

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MAY 2, 2013
7:00 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. Scott Baker Mr. Lane Beougher Mr. Nathan Burd Mr. James Comeaux Mr. Richard Hudson Mr. Marshall Spalding
Others Present:	Mr. Justin Robbins

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 4, 2013 MEETING

Chairman Beougher: Are there any corrections or comments, amendments, concerns?

Mr. Comeaux: Just on the minutes, on the first two pages, there are a couple of times where my name appears where it's actually Mr. Beougher, just procedural matters under 2, Approval of Agenda, Public Comment and Swearing in of Speakers. So once we get to business, all the names get corrected.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so Mr. Comeaux, you did not speak until we got past Item B1.

Mr. Comeaux: Yes, as hard as that is to believe.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, fantastic. I had one as well. There were two times when we talked about something – we were talking about the fascia of a building and it got spelled EFIS, all caps, and it actually should be EIFS, standing for Exterior Insulation and Finish System, and that is on the bottom of page 3. Any other corrections to the minutes of the April 4th meeting? (No response.) Hearing none, is there any objection to approval? (No response.) Hearing none, the minutes stand approved as amended.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Beougher: Are there any corrections or changes to this evening's agenda?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. Item C7 will now become Item C1 and all the other items will get bumped down one.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Robbins. Any other amendments to the agenda for this evening? (No response.) Hearing none, any objections to approval? (No response.) The agenda stands approved as amended.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Beougher: If you are here to speak to us on any topic that is not on this evening's agenda, this is the time to come forward to the lectern and do so. We have somebody. Could you please state your name?

Ms. Rukeyah Wise: My name is Rukeyah Wise. I represent K-R-S Barbershop Corp. and I thought I heard them say that C7 wasn't here tonight.

Mr. Robbins: No, no, it's being moved to the first item on the agenda.

Ms. Wise: Oh, okay, I was just confused.

Mr. Beougher: No further public comment? (No response.)

5. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Beougher: If you're here this evening to talk about an item or testify on an item that is on the agenda, could you please raise your right hand – stand and raise your right hand, please. (Mr. Beougher administers oath.)

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. 1792 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: E.R. CIMILLUCA, SIGN SHOP, INC., R & S INFINITY 99 CENTS (#159079). MONUMENT AND WALL SIGN REFACING.

Mr. Beougher: This was tabled at the last meeting. Can you please state your name for the record?

Mr. Timothy Masters: My name is Timothy Masters. I am the lead production manager for the Sign Shop. Sam was unable to make it this evening.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Great. Mr. Robbins, do you want to reintroduce this item?

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, this is Application #159079 for three sign refacings. We have an oval sign, a wall sign and then monument sign refacing. At the previous meeting, Staff and the Board had a series of concerns, including the red lettering on the white background. Staff recommended a neutral or muted color instead of the white for the background. The 99 cent portion of the sign seemed out of scale to the rest of the copy and the height of the sign. Staff recommended that this portion be scaled down or

possibly a portion of the signage be left off. You can see in the image that was sent in by the applicant that they had met that criteria. The “Infinity” and the store font on the sign should be scaled to match each other and both seemed distorted horizontally, and they did address that concern. And the 99 cent text on the monument tenant panel should be reduced in size to allow the other portion to be read and you can see they did that there. It was pretty scrunched up on the one previous. The reason for that is adequate space should have been allowed between the copy and the sign on the edge of the panel. The applicant has worked with Staff to address the concerns brought by the Board from the last meeting and following review by the Board, it is the recommendation of Staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted as the proposed signage is in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: So the word “store” has been removed completely to make space for the remaining text?

Mr. Masters: Yeah, it was one of the concessions that the store owner allowed us.

Mr. Robbins: There was concern of the oval sign since it is an existing sign and it’s just refacing, it’s grandfathered in, so that is allowable under our code.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, well, that’s a question we had and it’s been answered. So anything else you’d like to add?

Mr. Masters: The one thing that he brought up was the neutral or muted background. The landlord wanted us to keep it consistent with the rest of the signs in this center and every other sign in this center has a white background. That’s why I went ahead and went with the black drop shadow, to give it as much dark background as possible, but to also allow the tenant, or the landlord to be happy that all the signs within his center are consistent. So everything in that same center has a white background.

Mr. Beougher: And then the color on the text, aside from the shadow—

Mr. Masters: Is red.

Mr. Beougher: --is a light – I mean it looks like a light red.

Mr. Masters: It’s not. It’s the same red that’s in the American flag and the Ohio flag behind you.

Mr. Beougher: All right. In the photograph it looks a little lighter than it actually appears.

Mr. Masters: The renderings from a computer program sometimes aren't exactly perfect. As you can see in the picture, it looks like we're on _____, because there are two suns. It's just our rendering it came out a little redder than – or a little lighter than it actually will be.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Any questions from the members of the Board? (No response.) Hearing none, is there a motion?

Mr. Burd: I'll make a motion that we approve this as submitted.

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

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

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: I'm going to say this to all the applicant. All signage does require a sign permit. I just wanted to make sure that everybody knows that and I would double check with the Building Department to verify their requirements for erecting signage, especially contractor registration.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **5996 LIVINGSTON AVENUE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: KERIN WADE—

Ms. Rukeyah Wise: It's Kevin Wade. It's misspelled.

Mr. Beougher: Kevin. Okay, Kevin Wade, KRS BARBER SHOP CORPORATION (#159355). NEW ACCESSORY COMMERCIAL STRUCTURE

If you could, please state your name for the record.

Ms. Rukeyah Wise: Yes. My name's Rukeyah Wise.

Mr. Beougher: And Mr. Robbins will introduce the item.

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, this is for 5996 East Livingston Avenue, KRS Barber Shop, (Application #159355). The property is located approximately one-half mile west of the Livingston intersection – I'm sorry, the Brice Road intersection on East Livingston Road. It's zoned CC, which is the Community Commercial Overlay District and they're requesting Design Board approval for the placement of a commercial accessory building to the rear of an existing barber shop. The applicant has placed a modular job trailer to the rear of the site without prior zoning or Design Board approval.

You can see in the image here, this is the property that we're speaking of and the existing trailer, or the proposed trailer sitting to the rear of the site.

Mr. Beougher: Could you go back to that slide? I just need to get my bearings. What are the businesses that are adjacent?

Mr. Robbins: I believe this is a vacant carpeting building. This is a security office to the west. This is a car lot, I believe, further to the west. That's the best I can make out at the moment.

Ms. Wise: It's a restaurant.

Mr. Beougher: All right, thank you.

Mr. Robbins: The property is zoned CC and all adjacent properties are zoned CC as well and the neighboring uses include a security company, a car dealer, electrical contractor and a restaurant. The footprint of the proposed structure is 10 x 44, which is 440 square feet and the footprint of the existing primary building is approximately 580 square feet and, as mentioned, the proposed structure is a modular job trailer. Staff has concerns regarding the appearance and character of the proposed structure on the site. We do understand the necessity for office and storage space within the area of 580 square feet for the barber shop; however, I think we could find a more appropriate arrangement for the needed space – needed office space could be addressed through a permanent addition to an existing building. The building itself was originally constructed as a temporary job trailer. It was not intended as a permanent structure. These trailers are typically seen on construction sites where permanent placement is forbidden past the period of active construction. While _____ buildings are not uncommon as accessory buildings within commercial districts, these ordinarily are used as temporary buildings and Staff believes should not fall into this category. It is the recommendation of Staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. As stated in Section 1103.02(a), "It is the duty of the Design Review Board to ensure that the proposed structure preserves and enhances the overall architectural character and integrity of the design review district in which the structure is proposed to be located and to endeavor to assure that the proposed structure or alteration would not be at variance with existing commercial or industrial structures within the design review district." It is the finding of Staff that the placement of a structure intended for temporary use, even if a permanent foundation would be provided, is not in keeping with the desired character of the district and would adversely affect the overall appearance of the area. The building type, architectural features, material, size and character are not appropriate for an accessory structure within this district.

Mr. Beougher: All right. So I'm going to ask if you would like to respond and give us some background on why the structure's there, what it's being used for and make the case for us to consider this.

Ms. Wise: The structure is there-- Like he said, the square footage is about 580 square feet and we do have—

Mr. Beougher: Is that of the permanent structure?

Ms. Wise: The existing business that's already there, yes, sir. And we have four barbers in there. It's been in existence, the shop has, since 2004 and, if you can imagine the paperwork and trying to keep the business organized in that small of a building, it's hectic. Now we have four barbers working out of there and we actually need a little more space for storage of paperwork and other items that's a necessity for the barbers to utilize. We understand that it doesn't appear visually for you guys right now up to criteria, but we are willing to make changes to the structure to make it better for the visual and pedestrians that would be seeing it.

Mr. Beougher: Ms. Wise, are you – is Mr. Wade the owner of the business?

Ms. Wise: Yes, he is and he actually has changed careers and he's working construction now, so he owns that business as an extra way of income and he's actually got called out last week for the National Gas Pipeline so he's not here right now.

Mr. Beougher: And are you one of – can you—

Ms. Wise: Yes. I am his assistant, yes.

Mr. Beougher: You're his assistant. And does Mr. Wade own or lease the building?

Ms. Wise: He owns the building.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Wise: And we are aware of the way it looks and he is – we're willing to make additional changes to the outside structure or whatever we need to do in order to be able to keep some sort of space for storage.

Mr. Beougher: Questions from members of the Board?

Mr. Spalding: Yes, ma'am. I have a question. How long has the trailer been there and how did it get there?

Ms. Wise: Well, he actually moved the trailer there about two months ago and it was just maybe he got a great deal, it was just a _____ purchase and he had to get it out of there and I think he was kind of unaware of setting this sort of structure onto the property without getting the proper permits first.

Mr. Spalding: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions from the members?

Mr. Robbins: I would like to add the use of the building does matter and one of the things we look at is if it's strictly storage, which means the storage of materials and it's not actually heated, cooled, there's no water service, no gas service going to it. Those have different setbacks than buildings that are used for actual occupying the building. So if this is any kind of office space, we would have to consider it an actual building which would have a larger setback on both the sides and the rear; where if it were just a storage building, then we consider that an accessory structure and the setbacks are not quite so restrictive. So that's something to keep in mind I think in the future. But I think a project like this or a building like this, it seems very appropriate if there is extra space needed to build onto the existing building and not to have quite so large of an accessory structure that functions as storage.

Mr. Beougher: And perhaps I missed it, Mr. Robbins. What is the size, the area of the building?

Mr. Robbins: 440 square feet.

Mr. Beougher: So it's nearly as large but not larger than the main building?

Ms. Wise: Right. And it does have capabilities for, like he said, the plumbing, the electric and all that to be hooked up but—

Mr. Beougher: I did see a restroom on the floor plan and I'm assuming that it does not have power currently?

Ms. Wise: Correct.

Ms. Beougher: Or plumbing or gas or—

Ms. Wise: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: --other services. Okay. Any other questions? Mr. Burd?

Mr. Burd: Is building onto the current building, is that a possibility like adding this structure onto the existing building or is that something that just hasn't been considered?

Ms. Wise: Well, I don't think – I don't know if he's considered that yet. I think that he was more looking to try not to take over so much of the parking lot area that he has, but I'm not sure how building off the building, I don't know he even thought about that. He just really pretty much thought about storage.

Mr. Beougher: How many parking spaces are there on the lot?

Ms. Wise: There are approximately about ten parking spaces in the back and maybe you can probably fit about four cars in the front area. It's just a little harder to get out into the intersection if you park in the front of the building. It's just a little space.

Mr. Robbins: I think for the size of the building, it more than meets our parking requirements.

Mr. Beougher: Well, I was going to say it certainly would meet code, especially when we consider the uses, the barber shop and there are four barbers even with—

Mr. Robbins: If we parked it at one per 100 square feet that would be roughly six spaces.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah.

Mr. Comeaux: I have a couple questions real quick. Are there prohibitions on having two permanent structures on the lot at the same time?

Mr. Robbins: There are not.

Mr. Comeaux: And in terms of the setback on here, what would the setback be from the adjacent parcels and for the CC district?

Mr. Beougher: I think we're looking at rear yard and side yard.

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah. Rear and side, yes. And this gets to my question to you. I think what Mr. Robbins had indicated before is using a modular structure, a pre-fabricated structure isn't a problem necessarily, but it needs to look different than this one does.

Ms. Wise: Right.

Mr. Comeaux: But the next question is is can you use this structure given the limitations of the setback? Because if you have this thing that's – I don't know how wide it would be, 40 feet wide, and you might just not be able to get it on the parcel at all with the appropriate setbacks.

Mr. Robbins: So what we're looking at with the CC – with the rear yard has to be a minimum of 30 feet from the rear property line and the side yards have to be a minimum of 10 feet. So that's if the building going to be used for anything other than basically storage. By storage, I mean you stack your papers back there and we would consider it an accessory structure. If it's an accessory structure then those dimensions go down a little bit, but it's strictly used for storage in that case. I think as well as Mr. Comeaux voiced, that it's not necessarily the fact that it's an engineered building, but the fact that it's a building type that's typically associated with a temporary building. So

if you notice the buildings to the north of the property and the west of property, they appear at this point to be pre-engineered, steel-trussed buildings. Those are something that would be appropriate for the district; but something that is temporary in nature and is often seen as temporary, I think is the concern.

Mr. Comeaux: And my difficulty is without knowing— If you had come to us and you said this is our proposal to use of this structure and make additions so that this building doesn't necessarily look like this building, I might see my way to getting there if that makes sense. But if it's just this building plopped down and not having regard or sensitivity – I don't mean that pejoratively, but any concerns about where the right-of-ways and the setbacks are. It's just problematic for me to see.

Ms. Wise: I understand what you're saying and I do think that he took that into consideration. That's why he placed it at the rear.

Mr. Comeaux: At the rear, right. But the problem is he might have put it too far back and then, so he might need to put it up where he's going to take several parking spaces away. He might need to move it away from his neighbors one way or the other and I just can't see that.

Ms. Wise: We understand that. We're willing to do anything.

Mr. Comeaux: Right. But I just – without knowing more, I can't even see that it physically fits there at all.

Ms. Wise: Oh. Well, if you go back to the shot of the trailer that's existing – yeah, that. If you can see the width of that – the picture of that is showing the whole lot in the back and it has, I think it's 10 feet on each side left from the front – I mean from the west and east side. So if we have to move the structure onto the parking lot, there is enough room.

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah. And while I might take your representation, I can't see that there are 10 feet to each side and I can't there's 30 feet from the rear and then that's even – that's the initial concern of mine and then the second is just how does it look. And while you might use that as a basis for a building, it's going to need a number of refacing, accoutrements, what's the right phrasing? Accoutrements is not a good word to use, I suppose.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Baker, are you going to bail Mr. Comeaux out?

Mr. Baker: I'm going to try. A side of the – I know you're here for Design Review, but I have to comment that this building per code isn't going to cut it. I think it would cost more to try to bring this building up to code and make it look good aside from building something new. If you're adding on or, as discussed, another building, a new building, I can only imagine this is sitting on concrete blocks.

Ms. Wise: It's not sitting on concrete blocks yet, but it is sitting on a solid foundation.

Mr. Baker: Okay. Looking through this information, it's not up to par for code for, probably for anything.

Ms. Wise: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: All right.

Ms. Wise: So there's nothing additional that we can do besides just moving it out of there?

Mr. Baker: That's my hunch.

Mr. Beougher: So, just to comment. I think what would be a good idea is for Mr. Wade or yourself to have some conversations with some designers, some architects which are going to be required if you make a permanent improvement. They can also help you with the zoning and put it in per code and make the building look appropriate for the district and satisfy all of our concerns. And it's not going to cost a whole lot of money to at least get some counsel from a design professional.

Ms. Wise: Right. Information.

Mr. Beougher: You're not committing to building anything. You're not pulling permits. You're just having conversation and then they can give you some estimates on costs for your various options and we could probably come up with some names of architects locally that can help you if you're interested. All right. We do have some business to do here. Any other comments, questions? (No response.) All right. So my understanding is we need to make a motion in the affirmative, is proper procedure. Mr. Robbins?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a motion to approve?

Mr. Baker: I move for approval.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Mr. Baker with a motion. Is there a second?

Mr. Comeaux: I'll second.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Comeaux seconds.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Baker voted “no.” Mr. Beougher voted “no.” Mr. Burd voted “no.” Mr. Comeaux voted “no.” Mr. Hudson voted “no.” Mr. Spalding voted “no.”)

Mr. Robbins: And I would like to clarify, I believe the intent the Board was to address Section 1103.02(a) of the code, just want to throw that in there.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. That’s fine. That’s a good clarification. And I want to say that our decision is not casting aspersions on the business or anything else. It’s just a decision on whether it is appropriate for the location and our codes and so I would encourage you to work to develop a structure that is within the code compliance and come back and we’ll consider it.

Ms. Wise: Sounds great. Thank you guys for your time.

2. 7596 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; APPLICANT: BRIAN MCCAW, SIGNCOM, INC., KWIK ‘N KOLD DRIVE THRU (#1586560. EXTERIOR MODIFICATION – HISTORIC DISTRICT.

Mr. Beougher: Is Mr. McCaw or a representative here this evening?

Mr. Bruce Summerfield: Good evening. My name is Bruce Summerfield on behalf of Brian who’s not here.

Mr. Beougher: I’m sorry. You’re name is Bruce—

Mr. Summerfield: Summerfield.

Mr. Beougher: Summerfield. Okay. Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins: This is for Application #158656. The property is located in a strip retail center on the north side of East Main Street, to the west of the Waggoner intersection. It is in the CC district and the Historic Overlay district. They are requesting Design Board approval for the refacing and color change of an existing storefront awning. As you can see, this is the drive-thru located approximately one-third of the way to the west of the end of the building with the red awning as it stands now. This is an existing rendering of what it is and they’re proposing basically a color change to a black awning.

Mr. Beougher: And thank you, Mr. Robbins. Anything you’d like to add before we start asking questions? It appears to me that the graphics are the same size and scale and color except for the “N”.

Mr. Summerfield: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: And the “N” was a white circle with a red “N” showing the awning color through and you’re changing that to, it looks, a yellow “N” with a red circle?

Mr. Summerfield: More of an orange.

Mr. Beougher: Orange circle and to me that’s the only thing that doesn’t really read clearly and maybe it’s just the picture. I’m not sure how it’s projecting up there, but on our screen it’s difficult to tell what that is and it might be better and, in fact, cheaper, more efficient for you to consider silk screening the circle and cutting out the “N” like it was originally. And I say cheaper because then you’re not screening two colors and that’s just my observation at first glance. I’m looking at it and it doesn’t – it’s difficult to discern what it is.

Mr. Summerfield: It’s not a cost issue. It’s an eradicated awning, so it’s not printed on there anyway. It’s for the backlit bottom portion of that and when it’s illuminated it’ll have enough presence and contrast between the two colors. But I think the big change is when you go from the red background to the black, and the awnings are in pretty much disrepair and there was some forethought and intent of changing it to a cabinet to match some of the other storefronts throughout there, but I think the awning was preferred by Staff and by the comments we had from you guys, so we stuck with the awning.

Mr. Beougher: And I personally have no concern with the background color. I think it actually is bolder and makes a better statement. Having a red awning against red brick sometimes is an issue. Any other questions?

Mr. Comeaux: What is the illumination?

Mr. Summerfield: It’s internally illuminated with fluorescent lights.

Mr. Comeaux: Is that consistent with the way it is now?

Mr. Summerfield: Yes, there’s no change at all.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions? (No response.) I guess I should look at the Staff report. Mr. Robbins, does Staff have any concerns?

Mr. Robbins: No, none.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a motion?

Mr. Spalding: I propose that we approve as submitted.

Mr. Baker: Second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Baker voted “yes.” Mr. Beougher voted “yes.” Mr. Burd voted “yes.” Mr. Comeaux voted “yes.” Mr. Hudson voted “yes.” Mr. Spalding voted “yes.”)

3. 6224 EAST LIVINGSTON AVENUE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; APPLICANT: NIKKI DIXON, SCOTTY’S BAR AND PATIO (#159411). MONUMENT AND WALL SIGN REFACING.

Mr. Beougher: Please approach the lectern and state your name for the record.

Mr. Andrew Meyers: Good evening. My name is Andrew Meyers. I’m here on behalf of Scotty’s Bar and Patio and on behalf of Nikki Dixon, who, by the way, is seated here this evening and she asked me to speak on her behalf.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Meyers.

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, this is 6224 East Livingston Avenue, Scotty’s Bar, Application #159411. The property is located on the northeast corner of the Livingston and Brice Intersection. It is zoned CC and within the Community Commercial Overlay district. They are requesting Design Board approval for refacing of an existing wall sign and existing tenant panel monument sign. The existing internally illuminated wall cabinet measures 12 feet by 4 and the existing internally illuminated monument is 8 foot by 5. The existing business is adjacent to a pawn shop and a carryout and you can see it here. And one of the reasons the applicant is going through this is they are rebranding change in the name to “The Berg.” The new signage is to replace the existing tenant panel signs and building monument sign and it is fine with Staff. The signage is clear, legible and attractive. It is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage is keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Anything you’d like to add?

Mr. Summerfield: No, sir.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from the members?

Mr. Baker: So, obviously, the pawn shop remains.

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

Mr. Baker: And so, I guess I’m not sure if anyone shares any concern, but the color of the proposed sign matches the color of the pawn shop sign. I don’t know what that’ll end up looking like one big sign. I mean—

Mr. Beougher: The Berg Pawn Shop?

Mr. Baker: Exactly. I mean, they, you know _____ of each other but regardless that could read as one potentially.

Mr. Summerfield: I understand the concern. Not shown on the actual sketch that you have before you there is the actual contrast of the colors. The pawn shop, for an example, has a bright red lettering. The proposed color that we would like to use is a tomato red or a very, very dark red. I know that's not a lot of contrast but I just wanted to go ahead and make that comment.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Any other questions? (No response.) I'll entertain a motion.

Mr. Comeaux: I move that we approve this.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Comeaux. Is there a second?

Mr. Hudson: Second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: I just want to mention that sign permits are required for signage within the City so your signs require one and to the best of my knowledge, I can't recall whether or not one has been applied for on this one. And I'd like to also make sure you verify the requirements of the Building Department.

4. 6800 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; APPLICANT: CAROLYN MILLS, ALL STAR SIGNS, TRADEMARK PRINT & COLOR (#159304). MONUMENT SIGN REFACING.

Mr. Beougher: Welcome and could you please state your name for the record?

Ms. Carolyn Mills: Carolyn Mills, All Star Signs.

Mr. Steven Smith: Steven Smith, Trademark Print & Color.

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, this is for 6800 East Main Street, Trademark Print & Color, Application #159304. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street, approximately midway between Rosehill and Briarcliff intersections. It is in the CC Community Commercial Overlay district and they're requesting Design Board approval for the refacing of an existing tenant panel monument sign. Adjacent businesses include a Tim Horton's, an attorney and a chimney sweep. This is a business that had moved in. They are changing – you can see the Trademark to the left, Print & Color. It's the finding of Staff that the signage is clear, attractive and it is the

recommendation of Staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage is in keeping with the existing character of the area and would not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area. I would like to mention that the changeable copy board is not permitted under code, however it is in the existing sign, so it is permitted to remain.

Mr. Beougher: And it was installed during Streetscape and was negotiated when we negotiated the construction easements. Thank you. Anything you'd like to add?

Ms. Mills: I don't think so.

Mr. Beougher: I have a question for the business owner. Is this – you're operating now?

Mr. Summerfield: Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: And, so, did you buy the business that was there, or did you come in fresh?

Mr. Summerfield: No, we moved over from just outside of Obetz. We know the gentlemen who were there before. They closed their business.

Mr. Beougher: I thought that was what happened, but another print shop went in and I wasn't sure what happened.

Mr. Summerfield: I think he was having trouble selling it and it's really not zoned for a lot of things the way it's laid out. I just happened to be perfect for it.

Mr. Robbins: We had a childcare facility that proposed to go in there several months ago.

Mr. Summerfield: Well, I grew up in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Beougher: Welcome back.

Mr. Spalding: Welcome back.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Spalding. Any questions from the members now that we have the background information on the business?

Mr. Robbins: I would like to say something. As far as banners go on the existing storefront, I want to be clear that banners are allowed for a maximum of 30 days per calendar year and any kind of signage within the window has to be a maximum of 25% of the window area. So I recall there's some sort of temporary signage up there and I want to make sure that what's on the building now is meeting code as well.

Mr. Summerfield: There is really nothing in the windows. I had thought about putting perf in the windows, the one-way, but I'm not going to break the code just to do that.

Mr. Robbins: I think the 25% would be the maximum and that can be just opaque.

Mr. Beougher: Do we count the holes? I mean that's a nice effect. I've seen it used with great results, but it's not code compliant for the whole window. You'd be limited to a fourth of it. All right, any questions? (No response.) The sign looks good. I like what you've done with the color, copy, some of the letters read better than others, but I'm sure when it's lit you can read it pretty well. Questions? (No response.) Motion?

Mr. Baker: I move for approval.

Mr. Burd: I'll second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: I would like to remind the applicant that sign permits are required and all signage has to be installed by a registered contractor with the City. I would double check with the Building Department to make sure that all of their requirements are met.

5. **7522 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: BRI BAILEY, SIGN VISION CO., EDWARD JONES (#159385). SIGN REFACING

Ms. Jami Gray: I'm Jami Gray with Sign Vision.

Mr. Darren Gray: Darren Gray with Sign Vision.

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned this is for 7522 East Main Street, Edward Jones signage refacing. I want to clear up – originally they wanted to put in a new cabinet. We've been speaking with the applicant and they had decided that a sign refacing would be the way to go. So I just wanted to make sure that the paperwork is caught up and everything does say sign refacing and it's not a new cabinet.

The property is located in the commercial strip center on the north side of East Main Street, approximately ¼ of a mile to the west of Waggoner intersection. It is zoned CC and is within the Historic Overlay District. They are requesting Design Board approval for the refacing of an existing tenant panel wall sign. That sign is internally illuminated. It is existing. I'd like to mention that all the adjacent properties are zoned CC. It is the recommendation of Staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be

granted. The proposed signage is keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Anything you'd like to add?

Ms. Gray: No.

Mr. Beougher: So the documentation does say install an LED cabinet sign. The existing sign cabinet is not LED probably.

Mr. Gray: Fluorescent.

Mr. Beougher: And I assume that Staff recommended refacing because of the size?

Mr. Robbins: Cabinet signs are not permitted within the Historic Overlay and when they learned that they would not be able to put up another cabinet sign, they believed, and I believe their client felt as well, that the refacing would be the better way to go.

Mr. Beougher: And the size of the cabinet is the same as what we're seeing here? Was it a one-for-one replacement?

Mr. Gray: Yes, it's the exact same sign. The current letters are yellowing a little bit and the background's fading, but you won't even be able to tell it's a face change; same graphics and everything, same colors.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Any questions from the members? (No response.) So we're basically putting the same sign, but just getting rid of the yellow letters. Okay, this one's easy.

Mr. Comeaux: Is there a tenant panel on the monument then? Is that right?

Mr. Gray: No.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Hudson: I'll move to approve.

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: In case you guys haven't noticed, sign permits are required.

6. **1946 BALTIMORE-REYNOLDSBURG ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: CHRIS BURNS, PES, EAGLE LOAN COMPANY (#159275). NEW WALL AND AWNING SIGN, MONUMENT SIGN REFACING.

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

Mr. Chris Burns: Yes, Chris Burns with PES.

Mr. Beougher: Welcome, Mr. Burns. Mr. Robbins, please.

Mr. Robbins: As mentioned, this is for 1946 Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road. It's the Eagle Loan business, application #159275. The property is on the east side of Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road, approximately ¼ mile south of the Livingston intersection. It is zoned CS and is in the Consumer Services District. They are requesting Design Board approval for the construction of a new exterior wall sign, a monument sign refacing and awning signage. This is the building and they're on the end unit on the very left-hand side with the little corner sticking out there. This is the building that kind of has its back—

Mr. Beougher: We described it as a reverse storefront. It faces the access road and not the main drag.

Mr. Robbins: I do want to mention that the neighboring businesses include a Century 21 realtors and Tire Discounters. The property to the north is zoned CS, the property to the east is zoned PDR3 which is multi-family residential, and the property across Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road to the west is zoned R20.

As far as the signage goes, the original property, and I don't know if I had spoken to either you or members of your staff about the allowable amount of signage within the code. What was proposed are two wall signs, basically one for each corner of the architectural corner – I guess that's the best way to describe it. Under our code, only one sign is allowable and that sign has to face a primary street. So as far as the signage goes, I would like to say that the front wall signage is considered Type A with the maximum allowable square footage of 54 square feet. The monument sign is existing and the applicant is proposing to reface the existing tenant panel within the sign and they are proposing a sign for the front edge of the awning on the portion of the building that faces away from Baltimore-Reynoldsburg Road.

Mr. Beougher: This is the access road.

Mr. Robbins: Correct. And I drove past there today before the meeting and I double checked to make sure that signage is not placed on any other portion of the building facing that rear entry. So I think consistency-wise the Board has been concerned about light from those signs facing the residential district to the east. Staff recommends the Board approve the signage under the condition that the applicant remove the side wall sign from the application. The side signage is not allowable under

Section 1182.02(C1), which does not permit signage that's not facing a roadway. Following an agreement from the applicant to remove the side signage from the application, it is the recommendation of Staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage is keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Anything you'd like to add?

Mr. Burns: No, the customer just asked us to propose that to you, that side sign, because he wouldn't have signage on the backside facing the condos or the apartments.

Mr. Beougher: And, as I understand it, we would not be able to approve the side sign. It would need to have a variance applied for at the BZBA.

Mr. Burns: That's quite all right. The customer's fine with that.

Mr. Beougher: And is signage installed or are there banners there right now.

Mr. Burns: Nothing right now, sir.

Mr. Beougher: I thought I saw something driving by this weekend. Isn't there a banner? Your tagline I know I've seen somewhere and I thought it was there.

Mr. Burns: I was just up here last week and there wasn't anything and my company didn't put anything up.

Mr. Robbins: There is a banner that's in front of Century 21. It says "Space For Lease" and it's the size of the monument sign. It's pretty unattractive.

Mr. Beougher: I just remember thinking I liked the tagline, because it seemed appropriate. Okay, any questions from the members? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Burd: I'll go ahead and make a motion that we approve this with the one change being that the sign to the side of the building be removed from the application.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Burd. Is there a second?

Mr. Baker: Second.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: Signage does require a building permit and sign permits. I know with signage of this nature that they do require stamped engineering drawings and I would strongly encourage you to contact the Building Department to sort out their requirements.

8. **2225 TAYLOR PARK DRIVE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT JAMES PELTIER, EMH&T, WESLEY RIDGE (#159307). NEW PARKING STALLS

Mr. Beougher: Could you please state your name for the record?

Mr. James Peltier: James Peltier, EMH&T.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Peltier.

Mr. Robbins: This is for 2225 Taylor Park Drive which is the Wesley Ridge Retirement Community. They're requesting minor site alterations, basically an addition of a row of parking along a drive. This is Application #159307. The property is located on the west side of Reynoldsburg-Baltimore Road, approximately a quarter mile to the north of the Taylor Road extension intersection. The existing zoning for the multi-family residential is zoned AR-3. The portion of the property that they are proposing to build on and that they do own is zoned CS which is the Community Services district which is why you see them here today. All the surrounding properties are zoned CS with the exception of the Wesley Ridge project and adjacent businesses include a Shell station and McDonald's to the east and a Staples to the south.

There are a couple of issues that Staff had with the proposed parking layout. You can see an aerial shot here and it shows basically where they have the gravel area that follows the drive and that's proposed to be the parking spaces. The applicant is proposing the addition of 28 head-in spaces along the existing entry drive of the property. Wesley Ridge does own the lot to the south of the proposed parking. The next bullet point was cut off in the staff report, but Section 1180.11 requires a continued screen of evergreen hedges, trees or mounding, or a combination thereof along parking areas. Staff recommends the Board require the applicant to conform to Section 1180.11 of the code which also, in this case, requires two islands of interior lot landscaping. So for every 10 parking spaces you have within a new lot, you have to provide at least 200 square feet of interior lot landscaping. In addition, the applicant should provide continuous screening of the proposed parking area in accordance with Section 1180.11(b). Staff also had a little bit of concern regarding the pedestrian circulation to and from the proposed parking area into the existing complex. The sidewalk shown extending down – and we had spoken to this on the phone, Mr. Peltier, is that correct?

Mr. Peltier: Yeah.

Mr. Robbins: They have one that is basically on the outside of this curve and it seems like a good spot to basically bring it down and run it over to the edge of the curb

along the drive and then provide some sort of striping from those parking spots over. And we would encourage pedestrian striping basically to alert drivers to the presence of these pedestrians from the new spaces and Staff would encourage the Board to consider the necessity of additional sidewalks and pedestrian striping which would serve the new space. Following the determination by the Board regarding pedestrian access, crossings and the required landscaping, it is the recommendation of Staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed parking would be in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance of the area. And they have a plan shown here, so there is one portion of an interior lot which has an existing pole lighting, I believe, is on there as well and then they basically have to have one more of those in those spaces to satisfy the interior landscaping requirements. And then this is another showing taken from the site as it stands now. And, just for clarification, are those mounds of gravel still there?

Mr. Peltier: No. Those are gone.

Mr. Beougher: Anything you'd like to—

Mr. Peltier: We have since updated plans to show the landscaping and islands. I've got a copy. I don't know if you guys—

Mr. Beougher: I think we would. It looks like you've got it on the board? Why don't you hold it — okay. So it looks like at the head of every parking space there's-- And what kind of trees are they?

Mr. Peltier: I don't know. Whatever the code provides.

Mr. Beougher: Code trees. It specifies evergreen. All right. It looks like between the spaces where you've got some landscaping, it looks like a larger tree with some shrubs along the curb. Okay. Yeah. Can you just show us _____?

Mr. Comeaux: Will you be able to maintain 28 spaces or will you—

Mr. Peltier: No. We're going to cut it down to 25 now. Well, actually, I think _____.

(Several speaking off mic)

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Baker would like to ask a question, I believe.

Mr. Baker: Yeah. Does this trigger the need for any more handicap spaces or they already have more than enough?

Mr. Peltier: Yeah. Correct.

Mr. Beougher: And I think new building area would be the trigger, not new parking spaces. Is that correct?

Mr. Peltier: I think it goes by the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Baker: Increments of 50 or so, something like that?

Mr. Peltier: I'm not sure off the top of my head.

Mr. Baker: I think it is.

Mr. Beougher: How much traffic uses that drive back to the main complex?

Mr. Peltier: That is the main entrance to the complex. I'm not sure what the average daily traffic is though.

Mr. Beougher: And do you or the owner have any concern over cars backing out as cars are entering or egressing the site?

Mr. Peltier: No, because it's traveled pretty slowly through there. It's a retirement community.

Mr. Baker: There's not a lot of space between those first few spots and that entrance.

Mr. Peltier: Right. I did take one away, put the tree there and just making sure I was far enough back from the parking setback as well.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Any other questions?

Mr. Baker: Any discussion on the sidewalk that connects over to the existing--

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. Let's talk about the sidewalk. Mr. Robbins, can you kind of walk us through that again?

Mr. Robbins: What I originally spoke to the applicant about is there's a sidewalk on this existing curved area and their original idea was to bring it down and basically to this point here and provide a crosswalk there. The applicant has mentioned that most of the activity is occurring in this area of the premises and that he had proposed to put the crosswalk in this area coming across, because they figure most of the people would get out of their car and they would walk down and then cross at this point here.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Any response, any action on the owner's part to do that or is that their intent?

Mr. Peltier: Yeah. That's how we have done construction documents right now.

Mr. Baker: Is that all grass then to the front side of those parking spaces?

Mr. Peltier: At the south there? That was recently just there on construction staging. They've built a new addition so right now it's dirt but, yeah, it will be grass.

Mr. Baker: I'm trying to envision somebody getting out of their car the furthest spot from the building and either they're going to walk on the road, or they're going to walk in grass, or a foot of snow, so just debating where that crosswalk would go.

Mr. Beougher: You'll have to walk through trees now, code trees.

Mr. Baker: Well, that's true.

Mr. Peltier: Well, I look at it just as a normal parking lot. You have to walk next to your cars to get to the grocery store or something like that.

Mr. Baker: Yeah. Right at the entrance of a curved entrance. It's an interesting first few parking spaces there which is why it seems like it would be a nice spot to put a crosswalk.

Mr. Peltier: I mean, I don't think there would be an issue to put one there either. Like Justin mentioned, just the one _____ pedestrians the area.

Mr. Robbins: Is this proposed mostly as overflow parking? I mean, they see a need for this at this point where the capacity is just not there and then for Christmas parties they would fill it up or is this something that—

Mr. Peltier: I believe it's that and staff parking.

Ms. Kathy Miller: Can I approach – I didn't sign anything. I didn't know what my role would be in this.

Mr. Beougher: Please. Why don't you go ahead and go to the lectern and sign in after you testify.

Ms. Miller: I'm Kathy Miller. I'm actually the Executive Director at Wesley Ridge. So, just to explain. Listening to the sidewalk, the majority of the first building is sidewalk all the way down, so it wouldn't be that much of a problem to do an extension at that end. The majority of this parking is intended to be either employee parking or overflow. The majority that – the reason we needed this is we're sponsoring a lot of community events on our campus and those parking was overflow and so we were having problems on the campus and we were forcing employees to park off campus. So with the construction being completed, this opened an area for us to add additional parking.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Baker: I've parked in the gravel lot before for Halloween, I believe.

Ms. Miller: Yes. And to answer the earlier question that mounds are gone, it's been graded, seed was to be either placed today or tomorrow.

Mr. Beougher: And just so you understand my concern about cars parking head-in on the main path to and from your main parking area. Do you have any concerns with, you know, if you say it's staff parking or overflow parking, then I don't have as much a concern with the demographic of the visitors to your residence backing in and out in traffic. I mean, that's my concern.

Ms. Miller: And the traffic flow back in this area is strictly, for the most part, our residents or visitors, so it's very minimal. When we looked at putting the speed limit in there at 10 mph. We monitored traffic and, for the most part, we only had 16 cars coming and going on the average day.

Mr. Beougher: Per day?

Ms. Miller: And that was coming from the back up through the campus. The majority of our residents, the larger buildings are independent and don't often go out. Now the days we have an event, of course, those are higher traffic days.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Thank you. That helps. Any other questions? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Baker: Well, so are we saying no crosswalk is really necessary near the overflow because it's going to be employee overflow parking? Will there still be a discussion for the crosswalk then on the north side? That's the only thing I'm unclear on at this point in time.

Mr. Beougher: It'd be the west, not the east.

Mr. Baker: You're right, the west.

Mr. Beougher: I think, if I'm not mistaken, they have agreed to the crosswalk on the west end of the parking lot.

Mr. Baker: If that's the case, I would—

Mr. Beougher: And before you make a motion, I would just ask you to include the condition of the trees, code trees, shrubbery and other landscaping per code.

Mr. Baker: All right. We'll give it a whirl. You can correct me when I'm done.

Mr. Beougher: And a crosswalk.

Mr. Baker: I will make a motion to approve the revised site plan which is presented in front of us tonight with 25 parking spaces, the screening as required per the code and the crosswalk on the west side of the property. Anything else?

Mr. Robbins: Plus we added extension of the sidewalk as well to meet that crosswalk. Was that something we discussed?

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Baker: Yes. To extend the sidewalk to meet the proposed crosswalk on the west side.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Baker, for the eloquently stated motion.

Mr. Baker: My best one yet.

Mr. Beougher: Is there a second to Mr. Baker's eloquently stated motion?

Mr. Spalding: I'll second.

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

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Beougher voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Spalding voted "yes.")

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. You're approved.

Mr. Peltier: Thanks.

Mr. Beougher: And just a question before we adjourn.

Mr. Robbins: Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: Wendy's was on the BZBA agenda?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: What was the result?

Mr. Robbins: They were approved with several conditions. The variance was approved without condition.

Mr. Beougher: So 31 feet from the building?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. They're building it to 30 though. That's better.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, code-wise by a foot.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, every little bit. The major site plan was approved with conditions. Those conditions were to provide screening to the rear of the property around the cul-de-sac area. They submitted a plan to me today that shows the existing asphalt area and that part basically being removed and then replaced with trees that have pedestrian access between the cul-de-sac and the parking lot.

Mr. Beougher: More code trees.

Mr. Robbins: More code trees. Furthermore, the drawing was updated to reflect how the parking actually is in front of the barber shop or beauty salon, I believe. The site plan that was submitted showed several parking spaces basically inside their existing parking lot for the beauty shop. Now that is technically Wendy's property, so they had every right to do it, but I think they were being very reasonable with keeping the parking the way it was and continuing to let them use that portion of the property. In addition, they're required to put trees buffering on the east side of the property against the, I believe, there's a drive-thru there and then some more trees basically to the front of the drive-thru and then more code trees in between the parking lot and the existing beauty salon, but while retaining pedestrian access to and from that area.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you for the update and, again, before we adjourn I just want to make an observation and this is just a drive-by. Several months ago we approved the stair on the building at the southeast corner of Graham and Main and it's over the air handling units or over some mechanical condenser units. It appears that that stair empties into an area that is surrounding by landscaping and there's no way to get out of there once you're--

Mr. Robbins: This is the Pies?

Mr. Beougher: Pies, yeah

Mr. Baker: Too many code trees.

Mr. Beougher: It just seems odd to me that they have an egress there and no egress once you get down to the ground level. That may be a code enforcement or building code issue and I just wanted to raise that as just a concern. As I drive by, I get puzzled every time I drive by it.

Mr. Baker: I haven't noticed. Well, I'll have to look.

Mr. Beougher: And it's not just because I voted against it but I just – anyway, I'm bewildered. All right. Thank you very much everyone.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Beougher: We stand adjourned at 8:09 o'clock p.m.

Lane Beougher, Chair

Justin Robbins, Planning Administrator

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