



**MINUTES**

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2017 7:00 PM**

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

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

PRESENT: Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson  
ABSENT: Hudson

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Design Review Board – Regular – August 3, 2017

Minutes stand approved.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Snowden: I'm going to make the suggestion that just for the sake of clarity and doing exterior modifications before we do signage, that we review Item D2 and then Item D1 and then review Item D3 and so forth in numerical order.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, let's do that. Agenda stands approved with the changes.

**4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS**

Speakers for the evening sworn in by Mr. Zollars.

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. Application #179417; 7578 E. Main St; Dollar General Store; Applicant: Mark Bush/Reynoldsburg DG LLC; Historic District - Signage

Mr. Snowden:

7578 E. Main Street - Dollar General - Signage

Application: #179417 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on the north side of E. Main Street, just west of Waggoner Road.

Existing Zoning: CC Community Commerce District / HD Historic Overlay District.

Request: Request for a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications within the Historic Commercial Overlay Subarea of the Historic Overlay District.

Current Use: Vacant

Intended Use: Retail Sales

Applicant: Evans Capital Investments

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for wall and ground signage to accommodate a new commercial building.

The site is currently vacant, but is within an existing commercial shopping center with a variety of retail sales, small office, and eating and drinking establishment uses. To the north, the property is adjacent to an apartment complex (multi-family dwellings) in the AR-2 zoning district. To the south, the property abuts detached office buildings also in the CC district. All properties that front E. Main Street are within the Historic Commercial Overlay Subarea of the Historic Overlay District.

Per Section 1193.12 of the Zoning Code, the maximum area of the applicant's signage is 18SF for ground signage and 20SF for wall signage. The applicant previously received a variance to allow a wall sign up to 32SF. The maximum height for the ground sign is 6FT. The proposed signage meets those area and height requirements.

The applicant is proposing a post and panel ground sign. This is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines. The sign will be externally illuminated and the applicant has provided a landscape detail indicating how the lighting system will be screened. The sign is a 3 color sign when including the color of painted posts. The sign material is an HDU panel which gives the appearance of natural wood. The Board has accepted this type of sign as equivalent to wood in the past. The panel has round mitered corners which given it a traditional look.

The proposed wall sign consists of the same style, materials, and colors, but due to its size, it will have several butt joints with conceal mounting holes of the various panel pieces. The wall sign will be illuminated by gooseneck lamps, which are a permitted illumination type under the Historic Design Guidelines.

The applicant is proposing the ground sign be setback from the ROW of E. Main Street 10FT, which is the minimum requirement of Chapter 1181.

UPDATE: Staff has reviewed the two sign options that have been submitted since this application was tabled. Given the example sign prototypes contained in the Historic District Design Guidelines, Staff's position is that the post and panel sign, or another sign that resembles the hanging signage shown in the guidelines are the most appropriate sign type.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Historic Overlay District. Staff's position is that the applicant has met those standards, recommends the Board approve the original application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Mr. Snowden: This is unfinished business from last month's meeting. Since that time the applicant has submitted, based on comments received from the board at the last meeting, some additional signage options which I sent along to you. Those were listed as Option 1, Option 2, and the original option would still be in play if the board were to make a motion to

reconsider the item in terms of voting. We can still discuss. So, I'll help you when we reach that point, but just in staff's position is that the original understanding what was said at the last meeting that the two examples don't meet the historic district design guideline, prototype signs, the post and panel sign, or another sign that resembles the hanging style signage is what's shown in our guidelines. Those would be the most appropriate sign types. Again, I understand there are folks that want to see a different sign type and that's perfectly fine. I'm just kind of bound by what's in the guidelines. I can't take a position that's different from that if I don't have a reason and I don't really have a reason to in this case. With that I'm happy to answer any questions. I'm sure that the applicant is present and would be happy to answer any questions and I would just say that if you want to vote on this item someone would have to have a motion to reconsider, take a vote on the motion to reconsider from someone who was on the prevailing side at the last meeting. If the board takes no action then it would just remain as a certificate of appropriateness was denied as of the last meeting and the applicant would still have the right to appeal.

Mr. Zollars: Is the applicant here?

Justin Scalph: I'm with OneStop Signs, 2502 SR 131, Goshen, Ohio, representing Dollar General, 7578 E Main St. The last time we were here the post and panel sign was insufficient. What we came back with this time was basically option A or B. One of the cabinets is resting on top of a brick monument base. The other one is fixed to the structure overall. It's basically two options. What I was hoping is that we could gather some sort of consensus behind one of the designs and approve one of them this evening. I maintain the curvature bevels you guys liked. They kind of had the more historic fashion to it. Lighting remained external from goosenecks from below and the material is again that faux wood product. Wanting to appear as wood, but to also ensure longevity. Just let me know if you have any questions and again my name is Justin.

Unknown: Would we be able to pull up the latest two or all three of the... I didn't print off the...I saw them once, but I didn't print them off.

Mr. Snowden: While you do that let me send them around. It looks like I forwarded the e-mail because I was being so careful to make sure I forwarded the e-mail. I just didn't save the PDF in my file and I can't view my e-mail, so let me bring around these copies and I'll retrieve the PDF's from my e-mail when I get back to my office.

Justin Scalph: I think there's 8 copies there. I apologize.

Mr. Snowden: I have the original.

Justin Scalph: Square footage of the posting actually hasn't changed at all. It's the same as the post and panel. It's what was called for in the historic district. So, maintaining the historic standards in terms of size, but the material changed. I only have one copy of the old proposal from the original post and panel.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Snowden would you please remind all of us again what the historic district

signage requirements currently state.

Mr. Snowden: Would you like to look at the PDF of the document? Because I can provide that if you wish.

Mr. Zollars: I don't particularly. Do you want to have him tell us or have us read it?

Mr. Snowden: Let me locate it.

Mr. Zollars: On these two items. Any questions or anything we want to discuss prior to Mr. Snowden getting his information?

Mr. Hicks: I would just like to make a comment that the two brick selections I think would look much nicer overall. I think either one of them would probably be sufficient. My preference would be the full height brick one and my only comment would be maybe if we could mess around with the external lighting, maybe have them be a down light like a gooseneck or something. There's some images in the historic guidelines here that kind of show a lot of lighting like that, it's kind of down lighting.

Justin Scalph: If we do the brick wall, saying to the very top right, if it's basically essentially the panels that's posted to that structure we can do goosenecks from above. If we do this second type here gooseneck becomes more difficult. Does that make sense? As a term of conditional use if you guys want to approve above projection gooseneck lighting I can certainly (inaudible) if we choose the brick type extends to the very top of the height.

Mr. Snowden: It's on the screen in front of you. Can you see the screen? I'll turn the lights off. This the information that's provided. I'm not saying that I think that this document should not be updated; I'm just telling you this is the document we have.

Mr. Zollars: Now that we have that. Walk us through where we left things. We had an approval the last meeting.

Mr. Snowden: At the last meeting the board denied an application and asked the applicant to provide additional options. The board in order to take any action on that application including approving additional options needs to first take a vote so you need a motion, second, and a vote to reconsider. The motion must be made by someone who was on the prevailing side, which was the no vote. I can look back at who that was, but you remember how you voted, it's only been a month. At that point you can reconsider the additional options and someone can make a motion to say I approve the original option, I approve the Option 1 or I approve Option 2 or I approve some other 3rd Option that people come and negotiate through the process.

Mr. Bowman: I was on the prevailing side with the no votes, but I would like to make a motion to reconsider the application with all the new designs.

Mr. Hicks: I would like to second.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Snowden if you could please call the roll on that.

Mr. Snowden: So, just to remind you gentleman a yes vote will reconsider the item and this is application number 179417 for the record. Thank you very much. Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", Mr. Zollars "Yes". The motion to reconsider passes.

Mr. Zollars: Now we're back into discussing three options. Let's open up that for discussion. Anyone here on the board care to add or add to ask of that?

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment. I'd like to thank the applicant for going back to the drawing board and coming up with some great options here and my preference would be the full height brick and conditional approval with gooseneck overhead fixture as shown in the historic guidelines lighting options.

Mr. Zollars: Is that a motion?

Mr. Hicks: Yes.

Mr. Sampson: What is the material of the actual sign? The Dollar General Sign.

Justin Scalph: Typically it's aluminum acrylic, but in this case I think they call out for what they call HDU (inaudible) panel. So, it will be like an embossed texture sand blasted material. It's similar to what you would use on a faux decking material.

Mr. Sampson: Very nice.

Mr. Snowden: The Carnival Ice Cream sign, Mr. Sampson, is the same material.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Hicks has a motion. Is there a second?

Unknown: I don't think he completed his motion.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman I'd like to make a motion that we approve the Dollar General application with the full height brick option and conditionally upon them adding some overhead gooseneck fixtures to illuminate the sign.

Mr. Sampson: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: We have a first and a second. Mr. Snowden will you please call the roll.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Hicks, just for clarification the full height, is that Option 1 or Option 2? I can't see the options in front of me right now. Very well, we'll have to interpret it as the full height. Ok, very well. I know which one we're looking at. Thank you gentleman. Everybody clear before I call the roll?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", Mr. Zollars "Yes". It's approved on that condition sir. If you look on the staff report on page 4. I'll provide that to you in writing, but you'll need a zoning sign permit for the signage and you'll need to submit building plans for review and get building permits for the signage when the time comes.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Steven Hicks, Board Member
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Bill Sampson
<b>AYES:</b>	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Hudson

#### D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Application #179768; 2166 Baltimore Reynoldsburg Road; Noodles World Kitchen; Applicant: Stanley W. Young III, Branham Sign Co; Certificate of Appropriateness - Comprehensive Sign Plan

Mr. Snowden:

2160 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road - Noodles World Kitchen - Comprehensive Sign Plan

Application: #179768 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on the east side of Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road (SR256), just south of Farmsbury Drive.

Existing Zoning: CS Community Services District

Request: Request for a certificate of appropriateness for signage

Current Use: Restaurant (Eating and Drinking Establishment)

Applicant: Stanley W. Young, III/Branham Sign Co.

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for signage at an existing commercial building. The applicant has also indicated their awning replacement, although to replace awning with the same fabric technically Design Review Board approval is not required; however, since they've shown it we can discuss it if they wish. The applicant proposes multiple wall signs, so the application will be reviewed as a comprehensive sign plan.

The site is developed with an existing commercial building and related improvements. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS district, including retail sales, eating and drinking establishments, small office, personal service uses, and some auto related uses.

Per Table 1181, the applicant's sign is a Type B wall sign. The applicant's tenant space is 29FT wide, which would entitle the applicant to 58SF of signage. The applicant's total proposed sign is 45.9SF, which does not exceed the code requirements. The proposed 5 5/8IN projection of the wall sign is consistent with the maximum permitted by the Code, 12IN.

The applicant is proposing an internally illuminated channel letter wall sign on a red backer panel. The backer panel will be mounted directly to the building facade. The overall sign style and design signage is consistent with the sign types previously approved for the Shoppes at East Broad development. The signage matches the general scale of the building, with the main sign mounted to the fascia above the main entrance and the secondary sign side entrance. This is a typical and appropriate place for building signage. The sign's three colors do not exceed the four (4) color maximum of Chapter 1181.

The applicant has also proposed a new sign cabinet to be mounted to the existing monument style based. The colors and design of the sign are consistent with the proposed wall sign. Staff is open to different designs, but prefers a cabinet that does not exceed the width of the existing monument base. The proposed 7FT height and sign areas for both opens do not exceed the code requirements of Chapter 1180, which in this location are 10FT height and 50SF of area.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's position is that the applicant has met those standards, recommends the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. The Board will need to clarify which option of the signs they want.

Mr. Zollars: Any questions or discussions or would the applicant like to add anything to this?

Stanley W. Young III: Nothing really to add other than on the monument sign the preferred brand that Noodles World Kitchen would prefer is actually Option #1, which is the one with the reveal. Yes, it does go slightly beyond the brick as Mr. Snowden indicated. He would prefer it to be vertical, but I can just tell you that their preferred brand is Option #1. If you look at the old Noodles monument sign you'll see that it also was on a small reveal or pole cover there as well and it did extend beyond slightly as well. With this new design and new branding, the monument sign, the two wall signs are more of a rectangular square nature, where the old ones were more of a round type, so we just believe this all ties in well.

Mr. Snowden: So there actually thinking of the cabinet style being similar to the backer panel.

Stanley W. Young III: Correct.

Mr. Snowden: Ok. See I didn't get that there was a kind of square...

Stanley W. Young III: Yes, they're all designed square rectangular now. It just works really well.

Mr. Snowden: Ok. Whereas this was an oval and kind of like independently cut. This cabinet sign was, ok, got it.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you for the clarification.

Stanley W. Young III: Certainly.

Mr. Zollars: Board, comments, questions, motions?

Mr. Bowman: I like Option #1. I'm not sure if that's a consensus. I'm going to make a motion to approve the application with Option #1 on the ground sign.

Mr. Hicks: I second the motion.

Mr. Zollars: We have a second. Mr. Snowden any other questions or discussion? Mr. Snowden, if you could call the roll please.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", Mr. Zollars "Yes". Six votes in favor. Your certificate of appropriateness is approved. Mr. Young is in our office frequently enough that he knows the process as well as I do, but I will provide to him the information on page 10 in writing. He will need a zoning sign permit for the signs, as well as a building permit and plans for the wall signs and you might want to just touch base with Mr. Paskey about the ground sign how the monument vs the existing pedestal, how that's going to play into things.

Stanley W. Young III: Thank you very much.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Eliot Bowman
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Steven Hicks, Board Member
<b>AYES:</b>	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Hudson

2. 2166 Baltimore Reynoldsburg Rd; Application #179820; Applicant Brittany Catania; Certificate of Appropriateness - Exterior Modifications

Mr. Snowden:

2160 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road - Noodles World Kitchen - Exterior Modifications

Application: #179820 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on the east side of Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road (SR256), just south of Farmsbury Drive.

Existing Zoning: CS Community Services District

Request: Request for a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications.

Current Use: Restaurant (Eating and Drinking Establishment)

Applicant: Brittany Catania

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for

exterior modifications to an existing single tenant commercial building. The proposed modifications include the installation of a new pickup-window for drive-thru service.

The site is developed with an existing commercial building and related improvements. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS district, including retail sales, eating and drinking establishments, small office, personal service uses, and some auto related uses.

The applicant's proposed drive-thru use was previously approved for a special exception use permit by the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals. Staff is waiting for final confirmation from the City Council in order to issue the permit. The SEUP was approved by BZBA on condition that the direction of the entry to the eastern-most drive be reversed.

The proposed window location is similar to the existing rhythm of detailing on the north façade of the building. The window and drive-thru lane are screened along the north side by mature trees and evergreen shrubs. The applicant proposes to maintain the existing glass and unfinished aluminum storefront entry. Staff would like the applicant to verbally clarify that the proposed pickup window will have the same materials, because that is not indicated on the plan.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed exterior modifications enhance the characteristics of this commercial district. Staff's position is that the applicant has met those standards, recommends the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Mr. Zollars: Would you like to add anything to that? Or can you please confirm his thought.

Brittany Catania: Yes, I confirm that they will install an aluminum frame, so it will match the existing store front.

Mr. Zollars: Anything that you would like to add to that?

Brittany Catania: No.

Mr. Zollars: Board, any questions or comments?

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, was there two options on the monument sign?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks don't get ahead of yourself that's going to come under the next application. There are two applications.

Mr. Hicks: This is just the drive-thru?

Mr. Snowden: Yes. What happened is and actually this applicant and I'll go and publicly say, this applicant's doing a good job because they contacted me and although they had two separate applications they did coordinate with each other. The sign package folks and the

firm doing the exterior modifications, which isn't always the case here, so that's very helpful for us. That's going to come in the next application. My next report.

Mr. Sampson: Motion to approve as submitted for the drive-thru.

Mr. Bowman: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Snowden we have a first and second to approve. Can you please call the roll?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman who made the motion and who had the second?

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Sampson first and Mr. Bowman seconded it.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you sir. I'll call the roll. Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", Mr. Zollars "Yes". Six votes in favor. The certificate of appropriateness is approved. Mam, if you look on page 6, I've laid out the remaining steps in addition to getting the special exception use process and I'll provide that to you in writing, but you'll need a zoning certificate for the complete exterior modifications and whatever permits and plans required by our building division.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Bill Sampson
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Eliot Bowman
<b>AYES:</b>	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Hudson

3. 2365 Taylor Park Drive; Application #179813; Applicant David Keyser; Certificate of Appropriateness - Major Site Plan

Mr. Snowden:

2365 Taylor Park Drive - New Commercial Buildings - Major Site Plan

Application: #179813 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on the west side of Taylor Park Drive, just south of Taylor Road.

Request: Request for review and approval of a certificate of appropriateness for a major site plan.

Existing Zoning: CS Community Services District w/ Limited Overlay

Current Use: Retail Sales (accessory parking)

Proposed Use: Speculative Commercial Uses

Applicant: David Keyser/DBK Architecture

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a major site plan, in order to construct a two-building, commercial development and related improvements. The site will be a new outlot within an existing commercial shopping center.

The site of the proposed development is the accessory parking lot to a commercial shopping center. Neighboring uses in that shopping center include retail sales. The east, the property abuts a restaurant (eating and drinking establishment), also in the CS district. To the south, the property abuts a large, two-tenant commercial retail center. To the north, the existing shopping center abuts a senior living complex in the AR-3 zoning district.

The applicant is proposing two, one-story commercial buildings. The site's existing access to Taylor Park Drive will be maintained. The applicant is proposing to configure the site for drive-thru service. Given that no specific tenant is yet identified, a special exception use permit will be required to begin operation of the drive-thru use in the future. This configuration has the effect of pushing the building further back from Taylor Park Drive, but this is not avoidable given the proposed use.

The applicant has submitted elevations indicating the proposed building design, materials and general location of signage. There are no specific material requirements for the CS district; therefore, the style of design presented by the applicant is appropriate. Generally speaking, previous Commissions and Design Review Board members have asked for natural materials, such as the proposed brick veneer. The applicant is also proposing metal awning and storefront window systems, which are very typical to commercial retail buildings.

The applicant has proposed the general location and type of sign. Staff has no concerns with what is proposed, but a comprehensive sign plan approval will be required in the future. This should be done when detailed sign plans are available.

The applicant did not provide a lighting plan for the proposed development. Since the overall site is existing, the requirements of Chapter 1182 can only be applied to the new development. The applicant's site plan does not indicate any site lighting to be removed. Staff would like the applicant to submit a photometric plan indicating any proposed building lighting complies with Chapter 1182.

The applicant has provided a landscape plan that meets the general requirements of Chapter 1180. The site has existing tree and shrub plantings along Taylor Park Drive. The applicant has proposed some foundational plantings along portions of the proposed building facades.

At the request of Staff, the applicant relocated the dumpster enclosure to the west portion of the proposed new buildings. There was discussion.

I want to turn off from my report here. If you look on the plans there was discussion at Planning Commission and Planning Commission actually came to the realization and helped staff realize that if you have the dumpster enclosure located at this location, when the dumpsters being serviced you're actually blocking the drive that would go to the emergency access for the Violet Township Fire Department that's back there. So, the applicant discussed the alternatives with the Planning Commission and it was determined that locating the dumpster enclosure here along with the fencing that was proposed by the applicant would be more appropriate. Yes, it's in the front, but the applicant can still work with staff to get it

screened in addition to the fencing and there's already some existing decorative fence here and some existing planning. Unfortunately, you're moving a dumpster towards the front, but there's really no other way to accommodate this, now you've got blockage for public safety. That was what Planning Commission decided. I hope that the board would support that concept. Staff also had the position that since this area right here is a service area that additional landscape screening need to be provided in this area to screen that from the drive since it's a service area. The applicant provided sidewalks on the north side of the proposed development and those will service the main entrance, but it's not connected to any public sidewalks. Planning Commission did not have any concerns, but I just wanted to bring that attention to our boards.

Previously, this was proposed to front Taylor Park Drive. The applicant has provided significant screening plantings along the dumpster area, but it not clear from the plans if the dumpster will be screened with fencing or masonry walls. Staff would also like the applicant to clarify how the dumpster area will be accessed from the proposed service area.

Between the two proposing buildings, the applicant has designed an outdoor seating area. This is a nice amenity, which will be partly shaded by the proposed buildings, and is screened from the adjacent service area. Given that the service area between the buildings will be visible from the main entrance drive, Staff proposes that the landscape buffer adjacent to the east side of the dumpster enclosure area be extended to the east. This will screen the area from traffic where it enters the site.

The applicant has provided sidewalks along the north side of the proposed development, which will service as the main entrance, but has not connected that area to the public sidewalk along Taylor Park Drive. Staff would like this to be considered.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage and exterior modifications enhance the characteristics of this commercial district. Staff's position is that the applicant has met those standards, recommends the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness on the following conditions:

1. That the landscaped bed along the south side of the proposed development shall be extended eastward, in order to screen the designated service area in a manner acceptable to the Planning & Zoning Administrator; and that this revision shall be reflected on the site plan submitted with the application for a zoning certificate;
2. That the dumpster be relocated to the area at the southeast corner of the site that was discussed. That's different than my printed item #2 since that changed at Planning Commission.
3. That the applicant shall submit a photo-metric plan, indicating the lighting levels around the immediate area of the proposed development, which shall be reviewed by the Planning & Zoning Administrator for compliance with Chapter 1182.

That's a condition of the Planning Commission. If you don't want to bother with that commission they're doing it anyway. If you want to be consistent with what the Planning

Commission said that's perfectly fine. With that, I will turn things back over to our Chairman and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you Mr. Snowden. If you would please, can you go back to the google maps and show where this proposed building is.

Mr. Snowden: With the aerial photograph the development is going to be right here.

Mr. Zollars: Board, any questions or comments or would the applicant like to state anything?

Mr. Sampson: I'm looking at the site plan. With these new structures is the storm water run-off going to be the detention pond?

Mr. Keyser: Yes, the storm water, so we're studying the impervious and pervious area. If we have to increase the impervious area we'll have to take into consideration the current storage in those ponds, but the intent is that it will tie into existing infrastructure and (?) those ponds to the south.

Mr. Sampson: Who's doing the calculations, EMH&T?

Mr. Keyser: Yes.

Mr. Snowden: And so those will be reviewed by CT when it goes through the review process.

Mr. Sampson: That was my next question. Those will go to CT. Thank you.

Mr. Zollars: Anything else with the board?

Mr. King: I would like to move for a motion to approve application 179813 with the recommendation of staff with attention to Item 2 with the relocation to the southeast corner.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, we have a first. Anyone care to make a second?

Mr. Sampson: Second.

Mr. Zollars: Very good. Mr. Snowden we have a first and second. If you would call the roll.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", Mr. Zollars "Yes". Six votes in favor. The certificate of appropriateness is approved. Mr. Keyser and project team, page 14 of the staff report will be the most accurate description. You'll be going for a zoning certificate and then ultimately the building plans. We look forward to working with you. You'll be seeing myself, Dan, and Mr. Sampson and his team quite a bit in the future. I'll provide that in writing to you.

Mr. Sampson: Gentlemen, what is going in there?

Mr. Keyser: The owner is targeting a coffee user there. They don't have any commitments at this time. That's what's proposed.

Mr. Sampson: Very good.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Ivan King
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Bill Sampson
<b>AYES:</b>	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Hudson

- 4. Application #179791; 8073 E Broad Street; Ice Cream Rollery; Applicant: Logan Dilts, DaNite Sign Company; Certificate of Appropriateness - Signage

Mr. Snowden:

8073 E. Broad Street - Ice Cream Rollery - Signage

Application: #179791 - Certificate of Appropriateness  
 Location: Property is located on south side of E. Broad Street, east of Waggoner Road.  
 Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District  
 Request: Request for certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications.  
 Current Use: Vacant/Construction Pending  
 Applicant: Sean Clark/Danite Sign Company

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for signage to accommodate a new tenant within a new commercial building.

The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building and related improvements. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses and restaurants (eating and drinking establishment). To the north, the property abuts other commercial businesses across Broad Street in the City of Columbus. To the south, the property is adjacent to an agricultural use in Jefferson Township.

Per Table 1181, the applicant's sign is a Type B wall sign, which would entitle the applicant to over 40SF of signage. The applicant's proposed sign is 39.86 when measured to the closest regular polygon. The applicant should clarify that the sign does not extend further from the façade than the 12IN permitted by the Code.

The applicant is proposing three internally illuminated channel letter wall signs which will be mounted directly to the building facade. The proposed sign is consistent with the sign types previously approved for other tenants within the Shoppes at East Board development. The signage matches the general scale of the building, and main sign is mounted to the fascia above the main entrance. This is a typical and appropriate place for building signage.. The

sign does not contain more than the maximum of four colors permitted by the Zoning Code.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Following the meeting, Staff will mail a record of action notice to the applicant at the address provided. Provided the Board approves the application, the next steps are as follows:

1. The applicant should contact the Planning & Zoning Administrator at 614-322-6829 to submit an application for a zoning sign permit for the wall signs. Staff will require two sets of plans to confirm compliance with the approved certificate of appropriateness.
2. The applicant will need to contact the Building Division at 614-322-6802 to submit an application for a building sign permit, submit plans for review, secure permits, and complete the required inspections for the proposed wall signs.

Logan Dilts w/DaNite Sign: I think you did a great job. Yes, they would be 5 inch deep channel letters. If you have any other questions let me know.

Mr. Zollars: Board, questions, comments? Anyone care to make a motion and then someone please second?

Mr. Hicks: I would like to make a motion to approve as submitted.

Mr. Zollars: Very good Mr. Hicks. How about a second somebody please?

Mr. Bowman: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you Mr. Bowman. Mr. Snowden we have a first and second.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman I'll call the roll. Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", and Mr. Zollars "Yes". Six votes in favor. Sir if you look on page 16 those are the items that remain for your project. You'll need to get a zoning sign permit, which you'll be submitting plans similar to what you already submitted, as well as apply to our building division for permits. I'll provide that to you in writing.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Steven Hicks, Board Member
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Eliot Bowman
<b>AYES:</b>	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Hudson

5. Application #179803; 6471 E Main Street; Cashmax Title & Cash Loans; Applicant: Scott Smith, Scott Consulting, Inc; Certificate of Appropriateness - Signage

Mr. Snowden:

6471 E. Main Street - Cashmax Title & Cash Loans- Signage

Application: #179803 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on the south side of E. Main Street between Beeler Drive and Crest Street

Existing Zoning: CC Community Commerce District / CCO Community Commercial Overlay District

Request: Request for a certificate of appropriateness for new signage.

Current Use: Administrative/Business Office

Applicant: Scott Smith/Scott Smith Consulting, Inc.

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a new wall sign. Although the proposal will involve removal of an existing awning and installing a new building panel system on a portion of the front façade, Staff is treating the application as a review of signage since the changes are primarily to accommodate new wall-mounted signage.

The site is developed with an existing commercial building. Neighboring uses include other retail sales business and offices. All parcels that front E. Main Street with a commercial base zoning are within the Community Commercial Overlay District. To the south, the site abuts flex-warehouse space in the RI zoning district.

Per Table 1180, the applicant is permitted a wall sign up to 160SF. The proposed wall sign is only 160SF as boxed, but would actually be considered smaller based since calculation required by Chapter 1180 is a smallest contiguous area calculation. This meets the requirements of the code and is consistent with the scale of the building's façade.

The building's existing fabric cover awning has reached the end of its lifespan. Weathering has caused damage to the existing building façade behind the existing awning which the applicant must address in order to hang new signage. The existing awning fabric requires frequent maintenance and regularly comes loose from the awning frame.

The Board previously approved a certificate of appropriateness for a backer-panel style wall sign to be mounted directly over the building entry. This caused the sign to extend nearly two feet from the façade of the building, and to extend above the roofline, which is not

desirable in Staff's view. The applicant met with Staff and originally proposed to convert the entire awning to an internally illuminated awning, which is a prohibited sign type per Section 1196.11. At the point, the applicant elected to submit this proposal to remove the entire awning assembly in order to correct these issues in a more comprehensive manner. In place of the awning, the applicant will install a ribbed metal panel system. A metal panel system like this is much more weather resistant, and when used as accent material, is not inconsistent with the provisions of Chapter 1196.

The applicant's proposed wall sign consists of raceway mounted channel letters. Per Section 1196.11, raceway mounted channel letters are not a specifically prohibited sign type, and this style is used throughout the Community Commercial Overlay District. The sign consists of three colors, which is consistent with the provisions of Chapter 1180. The raceway and one of the sign face colors matched the color of the proposed blue ribbed panel, as well as the existing ground sign cabinet.

The applicant is not proposing any additional ground or directional signage as part of this application.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage and exterior modifications enhance the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay District. Staff's position is that the applicant has met those standards, recommends the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Mr. Zollars: Would the applicant like to add to any of that?

Scott Smith: No, just appreciate the consideration on the (inaudible, not near microphone) facade and awning is absolutely deteriorating across the whole top that might not show, so any rain is going right through it down onto the ground. Basically, underneath that is again that old brick facade from the old building construction and details, so we just elected let's just start over and do it right across the facade. The raceway letters again, raceway in this instance because there is, there are beams and there's black behind it, so wiring access is limited in that regard. Pretty much need to use that.

Mr. Zollars: Board, any questions or comments?

Mr. Sampson: Co-compliance comes under one of my departments and we appreciate your attention to this. I submit we motion to approve as submitted.

Mr. Havener: I just have one question. What are the plans for the monument sign?

Scott Smith: Just to leave that as is with the Cashmax panels on it.

Mr. Snowden: It's not showing in there, but he received a permit for, see the ground sign faces can be replaced by Staff if the color can be approved by Staff if the colors are consistent. I won't approve them if they're adding new colors to what's already there, but

given that they didn't change the color scheme I sort of had to approve it. I can't say the content is different because Cashmax and Titlemax because now I'm regulating what the content of the sign is which is a first amendment thing. In this case he's got the Cashmax with a white background if you drive by it and then Cashmax in a blue vinyl illuminated cabinet. Correct?

Scott Smith: Yes. They're actually molded lettering. It's consistent with the brand across the street.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, we have a first. How about a second?

Mr. King: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Snowden, we have a first and second. Could you please call the roll?

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", and Mr. Zollars "Yes". Certificate of appropriateness is approved. Mr. Smith if you look on page 19 in my report you'll see that you'll be going for a zoning sign permit and then applying for a commercial building permit, having plans submitted and getting inspections. I'll provide that to you in writing at the address you put on your application.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Bill Sampson
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Ivan King
<b>AYES:</b>	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Hudson

6. Application #179678; 8137 E. Broad Street; Fine Home Furnishings/Rooms for Less; Applicant: Sean Clark; Certificate of Appropriateness - Comprehensive Sign Plan

Mr. Snowden:

8137 E. Broad Street - Fine Home Furnishings/Rooms for Less - Comprehensive Sign Plan

Application: #179678 - Certificate of Appropriateness  
 Location: Property is located on south side of E. Broad Street, east of Waggoner Road.  
 Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District  
 Request: Request for certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications.  
 Current Use: Vacant/Construction Pending  
 Applicant: Sean Clark/Danite Sign Company

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for signage at a new commercial building. The signage is being reviewed as a comprehensive sign plan.

The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building and related

improvements. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses and restaurants (eating and drinking establishment). To the north, the property abuts other commercial businesses across Broad Street in the City of Columbus. To the south, the property is adjacent to an agricultural use in Jefferson Township.

Per Table 1181, the applicant's sign is a Type B wall sign, which would entitle the applicant to over 340SF of signage. Chapter 1181 allows the Board to approve up to 427SF of sign area when signage is reviewed as comprehensive sign plan. The applicant is proposing three signs, for a total sign area of 414SF. Through the comprehensive sign plan process, the applicant is requesting that the Board approve three wall signs, two signs in addition to the sign permitted by the Code. The applicant should clarify that the sign does not extend further from the façade than the 12IN permitted by the Code.

The applicant is proposing three internally illuminated channel letter wall signs. Two of the signs were approved in a previous comprehensive sign plan approval. The signs are mounted directly to the building facade. The proposed signage is consistent with the sign types previously approved for other tenants at the Shoppes at East Board development. The signage matches the general scale of the building, and main sign is mounted to the fascia above the main entrance. This is a typical and appropriate place for building signage. The proposed third sign balances out the façade architecturally. None of the signs contain more than the maximum of four colors permitted by the Zoning Code.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. And with that I'd be happy to answer any additional questions.

Mr. Zollars: Applicant would you like to add anything to that?

Sean Clark w/DaNite Sign Company: As Mr. Snowden pointed out we have had a conversation last time about putting that third sign up. They finally came up with their brand and how they want to do it and all the logos seem to match and all the designs and the signs although different brands, different colors tend to follow the same scheme as far as how they're put together on the wall.

Mr. Zollars: Board, any questions or motions?

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

Mr. Zollars: First. Second please.

Mr. Carr: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you. Mr. Snowden we have a first and a second. Would you please call the roll?

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", and Mr. Zollars "Yes". Certificate of appropriateness is approved. Mr. Clark starting on page 21 and going into page 22 is what remains with your process. You'll be going for a zoning sign permit and then the building permits for the signage.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Steven Hicks, Board Member
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Richard Carr
<b>AYES:</b>	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Hudson

7. Application #179774; 7643 E Main Street; Denise Hering DDS LLC; Applicant: Randy Hering; Certificate of Appropriateness - Exterior Modifications in Historic District

Mr. Snowden:

7643 E. Main St - Exterior Modifications - Hering DDS LLC

Application: #179774 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on south side of E. Main St just east of Waggoner/Graham Road.

Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce / HCO - Historic Commercial Overlay

Request: Request for the Board to issue a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications.

Current Use: Dentist Office (Professional Activities/Office)

Applicant: Randy Hering

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to make a building addition to an existing commercial building in the historic district.

The site contains a small commercial office building that was originally constructed as a single family dwelling. The proposed addition will be within an existing porch area at the front of the building. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses also within the historic district. The lot immediately to the east contains a single family dwelling, which is a non-conforming use. To the south, the property abuts single family homes in the R-3 district.

The applicant is proposing a building addition within an existing front porch that is approximately 200sf in area. Although this was the original entrance to the home, the area is no longer used for customer access. The applicant is proposing to maintain an 18" area at the front of the porch and the original handrail assembly in order to maintain the look of the original front porch.

The current building is clad clapboard siding and wood trim. The applicants plans indicate that vinyl siding will be used on the proposed addition. The applicant previously stated they were proposing to reuse the existing window and use a door that matches the characteristics of the existing door. The door and window indicated on the elevation are consistent with the

types shown as appropriate styles within the Historic Design Guidelines.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the propose exterior modifications enhances and protects the characteristics of the Historic District.

With that I'd be happy to answer any additional questions.

Mr. Sampson: Is this zoned for commercial?

Mr. Snowden: The base zoning is commercial. This is what we would call, this is kind of a non-conforming structure because the structure doesn't meet the requirements, but it meets the use requirements.

Mr. Sampson: Does this change have to go to BZBA or did it go to BZBA?

Mr. Snowden: It did not have to go to BZBA. It's already used as a dental office. It would have been required to probably get a use permit from BZBA many many years ago when the dentist office opened up, but it's considered permitted use today.

Mr. Sampson: Ok.

Mr. Snowden: It's a conforming use.

Mr. Sampson: Thank you Mr. Snowden.

Mr. Snowden: You're welcome.

Mr. Zollars: Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman if I could just get the applicant to tell me what's going on with the door and window? Mr. Hering could you just clarify?

Randy Hering: We're not reusing the same window. We're creating a window that looks like the existing window, just like the door. The existing building is vinyl sided.

Mr. Snowden: So my report is an error there.

Randy Hering: Yes.

Mr. Snowden: Let the record reflect that he's proposing vinyl. That's fine. The historic design guidelines say that the clap board and the maintenance of existing wood is preferred, but if a building already has vinyl then there's nothing that would prohibit the vinyl from being extended. You wouldn't want to extend, let's say, asbestos shingle because that's not historical in addition to being dangerous.

Mr. Zollars: Board, any further comments, questions?

Mr. Snowden: Just to remind the board, I seem to recall the discussion being that some folks felt that adding in within the porch was not positive and some felt that they were indifferent to it. That was my recollection of our conversations the last time.

Mr. Hicks: I was not in favor of this proposal first time around. I would like to see the historic district remain as historic as possible. I felt like this was a step in the wrong direction. I feel like the applicant's trying to make the best due with what he needs to do to make his business work. It's been approved once before, so I'll go ahead and join the party.

Mr. Sampson: Motion to approve as submitted.

Mr. Bowman: I second.

Mr. Zollars: Very good. We have a first and second. Mr. Snowden if you would call the roll.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bowman "Yes", Mr. Carr "Yes", Mr. Hicks "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Sampson "Yes", and Mr. Zollars "Yes". Thank you very much. Mr. Hering if you look on the report on the very last page 25. You're going to go for a zoning certificate and then apply for your building plans, but I think, did you already apply? You already have the building plans waiting for you?

Randy Hering: Yes, they were already approved.

Mr. Snowden: As soon as you can drop off the zoning certificate application and 2 sets of the plans you already submitted with this application then I can get that approved and then that will release your building plans.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Bill Sampson
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Eliot Bowman
<b>AYES:</b>	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, King, Sampson
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Hudson

#### E. OTHER BUSINESS

#### F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Zollars: Adjourned at 8:14 pm.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning and Zoning Administrator