



**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
September 4, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

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

ABSENT: Alabi

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers sworn in by Mr. Furst.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

App# 2025-0385; 6800 Frey Lane; Haidar Hashem; Variance

Ms. Cepek read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to speak, but the applicant was not in attendance. He said the board typically is not willing to grant variances without the applicant making some kind of presentation.

Mr. Furst motioned to table the application.

Mr. Benner: Second.

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

App# 2025-0432; 1488 Mariner Drive; Henriette Losokola for Divine and Favor Residential Care Services; Conditional Use

Ms. Cepek read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Pascal Lomandjo, speaking on behalf of his spouse and applicant Henriette Losokola, explained that they are seeking approval to convert their property for residential home care use. He noted they already operate an approved agency serving multiple counties but wish to use this property to house clients who lack stable housing. The home is fully furnished and ready, with one client already waiting for approval to move in, highlighting the urgency and need for the board's decision.

Mr. Furst asked the applicant if he had any objections to the conditions as outlined by staff.

Mr. Lomandjo stated he had no objections.

Ms. Bauthier asked the applicant what their largest number of staff on shift at any one time.

Mr. Lomandjo explained that the home would be staffed with three employees per shift, rotating to ensure continuous coverage. Each client would have their own dedicated space and be paired with a specific home care provider (HPC). If all residents require 24-hour care, each would receive one-on-one support, with staff scheduled around the clock to maintain consistent, individualized service.

Ms. Bauthier explained that zoning requires one parking space per eight beds plus spaces for the largest staff shift. With three staff members and one required for the bed, the site must provide four spaces. Currently, only three are available (one in the garage and two in the driveway), leaving the property short by one parking space.

Mr. Lomandjo asked if they could widen the driveway to allow two cars side by side, while also using roadside space for an additional vehicle. This, he suggested, would bring the total to the required four parking spaces without blocking the sidewalk.

Ms. Bauthier clarified that zoning requires four on-site spaces: one for the three beds and three for the largest staff shift. With only three available (garage plus driveway), the property is short one space. They emphasized that per code section 1105.01(G), parking must be located on the parcel itself and cannot be counted from the street.

Mr. Lomandjo responded that they would be willing to temporarily limit the facility to two clients instead of three until an additional on-site parking space can be provided, ensuring compliance with the zoning requirement.

Mr. Furst asks, for clarification, that the largest staff shift would be two at any given time.

Mr. Lomandjo emphasized the urgency of the request, explaining that a client with an immunocompromised condition has been waiting nearly three months and cannot delay placement through the winter. He clarified that while the facility was

planned for three residents, they currently only have one client ready and may take considerable time to find additional clients due to competition in the home care market. For now, they propose starting with that single client and gradually expanding as they meet the parking requirement, ensuring compliance while addressing the immediate need.

Mr. Furst asked the applicant if they would still like to move forward understanding it may not be possible for them to add an additional parking space on the property.

Mr. Lomandjo responded yes.

Ms. Barnhart asked the applicant about the status of the license.

Mr. Lomandjo confirmed that their agency has been licensed since last year, though the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities does not issue a traditional paper license. Instead, approval is provided via official email, listing the services authorized under the agency's assigned number. He offered to share this documentation with the board as proof of licensure.

Ms. Barnhart asked if they certify each location they operate or if it is just an overall license for the agency.

Mr. Lomandjo clarified it is an overall license in which they can operate in any county in Ohio.

Mr. Furst asked if staff is satisfied that the facility is adequately parked.

Ms. Bauthier cautioned that if approval is granted with a two-resident limit, the applicant must return to the board for permission to add a third. Failing to follow the set conditions could result in revocation of the conditional use approval.

Mr. Benner asked the applicant if they are already operating a home health care where they visit clients in their home. He also asked if the license they have includes operating a building without it being inspected or approved by the agency.

Mr. Lomandjo clarified that their agency is already approved to provide various services—such as respite care, in-home care, and non-medical transportation—but to operate this property as a residential care facility, they first need zoning approval from the board. Once granted, they can then pursue site-specific licensure and certification from the Department of Developmental Disabilities for the property itself.

Mr. Benner asked that even though they have someone on the waitlist, they have to wait for the license to come before they house that person.

The applicant responded yes.

Mr. Furst made a motion to approve the application with conditions as outlined by staff, and the additional condition that the maximum number of residents this facility can house is two.

Mr. Benner: Second.

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

6050 E. Livingston Avenue; Timothy J. McGrath for MYM Property Management, LLC.; Appeal to Zoning Code and Building Code Violation/Cease and Desist

The applicant agreed to table the case until the October 2nd Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Motion to table made by Mr. Furst.

Second by Ms. Kleckley.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

Zoning Code Update

- During a review of site plans and variances, staff found the landscaping tables in the zoning code had become mixed up through past updates. To fix this, they are moving the tables to their correct sections and eliminating a duplicate set of interior lot landscaping standards for commercial properties, keeping only the version most commonly used.
- Staff explained that a *sign face* is the surface where the message is displayed, and while sign face panels on legal non-conforming signs may be replaced, the structural box or cabinet cannot be replaced without it being considered a new sign under Section 1105.03.F.iii. This has led to variance requests when businesses rebrand—examples include Culver’s, Bath & Body Works, Walmart, and Sherwin-Williams. In contrast, newer code-compliant styles, like OhioHealth’s individual lettering, reflect current trends. Staff is asking the board’s opinion on proposed changes that would allow sign refacing (same size or smaller) without it being classified as a new sign, provided the existing width, height and square footage is not exceeded.
- Staff proposed updated wall sign regulations specifically for *Food Sales-Large Format Grocery & Retail – Extra Large Format* uses. The change would allow a wall sign at every public entrance, one brand sign, and additional signs for businesses located inside the main store (e.g., Starbucks, Ohio Liquor). These allowances would apply only in the CC,

BMD, and EMD districts. The proposal also includes permitting a designated *pickup area wall sign* for any business in those districts that operates a pickup location.

- Staff noted that many commercial centers currently use monument signs that don't meet today's standards, and the code lacks clear guidance for large shopping centers with multiple entrances and exits. To address this, they are considering an update that would allow a monument sign at each ingress/egress point to the site and an additional monument sign identifying the overall commercial center. This approach would better accommodate large, multi-tenant sites while ensuring consistency as older signs are upgraded.
- Staff outlined proposed Large Site Block Standards intended to ensure that big development sites are designed in a walkable and connected pattern. The purpose of these standards is to encourage the inclusion of new streets and blocks, pedestrian-oriented frontages, and public open spaces. They would apply within the EMD, BMD, CC, and Innovation zoning districts. Two plan types are envisioned: a Minor Block Plan, which would apply to sites under ten acres, and a Major Block Plan, which would apply to sites over ten acres.
- The city does not currently have commercial design standards for zoning districts that permit commercial development, except in the ORD-C and ORD-N districts. The proposed standards would extend to all new construction, renovations valued at more than 50 percent of a building's assessed value, and any changes in use within the CC, BMD, and EMD districts. The proposed standards would require building ground floors along primary streets to have at least 60 percent transparency, with upper floors maintaining a minimum of 30 percent. Entrances would need to be clearly identifiable and, for multi-tenant buildings, spaced no more than 75 feet apart. Roofing and lighting would follow design guidelines, including accent lighting that is fully shielded and pedestrian-scaled fixtures. Permitted materials would include glass, architectural metal panels, wood or fiber cement, stone or cast stone, and brick, with accent options such as stucco, decorative tile, and natural wood elements. Prohibited materials would include vinyl siding, EIFS, mirrored or opaque glass, unfinished concrete block, and synthetic stone panels without detailing.
- Staff introduced the Bryce Road Overlay, explaining that it applies to about 23–24 former single-family homes on the east side of Bryce Road that are now commercial or mixed-use properties. The goal is to preserve neighborhood character while recognizing that these smaller lots present

redevelopment challenges. After internal discussion, staff concluded that before advancing any proposal to council, they should engage directly with the affected property owners to ensure the overlay aligns with their needs. The corridor is narrow, bordered by suburban residential subdivisions, making large-scale redevelopment highly unlikely. Because of these constraints, staff's strategy is to first raise the issue with the board, then undertake outreach to the relatively small group of property owners, and finally return with a refined plan based on that input. They emphasized this is an early-stage effort that will require more engagement before moving forward, but wanted the board to be aware in case cases from this area arise in the meantime.

- Staff described a proposal to address commercial parcels without direct street frontage, which are mostly found in the BMD and EMD districts. The purpose is to ensure safe access, prevent traffic issues, and support the redevelopment of landlocked sites. Under the proposed rules, no new parcel could be created without legal access to a public or private street. Access could be provided through a 30-foot recorded easement, a shared driveway, or a new private street or service road meeting city standards. New lots would need at least 50 feet of frontage or a cross-access agreement with a neighboring property. Private and shared drives would have to be clearly signed and striped, and supported by legal maintenance agreements. In addition, redevelopment would trigger requirements for new streets or cross-access if traffic volumes exceed 50 peak-hour trips, if existing access is inadequate, or if multiple parcels are developed together.
- Staff proposed removing "Dwelling – Developmental Disability" as a separate definition and land use category from all sections of the zoning code. Instead, such facilities would be consolidated under the broader category of "Dwelling – Group." They also discussed possibly putting geographical limits on new locations of Dwelling - Groups.
- Staff stated that the whole legal-nonconforming section of the zoning code is under review, specifically noting that legal-nonconforming status may be increasing from three months to six months.
- Staff explained that the city's zoning code currently has conflicting rules for home occupations: the definition allows up to 35% of a dwelling's floor area, while Section 1105.13 limits it to 15% and also differs on whether signage is permitted. After discussions with the city attorney, staff recommends clarifying the regulations to make them consistent—limiting home occupations to the primary dwelling unit, capping the area at about 30%, and prohibiting signage. The intent is to ensure that home businesses do not

create traffic or disrupt the residential character of neighborhoods, ideally operating in a way that neighbors would not even realize they exist.

- Staff explained that a zoning certificate is required before any new use of land, building, or structure begins, or before any construction or alteration takes place. Recently, issues have arisen when businesses change owners or names but keep the same use. Even in those cases, a new certificate of occupancy is required, which first necessitates zoning approval. To avoid confusion and ensure proper documentation—especially for legal nonconforming uses—staff is proposing to add language clarifying that a zoning certificate is required for any new business or new use, including when ownership or the business name changes.
- Staff noted that the third variance finding of fact should be separated into two separate bullet points. To correct this, it will be renumbered as item 4, and the existing items 4 through 9 will be shifted to 5 through 10.
- Staff explained that while banner signs are currently limited to 45 days per year in commercial districts, temporary signs lack a defined time restriction. To create consistency, staff proposes applying the same rule so that temporary signs may also be displayed for no more than 45 days per year, with campaign signs excluded from this limit.
- Staff reviewed parking requirements for extra-large retail stores, noting that under the current 1 space per 200 sq. ft. standard, Target is required to provide 660 spaces and Walmart over 1,000. However, aerial counts from 2017 and 2019 show far fewer cars in use, with demand decreasing further due to online shopping, delivery, and pickup services. To better reflect current trends, staff proposes a new standard for retail buildings over 50,000 sq. ft., reducing parking to 1 space per 600 sq. ft. Under this rule, Target would need about 220 spaces and Walmart about 335, significantly less than current requirements.

2026 Calendar

Staff told the board that a draft of the 2026 Calendar had been made. The board will likely vote on the schedule in October, and members were invited to raise any



concerns.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 7:36 PM.

Planning and Zoning Administrator

Chairman