

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
DECEMBER 18, 2013 (rescheduled)

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Beougher: Okay, I will call the Special Meeting of the Design Review Board to order for the City of Reynoldsburg at 6:36.

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. Lane Beougher Mr. Nathan Burd Mr. James Comeaux Mr. Richard Hudson
Members Absent:	Mr. Marshall Spalding
Others Present:	Mr. Justin Robbins, Planning Administrator

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 7, 2013 MEETING

Mr. Beougher: Next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of our November 7th meeting. Are there any corrections, comments, amendments? (No response.) Hearing none, they will stand as distributed.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins, do we have some changes tonight?

Mr. Robbins: Everything should be on the agenda that you guys originally got. There's no changes from staff.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

5. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Beougher: (Mr. Beougher administers oath to speakers.)

B. NEW BUSINESS

1. **6150 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**

APPLICANT: BRUCE SUMMERFELT, SIGNCOM, NASTY'S SPORTS GRILL (#162841)

Mr. Bill Gargish: For all I know, Bruce is probably in Montana. I'm Bill Gargish, one of the developers.

Mr. Robbins: Again, this is Application #162841. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street near the western border of Columbus. The existing zoning is CS, Community Services and it is within the Community Commercial Overlay District. Applicant is requesting Design Board approval for the installation of a new monument sign with sign facings. The sign measures 10' 3-1/2" by 10' 4" and it's internally illuminated. Applicant has received a variance from the BZBA to allow signage exceeding the maximum 6'0" height for the district, allowing a maximum height of 10'3-1/2" and a maximum signage area of 55 square feet. Adjacent businesses include what is now a vacant Dunkin' Donuts and a Springleaf Financial along with Nasty's Bar & Grill. Just to give some background, due to limited visibility from the roadway, the BZBA did grant a variance to allow the sign with the height exceeding the maximum for the district. Applicant has worked with staff to design signage that is consistent with materials and appearance with the character of the surrounding area. Applicant for signage includes both the construction of the brick monument base and the sign facings as shown. I do want to be clear that the one being proposed is the green background for Nasty's. I believe a supplement might have been emailed. If not, I have one that's available. Basically the only changes is the background that you see on the Nasty's sign will be green. It's the view of staff that the proposed signage and brick base is clear, legible and attractive and in keeping with the character and materials of the district. It is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed sign is in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall character of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Robbins. Mr. Gargish, do you have anything to add?

Mr. Gargish: The only thing I'd like to add is that we appreciate your forbearance on this and that we have leased the Dunkin' Donut space to Domino's and they're in the process of _____, so we'll have that thing 100% leased and doing business on Main Street. So we'd like your approval, please.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from the members?

Mr. Robbins: What's going to happen is since they're putting up a new wall sign, that definitely needs Design Review and since it's in the Overlay District, even a sign reface requires Design Review approval. So Domino's will be in here either the beginning of January or February.

Mr. Beougher: I do have a comment. This is my own personal opinion. Having been on Council when we approved the funding for Streetscape Phase 1 and 2, and we have a consistent monument sign base which I'm not going to comment on the aesthetic value of that. I was surprised to see a sign with this configuration, but I also understand when _____ went in, their sign was obscured by the greenery and I do see the need. I'm just concerned that this

may set off a new round of one upsmanship, but it's been approved by the BZBA and it's before us now.

Mr. Robbins: If I may, there was certain consideration. As you know, there's a slight incline when you move from basically the edge of the city into the city and the signage that was there, we had a lot of images that were obscured by brick walls from the city along the streetscape, the trees and basically just the incline itself. It did make it very difficult to see existing signs.

Mr. Beougher: And I'm not disagreeing and I'm not saying that the base is not attractive. It's not in the realm of consistency that we did have and so I'm not saying I'm not going to support it, I'm just commenting that it surprised me to see the sign.

Mr. Gargish: The main reason is actually engineering, to help make sure it doesn't _____ brick.

Mr. Beougher: Are there any other comments? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Burd: I'll make a motion that we approve this as submitted.

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: Just for the record, building permits are required, so double check with the Building Department to make sure the requirements are met. They do require a sign permit before construction. If one has not been submitted yet, there's a stack of them over there.

2. **1304 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: RICHARD BIGHAM, GREAT VALUE MATTRESS (#162932). SIGN REFACE.

Mr. Richard Bigham: Richard Bigham (inaudible).

Mr. Robbins: Again, this is Application 162932. The property is located within the shopping center approximately one block south of the Brice and Main intersection. The property is on the east side of Brice Road. This is in the K-Mart shopping center. It's a couple storefronts down, I believe, to the south of K-Mart. They're requesting Design Board approval for refacing an existing wall sign that measures 93 x 22" with white lettering. This is part of the existing fascia on the front of the building. As far as I understand it's to be – the fascia's to be removed and basically milled out with kind of a lexan back to it.

Mr. Bigham: (Inaudible.)

Mr. Robbins: It's the finding of staff – well, just to say the signage is to be placed in the same location as the existing sign. The signage is clear, legible and attractive and it's the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The above signage is in keeping with the character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Bigham, would you like to add anything to Mr. Robbins' report?

Mr. Bigham: No.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from the members?

Mr. Comeaux: Is it internally illuminated?

Mr. Bigham: There's a cabinet there. The faces are aluminum. They route out the – there's white lamps behind them.

Mr. Robbins: And, just to be clear, the aluminum that is replaced—

Mr. Bigham: It'll be the same color, yes.

Mr. Beougher: What color is that?

Mr. Bigham: I honestly can't tell you.

Male: (Off mike, inaudible.)

Mr. Bigham: They're _____ brown. Thanks, Tim. I thought it was, but I wasn't sure.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions? (No response.) I'll entertain a motion.

Mr. Hudson: I'll move for approval.

Mr. Comeaux: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Any further comment? (No response.)

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: I would double check with the Building Department to make sure that a permit is not required for that particular type of sign. Also (inaudible.)

3. **6781 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: STEPHEN WORD, SGR RESTAURANTS (#162931). NEW SIGNAGE.

Mr. Beougher: If you could, please state your name for the record.

Mr. Dave Kincaid: I'm Dave Kincaid. I representing Wendy's franchisee owner.

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, this is Application 162931. The property is located on the south side of East Main Street, approximately halfway between Rosehill and Heinz Drive, in the CS Community Services District and it is within the Community Commercial Overlay District. They are requesting Design Board approval for the refacing of an existing monument sign, the refacing of three directional signs and that should say instead of four, two new wall signs. The Design Review Board, when the original building went through, had approved the now existing front wall sign. What they're proposing to do, they were granted a variance by the BZBA to allow signage on the sides of the building. The front signage is basically the exact same design as the side – I should say the side signage is exactly the same as the front. The existing monument sign is to be refaced and you can see this on Page 2 of the packet.

Mr. Beougher: We already approved the monument, right?

Mr. Robbins: I don't think we did.

Mr. Beougher: With the original package?

Mr. Robbins: It was my understanding when it originally went through that the signage would be picked up by a sign company who would deal with the refacing of the directional sign and the monument sign. It's all part of the application now. Again, directional signage is to be refaced, pretty standard for the Wendy's brand, and there were drawings that were submitted that show on the side of the building some signage, basically the building's designed for a small sign area. There is one thing that we have been discussing, I think – the Board has been discussing off and on, is the presence of lettering that isn't necessarily a sign, but is some type of graphic. This is something, if you recall, that Charlie's had a USDA Prime Stamp. This has one that says, "Quality that doesn't cut corners is our recipe." Then, in addition, the two actual signs on each side of the building. So, again, this question comes up.

Mr. Beougher: The actual signs have been given a variance, though?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct. The way the variance was written is to allow signage on the face of a building that does not parallel with a primary street. In this case, it would encompass all of those sign now. It gets a little bit tricky because the way we measure those is by taking the front façade of the building, if it's 80' behind the right-of-way line, then we give one square foot per linear foot. If it's more than 80', then we give two square feet per linear foot. Basically they replicated the same size of the front sign and put it to the sides, which I think is a reasonable request.

Mr. Beougher: (Inaudible.)

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. So I'm not saying they have 150 linear feet of signage or 150 linear feet on the side of the building. What they basically have is the same front building sign replicated on the sides and there's a graphic that's in addition to those signs.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Kincaid, is there anything you'd like to add to Mr. Robbins' statement?

Mr. Kincaid: No.

Mr. Comeaux: So if you add the sign and the graphics, are you within the permissible size?

(Conversation inaudible)

Mr. Robbins: It depends on how we want to interpret the code. We can look at from the standpoint that the actual wall signs that are going up, where the physical sign is being mounted, is going to be the same that's in front. Now we get into a little bit of a gray area because it's the graphic that's on the side of the building. Now if you want to take the linear foot, one square foot per linear foot of the building frontage, take the side of that and we're going to be well within that.

Mr. Beougher: I would like to interpret the code in the way that is most aesthetically appropriate and I'm not going to take a tape measure out and measure signs, but I think the signs are – they fit with the character of the design of the structure they're on, they do not overwhelm the face of the building they're on, the feature of the building they're on and they look reasonably appropriate. They do not offend my aesthetic sensibilities, if you will. Any other members have questions or comments? (No response.) In that case, I—

Mr. Comeaux: There's one note in there that says, "Side may be centered on wall for visibility." Is this the architect's that's making the note?

Mr. Kincaid: Yes, we were just trying to note that actually in this elevation they were showing it further to the south and actually the preference would be to

mount it in the center of that space. So, unfortunately, that particular elevation just had it further to the south, but we would like to be putting it in the center of that space.

Mr. Beougher: Questions, comments, opinions, motion?

Mr. Comeaux: I would move that we approve this item.

Mr. Burd: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Any further discussion? (No response.)

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: (Inaudible.)

4. **8467 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: SHELBY NIXON, SIGN VISION, CVS PHARMACY (#162937).
NEW SIGNAGE.

Mr. Beougher: Would you please state your name for the tape?

Ms. Jeannie Billar: Jeannie Billar.

Mr. Robbins: I do want to mention that there's a discrepancy between what is on the agenda in terms of the application number and what is in the Staff Report. I'll have to check and see. The application is 162931. I'm sorry, excuse me, 162937. My mistake, again.

Mr. Beougher: So it's the number on the agenda?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct. Just to be clear, application 162937 for 8467 East Main Street, CVS. The property is located on the southwest corner of Taylor Road and the East Main Street intersection. It is zoned CS, Community Services. They're requesting Design Board approval for new signage at the CVS location. Just as a bit of background, CVS is going through some rebranding and adding basically kind of a short-term (inaudible), I guess is the best way to describe it. The signage that's going up is to advertise the presence of that _____. The signage package includes the reface of one 3' x 4'9" monument sign, a new wall sign on the east measuring 2'2" x 13'8" and then a new sign on the east measuring 2'2" x 5'7", a new double face non-illuminated construction sign with vinyl overlay measuring 8' x 8' and then a new – on the south side – basically an entrance plaque (inaudible). The existing building facades are greater than 80' from the right-of-way, so the signage is considered Type B, which means we can go up to the two square feet per linear foot of building

frontage. With all the signage put together, it meets the maximum area requirements for Type B signage. The proposed signage is clear, legible and attractive and it is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted as the proposed signage is in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Robbins. Ms. Billar, would you like to add anything to the report?

Ms. Billar: No, I think that pretty much sums it up.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Any questions from the members for Ms. Billar or Mr. Robbins? (No response.)

Mr. Comeaux: I move that we approve this submission as presented.

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Hudson. Any further discussion? (No response.)

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: The signs do require building permits, so check with the Building Department to make sure everything's set to go. Any sign that goes up requires a sign permit, not including window signs.

5. **1355 BRIARCLIFF ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: E R CIMILLUCE, SIGN SHOPE INC, STICKS AND STONES
NEIGHBORHOOD BAR (#162976) NEW SIGNAGE.

Timothy: Sam's my owner. My name is Timothy _____.

Mr. Robbins: This is application 162976, for Sticks and Stones. The property is located on the west side of Briarcliff Road, south of East Main Street. It is zoned CC, but just to be clear, this is not in the Community Commercial Overlay District. This building – the property has no frontage on East Main, so it's not included in those overlay guidelines. They're requesting Design Board approval for the following signage: A post and panel sign measuring 4' x 6' and mounted on a sign measuring 10' to the top of the sign. For signage that is not within the overlay, we do have a maximum 10' of height for those signs. As far as the design and graphics of the sign goes, the signage meets the size and restrictions for Type A ground sign. Since the property does have no frontage on Main Street, it's not within the overlay. The graphic's good, the sign is clear, legible and attractive. It's the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of

Appropriateness be granted. I would like the Board to consider an appropriate height for this area. We do have a maximum 10'. Basically there's an Arby's in between this business and the street. Signs of this nature are not out of character for an area like this. There's a similar one for an insurance salesman and I think it's over 10', so it's one of the things I'd like the Board to consider is the height of this thing, if it's appropriate for the area. Following determination by the Board, staff would recommend approval.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Robbins. Timothy, do you have anything to add?

Timothy: Well, considering his heights, the reason that we were attempting the 10' height is because it is right in the midst of two parking lots, one for the Arby's and one-- So if there's vehicles parked directly in front of them as you can see in the pictures, there are parking spaces directly adjacent to the signage, our attempt is to allow the signage to be visible with vehicles parked in front of it and that stayed within the allowed height requirements of the city. So the bottom of the sign would then be 6' off the ground and the top of the sign would be a total of 10'.

Mr. Beougher: I'm thinking about bumping my head on the bottom of the sign.

Timothy: As you can see in the area – it is in an area where pedestrian traffic should not be. It's right adjacent to the provided sidewalks and it's just in a very small grassy area in between two parking areas. It's just like a dead man's island. It's not in an area where there should be any pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Beougher: Pedestrian traffic is wont to go where it shouldn't. Anyway, I'm just wondering if there shouldn't be some kind of a bar that would permit mowing, but not allow someone to go between the posts and hurt themselves.

Timothy: That is something that we could definitely add if that is your recommendation.

Mr. Beougher: For 90% of the population, it's probably not going to matter, but—

Mr. Hudson: What about some shrubbery.

Timothy: Looking at that area, I don't know, shrubbery may be a possibility. I do know we're applying for this as a permanent signage, but for all intents and purposes this is only intended to be a 3-4 month sign and then in the spring when the bar has built up some more capital, they are looking to get a little more attractive sign even than this. But because the way Design Review is and

because of the way businesses are, plans fall through. We're applying for a permanent sign, but it is truly a temporary signage just to get through the winter.

Mr. Beougher: The other potential issue is a car heading into that first parking space-- (Tape change). Any other comments? (No response.) Once again, this is outside of the Commercial Overlay area because it's not fronting Main Street. All right, I will entertain a motion.

Mr. Burd: I make a motion that we approve this.

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Any additional comments? (No response.)

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: I think you guys already have a sign permit. If not, there's a stack of them over there and check with the Building Department because they do require building permits.

6. **1349 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: PAUL HALL. ORIENTAL MARTIAL ARTS COLLEGE (#163103). SIGN REFACE.

Mr. Robbins: Application 163103. The property is located on the west side of Brice Road, south of East Main Street. The existing zoning is CC, Community Commercial and is within the overlay district. They're requesting Design Board approval for the refacing of an existing monument sign and possibly the refacing of an existing monument panel to the bottom of that there would be a digital sign. There's a couple things that I want to be clear with the Board, to make sure we're consistent in how we interpret the code. The overlay does have stipulations on what types of signage can go in there, primarily Section 1195.11(a) and (b). I'll just go ahead and read off the data. It says, (a) "In addition to all other code provisions, any new graphic or sign, other than a like-kind replacement for maintenance reasons, is subject to all the provisions of this section. (b) The following types of signs are not permitted: exposed neon, roof-mounted, monopole, rotating, signs with flashing messages or bare bulbs, changeable copy signs (except fuel pricing signage), signs on backlit awnings, off-premise signs, billboards, bench signs, and wall cabinet signs."

We've been back and forth with the applicant on the possibility of a digital sign in this area. I know the Board has seen these before, not necessarily in the overlay. There was one that we had allowed in CVS. It was to replace an existing that was already there, basically a monument sign and they were just basically doing a face change. So the applicant decided that if the Board does

consider this something that wouldn't be allowable in the overlay, that he'd be willing to basically remove this from the application and allow the Board just to vote on the graphics of the sign, the refacing. Following that, there's two parts to this, so staff asks the Board to consider Section 1195.11(b) of the code to determine if the signage as proposed meets the definition of exposed neon, flashing messages, bare bulbs or changeable copy signs. If the Board determines that the proposed digital sign meets any of the definitions in this section, staff recommends the Board request the applicant to remove the additional signage from the application. As far as the primary sign reface goes, staff would request the Board to consider how the proposed graphics and signage will fit into the existing and desired character of the area. Mr. Hall and I have been back and forth a little bit trying to get this to read a little more clear. It's a big sign, but just judging by the measurements on some of the images I've seen, we're looking at about 7' in height, is that roughly correct?

Mr. Hall: I believe so.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. So it looks to be about 12 x 7 is my guess just looking at this.

Mr. Hall: I believe that's right.

Mr. Robbins: There's a lot of lettering on there, a lot of colors, and staff would ask the Board to consider that in making a determination. Following a determination by the Board, staff would recommend approval. Do you have any comments?

Mr. Hall: If you don't mind, two comments. One is the reason that the applicant – the owner has asked to go towards this changeable sign is because it's at a height that's tall enough that makes it difficult. Right now the existing sign looks like this. It's one of those hang the letters up. It's a changeable -- I don't even know the name of it. I'm not a sign person. But, as you can see, it's not very attractive. So the idea was go ahead and clean it up and make it look more attractive. We have worked with a sign company to help us understand that we can put in a sign that would be occasionally changed but not intended to be actually a changing sign, so it's not distracting traffic on the road. So the idea is the middle of the night somebody reprograms it and then it puts up a description of another company in the shopping center.

Mr. Beougher: Right now it has Liberty Tax Service on the bottom?

Mr. Hall: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: And the top two rows are like a plastic letter sign. So the proposal is to have a digital sign that promotes one of the businesses in the center.

Mr. Hall: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: On a somewhat rotating basis once per day or week?

Mr. Hall: Once per week probably is what it would be.

Mr. Beougher: Why would that be preferable to – just asking a question – why would that be preferable to a fixed sign face that would have the businesses?

Mr. Hall: Because what happens is if you put up a fixed sign, then you'll actually have to replace that if someone else in the center has something that they're intending to promote. So you can put a fixed sign and declare the name of that business and then it's locked in until the next business decides that they want to pay the monthly fee to have that sign there. So this was intended to provide the changeability that the old technology—

Mr. Beougher: So it's an income generating device that is a way to charge the businesses for promotional—

Mr. Hall: That's my understanding and, again, I'm not the owner, so I'm just trying to understand through a language barrier.

Mr. Beougher: My concern is that we've approved LED type signs in the past and they've promised that they would never change and I drive by and they're changing, actually moving. Any other comments, questions?

Mr. Comeaux: So the digital sign, is it proposed to take the entire space of that rectangle?

Mr. Hall: It would be too costly in order to do that, so the sign that's currently being contemplated is actually shorter in height than what is shown here. It would be 22" tall and it would be 5' 6" in width.

Mr. Comeaux: So this would be text on the sign. What it's replacing is a changeable thing?

Mr. Hall: Sliding plastic, where you can hang a letter and then hang another letter and that sort of thing. So it's real old.

Mr. Comeaux: The one image that's on there in the upper left hand corner, I don't know what it is—

Mr. Hall: That's their logo. It's on the sign that's on the front of the building.

Mr. Comeaux: I just don't know that people would be able to identify that, but that's neither here nor there.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions? (No response.) Mr. Robbins, if you would. Are you recommending that they be considered as separate motions?

Mr. Robbins: Well, the way the code is stated is that we have one application there that gets an enough vote and you vote it down – you have to get all four board members, so it's all or nothing on this one. If there was some concern by the Board that the digital sign would not, in fact, pass, my guess is the applicant would likely remove it from consideration, remove it from consideration if that would be the case.

Mr. Beougher: So my take on the definition is whether or not this is including – and I'm focusing on the changeable copy signs, an exception being _____ signs. This is, in my estimation, a changeable copy sign. So, personally to me that meets the definition in 1195.11(b). Perhaps we should take a vote on members' opinion on that.

Mr. Robbins: All it takes is one who would read the definition like that.

Mr. Beougher: Is there anyone who disagrees or agrees with my interpretation of the way that reads?

Mr. Burd: I think it would be best to separate these, separate that sign out and possibly have further discussions on that, but not hang up the whole sign.

Mr. Hall: We're completely willing to do that. Part of our challenge has been we talked to the sign company about ways of blocking the lettering in so it wasn't changeable and there's not technology that lets that happen. So we didn't have an option and it doesn't seem like there's another alternative other than this old technology. So we were trying to achieve the objective of something that could be modified without having to come to the Board every time we want to put up a different sign and we just didn't know how to do that. Well, I think removing it and then seeking your guidance on how to handle the objective would be— My understanding is even if one of you believes that way, we're willing to go with the wishes. If it's not a consensus, then let's not move forward with it.

Mr. Beougher: And, Mr. Robbins, if we interpret it that way, that would require them to go before the BZBA for a variance.

Mr. Robbins: To allow changeable copy. This is a tough one, because, in my opinion, I'm agreeing with you that the way the code is written it does say changeable copy, but it's my belief that also the code is written a while ago when changeable copy referred to the actual lettering that was on the sign.

(Conversations inaudible.)

Mr. Comeaux: I think you're absolutely right about the interpretation of the language. My only flexibility would have been getting _____, replacing changeable text and it's an improvement on that, so I don't know— If you're asking me, we have a brand new sign we're going to put up, I would be completely there.

Mr. Beougher: How are you going to feel when you drive by and the Super Bowl's playing?

(Conversations inaudible.)

Mr. Comeaux: And from the point of being grandfathered in and conforming and non-conforming, we have to ask ourselves this is an existing non-conforming sign the way it is with changeable copy. With the changes to it, would you consider this lifetime maintenance and then, to that effect, is this bringing it any more into conformance than it already is? (Inaudible.) I'd like to make a motion that we approve the top portion of the sign as presented and eliminate the digital changeable text portion of the sign.

Mr. Beougher: Would it be your wish as the applicant to remove the digital copy?

Mr. Hall: Yes, please.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second to Mr. Comeaux's motion?

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Since the motion perhaps interrupted any further questions, are there any further questions or comments? (No response.) Hearing none, Mr. Robbins, would you please call the roll?

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Hall: Would you provide some suggestion or guidance in terms of how to achieve the objective and still make sure we're living up to the spirit of which you intend?

Mr. Beougher: I would-- That's a hard one. I would perhaps that you perhaps have some discussion with Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Hall: The guidance is important to us because I know you've got certain standards you're trying to hold to, but you can see our situation. We want to upgrade the quality.

Mr. Beougher: I think Mr. Robbins has a good sense of our intent and interest and he shares that interest with people in the city.

Mr. Hall: Okay, we'll come back with a separate application (inaudible).

Mr. Beougher: That's fine and the guidance, if it is a changeable copy sign, it would have to go through the BZBA.

Mr. Hall: That's fine. I'll work with Mr. Robbins.

7. **7088 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: DINA CHERNEY, SIGN GLO, ACE HARDWARE (#163023).
NEW SIGNAGE.

Ms. Dina Cherney: I'm Dina Cherney. Thank you for making this meeting possible.

Mr. Robbins: The application number is 163023. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street on the west side of Aida Drive. So this is in the former area of the TruValu Hardware Store. The request is Design Board Approval for the following signage: A new wall sign measuring approximately 7'6" by 50'. I should say 50' x 7'6". Staff has been in contact with the applicant in addition to the application. I don't know if you wanted to provide something on the monument sign?

Ms. Cherney: Did you get the email?

Mr. Robbins: I did not.

Mr. Beougher: Do the colors match with the center?

Ms. Cherney: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: So there's an existing monument sign tenant panel. There is an addition to this application that will be basically the same graphics and color you can see on the monument sign.

Ms. Cherney: TruValue's there right now, so we will just take that off.

Mr. Robbins: The sign is to be placed in the same location and use the same red background as the existing sign. The proposed signage and _____ is legible and attractive. It is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of

Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage is in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: I think the applicant, upon looking at the application, might be considering changing the color of the background, basically flipping the color of the text and background to match, so red background, white text. Ms. Cherney do you have anything to add?

Ms. Cherney: No.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions?

Mr. Hudson: Is there any signage on the side of the building since there's a street there? There's no application for it, correct?

Mr. Robbins: Correct. There's a storefront in between this building and the street, so they don't have any side frontage.

Mr. Beougher: I'm trying to judge-- The pictures are different sizes. Is it the same panel, same size?

Ms. Cherney: Well, it's going to have to be the same size, because we're using that area and that raceway. It will be the same size. It just looks bigger because of the way Ace is. I didn't pay anybody to do a field measurement.

Mr. Beougher: All right, thank you. It's just close, but I can't tell. Any other questions? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Hudson: I move to approve as presented.

Mr. Burd: I'll second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: This does require a building permit, so next step, stamped engineering drawings to the Building Department, contact Shirley down in the office and she should set you up with anything you need.

Ms. Cherney: Stamped engineer's drawings? For a wall sign?

Mr. Robbins: Uh-huh, commercial building. It requires electric work, it requires mounting hardware. (Inaudible.)

8. **8455 EAST BROAD STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: GLEN DUGGER/LIMITED BRANDS (#163067). NEW
MONUMENT SIGN.

Mr. Beougher: Please state your name for the record.

Mr. David Hodge: My name is David Hodge.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins, would you please introduce the item?

Mr. Robbins: Again, this is application #163067. The property is located on the south side of East Broad Street, west of Taylor Road. It's zoned RI, Restricted Industry. They're requesting Zoning Board approval for a new monument sign. To give the Board a little bit of background, they had gone through the BZBA to basically get a variance to allow changeable copy – I shouldn't say changeable copy – video image sign. Mr. Dugger had a very good explanation of the branding that The Limited has. You have basically a property that has 1,700 square feet of frontage along Broad Street and you have, within that property, an extraordinarily large warehouse and distribution center that had three different brands being run out of there, which is, I believe, Victoria's Secret, The Limited and Bath & Body Works. The other unit that they had is that within the fashion industry the branding is extremely important and running from one sign basically three different brands from that sign. This is the same sign that you can see --there's one right now on Morse Road that's just to the east of I-270 where they have another distribution center. So the signage itself is pretty straight forward and clear. The variance did state that they can't have any kind of abrupt change, nothing flashing, nothing moving; just basically one image that would slowly change either to black and then to another image, or one image directly into another image.

Back to the staff report, the new monument sign is to be located on the west side of the entrance drive. The LED video graphic would show changing images consisting of the company's brand and image and, again, a variance was granted by the BZBA in September of 2013 to allow a variance from Table 1181 and 1181.05(e)(3) of the zoning code to allow an increase in the maximum area of the monument sign from 100 square feet to 200 square feet and to allow the erection of signage that contains moving image illumination. I do want to say that this is a little bit different, I think, than what we've done in the past with the overlay. The overlay has specific requirements for changeable copy and _____ on the signs and the like. The Board has, in the past and the most recent example I can think of would be the church over on _____. They do have changeable copy that we limited to a certain amount of time.

(Conversations off mic.)

Mr. Robbins: A couple things to mention. It has 3700 linear feet of frontage on Broad. The closest building frontage is approximately 400' from the roadway, 460', so this building is 460' back from the road. They have pretty significant mounding that obstructs the view of that building along with landscaping on top of that mounding. The presence of the landscape buffering _____ set back from the roadway. Visibility of the building is negligible. Staff does understand the need for visibility and signage for businesses within the city. The presence of considerable landscaping, the large setback from the roadway allows visibility for signage only. The _____ signage restrictions are attractive and orderly appearances in all districts, to promote harmony and clarity with the signage and to protect the health, safety, morals and welfare of the community. The signage as proposed is larger than allowable by code, but the proposed signage does meet the intent of the signage code. Staff does have concern regarding the speed of changes for the images to be displayed on the sign. The Board has, in the past, placed restrictions on the speed of those images. Staff suggests that the applicant consider the minimum time allowable to change the image and that when the image does change it does not do so in an abrupt manner, no flashing, pulsing, anything of that nature, that it be a smooth transition from one image to the next, or fade to black and come back. The idea is not to distract people from driving. It's the finding of staff that upon those conditions and that the proposed signage is clear, legible and attractive, it is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage is in keeping with the existing code for the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area. It is the finding of staff that the signage as requested does not cause harm to the desired character of the neighborhood as set forth in the code and does not represent a burden to nearby property owners or the community as a whole. This building is so big it is the district, it is the character of the district.

Mr. Hodge: I'm with Smith & Hale, filling in for Glen Dugger this evening. There's no question that this is a unique sign. There's also no question that this is a unique property and a unique business, not just for the City of Reynoldsburg, but also for the region. They are practically worldwide in front of branding and trend setting and have established an aesthetic standard that, unfortunately, my wife adheres to as she proves to me month in and month out, especially around this time of year. So we are willing to commit to the conditions and would respectfully request that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

Mr. Robbins: I do want to mention to the Board that during the BZBA meeting, Mr. Dugger had expressed some concern with the time interval that – the maximum time interval that could be placed on there. He said the industry standard was 8 seconds. If you sat in the BZBA meeting we demonstrated how long that would be. So if you're sitting at a stop light, you might not even see the full rotation of the signs, but it's not going to be flashing—

Mr. Beougher: Well, as I drive east on Broad Street, there are a couple of billboards that change and that's probably about the interval that they do change, but it's a complete switch. It's not any movement between. Is that the concept?

Mr. Hodge: I do not know the signs specifically that you mentioned, but that's correct, but 8 seconds is the industry standard, so I would imagine that's what those signs are doing.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from the members?

Mr. Burd: Given the unique nature of the location and the sign, I would be comfortable with the 8 second interval as long as it's not an abrupt change. So personally, for me, I think this is acceptable for this location.

Mr. Comeaux: The BZBA approved the variance both as to size and the nature of the change?

Mr. Robbins: That is correct.

Mr. Hudson: I think it's a big improvement out there. I've seen these signs before and it will be nice to see it out there.

Mr. Burd: Justin, did you want us to specify in the motion the time interval of 8 seconds?

Mr. Robbins: I would be comfortable approving it with the interval of 8 seconds and we could say no animation or flashing.

Mr. Burd: With that understanding I make a motion that we approve this with the industry standard of 8 seconds being the appropriate interval between changes, also no abrupt changes, no flashing, nothing to distract drivers.

Mr. Comeaux: I will second the motion.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: A building permit is absolutely required, so the next step is to contact them and I don't know if Mr. Dugger has already filed for a sign permit or not.

Mr. Hodge: It would be the in-house architects with Limited Brands probably from here on out. Thank you all very much.

9. **1813 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: ART PENDERGAST, DONATO'S PIZZERIA, #163062. BUILDING DEMOLITION.

Mr. Beougher: Please state your name for the tape.

Mr. Art Pendergast: I'm Art Pendergast with Donato's Pizza.

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, this is Application #163062, 1813 Brice Road, Donato's Pizza is the applicant. The property is located on the west side of Brice Road midway between Radekin and East Livingston. It is zoned CC and is within the Community Commercial Overlay District. They are requesting Design Board approval for the demolition of two existing vacant commercial structures. All the adjacent properties are zoned CC Community Commercial and previously use of the commercial buildings with _____ retail.

A little bit of background and I think the applicant may want to speak a little bit to this as well. We've had something come to the Board very similar within the past couple months with the car wash. The applicant is proposing the demolition of these two commercial structures. The property was acquired by Donato's Corporation. We have an existing building to the south of the property. Staff has been in contact with the applicant to determine the eventual use and intent of the property. Applicant has stated that the long-term intent is not for this space to act as a parking lot, but for the eventual redevelopment. Part of that is basically getting rid of and prepping the site for eventual sale. The structure closest to the road will be demolished including all structural members and footings, compacted, filled, topsoil and grass is to be provided. The existing landscaping plantings are proposed to remain. Staff would ask that the Board require sod in place of seed in order to reduce the kind of immediate visual impact that seed could have, especially in the winter. The second building located to the rear of the site is to be demolished down to the footings. The building footprint will be replaced with asphalt to match the surrounding lot. It is the opinion of staff that the Board approve the Certificate of Appropriateness under the condition that sod be used instead of seed for the turf at the southeast corner of the property. It is the finding of staff that the proposed changes will not negatively impact the health, safety, morals or welfare of the community and will not adversely affect the character of the district. I do want to mention that this is a lot that is owned by Donato's and they are, from my understanding, keeping it pretty well maintained. The removal of these buildings isn't going to leave a gravel pit or lot, of swale that's open, along with the other issues that we had come across with the other project. The intent of this is redevelopment and them actually taking the footings out is, I believe, a really good step for something like that. That was kind of the thought process behind staff and some of the reason that we had that this is an appropriate move by the applicant. Do you have any comments?

Mr. Pendergast: Those buildings have been empty now roughly for almost eight years and continue to deteriorate. We've had some inquiries from people who were interested in leasing them, but not – but they do not lend themselves to the assembly use or any retail – current retail use and the requirements that would be there to redevelop these buildings. So rather than have them continue to deteriorate – we just acquired that last year. We had leased that previous to that. So now that we have it, we determined that we'd rather take them down than to maintain them as that's problematic in itself. So it's our intent to take them down and restore the surface as was mentioned, and not just to leave it back filled with gravel. Where the existing building is in the front, we'll just create just a green space there for the time being.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. I was told that the front building was previously The Ink Well and then there was either a nail or hair salon in the back. Any questions from the members?

Mr. Comeaux: Is there a drive across the property?

Mr. Pendergast: In the rear there's cross access here and then out there. There's also cross access across this parcel.

Mr. Comeaux: But we're not worried about people using this as a cut-through to other properties?

Mr. Pendergast: We're really not changing the nature of what happens along that regard now. For our current business our dumpster enclosures are down here and we're not really changing anything along those lines.

Mr. Hudson: Is this going to be additional parking for you over here?

Mr. Pendergast: There's parking along one side of that now, but we don't intend to restripe it or redesign it as parking. There's parking not only there, but in this lot that's in the back.

(Conversations off mic.)

Mr. Beougher: What is the business to the south?

Mr. Pendergast: Right at the corner, it used to be a BP Auto Repair. It's still an auto repair.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Any other questions? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Comeaux: I move that we approve the demolition of these two structures as described in the proposal with the caveat that they use sod.

Mr. Hudson: I second.

Mr. Beougher: Any further discussion? (No response.)

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted “yes.” Mr. Burd voted “yes.” Mr. Comeaux voted “yes.” Mr. Hudson voted “yes.”)

Mr. Robbins: The Building Department does have a demolition permit. I think the next step would be to contact _____. I believe in the State of Ohio building demolition is treated somewhat as building alteration. I believe they have specific paperwork to deal with.

(Conversations off mic.)

D. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Beougher: With no further business before us, I will adjourn the meeting at 7:51 p.m.

Lane Beougher, Chair

Justin Robbins, Planning Administrator

This document transcribed by:
Area East Secretarial Service
7668 Slate Ridge Blvd.
Reynoldsburg OH 43068