

Reynoldsburg

OHIO • 1839

Alex Furst, Chair
Keith Benner, Vice-Chair
Amy Barnhart
Norman Brusik
Hilary Conley
Yannick Tuwamo
Anita Ward

Planning & Zoning Board

7232 East Main Street
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
www.reynoldsburg.gov

Eric Meyer, Development Director
Phoenix Buathier, Planning &
Zoning Administrator

Thursday, May 7, 2026

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 1. Planning & Zoning Board - Regular Meeting - 04/16/2026
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. App# 2026-0161; MI Homes of Central Ohio c/o Steve Peck; Variance

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. App# 2026-0159; 8400 E. Main Street; Lamar Builders c/o Jack Reynolds for Ann Taylor of Plaza Properties; Variance

E. OTHER BUSINESS

F. ADJOURNMENT

ADJOURNMENT

**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
April 16, 2026**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Barnhart, Brusk, Conley, Ward, Furst

ABSENT: Benner, Tuwamo

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Board - Regular Meeting - 3/19/2026

The regular meeting minutes of 03/19/2026 were approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as submitted.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers were sworn in by Mr. Furst.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

Ms. Cepek read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst asked if the applicant was in attendance, which they were not. He states that the board has had previous application for child care facilities at this and other adjacent site where they had the exact same concern.

Ms. Barnhart stated that she has asked specific questions with regards to the drive

aisle and for the site plan and since they did not receive those materials, she made a motion to deny the request.

Mr. Furst stated that there was a motion to deny the request as submitted, and asked if there was a second.

Ms. Ward seconded the motion.

Mr. Furst asked if there was any discussion, then asked the roll to be called by staff.

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

NEW BUSINESS

App# 2026-0100; 2793 Taylor Road; Emily Ragsdale of Dewberry Engineering for Richcard Goff of Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust; Variance

Ms. Cepek read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to the podium to speak, and swore her in as a speaker.

Ms. Kat Levine stated her name and her address as 5140 Parkside Trail, Solon Ohio.

Mr. Furst invited her to give any testimony she wished.

Ms. Levine stated that the proposed pole is further away from the property line than existing poles, so there is really zero chance of increased light pollution onto adjacent properties. She stated they want increased safety for those parked there, and there is no real impact to adjacent properties.

Mr. Furst asked if there are any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Brusk stated that he had a question for staff, and asked if any complaints had

arisen due to the height of the existing poles.

Ms. Levine stated the poles have been there since the year 2000.

Ms. Buathier stated that staff does not know of any complaints.

Mr. Meyer stated that he is not aware of any and that he started in 2020, and that is where is knowledge is limited to but he is not aware of anything. He also mentioned that they are not code enforcement so he can't guarantee there have been no complaints, but there are none to his knowledge.

Mr. Brusk asked if they could meet the requirements if they had smaller poles, and if that had been evaluated, to possibly eliminate the need for a variance.

Ms. Buathier suggested the applicant would be better suited to answer that question.

Ms. Levine stated that Walmart does not want to reduce any parking spaces in line with the parking ratios put forth by the jurisdiction, and that adding more poles at the 20 foot height would increase safety at all with the lower height and would provide less light. She stated if you were parked next to the light, yes, but overall many smaller lights would not solve the issues.

Mr. Brusk stated he was just wondering if that had been considered.

Mr. Meyer stated that staff did not get a site plan showing that information so they could not review it.

Mr. Furst stated that staff's report was relatively compelling on this matter, especially because they have granted variances for the property in question in the past, particularly citing safety and circulation issues, which remain the issue at hand. He stated he would be supportive of granting this variance. He made a motion to accept the application as submitted.

Ms. Ward seconded the motion.

Mr. Furst asked for any additional discussion and asked staff to call the roll.

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

**App# 2026-0123; 7372 E. Main Street, Dino Herbert for Vets M-Tec, LLC;
Variance**

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst invited the applicant to the podium and swore him in as a speaker.

Mr. Herbert stated his name and that he is the architect for the property owner. His address is 850 Twin Rivers Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43216. He explains that the property owner couldn't attend but is proposing a small mixed-use building on a uniquely shaped 0.11-acre parcel that was created by a historic lot split and lacks direct access to East Main Street. Because part of the parcel lies in a floodplain, the building will be placed outside of it, though some parking spaces will remain within the floodplain—something he notes is common in the area. He says the project will go through additional review, including floodplain approvals and detailed site, grading, and utility planning. The building's elevation is expected to meet FEMA requirements. Nearby public parking is available, and waste collection and fire department concerns are manageable or will be addressed later. Several variances are requested due to the parcel's constraints, including use of a non-public alley for access, limited parking layout options for the narrow lot, and reduced landscaping requirements (arguing trees likely wouldn't survive). Overall, he argues the development is reasonable, fits the character of Old Reynoldsburg, and would improve the area.

Mr. Furst stated that he recalled when the property came before the board previously, and he was convinced at the time of its uniqueness and that the variance was necessary for the reasonable use of the property. He found that since the facts had not changed, his opinion is unchanged and he is convinced that there exist special circumstances or conditions. He believed this is the only parcel in the city landlocked in this way in the city.

Mr. Herbert said he agreed as far as he knew.

Mr. Furst stated he believes there is proof of hardship and he would be supportive of granting all five variances.

Mr. Brusk stated that he agreed and it would be an advantage to the area.

Mr. Furst said it would be one of the only true mixed used buildings in the district and would be an enhancement.

Mr. Meyer reminded the applicant that two board members were absent, and to pass the motion, he needs four votes.

Mr. Furst said the applicant could table the application or they could proceed with a vote.

Mr. Herbert asked if there was four out of the seven there.

Mr. Meyer clarified that he needs four votes to pass a motion, and there were five out of seven board members present.

Mr. Herbert asked if it would be at the next board meeting.

Ms. Barnhart stated that she would be in support of the variances.

Mr. Herbert says that in his experience presenting to many boards across different jurisdictions, he welcomes feedback and concerns and is open to making adjustments if needed. He emphasizes that the goal is not to bypass rules but to responsibly develop the property in compliance with regulations. He also raises a procedural question, asking whether the board would prefer to vote on the requested variances individually given the complexity and unique constraints of the parcel.

Mr. Furst asked the board if there was any opposition to any of the variances.

Ms. Conley stated that she had concerns about the ADA parking, but would be supportive of passing.

Mr. Herbert asked if the board was opposed to voting on each variance individually.

Mr. Furst made a motion to accept the variance for the right of way access as submitted.

Ms. Barnhart seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Furst made the motion to grant the variance for the vehicular motion as submitted.

Mr. Brusk seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Furst made a motion to accept and grant the variance for the unmarked ADA space as submitted.

Ms. Barnhart seconded the motion.

RESULT:	4-1
MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Barnhart
AYES:	Brusk, Ward, Barnhart, Furst
NAYS:	Conley

Mr. Furst made the motion to accept and grant the variance for residential landscaping as submitted.

Mr. Brusk seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Furst made the motion to accept and grant the variance for commercial landscaping as submitted.

Ms. Barnhart seconded the motion.

RESULT:	5-0
----------------	-----

MOVER: Furst SECONDER: Barnhart AYES: Ward, Conley, Brusk, Barnhart, Furst

App# 2026-0124; 7372 E. Main Street; Dino Herbert for Vets M-Tec, LLC; Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst asked if the applicant had anything to add.

Mr. Herbert said no, and that they went back and forth several times with staff to make sure that the look and feel of this building were consistent with the zoning code in terms of the colors and materials.

Mr. Furst stated that seeing how all the standards for the Certificate of Appropriateness application are met, he is supportive. He asked if there was any other questions. Mr. Furst made a motion to accept the certificate of appropriateness application as submitted with staff's recommendations.

Ms. Barnhart seconded the motion.

Mr. Furst asked for any additional discussion and then asked staff to call the roll.

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

App# 2026-0161; MI Homes of Central Ohio c/o Steve Peck; Variance

Ms. Buathier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you said, the application number is 2026-0161. The application type is a variance. The applicant is MI Homes of Central Ohio, care of Steve Peck. The description of the property is west of Summit Road, south of Maplewood. The zoning of the site is zoned RM residential medium, and the applicant is requesting a variance to increase the maximum garage

extension from the front facade of the building from eight feet to 20 feet, six inches. Before you is an image of the overall aerial of the subject site. This development was before you in 2024 for the approval of multiple variances, along with the approval of the Preliminary Plat. Here is the latest approved Major Site Plan layout of the overall site, which consists of 208 townhome lots and a 384 apartments within 16 buildings in the bottom right-hand corner of the site. Here is a list of the parcels that the variance is being request for. The applicant has listed 10 parcel numbers on the application, however 27 lots, if the variance was granted would receive the variance to Section 1105.06.D.ii. The reason that there is not 27 parcel listed on the application, is that 19 of the parcels are located in the orange area on the map shown before you, which have not been through the Final Plat process and officially been subdivided. Here is a zoning map of the site. Here is an image recently took by staff off of Summit Road. And here's an image of the site from the entrance into the site off of summit road. Here you can see a plan of the overall development. The variance requested would be for 27 of the 138 townhome lots located in Subarea A. Subarea A is highlighted in yellow. Before you is the overall development, with red dots over the lots that the variance is being requested for. There are 27 lots total that the variance request would apply to. Before you is one of the two 4 unit designs and one 6 unit design requesting the variance for the Ainslie Townhome Unit. It is the one unit within either a 4- or 6-unit building. Here is the front elevation of 1 of the 4-unit townhome designs. The Variance requested is from Section 1105.06.D.ii, which states "Garages in a residential district facing the street shall not be located more than eight (8) feet in front of the front façade of the structure". The applicant is requesting to increase the garage extension from the front façade of the building from 8 feet, to 20 feet 6 inches. The image before you shows each unit having a second floor extending over the garage, except for the "Ainslie" which is identified in orange. Here is a side view of what that would look like. The Ainslie Townhome is located on the right while the Campbell Townhome, which is one of the other 3 units that meet the residential garage design standards is shown on the left. The front façade for each Townhome is identified in red. The variance requested would pertain to the townhome unit named "Ainslie". As you can see before you, the garage, highlighted in blue, extends 20 feet and 6 inches from the front façade of the home, which is 12 feet and 6 inches more than what is permitted. Before you is an image of a four unit design proposed by the developer. This variance only applies to the "Ainslie" unit, or the one highlighted in blue, due to this design type not having a second floor extend over the garage. On the other 3 design type units, which are identified in yellow, the second floor extends over the garage, showing that the garage extends less than 8 feet from the front façade of the building, meeting this residential design standard. The lines shown in red on the image before you, show where the front façade of the house is located, due to the second floor of the townhome extending mostly over the garage, making the garage less than 8 feet from the front façade of the house. The residential design standards have been historically applied to each townhome unit separately, due to

each townhome being located on its own lot as depicted by the red lines. Here is the 6 Townhome Unit design that includes the “Ainslie” unit. At this point, only one 6 unit design type of Townhome has been provided to staff. The image before shows that only the Ainslie unit exceeds the permitted 8 foot garage extension past the front façade at 20 feet and 6 inches. Here is the image of the six-unit design, which shows each unit having a second-floor extension over the garage, except the “Ainslie”. As the current zoning code reads and has been historically applied by staff, each townhome lot is reviewed individually requiring all residential design standards to be met. If the building as a whole was developed as a condo, like the depicted image below, then the building would meet all residential design standards, due to the entire building being reviewed as one design. This issue is caused by the residential design standards historically being put into place with a single-family detached design review. This issue comes about because the residential design standards were created based upon detached single family dwellings. There has not been a thorough review of the residential design standards with regards to townhomes on individual lots. Here are the Findings of Facts for Variances. The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 1105.06.D.ii to allow 27 lots within the development to have a garage that extends an additional 12.6 feet from the permitted 8 feet from the front façade of the structure for a total of 20.6 feet. The applicant states that this unit, requiring the variance, was indicated throughout the Rezoning and Major Site Plan process. The parcels identified by the applicant have never been through the rezoning process within the City of Reynoldsburg. The townhome elevations provided by the applicant in the Major Site Plan, stated that the color images were a rendering to convey a sense of scale, style and quality, but did not denote an exact representation. During the Major Site Plan review process, staff asked the applicant for more detailed information regarding their townhome units due to the disclaimers provided by the applicant, to ensure all residential design standards would be met. The applicant responded to Staff’s comment and concern by stating that all zoning requirements would be met (See factor v. under Project Review). The applicant has since turned in building designs showing the Ainslie design, where staff informed the applicant that this design (the Ainslie) did not meet the residential design standards, which has led to the variance request before the board today. Staff does recognize that the garage residential design standard of not exceeding 8 feet from the front façade of the structure was originally contemplated for a Dwelling - Detached Single-Family home, and not townhomes. However, it has been applied to multiple townhome developments since the residential design standards have been implemented. While the townhomes are connected to form a larger whole building, the site was developed so that each townhome would be its own lot, and therefore has been reviewed now and in the past consistently as such lot needing to meet the garage extension from the front façade standard in Section 1105.06.D.ii. Staff is of the opinion that if the variance was denied, that applicant would not be deprived of the beneficial use of land, due to the Dwelling -Attached

Single-Family homes being a permitted land use in the RM zoning district. Also, the applicant has provided staff with a 4-townhome unit design, where each of the 4 lots unit types meets the residential design standards for each lot unit, showing there is a design that meets the garage residential design standards. That the request by the applicant is a matter of convenience due to the self-created hardship, since they have been able to show that the residential garage design standards have been met. Furthermore, staff is concerned this could set a precedent for all future residential homes within the city, if the variance is granted. Therefore, staff recommends denial of the variance requested based on the reasons stated above and review of the variance factors under the Project Review. Mr. Chariman,

Mr. Furst: Thank you. Is the applicant with us this evening? I just ask that you please state your name and address for the record before giving whatever presentation you wish.

Mr. Peck: Sure, Steve Peck, 41.

Mr. Furst: You can pull the microphone up. There you go.

Mr. Peck: There we go. Steve Peck 4131 Worth Avenue Columbus Ohio 43219. Is it okay to hand out a color rendering just because I think it would help because everything we've submitted so far is in plan view.

Mr. Peck: Okay, first, I just want to appreciate staff for the report. I think it does indicate that this is an issue with the condo requirement versus the few simple platted lot and how this unit would be permitted had we chosen to use a condo to transfer these properties. So an issue there that we certainly have been aware of. So. Couple of things with the Ainslie itself, I do wanna just point out that it is a two-bedroom unit which allows us some flexibility to kind of be more marketable to different family types and family sizes. So it is a smaller unit and that's why all the other units that have space above the garage are three-bed room units. So for us, it's important just to kinda have variety to be able to offer two different size families, so. Just to kind of describe the unit itself. In a townhome building, I certainly understand that this, call it the snout house that everybody calls it, in a single family home and understand the architecture and how it's not desirable. But in this townhome unit building, we actually feel like it provides more diversity rather than it kind of breaks up the plane of the unit versus all the facades being lined up on the, on the build line. So really just here to answer any questions, wanted to explain that the bedrooms understand kind of where we're at at this point, but appreciate any comments or concerns.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. This is Mr. First speaking as someone who was here when

this property has come before the board and who was involved in crafting the code language in question here this evening regarding the so-called snout house. That was indeed the intent, it was to not have that be a common architectural feature in the city. That notwithstanding I think the objectionableness of it from an aesthetic standpoint remains even if it isn't a multi-family use building, but I do understand that you are trying to provide some variety and heterogeneity. Are there any other two-bedroom units that fit kind of your general design standards that are not a so-called snout house.

Mr. Peck: No, not on this product.

Mr. Furst: Okay, not in this product. You mean that you'd have to change the entire layout of the adjoining units as well?

Mr. Peck: That's correct.

Mr. Furst: Okay. Yeah, I mean, at least from my perspective, I am relatively convinced by staff's report. According to my memory of the previous applications for this property and the adjoining units, their report is accurate. You know, I'm just not convinced of that you meet the variance standards. So perhaps, you know, you could go through those for us, they are outlined in 1109.11.D of our code and just kind of walk us through, particularly the ones that we would be interested in are the uniqueness of the site. I will say though that this board is typically not supportive of arguments of uniqueness or peculiarity for greenfield sites such as this one. And that the hardship or practical difficulty requirements. But if you could maybe just kind of maybe elaborate on those a little bit, we'd appreciate that.

Mr. Peck: So you're talking as it relates to, hold on, let me go, I'm trying to flip through this. Yeah, particularly.

Mr. Furst: Yeah, particularly subsection three, four, and I believe five would be the ones at least, speaking from my perspective, that I would like to hear you go into some more detail on.

Ms. Buathier: Just to let the applicant know it would, correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Chairman, but it's three four and five that are shown on the screen.

Mr. Furst: Yes that is correct.

Mr. Peck: Oh, okay. That will save me from flipping through, so sorry. On three, there is a special circumstance. I would say that all I can speak to on this is that the fact that had it been a condo, it would have been approved. I don't necessarily have a, in terms of the special circumstance, it's really about trying to be as much

as we can for as many customers as possible and remain flexible there and offer multiple units. Five was next?

Mr. Furst: Three, four, and five, please.

Mr. Peck: You know, it's hard to say, because we haven't gone to sales yet, what sort of, you know, we have a general consensus or some demographics of what these customers are. I can't say that 100% of them are going to want a three-bedroom. So when we go to market, it is really hard to say. These units, like the staff said, we do have a four-unit building that doesn't have this unit. And if everybody wants three bedrooms, we'll build that unit. But there are gonna be instances where we're gonna say we do need some two bedroom units. So I would say that's my response to that. And then five. Again, the strict application of the code residential, the residential medium zone, understanding again that it's sort of most has been intended for single family. And again, with this being a town home unit puts us in a little bit of a special circumstance.

Mr. Furst: Uh, just to correct that last statement. So the, that, um, statement about intended for a single family is not necessarily about the residential medium zone. It is that the design standard, the so-called snout house, uh, ban, if you will, was intended primarily to prevent single family homes.

Mr. Peck: Sure. Understand.

Mr. Furst: So this is Mr. First, I have monopolized the applicant's time. Are there any other questions or concerns for the applicant from the board?

Mr. Brusk: Is there any way, if this were granted, and I'm approaching staff on this, and attorney, is there any that we could put a restriction on the variance such that it would not cause a major problem with it being...

Mr. Furst: Precedence?

Mr. Brusk: Precedence is the word I was trying to start. Thank you.

Mr. Meyer: Are you, Mr. Brusk, this is Director Meyer, are you, when you say that, are you thinking in terms of trying to, and I'm just trying to unpack what you're stating, are trying to say to limit, try to find a way to limit towards townhomes as opposed to single family? Is that, is that what you are after? Could you unpack that a little bit, if you don't mind?

Mr. Brusk: Basically that is pretty much it. The intent on having the zoning was to not have this type on a single dwelling this type of a garage and I 100% agree with

that but if this were a condo and if it is connected like these are it would seem to me that that falls on the other side of what was intended. But nonetheless, that's the way it's written. Therefore, if there's a way of doing it and getting it, allowing the variance with making sure that it doesn't cause the precedence problem, I would be in favor of it. If there's not, unfortunately, precedence is something that we have to live with. And it would require a change in legislation.

Mr. Meyer: I'm going to put our city attorney on the spot. I mean, is there a way you could craft that to try to limit it to it in the way Mr. Brusk suggested that might, I guess, limit the applicability? I don't know if you have thoughts on that, Mr. Shook

Attorney Shook: Yeah, I think with any open greenfield site like you have, you're gonna end up setting more of a broad precedent than you typically would set. You can, I believe, limit the application here to townhomes, but it would apply to all attached single-family going forward. That would be the precedent that you would be setting. If you're concerned about whether you would be setting the precedent for detached single-family homes. I don't believe that that's a concern.

Mr. Meyer: So if I heard the City Attorney correctly, Mr. Brusk, it sounds like the City Attorney feels you could draft a motion that would limit the applicability to attached family, attached like this, but where it would not apply to detached single-family homes. I believe I'm interpreting what Mr. Shook said. Hopefully. He hasn't hit his button, maybe he will.

Attorney Shook: Director Meyer does a good job speaking, city attorney, so he's correct.

Mr. Brusk: I'd like to see what the rest of the board feels on this particular issue.

Ms. Barnhart: I am having a hard time with the hardship portion of it. And because I feel like there is an alternative solution. It's not necessarily the preferred and marketable solution, but there is a solution. It doesn't make the land unusable.

Ms. Conley: Well, I was wondering if the city attorney could repeat what you were saying. I need it one more time.

Attorney Shook: Yes, so it would be, if this particular variance were granted, it would probably be a broader precedent than is typically set when a variance is granted because it's a large greenfield site. So it's gonna apply to a lot more different types of properties than usual. But if you limit it to simply attach single family and distinguish it from detached single family, then the only precedent you're setting is for the attached single family. The townhome type development. Not the detachable single family.

Ms. Conley: So if I'm hearing this correctly, there's a way to minimize the precedent potentially.

Attorney Shook: Yes, yes, to that extent.

Mr. Furst: I mean, at least from my perspective, this is Mr. Furst, you know, I'm not convinced that the variance factors have been met. You know, based on the applicant's testimony, those factors three, four, and five, I do not believe are met, and therefore I would not be supportive of granting the variance. I of course do understand that you're trying to bring a product to market and am sympathetic from, you know, that side, but at the same time, you know, the code does require that the variance factors be met for us to grant a variance. Those would have to be met even if we were to grant a more narrowed variance, such that Mr. Brusk suggested, and there has been discussion here for, I would not be supportive of that, just due to the fact that the variance factors have not been met, period, regardless of the scope of the variance that we would grant. That's just my opinion.

Mr. Meyer: Mr. Furst if I may I just wanted to say the same comment I did for a previous applicant that there are seven members of the planning and zoning board. We have five here this evening for a motion to pass, you need four votes something I believe we can do if the applicant requested, Mr. Shook, I believe this is the thing I always forget. We have two board members absent. Is there a way, if the applicant would like, where we can keep the hearing open where all seven board members, if they were here, which we cannot guarantee, a board member's attendance. But if those that are not here, if they're here at another meeting, would be able to vote on this, I'm correct on that.

Attorney Shook: Yes, as long as you keep the testimony and the presentation of evidence open, so the hearing open to that extent.

Mr. Meyer: So just to, because Mr. Shook said I can sometimes speak attorney, I'll try to put that in simple terms. If you would like to request the board and the board votes affirmably, you could table this to another meeting. And if all the board members were there, they'd all be able to act on it. It doesn't, we can't guarantee attendance at a board meeting, but I just wanted to throw that out there since we have some board members missing. And we have seven board members, but you need four to pass the motion, or four affirmative votes, I should say.

Mr. Peck: Okay, I'll go ahead and request a table.

Mr. Furst: Okay, hearing at the applicant's request that we table this, is there a particular date that you'd like to table it for? I mean, if we just pick the next board

meeting, we can't necessarily guarantee that all the board members would be here. I believe there are some who are planning to be absent, so that may not be a good selection. But we do request that you do choose a date. Not that we leave it open indefinitely, but I want to give you enough time to prepare any additional materials which you may like.

Mr. Meyer: And the calendar is before you. Thank you, I believe Phoenix, it's the, I guess you call that like a brown on there, but you can see the meeting dates. It's usually the first and third Thursday of the month. So the next meetings are the May 7th, May 21st, and June 4th would be the next meetings. I don't know if there's a date to the Chairman's request that you might wanna pick, but the next two meetings are May 7 and May 21.

Ms. Buathier: And just so the applicant knows the deadline to apply for the May 7th for any additional material was today.

Mr. Peck: Okay, let's go ahead and try the 21st.

Mr. Furst: Okay. This is Mr. Furst hearing that the applicant would like to table this item while keeping the public hearing and presentation of evidence open until the May 21st regular meeting. I so move. Do I have a second?

Mr. Brusk: I'll second that.

Mr. Furst: That's Mr. Brusk, we have a second.

Ms. Barnhart: Can I go ahead I would like to suggest just as a point of discussion that maybe we use June 4th as a date in case there is not everybody is available on the 21st just so that there's a little bit of a buffer.

Mr. Peck: Is there like the week or two before the 21st that where you kind of check attendance or?

Mr. Meyer: So what we do is we ask the board members when we submit the packet which goes out a week in advance about attendance. Can we commit to having people show up? No, what we could do is you could say, you know craft the motion to where it would be, you, know, no later than you know, June 4th and then if you wanted to you know bring it bring it to the meeting so one of those lines we're happy to do that I would tell you that we do typically poll every board member and we ask them but as much as some people maybe that are residents think we have more power than that we can't force anybody to be here or drag them here so they're also volunteers and they'll get paid for the record too.

Mr. Furst: So I'd be happy to withdraw my motion and amend it for no later than June 4th, if that would suffice.

Mr. Peck: That's fair.

Mr. Furst: Okay. This is Mr. Furst. I withdraw my previous motion and now move that based on the applicant's request, we table this item until no later than the June 4 regular meeting, keeping the public hearing and presentation of evidence open until such time as he comes back before the board. Do I have a second?

Mr. Brusk: I still second this.

Mr. Furst: Still seconded by Mr. Brusk, all right, is there any additional discussion? All right, hearing none, staff, would you please call the roll?

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

Ms. Buathier: Just to let the applicant know, the deadline for the 21st is April 30th and the deadline for June 4th is the 14th of May.

Mr. Meyer: That would be if you wanted to add any additional information to the summary. You're also free to, like you did today, bring something to the meeting and hand it out if you wish. We just wouldn't have it in the board packet, so.

Ms. Buathier: Yeah, like the color rendering or whatever you would like. June 4th was May 14th. It's three weeks before the deadline day. I'm sorry, three weeks before the meeting day is the deadline.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 7:10 PM.

Planning and Zoning Administrator

Chairman

April 6, 2026

Planning and Zoning Board
City of Reynoldsburg
7232 E. Main Street
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068

RE: MI Homes of Central Ohio; LLC; Summit Road: Variance Application

Planning and Zoning Board:

Below is the staff review of the above referenced Variance Application.

1. Project Summary

- a. **Site Summary:** The subject site is located along Summit Road, and this variance request consists of 10 total parcels, the first 8 parcels are previously subdivided parcels: Parcel ID 125-026598-00.008 (0.08 acres), 125-026598-00.012 (0.08 acres), 125-026598-00.016 (0.08 acres), 125-026598-00.020 (0.06 acres), 125-026598-00.024 (0.06 acres), 125-026598-00.036 (0.07 acres), 125-026598-00.042 (0.07 acres), and 125-026598-00.048 (0.07 acres). The two additional parcels have not been subdivided, but will contain 19 additional lot homes that the variance request pertains to, Parcels #125-026598-00.002 and 125-026598-00.003. The total number of lots the variance request would apply to, once all subdividing of the property is complete, would be 27 lots. Parcel ID #125-026598-00.002 is 33.02 acres and #125-026598-00.003 is 7.38 acres according to the Licking County Auditor's website and all parcels currently consist of vacant land. All parcels are zoned RM, Residential Medium.
- b. **Surrounding Zoning:** The surrounding zoning of the subject site consists of SR, Suburban Residential to the north, west, and south. I, Innovation to the east, RM, Residential Medium to the south east. The surrounding land uses consist of single-family homes to the north, west, south of the site, along with multifamily apartments to the southeast and vacant land to the east of the site.
- c. **Applicant's Request:** The applicant is requesting a Variance to deviate from Section 1105.06.D.ii, to increase the maximum garage extension from the front façade of the building from 8 feet, to 20 feet 6 inches.
- d. **Statement of Hardship:** The applicant requests a variance to allow for garage projection to be more than 8 feet as required for homes with garages facing the street. That only one unit (Ainslie) does not comply with the standard and projects 20'6" in front of the façade. That this unit was indicated to be constructed throughout the rezoning process and on Major Site Plan approvals. That the unit will be constructed no more than one time in any one overall building and the offset created architectural diversity of the overall building facades. That of the 280 approved townhomes the requested variance will only be constructed on 27 of the units or 9.6% of the total project.
- e. **Comprehensive Plan:** The 2018 Comprehensive Plan, upon which the current zoning code is based, states that future development in the RM, Residential

Medium district "...should be well integrated with surrounding uses while allowing for more compact development to accommodate growth, smaller household sizes, an aging population, and a growing number of households without children. Two-unit buildings are encouraged where appropriate. Developments may include a range of housing options with different price points and styles including townhomes, dense single-family, row houses, and apartments."

2. Project Review

- a. Section 1105.06.D.ii states:
 - i. "Garages in a residential district facing the street shall not be located more than eight (8) feet in front of the front façade of the structure."
 1. A Structure is defined as "Anything constructed or erected, the use of which requires location on the ground, or attachment to something having a fixed location on the ground."
- b. The application that was submitted attempted to identify all the standards for variances 1-10. The additional reasonings along with the bullet pointed review did not fully address factors 1-10, but addressed some of the factors. Staff did their best, due to inadequate numbering of the additional reasoning and the bullet point section in the packet, to identify the appropriate factor which the applicant was addressing. Ultimately, the applicant did address all factors, in the numbered document (not the roman numeral one). Staff did their best to combine all three into the review below.
- c. The following variance factors are considered below:
 - i. The variance is in accord with the general purpose and intent of the regulations imposed by this Code in the district in which it is located, and shall not be injurious to the area or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.
 1. The applicant states they believe the requested variance is in accord with the general purpose and intent of the Residential Medium Zone (RM) development standards and they are not injurious to the area or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare. That the purpose of the RM district is to complement single-family residential development through the introduction of a more diverse range of housing option, including two-family buildings, townhomes, row houses, and apartment. Future development in the RM zones should be well integrated with surrounding uses while allowing for more compact development to accommodate growth. That they are requesting one variance which are not substantial deviations from the underlying development standards and are appropriate in context of this townhome community design. That these variances will ensure that the site may be developed in a manner which substantially complies with the RM development standards and fits within the general purpose of the district. That the requested variances are minor deviations for the code and they will only affect residents within this development. That therefore,

- these variances will not cause the public welfare any detriment.
2. Staff is of the opinion that the variance requested is not injurious to the area or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare. The variance is necessary due to the residential design standards for garages imposed on any new residential development within the city. When these standards were created, the garage extension from the front of the house was originally contemplated for a detached single family residential home, not townhomes. However, it has been applied to multiple townhome developments since its implementation. While the townhomes are connected to form a larger whole building, the site was developed so that each townhome would be its own lot, meaning each townhome on the lot needs to meet not only all residential design standards, but all other standards applicable on the lot, such as building setbacks, lot coverage, building height, etc.
- ii. The variance will not permit the establishment of any use which is not otherwise listed as a permitted use or a conditional use in the zone or district in which the subject property is situated.
 1. The applicant states that the requested variances will not permit the establishment of any use which is not otherwise listed as a permitted use or a special exception in the district, or which is expressly or by implication prohibited by this Code. That the RM district already explicitly permits townhome as a use. That the requested variances are minor deviations for development standards, not permitted uses, and will allow development of the townhome community as proposed.
 2. Staff is of the opinion that the land use of dwelling – attached single-family is a permitted land use in the RM, Residential Medium zoning district. The requested variance will not establish a land use that is not permitted.
 - iii. There exist special circumstances or conditions, fully described in the findings, applicable to the land or structures for which the variance is sought, which are peculiar to such land or structures and which do not apply generally to land or structures in the area, and which are such that the strict application of the provisions of this Code would deprive the property owner of the reasonable use of such land or structures. There must be a deprivation of the beneficial use of land, as opposed to mere loss in value as justification for the variance.
 1. The applicant states that special circumstances exist with this property insofar as it does promote housing generally, promotes a rare townhome product to the community by a proven local development company, promotes development on not only the subject property, but also additional targeted properties for the City, and creates an open space area for the City in perpetuity, as required by the variance standard of Code Section 1109.11.D.iii. That this unit was created to add the product offering to appeal to

various buyer profiles. That the request is a result of special conditions – extensive utility extensions, substantial off-site improvements, creating of a park/open space in perpetuity, a public/private collaboration.

2. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow the garage to extend an additional 12 feet 6 inches more than the permitted 8 feet from the building's front façade. The applicant has provided in the packet, elevations/floor assembly plans providing three different units (not including the Ainslie unit) with six different options within those units that could meet the requirement, and not need a variance. The applicant has also submitted a four-unit design that has been approved by zoning that meets the requirement for which this variance has been submitted. The applicant has not stated how this particular unit has some type of special circumstance or condition that would deprive the property owner of the reasonable use of land, since they have other options and designs that meet this requirement.
- iv. There must be a deprivation of the beneficial use of land, as opposed to mere loss in value as justification for the variance.
 1. The applicant states that the variances are not requested due to a loss in value or an economic hardship but, rather, they are requested to alleviate a deprivation of beneficial use of the land.
 2. Staff is of the opinion that the applicant has not adequately answered this variance factor, especially since zoning staff has approved a four-unit design that meets the zoning code. The applicant has not provided or proposed a six-unit design that would meet the zoning code; however, the land use of a townhome would still be permitted if the unit met the garage standard. Therefore, the deprivation of the beneficial use of land would not be applicable.
 - v. There is proof of hardship or practical difficulty created by the strict application of this Code, beyond simply a showing that greater profit will result if the variance is granted. Economic hardship is not grounds for the variance. Furthermore, the hardship complained of is not self-created nor is it established on this basis by one who purchased with or without knowledge of the restrictions. The hardship results from the application of this Code and is suffered directly by the property in question.
 1. The applicant states that a practical difficulty exists here in that the request is unique in nature creating (and donating) along the western side of the property a 23.2 +/- acre open space park area serving dual purposes of open space and park creating in perpetuity and buffering of existing and future uses, rather than simply removing this woodland area and spreading the development across additional property. That this is sound planning, without diminishing whatsoever the quality of the built environment, and maintaining an environmental area for the city, as provided by the variance standard of Code Section 1109.11.D.iv. That the

variances are not requested due to a loss in value or an economic hardship but, rather, they are requested to alleviate a deprivation of beneficial use of the land. That the requests promote necessary divergencies where the strict application of the Code does not improve the proposal, but rather defeats the stated RM objective of allowing for more compact development to accommodate growth, in addition to negatively impacting the aesthetic (garages) and minimizes the opportunity for the open space creation.

2. During the Major Site Plan review process, staff provided comments to the applicant regarding the images shown in the submittal, requesting that the applicant give more detailed design information to ensure all residential design standards for each unit were met. That there was not enough information provide in the application for staff to review to ensure all design standards were met, and if the residential design standards were not met during their new build submittal process, a variance would be needed. (See Townhome MSP Images and Disposition of Comments - Comment #71, page 14 of 31 in the supporting document). The applicant responded with “All proposed buildings shall comply with the existing zoning”. Therefore, staff accepted the applicant’s response comments with staffs understanding that during the new build application process, the residential design standards would be met. This is due to the applicant stating that the elevations provided in the packet were subject to change and did not represent an exact representation of the intended townhome on the site, and their response stating that they would comply with existing zoning standards. Staff is of the opinion that the hardship was not created due to the strict application of the code, but that the applicant was made aware of the residential design standards and has self-created this hardship by not meeting the residential design standards that they were made aware of and acknowledge in their response letter to staff during the Major Site Plan application process.
- vi. The variance is necessary for the reasonable use of the land or building, and the variance as granted is the minimum variance that will accomplish this purpose.
 1. The applicant states the requests provide the opportunity for this seasoned and experienced development company to introduce its product to the property, while offering a new 23+/- acre open space area for the benefit of the people of the City, consistent with variance standard 1109.11.D.v. That the requests are necessary for this reasonable proposal, and certainly none of the requests are unreasonable or unnecessary – they are the minimum necessary to accomplish the overall purpose of the neighborhood consistent with proven and sound townhome neighborhood development and explicitly objectives of the RM district. Lastly, that the requested variances are necessary for the reasonable use of the land and will

- ensure that the development may be constructed as proposed.
2. Staff is of the opinion that the land use of Dwelling – Attached Single-Family could be accomplished without the variance request. That the applicant has requested the minimum variances required to accomplish the applicant’s request.
- vii. The variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent area.
1. The applicant states that as provided in Code Section 1109.11.D.vi these requests do not impair an adequate supply of light and air to any adjacent property, substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent property – actually the opposite. That this proposal is responsible in every way through building code compliance, engineering compliance, construction and extension of warranted and necessary off-site improvements, and collaboration with the City towards beneficial open space creating and preservation for residents. These are minor architectural variances dealing with garage and façade setback and they will only affect the residents of this development.
 2. The variances, if granted, will not impair the supply of light and air, substantially increase congestion, endanger public safety, or significantly impact nearby property values.
- viii. The variance will not confer on the property owner any special privilege that is unduly denied by this Code to other land, structures, or buildings in the same district.
1. The applicant states that the requests will not confer any special privilege that is unduly denied by the Code to other land, structures, or building within the district, as provided under 1109.11.D.vii, this is a unique circumstance the result of a public/private collaboration to promote necessary housing stock in the city, provide important utility extensions and connections, and opening and preserving an open space park area in perpetuity.
 2. Like staff has stated in prior variance findings, the residential design standards of a garage being no more than 8 feet extended from the front façade of the building has been implemented and enforced on all new residential homes within the city. Staff is of the opinion that if the variance is granted, then this applicant will be given special privileges that have not been permitted to previous townhome developers within the City.
- ix. No nonconforming use of neighboring land or structures in the same district and no permitted or nonconforming use of land or structures in other districts are considered as grounds for approval of the variance.
1. The applicant states that in accordance with Section

- 1109.11.D.viii, these requests are unrelated to any nonconforming use of neighboring land in the same district and no other real estate or off-site condition is cited or considered grounds for the request – rather this is promotion of sound development and planning practices consistent with explicit objectives of the RM district under the Code and the end result of collaborative effort between the Applicant and the City creating important quality housing, extending utilities for this and additional important development, and creating an excellent open space/park for the benefit of the city.
2. Staff is of the opinion that the applicant is not using neighboring structures or land as grounds for consideration of approval of the variance.
- x. The variance is not a matter of convenience when other remedies are available within the provisions of this Code.
1. The applicant states that as provided in 1109.11.D.ix the request is not a matter of convenience, this is a matter of creating a development to locate proven housing stock built by this applicant and a public/private partnership furthering the mutually beneficial objectives of creating housing, extending utilities, and preserving open space. That these are minor but necessary variances to develop this townhome project as proposed and they are not requested as a matter of convenience. That no code is ever perfect, every property is unique, and surrounding circumstances are always important relevant factors in any variance determination.
 2. The applicant does have a 4 unit building design that meets all residential design standards, along with having 6 unit types of variations proposed (Campbell, Campbell 2, Braeden, Braeden 2, Braeden 3, Dublin) that meet residential design standards for the garage. The Ainslie unit is the only unit that does not meet the garage residential design standards. The applicant has not stated why the Ainslie unit has to be done and is necessary and not a matter of convenience.

3. Recommendation

The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 1105.06.D.ii to allow 27 lots within the development to have a garage that extend an additional 12.6 feet more than the permitted 8 feet from the front façade of the structure for a total of 20.6 feet. The applicant states that this unit, requiring the variance, was indicated throughout the Rezoning and Major Site Plan process. The parcels identified by the applicant have never been through the rezoning process within the City of Reynoldsburg. The townhome elevations provided by the applicant in the Major Site Plan, stated that the color images were a rendering to convey a sense of scale, style and quality, but did not denote an exact representation. During the Major Site Plan review process, staff asked the applicant for more detailed information regarding their townhome units due to the disclaimers provided by the applicant, to ensure all residential design standards would be met. The applicant responded to City Staff's comment and concern by stating that all zoning requirements would be

met (See factor v. under Project Review). The applicant has since turned in building designs showing the Ainslie design, where staff informed the applicant that this design (the Ainslie) did not meet the residential design standards, which has led to the variance request before the board today.

Staff does recognize that the garage residential design standard of not exceeding 8 feet from the front façade of the structure was originally contemplated for a Dwelling - Detached Single-Family home, and not townhomes. However, it has been applied to multiple townhome developments since the residential design standards have been implementation. While the townhomes are connected to form a larger whole building, the site was developed so that each townhome would be its own lot, and therefore has been reviewed now and in the past consistently as each lot needing to meet the garage extension from the front façade standard in Section 1105.06.D.ii.

Staff is of the opinion that if the variance was denied, that applicant would not be deprived of the beneficial use of land, due to Dwelling -Attached Single-Family homes being a permitted land use in the RM zoning district. Also, the applicant has provided staff with a 4-townhome unit design build, where each of the 4 lots/unit types meets the residential design standards for each lot/unit, showing there is a design that meets the garage residential design standard. That the request by the applicant is a matter of convenience due to the self-created hardship, since they have been able to show that the residential garage design standard has been met. Furthermore, staff is concerned this could set a precedent for all future residential homes within the city, if the variance is granted. Therefore, staff recommends denial of the variance request based on the reasons stated above and review of the variance factors under the Project Review.

DISPOSITION OF COMMENTS

October 17, 2024

Summit Crossing – Major Site Plan, Preliminary Plat, Variance Requests

City Planning Staff Comments:

Major Site Plan Requirements Comments:

1. Provide the zoning of all adjacent parcels on the Major Site Plan. It is shown on a separate sheet, however, it is required to be shown on the Major Site Plan. Section 1109.17.C.ii.2

Response: See Exhibit F-1.

2. Show the location of all proposed buildings and structures on the Major Site Plan. This includes the location of all mailboxes, pavilions, kiosks, clubhouses, pools, and any other maintenance or other intended buildings on the site. Section 1107.C.ii.3.

Response: See Exhibit F-3- Through F-6.

3. Provide on the landscape plan, all landscaping materials and plantings that address Section 1105.07 requirements. Section 1109.17.C.ii.6
 - a. Please provide specific intended tree types and planting types for all landscape related documents.

Response: See Exhibits H and G.

4. Provide architectural plans of all buildings and structures proposed on the site. This includes mailbox pavilions, kiosks, clubhouses, other accessory structures proposed on the development. Section 1109.17.C.iii M/I

Response: All proposed buildings shall comply with the existing zoning.

Document Comments:

1. Under “Site Statistics”, the “Total number of units” is unclear if it is for the whole site. Can you please clarify the number to state total number of units for the entire site.

Response: See Exhibit F-1. Units for each Subarea is presented.

2. Under “Site Statistics”, please state how many units are in a single “G-unit, J-unit and L-unit” building. This is to ensure that the total number of units on site is correct, and to ensure the right number of parking spaces is also provided.

Response: See Exhibit F-1 for total units per building in Subarea C.

3. The application states the total parking on site is 703 parking spaces. There appears to be 630 actual off-street parking spaces shown on the overall site plan, with an additional 24 on street parking spaces, with 94 parking spaces listed as garage spaces. All three added together equals 748 parking spaces. Please clarify how 703 parking spaces were counted.

Response: See Exhibit F-1. The parking numbers have been revised.

- a. This number also does not appear to include the required off-street parking for the clubhouses on the site or the townhome parking requirements.
 - i. 280 townhomes would require 560 off-street parking spaces with one enclosed and one unenclosed parking space on each parcel. Section 1105 – Table 1105.01A

Response: See Exhibit F-1. The parking numbers have been revised. Each townhome will have 4 spaces: two garage and two driveway for a total of 1,120 spaces.

- ii. 384 apartment units would require one off-street parking space for each unit plus one parking space per each five units to accommodate visitors. Section 1105 – Table 1105.01A

Response: See Exhibit F-1. The parking numbers have been revised. 1 space per unit (384) + 1 space per every 5 units (77) = 461 required spaces. 484 spaces have been provided.

- iii. Clubhouses are generally parked at one off-street parking space per 200 sqft of building area, due to their recreational facility designation/use. If the clubhouse is intended for office use, then it would be parked at one off-street parking space per 250 sqft of building area, based on Table 1105.01A.
 - 1. Please provide the square footage of both clubhouse and the intended land use of the clubhouse in the parking calculations.

Response: See Exhibit F-1. The parking numbers have been revised. For Subarea A and B, the pool house is 768 sf. Since this building is only used for recreation, not office, at 1 space per 200 sqft 4 parking spaces are required. 12 spaces have been provided. Note the non-enclosed area of the pool house has not been included in the calculation.

For Subarea C, the clubhouse is 4500 sf. At a rate of 1 space per 200 sf 23 spaces are required. 23 spaces have been provided.

- iv. Please provide the number of parking spaces for each type of garage/garage location on site, to ensure the correct number of garage spaces are provided.

Response: See Exhibit F-1.

- v. Please label in the parking calculations, that 9 off-street parking spaces will be provided for the amenity park location.

Response: Addressed.

- vi. Please label in the parking calculations that 12 off-street parking spaces will be provided for one of the mail box locations.

Response: Addressed.

- vii. Please label and identify the 24 on-street parking spaces on the major site plan and in the parking calculations.
 - 1. Please clearly explain how the required off-street parking space for each parcel and each land use are met/obtained on the major site plan, along with stating those calculations in the “Site Statistics”. Section 1105 – Table 1105.01A

Response: Addressed

4. The site plan states the 22 ADA parking spaces are provided on the site, that 18 are head-in parking and 4 are in the garage parking.
 - a. The site plan shows surface parking ADA spaces. 20 ADA spaces in off-street surface parking lot spaces and 2 ADA spaces in on-street parking spaces.
 - i. Please clearly identify where the 4 ADA garage parking spaces would be located on the site plan and/or revise the number of ADA parking spaces provided on the overall site plan.

Response: The ADA garage spaces have been labeled on Exhibit H-1.

5. Please change in the "Site Statistics" "Head-in Parking" to "off-street parking".

Response: Addressed.

6. Under "Notes" Note C states, "Reserve "A" shall be deeded to the City of Reynoldsburg for a Public Park. Reserves "B-F" Open Spaces/Stormwater Facilities shall be owned and maintained by the Summit Crossing Homeowners Association.
 - a. This statement implies that the City will own and maintain all of Reserve A, which based on the Major Site Plan, would include the Retention Pond for the site, which is a stormwater facility, but is not located on B-F.
 - i. Please show the retention pond for the site, not a part of the City's intended Public Park. The City will not accept or maintain the sites intended Retention Pond.

Response: Note "C" has been revised to clearly state the intent that all of Reserve A shall be owned and maintained by the City and that the storm water management basin, which is located on Reserve A, shall be maintained by the HOA via storm easement. Items such as maintaining landscape and mowing grass shall be the responsibility of the City.

7. Remove under "Notes", Note F states that this document is only for Subarea A & B.
 - a. Please clarify if Subarea C is also applying for a Major Site Plan.
 - i. If the site is being developed as a Major Site Plan for Subarea A & B only, then remove everything regarding Subarea C.
 1. Please know that Subarea C, will require its own Major Site Plan, and that this parcel would be held to the current zoning code regulations at the time of it being developed/major site plan submitted. This would include everything from density based on the parcels acres, to landscaping, lighting, design standards, parking, etc.
 - ii. If the site is being developed for all Subareas, then all information for all Subareas will need to be shown/provided. Note F would need to be removed.

Response: The Phase note on Exhibit F-1, formally Note "F" is now note "G", has been revised. It no longer excludes Subarea C. Phase lines for Subarea C are shown on the plan view of Exhibit F-1. It is the intent that the Major Site Plan also pertains to Subarea C.

8. If the entire site is being developed under this Major Site Plan, then all zoning requirements for the whole site plan will need to be shown/met.
 - a. There appears to be information missing such as:
 - i. The clubhouse will need to be shown on the overall project plan.

Response: See Exhibit F-1.

- ii. The Meter Building, if there is a second one (Phase A & B), based on what the utility plan alludes to, will need to be shown.

Response: The Master Meter for Subareas A and B is shown on F-7 and will not be in a building.

- iii. The clubhouse and other accessory structures elevations in the townhome portion will need to be provided, and in color.

Response: All proposed buildings shall comply with the existing zoning.

- iv. Elevations of the structure's in the apartment complex, in the common areas between buildings.

Response: See Exhibit H-5, H-5.1 and Tab K.

- 9. 7 lots appear to not meet the minimum lot width of 23 feet per Section 1103.19. III Development Standards. Lot Width for Townhomes & Condos only (Min FT)
 - a. Lots 63, 69, 76, 82, 266, 267 & 268
 - i. If the minimum lot width of 23 feet is not met, a variance would be required for these lots prior to the Major Site Plan approval.

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant.

- 10. 49 lots do not meet the minimum lot depth of 100 feet per Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Lot Depth (Min FT)
 - a. Lots 93, 98, 99, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 114, 115, 120, 121, 126, 127, 132, 133, 138, 139, 144, 145, 150, 151, 156, 157, 162, 163, 168, 169, 174, 175, 180, 181, 186, 187, 192, 193, 198, 199, 204, 205, 210, 211, 216, 217, 222, 223, 228, 229, 234 and Reserve E.
 - i. If the minimum lot depth of 100 feet is not met, a variance would be required for these lots prior to the Major Site Plan approval.

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant.

- 11. 94 lots do not meet the minimum lot depth of 100 feet per Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Lot Depth (Min FT) or the minimum lot width of 23 feet per Section 1103.19. III Development Standards. Lot Width for Townhomes & Condos only (Min FT)
 - a. Lots 94, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 102, 103,106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135, 136, 137, 140, 141, 142, 143, 146, 147, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 155, 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177, 178, 179, 182, 183, 184, 185, 188, 189, 190, 191, 194, 195, 196, 197, 200, 201, 202, 203, 206, 207, 208, 209, 212, 213, 214, 215, 218, 219, 220, 221, 224, 225, 226, 227, 230, 231, 232 & 233.
 - i. If the minimum lot depth of 100 feet and the minimum lot width of 23 feet are not met, a variance would be required for these lots prior to the Major Site Plan approval.

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant.

- 12. Lot 69's driveway appears to be encroaching onto lot 68.
 - a. Please know that one lots driveway cannot be located/run through another lot. Please correct.

Response: The plan has been changed to remove the driveway overlap.

13. Lot 76 driveway appears to reduce in size. Please provide the width of the intended driveway.

Response: Addressed and dimensioned.

14. The lots square footage throughout the site appears to be off consistently. This includes multiple lots, over 100, throughout the site. Section 1111.05.D.iv.2

- a. For example, a lot that is 24 feet by 114 feet would be 2736 square feet (lot 61 or 247). The major site plan however states the lots square footage is 2762 square feet. Please provide the correct lot square footage for each parcel on the site.
- b. For example, lots 36, 37 & 38, or 270, 271, 272 & 273 are all the same dimensions; however, they have different square footage numbers for the lot sizes.
 - i. Provide the correct square footage of each intended lot.

Response: The lot areas are computer generated per the CAD linework. The discrepancy is due to the front and rear lot lines are not parallel, and the computer rounds to the nearest 1 foot.

15. Show and state on the major site plan, the required front setback of 20 feet along all drives/street. This includes private drives. Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Setbacks & Section 1109.17.C.5

Response: Setbacks are shown and labeled.

16. Show and state on the major site plan, the required rear setback of 20 feet for all lots applicable. Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Setbacks & Section 1109.17.C.5

Response: Rear setback lines and labels have been added to all lots, see Exhibits F-3 through F-6.

17. Please know that if you intended to build any attached decks to your townhome structures or apartment buildings, the decks too will have to meet the required rear and front setbacks (whichever setback is applicable). Section 1113.D.Deck

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant. No variance is requested for deck encroachments; however, a variance is being requested for front porches.

18. Please know that front porches or any other type of unenclosed awning, canopy, unenclosed patio, etc. that do encroach into setbacks, will have to meet Section 1101.13.G of the zoning ordinance.

- a. This due some townhomes appearing to be located along or very close to both rear and front setbacks.
 - i. Please know if you cannot meet these requirements, a variance from this section would be needed. It is however unclear if this would be needed, since specific lot details are not reviewed at this time, however the applicant should be aware of these regulations.

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant. No variance is requested for deck encroachments; however, a variance is being requested for front porches.

19. It is unclear where the parcel line is for "Reserve C". Please clearly identify the lot line for Reserve C.

- a. It is unclear where the proposed parcel line is on the site.

Response: Addressed.

- b. Are you proposing parking that would be divided among the roadway and the parcel?
 - i. Please know that all on-site parking spaces need to meet the minimum parcel setback of 5 feet per Section 1105.01.G.ii

Response: The parking at Reserve "C" has been revised to comply.

- 20. Please know that the clubhouse required parking will need to be located on the same parcel as the clubhouse. This applies to both clubhouses. The townhome clubhouse appears to have issues meeting this requirement. Section 1105.01.G.i

Response: The parking at Reserve "C" has been revised to comply.

- 21. The zoning code states, "Parking or loading facilities shall not be permitted on the right-of-way of any public dedicated thoroughfare, except as provided by a public authority"(Section 1105.01.G.i). The code also requires that, "Access for all parking and loading facilities (except those required for Attached Single-Family, Detached Single-Family and Two-Family dwellings) shall be designed to permit any vehicle entering or leaving the premises to be traveled in a forward motion" (Section 1105.01.G.iv).

- a. Please know that the on street parking would not be permitted due to both regulations applying.

Response: Understood.

- 22. For all parking in the development that is not the garage/driveway parking for the townhomes, will require 22 foot maneuverability for 80 degree or more angled parking. Please show the required maneuverability per Section 1105.01.G.vi.Table

- a. This includes all drive aisles throughout the apartment complex development. Please label and show.

Response: Parking dimensions have been added. See Exhibits F-3 through F-6.

- 23. Private Roads states "any passageway designed for use by motor powered vehicles, upon property owned by one or more person, firms or corporations where such passageway servers in excess of four dwelling units" (Section 1111.15.B.i). The private roads would fall under this definition.

- a. Section 1111.15.B.iv requires the minimum pavement width of a private roadway to be 26 feet. The minimum width of a private street is 26 feet.
 - i. If the minimum width of 26 feet is not provided, a variance would be needed.
 - 1. Please know that a public ally way requires a minimum right-of-way of 20 feet with a minimum pavement of 18 feet. If you choose to go this route instead.

Response: Per follow-up discussions, Mount Drum Alley's width has been increased to 20', measured from face of curb, while Sanford, Fairweather, Wrangell, Lucania, Whitney, Alverston, and Elbert Alleys will remain 18' wide, measured from face of curb. For Private Drives, the proposed pavement width is 26' measured from face of curb.

24. Provide a note on the site plan, stating the intended hard surface to be used throughout the apartment complex parking/drive aisle areas, along with the townhome driveways. Section 1105.01.G.viii

Response: See note F that states parking areas shall be asphalt. The parking at Reserve C has been revised to comply.

25. Please clarify what the green and red dot on the lighting plan mean.

Response: See Exhibit F-9. The green dots are proposed pole lights in Subareas A and B, the red dots are proposed pole lights in Subarea C. Note the green and red dots are also located next to the appropriate detail.

26. The statistics on the street lighting plan, which includes a photometric plan, appear to be the exact same statistics as the preliminary, without 20 plus additional parking lot lighting on the site. Please ensure that the photometric plans statics are up to date and include all lighting on the site.

Response: The Photometric Plan submitted with the Preliminary Plat has been revised to include Subarea "C", and is similar to the Photometric Plan with the Major Site Plan.

27. The lighting plan for the apartments states that the mounting height of the parking lot lighting will be 30 feet. The maximum permitted height for parking lot lighting is 20 feet.

- a. A variance from Section 1105.09.B.ii would be needed if you intended to increase the height of the parking lot lighting over 20 feet.

Response: The note "mounting height to 30 feet" appears on the Shakespeare S-Series product sheet stating that the pole is capable of achieving this height. For this project a fixture height of 14' will be installed. The photometric study was prepared with a 14' fixture height. A red box has been added to the product sheet to indicate the proposed height.

28. Based on the lighting plan, there appears to be significant areas in the apartment complex and the private townhome area that will not have parking lot lighting/street lighting or any lighting at all.

- a. Staff has concerns, since multiple areas on the site will not have any lighting including areas that are intended for handicap accessible parking spaces for apartment units. Staff recommends that security lighting or some type of lighting, be installed in these areas, to ensure usable parking space areas after dusk.

Response: Two additional lights have been added to Subarea A and B. One at the CBUs in Reserve C and one at the CBUs in Reserve D.

29. Please know that a photometric plan is required for all lighting on the entire site. The photometric plan should state the foot-candles at all residential land uses property lines that the development abuts. Section 1105.09.B.i

Response: See Exhibit F-9.

30. Clarify what "f/f" on the detailed Major Site Plan means. It is unclear what it means, and there is not a legend identifying it.

Response: "f/f" stands for Face of Curb to Face of Curb. See Note E, Exhibit F-1.

31. State on the cover page of the Major Site Plan, the required setbacks for townhomes and the apartment development. Section 1109.17.C.ii.5

Response: The setbacks for the townhomes are stated on Exhibit F-1 as well as shown on the Typical Lot details.

32. Please identify "Park Place" as "Park Place North" on the Major Site Plan.

Response: Addressed.

33. Label and identify the streets right-of-way widths on the Major Site Plan. Section 1111.05.D.iv.1

Response: Addressed. Street reserve widths on Private Drives are also labeled.

34. Dimension at least one parking space on the Major Site Plan, to show that the required parking space dimensions are met. Section 1105.01.G.i

Response: Addressed.

35. Label all sidewalks on the Major Site Plan, along with providing their dimensions.

Response: See Note B, Exhibit F-1.

36. Provide/state the required ADA parking space dimensions for all accessible parking spaces. Section 1105.01.G.v.2

Response: A parking detail has been added to Exhibit F-1.

37. Dimension and identify the required 3 foot setback for the fence along Summit road on the Major Site Plan. Section 1105.11

Response: Addressed.

38. Please know that the maximum lot coverage, including all impervious surface is 70%. That you will qualify for the additional 10% credit, bringing the total maximum lot coverage to 80%.

Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Lot Coverage/Open Space

- a. Please know that if you exceed 80% maximum lot coverage on any lot, you will need a variance for that lot and any other lot exceeding 80% in the development before Zoning will sign off on a Zoning Certificate for a New Build Application.

The largest percent of lot coverage is 67.7% therefore a variance has not been requested

- **Smallest lot is 76' deep x 21' wide = 1,596 sf (rounded down to nearest whole number)**
- **Impervious area for the biggest townhome on the smallest lot =1,080.2 sq ft
(House: 743.1 sf + driveway: 327.1 sf + stoop: 10 sf)**
- **$1080.2\text{sf} / 1596\text{ sf} \times 100 = 67.7\%$**
- **Measured from R/W to reserve line.**
- **Pertains to lots: 206-209, 212-215, 110-113, 116-119, 122-125, 128-131, 134-137, 140-143 and 146-149.**

39. Provide the maximum height of the proposed street lighting. Section 1105.09.B

Response: The maximum height for proposed public street lights shall be 14'. See Exhibit F-9.

40. Will there be any other street lighting or exterior lighting on the subject site?
- a. If there will be other exterior lighting including street, walkway, parking lot, security, etc. Then the additional lighting will need to be all shown on the lighting plan and photometric plan, meeting all lighting requirements.
 - b. If there will be any additional street lighting specifically, it should also be shown on the photometric plan provided, along with showing that all requirements from Section 1111.13.Street Lights and how it is met.

Response: Two additional lights have been added to Subarea A and B. One at the CBU's at Reserve C and one at the CBU's in Reserve D. Otherwise, no additional lights are proposed.

41. Please provide a photometric light plant that shows the foot candles at the boards of the parcel that abut residential zoned or used land uses. Section 1105.09.B.

Response: Foot candle information is shown on Exhibit F-9.

42. The subject site has roughly 16, 146 feet of road frontage throughout the site. The proposed landscape plan appears to show mainly "street trees" with some additional trees throughout the subject site.

- a. The applicant will need to provide a landscape plan, showing and stating how all landscape requirements are met for the townhome development portion. Section 1105.07
 - i. Please know this includes a Tree Survey, Tree Removal Plan, a Tree Preservation Plan, a Tree Replacement Plan for the Major Trees removed from the site, General Landscape Standards, Street Tree Requirements, Interior Lot Landscaping Requirements, Buffer Requirements, Parking Area Landscaping Standards and Screening and Landscaping for Service Structure Requirements.
 1. There is not enough information provided in the landscape plan to review all of these requirements.

Response:

- **Street trees have been revised to meet the spacing requirements for public streets. There is a deficit of 7 street trees along Park Place North and Allegro Drive due to space limitations; however, Denali Avenue has a surplus of 7 street trees.**
- **Trees along Alleys are not required but will be provided based on available spacing with driveways.**
- **Lot trees will not be required at this time based upon the Tree Preservation within Reserve "A". The total tree credits within this reserve is 5,623 which more than offsets the requirements for lot trees.**
- **The Developer reserves the right to provide additional landscape at their discretion.**
- **See Exhibits G-6 and G-7 as well as Tab E, Existing Tree Survey Memo.**

43. The subject site appears to be removing existing trees near the amenity area and where the road/townhome construction will be located.

- a. Please provide a tree survey, identifying all major trees removed from the site. Along with a tree replacement plan. Section 1105.07.B & E

Response: See Exhibits G-6 & G-7 for tree removal quantities.

44. The applicant will need to show the required 6 foot landscape setback around the site per Section 1105.07.F.ix

Response: No setback is required.

45. Staff reviewed the proposed street trees, and reviewed them based on the maximum distance a street tree could be apart, with the largest size and determined that 155 street trees are missing.

- a. The applicant will need to provide the type of tree, identify if it is a small, medium or large tree, and follow the required spacing for trees per Section 1105.07.G on the landscape plan
 - i. If the required number of street trees cannot be provided, a variance for the required number of trees would be needed, along with a site plan showing where the trees requesting a variance for would have been required to be located.

Response:

- **Street trees have been revised to meet the spacing requirements for public streets. There is a deficit of 7 street trees along Park Place North and Allegro Drive due to space limitations; however, Denali Avenue has a surplus of 7 street trees.**
- **Trees along Alleys are not required but will be provided based on available spacing with driveways.**
- **Lot trees will not be required at this time based upon the Tree Preservation within Reserve "A". The total tree credits within this reserve is 5,623 which more than offsets the requirements for lot trees.**
- **The Developer reserves the right to provide additional landscape at their discretion.**
- **See Exhibits G-6 and G-7 as well as Tab E, Existing Tree Survey Memo**

46. The clubhouse for the townhomes states the sidewalk will be 5 feet wide (Exhibit G-2). Will all sidewalks throughout the site be 5 feet?

- a. If all sidewalks throughout the site will be 5 feet, please provided a note on the cover sheet stating this.
- b. If all sidewalks throughout the site will not be 5 feet, please clearly label the width of all sidewalks throughout the site.

Response: All walks will be 5' wide, within Subareas A, B and C, with the exception of private walks leading directly to townhomes, which will be 4' wide. See Note B, Exhibit F-1.

47. The proposed height of 4 feet and 6 inches of the 4-rail fence exceeds the maximum height of a fence permitted in the front yard, which is 4 feet. (Exhibit G-3)

- a. If the applicant would like to exceed the maximum height of 4 feet, the applicant will need a variance.
- b. If the applicant revised the drawing to show the fence at 4 feet or less, a variance would not be needed.
- c. Please also be aware that the opacity of the fence will need to be stated for the fencing, not exceeding the maximum opacity of 50%.

Response: The 4-rail fence has been replaced with a 3-rail fence that is 4 feet high or less and does not exceed 50% opacity. See notes and detail, Exhibit G-4.

48. The proposed street trees, after looking at the specifications on Exhibit G-4, appear to actually be interior trees.
- a. Street trees are required to be located in the right-of-way, in between the sidewalk and street right-of-way. Section 1105.07.G. iv.

Response: Street trees have been revised to lie within the tree lawn.

Please also show on the street tree plan, that the 20 foot sight triangle is maintained at street intersections throughout the site.

Response: Sight triangles have been added to Exhibit G-1.

49. Exhibit G-4 with regards to interior lot landscaping will need to meet Section 1105.07.H.i.1. This includes the correct square footage for each lot, including the reserves/other lots that are open space/clubhouse/etc.
- a. Please also know that based on our standards, each residential lot requires at least one tree. So if the lot is 2,500 square feet, one tree at 2 inch diameter will be required, which means that at least 287 interior lot trees will be required, likely more for larger reserve parcels.
 - i. The calculations for the required trees will need to be provided for the entire site.
 1. Please know that interior lot landscaping standards can also use existing healthy trees that will remain on the development after it is developed, towards credits to interior lot landscaping requirement. Section 1105.07.G.ii
 - a. You will need to provide all required documentation in the tree preservation plan, showing this information.

Response: Lot trees will not be required at this time based upon the Tree Preservation within Reserve "A". The total tree credits within this reserve will be 5,623 which will more than offset the requirements for any lot trees. The Developer reserves the right to provide additional landscape at their discretion.

50. Remove the not, "*units subject to change based on marketing conditions" from Exhibit G-4.

Response: All units will be subject to change based on marketing conditions, but all units will meet all the requirements set forth in the zoning documents.

51. Remove under the "Landscape Notes" Comment F from Exhibit G-4. Since all landscaping types are required to be identified during the Major Site Plan process. Section 1109.17.C.ii.6

Response: Addressed.

52. Provide/show the 20 foot side setback of the apartment complex along the lot line that abuts townhome unit 280. Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Setbacks & Section 1109.17.C.5

Response: Addressed.

53. Provide/show the 20 foot front setback of the apartment complex along Park Place North.
Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Setbacks & Section 1109.17.C.5

Response: Addressed.

54. Identify the height, type and opacity of the fence intended for the dog park. Section 1105.11.A.ii

Response: Addressed. See Exhibit H-5.1.

55. Provide the setback of the proposed dog park fence location to the property line.

- a. Please know that fences located along frontage require a 3-foot setback from the property line, with 50% opacity and a maximum of height of 4 feet. Section 1105.11.A.ii

Response: Addressed. See Exhibit H-1.

56. Please know that any deck that is attached to the apartment complex, will be required to meet the building setback.

- a. This is mentioned due to apartments 14, 15 and 16 appearing to have some portion of the building located over the 30-foot rear setback line.
 - i. If the building does not meet the required setback, then a variance would be needed.

Response: Addressed. The site plan has been revised to comply with this comment.

57. Identify what will be located between buildings 3 & 6, and 4 & 5. There appears to be something in the common space.

- a. If it is a structure, please identify it and provide the necessary building elevations for it.

Response: The areas will include a patio with grill, seating and an arbor. Call-out notes have been added to Exhibit H-1.

58. Please clarify for the community garden if there will be fencing, pavement, and intended ground cover for the site.

- a. Please identify any materials that are intended to be used, meeting all zoning code requirements for things such as fences.

Response: See Exhibit H-5.1, Detail 4, for community garden information.

59. Provide the required screening along the eastern parcel line for the apartment complex, where parking lots are within 50 feet of a residence.

- a. Please state and provide the required information showing how you will meet Section 1105.01.G.iii requirements.

Response: Evergreens have been added adjacent the parking lots to comply with this requirement. See Exhibit H-2.1.

60. On sheet H-2, please change under Tree Replacement not, minimum caliper of (1.75") to 2". Since it now states 2 inches instead of 1.75 inches due to a recent code update. Section 1105.07.E

Response: Addressed.

61. On Sheet H-2, for Street Trees, it appears to be short 5 large trees, if you are doing large trees at a maximum of 45 feet apart. Please correct the number of street trees provided on the site.
Section 1105.07.G

Response: Addressed.

- a. Please show the distance between the street trees, along with providing the tree type, and the size of tree.
 - i. Please ensure the tree is an approved street tree, from the City of Reynoldsburg approved street tree list

Response: Understood.

62. If credits for existing trees were intended to be used on this site, then a tree survey meeting all of Section 1105.07.H.ii would need to be submitted during the Major Site Plan review process.

- a. Trying to do that later, would result in a modification to the existing Major Site Plan. Which would be a new application, fee and supporting materials needed.

Response: See Exhibits G-6 & G-7.

63. Add the number 38 to evergreen trees at 6" GHT. In the "Parking Area Berm" section on sheet H-2.

Response: Addressed.

64. Please remove the wording "preliminary not for construction" off of all applicable documents.

Response: Addressed.

65. Provide the height of the proposed apartment homes on the elevation sheet.

Response: See Tab K.

66. Provide the required information, showing/stating how Section 1105.06.C.ii standard is met on all sides of the apartment building.

Response: See Tab K. Note added to building elevations.

67. Provide the required information, showing/stating how Section 1105.06.H standard is met on the apartment building.

Response: See Tab K. Note added to building elevations.

68. Provide on the clubhouse and miscellaneous elevations, the height and materials used for all structures on the site.

- a. Please also ensure that any structure's not identified on the elevations, such as the mail kiosk or open space structure area also provided in the elevations.

Response: See Exhibits H-5 and H-5.1 as well as Tab K.

69. Provide color elevations of the actual clubhouse intended in the townhome sections. Please provide the height, type of materials used throughout the building and any other pertinent detail.

Response: All proposed buildings shall comply with the existing zoning.

70. Provide color elevations of any and all other structures buildings that are not the clubhouse or townhomes in the Major Site Plan, such as the mailbox units.

Response: All proposed buildings shall comply with the existing zoning.

71. Provide color elevations of both townhome types intended for the site. The current elevations state it is subject to change and that it does not denote an exact representation of the intended townhome.

a. Exact renderings of the Townhomes are needed. This would include color elevations showing all 4 sides, identifying the height of the building, and meeting all residential design standards found in Section 1105.06

i. Please know that if the townhome does not meet the residential design standards found in the Zoning Code, then a variance would be needed.

Response: All proposed buildings shall comply with the existing zoning

72. Please know that sign permitting process is not reviewed during the Major Site Plan process. It is a separate sign plan permit.

Response: Understood.

73. The developer states on their application that they will provide a, "contribution in the amount, in lieu of improvements agreed to by the City". The City is currently working on updating the 2023 numbers gathered from a Summit Road Improvement Study and will submit the updated numbers to the developer, for the developer to agree to in lieu of doing a traffic impact study/traffic improvements in and off the site due to the City's intent to improve Summit Road in the near future.

Response: Understood.

74. As a part of addressing the comments from the City, the City is willing to discuss modification to the layout and size of reserve A.

Response: Understood.

Planning Staff Comments: Preliminary Plat

1. On the application, the applicant states there are 287 lots proposed on the preliminary plat.
 - a. There are only 280 lots identified by the applicant on the preliminary plat. Please identify the other 7 lots, with a lot number on the preliminary plat. Section 1111.05.D.iv.2

Response: The additional 7 lots are Reserves, each has been assigned a lot number.

2. 7 lots appear to not meet the minimum lot width of 23 feet per Section 1103.19. III Development Standards. Lot Width for Townhomes & Condos only (Min FT)
 - a. Lots 63, 69, 76, 82, 266, 267 & 268
 - i. If the minimum lot width of 23 feet is not met, a variance would be required for these lots.

Response:

- **See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant.**
 - **Lots on curves are measured from the setback not from the “reserve line”.**
 - **Dimensions have been added to all of the curved lots at the building line for clarification.**
3. 49 lots do not meet the minimum lot depth of 100 feet per Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Lot Depth (Min FT)
 - a. Lots 93, 98, 99, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 114, 115, 120, 121, 126, 127, 132, 133, 138, 139, 144, 145, 150, 151, 156, 157, 162, 163, 168, 169, 174, 175, 180, 181, 186, 187, 192, 193, 198, 199, 204, 205, 210, 211, 216, 217, 222, 223, 228, 229, 234 and Reserve E.
 - i. If the minimum lot depth of 100 feet is not met, a variance would be required for these lots.

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant.

4. 94 lots do not meet the minimum lot depth of 100 feet per Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Lot Depth (Min FT) or the minimum lot width of 23 feet per Section 1103.19. III Development Standards. Lot Width for Townhomes & Condos only (Min FT)
 - a. Lots 94, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135, 136, 137, 140, 141, 142, 143, 146, 147, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 155, 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177, 178, 179, 182, 183, 184, 185, 188, 189, 190, 191, 194, 195, 196, 197, 200, 201, 202, 203, 206, 207, 208, 209, 212, 213, 214, 215, 218, 219, 220, 221, 224, 225, 226, 227, 230, 231, 232 & 233.
 - i. If the minimum lot depth of 100 feet and the minimum lot width of 23 feet are not met, a variance would be required for these lots.

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant.

5. Lot 69's driveway appears to be encroaching onto lot 68.
 - a. Please know that one lot's driveway cannot be located/run through another lot. Please correct.

Response: The plan has been changed to remove the driveway overlap.

6. Lot 76 driveway appears to reduce in size. Please provide the width of the intended driveway.

Response: Addressed and dimensioned.

7. The lots square footage throughout the site appears to be off consistently. This includes multiple lots, over 100, throughout the site. Section 1111.05.D.iv.2

a. For example, a lot that is 24 feet by 114 feet would be 2736 square feet (lot 61 or 247). The preliminary plat however states the lots square footage is 2762 square feet. Please provide the correct lot square footage for each parcel on the site.

b. For example, lots 36, 37 & 38, or 270, 271, 272 & 273 are all the same dimensions; however, they have different square footage numbers for the lot sizes.

i. Provide the correct square footage of each intended lot. Section 1111.05.D.ii.1

Response: The lot areas are computer generated per the CAD linework. The discrepancy is due to the fact that the front and rear lot lines are not parallel, and the computer rounds to the nearest 1 foot.

8. Show and state on the preliminary plat, the required front setback of 20 feet along all drives/street. This includes private drives. Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Setbacks

Response: Setbacks are shown and labeled. Note, additional information has been added for clarity.

9. Show and state on the preliminary plat, the required rear setback of 20 feet for all lots applicable. Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Setbacks

Response: Rear setbacks lines and labels have been added to all lots, see Exhibits F-3 through F-6.

10. Please know that if you intended to build any attached decks to your townhome structures, the decks too will have to meet the required 20 foot rear and front setbacks (whichever setback is applicable). Section 1113.D.Deck

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant. No variance is requested for deck encroachments; however, a variance is being requested for front porches.

11. It is unclear where the parcel line is for "Reserve C". Please clearly identify the lot line for Reserve C.

a. It is unclear where the proposed parcel line is on the site.

Response: Addressed.

b. Are you proposing parking that would be divided among the roadway and the parcel?

i. Please know that all on-site parking spaces need to meet the minimum parcel setback of 5 feet per Section 1105.01.G.ii

Response: The parking at Reserve "C" has been revised to comply.

12. Please know that the clubhouse required parking will need to be located on the same parcel as the clubhouse. Section 1105.01.G.i

Response: The parking at Reserve "C" has been revised to comply.

13. The zoning code states, "Parking or loading facilities shall not be permitted on the right-of-way of any public dedicated thoroughfare, except as provided by a public authority"(Section

1105.01.G.i). The code also requires that, "Access for all parking and loading facilities (except those required for Attached Single-Family, Detached Single-Family and Two-Family dwellings) shall be designed to permit any vehicle entering or leaving the premises to be traveled in a forward motion" (Section 1105.01.G.iv).

- a. Please know that the on street parking would not be permitted due to both regulations applying.

Response: Understood.

14. For all parking in the development that is not the garage/driveway, please know that a required 22 foot maneuverability for 80 degree or more angled parking that is required. Please show the required maneuverability per Section 1105.01.G.vi.Table

Response: Parking dimensions have been added. See Exhibits F-3 through F-6.

15. Private Roads states "any passageway designed for use by motor powered vehicles, upon property owned by one or more person, firms or corporations where such passageway servers in excess of four dwelling units" (Section 1111.15.B.i). The private roads would fall under this definition.

- a. Section 1111.15.B.iv requires the minimum pavement width of a private roadway to be 26 feet. The minimum width of a private street is 26 feet.
 - i. If the minimum width of 26 feet is not provided, a variance would be needed.
 1. Please know that a public ally way requires a minimum right-of-way of 20 feet with a minimum pavement of 18 feet. If you choose to go this route instead.

Response: Per follow-up discussions, Mount Drum Alley's width has been increased to 20', measured from face of curb, while Sanford, Fairweather, Wrangell, Lucania, Whitney, Alverston, and Elbert Alleys will remain 18' wide, measured from face of curb. For Private Drives, the proposed pavement width is 26' measured from face of curb.

16. Staff reviewed the proposed street trees, and reviewed them based on the maximum distance a street tree could be apart, with the largest size and determined that 155 street trees are missing.

- a. The applicant will need to provide the type of tree, identify if it is a small, medium or large tree, and follow the required spacing for trees per Section 1105.07.G on the landscape plan
 - i. If the required number of street trees cannot be provided, a variance for the required number of trees would be needed, along with a site plan showing where the trees requesting a variance for would have been required to be located.

Response: Street trees have been revised to meet the spacing requirements for public streets. There is a deficit of 7 street trees along Park Place North and Allegro Drive due to space limitations; however, Denali Avenue has a surplus of 7 street trees. Trees along Alleys are not required but will be provided based on available spacing with the driveways. The Developer reserves the right to provide additional landscape at their discretion.

17. The proposed height of 4 feet and 6 inches of the 4-rail fence exceeds the maximum height of a fence permitted in the front yard, which is 4 feet.
 - a. If the applicant would like to exceed the maximum height of 4 feet, the applicant will need a variance.
 - b. If the applicant revised the drawing to show the fence at 4 feet or less, a variance would not be needed.
 - c. Please also be aware that the opacity of the fence will need to be stated for the fencing, not exceeding the maximum opacity of 50%.

Response: The 4-rail fence has been replaced with a 3-rail fence that is 4 feet or less and does not exceed 50% opacity. See notes and detail, Exhibit G-4.

18. Provide in the preliminary plat packet, a copy of the general layout of all site improvements to be installed on the entire tract of land to be developed. This is required, even if only a portion of the site is intended to be developed. Section 1111.05.B
 - a. Please show the intended apartment layout, showing the intended site improvements.

Response: Addressed.

19. Provide on the preliminary plat, the name of the engineer, their seal and signature, of the engineer that prepared the preliminary plat. Section 1111.05.D.i

Response: EMH&T's engineers prepared the preliminary plat, however, per Section 1111.05.D.i which states: "The preliminary plat shall contain the following, and be prepared by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Ohio:", EMH&T engineers as a policy do not seal and sign preliminary work and do not interpret the Section to indicate its required.

20. Provide on the preliminary plat, the names and addresses of the owner on the preliminary plat. Section 1111.05.D.i.4

Response: Addressed See Sheet 1.

21. Provide/identify the name and address of the project developer on the preliminary plat. Section 1111.05.D.i.4

Response: Addressed See Sheet 1.

22. Provide/Identify the name and address of the surveyor who made the preliminary plat, on the preliminary plat. Section 1111.05.D.i.4

Response: Addressed See Sheet 1.

23. Provide the legal description of the parcel being subdivided with the preliminary plat. Section 1111.05.D.i.7

Response: Addressed See Sheet 1.

24. Label in a legend, the boundary lines symbol shown on the plat. Section 1111.05.D.ii.1

Response: Addressed See Sheet 1.

25. Provide the widths and names of all existing and previously platted streets or alleys on the preliminary plat. Section 1111.05.D.ii.2

- a. This includes Park Place N., the existing road to the South, Allegro Drive connecting to the North and Summit Road to the East of the site.

Response: Addressed.

26. Label existing water, sewer and underground facilities on the utility plan. Section 1111.05.D.ii.3
 - a. Please also identify what the utilities are in the legend, that are existing, that are identified near or along Summit Road.

Response: Addressed.

27. Are there any existing zoning restrictions on the site? Section 1111.05.D.ii.5
 - a. If there are no existing zoning restrictions on the site, please state this in a note on the preliminary plat.
 - b. If there are existing zoning restrictions on the site, please list/show/state the existing zoning restrictions on the preliminary plat.

Response: The Applicant is not aware of any existing zoning restrictions on the site and a note has been added to Sheet 1.

28. Provide on the preliminary plat, all existing and proposed easements. Section 1111.05.D.ii.8

Response: Addressed See Sheet 7

29. Provide a note on the preliminary plat that all elevations are based on NAVD (North American Vertical Datum) 1988 datum. Section 1111.05.D.iii

Response: Addressed.

30. Clarify what “f/f” on the detailed Preliminary Plat means. It is unclear what it means, and there is not a legend identifying it.

Response: “f/f” stands for Face of Curb to Face of Curb. See Note E, Sheet 1.

31. Please clarify the lot width of lots 63 & 82. It is unclear what the width is, due to multiple numbers being stated. Please provide 1 number for the lot width of both of these parcels.

Response: Addressed.

32. Label and identify the streets right-of-way widths on the Preliminary Plat. Section 1111.05.D.iv.1

Response: Addressed.

33. Under “Notes” Note C states, “Reserve “A” shall be deeded to the City of Reynoldsburg for a Public Park. Reserves “B-F” Open Spaces/Stormwater Facilities hall be owned and maintained by the Summit Crossing Homeowners Association.

- a. This statement implies that the City will own and maintain all of Reserve A, which based on the Preliminary Plat, would include the Retention Pond for the site, which is a stormwater facility, but is not located on Reserves B-F.
 - i. Please show the retention pond for the site, not a part of the City’s intended Public Park. The City will not accept or maintain the sites intended Retention Pond.
 1. This needs to be clearly identified and defined for the requirement of Section 1111.05.D.iv.3

Response: Note C has been revised to clearly state the intent that all of Reserve A shall be owned and maintained by the City and that the storm water management basin, which is located on Reserve A, shall be maintained by the HOA via storm easement. Items such as maintaining landscape and mowing grass shall be the responsibility of the City.

34. State on the cover page of the preliminary plat, the required setbacks for townhomes.

Response: Addressed.

35. Bear and Hunter as street names already exist in Licking County. Please select new street names.
Section 1111.05.D.iv.6

Response: Addressed.

36. Blackburn as a street name already exist in the City of Reynoldsburg. Please select a new street name. Section 1111.05.D.iv.6

Response: Addressed.

37. Please identify "Park Place" as "Park Place North" on the Preliminary Plat, since this road has a north and south on the existing street names below in the AMH Development. Section 1111.05.D.iv.7

Response: Addressed.

38. The following street names need to have the proper street ending names per Section 1111.05.D.v:

- a. Whitney Place
- b. Sanford Place
- c. Fairweather Place
- d. Hubbard Place
- e. Alverstone Place
- f. Elbert Place
- g. Saint Elias Drive
- h. Denali Avenue
- i. Foaraker Place
- j. Whatever new name for "Bear" Place
- k. Whatever new name for "Hunter" Place
- l. Whatever new name for "Blackburn" Court

Response: Addressed.

39. Dimension at least one parking space on the preliminary plat, to show that the required parking space dimensions are met. Section 1105.01.G.i

Response: Addressed.

40. Provide/state the required ADA parking space dimensions for all accessible parking spaces.
Section 1105.01.G.v.2

Response: Addressed. See Sheets 1 and 9.

41. Provide the required documentation, indicating the responsible party for maintenance of the private roadways for the Preliminary Plat. Section 1111.15.B.II

Response: See Note "G" on Sheet 1.

42. Label the sidewalks on the preliminary plat, along with providing their dimensions.

Response: See Note "B" on Sheet 1.

43. Please know that all electrical and telephone lines will need to be located underground. Please provide a note on the preliminary plat the all electrical and telephone lines will be located underground. Section 1111.15.I

Response: See Note "I" on Sheet 1.

44. Show the Sanitary Sewer on the Preliminary Plat meeting all requirements of Section 1111.16.

a. Sanitary Sewer is not shown on the Utility Plan in the Preliminary Plat package.

Response: The proposed sanitary sewer alignment has been added to the Utility Plan.

45. Please know that the maximum lot coverage, including all impervious surface is 70%. That you will qualify for the additional 10% credit, bringing the total maximum lot coverage to 80%.

Section 1103.19.III Development Standards. Lot Coverage/Open Space

a. Please know that if you exceed 80% maximum lot coverage on any lot, you will need a variance for that lot and any other lot exceeding 80% in the development before Zoning will sign off on a Zoning Certificate for a New Build Application.

The largest percent of lot coverage is 67.7% therefore a variance has not been requested

- **The smallest lot is 76' deep x 21' wide = 1,596 sf (rounded down to nearest whole number)**
- **The impervious area for the biggest townhome on the smallest lot =1,080.2 sq ft
(House: 743.1 sf + driveway: 327.1 sf + stoop: 10 sf)**
- **$1080.2\text{sf} / 1596\text{ sf} \times 100 = 67.7\%$**
- **Measured from R/W to reserve line.**
- **Pertains to lots: 206-209, 212-215, 110-113, 116-119, 122-125, 128-131, 134-137, 140-143 and 146-149,**

46. Provide the maximum height of the proposed street lighting. Section 1105.09.B

Response: The maximum height for proposed public street lights shall be 14' for all parking and street lighting throughout the site.

47. Will there be any other street lighting or exterior lighting on the subject site?

a. If there will be other exterior lighting including street, walkway, parking lot, security, etc. Then the additional lighting will need to be all shown on the lighting plan and photometric plan, meeting all lighting requirements.

b. If there will be any additional street lighting specifically, it should also be shown on the photometric plan provided, along with showing that all requirements from Section 1111.13.Street Lights and how it is met.

Response: Two additional lights have been added to Subarea A and B: one at the CBUs at Reserve C and one at the CBUs in Reserve D. Otherwise, no additional lights are proposed.

48. Please provide a photometric light plant that shows the foot candles at the boards of the parcel that abut residential zoned or used land uses. Section 1105.09.B.i

Response: Foot candle information is shown on Exhibit F-9.

49. The subject site has roughly 16, 146 feet of road frontage throughout the site. The proposed landscape plan appears to show mainly “street trees” with some additional trees throughout the subject site.

- a. The applicant will need to provide a landscape plan, showing and stating how all landscape requirements are met during the Major Site Plan review. Section 1105.07
 - i. Please know this includes a Tree Survey, Tree Removal Plan, a Tree Preservation Plan, a Tree Replacement Plan for the Major Trees removed from the site, General Landscape Standards, Street Tree Requirements, Interior Lot Landscaping Requirements, Buffer Requirements, Parking Area Landscaping Standards and Screening and Landscaping for Service Structure Requirements.
 1. There is not enough information provided in the landscape plan to review all of these requirements.

Response:

- **Street trees have been revised to meet the spacing requirements for public streets. There is a deficit of 7 street trees along Park Place North and Allegro Drive due to space limitations; however, Denali Avenue has a surplus of 7 street trees.**
- **Trees along Alleys are not required but will be provided based on available spacing of driveways.**
- **Lot trees will not be required at this time based upon the tree preservation within Reserve “A”. The total tree credits within this reserve is 5,623 which more than offsets the requirements for lot trees.**
- **The developer reserves the right to provide additional landscape at their discretion.**
- **See Exhibits G-6 and G-7 as well as Tab E, Existing Tree Survey Memo.**

50. The proposed street trees, after looking at the specifications on Sheet 13, appear to actually be interior trees.

- a. Street trees are required to be located in the right-of-way, in between the sidewalk and street right-of-way. Section 1105.07.G. iv.

Response: Addressed, Street Trees shall be located within the tree lawn.

- b. Please also show on the street tree plan, that the 20 foot sight triangle is maintained at street intersections throughout the site.

Response: Sight triangles have been added to the Landscape Plans.

51. The applicant will need to show the required 6 foot landscape setback around the site per Section 1105.07.F.ix

Response: No setback is required.

52. Sheet 13 with regards to interior lot landscaping will need to meet Section 1105.07.H.i.1. This includes the correct square footage for each lot, including the reserves/other lots that are open space/clubhouse/etc.
- a. Please also know that based on our standards, each residential lot requires at least one tree. So if the lot is 2,500 square feet, one tree at 2 inch diameter will be required, which means that at least 287 interior lot trees will be required, likely more for larger reserve parcels.
 - i. The calculations for the required trees will need to be provided for the entire site.
 1. Please know that interior lot landscaping standards can also use existing healthy trees that will remain on the development after it is developed, towards credits to interior lot landscaping requirement. Section 1105.07.G.ii
 - a. You will need to provide all required documentation in the three preservation plan, showing this information.

Response: Lot trees will not be required at this time based upon the Tree Preservation within Reserve "A". The total tree credits within this reserve will be 5,623 which will offset the requirements for any lot trees. The developer reserves the right to provide additional landscape at their discretion.

53. The clubhouse states the sidewalk will be 5 feet wide. Will all sidewalks throughout the site be 5 feet?
- a. If all sidewalks throughout the site will be 5 feet, please provided a note on the cover sheet stating this.
 - b. If all sidewalks throughout the site will not be 5 feet, please clearly label the width of all sidewalks throughout the site.

Response: All walks will be 5' wide, within Subareas A, B and C, with the exception of private walks leading directly to townhomes, which will be 4' wide. See Note B Exhibit F-1.

54. The setback of the proposed 4-rail fence will need to be shown on the Major Site Plan.
- a. Please know the required setback along road frontage for a fence is 3 feet.

Response: Understood and labeled.

55. Please know that sign permitting process is not reviewed during the preliminary plat or Major Site Plan process. It is a separate sign plan permit.

Response: Understood

56. Remove the not, "**units subject to change based on marketing conditions" from sheet 13.

Response: All units will be subject to change based on marketing conditions, but all units will meet all the requirements set forth with these zoning documents.

57. As a part of addressing the comments from the City, the City is willing to discuss modification to the layout and size of reserve A.

Response: Understood.

Public Service Comments - Major Site Plan:

- Public Service has no comments for this application at this time.

No Response.

Public Service Comments - Preliminary Plat:

- Public Service had the following comments for the Preliminary Plat:
 1. (pg. 2) Existing Conditions Plan – Do you have any tentative verification date for the Army Corps of OEPA?

Response: A Field Investigation was conducted on July 10, 2024 and a report prepared dated August 9, 2024, See Tab I. The Applicant will submit to the USACE for verification after the Major Site Plan is approved.

2. (pg. 7) Utility Plan – The Sanitary Sewer/ Force Main locations on the plan?

Response: See Exhibit F-7.

3. (pg. 8) Street Lighting Plan – Public Street Light Pole plan meets the approved scope

No Response.

4. (pg. 9) Typical Sections - Pavement Legends are good per Standard Drawings

No Response.

Public Service Comments - Variance:

- Public Service has no comments for this application at this time.

No Response.

The West Licking Fire District Comments

- 1) All fire hydrants on a private system shall have the bonnet of the hydrant painted blue. This comment shall be added to the detail page of the construction plans.

Response: Understood.

- 2) All fire hydrants shall have: One (1) 5” Stortz connection / Two (2) 2.5” hose connections. This comment shall be added to the detail page of the construction plans.

Response: Understood.

- 3) Per the Fire Districts regulations section J note (b): All fire hydrants shall be installed every 500’ in residential areas and 300’ in all commercial areas (apartment complex).

Response: Understood.

- 4) Sheet 7: Show hydrant locations along Saint Elias St.

Response: Addressed.

- 5) Per the Fire Districts regulations section I note d: fire apparatus access roads or drives shall be a minimum width of 20'. All alleys shown and Black Burn St. shall be upsized to 20' in width.

Response: Per follow-up discussions, Mount Drum Alley's width has been increased to 20', measured from face of curb, while Sanford, Fairweather, Wrangell, Lucania, Whitney, Alverston, and Elbert Alleys will remain 18' wide, measured from face of curb.

- 6) Per the Fire Districts regulations section I note g: all fire apparatus access drives and roads shall be built to support the imposing loads of 85,000 pounds.

Response: Understood.

- 7) Per the Fire Districts regulations section I note e paragraph 3: all streets that are 28' or less in width shall have signs posted on the fire hydrant side of the street stating "NO PARKING".

Response: Understood.

- 8) The HOA shall be responsible for annually maintaining ALL private fire hydrants.

Response: Understood.

- 9) If in the future the HOA disbands, who is responsible for annually maintain the Fire hydrants?

Response: If this unlikely scenario happens, decisions regarding maintenance of fire hydrants, and other facilities, will be made at that time.

- 10) Provide an auto turn for all streets. The Fire Districts largest fire apparatus is our ladder truck. The dimensions of the apparatus is 49' in length and 8' 4" wide.

Response: An Autoturn exhibit has been sent to the Fire District.

Sands Decker Comments - Major Site Plan:

ROADWAYS / ACCESS

1. The development has both Public and Private Streets.

No Response.

2. Public Streets are shown as 32' and 36' (F/F), with Private Streets shown as 26' and 18' (F/F).

Mount Drum has been revised to 20' wide

3. Recommend Public Streets provide no less than 20' width (F/F), as discussed with Fire

Response: Per follow-up discussions, Mount Drum Alley's width has been increased to 20', measured from face of curb, while Sanford, Fairweather, Wrangell, Lucania, Whitney, Alverston, and Elbert Alleys will remain 18' wide, measured from face of curb. For Private Drives, the proposed pavement width is 26' measured from face of curb.

4. Recommend smaller Private Streets provide ADA Compliant access for all sidewalks at intersections.

Response: Ramps will be provided along Alleys per std Dwg R-12, as discussed.

5. Final design to provide soil bearing data to accommodate minimum pavement composition designs (both public and private road areas). Will be provided with Final Engineering

Response: To be provided with final engineering.

6. Intersections designs should provide Autoturn delineations exhibiting access for local Fire Department Vehicles and Equipment.

Response: An Autoturn exhibit has been sent to the Fire District .

7. Lot numbers 69 & 76 appear they may have a driveway access concern. Please verify and revise if necessary.

Response: Lot 69's drive has been adjusted to remove the overlap.

8. Pedestrian sidewalks should be provided for the length of the development along Summit Road.

Response: The Developer is contributing Fee-in-Lieu-of Widening, pedestrian walk should be included.

9. A small amenity / park area is provided in the southwestern area of the development. Adequate access and parking appears to have been provided.

Response: Understood.

10. Development handbook requires 5-foot sidewalks.

Response: All walks will be 5' wide, within Subareas A, B and C, with the exception of private walks leading directly to townhomes, which will be 4' wide.

UTILITIES

11. Plans indicate 8-inch water lines throughout both public and private areas, domestic in private

Response: Also notes 4" & 2".

12. Separate Master Meters are shown for private areas. One for Subareas A & B and one for Subarea C.

Response: Yes.

13. Lots 1-12 and 269-280 in Subarea A will be served directly off of the public water line.

Response: Yes.

14. Lots 251-268 in Subarea A show being served by a 2-inch line from the master metered area. Please ensure the 2-inch line will provide adequate capacity to serve a total of 18 lots.

Response: Capacity analysis for the proposed water lines will be provided during final engineering.

15. Are Fire Hydrants on private systems planned for HOA or Complex ownership and maintenance?

Response: Yes.

16. Identify any / all proposed FDC locations.

Response: Both fire & domestic services are shown at breezeways (mid bldg) in Subarea C.

17. Sanitary sewer is shown, connecting offsite to an existing sanitary sewer and continuing through the project to a proposed manhole at Summit Road.

No response.

18. A portion of this runs through the wooded area. Please identify tree clearing limits.

Response: See Tree Impact Plan.

19. Private area sanitary sewers are shown as 8-inch, with Public Area sanitary sewers shown as 18-inch and 12-inch.

Response: Onsite needs are 8", 12", 15" & 18" are extended for upstream sites.

20. It is assumed that the 8-inch sanitary sewers in the private areas will be public sewers, with easements. Please confirm.

Response: Confirmed.

21. No easements are shown or identified for sanitary sewers. Please provide locations and widths (per utility regulations).

Response: 20' easements will be added.

22. Street lighting is shown for the Public Streets and Subarea C (apartments), while none are shown for Private Streets in Subarea A and B. Please provide adequate street lighting in all areas, with updated photometric plan.

Response: Two additional lights have been added to Subarea A and B: one at the CBUs at Reserve C and one at the CBUs in Reserve D. Otherwise, no additional lights are proposed.

23. For water line and sanitary sewer along Park Place and Denali Street, based on the City's regulations regarding upsizing utilities, staff will need to work with the applicant to confirm the correct sizing.

Response: Sanitary sized per calculations/trib area determined by City. Water connections shown based on conversation with City's Engineer and sizes based on modeling.

STORMWATER

24. The plans show a regional detention basin being provided to meet the required stormwater detention and water quality treatment.

No Response.

25. Calculations will need to be provided for sizing of all storm piping and the proposed retention basin.

Response: Understood.

26. Calculations will need to show that the discharge does not exceed the limits of the receiving stream.

Response: Understood.

27. Detailed flood routing will need to be provided for the entire development.

Response: Understood.

28. Maintenance of the Basin should be identified, and it is assumed at this time as the responsibility of the HOA. Per meeting, owned by City, maintained by HOA

Response: Understood.

29. Provide access location(s) (easement?) to basin for future maintenance needs.

Response: A stormwater easement has been added to Reserve "A" for the basin including a 20' wide easement between the park parking and lot 268.

DETAILS / SPECIFICATIONS

30. Details / section compositions should be adjusted, as may be required per comments above.

Response: Understood.

31. Where applicable, refer to Reynoldsburg Standard Construction Drawings.

Response: Understood.

TRAFFIC STUDY

32. Please include any traffic studies prepared in association with this project and access point onto Summit Road.

Response: Applicant/Developer is contributing Fee in Lieu of widening.

Sands Decker Comments - Preliminary Plat:

ROADWAYS / ACCESS

1. The development indicates both Public and Private Streets.

No Response.

2. Public Streets show 50', 60' and 67' wide right-of-ways, with 26', 32' and 36' wide pavement sections (F/F).

No Response.

3. Private Streets show 50' and 20' wide right-of-ways with 26' and 18' wide pavement sections (F/F).

Mount Drum has been revised to 20' wide.

4. Recommend Private Street right-of-ways be adjusted to provide no less than 20' wide pavement sections (F/F). adjusted Blackburn to 20' per Meeting, remaining 18' alleys ok

Response: Per follow-up discussions, Mount Drum Alley's width has been increased to 20', measured from face of curb, while Sanford, Fairweather, Wrangell, Lucania, Whitney, Alverston, and Elbert Alleys will remain 18' wide, measured from face of curb. For Private Drives, the proposed pavement width is 26' measured from face of curb.

5. Recommend ADA Compliant access for all sidewalks at all intersections, public and private.

Response: Ramps will be provided along alleys per std Dwg R-12, as discussed.

6. Lot numbers 69 & 76 appear they may have driveway access concerns. Driveway for lot 69 encroaches lot 68. Lot 76 may not meet the minimum driveway width. Please verify and revise if necessary.

Response: Lot 69 drive has been adjusted to remove the overlap.

7. Pedestrian sidewalks should be provided for the length of the development along Summit Road.

Response: Developer is contributing Fee-in-Lieu-of widening, pedestrian walk should be included.

8. Development handbook requires 5-foot sidewalks

Response: All walks will be 5' wide, within Subareas A, B and C, with the exception of private walks leading directly to townhomes, which will be 4' wide.

UTILITIES

9. Sanitary sewer is not shown on Preliminary Plat, this needs added.

Response: The proposed sanitary sewer alignment has been added to the Utility Plan.

10. Other sheets indicate sanitary sewer connecting offsite to an existing sanitary sewer and continuing through the project to a proposed manhole at Summit Road.

No Response.

11. A portion of this runs through the wooded area. Provide easement for this utility.

Response: Addressed.

12. Waterline is shown coming through the project from the north end and not connecting to development to the south due to differential in pressure zones.

Response: Correct, as directed by City Engineer.

13. Provide easements for all utilities as needed. Please provide locations and widths (per utility regulations).

Response: Addressed.

STORMWATER

14. The plans show a regional detention basin being provided for stormwater detention and water quality treatment.

15. Detailed flood routing will need to be provided for the entire development.

Response: Understood.

16. Maintenance of the Basin is identified as the responsibility of the HOA.

Response: Understood.

17. As the stormwater basin is located within Reserve "A", which is being granted to the City of Reynoldsburg, provide an easement around the basin within Reserve "A", for HOA maintenance.

Response: a stormwater easement has been added to Reserve "A" for the basin.

18. Provide access location easement(s) to basin for future maintenance needs.

Response: A 20' access will be added between park parking & lot 268.

Sands Decker Comments – Variances

The Variance and Conditional Use Application lists two properties. Property one: 011-026598-00.003. Property two: 011-026598-00.002. The Applicant is MI Homes of Central Ohio c/o Andrew Gottesman. There are 2 variances being requested with this application. The variance application is associated with a proposed development of a 69(+/-) acre residential community, providing 280 townhomes and 384 apartments. The site will be rezoned to the Residential Medium Zone (RM) to permit the proposed multi-unit residential development.

No Response.

Variance One

- 1. The first Variance** the applicant is requesting is to reduce the minimum lot dimension (width) from 23 feet to 21 feet and to reduce the minimum frontage dimension from 23 feet to 21 feet. This is being requested for 94 of the 280 total townhome sites.
2. The variance request does not distinguish which lots (or lot numbers) this would apply to.
3. We recommend that the applicant indicate which of the 94 lots this variance would apply to.

Response: See revised variance materials prepared by the Applicant.

4. Engineering does not have concerns regarding this request.

Variance Two

- 5. The second Variance** the applicant is requesting pertains to service structures and their setbacks, and this would pertain to all lots within the townhomes.
6. They are asking for a reduction in the setback of the cooling units (A/C) from 3 feet from the lot line to 0 feet from the lot line, allowing the placement of the units at the lot line, away from any impact to access of the garage doors.
7. Engineering does not have concerns regarding this request.

No Response.

TOWNHOUSE

Subareas A



Each townhome unit will range in size – 1,500 sf to 2,136 sf
Subject to change based on market conditions.

Townhome rendering is provided to convey a sense of scale, style and quality and not to denote an exact representation. The final design of the proposed Townhomes in Subarea A may vary from this image per market conditions and shall be approved administratively by City staff.

TOWNHOUSE

Subareas B



Each townhome unit will range in size – 1,630 sf to 1,925 sf
Subject to change based on market conditions.

Townhome rendering is provided to convey a sense of scale, style and quality and not to denote an exact representation. The final design of the proposed Townhomes in Subarea B may vary from this image per market conditions and shall be approved administratively by City staff.

*All submissions must include a physical and digital copy. The physical copy may be dropped off or mailed to the address above. The digital copy can be submitted to the Building Department at: permit@reynoldsburg.gov

*Please know that an application will not be processed until payment has been received.

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD VARIANCE AND CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION

Property Address: MULTIPLE / ATTACHED	Parcel ID#(s): ATTACHED AND 125-026598-00.003 / 125-026598-00.002
---	--

I. PROPERTY OWNER OF RECORD

Property Owner Name(s): MI HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO LLC	
Contact Email: SPECK@MIHOMES.COM	Contact Phone Number: 614.402.8330

II. BUSINESS/TENANT INFORMATION (IF APPLICABLE)

Business Name: N/A	Contact Name:
Contact Email:	Contact Phone Number:
Description of Use:	

III. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Applicant Name: MI HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO LLC	Applicant Address: 4131 WORTH AVE STE 316 COLUMBUS, OH 43219
Applicant Phone Number: 614.402.8330	Applicant Email: SPECK@MIHOMES.COM
<input type="checkbox"/> Property Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Business Owner/Tenant <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Architect/Engineer	<input type="checkbox"/> Owner's Consent Attached.

PROJECT INFORMATION

CHECK AND DESCRIBE IF APPLICABLE: Variance Conditional Use Variance or Conditional Use Extension (\$50)
 Residential (single-family residential only)(\$200) Non-Residential (all residential except single-family residential)(\$450) Engineering Report (\$750 [min])

Description of Project: **OVERALL PROJECT IS A SINGLE FAMILY TOWNHOME PROJECT BEING DEVELOPED IN 3 PHASES WITH PHASE 1 HAVING COMPLETED DEVELOPMENT AND BEGINNING INITIAL HOME CONSTRUCTION. IN EARLY SUMMER OF 2026. VARIANCE IS FOR CODE SECTION 1105.06 (D)(ii) GARAGE STANDARDS.**

Please review the attached checklist and note the items you are responsible for submitting with this application. All required items must be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Administrator.

Applicant Signature: *Heather* Date: **3.26.26**
By signing this application, I certify that I am the owner of the property or the owner's agent, and that the work is authorized with the full knowledge of the owner.

OFFICE USE ONLY

* Revised 2026

Additional Notes:

Zoning District: _____

Additional Approval Required

Major/Minor Site Plan
 Other: _____

P&Z Administrator: _____ Date: _____

PZB Meeting	
Date: _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved as Submitted	
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved w/ Conditions	
<input type="checkbox"/> Tabled	
<input type="checkbox"/> Denied	
<input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn	

ParcelNumber	Column1	Street	City	CurrentLegalDescription
125-026598-00.008	1124	PARK PLACE	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 3 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.012	1136	PARK PLACE	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 7 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.016	1148	PARK PLACE	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 11 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.020	1098	ALLEGRO	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 15 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.024	1112	ALLEGRO	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 19 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.036	9172	SAINT ELIAS	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 27 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH B
125-026598-00.042	9188	SAINT ELIAS	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 33 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH B
125-026598-00.048	9204	SAINT ELIAS	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 39 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH B
125-026598-00.005		Additional 19 Waple Acres		
125-026598-00.002		Between these two parcels		

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT

Reynoldsburg Zoning Code Section 1109.11(D)

Application No.: _____
Location: 8718 Summit Road SW (Parcels 011-026598-00.003 and 011-026598-00.002) and others noted.
Proposal: To develop the site with residential community with 280 townhomes
Applicant(s): MI Homes of Central Ohio c/o Steve Peck
4131 Worth Avenue, Suite 310
Columbus, Ohio 43219
Property Owner(s): MI homes of central ohio LLC
Date of Text: March 26, 2026

The Applicant submits this statement in support of its variance requests in accordance with Reynoldsburg Zoning Code ("Code") Section 1109.11(D)(i-ix). The balance of the significant unique facts and circumstances associated with this request warrants the approval of the requested variances. Each request furthers the spirit and intent of the varied regulations, promotes appropriate development of the property, are in furtherance of important City objectives among which are creation of a diversity of housing stock, maintenance and creation of important open space areas, and the opening of additional development corridors through the extension of public utilities

This variance application concerns the townhome subarea comprising approximately +/- 30.1 acres of the total site area. The Applicant intends to develop this subarea with 280 for-sale townhomes on individual fee simple lots. In order to develop the site as proposed, the Applicant respectfully requests the following variances:

- 1. Section 1105.06(D)(ii) – Garage Standards.** The Applicant requests a variance to allow for the garage projection to be more than 8 feet as required for homes with garages facing the street. Only one unit (Ainslie) does not comply with the standard and projects 20'6" in front of the façade. This unit was indicated to be constructed throughout the rezoning process and on Major site plan approvals. The unit will be constructed no more than one time in any one overall building and the offset creates architectural diversity of the overall building facades. Of the 280 approved townhomes the requested variance will only be constructed on 27 of the units or 9.6% of the total project.

Additional Reasoning:

Code Section 1103.19(I) explicitly states the objective of this RM district to “complement single-family residential development through the introduction of a more diverse range of housing options” and to promote development that is “well integrated with surrounding uses while allowing for more compact development to accommodate growth.” The Applicant’s requests collectively therefore are:

(i) in accord with the above Code quoted general purpose and intent of the RM district, as required by the variance standard of Code Section 1109.11(D)(i);

(ii) this request does not establish any use not permitted in the RM district, as required by the variance standard of Code Section 1109.11(D)(ii);

(iii) special circumstances exist with this property insofar as it does promote housing generally, promotes a rare townhome product to the community by a proven local development company, promotes development of not only the subject property, but also additional targeted properties for the City, and creates an open space area for the City in perpetuity, as required by the variance standard of Code Section 1109.11(D)(iii);

(iv) a practical difficulty exists here in that the request is unique in nature creating (and donating) along the western side of the property a 23.2+/- acre open space park area serving dual purposes of open space and park creation in perpetuity and buffering of existing and future uses, rather than simply removing this woodland area and spreading the development across additional property. This is sound planning, without diminishing whatsoever the quality of the built environment, and maintaining an environmental area for the City, as provided by the variance standard of Code Section 1109.11(D)(iv);

(v) the requests provide the opportunity for this seasoned and experienced development company to introduce its product to the property, while offering a new 23+/- acre open space area for the benefit of the people of the City, consistent with variance standard 1109.11(D)(v);

(vi) as provided in Code Section 1109.11(D)(vi) these requests do not impair an adequate supply of light and air to any adjacent property, substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent property – actually the opposite. This proposal is responsible in every way through building code compliance, engineering compliance, construction and extension of warranted and necessary off-site improvements, and collaboration with the City towards beneficial open space creation and preservation for residents;

(vii) the requests will not confer any special privilege that is unduly denied by the Code to other land, structures, or buildings within the district, as provided under 1109.11(D)(vii), this is a unique circumstance the result of a public/private collaboration to promote necessary housing stock in the City, provide important utility extensions and connections, and opening and preserving an open space park area in perpetuity;

(viii) in accordance with 1109.11(D)(viii) these requests are unrelated to any nonconforming use of neighboring land in the same district and no other real estate or off-site condition is cited or considered as grounds for the request – rather this is promotion of sound development and planning practices consistent with explicit objectives of the RM district under the Code and the end result of collaborative effort between the Applicant and the City creating important quality housing, extending utilities for this and additional important development, and creating an excellent open space / park for the benefit of the City;

(ix) as provided in 1109.11(D)(ix) the request is not a matter of convenience, this is a matter of creating a development to locate proven housing stock built by this Applicant and a public / private partnership furthering the mutually beneficial objectives of creating housing, extending utilities, and preserving open space.

The Applicant is an experienced developer who has built the requested product in other markets across the country. It knows how to develop townhomes to a high-quality standard which is attractive to the community and its residents. Based on this experience, the Applicant knows that the requested townhome development proposed will deliver the quality-of-life experience that those residents desire. Notably, the Applicant performed the due diligence necessary to identify the specific lots which need this reduction and, as a result, only approximately 10% of the lots will utilize this garage offset variance.

Through this Applicant's extensive national development experience, it knows the proposed townhome lot sizes are typical, and delivers quality homeownership to a market segment specifically seeking this unique opportunity. It is necessary in some jurisdictions to request divergences, but the result is always a quality design.

The Code provides that variances are warranted upon concluding requests meet the standards of 1109.11. In summary these requests collectively:

- Adhere to the general purpose and intent of the RM district.
- Are not injurious to the area or are otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.
- Do not permit the establishment of prohibited uses.
- Are the result of special conditions – extensive utility extensions, substantial off-site improvements, creation of a park/open space in perpetuity, a public/private collaboration.
- Promote necessary divergences where the strict application of the Code does not improve the proposal, but rather defeats the stated RM objective of “allowing for more compact development to accommodate growth,” in addition to negatively impacting the aesthetic (garages) and minimizes the opportunity for the open space creation.
- Are necessary for this reasonable proposal, and certainly none of the requests are unreasonable or unnecessary – they are the minimum necessary to accomplish the overall purpose of the neighborhood consistent with proven and sound townhome neighborhood development and explicit objectives of the RM district.
- Are warranted where there will be no diminution of adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, no substantial increase of public street congestion, no increase in the danger of fires, no endangerment to public safety, and will not substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent area.

- Will not confer any special privilege on the Applicant – this rather consummates an established public / private collaboration to promote quality development in the City and open additional proximate development opportunities.
- Rely on nothing but the merits of the request under the 1109.11 standards as the basis for the request – so no other uses or circumstances provide the basis.
- Are not a matter of convenience – no Code is ever perfect, every property is unique, and surrounding circumstances are always important relevant factors in any variance determination.

Having demonstrated the requested variances meet the 1109.11 Code standards, the Applicant respectfully requests approval of these variances to allow the proposed development to proceed as submitted.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Peck MI Homes of Central Ohio LLC

Section 1109.11(D)
STANDARDS FOR VARIANCES

The Applicant submits these responses pursuant to the Section 1109.11(D) criteria:

1. The Applicant believes that the requested variance is in accord with the general purpose and intent of the Residential Medium Zone (RM) development standards and they are not injurious to the area or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare. The purpose of the RM district is to complement single-family residential development through the introduction of a more diverse range of housing options, including two-family buildings, townhomes, row houses, and apartments. Future development in the RM Zones should be well integrated with surrounding uses while allowing for more compact development to accommodate growth.

The Applicant is requesting one variance which are not substantial deviations from the underlying development standards and are appropriate in context of this townhome community design. These variances will ensure that the site may be developed in a manner which substantially complies with the RM development standards and fits within the general purpose of the district. The requested variances are minor deviations from the code and they will only affect residents within this development. Therefore, these variances will not cause the public welfare any detriment.

2. The requested variances will not permit the establishment of any use which is not otherwise listed as a permitted use or a special exception in the district, or which is expressly or by implication prohibited by this Code. The RM district already explicitly permits townhome as a use. The requested variances are minor deviations for development standards, not permitted uses, and will allow development of the townhome community as proposed.

3. This unit was created to add to the product offering to appeal to various buyer profiles.

4/5. These variances are not requested due to a loss in value or an economic hardship but, rather, they are requested to alleviate a deprivation of beneficial use of the land.

6. The requested variances are necessary for the reasonable use of the land and will ensure that the development may be constructed as proposed.

7. The variances will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent area. These are minor architectural variances dealing with garage and façade setback and they will only affect the residents of this development.

8. The variances will not confer on the property owner any special privilege that is unduly denied by this Code to other land, structures, or buildings in the same district.

9/10. The Applicant is not asking that nonconforming use of neighboring land or structures in the same district or that permitted or nonconforming use of land or structures in other districts be considered as grounds for approval of the variance. As stated above, these are minor but necessary variances to develop this townhome project as proposed and they are not requested as a matter of convenience.

SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE A

1 4

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Licking, City of Reynoldsburg, and in Lot 12, Section 9, Township 16, Range 20, Refuge Lands, containing 23.872 acres of land, more or less, and 23.872 acres being comprised of a part of each of those tracts of land conveyed to M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC by deed of record in Instrument Numbers 202501230001182 and 202501230001206, Recorder's Office, Licking County, Ohio.

The undersigned, M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company, by TIMOTHY C. HALL, Area President, owner of the land platted herein, duly authorized in the premises, does hereby certify that this plat correctly represents its "SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE A", a subdivision containing Lots numbered 1 to 24, both inclusive, and areas designated as Reserves "A", "B", "C" and "D", does hereby accept this plat of same and dedicated to public use, as such, all of Allegro Drive, Denali Avenue, Forker Place, Park Place North and Summit Road shown hereon and not heretofore dedicated.

Easements are hereby reserved in, over and under areas designated on this plat as "Easement" or "Drainage Easement" for the construction, operation and maintenance of all public and quasi public utilities above and beneath the surface of the ground and, where necessary, for the construction, operation and maintenance of service connections to all adjacent lots and lands and for storm water drainage. Within those areas designated "Drainage Easement" on this plat, an additional easement is hereby reserved for the purpose of constructing, operating and maintaining major storm water drainage swales and/or other storm water drainage facilities. No above grade structures, dams or other obstructions to the flow of storm water runoff are permitted within Drainage Easement areas as delineated on this plat unless approved by the Reynoldsburg City Engineer. Easement areas shown hereon outside of the platted area are within lands owned by the undersigned and easements are hereby reserved therein for the uses and purposes as expressed herein.

In Witness Whereof, TIMOTHY C. HALL, JR., Area President of M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC, has hereunto set his hand this 21st day of July, 2025.

Signed and Acknowledged
In the presence of
Timothy C. Hall, Jr.
M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC
By Timothy C. Hall, Jr., Area President
Notary Public,

STATE OF OHIO
COUNTY OF FRANKLIN ss:

Before me, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared TIMOTHY C. HALL, JR., Area President of said M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC, who acknowledged the signing of the foregoing instrument to be his voluntary act and deed and the voluntary act and deed of said M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC, for the uses and purposes expressed herein.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 21st day of July, 2025.

My commission expires 6/25/28

Darlene W. Smith
Darlene W. Smith
Notary Public,
My Commission Expires 06-25-28



Approved this 31 day of July, 2025
[Signature]
Chairman, Planning and Zoning Board,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio

Approved this 22 day of August, 2025
[Signature]
City Engineer,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio

Approved this 14 day of July, 2025
[Signature]
Director of Public Services,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio

Approved and accepted this 14th day of July, 2025 by Ordinance No. 38-2025, wherein all of Allegro Drive, Denali Avenue, Forker Place, Park Place North and Summit Road dedicated hereon are accepted as such by the Council for the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

[Signature]
M. Mike Forker
City Clerk,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio

Transferred this 1 day of October, 2025
[Signature]
Michael L. Smith, JAS
Auditor,
Licking County, Ohio


Filed for record this 1st day of October, 2025 at _____
M. Fee \$ _____
File No. _____
[Signature]
Recorder, JH
Licking County, Ohio



202510010018725
File No. 317226
LICKING COUNTY
From 10/1/2025

Recorded this 1st day of October, 2025
Plat Book _____, Pages _____

SURVEYED & PLATTED
BY





EMHHT
Brent, Architects, Engineers & Planners, Inc.
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43244
Phone: 614.779.1800 Fax: 614.779.3448
emhht.com

We do hereby certify that we have surveyed the above premises, prepared the attached plat, and that said plat is correct. All dimensions are in feet and decimal parts thereof.

- = Iron Pin (See Survey Data)
- = MAG Nail to be set
- ⊙ = Permanent Marker (See Survey Data)

[Signature]
Professional Surveyor No. 7865
Date 18 July 25



LOCATION MAP AND BACKGROUND DRAWING
NOT TO SCALE

SURVEY DATA:
BASIS OF BEARINGS: The bearings shown hereon are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System, South Zone, NAD 83 (2011). The portion of the centerline of Summit Road, having a bearing of South 03° 59' 20" West, is designated as the "basis of bearings" for this plat.

SOURCE OF DATA: The sources of recorded survey data referenced in the plan and text of this plat are the records of the Recorder's Office, Licking County, Ohio.

IRON PINS: Iron pins, where indicated hereon, unless otherwise noted, are to be set and are iron pins thirteen sixteenths inch inside diameter, thirty inches long with a plastic plug placed in the top end bearing the initials EMHHT INC.



PERMANENT MARKERS: Permanent markers, where indicated hereon, are to be one-inch diameter, thirty-inches long, solid iron pins, are to be set to monument the points indicated, are to be set with the top end flush with the surface of the ground, and then capped with an aluminum cap stamped EMHHT INC. Once installed, the top of the cap shall be marked (punched) to record the actual location of the point.

SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE A

3 4

- ③ EASTWOOD RESERVE PHASE 1
I.N. 202309110016512
- ④ EASTWOOD RESERVE PHASE 3
I.N. 202404220006617

- M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC
I.N. 202501230001182
- M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC
I.N. 202501230001206



- Legend
- Existing Property Line
- - - Existing R/W Line
- - - Existing R/W Centerline
- - - Existing Easement Line
- - - Subdivision Boundary Line
- - - Lot Line
- - - R/W Line
- - - R/W Centerline
- - - Easement Line

- ① A=90°00'00" R=20.00'
ChBrg=N46°59'20"E
Ch=28.28'
- ② A=90°00'00" R=20.00'
Arc=31.42'
ChBrg=N41°00'40"W
Ch=28.28'
- ③ A=248°03' R=945.00'
Arc=46.19'
ChBrg=S19°55'59"W
Ch=46.19'
- ④ N68°40'00" W
56.00'
- ⑤ A=49°00'48" R=205.00'
Arc=75.38'
ChBrg=N68°28'57"E
Ch=170.07'
- ⑥ N03°59'20"E
5.00'
- ⑦ S86°00'40"E
5.00'
- ⑧ A=90°00'00" R=20.00'
ChBrg=S41°00'40"E
Ch=28.28'

SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE A 2024-0981


SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE A

2 4

CURVE NO.	DELTA	RADIUS	LENGTH	CHORD	CHORD DISTANCE
C1	71°50'34"	175.00'	218.43'	N 58°04'02" E	205.34'
C2	37°30'30"	915.00'	48.90'	N 20°35'01" E	49.90'
C3	83°38'33"	145.00'	21.88'	S 89°59'50" W	21.88'
C4	63°11'48"	145.00'	158.93'	S 53°44'40" W	151.95'
C5	2°36'08"	885.00'	40.19'	S 20°50'41" W	40.19'
C6	174°48'45"	945.00'	13.40'	S 21°44'23" W	13.40'
C7	22°49'50"	265.00'	81.89'	S 33°33'40" W	81.15'
C8	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	S 41°00'40" E	28.28'
C9	90°00'00"	25.00'	39.27'	N 48°59'20" E	35.35'
C10	90°00'00"	25.00'	39.27'	N 41°00'40" W	35.35'
C11	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	S 41°00'40" E	28.28'
C12	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	S 48°59'20" W	28.28'

- ① A=90°00'00" R=20.00'
ChBrg=N46°59'20"E
Ch=28.28'
- ② A=90°00'00" R=20.00'
ChBrg=N41°00'40"W
Ch=28.28'
- ③ A=2°48'03" R=945.00'
ChBrg=S19°55'59"W
Ch=46.19'
- ④ N88°40'00"W
Ch=48.19'
- ⑤ A=49°00'46" R=205.00'
ChBrg=N69°28'57"E
Ch=170.07'
- ⑥ N03°59'20"E
5.00'
- ⑦ S86°00'40"E
5.00'
- ⑧ A=90°00'00" R=20.00'
ChBrg=S41°00'40"E
Ch=28.28'

- Line Type Legend
- Existing Property Line
 - Existing R/W Line
 - Existing R/W Centerline
 - Existing Easement Line
 - Subdivision Boundary Line
 - Lot Line
 - R/W Line
 - R/W Centerline
 - Easement Line



① TAYLOR WOODS
SECTION 9
P.B. 17, P. 237


② MAPLEWOOD SECTION 1
I.N. 202305110008334

- = Iron Pin (See Survey Data)
 - = Wood Nail Marker (See Survey Data)
 - ⊙ = Permanent Marker (See Survey Data)
- Legend
- BL = Building Line
 - EMT = Easement

SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE A 2024-0881

SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE A

4/4



NOTE "A": All of Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase A is within Zone X (Areas determined to be outside 0.2% annual chance floodplain) as delineated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map for Licking County, Ohio and Incorporated Areas, map number 39089C0409K with effective date of July 31, 2024.

NOTE "B" - ACREAGE BREAKDOWN:
 Total acreage: 23.872 Ac.
 Acreage in Reserves: 16.699 Ac.
 Acreage in lots: 2.231 Ac.
 Acreage in public rights-of-way: 4.942 Ac.

NOTE "C" - ACREAGE BREAKDOWN: Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase A is out of the following Licking County Parcel Numbers:
 125-024598-00-002 2.746 Ac.
 125-026598-00-003 21.126 Ac.

NOTE "D" - RESERVE "D": Reserve "D", as designated and delineated hereon, shall be owned and maintained by the developer, its successors and assigns, for the purpose of future development.

NOTE "E" - RESERVE "B" AND RESERVE "C": Reserve "B" and Reserve "C", as designated and delineated hereon, shall be owned and maintained by an association comprised of the owners of the fee simple titles to the lots in the Summit Crossing subdivisions for the purpose of open space storm-water facilities.

NOTE "F": The purpose of this plat is to show certain property, rights of way, and easement boundaries as of the time of platting. At the request of zoning and planning authorities at the time of platting, this plat shows some of the limitations and requirements of the zoning code in effect on the date of filing this plat, for reference only. The limitations and requirements may change from the time of platting to the time of recording. The zoning code as adopted by the government authority having jurisdiction then applicable use and development limitations of the zoning code as adopted by the government authority having jurisdiction conflicting limitations and requirements that may be shown on this plat. This note should not be construed as creating plat or subdivision restrictions, private use restrictions, covenants running with the land or title encumbrances of any nature, except to the extent specifically identified as such.

NOTE "G": No vehicular access will such time as the public street right-of-way is extended and dedicated by plat or deed.

NOTE "H" - RESERVE "A": Reserve "A", as designated and delineated hereon, shall be owned and maintained by City of Reynoldsburg for the purpose of parking and for public playground use.

NOTE "I": At the time of platting, electric, cable, and telephone service providers have not issued information required so that easement areas, in addition to those shown on this plat as deemed necessary by these providers for the installation and maintenance of all of their main line facilities, could conveniently be shown on this plat. Existing recorded easement information about Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase A, or any part thereof, can be acquired by a competent examination of the then current public records, including those in the Licking County Recorder's Office.

SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE A 2024-09B1

SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE B

1/2

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Licking, City of Reynoldsburg, and in Lot 12, Section 9, Township 16, Range 20, Reliance Lands, containing 3.045 acres of land, more or less, said 3.045 acres being comprised of a part of each of those tracts of land conveyed to M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC by deed of record in Instrument Numbers 202501230001182 and 20250123000206, Recorder's Office, Licking County, Ohio.

The undersigned, M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company, by TIMOTHY C. HALL, Area President, owner of the lands plated herein, duly authorized in the CROSSING, does hereby certify that this plat correctly represents its "SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE B", a subdivision containing Lots numbered 25 to 82, both inclusive, and an area designated as Reserves "E" and "F", does hereby accept this plat of same.

Easements are hereby reserved in, over and under areas designated on this plat as "Easement", "Drainage Easement", "Sidewalk Easement", or "Reserve "E" for the construction, operation and maintenance of all public and quasi public utilities above and beneath the surface of the ground and, where necessary, for the construction, operation and maintenance of service connections to all adjacent lots and lands and for storm water drainage. Within those areas designated "Drainage Easement" on this plat, an additional easement is hereby reserved for the purpose of constructing, operating and maintaining major storm water drainage swales and/or other storm water drainage facilities. No above grade structures, dams or other obstructions to the flow of storm water runoff are permitted within Drainage Easement areas as delineated on this plat unless approved by the Reynoldsburg City Engineer. Within those areas designated "Sidewalk Easement" on this plat, an additional easement is hereby reserved for the purpose of constructing and maintaining a sidewalk and/or shared use path for use by the public. Easement areas shown hereon outside of the platted area are within lands owned by the undersigned and easements are hereby reserved therein for the uses and purposes as expressed hereon.

Easements are hereby reserved in, over and under areas designated on this plat as "Private Utility Easement" (P.U.E.) for the transmission, operation and maintenance of storm water and other utilities and facilities. Said facilities shall be owned and maintained by one more condominium associations as will be established subsequent to the recordation of this plat. Said facilities will not be dedicated to the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio and the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio will not be responsible for the maintenance of said facilities.

The owners of the fee simple titles to Lots 25 to 82, both inclusive, and areas designated as Reserve "E" and "Reserve "F", shall have and are hereby granted a non-exclusive right-of-way and easement for access to and from public streets, in and over said Reserve "E" to be shared with the owners of the fee simple titles to each other of said lots 25 to 82, both inclusive, and areas designated as Reserve "E" and Reserve "F".

In Witness Whereof, TIMOTHY C. HALL, JR., Area President of M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC, has hereunto set his hand this 21st day of July, 2025.

Signed and Acknowledged

In the presence of:

Timothy C. Hall, Jr.

Darlene W. Smith

M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC

By: TIMOTHY C. HALL, JR., Area President

STATE OF OHIO

COUNTY OF FRANKLIN ss:

Before me, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared TIMOTHY C. HALL, JR., Area President of said M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC, who is duly qualified and qualified to execute the foregoing instrument, and the voluntary act and deed of said M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC, for the uses and purposes expressed herein.

21st day of July, 2025

My commission expires 11-27-29

Darlene W. Smith Notary Public, State of Ohio



Darlene W. Smith
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Commission Expires 11-27-29

Approved this 9th day of July, 2025

[Signature]
Chairman, Planning and Zoning Board,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio

Approved this 26th day of August, 2025

[Signature]
City Engineer,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio

Approved this 14th day of July, 2025

[Signature]
Director of Public Service,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio

Approved and accepted this 14th day of July, 2025 by Ordinance No. 38-2025, wherein all of Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase B is accepted as such by the Council for the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

[Signature]
Mayor,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio

Transferred this 1st day of October, 2025.

[Signature]
Auditor,
Licking County, Ohio


Filed for record this 1st day of October, 2025 at _____ M. Per \$ _____

[Signature]
Recorder,
Licking County, Ohio



Recorded this 1st day of October, 2025.

Plat Book _____ Pages _____



LOCATION MAP AND BACKGROUND DRAWING
NOT TO SCALE

SURVEY DATA:


BASIS OF BEARINGS: The bearings shown hereon are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System, South Zone, NAD 83 (2011). The portion of the Summit Road, having a bearing of South 03° 59' 20" West, is designated as the "basis of bearings" for this plat.

SOURCE OF DATA: The sources of recorded survey data hereon in the plan and text of this plat are the records of the Recorder's Office, Licking County, Ohio.

IRON PINS: Iron pins, where indicated hereon, unless otherwise noted, are to be set and are iron pins, thirteen sixteenths inch inside diameter, thirty inches long with a plastic plug placed in the top end bearing the initials EMHT INC.

PERMANENT MARKERS: Permanent markers, where indicated hereon, are to be one-inch diameter, thirty-inches long, solid iron pins, are to be set to monument the points indicated, are to be set with the top end flush with the surface of the ground, and then capped with an aluminum cap stamped EMHT INC. Once installed, the top of the cap shall be marked (punched) to record the actual location of the point.

SURVEYED & PLATTED
BY



We do hereby certify that we have surveyed the above premises, prepared the attached plat, and that said plat is correct. All dimensions are in feet and decimal parts thereof.

- = Iron Pin (See Survey Data)
- = MAG Nail to be set
- ⊙ = Permanent Marker (See Survey Data)

By: *[Signature]*
Professional Surveyor No. 7865

Date: 12-27-25

SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE B

2/2

NOTE "A": All of Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase B is within Zone X (Areas determined to be outside 0.2% annual chance floodplain) as delineated on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map for Licking County, Ohio and Incorporated Areas, map number 390089C0409K with effective date of July 31, 2024.

NOTE "B" - ACREAGE BREAKDOWN:
 Total acreage 5.045 Ac.
 Acreage in Reserve "F" 0.634 Ac.
 Acreage in Reserve "E" (Private right-of-way) 0.761 Ac.
 Acreage in lots 3.650 Ac.

NOTE "C" - ACREAGE BREAKDOWN: Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase B is out of the following Licking County Parcel Numbers:
 125-026-598-00-002 0.711 Ac.
 125-026-598-00-003 4.334 Ac.


NOTE "D" - RESERVE "F": Reserve "F", as designated and delineated hereon, shall be owned and maintained by the developer, its successors and assigns, for the purpose of future development.

NOTE "E" - RESERVE "E": Reserve "E", as designated and delineated hereon, shall be owned and maintained by the Summit Crossing master association. The drives constructed within said Reserve "E" will be private drives which will be owned and maintained by said association. Until such time as said association is formed and funded, the developer will be responsible for the maintenance of said Reserve "E". Said drives will not be dedicated to the City of Reynoldsburg and the City of Reynoldsburg, will not be responsible for the maintenance of said drives.

NOTE "F": The purpose of this plat is to show certain property, rights of way, and easement boundaries as of the time of platting. At the request of zoning and planning authorities at the time of platting, this plat shows some of the boundaries and requirements for this plat. The boundaries and requirements shown on this plat are for reference only. The limitations and requirements may change from time to time and should be reviewed to determine the then current applicable use and development limitations of the zoning code as adopted by the government authority having jurisdiction. The then applicable zoning code shall have control over conflicting limitations and requirements that may be shown on this plat. This note should not be construed as creating plat or subdivision restrictions, private use restrictions, covenants running with the land or title encumbrances of any nature, except to the extent specifically identified as such.

NOTE "G": At the time of platting, electric, cable, and telephone service providers have not issued information required so that easement areas, in addition to those shown on this plat as deemed necessary by these providers for the installation and maintenance of their services, are shown on this plat. Existing recorded easement information about Summit Crossing Section 1 Phase B, or any part thereof, can be acquired by a competent examination of the then current public records, including those in the Licking County Recorder's Office.

MAPLEWOOD SECTION 1
 I.N. 202305110008334



SCALE: 1" = 40'
 GRAPHIC SCALE (in feet)
 O = Iron Pin (See Survey Data)
 ● = Mark Nail to be set
 ⊙ = Permanent Marker (See Survey Data)

Legend

- BL = Building Line
- DL = Drainage Easement
- PUE = Private Utility Easement
- S.E. = Sidewalk Easement
- E.E.1 = Existing 20' Easement
- E.E.2 = Existing 25' Easement
- E.E.3 = Existing 15' Easement
- E.E.4 = Existing Easement
- IL = Ironing Easement
- EL = Existing Property Line
- ERW = Existing R/W Line
- ERWCL = Existing R/W Centerline
- ERWEL = Existing Easement Line
- ESBL = Subdivision Boundary Line
- LL = Lot Line
- R/WL = R/W Line
- R/WCL = R/W Centerline
- EL = Easement Line


CURVE TABLE

CURVE NO.	DELTA	RADIUS	LENGTH	CHORD BEARING	CHORD DISTANCE
C1	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	S 41°00'40" E	28.28'
C2	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	N 48°59'20" E	28.28'
C3	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	S 41°00'40" E	28.28'
C4	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	N 48°59'20" E	28.28'
C5	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	N 41°00'40" W	28.28'

CURVE TABLE

CURVE NO.	DELTA	RADIUS	LENGTH	CHORD BEARING	CHORD DISTANCE
C6	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	S 48°59'20" W	28.28'
C7	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	N 41°00'40" W	28.28'
C8	90°00'00"	20.00'	31.42'	S 48°59'20" W	28.28'


SUMMIT CROSSING SECTION 1 PHASE B 2024-0981



UNIT #xx CAMPBELL UNIT #xx BRAEDEN-2 UNIT #xx AINSLIE UNIT #xx DUBLIN

Upper Floor Assembly Plan


SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"



UNIT #xx CAMPBELL UNIT #xx BRAEDEN-2 UNIT #xx AINSLIE UNIT #xx DUBLIN

Main Floor Assembly Plan


SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"



UNIT #xx CAMPBELL UNIT #xx BRAEDEN-2 UNIT #xx AINSLIE UNIT #xx CAMPBELL-2

Upper Floor Assembly Plan

SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"



UNIT #xx CAMPBELL UNIT #xx BRAEDEN-2 UNIT #xx AINSLIE UNIT #xx CAMPBELL-2

Main Floor Assembly Plan

SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

ParcelNumber	Column1	Street	City	CurrentLegalDescription
125-026598-00.008	1124	PARK PLACE	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 3 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.012	1136	PARK PLACE	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 7 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.016	1148	PARK PLACE	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 11 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.020	1098	ALLEGRO	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 15 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.024	1112	ALLEGRO	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 19 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH A
125-026598-00.036	9172	SAINT ELIAS	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 27 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH B
125-026598-00.042	9188	SAINT ELIAS	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 33 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH B
125-026598-00.048	9204	SAINT ELIAS	REYNOLDSBURG	LOT 39 SUMMIT CROSSING SEC 1 PH B
125-026598-00.003	Additional 19 Variances			
125-026598-00.002	Between these two Parcels			



April 29th, 2026

Planning and Zoning Board
City of Reynoldsburg
7232 E. Main Street
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068

RE: Lamar Builders c/o Jack Reynolds for Ann Taylor of Plaza Properties, 8400 E. Main Street:
Variance

Planning and Zoning Board:

Below is the staff review of the above referenced Variance Application.

1. Project Summary

1. **Site Summary:** The subject site is located at 8400 E. Main Street. It is on one parcel, 013-030198-00-000, that is 7.74 acres with no structures on the site, but there is a retention basin. A retention basin (or wet pond) is a landscaped, permanent stormwater management facility designed to capture runoff, storing it until it infiltrates the ground or evaporates. The subject site is zoned EMD, East Main District. The site is located at the entrance to the Reserve at Reynoldsburg housing development.
2. **Surrounding Zoning:** The surrounding zoning of the subject site consists of CC, Community Commercial District to the East, SR, Suburban Residential to the North and West, and OS, Open Space to the South. The surrounding land uses consist of vacant land to the West, Dwelling – Detached Single-Family to the North, vacant land and Dwelling – Detached Single-Family to the East, and graveyard to the South.
3. **Applicant's Request:** The applicant is requesting the following variances:
 - i. Section 1105.11.A.iii.1
 1. To increase the permitted height of 4 feet to 5 feet along E. Main Street and 6 feet along Reserve Drive.
 - ii. Section 1105.11.A.iii.7
 1. To allow chain link as a material for the proposed fence.
4. **Statement of Hardship:** “The property owner is seeking variances to elements of the fencing section of the Zoning Code to prevent access to the pond located on the site. There is a concern that the public will trespass and enter the pond area. There are liability concerns that the use of the pond area by the public presents an attractive nuisance that the property owner wants to address with the construction of the proposed fencing. The hardship in this instance is the Code restricts the height of any fencing to 4; and it is a concern that the maximum height outlined in the Code will not be adequate to prevent trespassing into the pond area. The hardship for the fencing type (chain link) is to reduce the opacity to the pond area to ensure visibility of the pond area. The chain link fencing will also minimize the visibility of the fence within the neighbor thereby allowing the public to see the amenity which consists of the pond and forested area. The height of the fencing

and the chain link will benefit the neighborhood by securing the pond from access and maintaining the view shed that is created by the existing pond and forested area. The granting of the requested variances will alleviate the hardship of providing adequate security to protect the owner from liability and the neighboring public. The fence will provide visibility into the fenced area which is necessary for security purposes. The property owner therefore requests the granting of the variances by the Planning and Zoning Board delineated by the application.”

5. **Comprehensive Plan:** The 2018 Comprehensive Plan, upon which the current zoning code is based, states that the intent of the EMD, East Main District is to “...connect gateways into Reynoldsburg with the downtown, as well as serve commercial needs scaled to accommodate the immediate neighborhoods. The districts should incorporate a mixture of small commercial and office uses, residential units, and retail uses, including shopping and dining.”

2. Project Review

1. The following variance factors are considered below:
 - i. The variance is in accord with the general purpose and intent of the regulations imposed by this Code in the district in which it is located, and shall not be injurious to the area or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.
 1. The applicant states “The requested variances are in accord with the general purpose and intent as the property owner is seeking to secure an existing pond from entry as there is a fear of drowning by neighboring children and trespassing individuals. The granting of the variance are not injurious to the area nor otherwise detrimental to the public rather the proposed fencing is being erected to protect the public. The proposed height is to prevent trespassing to the existing pond and the fencing material acts as a deterrent and is not obtrusive to the eye.”
 - i. Staff is of the opinion that granting the requested variances would not be detrimental to the public welfare if permitted. However, the code does not permit chain link as a new fence material anywhere within the city.
 - ii. The variance will not permit the establishment of any use which is not otherwise listed as a permitted use or a conditional use in the zone or district in which the subject property is situated.
 1. The applicant states that “The variance is being requested to alter the type and height of the fence proposed for the site. Fencing is permitted in the EMD district so a use variance is not being requested”
 - i. Staff is of the opinion that granting the requested variances would not permit any use that is not listed as permitted or conditional in this zone. The applicant is not changing a use.
 - iii. There exist special circumstances or conditions, fully described in the findings, applicable to the land or structures for which the variance is

sought, which are peculiar to such land or structures and which do not apply generally to land or structures in the area, and which are such that the strict application of the provisions of this Code would deprive the property owner of the reasonable use of such land or structures.

1. The applicant states that “The property owner has a large pond that collect stormwater drainage from surrounding offsite properties including municipal and non-municipal stormwater flows, including the Kroger’s lot to the east, and therefore the pond cannot be filled in so the owner needs to protect itself from liability and the general public from accessing the pond and therefore the variances. The variances are peculiar to the land as it contains a large pond which needs a security fence to deny access to the pond. The strict application of the cited sections of the Zoning Code would deprive the owner the reasonable ability to provide the need security to the site.”
 - i. The land use of a retention basin on this parcel, based on the 1995 Franklin County aerial image which shows a portion of the site with the pond still being there, has existed for the last 30+ years. Staff is of the opinion that retention basins are not a unique feature within the city, there are many retention basins in the city. Staff does not believe there are special circumstances that exist in this case.
- iv. There must be a deprivation of the beneficial use of land, as opposed to mere loss in value as justification for the variance.
 1. The applicant states that “The variances are needed to prove a beneficial use of the property as the fencing will allow the provision of security to the site at a reasonable cost. The beneficial nature of the fencing is to deny access to the pond from those trespassing on the property as the pond can be a hazard to children and trespassing individuals in the area”
 - i. The applicant is not deprived of the beneficial use of land, due to the fact that the property has been used as a retention basin over the last few decades at least.
- v. There is proof of hardship or practical difficulty created by the strict application of this Code, beyond simply a showing that greater profit will result if the variance is granted. Economic hardship is not grounds for the variance. Furthermore, the hardship complained of is not self-created nor is it established on this basis by one who purchased with or without knowledge of the restrictions. The hardship results from the application of this Code and is suffered directly by the property in question.
 1. The applicant states that “There is a practical difficulty as the property owner is seeking to secure the pond area with a fence that is adequate to prevent access to the pond area by children and other trespassing individuals”
 - i. Staff is of the opinion that this hardship is self-created and



the property owner could secure the retention basin using a permitted fence material. If a fence were to be put up to stop trespassing into the retention basin, the fencing should be placed around the retention basin for safety purposes and not the entire property.

- vi. The variance is necessary for the reasonable use of the land or building, and the variance as granted is the minimum variance that will accomplish this purpose.
 - 1. The applicant states that “The variance is necessary to allow the owner to adequately secure the property which will allow a reasonable use of the property as the fencing will protect children and trespassers from accessing the pond. There is no economic hardship nor gain by the granting of the requested variances as the property owner is simply working to secure the property. The hardship is created by the Code as it prevents the owner from securing the property. The variances are necessary for the reasonable use of the property as the fencing will allow the owner to secure the pond area from the public. The requests before the Board are the minimum to secure the pond from the public.”
 - i. Staff is of the opinion that this variance is not necessary for the reasonable use of the land. The pond could be secured in a way that meets the zoning code.
- vii. The variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent area.
 - 1. The applicant states that “The granting of the variances will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property nor substantially increase the congestion in the public streets nor increase the danger of fire, endanger public safety nor substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent area.”
 - i. The Fire Department does not have concerns with regards to this variance. Upon review of the site plan, the site is completely enclosed by fencing. The applicant has not provided a location for a gate on the site plan to ensure that if there was a safety concern, safety personnel could easily access the site. Therefore, staff recommends that if a fence is placed on the site, that a gate be provided to allow for safety/rescue personnel access.
- viii. The variance will not confer on the property owner any special privilege that is unduly denied by this Code to other land, structures, or buildings in the same district.
 - 1. The applicant states “No, the granting of the variances will not confer on the property owner any special privilege that is unduly denied by the Code to other land, structures or buildings in the same district. The aim of the owner is to protect the public by

fencing the pond. The property is in the EMD district and serves commercial businesses in the area. There are single family homes and condominiums to the north and west and the fence would serve to prevent trespassing on the site.”

- i. Staff is of the opinion that the variance would confer special privileges of having a chain-link fence. There are a multitude of other permitted fence materials that are permitted in the code, such as vinyl, which the applicant has already proposed to sue for a portion of the fencing. Staff has not seen how the applicant has tried to resolve the purpose of securing the retention basin in other manners to not require a variance.
- ix. No nonconforming use of neighboring land or structures in the same district and no permitted or nonconforming use of land or structures in other districts are considered as grounds for approval of the variance.
 1. The applicant states that “No, there are no neighboring land use or non-conforming structures that are to be considered as grounds for approval of the variances.”
 - i. Staff is of the opinion that the applicant does not use any of these arguments as grounds for approval.
 - x. The variance is not a matter of convenience when other remedies are available within the provisions of this Code.
 1. The applicant states that “No, the requested variances are not a matter of convenience rather for safety of those in the surrounding areas and there are no other remedies available within the provisions of the Code to remedy the need for protecting the public.”
 - i. Within the zoning code, four-foot fencing is required for securing pools within the city. The applicant is requesting to increase the height of the fencing by one foot in some areas and two feet in other areas. It is unclear why a five/six-foot fence is needed, when the code uses four feet for other safety purposes such as fencing for pools.
 - ii. The applicant has not provided anywhere within the application why the use of chain link material is necessary, especially when an alternative material is proposed for a portion of the site. Staff believes that the use of chain link fencing is a matter of convenience and the applicant has not provided a reason as to why vinyl could not be used throughout the whole site.

3. Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting 2 variances, the first one is to increase maximum permitted height of the fencing along a road, and the second one is to permit chain link fencing as a material, which is not permitted within the city. The first variance request is to increase the permitted maximum height of fencing from 4 feet to 5 feet along E. Main Street and 6 feet along Reserve Drive (Section 1105.11.A.iii.1). The second variance requested is

deviate from the permitted materials list, to allow chain link fencing (Section 1105.11.A.iii.7).

The zoning code requires that all fencing that is considered to be located between the front setback line for structures, and in front of the front facades of the principal structure, that fences are not permitted to exceed 4 feet in height. Since there is no principal structure, but the fence is located 3 feet from the property line, the maximum fencing height of 4 feet would apply.

The applicant states safety reasons for wanting to increase the height of the fencing on the site along E. Main Street and Reserve Drive, to prevent people from trespassing onto the property, but specifically to address the safety concerns of people trespassing onto or in the existing retention basin. The applicant has not addressed why this site is unique, as many other sites within the city have retention basins, or how they have tried other approved fencing materials other than chain link to address their concerns. The applicant has stated they want to protect the owner from liability and keep trespassers away from the retention basin.

Staff is of the opinion that perhaps signage, and an approved fence material in the zoning code at a height of 4 feet, could achieve and address the applicant's safety concerns without needing a variance. While the site plan does not show how far the retention basin is located from E. Main Street or Reserve Drive, if the location of the fence were to be at least 20 feet from the property lines along E. Main Street and Reserve Drive, then the fencing could be as high as 8 feet, since it would be located behind the building setback area. If the retention basin was within the 20-foot building setback, and the Board felt that there were special circumstances to permit a fence at 5 and/or six feet in height, then staff would recommend that the following conditions below be met if the Board were to grant the height variance. However, staff is not sure if the placement of the fence is possible outside of the building setback area along road frontage. That the variance requested made by the applicant for an increase in height and the use of chain link as a material is one of convenience since there are no unique or peculiar circumstance cited in the applicant's application, other than it being a retention basin, which is not unique within the city. Staff also believes that approving chain link as a permitted material for fencing would set a precedent for all properties in the City of Reynoldsburg, especially when the applicant has provided a portion of the proposed fencing material to be vinyl, which is permitted. Finally, staff believes that if the variance for the height of the fence were increased, that unless the Board identified unique and special circumstances as to why it should be permitted and was not a matter of convenience, that this too could set a precedent for all fencing within the city. Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of both requested variances.

If the Board voted to approve the maximum height variance from 4 feet to 6 feet for street frontage, then staff would recommend the following conditions:

1. That the applicant provides a fence material that is permitted within in the Zoning Code.
2. That the fencing be located around the retention basin within 10 feet of the

retention basin.

3. That a gate be provided to access the retention basin. That the gate be located in an area that is easily accessible for safety personal to access.
4. That a tree survey, tree removal plan, and if necessary, a tree replacement plan be provided to staff, meeting all landscape requirements to staff satisfaction, prior to the fence permit being approved.
5. That the applicant provide documentation to ensure Section 1105.11.E.iii is met to staffs satisfaction, prior to the fence permit being approved.



Reynoldsburg

Building/Zoning Department
 5967 S. Edw.
 DVA Village AZ 43068

App./Case#: 2026-0159
 Date Submitted: 3/26/26
 Fee Amount: \$450.00
 Paid: CC

*All submissions must include a physical and digital copy. The physical copy may be dropped off or mailed to the address above. The digital copy can be submitted to the Building Department at: permit@reynoldsburg.gov

*Please know that an application will not be processed until payment has been received.

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD VARIANCE AND CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION

RECEIVED

APR 7 2026

REYNOLDSBURG BUILDING DEPT

Property Address: 8400 East Main Street	Parcel ID#(s): 013-030198-00-000
--	-------------------------------------

I. PROPERTY OWNER OF RECORD

Property Owner Name(s): Woodland Plaza Ltd	
Contact Email: Ann.Taylor@PlazaProperties.com	Contact Phone Number: 740-920-4150

II. BUSINESS/TENANT INFORMATION (IF APPLICABLE)

Business Name: Plaza Properties	Contact Name: Ann Taylor
Contact Email: Ann.Taylor@PlazaProperties.com	Contact Phone Number: 740-920-4150
Description of Use: variance for new fencing around pond to prevent access to the pond	

III. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Applicant Name: Lamar Builders c/o Jack Reynolds	Applicant Address: 172 E. State Street, Suite 550, Columbus, OH
Applicant Phone Number: 614-221-4255	Applicant Email: JReynolds@SmithandHale.com

Property Owner Business Owner/Tenant Contractor Architect/Engineer Owner's Consent Attached.

PROJECT INFORMATION

CHECK AND DESCRIBE IF APPLICABLE: Variance Conditional Use Variance or Conditional Use Extension (\$50)

Residential (single-family residential only)(\$200) Non-Residential (all residential except single-family residential)(\$450) Engineering Report (\$750 (min))

Description of Project: A 5' tall vinyl fence which is 537' long will be built along 3E Main St. and a 360' long 6' tall chain link fence along Reserve Dr. and then 1244' around the remainder of the pond. Variances are requested to 1105.11.A.ii(7) - chain link and 1105.11.A.ii(1) = Height. * Note the chain link fence can not be used to support the existing fence.

Please review the attached checklist and note the items you are responsible for submitting with this application. All required items must be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Administrator.

Applicant Signature: *Jack Reynolds* Date: 3/25/26

By signing this application, I certify that I am the owner of the property or the owner's agent, and that the work is authorized with the full knowledge of the owner.

OFFICE USE ONLY

* Revised 2026

Additional Notes:

Zoning District: EMD

Additional Approval Required

Major/Minor Site Plan
 Other: _____

P&Z Administrator: _____ Date: _____

PZB Meeting	
Date:	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved as Submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved w/ Conditions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tabled
<input type="checkbox"/>	Denied
<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawn

Standards for Variance – Section 1109.11.D
8400 East Main Street
Woodland Plaza Ltd.

1. The variance is in accord with the general purpose and intent of the regulations imposed by this Code in the district in which it is located, and shall not be injurious to the area or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

The requested variances are in accord with the general purpose and intent as the property owner is seeking to secure an existing pond from entry as there is a fear of drowning by neighboring children and trespassing individuals. The granting of the variance are not injurious to the area nor otherwise detrimental to the public rather the proposed fencing is being erected to protect the public. The proposed height is to prevent trespassing to the existing pond and the fencing material acts as a deterrent and is not obtrusive to the eye.

2. The variance will not permit the establishment of any use which is not otherwise listed as a permitted use or a conditional use in the zone or district in which the subject property is situated.

The variance is being requested to alter the type and height of the fence proposed for the site. Fencing is permitted in the EMD district so a use variance is not being requested.

3. There exist special circumstances or conditions, fully described in the findings, applicable to the land or structures for which the variances is sought, which are peculiar to such land or structures and which do not apply generally to land or structures in the area, and which are such that the strict application of the provisions of this Code would deprive the property owner of the reasonable use of such land or structures.

The property owner has a large pond that collect stormwater drainage from surrounding offsite properties including municipal and non-municipal stormwater flows, including the Kroger's lot to the east, and therefore the pond cannot be filled in so the owner needs to protect itself from liability and the general public from accessing the pond and therefore the variances. The variances are peculiar to the land as it contains a large pond which needs a security fence to deny access to the pond. The strict application of the cited sections of the Zoning Code would deprive the owner the reasonable ability to provide the need security to the site.

4. There is deprivation of beneficial use of land, as opposed to mere loss in value as justification for the variance.

The variances are needed to prove a beneficial use of the property as the fencing will allow the provision of security to the site at a reasonable cost. The beneficial nature of the fencing is to deny access to the pond from those trespassing on the property as the pond can be a hazard to children and trespassing individuals in the area.

5. There is proof of hardship or practical difficulty created by the strict application of this Code, beyond simply a showing that greater profit will result if the variance is granted. Economic hardship is not grounds for the variance. Furthermore, the hardship complained of is not self-created nor is it established on this basis by one who purchased with or without knowledge of the restrictions. The hardship results from the application of this Code and is suffered directly by the property in question.

There is a practical difficulty as the property owner is seeking to secure the pond area with a fence that is adequate to prevent access to the pond area by children and other trespassing individuals.

6. The variance is necessary for the reasonable use of the land or building, and the variance as granted is the minimum variance that will accomplish this purpose.

The variance is necessary to allow the owner to adequately secure the property which will allow a reasonable use of the property as the fencing will protect children and trespassers from accessing the pond. There is no economic hardship nor gain by the granting of the requested variances as the property owner is simply working to secure the property. The hardship is created by the Code as it prevents the owner from securing the property.

The variances are necessary for the reasonable use of the property as the fencing will allow the owner to secure the pond area from the public. The requests before the Board are the minimum to secure the pond from the public.

7. The variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent area.

The granting of the variances will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property nor substantially increase the congestion in the public streets nor increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety nor substantially diminish or impair property values of the adjacent area.

8. The variance will not confer on the property owner any special privilege that is unduly denied by this Code to other land, structures, or buildings in the same district.

No, the granting of the variances will not confer on the property owner any special privilege that is unduly denied by the Code to other land, structures or buildings in the same district. The aim of the owner is to protect the public by fencing the pond. The property is in the EMD district and serves commercial businesses in the area. There are single family homes and condominiums to the north and west and the fence would serve to prevent trespassing on the site.

9. No non-conforming use of neighboring land or structures in the same district and no permitted or non-conforming use of land or structures in other districts are considered as grounds for approval of the variance.

No, there are no neighboring land use or non-conforming structures that are to be considered as grounds for approval of the variances.

10. The variance is not a matter of convenience when other remedies are available within the provisions of this Code.

No, the requested variances are not a matter of convenience rather for safety of those in the surrounding areas and there are no other remedies available within the provisions of the Code to remedy the need for protecting the public.

Statement of Hardship

The property owner is seeking variances to elements of the fencing section of the Zoning Code to prevent access to the pond located on the site. There is a concern that the public will trespass and enter the pond area. There are liability concerns that the use of the pond area by the public presents an attractive nuisance that the property owner wants to address with the construction of the proposed fencing. The hardship in this instance is the Code restricts the height of any fencing to 4' and it is a concern that the maximum height outlined in the Code will not be adequate to prevent trespassing into the pond area. The hardship for the fencing type (chain link) is to reduce the opacity to the pond area to ensure visibility of the pond area. The chain link fencing will also minimize the visibility of the fence within the neighbor thereby allowing the public to see the amenity which consists of the pond and the forested area. The height of the fencing and the chain link will benefit the neighborhood by securing the pond from access and maintaining the view shed that is created by the existing pond and forested area.

The granting of the requested variances will alleviate the hardship of providing adequate security to protect the owner from liability and the neighboring public. The fence will provide visibility into the fenced area which is necessary for security purposes. The property owner therefore requests the granting of the variances by the Planning and Zoning Board delineated by the application.

EXHIBIT A

7.742 ACRES

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Licking, City of Reynoldsburg, Section 8, Township 16, Range 20, Refugee Lands, being a part of the tract conveyed to Bernard R. Ruben by deeds of record in Deed Book 694, Page 231, Deed Book 694, Page 234, and Deed Book 703, Page 503, (all references are to the records of the Recorder's Office, Licking County, Ohio) and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning for Reference, at a concrete monument found in the northerly limited access right-of-way line of U.S. 40, in the line common to said Ruben tract and the tract conveyed to Kenneth E. and Beulah M. Young, Co-Trustees by deed of record in Instrument Number 200402260006622;

Thence South $88^{\circ} 46' 54''$ West, a distance of 258.44 feet, with said northerly limited access right-of-way line, to an iron pin set at the intersection of said northerly limited access right-of-way line and the westerly right-of-way line of Reserve Drive, as recorded in Plat Book 16, Page 239, being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence continuing with said northerly limited access right-of-way line, the following courses and distances:

South $88^{\circ} 46' 54''$ West, a distance of 350.44 feet, to a concrete monument found;

North $87^{\circ} 14' 37''$ West, a distance of 188.02 feet, to a $3/4$ inch iron pin found in the line common to said Ruben tract and the tract conveyed to Robert P. Selfinger, Jr. by deed of record in Instrument Number 200310150050145;

Thence North $03^{\circ} 32' 00''$ East, a distance of 494.94 feet, with the westerly line of said Ruben tract, and the easterly lines of said Selfinger tract, the tract conveyed to Deems Investment Corporation by deeds of record in Deed Book 789, Pages 157 and 163, and the tract conveyed to Dominion Homes, Inc. by deed of record in Instrument Number 199909300040532, to an iron pin set at the southwest corner of Reserve "A" of "Reserve at Reynoldsburg, Section 1", a subdivision of record in Plat Book 16, Page 239;

Thence North $83^{\circ} 20' 10''$ East, a distance of 626.98 feet, with the line common to said Ruben tract and said "Reserve at Reynoldsburg, Section 1", to an iron pin set in the westerly right-of-way line of said Reserve Drive;

Thence with said westerly right-of-way line, the following courses and distances:

South $03^{\circ} 52' 51''$ West, a distance of 20.69 feet, to an iron pin set at a point of curvature;

With said curve to the left, having a central angle of $35^{\circ} 29' 27''$, a radius of 225.00 feet, an arc length of 139.37 feet, and a chord which bears South $13^{\circ} 51' 52''$ East, a chord distance of 137.15 feet, to an iron pin set at a point of reverse curvature;

With said curve to the right, having a central angle of $82^{\circ} 32' 38''$, a radius of 169.25 feet, an arc length of 243.84 feet, and a chord which bears South $09^{\circ} 39' 43''$ West, a chord distance of 223.29 feet, to an iron pin set at a point of tangency;

South $50^{\circ} 56' 02''$ West, a distance of 5.70 feet, to an iron pin set at a point of curvature;

EXHIBIT A continued

0.988 ACRE

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Licking, City of Reynoldsburg, Section 8, Township 16, Range 20, Refugee Lands, being a part of the tract conveyed to Bernard R. Ruben by deeds of record in Deed Book 694, Page 231, Deed Book 694, Page 234, and Deed Book 703, Page 503, (all references are to the records of the Recorder's Office, Licking County, Ohio) and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a concrete monument found in the northerly limited access right-of-way line of U.S. 40, in the line common to said Ruben tract and the tract conveyed to Kenneth E. and Beulah M. Young, Co-Trustees by deed of record in Instrument Number 200402260006622;

Thence South 88° 46' 54" West, a distance of 158.06 feet, with said northerly limited access right-of-way line, to an iron pin set at the intersection of said northerly limited access right-of-way line and the easterly right-of-way line of Reserve Drive, as recorded in Plat Book 16, Page 239;

Thence with said easterly right-of-way line, the following courses and distances:

With a curve to the right, having a central angle of 94° 59' 45", a radius of 20.00 feet, an arc length of 33.16 feet, and a chord which bears North 43° 43' 13" West, a chord distance of 29.49 feet, to an iron pin set at a point of compound curvature;

With said curve to the right, having a central angle of 47° 09' 23", a radius of 170.00 feet, an arc length of 139.92 feet, and a chord which bears North 27° 21' 20" East, a chord distance of 136.00 feet, to an iron pin set at a point of reverse curvature;

With said curve to the left, having a central angle of 74° 52' 30", a radius of 224.25 feet, an arc length of 293.05 feet, and a chord which bears North 13° 29' 50" East, a chord distance of 272.64 feet, to an iron pin set at the southwest corner of Lot 12 of "Reserve at Reynoldsburg, Section 1", a subdivision of record in Plat Book 16, Page 239;

Thence North 66° 03' 38" East, a distance of 88.98 feet, with the line common to said Ruben tract and said Lot 12, to an iron pin set in the westerly line of said Young tract;

Thence South 03° 46' 39" West, a distance of 440.92 feet, with the line common to said Ruben and Young tracts, to the POINT OF BEGINNING, containing 0.988 acre of land, more or less.

Subject, however, to all legal rights-of-way and/or easements, if any, of previous record.

Iron pins set, where indicated, are iron pipes, thirteen sixteenths (13/16) inch inside diameter, thirty (30) inches long with a plastic plug placed in the top bearing the initials EMHT INC.

Bearings are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System as Per NAD83. Control for bearings was from coordinates of monuments Glen Rest and Reynoldsburg established by the Franklin County Engineering department.

EVANS, MECHWART, HAMBLETON, & TILTON, INC.


James M. Pearsall

James M. Pearsall
Professional Surveyor No. 7840

11/17/05

Date

JMP:tnw/Nov05
0_988 ac 52404.doc



7.742 ACRES

- 2 -

With said curve to the left, having a central angle of $47^{\circ} 09' 23''$, a radius of 230.00 feet, an arc length of 189.30 feet, and a chord which bears South $27^{\circ} 21' 20''$ West, a chord distance of 184.00 feet, to an iron pin set at a point of tangency;

South $03^{\circ} 46' 39''$ West, a distance of 8.74 feet, to an iron pin set at a point of curvature;

With the arc of said curve to the right, having a central angle of $85^{\circ} 00' 15''$, a radius of 20.00 feet, an arc length of 29.67 feet, and a chord which bears South $46^{\circ} 16' 47''$ West, a chord distance of 27.02 feet, to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING, containing 7.742 acres of land, more or less.

Subject, however, to all legal rights-of-way and/or easements, if any, of previous record.

Iron pins set, where indicated, are iron pipes, thirteen sixteenths (13/16) inch inside diameter, thirty (30) inches long with a plastic plug placed in the top bearing the initials EMHT INC.

Bearings are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System as Per NAD83. Control for bearings was from coordinates of monuments Glen Rest and Reynoldsburg established by the Franklin County Engineering department.

EVANS, MECHWART, HAMBLETON, & TILTON, INC.



11/17/05

James M. Pearsall
Professional Surveyor No. 7840

Date


JMP:tnw/Nov05
7_742 ac 52404.doc

AND THE FOLLOWING PROPERTY:



Newark 10PM

43023



Newark 10PM

43023



Menu



Quotes



Lists



Ann

Order #WK20751554

Placed on: Apr 06, 2026

RECEIVED

APR 7 2026

REYNOLDSBURG BUILDING DEPT

Billing Information

Ann Taylor

3016 Maryland Avenue
Bexley OH 43209

Payment Method: VISA ***4762

Item	Price/Item	Qty	Line Total
Store Pickup (4 items)			
5200 Hamilton Rd 3828, Columbus, OH 43230			
Items picked up from store 3828			
Everbilt 3/8 in. COMP x 3/8 in. COMP x 60 in. Universal Stainless Steel Dishwasher Connector	\$20.97	1	\$20.97
Available: Tomorrow			
Glacier Bay Brindle 24.5 in. W x 16.25 in. D x 33.8 in. H Single Sink Bath Vanity in White with White Cultured Marble Top	\$259.00	1	\$259.00
Available: Tomorrow			
SnappyTrap 1-1/2 in. All-in-One Drain Kit for Single Bowl Kitchen Sinks, Bar Sinks and Utility Sinks	\$19.62	1	\$19.62
Available: Tomorrow			
InSinkErator Power 900, 3/4 HP Garbage Disposal, Power Series EZ Connect Continuous Feed Food Waste Disposer	\$199.00	1	\$199.00
Available: Tomorrow			
Store Pickup (3 items)			
5200 Hamilton Rd 3828, Columbus, OH 43230			
Items picked up from store 3828			
Delta Charmaine Single-Handle Pull-Down Sprayer Kitchen Faucet with Soap Dispenser and ShieldSpray Technology in Stainless	\$244.62	1	\$244.62
Available: Apr 09 - Apr 14			
Glacier Bay Builders 4 in. Centerset Double-Handle Bathroom Faucet in Matte Black	\$35.84	1	\$35.84
Available: Apr 09 - Apr 14			

Glacier Bay Tight Radius 33 in. Drop-In Single Bowl	\$241.40	1	\$241.40
18 Gauge Stainless Steel Kitchen Sink with	\$284.00		
Accessories	Saved 15%		

Available: Apr 09 - Apr 14

Store Pickup (1 item)

1330 N 21st Street 3887, Newark, OH 43055

Item picked up from store 3887


24.5 in. W Cultured Marble Vanity Backsplash in White	\$30.69	1	\$30.69
---	---------	---	---------

Available: Apr 07 - Apr 09

Subtotal		\$1,051.14
Pick Up In Store	FREE	
Sales Tax	\$83.86	
Total		\$1,135.00
You Saved	\$42.60	

Need help?

Online Customer Support: 1-800-430-3376	Call 7 days a week: 6 a.m. to 2 a.m. EST
--	---

 [Download Our App](#)

Need Help?

Visit our [Customer Service Center](#) or Text 78465

Store Locator | ©2000-2026 Home Depot | [Privacy & Security Statement](#) | [Terms](#) | [My Preference Center](#) | [California Privacy Rights & Report](#) | [Limit the Use of My Sensitive Personal Information](#) | [Do Not Sell or Share My Personal Information](#) | [California Supply Chain Act](#)

[Provide Feedback](#)

From: [Doug White](#)
To: [Emma Cepek](#)
Cc: [Phoenix Buathier](#)
Subject: RE: 8400 E. Main Street Variance
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 11:42:22 AM

[NOTICE: This email originated outside of the City of Reynoldsburg.]

Emma,

Disregard my last email, I mixed up the variances for the different developers. The Fire District has no issues or concerns with the fencing variance for 8400 E. Main St. development.

Doug White

West Licking Fire District

Fire Marshal

Office: 740-927-3046 opt. 2

dwhite@westlickingfire.org

From: Emma Cepek <ecepek@reynoldsburg.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2026 9:17 AM
To: Doug White <DWhite@westlickingfire.org>
Cc: Phoenix Buathier <pbuathier@reynoldsburg.gov>
Subject: 8400 E. Main Street Variance

Good morning,

I am sending you 8400 E. Main Street Variance Application and supporting items that are scheduled for the May 7th Planning and Zoning Board meeting. Our code requires us to send out a staff report at least a week in advance of the meeting. Therefore, I am asking for any comments the Fire Department may have by Tuesday April 28th so that we can incorporate them in the staff report that goes out first thing on April 30th.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call or email. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Emma Cepek, MPA

PLANNER I

—

City of Reynoldsburg
7232 East Main Street | Reynoldsburg, OH 43068

Direct 614-322-6800. ext. 6720 Zoning Line 614-322-6850
E ecepek@reynoldsburg.gov

www.reynoldsburg.gov