

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
OCTOBER 3, 2013
6:30 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2013 MEETING

Chairman Beougher: Next on the agenda is approval of the minutes of our September 5, 2013 meeting. Are there any amendments to the meeting as distributed? (No response.) Hearing none, they will stand approved as distributed.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Beougher: Approval of the agenda is the next item and I would like to make a – not necessarily a change, but just an addition to Public Comment, Item A4. I have asked the City Attorney to provide some comments to us and he's provided a memo related to our July meeting. Is there any objection to having Mr. Hood speak at that time? Seeing none, I'll consider that approval of the amended agenda.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Beougher: Is there anyone other than Mr. Hood that would like to make any comments on an item that's not on the agenda? (No response.) Seeing none, Mr. Hood, would you please address the Board? And I want to thank you for coming here today. I know Thursdays are awful busy for you.

Mr. James Hood: It was, but thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Board and thank you for your service to the Board and the City as a whole. I provided you a memo, I hope addressing two main points. One, generally the authority granted to the Board and Boards like yours in the State of Ohio and specifically the authority granted to you by City Council. As I'm sure all of you know, your Board was created by ordinance by City Council under the Charter Section 707 that gives them the grant of authority to create certain Boards that they find that is necessary to the City to conduct

our business. I know that you had a speaker here last – I’m sorry, at your July meeting, I believe, and she brought up certain things, maybe not in the most articulate way, but one of those things I think that she at least tried to touch was the notion of the government’s or the City’s role in regulating Commercial Speech. You will find a section dedicated specifically to that in the memo. I urge you to read it. I tried not to be as long-winded as I am as an attorney. It is four pages, but if you would like to discuss it I’m happy to discuss it with you privately or come back once again to another meeting and discuss it openly with you all collectively together.

But the gist of it is, that sign regulations and Commercial Speech regulations are very well entrenched in Ohio law. You have the authority to regulate them in certain manners. The tipping point and the balance really becomes whether or not you’re doing it purely for an aesthetic purpose because it looks better than other things. But if there are other purposes that are identified such as character and fitness of the different enterprise zone or zone that we have dedicated in the past, the community, the general welfare of the community and its characteristics that are already present in the district itself to adhere to that historical nature and things of the like. If we can identify and articulate those types of issues, you have the right to impose sign regulations. Commercial Speech is protected speech under the First Amendment. There is no question about that. However, it is the least protected speech other than non-protected speech; the proverbial someone yelling “Fire” in a crowded room or movie theater that is entitled to no protection.

Commercial Speech is entitled to protection, but is also regulated speech. There is a very good quote from a Supreme Court case that originated in Ohio that talks about the corollary between commerce and businesses and the way they speak to their customers. There’s a direct connection between their signage, the Commercial Speech and how they draw their customers in. That is left to the local governments to regulate because there is no state framework to do so that is given to us by our humble amendment in the Constitution of the State of Ohio and the City has chosen to exercise that authority. So what you’re doing is perfectly legal and well appreciated, I’m sure for the most part by folks like me. So if there are any specific questions either about my memo that you would like to get back to me with, if there’s a general question you would have me try to answer now, I’ll do my best or I certainly will get back to you if you have something that is on your mind that you would like to talk about.

Mr. Beougher: Do any of the members have questions for Mr. Hood? (No response.) I’ll ask a question or two and I’ll try not to be too long-winded as well. Architects can be long-winded as well as attorneys. You know, there are some in my profession who say you should only be able to vote up or down on their application, that you should not be able to design the building for them and I agree with that concept, but a lot of times our inquiry is “Did the applicant consider other alternatives?” Sometimes we see a font on a sign and it doesn’t read from the distance to the street that we think is appropriate and so, you know, we’re not trying to redesign their project for them but we’re trying to just make sure that they have exhausted all other resources to do their project or do their sign or—

Mr. Hood: This Board has the right and the authority, I should say, to approve, deny or approve of conditions or modifications, applications for either a Certificate of Appropriateness, Zoning Certificate. Don't want to get caught up in the semantics of it, but that's what you have the authority to do, approve, deny, approve with modifications, or approve with conditions. That's what you have the right to do. And I would hope, and we spoke before the meeting started, that some of those things that you're speaking of, the due diligence, the living up to the City's maybe expectations in certain characteristics fitting with the actual place where the development or construction/reconstruction is taking place meets the standards of the neighborhood. I would hope that the majority of those things would be addressed by the staff, and I know that Justin does a very good job in doing those things before it comes to the Board. I understand that all issues can't be addressed because he can't be in the minds of all the Board members. But I hope, for the most part, those things would be addressed before they actually came to the Board, because the last thing we want to do is make an applicant wait the amount of time before the next Board meeting and delay the project any farther. We want to be as efficient and as quick as we possibly can to get what we need to get done to get the approval process through. So you have the right not only to suggest, but actually grant with modification or condition, those types of things; but I urge you to take into consideration that balancing act between, you know, the real intent of the code and getting bogged down in the minute details and in the notion of redesigning a submission that was sent to you.

Mr. Beougher: And speaking of balancing acts, I think all of us are interested in being business-friendly and welcoming businesses to Reynoldsburg, but we also have a responsibility to protect existing businesses and make sure that new businesses coming in have appropriately designed signage and building features to contribute positively to the area in which they are located. A lot of times we get challenged on issues of financial hardship. Do you have any opinion on how far it is appropriate for us to push an applicant to do something a little nicer, a little better? I know in years past the Review Board was requiring brick on almost every project. And what's your opinion?

Mr. Hood: My opinion, both as City Attorney and as a citizen of Reynoldsburg is the standards are minimum standards and I have the suspicion in the terms of property maintenance codes evaluations a lot and so does Mr. Burd as Service Director. Those are also minimum standards which the Council has adopted through ordinance to be basically the floor. It's not the ceiling that we aspire to obtain, but we require your grass to be no longer than six inches, okay? Now hopefully we would expect, and most people would like their neighbors to cut the grass more often than when it reaches 6 inches in height but that's the minimum that we are willing to put with, if you will, as a community. So there are truly minimum standards. It does not mean that we cannot reach for the higher ceiling and do more. But that is my opinion on that and I think that analogy is an appropriate one.

Mr. Beougher: And so when someone brings up constitutional issues we shouldn't be concerned or concerned about our personal liability acting in the interest of the City?

Mr. Hood: That is an excellent question, Mr. Beougher. One that has not been posed, but I am certainly willing to opine on that. The constitutional nature, at least in the way that was brought to you in the July meeting, is not one that you need to concern yourself with. I have reviewed not only the ordinances, our policies, but also the case law. You are free to enforce the existing code as it sits now. I know that we have issues with sign regulations a lot and that also becomes a property maintenance code issue with temporary signage, because those are the gentlemen that actually enforce it; but I feel very confidently that you are not doing anything immoral, illegal or improper in doing your business as a Board.

That does bring me to the next step, though. If there was an allegation made, you acting within your official capacity here as a Board member, would be granted immunity, okay? As long you acted within your scope here as a Board member. If you step outside of the scope of your membership here, you would basically acting as an individual. But as you act as an official of the City you are entitled, as I am entitled and Mr. Burd in his other role with the City, to immunity, okay? Which basically means, in a nutshell, that even if you are negligent and you do something improper, you are still granted immunity. Not only would you be covered by our insurance policies that we have for all of the administrative departments and Boards, but long story short, simple negligence without malicious intent is basically granted immunity for government officials. The notion being, sovereignty is that the folks of Reynoldsburg collectively should not pay for a simple mistake made by either an official or an employee of the City, even though if they were in either private America in their private lives they would be held responsible financially.

Mr. Beougher: You sometimes hear the words arbitrary and capricious used in this context and as long as we are consistently applying the regulations, I think we are—

Mr. Hood: Consistency is absolutely the key. Arbitrary and capricious is a standard here as in other administrative functions or of the City. BZBA has the same standard. Actually, as a matter of fact, City Council has the same standard. If one of your decisions was appealed to that Board, appealed to that Council, a denials appeal. That is a minimum threshold. We cannot make arbitrary and capricious decisions. Basically the way I try to explain it is be reasonable; not only be reasonable, be able to articulate why it is you made the decision you made. And I would urge you as well to make sure, and it's in my memo, to make sure the record is clear, okay? I realize that in a perfect world I would love for you all to do written findings for your approval or denial later, but this isn't a perfect world and I'm not going to ask you to do anything more than what you're willing to volunteer right now. But make sure the record is clear why it is you made the decision that you made and fall back on those Design standards and your role in reviewing those applications, which is also outlined in your memo.

I urged Council to do the same thing when they hear your appeals, BZBA appeals.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Well, that's all the questions I have. Does that bring up any other questions for the members?

Mr. Spalding: No. I just want to thank you for your support. It's important that we know that we have that kind of – in standing up and standing behind us, support.

Mr. Hood: Well, I understand, Mr. Spalding. I do certainly appreciate your volunteerism here. I know you're not compensated for your work here. Also understand I read every bit of the minutes that come before me even though I may not appear at the meetings. I do still read all the minutes and I try to get a good understanding of what's going on. And if I do see issues, I certainly will alert Justin or the Development Director or maybe Mr. Beougher to make sure that you all know that there may be something that needs consideration.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you very much.

Mr. Hood: Absolutely. Thanks for having me. I appreciate it.

Mr. Beougher: All right. That takes us to Swearing in of Speakers.

5. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Beougher: If you're here to speak on an item on the agenda tonight, will you please rise and raise your right hand?

(Mr. Beougher administers the oath.)

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. 6471 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: JIM HARTLEY, SIGNCOM, INC., TITLE MAX/BGS MAIN LLC (#161195).

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins, I know that there was a special meeting of the BZBA tonight dealing with – is this the right—

Mr. Robbins: No, a different project.

Mr. Beougher: We were just briefed. This is the one that we ask questions and said he would not have to appear.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. So what's going on is the application is still being, I believe, appealed to the City. Again, we feel uncomfortable in allowing the Design

Review Board, or encouraging the Design Review Board, to approve signage for a use that's not been allowable through the City.

Mr. Beougher: And, as I recall, we are only permitted to table or postpone an item one meeting, or is that incorrect?

Mr. Robbins: I believe it is 45 days.

Mr. Beougher: So we would be outside of that 45-day limit if we tabled it again?

Mr. Robbins: That would be correct.

Mr. Beougher: So they would have to – our action should be to deny it and then have them re-apply.

Mr. Robbins: I think that would be the—

Mr. Beougher: And the motion needs to be in a positive? So we need a motion to approve?

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a motion to approve?

Mr. Spalding: I have a motion to approve.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second?

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Spalding and Mr. Hudson. Mr. Robbins, would you please call the roll?

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Beougher voted "no." Mr. Burd voted "no." Mr. Hudson voted "no." Mr. Spalding voted "no.")

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, gentlemen, and the applicant is encouraged to re-apply after their appeal is resolved, if it's resolved positively?

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. 8467 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: BILL HELLMAN, CVS CAREMARK, LLC (#162177). EXTERIOR SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Beougher: Is there someone here to address this item? Mr. Robbins?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. Just to give you a bit of background, this is a company that works for CVS. They are located out of Minnesota, I believe. Staff didn't think it would be necessary for the gentleman from Minnesota, I believe, he had perhaps worked something out for somebody to come here, but apparently not. So I think this one's pretty straight forward. 8467 East Main, CVS, minor site alterations, Application #162177. The property is located at the corner of Taylor Road and East Main Street. What they're doing is they submitted for a minor site plan application basically to move and re-stripe the parking lot, to move some ADA parking spaces closer to the door, add some striping across the parking lot, and then create a sidewalk that actually connects the parking lot to the public sidewalk. There is a portion of the minor site plan application that requires Design Board approval which is why you guys are seeing this application right now.

Final determination by the Board regarding their pedestrian access and crossing is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed improvements meet the standards in Section 1103.12 and are keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Robbins. Are there any questions from the members for Mr. Robbins? (No response.) And I assume the Building Department is involved in the disabled parking?

Mr. Robbins: I believe so. I think the same numbers are being kept. They have some existing spaces that are – I can see them here. There are three – it looks like there's one van access, two regular ADA spaces and those are just moving to the corner of the building and that would allow easy access for folks needing those spaces to the building.

Mr. Beougher: And they're involved in reviewing the accessible route to the public way?

Mr. Robbins: I believe so, either them or the Engineering Department.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Any other questions?

Mr. Spalding: I do have one question. On the diagram, where is that sidewalk you mentioned is actually going to be? Can you go back to the building so I can see. I just want to see where—

Mr. Robbins: It's going to run basically across here—

Mr. Spalding: Okay.

Mr. Robbins: --and it jogs around the tree. I think they're doing that to get the slope correct.

Mr. Spalding: I understand. Yeah. When I went by there today and was trying to see it and I was trying to figure out exactly where that went. Thank you.

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

Mr. Burd: I move that we approve this as submitted.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second?

Mr. Spalding: Yes. I second that.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Burd and Mr. Spalding. Any further discussion? (No response.) Mr. Robbins.

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

Mr. Beougher: There's no one here to remind that they need a permit.

Mr. Robbins: I encouraged the applicant to contact the Building Department and Engineering Department to make sure that all of their requirements are met.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Robbins.

2. 6557 EAST LIVINGSTON AVENUE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: E R CIMILLUCLE, SIGN SHOP, INC., BESSIE AFRICAN HAIR BRAIDING, (#162138). NEW WALL SIGNAGE.

Mr. Timothy Masters: My name is Timothy Masters. I am the lead designer and production manager at the shop. I did notice one correction that needs to be addressed, is this is not new wall signage. This is simply a reface.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Masters.

Mr. Robbins: Oh, yeah. I see what you mean. I apologize for that. It is a refacing.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins, can you introduce the revised application?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. As mentioned, this is 6557 East Livingston Avenue, Application #162138. The applicant is requesting Design Board Approval for the refacing of an existing wall sign measuring 8 feet by 4 feet. The existing property is within the Community Commercial Overlay District and adjacent businesses include

general retail within the plaza area and I believe it's one of these over here. Is that correct?

Mr. Masters: Is that the third one over -- your hand's, right there.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. One thing I brought up in the staff report, and this is something that I talked to Mr. Cimillucle about, was just the legibility of the sign. Again, we're not here to design the signs. It's just the size and the fact that it's italic might be a little bit difficult to read from a distance. He did indicate that the applicant, that was their logo, so this is—

Mr. Masters: We did address that with the applicant and we've come to the point where they're so far off Livingston Avenue anyway that there wasn't anything that we could do to make it more readable that was within -- so they just want their signage for purposes of identification when the people get into the parking lot and closer. You're never going to be able to read this particular signage from Livingston Avenue. I mean, you're so far off the road. So they just wanted it to look nice and appealing.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. For the record, it is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for the sign refacing. The proposed signage is in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Is there any way to make -- are the colors involved in the branding?

Mr. Masters: The colors-- The customer actually provided me with a design that I even re-designed to make it bolder. I mean, I've already put two steps in to make it more readable and this was the compromise that myself and the customer have already come up with.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you. Do the members have any questions?

Mr. Spalding: I have one question. On the sign itself, okay? I mean, there are two different phone numbers.

Mr. Masters: Um-um.

Mr. Spalding: Is there a reason for that?

Mr. Masters: To the best of my ability I tried to convince them to not use two phone numbers. I have always in my entire career -- I've been making signs for 17 years -- never put two phone numbers on a sign but it was just -- that was what the customer wanted.

Mr. Spalding: Just interesting. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: So the second one is for those who can't—

(discussion)

Mr. Masters: The second one is the owner's cell phone number, almost like an after hours number so it would be – they're not planning on doing regular hours. I'm not 100% for certain, but he was pretty adamant that they were both on the sign.

Mr. Spalding: Okay. That's fine.

Mr. Spalding: It just brings up a recollection. There was a time when our state office was out of power. You were supposed to call a number and it was alphabetical characters for the last four characters and everyone was trying to call it on their cell phone and it didn't have any letters, it just had the numbers. So like, okay now, it was 1, ABC. So modern technology. Okay. Any other questions?

Mr. Hudson: The only thing I saw that was a problem was expand "The Mind Feel Beautiful". It's so small. Even if you're standing close to it you probably couldn't see it.

Mr. Masters: It's almost a throw-away line to the customer, but that is the exact branding that they wanted.

Mr. Hudson: It's so small. It's very hard to read.

Mr. Beougher: You want to expand the letters, not just mind.

Mr. Masters: That's actually on my initial re-design for the customer, had it larger, and this is something that they – I actually told them, I said, "Nobody's going to read it." And they said, "I don't care."

Mr. Hudson: You could make her whole logo wording larger by reducing or taking that out and just making it bigger and you could see more of it.

Mr. Masters: Honestly, at that point, the extra _____ is only going to get your letters up another 1 or 2 inches. It's going to give you 20 feet of readability, so that's why they only want – that's why they went ahead and went with the design.

Mr. Hudson: Well, if that's what they want, I mean, I'm fine with it. I just thought it looked a little busy in that area.

Mr. Masters: In my professional opinion, this isn't one of those that I'm going to run out and tell the world that I designed, but it is what the customer wants.

Mr. Beougher: Well, you're on record now. All right. Mr. Burd, do you have any questions?

Mr. Burd: No, I'm fine with it.

Mr. Beougher: All right. I think we've exhausted the level of inquiry that we're permitted without voting on it, so is there a motion?

Mr. Hudson: I'll move to approve as is.

Mr. Burd: Second.

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

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

Mr. Robbins: And I'm going to have to say this two or three times. Make sure the sign permit has been submitted. Every sign, even a reface, requires a sign permit. Double-check with the Building Department to make sure that their requirements are met and the City does require that anybody placing a sign within the City, even a re-face, is to be licensed and bonded. Just for the record.

Mr. Beougher: So, you said three times. I see you're also on C3—

Mr. Masters: And 5.

Mr. Beougher: And 5. Okay. So you get a break. All right.

3. 6563 EAST LIVINGSTON AVENUE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: E R CIMILLUCE, SIGN SHOP, INC., BUCKEYE CHICKEN (#162137). NEW WALL SIGNAGE AND SIGN REFACE.

Mr. Beougher: All right. And Mr. Masters is once again appearing for applicant. Mr. Robbins, would you introduce the item?

Mr. Robbins: I would love to. Again, 6563 East Livingston Avenue for Buckeye Chicken, Application # 162137. The property is located in the Blacklick Plaza Shopping Center at the corner of East Livingston Avenue and Baldwin Road. The same shopping center, just an outbuilding, the vacant Dairy Queen, which is now operating as Buckeye Chicken. Requesting Design Board Approval for the following signage. A reface of an existing pole sign measuring 9 feet by 5 feet 8 inches and new wall signage measuring 8 feet 2 inches by 4 feet 11 inches. The existing property is within the Community Commercial Overlay District. The property again is a former Dairy Queen. Applicant was granted a Special Exception Use Permit in December 2012. And we can see – first

to give you an idea of where this area is. This is the Dairy Queen – excuse me, Buckeye Chicken building on East Livingston and this is looking toward the south and then we have the proposed signage. So the pole sign is existing and the reface, the sign is existing non-conforming. They are allowed to reface by code. The issue is – and I'll just read off what the code says, "Relocation and replacement of non-conforming signs so the non-conforming sign shall not be structurally relocated or replaced unless it is brought in compliance with this chapter. Should any replacement or relocation take place without being brought into compliance, the sign shall be existing illegally. A non-conforming sign shall be maintained or repaired in accordance with the following..." and it goes on.

Part of the application was the sign that you see on the front of the building is an existing cabinet sign that currently exists on the west side of the building and the proposal was to move the cabinet to the front of the building and then reface it. Since cabinet signs are not allowable in our Overlay, this is not something that's allowable by code. So, as staff, we recommended that the Section 1181.05(f)3 says the moving of a non-conforming sign is not allowable. Staff has no concerns with the graphics or the shape of the signage, but recommends that the Board approve the signage under one of the following conditions. First, is that the either/or, that the applicant can leave the existing wall sign in its current location and reface the existing cabinet, or the applicant can place a new non-cabinet style sign with the same graphics and location as proposed. Following decision by the applicant and a determination by the Board, staff recommends the proposed signage be approved with conditions. Once conditions are met, the proposed signage is in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area. And this is something I believe I did let Mr. Cimilluce know ahead of the meeting that this was going to come up.

Mr. Masters: We've already discussed this with the customer. The customer is concerned why you wanted to move it anyway, because on the west side of the building there are trees or something. So he is just going to dismount and dismantle the non-conforming cabinet and we will be placing a flat face sign on the front of the sign on the front of the building on non-illuminated, non, you know -- and then, at that point, if he desires illumination because those parking lot lights are not enough or something, then he or his building company will come before the Board for a simple spotlight at a later date. But for now that sign will not be illuminated. It'll just be a flat sign.

Mr. Beougher: I certainly wish Mr. Hood were still here. When I look at the image of the sign, I make a connection to a certain academic institution and their athletic program.

Mr. Masters: It was – that is intentional but it is within – the copyright laws have not been infringed upon because they are not in the proper proportions to theirs. The red stripe is wider and both the black and white stripes are narrower than said institution and when they were doing business down on Livingston Avenue, this particular company has already had a fight with said academic institution and won because they

do not and cannot own the word Buckeye. This is the Buckeye State. So all of those concerns have already been addressed.

Mr. Beougher: Well, okay. I asked the question I had to ask. Any questions from the members?

Mr. Burd: Just so I'm clear, the flashing sign, you mention that's where it's identified in the picture.

Mr. Masters: Yes, that is where we're still going to put it. We were going to be a sign – it's already been moved once. When it was the Dairy Queen, it was in the tan area. You can almost see a ghost of it there. Then it was moved to the side of the building by a previous tenant so, apparently, it's already outside of code. So they're just going to dismantle it.

Mr. Beougher: So that would qualify under the second condition that we were looking at?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, it wouldn't be a cabinet sign anymore and it would allowable under code.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Spalding: I do have one question. I want to just see the sign on the far left. I wanted to see what it looks like from the sky. Is that going to be illuminated? The big sign?

Mr. Masters: Yes. The big sign has light bulbs in it now. Actually if you drive by that's all you can see is the light bulbs. The area below is changeable lettering sign, still existing from when this was a Dairy Queen. So they're just going to keep that. They have letters for it. So that bottom sign, we're doing absolutely nothing to. We're just refacing the top. I have the old Dairy Queen face in my shop so that I can get the exact size.

Mr. Spalding: And for sure you're going to dismantle the old drive-thru sign on the west side? You're going to take that down?

Mr. Masters: Well, that's up to the customer, but nothing is going to happen with it at this time and the plans are for them to dismantle it, but that's not something that we're going to do at this point. We've told the customer what the recommendation of the Board – cause the Board said they could reface it as it sits according to Mr. Robbins and they decided to just have it dismantled since it's not even viewable because of trees. So that is the plan, but it's not our company's business.

Mr. Spalding: I appreciate it.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you Mr. Spanding and that you, Mr. Burd, prior to that. Any other questions? (No response.) Just looking at the pole sign and if you made the background green and then had thin red stripes and then some numbers at the edges-- Anyway. Okay, is there a motion?

Mr. Burd: I make a motion that we approve the sign as presented with the understanding that the applicant replace a new flat face sign at the location of the building as presented.

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

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

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

Mr. Robbins: Real quick, we're going to need you to resubmit – I believe sign permits are already on record with our office. If they are not, sign permits will need to be applied for for each sign. With that sign permit, we need to see updated material that shows how that sign is going to be actually constructed, something that shows it's not a reface but actually a new sign. In addition, I know the Building Department will require drawings and a building permit for any sign that goes up. So just as long as you're aware of that.

4. **2080 BIRCHVIEW DRIVE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: ELITE ROUTING SOLUTIONS, EDEN AT CALEB'S CROSSING (#162289). SIGN REFACE.

Mr. Mike Lyons: My name is Mike Lyons with Elite Routing Solutions.

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

Mr. Robbins: Yes. One thing I want to point out is the Application number on the staff report is different than the Application number that you see on the screen. The one on the screen is correct. The one on the staff report is incorrect.

Mr. Beougher: And that matches the one in the agenda?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct. So this is Application number 162289, for 2080 Birchview Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, requesting Design Board approval for the following signage: The refacing of an existing monument sign and refacing of an existing wall sign. The existing monument sign is within the existing Community Commercial Overlay District. A comprehensive sign plan was approved as submitted by the BZBA. Adjacent land uses include multi-family residential and general office. I would like to say that this is multi-family residential. So part of this was they did have to

go through Comprehensive Sign Plan because it was part of the residential area, and then they had to go through Board of Zoning and Building Appeals because it's in the Overlay District. You can see in the first image on the corner of the property at Eastgreen and Brice Road is the existing monument sign, which I assume you have an agreement with the bank that's here. They're basically just taking the face off, putting in a new face to reflect the new property owner and the new name of the development. In addition, there's the clubhouse back here in front of the pool, and you can see where the existing wall sign is that will be refaced, again to show the new property owners and the sign face as submitted.

I do want to say that technically, as far as I understand, since only the monument sign is in the Overlay, I believe that is all that would be covered under this application. It's a tricky situation, but I think if we can approve both of them, I don't see an issue with it.

As far as a recommendation goes, the sign is clear, legible and attractive and it's the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted as the signage is in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Robbins. Anything you'd like to add?

Mr. Lyons: The only thing I'd like to add is that is some old art work. The new updated art work I dropped off and submitted. That's not what's up there. It's similar, but-- Yep, exactly.

Mr. Beougher: So the exhibits in your package are the current exhibits and the only comment I'd have on the monument sign is the "L" in leasing is missing, but it's kind of nice because then you have an easing. I'm assuming the "L" will come back.

Mr. Lyons: That's what's currently on there now.

Mr. Beougher: So it will have an "L". It will be a leasing sign and not an easing sign?

Mr. Lyons: That is correct.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from members? (No response.) Can I get a motion?

Mr. Spalding: I move that we approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: And before we take the vote, Mr. Robbins, do we need to clarify that we're approving only the monument sign or do we just approve the application?

Mr. Robbins: I would say we approve the application.

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

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

Mr. Robbins: A sign permit is required for each of the signs to be refaced. I would double check with the Building Department to make sure the requirements are met and they do require stamped engineering drawings for new signage. I would also like to say that you want to make sure that you are licensed and bonded through the City as well, and insured. Thank you.

5. **1500 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: E R CIMILLUCE, SIGN SHOPO, INC., M L SLANE REALTY (#161818)

Mr. Beougher: This is for a new monument sign. Mr. Masters, I think we know you by now so, Mr. Robbins, could you please introduce the item?

Mr. Robbins: Again, this is for 1500 Brice Road, Application #161818, requesting Design Board approval for a new tenant panel, pole style ground sign measuring 4' x 8'. There is an Overlay District along Brice Road. It does cut out in that area, so this is not part of the Overlay District. Again, the existing property is not in the adjacent. Adjacent land uses include single family residential to the east, medical offices to the north and the south. This is the property. The back story is that they have had an existing sign. That sign was destroyed in some sort of windstorm, I imagine probably the same one that took out the car wash. What they're proposing is a sign in the same location, and you can see the sign here. I believe the materials are white PVC—

Mr. Masters: White PVC posts with what we call Max Metal. It's a thin aluminum face with a plastic core so that it gives you the durability, you know, the wearability of the metal without the weight.

Mr. Robbins: So, again, because this is not in the Overlay District, there is a 10' maximum to the height of the sign versus the 6' that you see in the Overlay.

Mr. Masters: So it's an 8' sign with only 1' off the ground, so it is definitely within the 10' maximum height requirement.

Mr. Robbins: Again, the signage is to be placed in the same location as the existing sign. The rest of the signs in the area are of typical character for what you would see in that area. This is fairly well matching with the surrounding land uses, the surrounding businesses. The signage is clear, legible and attractive and it's the recommendation of staff that a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The

proposed signage is in keeping with the character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, thank you, Mr. Robbins. Mr. Masters, would you like to add anything?

Mr. Masters: No.

Mr. Beougher: Do the members have any questions?

Mr. Hudson: Is there any possibility of doing some landscaping around the bottom of the sign?

Mr. Masters: Well, there is actually landscaping still in the area. There's a mulch pit there. That overhead actually shows the old sign before it was destroyed. It had a single pole coming up and then it was actually internally illuminated, where this one is going to have the two poles on the sides and not be internally illuminated. It's a realtor's office. She's not encouraging people to come in after 5:00 anyway, so they didn't see any need or purpose for internal illumination.

Mr. Hudson: It's the landscaping. It looks like there's some landscaping there now.

Mr. Masters: Yes. There is a mulch area with-- I'm not 100% certain. It's been a while since I drove past it. It's going in an area that was already landscaped for the old signage and they're planning on maintaining that landscaping.

Mr. Beougher: Based on the color it looks like some fall mums or something like that. You said it's not internally illuminated. You're not planning to externally illuminate it?

Mr. Masters: We are not. So what the customer does after we're done erecting the sign, that's up to them. We're not planning on doing any illumination to the sign whatsoever.

Mr. Beougher: And I assume, Mr. Robbins, that would not be appropriate under the code?

Mr. Robbins: External illumination? As long as it doesn't cause reflection or glare, it's not problematic.

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

Mr. Hudson: I'll move to approve as submitted.

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

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

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

Mr. Robbins: I do know for a fact that this will required stamped engineering drawings and will require a building permit.

Mr. Masters: Those are either already completed or in process.

Mr. Robbins: Okay, sounds good. And I do believe I have the sign permit which I can approve tomorrow. Let the building department know as well.

6. **6294 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT:
MIKE MCCRONE, ADA ARCHITECTS, INC., HARBOR FREIGHT TOOLS (#162175).
NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDING

Mr. Beougher: Welcome, and could you please first state your name for the record?

Mr. Mike McCrone: I’m Mike McCrone with ADA Architects.

Mr. Adam Steele: I’m Adam Steele with Harbor Freight Tools, National Director of Construcion.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Mr. Robbins, could you introduce this item to the Board?

Mr. Robbins: Again, 6294 East Main Street for Harbor Freight Tools, a new commercial structure and major site plan, Application #162175. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street across from Idlewild Drive. Requesting Design Board approval for the development of a site and a new 15,000 square foot masonry building with a free standing ground sign. It is currently vacant. The property is located in the Community Services district. The application has gone before the BZBA in September. The application was tabled to resolve Streetscape and easement issues. As of two hours ago, the major site plan application was approved by the BZBA previous to this meeting. The updated approved plans, I believe, were sent to you. However, if the Board does not have them, I do have copies up here that you can feel free to take a look at. Let me make sure you have a copy of that actually.

As a bit of background, we’ve been working with this applicant for some time now to meet the intent of the Overlay code. They have responded very well to basically meeting the intent of the code as it involves site design and layout. The building has been brought up close to the street, windows in the front, parking layout works very well and there is a possibility of a stop light that the applicant and the adjacent property owner, I think, will be pursuing in the future. As far as the building goes, again, staff has found the applicant has made a good faith attempt at following the intent of code. The

building front along East Main includes _____ windows and contracting materials that would add to the pedestrian interest.

What staff does have concern regarding the arrangement and the composition of the clear story windows on the east and west façade of the building. One of the things to understand that this is going to be one of the first buildings that you see as you travel into Reynoldsburg and that façade that faces west is going to be one of the first things as well. The concern of staff is that the architectural detail and characteristics, I think, to put it bluntly, could be a little better, a little more engaging for the pedestrians on the street and for the character of the district. The windows are positioned – they break up the accent banding around the building. There's no detail above the window and staff does understand that the windows require a certain height to accommodate interior shelving within the building. Not to design the building, but a possible solution would be to add more vertical elements to kind of break up that front façade and get a little more architectural character. Again, the concern is large expanses of façade that aren't really articulated that well.

Staff finds that the applicant has made, in regards to site adapting, has made a good faith attempt at following the intent of the code. Screening is provided at the edge of the property, interior lot landscaping is provided within the parking islands. After a review by the Board, staff recommends a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted with the condition that the applicant work with staff to resolve the issues on the façade, basically adding some sort of architectural detailing characteristics.

Just so the Board understands, I believe the applicant is on a timeline in order to get to December 11, I believe, permits have to be issued by the City or else the property deal falls through. That is my understanding. So if the Board decides that tabling is the best option at this point, they can come back in a month and, in the meantime, still get some things done in terms of getting drawings finished up and basically ready for submission to the Building Department. So I guess the question is what would the Board decide as what is reasonable and what is necessary for the façade of the building. I hope I was somewhat articulate in my presentation.

Mr. Beougher: I think you expressed your concerns very well. Thank you, Mr. Robbins. I want to thank Mr. McCrone for coming before us last month as well and giving us a heads-up and asking for our input. I appreciate the fact that you used masonry and some brick. Looking at the renderings, I share Mr. Robbins' concern about the windows breaking that accent band. It does look kind of unplanned, if you will. I like the _____ at the corner there with the extra mullion that we don't see on the elevations we have. I like that grid appearance and it seems like that might provide you with an opportunity to incorporate the windows into that rhythm, perhaps directly under the sign band – I'm sorry, not sign band, but accent coursing. The colors, to me, are pleasing, but that's just my opinion. Mr. McCrone, would you like to add anything to Mr. Robbins' introduction?

Mr. McCrone: Yes. We're willing to add the pilasters and work with our design team to add a little bit more favor to that elevation. We are under the time constraints and we've shown that we've worked with all of the Boards to accommodate any request that they've had, so we will work with the Board, make revisions as necessary, and we'd like to proceed with the construction drawings. Do you want to add something, Adam?

Mr. Steele: I appreciate Mr. Robbins' comments about efforts working with us. We're excited to come to Reynoldsburg and excited to be on the Gateway coming into Reynoldsburg, and I understand Mr. Robbins' and the Board's concern, and we'll concur and deliver what the City wants. The concern that we have is like we talked about, the real estate deal needs to be completed by the middle of December, or the deal falls through. So what needs to happen is all the government we need is at hand and we need to present those at the closing. That's the urgency and also the willingness to work very closely with the City to expedite this project.

Mr. Beougher: I see some masonry panels by your chair back there. Can you perhaps show us the pretty colors?

Mr. Steele: I wanted to show you the different type of masonry. There's face brick. These are the colors you see. We're going to do similar colors to these. These are actually the colors on the adjacent building. They have a brick base (inaudible). We're proposing to do something that kind of accentuates those colors (inaudible). So this would be the face brick material at the corners and at the towers. As far as the masonry material _____ 4" high _____ CMU that's flow-thru wall. We feel that's better because of the large mass. The building next door and most of the buildings I see are smaller (inaudible). We feel masonry is appropriate for a larger mass. (Inaudible – off mic)

Mr. Robbins: So that would be the water table?

Mr. Steele: Yes. You have some cornice and then some type of the entry and on top of the building we propose EIFS for those. These aren't the exact colors we're using, but they would be in the vicinity of these colors. (Inaudible – off mic)

Mr. Beougher: Is Spec Brick the system that has an internal water management feature?

Mr. McCrone: Well, these are thru-wall CMU and as far as water management, they have integral water repellant and there's also, if we're interested in doing it, there's a coating that you put on the post, insulation coating, and we have water management within out details. There's a thru-wall block. We will manage the water near the bottom of the wall with weep holes and flashing.

Mr. Beougher: I saw a product that Oberfield's was displaying at a trade show and it had some sloped features on the inside that directed water towards the outside and I just – I couldn't remember the name. Thank you.

Mr. McCrone: We have details in the construction drawings that at every place that water would collect, to get the water out we have flashing and weep holes.

Mr. Beougher: I do like flipping the colors because of the height of the building as well as it's placement adjacent to the roadway. The other building is way back behind the parking lot and does not have the physical presence that yours will. So a lighter color will be a little less ominous. Any questions from the members?

Mr. Robbins: Mike, if I can, I have the original rendering that you had sent over. To give you a bit of background, they designed the side façade of the building to have signage, both sides. In our code it's only allowable on the front that faces Main Street. So this is what was originally submitted. You can tell just the front façade and how that breaks up that expanse. I think this architecturally works pretty well. I just wanted to let the Board know and the direction, I guess, of something to break up that façade a little bit and create a little more of a pattern, little more rhythm, a little more interest for pedestrians and to fit in with the character of the area.

Mike, what was this original material that you had inside those front entryways? The white that looks like a panelized system?

Mr. McCrone: Originally it was EFIS, but we changed that to masonry after we spoke last month about the desire of the Board that most of the materials be masonry. We're not opposed to an element like that and that's a possible solution for your concerns. The reason we changed it is because we had intended signage to be there. Since the code didn't allow signage, we felt that that element looks empty without the signage. That's why we changed it.

(Discussion off mic.)

Mr. Robbins: I don't think I asked you, but does Harbor Freight have any logos besides the—

Mr. McCrone: No. Well, I'll take that back. It just says, "Harbor Freight, Quality Tools, Low Price." That signage mainly is in the _____ and that would be an alternate sign instead of saying the two line Harbor Freight Tools, there's an alternate sign that says more of a logo incorporated. So if you propose that we do that and that satisfies your concerns and enables us to incorporate that requirement or that approved with modifications, we'd be agreeable to that.

Mr. Robbins: This is something I just wanted the Board to have a chance to take a look at.

Mr. Beougher: It's definitely a more dramatic appearance from the west and in looking at the elevation now, it doesn't look nearly as good. Did I hear you say you'd be willing to do that? I mean you like the appearance?

Mr. McCrone: I think it looks a little more inviting as far as appearance, just looking at it as a store. I like that bump-out, it looks good.

Mr. Beougher: And, who knows? We might change our code one day to allow signs on the side, or you could go after a variance, so it gives you a place to put something if you so choose later with approval.

Mr. Robbins: Another thing I do want to bring out is the elevation on the east side. I think a bump out like this, it does help to break that up and it gives it a little bit of articulation.

Mr. McCrone: I would just like to comment on the east side. The east side is very close to a storage facility. I'm not sure that is appropriate to have that type of tower on the east side.

Mr. Robbins: I would agree with you.

Mr. McCrone: I'd be willing to do piers and masonry color changes on the east side, but I think that tower element really belongs on the south side and the west side. On the east side we would do piers and color changes as opposed to a tower.

Mr. Beougher: Something to break up the width of the wall. It just looks very long.

Mr. McCrone: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: And Mr. Robbins asked about the rack height related to the windows. Is that the reason they're at the location they are?

Mr. McCrone: Yes. Harbor Freight uses gondolas that are 7' in the sales area and 8' in the sales replenishment area. The reason those windows are there for us is for natural light, but we have so many racks that are required that we really need that exterior wall for the racks. We are relocating several of our planned racks in order to accommodate the 40% light at the glazing in the front and the south wall and as it turns the corner to the west wall, but we really need the remainder of the wall for the racking.

Mr. Beougher: So is lowering the windows not an option then?

Mr. McCrone: It really isn't, because then you would see the back of gondolas and we really – we've already relocated quite a few of them and there's strict protocol for the amount of racking and the perimeter walls are very important. The racking is staged there. So if we were to skip racking at all of those windows, we would really compromise the fixture plan.

Mr. Robbins: I'm going to throw out some ideas, I guess, involving the east elevation as if you had this façade like you have now. Basically for each column line, if

you had a pier and then you had the window centered in between those and then if you had some sort of outline on the bottom of those windows basically to give them a little more mass, it could be a color change underneath them or you said set the material back an inch. It could be a way, I guess, to start to create a pattern between the piers and the windows and it could make a really nice façade. But, again, I don't want to design buildings for people.

Mr. McCrone: I like that suggestion. I think we can accommodate that.

Mr. Beougher: If I were drawing this is my office, I would move the windows up and down and maybe stop the sill off the bottom of that band and maybe even put it on top, but the niceness would be lost in lining it up with the _____ on the corners. How high – could they go higher?

Mr. McCrone: Yeah, the windows can go higher, they just can't go lower.

Mr. Beougher: So what's the ceiling height?

Mr. McCrone: There's no ceiling. The lowest roof structure in the rear is 13' and at the front, I believe, it's 18'. So we can go to the bottom of 12'8", whereas now the bottom is roughly at – I'm sorry, the top of the window's at 12'8", now I believe the top of the window is roughly 11'4".

Mr. Beougher: So you are constrained in the back at least.

Mr. McCrone: Yes. There's no view of those windows from the front. The front and the back are not the same, cause the front has the low windows, the side – we have the ability to move those up as necessary to give it more flair.

Mr. Robbins: I have a zoomed-in version of the elevation. The different accent band _____, top of the entry element is 18' and what did you say was the bottom of the joists at the lowest point in the building?

Mr. McCrone: I believe at the front – actually the back, I believe we've raised it above the minimum. The back is 14' and the front, $\frac{1}{4}$ " per foot at 100', I think it's 20'4" at the bottom at the front. So there's plenty of room to move the windows up.

Mr. Beougher: I thought I heard something about 13' at the lowest point.

Mr. McCrone: I believe we designed this to give us more than the minimum. So at the rear the bottom of the joist is 14'. The roof slopes up to the front at $\frac{1}{4}$ " per foot, so I believe that's 2'4" roughly of roof slope. So at the front, the bottom of the joist is roughly 16'4".

Mr. Beougher: And I don't know that moving the windows up is going to solve the aesthetic issue that Mr. Robbins expressed initially.

Mr. McCrone: So on the west end, we discussed how we could add the tower. We could also work with the windows to add more interest. On the east elevation we were talking about pouring a pier at each column line and also moving the windows up and making a relationship between the windows and the banding, that the windows would be above the band and we're willing to do those.

Mr. Robbins: It seems another way you could do it as well is have the banding as kind of a visual header for the windows. So if you pop that up above the window, have it run around the building, the windows sit below it and then you have something that kind of anchors it in a little bit. But I guess that messes up the front façade.

Mr. Beougher: Well, yeah, the top of the storefront both here and on the front is also the bottom of the band. So you begin destroying that design balance that he's worked so hard to achieve. So, Mr. Robbins, would you be comfortable if we approve this working with Mr. McCrone to achieve the things we've discussed?

Mr. Robbins: I would. And one thing I would ask of the Board is before I give my final approval, if the Board deems appropriate, if I can get feedback from the Board as well via email or some other method.

Mr. Beougher: That seems fine. I like that idea.

Mr. Robbins: And part of this, as well, was sorting out the easements and, to a certain extent, it was a little in flux with the site plan and figuring out how the building was actually going to work. It was approved a couple hours ago, but the site plan was more of the focus.

Mr. McCrone: The site plan was more of the focus. Not knowing if the building was and having the site plan approved, that was a focus. Another thing that has driven some of this design is Harbor Freight is not a high end tool store. We don't want to exhibit opulence on our façade. The customer that we look for doesn't – I mean we don't want to show an opulence on the outside. So it was intentionally designed somewhat different for that reason.

Mr. Beougher: I feel your pain, Mr. McCrone. I've had clients like that. Even when they could afford to be opulent, they didn't want the perception that they were. So any other questions from the members?

Mr. Burd: I appreciate your willingness to work with us on this. This is obviously an exciting this for the City and I just appreciate your willingness to be flexible in some of these design matters. It's very helpful for us.

Mr. Beougher: I think we need a motion that is conditioned on working with staff on some of the finder points as discussed here tonight.

Mr. Burd: I'll make a comment before I make a motion. I'm going to reference the date of 8/19 the rendering that had the elevated west side of the building _____, on that drawing. It was the rendering that we talked about on the west side of the building. I think if you're in agreement with that, I think the motion I would like to make would include reference to that window and to the west side of the building as what we'd like to see. Okay, with that understanding, I make a motion that we approve this with the 8/19/13 rendering for the west side of the building and that applicant will work with staff in the coming weeks on the east side of the building and we will provide feedback as appropriate.

Mr. Spalding: I second.

Mr. Beougher: Any other comments, questions, concerns?

(Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

7. 7094 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO 43068: APPLICANT: TRACY FRIDENMAKER, BRANHAM SIGN COMPANY, CENTRAL OHIO PRIMARY CARE (#162254). NEW WALL SIGN AND SIGN REFACE.

Mr. Beougher: Next Item is C7. 7094 East Main Street. Applicant: Tracy Fridenmaker, Branham Sign Company, Central Ohio Primary Care, Application #162254. This is for a new wall sign and sign reface. Could you please state your name?

Mr. Jeff Smith: My name is Jeff Smith with Branham Sign Company.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Smith. That's easier to pronounce. So, Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins: Again, for 7094 East Main Street, Central Ohio Primary Care, Application #162254. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street in front of Reynoldsburg Shopping Center. The zoning is CC, Community Commercial, and it is within our Community Commercial Overlay District. The applicant is requesting Design Board approval for the following a signage: a refacing of an existing monument sign and the installation of one non-illuminated wall sign measuring 168 inches by 35 inches. Existing adjacent businesses include a gas station, car wash, grocery store, and general retail. You can see this is, I believe, the home – excuse me, the previous home of Primary Care Physicians—

(speaking off mic)

Mr. Robbins: OSU, yeah. I believe it was. This is the signage that's being proposed.

Mr. Smith: The actual signage on the front of the building exists.

Mr. Robbins: Oh, it does?

Mr. Smith: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: Oh, excuse me.

Mr. Smith: It is an existing wall sign.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. So it's two refacings then?

Mr. Smith: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. My mistake. Let the record show that it is two refacings of one existing wall sign and one existing monument sign. The wall sign and monument refacing meets all code requirements. It's the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage meets the standards of Section 1103.12. It's keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

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

Mr. Smith: No.

Mr. Robbins: I like the eucalyptus font underneath. It's interesting. Not on the signage.

Mr. Beougher: Not on the signage.

Mr. Robbins: Not on the signage.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I'll just make a comment. I'm pleased to see another physician's office going in here. I was on Council when this came in as Ohio State and they did an expansion into the right-of-way and it was the subject of some controversy and now that we have a 20 foot build-to line they would actually have to bring it out farther, so this is the way the wheel turns, I guess, but I'm glad to see it's going in. Questions from the members? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Hudson: I'll move to approve as presented.

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins.

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

Mr. Beougher: Apparently men of few words are rewarded.

Mr. Smith: Thank you.

Mr. Robbins: A sign permit is required for each sign, even refacing. You have to be licensed, bonded, insured with the City and I would double-check with the Building Department to make sure all the requirements are met as well.

Mr. Beougher: And before I adjourn, there was a change to the agenda that was distributed and that’s what confused me because I had an extra exhibit. Has that been withdrawn?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. It is withdrawn by the applicant. I apologize to the Board members if there was confusion. That was a chiropractic office in the Historic District. They withdrew it. I believe they wanted to wait until sometime next year to take it through DRB.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So we don’t need to hold onto the exhibit?

Mr. Robbins: That’s correct.

Mr. Beougher: I like to recycle things as soon as possible.

E. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Beougher: With no further business before the Board, we stand adjourned at 7:55 p.m. Thank you, gentlemen.

Lane Beougher, Chair

Justin Robbins, Planning Administrator

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