



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, MAY 3, 2018 6:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Cullinan, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks
ABSENT: Bizjak

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – April 5, 2018

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
----------------	-----------------

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Zollars: Do we have any changes or additions to the Agenda?

OMH: Yes, in your packet there is a application for 6561 E. Livingston Ave. it did not make it onto the Agenda. However, the property owner for that application is also the property owner for the first applicant on the Agenda. So, we would like to move it to that.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, we can do that.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers sworn in by the Chairman

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. 6561 E Livingston; Application # 2018-14; Applicant David Bishoff; Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Willis: We have two applications at the Blacklick shopping plaza. The first one is a certificate of appropriateness for an exterior modification on the back side of the building. The applicant is looking for a new overhang door. That is the photo on your screen of the existing overhang door, and in your packet the applicant is going to put in a larger overhang door. When I spoke with the representative of that organization, they weren't sure of the color, but were sure it was going to match pretty close to the exterior it's currently painted.

This building faces to a back alley and a large wooden fence, so, it is screened from the apartment building to where it is now.

Mr. Zollars: Would you like to add anything to that sir?

Unknown: inaudible

Mr Zollars: Ok. Very Good. I would like to entertain a motion followed by a second for an approval of a new door.

Mr. Willis: Can I step in? Just one question. Is this a single modification for this single tenant or do you have plans to modify the entire back side of this building?

Unknown: It's just this tenant.

Mr. Willis: Ok.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, very good. A motion followed by a second please.

Mr. Cullinan: I'd like to make a motion to approve as submitted.

Mr. Zollars: We have a first how about a second?

Mr. Bowman: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: If no further questions, Mr. Bowsher, would you please read roll.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tyler Cullinan, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Eliot Bowman, Commissioner
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks
ABSENT:	Bizjak

2. 2644 TAYLOR RD; Application # 2018-11; Applicant: BRANHAM SIGN CO;
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PLAN

Mr. Willis: Our next application was tabled from the last meeting. 2644 Taylor Rd, this is the former Gander Mountain building. City staff has worked with the applicant to make revisions based on comments from Planning Commission. I have a couple of those on the screen. Items you are reviewing; we have a new monument sign proposed on Taylor Rd., new main identity sign on the North and West elevation, and additional signage on the South elevation facing I-70. We talked a little bit at the last Planning Commission about shying away from these tall monument signs. The Applicant has proposed a monument sign with a brick base, than meets code. So, that is the first item we are addressing. Second one, we have two main identity signs. At the last meeting we had a little bit of confusion as to the front of the building. We have two different elevations; one facing Taylor Rd., and one facing that parking lot on the West. I think there was some confusion whether they had a diagonal

entrance facing one way. Both of these signs are under the allotted sign area of the code. The last elevation in the rear, or south facing elevation, facing interstate I-70. Just a correction on the staff report that's provided to you. The total combined area that the applicant is requesting is 1100 square feet. The building is less than 80 ft from the lot line. Really, the allotted amount they are allowed in the code is actually 170 square feet, so this exceeds the threshold. Additionally, we talked with the applicant about the images and we still have some questions about the nature of the material being used to print those images. We understand the applicant can speak to that as well.

Mr. Zollars: Do either of you care to add anything to this?

Mr. Young: Certainly, Stan Young, Branham Sign Company. First of all I would like to thank the Planning Commission for their consideration and input in this project. It is an extremely visible and exciting project from a retail perspective. As you all know due to the nature and size of this, graphics are going to be an extremely important part of this whole program. We appreciate your input and your thoughts. As you had suggested at the last meeting, the drawings that you have are the correct building elevations, the original drawings had not had that. What you have in front of you is correct... to be specific the elevation on Taylor Rd. has basically two sets of letters. You have the BIG SANDY which is 111 square feet. Then, you have the furniture and mattress, which is 55 square feet. So, you end up with about 167 square feet for that sign elevation. On the parking lot side, you have a little bit less. Big Sandy logo and the HG TV's and appliances comes in at about 163 square feet. As staff has indicated, we had originally proposed a pylon sign and with some comment from you folks the pylon sign was deleted, and we have decided to do a face change on the existing monument sign; which is 45.3 square feet. We should have a drawing on that. Lastly, we should have the freeway elevation showing. Option A is you have the Big Sandy logo in the front with the four images on that elevation, which in our opinion from a retail perspective is important because of the nature of this business, their branding and the fact that this building is so wide it needs something to help break that long building elevation up. I would personally from a sign perspective be happy to answer any questions. We also have Laura here from Big Sandy, which I'm sure she has some comments as well.

Ms. Timberlake: You can see that we have gone a different direction since receiving information about what was happening in and around the store itself, we felt like this look would be a better fit for the area. Things are moving along well on the inside so, were excited about that. I did want to mention on the flex signs that we have referenced on the framed back wall that we are proposing. This has also been done... I was hoping they would be installed but.... it will probably be next week at our Heath location, Heath, Newark. Very similar, same exact size. Like I said I hoped to have that so I could show you what it looks like on the building because I think that would have spoke a thousand words. We do have those examples and it is a similar building in that it is a very long and blank wall. That was the intent there, I'm happy to answer any non- technical questions. Again, I appreciate ya'll time and the City was very helpful.

Mr. Zollars: Board, questions?

Mr. Hicks: First of all I would like to thank the applicant for making an investment in the community. It's a vacant retail space and we are very excited to see somebody moving in there. I'm also really excited to see the changes that you have made on the monument sign, I really appreciate that. You heard us when we were talking about Reynoldsburg branding and that we are trying to have a nice cohesive, pleasant community. In regards to the front elevation also, great you had the actual elevation on here. I think this is much easier for us to visualize, and I think the signage on the front of the building looks appropriate. As far as the signage on the back, it appears that the means and method you measure, the Big Sandy Superstore sign may be larger than were allowed per code, but if you measure it the other way it's not. Overall I think this is an application that could gain my support for approval, under the condition that we do something else with the image signs on the back of the building. I understand your need to show people the brand awareness and what you have in Big Sandy and HG TV's, appliances, mattresses, and furniture. I think it would be appropriate, and would gain my support if we could maintain the banner sign part where it says HD TV's and keep the text with the red background, but to eliminate the images. Either, handle it that way or the way you have the raceway sign on the front of the building that has furniture, mattresses, and HD TV's, and appliances on the front of the building, something that along the back of the building. I think it would warrant my conditional support.

Ms. Timberlake: I will thank you also for helping me remove the digital signs, never been a fan... that's our owners.

Mr. Zollars: Any staff comments?

Mr. Willis: Yeah, one quick note just on what you said Mr. Hicks. There's a correction on that staff report, we went back and measured the distance between that set back to the right away, and it's under the 80 foot threshold. So, the permitted area for that main identity sign, by code, is actually 170 feet.

Mr. Hicks: 170 feet of signage?

Mr. Willis: Yes, 170 feet of signage

Mr. Hicks: So, it is significantly bigger than... (inaudible)

Mr. Willis: Yes, it is significantly bigger.

Mr. Hicks: I appreciate that, I also think that it's off the freeway and you are talking about right of way to the freeway versus right away to Rosehill Rd. I think with the size of the building, I don't think it is inappropriate. It's our job here to interpret that.

Mr. Zollars: Any other questions from the board? Mr. Hicks, I want to clarify your statement. Your saying remove the visuals and just put the letters?

Mr. Hicks: Yes, just the text in either the raceway style or if they want it to be a solid red banner with white letters, that would be appropriate.

Unknown: Inaudible

Mr. Young: I'm not quite sure where your concern stands, is it from the quantity or the size. We would be... can be persuaded to actually reduce some of the sizes of these images on that elevation, if that would help.

Mr. Hicks: I think my issue is with the images themselves. Having images of the furniture and everything inside and just the precedent that it sets. I would prefer... I just think it makes the building look cleaner and the overall look and feel would be better if you have just the text and not actual images.

Mr. Young: Certainty, and I appreciate your comment. I'm prepared to offer you an alternative, if I may. (Inaudible)... Those are smaller in size, so they are not maybe as (Inaudible) as maybe what you are having an issue with, they are reduced in size.

Unknown: What is that size?

Mr. Young: 150 square feet a piece, instead of 285 square feet a piece. So, they are somewhat smaller.

Mr. Bowman: Proposed is 15x19, right? 15 feet by 19 feet for each of these.

Mr. Young: Yes sir the original proposal was that, that's correct.

Unknown: per sign

Mr. Young: Yes, that is correct. these are much smaller...

Unknown: Eleven and a quarter by fifteen feet.

Mr. Young: There much smaller in size, so if your concerned stems from the fact that these things are just too much on the wall, there's an alternative for you to consider. Which, from a brand perspective, to these folks, I can tell you, it's extremely important. This is part of their brand, this is what people look for in all of the Big Sandy's.

Mr. Zollars: I appreciate Mr. Hicks comments and I'm going to agree with him. Didn't I hear you say, I'm sorry I forget your name.

Ms. Timberlake: Laura

Mr. Zollars: Didn't you say that you were a proponent of removing them anyways?

Ms. Timberlake: Of the digital.

Unknown: Inaudible

Mr. Zollars: That's a 10 x 15, that's a big piece of that building. Inaudible.

Mr. Bowman: I'm just trying to think of other retail buildings in our city that have those, and none exist. So, it's hard to try to make that fit. Like Mr. Hicks said... now you have a precedent and how many people are coming in for image banners? I know there's a personal preference element to it. But, there is also... and I know that to the owners it is an important piece of marketing to them. Of course our job is to make sure it fits with the rest of the city.

Mr. Bowsher: Can I ask real quick, where at on the building in Heath that is was located and what was it fronting and how big are those signs? What were some of the comments they had? Maybe for reference.

Ms. Timberlake: Inaudible... What's behind there? Yeah, Target. So, it's basically on the back side, the far side is actually still attached to the mall. So in interest, they just annexed it. There it is actually three signs, I believe. This is a picture of the wall... Inaudible. Then, let's see if they have any specific comments on the permit itself. Size wise... Inaudible... On that particular wall there's lighting. So, basically they are strategically placed, centered between the lines.

Mr. Zollars: Short... I'm not a big fan of that. For the city, for us moving forward. If we can assume that's not going to happen, do you have a preference on the lettering for the front of the building? Is it furniture and mattress or would you rather go with something colored.

Ms. Timberlake: For my understanding, let me just clarify to make sure I understood correctly. The fourth variation, which would be the back wall, could we table that and revisit that. Obviously my main concern is getting the front and the actual entrance sign... making sure that we get those things approved, so... My concern is production, we're looking now, we have pushed opening now to July. So, if we could perhaps table that back wall and revisit that, I could go ahead and get rolling on.

Mr. Hicks: Just as a comment, I would be willing to approve the whole package with the one condition. Basically eliminate the images on the back of the building. So, you could maintain the text and the banner that says, HD TV's, Appliances, Mattresses, and Furniture, but just not have an image behind it. We can do that or... conditionally approve it and we would basically eliminate those completely. Then, you could come back with an additional signage package with a new application. Is that correct Mr. Willis and staff?

Mr. Bowsher: Yes, you could do both.

Mr. Hicks: Just physically how we would work through the system. So...

Ms. Timberlake: Ok, and if for some reason... my main concern being that is we go back to our owners and there is a change or they are interested in doing something else.. obviously I hear you loud and clear on the actual visuals. Would we have the ability to then submit an amended, or is that set in stone on the back wall?

Mr. Zollars: I think what Mr. Hicks is proposing is that we make a motion to approve everything, except the back. Then you can work with staff on the back.

Ms. Timberlake: That's perfect.

Unknown: Inaudible

Mr Bowman: It would essentially be a conditional approval basically approving everything except. The condition would be don't use the images.

Ms. Timberlake: Just use the words.

Mr. Bowman: Yes, but this also means that the big identity sign on the back would also be approved.

Ms. Timberlake: Ok.

Mr. Zollars: If you want to come back at any time, you would be welcome to.

Ms. Timberlake: That makes sense.

Mr. Hicks: I don't think I'm ever going to be swayed to approve that type of sign anyway. Just so you know and I don't... just catching us on a different month, I don't know if that's going to work.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, then it sounds like we are very close to a motion if someone would care to make one.

Unknown: Inaudible

Mr. Hicks: I move that we approve the applicants submission, conditionally upon then removing the images related to the HDTV's, appliances, mattresses, and furniture signs. However, the applicant can keep the text as displayed in the elevation to include; HDTV's, appliances, mattresses, and furniture signs.

Mr. Zollars: We have a first, do we have a second?

Mr. Cullinan; I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Very good, we have a first and a second. Mr Bowsheer, can you call the roll?

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks
ABSENT:	Bizjak

3. ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: Amending Section 1151.01 Initiation of Amendments, Section 1151.02 Petition for Zoning District Change with Development Plan, Section 1151.03 Public Hearing and Referral to the Planning Commission, Section 1151.05 Action by Council, Section 1151.06 Amendment of Development Plan, and Section 1151.07 Effect of Approval of Chapter 1151 Amendments. (Held from 4/9/2018; Approved by Planning Commission 3/8/2018 and 5/3/2018).

Mr. Bowsher: The agenda item of the ordinance to amend the code of ordinance for the City of Reynoldsburg, in section 1151.01. This was done by a charter that was passed last year. It was done to do some cleanup of the current proposal. You have in front of you the packet of what those changes were. This Ordinance was to clean up some of the language to make sure that our code was following the charter amendments. It was removing the joint meeting for Council and Planning Commission. It was trying to get rid of some of the red tape, and putting the Service Committee discussion and first reading by council after the Planning Commission. Planning Commission would hear first and then it would move forward, given your recommendation to Council, instead of Council then Planning Commission, then back to Council. This was the wording, I know there was a bit of confusion from some of the audience at council, about a month ago. That is why it was pushed back here. So, given that if there is any discussion, I'll try to answer, I believe there are some in the audience that would like to discuss as well.

Council Member Mr. Luzader: I referred to as back to you gentlemen from the service committee. There was some question amongst some council members as to whether this actually did meet the qualifications of our changes that were in the charter and from some of the discussions I had I thought maybe some of you had a couple of more questions. So I just wanted to make sure that you had a chance to get your questions clarified with the city attorney and to make sure that the proposed language was what you gentlemen to work with and future planning commission members and also met the conditions of the charter. I think this language does meet those conditions. But I just wanted to make sure that everything was clarified so if you gentlemen are happy tonight we'll go ahead and send it back to council again and we'll take care of it. Otherwise if you've got any questions or concerns I urge you to give it to city attorney and make sure that those are addressed.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Jerry if you don't mind when Mr. Snowden brought this to us I think we reviewed it and we were generally in agreement with it. That's why we recommended approval to send it to council. In the meantime since it's been referred back to us we've had another bite at the Apple at this. I've had more time to review it as well as just our code in general and have been talking with some other resources in town. I was at a meeting yesterday at the BIA they're the folks that put on the Parade of Homes and have a lot of developers and talking about different ideas and different ways that we can attract more

investment into Reynoldsburg. So I have about a half dozen or so modifications changes and additions to the 11 51 changes that have been proposed. And I'd like to see some of those get implemented and coordinated talk to Mr. Hood the city attorney. And I think that we could get together and draft that language. So if you don't mind I would like us to actually table this get the language finalized with Mr. Hood. Bring it back here get it approved or recommended for approval assuming that everybody supports the changes and then send it back to council. If that's okay there's just some things like I'd like to add not it's not we're trying to simplify things so we don't want to add steps but we do want to add a process concept review. I think it's important especially when you get into plan developments for a nonbinding process where developers can or anybody that wants to rezone a property can submit something that's nonbinding and get it before planning commission and more of an informal way to get a discussion and some feedback on the items before they commit to doing a traffic study before they have to commit to all these costs and put the property in the contract for different things. So I think a concept process would benefit us. There's also some other kind of technical things in the process of making sure we have proper notice maybe adding the requirement for mean we have a we have a provision that says you have to post notice on the property but it doesn't really say what that is. So the difference between you know stapling an 8 1/2 by 11 sheet of paper on a tree in a field versus you know putting up a yard sign that has the date of the hearing and everything else. But the most important thing is removing the joint meeting and planning commission and council which I don't think is very effective into a couple of those and reorganizing so that applicants come to a planning commission. They can stay here for a few times so we can get the best deal for both parties going through like a planned development process and then refer it to council after it's been thought about for a little bit. So if we don't mind I would I'd like to table this one more month. Work with Mr. Hood to get the language finalized and some of these ideas and then present it to you next month.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Excuse me one second. Can I get done in 30 days? If not I suggest we do this and then work on that.

Unknown: I think we can do it in 30 days. Can we do this on Thursday minutes?

Mr. Luzader: Mr. Hood says right now we are in no hurry. What we have in place we'll cover for the time being. It's just that these changes will make the process smoother and faster and more advantageous for the city and the developers.

Mr. Zollars: The reason I say if this is good to go and we agree with that why don't we put in place we don't have to revisit this and talk about it again next time.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Hicks. Two questions one the conceptual stuff that you're referring to. What exactly are you proposing as far as that process this body different body is resources that staff has?

Mr. Hicks: Yes, the city of Delaware I've gone through this process before the city of Delaware has a concept phase like this and it's nice because it's nonbinding and it's up to the applicant to submit as little or as much as they want. If you want to do a planned development in the city of Reynoldsburg to submit a planned development there's a whole

list of requirements that you have to meet. And it costs the significant amount of money to prepare all those items you have to pay professionals to do all that you know with a concept plan you could have something that just as an illustrator of Plan, a sketch wouldn't cost developers very much to bring it forward. You get a unit count you get a site layout and it would come before planning commission and then planning commission could provide comments but we wouldn't take a vote. We would just say we like your idea we don't like your idea. You know do this do that. And then they could start the development process that are code which has submission requirements and has a different cost and costs involved in it. And I think in Delaware it's worked out pretty well. I've gone through it once and it did give us at least a baseline to know where we stood with planning commission on a lot of the concepts.

Mr. Zollars: Okay. Go ahead.

Mr. Cullinan: Just with the conceptual review Westerville also does that same process I've done that probably three or four times. It is really valuable. You like a lot of times there's an application that comes forward there's one or two big things that is a big change to shift something or move it. It gives you that time to kind of nail down see what are sticking points that you need to address or work through and then have that full submittal and the like you're saying you waste a lot of time going back. Yeah I mean everything.

Mr. Hicks: In general I'd like to see us just you know work our process to be more simple easier to understand for developers and more attractive to investment. And at the same time I'd like to see us work on raising our design standards. So I'd like to see more investment in town and have developers do commit to building something in town to get a better product out of them. And I think that would be beneficial to our residents I think it be beneficial to attract jobs and development of some parcels of town or redevelop in a place like Main Street I think it would be very good.

Mr. Zollars: I agree with you. Are you opposed to approving this and we can start down that road.

Mr. Hicks: I just think while we're here I'd like to just have 30 days to tinker with it and then send it on down the road.

Mr. Zollar: The process? You need 30 days to think about this? Us first and then second.

Mr. Bowsher: Can I Can I just interject real quick. Yeah. Just knowing that you know you were there last night. The comprehensive plan. I think because we were not doing anything with this and knowing that we're also going to do a zoning code rewrite at the end of the comprehensive plan and address a lot of these issues. I think we share them across the board. Mr. Hicks that there are some red tape that we need to kind of get through we need to be a bit more business friendly. I think the entire staff agrees with you on that. What I don't want to do is drag this out when we already have the language in place that's ready to go. What I would like to do and I wish we would have had the chance to speak about this before this is to work with staff to bring you in maybe with a comprehensive plan and with the zoning

review and go and fix those issues with the professionals to write that language. But at the same time approve this knowing that we're going to address those issues in the future. I think as a staff perspective that's what we would like to see in this kind of moving perpetual forward but not that we're putting down any of those. I think those are all great ideas that we need to address. I think that some of the issues that we have for you guys the first time you get to see something you know because of the public hearing aspect you don't get to see that conceptual drawing and you don't get to see those variance changes and staff should do a better job of making sure that we're emulating what the new standard for Reynoldsburg should be and getting everybody on board as far as planning commission and myself and my staff to make sure that we're putting out this product. But I think this is something that we can do after we approve this. If that's something you're willing to vote on tonight.

Mr. Bowman: Say we approve this we vote and approve this as is tonight does because I actually like this concept this idea of conceptual council. I don't know what you'd call it or advice on the direction of review a conceptual review. I actually like that idea and hearing that it's worked well in other and other cities is promising to me I think that's good with this body be the ones who discuss implementing that or would that be out of our hands if we approve this tonight.

Mr. Bowsher: I don't think that you would be out of the process especially if we were to do anything that was changing anything to do with planning and zoning that would come here. And then ultimately city council would have the final say as to day on this as well.

Mr. Luzader: If I may recall I agree with Mr. Hicks and his ideas and his concepts but I also agree with what you just said is when our comprehensive master plan is developed we are probably going to be looking at almost a total rewrite of our zoning code and we can implement a lot of this into that rewrite because that's not going to be too much further down the line. And if we go ahead and pass this tonight that will go ahead and get this in place and we can get those portions taken care of and whatever input you would like you can get with Mr. Bowsher or whatever when they have their discussions and comprehensive master plan and implement those ideas. And I think I'd be a better way to go.

Mr. Zollars: OK. All right well Mr. Hicks you want to discuss that.

Mr. Hicks: No I think as long as we don't take our eye off the ball I just want to see. I mean you know you know Reynoldsburg has to be competitive in order to attract investment. Right. You know when people are looking at you know Amazon and the home office and these kinds of things are Amazon headquarters you know that talks about. We have to remain competitive and I think we have a lot going for us as a town. But I think there's a lot of things that we can do that we just haven't paid attention to in a long time that could really improve our attractiveness to potential employers. And we really need more employers in town. We've got too much retail and we need those job creators in town and ways that we can lighten up the process. I just want make sure we don't lose track of it now.

Mr. Zollars: As a member of the comprehensive plan steering committee we did talk about this yesterday and at the end of that process is a revamping or at least a discussion of

improving or changing where we currently have. But I would like say a motion to approve this that we can start down that road. Keeping the eye on the ball now.

Mr. Luzader: I would I would just reiterate that with you on the steering committee for the comprehensive master plan and Mr. Bowsher and OHM as our advisor, get your ideas to them and make sure that they get implemented when we start discussing the entire zoning code.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Hicks, anything else anyone else board. Okay.

Mr. Cullinan: I'd make a motion that we recommend respect to council that the correct action. Yes and that we continue to move forward with just in general trying to improve our code and make development happen naturally.

Mr. Zollars: We have a first about second?

Mr. Bowman: I'll second but I do want to note that I think that.

Mr. Hicks's idea should definitely remain a talking point throughout the entire process until it's until it's really implemented. So I second.

Mr. Zollars: Very good. Okay. We have a first second. My comment is I agree with Mr. Hicks's comments and we will work with this body will move forward as best we can towards that end. Okay Mr. Bowsher can you call the roll please?

They motioned to approve this, but go back to Council.

RESULT:	REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 5/29/2018 7:43 PM
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks	
ABSENT:	Bizjak	

4. 6995 E Main St; Application #2018-0011; Applicant: J. Waddell W/DaNite Sign Co
Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Willis: Our next application is 6995 E. Main St. This is across the street from the Kroger building. A certificate of appropriateness application. The previous tenant was The Smokers Preferred shop. A new Allstate business is coming in. The applicant is requesting a new identity sign, and a surface window treatment as well. You'll see in your staff report, according to the code the building is less than 80 feet back front the right away. So, the sign area on this is 37 1/2 square feet exceeds the one square foot per linear foot width of the tenant space, which is 20 feet. The threshold here is 20 square feet and if you look on that shopping plaza, there are some signs that are non conforming that are a little bit larger. Then there is one at the far end that appears to be conforming. The window signage is not a sign that requires a permit. However, it is exceeding the square foot threshold. So, that will be a point of discussion. I'm not sure of the applicant is here... no.

Mr. Zollars: Comments or questions for discussion from the board?

Mr. Bowman: I'm just thrilled they are going into this location and this unit. That particular building is in need of new tenants. Obviously, I want things to be to code, but also I don't want any... I'm a little nervous about having a deal breaker. I really want them in there.

Mr. Zollars: I agree with you 100%. Staff, there is a 20 square foot allowance, and they are at 21?

Mr. Willis: They are at 37 and a half.

Mr. Bowsher: Administrative approval would be at 32 or below. Now given... normally what we would do on figuring signage is factor in the entire building. Because this has multiple different breakups due to tenant space, we can only a lot from what they have. So, it's a narrow building, but if you were to consider the entire space, it would fall into code. I personally could make the recommendation that staff would still approve this given the nature of the sign, and that it wouldn't be out of character with the other signs that surround it.

Mr. Bowman: I think to me that plays a big factor. It doesn't look too big, it doesn't look oversized. It looks like it would fit... in a fact it almost looks in a way smaller than the entirety of the Smoker's Preferred sign that was...

My Willis: It is smaller than the.. Inaudible

Mr. Bowman: Even that's a step in the right direction.

Mr. Zollars: It sounds like we are close to a motion, if someone would like to make one and someone follow that with a second.

Mr Hicks: I would like to move that we submit the application as submitted.

Mr. Bowan: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: We have a first and second, can you call the roll please?

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks
ABSENT:	Bizjak

5. 2339 Taylor Park Dr; Application #2018-13; Applicant: Becky Ross W/Kap Signs Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Willis: Our next application is the Ashley Home Store at 2339 Taylor Park Dr. The issue is approving a comprehensive sign plan. There are two main identity signs facing the front of that street, as well as two tenant signs in the shopping mall main side. You'll see in your staff report, also in the application on the screen that both the primary and the secondary sign on

the front conform to code. They're well under the allotted threshold . Then the Ashley Home Furniture sign is going to go right below that Target sign, on the Taylor Park monument sign. Technically, code permits the replacement of existing tenant signs with new.

Mr. Bowsher: Based on setback of more that 80 square feet, they are well under their allotted size limit. They are also trying to open by May 10th to have a grand opening.

Mr. Zollars: Any questions from the board? Excuse me ma'am, did you sign in? Ok, can you speak into the misrophone? Thank you.

Ms. Westbrook: I'm not sure if you got the new signage, I got it yesterday. Where the better sleep shop sign is at, there is supposed to be a door.

Unknown: That's in here.

Mr. Zollars: I think we're ok, we're current, right staff

Ms. Westbrook: Ok, with the sign moving up eight feet, you have that? Also, there's no door there?

Mr. Bowsher: Can we have the copy please?

Unknown: So you are moving the door and just moving that up?

Multiple people talking: Inaudible.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you for clarifying. Questions or discussions on that?

Mr. Bowman: Does that affect anything that staff has to do? No? Ok.

Mr. Hicks: The Better Sleep Shops sign, that's not a panel sign is it? This is individual channel letters or...

Ms. Westbrook: No, it is a sign. With the letters Better Sleep Shop on it. It's not just a cabinet with the vinyl insert.

Mr. Bowsher: From what I'm seeing is it has a backer, which is that white space with channel letters on top of that.

Mr Hicks: Thanks

Mr. Zollars: Any other questions or discussion? Ok, how about a motion followed by a second.

Mr. Bowman; I motion to approve as submitted.

Mr. Hicks: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Very good, we have a first and a second. Can you call the roll please?

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks
ABSENT:	Bizjak

6. 2793 Taylor Rd; Application #2018-15; Applicant Ashley Newnam; Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Willis: Our next application is 2793 Taylor Rd. This is the Wal-Mart. They are submitting a comprehensive sign plan. Looking to change the pick up space for ordering groceries online. The pickup sign is going to move on that front elevation, and then there is also a clarified internal circulation signage. The new pickup sign appears to be the same exact as the old one, but they are just moving it to a new location. So, they can better service their users that way. A series of internal circulation improvements that are on those large sheets for you.

Mr. Zollars: Internal circulation?

Mr Willis: Sorry, there are new signs in the parking lot to guide drivers through out, new parking signs as well.

Mr. Zollars: Any questions from the applicant or the board?

Ms. Newman: WD Partners, we are the architect on board for this project. I provided some slide... I just wanted to run through the project a little bit to give some color to the situation. As staff mentioned, we are moving the pickup sign to one corner to the other corner. In addition we are also branding and painting where that is located, the orange color there. The direction running signs are non illuminated, three square foot signs, place mounted. They will just say pick up and then an arrow showing customers to that designated parking area. Like staff said it is for an online grocery store pickup. Were re stripping some parking spaces, 10 of them, for exclusive use of the online grocery pick up. There will be signs at the actual parking spaces to designated those spaces as well. There will also be directional pavement makings. I just wanted to make sure that's clear.

Mr. Zollars: Any questions board?

Mr. Hicks: I just want to make a comment out of the six or eight times that Wal-Mart has come before us the last two years, this is the first time we have has a slide show, and I appreciate the dedication. I support the changes again, as I always support the changes, and look forward to when you come back.

Mr. Zollars: Any additional comments you want to add staff? If not I will take a motion and second please.

Mr. Hicks: I would like to move that we approve as submitted.

Mr Cullinan: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, we have a first and a second, you can call the roll.

42:38

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks
ABSENT:	Bizjak

7. 6515 E. Livingston Ave; Application # 2018-0009; Applicant: Velma Truesdale;
Certificate of Appropriateness - Main Front Entrance Sign

Mr. Willis: The second application was tabled from last month's Planning Commission Meeting. We wanted to get some additional clarification from the applicant regarding the modifications to the existing sign for the Blacklick Plaza. This sign is out front. Currently, the sign doesn't conform to zoning standards as is. The code permits non conformed signs to remain provided that the size and shape of the sign are not altered. The sign panels may be replaced. This is what the existing panel is. I know the Planning Commission had some questions on how this new sign was going to relate to the modifications that have been made to the building so far to date. Additionally, staff had some questions on the new tenant sign panels that you will see on your screen. What material they are, because we are basically doubling the number of tenant signs that are on that panel from six to twelve. Planning Commission had questions on how this new sign was going to relate to the overall improvements being made at that site. Lastly, I wanted to point out, currently on the Baldwin rd. Entrance there is an abandoned sign that does not appear to be in use. That seems to be something that needs to be addressed.

Mr Zollars: Any Comments?

Applicant: inaudible

Mr. Zollars: Can you come up to the microphone and sign in after you are done talking so we have you on record please.

Mr. Bishoff: We don't have any plans for the Baldwin rd. exit sign yet, but like I said we are planning the next move for that area.

Mr Willis: Do you have a time table for that?

Mr. Bishoff: I do not have a time table yet for the Baldwin rd. signs.

Mr. Willis: Ok.

Mr. Zollars: Any questions from the board?

Mr. Hicks: I did have one question. The center has been going through some renovations and it appears that the bright blue color has been added in certain areas. Is there an overall plan to change any of the roof shingles or other exteriors on the building to coordinate along with that blue color?

Mr. Bishoff: Inaudible

Mr. Hicks: Ok, and then to expand on the questions. Mr. Willis asked about the tenant panels, are those intended to be plastic with vinyl letters and then they will all have that color scheme? Or, are those reserved to be in the tenants reserved colors with logos placed on there?

Mr. Bishoff: Inaudible

Mr. Bowman: With the Baldwin rd. Entrance, it is just the two poles there now, correct? It seems that if we are redoing the signage that I would personally like to see, at least, a conceptual rendering about that entrance. I feel a little bit strange approving one sign, but not anything regarding the other one. Do you think the owner would be willing to provide at minimum, a concept of what they plan on doing with the Baldwin entrance sign?

Mr. Bishoff: Inaudible.

Mr. Zollars: To follow up on that question, along with a time frame to get that done.

Mr. Bishoff: For the designs? Time frame I can't speak on right now because I don't know. We haven't really addressed that Baldwin entrance very much at all. We have been ocusing our attention on the Livingston entrance. So, as far as a time frame, I can't speak on that right now.

Mr. Zollars: Let me ask a question staff. Do you have an opinion on that sign at this point?

Mr. Willis: It is an abandoned sign. I don't know exactly how long it's been like that, but it seems that there should be some type of time table with that action. The fact that it is an abandoned sign, but also that is it non conforming suggests that is should probably, when it comes down should not be at that same height.

Mr. Bowsher: To add to that as well, we are doing these sign changes and some of the roll up doors, my question is what else is in the vision and if there are other things that are going to happen; sign changes, blue and white lettering on the building itself, maybe a minimum site plan to get a full vision of exactly what we are going to expect here. Maybe, approve that, rather than nickel and dim eng things, is what I would like to see. To get a full vision of what you expect it to be.

Mr. Hicks: Just to expand on that, on a lot of these older properties once you go in and start changing one thing, it kind of sets off a chain reaction that you need to change more than one

thing to make it all look cohesive, like it should be there. You have already started the process of making the changes out there and it doesn't really look cohesive. So, I think something like the eye sore from the Baldwin rd. entrance needs to be approved in order to get some cooperation from the Planning Commission. We just want to see what the end goal is going to be for the property so that it does look cohesive, and we have the opportunity to remove some eye sores. I'm just not in a position where I feel super strong to support this tonight. I hate to table it again, but I think if we give it another month here we could see the bigger vision.

Mr. Bowman: I agree, I think you have an application here, say we approve this application. Then, you are going to have to do another one for the sign for this unit here and it's just another application cost, and time that you would have to be here. I would be most comfortable approving something like this if there was a comprehensive visual plan, and that would be my suggestion to take to the owner should be tabled tonight. What were looking for is something that is an overall idea or concept of what this property is really going to look like.

Mr. Bowsher: To add to that, I think what were describing is a minor sight plan, which is another zoning certificate application. I think we table this because he is still going to need the signage to add to that. So, the cost is still built in, but I think maybe we require an additional minor site plan that we would be willing to walk you through in order to get that overall picture of the idea. We will bring this and the minor site plan on the June 7th meeting and vote on all of it.

Mr. Zollars: I would like to make sure it is clear. We, I at least, expect something to be addressed with the sign. Addressed or removed on the June 7th meeting.

Mr. Bishoff: Ok, sounds good.

Mr. Willis: I have one additional point on that, which is, if the Baldwin rd. sign has to be removed, it's not going to be allowed to be replaced with one of these 20 ft high signs. So, we will have this issue where on Taylor Rd. were going to have the sign, as is, which is 20-25 feet. But, on Baldwin rd. we are not going to be able to have that. I'm just wondering if there is any willingness or consideration to using a monument sign with a brick base. Similar to what we see along E. Main st. as a potential option, because a model like that is what is going to have to be at Baldwin Rd.

Mr. Bishoff: So, removing the sign on Baldwin Rd. would not be an issue?

Unknown: No.

Mr. Zollars: Any other questions before I make a motion to table this? Ok, does anybody care to make a motion followed by a second?

Mr. Hicks: I would like to make a motion to table.

Mr. Zollars: I have a first, how about a second?

Mr. Bowman: I second

Mr. Zollars: Thank you. Mr. Bowsher, can you please read roll on that motion?

Mr. Bowsher: Four votes, it is tabled.

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 7/5/2018 6:00 PM
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Eliot Bowman, Commissioner	
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks	
ABSENT:	Bizjak	

E. OTHER BUSINESS

None

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning and Zoning Administrator