



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 2016 7:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Design Review Board – Regular – June 2, 2016

Minutes stand approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Chairman Zollars: If you are speaking tonight, please stand up and we will swear you in.

Mr. Snowden: Let's just go ahead and do it, that way if you do end up with questions, we do not have to do it then.

Chairman Zollars: You are addressing the Board, so raise your right hand if you would please. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give in front of the Board will be truthful? If so, answer, "I will." (*Audible "I will's."*)

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. **7088 E. Main St.; Application #173911; Applicant: Viktor Prozapas; Business: Adrenalin Trampoline Park, LLC; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Chairman Zollars. 7088 E. Main Street - Get Air Trampoline Park for Signage. Application: #173911 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the north side of E. Main Street between Aida Drive and Briarcliff Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. This was an item that was tabled at our last meeting, and as you probably recall, there were some questions raised by the Board and Staff as to the size of the signage, given the size of the panel, the colors of the new proposed signage. So, you can see on the last page of the application that the applicant took that into consideration and submitted a new revised drawing, and provided the correct dimensions that Staff requested. Looking at this now and

evaluating the size of the sign, Staff found that the sign is probably oversized, given the size of the tenant space. And, looking at that center, that indicates to Staff that a Comprehensive Sign Plan was probably approved for that whole center at some time in the past, which would have allowed them to show all of the signage that they were proposing. Both of the previous tenants utilized that sign board, so this is going to be its third reincarnation as signage in Reynoldsburg. So, I am treating this as an existing non-conforming sign, but I did just want to comment that it does appear to be oversized based on how we calculate signage. I don't feel it is overly large, given the size of the fascia, and that is really my main concern that it looks appropriate to the location. You can see that the applicant has proposed to utilize colors from the new signage to paint the background cabinet, which makes the whole sign package more consistent with itself. For those reasons, I will support the new design and I recommend the Board apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted.

Chairman Zollars: Thank you very much Mr. Snowden. Any questions or comments from the Board?

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, I have one comment in general. With the multiple background colors on the sign, with the green and the yellow, and then repeating the same colors within the graphics and text of the sign, I feel it does not improve or fit in with the character or nature of the existing center. I think that the two previous signs were significantly different in that they just had one color with one color background and one color text and were less confusing and easier to read. So, I would like to say that in its current configuration, I would not be supportive of the sign because I do not think it improves the character and architecture of the center or the community.

Chairman Zollars: Ok, very well.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, just to make one comment in response, all that the Board said in regards to the applicant last time was that they wanted to see colors used, rather than the red, that were I the signage. The Board did not specify specifically, and I did not specify specifically that the applicant do it one solid color, although we could have conveyed that to him. So, if that is something where the Board wants to approve conditions, and others are in agreement, then I would just say pick a color and approve it with conditions, and I am sure the applicant will be amenable to that. I do not think they will care one way or the other. That is my guess, they are not present.

Mr. Sampson: Just looking back over the years with what the Design Standards are for this particular area, I do know they are different than what we have throughout the rest of the City. Does that make a difference in terms of what we understand as being standard, and what applicants come forward with in this particular center and propose?

Mr. Snowden: I don't know that I can provide any particular guidance in this case. Unfortunately, this is a subjective thing. The statement has been from the Board and it is

within the Design Review, that the signage be consistent with itself. So, my interpretation of that would be that at least they have the same colors used throughout the project. But, if the Board is more comfortable saying let's do a solid background here because there was a solid background previously, and the other signs on the site have a solid background, that is also appropriate. Both are correct. There is really no correct answer here.

Chairman Zollars: Well let's see if anyone cares to make a motion one way or the other.

Mr. Hicks: I would like to make a motion to approve the signage conditionally upon the background color of the sign being the yellow and not having any of the green in the background color of the sign.

Mr. Sampson: I will second as stated.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: I will contact them with that condition, and provide that in the written record of action to the applicant. As I stated, I do not think they were going to care either way. That is something I will keep in mind in the future as I am discussing with applicants.

RESULT:	APPROVED [5 TO 0]
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
SECONDER:	Bill Sampson
AYES:	Zollars, Hicks, Carr, Cullinan, Sampson
ABSTAIN:	Bowman
ABSENT:	Hudson

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **7509 E. Main St.; Application #174021; Applicant: David Kaplansky, DPM; Business: Kaplansky Foot & Ankle Centers; Signage - Historic District**

Mr. Snowden: 7509 E. Main Street - Kaplansky Foot & Ankle Centers - Signage - Historic District. Application: #174021 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located along the south side of E. Main Street between Jackson Ave and Cypress Alley. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / HCO - Historic Commercial Overlay. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage in the Historic District. Current Use: Professional Office. Applicant: David Kaplansky, DPM. I will repeat Mr. Sampson's note that the applicant was a long time resident and did pass away, and that is unfortunate and very timely given the Board's review of this property. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface a sign at an existing commercial building within the Historic District. It is developed with a commercial building and related improvements. Neighboring properties are developed with other commercial businesses also in the CC District. To the south, the property is adjacent to single family dwellings in the R-3 District. Single family home in the Marboro Heights neighborhood back up to this property. This lot and all neighboring lots are within the HD - Historic Overlay District. This is an internally illuminated ground sign consists of individual panels of the various business in the building. The sign is non-conforming given the current

Historical requirement, but it would have been a conforming sign, most likely, when it was built. The majority of the existing faces consist white plastic faces covered with a dark vinyl that allows alight to pass through and illuminate the letters. The proposed sign face is consistent with the majority of the existing faces. The applicant has also shown images of their proposed window graphics and small building mounted sign. A zoning sign permit is not required for signs of this type. I recommend 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 recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. All I am saying here gentlemen is that you have a sign that is majority dark background. If we are replacing faces, let's have the same color background. There are two that are white. If we work with those property owners in the future to do a reface, would probably just request that they conform. That is typically what we would look for in a multi-tenant sign like this.

Mr. Bowman: That is what they are proposing, right?

Mr. Snowden: They are basically requesting to take the top out and replace that with a new tenant.

Chairman Zollars: I will entertain a motion.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: I will provide you a written record of action stating the next steps. Basically, you are going to get a zoning sign permit from me and that will authorize you to do the sign reface.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Eliot Bowman
SECONDER:	Tyler Cullinan
AYES:	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Cullinan, Sampson
ABSENT:	Hudson

2. 8119 E. Broad St.; Application #174080; Applicant: Adams Signs; Business: Sally's Beauty ; Signage

Mr. Snowden: 8119 E. Broad Street - Sally's Beauty - Signage. Application: #174080 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the south side of E. Broad Street, east of Waggoner Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for new signage. Current Use: Retail Sales. This center is under construction. Phase one is mostly complete. Applicant: Adams Signs . The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a new wall mounted sign on the front facade of a commercial building. The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building and related improvements. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses. To the north, the property abuts other commercial businesses on the north side of Broad Street in the City of Columbus. To the south, the

property is adjacent to an agricultural use in Jefferson Township. The applicant is proposing to install a new wall sign with an area of 30SF. Per the Code, the applicant is entitled to 40SF of sign area. The 3IN sign projection from the facade does not exceed the 12IN allowed by the Zoning Code, this is what I would look at from a technical standpoint. The proposed sign consists of two colors and the channel letters will be mounted directly to the building's façade. The sign is consistent with the scale of the building's façade and with the size and style signage approved for the other tenant spaces in the same shopping center. We have mostly channel letter on this structure and it is nice to have that consistent. My only concern is this is a case where they are dividing up a tenant space, and as you can see, the signage is not really centered within that fascia, east to west. I think the rendering makes the sign look a little bigger than it probably is, and since the photograph is from an angle, the rendering probably makes it look closer to that vertical belt course than it will be in reality. I would just like the applicant to clarify what the distance is from that vertical belt course. Ideally you would like that signage to be equal distance on the facade. In this case, that tenant space is not lining up with where the facade is. If you move it too far to the left, then that signage would not be directly over the tenant space. I am open to what the Board would like to see. Generally, I am supportive of the signage. I just want clarification and would like to see what the Board's concerns are. I would like the Board to apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage and exterior modifications enhance the characteristics of this commercial district. I recommend approval but let's get the clarification from the applicant for those details. With that, I will turn things back over to our Chairman.

Chairman Zollars: Ok, thanks. Would you like to add anything to this.

Mr. McQuine: I'm Mike McQuine with Adams Signs, 1100 Industrial Ave. I have 7FT 9IN, is the total length of Sally's beauty, so we can center that over the door, no problem.

Mr. Snowden: Do you see on your application how that appears that there is a belt course and a step back for the facade. Do you see that?

Mr. McQuine: I think there was like 10IN get way. If you want us to hug more toward that wall, we can.

Mr. Bowman: I think we might want to hug more to the left. I am not sure if you put that up against the step back, I think it might not look good.

Mr. McQuine: I didn't think so either. That's why they put the application where it was.

Mr. Bowman: First of all, thanks for going to thirty and not forty. Obviously you want your signage to be visible, so that we can see the store. And from a Design Review standpoint, we are just wanting to make sure it looks good. So, we want it to be as centered as possible, and

at the same time we want it to look normal.

Mr. Hicks: Is the tenant space divided just left of the front door on that unit, or is the dividing wall somewhere between the door that we can see and the one on the left?

Mr. McQuine: They have only got that little door to the right.

Mr. Hicks: Is it possible to just center the sign of the center of that door?

Mr. McQuine: We could do that. I did not want to go too far into that column because the sign would be back here.

Mr. Hicks: I move for approval conditional upon the center of the Sally Beauty Sign being centered upon the tenant's door directly below it.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Very well, I will provide a written record of action stating specifically what that condition is, and you will know that when you apply for your zoning sign permit and building plan permit for that.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
SECONDER:	Tyler Cullinan
AYES:	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Cullinan, Sampson
ABSENT:	Hudson

3. **1604 and 1614 Lancaster Ave.; Application #174311; Business: Tata Excavating, Inc.; Minor/Exterior Modifications - Rear Door Addition to Each Suite**

Mr. Snowden: 1604 & 1614 Lancaster Ave - Blacklick Office Center - Exterior Modifications. Application: #174311 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the east side of Lancaster Ave between John Street and Jackson Ave. Existing Zoning: CO - Offices & Institutions District. Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications. Current Use: Commercial Office. Tata Excavating is our applicant. So, this property owner has what we commonly call in the development or Real Estate world is office condos. They are essentially small office spaces. They have two office buildings that look similar, although they are configured just a little bit differently. And what the applicant is proposing to do is add a small door, and another one that mirrors that, to basically divide up the office and rent a smaller office package. The reason they are proposing that is partly because there is vacant space, and folks don't want the entire space that they are offering as one tenant space. The brick veneer around the side is going to stay in place. The proposed glass entry doors with the aluminum door system, match the entry doors on the south facade. The windows and signage are going to be staying in place as you

see indicated on the plans, and that is going to place the entry door here, so you are looking at basically taking out one piece of landscaping, and running a four foot concrete walk up to that, to allow access. So, that allows them to rent this end unit independently of the access over here. Let me give you a larger image. This is immediately south of the township cemetery. You have Hannah Ashton Middle School, the cemetery, and then these two. The neighboring uses, you have a church behind (S-1), you have some homes that are in R-2, you have some homes in Truro Township on the opposite side of Lancaster. Then you have the township cemetery as the land use immediately to the north.

Chairman Zollars: Ok, thank you very much.

Mr. Snowden: They have if so nicely landscaped back there that you might not know that the office is landscaped. I would recommend that the Board apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage and exterior modifications enhance the characteristics of this commercial district. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Chairman Zollars: Very good, thank you Mr. Snowden. Any questions or comments from the applicant, or the Board?

Mr. Snowden: I will provide a written record of action. It will go out Monday. You have already submitted your Zoning Certificate and you will want to submit your building plans. When those are done, we will give you a call and you can pick them up and start your project.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Eliot Bowman
SECONDER:	Bill Sampson
AYES:	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Cullinan, Sampson
ABSENT:	Hudson

4. **8035 E. Broad St.; Application #173938; Applicant: Michael Smith; Business: Hobby Lobby; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: 8035 E. Broad Street - Hobby Lobby - Signage. Application: #173938 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on south side of E. Broad Street, just east of Waggoner Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services. The request is for approval of a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales. Applicant: Stanley W. Young, III/Signsmith. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for 5 new wall signs up to 402.8SF of signage on this commercial building, again phase one under construction related improvements. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS District, including retail sales, an eating or drinking establishment and some auto service related uses.. To the rear, the property abuts agricultural property in Jefferson Township. So. We are back to the Shoppes at East Broad. This is the final anchor tenant, Hobby Lobby. And, as you recall from the design review of the structure, the building footprint is in this area. The applicant

was required by the current sign code to secure a comprehensive sign plan from BZBA because they were proposing four wall signs instead of the one that was permitted by code. So, what they have chosen to do in this case, they are allocated up to 567SF of total sign area is what they are permitted. They are proposing to take 402SF total and spread that out to five signs there on the facade. The main sign, and four other signs describing the types of services and products that they provide there. This is pretty typical for a commercial business of this size. At the request of Staff, the applicant, originally there were six signs, they reduced it to four, and they centered the flanking signs on the wall panel system so that they would look more attractive and not be broken up by wall seams that did not jive with where the signs location were. BZBA approved that sign and found that their request was reasonable and approved it at their July 21st meeting. Again, internally illuminated signage, channel letters, just like the rest of the center. They proposed two different colors so it is not like we have a variety of colors and images. The channel letters appear to be facade mounted. I did not see a raceway indicated. They are facade mounted and consistent with the rest of the shopping center. I recommend the Board apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of this commercial district. Staff's recommendation is that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Chairman Zollars: Very good. Would you like to add anything to that?

Michael Smith: Just the smaller letters that are on the side are not illuminated. They are usually blue. The Hobby Lobby is the only one on the building that illuminate, and they are orange.

Chairman Zollars: Any questions for the Board?

Mr. Sampson: The type font and colors, those are Hobby Lobby standards, is that accurate? That is what I thought.

Mr. Hicks: The panel signs that are going to go on your large monument, on your drawings, they do not have any dimensions. They just say no survey required. I am assuming, normally typically require dimensions on all the signs.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks I do. Refaces are a little bit different. The history of this, and I went back and looked at this whole site and this is complex because they have been through so many different site plans. They did a 2007 site plan. They did two different phases of a site plan in 2014 and then they did another one with us last year. Basically they did a comp sign plan when this all got started, and that got them probably some taller multi-tenant signs than they would have had normally by code. And, the justification they used for that are that the buildings are far back from the street, they made considerations with the landscaping and so forth, and I am sure that is why they were approved for that. So, yes I do need the dimensions. I will request that they add the dimensions for the zoning sign phase. But, it really is not that big of a concern when you are talking about refacing.

Mr. Hicks: I was just curious if you were calculating this, how you were calculating if you did not have the dimensions. But, I understand it has to fit and I want to make sure there is no misunderstanding that the sign gets to be whatever dimension they want, or that it has no dimension.

Unknown Speaker: The east and west pylons are 28IN tall and 60IN long.

Mr. Snowden: Would you make a note Sir, to put the dimensions on there for the drawings?

Unknown Speaker: I only have one other question then, the small brick monument sign that is visible as you are going north on Waggoner, I am curious if that was previously approved to be a multi-tenant sign, or if that was suppose to be a single tenant sign, just due to its size, and, if there were any other approved signs for the other half of that sign.

Michael Smith: It is kind of odd that Hobby Lobby would get that sign with so many new businesses going in, and it is kind of out there by itself.

Mr. Snowden: To answer the question, I do not have the previous comp sign from 2007, or whenever that is, at least in a manner that I can locate. I am assuming they got the sign approved for the location, or else it would not be there because they would have had to get a permit and I can see that the permit was pulled. So, that indicates to me a comp sign plan was done. Whether or not that was designed for two different tenants on that comp sign plan, really does not make a difference if BZBA and DRB are comfortable with what they are proposing here. You may have a case where you have a tenant put up a sign a later they want to turn it into a multi-tenant sign because more tenants are added, so that is ok. The second part of your question, there is no other business that is going in at this time. I am assuming that Giltz and associates are leaving that open for other tenants that may want to request or pay for the privilege of being on there. My view would be that if they are doing a channel letter sign on that, then the next guy is also. And. If is not illuminated, correct?

Michael Smith: Actually, they are just pin mounted letters.

Mr. Snowden: My recommendation to the Board at that time will be that the next guy come in and do pin mounted letters and non-illuminated as well.

Unknown Speaker: That is my only comment that due to the size of that sign, my assumption, is that it has been there for so long, that that would be a single tenant sign, and that trying to squeeze two of them into one sign eventually, may look kind of awkward. Especially in the interim period when there is only one tenant on it, I think typically a sign of that size I would expect it to be a single tenant sign, or a sign with the name of the shopping center on it.

Mr. Sampson: Let me clarify, I know when they put those backgrounds in place, I think they used that particular background, and let me ask, is Hobby Lobby the largest business square footage in the Shoppes at east Broad?

Unknown Speaker: I would think so. Before all the new businesses, it was just Lowes.

Mr. Sampson: It was my belief that that was meant to really highlight the primary business at that location. It was simply an incentive, what was meant to be an additional feature that the primary tenant would be allowed at that location.

Unknown Speaker: Or as far west as someone mentioned, I would think that that would be to name the center because there is not a sign at that end that has the name of the center on it.

Mr. Sampson: That may be a consideration down the road to make it a different sign mount, and to allow all of the businesses to be located there, or to simply take it out.

Mr. Snowden: Gentlemen, the only thing that I could do for you, and we don't normally do this but I have a good positive working relationship with this developer, if the Board wants to take a five minute recess, I can go back to the office and call that gentleman on my cell phone, and try to get some clarification about what their thought process is there. I would be happy to do that if that is the will of the Board, especially since it is the last item. It is up to you.

Unknown Speaker: I think I would be willing to approve the sign conditionally upon Hobby Lobby getting that full monument sign. I think it would be appropriate, it makes sense, and then the monument sign is being used.

Mr. Bowman: I would move for a finite recess to get that information because if there is an agreement in place, I think we need to know that, even with a condition.

Mr. Hicks: My only comment would be, and as a common sense solution, I agree with you Mr. Snowden, but is that same consideration given to anybody else that comes in here, and there plans are not necessarily clear. Or. We raise an issue with their plans and the developer does not show up to this meeting in order to answer that question. So, if we are setting a precedent that we are willing to take a recess for everybody, to go give them a call or run out and grab them to bring them into the meeting, that is my only concern. I'm not saying it is a bad idea. I think it is a common sense way of dealing with this, but long term.

Mr. Carr: For consistency at this development, like if you go to the corner of Waggoner and Broad St., on similar signage there it is just as low on both sides. So my guess is that was the intent for those monuments. That would seem to make sense and at least be consistent for that whole development.

Unknown Speaker: One thing I do want to nip in the butt, I'm not a big fan of stopping a meeting to investigate anything. That is not what we are here for. I will entertain a motion that we set this piece aside for clarification and either do an email or phone call vote on this particular sign, and approve everything else once we get clarification, and some communication from Mr. Snowden and the developer.

Unknown Speaker: If it is only going to be the one side on this monument, the dimensions will probably change.

Unknown Speaker: They would have to change to mirror that.

Unknown Speaker: I think we would have to throw it back to the developer and Hobby Lobby.

Michael Smith: On my end they just roll through, and if they see something, if your van is parked out there they are going to try to put Hobby Lobby on it. They want their name on everything.

Mr. Cullinan: Could we come up with what the Board wants as a sign, approve that, and then Mr. Snowden can approach the developer? And if there are concerns from the developer on other agreements they have made, they can address that at the next meeting.

Mr. Snowden: Gentlemen, I think the best course of action, and all of your points are well taken. We all want the same thing and that is for this to work. My recommendation at this point, given your feedback, is that the Board approve this on condition that only one sign will be allowed at that location, and the sign will be centered on the spot.

Unknown Speaker: And, I think you could have some language where they could scale that up slightly, and I think we would leave that to Staff.

Unknown Speaker: I think to keep consistent with the store front, if you just took Hobby Lobby and put beside each other, it probably would work.

Mr. Snowden: Gentlemen, the fact is, if you did that and you delegated that authority, I would get something that fit on the fascia for that sign. If the developer all of a sudden said that actually the other half was suppose to be for TJ Maxx, and they want to come back and get TJ Maxx approved to be there, for one sign, that is there prerogative. They have not shown us what is going on, on the other side. We are going to say they get one, Staff will take care of scaling to get it centered, if they want to give the other half to another tenant, that tenant will come back and show their Comprehensive Sign Plan.

Mr. Hicks: Who would like to make a motion?

Unknown Speaker: I think you should make the motion Mr. Hicks.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the signage plan with one condition, that the monument sign on Waggoner Road remain a single tenant sign, that the Hobby Lobby signage be centered upon the sign, and that Staff shall have the authority to work with the applicant to scale the Hobby Lobby sign size and orientation in a way that is appropriate for the monument sign.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Very well, they are approved on the conditions and I will send that out in writing. I will reach out to the developer and if they want to make a different decision regarding how that is used, with another client, that is them, but Hobby Lobby will be approved to do that. The best thing that you could do if you want to make a note is probably be to redo that rendering email to me and I will tell you if we are in the ballpark.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
SECONDER:	Eliot Bowman
AYES:	Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Cullinan, Sampson
ABSENT:	Hudson

E. OTHER BUSINESS

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman

Planning Administrator