



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2017 5:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Design Review Board – Regular – May 4, 2017

Minutes stand approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stand approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Application #177397; 7175 E. Main Street; Kamana Grocery; Applicant: Stanley W. Young; Signage

Mr. Snowden -

7175 E. Main Street - Kamana Grocery - Signage

Application: #177397 - Certificate of Appropriateness

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

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

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

Current Use: Retail Sales

Applicant: Stanley W. Young III, agent for Branham Sign Co.

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a new wall sign. The sign will accommodate a new business within an existing commercial building.

The site is developed with an existing commercial building. Neighboring uses include other retail sales business and offices. All parcels that front E. Main Street with a commercial base

zoning are within the Community Commercial Overlay District. To the north, the site is adjacent to the City's Municipal Center across E. Main Street.

Per Table 1180, the applicant is permitted a wall sign up to 69SF. The proposed wall sign is only 48SF. This meets the requirements of the code and is consistent with the scale of the building's façade.

Generally speaking, Staff's position is that signage for a particular tenant in a multi-tenant building should be consistent with other signage located at a single site. In this case, the majority of the tenants in the attached multi-tenant commercial building have internally illuminated awnings, which is a prohibited sign type in the Community Commercial Overlay District per Section 1196.11. Staff supports the proposed non-illuminated metal panel sign. Staff has reviewed the provisions of Chapter 1196. Although it is important that signage on commercial buildings be consistent internally, challenges are presented when applying the design review guidelines and provisions of the Zoning Code to structures with architectural details and signage that is non-conforming. In this case, it would not be reasonable to require the applicant to get a variance for a prohibited sign type in order to match the existing signage. Staff's position is that the Board allow this signage, and require removal of other non-conforming signage at the site and replacement with similar signage in the future.

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

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

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

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Application #177774; 8301 E. Broad Street; Aldi Grocery Store; Applicant: Kailen Akers; Exterior Modifications

Mr. Snowden -

8301 E. Broad Street - Aldi Grocery Store - Exterior Modifications

Application: #177774 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on the south side of E. Broad Street, east of Waggoner Road.

Existing Zoning: CS Community Services District

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

Current Use: Grocery Store (Retail Sales)

Applicant: Kailen Akers

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications to an existing single-tenant commercial building. The proposed modifications involve a building addition.

The site is developed with an existing commercial building and related improvements. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS Districts, including retail sales, an eating or drinking establishment, and some auto service related uses. To the east, the property abuts a corporate headquarters and distribution center in the RI restricted industry district. To the south, the property abuts another commercial business in the CS district. To the north, the property is adjacent to a shopping center and multi-family housing complex across E. Broad Street in the City of Columbus.

The applicant was previously approved for a variance to expand the building and parking into the required rear and side setbacks, respectively. Given the overall scale of the site and the distances between existing buildings, Staff had no concerns.

The applicant is proposing a 1300SF expansion to the rear of building. The proposed expansion will be clad in the same materials already used on the entire building exterior. The existing rhythm of brick detailing will be maintained on the proposed addition. The applicant does not appear to be proposing any additional rooftop-mounted or other service equipment that would trigger additional requirements of the Zoning Code.

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

Mr. Sampson - We received a report that there was some debris at the front of the property. Has it been addressed?

Mr. Snowden - Jamal with code compliance had been out to the location and spoke with the management and gave them the notification following our normal procedures. That was as of yesterday evening, so I don't know if it's been cleaned up, but he will reinspect.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Richard Hudson
SECONDER:	Bill Sampson
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Hicks, Sampson
ABSENT:	Bowman, Carr, King

2. Application #177836; 2227 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road; Rapid Fire Pizza; Applicant: Nathan Liggett; Exterior Modifications

Mr. Snowden -

2227 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road - Rapid Fire - Exterior Modifications

Application: #177836 - Certificate of Appropriateness
Location: Property is located on west side of Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road, just north of Taylor Park Drive.

Existing Zoning: CS Community Services District

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

Current Use: Restaurant (Eating and Drinking Establishment)

Applicant: Nathan Liggett, Agent for RFP Columbus LLC

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications to an existing multi-tenant commercial building. The proposed modifications involve construction of a new patio seating area and changes to the building's glass storefront window/door system.

The site is zoned CS, and is surrounded on the north, east, and south by other commercial businesses in the same zoning district. To the north, the abutting use is a tire shop (auto services). To the south, a restaurant and gasoline station is adjacent across Taylor Park Drive (gasoline station/eating and drinking establishment). To the east across Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road, the site abuts a commercial shopping center commonly known as the Taylor Square Shopping Center. To the west, the property is adjacent to a senior housing complex (residential care facility) in the AR-3 zoning district.

The applicant is proposing new fencing and a modification to the door/window configuration on the north side of the building. The proposed patio area will consist of an existing concrete slab, and will be enclosed with a black aluminum fence. The proposed door/window modification will include an additional doorframe which matches the existing building storefront in terms of colors and materials. Staff has no concerns.

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

Mr. Hicks - It appears the patio is also going to be expanded, is there any specification what the material will be?

Mr. Snowden - I would recommend, since they didn't specify a material, to approve it upon condition that the expanded patio be a concrete pad.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
SECONDER:	Bill Sampson
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Hicks, Sampson
ABSENT:	Bowman, Carr, King

3. Application #178060; 137 S. Waggoner Road.; United Dairy Farmers; Applicant Tim Kling; Major Site Plan

Mr. Snowden -

137 S. Waggoner Road/7619 E. Broad Street - United Dairy Farmers - Major Site Plan

Application:	#178060 - Certificate of Appropriateness
Location:	Property is located on the southwest corner of E. Broad Street and Waggoner Road.
Request:	Request for review and approval of a certificate of appropriateness for a major site plan.
Existing Zoning:	PCD Planned Commercial Development District
Current Use:	Vacant Land
Applicant:	United Dairy Farmers

The applicant is requesting that the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness application for a major site plan, in order to construct a commercial building, gasoline fueling canopy, and related site improvements.

The 6.424AC site consists of three separate parcels and is improved with an existing single family dwelling. To the north and east, the property abuts other commercial businesses in the CS zoning district, and across Broad Street in the City of Columbus. To the southwest, the property is adjacent to single family dwellings in the R-1 zoning district.

The applicant has provided building elevations showing a 1 story commercial building. The proposed building materials consist of wood plank and stone. The proposed fuel pump canopy consists of similar materials. The site plan indicates general compliance with the landscape and buffering regulations of Chapter 1180, including parking lot perimeter plantings and service structure screening.

Staff has reviewed the applicant proposed lighting plan, and found it to be generally compliant with the provisions of Chapter 1182. The rezoning text made a specific provision that allowed increased lighting levels beneath the fueling canopy, in order to promote safety

within the site. The proposed plan is consistent with the deviations permitted by the text. The applicant is proposing some lighting around the rear retaining wall of the site. Although there will not be any activity in this area, Staff agrees that this is necessary to promote site security. The existing mature woods, as well as the full cut-off style fixtures minimize any light trespass, according to the plan.

Mr. Hicks - I have some concerns about the development and the proximity to the neighbors there and a few items on the site. Is there a sidewalk proposed with this development?

Unknown* - There are sidewalks stubbed out at the intersection there, but I don't see any sidewalks on this site connecting them. There's never a sidewalk there until the property is developed to put one in.

Mr. Snowden - I don't see it shown on these plans, it was shown on some of the plans that were submitted with the rezoning portion. The code does require 4 foot sidewalks to be installed. At minimum they should be installed in the portion of the site that's developable. If the board approved it as a condition the board could require that they be placed on the entire site. We also have information that Columbus is going to be doing some additional pedestrian &/or bicycle improvements along Broad Street. Mr. Sampson has had conversations with them, but at minimum the Waggoner Road frontage should have sidewalks on it. If you want, we can make it a condition of approval. The pavement width of the Waggoner Drive is approximately 22 to 24 feet, which is a great cost to them because of the bridge. Unfortunately Mr. Hershberger isn't here because of the rescheduled meeting. I don't have a problem with the board making it a condition that there be a pedestrian connection and allowing me to work with Mr. Hershberger. My concern is that we would go back to him and he would say it's going to be really challenging. That's my concern.

Unknown* - I was somewhat surprised on the tree survey. From my understanding of reading our tree survey code you can remove a tree, tree removals are approved if you need to do it to develop a site. There's also a section that if you remove one you must replace it. I'm trying to figure out where the replacement trees would be going on this site or why there are so few of them, what the arrangement is.

Unknown* - It's a heavily wooded site on the corner. It was just 2 years ago that 2 out of 4 corners of that intersection were heavily wooded and quite nice. I just want to make sure we are following our own code here on this site.

Mr. Hicks - There's a lot of trees identified on the survey. A lot of them are more than 6 inches in caliber. What I think is peculiar is that there's a significant number of them that have been labeled as poor, which is surprising. I've done a few tree surveys and I've never had as many a significant number be rated as poor which I think you would not replace them since they are labeled as poor. Generally you don't get by with that many labeled in poor condition. I understand if it's an Ash, but generally a 20 inch Maple is not in poor condition. I have concerns about the way the inventory has been done. I have concerns about the southeast corner of the property. It's next to a neighborhood that's been there since the 1960's. I don't know what the current zoning is.

Unknown* - There's no room to replace the trees.

Mr. Snowden - The previous zoning was R-1, that was a place holder zoning from the annexation and the planning commercial development is the current zoning district.

Unknown* - As the design review board we should have some respect for the aesthetic of what were authorizing to go right into a community that's been there since the 1960's next to a wooded lot that was zoned as R-1.

Mr. Sampson - What were holding UDF accountable for in this area. Mr. Snowden can you clarify as to what were holding UDF accountable for in this area?

Mr. Snowden - They are responsible for compliance with the landscape and buffering section. It is not required to be stamped by a landscape architect or horticulturist; however a lot of communities do that. That's something that the board and planning commission can consider in the future. If I take this methodology (I'm looking at Page L-1.02) at face, value they have met the code requirements. The portion that needs to be taken into consideration is the fact that they are doing the preservation area.

Mr. Sampson - The issue is requiring a pedestrian sidewalk that essentially goes nowhere. My ultimate goal, as service director, would be that we have a pedestrian sidewalk or a sidewalk bike path all along Waggoner. That's our goal. At this point, what we're requiring of UDF I think is to have a pedestrian sidewalk that essentially goes nowhere is really not part of this project.

Unknown* - Well, you never have a sidewalk to anywhere if you never require somebody to put it in when they develop.

Mr. Snowden - I'll go and review what was submitted in the rezoning phase. The code does require the 4 foot sidewalk unless our city engineer and service director say that it's not in the best interest of the city. The board can approve it as a condition. It sounds that Mr. Johnson is not opposed to adding the 4 foot sidewalk on Waggoner Road.

Mr. Snowden - Addressing Mr. Hicks, Yes, they are meeting the minimum requirements of the code for the tree ordinance assuming that the methodology used on L-1.02 is correct.

Mr. Hicks - We have a few more details on these submittals as far as the building and materials. I don't see the materials being specified what they are. There's a dumpster enclosure on the property and there's no elevation showing us what the dumpster enclosure is going to look like and its very visible and from what I understand there's a retaining wall. We do not have any idea what it's going to be made of or what it looks like.

Unknown* - If they present the material to you and it's not in compliance, you would let us know, but if we approve as presented then we don't have it out.

Mr. Snowden - Anytime anyone shows something on a set of plans, even if the materials are not specifically called out and they didn't provide a material sample, which is required, if for example the brick materials don't match the same color your being shown, I could say it's not in compliance when I approve the final zoning certificate.

Mrs. Hicks - My main concerns were the design of the application is the sidewalks, connectability, the trees, and some type of buffering from the neighboring community and the specifications on the building materials, dumpster enclosure, and the retaining wall.

Unknown* - Is there a motion somewhere in there?

Mr. Snowden - We are in the discussion phase. Mr. Sampson made a motion, 2nd by Mr. Hudson to approve his submitted. We need to make a determination on that motion and then if that motion did not pass, then any additional motions could be made at that point.

Unknown* - With the current motion that's on the floor, I would vote no and if it did fail I would recommend a move to table the issue, so we could work out some of these details and get these items resolved.

Unknown* - We have a motion and a 2nd, so why don't we get that off the table and see where that leads us.

Mr. Snowden - If there's no further discussion, do you want me to call the roll or do you need further discussion?

Mr. Zollars - I want to make it clear that I'll go on record speaking for UDF. If it becomes an important thing to put those sidewalks in there and it makes logical sense from an attorney's standpoint, they will do it. They're not going to resist. They have over a million dollars in this site before they built the building, but we'd like to get going with this thing.

Unknown* - If there's no further discussion on Mr. Sampson's motion let's vote on his motion.

Mr. Snowden - I'll call the roll. Mr. Hicks - No, Mr. Hudson - Yes, Mr. Sampson - Yes, Mr. Zollars - No. That did not approve the Certificate of Appropriateness. Do you want to continue your discussion?

Mr. Hicks - I'm not going to make a motion, but my idea is that we make a motion, we table this, there's precedence here on this board. We've tabled a lot of things that have unresolved issues, I don't see how this is any different, but we've tabled plenty of other issues for things that are more minor than what we've talked about at the meeting tonight. I would like to have this tabled, so that we can see a sidewalk on the site plan, so that we can see some increased buffering along that south property line where the preservation area is non-existent or gets really thin and I would like to see the specifications on the building materials, dumpster enclosure, and that wall just like we require every other applicant.

Mr. Snowden - Addressing Mr. Hicks, Do you want to table to the next regular meeting of the board?

Mr. Hicks - Next regular scheduled meeting.

Mr. Snowden - Tabled to next meeting on July 6.

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 8/3/2017 7:00 PM
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member	
SECONDER:	Bill Sampson	
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Hicks, Sampson	
ABSENT:	Bowman, Carr, King	

4. Application #178044; 1933 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road; New Shopping Center; Applicant: Brad Williams; Major Site Plan

Mr. Snowden -

1933 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road - New Commercial Shopping Center - Major Site Plan

Application: #178044 - Major Site Plan

Location: Property is located on the northwest corner of Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road and the south leg of Stonetrail Way.

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

Existing Zoning: CS Community Services District

Current Use: Car Wash (Auto Services)

Proposed Use: Shopping Center (Retail Sales)

Applicant: Brad Williams

The applicant is requesting that the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a major site plan in order to construct two building, neighborhood scale, commercial shopping center and related improvements.

The site is an existing carwash developed with a building for self-service and automatic car washes, as well as related improvements. To the south and east, the property abuts commercial shopping centers in the CS district. To the north and west, the property abuts multi-family dwellings in the AR-1 zoning district.

The applicant is proposing two, one-story commercial buildings. The site will have access from both Stonetrail Way and Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road. The access drive from

Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road will separate the two proposed buildings. All parking is behind the buildings or to the side. No parking is proposed within the required setback, consistent with the regulations of the Zoning Code for commercial parking lots.

In order to accommodate their proposed construction schedule, the applicant is proposing a phase implementation of the site plan. This is perfectly acceptable under the requirements of the Zoning Code. The applicant has been informed that an additional certificate of appropriateness will be required for signage and any additional architectural changes to the proposed Phase II buildings to meet the needs of any future tenants. The applicant should also be aware that the City retains the power to require additional traffic studies, should a tenant be proposed that has a higher traffic impact, such as a restaurant. The applicant should clarify how they propose to limit customer traffic to the remainder of the site, from the first phase of development.

The applicant has submitted elevations indicating the proposed building design, materials and general location of signage. There are not specific material requirements for the CS district, therefore, the style of design presented by the applicant is appropriate. However, generally speaking, previous Commissions and Design Review Board members have asked for additional natural materials, such as brick or stone.

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

The applicant has provided a lighting plan which appears to meet the requirements of Chapter 1182 for intensity at the perimeter of the site. The mature trees and other natural screening will keep light trespass to a minimum. The proposed 20FT pole height meets the Zoning Code requirements. The proposed black finish is consistent with the building architecture.

The applicant has provided a landscape plan that meets the general requirements of Chapter 1180. The site has existing mature trees on the north and west sides. The applicant proposes to maintain these trees, consistent with the code requirements and the conditions of previous variance approvals. Staff has reviewed the applicant's plant material calculations for detailed compliance and found the information to be accurate.

The applicant has indicated the location of their dumpster enclosures but has not provided a detail. The applicant should clarify the height and proposed materials. Staff's preferred material is masonry that matches the building architecture.

Brad Williams (Applicant) - With Thomas English Retail Real Estate, we're the developer of the project. 725 East 65th Street, Indianapolis, Indiana. One point of clarification on the separation in the phasing. We're going to run the curb where the curbs going to go, but where there is that section of pavement that pavement would tie back in. Our thought was that we would pin down large bumpers across that, so we can easily pull them up, as opposed to pouring that curb in place. Another point, we have a supplement to the dumpster, if I

could pass that out. You'll see on the handout for the dumpster enclosure, we would do a standing block, matches the channeling that's going on the corner of the building, so that it has a similar look and it would get painted a dark gray color that is specified for the elevations. Those materials for the elevation are shown on page 10 and 11.

Mr. Zollers - Are you putting a demising wall in there at this time.

Brad Williams - Not up front.

Mr. Snowden - Addressing Mr. Williams, What's your schedule for phasing?

Brad Williams - We'd like to get under construction, so we can be enclosed this year. The role out on the 2nd phase is really going to be a function of the lease activity. There has been some interest, so we're hoping that we may initially submit architectural plans on the single occupant building and would love to do them together, but will probably follow that afterwards. Site infrastructure will be complete, it's just that paving in that last part of it that would be the finished pieces.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
SECONDER:	Bill Sampson
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Hicks, Sampson
ABSENT:	Bowman, Carr, King

5. Application #178150; 8123 E. Broad Street; Torrid; Applicant: Jill Hopkins; Signage

Mr. Snowden -

8123 E. Broad Street - Torrid - Comprehensive Sign Plan

Application: #178150 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on south side of E. Broad Street, east of Waggoner Road.

Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District

Request: Request for a certificate of appropriateness for signage.

Current Use: Vacant/Construction Pending

Applicant: Jill Hopkins/Anchor Signs

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

The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building and related improvements. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses and restaurants (eating and

drinking establishment). To the north, the property abuts other commercial businesses across Broad Street in the City of Columbus. To the south, the property is adjacent to an agricultural use in Jefferson Township.

Per Table 1181, the applicant's sign is a Type B wall sign, which would entitle the applicant to 64SF of signage. The applicant's proposed sign is 60SF, which does not exceed the code requirements. The proposed 5IN projection of the wall sign is consistent with the maximum permitted by the Code, 12IN.

The applicant is proposing an internally illuminated channel letter wall sign. The sign is mounted directly to the building facade. The proposed signage is consisted with the sign types previously approved for the Shoppes at East Broad development. The signage matches the general scale of the building, with the main sign mounted to the fascia above the main entrance. This is a typical and appropriate place for building signage.

The proposed projecting sign is permitted under the provision of Section 1181.03(c)(1)(B). The maximum permitted projection of the sign is 4FT and the applicant is proposing 3FT. The colors and materials of the project sign is consistent with the proposed wall sign.

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

E. OTHER BUSINESS

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning and Zoning Administrator