



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, MAY 5, 2016 6:30 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Design Review Board – Regular – April 7, 2016

Minutes stand approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Chairman Zollars: If you intend to speak tonight, please sign in. All those that are testifying or speaking, please stand, raise your right hand, and repeat after me. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you 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. **6630 E. Main St.; Application #173137; Applicant Tony Fredenburg; Business: the Kroger Co.; Major Site Plan Review - New Commercial Building; Signage**

6630 E. Main Street - Kroger - Major Site Plan. Application: #173137 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Location: Property is located on the north-west corner of E. Main Street and Rosehill Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. Request is for a review of a major site plan, including signage, in order to construct a new commercial building. Current Use: Vacant land. Applicant: The Kroger Co. C/o Tony Fredenberg/David Hodge. Proposal - The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a major site plan, including signage, in order to construct a new 101,497 SF commercial building, gasoline station and related improvements. The 16.47AC site consists of multiple parcels that have a variety of legacy uses, including residential dwellings, a mobile home park, a retail sales business, some personal services uses. This entire site has been designated as commercial since approximately 1972. The main tracts are

undeveloped at this time, but were previously used for a trailer sales business. Along Main Street, the site abuts other commercial businesses, all in the CC district. To the north, the property abuts a multi-family housing complex. Along the northernmost lot line, the site is adjacent to single family dwellings in the City of Columbus. All parcels that front E. Main Street are within the Community Commercial Overlay. Records indicate that commercial zoning has been applied to the majority of the site since the early 1970s. The applicant has already received the required approvals for a major site plan, variances, and special exception use permits from the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals. The variances dealt with areas of the Community Commercial Overlay that didn't really function well with the big box style site that the applicant was advocating for in this case. The Community Commercial Overlay was geared toward a lot of the small three and four tenant buildings we see along Main St. The applicant met with Staff several times during the pre-application phase. As you can see, the applicant has their main building, they have a fuel center, and then they have a building pad available for future development for retail. They were originally showing the fuel center on the corner, so staff worked with them to relocate the fuel center, in order to create a location where a more distinctive retail building could be located on the corner. The applicant was agreeable to Staff's proposed changes and Staff supports the general layout of the site plan. Traffic & Parking - Staff has reviewed the site circulation study and found that the applicant is exceeding the minimum parking requirements of Table 1179. The required parking for grocery store is 1 space for every 300SF of building area. This would require the applicant to have 338 parking spaces on site, and they have provided 634 spaces. The applicant has provided a traffic study for review by the City Engineer. The applicant proposes to reduce the number of curb cuts on E. Main Street and Rosehill Road as part of this proposed development. The applicant has provided a detailed landscape plan the showing proposed screening of the neighboring single and multi-family dwellings. Upon review of the plan, Staff requested that the applicant extend the proposed mounded along the entire rear of property. After conducting a meeting with the neighboring property owners, the applicant has submitted a revised landscape plan extending the mound and adding a rear privacy fence. Staff is comfortable that the fence and the amount of landscape materials shown on the plan meet or exceed the requirements of Chapter 1180. The applicant has already committed to modify the landscape plans to mitigate the concerns of some neighbors, and to modify materials proposed on the fuel center building to match the main structure. Sign - Per the Code, the applicant is permitted one sign up to 760 SF in area on the main building. The applicant has submitted a comprehensive sign plan showing 273.66 SF of signage to be split up in 6 individual, internally illuminated signs. Staff reviewed this and found it to be positive because they are not using all the signage they are entitled to. That is a lot of signage, given the size of the building and the setback. They are using the signage to articulate where the enter the building to get these various services. Staff supports this because the amount of wall signage is less than would be permitted by Code and is sited to indicate where to enter the structure for the various services. The applicant also proposed

141.12 SF of signage on the gasoline station. Signage areas for gasoline stations are very difficult to determine based on the code, but staff is comfortable the proposed signage is consistent with typical gasoline stations and is not overpowering the canopy. The applicant has already clarified that gas pump signage can be LED style, and this is consistent with the Zoning Code. Finally, the applicant is proposing a 118.02SF ground sign with multiple sign panels for service uses and an LED style sign for fuel pricing. Staff supports that idea that the applicant is concentrating all of their signage is one location rather than having separate ground signs for the store and gasoline station. The proposed signage is larger than would be permitted under the Community Commercial Overlay, but a building setback of this distance was not envisioned when that Chapter was enacted. The applicant worked Staff to lower the height of the sign, change the style and materials to be consistent with the design on other signage along E. Main Street. Staff also supports the use of the same brick materials used on the main structure. The applicant has also proposed a similar, slightly smaller ground sign along Rosehill Road, which is consistent with the provisions of the Code. BZBA required the applicant to use the same brick material from the main structure on the fuel center. The applicant also proposed a landscape plan which has been revised since they made their application. That was to accommodate some resident concerns at the BZBA meeting. The residents requested that the evergreens be along the north side of the screening so that they would have some year around greenery between them and the Kroger. The screening there consists of the landscape that is in your packet, and a six foot vinyl fence that everyone was agreeable to at the previous meeting. I recommend that the Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed major site plan and signage enhance 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. With that, I will turn things back over to our chairman. I will be happy to answer any questions, and the applicant is here to answer questions as well.

Chairman Zollars: I would like to ask the applicant the location of the building and the set back. A lot of buildings along Main St. In this area have a much closer set-back to Main St. I know the newer Harbor Freight location on main St., set a little closer to the road. There is a Kroger north of the Short North that is a little bit closer to the road. This is a traditional setting with the Kroger set back and the parking in the front. Was there consideration for the site layout, to have the building a little closer to the front, maybe a little more walking accessible down Main St.

Ms. Rose: Hi, I am Heidi Rose with Burd Engineering. I am representing the Civil engineer. We had looked at moving the building closer to the road, but the way the parking lot would lay out was not conducive to what Kroger wanted. We worked with the City, and we also discussed the future retail. We also added sidewalk in from Main Street to the building to help pedestrians.

Mr. Brown: I am Jim Brown. I am a construction manager with Kroger. I think the footprint of our building was not conducive to this type of a layout. The one on High Street

that you mentioned, the Main entry does face the large parking area. We just happen to have High Street along the side of the building there.

Mr. Hicks: Is that it part because of a market study that you feel that this particular building type fits this particular market? The existing Kroger that is farther east, is a little closer to the road and is not necessarily super walkable, but it definitely is more of a neighborhood feeling type grocery store, whereas this is more super market type. I am just kind of curious what the reasonings may be as to why this is. There are different types of buildings that Kroger has, so why a different building type doesn't fit in this market.

Mr. Brown: I think the existing Kroger is not sufficient for the customers, for the business, for the community. This building is going to be twice the size of the existing store. And, when you look at all of the amenities they are going to be providing, it really laid out this 100,000 SF store. When you talk about the High Street store for example, is 57,000 SF. So it is a much smaller store, much smaller parking lot, and the parking ratio is about the same, but far fewer spaces.

Mr. Snowden: Dan and I felt that given the scale of this thing, and given the cooperation to identify a retail site that would be on the corner, we thought was a pretty big win. Especially given that the original site plan proposed the fuel center there. And, looking at it from Kroger's standpoint, they wanted to directly compete with the United Dairy Farmer's fuel center across the street. We looked at it as we were able to make a positive change, although we did not get everything we wanted in terms of pedestrian accessibility, we felt it was a good compromise given what was originally proposed to us in the pre-application phase.

Mr. Hicks: As we look to the future, and the development of Main Street, and what Main Street is going to be in the next twenty to fifty years, I had hoped this was a major investment in Main Street, and I am very appreciative of that, and Kroger is a great partner in that. I also like to have an eye to the future of accessibility and the types of residents that live in this area, and how accessible it is going to be if you don't have a car. How easy is it going to be to get in and out of this Kroger? And we are really interested in serving that type of consumer here. I think that is one of my concerns with the building. I had a couple of other questions. The exterior facade, up and down Main Street we have a lot of brick, and on your monument sign there is brick. The exterior brick on this would be like a split faced block. Are there any considerations for incorporating some of that same brick that we have up and down our sidewalks, on the corner features, on the monument sign, on the facades of the building?

Mr. Brown: I believe that we are utilizing that brick along the front of the building for the monument signs.

Mr. Snowden: The brick color that they are utilizing is a little different. I did not see split face in the exterior, but maybe I missed something along the rear of one of the elevations.

Mr. Brown: It is like a cast brick, but I would imagine...it will look more like a large block. It is going to be 16" wide, 8" tall.

Mr. Fry: Really there are three different masonry products on the building. The majority of

the field is the cast brick product. It is 4 x 16, so it still has that brick proportion, but it is a little bit larger to fit the scale of the building. There are some horizontal accent bands with a lighter brown color. That would be the split-faced block. There is also burnished block which is really the same product as the split-faced, only the face is ground down so you get that exposed aggregate look. That is used around the vestibules, and an accent portion at the seating area at the right side of the south elevation. So there are some similar color materials, some variation texture, some banding, very detailing variation in the elevation.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, most of our buildings that have been developed since the Design Review Board came into being, along main Street have a very traditional look, entry porticos and that sort of thing. This is a little bit more of a modern take on a commercial building. So, it is definitely different than what is there. I like it. Ultimately you get to the point where there are some tastes issues to it, but it is definitely something that is a little bit more modern than what we see when you think about the facade improvements that were done many years ago to the shopping center that Kroger is in, where you have these palladia columns at the front that make it with a gabled roof, so this is definitely different.

Chairman Zollars: Kroger team, anything you would like to add to this?

Ms. Horn: I am Jordan Horn. I am with Kroger Real Estate, so I appreciate your time this evening. We are very excited to bring this new 100,000 SF store to Reynoldsburg. It is also one of new prototype exteriors. This is one of the first few that will be in the Columbus area, which we are excited to be rolling out across the country. So, this new store is going to be bigger and better looking, and substantially different in expanded offerings. We are really excited about bringing to the community, in addition to our architect and our construction manager, that you have already spoken with, we do have our landscape architect here, so we have a little bit of everybody here.

Unknown Speaker: I have noticed that in some of the other Krogers in the area a kind of cart system with some striping and some additional signage and I didn't know if that is something that would also be incorporated into this. And what, if any, type of signage would be included in that.

Ms. Horn: For our cart corral, typically out in the parking lot, but as far as the additional signage goes, that is not in our request to have additional signage on the cart corrals. There will be some identification as far as small signage for the person returning their carts.

Chairman Zollars: Any other questions from the Board? Alright, we will call the vote. Mr. Snowden, if you would please.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: I think Kroger has met with us enough that they know what the process is at this point. You will want to submit an application for a zoning certificate and zoning sign permit. You will want to submit for a plot-grade-utility plan review and approval, which is the civil engineering package that is reviewed by our City Engineer. Once that is complete, I can issue the zoning certificate, and from there you also want to submit your building plans for review, secure the permits, and complete the required inspections. The numbers for the

folks you are going to be doing that with are listed. Thank you very much.

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

2. 1607 Brice Rd.; Application #173161; Applicant: DaNite Signs; Business: Allstate - Davie Financial; Signage

Mr. Snowden: 1607 Brice Road - Davie Financial - Signage. Application: #173161 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the west side of Brice Road between Retton Road and Roselawn Ave. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Administrative/Business Office. Applicant: DaNite Signs. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface an existing internally illuminated monument style cabinet sign, and install a 36SF non-illuminated aluminum wall panel sign. Existing Site & Context - The site is developed with an existing commercial building used for a financial services office. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City. To the west, the property abuts a fraternal organization lodge in the CO district of the City. To the east, the property is adjacent to single tenant freestanding office structures in the NC district. The applicant is proposing to erect a 36 SF non-illuminated all panel. This is significantly less than the 93SF of wall signage the applicant is entitled to per the Zoning Code. The panel is proportional of the proposed wall, stepped back from the main front facade, and is consistent with the character of the proposed ground sign. The applicant is proposing to reface an existing 48.55 SF monument style ground sign. The sign is internally illuminated and consists of two panels. The propose faces will have two colors and one logo. The proposed panels are consistent with each other, the overall color scheme of the monument sign and the proposed wall mounted sign. 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 as submitted. With that, I will turn it back over to our Chairman.

Chairman Zollars: Any questions from the Board? Would the applicant like to add anything?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Sir, you will need to submit for a zoning sign permit application for the proposed sign reface. Staff will require two copies of plans to confirm compliance with the approved Certificate of Appropriateness. Once that is secured, you will need to submit to our Building Division for building plans for the new wall sign, secure permits, and complete the

required inspections. I will provide that to you in writing and have a great day.

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

3. **2437 Taylor Park Dr.; Application #173228; Applicant: Jami Gray; Business: Target; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: 2437 Taylor Park Drive - Target Pharmacy - Signage. Application: #173228 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Property is located along the north side of I-70, west of Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District. Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales/Pharmacy. Applicant: Golden signs out of Milford, Ohio. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a new wall mounted sign on the front facade of an existing commercial building. This sign replacement is part of re-branding and will replace an existing channel letter sign. The site is developed with an existing commercial building and related improvements. The other tenant spaces include other retail sales uses. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS district of the City. To the west, the property abuts Blacklick Metro Park, that is what is directly behind this property. The applicant is proposing to install a new 35.7 SF wall sign. The proposed sign consists of internally illuminated channel letters mounted to the building facade. The proposed signage is consistent with the style of signage used throughout the entire commercial shopping center and with the existing pharmacy sign. This is a pretty simple one, the applicant, CVS, is taking over all of Target's pharmacies and they are basically taking down the generic pharmacy signage, rebranding it, one color in the exact same location, with no increases in size. I recommend the Board 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.

Chairman Zollars: Thank you Mr. Snowden. Any questions or comments from the Board? Does the applicant have anything to add?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: You will want to submit for a zoning sign permit application for the proposed sign reface. Staff will require two copies of plans to confirm compliance. Then you will want to submit building plans for the new sign, secure permits, and complete the required inspections. Have a great day.

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

4. **8173 E. Broad St.; Application #173241; Applicant: Philip Redke; Business: TJ Maxx; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: 8173 E. Broad Street - TJ Maxx - Signage. Application: #173241 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on south side of E. Broad Street, east of Waggoner Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District. The request for certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales. As you can see here, this building is currently under construction. Applicant: PR Signs & Services/Philip Radke, there address and phone number is listed. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a new wall mounted sign on the front facade of a commercial building. The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building and related improvements. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses. To the north, the property abuts other commercial businesses on the north side of Broad Street in the City of Columbus. To the south, the property is adjacent to an agricultural use in Jefferson Township. The applicant is proposing to install a new 209.7SF of signage. Per the Code, the applicant is entitled to 248SF of signage. The applicant worked with staff to reduce the amount of sign area and number of wall signs originally proposed. When TJ Maxx originally made their application, they were actually proposing to do a Comprehensive Sign Plan to do four, then three wall signs. Staff worked with the applicant, and there are a couple of reasons for that, TJ Maxx is the closest tenant space next to the Lowes. The applicant was proposing to put wall signs on the south facade, which is to the agricultural property that is in a permanent farmland preservation district, and probably will never be developed. So that is signage that is unnecessary and goes to nothing, and no one can see it. The applicant was proposing signage to face the Lowes, it would have been slightly visible from the Lowes, but the distance across here is only between twenty and thirty feet. To think you are going to have a lot of visibility from the street, I did not support that. So, the applicant was very gracious and revised their plans in order to basically go with one sign. That is what everyone else in the shopping center is doing, and that is what was designed for when the original phase 1 for the Shoppes at East Broad was approved through BZBA and DRB, last year. The sign is consistent with the scale of the building's façade and with the signage approved for the other tenant spaces in the same shopping center. The 7 IN sign projection from the facade does not exceed the 12 IN allowed by the Zoning Code. I 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 that, I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Zollars: Any questions from the Board?

Unknown Speaker: Mr. Snowden, I have one quick question. When the Sports Authority was approved on the monument sign, there was some brief discussion about trying to keep the Sports Authority sign and the TJ Maxx sign separate because they are essentially the same red and white look and they were conflicting or indistinguishable between the two.

Mr. Snowden: You are correct, Sir.

Unknown Speaker: Is this proposal for where the TJ Maxx sign will be adjacent to, or not right next to, or above.

Mr. Snowden: It is adjacent, but here is the thing, Sports Authority has declared bankruptcy nationally and they are not going into the shopping center. So, we will be fine on that front.

Chairman Zollars: Anything else from the Board? Anything from the applicant?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: The items you are going to need to complete are listed, I will provide it in writing. You will need to submit a zoning sign permit for the new sign, and submit building plans for the sign. Secure the permits and inspections. Thanks.

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

5. **2413 Taylor Square Rd.; Application #173268; Applicant: DaNite Signs; Business: IHOP; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: 2413 Taylor Square Drive - IHOP - Signage. Application: #173268 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Location: Property is located on the east side of Baltimore-Reynoldsborg Road just south of Taylor Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District. The request for certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Eating or Drinking Establishment. Applicant: DaNite Sign. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for new wall mounted signage on the front and side facades of an existing commercial building. The site is developed with an existing commercial building and related improvements for an eating or drinking establishment. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS district of the City, including eating or drinking establishments and a hotel. Pretty typical for a development next to a highway. The applicant previously received a variance, case #66-ZV, from the Zoning Code to allow a wall sign on the north façade of the building which does not parallel any public street. Wall Signs - The applicant is proposing two new wall signs. The size of the proposed wall sign on the north façade is 21 SF in area. The sign proposed on the front or west façade is 162 SF, which is two square feet less than the 164SF of sign permitted by Code. So, even if we termed the entire thing a sign, they are still within their permitted signage per the Code. The applicant is also proposing a small circle sign. Technically that could be termed an additional sign, so I would recommend the Board approve on the condition that 24 hour sign be integrated in that overall main sign on the front. It would be very easy to just mount that. Like I said, it is almost like a building detail, rather than a sign, as we traditionally know it. The way that they have designed it, I have termed it all signage. Materials Changes - The applicant is proposing a very minor change to the wood paneling above the gabled entrance. The area was so minor, that staff included this review as part of the signage. The proposed paneling is consistent with the wood material proposed on the wall sign. They are proposing to do an overlay on this with a very similar wood, and the 24 hour sign. I am suggesting if we move the 24 hour sign to the main side, then they reface that with some wood. I did not even feel comfortable terming that an architectural modification because we are adding one material. It is just slightly different from an in kind replacement. That is why I did not require exterior modification level review. In this case, I think it is fine that they do that, as long as they relocate the 24 hour sign, just so we don't run into any problems that need to require variances. It is such a big sign anyway, it seems silly

to not just utilize whatever they need. I recommend the Board 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. I would recommend in this case that we add the condition that the 24 hour round sign is relocated to the main front facade.

Mr. Sampson: Let me add that the City stepped up for both IHOP and the Olive Garden, and visibility from the roadway is very limited, so we stepped up to really clear out that public property to increase that visibility. We value the businesses that are in Reynoldsburg, and certainly both IHOP and the Olive Garden, and we do not want them to be hidden in any way. The City does recognize the issue with the signage and the visibility and is stepping forward, and will contain that property.

Mr. Snowden: For those of you that do not know the area well and do not know what Mr. Sampson is speaking of. This was the condition of the right away in 2014. The city's land basically extends from this surface of the street all the way to this fence here, and beyond is the applicant's private property. This is the condition in December. The City is committed to make that a better gateway and not allow that level of growth there. It was becoming unsightly, and the property owners were not happy with that. Mr. Sampson, Mr. Havener, and one of our previous Service Directors felt that was not the condition that a piece of our property should be maintained.

Chairman Zollars: Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Hicks: I had one question in regards to the front of the building and the main sign panel. In the corner, it calls it out as LED channel mounting to be determined. Is there any clarification on exactly how the sign is lit? Is it internally illuminated? Would that just be on the white IHOP letters, or in the gaps on either side?

Unknown Speaker: From the engineer drawings, it had the IHOP and swoosh below it, but I did not see any other parts of it as being illuminated internally with LED's. I don't know that to be true or not.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks and other members of the Board, I am not aware of that. Based on the plan that they submitted, it was not illuminated except for the item. If you look at the last page, or second to last page in that packet, they called out just that smaller area to show that is illuminated.

Mr. Hicks: So that IHOP, the lettering here, is the lettering from this entire sign panel?

Mr. Snowden: That is how I am reading it.

Mr. Hicks: I just wanted to be clear so that we are not approving and there is a slight chance they just start mounting LED's in all kinds of crazy places.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, that is a great point. The idea is, what is signage? The definition of sign in our Zoning Code could include a lot of different things. What is signage? They are mounting this larger square on this. The purpose of it is clearly to attract attention, but it is also integrated with the architecture of the building. I am terming the whole thing a sign. I think it is positive that a portion of it is not illuminated because I do not want to see an

excessive amount of illuminated sign. I think it is a good trade off. Yeah, they are allowed to have a big sign, but only a portion of it is internally illuminated, which means you are going to see it at night, and the rest of it is architecturally integrated with a building that has materials that are utilized in other places. I think that is positive.

Mr. Hicks: When I review this, it appears that the dimensions of the IHOP lettering on this panel match that of the last page of the packet. I think when we make our motion that we make it conditional that that part of the panel will be illuminated, and only that part. I just want to make sure we are not blindly approving complete illumination that could be seen from space, or whatever.

Chairman Zollars: Mr. Hicks, do you want to make that motion?

Mr. Hicks: I move that we approve the IHOP signage conditionally upon them relocating the 324 hour sign that is on the gable, as presented onto the main wall sign on the front of the building. Secondly, conditionally upon LED lighting being limited to the channel letters and sign as proposed on the last page of their submittal.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Those items are contained on page fourteen, I will provide them in writing. You want to submit a zoning sign permit application for all the proposed sign reface. Staff will require two copies of plans to confirm compliance with the approved certificate of appropriateness. Once a zoning sign permit is secured, the applicant will need to contact the Building Division to check on that materials change to the gable and whether or not that is going to be part of the review, or a separate review, or how that is going to be handled since you are changing material and it will be mounted to the surface.

Chairman Zollars: Thank you.

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

6. 6308 E. Main St.; Application #173300; Applicant: Richard Bigham; Business: My Car Loans; Signage

Mr. Snowden: 6308 E. Main Street - My Title Loan - Signage. Application: #173300 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Property is located on the north side of E. Main Street, just west of Brice Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Administrative/Business Office. Applicant: Richard Bigham. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface an existing internally illuminated, ground mounted cabinet sign. The site is developed with an existing commercial building. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City. To the west, the property abuts a plumbing contractor's office and mini-storage facility. To the north, the property abuts an auto services use. To the east, the

property is adjacent to a gasoline station. All parcels that front E. Main Street are within the Community Commercial Overlay. This item was referred to the Planning & Zoning Division from the Code Compliance Division. You will probably remember that the applicant came in for a wall mounted sign two months ago, and the wall sign was completed and the property owner elected to reface the cabinet sign without including that in their original application. They certainly could have done that and they just chose not to. So, we had to circle back with them and get them to comply with the process. I guess the lesson is that it is easier to do it all at once and the first time, but here we are. The applicant is proposing to reface an existing 32 SF monument style ground sign. The proposed sign panel contains three colors and is consistent with the colors and style of the tenant's wall sign. I recommend 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 as submitted. With that, I will turn it over to our Chairman, and I am here for questions.

Chairman Zollars: Any questions from the Board?

Mr. Hicks: Will this be refacing on both sides of that monument sign? You have dual tenants in that facility, is the other half the other tenant, or is it both sides for the one tenant?

Mr. Bigham: I am Richard Bigham. I will say he same thing on both sides. It is a car loan, title loan company, that has the name of the company, the function, and the phone number.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, this sign cabinet basically fell off last July or August, and one of our Code Compliance Officers at the time, at my request, made contact with the property owner to write a violation to remove the sign cabinet from the site, because it is unsafe and not attached to the sign, and it is in violation of our code because it is not in good repair. The applicant could have repaired it, but they chose to remove it and put it in storage. What I am guessing probably happened, is that when the new tenant came and mounted their sign, they realized they had a monument base and thought they could remount and reface. So, they did go ahead and reface both sides. Both sides are the same. If you drive by it o your way out of here, you will see it is already done, So, because of that our Compliance Officer saw that and wrote him out to say that he needed to comply with the process for approval.

Chairman Zollars: I have got a question. What happens if a dry cleaner want a little piece of the action?

Mr. Snowden: That is a great question, Mr. Zollars. Ultimately it is the property owner's choice how they want to use this signage. As far as moderating between the two tenants, that is not something the City or the Board needs to concern themselves with. What the Code says is that they get one sign per property. Just because My Title Loans is utilizing this entire ground monument style sign, does not mean that \$1.99 cleaners is permitted by code to put up a new monument sign, and get approval. This is the sign for this property. So, if the property owner has elected to have one of the tenants utilizing the whole thing, thjat is their choice provided it is approved by DRB, and DRB finds that it is consistent with the colors, and that it works there and is not bigger than permitted by the Code, and all the normal things

that we do.

Chairman Zollars: Thank you very much. Any other questions from the Board? How about from the applicant?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Bigam, we will provide it in writing, but you will need a zoning sign permit to officially put this issue to bed. Once you pull that zoning sign permit, I will inform Code Compliance that you are in compliance.

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

7. **1468 Brice Rd.; Application #173315; Applicant: Sign Shop Inc.; Business: Atrium Personnel; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: 1468 Brice Road - Atrium Personnel - Signage. Application: #173315 - Certificate of Appropriateness. For the property located on the northeast corner of Brice Road and Rygate Drive. Existing Zoning: NC - Neighborhood Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Administrative/Business Office. Applicant: Sign Shop Inc., DBA Signarama Reynoldsburg, and their information is listed there. I am going to cut to the chase on this. Some of you will probably notice, one person in particular that made a recommendation that some additional graphics should be incorporated on the sign. Since this was approved in February, the tenant's corporate office made contact to state they had some problems and been through a management change. I informed them they were operating a business without a zoning certificate. We fixed that, which you probably remember from the Staff Report last time. We got the use approved, and our building division checked it out. From there, they decided they needed more information on the sign. I told them that we had discussed that at our last Design Review meeting. The applicant is back to add a little more signage, a little more graphics to the same cabinet sign. Everything else is still going to be the same that is required for the sign, even though I am considering this a reface in terms of zoning, because the cabinet was already there. It works better because it feels up the space better, it divides the signs into thirds. It is not adding new color, so basically, I am fine with it, it is just funny how it turned out. 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 as submitted. I am here to answer any questions.

Chairman Zollars: Any comments from the Board? How about from the applicant?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Ok, thank you very much. To the applicant, the items you will need to complete, in order to complete development and review for this, are listed on page twenty. You will want a zoning sign permit, for the reface. You will want to submit building signs for this showing how the cabinet is going to be remounted to the existing post, and we will go from there. If the design changes again, we will do it again.

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

8. 1762 Brice Rd.; Application #173320; Applicant: Sign Shop Inc.; Business: New Born Ministries; Signage

Mr. Snowden: 1762 Brice Road - New Born Ministries - Signage. Application: #173320 - Certificate of Appropriateness. For the property located on the east side of Brice Road between Brice Road and Century City South. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Semi-Public Use. Applicant: Sign Shop Inc., DBA Signarama Reynoldsburg. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface an existing internally illuminated cabinet sign. The sign is an existing non-conforming sign mounted to the soffit of the building. The site is developed with an existing commercial building. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City. There is a retail store, there is a small tax office, there is a car wash, on the same site. To the north, the site is adjacent to a multi-family dwelling complex in the AR-3 district of the City. The applicant is proposing to reface an existing 54SF roof mounted cabinet sign. The proposed sign panel contains three main colors and two small logos. The sign is part of a soffit mounted sign cabinet system that extends across the front of the entire building. 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. Let me say one caveat to what I just said, I did some research on this property, and it appears to me that the semi-public use at this location does not have the required special exception use permit, and some of the other things that they need. Ultimately, this applicant is their sign contractor. We can go through the whole process, but I am not going to issue any zoning sign permits until we take care of getting the use actually approved. Even if the Board approves it tonight, it does need to be conditioned. Those are things that they have to do per the Code now. So, just know that you can approve the signage, but they are going to need to work with me, and I will provide that information in writing. Bill, I think Code Compliance went out to issue a notice earlier today, and we can discuss that internally, to get them into compliance. One of the things I have been trying to avoid is issuing signage permits, and other permits for folks that don't have their main zoning clearance to even be there. It has happened in the past for various reasons, and we just try to make sure it doesn't. With that, I

will turn it back over to our chair.

Chairman Zollars: If we do approve it tonight, the applicant, or tenant, do not need to come back again?

Mr. Snowden: They do not need to come back to the Board for signage. I just wanted the Board to understand just because you are saying yeah the signage is ok, doesn't mean that they are exempt from all of these other things. I am going to do those things regardless of what is decided here tonight. I just wanted everybody to know.

Chairman Zollars: Questions, comments from the Board.

Mr. Hicks: Is the window sign part of the application that is shown in the window, and is that compliant with square footage of window?

Mr. Snowden: It is not part of the application packet because we don't normally require Design Review Board approval for the window signage because it is listed in our code under signage not requiring a zoning permit in the first place. However, based on the size of those windows, I am going to go out on a limb and say it is probably above the 25% of the individual window frame, or very close to it.

Unknown Speaker: Also, those are temporary signage. They do have plus on taking some of them down. Also, if you noticed, they are only using one of the two boxes that encompasses their unit. The empty box to the left, which is like a 32 SF sign, is also this tenants, and they are leaving it blank at this time. So, they are not even touching their total amount.

Mr. Snowden: To the applicant, just know this about the window signs, it is not required to have DRB approval, they get 25% of the window. So, if what is there, is over 25% of the window, then Code Compliance will let them know. If it is not, then it can stay there.

Unknown Speaker: They are a huge facility. They have like 2/3rd's of that.

Mr. Snowden: Even so, it is 25% of the individual window frame. Just because they have additional windows, that don't have any signage, does not mean they get more than 25%. Ultimately, the tenant has to be in compliance with the regulation. That is just a fact.

Chairman Zollars: Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Snowden: Tim, the items are: the tenant should contact me to submit a special exception use permit application, zoning certificate application and building occupancy application before the business begins to operate. Just stay in touch.

RESULT:	APPROVED [5 TO 1]
MOVER:	Tyler Cullinan
SECONDER:	Richard Carr
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Hicks, Carr, Cullinan
NAYS:	Sampson
ABSENT:	Bowman

E. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, may I make one announcement before you adjourn?

Chairman Zollars: Yes.

Mr. Snowden: Those of you who contacted me about the Shoppes at East Broad trees issue, it is a work in progress, and I have met and been in contact via phone with the property owner, and we are still working through it. I just wanted to give the Board an update, and it has not been forgotten.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning Administrator