



**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.



Chairman