

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SEPTEMBER 5, 2013
6:30 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 11, 2013 MEETING

Chairman Beougher: Next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of our July 11, 2013 meeting. Are there any amendments to the minutes as they were distributed? I do have a comment. We were asked to listen to a statement at the end of the session that was not on the agenda and I do apologize to the members. Proper procedure would have been to adjourn and then allow members to listen to the comments if they wished or to leave. The comments brought up some issues that I've sent an email to the City Attorney. He's on vacation, I believe?

Mr. Robbins: Um-um. Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Hopefully at some point he can address but in the meantime I did make some copies of a training manual for Design Review Boards and Historic Preservation Commissions that I would encourage you to read at your leisure. I am probably strange, but I enjoy reading about case law, so enjoy.

Mr. : Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: I would entertain – well, if there are no amendments to the minutes as distributed they would stand approved as submitted.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Beougher: Next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or changes to this evening's agenda?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. I want to point out that the agendas in front of you when you sat down are the updated agendas. The material is the same as the one you were previously given. The order has been switched around to match that of staff report. In addition, I would like to add under Other Business, Item D. Mike McCrone from ADA Architects would like to give a short presentation on a possible project that's coming at the next review meeting, just to get some preliminary feedback from the Board.

Mr. Beougher: Say that again. Where are we putting it Under—

Mr. Robbins: Under D, Other Business.

Mr. Beougher: And then adjournment would be—

Mr. Robbins: E.

Mr. Beougher: Adjournment which is now C will be E.

Mr. Robbins: Right.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Very good.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Beougher: If you would like to make a comment on any issue that is not on this evening's agenda, now would be the time to approach the lectern and make them. (No response.) Not seeing a rush to the podium, we'll assume that no one has any comments.

5. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Beougher: If you are here to speak on an item that is on agenda, we would ask you to please rise and raise your right hand. (Mr. Beougher administers the oath.)

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. 6150 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT:
NASTY'S SPORTS GRILL (#160670DR). NEW SIGNAGE.

Mr. Beougher: If you're here to address this issue, could you please approach?
Okay. Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins: This is Signcom.

Mr. Malone: Yeah, but I wasn't here for that. The customer was supposed to be representing it. I _____ if I knew I was supposed to. So I will address it.

Mr. Beougher: It is Old Business, so is there a change on the application?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, they-- Let me give you a brief background on what's been going on. After it went through Design Review we were in contact with the owner and the property owner and they had decided that a revision to the sign would be appropriate, better convey this into their brand and be a little clearer from the street. They resubmitted for the application the sign that you see on the screen and that was included hopefully in your packets. It's somewhat close to what was originally approved, but staff didn't feel confident making that decision without basically any kind of feedback from the Board. So what we're after tonight is approval from the Board of the resubmitted sign or the changed sign.

Mr. Beougher: I think it was in the emailed packet--

Mr. Robbins: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: -- included with the revised staff report.

Mr. Robbins: My apology, gentlemen, if you didn't get that hard copy to begin with.

Mr. Beougher: So without reading the minutes, our comments were about -- is this the one we commented on the font or—

Mr. Robbins: Yeah.

Mr. Beougher: And they've added some sports items.

Mr. Comeaux: Some balls.

Mr. Beougher: Some balls. Okay. Of various types. Does anyone have any questions or comments about the revised sign? And we did authorize the sign?

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: So we're amending our authorization to—

Mr. Robbins: Yes. I think this is an unusual circumstance, but I feel that it would be best for the City moving in the right direction, I think.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a motion to approve?

Mr. Comeaux: Just one quick question. There was also discussion about the monument sign.

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

Mr. Comeaux: Is that just going to stay the same as it was presented last time?

Mr. Robbins: I did not receive material for that update. I believe that the property owner – and this is – there was a variance that was submitted to increase the height of that monument sign and to then to add more tenant panels. So they would have to go through Design Review again for that, the whole sign, and when they do that they can get Review Board approval for each tenant panel that goes on there, yeah.

Mr. Comeaux: Thank you. My apologies.

Mr. Beougher: No, thank you. And that brings me to a question. The length of the sign panel, is that the same as it was in the previous submission?

Mr. Robbins: That's a good question and that's something I can answer.

Mr. Beougher: But it's still within the area that's allowable I assume?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. This is a type B sign, so they're allowed 2 square feet per linear footage of building frontage so it would – I don't even think they have enough space on the wall to fill up that area.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Would you like to make a motion?

Mr. Spalding: I move that we accept the new sign as presented.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second?

Mr. Burd: Second.

Mr. Beougher: Any further discussion? (No response.) Hearing none, Mr. Robbins, would you please call the roll?

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

Mr. Beougher: Since there's no one to remind that they need a sign permit, we'll move on to Item C1.

Mr. Robbins: It's the gentleman from Signcom. Sign permits and building permits are still required.

NEW BUSINESS

1. 6471 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: JIM HARTLEY, SIGNCOME, INC. TITLE MAX/GBS MAIN LLC (#161195DR). NEW SIGNAGE.

Mr. Beougher: Is there someone to answer questions? If you could please state your name for the record and then we'll let Mr. Robbins introduce the item.

Mr. Jim Hartley: Thank you. I'm Jim Hartley with Signcom.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Hartley. Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, this is Application #161195 for 6471 East Main Street requesting Design Board approval for the following exterior modifications including installation of a new sign face and existing monument sign and new wall signage approximately 60 square feet facing Main Street. The property is located within the Community Commercial Overlay District and the property was previously used as an automotive parts store.

I want to bring it to the Board's attention that this property has not been granted zoning approval at the moment to operate Title Max. They went to the BZBA for determination on whether or not it's a pawnbroker. The Board failed to decide that it was not. They did not pass the zoning certificate and they appealed to City Council. City Council then voted that it was to be considered a pawnbroker per our code. So, that being said, this is the sign that they are proposing for the monument existing and then a wall sign. You can see here a drawing of the site. And the sign itself, the lettering is clear. I believe the sign box is existing, so it's just a reface for a tenant panel. And then the wall sign, again, about 60 square feet, well within code.

As mentioned, applicant is proposing a sign face in an existing monument sign, installing type A wall sign within an area of approximately 60 square feet. The sign conforms to the standards of a type A wall sign as the building frontage is approximately 80 square feet. Currently, the business does not have approval to operate at this location. Staff does not have a concern regarding the signage as proposed, but does not recommend approving the signage for a use that is not currently approved to operate. For this reason, staff recommends tabling the application if agreed upon or requested by the applicant. So, basically the sign as designed—

Mr. Hartley: I wasn't aware of that but may I make a request? Is it possible that we could approve the signage with the stipulation that if the zoning for the business gets approved that the signage -- so that we wouldn't have to -- of course, if the business doesn't get approved, there wouldn't be any signage. It was save us all another step.

Mr. Beougher: I'm fine with that I think. Mr. Robbins, do you have any concerns making it contingent upon—

Mr. Robbins: I think the issue would be is—

Mr. Beougher: A special exception?

Mr. Robbins: --the Board making an approval and once that approval is made, staff doesn't have any kind of leeway to not issue a sign permit so long as the sign is constructed or basically brought back as proposed and approved by the Board. The concern, I guess, is that the Board approves, I would hold onto the sign permits and then all of a sudden we get Title Max saying, "Put up the signs as the Board approved. You don't have any grounds for—"

Mr. Hartley: We would certainly agree to not apply for a sign permit until the zoning was approved. And I understand if it puts you in a compromising position. I understand if you can't do that. We can table it.

Mr. Comeaux: My apologies. How long do they have after we approve something to get to apply for the sign permits?

Mr. Robbins: There is nothing in our code that I can find that actually says once Design approval is given that there is a statute of limitations of how long that's good for.

Mr. Comeaux: So it's not like it-- That answers my question.

Mr. Burd: We would have some concerns and it has nothing to do with the sign. I think it's a good looking sign but City Council had significant discussion about this and I think that we'd be sending mixed messages as a City if they are saying, "No" to an operation and we're saying, "But here's your sign approval." I think that we need to wait until the issue gets sorted out and I hate to have you come back but—

Mr. Hartley: No, I understand.

Mr. Burd: --I want the City to at least be consistent with our activities until whatever zoning issues are resolved. That would be my preference.

Mr. Hartley: Sure. If I may also offer one more addition. We're approving the architectural design. We are not approving permits or installation of the sign so I understand not only would you send a mixed message, you would be only approving the design, not the permitting of the signage, so just offering more information. I certainly respect your position. I can see how some form of approval may give the client a mixed message, "Oh, well, we can get signs approved. I'm sure we're on the way to getting the business approved." So I can understand your position.

Mr. Burd: Thank you.

Mr. Robbins: And, Mr. Hartley, I was in contact with Todd Dillon who's the property manager there and I did make him aware of that. If that was not relayed to you, that's my apology.

Mr. Hartley: Blindsided. Totally blindsided that they've had any concern. They have actually shipped signs to my plant so.

Mr. Robbins: Okay.

(discussion)

Mr. Hartley: Fortunately I didn't fabricate it.

Mr. Beougher: In the interest of saving a trip perhaps – I mean, if there are any questions or concerns about the design of the sign, perhaps now we could ask those questions and consider it under Old Business at our next meeting and then you may not be required to be here unless a member expresses a question in advance. Is that reasonable?

Mr. Robbins: I think that would reasonable.

Mr. Hartley: I will volunteer one thing about the design. The wall sign, only the letters light. The blue box behind it is just a backup panel that allows us to install it one piece, so the only thing that lights at night is the white and the red.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So the blue is an opaque.

Mr. Hartley: Correct. If you look at that cross section, it's just a backup panel to support the two _____.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, got it.

Mr. Comeaux: So, this might not – you might not be able to answer this, but the red and blue striping that the previous owner had used as kind of a corporate thing, do you know if the client's going to keep that?

Mr. Hartley: Based on the elevation they have supplied, and I'm only basing it on the elevation they supplied-- Is it gone in this rendition?

Mr. Comeaux: It's there.

Mr. Robbins: It's still there.

Mr. Hartley: Oh, okay. Lower on the garage doors you mean?

Mr. Comeaux: I think that's brick.

Mr. Hartley: Okay. I'm sorry. But not up on the canopy. That's where I was looking. I'm sorry. I can't answer that question.

Mr. Comeaux: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Painted split base block, if I recall correctly.

Mr. Robbins: If those are Title Max's colors to begin with, I think they're pretty lucky to get a vote.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Other questions? (No response.) In light of the situation with the occupancy, I'll entertain a motion to postpone until the next meeting.

Mr. Burd: So moved.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second?

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. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

Mr. Hartley: I appreciate your flexibility. Thank you.

2. 7657 – 7661 FARMSBURY DRIVE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: GUO XIANY ZOU, MIZUMI (#161582DR). NEW WALL SIGN.

Mr. Beougher: Is the applicant or representative here this evening?

Mr. Robbins: I do not see the applicant.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins: This is for 7657 – 7661 Farmsbury Drive, Mizumi Buffet. It was previously, I believe, a Japanese sushi buffet or something of that nature. The property is located in the Taylor Square Shopping Center. The existing zoning is CS, Community Services, and they are requesting Design Board approval for new wall signage. Current use, I believe, is vacant. The new signage is measuring approximately 26 square feet and it faces U.S. 256. All adjacent properties are zoned CS, Community Services. You can see on here is the wall sign, channel letters. I believe the Buffet portion is to remain. The only part that's changing is the Mizumi. They have gone in to get a tenant panel that doesn't require Design Board approval for a wall sign – or tenant panel in this district, so the wall sign is considered a commercial

exterior change. Staff recommends approval of the sign as proposed. There is nothing problematic that we see.

Mr. Beougher: The last building had pink colors ready for the applicant. This one has already got a buffet sign. We just need to change the first part. Any questions?

Mr. Comeaux: Are the channel letters the same format. I mean, the font is different between Mizumi and Buffet but is one neon and the other some older? I guess Buffet -- LED, I'm sorry. The Mizumi is LED, right?

Mr. Robbins: It should be.

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah. It says LED modular, but I don't know about the old one. Does that matter?

Mr. Beougher: It would make a difference in appearance.

Mr. Spalding: That is the same question that I had. The letters – they don't even look like they're the same language. They could look more similar.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Spalding. I'll just make an observation. I'm assuming the photograph, if you switch back, Mr. Robbins. I'm assuming the photograph, the Buffet is an actual photograph, so there's some shadow there?

Mr. Robbins: It appears, yes.

Mr. Beougher: And I don't know if they attempted to match the – I mean, it's very similar in character. It just is missing the shadow and might look a little thinner.

Mr. Spalding: That was the right word, thinner. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins, do you have a sense of whether they were trying to match the existing text?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. I believe they were.

Mr. Beougher: So it may be somewhat deceptive. Installed it might be a better match and it appears that the colors do match. What was in there before? Mr. Robbins, do you recall? Was that the—

Mr. Robbins: A Japanese sushi buffet.

Mr. Beougher: And that hasn't been that long ago.

Mr. Robbins: No. I believe before that it might have been a Chinese buffet.

Mr. Beougher: Originally it was and then it was DiVinci's or something.

(speaking off mic)

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

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

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Hudson. Is there a second?

Mr. Spalding: I second.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Spalding. Any further comments, questions, discussion? (No response.)

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

Mr. Robbins: Let it be noted for the record that sign permits are required as are building permits, with stamped engineering drawings and I recommend the applicant contact the Building Department to verify the requirements.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Robbins.

3. 7616 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: RON MOODY, RAMY MALKA (#161723DR). NEW SIGNAGE.

Mr. Beougher: Please approach the lectern and state your name for the record, please.

Mr. Omar Lugo: My name is Omar Lugo. I'm here for Ron Moody, working for Sign City.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you very much. Mr. Robbins, would you introduce the item?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. Again, this is 7616 East Main Street, Valero, Application #161723. The property is located on the northeast corner of East Main Street and Waggoner Road. The existing zoning is CC, Community Commercial and is within the Historic Overlay District. They are requesting Design Board approval for the installation of a new wall sign. Just to give you a bit of a background, this project has been through twice, once for, and correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the way it is set up is that Valero is operating as the fueling station and then there's a separate entity called Smart

Stop that is operating the convenience store. So it's very similar to the BPs that you see the compass at or any of those types of organizations.

The wall sign measures 75 by 60, sandblasted and custom painted, installed with flush mounting to the building. Again, the property is located in the Historic District. Previously the Buckeye Gas & Go and presently approved to operate as Valero. The property is located on two parcels at the northeast corner of East Main Street and Waggoner Road. Concerning properties, including a chiropractic office to the east and a single family residence to the north. All adjacent properties are zoned CC, Community Commercial.

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

Mr. Lugo: No.

Mr. Robbins: One thing that I would like to point out. There are a couple of things I wanted to mention, is that we do have a 20 square foot maximum on signage within the Historic District. This one is measuring out with – if you're to take the outside dimensions of 60 by 75 it would be 31.25, so I would like the Board, if it decides to approve, to do it upon the condition that they basically approve if the signage area is 20 square feet or below. In addition, I want to point out that no exterior lighting has been proposed for this sign.

Mr. Lugo: Correct.

Mr. Robbins: I was in contact with somebody at the sign company to mention that that can be approved as well. I never heard back or got any additional material from them to do that. So any exterior modifications to any building in the Historic District has to come through this Board. Thirdly, there is an existing tenant panel on the back side of the retaining wall of this building. Also, brought to the attention of the sign company that that could go through Design Review as well. We never received any additional information regarding that. So if approval of it comes through this would not be including that tenant panel.

Mr. Beougher: I notice that that box has been removed, so they may have just decided it wasn't worth the effort.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. If that's the case, then I just wanted to make that clear to the Board and the applicant as well.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from the members? I'm not familiar with the brand. Can you tell me a little bit about it? What region do they operate in?

Mr. Lugo: I have to apologize about that. I heard about this about five minutes before I had to come here, so I can only attest to the fabrication of the sign materials, how we would mount it, etc.

Mr. Beougher: And the material of the sign. It says sandblasted. Is that a wood?

Mr. Lugo: Actually, it's a high density foam, urethane.

Mr. Beougher: And if there were any light it would have to come from somewhere else, another source, another light source?

Mr. Lugo: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: And are you aware of any – in the five minutes that you knew about it, are you aware of any intent to light the sign?

Mr. Lugo: No, I don't.

Mr. Beougher: It does have a light bulb as part of the sign.

Mr. Lugo: I know.

Mr. Beougher: It doesn't work apparently.

Mr. Lugo: I know that because previously there was another design that was being thrown around for an LED type of a sign but this is what he went with.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Well, they can always come back if they decide to upgrade or light it from some other location with the canopy. Any other questions from members? (No response.)

Mr. Robbins: There are a couple of things I want to point out in the code involving the materials of signage. The Historic District is something that basically wood is what is expected. Under our code, under Section 1194.12 Graphics, it does say in letter H that certain signs are not permitted because they involve materials, colors and designs that would not have been used historically in the area such as, number two is plastic vinyl signs. You said it was a high density foam, is that correct?

Mr. Lugo: It's a high density urethane, yes. And it would be hand painted. It's similar to wood; it just lasts a thousand times longer and it would be custom routed.

Mr. Beougher: I think the issue is it would not conform to our code as proposed. Do you know if wood would be an acceptable alternative to the owner?

Mr. Lugo: I am not aware of that at the moment.

Mr. Robbins: And just to clarify as well, it does say sign materials under the same section, all signs shall be constructed of natural materials. Sign materials should

complement the primary structure. It looks like we have split faced block and then some sort of siding, too, I'm guessing—

Mr. Lugo: Yeah.

Mr. Robbins: --with the compression wood on the gable.

Mr. Lugo: It looks like a – it's like a siding that is not vinyl.

Mr. Beougher: I want to venture that it's stained cedar but I'm not entirely certain. It's like a gray.

Mr. Lugo: From what I saw of it today because I went into the store to install different signs in the interior. It looked like something comparable to what you would do with your deck. It's not quite vinyl, but it has kind of a cement type of a texture to it.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So it could be like a cement fiber board.

Mr. Lugo: Um-um. That's what it looked like.

Mr. Beougher: So what I think what we're looking for is a motion that would have a condition attached that the sign be of wood or another natural material.

Mr. Comeaux: Can I ask about the size real quick? Is – like the eyebrows on this guy. Is there going to be a board that it's affixed to or are the eyebrows going to be affixed to just whatever the face is there?

Mr. Lugo: That is an excellent question.

Mr. Comeaux: And similarly where it says, "Come on in. It's a good idea." Is there going to be white board backing it. I think that goes to Mr. Robbins' question about the size of it.

Mr. Lugo: I cannot answer that. I'm sorry. I just know the nature of the material and the way that it would routed so it would have to have some sort of backing in order for that to work out right. But I don't know what color it would be, if it would match that with the backing or not.

Mr. Comeaux: It would pretty much match the image itself, though, the size of it?

Mr. Lugo: Um-um.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: I think there are a lot of questions here whether they would be amenable to a natural material, what that might be. I'm not sure what the urgency is of the sign. Obviously, they're open now and operating and would like to let people know who they are, but I'm almost considering that we might be better off tabling this and getting more information. Any advice, Mr. Robbins?

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, the two things that we're concerned with would be the material and the size. And, of course, the eyebrows and "Come on in. It's a good idea" portion of it as well. I think it's something that needs to be clarified a little bit and how that sign is actually going to look. You know, if they can meet those conditions, I really don't see too much of an issue with it. I'm not uncomfortable with approving if they change those, if the Board makes conditions. But, if the Board is not comfortable with that, I think staff would be in agreement.

Mr. Beougher: Well, I will let the Board decide. What motion would you like to make?

Mr. Comeaux: I'll make a motion that we approve this provided that the sign is constructed with materials consistent with our code, preferably, I think-- Is it preferably or exclusively wood ?

Mr. Robbins: The code doesn't say what it has to be. It says natural materials.

Mr. Comeaux: It's says natural materials. So the first condition is that the sign will be constructed of natural materials and the second is, is that there's a little bit – you provide some description to Mr. Robbins about the backing for the sign to make sure that we don't – so the sign is not too large.

Mr. Lugo: Got it.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you for the motion, Mr. Comeaux. Is there a second?

Mr. Burd: I'll second.

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

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

Mr. Robbins: I would like to point out that sign permits are required for any sign in the City and for a sign of this nature it does require a building permit for which stamped engineering drawings I know are required. So the next step will be you'll get a letter in the mail from our admin staff outlining the conditions of approval including a switch of materials and that you clearly state the size of the sign and the sense of what is going to go up. Those materials have to be submitted before we can approve. So I

have to see something different than what's here resubmitted to us before I can issue the sign permits.

Mr. Lugo: Thank you.

3. 1780 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: ALETHIA HARRIS, IMPALA CAPITAL LLC (#161019DR). EXTERIOR MODIFICATION.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Could you state your name, please?

Ms. Tina Harris: My name is Tina Harris. I'm here to represent Raphael's Soul Food Café.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins: Yes. Again, this is for 1780 Brice Road, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Applicant is Raphael's Soul Food Café, Application #161019, exterior modifications. The applicant is requesting Design Board approval for the final installation of a new wood privacy fence to the rear of the existing shopping center. The property marked is zoned AR-3 which is the Century City apartments and all other adjacent property is zoned CC, Community Commercial. And currently, I know there was a 99-cent store that was going in to the south.

Ms. Harris: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: Are they there right now?

Ms. Harris: They're here.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. So that's incorrect. There is a tenant to the store and it's a 99-cent store. The applicant has provided us with a drawing showing the layout of the building plan. And then the back patio that's proposed to measure 11 feet extending into the back – the rear alley by 20 feet 8 inches and it's proposed to be surrounded by a wood privacy fence, appears to be cedar. The drawings that we have do state 4 inch steel posts filled with concrete topped off 36 inches above grade, a total of five that are to surround the fence. The main concerns that staff has are with safety and this is something that we have gone through with a very similar property across the street. There was a child care facility that had a play area in back and the issue was that with traffic coming up and down the street that this could pose a safety hazard for the people within the fence. Recently I think we've learned that there is possibly a business moving into the Century City – excuse me, not Century City, the Valu King building.

Ms. Harris: Odd Lots.

Mr. Robbins: Yes. The concern from staff is that this would be something that would generate some kind of truck traffic in the rear. What I think we would like to see

is something that could basically clarify that the folks within the fence would be safe from any kind of truck traffic that could happen to pop through, I guess. It looks like the rear of the property that there seems to be enough room back there extending 11 feet into it. So that would be about this line right here and the spaces are these two guys right here so it would be taking up 20 feet of that area. In addition, I think possibly the fence, something along the lines of a, I believe it's called a flutter fence or a – it's one of those that have the fence slats on either side. Excuse me, I can't remember the name of those right. I do fence permits all day. I'm at a loss at this moment. Something like that I think would be a little more visually appealing but I'll leave it up to the Board.

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

Ms. Harris: No. I'm sorry, I don't know much about the fence that this architect did design and we're just trying to make it safe, put the metal posts there so, other than that I don't really know much.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. And I do have a question. The layout in the floor plan shows dining, a bar, kitchen, corridor, restrooms, and then there's retail in the lower half of the space. Is that—

Ms. Harris: Yes, sir, that is correct?

Mr. Beougher: --part of your space? Okay. So you have a very compact dining area.

Ms. Harris: It's very small.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. So you need the patio.

Ms. Harris: We would like the patio, yes, sir .

Mr. Beougher: And what is the nature of the retail?

Ms. Harris: It's sort of a gift shop.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. All right. Any questions from the members?

Mr. Spalding: Is the patio going to be designed for tables? I mean, help me out so I understand.

Ms. Harris: Yeah. It'd be for a couple more seating and just to give a more warm setting for the people who want to dine in, but to have an option to sit in and outside, something different. So, yes, there will be more seating.

Mr. Spalding: So it's not just for people that want to go smoke, right?

Ms. Harris: Oh, there's no smoking.

Mr. Spalding: Okay. Very good.

Mr. Robbins: On page A4 of the application packet that was given to you, they do have a table layout that shows three round four-tops and then two two-tops close to the building.

Mr. Spalding: One other question.

Ms. Harris: Yes, sir.

Mr. Spalding: I look at this floor plan and the same thing that Lane had said. When I look at your bar, right? I remember – and it would be in all the Council meetings, you don't have a liquor license, per se, that they can drink in, but they can buy something, say wine and buy your wonderful food and leave.

Ms. Harris: Yes, sir.

Mr. Spalding: Okay. So your bar is really a serve-carryout more so than consumption inside?

Ms. Harris: There's absolutely no consumption of alcohol inside or out.

Mr. Spalding: Very good. Okay. I understand. That makes more sense of the layout.

Mr. Beougher: There are also four posts in the front and there are some tables on the table in _____. Are those going to be used?

Ms. Harris: I'm sorry, sir.

Mr. Beougher: That the tables on the front in front of the retail space.

Ms. Harris: Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Robbins: I'm sorry. I don't have an image of that.

Ms. Harris: (Inaudible)

Mr. Robbins: --the page A4 on the front right here there are three tables in the front?

Ms. Harris: Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: But that's not part of the application. This application is just for the fence.

Mr. Spalding: The fence.

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Robbins, on this page here – on that it says there's 22 feet from the fence to the edge of pavement. So is there like a curb or is it just all flat parking lot? I mean, I think Mr. Robbins' concerns, are there cars coming back through here right now or—

Ms. Harris: It's a flat surface. It's all flat there.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay. So there's no thing to stop a car from driving-- Have you considered putting – I don't know the right term. In this little—

Mr. Beougher: Bollards?

Mr. Comeaux: Yes, bollards around there with some landscaping perhaps, just because I would hate for somebody to come around from the old Valu King heading up to Century City apartments and take out this fence. I suppose we shouldn't—

Ms. Harris: I understand.

Mr. Comeaux: But have you thought about putting bollards in?

Ms. Harris: Yes. That's what I think is on there.

Mr. Comeaux: Oh, okay.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. Those are the steel posts. I don't know exactly what type of requirements that are going to be necessary to stop. I mean, the big issue now is that if a new retailer comes into the Valu King—

Ms. Harris: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: --you know, there's going to be increased truck traffic in the back and—

Ms. Harris: We're kind of separated from them. There is little brick stone that separate us between them.

Mr. Robbins: Wheel stops.

Ms. Harris: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: Those little guys. You can see them right there on the image.

Mr. Spalding: Right. There you go. It is a separation.

Mr. Comeaux: And I suppose my inclination in that respect would be if they're within their setback, it's incumbent upon Valu King to get his trucks _____.

Mr. Burd: Thank you for being here. I know you had to bring your business in front of Council, correct, to talk with Council about—

Ms. Harris: Yes.

Mr. Burd: --where it was going to be in the zoning and all that?

Ms. Harris: Yes.

Mr. Burd: Was the patio always part of the plan or is this something that has been new since you guys—

Ms. Harris: We always wanted the patio.

Mr. Burd: Okay.

Ms. Harris: We just had to get the design together and make it appropriate to bring in front of Council, so yes, we always wanted it.

Mr. Beougher: And perhaps a question for Mr. Robbins or Mr. Burd. Is that roadway, the asphalt to the left of the wheel stops, is that a public way or is that a private?

Mr. Burd: I believe that is private, but I don't want to go on record with that because I'd have to look it up on our GIS, but I don't believe that is a main road. I don't think – I think it's—

Mr. Robbins: I do not believe so either.

Mr. Burd: No.

Mr. Robbins: I will check right now.

Mr. Beougher: It appears that there's a path of travel away from the building and there might be areas where dumpsters or other equipment might sit next to the building.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. It's not part of a public way according to our GIS.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Any other questions?

Mr. Comeaux: The height of the fence is going to be--

Ms. Harris: Good question. I don't have my drawings here in front of me.

Mr. Comeaux: Just try to _____.

Ms. Harris: I apologize.

Mr. Comeaux: I'd say for establishments we've encouraged people to not have a 7 foot tall privacy fence or whatever it is.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Comeaux, on sheet A2 there's a note that says it's a 6 foot high wood fence.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: There it also says that the post adjacent to the building is a 4 by 4 pressure treated post.

Mr. Robbins: So I want to point out sheet A2 shows the _____ and then the part that was given in the packet was a drawing that was provided and those show bollards beyond the fence and those are on the screen right now. You can see right there. They have a note bold in there, 4 inch steel posts filled with concrete, top of post to be 36 above grade, a total of five.

Mr. Beougher: Total of five or total of nine.

Mr. Robbins: Excuse me. I believe it's nine. I think you're correct.

Mr. Beougher: And they do wrap around the fence and do appear that they would provide some protection and a car would not be able to go between them perhaps. Any other questions? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Spalding: I move that we accept the fence as proposed.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Spalding. Is there a second?

Mr. Comeaux: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: And before I ask for further discussion, in the staff report there was a recommendation. Mr. Robbins, are you satisfied that the safety concerns have been addressed at this point?

Mr. Robbins: If the bollards are in place and those bollards meet a specification that can withstand the impact of a car, I think that would address the safety concern.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Further discussion?

Mr. Burd: I know we had a motion and a second and I don't want to change topic too much but since we're Design Review Board, do you have plans for signage on the front of the building, the Brice Road side? I'm sorry to change the subject—

Ms. Harris: That's okay. And, yes, we do.

Mr. Burd: And you have a vinyl banner up now, is that right?

Ms. Harris: It's not actually – there's one up but the landlords are thinking about it's really small and there's one on the vacant end of the building that's not rented so he's trying to see whether or not if he can exchange that one for the small one we have.

Mr. Burd: I didn't mean to change the topic. I just wanted to check on that.

Ms. Harris: That's okay.

Mr. Burd: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Burd. Any further discussion? (No response.) All right. We have a motion and second on the floor. Mr. Robbins, would you please call the roll.

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

Ms. Harris: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Good luck.

Mr. Robbins: If you would give me a call tomorrow we can discuss the _____ and for the record as well, signage does have to go through this same Board so when you're ready to come through.

Ms. Harris: Okay.

Mr. Robbins: Thank you.

5. 1299 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: BOB OSMONT (#162014DR). DEMOLITION OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL STRUCTURE.

Mr. Beougher: And this was provided as part of the email and staff report, I believe.

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

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

Mr. Bob Osmont: Yes. My name is Bob Osmont.

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

Mr. Robbins: Yes. Again, this is for 1299 Brice Road, Application #162014, demolition of an existing commercial structure requesting Design Board approval for the demolition of an existing commercial structure; in this case, a car wash self-serve. The property to the north is zoned RI, Restricted Industrial. All other adjacent properties are zoned CC, Community Commercial. The existing structure has been damaged by wind and the property owner is requesting approval for demolition. No further improvements or structures are proposed for the site at the moment. The applicant has provided some images of what's currently there and this was damaged in the windstorm--

Mr. Osmont: In the June-July period.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. So as it stands, the roof is missing off of one-half of the structure. It looks like some equipment was removed, some of the walls have – I don't know if that's damage from the storm or what's happened since. You can see as it stands. Let me pull up our handy map.

Mr. Beougher: While you're doing that – the structure that it's adjacent to, what is that?

Mr. Osmont: There are two structures. There's a – on the north side of the property as you're facing going west, there's a manufacturing building and then _____ of that there is a house that's used as a commercial building.

Mr. Beougher: Is that the machine shop?

Mr. Osmont: Yeah. There was a machine shop there run by Manifold & Phalor for a number of years and then they moved out.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Is it vacant now?

Mr. Osmont: No. There's a car operation in there that specializes in rebuilding Mustangs and Camaros, etc.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you. So now Mr. Robbins has the image up.

Mr. Robbins: Yes. To be clear, you can see the center portion of it and this is the building that's closer to Brice Road. The center portion here, this roof is on, I believe, and then the four bays to the west the roof is completely gone and it sits right now in this parking lot over here. Was that removed completely by the storm or that was done previously?

Mr. Osmont: Yeah. What happened, there was a major storm that came through. Well, let's see. Please repeat your question.

Mr. Robbins: The roof – I was just curious if that was actually taken off by the storm or if that was something that was done after?

Mr. Osmont: No. That roof was -- a major storm came through and I think we had sort of a micro burst that occurred in that specific area and literally lifted that roof off and moved it all the way across. Okay? And it was a very unusual atmospheric condition.

Mr. Robbins: And this car wash was a vacant to that previous?

Mr. Osmont: No. The car wash – the property was previously owned by Manifold & Phalor and they closed the car wash about 2½ years ago and it has been closed since that period of time because it was unprofitable, so it's been vacant for 2½ years.

Mr. Beougher: And so the demolition will be the complete structure or—

Mr. Osmont: Yes. What our plan would be, because of the damage that was done, I mean, you have some options. We do not intend to reopen the car wash in any way, shape, manner, or form. So the options would be number one, to clear off all the debris like the roof that's been down there, you know, the blocks. Technically, I guess you could leave up some of the walls, but our view was we should probably just go through and take the whole thing down.

Mr. Robbins: What are the plans for the building to the west, the one that was not damaged but is still currently vacant? That's part of the same property, correct, this car wash and this – if you can see on the screen—

Mr. Osmont: I'm having difficulty seeing that. That is also a car wash. We have no plans for that. We have no plans to take them down at this particular time. And, again, that's been vacant for the 2½ years.

Mr. Robbins: So the primary concern that staff had, and this is something that – this came to us from the Building Department as a demolition request and since this is a change in a Commercial District, this does have to go through Design Review Board. The primary concern of the City is twofold. First, the character of the area, I believe,

would be negatively impacted both by a car wash that's been damaged by a storm left as is, but also a vacant parking lot within almost the center of our Commercial corridor, Brice Road and East Main. The second would be the consequences of an unattended parking lot. We've had a lot of issues in places that have vacant lots in front of buildings, most notably at the old brewery that's to the east of the City, which is a place that truck drivers like to park their tractor trailers and you see cars for sale and things like that. I could see this becoming a very hospitable area for those types of endeavors, I guess is what I'm trying to say.

What staff is looking for from the Board is some sort of recommendation on how this lot should be left and we are looking from some room for the applicant to meet us in a reasonable manner to make sure the lot doesn't ruin the character of the area and doesn't promote any kind of activities that would otherwise negatively affect the character of the area.

Mr. Osmont: I'm not sure exactly how to respond to that and right now the property is vacant, has been vacant for 2½ years. I talked to Joe Creek, who is the previous owner, and they haven't had any problems from his experience since they closed the car wash in terms of people parking the vehicles or people selling off the lot. We have the commercial property just south and also north of there and if any of that type of activity did occur, it's something that we, as a business owner, would take care of. I'm not sure until -- ultimately if the area economically starts to come back, we would probably be looking at redeveloping the entire property but, again, that's going to be in the foreseeable future. We're taking a section that's about 20 to 25 feet across that runs north-south and basically be taking down a building I think that looks very badly damaged. And when you look at the economics associated with it, there's really not very much we can do. Obviously, if we have a problem with people coming on the property we're going to take care of that, because certainly we don't want to have people there. I would like to point out that in front of the building there are some trees that sit up in there and sort of shield that property from the back and, as I say, nobody's experienced this problem in the past.

Mr. Burd: Just a quick question. So the demolition, which I agree is a must-do here, given the condition of the building. What would be left there is basically just the concrete base—

Mr. Osmont: There will be two basic options. We have one, we could leave – the concrete base is already there, so that would be leveled out. The other option that the demolition guys talked about is possibly taking some of the concrete, crushing it up and sort of spreading it over that particular area. That would be an option.

Mr. Beougher: You talked about leaving the walls standing at one point. Is that really an option? I mean, there's—

Mr. Osmont: Realistically, no. All right? I think we should take it down. I think that the structure as it is right now is not very desirable in terms of the way it looks, etc. and we should be moving forward on it.

Mr. Beougher: And my concern as an architect would be you've got unbraced masonry walls that, you know, the roof structure is an integral part of the structure of that assembly and another wind would collapse it on top of somebody. So I think that would be a tremendous safety concern from your standpoint of it and the City's standpoint. Even if you take the walls down to grade and leave the slabs between the walls, how are you going to treat the masonry that goes through the floor, because that goes down in the foundation? So are you going to fill that in with concrete to match the slab or what's your proposal?

Mr. Osmont: You know, I haven't gotten into that kind of detail, but I presume they're going to take it all the way down to the slab and – the contractor couldn't be here – the demolition contractor couldn't be here, but I presume they're going to take it all the way to the slab and it would just be solid going across. But again, he's talked about possibly using some of the concrete and sort of leveling out some of those areas, crushing it up and leveling it.

Mr. Beougher: Any thoughts from the members?

Mr. Burd: Just a comment and this is more for the Board. We talk a lot about this part of the City and we talk a lot about trying to make it an economic comeback here and trying to revitalize the area. Just for the Board to be aware, in March we're going to break ground on about a \$5 million – actually I think it's closer to – well, it's about a \$5 million construction project that's going to repave the entire road. It's going to add in some new curbing, new sidewalks, new street lighting and crosswalks and so we're trying as a City to get the infrastructure in place to make this a more attractive stretch of road to do business and we certainly hope from the City's perspective that that's successful in starting a comeback for this area. I just wanted to mention that in terms of overall of what we're looking at. Along with that is going to become an increased commitment to property maintenance code enforcement up and down Brice Road and so the City is kind of on the same page for that. I just say that to remind the Board what will be happening in this area soon in case they want to factor that in the thought process.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Burd.

Mr. Spalding: Yeah. The only comment I have – when I reviewed the pictures and looked at this, I mean, I thought that it already had been demolished so I think we probably should finish – we should finish the job and take it down to where it should look. That's horrible. I mean, it's horrible and I think we should definitely go forward in doing it.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Spalding. Any other comments from members?

Mr. Robbins: Will there be any recommendations from the Board as to what should happen to the property after demolition? The applicant did mention that the area, you know, in order for any kind of redevelopment to happen, would have to improve economically and I'm not sure how vacant parking lots of demolished buildings help to improve the character of an area.

Mr. Osmont: Ultimately, if you're going to improve the character of the area, I think that entire area's got to be redeveloped from what it is. All right? And that's sort of a long term vision, but to – you know, we'd love to have somebody come in, we'd love to be able to build a building, we'd love to have somebody come in there and make it economically feasible, because, like you said, it's just sitting here for us and it's not doing anything for us, but we have to deal with the reality of the situation as it is today. We've done a little exploration, but we really haven't seen very much interest in anybody coming into the area when we talked to the real estate brokers.

Mr. Beougher: So if I were looking at a site like this as a developer, it seems to me that I'd prefer a site that was totally demolished down to the foundation, everything removed, that was a clean slate that I could come in and prepare a pad and construct a structure. It seems to me that having the slab, the walls, the foundation, all of that remaining in a sea of asphalt is not going to be as attractive to someone you're marketing the property to. Do you have any thoughts about that or about how you're marketing the property, or are you marketing the property at all?

Mr. Osmont: No. We are not marketing the property at this particular stage and clearly, I think from – as you say, somebody – if they're coming in and would like to have us clean the site as it could possibly get and clearly by taking down the walls and leveling the property out, I think it'll make it that much more attractive. But, again, I'm not sure how realistic that is in today's environment.

Mr. Robbins: The ultimate goal for the existing vacant car wash to the west-- Now, it's just an assumption here, that that will not open back up as a car wash at any point. Would that be correct?

Ms. Osmont: I beg your pardon? I'm sorry.

Mr. Robbins: This portion back here, this is part of your property as well, right?

Mr. Osmont: Yes, it is.

Mr. Robbins: It was not damaged during the wind storm.

Mr. Osmont: No. It was not.

Mr. Robbins: That is likely never to open back up as a car wash. Is that correct or do you guys have—

Mr. Osmont: We have no intention to open it. The previous owner who had a very mechanical background wasn't able to make the car wash successful in that area and we have no plans.

Mr. Spalding: But you wouldn't demolish it unless it suffered wind damage and so forth also, right?

Mr. Osmont: If it had suffered extensive wind damage we certainly would have done so.

Mr. Beougher: In the staff report the question is pretty clear. The Board will consider how the vacant lot will impact the character of the district and what remedies should be made to accommodate a vacant lot within the district and I think we're perplexed at this point. It seems to me that you're interested in doing the bare minimum to demolish, degrade and then leave it sitting until conditions in the area improve. Is that an accurate characterization?

Mr. Osmont: Well, our basic plan is to eliminate what basically is in terms of a property that's been damaged, to bring it down because of safety reasons and also because of the way it looks. Okay? So we're going to bring it down and that stays. The property has been vacant for 2½ years and the previous owner tried to market the property with almost no success whatsoever. All right? We would love to find somebody to move into the property or redevelop that entire area if we could but, unfortunately, the reality is so far from – what brief discussions that we've had, we haven't had a very positive response. But, like you, we would love to see the area redeveloped.

Mr. Beougher: Well, in the interest of public safety, it has to come down.

Mr. Spalding: Right. Absolutely.

Mr. Beougher: As far as how to leave the site, I'm a little frustrated because I really think it ought to be a little more shovel-ready, if you will. But I get the sense that that's not something you're willing—

Mr. Osmont: Well, that is our game plan, to spend the money in terms of bringing it down, getting debris off the property and getting it fixed up to the extent that we can. And then longer term, we'd certainly like to develop some plans to redevelop that entire area, not just the car wash but possibly the manufacturing building and possibly the commercial house just to the south of the area, because if you could put all those three together, possibly you could do something with it.

Mr. Spalding: Do you own any of the other properties?

Mr. Osmont: We own the manufacturing building and we own the commercial property, the house that's on the south side.

Mr. Spalding: Okay. You own quite a – almost the whole section, like Monopoly.

Mr. Osmont: Yeah. But there's easements have run through – back to the Maaco shop in the back and there's easement that runs to the automotive shop on the north side. In addition, there's a tower back there in the rear of the property where there are easements that run back and forth across the property.

Mr. Comeaux: So one drive is an easement.

Mr. Osmont: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Comeaux: That one drive to the south, is it—

Mr. Osmont: _____ through there, that is an easement that runs back to the—

Mr. Comeaux: You can't close out that drive.

Mr. Osmont: --Maaco.

Mr. Robbins: I assume this back here would be the easement—

Mr. Osmont: And that's also an easement running back in that area, back to the tower that's back there.

Mr. Comeaux: In a perfect world, I'd like to see everything demolished, all traces gone and the lot even taken out leaving the existing roadways, and grass planted, and I'd like if it would create a market in that way. I don't think you're going to have any success with the parking lot, with the foundation and the slab and it's – I've seen those and they're nasty. You can't really park cars on them. And even if you took it down below grade and planted grass over the site that would at least clean up the area.

Mr. Osmont: And then we're talking about – we're talking about an area that's 26 feet across out of about 150 area and on all sides there's asphalt, right? And what you're talking about is a major redig up and a major rebuild and we, quite frankly, can't afford it. We're a small business. We're not a big corporation and we'll just leave it like it is unless – or somebody telling us to take it down, then we take it down. I think we're acting responsibly by taking an action to try to get the property cleaned up, by taking it down within the economic means that we can afford to do. We didn't have any insurance on this. All right? So we're going to be paying for this, for all this, and we can't afford this. If you want us just to take the roof and the other things away we'd be

happy to do so. But we're proposing to take it down the level, to level it down and I think that's a reasonable position for us to do. We can't afford to beautify this area. We'd be out of business. I mean, that's the reality of it. If you guys would like to build a building on the property, the City wants to come in and buy it and put a building on it, you know, and as part of the cost – I mean, people take out the concrete thing. I don't know what to tell you.

Mr. Beougher: I said if it was a perfect world.

Mr. Hudson: I understand exactly what you're saying. If I were in your shoes I'd do exactly the same thing. What the Board is proposing to beautify, it isn't going to happen. You don't have the money. You're getting it down, the safety factor. You're taking it down and that keeps people from being hurt and I think that's what you have to do. As far as the rest of it, it isn't going to happen. So I know what you're saying but, no, it's get it down and he can't afford it. If you were in his shoes you couldn't afford it either, so it's fine what you're doing.

Mr. Beougher: Is that a motion?

Mr. Hudson: That is my motion.

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

Mr. Burd: I just want to clarify that we're talking about a total demo of what's there. I don't want there to be any confusion. I don't want to leave here today with walls standing. I know that's not your intent. I'm sorry. I don't want there to be any confusion when we leave tonight that there's leeway if we leave walls standing. I—

Mr. Osmont: Our intent is for all the walls to come down.

Mr. Burd: The concrete base is going to be left.

Mr. : If the motion was appropriate that's fine but I think that we may want to put in a motion that it will be a complete demo and that the property would be left as sanitary condition as it can be given the circumstances.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Mr. Hudson, I appreciate your passion.

Mr. Hudson: I'm just saying there's a building on the corner. It's been there what, five years, 10? It's still there. I agree with him totally. Take it down, take it down to the base and improve the safety factor and that's where it's going to have to go.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So, Mr. Robbins, do you have appreciable motion out of what Mr. Hudson's statements were or do we need to restate it?

Mr. Robbins: I think a re-statement would be good just for the record.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Hudson, would you like to formulate your motion again?

Mr. Hudson: Remove everything above grade down to the concrete pads and remove it and I think that's where it has to go to. That takes care of the safety factor. It doesn't go below grade as you have asked for. Does that sound about right?

Mr. Beougher: Sounds about right.

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Spalding. Any other comments?

Mr. Burd: I have one. I know you've been in touch with the Building Department about the demolition. Do you have a schedule in mind of when this would occur?

Mr. Osmont: I'm sorry.

Mr. Burd: For the demolition, do you have a time—

Mr. Osmont: This is the first phase. We've got to go through and get the EPA approval for checking any environmental conditions and I understand that's a two or three week process. But the first thing is to get the approval from the City to go ahead with the demolition. Then we move forward with the EPA and then we'll move forward as quickly as we can with the contractor to get this thing going and—

Mr. Burd: Your intent is to act as quickly as you can.

Mr. Osmont: My plan is to get this done as quickly as we possibly can given the constraints of regulatory approval.

Mr. Comeaux: There are no tanks under there, are there?

Mr. Osmont: There's a concrete vault on the left side, right.

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

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

Mr. Robbins: To let you know, I have been in contact with the Building Department and I just want to make you aware of this as they will need a plan of what's going to occur at the site, something showing what exactly is being proposed to be taken down. I would strongly advise to call Shelly Taylor.

Mr. Osmont: This is a requirement again to tell you what we're going to be taking down? We're basically taking down everything off the site.

Mr. Robbins: Typical for a demolition permit. So I would just – I would strongly—

Mr. Osmont: What do we have to do? Do we have to submit the plans to them?

Mr. Robbins: I would strongly recommend that you contact her tomorrow and verify the requirements. What I just—

Mr. Osmont: I thought that the Design Review Board that approved this. Is there another body that we've got to go through?

Mr. Robbins: No. We would be the Zoning Board so we approve design review in the City. The Building Department is the one that follows the Ohio Building Code and the building code for the City of Reynoldsburg, so—

Mr. Osmont: But we're not building anything on this property.

Mr. Robbins: According to the building code a demolition of a property is considered construction of one type and that's why you need permits for that, so I would just strongly recommend that you contact the Building Department to make sure that their requirements are met. Okay?

Mr. Osmont: This is another reason why we have the delays. Okay. We'll do that. Are there any particular requirements that they have that we have to be involved in?

Mr. Robbins: I can't speak to that. I would just double-check with them.

Mr. Osmont: Okay.

Mr. : It's basically a permit and it's not unique to Reynoldsburg. I mean, a demolition permit would be required wherever you were located.

Mr. Osmont: Okay. That's fine. I'm sorry to express my frustration, but we do want to get moving forward on this.

Mr. Comeaux: And I suspect your demolition contractor has gone through this process before.

Mr. Osmont: I am sure he has and he's a lot better at it than I am.

Mr. Robbins: I believe he already has a permit filed with the Building Department – I believe. I'm not for certain. _____ comment to me so I have a blanket

statement that I say. I say contact the Building Department because we can give zoning approval. We cannot give building permits or demolition permits.

Mr. Osmont: I appreciate the advice and apologize for my frustration over this. Okay?

Mr. Beougher: Thank you and good luck.

Mr. Osmont: Well, thank you very much for your consideration and your approval and thank you for your comments.

Mr. Beougher: Before we adjourn we have an item of Other Business under D.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins, do you want to introduce the speaker?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. This is Mike McCrone from ADA Architects. They are right now working with staff. They have a major site plan and a variance and a zoning certificate that's been submitted to the City and this is for the development of the site that is just to the eastern edge – it's near the western edge of the city, excuse me, is the way I want to describe it. If you remember this site, this is where I believe Family Dollar wanted to go in at one point. The applicant wanted the chance to come in and address the Design Review Board. He's been working with staff to make sure that the building is—

Mr. Beougher: In front of the storage?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. Where the mouse is.

Mr. Beougher: Where the big flag is.

Mr. Robbins: He wanted the opportunity to come in and address the Board and perhaps get some preliminary non-binding feedback as to the design. They have, as I said, worked with staff to bring their building as close to our design regulations as basically could be done. Their interest is time, so they want to make sure when they come through Design Review that all the concerns that the Board could have would be ironed out previous to the meeting. So I think that's what he's after at this point and if there's anything that you have to say, I think you have that chance.

Mr. Mike McCrone: Okay. My name is Mike McCrone with ADA Architects. I'm representing Harbor Freight Tools that wants to build on the north of East Main Street across from Arborwild Drive. What I came tonight to do is to talk about the materials and ask if there are any material restrictions such as most of the buildings I see when I drive down Main Street are a face brick material. Are there any restrictions such as it has to be face brick or can it be a jumbo brick? Can it be a monarch brick? Can it be a

concrete masonry unit? Because when I come to present this on October 3rd I want to make sure to have the proper materials and I don't see anything in the code that dictates those restrictions, but I do see visually driving down the street that everything is face brick with a dimension of 8 inches wide by 2¾ inches high.

Mr. Beougher: I'm not sure that everything is. I recall that the pharmacy at Brice and Main-- You've got the pharmacy on the northeast corner and the Speedway Gas Station on the northwest corner and they both have the same color brick. The gas station is a standard brick and the pharmacy is a larger brick. I don't know if that's the jumbo, monarch or what size it is specifically, but I do know someone walking by may not notice it but I, as an architect, do. So you might want to take a look at that and get a sense of the size. As far as our regulations, they're pretty well spelled out in the code and in the overlays. Mr. Robbins, have you directed him to the materials?

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

Mr. McCrone: I've seen the Community Commercial Overlay. I studied it. I don't see anything in there about restrictions of sizes of masonry. We wanted to build with masonry, don't necessarily want to build with brick. Our standard is a through wall CMU and my concern is that I didn't see any buildings built with through wall CMU. We want to make sure we fit in with the community and we will build with brick on block if that's necessary and we don't want it to stand out as a – just something that doesn't fit in with the community. I also want to get the specification for the Reynoldsburg brick. Is there a specific specification, because we want to try to use some of that color in our design.

Mr. Beougher: Are we talking about the Streetscape wall brick?

Mr. McCrone: Correct.

Mr. Robbins: Off the top of my head, that's not something I – not information I can give you at this moment. I believe that if we check in with our Engineering Department and check some of the records that we have in the Planning & Zoning Department, that's probably something we can find.

Mr. Beougher: I just recycled the drawings that I had at my house. I'm sure there are some here and I'm sure there are specifications.

Mr. McCrone: So we'll ask for that off the record maybe by email.

Mr. Beougher: You know the other thing is specifications are wonderful but with brick you almost have to do a visual match.

Mr. McCrone: Right. And that's fine. What we intend – what you see here is the Streetscape wall – we want to match the other Streetscape walls. They seem to have a reddish brown brick and we would build the Streetscape wall out of the same

face brick, standard face brick material that all of the other ones are. So what I think we will do is come up with materials, get material samples, bring those before the Board. I just don't want to come in with materials that won't be acceptable since our intent is to have this building built by the end of May and we want to get started with drawings. We know that we have BZBA on the 19 of September and want to come back here on October 3rd with proposed materials that will be acceptable.

Mr. Beougher: Well, as you can tell, we spent some money on Main Street in recent years. I don't know what the total cost was. It seems like we had two phases of about \$8 million each, something like that, and we tried to improve. We buried all the cable and definitely did some improvements and are trying to upgrade the finishes on the exteriors of the buildings. There are a few buildings that are remaining that are not face brick, but I think we are trying to encourage folks do an upgrade if we can. And so if there's a possibility of using brick, even if it's a larger size, I think that would be, in a perfect world, more to my liking but then it's not just me, it's the other members of the Board and I'll ask for their comments.

Mr. Hudson: If you look at the, what are these, U-Store-Its next door?

Mr. McCrone: Right.

Mr. Hudson: He has a reddish brick color which kind of looks very nice for a U-Store-It and if you follow that same color scheme it would like very nice.

Mr. McCrone: Right. We have portions of the building accents that utilize those same colors. We intend to use a lighter color on the main field of the building but introduce colors similar to those on the U-Store-It wall that's behind us and on the adjacent building where Dunkin' Donuts, Las Margaritas and the Spring Leaf Financial are and we definitely are going to use a masonry product on the entire building except for the cornice elements at the top of the walls so it will be masonry. We just want to determine, where we introduce face brick, can we use a face brick at the corner piers and the accents and use a CMU product on the majority of the rest of the building? That would be our intent.

Mr. Spalding: In October when you come back, are you going to present your signs as well?

Mr. McCrone: No. We won't present the signage. Signage is a different submission. We're not going to ask for approval of signage. The sign company – to give you a little bit of background very quickly, there are 422 Harbor Freight stores across the country and the signage is always a completely separate submission.

Mr. Spalding: I understand. And what does this company actually do? I'm not familiar—

Mr. McCrone: Harbor Freight Tools sells tools. They have their own brands. It's more of a discount tool store and they sell only tools. It's not like a Home Depot that sells other things. It's strictly tools. Our building is 15,000 square feet and it's just – you come in for tools.

Mr. Beougher: Sales only or do they rent as well?

Mr. McCrone: They don't rent anything, it's all sales.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Robbins: Harbor Freight has a pretty large substantial online presence, correct?

Mr. McCrone: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: Mail order.

Mr. McCrone: Correct.

Mr. Robbins: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: Do they have any other stores in Central Ohio?

Mr. McCrone: There are two stores in Columbus and they're just national, pretty well spread across the country. We've opened 44 stores the last fiscal year and we're scheduled to open 75 in the coming year. So I don't know specifically throughout the State of Ohio what the distribution is but two in Columbus. We're building one in a suburb of Cleveland. There's an existing one in a suburb of Cleveland. Other than that, I don't know specifically where they are in Ohio.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mr. Burd: The closest one that I'm aware of is Cleveland on 161. That's the one I frequent all the time, so that would be the next closest Harbor Freight in the Reynoldsburg Area.

Mr. McCrone: And there are two in Columbus.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Comeaux: I'll ask a question, sure. So your idea would be to have brick accents – it looks about 4 or 5 feet high facing Main Street and then along the, I guess, the western edge of that building?

Mr. McCrone: I believe – I would say that at least three sides of the building would be the same and then the back of the building, we would possibly do something that doesn't have all the accents. If you look at the building next door, they did the same thing. They have brick on three sides. Then on the back they have a split face CMU.

Mr. Comeaux: So it goes from the ground all the way up, right?

Mr. McCrone: Well, you're going to have—

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah. That's fine.

Mr. Robbins: I think that's a fairly standard detail. You have a water table look brick and then a change of material after that. It's usually about 48 inches in height, something around there. The question I would have is the west side of the façade, is there anything that could be done to kind of break up those large expanses of wall right there? And I know a submission that you had earlier had awnings over the front entrance of the building, which I think it actually helped to add a fair amount of visual interest, let's say, to the front entrance which faces the parking lot. So I was just curious to see if that would be something that you guys would entertain.

Mr. McCrone: It's a possibility. The director of construction doesn't like awnings and when we showed the awning as one we thought we could get a sign above that element and without a sign we decided to remove the awning. The way it broke up the expanse possibly there could be more windows on the sides of the tower, possibly a series of windows on both sides of the entry tower, that would break things up a bit.

Mr. Beougher: And it appears that you're coming out to the build-to line?

Mr. Robbins: They're going for a variance.

Mr. Beougher: How much?

Mr. Robbins: Thirty (30) feet. We require 20. There is an easement that runs across the property so what they've done is their building face is to be, I believe, 30 feet from the right-of-way. The easement comes out 26 feet, I believe, off the top of my head and then they need space for the footings to be placed in the ground without violating the easement.

Mr. McCrone: There's actually an easement for 35 feet and that's a City of Reynoldsburg easement. The easements – and we hope that we're able to build in that the easement area, especially since they're Community Development requirement is for the building to be built within 20 feet. What we cannot build into is a sanitary sewer easement and that is, I believe, the sanitary sewer easement is 27 feet and we cannot build into there, so we proposed to have our footings right on that line. So we're

building the building up as close as we really feel we can without – we can't build into a sanitary easement.

Mr. Beougher: But you're still farther forward than any of the buildings adjacent which is an improvement in my view.

Mr. McCrone: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: So we can see that beautiful brick. You know, I recall a time when the Development Director went out of town and the Board approved a split face block on a building and he was a little upset about it, but we have been trying to encourage folks to give us their best. You know, we realize we're not other communities that have a little higher profile image in Central Ohio but we want to be making Reynoldsburg better, making it a place that people want to live and shop in and work in and I think the quality of design -- and if you came in with a design that just blew us away and it was made out of paste, we might accept it. I mean, it's all about the balance of design and materials and the way things are integrated.

Mr. McCrone: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: So, blow us a way with your design and we might approve something other than brick.

Mr. McCrone: What I believe we will do is we'll use quite bit of face brick. We'll introduce it at certain portions of our building and just make it clear because on our rendering you see colors but you don't really see the detail of what the materials are. And we'll bring samples of those – at a minimum, the colors, and ask for an approval on October 3rd of the design intent, at least with comments.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So, since there's no motion on this one it's a little easier, so thank you for coming in.

Mr. McCrone: Great. I appreciate you're taking the Other Business here unscheduled. I just want to make sure that we come in with an acceptable design when we come back.

Mr. Beougher: Give us your best.

Mr. McCrone: Okay. Thank you.

E. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Beougher: All right. Seeing no Other Business before us, we stand adjourned at 8:09 o'clock p.m.

Lane Beougher, Chair

Justin Robbins, Planning Administrator

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