



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2017 7:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Design Review Board – Regular – April 6, 2017

Minutes stand approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda amended to move item C1 to item E1.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers sworn in.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. 1481 Lancaster Ave.; Application #176418; Applicant: Steven Hicks; Historic District - Exterior Modifications.

1481 Lancaster Avenue - Single-family Dwelling - Exterior Modifications

Application: #176418 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on the southwest corner of Lancaster Avenue and Rickly Street.

Existing Zoning: R-3 Single-family Residence District

Request: Request for a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications within the Historic Overlay District.

Current Use: Single Family Dwelling

Applicant: Steven Hicks

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a new accessory structure and exterior modifications to an existing accessory structure within the HD Historic Overlay District.

The site is an existing single family dwelling with a detached garage/barn on a platted lot. All adjacent lots are also in the R-3 zoning district. The existing home and all accessory

buildings were originally constructed prior to the enactment of the Zoning Code. The lot was platted prior to the enactment of the current Subdivision Regulations.

The applicant has already been granted a variance for the location of the accessory structure by the BZBA. The applicant's lot is narrower than would be permitted by the Subdivision Regulations, which requires the applicant to place it within the required setback for accessory structures. This is consistent with accessory structures and site design practices from the late 19th Century, which is when the lot was originally platted and main home constructed.

The applicant is proposing both the new and existing accessory structure to be clad in a vertical wood panel siding, with batten stripes along the seams. The existing standing seam metal roof on the barn will be maintained and painted. The proposed accessory structure will also have a standing seam roof. Both buildings will be trimmed around the edges. These materials are typical of the late 19th century, and consistent with the materials on the existing home. Staff supports the applicant's material choices.

The applicant is proposing, red and slate gray as primary building colors for the barn and proposed accessory building, respectively. The proposed trim pieces will be white. These are very common colors to the period, and match nicely with the existing main structure. Staff supports the applicant's color choices. Recommend approval as submitted.

RESULT:	APPROVED [4 TO 0]
MOVER:	Eliot Bowman
SECONDER:	Richard Hudson
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Sampson
ABSTAIN:	Hicks
ABSENT:	Carr, King

2. 7535 E. Main St.; Application #176979; Applicant: Patricia Palermo; Business - Dental Office; Historic District - Exterior Modification and Signage.

7535 E. Main Street - Palermo Medical Office Building - Exterior Modifications - Historic District

Application: #176979 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located along the south side of E. Main Street between Jackson Avenue and Waggoner Road.

Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / HCO - Historic Commercial Overlay

Request: Request for certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications to a building in the Historic District.

Current Use: Medical Office

Applicant: Patricia Palermo

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to make exterior modifications to an existing building in the Historic District.

The site is developed with a commercial office building and related improvements. Neighboring properties are developed with other commercial businesses also in the CC

District. To the south, the property is adjacent to single family dwellings in the R-3 District. This lot and all neighboring lots are within the HD Historic Overlay District.

The applicant is proposing a variety of exterior modifications to an existing commercial office building. The existing building was constructed in the early 1980's and predates the original adoption of the Historic Overlay District regulations in 1996. Challenges are always presented when applying Chapter 1193 and the Historic Design Guidelines to suburban style structures or structures with modern architecture within Olde Reynoldsburg.

The applicant is proposing the paint both the brick and stucco exterior cladding of the building. The applicants color choices are attractive, but do not have any historic significance. Unpainted brick is a preferred material within the district. Update: The applicant has submitted a revised scope of working clarifying their intended colors.

The applicant is proposing to replace an existing internally illuminated ground sign, as well as a pin mounted wall address sign. The proposed ground sign will be refaced with wood boards and pin mounted aluminum metal. The proposed wall sign will also be constructed of aluminum and pin-mounted to the façade. Aluminum is not a traditional or natural material for signage per the Zoning Code

The applicant has submitted a revised scope of work clarifying their materials choices. The address signage will be painted rather than replaced with brushed aluminum.

The applicant is proposing a new awning/entry feature. The proposed entry feature appears to use the same wood and brushed aluminum proposed for the sign. Staff has concerns that this aluminum is not an appropriate material within the Historic District.

The applicant has submitted a revised scope of work clarifying their materials choices.

The applicant has submitted renderings indicating their proposed landscape plans. Staff has concerns that the proposed plant material does not appear to be native or common to this part of the country. The renderings indicate that the proposed ground cover will be gravel, which is not a historic landscape material. Some of the plants are placed in aluminum planters which are not typical to landscape areas within the Historic District. The applicant is going to need to indicate the proposed planting areas on their site plan.

The applicant has provided a revised scope of work for the building's landscaping. The applicant has clarified to Staff that they are not posing to add the gravel ground cover or non-native plants or cactus show in the example.

Mr. Snowden stated that the only concern he had was that the address lettering should be a matte finish would be more appropriate in his opinion.

Mr. Zollars asked the applicant if she would be agreeable with changing the paint to matte.

The applicant replied yes.

Mr. Bowman moved Approval with condition of address lettering being of matte finish.

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

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. 8137 E. Broad #177268 Applicant Sean Clark

8137 E. Broad Street - Fine Home Furnishings/Rooms for Less - Comprehensive Sign Plan

Application: #177268 - 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 certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications.

Current Use: Vacant/Construction Pending

Applicant: Sean Clark/Danite Sign Company

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for signage at a new commercial building. The signage is being reviewed as a comprehensive sign plan.

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 over 340SF of signage. The applicant is proposing two signs, for a total sign area of 180.55SF. Through the comprehensive sign plan process, the applicant is requesting that the Board approve two wall signs, one sign in addition to the sign permitted by the Code. The applicant should clarify that the sign does not extend further from the façade than the 12IN permitted by the Code.

The applicant is proposing two internally illuminated channel letter wall signs. The signs are mounted directly to the building facade. The proposed signage is consisted with the sign types previously approved for the Shoppes at East Board development. The signage matches the general scale of the building, and main sign is mounted to the fascia above the main entrance. This is a typical and appropriate place for building signage. Neither sign contains more than the maximum for four colors permitted by the Zoning Code.

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.

Mr. Snowden stated that the only concern he had from a design standpoint was that it's not entirely balanced.

Mr. Zollars asked if the applicant had anything else to add.

The applicant stated that the client had 3 outlets in the Columbus area currently in which 30% of the store will be rooms for less and 70% of the store will be fine home furnishings which is the reasoning for the 2 signs.

Mr. Sampson asked if both signs are backlit.

The applicant replied that they are both backlit but they are flush mounted.

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

2. 2200 Baltimore Reynoldsburg Road #177335; Applicant Hallie Ervin; Minor/Exterior Modifications

220 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road - Smokey Bones - Exterior Modifications

Application: #177335 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on east side of Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road between Farmsbury Drive and Taylor Park Drive.

Existing Zoning: CS Community Services District

Request: Request for certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications.

Current Use: Restaurant (Eat and Drinking Establishment) Applicant: Hallie Ervin

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 new paint colors.

The site is developed with an existing single-tenant commercial building and related improvements. Neighboring uses include a variety of commercial businesses, including auto services uses, retail sales and other eating or drinking establishment. The parcel is an outlot developed as part of the Taylor Square Shopping Center. The entire development is zoned CS Community Services District, with a limited overlay with no special requirements for signage.

The applicant is proposing a general refresh of the building's exterior surfaces and materials. The applicant proposes to repaint the existing standing seam metal roof. The building's exposed rough wood detailing, which is currently stained, will be painted black, which will hide the condition of the weathered wood. The negative spaces on the building's upper facades are finished with hardie plank siding that will be painted charcoal grey. The pallet of colors is consistent on all four sides of the building. There is no proposed change to any wall or ground signage at the site.

Mr. Hicks asked if the entire roof is metal roof or if parts are different materials.

The applicant responded that there are different materials. The top of the roof is standard roof as seen on a house (shingled). The front exterior part where it overhangs for rain that is rusty grain color they want to paint it black for curb appeal.

Mr. Hicks responded, the main part of the roof is not going to change, those colors are going to stay the same.

The applicant said yes.

Mr. Snowden said the flared roof is red, the flared standing seam metal roof and the overall gabled roof is green asphalt shingles which has been replaced once since the building opened so that's probably why they're not proposing to do anything to it.

The applicant responded that is correct.

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

3. 6754 E. Main #177389; Applicant Chad Koehneke

6754 E. Main Street - Belflex Staffing - Comprehensive Sign Plan 24:00

Application: #177389 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on north side of E. Main Street between Briarcliff Road and Rosehill Road.

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

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

Current Use: Administrative/Business Office

Applicant: Chad Koehneke/Signrama

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for new wall signage at a new office use. The application will be reviewed as a comprehensive sign plan.

The site is an existing multi-tenant commercial building with a gasoline station use, and two units for other commercial tenants. The other commercial tenant space is occupied by a retail sales business. The site received a special exception use permit from the Board for rental of vehicles/trucks.

Per Table 1181, the applicant's sign is a Type B wall sign, which would entitle the applicant to over 60SF of signage. The applicant is proposing two 6.69SF signs, for a total sign area of 13.39SF. Through the comprehensive sign plan process, the applicant is requesting that the Board approve two wall signs, one sign in addition to the sign permitted by the Code. The applicant should clarify that the sign does not extend further from the façade than the 12IN permitted by the Code.

The applicant is proposing two internally illuminated channel letter wall signs. The signs are mounted to raceways that generally match the color of the building façade. The proposed signage is consistent with the permitted sign types within the Community Commercial Overlay District per Section 1196.11 of the Zoning Code. The signs are mounted to the building fascia, which is a typical and appropriate place for wall signage. The two colors used in the sign lettering does not exceed the four color restriction of the Zoning Code.

The applicant has submitted drawings of additional windows graphics and a small entry sign for the rear or north door of the tenant space. The signage is consistent with the colors and style of the wall signage, so Staff has no concerns. The applicant is also proposing to reface two existing ground signs. The main ground sign also contains signage for other tenants. Staff has some concerns that the signage as shown in the drawings does not reflect the final design. Staff also has some general concerns about the small directional sign. This sign was

originally a directional entry sign, and has been refaced several times with review/zoning sign permit. The has been significantly damaged and is no longer part of a matching set of entry/exit signs at the site. Staff recommends that sign be removed as a condition of this approval.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay District. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness on the following condition:

1. That the 6SF entry sign be permanently removed.

Mr. Zollars asked the representative for the applicant if he would like to add anything to the presentation.

The representative (Jason Matney of Bellflex Staffing) stated that in regards to the ground sign, he thought it was placed on top because the place they took over moved over and that it was the spot for that particular part of the property.

Mr. Snowden replied that it should have had a permit and that if they proposed to move it down, it needed to have a permit. He added that it is a re-face which doesn't require Design review board to approve it, but there are concerns in that one person did a light background, another a dark background and the backgrounds should match. The sign colors need to be consistent.

Mr. Zollars asked what kind of condition is the other sign in and should that be mirrored that as well.

Mr. Snowden responded that the small 6 foot ground sign, there is nothing matching on the other side. If they had a matching entry feature, I would have as a condition that they would need to repair it to the satisfaction of the Building Official, they need to reface it to a color that matches the cabinet or have directional something, but the fact is number one it's blocking the ground sign, number 2 on arial photographs the entry way was in a different location so it needs to come out.

Mr. Hicks moved the approval under the condition that sign be removed.

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

4. Application 177397; 7175 E. Main Street, Applicant Stanley W. Young- Signage

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 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 and the other signage at the site.

Generally speaking, Staff's position is that sign 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.

Mr. Snowden presented some history of this building- although attached, it has a separate owner. It was a pharmacy and then the post office and the buildings are physically attached but there is a dividing lot line between the 2 tenants.

The applicant is not proposing any additional ground or directional signage as part of this application. The applicant was advised they could have no more than 25% window graphics at the location.

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 it that the Board approves the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Mr. McCallum in for Mr. Young.

Mr. Sampson stated that those canopies aren't going anywhere and that he would prefer a canopy style sign to what is being recommended.

Mr. McCallum replied that the only problem was that it was cost prohibitive.

Mr. Snowden said that it may be possible for the applicant at a future time to do some sort of canopy entry feature. He added that it's a good point, you want to be consistent but the challenge is they would need a variance through BZBA and this is the path of least resistance.

Mr. Havener asked Mr. Sampson if he was referring to an awning above the entire window width.

Mr. Sampson replied that he would like to see the awning above the entrance way removed and then something centered in line with the rest of the complex.

Mr. Havener said that he thought if they put signage above the window, with an awning, awnings don't typically go just above the window they go the full length of a window opening and if you're going to do this it might come into play with the rest of the design of the building because you have the same set of windows to the right. In order to make the building to look congruent, you'd probably want to have the awnings over both sets of windows.

Mr. McCallum said that would be very expensive, but that would be the end result.

Mr. Sampson said that Design Review Board isn't to determine the most cost effective avenue for applicants; it's to determine what is going to fit a particular location.

Mr. Hicks asked if it would balance with the box signs on the corner.

Mr. Snowden said he appreciates Mr. Sampson's comments and it's a perfect example of what no code or example has done. He continued that the Board can either try to approve, but there is no good condition, the Board can even table and have the applicant go back.

Mr. Sampson made a Motion to table.

Mr. McCallum said if I may re-iterate, this is a startup business, if you've met these guys, you'll know they're not going to put \$10,000-\$12,000 in an awning with a startup awning like that. He said I can understand but our best course is a non-illuminated wall sign.

Mr. Bowman asked about an awning just over the main entrance. With no signage above the window, would that be too bare looking or would an awning over the main doorway where this existing structure is over the main entrance, would that suffice or would that be a little bare?

Mr. Sampson responded the awning and the wall sign or just the awning.

Mr. Bowman said just the awning.

Mr. *** said I kind of like the idea of kind of transition or compromise of the aesthetic over top of the windows sort of what the applicant is proposing some type of awning over top of the entry that the shape sort of matches the other side of the center.

Maybe that's sort of the compromise that it's hard to tell them that they need to do an awning that per the code that they're not allowed to do and it would require a variance but I do see what you're saying. We need to pick a direction with that particular building.

Mr. Zollars asked of going forward would we be able to make this new sign the new standard.

Mr. Snowden said yes the Board could choose to take that path and say for this entire thing, we're not going to be approving new cabinet signs, wall sign reface, if you pull this stuff down, you got to go with this, that is a possibility.

Mr. Zollars said back to the motion, is there a second?

Mr. Bowman said I think there should be some discussion with the applicant and owner.

Mr. McCallum asked if there is any temporary signage permit available.

Mr. Snowden replied that there was a banner permit available.

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 6/8/2017 5:00 PM
MOVER:	Bill Sampson	
SECONDER:	Eliot Bowman	
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Sampson	
ABSENT:	Carr, King	

E. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 7578 E. Main St.; Application #176472; Applicant: Evans Capital Investments, Ltd.; Business: Reynoldsburg (E. Main) DG (Dollar General), LLC; Major Site Plan, Historic District - New Commercial Building.

7578 E. Main Street - Dollar General - Major Site Plan

Application: #176472 - Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: Property is located on the north side of East Main Street, just west of Waggoner Road.

Existing Zoning: CC Community Commerce District / HCO Historic Commercial Overlay District

Request: Request for a certificate of appropriateness in order to construct a new Commercial building and related improvements.

Current Use: Vacant Land

Applicant: Evans Capital Investments, Ltd.

The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness in order to construct a new, freestanding, commercial building.

The proposed site consists of a 4.3 acre commercial shopping center with various commercial business uses. The applicant intends to split a portion of that parcel off, in order to construct this proposed free-standing commercial building. To the north, the property abuts an apartment complex (multi-family dwellings) in the AR-2 zoning district. All adjacent properties that front E. Main Street are within the Historic Overlay District.

The applicant has already been granted variances from several sections of Chapter 1193 by the BZBA. The variances allow the building to be setback from E. Main Street. The applicant claimed hardship due to the presence of underground sanitary sewer lines near the front of the parcel.

The applicant has provided a defined pedestrian path between the E. Main Street frontage of the property and the main entrance of the proposed structure. The sidewalk is separated from the traffic circulation and parking. The applicant's design places bike racks and a seating area along this path, in order to comply with the pedestrian amenity requirements of Section 1193.09.

Staff has reviewed the application for compliance with the requirements of Chapter 1180. Generally speaking, the applicant meets those minimum requirements. Since the last meeting of the Board the applicant has submitted a revised landscape plan, in order to address concerns raised by the Board. The revised landscape plan includes screening along the west side of the loading area, and screen the dumpster with a masonry enclosure that matches the

materials used on the main structure. Staff would like additional clarification about what landscape materials will be used along the east side of the proposed building. The applicant has submitted a basic utilities plan and facilities demand worksheet, which have been forwarded to the Department of Public Service and City Engineer for preliminary review. The applicant proposed to accommodate their stormwater runoff in an underground detention basin. This basin will be reviewed for compliance with the City's stormwater manual by the City Engineer. The applicant provided architectural elevations showing the proposed building. The applicant applied for and received a variance to allow the proposed building to be setback from the street. The applicant has provided a revise plan that addresses staff's concerns that the building be placed on the same plane as the existing shopping center. The applicant proposes to clad their building in brick veneer. The proposed veneer meets the requirements of Chapter 1193 for natural materials. UPDATE: The applicant has provided revised building elevations, and has selected brick veneer that more closely matches the materials of the existing shopping center. The applicant has worked with Staff and the Board to submit additional revised architectural renderings to further address concerns of the Board which were raised at the last two regular meetings.

The applicant has provided a small screened area on their front sidewalk. Staff understands that this is to be used to vending, but the applicant should clarify what activity they propose here.

The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage and exterior modifications enhance the characteristics of the Historic Overlay District.

For the applicant:

Alex Frazier, Hurley and Stewart

Mark Bush Capital Growth

Mr. Bush said that they appreciate the comments from the last meeting, the one that sticks out being that it doesn't look like it belongs. Awnings have been added in different areas and in option 3 it extends the full length of the building and has the brick columns that mimic the adjacent buildings. Proposed exterior illuminated sign shown to the board and also shown a coping at the top of the building for accent which extends down the sides of the building. He continued that with option 1 they did not extend the full length of the building with the awning in trying to match the historic overlay but there are bump outs on the front to change the plain.

Mr. Bush continued that the original height of the building was 23ft 4 inches and then the additional brick accent was 8 inches, so 24 feet, the finished floor with the grading there is 31/2 feet of drop across this site so the finished floor of that building in relation to the center next door with the bump up on the facade is 2.44 feet so add another 8 inches so 3.11 feet higher, then there is about 25-30 feet separation between the buildings.

Mr. Frazier stated that he would like to point out that the center vestibule is the only bump up. Option 3 it's the same roof line.

** Board member asked if the highest point on option 1 is 24 foot tall and all of option 3 is the same 24

Applicant replied No I think its lower. Just over 20.

** Board member asked do we know what the existing height is there.

Applicant replied I think 18.9 to the top of the building

Mr. Sampson asked with the building location, is the parking all in the front?

The Applicants replied that it is. There was a variance received for the placement of the building due to the utilities due to the large stormwater and sanitary.

Mr. Sampson asked where would the signage be- close to Main Street.

Reply inaudible.

**Board member asked Mr. Snowden asked if the signage packet the correct one

Mr. Snowden replied that the is not, the signage was not being approved because the issue with the signage being that there was a variance which was denied by Board of Zoning and Building Appeals which has to go before Council.

**Board member said that historic overlay requires storefront windows, are any of the windows in option 1 or 3 real windows or are they still the blacked out glass panels as seen in the last meeting.

The Applicant replied correct, they are the non-see through glass based on the floor plan because you're looking at the back of coolers and offices, restrooms, things of that nature and we received variances for that from the BZBA as well on the clear glass.

Mr. Zollars said that there are two options and that we need to either eliminate one or approve one or not approve either.

Mr. Hicks said that they really appreciate the applicants persistence and they've really worked with staff to try to do the best they can, unfortunately it's an awkward site being a vacant space in the middle of an existing center that appears to have been a final phase of a center that has never been completed. So the site itself has some real challenges to put what is a cookie cutter product in the middle of a center and I appreciate that they have tried to put a lot of different facade materials and they've done their best to dress up the product that they have as best that they can but unfortunately, I just don't think that it's an appropriate fit within the historic district within an existing center, as much as it gets close option 1 better than option 3 to match, it's just an awkward fit that I just can't support.

Mr. Snowden said unless there is any immediate question from the board, Mr. Brusk said he would like to speak on it. Once Mr. Brusk's comments are completed, I would give the applicant the ability to address anything he stated in there and at that point he can proceed. The Board should do one of two things, discuss which one they like better or as Mr. Hicks said that he can't support either option but I feel trying to table on from this point would be inappropriate.

Norm Brusk said that last month he objected to this store because he felt that there were too many Dollar General stores and that he didn't feel that it fit with the Historic area. He said

the question isn't if the building matches the building next to it but does it fit in with the historic area. He asked if anyone remember the restaurant on Main Street- the Longbranch and it reminds him of that. He continues that he doesn't now feel like it falls into the category that he originally thought it did and that it is much nicer and doesn't have that cookie cutter Dollar General feel.

Mr. Bowman stated that he didn't think you could put any buildings in that space and make it fit and that he feels the applicant has done what they can do to make it fit as best as it can. Mr. Bowman made a Motion to approve option 1 as submitted.

Mr. Hicks said that in response to Mr. Bowman that it is an awkward site and that the only thing that can really be done is to finish the center with the same facade that is in there and for everyone to think about, the center is 2 separate parcels with one ownership and what is going to happen is these guys are going to buy this and subdivide that into a separate parcel and now there will be 3 parcels where there was 2. At some point there could be re-development and by this getting subdivided out it will never be feasible. He added that he did appreciate what the applicant did however.

Mr. Snowden recommended that the board take 2 votes, one to approve the option and one to disapprove the certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Sampson asked when there will be a resolution on the signage.

Mr. Snowden replied that he didn't know because two things could happen, one being the appeal at City Council could be denied, the applicant would then only be allowed signage that the code permits 18 square foot ground sign, they're proposing 50 and a 24 square foot wall sign, they're proposing 50. So the applicant can still have signage, but the signage would be small. He said the signage would be awkward because of the size of the building and that basically assumes a small historic signage. So it is unknown what will happen. If it is approved, then theoretically then it could be as long as July before the signage is before this body.

Mr. Sampson stated that he would like to make a Motion that it be tabled until confirmed by City Council.

Mr. Snowden said that there was already a motion and a second, he needed to call the roll on that motion

So on the Motion: MOTION TO APPROVE OPTION 1 AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION: Bowman

Second unk

Roll: Bowman Yes, Hicks Yes, Hudson Yes, Sampson No, Zollars Yes

4-1 to approve option 1

Mr. Sampson requested to withdraw his motion to table he didn't want to waste anyone's time any further and he respected everyone's time.

Motion is to affirm certificate of appropriateness with Option 1 as the choice.

RESULT:	APPROVED [3 TO 2]
MOVER:	Eliot Bowman
SECONDER:	Bill Sampson
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman
NAYS:	Hicks, Sampson
ABSENT:	Carr, King

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning and Zoning Administrator