

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
JUNE 7, 2012
7:00 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. Kevin Bainter Mr. Lane Beougher Mr. James Comeaux Mr. Richard Hudson Mr. Marshall Spalding Mr. Bill Smith
Members Absent:	Mr. Scott Baker
Others Present:	Mr. Aaron Domini

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2012 MEETING

Chairman Beougher: The minutes have been distributed. Are there any questions, concerns, comments, revisions?

Mr. Smith: I've read through the minutes and I move for their approval.

Mr. Beougher: We'll take a second.

Mr. Bainter: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: We'll get you next time, Mr. Spalding. All in favor of approval of the minutes please signify by saying "aye." (Response is "aye.") Any opposed. (No response.) Minutes are approved as distributed.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Beougher: There are four items of New Business, no Old Business. Are there any additions to tonight's agenda, Mr. Domini?

Mr. Domini: No changes.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Beougher: If anyone would like to speak on an issue that is not on tonight's agenda you may approach the microphone and make them. Seeing no one rising and coming forward, we will assume that there's no public comment tonight.

5. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

(Mr. Beougher administers the oath.)

B NEW BUSINESS

1. 7601 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: MICHAEL BECHER, FRESH MARKET PIZZA, LLC, (5550-DR). NEW GROUND FACE CHANGE AND DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE.

Mr. Beougher: Is Mr. Becher or a representative of this business here this evening? Thank you. Please come forward to the podium – sorry to the lectern and state your name for the record and then we'll introduce the item.

Mr. Rob Gordon: Rob Gordon.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Gordon. Mr. Domini.

Mr. Domini: We did put together some slides here. I wasn't sure how you guys have been operating but this is how we did it when I left, so I'll give an overview and then turn it over to the applicant. There are basically two things that are part of this application, the sign refacing and the dumpster enclosure. Prior to the meeting the applicant has indicated they are going to hold the dumpster enclosure piece of the application. We have discussed this item with them periodically through this process and I think it's just going to work out with them if they don't have that. They're going to destroy the canisters. But we did have some concern, as you notice in the staff report, how that relates to the residential to the south, but we don't have to address that.

From my review, it's just a straight forward face change. While the sign is non-conforming under the new overlay, my interpretation was that this was like kind of a replacement of general maintenance, therefore I didn't see a need for a variance or anything like that. Here is just real quick for those of you – this is in the Epicure building which is at the corner of Waggoner and Graham and this is the existing property looking south from Main Street where that existing ground sign is. The dumpster enclosure would have been on Graham, but we're not going to address that item anymore. So, again, a look at the site of the proposed location of the ground sign. I don't have a scan of the actual signage but you have that in your packet and I think it compliments the Olde Reynoldsburg colors and I don't see any problems with it from a my standpoint.

Mr. Beougher: And the sign has been installed?

Mr. Domini: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Mr. Gordon, do you have any comments?

Mr. Gordon: No, just what he said. We really never were happy with the dumpster location and we wanted to put it temporary. If you guys thought it won't go we have a little bit of an incline and slope and some really nice looking trees and we couldn't get a level dumpster pad there, so we would have lost a lot of nice trees. So we thought we'd go with the dumpster pad and then we just – Mike decided he liked the way that all looked. He'd rather pay a little money and do the canister route and we're happy with what we've got there. As far as the sign, we just had a miscommunication with our sign people. They got ahead of what we could do, so once it went out, we didn't know when the signs would go up. Other than that, that's all I have.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Thank you. Do the members have any questions? (no response.) Okay. We have a quiet group tonight.

Mr. Spalding: I propose a motion that we accept the sign as presented and then move on.

Mr. Smith: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: All right. We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? (No response.)

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes." Mr. Smith voted "yes." Mr. Bainter voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes.")

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Motion is approved. You have your signs. You don't have to take them down.

2. 6961 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: KATE CSONTOS, KEYBANK (5551-DR). EXTERIOR FAÇADE RENOVATIONS.

Mr. Beougher: And I assume we are speaking to Ms. Csontos. Could you please state your name for the record, for the recording and then we'll introduce the item.

Ms. Kate Csontos: Kate Csontos (speaking off mic)

Mr. Beougher: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Domini: This application is for removal of that existing mansard roof of the bank. For those of you who can't picture this in your head, Key Bank is located at the corner of East Main and Briarcliff, just to the west. The surrounding land use is major commercial with multi _____ in the rear and I'll show you a shot of that in a minute so

you'll see how that relates to the site. The façade of the existing building above the windows _____ the building. That mansard roof which wraps the entire building proposed to remove and replace with the flat roof _____. Just to walk you through it. As you're looking at your packet there, _____ on the bottom of the existing elevation that faces – I guess that'd be the west elevation and the top with the new west elevation. You have in the staff report-- I had some concerns about this because based on the Board's interpretation, you may or may not have some issues that meet code. The first one – and I have the revised drawing to pass out as well that the applicant has brought. They changed the application based on some of the feedback I gave her prior to tonight's meeting. We did have some concerns, number one, about that _____ not meeting the building code which requires a minimum depth of 8 or 12 feet _____ which I don't really require that the _____ mechanical _____.

The other issue is that the mansard, it met our minimum height requirement in the overlay of 18 feet. _____ says 19. Depending on how the Board looks at this application with the new parapet out front, I believe that meets the minimum height requirement but the rest of the building doesn't, so if somebody _____. From this angle, that area you can the multi-tenant in the back which gives you some idea of that interacts with the site that we're considering here. And then under the original proposal the mansard roof was to remain on the rear elevation at the rear of the property. Again, this is in your packet but this is the front elevation to the bottom of the existing with the mansard and then the proposed on top with that new parapet _____. There are a number of other façade changes as well. I'm sure you'll look at those in some of your packets there. Here's the new proposal presented by the applicant so now a minimum depth to that parapet up front. The mechanicals which were in back which are shown here have been moved up and mostly concealed by that new parapet. And then the mansard that was to remain on the rear side of the building is now removed. So I think some of our comments were received and the applicant made an effort to change these things based on our comments.

The building height is still something I question in regards to and I'm looking to the Board for clarification of that. This is something new. I don't remember seeing this when I was here. _____ in the past but definitely something I think should generate some conversation.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Ms. Csontos, would you like to address the staff concerns?

Ms. Csontos: Just a couple (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Beougher: So I think we have an interpretation issue in the design standards and this is provided in your staff report. Basically, Section 1195.07 says Item B, "The height of a building shall be a minimum of 18 feet above grade." So I think the question we have to consider is, is that all of the building, is that some of the building, what portion of the building being 18 feet or higher is appropriate? Is that accurate?

Mr. Domini: Yeah, and I have the definition from our code for building height if that would be helpful.

Mr. Beougher: That would be very helpful, please.

Mr. Domini: Per our code, building height as defined is the vertical distance from the finished grade to the highest end of the _____ or to the deck line of the mansard roof, or the _____ height level between the eaves and the ridge are gabled, hip and _____ roofs.

Mr. Comeaux: Can you read – read that whole thing again real quick.

Mr. Domini: Building height is defined as the vertical distance from the finished grade to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof or to the deck line of a mansard roof.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay. So the deck line would be what? Would it be the top of the mansard or where you put the mansard on?

Mr. Domini: I don't think I'm really—

Mr. Comeaux: Okay. That's fine. I'm asking—

Mr. Beougher: So it's an architectural term that I'm not real familiar with actually, deck line—

Mr. : Well, to me, I'm just curious, but from your definition the existing building, since this is a flat roof, is already out of compliance to begin with.

Mr. Beougher: No. Because the mansard is—

Mr. : It didn't say that in the definition, I believe, if I heard it right.

Mr. Domini: Depending on what you consider the deck line. So the existing building was 19 feet, 2 inches, I believe, so it would meet the requirement. But, again, depending on where you measure that from _____. Either top of the mansard or the deck line. The deck line is—

Mr. : The roof.

Mr. Domini: Right.

Mr. : Right.

Mr. Domini: Which is kind of what I'm thinking. That'd be my guess.

Mr. Beougher: And if we had a pitched roof, since the cornice is at 13 feet, we'd take the midpoint which would make the peak – what would that be? Twenty-three (23) feet – would get us to 18 feet at the midpoint. So, was there any consideration given to increasing the apparent volume of the structure?

Ms. Csontos: As of right now, we have – we didn't talk (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Domini, asking a question – I don't know if you know the answer. This is a clause that I had not seen before either, the height clause, I'd never run across it. Do you know when we adopted that?

Mr. Domini: We adopted it _____.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. That would be the Overlay Committee that you had served on.

Mr. Comeaux: Sure. Well, no, but my point then is this would get – so kind of like you have a non-conforming sign. Is the sign – are we now less conforming or more conforming? And because I don't know what deck line means – guess we didn't look at that. But anyhow—

Mr. Beougher: I think with the mansard it presents as a taller structure from the street and I think that's – the intent of the code was to – the whole idea of what we were doing with the Overlay text was to try to create a more dignified façade along the streets and some would call that _____ but it's an idea of trying to create a consistent façade line and not having buildings that are only 13 feet tall that you can't see as you drive through. And we were also encouraging second floors and live/work and things that like which are a little out of the box for Reynoldsburg, Ohio but we were making the effort. So if you'd like to add a second story—

Ms. Csontos: (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions?

Mr. Domini: I have a question, Mr. Beougher. From this elevation it looks like the condenser is 80 – 90% visible. Is that going to be all within the new parapet – I call it a parapet because I don't know what else to call it – new front wall?

Ms. Csontos: (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Domini: And did I hear you say that your contacts would not be interested in extending that wall _____?

Ms. Csontos: (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Smith: In my reading of the staff review and recommendations, there appears to be a reference here to Section 1195.07(h) which would require parapet walls to extend 12 feet beyond the corner if they are to be terminated and in the revised drawing that we have presented to us, I don't see a dimension. Is that dimension from the face of the parapet to its rearward extension 12 feet?

Mr. Domini: Yes.

Mr. Smith: It is.

Mr. Domini: The intent of those in attendance who helped write this _____ of which I'm in was that we didn't want the faux parapet that we see all the time. So for gables and parapets, we wanted them to extend – we wanted them to have a minimum depth and then extend to the side of the building at a minimum of 12 feet. I believe that's what the applicant's provided to us because I _____.

Mr. Beougher: We were trying to avoid the flat gable with braces to the back of it that you could see from the road. The wrap would provide that structural bracing versus – anyway—

Mr. Smith: Well, I guess the troubling thing is that it appears in the photograph that the – is the main entrance facing Main or is it facing Briarcliff? It looks like it's facing Main Street. Is that the case?

Ms. Csontos: And that's what we're proposing (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Smith: Okay. It just seems that the extension of the parapet, because you have a corner lot there, comes off as being somewhat minimal and the mass of the building would be enhanced if that wall were extended rearward some additional distance, in my view.

Ms. Csontos: I don't think that would be a problem. We were trying to meet the 12 foot requirement _____ (speaking off mic – inaudible)

Mr. Smith: That's all right.

Ms. Csontos: (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Smith: Well, I can see where you are aligning it above one of the columns and—

Ms. Csontos: (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Beougher: Are there any other entrances on the building?

Ms. Csontos: (speaking off mic - inaudible)

Mr. Beougher: I'm thinking about how are we addressing Briarcliff?

Mr. Smith: That's kind of what I was getting at, too.

Ms. Csontos: There will be signage proposed (speaking off mic – inaudible)

Mr. Beougher: So you're talking about signage on the fascia between the cornice and the columns?

Ms. Csontos: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: So that's small signage.

Ms. Csontos: It would be smaller than what exists today, correct.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions?

Mr. Hudson: If we were to take that all the way to the edge of the building, how are you going to wrap it around the corner? You may have to take it all around the building.

Mr. Beougher: You're saying if—

Mr. Hudson: If you take this height here and extend it all the way over to the edges, what are you going to do, take it around the building? You're going to have to take it all the way around the building _____ cut it off. And here you'd cut it off.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. It's actually – can you project the one with the 12 foot extension?

Mr. Hudson: That doesn't come to the end of the building. You're taking it all the way to the end and then, what are you going to do, cut it here at the edge? It's not going to look right. You'd have to take it all the way back here.

Mr. Beougher: And I think that was the earlier discussion, was it's ending over the top of a column which you see an elevation, you're not going to see it in perspective. Another option would be to carry it further along Briarcliff at least. Once again, trying to get some more height – might be a good place for a sign. And I know that cost is an issue, but so is appearance.

Ms. Csontos: I think our biggest thing is we feel like we are improving the appearance of the current structure. Since there are a couple of interpretations of the code, I think overall we feel that we are improving it and not just that, but we're also just

trying to maintain it at this point and allow them to stay there since, again, there are those leaking and rusting out issues currently.

Mr. Beougher: If we're too harsh are they going to vacate the premises?

Ms. Csontos: I don't know, but I know that it might -- if there's too much budget involved, it's a dead deal at this point so -- and that's—

Mr. Beougher: Well, that certainly comes into play, but perhaps not. Any other comments or concerns, questions? All right. Would anyone like to -- and there are some recommendations in the staff report. Mr. Comeaux.

Mr. Domini: Yeah, I pulled this up for further -- I'm sorry, Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Domini, on the -- the definition you read to us there was a clause near the end about the mean height of the structure, is that right? Can you read that clause to me real quick?

Mr. Domini: The definition of building height is the vertical distance from the finished grade to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof or the deck line of a mansard roof, or to the mean height level between the eaves and the ridge for a gabled, hip and gambrel roof, which we don't have.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay.

Mr. Domini: So I don't think that applies because it specifically defines it.

Mr. Beougher: And then the roofing material specification, as far as a flat roof -- it's not a visible roof, but the Overlay is looking for a coping that goes up higher, a parapet wall that goes up higher -- okay -- or some kind of roofing material. All right. Would anyone like to make a motion, having discussed it at length?

Mr. Domini: Mr. Beougher? I would just like to -- my recommendation would be to see that parapet extend the length of Briarcliff. I don't think that's a huge additional cost -- or some other kind of detail done so that Briarcliff is treated a little bit better. That's a pretty high volume of traffic coming, going to the west and I guess I just -- I still have some reservation of how we end that. I know what the Overlay says and what our intent was and I think we're -- I feel like the Board's getting away from this issue of the building height and giving the nod to the applicant that this is going to meet our intent, but I still have some concern about the 360° architecture. I know you have to have access to those mechanicals but, at the same time, you know-- I'd defer to you and to some of the others on the Board.

Mr. Beougher: How is access to the roof obtained? Is it through a roof hatch or a ladder?

Ms. Csontos: It doesn't look like there's a roof hatch on the plan. Typically, they'll just put a ladder up on the—

Mr. Beougher: Yeah, which would then require a door or other—

Ms. Csontos: Correct. And roof_____.

Mr. Beougher: Access panel.

Ms. Csontos: Yeah. There's no roof hatch in the building right now. I don't think we would be opposed to extending the parapet as far back as we can along Briarcliff in order to kind of bring the height that is desired to that side of the building. I would recommend that we don't do it the full way or you won't be able to access half the roof and there are a lot of vents that pop up, just small vents that obviously come with any building. So we would request again, for practicality purposes, that it not extend the full length, but I don't think we would be opposed to at least to halfway, three-quarters of the actual entire roof.

Mr. Beougher: My concern – I would be concerned that if we only extend one side of it we're going to see the back side and what is material of the back side of that wall?

Ms. Csontos: It's going to be a stucco wall so if you would like a finished side on the other side we would do that also.

Mr. Beougher: And it would just go back to, Mr. Domini, the next column?

Ms. Csontos: They're at 8 foot base currently so we could add another 8 feet onto it ideally and that would be the next column bay. And again I would have to double check that once we actually put in the plan, so it might be 9 or 10 depending on where that 12 foot did land, but I want to say it's on a column and they're 8 foot base.

Mr. Beougher: Give you a nice place for a sign.

Ms. Csontos: And I agree. I think if we do that I would definitely go to the client and propose putting the sign up there because the space we're working with wouldn't allow them for a large sign.

Mr. Beougher: That's correct. Yes, sir.

Mr. Smith: I wanted to ask if there is a commensurate 12 foot return on the opposite side?

Ms. Csontos: There is.

Mr. Smith: So that'll get us almost back to where the roof overlay and the drive-thru lanes exist?

Ms. Csontos: Correct.

Mr. Smith: So we actually have a three-sided parapet that we're discussing?

Mr. Beougher: Yes.

Ms. Csontos: Correct. That's kind of the u-shape that I was saying. If you're looking at it in the plan it will be a u-shape.

Mr. Smith: The U has become a J.

Ms. Csontos: Exactly. My U has become a J.

Mr. Beougher: And I would also note that on the short leg of the J, that's where the drive-thru is.

Mr. Smith: Yes.

Ms. Csontos: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: So you've got a different condition there anyway.

Mr. Smith: Yes, you do.

Mr. Beougher: Would that be acceptable to the bank?

Ms. Csontos: Extending it probably another 8 feet? Is that—

Mr. Beougher: No. Well, okay. So what we're saying is that you would extend – right now it appears that it is centered over the first – I'm sorry, the second column on the side elevation—

Ms. Csontos: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: --and the bays are labeled as 8 feet, so we're asking you to extend it 24 feet to the second column.

Ms. Csontos: Okay, yeah. No, I don't think they would have a problem with that. It's the same building materials. I don't see that really increasing, like you said, the budget much, so—

Mr. Beougher: And then the only problem could be the long leg of the J could be flapping in the breeze and might require some additional structure.

Ms. Csontos: I think we'll probably have to – yeah, brace it up a little bit since—

Mr. Beougher: Or widen or—

Ms. Csontos: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: Does the Board agree with that concept?

Mr. Spalding: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: And is there a motion to—

Mr. Spalding: I propose that we accept the J shape of the parapet and go ahead and pass it as presented.

Mr. Beougher: With the additional 24 feet.

Mr. Spalding: Right. The J shape—

Mr. Beougher: You'll accept the friendly amendment?

Mr. Spalding: Right.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second?

Mr. Domini: Would you please restate that for the record, Mr. Beougher, so I'm clear on what the motion—

Mr. Beougher: Let me get a second.

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: No. You can't second, you're on motion.

Mr. Bainter: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Motion by Mr. Spalding was to accept the revised proposal with the 12 foot return on the east side and a, what appears to be, a 36 foot return on the west side.

Ms. Csontos: I believe it would be 24.

Mr. Beougher: Well, it was adding 24 to the 12 that were already there.

Ms. Csontos: I think that'll put you almost to the back of the building. Basically, to the last column line?

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. But if this is already a 12 foot return—

Ms. Csontos: Correct. Yeah.

Mr. Beougher: --it takes it to that column and then there are three 8 foot bays. That's 24 so that's 12 plus 24 is 36.

Ms. Csontos: So we're going to go to that back column line, okay.

Mr. Beougher: That's the intent of the motion, Mr. Spalding?

Mr. Spalding: Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I have restated the motion and Mr. Spalding agrees with the motion as stated.

Mr. Spalding: I do.

Mr. Beougher: Any further discussion?

Mr. Comeaux: Are we comfortable with how the mechanicals are going to be screened?

Mr. Beougher: The mechanicals are moving behind the parapet.

Ms. Csontos: Correct.

Mr. Comeaux: And was there a question about the type of material?

Mr. Domini: I think Mr. Beougher asked the question if the back side is going to be finished material as well. The applicant said—

Mr. Comeaux: I just want to make sure that there is. My apology.

Mr. Beougher: And that's a good question. The back side is stucco on all three—

Ms. Csontos: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: --interior sides?

Ms. Csontos: That'll be the entire – correct. And again there may need to be some sort of bracing for that longer wall and that would be the only additional item.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Hudson voted “yes.” Mr. Spalding voted “yes.” Mr. Smith voted “yes.” Mr. Bainter voted “yes.” Mr. Beougher voted “yes.” Mr. Comeaux voted “yes.”)

Mr. Beougher: Thank you very much.

Ms. Csontos: Thank you very much.

Mr. Beougher: You have your certificate of appropriateness.

3. 6895 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: JIM GRAY, SIGN VISION CO., ROMINE CPA & ASSOCIATES, (5552-DR). GROUND SIGN FACE CHANGE AND NEW GROUND SIGN.

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

Mr. Jim Gray: Jim Gray.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Gray.

Mr. Domini: I just want to make sure the last applicant did sign the sign-in sheet.

Ms. Csontos: I was going to wait until the_____.

Mr. Domini: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mr. Domini: I think I can make this pretty easy. The applicant has submitted two signs. In the staff report there was an error. There’s only one face change. Mr. Gene Johnson’s not changing his face and one face is being changed. The issue that came up, and I believe the staff report addresses this, is you’re only permitted one ground sign per business per parcel. This would, in fact, make two, so the applicant’s provided you with a variance application tonight. So all he’s asked is that we review and approve tonight is a face change. They’re going to come back and see if they can get a variance for that ground sign in the back. It is a unique condition, so we’ll see how the BZBA determines that.

Mr. Beougher: And our approval would be contingent on approval of the variance by the BZBA?

Mr. Domini: I don't know how you'd like to do that. Either he comes— You table that piece or he submits a new application—

Mr. Beougher: Oh, complexity.

Mr. Domini: I think you can table it because the – well—

Mr. Beougher: Can we table part of an application?

Mr. Comeaux: What's the problem?

Mr. Beougher: Or are we tabling the whole application?

Mr. Domini: I think the applicant would like to move ahead with the face change. _____ submit a new application unless you have dealt with this in the past.

Mr. Beougher: This seems new, so I think you'd need to submit a new application.

Mr. Gray: For?

Mr. Beougher: For the sign for which you've submitted a variance.

Mr. Gray: I did that with Aaron. He has the application for the variance.

Mr. Beougher: He has the application for the variance that will go to the BZBA, but you still need to have the—

Mr. Domini: The ground sign—

Mr. Beougher: --other graphics approved by the Design Review Board.

Mr. Domini: What we're trying to figure out is, can't approve part of the application. We either approve the application or we don't and since they were submitted together – if you get the variance, you just have to come back before the Board and get the ground sign approved.

Mr. Gray: Get this one approved for the Main – this face change?

Mr. Domini: Yeah. Get the face change approved, come back, go before the Board of Zoning, get the variance, and then you'll have to come back again to get the ground sign.

Mr. Comeaux: So like the ground sign, the single ground sign that you're interested in?

Mr. Gray: This one here.

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah. We can address that tonight.

Mr. Gray: That's what I'm asking for. Let's get this approved—

Mr. Comeaux: --the multi-tenant one—

Mr. Gray: We're coming back, yeah.

Mr. Comeaux: We're all on the same page.

Mr. Gray: We're on the same page, yeah.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Thank you. Would you like to address any of the other issues or—

Mr. Gray: We can address the second ground sign when we come to the meeting for that. This is pretty simple, just a face change.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So we're looking at the face change only at the Main Street side. Any questions from the panel?

Mr. Smith: The only one I have is that the way it's presented, the new sign appears to be slightly taller than the other. Is that just a graphic representation issue or are they intended to be the same height?

Mr. Gray: It's existing cabinet. All we're going to do is slide new faces in it so it's there. We're not changing the cabinet, only painting it.

Mr. Smith: Great. That's it.

Mr. Beougher: I think that the initials in the other sign actually are higher than—

Mr. Gray: The T J?

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. But I agree with you, Mr. Smith, it'd be nice if they lined up but it's an existing sign box.

Mr. Smith: Beat to fit and paint to match perhaps.

Mr. Beougher: No, a little Bondo. Okay. Any other questions?

Mr. Comeaux: Is the sign translucent or is it—

Mr. Gray: The white will be. The black and the green will be opaque.

Mr. Beougher: You've been before us before. Any other questions? (No response.) Is there a motion to approve the ground – I'm sorry, the face change only?

Mr. Bainter: (inaudible)

Mr. Spalding: Second.

Mr. Beougher: Any discussion? (No response.)

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Smith voted "yes." Mr. Bainter voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. We'll see you later.

Mr. Gray: Thank you.

4. 1288 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: RICHARD BIGHAM, BIGHAM SERVICES, 1286-1314 BRICE RD CO LTD (5553-DR). REFACE EXISTING SIGN.

Mr. Beougher: Is the applicant here tonight? Good evening, Mr. Bigham.

Mr. Richard Bigham: Richard Bigham, 326 Canyon Drive, Columbus. I'm the sign installer.

Mr. Domini: I don't have much to present on this, Mr. Beougher. It's a pretty straightforward face change to an existing business.

Mr. Beougher: That's a good thing.

Mr. Domini: Shouldn't say existing business, existing tenant space, new business.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from the members? Lot of color.

Mr. Bigham: Say again.

Mr. Beougher: Lot of color. How does this relate to the signs along the remaining businesses? Are their colors similar or multiple colors?

Mr. Bigham: I've been there. I don't really recall. I don't remember who all is in there.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. From the second picture—

Mr. Bigham: The building is – you can just see it there in the corner of the picture. It's pretty colorful.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah.

Mr. Bigham: I'm not sure what it is.

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

Mr. : I think Mr. Domini's trying to bring it up so that you can get a feeling for the rest of the signage.

Mr. Domini: It's hard to say on this. That strip center has changed out so many businesses I don't know if this is accurate. There's an H&R Block which is green and white. There's another childcare facility in there so I don't think this is good depiction.

Mr. Beougher: And this is by K-Mart?

Mr. Domini: Yeah.

Mr. Gray: Right.

Mr. Beougher: Which is blue and white I think. Okay. Is there a motion?

Mr. Comeaux: I'll move for approval.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second?

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

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

(Mr. Domini called the roll. Mr. Bainter voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes." Mr. Smith voted "yes.")

Mr. Beougher: All right. That concludes our business for this evening and we stand adjourned.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at _____ o'clock p.m.

Mr. Lane Beougher, Chair

Mr. Aaron Domini, Planning Administrator

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