the facilities of my friend. She discovered something odd and got him out immediately, and he went to another facility that's where the incident happened.

Ms. Kleckley: I have a couple of questions. Safety is probably one of the largest issues that we're faced with today, and I have a question for staff too. So, Miss Mitchell mentioned enforcing oversight, who will monitor that?

Mr. Meyer: In what respects? From a safety standpoint, I mean, there are licenses with the state that we're not really able to speak on as because that comes from the state. From a safety standpoint, there is typically fire, EMS, police. There is code enforcement if you are violating rules of property maintenance. If you're violating rules of any sort of conditional use, we do have the ability to revoke conditional uses if you're not following them. So, I mean, this would be typical of any kind of city business. As far as the rules the state has, I'm not able to speak on that. America, our Assistant City Attorney may know that, but that's not something that city staff has an awareness of.

Ms. Andrade: Yes, so I can talk about it a little bit. There are, first of all, there are special responsibilities that these houses do have to follow that are in the Ohio admin code, and they do have to verify that they're keeping up with those responsibilities quarterly, if they're not, if they're ever not at any point, the office does, then go to the Office of Legal and Regulatory services, and then also the Bureau of licensure and certification, so they can immediately withdraw if at any point they're not following those responsibilities as well as there could be legal action taken with the state at that point, point, which would be just one of the state departments that have their own prosecutors, that you know, do their thing. They also, the people that live there do have to have, they do have to meet mental health requirements that they update every year, which is called the loc. It. The

level of care. And they go through these mental health evaluations, because they even be in that house, they have to meet a certain level of they have to require some level of care. And so they go through these mental health evaluations. They meet that certain level of care. They do those once a year, if at any point it changes, then they also have to report to these same regulatory services. They have to report to them at that point they would decide whether or not they still meet the recommendations to live in the home so outside from even Reynoldsburg, with everything that mister Meyer just said, there's also state regulations that they are following.

Ms. Kleckley Okay. Thank you. My next question is, you said that you had the authority to either accept or ask someone to leave the property. So, what is your eviction policy like?

Mr. Kamgang: I mean, if I need to start from the vetting process. We are very clear. Anybody with a history of violence, sexual predation, robbing, any type of felony, we will not we want, you know, there's no way you can stay over there. The second thing is, if you're not taking your medication the way you should, you know we can kick you out technically, if you know any type of disorderly conduct in the community that you know, we feel, you know can put the safety of the residents or the neighbor in danger, you know, we will take action to make sure you're out.

Ms. Kleckley: So, on the eviction policy is that, like within 24 hours, is that within?

Mr. Kamgang: Yes. Evictions, yes. Most of the time you have a 30-day notice, but if it is a crisis, you know that you have processes to get them out, you know as soon as possible,

Ms. Kleckley: And what is the proximity of this home to the school?

Ms. Andrade: I think it's 1580 feet away from the high school. Yes, sorry STEM Yes. Sorry, Junior High School. Thank you.

Mr. Kamgang: I mean, and we have, I believe there two facilities like in between the school and just about, I would say, about 150 meter away from that, you know, and they just in between two schools. And so far, I'm not sure if there are any type of safe, safety issue reported so far.

Ms. Kleckley: Okay, thank you. No problem. Miss Ward. Do you have anything? Um, thank you. You said that someone is available 24 hours a day, but does that mean they are on site 24 hours a day?

Mr. Kamgang: Because those people are deemed independent, we have to make

ourselves available 24 hours, but nobody has to be there. No, no. So, this is what, according to the, you know, to the to the law, we have to ensure that, you know, they are fed. We have to ensure that we have to witness them take their medications. You know, we have to ensure that they have all the minimum, all the minimum, you're not required, the type of the service that we are giving. We are not required to be there, but we are available 24 hours. The facility has a phone, and if there's anything, we are available 24 hours. We are not supposed we are not required to be there, 24 hours, but we are required to be available 24 hours.

Ms. Kleckley: So, how often is someone in that house?

Mr. Kamgang: So, like, I would say, most of the most of the day there's somebody in the house, because you have somebody over there in the morning to make their breakfast, make sure they take the medication, clean up the area, get the lunch ready, and then, you know, evening, get the dinner, their dinner ready, ensure that they get their medications. So, most of the time during the day, there's somebody in there, and not at night. At night, usually, no.

Ms. Kleckley: Okay, so I have a question. Yes, are you finished? Yes, I am. So, one of the staff recommendations is that the site will be staffed 24 hours daily. You saying that's not going to be a possibility?

Mr. Kamgang: I mean, according to the class two, I mean, the lawyer can help me here, according to the class two residential the class two residential care facility under the Mental Health because those people are deemed independent. They are independent. It. Some of them were, they are not, you know, they're not disabled, right? They're not disabled. They just need some, you know, we just need to ensure they just need to be at a place where, you know, we can be sure that they're going to do what they need to do for the for them to continue to be stable.

Mr. Meyer: I would just say for clarity, staff worked with City Attorney Chris hook to put together these recommendations. So, the staff recommendations you see before even up on the screen for those in the audience. This is based upon staff recommendation in consultation with our legal team as to what staff and our legal team would prefer. So, I'm not able to speak on whether or not the 24 hour thing is required or not, but from a staff and legal team recommendation, our recommendation would be item two on there that would be staffed 24 hours a day. I'm just clarifying the staff recommendations that we have before the planning and zoning board.

Ms. Barnhart: So, that would be somebody, at least one person, one staff person on site, 24 hours a day, is that the intention of that recommendation?

Ms. Andrade: So, what Mr. Meyer said is correct. It doesn't specify, according to the regulations, whether or not they need to be there 24 hours. But that was something that we wanted specifically as the city of Reynoldsburg, one of our conditions. But it to my understanding, that is what we were thinking. At least one person staff there, 24/7.

Mr. Meyer: And staff agrees, as state by our attorney, that was the intent of item number two on there is that there's somebody on-site 24 hours.

Mr. Brusk: Hearing what you had said. We do have that recommendation, and my vote would be no if you say that you cannot meet that, or will not meet that.

Mr. Kamgang: I mean, if that's the recommendation, yeah, we can definitely make sure we yeah, we can comply with that.

Ms. Alabi: A follow up question. Sorry, do you want to go ahead?

Ms. Barnhart: Go ahead. I've got a bunch of questions.

Ms. Alabi: So, if you are willing to meet a staff member being there 24 hours a day, what type of licensing will you ensure that that staff member has? Can you repeat the question please? What type of licensing will that staff member have that is going to be on site for 24 hours a day?

Mr. Kamgang: For the license they have to be they have to be able to pass medications, they have to have a in that they have to pass a background check and everything as a life. I mean, it's mainly being able to pass medications.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay, so I have a few questions just to clarify some things that have been said all around the residents of this home would be referred by different agencies where the potential residents have been essentially designated for a level of care that is needed. So these potential residents are deemed to require their independent living, but they're deemed to require some assistance is then, is that correct?

Mr. Kamgang: Yes.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay. Based on the business model that you and your wife are putting together these potential residents; you would then screen them before an actual placement would happen?

Mr. Kamgang: That's correct.



Ms. Barnhart: Would these placements? Are they meant to be a permanent placement? Are they meant to be a short term, you know, placement? What is the intention with the placement?

Mr. Kamgang: Most of the time, they are permanent. They are permanent.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay. And, it sounds like we heard that they would be re-evaluated on an annual basis to make sure that they fit with the designation for the level of care that they're at.

Mr. Kamgang: That's correct.

Ms. Barnhart: Are there treatments or doctor visits, or anything therapies happening on site, at the home?

Mr. Kamgang: No.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay, so any therapies, they would go?

Mr. Kamgang: Yeah. Just residential. That's just their residence. No therapy happening.

Ms. Barnhart: As far as operating, you and your wife would be operating this?

Mr. Kamgang: Yeah, my wife and I would be up there.

Ms. Barnhart: And would you have any other employees?

Mr. Hamgang: Yes.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay. Do you know how many employees you would need?

Mr. Kamgang: You would probably need somebody to cook, somebody to clean, and we'll definitely find somebody who can be there at night.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay, can you tell me about the licensing? So, you mentioned that you need the zoning in order to continue with the licensing as operators of this type of business. What are the different certifications that you need to have in order to operate so type of home?

Mr. Kamgang: The first thing is usually the fire heat and cooling. Fire heat and cooling electrical inspections, and the fire is only done with the fire department, and they cannot do that because they also know the rule. They cannot do that until you

have a zoning certificate. Once we have the zoning certificate, then we go to the Ohio Department of Mental Health, we fill out the applications, and then the server will come, you know, to ensure that the House meet the criteria before they can move towards licensing the place.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay? And then, personally, you as the business, you know, are you required to have, you know, a first day training, CPR, are there other traders that you need to have?

Mr. Kamgang: Yes.

Ms. Barnhart: And you know, since these are people that have some sort of mental health condition, you know, is there training for...

Mr. Kamgang: Yes, this training. mandatory,

Ms. Barnhart: yeah, okay, that you know, helps with bringing people down.

Mr. Kamgang: Yes, they are mandatory training, yeah, that includes crisis management.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay. Of the staff recommendations here are, if this board were to approve this conditional use application, are you amenable to meeting these requirements.

Mr. Kamgang: Yes.

Ms. Barnhart: On number four, it would likely be that the wording would be changed just to say no more than five unrelated persons, yes. Do these potential residents, do any of them drive?

Mr. Kamgang: Yes, they have cars.

Ms. Barnhart: Yes, would they? Okay?

Mr. Kamgang: I mean, like the because I've, you know, I've been around to this type of business for about four years, and most of the facility that I that checked, you know, you have some time, one or two residents that actually drive.

Ms. Barnhart: So, with the residents, and I understand that you will have staff, but do you have some sort of program that they are responsible For, some household chores, and that, you know, yard work and things that you know, the community, the neighbor, the neighbors would be concerned, no?

Mr. Kamgang: For that, you know, I'm completely responsible for that. Okay?

Ms. Barnhart: I think that wraps up most of my questions. Does anybody have any follow ups to that?

Mr. Brusk: Other than I would this number, I would like to make that motion that on Item four on the stack, a, four on the staff recommendations to change it to say that.

Ms. Barnhart: Well, Mr. Brusk, am I out of order? No, I was going to make a recommendation if you you can, if you wanted to make a motion, you could include that as a part of the motion that that what we would be changing it to, okay, yep, yep. So, at this point...

Ms. Buathier: Mr. Chairman, we would just like to let the board know that the required parking is one per eight beds plus one per employee based on the largest staff ship. It. And based on the site, there appears to be four parking spaces. So, one would be required for the five unrelated and then the largest number of staff, which, if it's no more than three, you would meet the parking requirement at one time at your largest staff shift.

Mr. Kamgang: That's why I say most of the time when you go to the houses, you know at the most you will find you can find two resident driving, and that is something that we can make sure that we also include in our vetting process to make sure that we are complying with the parking limitations.

Ms. Barnhart: And I think what staff is also trying to ask is, would you have more than three employees on site at a time? No, okay, no. Is that...

Ms. Buathier: It would meet the four parking spaces that are provided on the site? Okay?

Ms. Barnhart: Great. I All right. Do we have anybody wanting to make a motion?

Ms. Andrade: Can I just ask one question? And I don't know if this is something that Mr. Meyer already has the answer to, but Sir, are you thinking of getting your licensure through the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services or the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities mental health. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Barnhart made a motion that the application for the conditional use subject to the staff recommendations noted in the staff report, with the caveat that for

condition four we amend that to be no more than five unrelated persons be permitted to reside on the premises, not including staff.

RESULT:	Defeated (2-3)
MOVER:	Amy Barnhart
SECONDER:	Norman Brusk
AYES:	Barnhart, Brusk
NAYS:	Alabi, Kleckley, Ward

Ms. Andrade then went on to remind the Board that state law supersedes local law. As a result, the City cannot stop the home from opening as long as the applicant gets an appropriate license and meets residential code.

Mr. Meyer added that the restrictions suggested by staff and the City Attorney are more restrictive than what is required under state law. Mr. Meyer then asked Ms. Andrade what the process would be for reopening the item and holding another vote.

Ms. Andrade noted that the Board would need to vote on a motion to reopen the item. Ms. Andrade also restated the state law supersedes local law, at the request of Mr. Meyer. Ms Andrade noted that state law does trump city law.

Ms. Andrade then referred to the Ohio Revised Code sections for this type of home.

Ms Andrade: The first one designates that as long as the criteria is met and as long as it's licensed as a residential facility, then it is permitted to be used in any residential district or zoning, as long as that meets what I was talking about, area, height, yard, the just strictly zoning requirements. So, then we go down here and we look to those specification criteria, which is class two facilities, which is what he is wanting, provided that one or two related persons with mental illnesses, one or two unrelated people who are receiving residential state supplement program, or three to 16 unrelated adults. And then, if we look to what the staff is recommending that does, can you go one more? Sorry, thank you. That does meet those requirements. And like they said, it is more strict than what the state is. So, the state is very general in that they are just saying, as long as you only have those number of people with those requirements, which is mental illness or the state program, or they're unrelated, and you have your license, as long as just those two big things are met, you can have the residential facility. And since those two things are being met, they do, we would have to pass it however. I mean, we can make our vote conditional as a yes, but that yes is conditional upon licensure, which they

have to provide us before they start operating business there.

Mr. Meyer noted that the applicant would not be submit to additional restrictions above and beyond state law since the Board voted to deny the Conditional Use Application. Mr. Meyer then noted that the Board could vote to reopen the item if they would wish to place more stringent conditions on the case.

Mr. Meyer noted that the public comment period for the meeting had previously ended, and request that the audience refrain from shouting out questions.

Ms. Andrade noted that she would recommend the Board reopening the case and placing additional restrictions on the home.

Ms. Barnhart made a motion to reopen the case.

RESULT:	Approve (5-0)
MOVER:	Amy Barnhart
SECONDER:	Toni Kleckley
AYES:	Barnhart, Alabi, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	None

Ms. Barnhart noted that Mr. Benner and Mr. Furst would not be able to participate in future votes on this item. Ms. Barnhart noted that, as a result, only the currently participating five Board members could vote at any point on the case. Ms. Barnhart then stated that it would make sense to take a vote now, as opposed to tabling the case to the future, based upon the additional information provided by staff and Ms. Andrade.

Mr. Brusk stated that he was comfortable with the amended recommendations that were voted upon. Mr. Brusk also noted that the restrictions suggested by staff and the City Attorney were more stringent than what other similar homes in Reynoldsburg are operating under. Mr. Brusk asked staff if there was any information about the rules that other operating homes would be subject to.

Mr. Meyer noted that there was not a comprehensive report available listing the problems that the City has experienced with similar homes. Mr. Meyer stated that the home would be subject to code enforcement and the conditions passed as part of a conditional use approval. Mr. Meyer noted that, to his knowledge, a conditional use for this type of home had not been revoked during his time at the City. Mr. Meyer noted that he did not know the number of similar homes operating in the City.

Mr. Kamgang stated that there were five similar facilities in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Brusk asked Mr. Kamgang if he was aware of problems with the five facilities operating in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Kamgang noted that there was an issue with one facility in which a resident was kicked out.

Ms. Barnhart asked Mr. Kamgang if he would be amenable to the staff recommendations noted in the staff report, with the caveat that condition four be amended to state that no more than five unrelated persons be permitted to reside on the premises, not including staff.

Mr. Kamgang noted that by law he could not open without a license from the state.

Ms. Kleckley asked Mr. Kamgang how close the other similar facilities in Reynoldsburg were to schools.

Mr. Kamgang stated that in his research, he did not know the exact distance from schools for each of the other facilities operating in Reynoldsburg,

Ms. Kleckley asked if there are restrictions on facilities such as what Mr. Kamgang proposes to open in terms of how far they are allowed to be from schools.

Ms. Andrade stated that there are not restrictions for these types of facilities. Ms. Andrade did note that they generally cannot have sex offenders and that there are other state laws that govern those on the sex offender registry which prohibit people on the registry from living within 1,000 feet of a school. Ms. Andrade also noted that the Board could recommend adding a condition of a similar nature.

Ms. Barnhart asked Mr. Kamgang if he would be amenable to the board adding an additional condition to the ones discussed, which would exclude any potential residents that are on the sexual offenders list.

Mr. Kamgang noted that based on what he submitted.

Mr. Meyer stated that, based on what was submitted by the applicant, staff's understanding is that along with allowing no more than five residents who do not have violent criminal, sexual or drug related criminal backgrounds on site, the applicant states the house will continue to be like any other single-family house in the community. Mr. Meyer noted that staff's understanding is that the applicant would not allow anybody with a history of violent, criminal, sexual or drug related criminal backgrounds on site.

Mr. Meyer then asked Mr. Kamgang to confirm the accuracy of what Mr. Meyer just stated.

Mr. Kamgang stated that what Mr. Meyer stated was indeed correct.

Ms. Kleckley asked if there was a restriction on how close a facility like the applicant's proposed facility could be to a school.

Ms. Andrade noted that the applicant would have to follow other laws, such as sex offender laws. But, Ms. Andrade noted that the board could add a specific condition banning sex offenders if the Board wished.

Mr. Brusk suggested adding a condition banning sex offenders to the other conditions previously discussed by the Board.

Ms. Andrade, Ms. Buathier and Ms. Andrade provided clarity on the wording of the potential motion suggested by Mr. Brusk.

Ms. Barnhart made a motion that the conditional use application be approved with the four staff recommendations, with condition number four being changed to read no more than five unrelated persons be permitted to reside on the premises not including staff, and that a fifth recommendation be added to exclude any potential resident with a history of violent crime, sexual predation, violent behavior, drug trafficking or robbery from being able to reside at the dwelling.

RESULT:	Defeated (3-2)
MOVER:	Amy Barnhart
SECONDER:	Norman Brusk
AYES:	Barnhart, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	Alabi, Kleckley

Mr. Meyer noted that the motion did not pass even though it received a majority of votes. Mr. Meyer noted that a motion requires four votes to pass. Mr. Meyer noted that the Board could move on to the next board case, which would leave the facility subject to state regulations and not the additional conditions that had been proposed by the Board. Mr. Meyer also noted that the Board could vote to reopen the case.

Ms. Barnhart noted that there would be no additional Board members able to vote on this case in the future and suggested that the Board reopen the case and then revote.

Ms. Andrade stated that to do so, a motion to reconsider would need to be made.

Ms. Barnhart made a motion to reconsider and reopen the case.

RESULT:	Approve (4-1)
MOVER:	Amy Barnhart
SECONDER:	Norman Brusk
AYES:	Barnhart, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	Alabi

Ms. Buathier stated that the case was reopened for consideration by the Board.

Mr. Brusk suggested that Ms. Barnhart make the same motion that had previously failed.

Ms. Barnhart made a motion that the conditional use application be approved with the four staff recommendations, with condition number four being changed to read no more than five unrelated persons be permitted to reside on the premises not including staff, and that a fifth recommendation be added to exclude any potential resident with a history of violent crime, sexual predation, violent behavior, drug trafficking or robbery from being able to reside at the dwelling.

RESULT:	Approve (4-1)
MOVER:	Amy Barnhart
SECONDER:	Norman Brusk
AYES:	Barnhart, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	Alabi

NEW BUSINESS

App# 2025-0125; 8718 Summit Road; Matt Kirk of EMH&T for M/I Homes of Central Ohio, LLC; Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase A Final Plat

Mr. Meyer noted that Mr. Benner had returned to the dais and would now return to participating in the meeting.

Mr. Benner asked if the Board would like a break. Mr. Benner then stated that the Board would move on to the next case.

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Benner then asked if the applicant is present. A representative for the applicant did not identify themselves or make their presence known.

Ms. Barnhart asked which component of the plat was apartments and which was townhomes.

Ms. Buathier noted the area of the plat that would contain apartments and the area that would contain townhomes.

Mr. Benner asked if there were any questions or comments on the application. Mr. Benner then asked if any board member would like to make a motion on the application.

Ms. Barnhart then made a motion to approve the application subject to the staff recommendations provided in the staff report.

RESULT:	Approve (6-0)
MOVER:	Amy Barnhart
SECONDER:	Norman Brusk
AYES:	Barnhart, Benner, Alabi, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	None

App# 2025-0126, 8718 Summit Road; Matt Kirk of EMH&T for M/I Homes of Central Ohio, LLC; Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase B Final Plat

Mr. Benner asked staff to move onto the next agenda item.

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Benner then asked if there was a motion from a Board member.

Ms. Barnhart then made a motion to approve the application subject to the staff recommendations provided in the staff report.

RESULT:	Approve (6-0)
MOVER:	Amy Barnhart
SECONDER:	Keith Benner
AYES:	Barnhart, Benner, Alabi, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	None



App# 2025-0138; 7460 Taylor Road SW; Core5 Industrial Partners for Reyno Holding Co; Variance

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Ms. Buathier then read an email from Board Chair Alex Furst into the record:

Hi Phoenix,

I am writing to voice support for variance application #2025-0138 for the property located at 7460 Taylor Road SW.

In a perfect world, the Reynoldsburg zoning code would be exactly calibrated to the scale and type of development we desire in the community, but that is not reality. As we experienced with The Alliance project, the BMD/EMD "Insight" districts and the Innovation district are poorly calibrated when it comes to large-scale commercial enterprise development. As one of the persons involved with the zoning code rewrite, I recall that the setback requirements were intended to prevent undesirable development on existing lots, most of which are but a few acres in size. Parcels on the scale of the 7460 Taylor Road site are unique in the district. In fact, few parcels of this size exist in the city at large.

I agree with the staff report. While redevelopment could theoretically occur on a smaller scale on this parcel, it would either require lot splits and/or seriously jeopardize the full potential of the acreage. Given the use and building forms on the neighboring parcels, many smaller buildings would function less efficiently than what the applicant has presented, and it is not clear that a variance would not be necessary even then to satisfy the strict requirements of the zoning code. If we are to grant a variance, granting one variance over many smaller variance is clearly better.

I am of the opinion that the variance requested is the minimum necessary to render the parcel usable according to the purpose and intent of the Innovation district. If smaller scale development were feasible on this parcel, it would have been accomplished already given the proximity to thriving neighboring commercial uses. For the reasons outlined in the staff report, this variance is necessary for the reasonable use of the land. Furthermore, this development is exactly the sort that the Innovation district was intended to achieve.

This parcel has remained vacant in my living memory. I am supportive of granting the variance. I hope the lessons learned from this application and The Alliance project inform future zoning code calibration adjustments.

Alex Furst

Mr. Benner called JD Barnes, the representative from Core5, to speak to the Board.

Mr. JD Barnes: JD Barnes of core five industrial partners. Thank you for the time this evening. So the parcel and the project we are extremely excited about. It's a three-building site. We are focused on Class A industrial construction projects exclusively in our portfolio, the buildings that are laid out. Really, the request this evening is not a zoning change, it's just a variance focus specifically on building setbacks, so the distance increasing the distance from the road, at right of way, I should say from 20 feet to well roughly 1000 feet for the rear building. But even, as you can see in the rendering or drawing that's up on the drawing up on the screen, we really are trying to be intentional about creating a safe space for access for any vehicles entering the property, as the fire department accessing the entire perimeter of each of the buildings, and then we're also creating space that will be required for storm drainage, landscape buffering anything that would be required for utilities and or easements to service these facilities, all while providing obviously, a functional space that meets all of the appropriate and applicable codes. Are there any questions about I guess we are, as a company. We've obviously have a track record here in the city of Columbus. We've done successfully about a half dozen projects. We're looking forward to this one, specifically here in Reynoldsburg. This will be our first project in Reynoldsburg. However, we have completed projects in Etna Township, two recently.

Mr. Benner asked if there were questions from the Board for the applicant.

Mr. Brusk asked Mr. Barnes if the site had only one entrance.

Mr. Barnes responded that there is one primary entrance to the industrial park, but that there is expected to be an additional right in, right out access point in the northwest corner of the site that would be intended for light duty vehicular traffic.

Mr. Benner asked Mr. Barnes to take a seat while public comment is heard.

Mr. Benner called Mr. Greg Nigel to address the Board.

Mr. Greg Nigel: My name is Greg Daigle. I live at 8127 Taylor Road. This is a nightmare. It really is. I live on that road, and I've lived down on it since it was a gravel road, and it's not like that anymore. It's noisy, and I live on it. I live on the road, so it's just awful. And I really, I just couldn't believe it when I heard it, to be honest with you. So that's all I really wanted to say. Thank you. Thank you so



much.

Mr. Joel Perry of American StructurePoint, representing the applicant, was then called to address the Board.

Mr. Joel Perry: Hello. My name is Joel Perry. I'm with American structure point, the civil engineering consultant on the project. Did sign up to speak, but more so if we've got questions about access, utilities, any of the specifics of the site.

Mr. Benner noted that he appreciated Mr. Barnes speaking on behalf of the applicant, but that he wanted to confirm there was no other public comment.

Ms. Buathier stated that there was no other public comment.

Mr. Buathier noted that staff did want to inform the board that the applicant has submitted a major site plan, and they are currently also going through that process, and any concerns regarding traffic will be addressed during that major site plan review. If there is any through engineering,

Mr. Benner noted that he thought traffic might be an issue.

Mr. Meyer noted that as part of the major site plan process the traffic and access would be evaluated by engineering.

Ms. Ward asked if there was housing north of the site.

Mr. Meyer stated that the uses were over 300 acres of logistics and industrial to the west, an existing concrete plant to the south, vacant land to the west and housing to the north.

Mr. Benner stated that there is a gas station to the north of the site as well.

Mr. Benner stated that he would entertain a motion and also thanked Mr. Furst for providing input on the project.

Ms. Andrade asked the Board to be specific about the uniqueness of the site in any motion that is presented.

Ms. Barnhart stated that her intent was to make a motion that included consideration of the unique size of the site, the safety access, and the sloping of the site. And, that the size of the site was a key factor.

Ms. Andrade stated that she would recommend include the size of the site in the

motion and the slope.

Ms. Buathier: The applicant stated that a maximum setback in regards to the circulation and fire would not account for any public utilities or easements that may exist along the frontage of the property and proper Fire Department access via building circulation and fire hydrants that are outside the building fall at 1.5 times the building height. So additionally, they would need access around the building at 1.5 times the height for fire and I can't speak for the applicant, but it was our understanding that the reason that the site was developed that way and not put close to the building is because the fire hydrants would have to be with at 20 feet. The building is proposed to be, I think, 42 feet between 40 and 42 feet at one and a half, it would need to be at least 60 feet set back so that the fire department would have drive access for to access it, also for safety for fire. That is how we interpret it. The applicant could potentially confirm that information, but that's also part of in their statement of hardship on page four.

Mr. Barnes: The last comment about it not is not a matter of convenience, very correct so to allow the appropriate distance for all the utilities, as well as that fire department and fire hydrant, like I'll say, this has to be outside of the fall zone with your building height. So, in the event that there was a catastrophic fire, the exterior wall panels have to fall outside, which are actually designed to fall in. But in the event that they were to fall out in some kind of catastrophic event, it would not take out like the fire hydrants. Is the background of that hardship.

Mr. Benner: if I may. I think, all due respect to Mr. Shook, the Board is loath to approve a lot of variances, but last six, eight, nine months, we have approved more than I care to because the code was so poorly written. I am not casting aspersions on anyone here or anyone who had anything to do with writing that zoning code. But it does leave things to be desired. I also think again that there are several reasons that this application may be approved for variance, not just the hardship, not just the sloping utility situations, etc, etc. I don't know that reading all of that into our motion might take longer than the original issue we had here while I was gone. And I don't think you need to read the whole thing. I just think you just need to mention it, just how you did right now, very quickly. And I have her here as slope size fire, just a general mention. Thank you. Good with that?

Ms. Andrade noted that she was fine with the right Mr. Benner. Suggested. Ms. Andrade also stated that the intent of Mr. Shook was to clearly note the variance rationale to limit the potential of future issues arising.

Ms. Barnhart made a motion to approve the variance as submitted with the staff recommendations due to the site being in excess of 50 acres and the downward westward slope and to allow for appropriate distance for fire department access

throughout the site that we approve this request.

RESULT:	Approve (6-0)
MOVER:	Amy Barnhart
SECONDER:	Teresa Alabi
AYES:	Barnhart, Benner, Alabi, Kleckley, Ward, Brusk
NAYS:	None

OTHER BUSINESS

IPad Update

Mr. Meyer noted that staff had received eight iPads for the use of Board members during Planning and Zoning Board Meetings. Mr. Meyer noted that the iPads would be required to stay at City Hall. Mr. Meyer then asked for Board members to login to the Board Portal and attempt to access their Board Accounts. Mr. Meyer then stated that after testing the iPads at multiple Planning and Zoning Board Meetings, the goal would be to limit the use of paper going forward. Mr. Meyer also noted that paper copies of packets would be provided for those Board Members who need them.

Tomato Festival

Mr. Meyer explained that the Board calendar was put together before 2025 Tomato Festival dates were finalized. As a result, the August 7th Planning and Zoning Board meeting conflicts with the Tomato Festival. Mr. Suggested that the options would be to move the meeting to July 31, 2025, move the meeting to August 14th 2025 or cancel the meeting. Mr. Meyer asked the Board to look at their calendars and think about the best option.

Mr. Benner noted that the schedule would be partially informed by the number of active cases at the time of the meeting. Mr. Benner suggested that the Board look at their schedules and come prepared to talk about moving the August 7, 2025 Board meeting at the next Board meeting.

ADJOURNMENT



Planning and Zoning Administrator

Chairman