



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015 6:30 PM

PLACE: COUNCIL CHAMBERS
7232 E. MAIN ST, REYNOLDBURG, OH 43068

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Comeaux, Hudson, Bowman, Hicks, Burd
ABSENT: Zollars

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Design Review Board – Regular – October 1, 2015

Minutes Stand Approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Comeaux: Next item on the Agenda is the approval of the Agenda. Mr. Snowden are there any changes that you have?

Mr. Snowden: Only one note, Mr. Chairman. Due to the limitations of the computer system, you will see "Item C., Staff Report". That is just a way for Rochelle to properly load the Staff Report so that it appears. The program is geared towards legislation for City Council, which would be individualized. So, you do not need to read Staff Report, that is included in the individual item. It is just a technicality of the system.

Chairman Comeaux: Are there any changes to the Agenda from any members of the Board? Seeing none, we will proceed with the Agenda as it has been distributed.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Chairman Comeaux: The next item on the Agenda is the Swearing in of Speakers. If you are here to speak before us this evening, please raise your right hand and promise to testify truthfully to the Committee. Thanks.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

C. STAFF REPORT

1. Design Review Board Staff Report

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. 1749 Brice Rd.; Application #171413; Westside Graphix; Applicant: Kirk Ramer; Signage

Chairman Comeaux: Is the applicant here this evening? Mr. Snowden, this is the item that was on the agenda last time that we tabled because they did not appear, right?

Mr. Snowden: Chairman Comeaux and other members of the DRB, the Commission chose to table it because in addition to not appearing, which is not a technical component, but it is recommended, the individual also did not submit plans that allow the Board to make any real decision. They did not include dimensions, materials, colors, all the things the Board needs to make the decision. And, in this case, this was Application #171413 for 1749 Brice Road. The applicant received that notification in writing and via email stating what was discussed at the previous meeting, and the applicant also did not submit any additional requirements, which again, limits the Board's ability to make a decision. And last, Staff is working with Code Compliance for several code violations at the site, that are related to signage. The applicant has placed a banner within the sign cabinet that they have been proposing to reface, which is obviously not acceptable per 1181.05 of our sign code. That being said, Staff would be happy to go through the report, if the Board would require it. However, it is Staff's view that the Board should deny this Certificate of Appropriateness, as the information that has been provided is not sufficient.

Chairman Comeaux: May I ask a few questions? So, you have been in contact with them about the violation they have ongoing?

Mr. Snowden: Our code compliance has issued a notice for that. Because that is just something we do not accept. The banner does not have a permit and any refacing of cabinets has to be approved by this Board. With the assistance of Directors Burd and Havener, the code compliance officer, Mark Thompson, for that area, has written, and we did not receive a response from the applicant about that either.

Chairman Comeaux: Have you made an effort via email or phone to contact them?

Mr. Snowden: I have. They received a letter notifying them, to the address provided on there, which is their existing business on the west side of Columbus, stating everything that was discussed at their previous meeting, and what they needed to do to proceed. Staff was also in communication several times via email because they were also applying for zoning clearance and a building Certificate of Occupancy to actually legally open the business. In summary, it is my professional opinion that Staff and the City government has done their due diligence with this applicant and without editorializing too much, the applicant just does not seem to want to cooperate with the process.

Chairman Comeaux: The only thing I would say is, it might be, just cut things off at the pass, if you would contact and list the property owners name. The next call I suspect you are going to get is when they get a violation, they are going to go to their landlord and they are going to say, "You are going to help me out." So, you might want to be proactive and just contact the landlord.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, we have been in contact with the property owner for this location and their cooperation has not been forthcoming either.

Chairman Comeaux: That's fine. I don't mean to tell you how to do your job, and I hope it did not come across that way.

Mr. Snowden: No Sir, you didn't, and I like that the Board is feeling engaged overall with the process and wants to understand it. This is a property where we have had a series of graphics and sign code violations over the years.

Chairman Comeaux: One final question, I promise, we can't table it again, correct?

Mr. Snowden: There is nothing that would prohibit it, to my knowledge.

Chairman Comeaux: Isn't there a certain number of days, after which we can't table it?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, Let me check the code. There is for some BZBA items. I have to apologize, I have not memorized it all.

Chairman Comeaux: While I am very sympathetic to your view, it is \$75.00 they paid, and if we reject them, they have to pay \$75.00 again. So, if we could table it, I would encourage us to do so, but I am not even sure we are even able to do that.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, pardon me, you are correct, Sir. 1103.11, The Board shall review and approve all applications within 45 days of the original meeting. So, if you table it to the following meeting, you would be beyond the forty-five days. The idea behind that for our new Board members, the idea behind this concept is to make sure the Board is making decisions in a timely manner, and not purposefully stringing applicants along ad nauseum. As I stated, it's the Staff's position that the City and Staff have done their due diligence with this applicant.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? If a decision is not made within the forty-five day period, is it denied, approved. I have seen other things where if you do not make a decision, that it is automatically approved. I want to make sure we are clear.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, it does not say specifically, and the language reads that each application, that the Board should approve modifications or conditions, or disapprove. So, I would interpret that as the Board needs to take some sort of action. One or the other.

Chairman Comeaux: Ok, with that in mind, I would entertain a motion... Mr. Snowden, again I do not have Robert's Rules with me. Can we entertain a motion to reject, or do we always entertain a motion to approve and just let it fail?

Mr. Snowden: It is generally advisable for the Board to entertain a motion for approval. If the Members are not willing to approve, just simply vote "no" at that point.

Chairman Comeaux: I will entertain a motion on this item. If you would like to make the motion...I have been told that Chairs should not make the motion.

Mr. Snowden: Five votes against, the Certificate of Appropriateness is denied. They can always reapply and staff can work with them, as long as they are following the process.

RESULT:	FAILED [2 TO 3]
MOVER:	Eliot Bowman
SECONDER:	Richard Hudson
AYES:	Hudson, Bowman
NAYS:	Comeaux, Hicks, Burd
ABSENT:	Zollars

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. **1418 Brice Rd.; Application #171819; Applicant: Sign Shop, Inc.**

Chairman Comeaux: If you could please state your name for the record, then Mr. Snowden will give us a brief presentation and will come back to you with some questions.

Mr. Masters: I am Timothy Masters.

Chairman Comeaux: Alright, Mr. Snowden.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. 1418 Brice Road - Buckeye Pediatrics - Signage; Application: #171819 - Certificate of Appropriateness; Location: Property is located on the east side of Brice Road between E. Main Street and Rygate Drive; Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay; Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage; Current Use: Professional Services/Medical Office; Applicant: Sign Shop Inc., dba Signorama Reynoldsburg. Background Information: Proposal - The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface an existing multi-tenant monument sign. Existing Site & Context - The site is developed with an existing commercial building used as a multi-tenant office building. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City. To the south, the property abuts single-family dwellings in the R-3 district. Staff Review: Ground Sign - The applicant is proposing to reface the existing multi-tenant monument style ground sign with two 9.2sf faces. The existing monument sign is generally consistent with the architectural characteristics of the structure. The proposed graphics are consistent with the existing sign faces. The existing sign does not exceed the 100sf ground sign limit per the Code. Materials & Colors - Vinyl, acrylics and painted aluminum are among the permitted materials in the Community Commercial Overlay. The applicant did not provide a specific statement of what materials they will be utilizing and should include that information on the plans attached to their zoning sign permit. Again, we are assuming this is vinyl or an acrylic panel.

Mr. Masters: It is actually going to be vinyl on lexion, yes.

Mr. Snowden: Great, let's just state it on the plans so Staff has record of what materials are being used. The proposed sign package contains only three colors, two of which are already utilized on existing panels. Staff feels that the overall composition of the proposed sign face

is consistent with the existing monument sign. Staff Recommendation: The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approves the certificate of appropriateness. And with that, I will turn it back over to our chairman.

Chairman Comeaux: So, this is just for the monument sign? There is no additional signage on the building?

Mr. Snowden: None was presented. Mr. Masters, is that correct?

Mr. Masters: They are actually on the other monument for the same building. They were given permission to use a larger space, so they are just moving their monument signage. This is an existing company that has been in the community for years. They are just getting a bigger, and putting their logo out because there are just words on the existing sign as well.

Chairman Comeaux: So they are happy with the existing signage?

Mr. Masters: Correct.

Chairman Comeaux: Are there any questions from any of the Board Members, regarding this sign?

Mr. Hicks: Just to be clear, this will be on both sides of that monument sign?

Mr. Masters: It is. In the picture, it is the lower left hand corner, but coming from the other direction, it will be the lower right. So it will be the exact opposite space. We are replacing the existing signage from the previous tenant.

Chairman Comeaux: Any additional comments from the Board Members? Hearing none, I will entertain a motion.

Mr. Snowden: Staff will mail a record of action notice to the applicant at the address provided. The applicant should submit a zoning sign permit application for the proposed sign reface. As I stated, tell me what materials are on there, so we have proper documentation of that. Staff will require two copies of plans to confirm compliance with the approved certificate of appropriateness. And with that, I will turn it back over to our chairman.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Nathan Burd, Service Director
SECONDER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
AYES:	Comeaux, Hudson, Bowman, Hicks, Burd
ABSENT:	Zollars

2. **7345 E. Main St.; Application #171825; Applicant: Charity Connell, Connell Hardware**

Chairman Comeaux: Ms. Connell, if you could please state your name for the record, and Mr. Snowden will give us a brief presentation.

Ms. Connell: Charity Connell.

Chairman Comeaux: Thank you. Mr. Snowden, can you give us a reminder about what this is about please?

Mr. Snowden: Yes, Sir. Mr. Chairman, other Members of the Board, 7345 E. Main St. - Connell Hardware Building - Exterior Modifications; Application: #171825 - Certificate of Appropriateness; Location: Property is located on the southwest corner of Main Street and Lancaster; Avenue; Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce / HCO - Historic Commercial Overlay. The request is for Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior modifications in the Historic District; Current Use: Vacant Space/Commercial Retail; Applicant: Charity A. Connell. Background Information: Proposal - The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to modify the exterior of a commercial building in the Historic District. This proposal includes the construction of new raised masonry planters in a location in which they were historically present. Existing Site & Context - The site is developed with an existing commercial building that was previously used for retail sales. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses, including eating and drinking establishments and personal services in the CC and CS districts of the City. To the south, the property abuts single-family dwellings in the R-3 district. The whole area is part of the Historic Overlay District. Staff Review: Historical Significance - Staff has reviewed historic photographs of this building and found that masonry style planters were present on the site until 2009. The proposed planters are slightly smaller than the historic ones. Ms. Connell, you stated that those were constructed in about 1950, correct?

Ms. Connell: They have been there for quite a while.

Mr. Snowden: The previous ones?

Ms. Connell: Yeah.

Mr. Snowden: So, there are some additional historic photographs showing when the building had two separate ground level entrances, which was also interesting. This is a feature that did exist for many years and it is a logical feature given the current location of the doors on

this building, which is the pair of double doors, rather than two individual tenant spaces. Materials & Colors - The historic planters were brick, and the applicant is proposing to utilize a similar brick to construct the proposed planters. Staff is comfortable with the proposed brick color because it complements the stone water table utilized for the first 2'-3' of the facade above grade. Staff felt that the pictures provided show a material that is consistent with what is there although it is not exactly the same. Given a building this old, there is a variety of masonry material on the exterior of it, but Staff didn't feel this was something that felt significantly out of place. Staff Recommendation: The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Historic Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is that the Board approves the certificate of appropriateness. The one item that Staff would like to point out under considerations, under 1193.05, if you look in that section, it is in our Historic Overlay District. It does encourage the Board to consider whenever feasible to restore or replace a feature that was historically present, so staff felt it was consistent with the letter and the intent of the code. With that, I will turn it back over to our Chairman.

Chairman Comeaux: Do you have anything to add Ms. Connell?

Ms. Connell: Not really.

Chairman Comeaux: That's fine.

Ms. Connell: I mean because the old planters were torn out so that sandstone wall is still there and this basically is to improve it.

Chairman Comeaux: In terms of how far it comes out from the building, is it about the same distance out as it use to be, so it is not cutting into the sidewalk more?

Ms. Connell: No, they should not have to cut the sidewalk more, is my understanding. There is still a drop off there where the other planters were.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, it has sort of become just kind of a debris catching area, but it has caught some gravel. The area where the planters were previously located has sort of caught some broken aggregate type of material. As far as actually cutting the sidewalk and decreasing the size, that is not going to need to take place given the dimensions that the applicant has provided.

Mr. Hicks: Ms. Connell, there is an existing bench or something in that area? Is that bench still there?

Ms. Connell: The bench is from the City. That is when the City put the benches out. And, the bench was anchored in front of one of the planters before.

Mr. Hicks: So, will it be reanchored?

Ms. Connell: It depends on what the City wants to do with the bench. If they want to put it

back there, they can. I have no problem with that. Or they can take it and put it somewhere else. It was anchored in front of the one planter, in front of the art studio at one time.

Mr. Snowden: Gentlemen, if you look at the screen in front of you, you should be able to see what is existing now. And, if I go back to a previous view, from like 2012, this is what was existing before. So, those evergreens did kind of hide the building facade, but as you can see, the building facade as far as the wood and materials, has been cleaned up quite a bit since then. The other photos that I have seen show a doorway here and here, given the configurations of the doors in this manner, this is a logical addition.

Chairman Comeaux: I didn't recall that the evergreens had grown so large. What do you intend to plant?

Ms. Connell: The evergreens were pushing the bricks away from the wall and they were cracking. I am doing low planting. I know the evergreens were a big issue with people. When you could turn off of 256 and make a left hand turn, that was a big issue, because they were too tall. So, low growing, whatever I can put it there.

Chairman Comeaux: It's just more my curiosity.

Ms. Connell: Something low growing.

Mr. Hicks: One other question in regards to the actual materials you are using. It's very nice, I think it is an artificial concrete brick, kind of a stone look, rather than a clay brick look. A majority of your building is brick. Was there any consideration for using a red clay brick instead of these. I think these stones interlock so I know there are a lot of these uses for them.

Ms. Connell: This stuff will interlock, too. No, I did not consider brick. I think we went cost effective, for me. And, I liked the way it looked.

Mr. Hicks: One follow-up, the other problem that you had with the brick, from what I understand, was it was probably collecting water, freezing, thawing, pushing out, etc...

Ms. Connell: Right, there was a drain.

Mr. Hicks: I am assuming that with the contractor that you are working with, with these new planters, that you are going to take precautions so that it does not heave out in that sidewalk. I know I walk past this building everyday. I love this building, by the way. It is pretty tight right there. And, as we know, people fly down Main Street and then they hook that right hand turn and try to round it as much as they can. I have a little bit of concern with that pinch point right there, to make sure that what you are doing for one is not encroaching anymore than the vacant space that is there, where the old one was. And two, that it is going to remain permanently attached to the building so that you do not have to do it again.

Chairman Comeaux: If there is no other discussion, I will entertain a motion.

Mr. Snowden: Charity has been working with us, I just want to be clear. I have checked with the Building Division and they have reviewed what you have submitted, and their statement was that no building permit will be required. So you can proceed with the project. I will issue the actual certificate on Monday. I will mail it to you. So don't start until Monday. The applicant is advised the window graphics on the front doors of the structure and vinyl planter signs along the east side of the property are prohibited per Section 1181.05 of the Zoning Code. The other thing about signage on a building like this is, as you know gentlemen, our code says that 25% of a given window can be window signage. So, something like this is a lot more than 25%, even if I count each door. I understand, you have to work with your tenants, but your tenants need to modify their window signage, 25% of a given pane there.

Chairman Comeaux: They can move that over one way or the other. Right now they have it all over the doors, they can probably put more than that over the windows to the left or to the right.

Mr. Snowden: That is accurate. In this case, this is more than 25%.

Ms. Connell: Those are coming down. They have moved out.

Mr. Snowden: Understood, I just want to be clear on what the code says.

Ms. Connell: So, like Vick's sign that says, "Coming Soon", or whatever it says, can they have just one in, and take one out.

Mr. Snowden: That would probably be ok.

Ms. Connell: What about on the art studio?

Mr. Snowden: Probably one of these signs, instead of all of this. Probably one. So, if she had this down here, probably not the rest of these. The vinyl on the east side of the building. The last thing I want you to be aware of, and I know we have discussed this, but the "Art 4 Kids", which was approved by this Board, never completed the building permit process.

Ms. Connell: I have said something about that. I can say something again to her, but you guys are probably going to have to pursue that.

Mr. Snowden: Well, here is the problem, ultimately, as the property owner, you are responsible.

Ms. Connell: Oh, really?

Mr. Snowden: So, if we start pursuing it, we will be issuing you notices of violation.

Ms. Connell: So, she owes more money on it?

Mr. Snowden: Her permit may have expired at this point. She should contact the Building Division and find out what she needs to do. She may need to submit a new permit, for review, new plans for review. She should contact the Building Division and take care of that. It has been more than six months.

Ms. Connell: Oh yeah, I know it has been. So, she did not complete...tell me again.

Mr. Snowden: The building permit process, for the sign. So she needs to contact Building Division and do what they tell her. What I have a feeling they will tell her is this, "Submit new engineered plans, for the sign. Get them approved, and have them inspected."

Ms. Connell: Did you already approve the sign at one point?

Mr. Snowden: The Design Review Board approved the sign, Building reviewed the plans previously and found that the plans were not sufficient and the applicant never submitted the proper plans. So, that is an illegal sign. You should probably address that. Just keep working with us. With that, I will turn it back over to our Chairman.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
SECONDER:	Eliot Bowman
AYES:	Comeaux, Hudson, Bowman, Hicks, Burd
ABSENT:	Zollars

3. **6950 E. Main St.; Application #171896; Applicant: Sign Craft Industries, Christina Beyerl**

Chairman Comeaux: First Merchants Bank. If you could state your name for the record please, then Mr. Snowden will give us a brief introduction, and we will have a few questions for you.

Ms. Beyerl: Christina Beyerl.

Chairman Comeaux: Mr. Snowden:

Mr. Snowden: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6950 E. Main St. - First Merchants Bank - Signage; Application: #171896 - Certificate of Appropriateness; Location: Property is located on the northwest corner of Main Street and Briarcliff Road; Existing Zoning: CO - Offices & Institutions District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay; Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage; Current Use: Bank; Applicant: Sign Craft Industries. Background Information: Proposal - The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for new and altered signage on an existing commercial building. This will include a new building mounted wall sign and refaced monument-style ground sign for each building frontage. Existing Site & Context - The site is developed with an existing commercial building used as a bank. Neighboring uses

include other commercial businesses in the CC and CS districts of the City. To the north, the property abuts multi-family dwellings in the AR-2 district. Staff Review: Molding Mounted Signage. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing wall signs with two new wall signs labeled Sign #017 and Sign #012 on the applicant's plans. The structure is on a corner lot, the applicant is permitted one wall sign on the facade parallel to each frontage. As the Board knows, normally we only deal with one sign per tenant, but since they are on a corner lot, they get two. That is why you are seeing two existing, and the applicant is proposing two. Sign #017 is an internally illuminated channel letter sign mounted on a raceway. The sign is 42.10sf. That is the sign that faces Briarcliff Road. Sign #020 is a 100.62sf internally illuminated channel letter sign mounted directly to the metal facade. Essentially this is what we would call a rebranding. They are really not changing any significant portion of what is there. Per code, there is going to be a 50sf wall sign, permitted on each side. Applicant is showing sign #020 as 100.62 sf. Staff feels that applicant may have used a different calculation method for the sign area. Per Code, Reynoldsburg utilizes a method commonly known as smallest contiguous area. I think the applicant used a different measurement method and then that caused the sign calculation to be larger. What smallest contiguous area means for our new Board members is, if you draw a line around the signage, staying as close as possible to the sign, but encompassing all items, for this channel letter sign, that is the area of the sign. Some cities would just say that you have to draw a square, and if there is dead space in there, that still counts as part of your sign because it is within a rectangle, or whatever. Assuming that the applicant could probably meet the 50 sf if they recalculate, given the amount of area that is in that sign. Staff recommends that the applicant recalculate the sign area and submit that information on plans for a zoning sign permit application. If it does turn out to still be bigger than the 51 sf that is permitted there, they would just reduce it until it can meet the zoning sign plan, as long as they don't change the graphics, Staff would hope the Board would be comfortable with that. Ground Sign - The applicant is proposing to reface the existing monument style ground signs. Both signs are 38sf which is within the 50sf permitted per Code. The existing monument signs are generally consistent with the architectural characteristics of the structure. The proposed graphics are consistent with the building mounted signage. The existing sign does not exceed the 50sf ground sign limit per the Code. The applicant is permitted one ground sign per frontage by the Code. That is why the applicant has two signs. Materials & Colors - Both of the proposed signs are consistent with one another and are part of a larger rebranding of CS Banks. The proposed signage material is vinyl, acrylics and painted aluminum which are a permitted material in the Community Commercial Overlay. The proposed sign package contains only three colors, which is a decrease of one color from the current signage. Staff feels that the overall composition of the proposed sign package is internally consistent and appropriate to the location and use of the building. Staff Recommendation: The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is it that the

Board approve the Certificate of Appropriateness on the following condition: That the applicant provide revised plans recalculating the area of the sign #020 or reduce the area of the sign to meet the Code. With that, I will turn it back over to our Chairman.

Chairman Comeaux: A couple of questions I have, and then I will ask for further questions. The small directional signs on the property, those are not in our purview, but I assume they are being changed, right?

Mr. Snowden: As long as they are under six sf, they do not need a permit, and they are not reviewed by the Board. The purpose of that would be to direct the signage internally. That is six sf total on either side. If the applicant wants to answer that, will those be changing as well?

Ms. Beyerl: They are changing. They are actually 5.3 sf.

Chairman Comeaux: You understood his comment about how you calculate the size of the sign? You think you will be able to scale it down to meet the requirements?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, I don't even think she will need to decrease the size of the sign, just change how it is calculated.

Chairman Comeaux: So, you understand, and he understands, that's great. A couple of concerns that sometimes arise when you change the facing here. This one, not so much, but the other one where you have a facade. Are you from the sign company?

Ms. Beyerl: I am from the sign company.

Chairman Comeaux: Sometimes when they take signs off the facade, you can see the shadow of the old one. Are you going to take efforts to restore the facade you are putting it on? It looks like these signs are going to be a little bit larger, so it is not too much of a concern. But, I hate when you take a Subway out, and then you have a small sign, and you can see what use to be there.

Ms. Beyerl: Right. The customer, with it being a bank, we were in a quick turn around, so, after the fact we do plan to go back and repair the walls and make sure everything looks like it did before.

Chairman Comeaux: The only other thing I saw, I guess because it was grand fathered in, or something like that, they have a changeable text sign that runs along Main, and you are replacing that?

Ms. Beyerl: That is actually coming out.

Chairman Comeaux: So, they are aware, once they take that out, our current code would not allow them to put changeable text in.

Ms. Beyerl: I do not believe they want it, so I think that is perfectly fine.

Chairman Comeaux: That's a minor thing and no one really pays attention to such things.

Mr. Snowden: That's ok, that's what the code states, so we have to stick with that. Given the height of these monument signs, we are not seeing a lot of folks wanting that, because they are not high enough.

Mr. Bowman: I have a question.

Chairman Comeaux: Yes Mr. Bowman, please.

Mr. Bowman: Sign 021 and 023, these signs, just out of curiosity, are they illuminated.

Ms. Beyerl: Yes, they are eternally illuminated.

Ms. Bowman: So all the signs will be illuminated?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Bowman, that is permitted per code. Some cities have, for example, where they only permit externally illuminated ground mounted signs. So that means you need to have uplighting, as it is called in the industry. But, in this location on Main Street, the internally illuminated is permitted.

Mr. Bowman: Great, thank you.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, I only have one question. I think our only concern is that the sign that is replacing the one on the south elevation, may or may not be too large per our code. Do we have an estimate of the square footage of the existing CS Bank sign? Because, just eyeballing this, it does look bigger. I think that is partly because First Merchant Bank is a bit of a mouthful. Do you know what the approximate size of the existing sign is?

Ms. Beyerl: I do not know the exact square footage based off of the code. I go by the square, which would work for CS Bank. I believe the existing is around 70 sf. With First Merchants Bank being a lot longer than CS Bank, they wanted it just as large but with their name.

Mr. Snowden: We calculate the wall signs by one square foot per frontage of the building. So, the length of the facade on the south side is about 51-52 sf. I did not find evidence of any variances, or comprehensive sign plans that would have increased the amount of signage being approved at this location. Maybe that was an oversight from the previous approval, I do not know. But, like I said, with the calculation that you are making, you can come close if you do a contiguous area calculation. In that case, just scale it down a little bit and we will live with it.

Mr. Hicks: I have a question on the east elevation sign #017, it appears you are utilizing a raceway on that sign, so I assume all the wires that illuminate that sign are in that channel that are behind the letters. Are you using a raceway there for any particular reason?

Ms. Beyerl: Actually, what it is mounting to is windows, so there are emollients on there.

Mr. Hicks: Another follow up question would be, the current CS Bank sign has a black raceway, which I think kind of blends in maybe a little bit better. I'm just curious, on yours you have like a gray raceway. It is just more visible. Is that possibly because your text is black so you can't put the black raceway behind the black text. Or, is there any other thing that you can minimize the fact that it is a raceway?

Ms. Beyerl: We try to match the color as close as possible. So, what is showing on our rendering is what our designer polled. When we went out there and did technical surveys, we matched the emollient to make sure it is going to match as closely as possible. The color on there may not be exactly as painted.

Mr. Hicks: Thank you.

Chairman Comeaux: So, the main concern I heard was the size of the sign south facing/Main Street facing sign?

Mr. Snowden: That was Staff's concern from a technical standpoint. I think some other great points have been raised.

Chairman Comeaux: We don't have the ability to enlarge the sign. All the other things we can kind of live with. Is it gray or is it black, right? We might prefer gray to black or whatever. But, we can't live with the wrong size. I will entertain a motion.

Mr. Burd: I will make a motion that we approve this item with the stipulation that the sign elevation fits within our code.

Mr. Snowden: You and I have gone over the process but I always provide the application a written record of action stating exactly what we talked about tonight. The applicant should submit a zoning sign permit application for the proposed signage. Staff will require two copies of plans to confirm compliance with the approved Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant will need to contact the Building Division at 614-322-6802 to submit building plans for review for the proposed wall sign, and they do require engineered plans for that, so be aware of that. Other than that, it's a pleasure.

Ms. Beyerl: Thank you very much.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you gentlemen, it is a pleasure to serve you.

Chairman Comeaux: Before we adjourn, I would just like to say that it is good to see you Mr. Bowman and Mr. Hicks. You both asked great questions tonight, and more than anything, it will be easier to meet quorum. Thank you very much for your time. Having no other business before us, we will stand adjourned.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Nathan Burd, Service Director
SECONDER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
AYES:	Comeaux, Hudson, Bowman, Hicks, Burd
ABSENT:	Zollars

F. OTHER BUSINESS

G. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning Administrator