



**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
January 15, 2026**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Benner, Brusk, Conley, Tuwamo, Ward
ABSENT: Barnhart, Furst

Mr. Benner made a motion to excuse Mr. Furst's absence.
Second by Ms. Ward.

RESULT: 5-0
MOVER: Benner
SECONDER: Furst
AYES: Brusk, Conley, Tuwamo, Ward, Benner

Appoint Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary

Ms. Barnhart is now in attendance.

Mr. Benner motioned to nominate Alex Furst to be chairman.

Second by Ms. Barnhart.

RESULT: 6-0
MOVER: Benner
SECONDER: Barnhart
AYES: Ward, Tuwamo, Conley, Brusk, Barnhart, Benner

Mr. Brusk made the motion to nominate Mr. Benner for vice-chair.

Second by Ms. Barnhart.

RESULT: 6-0
MOVER: Brusk
SECONDER: Barnhart
AYES: Benner, Conley, Tuwamo, Ward, Barnhart, Brusk

Mr. Benner made the motion to nominate staff as secretary.

Second by Ms. Barnhart.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | 6-0 |
| MOVER: | Benner |
| SECONDER: | Barnhart |
| AYES: | Conley, Tuwamo, Brusk, Ward, Barnhart, Benner |

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Board - Regular Meeting - 12-18-2025

Minutes approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers were sworn in by Mr. Benner.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

App# 2025-0563; 166 Cady Court; James Knox of Suncraft Corporation, Inc. for Richard and Katherine Verhoeven; Variance

Mr. Benner: Excellent. In that case well go to C, unfinished business. Application number 2025-0563, 166 Cady Court. Staff, would you read the application?

Ms. Buathier: Yes, Mr. Chair. Application number 2025-0563. The application type is a variance for a rear yard setback. The applicant is James Knox of Suncraft Corporation Inc. For Richard and Catherine Verhoeven. The property is located at 166 Cady Court. It consists of one parcel that is zoned SR, suburban residential and the applicant is requesting a variance to Section 1103.17.III.Development Standards.Setbacks.Rear Minimum Setback. Before you is an aerial

of the site. Here's a zoning map of the site. Here's a Google Street view of the site from Cady Court. The parcel is 0.23 acres and currently contains a dwelling detached single-family home. The applicant is requesting a variance to Section 1103.17.III, development standards, setbacks to the rear yard minimum setback to allow their proposed open air covered porch to encroach into the 30-foot rear yard setback. Here is the site plan showing the location of the requested open air covered porch. The applicant is requesting that the rear setback be 26 feet from the rear property line for a reduction of four feet based on the site plan provided. The applicant is requesting the variance for the area outlined in green, that is 12 feet by 14 feet for the open air covered porch. Here are elevations showing the left, right, and rear elevations of the open air covered porch. You can also see the overhead version of the proposed open air covered porch in green. The area identified in blue is not requesting a variance, due to it having to meet the accessory structure standards, not the building setback standards. The area identified in green, which is 12 feet by 14 feet, is the open air covered porch, which is what the four-foot setback reduction to the 30-foot rear setback line is requested for. Reducing the required 30-foot rear setback by four feet would require this parcel to have a 26-foot rear setback. The applicant states that the irregular shape of the lot as a reason for the hardship of the site due to it being situated in a cul-de-sac and the front property line curving, which in turn push the house farther into the lot, causing the proposed open-air covered porch to need a variance. They also stated that the rear property line is angled and that the lot's characteristics reduce the size of the usable rear yard. Here are the variance finding of facts. Staff recommends denial of the requested variance. The request appears to be driven primarily by convenience, and there is no demonstrated deprivation of property use as the site is currently being used as the intended for a dwelling detached single family. The lot is similar in size and shape to the surrounding properties and does not exhibit unique physical characteristics that would justify a variance. Both the home and existing patio comply with the zoning code as built, and the applicant is choosing to pursue an encroachment into the required rear setback. The applicant also has not demonstrated why a covered porch is necessary for the reasonable use of the property. The applicant has not provided staff with any alternate design options that wouldn't require a variance and as a result staff is not able to evaluate the impacts the code has on this project. Additionally, granting the variance would confer a special privilege to the applicant and could establish an undesirable precedent for similar requests in the future. The applicant's request came before the board on December 4th, 2025 meeting, and they asked for more time to look into the board's concerns. Staff did not receive any additional information or communication from the applicant. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Benner: Thank you, staff. I'll invite the applicant now to speak. I'll ask that you do speak into the microphone, that you say your name and address for the record, please.

Mr. Borovetz: My name is Jeff Borovetz and I'm with Suncraft Corporation and my address is 122 West Johnstown Road, Gahanna, 43230. Want me to just go ahead? So I think probably the best place to start and this is a continuation of the last meeting would be to address staff recommendations. The first item here, it's on the fourth sentence. It says in the staff recommendations that the lot, and this is staff says this, that the lot is similar in size and shape to surrounding properties and does not exhibit unique physical characteristics. I contest that. If you look at the survey and you look the layout of this particular lot, it is different. It's not rectangular in shape. Because it's an odd shape, the front curve of the street pushes the house deeper into the lot. That's the first problem. And then the second problem is the rear line is angled. It's not straight. And because of the angle in the rear line, it cuts into the usable rear yard space. So, to say that this lot is the same as the other lots in the neighborhood in the same zoning district. That is not true. It's not correct. It says here that, and then staff also says

that granting the variance would confer a special privilege. Well, I would say it does not confer a privilege. If you look at the neighboring homes on this street, if you look the houses on the left side of the street, which are exactly in the same zoning district, you've got, if you go up from the bottom, you've got the second house and the fourth house, both have porch additions on the back. And those porches are probably 15 feet to the property line. They have not respected the 30-foot rear yard setback. And those are on the same street in the same zoning district. So you couldn't say that by granting this variance, that it's going to confer a special privilege to this property owner that would impact or set a precedent, because that's not true. It says here the applicant has not demonstrated why a covered porch is necessary for use of the property. The homeowner has asked to have a covered porch. They want to have a space out there to sit where, if it's raining, they're not going to get wet, and then protection from the sun. If you look at what has been proposed for construction, you look the shape of the porch, it's an angle cut. It's only four feet at an angle. It's the corner of the porch that's obstructing, or that's encroaching. We did explore other alternative places to put the porch and they just don't exist. If you look at the left side, if you're looking at the diagram and what I'm looking at is this. Exactly, so if you look at this side over here, the left-side, those are bedrooms, there's no way to get to the porch, but we have the same problem. Because of house jogs, you still have the depth problem. You're limited to about eight feet. So it just doesn't give you enough space And once again, we're only talking about the porch. The deck is not an issue because the deck is viewed differently. Any questions?

Mr. Brusk: I have quite a few. First of all, looking at that drawing that you did, the one that's up on the board now, I can see possibility, I don't know whether it's feasible or not, but it certainly could be looked at, that the corner of that proposed room be at an angle that gives it that four feet.

Mr. Borovetz: That would look terrible. I mean, as far as appearance, you know, and...

Mr. Brusk: I didn't say, all I said was that has not been looked at and it should have been.

Mr. Borovetz: But it wouldn't look right, it would look terrible.

Mr. Brusk: Secondly, you've said that the other properties have, some of them have encroachment into that.

Mr. Borovetz: They're not. Well, they do a lot. Yeah.

Mr. Brusk: Yeah, and the reason for that is not because they were given special privileges, it was because they were grandfathered in. There was a different zoning at the time.

Mr. Borovetz: How much different was it, do you know?

Mr. Brusk: Pardon me?

Mr. Borovetz: Do you know how much difference it was?

Mr. Brusk: As far as what?

Mr. Borovetz: What was the old zoning setback?

Mr. Brusk: I don't know that.

Mr. Borovetz: Do we know?

Ms. Buathier: Per our retention record, we're not required to keep old zoning codes, but I can

tell you that based on the aerials that we have on our GIS, those were done sometime in the late 90s, early 2000s, which was under a completely different zoning code. Our current zoning code was just redone in 2020.

Mr. Borovetz: The current, this 30 foot setback was done in 2020?

Ms. Buathier: The overhaul from an old zoning code that was multiple decades. The city redid along with the zoning map in 2020.

Mr. Borovetz: Is that, so that 30 foot rear yard setback, was that just, is that the new rule throughout?

Ms. Buathier: Far as I know from 2020 forward, yes.

Mr. Borovetz: No matter what neighborhood, that's what goes now.

Ms. Buathier: Based on SR, Suburban Residential Zoning, for a detached single-family home.

Mr. Borovetz: So it's possible that, you know, applying that 30-foot setback to this lot does create a problem and to this neighborhood because I think if you look at all the houses, if you apply that 30 foot setback, it does create hardship. And that's why we're here, there is a hardship. That rear property line at an angle, you can see, if it was straight, we wouldn't be here tonight. If the street didn't have that curve, which pushes the house back. You can see the 30-foot build line. You see the left corner of the house. It's pushing the house, back. If that was a straight line, then the house would be pulled all the way up 30 feet from the street, and there'd be plenty of rear yard. But the purpose of being here tonight, and the reason we're here, and the reasons you asked for a variance is for a hardship, and the hardship, there are two of them. It's that angled rear property line, and it's the curved front line. And I'm not sure why the previous staff recommended denial of this request, because certainly a property that has this shape is a candidate for approval of a variance due to the rear line angle and the front. It's a property that has a problem.

Mr. Brusk: Not that I'm not sympathetic to the thought, if I had that home, I would want to do that myself. But the biggest problem is precedence. And precedence is important because you let this go, it gets any other properties in the zoning.

Mr. Borovetz: If you had another lot that had a funny shape, I think, and you had a property owner that wanted to build a porch...

Mr. Brusk: It becomes a slippery slope, sir.

Mr. Borovetz: I don't think so, because if you look at all the other lots, there isn't any that have this situation. There are none. There are none.

Mr. Benner: If I may, number one, as explained at the last time you were here, this code is law passed by the city council. It's not for us to determine whether that's fair now or not fair now. The laws were adhered to at the time for those other homes. You seem to be suggesting we should have a different code for cul-de-sacs. We don't, I'm sure that there's something very, I live in a cul-de-sac. I think it's awesome. If it affects what I want to build in my backyard, then that's on me. The current law, and it hasn't changed, and you do not meet the hardship requirements.

Mr. Borovetz: What is the hardship requirement?

Mr. Benner: A hardship has to be more than just convenience. It has to...

Mr. Borovetz: Why do you say it's convenience?

Mr. Benner: It would be very convenient for them, and if you would allow me to finish, it would be a very, very convenient and nice for them to have a porch. I think that's awesome! It does not fit within the current zoning code.

Mr. Borovetz: Well, because the new zoning code is applied to a lot that doesn't fit. You have unilaterally taken a new zoning code in a rear yard setback and said, all the lots are going to have to have this 30 foot setback. This lot's too small to have that 30 foot Setback.

Mr. Benner: I used to have a yield sign at the end of my street. Now it's a stop sign. I still have to stop. The law changed. It's inconvenient for me to have to stop, but I do.

Mr. Borovetz: I think this is different than a stop sign.

Mr. Benner: I appreciate your thoughts.

Mr. Borovetz: I mean it's not a thought it's a fact I mean that's the purpose of a variance request is because there's a hardship and when there's, and this is a proven hardship the lot shape is a hardship.

Mr. Benner: In your eyes. Not in the eyes of the staff, not in the eye of those...

Mr. Benner: That's the definition of a hardship in a zoning request.

Mr. Benner: It has to be something that deprives you of the use of the house or the building that it was designed to be. And as they stated in their opinion, you're a single family home and you have every right to use the single family home. You're not being deprived of the use.

Mr. Borovetz: Are variances ever approved in this forum in Reynoldsburg?

Mr. Benner: Sure, variances have been approved.

Mr. Borovetz: So a variance is then a...

Attorney Shook: Just a point of clarification real quick so we don't have too much back and forth. It's the members of the board who ask the questions of the applicant, not the other way around. Just want to make sure we're clear on that.

Mr. Borovetz: Okay, so. So when you give a variance, when you approve a variance you're approving a deviation from the law, okay, and that's what we're asking for. So obviously they're approved. This is our application to deviate from what's here and our reason and justification is there's an angled backyard. There's just not enough space to have a porch. We're not asking to build a porch that's oversized, we're asking to build a pretty modest sized porch. And the reason for the variance request is simply that the rear yard is angled. This is common. I do these all the time. I just had two in Upper Arlington, both of them were approved back to back one after the other.

Mr. Benner: Are there any other questions for this applicant from the board? Is there anyone else that wants to speak on behalf of this application? If you'll come to the podium, please. I assume you signed in. You swore in. State your name and address for the record, please.

Mr. Verhoeven: Sir, my name is Richard Verhoeven. I am the homeowner, along with my wife

Katherine, and I live at 166 Cady Court in Reynoldsburg. I have done so for 30 years now. Is it possible to go back to the, I don't have it on me, the staff recommendations, so I can answer to some of this. It stated on there earlier that, and one thing I did want to say before I forget is that no one's trying to break the law here. I'm a deputy sheriff myself, okay? We're just trying to get the variance, just four foot of zoning. The actual, I had a porch there that I put in there way back in the day when I first bought the house in the 90s. I think I had the porch poured in '20. The new deck I'm putting on is just going to be wood, it's going to be elevated, and it's actually fitting over the same footprint that was there all these years. I just want a roof on it now. And some of you are new, and I don't want to have to bring up old things, or whether you've read the minutes or not. I originally did this for my mother, who has since passed in October, OK? I wanted to be able to wheel her out, put her under covered porches so she can enjoy it. I asked my neighbors to the rear of me, did they have a problem, and both people on each side of me and they had no problem. And I have people to support that fact that I did bring in with me. And so I just, you know, being a Reynoldsburg resident for all these years, I just wanted to be able to sit on a porch just like some of my neighbors have. So that's really all I wanted to say. So that is, and I don't understand really the hardships of the curve, you know, I chose that lot. That was the last lot in the neighborhood and I enjoyed it I've enjoyed it for 30 years. So I just, I'm also trying to get to variance because I'd like to have a cover roof on the same footprint of the existing spot.

Mr. Benner: Thank you. Anyone else? Again, ask you that you speak into the microphone, say your name and your address, please.

Mr. West: My name's Henry West. I live at the corner at 166 Cady Court. I had a very similar, almost identical porch built by Jeff a couple of years ago and I have nothing but positive comments about the appearance and how it seamlessly integrated into the house, looks like it should have already been there. You know, the question, the property in question is clean, well kept. The project will be esthetically pleasing. You'll add real value to the property. None of the adjacent neighbors have any kind of problem with it. It will not block any views or cause any hardships to anyone in the area. And if I understand correctly, they could have the roof in that area. If it was not connected to the house. So the problem is the fact that it's connected to the house so we could have it, in that airspace by disconnecting it. Of course, that would let the weather in, weather comes from the West. It feels like in that respect, it's a small ask.

Mr. Benner: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

Mr. Melisi: Yes, my name is Joe Melisi. I live at 171 Cady court, which is the house directly across, which has been cited a few times in the situation. I'm here in support of the requested variance. From my perspective as a neighbor the angled rear lot line and the curb portion of the cul-de-sac limit the usability of the rear yard in a meaningful way. The request is to allow modest improvement in the yard and to function more similarly to other homes in this neighborhood that do not face that same combination of the curve in the cul-de-sac and the line in the lot. It provides proportional relief that preserves the intent of the setback, which I think is everyone's goal. There are existing homes, as I mentioned, including mine, where a lot conditions have influenced how unique structures relate to the rear setback. And those conditions have existed over time without negative impacts on surrounding properties. Because the proposed structure is entirely in the rear yard. It will not affect the public streetscape or public safety. For those reasons, I do believe the request represents reasonable case-specific relief that does not confer a special privilege. Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. Benner: Thank you.

Mr. West: I'm Patrick West. I live at 236 Kings Meadow Lane in the same neighborhood, just a half dozen houses down the street. I've been a real estate agent in Reynoldsburg for 36 years. I helped them build this house. I've sold most of the houses in the neighborhood. I have spoke with all of the adjacent neighbors, Luzios, at 185 Kings Meadows Lane, which is directly behind this house, and they actually had them review the plans, and they are perfectly fine with that. I understand variances and how they work and precedent and all that but all I want to say was we have several houses that do have the old code and it's not a problem for the neighbors or for the neighborhood and this again would be a value added item for the for the house and for the neighborhoods.

Mr. Benner: Anyone else. Certainly. I ask you to please state your name again for the record.

Mr. Borovetz: My name is Jeffrey Borovetz, 122 West Johnstown Road, Gahanna. So, I guess I want to just make this clear also. It's my understanding that if it's not attached to the house, as the neighbor said, it doesn't need a permit, I mean, it doesn't need a variance request. It could just be built. To take that further, it could be much, much bigger. It could be much, much closer to the rear line and it would be approved. It's okay to build it because it's not attached. So, think about the impact of that. Think about a porch that's three times bigger, that's ten feet from the property line and spans all the way across the back of the house. That would be acceptable. We wouldn't be here tonight and it could approved. So, when you compare that to what the ask is here for the four-foot encroachment, and if this is the porch, it's an angle cut, it is like this. I think it's a little confusing when you look at that drawing because you see the deck, which is the square and blue, that's not in question. That's what I'm saying. Because the deck is built freestanding, that deck could be five times bigger and it's not an issue. The porch could be five times bigger. Not attached to the house, that's not an issue. What we're asking for is an angle cut like that.

Mr. Benner: Staff, do you have answers for the issues raised by that?

Ms. Buathier: Is there anything specific that you would like me to address first?

Mr. Benner: Would this be approved if it was freestanding?

Ms. Buathier: So under our current code with the definition of a deck, a deck that is attached to the house is considered part of the principal structure and has to meet the building setback, anything like the deck on the right side that's identified in the blue on the image that was identified as a free standing deck, which means it's not attached to the house, which means it falls under the accessory structure standards, which would be the three feet from the side and the rear property line. But this is identified as being attached to the house based on the definition, it has to meet the building code setback. We also have accessory structure requirements, this has been evaluated based on it being attached at the house, there are other regulations for accessory structures such as they cannot occupy more than twenty percent of the rear yar. So the deck in blue is considered for that 20 percent. The deck in green is not because it would be considered part of the primary structure so there are different requirements for different things where the overall lot coverages are also taken into account for both so there's different standards for different things.

Mr. Meyer: I would just add that we didn't receive any additional drawings, so this is all we evaluated. We can't speak to is there a design that would meet the code because we were not presented with one that it attempted to, so we can't answer that one way or the other just

based upon the information provided.

Ms. Buathier: And the other portion of it, so that is addressing the deck, the other portion that comes out from the house, the roof is also attached to the building, which also means it needs to meet the building set backs.

Mr. Benner: So the roof is also an issue.

Ms. Buathier: The variance is for the roof and the deck that is attached to the house.

Mr. Benner: Thank you. One last time, any board members, any questions for the applicant? Seeing none, based on staff's recommendation, I make a motion that we decline this variance. Do I have a second?

Ms. Barnhart: Second.

Mr. Benner: Staff?

Mr. Meyer: Just to be clear, for the new board members, if you're voting yes on this motion, you are denying the variance, unless City Attorney Shook would like to add anything to that.

Attorney Shook: Yeah, so you're right about that. The other thing is after the second comes in, you do have to open it up for discussion before the vote. Not that we often have discussion after the second motion, but you do you have to open it up for that purpose.

Mr. Meyer: So we have a first and a second.

Mr. Benner: I have a first and a second. Are there any other comments or discussion from the board? Seeing none, could you call the roll, please?

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| RESULT: | 4-2 |
| MOVER: | Benner |
| SECONDER: | Barnhart |
| AYES: | Brusk, Conley, Barnhart, Benner |
| NAYS: | Tuwamo, Ward |

App# 2025 - 0620; 7480 E. Main Street; Krishna Dahal for Comfort Health Care Agency; Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Benner asked if the applicant was there.

Ms. Buathier stated that staff spoke to the applicant who said they are out of state and would not be able to attend the meeting.

Mr. Benner stated that although approval is recommended by staff with conditions,

they have not had the opportunity to ask the applicant about the conditions.

Ms. Barnhart stated that she would be okay approving the application with the conditions.

Mr. Brusk asks how they would know if the applicant is in agreement with the conditions.

Attorney Shook stated that if the conditions are set, they must comply with them. If they proceed with the sign and do not comply with the conditions, they will get a violation from the city.

Mr. Brusk stated that in the past they have asked the applicant if they can meet the conditions or not. He was hesitant in the case that they would not be able to meet the conditions.

Attorney Shook stated that by not being there, the applicant forfeited their right to object to the conditions. Whatever the board chooses, they are stuck with those conditions with no right to argue.

Mr. Benner asks if they do approve it, who follows up to see if they met the conditions.

Ms. Buathier explained that there is a sign permit, and until the conditions are met, staff does not approve the sign permit. She stated that the recommendations come from the maintenance and repair required for existing signs. If the board were to approve the application without conditions, staff still has the ability to hold the applicant to the maintenance and repair requirements found in Section 1105.03. While reviewing this application, staff noticed that the sign needed repair, so added the condition in advance.

Mr. Benner clarifies that if they approve the application in the applicant's absence, they are required to adhere to the conditions the board applies. Additionally, in order to get the sign, they must apply for a sign permit.

Ms. Buathier stated that the applicant has already applied for a sign permit, and when they applied they were notified they needed a Certificate of Appropriateness. The sign permit will not be signed off on until the Certificate of Appropriateness' conditions are met.

Mr. Benner made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Second by Ms. Barnhart.

Mr. Benner asked if there is any other discussion.

Mr. Brusk stated that he wanted to see something explicit that shows that they completed the conditions. That they prove that they did it.

Ms. Buathier stated that the conditions says that the applicant must notify staff within 6 months that the maintenance has been done, so that staff can verify and check.

Mr. Brusk stated he wants the applicant to show proof, not just notify staff.

Attorney Shook stated it is in the condition that the applicant complete and notify staff, and it will be up to staff to decide if it is complete. Since it is a condition, the applicant has no choice but to complete the condition.

Mr. Benner stated there is a first and a second, and asked staff to call the roll.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | 6-0 |
| MOVER: | Benner |
| SECONDER: | Barnhart |
| AYES: | Brusk, Tuwamo, Ward, Conley, Barnhart, Benner |

NEW BUSINESS

App# 2025-0650; 6328 E. Livingston Ave; Grace Benson for Grace B Daycare LLC; Conditional Use

Ms. Bauthier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Benner invited the applicant to the podium to speak.

Mr. Fowler, partner for Grace B Daycare, stated they are in conversation with the

property owner about relocating the dumpster and that they have enough space for an outdoor playground.

Mr. Benner asked if the playground would be on the blacktop.

Mr. Fowler said yes, and that the dumpster is no longer in use and they have space to build a playground big enough for the number of children they will have.

Mr. Benner asked how many children.

Mr. Fowler said 15.

Mr. Benner asked if he operated the bingo parlor too.

Mr. Fowler said no.

Mr. Benner asked if there is loading going on behind the unit, such as truck traffic for deliveries. He wanted to know if this is something Mr. Fowler knew or if they need to put it on hold to be able to answer these questions.

Ms. Benson stated there is not too much loading or delivery, with nothing happening on the back side of the unit. There are apartments to the north and there is no traffic from that. No one is using the dumpster in the back, which is why they are asking to relocate it.

Ms. Barnhart stated it would be important to see a site plan because she wants to know where the trash would go and the size of the playground in regards to the property line and drive aisles, so they can see about vehicle accessibility.

Ms. Benson stated that it is a very big space and the road is not close to the building.

Ms. Barnhart stated that a 30 foot playground might encroach into the vehicular traffic way, which is why the board wants to see a site plan.

Mr. Benner clarified that the site plan needs to be to scale to see whether or not there is enough room.

Ms. Buathier stated that once there is a public hearing, the board has 60 days to make a determination, unless the applicant requests to hold it longer. If it is not held, a decision would need to be made by March 5th. She stated a to-scale site plan is generally done by an engineer or architect and she's not sure how long it would take to obtain.

Mr. Benner asked the applicants if they understand and they said yes. He asked if they would be okay with placing the application on hold until they can get the site plan.

Ms. Benson said okay.

Mr. Meyer asked the board to put a date on the hold.

Mr. Benner agreed.

Ms. Buathier stated that the deadline for the April 16th meeting would be March 26th.

Mr. Benner asked the applicant if they could have a site plan by that date.

Ms. Benson said yes.

Ms. Barnhart clarified that if they get the site plan earlier, they can turn it in and reappear before the board earlier.

Mr Benner motioned "that we will place this issue on hold until at least the April 16th meeting. But you have every right, should you be able to get yours to scale site plan finished to submit it earlier at which time we would be able hear it earlier. Can I get a second?"

Ms. Barnhart seconded.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | 6-0 |
| MOVER: | Benner |
| SECONDER: | Barnhart |
| AYES: | Brusk, Conley, Tuwamo, Ward, Barnhart, Benner |

OTHER BUSINESS

Rules of the Reynoldsburg Planning and Zoning Board

Ms. Buathier explained the three proposed changes to the rules. 1- the first meeting in January and July is at the discretion of the board. 2- font changes. 3- the deadline for submitting board cases is now 3 weeks prior to the meeting instead of 2.

Housing Council

Mr. Meyer explained that the city has a housing council and a member of the board needed to be nominated for a position on the council, and he suggested Mr. Furst.

Mr. Benner motioned to appoint Mr. Furst to the housing council.

Second by Ms. Barnhart.

| |
|--|
| RESULT: 6-0 |
| MOVER: Benner |
| SECONDER: Barnhart |
| AYES: Brusk, Conley, Tuwamo, Ward, Barnhart, Benner |

ADJOURNMENT

Planning and Zoning Administrator

Chairman