



**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
September 7, 2023**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Alabi, Barnhart, Benner, Kleckley, Zollars

ABSENT: Bivens, Furst

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes stand approved

Planning & Zoning Board - Regular Meeting - 7-20-2023

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as submitted.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

**App# 2023-5471; 7324-7330 E. Main Street; Trivium; Certificate of
Appropriateness**

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Zollars abstained from the application.

Mr. Spencer from Trivium Development explained that the previous approved plans were still being reviewed and the changes are reflective of tenant improvements. No changes to the materials have been made.

Ms. Barnhart: I move that we accept the application as proposed.

Ms. Alabi: I'll second.

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Barnhart
SECONDER:	Alabi
AYES:	Alabi, Barnhart, Benner, Kleckley
ABSTAIN:	Zollars

1122 Lancaster Avenue; The Oliver Reynoldsburg; Appeal of Code Violation Notices and Invoices

Mr. Meyer turned the application over to Mr. Leist to explain.

Mr. Leist did not see the applicant present. On July 31st, 2023, the city received a notice of appeal by an attorney, Adam Todd, representing Michael Oliver and the Oliver Project in Reynoldsburg. The notice was to appeal three notices of violations. The first violation was issued on July 5th regarding the height requirements of unmowed grass. The violation was for having grass in excess of six inches. His notice of appeal was not submitted until July 31st, 2023. Per code section 1701.06, the requirements for a notice of appeal to a code violation has to be made within 14 days. Mr. Leist asked the panel to find that the appeal to that code violation was not well taken.

As far as the other violation he was objecting to was the characterization of a fallen tree, which our code officer cited them for on July 20th, 2023. The fallen tree was making it difficult to mow the grass in this area. When our code officer went back on July 27th, 2023 to re-inspect the property, the tree was still down. Although this appeal was timely filed only 11 days after the code violation, they are not here to present their appeal. The characterization of this tree as being rubbish could have been brought into another section, like pruning and maintaining of trees on properties adjacent to roadways. For purposes of the enforcement of the violation, it is a minor issue and the violation falls well within the rubbish definition. Again,



we got the appeal on July 31st and they are not here to challenge the appeal. We had our third party service remove the tree and the total cost of that removal was \$590. Additional \$180 in administrative fees. For a total of \$770. Given the fact that we feel as if the code violations are proper and the applicant is not here to present their appeal, we would ask for a motion denying the appeal.

Mr. Benner: I make a motion that we reject this appeal.

Ms. Kleckley: Second.

RESULT:	Denied
MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Kleckley
AYES:	Alabi, Benner, Kleckley, Zollars,
ABSTAIN:	Barnhart

OTHER BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Planning and Zoning Administrator

Chairman