

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
NOVEMBER 6, 2014
6:30 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER – Meeting called to order at 6:35 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Mr. Lane Beougher
Mr. Nathan Burd
Mr. James Comeaux
Mr. Hudson

Members Absent: Mr. Pat Zollars

Others Present: Ms. Megan Moeller

2. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2014 MINUTES

Chairman Beougher: Next item on the agenda is approval of the October 2, 2014 minutes which were very interesting. Are there any corrections to the minutes?

(Man speaking off microphone.)

Mr. Beougher: Not unless we want to monkey with page 28.

Mr. Burd: Everything I wanted to see is in there.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Well, I think it breaks some records. So hearing no amendments, they will stand approved as distributed.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Beougher: Next item on the agenda is Public Comment. Is there anyone who would like to address an item that is not on tonight's agenda? If so, please approach the lectern and this is your opportunity. Seeing no one rushing forward, we will move on to Item A4, Swearing in of Speakers.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

(Mr. Beougher administers oath.)

B OLD BUSINESS – None

C NEW BUSINESS

1. 2087 BALTIMORE/REYNOLDSBURG ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO. APPLICANT: DANTE SIGN COMPANY FOR VAPORFI. SIGNAGE #166927

Mr. Beougher: Would you please approach the lectern and say your name for the record?

Mr. Logan Diltz: My name's Logan Diltz with Danite Sign Company.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Diltz. Meagan, would you please introduce the item?

Ms. Moeller: I will do the presentation first and then I will pull up the slides. This is for 2087 Baltimore/Reynoldsburg Road. It is for Vaporfi, Application #166927 for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the west side of Baltimore/Reynoldsburg Road, south of Stone Trail Way. The existing zoning is CS which is Community Services. The request is for Design Review Board approval for a new wall sign. The current use is retail.

The proposal is approval for a new wall sign measuring approximately 7'4" x 18" proposed to be internally illuminated channel letters. The colors are proposed to be green and white. Some existing site and context: The length of the primary frontage is approximately 25'. The store front is approximately 140' away from the right-of-way and the previous business was a camera store.

Staff review and recommendations: The proposed signage is clear, legible and attractive and it is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage is keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Ms. Moeller. Mr. Diltz, do you have anything else to add to the presentation?

Mr. Diltz: Yeah, I do kind of. Got kind of an interesting situation here. We were actually fabbing the small letters here this morning and we were having some issues with them, so we're hoping that we can modify it a little bit to instead of do the individual letters, to do a channel cabinet that we see on the second page. Then on the third page it's got more detailed dimensions and stuff.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so the size has not changed overall?

Mr. Diltz: No. The overall size would be the same.

Mr. Beougher: Actually $\frac{3}{4}$ " shorter and 4" longer because of the channel cabinet.

Mr. Diltz: Yeah, the channel cabinet would actually be about the same size. The actual copy would shrink a little bit because you have to have some room around the edge, but everything else is about the same size.

Mr. Beougher: Ms. Moeller, does that still fit within the allowable area?

Ms. Moeller: Cabinet signs are prohibited in the City of Reynoldsburg. Why did you guys want to change it?

Mr. Diltz: It's not really a cabinet. It's actually just like a large channel letter with the trim cap the same. The same way you would make the "V" in Vaporfi. It's exactly the same thing, it's just smaller, longer and you put vinyl lettering on it. I wasn't sure how you would classify it. We call it a channel capsule.

Ms. Moeller: Yeah, I think I would consider this a cabinet style sign because it's not just a sign face. It would actually have stuff inside of it in terms of lighting, I'm assuming.

Mr. Diltz: Yeah, it would be internally illuminated.

Ms. Moeller: I think it would have been wise to stay with the channel letters on this one. I don't know what you want to do.

Mr. Diltz: That was our intention, and we think that the channel letters, the individual letters definitely look better, but we – they're so small we just couldn't get the trim cap and everything to fit right and it just wasn't turning out right. So in order to keep the – because they really need the E cigarettes and custom blends to kind of explain what Vaporfi is. They do some unique things there that not everyone really knows about and if you just see Vaporfi, you don't necessarily know exactly what the business is. So we really wanted to keep that, but the only we can do that and fit within the space is if we do to a channel cabinet like that.

Mr. Robbins: This was a difficult one for us and the Board to kind of look at, because you have the character of a cabinet, which is basically a giant square/rectangular box and there's a piece of Lexan that's tossed in there and moved around. This one, I think, is a lot smaller and it does include channel letters, but I agree with you because, to some extent, it very much feels like-- Is this piece of Lexan, is it removable? Could you plop in something else right there?

Mr. Diltz: Yeah, it would be the same way any other channel letter face could be removable.

Mr. Beougher: So on this strip center we have some – don't we have some wood plaque-type signs with—

Mr. Diltz: Yeah, there's multiple different – kind of all over the place with the signs in this center.

Mr. Beougher: So I guess my question is do you have to see the smaller text at night? In other words, could it be a non-illuminated sign that you would only see during the day and then, as you drive by, you'd see the Vaporfi but you've driven past it 100 times and you know what it means?

Mr. Diltz: Potentially, yeah. We could definitely make these letters out of PVC or something non-illuminated. That's definitely an option.

Mr. Beougher: Is staff more comfortable with that approach?

Mr. Robbins: Very much.

Ms. Moeller: Yeah.

Mr. Beougher: I think that's probably your best option unless you can fabricate the individual letters.

Mr. Diltz: Gotcha.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from the members? I'm sorry, are you done with your discussion?

Mr. Diltz: Yes, that's all I had.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from the members?

Mr. Comeaux: Would you want them to have external lighting, like gooseneck or anything like that? I can't remember what the other signage is in that plaza.

Mr. Beougher: I believe there is already—

Mr. Robbins: Right above it there are existing – not really gooseneck, but like fluorescents that kind of shine down on it.

Mr. Comeaux: So even if you're driving by at night, you'd still have some external illumination on it.

Mr. Diltz: I would still want to keep the internally illuminated Vaporfi. We'd have to see how it would look with the Vaporfi letters lit up and the additional light shining on it. It might look kind of silly, I'm not real sure.

Mr. Beougher: I'm wondering how accurate you could be if you taped off part of the fluorescent lights. Anyway, just direct to the bottom part of the sign. So I suggested an approach. Are you comfortable with that approach and trying to use the existing lighting or not? I know you'd rather do the other.

Mr. Robbins: If you direct your attention to the monitor, this building is symmetrical and you guys are at one end with the previous Cord Camera and this is the other end. You have 5 Bean Coffee and then the nails, both of those have illumination from the outside and both are kind of non-illuminated panels. So it looks like the way the architecture's already set up, that's something that's very much an option if that's something you would be keen on doing rather than having outside illuminate and then inside illumination for the sign as well, which could be problematic.

Mr. Diltz: We had originally proposed that to the clients, but the Vaporfi is a franchise and they have very strict sign requirements. They've kind of forced us to go with the internally illuminated and the landlord-- I mean there are other signs in there that are channel letters, so it does fit with the other signs, but they definitely would prefer the internal illuminated letters.

Mr. Comeaux: So you have talked to the landlord about it?

Mr. Diltz: Yeah, the landlord approved all this stuff.

Mr. Beougher: I've been here too long, because originally the concept for the signage for this entire center was they would all have the same sign as the 5 Bean Coffee and the nails. I think Original Mattress Factory was the first one to use individual letters and we approved it with some hesitation. Then Cord Camera came in. So that's kind of the weird history. I guess I'm not certain where we are on the concept for the smaller letters. I know you haven't talked to your client. Where are we with your comfort level on what we can approve or what we've indicated we would approve? Have we indicated what we're going to approve?

Mr. Robbins: As far as the individual letters go for the bottom portion, the smaller letters, if it was non-illuminated, I'm very comfortable with that. As far as the channel letters go, I'm going to leave that decision to the Board because in one instance you have an existing business in that same spot with illuminated channel letters. So they're basically coming in with, to some extent, what's already there. On the other side of it, we have two businesses at the opposite end of the building kind of with the same signage that was originally intended for it. So I think that's a question for the Board.

Mr. Beougher: My question to you is are you comfortable with that approach of having a non-illuminated sign below the Vaporfi logo?

Mr. Diltz: I think my client would be okay with that. Yeah, I don't think he'd have an issue with that.

Mr. Beougher: Is the Board comfortable with that approach and can I get a motion?

Mr. Comeaux: I'll make a motion that we approve the sign with the Vaporfi lettering as presented in the initial presentation and the lettering "E Cigarettes plus Custom Blends" will be in non-illuminated PVC and if there's external lighting available, that is fine as well.

Mr. Beougher: That's quite a motion, Mr. Comeaux. Is there a second?

Mr. Burd: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Any further discussion? (No response.) Ms. Moeller, would you please call the roll?

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

Mr. Robbins: With every sign that's built in this city, if it's something that has to be bolted to the building or involves electric, it does require a building permit. So the task of this Board is to approve what's allowable to go in and the Building Department is going to issue building permits which you'll have to apply for if you have not done so already. In addition, every sign that goes up requires a sign permit, basically giving the final go-ahead and a resubmission of any changes that you've made to that sign permit. That's approved through the Zoning Department and that's something we can get out in a couple days.

2. 7366 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:
APPLICANT: BETH LONG FOR R.A. LONG PAINTING. SIGNAGE. #167085

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

Mr. Richard Long: My name is Richard Long, obviously not Beth Long. We own the R.A. Long Painting Company, 7366 East Main Street.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Long. Ms. Moeller, would you please introduce this item?

Ms. Moeller: This is for 7366 East Main Street. It's for R.A. Long Painting, Application #167085 for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street east of Lancaster Avenue. The existing zoning is CC which is Community Commercial, and is located within the Historic District. The request is for Design Review Board approval to reface two awning signs measuring 24" x 48", which is the graphic containing the business name and the proposed signs are to be finished with vinyl. The signs are proposed to be installed on the two awnings adjacent to the primary structure. The sign to the west of the primary entrance is proposed to include their business name and website and the sign to the east sign of the primary entrance is to include their business name and phone number.

So for some existing site and context, the property is zoned CC and is within the Historic District. The former business also had signs on both of their awnings.

Mr. Beougher: As did the business before that.

Ms. Beougher: Exactly. Just for some review and recommendations, for the sign material, although it's proposed to be vinyl and not technically natural in nature, staff feels that it's an acceptable use because it's on an awning, it's not a sign itself. I think it's probably the best choice in terms of putting it on the awning. In terms of the number of signs, Section 1194.12(f) states that "businesses shall be permitted one wall or awning sign." Staff would like the Board to make a determination regarding whether the number of signs being proposed is keeping with the character of the district. The proposed signage would reface the two existing awning signs and staff finds that this is an allowable modification. I think it's probably a little better if it's symmetrical on both awnings as opposed to just one. It's been there – previous businesses had the same thing. So following a determination by the Board, it is the determination of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage is keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Long, would you have anything to add to the staff report?

Mr. Long: I was having a little trouble hearing her. Was she saying that you're okay with it or you're not okay with it?

Mr. Beougher: Well, that's for us to decide. Staff is okay with it and I'm looking at the picture. It looks like one of the signs will be blocked by the hanging baskets. Those are pretty robust hanging baskets.

Mr. Long: Which, by the way, are taken down at the end of October, which I have no problem with.

Mr. Beougher: So anything you'd like to add to Ms. Moeller's report?

Mr. Long: First of all, I apologize for the-- We own the building. Avidia moved out and we, in haste, moved in and it sounds as if my wife and I readily changed the signs Times Roman. It's something we've used in the vicinity here for 20 years. We didn't mean to upset the apple cart here. The canopy was put up by Dante Sign, the fellow that was just here. The canopy itself is very nice, brand new, four grand. We didn't really feel like replacing the awning because it was just about brand new. So we did it as tastefully and tactfully as we possibly could. There are also two units. We have an upper and lower level. That's why we want to hold on to the two awnings there, because we could potentially have two tenants. So I can tell you that we're buying another property. I don't know how long we'll be there. I'm sure the next tenant that comes in will replace the awning and do a Jim Dandy job. So I apologize for doing things a little backwards here. We're owners and don't do it every day.

Mr. Beougher: So, Mr. Long, are you occupying the building for your business or are you still on Taylor Road?

Mr. Long: We sold Taylor Road and we're doing another place.

Mr. Beougher: But, in the meantime, you're here?

Mr. Long: In the meantime we own that building, so we just decided to occupy our own building. I'm not sure how long we'll be here and hopefully things will work out with a new tenant shortly.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions for Mr. Long from staff?

Mr. Robbins: I actually just have one. Can you flip back to the other slide? I think just from an understandability point, but where it says [www.RALong Painting?](http://www.RALongPainting.com) If you had the option to change it, it would make more sense to have [RA Long Painting.com](http://RALongPainting.com).

Mr. Long: You're probably right about that. We might be able to arrange to have something along those lines but, again, I don't believe we'll be here that long but, yeah, you're probably right. We should have brought it in beforehand, but in haste we installed it.

Mr. Beougher: It's not the first time. Any other questions? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Burd: I'll make a motion that we approve this item as submitted and also approve any text changes to the web domain if he chooses to do that.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second?

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

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

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

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Long, and since the awnings are already installed, I guess you don't get the lecture.

Mr. Robbins: A visit to DRB is not complete without a lecture. If you've not do so already, a sign permit's going to be required. We'll consider this a reface. I do want to mention that if those awnings were put up, I would check with the Building Department to make sure that the proper permits are pulled for those, because I know sometimes they do require building permits for awnings. It's probably up to the contractor, but I would just double check.

Mr. Long: Okay, will do. Danite did it and they were permitted, but I will double check. Then we did get occupancy and they wanted a building permit for occupancy, so we did recently pull that.

3. 7524 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO;
APPLICANT: BETTY SMITH FOR *IT TAKES A VILLAGE LEARNING CENTER*.
MINOR SITE PLAN, APPLICATION #167387.

Mr. Beougher: Folks, could you please state your names for the record and we'll have Ms. Moeller introduce the item.

Ms. Betty Smith: Betty Smith.

Mr. Gene Johnson: I'm Gene Johnson. Betty is the owner-operator of It Takes a Village Learning Center, has been for 11 years, at the location of 7458 East Main Street.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Ms. Moeller, would you please introduce the item?

Ms. Moeller: This is for 7524 East Main Street. It's for It Takes A Village Learning Center and it's for exterior modifications. The application number is 167387 for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street, west of South Waggoner Road. The existing zoning is CC, Community Commercial and is within the Historic District. The current use is vacant/recreation. There's a jazz studio that was there. The proposal includes a request for Design Review Broad approval for the following signage: A new wall

sign measuring 2' x 14'. The sign is proposed to be located above the main entrance on the south face of the building. The sign is proposed to be cabinet style and internally illuminated. The proposed colors include a brown background with white text and multicolored graphics. A wall sign relocation is the second one, measuring 2.5' x 18'. The sign is proposed to be shifted to the left of the existing location. And the last one is a new monopole ground sign measuring approximately 9' in height with a 15 square foot sign face. The sign is to be double-faced and internally illuminated and the proposed colors include brown background with white text and multicolored graphic. So that's the first portion of it.

And then it looks like we were submitted some additional information at the beginning of this meeting. So I'll just read it over what staff had from the previous and then you have can have Ms. Smith and Mr. Johnson talk about it. So the request is for Design Review Board approval for the following exterior modifications: Installation of either wrought iron or chain link fencing to border a proposed play area connected to the east side of the building. The installation of a door to the east side of the building is the second modification.

So I will move on to the review and recommendations. Looking at the exterior modifications for the fencing, the application provided two types of fences, wrought iron and chain link to staff. Section 1194.07(k) states that chain link fences are not permitted in the Historic District, however staff finds that the wrought iron style is acceptable so long as it does not exceed 4' in height. Looking at the wall and monument signs, staff has some concerns regarding new monument sign as they are not in conformance with the code in regards to the style, material, illumination, height and number of signs. I'll go over each of these.

In terms of the sign style, just as we had said previously, cabinet style signs are strictly prohibited in the City of Reynoldsburg. Looking at the sign material, Section 1194.12 of the code states that all signs in the Historic District shall be constructed of traditional and natural materials. The applicant is proposing to install an aluminum cabinet for the wall sign and an aluminum frame for the monument sign, which is not considered a traditional or natural material. Looking at illumination, the signs are proposed to be internally illuminated and Section 1181.02(c)(2) states that internally illuminated signs are not permitted in the Historic District. In regard to the monument sign height, the monument sign is proposed to be approximately 9' in height, exceeding the required maximum sign height of 6', so it's exceeding it by 3'. Regarding the number of signs, applicant has proposed two wall signs for the business which exceeds the one sign per business requirement as stated in Section 1194.12(f). Looking at the relocated wall sign, as I said before, all signs in the Historic District shall be constructed of traditional, natural materials with the exception of non-conforming signs. So the Board should inquire of the applicant regarding the materials of the existing sign. Section 1181.05(f) states that a non-conforming sign shall not be

structurally relocated or replaced unless it is brought into compliance with the code. If the existing sign is aluminum, it must be brought into compliance upon relocation.

Moving on to the recommendations, following a determination by the Board, it is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be tabled so the applicant can address the following concern from staff: specifying the style and location of the proposed fencing, which you did give us some additional information which I appreciate; provide a site plan that illustrates the extent of parking spaces that would be removed due to the proposed exterior modifications, and, finally, to bring the proposed signage into conformance with the Historic District code by modifying the proposed sign material, style and height.

Mr. Robbins: There's a couple of things I want to go over as well with the site plan that was just submitted. One of the issues and one of the reasons we had you go through a minor site plan is because you're manipulating the number of parking spaces within the parking lot and you're changing the ingress and egress of some portions of this plan. Now I understand that it was an existing bank so you have, basically, a defunct bank teller and that portion is now going over to outdoor play area for the kids. So it looks like the amount of parking spaces that you're taking up are now being replaced on the side of the building in front of the bank teller. Is that correct?

Mr. Johnson: That's correct.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. I think that's definitely a very good move in the right direction. One thing I want to clarify as well with the monument sign. We had talked about this in the BZBA meeting as well.

Mr. Johnson: I want to make sure there's no confusion. There will not be a freestanding pole like that at all. That will actually be integrated as it shows in the bottom left picture, so it will be two poles made to look like one. The sign manufacturer said that the existing pole could stand some additional tweaking up anyway, so he suggested this pole would be side-by-side with the other one but wrapped as it is now, so that it will only look like one pole. So this picture that you all see right here, it will appear to be one sign. It will be, in fact, one sign. We notch this corner on the sign to match the notched corner on the existing sign.

Mr. Robbins: One of the issues that we have is we have area requirements, area maximums for signage. So this existing sign that's here, not the one that you're showing, but the dashed-in one right now we consider existing, non-conforming, so it's in violation of our current maximum height and our current area. The addition of a sign – and this is actually pretty clever because it's now considered one sign if it's joined in there. I think, again, we're adding signage when we're already over on the area, so that's another main concern.

I'm going to skip ahead as well to the front wall sign. I want to be clear on what that is existing and what you guys are planning to do. So if I understand, it's an existing fascia sign, is that correct? So there's an existing backlit channel that extends the length of the building and there's basically pieces of Lexan or PVC that come out and get replaced, is that correct?

Mr. Johnson: Are we on the face of the bank building now? Yeah. The cabinet is gone, but my understanding when the bank had it there was a sign there, I'm told. That cabinet there will be identical to the cabinets on the other strips —other photos that you have there, same material, same everything, so it will look like they were all done at the same time.

Mr. Beougher: The BZBA did not approve any variance related to the signage?

Mr. Robbins: Correct. Let me give the Board a little background as well, just so everyone's up to speed on what's happening. Mr. Johnson and Ms. Smith came through the BZBA at the last meeting. They were denied the Special Exception. They appealed to Council and Council approved it at the next meeting. So that occurred the week prior to this past Monday, so you guys had a very short amount of time. We wanted to make sure to give them a chance to come in and talk to the DRB without waiting a full other month ahead of that. So I think that's important to make sure that when people are allowed to come in there, given due process, I guess. We haven't had a whole lot of chance, I think, to review this to the fullest extent and I think that—

Mr. Johnson: Well, this sign proposal was submitted several weeks ago. It hasn't changed. We'd like to work with _____ and Meagan. We want it to be exactly the same as the other _____.

Mr. Robbins: Can you pull up the street image? To your knowledge, the wall cabinet sign, is it the same dimension and area as the ones that are existing?

Mr. Johnson: Exactly. And, Meagan, I think you remember, we wanted to make sure there would be no issues on dimensions or anything. I think we're perfectly conforming with the size and shape of that.

Mr. Beougher: So you're conforming to the size and shape of the non-conforming sign?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah and I think this is where it gets a little tricky and we're going to have some guidance from the Board. Our code does stipulate that all signs in the Historic District, wall signs at least, have to be traditional natural material, they can't be interior illuminated. The problem I see is that we have a building that has an existing array of signage and I'm wondering—

Mr. Beougher: Which is all not in compliance with our code.

Mr. Robbins: Right.

Mr. Johnson: Well, I assumed when Edwards Investments were in there, cause it's not been that long ago, or Tyler's Bakery, did they have – did you have any issues with their signs, cause they're doing the same thing.

Mr. Beougher: I'm assuming, and I would have probably been here, that they had cabinet signs that were not taken down. They were left. They were just refacing existing non-conforming signs.

Mr. Johnson: Right. And the cabinet that was here is still available, but Mike Ploy said it's not worth saving. He has it.

Mr. Beougher: But the fact that it was taken down is the problem. Let me just-- Can you zoom in on the wall area to the right of the-- Yeah. What-- There's some discoloration over to the far right behind the red pickup truck, like there was a sign or something there, or maybe it's just—

Mr. Johnson: Oh, I don't know. When the bank moved out, they did quite a bit of brickwork in the back.

Mr. Beougher: I bet there was an ATM there or something. So what I'm seeing there as an architect is a big vast expanse of brick that would be a perfect canvas for a nice conforming sign.

Mr. Johnson: So you're suggesting that we have a sign right there that's different from all the rest of them? That doesn't make much sense to me.

Mr. Beougher: Well, you have a wall that's different from everybody else's too, but it would be in compliance with the current code if it were of natural materials and so forth and so on.

Mr. Johnson: Well, we could just have Mike rebuild the sign that was there, the same shape and dimensions as the one we proposed.

Mr. Beougher: But it's not there, that's the problem.

Mr. Johnson: We thought there would be a whole lot less questions. We can put it on the brick there if you want. We anticipated concerns about the sign being different than the ones that are all along the front of the center. _____, she wanted to be sure it matched the other cabinets.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, questions from the members at this point?

Mr. Comeaux: So there's another sign on the other side of the building? Is that correct?

Mr. Johnson: On the back side of the building, on the strip that runs north from the bank building. Right there. There's a Jazzercise sign there now. We're just going to reuse that cabinet.

Mr. Beougher: So that's an existing cabinet?

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Mr. Beougher: So let's talk about that for a minute. That cabinet is in a current location and, as I read the staff report, if that is relocated then it has to conform to the current code. Is that correct? So they would be better served to leave it where it is and reface it—

Mr. Johnson: We could do that, but I think, Mr. Beougher, it's a little bit to the right of being centered off of two storerooms. There's a former insurance office here and a former Jazzercise there. We thought it was more aesthetically pleasing to center the sign, just slide it a little bit to the south.

Mr. Beougher: I won't disagree, but the fact that you take it down and put it back up again, that's where the code kicks in.

Mr. Johnson: Maybe we can just slide it over.

Mr. Comeaux: So will your clients be entering under both of the signs? Is that the plan? Parents and children, sorry.

Mr. Johnson: They'll be coming in on the main entrance on the face of the bank building.

Mr. Comeaux: The one that faces Main Street?

Mr. Johnson: Correct.

Mr. Robbins: There's an access road that comes from the shopping center to the east, so anybody coming there could get a good view of the sign that's existing. You know, that's a tricky one that we haven't come across yet, because if you have, let's say, three existing businesses, each with their own sign, each allowable by code in terms of number and you have one that expands into the other ones, all of a sudden they're, to some extent, not conformance because they're allowed one wall sign.

Mr. Beougher: So, Mr. Robbins, when you say it's an access road, it's not a legitimate dedicated street?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Johnson: No, but if you're westbound on Main Street, you see that area right there on the north portion of the strip center.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, enough about signs, let's talk about fence.

Mr. Johnson: Well, should we resolve the sign thing?

Mr. Beougher: Let's talk about the fence and see what percolates.

Mr. Robbins: I'm going to turn the lights back on, because there was a site plan that was submitted that I think has a little more detail.

Mr. Beougher: All right, so the fence. So what you gave us tonight shows the layout of the fence, the fenced playground area of 1,400-and-something square feet.

Mr. Johnson: No. There are three small playgrounds, the total is something over 4,000 square feet. That includes the area—

Mr. Beougher: The stippling is driving me crazy.

Mr. Comeaux: I think it says 3440.

Mr. Robbins: I would agree.

Mr. Comeaux: Sir, on the site plan you just gave us today, there's a shaded area and it says fenced playground and I think Mr. Beougher was reading that as 1440 and I believe it's 3,440. Is that what you were referring to?

Mr. Robbins: That's what I read as well.

Mr. Johnson: The drawing's accurate. I'm not sure the mathematics are.

Mr. Comeaux: So you're saying it's about 4,000 square feet.

Mr. Johnson: Yes. We have certain requirements, as you all know, in dealing with Family Services. The fence we would have preferred to use was this one right here, which is also wrought iron, but it's one rail at the top but it's only made 36" high and we're required to have 48-54". So the one we selected was this one down here, it's two rail.

Mr. Comeaux: So these posts – we’ve had this question a couple times with some childcare centers that have come through. So this fence is going to be along an area where cars will be driving back and forth, right?

Mr. Johnson: Correct.

Mr. Comeaux: So the posts are just aluminum posts?

Mr. Johnson: Yes. They’re on display at Menard’s. They’re very sturdy and have a very good base, and that’s our concern, too. Kids get rough. We want to be sure that they don’t tear up the fence.

Mr. Comeaux: Well, I’m more concerned about a car coming from, say Donato’s, around the corner to Tyler’s for instance. If you pick up cookies and pizza on the same night as somebody might, and a car hitting it. I don’t know the specifications and I don’t know if there’s any curbing that’s being proposed to keep the cars, or whether that’s a concern to anyone else.

Mr. Robbins: This has come up a lot of times in retail type settings where there is a playground that could potentially be in conflict with cars and, in the past, the Board has required the installation of bollards that could basically withstand the impact of a car. Like Mr. Comeaux says, if somebody goes to the Quik Stop and keeps on going, that could be a potential issue, or tries to go to the bank.

Mr. Johnson: The drive-thru area, the former bank drive-thru is – I guess you’d call them bollards – big heavy steel posts that had rubber mounted on the sides of them. A truck could hit those and they’re not going anywhere. The only area that you’re talking about would be if a car came back through here and suddenly just turned left and drove through the fenced area. That’s the only area there that would be vulnerable to some vehicle.

Mr. Robbins: So if you look at the drawing that you had submitted, where we had the fenced playground area, the part that had the stippling, against the bank teller we have 44’ 10”. Roughly half of that is taken up by the actual teller window, correct, and that’s the part with the concrete bollards. So we’re left with about 22’ of that fence line and it extends down 46’ 3” and then back 30’. I don’t know if the 30’ is that much of a concern, but, in my mind, if you look down on the image, there’s the aisleway that basically dead ends directly into that playground. And my guess is that’s what the Board will have concern with and, in the past, that’s what’s been of concern as well. Do you see what I’m talking about. I’m going to come down and show you real quick.

(Mr. Robbins and Mr. Johnson talking off microphone.)

Mr. Robbins: Again, it's something that's typically brought up in the BZBA and sometimes required, but this situation's a little bit different.

Mr. Beougher: So looking at the samples of fence material, which product are you proposing?

Mr. Johnson: The one that has the checkmark.

Mr. Beougher: So the arched gate with the flat top spans. Are the gates marked? Maybe there's not a gate section.

Mr. Johnson: Do you have that sheet I just turned in this evening?

Mr. Beougher: Yes. There's an arched gate inset. I'm assuming you're not going to use the gate.

Mr. Johnson: There will either be two or three gates.

Ms. Moeller: It appears one of the gates is on – if you're looking just down on the images on the east, it's the very east.

Mr. Beougher: I see it.

Mr. Johnson: These are three separate playgrounds.

Mr. Beougher: I see one at the northwest corner, that 30' span by the building, and I see one at the southwest corner under the bank drive-thru. So there are two that I see. Okay, so we're talking about the flat top with another horizontal bar immediately below it and the arched gates would be at those two locations.

Mr. Johnson: Kind of yet to be determined exactly where the gates will be.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, good enough. I much prefer that type of fencing than anything with something sharp and pointy at the top.

Mr. Johnson: Oh, that's illegal. We can't even think about that. I did a little tour of the city, the existing childcare centers, rather shocking. The fencing leaves a lot to be desired. But this certainly – I mean obviously it's going to cost a lot and we'd love to do vinyl coated black chain link, but I'm sure that would meet with resistance from the standpoint of the historical area. We're trying to be as historically correct as possible, just Grandview, Bexley, German Village that's where you see all these wrought iron fences.

Mr. Beougher: Well, this is definitely an improvement over chain link, vinyl coated or not.

Mr. Johnson: It costs three times as much.

Mr. Robbins: You can recycle it when you're done. It's aluminum.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, questions from the members about the fence?

Mr. Johnson: We can try if you want, what do you call them?

Mr. Beougher: Bollards, b-o-l-l-a-r-d-s.

Mr. Johnson: If you want one at the angled fence area, from a safety standpoint, we could put one in there and just paint it black so it would just kind of disappear in the fence.

Mr. Hudson: I was thinking one isn't enough. I'm looking at where O'Toole's is and there's a few drinkers that come out of there and—

Mr. Beougher: Well, hopefully they're not doing it during daycare hours.

Mr. Hudson: Oh, trust me. But making that turn there, I would say at minimum two of those bollards.

Mr. Johnson: Let's point out that's not where they exit. They exit further east. There's another drive.

Mr. Hudson: Oh, I know there's another drive, but you can go down to the end and turn there and go out. I'd hate to see somebody drive into that fence and just miss that one bollard. I'd say two of them would be better.

Mr. Johnson: Well, the drunks probably aren't out driving around during daycare hours cause we close at 6:00.

Mr. Hudson: Well, they're open early.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, any other questions on the fence issue? (No response.) A lot to take in. So let's go through the staff recommendations one-by-one, and you probably don't have the staff report, but there are some bullet points: "Specify the style and location of the proposed fencing." You have done that. "Provide a site plan that illustrates the extent of parking spaces that would be removed." I think we're losing a net of four—

Mr. Robbins: A net of one. They are taking up four of them and replacing three. Since we don't have parking requirements specifically for day-

cares, it's extraordinarily difficult to do a parking calculation, however I think a loss of one is very acceptable.

Mr. Beougher: You need more in the morning and in the afternoon, during rush hour.

Mr. Johnson: I mean there's all kinds of parking behind these building, too.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so two down. The last one's the issue: "Bring the proposed signage into conformance with the Historic District code, by modifying the proposed sign material, style and height. So that's where we run into some difficulty.

Mr. Johnson: I'm a little surprised that I didn't hear any of that from you guys before this, because we thought we were doing absolutely the perfect plan by matching the existing.

Mr. Robbins: Well, this is something that I did bring up at the BZBA meeting with the second sign, the monument sign. I honestly don't know the best way to go about addressing that. As far as this was concerned, it was my understanding that this was an existing sign cabinet, so that was a misunderstanding, I think, on our part. I didn't quite realize that it was being replaced.

Mr. Johnson: Well, I thought it was too. In fact, Megan asked me and I said it's not there so we need another permit. So I called and I got the thing but it sat there for a long time, for years on the bank, and he said I just duplicated it for the new one. So we bought another permit then, because it wasn't just a replacement, even though it's the exact same size and shape.

Mr. Beougher: What was the bank that was in there and what sign did they have?

Mr. Johnson: State Savings Bank. They were there for a long time. They had something here and it's still laying in the yard over on 5th Avenue at Columbus Sign Company. There was something here, I can't tell you what it was. I'm guessing it may have had something to do about the ATM.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so Mr. Robbins and Ms. Moeller, let me ask what we can approve. I'm presuming that we can approve a refacing of the existing sign on the east facing wall, provided it stays where it's at.

Mr. Robbins: Correct. And you have two sign cabinets there right now, correct, within your single storefront on the east side? The Jazzercise sign and isn't there another one there?

Mr. Johnson: (Inaudible – off microphone.) Beougher, you of all people, I thought you would have said, “I need you to move that Jazzercise sign over so it’s centers over the two storerooms that are involved.

Mr. Beougher: If we didn’t have a sticky code issue, I would.

Mr. Johnson: Well, of course you would. It’s what is aesthetically pleasing. It’s the correct way to balance the face of the strip center.

Mr. Beougher: You would need to go back to the BZBA and request variances on the two signs to-- Is that correct? We can’t approve them is what I’m saying.

Mr. Robbins: It gets tricky because the way our zoning works is if something’s existing, it’s basically allowed to stay there in its current form. You can’t change the code and then force everybody to do it. But once it is removed, once it’s taken down, then all of a sudden whatever’s put back up has to be in conformance and I think that’s what a lot of the issues are stemming from with this discussion tonight.

Mr. Johnson: I think you guys are splitting hairs over that because we’re going with the State Farm sign. It’s no longer there. We’re just moving – we’re making it much more aesthetically correct, Mr. Beougher, by putting the—

Mr. Beougher: But it’s outside the scope of our ability to approve is what I’m telling you, Mr. Johnson, thank you. You would need to go back to the BZBA and apply for a variance for the relocation and for the additional sign cabinet for nonconforming signs and that’s what I think the staff report is saying. If you left the one cabinet sign in place and just refaced it, we can approve that tonight.

Mr. Robbins: And there’s two on the east side. I mean those are existing. Those can both be refaced.

Mr. Beougher: Which makes no sense, right?

Mr. Robbins: It doesn’t, but it’s allowable.

Mr. Beougher: It’s really dark on the photo. Where are the two current ones? I see the Jazzercise sign with the arrow in the bottom photo there.

Mr. Johnson: We’re proposing to reduce the amount of square feet of signage on the north building on the east wall to the remaining sign which is Jazzercise.

Mr. Beougher: So you’re eliminating one of the cabinet signs that’s there now.

Mr. Johnson: The State Farm sign.

Mr. Robbins: Can you see the image on the screen?

Mr. Johnson: I can.

Mr. Robbins: I just want to be clear. We have a sign here, correct?

Mr. Johnson: Right.

Mr. Robbins: And is this one as well, or is that something different?

Mr. Johnson: Yeah. It's just common sense logic that we center it. I knew Mr. Beougher was on here and he'd find fault with us for not having it centered from an architectural standpoint. You want to keep it where it is now? I will keep it where it is now. I think it's inappropriate, but we'll do it.

Mr. Robbins: So on the east side there's just one sign that's existing, is that correct?

Mr. Johnson: The Jazzercise sign.

Mr. Robbins: So I think we could look at it another way as well. If there's an existing cabinet sign on the building, yes, you're moving it but you're not increasing the overall nonconformance. I think that's an atypical way to see things, but if we say there's a total of 9 cabinet signs on the building, one moves to the front there's still 9 cabinet signs on the building. It could be at least a way to look at it, I think.

Mr. Beougher: Can it be non-structurally relocated? That's what the staff report says is if it's structurally relocated or replaced, it has to be brought into compliance with the code. So, how much leeway do we have? I'm putting you on the spot, Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins: I'll repeat again, I think this one's hard. I do think the applicant has a point that the existing signage on the front, on the rest of the tenant spaces, what they're proposing to do is to match that. And I agree from an aesthetic standpoint, it does – I mean it would match what's there. To a certain extent that makes sense. On the other hand, the code does say that it's problematic to remove something and then put it back; at that point it does have to be brought into conformance. But if it's something existing on the building and it moves to another side of the building—

Mr. Beougher: I don't have personal knowledge that there's not a sign cabinet there, but that probably doesn't help. Do you have personal knowledge that it's there?

Mr. Comeaux: I do not.

Mr. Burd: I do not.

Mr. Hudson: I do not.

Mr. Comeaux: I want to take a detour real quick to the monument sign. I can almost wrap my head around what Mr. Robbins is saying and I think there are probably good arguments to say the consistency for the other tenants and stuff like that. What's happening with the monument sign is different. That's – even if there's one pole, that's a different-- Like if you were just taking a different face on the existing monument sign and changing it, to add additional square footage and increase the square footage of the monument sign, that's the one I have—

Mr. Johnson: No, wait, hold on. There's no place for Betty's sign, It Takes A Village Sign, to go on there.

Mr. Comeaux: I understand that. I do understand that. And I understand that that is – puts them in a predicament, but that doesn't change the fact that the sign has changed. You know what I mean? I like the design with one pole and kind of fitting it snugly underneath there, but in terms of what we can approve, cause like I was alluding to, I can probably get my head around it and, to be honest with you just from a non-- Without looking at the code, your arguments are very persuasive with respect to the cabinet signs. Your arguments are both persuasive absent the code, and I think I might be able to get around a way that I could support that. The monument sign's a different piece, because this is – this sign is-- You could tell me that we're taking these box signs and moving them around, right, and I could say, "Oh, yeah, that makes sense." But this is a new sign to me if you add the new portion.

Mr. Johnson: Maybe I didn't communicate properly. My client has been doing – his company is 110 years old. The operate within most of the sign codes around Ohio. He said, "I can mount this same sign on that same pole." He said, "It'll be a better job if we drop another pole underneath it and make it stronger, because the existing sign" – which he did – really there's a lot of wind factors. He said, "I could mount a sign on that pole and then wrap it and you wouldn't see it anyway." He said, "But I'd like to put another pole in there and still wrap it. You'll never know there was a second pole there."

Mr. Comeaux: And I suspect he's absolutely right that the sign would be better, but it would – the sign would be different. Right now the sign is a certain

square footage for instance. It's 24 square feet. It's out of compliance. So if the landlord wanted to go through and redesign this whole sign, we would be giving the same song and dance to that. You know what I'm saying?

Mr. Johnson: Well, the landlord has talked about the idea – they still have several things which we don't like and you don't like. They haven't said they're going to do it, but they've thought about just eliminating this whole sign there. I said, "If you're going to do that, let's get busy right now, because we don't want to buy a sign and then have you pull it down. Have you got this picture? See, Betty's sign would be right below that here with the same notch out of it to make it aesthetically correct. I don't know what the square feet code is for a monument sign since they own the whole darn center and this is the only one for the entire center, but I think we're under the size.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, it's a bit more restrictive in the Historic District. You're at a 6' maximum height. Typically the signs have to be wood signs. A really good example of one is Pie's up on Main Street. They have basically a two pole sign, it's wood in the center and I'm looking up the area.

Ms. Moeller: Ground signs, the area requirement is up to 18 square feet.

Mr. Johnson: If I owned the center and I don't, I don't have any financial interest in it, I'd be coming up with a whole new plan for the whole center. I'd have two monument signs to support the tenants because right now they're separated with that green area, that grassy area in the middle, which there is now something in the works for that, but it's only in the beginning stages.

Ms. Moeller: I do want to point out a portion of the code that's under the General Standards from the sign requirements and it says, "Businesses shall be permitted one wall or awning sign as well as one ground or projecting sign." So it's saying "businesses" not "property". So I just don't know how you'd interpret that, but I think it's something to note in that regard.

Mr. Robbins: What section's that?

Ms. Moeller: I think it's 1194—

Mr. Beougher: It's 1194.12(f). I don't think the intent would be to have one ground sign in front of every business in a strip center. That gets tricky.

Mr. Johnson: But I think the tenants in this combined center here are not being done right, because there's too many storerooms, too many square feet of storerooms and too many individuals to carry all on just one monument sign. If we're looking at a common sense thing, maybe if they just changed the ownership where the grass area is, have the east portion where O'Toole's and

the rest of them are as one ownership and the west portion under separate ownership and that would end the discussion, wouldn't it?

Mr. Robbins: You are the devil's advocate.

Mr. Comeaux: Well, the point is you are correct. If we were designing it, that's what we would do. The problem for me, personally, and I'm only speaking for myself, is we're constrained by what we are allowed to approve and what we're not allowed to improve and I'm not trying to – cause I mean you're right. If you're designing it the way you've said would be an improvement. But I'm constrained by what I'm allowed to approve.

Mr. Johnson: Well, sometimes I think we have to use – I say this to the bankers – common sense lending, maybe common sense bureaucracy, but it seems to me that we've got some pretty simple issues here.

Mr. Beougher: Anybody think this is a simple issue?

Mr. Comeaux: No. If you change it here, then it's going to get changed somewhere down the trail, cause somebody's going to say, "Hey, you did it here, why can't I do it?"

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, we always worry about something (inaudible).

Mr. Burd: Well, for instance, we've told you that we expect a fence of a certain size and certain quality, right? You would be quite upset with us if a different person came in front of us next month and we said, "You know what? Chain link's fine by us." My point is I'm constrained. I agree with you that I need to have more common sense, but I'm not allowed to have common sense in certain respects. Does that mean-- I'm sorry if I put it that way, but—

Mr. Robbins: You're constrained by the powers granted to you through this Board.

Mr. Johnson: Hopefully we're going to soon be revisiting our whole code system and getting it a little more updated. It's been long overdue.

Mr. Beougher: That horse is on the table and it's been beaten to death.

Mr. Johnson: Didn't Mr. Robbins come up with a justification you could go with what we're proposing on the signage?

Mr. Robbins: I think for the wall signs, yes. The monument sign is a more difficult question, because that's an increase in area to something that's nonconforming.

Mr. Johnson: If we split the ownership on Main Street so there's an east shopping center and a west shopping center, two different owners, then we don't have a problem. In fact, we could have three owners, because the other area that's about to get developed is the large grassy area, probably an acre. So we could have three owners and three monument signs. That would be one way of dealing with the code. The east unit where O'Tooles, and First Federal Credit Union and all that is; another ownership for the undeveloped land; and a third one will be this piece.

Mr. Beougher: So the size of the proposed monument sign is 6' wide by 2'6" high, is that right? So that's within the 18 square foot area. The height limitation is 6'. So the sign as presented could be created, but it would have to be lowered so that the dimension that is currently 7' on the drawing would need to be 3'6". The 7' would have to be cut in half.

Mr. Johnson: So the height of this one, which the base won't show of course—

Mr. Beougher: But the top of the sign itself has to be 6' above adjacent ground.

Mr. Robbins: That's the same for all community commercial as well as the Historic District.

Mr. Johnson: I've subscribe to the lower position that we've taken for the last several years.

Mr. Beougher: But we also have most of our ground signs close to the street.

Mr. Robbins: Well, the top would have to be 6' above grade. What he's saying is the 7' would basically have to be 3'6" in order for the sign that's been proposed to be even—

Mr. Beougher: But we also have most of our ground signs closer to the street and that makes more sense if it's lower to conforming standards. I mean you wouldn't — the sign that's there now is nonconforming. You wouldn't want to place a conforming sign next to a nonconforming sign, because it just gets (inaudible). But if you move it to the street, probably conforming? Where would it need to be located? It has to be where in relation to the right-of-way?

Mr. Robbins: 10' setback from the right-of-way.

Mr. Beougher: Is that in the middle of the parking lot? It probably is. There's a little peninsula there. There's something in there, isn't there? What is that?

Ms. Moeller: This is the front of the proposed daycare. That's the monument sign.

Mr. Johnson: (Speaking off microphone – inaudible.)

Mr. Robbins: That's up to them.

Mr. Beougher: So that is the location?

Mr. Robbins: That's where it is.

Mr. Johnson: (Speaking off microphone – inaudible.)

Mr. Beougher: Bring it out.

Mr. Johnson: You think that looks better?

Mr. Beougher: No, but that's conforming.

Mr. Johnson: Well, again, common sense bureaucracy. I have a tremendous amount of appreciate for Mike Coy and his designs. I've used him for 40 years all over Ohio and he thought it would be ideal to tie it in like this. (Off mic – inaudible.)

Mr. Beougher: Anybody have any ideas?

Mr. Hudson: Put a freestanding sign elsewhere in the parking lot. I don't know what else to do.

Mr. Johnson: We can do a freestanding one, but we thought that would be opposed. Given our druthers, I guess we'd prefer to have a separate one, but then that creates more problems for you guys for future.

Mr. Beougher: We could put it in the little island there. Illumination? Non-illuminated?

Mr. Robbins: Non-illuminated.

Mr. Johnson: I don't even know if the original monument sign was illuminated.

Mr. Beougher: I think it was originally, but I think when we approved the refacing, we required them to be opaque. If I drive by on the way home tonight, it'll be lit up like Christmas, right?

Mr. Johnson: Well, Mike must know because this shows it as being illuminated. I kind of think they are, but I can't stand here and say they are.

Mr. Beougher: Well, once again, it's a nonconforming existing sign. So the sign that you're allowed to have per the code, and we can't violate the code, just like you can't, we can approve a sign that is 6' high, is 10' back from the right-of-way, and I'm looking at that island. That gets it away from the nonconforming sign such that it would stand out. There's no other city signage or ODOT signage there. It is not allowed to be illuminated.

Mr. Johnson: I think it's more than 10' back.

Mr. Beougher: Understood. It's a nonconforming sign. It shouldn't be more than 10' back. Anyway, if we put the 6' high sign on the island 10' back from the right-of-way, you're in conformance, non-illuminated, don't need to run electric to it. The landlord has to agree to allow you to put a base and a sign there and we're going to look the other way on the front box sign that's nonconforming too.

Mr. Comeaux: I would prefer to look at it not that we're looking the other way, but we're rearranging boxes.

Mr. Robbins: I can't say I'm 100% convinced on the monument, the reason being if we go up and down the roadway, and this is the development to the east, we have a multi-tenant sign there. My concern, and this is something that was brought up by Mr. Comeaux, is that once we have two monument signs for one property granted by the DRB, it kind of sets a precedent of sorts. And I completely understand the need for monument signage, I absolutely do, but I'm also looking at what it's going to be like in the future when, again, people start coming and saying, "Well, I have 16 tenants in a strip mall. I want a different monument sign for each one."

Mr. Johnson: Well, obviously you can't do it. You're talking about 10' back. This one appears to me to be probably 12-15' from the right-of-way. So is the desire to have the signs closer to the right-of-way or farther back? (Inaudible, off mic.)

Mr. Beougher: Yes. The desire is that it's 10' exactly and that's a nonconforming sign, which is not.

Mr. Johnson: So along Main Street, any of our new signs, we have them no further away than 10' from the right-of-way?

Mr. Beougher: That is the goal of the code.

Mr. Robbins: There's a 10' setback from the right-of-way for signage and that's all signage in every district.

Mr. Johnson: Are you guys sure about that? My building for example, I know I'm conforming there—

Mr. Beougher: Right. That sign was placed during Streetscape Phase I or II and so it would have been placed, unless there was a utility easement, right on the right-of-way.

Mr. Johnson: So when we did the banks and the fast foods and all those along there we didn't want them to go any further back off the road than 10'?

Mr. Robbins: No. The setback is 10', so they can't be closer to the road than 10'.

Mr. Johnson: But they can be farther?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, they can be farther.

Mr. Johnson: This is probably 15' I would guess.

Mr. Beougher: Once again, Mr. Johnson, if you put a sign that's 6' tall on that pole and I don't know that we can approve an appendage to a nonconforming sign, can we?

Mr. Robbins: In my mind that would be exceeding the area of what's already there. So we take the 18 square feet, what's existing gets to stay, gets to be refaced, but any additional signage is then nonconforming. It's not allowable. That's wherein the problem lies.

Mr. Beougher: So my proposal to put it in the island is—

Mr. Robbins: We have almost two-- The way our standard sign code reads, Table 1181, "Permitted Signs," it says, "Ground signs, allowable: 1 per frontage." And then, as Ms. Moeller brought up, "Within the Historic District, the following type of signs are appropriate: ground signs, projecting signs, wall signs." And then "Businesses shall be permitted one wall or awning sign as well as one ground or projecting sign." So we have almost two ways you could read that.

Mr. Johnson: It sounds to me like it should not be a problem for you to interpret it either way.

Mr. Robbins: Again my very much concern is when that happens, you know, how many other tenants are in this building, all of a sudden every single

one of them is going to want a ground sign for each of their businesses; and then the property to the east, every single one of them is going to want a ground sign.

Mr. Johnson: Has that happened with the Kroger Center on Main Street?

Mr. Robbins: Not yet, because we haven't done this yet.

Mr. Beougher: They have a multi-tenant sign at the entrance.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, and the property to the east does as well. I mean they have – it's existing nonconforming, but they have tenant panels. They had 10 tenant panels.

Mr. Comeaux: I vaguely recall when, I can't remember whether it was Tyler, whoever the last tenant was that came through for this signage, I remember saying, "Well, what happens when you get another tenant?" And the reaction was basically like, "We'll worry about that later." Because if this was a true multi-tenant sign, they would just swap out, or make Tyler go smaller, or make Nationwide go smaller and then slide hers in there. And if that's what you were asking, I'd be like, "Hey, let's have at it," but that's not what you're asking, and that's what I'm having a difficult time just personally. If you look at the code it says if you have a nonconforming use, we're not supposed to expand it, and that's my problem. And it's not that I'm not smart, or creative, or whatever else, it's just that I'm bumping up against that.

Mr. Beougher: Or that you have no common sense.

Mr. Comeaux: Well, that has been alleged at me various times in my life; but that's just what I'm constrained by and I feel, in a certain sense, that aesthetically it's not the right choice, practically in some ways it's not the right choice, but it's the choice that, again, I'm only speaking for myself here, that I can't expand something that is out of conformance. I just can't do it and I'm only speaking for myself.

Mr. Johnson: And you and I both know that our overlay, our code, drastically needs revisited.

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah, you're exactly right, but the thing is, again, I can't rewrite the code and that's my problem.

Mr. Beougher: You and I kind of did. We're kind of responsible for this, Mr. Comeaux, along with the rest of the committee. Now we have to deal with it.

Mr. Comeaux: Now we have to deal with it. That's fair, too.

Mr. Beougher: Is someone willing to offer a motion, Mr. Hudson?

Mr. Hudson: No, no.

Mr. Johnson: Is there another option of going back and getting a variance?

Mr. Beougher: Absolutely.

Mr. Burd: The variance that was applied for before, was a use variance, is that right?

Mr. Johnson: (Inaudible, off microphone.) So then the issue became at the BZBA was well this is a _____. No it's not. They're right down the street 350', same zoning, same Historical District, same everything. It's net zero. It's not an additional childcare center. So I talked to Mel about it and he said, "Well, hell no, I didn't mean for that to apply to an existing one." So somebody on the BZBA said, "Well, yeah, but I have to go by this ordinance." The rest of the City Council said, "Nonsense. That was not intended to apply to a situation like this."

Mr. Comeaux: And to take that as an analogy, that is how I can get my head around moving your box from Jazzercise over a little bit and moving your box to the front of the building. That's how I can get my head around that as an analogy.

Mr. Johnson: (Inaudible, off microphone.)

Mr. Robbins: I'm going to put out a couple scenarios. I'm sure you hate these. The first is everything stays as submitted and the Board votes on it, up, down, table. It could be an option. The second is if there is some push back from the board about the addition of the monument sign, then you could request that it be removed from the application and the Board can then vote on that portion of the application without the monument sign. In the meantime you would have the option to go through the BZBA and request a variance basically, a signage variance that would allow greater area for the sign and then possibly, if they wanted to, they could have the entire sign kind of reconfigured. By that, I mean at this point you're going to have how many tenants in the building? There's probably 8, 9 and right now there's only room for two tenants on the existing sign. As per your proposal, you're going to get three tenants on there, leaving all the rest of them without signage which, in my mind, it's an issue. I mean I feel like every business should be allowed to have a sign along the street. So if the property owner was eventually looking to redo the signage and allow for all the rest of the tenants, they could get a variance for that. They could come back through DRB and they could get a sign that's appropriate for the area, but that accounts for all the rest of the tenants that are in that building as well, including your own. I think that would be a very reasonable way to go about things, especially if, like you say, they're looking at redoing the sign completely

because my guess is you're probably not the only tenant that's wanting signage and knocking on their door saying—

Mr. Johnson: (Inaudible – speaking off microphone.)

Mr. Robbins: What I'm saying though is if we went along that course, if the Board votes yes to open up a childcare, you can put up the signage in the front of the building and you would have the signage on the side of the building. The only thing you would be without is a monument sign but, in the meantime, you could apply for a variance, perhaps work with the property owner and some other tenants in the space and then get a larger sign that would comprehensively include all the other tenants in there. Again, this is not something that's out of the ordinary for these strip centers within the Historic District, because if you go a little bit to the east, we have the Quick 'N Cold Center that has 10 tenants and then if you go across Waggoner just behind Pies & Pints, there's a strip center and there's probably 6 tenant sign panel up there as well. I think there's leeway from the BZBA in terms of dealing with some of these buildings that were not necessarily built according to our Historic District.

Mr. Johnson: (Inaudible – speaking off microphone.)

Mr. Comeaux: When are you wanting to operate there?

Mr. Johnson: (Inaudible – speaking off microphone.) I will suggest that the owners create three ownerships.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, who wants to make a motion?

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Robbins, if we made a motion that included everything that was resolved in our discussions and did not address the monument sign, would we have to table the monument sign, or could we just approve what we want to approve and leave it open for continued—

Mr. Robbins: The problem is we have one application, so you have to vote on the entire application. Now it's up to the applicant – there's nothing in our code that says you can't remove things at any point and say, "Well, is this something we're willing to trade in order for approval if there's some issues and some other items on that agenda.

Mr. Johnson: We paid for three separate sign permits.

Mr. Comeaux: So because it's one application, we can't approve the fencing, the wall signage and the parking without also voting on the monument sign?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Comeaux: That's a problem.

Mr. Beougher: But we could pull out the monument sign or also stipulate that it only be 6' high.

Mr. Johnson: We said we'd agree to that.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so if no one is willing to make a motion, the Chair will. I move approval of the package as presented with the stipulation that the ground sign not exceed 6' in height, that the fencing be of the material presented this evening, and that two wall signs with the facing as presented on existing sign cabinets be approved.

Mr. Hudson: Did you say move the one sign?

Mr. Beougher: I didn't. I just left it as presented with certain stipulations. Is there a second?

Mr. Burd: I will second that.

Mr. Beougher: Further discussion? (No response.) Ms. Moeller, would you please call the roll?

(Ms. Moeller called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes.")

Mr. Comeaux: So you included the—

Mr. Beougher: The monument sign, the ground sign 6' in height, no illumination. Didn't say that, but I'll accept the friendly amendment.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay, sorry, my apologies.

(Ms. Moeller continues the roll. Mr. Comeaux voted "yes.")

Ms. Moeller: Could you also address did you guys allow the aluminum frame, just out of curiosity?

Mr. Robbins: That was basically the cabinet sign that's existing and moving to the front, so yes.

Mr. Comeaux: The monument sign natural materials or aluminum frame?

Mr. Beougher: We were calling the roll. Okay, let me withdraw the motion because we need to go back and revisit the materiality of the sign. Okay, so allowable materials are natural brick, stone, wood.

Ms. Moeller: Bear with me one moment here and I'll read the section of the code.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Beougher, were we talking about the sign above the door on the face of the bank building?

Mr. Beougher: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: No, this is the monument sign. We're considering the sign above on the wall existing basically, just changing locations.

Mr. Beougher: We're considering it an existing cabinet and whether it shifts or not is not part of the motion. It's undetermined.

Ms. Moeller: So I will read the portion of the code that defines traditional and natural materials. It consists of clay bricks, stone, cultured stone, wood or fiber cement board siding. The very vague traditional, natural materials.

Mr. Beougher: So, Mr. Robbins, you pointed out the Pie's sign, which is a sandblasted wood type sign on two poles. That would be an example of a conforming sign with the appropriate materials and there are other examples, I'm sure, that we have approved.

Mr. Robbins: We actually had an application for one come in just recently that's pretty appropriate. Unfortunately we don't have a copy of that right now.

Mr. Johnson: Point of reference: When we talk about natural materials, I'm not referring to Betty's sign, but just in general, everybody wants to avoid a lot of maintenance. Do we consider Hardy Board, which is almost impervious—

Mr. Beougher: That would be fiber cement siding. That is appropriate, although I would argue that it's not true and natural. So Ms. Moeller has pulled out a sign that we approved last month.

Ms. Moeller: Right. Sandblasted, historic in nature and it's 6' high.

Mr. Beougher: That's a good example. All right, am I ready to remake my motion? I don't know that I can remember it. I will remake the motion to approve application #167387 for refacing of two existing cabinet wall signs to include a ground sign to be in conformance with the code, which means it must be no more than 6' in height. The proposal is for a 15 square foot sign face. It is not to be illuminated and will be constructed of natural materials with graphics similar to those presented on the exhibit; a wrought aluminum fence as proposed this evening with the play area as designed on the site plan presented this evening. This also included a door on the east side of the building which we did

not discuss, but I assume that's because no one had an issue with it; and everything else on the staff report is additional information. So I think that covers all of the elements of the proposal. Is there a second?

Mr. Burd: Well, I will second that. I don't want to keep bringing up things, but do we want to specify bollards in the motion on the fencing or not, or do you want to leave that open for what they want to do. It makes no difference to me, it's just something else we talked about.

Mr. Beougher: I will add to my motion, Mr. Burd, a stipulation that the applicant work with staff to determine placement of bollards to protect the fenced play area from inebriated patrons of establishments to the east.

Mr. Burd: Second.

Mr. Beougher: Further discussion? (No response.)

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

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Johnson, we didn't think outside the box, I think we threw the box away.

D. OTHER BUSINESS – None

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Lane Beougher, Chair

Megan Moeller, Planning Adm.

This document was transcribed by:
Area East Secretarial Service
8363 Schott Road
Westerville Oh 43081
614-313-3351