



**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
August 21, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

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

ABSENT: Barnhart

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Board - Regular Meeting - 07/17/2025

Minutes approved as submitted.

Planning & Zoning Board - Regular Meeting - 07/31/2025

Minutes approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers were sworn in by Mr. Furst.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

App# 2025-0208; 7041 E. Main Street; Driven Brands, Inc. care of John P. Slagter, Esq. for Ashley Daly of Take 5 Oil Change; Variance

Ms. Bauthier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Vacanti, representing Driven Brands/Take Five, presented two variance requests for a narrow lot on Main Avenue. He explained that the site's unique

shape and limited frontage make strict zoning setbacks unworkable, but the proposed redevelopment—demolishing a vacant car wash to build a new oil change facility—aligns with the zoning code’s intent, adds buffering and revised circulation plans, and provides minimal impact on traffic. He emphasized that staff support, operational adjustments, and signage will mitigate stacking concerns, making the project consistent with surrounding uses and beneficial for the community.

Ms. Zachary of Arnold Consulting confirmed that, following the board’s feedback, the site plan was revised to better address concerns about the abort lane. She noted that while a true maneuvering lane isn’t feasible, signage and staff assistance will ensure safety, and otherwise the plan remains consistent with the earlier proposal.

Mr. Furst: I think it is clear that from the layout of the site that its dimensions being so particularly long and narrow, it does present some unique challenges such that I would consider this a unique site, especially in the district where the properties tend to be more wider and shallower. Any objections to my statements? All right, well, I do recommend that we approve these variances as submitted. Do I have a second?

Ms. Kleckley: Second.

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

App# 2025-0207; 7041 E. Main Street; Driven Brands, Inc. care of John P. Slagter, Esq. for Ashley Daly of Take 5 Oil Change; Conditional Use

Ms. Bauthier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Vacanti reiterated agreement with staff’s support, noting that left-turn restrictions onto Main Street due to a planned median will be addressed later in the major development plan process. For the conditional use review, he emphasized the project’s compatibility with surrounding commercial uses, absence of noise impacts, availability of utilities, and inclusion of substantial buffering, concluding there would be no detrimental effects.

Ms. Alabi is present for the meeting.

Mr. Furst: Speaking for myself, I think that the application is pretty clear that since all the factors are met, including the supplemental factors required for the drive-through, that we should approve this application as submitted with staff’s recommended variance requirement language. Are there any questions or comments? Do I have a second?

Ms. Kleckley: Second.

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

NEW BUSINESS

App# 2025-0402; 6334 E. Livingston Avenue; Kendra Soler for Happy Hills Child Care Center, LLC; Conditional Use

Ms. Cepek read the staff report into the record.

Ms. Soler outlined a proposal to adaptively reuse a 5,000-square-foot vacant space in a commercial center at East Livingston and Bryce Road into Happy Hills Child Care. The plan involves interior renovations and minor site improvements, including removing six parking spaces to create a fenced outdoor play area with protective bollards for safety. The project will maintain clear traffic flow, ensure a secure environment for children and staff, and align with the city's Innovation Zone goals by adding a family-oriented service to support Reynoldsburg's growing community.

Ms. Ward: I have a questions about trucks using that area to get to Big Lots, because they're not going to turn around back there. So how close are they going to be to the play area?

Ms. Soler clarified that the outdoor play area will be placed to the side rather than the rear of the building, leaving about 30 feet of clearance near an existing bollard to maintain normal traffic flow. By not designating loading spaces behind the building, truck access for nearby businesses like Big Lots can occur from the opposite side, ensuring this area remains a safe, no-loading zone adjacent to the childcare center.

Mr Benner asked where the proposed play area will be, and Ms. Soler clarified it will be on the right side of the building. Mr. Benner asked about the play area going on the existing concrete and Ms. Soler clarified there would be a softer play area surface going on top.

Mr. Furst: Seeing as how this application meets all the necessary requirements, I do move that we approve it as submitted. Do I have a second?

Ms. Kleckley: Second.

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Kleckley

AYES:	Brusk, Alabi, Benner, Kleckley, Furst
NAYS:	Ward

App# 2025-0405; 7890 Palmer Road; Thomas and Clara Jones; Variance

Ms. Cepek read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Tom Jones explained that he and his wife are requesting an 180-square-foot area variance to build a shed for their golf cart, tractor, and snow blade to help maintain their large, sloping property. With their garages already used for cars, tools, and hobbies, the shed would provide needed storage, be painted to match their home, and remain discreetly placed out of view. Having lived on the property for 28 years, they emphasized the shed's necessity for upkeep and asked the board for favorable consideration. Mr. Furst: Are there any questions or comments from the applicant from the board?

Ms. Kleckley asked if the home is in an HOA

Mr. Jones answered no, that it is a single family home built in 1952.

Ms. Kleckley stated she did not want the applicant to incur any fines.

Mr. Furst cited variance factor 1109.11.D(3), noting that to justify approval, the applicant must show unique circumstances that distinguish the property from others and demonstrate deprivation of reasonable use, not just loss of value. He asked Mr. Jones to clarify what specific conditions of his property—beyond its size and rolling topography, which seem common in the area—make it uniquely deserving of a variance.

Mr. Jones explained that the steep, rolling slope of their property makes maintenance physically demanding, which is why they rely on a golf cart and tractor to manage yard work and waste. With extensive frontage, trees, and landscaping to care for, the proposed shed would provide proper storage for these tools and equipment, replacing the current practice of tarping items outdoors, which he acknowledged looks tacky.

Mr. Furst asked Mr. Jones whether denial of the variance would prevent him from reasonably using the property as a single-family residence.

Mr. Jones responded that, given the size and layout of his property, the shed would be discreetly placed, designed to match the home, and built to high standards. He emphasized that it would not negatively impact the area and would instead be an improvement, providing appropriate storage and enhancing the property's upkeep.

Mr. Furst clarified that while quality materials and aesthetic compatibility are appreciated, they cannot be considered under variance factor 1109.11.D. He stated that, based on the testimony and application so far, he was not yet

convinced the property is unique compared to others in the area, and he invited Mr. Jones to elaborate further if there were distinguishing characteristics that might justify the variance.

Mr. Jones reiterated that his property is distinct from surrounding lots, noting its steep slope, wooded areas, and history of being subdivided from a larger original tract. He emphasized that these features make it unique compared to neighboring parcels, reinforcing his belief that the site is unique.

Mr. Furst sought clarification, asking Mr. Jones whether neighboring properties to the north and west also experienced similar elevation changes.

Mr. Jones clarified that unlike his lot, neighboring properties are mostly flat and lack walkout basements. While one adjacent parcel has some slope, it remains overgrown and unmanaged, making his property's combination of steep grade, maintained woods, and walkout design distinct and, in his view, unique within the area.

Mr. Furst asked what other remedies had been considered.

Mr. Jones said they did not consider other remedies.

Mr. Furst stated he has concerns that granting this variance would confer upon the property your honor special privileges, which are unduly denied by the code to other properties also in the district.

Mr. Brusk stated that granting this variance would set a precedent that he doesn't think the board should set.

Mr. Jones asked if they were going to strike out.

Mr. Brusk apologized and stated he was sympathetic to the applicant's point of view.

Mr. Furst asked if anyone would like to make a motion.

Mr. Benner: I move that we deny this application based on staff's recommendation. The property is not unique, it would set a precedent and quite honestly, there's no hardship. It doesn't meet any of the requirements for a variance.

Mr. Furst asks for a second.

Mr. Brusk: I'll second.

RESULT:	Denied
MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Brusk
AYES:	Alabi, Furst, Benner, Brusk
NAYS:	Ward, Kleckley

App# 2025-0348; 6808 Frey Lane; Jennifer Burnside; Variance

Ms. Cepek read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Dennis Burnside, accompanied by Jennifer Burnside, explained that their contractor normally handled permitting on past projects, but this time they overlooked it and now their patio was built out of compliance. Acknowledging the oversight, he noted that staff has recommended approval of the variance and offered to answer questions or provide further clarification if needed.

Mr. Furst states that anything they can say in support of their application would be useful.

Mr. Burnside explained that he inferred that these setbacks exist mainly to prevent overcrowding and manage stormwater. He argued stormwater isn't an issue here since the property sits near a large floodplain, and runoff is already directed through a proper drain system installed with the patio. He concluded by leaving the decision to the board's discretion.

Mr. Brusk stated that he understands their issue, and stated that since there are no setback requirements for the town homes themselves, there should be no setbacks for patios. He stated while approving the request may set a precedent, they felt it would be an appropriate one for similar townhouse properties and voiced strong support.

Mr. Benner: Apparently Mr. Brusk did everything but make a motion. I move that we approve this. A precedent has been set for other zero setbacks. It would be silly

not to, I think.

Mr. Brusk: I'll second since I didn't do the motion.

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

App# 2025-0365; 6824 Frey Lane; Garic B D Warner; Varaince

Ms. Cepek read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to speak, but the applicant was not present.

Mr. Furst: The precedent clearly has been set on this matter, given our previous application. I would prefer that the applicant be present to address any questions, but barring that, this is Mr. Furst, I do move that we accept this application as submitted. Do I have a second?

Mr. Benner: Second.

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

App# 2025-0404; 7185 E. Main Street; Anup Janardhanan and Jay Boone of Moody Nolan for Metropolitan Housing Partners, Inc.; Variance

Ms. Bauthier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to the podium.

Ms. Bethany Hahn, Assistant VP of Planning and Development at CMHA, introduced *The Heights on Main*, a 103-unit mixed-income housing project in Reynoldsburg. Of these, 25 units will include project-based vouchers, with the rest available to households earning up to 80% AMI. She highlighted CMHA's growth from 2,500 to 6,000 units in eight years, its commitment to expanding affordable housing across central Ohio, and the strong community and political support that helped secure competitive tax credits. Positioned along a planned bus rapid transit line, the project is seen as innovative in its location, funding, and partnerships, with Moody Nolan serving as architects.

Mr. Furst swore in the rest of the speakers. Mr. Furst asks about building a four story building instead of a five story building.

Mr. Anup Janardhanan of Moody Nolan explained that the Heights on Main design was shaped by funding requirements and site constraints. To meet the 100-unit target set by tax credit feasibility, the team had to work around a north-south sewer line, a floodway, and floodplain restrictions. These conditions limited the layout to an L-shaped configuration and required building upward; while four stories might have been possible on another site, here a five-story design was the only way to achieve the needed unit count.

Mr. Furst noted that variances for Greenfield projects are usually met with skepticism and asked the applicant to explain what alternative site layouts or building configurations were considered. They requested a brief overview of those options to better understand the design process and to show why the submitted plan is the only feasible solution.

Mr. Janardhanan said bar- and E-shaped designs were considered but couldn't meet parking and floodplain constraints, leaving the L-shaped layout as the only feasible option.

Mr. Furst asked if first-floor residential units were added due to funding needs and site constraints like the floodplain and sewer line.

Mr. Janardhanan agreed.

Mr. Brian Szuch, architect on the project, noted that while the zoning code allows five stories at 60 feet, structural and mechanical needs make 12-foot first-floor clearances impractical without reducing upper floors to under 8 feet. They argued the design still meets the intent of providing active retail frontage on Main Street while maintaining more appropriate residential ceiling heights above.

Mr. Furst asked whether the zoning code's height and clearance requirements are unusually restrictive compared to other municipalities the applicant has worked with.

Mr. Szuch responded that zoning codes vary by age and maturity, and unique cases often reveal unforeseen challenges. In this instance, the project's combination of vertical and horizontal mixed use created a situation the code likely did not anticipate, even if it was well-intentioned.

Mr. Benner asked whether, without the floodplain and sewer constraints, the project could comply with code, noting that parking and fire access also factored in. He also inquired if additional parking would come from the agreement with the YMCA.

Mr. Meyer clarified that only two spaces are available through the YMCA agreement. Taking more would put the YMCA itself out of compliance with its parking requirements, so no additional shared parking is feasible.

Mr. Benner asked if the unique nature of the property was considered when the property was purchased for this project.

Mr. Meyer clarified that the city is contract with the applicant, but the property is still owned by the city.

Ms. Hahn added that the property is under contract but not yet purchased, and the team has worked hard to make the tight site feasible. They noted that because HUD is involved through project-based vouchers, floodplain regulations are even stricter than local requirements, adding to the project's challenges.

Mr. Benner stated he assumed the contract is contingent.

Mr. Furst swore in an additional speaker, and invited them to speak.

Ms. Whitney Welch, a nearby resident, expressed support for affordable housing but opposed the proposed building's five-story height. She explained that her neighborhood consists of smaller, older homes and gardens, and such a large structure would dominate the character of Main Street, becoming its focal point. She also raised concerns about limited parking capacity, urging the board to vote against the project at its current scale.

Mr. Furst acknowledged the neighbor's concerns but noted that other multi-story residential projects of similar scale have already been approved in the area, though not yet built. He thanked the speaker for their input before moving the board toward discussion and a motion.

Mr. Benner emphasized that for new development on open land, compliance with zoning is generally expected. While acknowledging the site's unique challenges, he questioned whether reducing the unit count—such as to 80—had been considered as an alternative that might avoid the need for a height variance. He stressed the board's responsibility to ensure applicants explore all options to meet code before granting variances.

Mr. Szuch stated the code's blanket 12-ft clear first-floor ceiling requirement conflicts with the 60-ft/5-story cap. Meeting both pushes the second floor to ~16 ft and makes four or five stories impractical. He contended a variance is needed to meet the code's intent without compromising upper-floor residential design.

Mr. Benner stated the board is there to uphold the zoning code.

Mr. Furst invited other board members to speak.

Ms. Alabi said she agrees with Mr. Benner and Ms. Welch. She stated five stories is a lot for the area and would like to see it meet the code.

Mr. Brusk stated he sees the problems with the site and does not have a problem moving forward, and that he would vote yes.

Mr. Furst observed that the zoning code does not clearly define "clear ceiling height." He suggested that an applicant could argue the requirement is open to interpretation, meaning the project might comply without needing a variance, depending on how the standard is defined.

Mr. Benner said he was conflicted—while he liked the proposed building, he hesitated to grant a variance solely because the zoning code may be imperfect. He stressed that variances should be based on the site's unique conditions, not flaws in code language, and wanted assurance that every possible alternative had been explored to comply before considering approval.

Mr. Furst acknowledged the applicant's need for 100 units to ensure financial feasibility but asked them to expand on how the site's unique conditions made a

variance unavoidable. He also encouraged more detail on alternative configurations considered, suggesting that such clarification might address board concerns.

Attorney Shook clarified that building height itself cannot be used as a basis for denying the project, since the proposed height complies with what is permitted in the district.

Mr. Meyer reiterated that the proposed height is permitted throughout Main Street districts and not grounds for denial, noting that concerns about height would require a zoning code change. He then asked the City Attorney whether the board has the authority to interpret or define “clear ceiling height,” since the term is not explicitly defined in the code.

Attorney Shook advised that when zoning code language is ambiguous, the board may interpret it, but that interpretation must favor the property owner, since the city bears responsibility for drafting clear regulations.

Mr. Furst noted there’s disagreement on whether elements like ductwork and drop ceilings count toward “clear ceiling height.” He suggested that if the applicant argued such features were excluded, the project’s first-floor height calculations could show compliance with the requirement.

Mr. Brusk asked if a five-story building of any sort could be built there.

Mr. Furst replied yes, as long as it was no higher than 60 feet tall.

Mr. Szuch clarified that the variance request stems only from uncertainty over how “clear ceiling height” is defined. He explained the design already provides a predominant first-floor height above 12 feet, and if that interpretation is accepted, no variance would be necessary—the application was filed only to avoid conflicting with staff’s definition.

Mr. Brusk asked if the uses are permitted.

Mr. Meyer clarified that the proposed uses are permitted under the zoning code. He clarified that the variance request is not about overall building height, which complies with zoning limits, but specifically about the “clear ceiling height” requirement.

Attorney Shook asked whether the variance for the 10-foot clear ceiling height applies to the portion of the building facing East Main Street or to the side facing Davidson.

Mr. Szuch explained that most of the first-floor ceiling height is 12 feet, but when factoring in structural elements and ductwork—as directed under the current interpretation—the measured clear height drops to about 10 feet, which is why the variance was requested.

Attorney Shook stated as he was looking at the language, it referenced a 12 foot minimum clear for first floor ceiling height under the column for East Main Street fronting.

Mr. Szuch confirmed they were told the clear ceiling height requirement also applied on the Davidson-facing side, even for residential areas, which they felt was inappropriate.

Attorney Shook asked whether, under staff's interpretation of "clear ceiling height," any parts of the Main Street-facing portion of the proposed building fall below 12 feet.

Mr. Szuch safes, taking into account items of structure and mechanics.

Mr. Furst asks for staff to clarify the definition of minimum clear ceiling height.

Ms. Bauthier stated that "clear ceiling height" is measured from the floor to the lowest point of the actual ceiling surface, and does not include ductwork, mechanicals, electrical systems, or sprinklers.

Mr. Furst pointed out a discrepancy, noting that staff excluded ductwork and mechanicals from the ceiling height calculation, while the applicant seemed to be including them.

Mr. Meyer explained that staff used a definition of "clear ceiling height" from NAIOP, a real estate trade group, though it is generally applied in industrial contexts. They acknowledged difficulty finding a definitive source but chose it to provide the board with a professional reference.

Ms. Bauthier clarified that clear ceiling height is measured to the lowest point of any element protruding from the ceiling itself—such as sprinklers below ceiling tiles—rather than the tiles or ceiling surface above.

Mr. Furst asked Ms. Bauthier if anything that produces from the ceiling is the lowest point.

Ms. Bauthier replied yes.

Mr. Furst stated he believes staff's definition is in accord with the applicant's definition.

Mr. Benner asked the applicant to clarify their earlier statement, confirming whether most of the first-floor area along Main Street does, in fact, meet the 12-foot ceiling height requirement.

Mr. Szuch clarified that the Main Street retail frontage has a predominant ceiling height of 12 feet 3 inches, exceeding the requirement. While soffits and ductwork occasionally lower portions of the ceiling, the design intent is to keep the space as open as possible for retail use. He added that applying the same 12-foot standard to small residential units along Davidson is impractical, as it distorts proportions and negatively impacts upper floors, even though the overall height and story limits are met.

Mr. Furst remarked that he had expected the project to require more variances, as is common with large adaptive reuse or greenfield developments. He concluded that this request represents the minimum necessary to meet code requirements while upholding the code's intent.

Mr. Meyer asked if Attorney Shook had anything to add.

Attorney Shook stated the board has tabled less discussed cases in the past, and recommended the case be tabled because of the interpretation of language.

Mr. Meyer emphasized that since the zoning code lacks a definition for "clear ceiling height," staff adopted one as a best attempt but are not strongly attached to it. They acknowledged it was a rough fit, invited consideration of alternative

definitions, and noted the board has at times provided its own interpretations during meetings.

Mr. Furst said the board's decision was uncertain to him at that point, but offered the applicant the option to table the variance request. This would allow time to prepare more materials or work with staff on clarifying the disputed ceiling height definition, without delaying consideration of the applicant's other items that evening.

Mr. Benner asked for clarification if they could vote on the next items without the variance.

Mr. Furst said yes they could vote on the other items with this condition.

Ms. Bauthier clarified that to meet the certificate of appropriateness standards, the applicant must first secure this variance. Approval of the major site plan depends on obtaining the certificate, which in turn requires the variance.

Mr. Meyer asked whether, since a planning and zoning board member was absent, tabling the case would allow that member to participate and weigh in at a later date, clarifying the option for the applicant.

Attorney Shook clarified that an absent board member could participate later only if the hearing remains open for additional testimony; if the hearing is closed for deliberation, they would not be able to weigh in.

Mr. Meyer asked if the board would need to put this language in their motion.

Attorney Shook replied yes.

Mr. Furst added that if the applicant chose to table the request, the board would need to know how much time they required to prepare additional materials. He cautioned that meeting the next regular submission deadline would be difficult but suggested the following meeting as a more realistic option, with the board willing to keep the hearing open if the timeline remained reasonable.

Ms. Bauthier outlined the upcoming submission deadlines: the September 4th deadline had already passed, the deadline for the September 18th meeting was August 28th (one week away), and the deadline for the October 2nd meeting was September 11th.

Mr. Janardhanan asked what kind of clarifications the board was looking for.

Mr. Furst reiterated that the board would like the applicant to provide a stronger narrative about the site's uniqueness and more detail on alternative building configurations considered. Even testimony about initial thoughts—such as whether a three- or four-story design was explored—would help demonstrate that the team gave full consideration to other options before concluding the current plan was the only feasible solution.

Mr. Janardhanan stated a four story building would not work within the floodplain constraint.

Mr. Furst stated he did not understand why that would be the case.

Mr. Janardhanan stated you could not fit 100 units.

Mr. Furst said they cannot consider that argument.

Mr. Janardhanan said they are just trying to be within the 60 foot limit and the

variance is only asking for the ceiling height of the first floor.

Mr. Furst emphasized that while the variance request is minimal, the board expects detailed testimony addressing variance factors—especially site uniqueness and hardship. They asked the applicant to provide more narrative or written explanation about alternative layouts, floor counts, and uses considered, to show due diligence. The board wants assurance that the chosen design wasn't simply preference on a blank site, but the only feasible option given the property's constraints.

Mr. Benner advised the applicant to expand on the alternative designs they briefly mentioned, such as U-shaped or other layouts, and explain why each was unworkable. He stressed that the board isn't concerned with financial feasibility or unit count, but rather with understanding how different options were evaluated and ruled out.

Mr. Szuch detailed the design alternatives considered. They first explored mirroring the L-shape but couldn't build over the sewer line, forcing development to the east side. A U-shaped layout was rejected due to fire access issues—trucks couldn't enter and exit safely—and floodplain encroachment. Even reversing the U created site access problems. Despite these challenges, they managed to meet parking needs (with YMCA's help) and stay within the 60-foot, five-story zoning limits. He stressed the only reason a variance is needed is the ambiguous "clear ceiling height" language, since the design otherwise satisfies code intent.

Mr. Eric Walsh, the project's civil engineer, explained that extensive modeling and coordination with the city's floodplain administrator shaped the site design. The L-shaped footprint was the only viable option because other configurations either intruded too far into the floodway or couldn't meet drainage and grading requirements. Significant grading was required just to achieve compensatory storage and maintain stormwater flow to the stream. Constraints from the YMCA's adjacent hill and parking further limited options, making the chosen design the only feasible way to minimize floodplain impact while meeting city standards.

Mr. Furst thanked the applicants and noted that, based on their testimony, it was clear they had seriously evaluated multiple design alternatives. He emphasized that the board's main concern was ensuring the chosen plan wasn't simply the easiest option, but the result of thorough consideration of the site's constraints.

Mr. Walsh added that the site's 72-inch sanitary sewer created a major hardship, as it cuts the property at an angle and severely limits building placement. The team explored options including leaving it in place, relocating portions, or rerouting it through Main Street, but each posed major engineering, cost, and operational challenges. Coordinating with both Reynoldsburg and Columbus, they worked to minimize impacts, keep structural loads off the sewer, and meet strict alignment requirements, while also addressing a water main relocation. He emphasized these efforts highlight the site's unique and significant constraints.

Mr. Furst asked for any additional comments or questions for the applicant. He then asked the applicant if they would like to table the case or move forward with a vote.

Mr. Szuch concluded that their variance argument remains unchanged, emphasizing that aside from the ambiguous ceiling height definition, the project meets requirements. He maintained they will deliver functional ceiling heights but cannot satisfy the code's wording as written, and respectfully urged the board to follow through on the request.

Mr. Furst stated he was convinced by the applicant's testimony that unique site conditions create a genuine hardship and that the requested variance is the minimum necessary. He then moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Brusk seconded.

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

App# 2025-0248; 7185 E. Main Street; Anup Janardhanan and Jay Boone of Moody Nolan for Metropolitan Housing Partners, Inc.; Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Bauthier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to speak, noting for the record that the applicant is the same as the previous application.

Mr. Janardhanan clarified that the patios will use brick and the terrace columns will be Hardie material, both of which are approved, noting this detail was missing from the submitted elevations.

Mr. Furst confirmed that the applicant must update the revised application to note the brick and Hardie materials to meet staff's conditions. He then asked whether the applicant had any objections to the listed staff conditions.

Mr. Janardhanan said he had no objections.

Mr. Furst moved to approve the application with conditions as outlined by staff.

Ms. Kleckley seconded.

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

App# 2025-0246; 7185 E. Main Street; Anup Janardhanan and Jay Boone of Moody Nolan for Metropolitan Housing Partners, Inc.; Major Site Plan

Ms. Bauthier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to speak, noting for the record the applicant is the same as the previous application.

Mr. Janardhanan confirmed for the record that there will be exactly 103 units, since the number of 100 had been used throughout the meeting. He also stated all conditions are acceptable.

Mr. Furst motioned to approve the application with the conditions outlined by staff.

Mr. Benner seconded the motion.

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

App# 2025-0380; 6269 E. Main Street; Brandon Nkengasong for BEZ Auto Detailing, LLC; Appeal to Zoning Certificate

Withdrawn by the applicant.

Motion to accept the applicants withdrawal made by Mr. Furst. Seconded by Mr. Benener.

RESULT:	Withdrawn
MOVER:	Alex Furst
SECONDER:	Keith Benner
AYES:	Furst, Benner, Alabi, Kleckley, Brusk, Ward

OTHER BUSINESS

Zoning Code Update

Tabled until next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 8:24 PM.

Planning and Zoning Administrator



Chairman