



**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
November 16, 2023**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Furst, Kleckley, Zollars, Barnhart, Benner, Bivens

ABSENT: Alabi

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers sworn in by Mr. Zollars.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Stella Todd, P.O. Box 1026 Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068.

Ms. Todd wanted to discuss the area in which children walk back and forth to school and how it needs to be cleaned up a bit more. There's trash going up and down the street. She stated that Reynoldsburg is doing a pretty good job at keeping the streets clean as far as mowing. Ms. Todd did not state what street she was referring to or what school.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

App# 2023-5486; 7305 E. Main Street; Richard Holmes; Variance

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Zollars asked for the applicant to state their name and address for the record.

Mr. McCash is the attorney representing 1833 French House LLC and Profilers Grooming Company LLC.

Mr. Furst asked about the conditional use application and their desire to maintain the historical character of the building, but planning to use modern materials. He

asked them to expand on how they plan to maintain the historical character.

Mr. McCash explained they plan to maintain as much as the historical characters, as far as size of windows, locations, etc., but also use modern materials that are more durable and easy to maintain. He stated that the structure of this house has suffered for a while for not having proper maintenance. They are not going for historic preservation, but actually trying to mimic the historical character while using modern materials to ease the maintenance.

Mr. Furst asked if the masonry material on the back was actual stone material versus a plastic that mimics masonry. Mr. McCash told the board it is an actual stone that is already on the building. Mr. McCash explained that putting stone on requires a foundation and that's why synthetic stone is used. Mr. Furst explained that if the application called out stone, that the board would hold them to that material. Mr. McCash said, "we will not be installing plastic."

Ms. Kleckley asked the applicant to update the board on any updates regarding the hardship on the third sign.

Mr. McCash told the board they are able to have two signs of any particular combination. The building next door has a ground sign, a wall sign and a wall sign on the alley side. He pointed out that the chiropractor's office also has these same three signs. From their standpoint, the client is asking to be treated just like his next-door neighbor. Mr. McCash explained that their third sign is a barber pole, which is a traditional sign that dates back to the middle ages and it's an iconic logo. Mr. McCash stated that by Ohio law, he has to have a sign or barber pole at the entrance for licensing. The main entrance is on the south side of the building to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and accessibility. Rather than putting a sign with the business name, the applicant wants to put a barber pole sign. The applicant is asking for traditional signage with a glass piece and internally illuminated. This sign will only be illuminated when they are open. The business hours are 9 A.M. to approximately 7-7:30 P.M.

Mr. Benner wanted to ensure the applicant was aware that everyone else on Main Street was treated according to the zoning code at that time. The chiropractor's office has been there a long time and doesn't compute with the current application. This application is being reviewed on the zoning code as of right now. If this application was 10 years ago, he might have gotten it, but today's code says two signs.

Mr. McCash was not aware if any of the businesses around him were granted variances, or if the code changed, but they have three signs and would like similar signage granted to him.

Mr. Benner reiterated that anywhere you go in Reynoldsburg, you may find things that have been there that were grandfathered in. The city does not go out and make people change things, but anything new is subject to the current code.

Mr. Furst: We have consistently, especially in this district, denied variances for

additional signs. So, you know, if we were to deny this variance, it would be consistent with those prior determinations.

Mr. McCash recognized that the city has made some changes to the code, but believes the barber pole is a slightly different type of sign. He believes this sign is a piece that would only be there for this business and would be removed in the future if another business was to come in.

Mr. Furst explained that this request is for an internally illuminated sign, not a variance request for a barber pole. Giving a variance for an internally illuminated sign on this property would allow subsequent use of the sign for future businesses, where none are in this district.

Mr. McCash respectfully disagreed, they are asking for a variance for a third sign, the third sign being a barber pole. A barber pole that is internally illuminated. He claims the variance is specific to just the barber pole itself.

Mr. Furst asked if the applicant would be willing to accept a non-illuminated barber pole.

Mr. McCash stated that his client would prefer a traditional barber pole that is internally illuminated. The light will go off when the business is closed. This would not be illuminated 24 hours to advertise the business.

Mr. Furst explained that the concern is more about setting a precedent that might be harmful in the future.

Mr. McCash doesn't feel as if this will set a harmful precedent because the internal illumination is specific to the barber pole, as an iconic, traditional, barber pole sign.

Ms. Buathier reminded the board and applicant that the variance is to allow three signs, instead of two. Not a specific sign. There are four variances; one for the number of signs, one is for the type of material for a projecting sign, one for the type of external illumination that is not listed and one to allow one projecting sign to be internally illuminated.

Mr. Zollars asked to have a motion on each variance individually.

Mr. Bivens: I motion that we deny the variance for three signs.

Mr. Furst: Second

RESULT:	DENIED
MOVER:	Bivens
SECONDER:	Furst
AYES:	Benner, Kleckley, Zollars
NAYS:	Barnhart

Mr. McCash wanted to note in the record that the applicant was not permitted to provide any type of presentation or testimony before the decision was made.

Mr. Furst doesn't have any issues with the externally illuminated sign or the sign material and thinks it is consistent with how the signs are lit within the district.

Mr. Benner offered the applicant a chance to discuss the additional variances. Mr. McCash told the board the exterior illumination is soffit lighting to prevent anything that may detract from the architecture of the building.

Mr. Benner confirmed that the applicant had nothing to add about the other three variances.

Mr. McCash asked for the glass part of the barber pole to be supported.

Mr. Benner once again ensured the applicant didn't have anything to add to any of the other variances.

Mr. McCash said as far as the variance for the material, no.

Mr. Furst: I move that we accept the variances in these sections as stated by staff for the projecting sign material and the front lit external illumination.

Ms. Barnhart: I'll second.

Ms. Buathier noted the sections 1105.03.C.V.2 and 1105.03.C.11.

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Barnhart
AYES:	Benner, Bivens, Kleckley, Zollars

Ms. Buathier: That just leaves the variance for internal illumination, section 1105.03.C.3.

Mr. McCash reiterated that his client would like this to be more of an open sign where it would only be on when the barber is there. Hours of operation are 9am - 7:30pm. The only time it would be on in darkness would be the 6pm-7:30pm time period. This is not on all night like other signs that are internally illuminated.

Mr. Furst asked if the board was to restrict the variance to the barber pole for this specific use, for this conditional use application, if the applicant would agree to that. Mr. McCash said, "Yes".

Mr. Meyer asked for the applicant to verify the hours because there seemed to be a conflict in what Mr. McCash said. Mr. McCash confirmed the hours are 9am - 7pm.

Mr. Furst: I do move that we accept the variance for the internally illuminated projecting sign with the following conditions: that it only applies to a barber pole

projecting sign, that it is for this site, and this specific Certificate of appropriateness that the applicant is presenting this evening, and that the sign only be lit during the applicant's stated business hours.

Mr. Bivens: I'll second.

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Furst
SECONDER:	Bivens
AYES:	Barnhart, Benner, Kleckley, Zollars

App# 2023-5487; 7305 E. Main Street; Richard Holmes; Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst asked the applicant why they chose this location as there are a number of haircutting establishments in close proximity. Mr. Furst stated there are two other shops within a one block radius and a number of women's haircutting establishments nearby. Mr. Furst is worried about another failed business at this location.

Mr. McCrary told the board this is an upscale male barber shop or male spa. They will offer pedicures, manicures and massages, with memberships. This is not a walk-in, looking for clients, this is membership-based.

Mr. Furst asked Mr. McCrary if he thought his business plan significantly set himself apart from his competitors. Mr. McCrary said, "most definitely".

Mr. McCrary agreed with the staff's recommendation for the roof to be black material.

Mr. Bivens: I make a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the staff recommendations.

Ms. Kleckley: I second.

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Bivens
SECONDER:	Kleckley
AYES:	Barnhart, Benner, Furst, Zollars

NEW BUSINESS



OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Planning and Zoning Administrator

Chairman