



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2016 7:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

Minutes stand approved.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Carr, Sampson, Cullinan
ABSENT:	Hicks

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Zollars: Anyone who will be speaking, please sign in on the table. Anyone speaking who has not signed in? We will take a minute to get everyone signed in. All of you who are testifying tonight before us, if you would stand and raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give in front of the board will be truthful? If so, please answer, "I do." (*Audible I do's*) Thank you.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **6360 E. Main St.; Application #173619; Applicant: Jason Goss; Business Name: Auto Direct Columbus, OH Inc.; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: 6360 E. Main Street - Auto Direct - Signage. Application: #173619 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the north side of E. Main Street between Brice Road and Rosehill Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request is for review and approval of a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Auto Sales. Applicant: Jason Goss. This has been an ongoing situation here at this property. The Code Compliance Division

issued a notice to the property owner in December of 2015 that the sign had been refaced without the required certificate of appropriateness and zoning sign permit. This application was made in May. The applicant did not secure a Special Exception Use Permit and they eventually secured the permit but they have not complied with the conditions of the Special Exception Use Permit that was issued in October of 2015. The applicant has been granted additional time by City Council last month to be in compliance. For example, the applicant pulled down the building to make some engineering modifications to their site. They needed to repair a portion of their rear building. There have been some ongoing issues here. To bring everybody up to speed, they have proposed to reface an existing 49.5SF sign. It is an existing sign but it was billed as part of the Main Street commercial corridor, so it complies with all of our sign regulations for this corridor. It includes two colors on a white background. Upon visit to the site, Staff has observed that the applicant has been modifying this signage cabinet by putting American Flags and holders and things on top of the sign cabinet. For the sections cited in the code in the Staff Report, that is actually prohibited. Obviously we do not want to say that they can not display American Flags where ever they want, however, given these sections of code, they cannot attach anything to a sign that is designed to attract attention by movement, or as a banner or pendant. He can display the American Flag anywhere else on the property, as far as I am concerned, just not attached to the sign. Since this is not a customary location to display flags, Staff recommends that the flags be removed as condition of his approval. With that, the Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness on the following condition: That the applicant shall be in compliance with Sections 1181.04(e)(1) and 1181.04(e)(2) of the Zoning Code and that no flags or other device that uses motion to attract attention shall be mounted to any part of the sign structure. I do not see the applicant or his representative in the audience with us this evening, but under next steps I have made our Code Compliance Division aware of several other minor violations of our Zoning Code, some flashing signage, signage mounted to cars. The reason I am making a bigger deal out of this than we maybe normally would, is because I want the Board to understand that although the applicant is asking the Board to approve this sign reface, it does not mean they have carte blanche to not comply with our Zoning Code throughout the rest of the site. I am working with our Chief Building Official and Code Compliance Officers to get compliance.

Chairman Zollars: Very good, thank you. Any discussion or questions? The applicant is not here. Any questions from the Board, hearing none, do we have a motion?

Mr. Bowman: I will move to approve based on Staff's recommendation with the condition that the aforementioned sections of the Zoning Code are addressed.

Mr. Sampson: I second.

Chairman Zollars: Ok, thank you. Any questions or discussions? I do have one question to Mr. Bowman's statement, is there a time frame that we can put in number 2.

Mr. Snowden: My interpretation is that if no time frame is placed on there, that means that I am not going to issue the Zoning Sign Permit until that is in compliance. I would say, he can leave it up there at his own discretion, but I am not going to issue the Zoning Sign Permit. What that would mean is that we could continue enforcement of that section of the Zoning Code. In this case we do not have to put a time because we could continue enforcement following our normal procedure.

Chairman Zollars: Very good. Would you please call the roll?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Very good, I will provide written notice to the applicant, following our normal procedure.

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

2. 7453 E. Main St.; Application #173791; Applicant: S.E.I. Real Estate Holdings, LLC - Mark Hazel; Historic District - Window Replacement/Modification

Mr. Snowden: 7453 E. Main Street - SEI Real-Estate Building - Historic District: Exterior Modifications. - Application: #173791 - Certificate of Appropriateness. - Location: Property is located along the south side of E. Main Street between Jackson Ave and Cypress Alley. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce / HCO - Historic Commercial Overlay. The request for certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications. Current Use: Professional Office. Applicant: SEI Real-Estate Holdings LLC. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to replace windows on an existing commercial building within the Historic District. Existing Site & Context - The site was 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. This lot and all neighboring lots are within the HD - Historic Overlay District. STAFF REVIEW - Window Style - The existing office building has a mansard roof and several non-historic window styles. The applicant proposes to replace the three windows on the north facade, which face Main Street, with new horizontal sliding windows. From the base, for the first six feet, it is brick. It also has a shingle mansard roof, so it definitely is not a traditional structure like you see in the Historic District. As you can see from the picture in front of you, they have several different kinds of windows already in place. They have some that have a muntin or grid. They had some that did not. The style of window that they are proposing, which is a horizontal sliding window, is specifically labeled as inappropriate by our Design Guidelines. So, you can see there are grids, muntins, and a couple of windows. Some in one pane, and not in the other. These are basically tape that was put on the window. You definitely have some inconsistency with what is existing. The problem is that putting in a window that would meet the Historic Guidelines is a challenge given the window sizes here. And so, I am making the recommendation that the applicant work with Staff and select an appropriate

muntin pattern, that would be like a window grid. So, the idea here is we have some inconsistency, we have a window style that is labeled as inappropriate, but we are going to require the applicant to put a grid to give a little more of a historic flavor. The reason I did not prescribe a specific style is because there are two or three different styles that they could use that are in there, and I think we should leave it up to them as to what will work for them. But, I think we should require the grid in this case because we are allowing a non-historic window type. The color is going to match. They have white window frames, so that is going to match that window well a lot better. So, that is why I am supporting what normally would be considered inappropriate window type. With that, I recommend that the Board apply the standards for design review and determine if this enhances the Historic District. I recommend that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness on the following condition: That the applicant work with Staff to select and appropriate muntin pattern from the Historic Design Guidelines and submit the revised plans along with their application for a zoning certificate. With that, I will turn things back over to our Chairman.

Chairman Zollars: Very good. Is the applicant here? Is there anything that you would like to add?

Mr. Hazel: I plan to replace all the windows.

Mr. Snowden: So it is not just the three, it is all five?

Mr. Hazel: Yeah. It is for energy efficiency. They are aluminum frames.

Chairman Zollars: Any questions from the Board?

Mr. Bowman: These muntin patterns, are they a substantial cost to you?

Mr. Hazel: The word from the manufacturer is that they are similar to what is on it now, which is a tape. I could literally do six inch squares, ten inch squares.

Mr. Snowden: I will give you the Design Guidelines, you pick one. It is really that simple.

Mr. Hazel: It is an adhesive, just to make it look like it has got some.

M. Bowman: Is it going to be a substantial cost to you to add these muntins?

Mr. Hazel: I don't know. I don't think it would be significant based on the total cost.

Mr. Bowman: I have never bought muntin before.

Mr. Hazel: My windows have a plastic thing that flexes. This would be kind of like a decal.

Mr. Bowman: I would guess, based on that description that it would not seem like a substantial cost. The reason I ask that is because the windows are obviously not historical and you can not help that. They are what they are. If you were meeting guidelines already, I

would hesitate, even though the grids obviously would look great and fit into the Historical District, I did not want to put any undue substantial cost, but it sounds like maybe it will not be so substantial if it is just a little vinyl tape.

Mr. Snowden: I think it is a good compromise given the fact that we are flexible with the fact that he has a window hole that he has to fill with something.

Mr. Carr: Is the vinyl coming from the manufacturer?

Mr. Hazel: I am not sure if the window company will be providing it, or if I will have to go down to the sign place and get vinyl tape. What is on it is literally like sticky aluminum foil, and it is half falling off. That is why some windows have it and some don't.

Mr. Carr: I would frankly be surprised if they didn't do this for you. It would be rather insignificant per window. I motion that we approve as submitted with the provisions from staff.

Mr. Cullinan: I will second.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: The next steps, I will provide in writing. Basically we should look at the Design Guidelines so that you can tell your manufacturer. You will need a Zoning Certificate, and submit your building permit to our Building Division to do the work, so it can be inspected. Ok?

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

3. **8163 East Broad St.; Application #173860; Applicant: Stanley Young; Business: Shoe Dept. Encore; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: 8163 East Broad Street - Shoe Department Encore - Signage. Application: #173860 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Property is located on south side of E. Broad Street, east of Waggoner Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District. Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for new signage. Current Use: Retail Sales. Applicant: Stanley W. Young. 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. For those of you who have not been out to the Shoppes at East Broad, you will definitely like the architecture, and I think the overall composition of the site has come together well. The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building and related improvements. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses. The applicant is

proposing to install a new wall sign with an area of 133.1SF. Per the Code, the applicant is entitled to 140SF of sign area. The 5IN sign projection from the facade does not exceed the 12IN allowed by the Zoning Code. These are directly wall mounted channel letters. There is no raceway or anything raining this above the facade. If you look, it is proportional on the fascia for signage. That is what we like to generally see. 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. They are utilizing two colors, black and gray, and no other logos. Consistent with the size and signage of what has been approved for the rest of the shopping center. I recommend the Board apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage and exterior modifications enhance the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Chairman Zollars: Very good, thank you. Any discussions or questions from the applicant?

Mr. Sampson: For my own clarification, this signage is not currently in place, is that correct?

Mr. Young: That is correct.

Mr. Snowden: I visited the site today and it is not in place.

Chairman Zollars: Any questions from the Board? Does anyone care to make a motion?

Mr. Cullinan: I will make a motion to approve as submitted.

Mr. Sampson: Second.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: I will provide a written record of action to the applicant. Basically you are going for a Zoning Sign Permit and for the stamped plans for the Building Permit.

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

4. 7315 E. Main St.; Application #173878; Applicant: Nathan Myers; Historic District - Minor Exterior Modifications

Mr. Snowden: 7315 E. Main Street - Myers Co. Building - Historic District: Exterior Modifications. Application: #173878 for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Location: Property is located along the south west corner of E. Main Street and Apple Alley. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce / HCO - Historic Commercial Overlay. : Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications, a building addition. Current Use: Administrative/Business Offices. Applicant: Nathan Myers. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to add an addition onto an existing commercial building within the Historic District. The site is developed with a commercial building and related improvements, such as the parking lot. To the south, the property is adjacent to single family, which is across the alley This lot and all neighboring

lots are within the HD - Historic Overlay District. The existing office building was originally constructed as a dwelling. Staff did some research with the County Auditor's Office which indicated the construction date as 1900, which is often used as a placeholder for buildings constructed prior to that for which specific data is not available. It is definitely a very early 20th Century, 19th Century building. The applicant can probably give us the year. According to the County records, the most recent renovation was in 1989. Based on my research, the parking lot was installed around 1970. I am guessing this has had a commercial use for approximately the last forty some odd years. The property received a zoning certificate for an administrative office use in 2014. The applicant is proposing to add a 66SF addition to the rear of the structure to accommodate an ADA restroom, assessable to their first floor staff. The proposed addition will extend the materials and colors of the existing building, for which a certificate of appropriateness was approved by the Board in 2014. The proposed addition does not modify any of the existing parking, nor does change the building elevation when viewed from E. Main Street. They are basically going to be taking out this plant material and constructing this addition at the rear. It does not change the existing elevation of the property as you view it from East Main Street. The various additions to the main structure are these kind of stepped back lower additions and that is pretty typical of 19th century residential structures. It is consistent to how these changed over time as folks added on and families grew. Given the two story design of the main part of the structure, Staff does not feel the proposed addition overwhelms the original character. Window - The drawings appear to indicate that the applicant is reusing the existing picture window and shutters and relocating them to the new rear wall of the building. I was out at the site today and some of the framing around the framing windows was not in great condition. The applicant is actually residing this based on a Certificate of Appropriateness that was approved in 2014. By the way, those expire in a year now, but when the applicant was proceeding, we did not have an expiration in place. The applicant should clarify what they are proposing. Again you have a situation where you have an inappropriate window, the picture window, the enlarged windows. You can not tell from the image, but the windows on the second story now appear to have a one over one style. I am going to recommend if the applicant is using a new window, that they use a one over one style at the back. If they are using a picture window that they at least give us a muntin or a grill to give us that same style. It is a little bit deceiving because they have a picture window here at the front. I ask the applicant to clarify that. With that I would be happy to answer any questions of the Board. I will recommend that the Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted with the clarifications.

Chairman Zollars: Mr. Myers, anything you would like to add to that?

Mr. Myers: Like you said, we are wanting to add a bathroom for the staff on the first floor. When I was talking to the Building Department they said it should be ADA, so that is what we were planning on doing.

Chairman Zollars: Any questions or comments from the Board?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Myers, could you clarify, I saw that some of those picture windows are rotted out, are you utilizing a new window for that rear window, or are you trying to relocate that picture window?

Mr. Myers: No, I am not going to relocate it.

Mr. Snowden: Were you comfortable with what I said and using a vertical one over one window on the back? You did not indicate on your plans.

Mr. Myers: Yes that is what we wanted to use.

Mr. Snowden: Just wanted to clarify. It sounds like we are all in agreement. I noticed you used that on the upper story. Were those replaced as well?

Mr. Myers: Yes.

Chairman Zollars: Anything from the Board?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: It really is looking nice, Mr. Myers. The items remaining for you to complete are listed on page 11 of the Staff Report, but I will provide it written to you. Basically, you are going to pull a Zoning Certificate, and then submit for your building plans to go out for review. I am sure we will be seeing you very soon. Take care.

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

5. 6541 E. Livingston Ave.; Application #173913; Contact: Mahoganey McKinney; Business: Hoggys Wash & Fold; Signage

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman, 6541 E. Livingston Avenue - Hoggy's Wash & Fold - Signage. Application: #173913 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Location: Property is located on the south side of E. Livingston Avenue between Briceton Dr and Baldwin Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Personal Services. Applicant: Mahoganey McKinney. Basically what you have here is an existing Laundromat in the establishment. We have some office, we have some retail, and I recently learned we are going to have to have some business services, like a paint contractor company is going to be moving into one of the bays. Those are the other uses that are adjacent to this. This use we consider personal services because it is there to serve individuals, examples are dry cleaners, hair salons. The applicant is proposing to reface an existing internally illuminated wall mounted cabinet sign. The propose sign face contains a background image, text, and two primary colors. Staff recommends 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. My one item that I would like the applicant to see, assuming the Board approves it, make sure when you submit a Zoning Sign Permit that you give me the dimensions of the sign. I have to document it. I know it seems obnoxious because you are re-facing an existing cabinet, but I have to document it to confirm compliance with the Code. Just make sure you get me that on any subsequent applications. At least email it to me. I will turn it over to our Chairman.

Chairman Zollars: Very good. Ms. McKinney, anything you would like to add to that? Board, any questions for Ms. McKinney? Hearing none, I would like to entertain a motion.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: I will provide you a record of action, but all you need is a Zoning Sign Permit, which you might have already applied for. Just email me the dimensions, that is what I really need to document. Ok? Have a tremendous day.

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

6. 7088 E. Main St.; Application #173911; Applicant: Viktor Prozapas; Business: Adrenalin Trampoline Park, LLC; Signage

Mr. Snowden: 7088 East Main Street between Aida Drive and Briarcliff Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Commercial Recreation Facility. Applicant: Victor Prozaps. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface an existing internally illuminated wall mounted cabinet sign. The site is developed with an existing commercial building. Neighboring uses in the same shopping center include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City, such as a retail sales, a grocery and a fitness center. To the north, the property abuts single family dwellings in the R-3 District. Neighboring uses along E. Main Street consist of various commercial businesses, this is the Reynoldsburg Shopping Center, it has been around for many years and is a heavily traveled commercial corridor. All the properties which front East Main are in the Community Commercial Overlay. The applicant is proposing to reface an existing internally illuminated wall mounted cabinet sign. The propose sign face contains a logo with stylized text, a separate text block, and 3 colors. The sign will be mounted to the existing red sign board used for a previous sign. Signs are calculated by the width of the tenant space and the applicant did not provide that. However, I am assuming it does not go over it because that entire red board would have needed to comply when it was approved by the Board and our previous Planning Administrator. It probably meets the area, but I do not have a way to know that since they did not provide it to me. I would appreciate them proving to be with any subsequent permit. I am a little

concerned about the use of the red background sign, because we are just slapping up on the front of it and the red does not really tie in. If they had used the red on the proposed signage, I would be a little bit more comfortable with it. They are basically using a leftover signboard. My suggestion to the applicant is see if they were open to possibly painting that back to match the returns, what kind of costs and issues that was going to add to their project. Obviously when they done attend, we do not have a way to ask them that. How the Board proceeds, is up to the Board. The Board can table it and wait till they come and I will contact them, the Board can approve and leave it up to my discretion, I suppose.

Chairman Zollars: Board, any guidance or suggestions for Mr. Snowden?

Mr. Bowman: Essentially the color scheme is going to be green and red.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Bowman, you will notice the applicant was in such a hurry to submit plans, that the plans that their sign contractor submitted, showed the sign being mounted to the existing red sign Board. But the cut away that they gave from the side shows it being mounted directly to the facade. So, how can I even confirm that they are meeting the maximum requirements for the sign. It definitely makes life difficult.

Chairman Zollars: Let me ask you a question. Are we meeting in August. I believe we do not meet in August. Is that right?

Mr. Snowden: In the past, the Board has not met in August. However, Dan and I, given all our Boards are only meeting once a month, we have been asking all of our Boards not to take a month off and to meet in August. Especially since we have been taking time off when there is nothing to meet about.

Chairman Zollars: Do we know where they are in the construction process? Where I am going with this is I would hate to delay this at the expense of a sign that could possibly be handled internally.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Zollars, the issue her is that the applicant here was the proprietor or the Ace franchise, and that did not work our for him. So, my understanding is that the applicant is still contractually bound to the space. He is also an operator of this business in another part of the City and decided to bring this business to Reynoldsburg. He also has informed me that he is still in negotiations with his property owner. He got a Special Exception Use Permit approved by City Council, but that does not mean that his landlord will even let him do that. He as not submitted any building plans. Any building plans go out for review and there will be a minimum of three weeks for them to go to our plans review. They will have to check the ceiling heights and so forth. We do not have any of that at this point.

Chairman Zollars: So tabling this may not be an issue?

Mr. Sampson: I motion to table.

Chairman Zollars: Mr. Sampson has motioned to table. Does anyone care to second that

motion?

Mr. Carr: I will second that motion until August or when the applicant is available with a full set of what he is planning.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Very well. Gentlemen, I will contact the applicant and inform him of what the Board's concerns were in this case, and we will see if we can get some better plans from him, and get those distributed to the Board prior to the next meeting. I will let him know that the Board supports the project and thinks we are moving in the right direction but that there are clearly some things that were missed.

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 8/4/2016 7:00 PM
MOVER:	Bill Sampson	
SECONDER:	Richard Carr	
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Carr, Sampson, Cullinan	
ABSENT:	Hicks	

7. 7610 E. Main St.; Application #173916; Contact: Sam Long; Business: First Federal Service Federal Credit Union; Signage, Historic District

Mr. Snowden: 7610 E. Main Street - First Service Federal Credit Union - Historic District: Signage. - Application: #173916 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Location: Property is located along the northwest corner of Waggoner Road and E. Main Street. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce / HCO - Historic Commercial Overlay. Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Professional Office. Applicant: Sign Shop Inc. (DBA Signarama Reynoldsburg). The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to erect a new ground sign on the site of an existing commercial building within the Historic District. The site is developed with a commercial building and related improvements. Neighboring properties are developed with other commercial businesses also in the CC District. This lot and all neighboring lots are within the HD - Historic Overlay District. The applicant is proposing a 17.875SF wooden post and panel sign to replace a non-conforming internally illuminated sign that was damaged in an automobile accident and subsequently removed. The story behind this is that you can see the base of the previous internally illuminated sign at this location. Unfortunately, it sounds like several years ago a drunk driver took out that sign. I do not know if everybody was ok but the sign was not. The sign was removed from the site and it was a non-conforming sign anyway. Therefore, when Signarama's representative contacted Staff, Staff informed them that although it was internally illuminated, it did get taken out by an accident and we still need to comply with the current code. Signarama went back to their client, they came to us with a post and panel sign, it is not externally illuminated although that type of sign is easy to externally illuminate if the applicant wanted to in the future. The white sign trim matches the white trim used on the main structure. I recommend the Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. With that, I would

be happy to answer any questions about this one.

Chairman Zollars: Any questions from the applicant? Anything from the Board?

Mr. Sampson: Mr. Snowden, do the requirements to have a brick base on street signage apply this far down Main Street?

Mr. Snowden: That is a great question. The monument style sign is in the Community Commercial Overlay, so that is anything on Main Street, Brice Road, except for the Historic District. In the Historic District, it says that they can have a monument style, or post and panel sign like this, so it does not have to have a brick base, but it has to be made of natural materials. For example, it could not be a post and panel sign with a metal aluminum tube. It needs to be metal or some material that appears to be wood. So, this is one of the styles that is acceptable. The maximum size for this is 20SF for wall signs, 18SF for the ground mounted signs, and that is what they proposed in this case.

Mr. Sampson: Thank you Mr. Snowden for the clarification.

Unknown Speaker: This new sign that is coming in, in any way is it going to hide this stump? How is that going to be addressed? My concern is that this will be an obstruction. Will it look odd in front or next to this new sign?

Unknown Speaker: Honestly, as long as there is no electric in there, we will get that off the ground and be done with it, but if there is electric in there, we will have to have an electrical contractor come in and remove the electric. The sign itself is cedar. It is not a faux wood. It is a three dimensional sign that will be sand blasted. It is going to be a really nice addition. The client decided to not illuminate it because they close at 5:00. And, no where in Ohio is illumination needed before 5:00. So, that is why they chose no illumination at all.

Unknown Speaker: I think it works with their colonial design anyway.

Mr. Snowden: I do not think there is a reason to put removal of the existing sign destruction on as a condition of their approval, but let me put that on the radar of our Chief Building Official to make sure there is not any outstanding issue. I know that sometimes the Code Compliance Division has issued notices for something that is a tripping hazard, or something that is an electrical hazard. It sounds that the applicant is going to be a good actor. Also, our Building Division will be required to inspect this as well, but at least let me put it on his radar so that he is aware it is out there.

Unknown Speaker: I just don't want it to hurt the look of the sign if it is right next to that post.

Unknown Speaker: The plan is to literally straddle that post so the center of the new sign will be right where that post is.

Chairman Zollars: If there are no other questions or discussion, I will entertain a motion.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: You know the drill as well as we do at this point, because of how many signs we do. I will discuss with our Chief Building Official because there is electric there. There may be something that he wants to see in the capping off, or whatever, which could probably be accommodated when his inspectors are inspecting the new signage. So, I will just put on his radar to make sure we do not have any issues.

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

E. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Zollars: Is there any opposition to meeting in August?

Mr. Carr: I want to make sure that the new time for this meeting is 7:00.

Mr. Snowden: I changed it on the documents and on the website, I properly informed the applicants, Rochelle informed the applicants, I informed the applicants again. I informed the Board earlier today when I was in panic mode because I had noticed that one of our templates had not changed because Rochelle had to contact the company that runs our Minutes program to have it changed, and it still said 6:30. For those of you who are hear, and I think Mr. Zollars' statement is well taken. I don't want to be here any later, but we needed the time with Planning Commission, and we will probably continue to need time at Planning Commission to get things done. The only reason we do not have DRB meeting on another night from Planning Commission, there is some advantage because we are requiring two approvals for some folks, to be able to do them in the same night. Ins a lot of other communities you are doing that in one meeting and are in and out. We at least need to be able to do them in the same night if we want to stay with our peer cities. That is why I am not advocating for us to go to another night. With regard to the meeting time in August, we are having a lot of Development now, so if the Board is willing, that would be great. What the Charter says is that you meet every month but that you can designate one month where you do not meet. The Charter also says you have to meet once a month, but you can meet four times a month if we wanted to.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning and Zoning Administrator