

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MAY 1, 2014
6:30 P.M.

A. ROLL CALL

1. Members Present: Mr. Nathan Burd
Mr. James Comeaux
Mr. Richard Hudson
Mr. Pat Zollars

Members Absent: Mr. Lane Beougher

Others Present: Mr. Justin Robbins

2. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 3, 2014 MINUTES

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Are there any comments, corrections, adjustments to those from the members who did have a chance to look at them already? (No response.) Hearing none, they'll be approved as distributed. I took a look at mine and I see no problems.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Now is the opportunity for public comment. If you're here in this space today to talk about an item that's not on our agenda, this is your chance. (No response.)

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Acting Chairman Comeaux: The rest of you who are here to talk about those things and who are going to speak in front of us, if you would just raise your right arm, please, and swear or affirm that the testimony you give is truthful to the best of your knowledge. Fantastic. Thank you.

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. 6492 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; APPLICANT: BRENT FRALEY/FRALEY & FRALEY, LLC/FOR RENT-2-OWN. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS. (#164092)

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Please come and state your name for the record. Did you get a chance to sign in? Okay, great. State your name for the

record and then Mr. Robbins will give a brief summary of it and then we'll have a little back-and-forth and give you a chance to respond to any concerns.

Mr. Dennis Beatty: Dennis Beatty, architect. I was the architect for the project.

Mr. Robbins: So, again, this is Application #164092 for 6492 E. Main. I think at the last meeting we gave a pretty decent introduction on it, so we'll just talk over what some of the recommendations from the Board were, what the applicant has resubmitted and then maybe discuss some further concerns by staff.

At the last Board meeting the Board had recommended that the application be tabled due to a couple factors: first of all, the presence of EFIS on the front façade, the size of the sign that was proposed, the number of signs that were proposed, and give the applicant another opportunity to kind of address some of those concerns by the Board and I think, by and large, they did. A couple things that I just want to discuss real quick and possibly ask the applicant about was first I'm going to talk about the materials, the parapet and then I'm going to talk about the signage. So those are the three things that I want to cover very, very quickly and just kind of get your opinion on them.

It's kind of our assumption that when the parapet was discussed, when the parapet was proposed, I assume, for the building was to basically accommodate a larger sign. Since the sign area has been reduced and it seems like it could actually fit on the existing façade, is the need for a parapet still there? When I say "parapet" I mean the gabled parapet in the front. This guy right here.

Mr. Beatty: We have sort of established a look for all of his buildings and that kind of gives that look as the rest of the buildings, like a McDonald's looks like a McDonald's. So that's kind of why that parapet was built like that.

Mr. Robbins: Okay, so it's part of the branding.

Mr. Beatty: It's part of the branding, correct. We've done about 7-8 of these now.

Mr. Robbins: Okay, so that's the first one. And I did see that you reduced the size of the sign. I think the sign looks very nice and will fit very nice on there. While this is up on the front façade, I also wanted to ask about the red banding on the bottom. Now on the existing image there seems to be about a 12", like a rim board along the base of this, right underneath Carpet One. The red banding that you're proposing, is that basically going to take the place of that bottom rim board, or is that something additional that's going to be added to the bottom of that siding area? Let me pop this back up for you.

Mr. Beatty: I believe that's an additional.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. Now the addition of that would make it hang over the windows. Is that correct?

Mr. Beatty: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: Okay, so that's the intent?

Mr. Beatty: It does hang down a little bit.

Mr. Robbins: I guess the other question I have is does that red banding continue – I know on one of the facades to the west – the façade to the west it continues on about half way down the building. On the east façade does it do the same or does it just stop at the corner?

Mr. Beatty: I don't remember, I'm sorry. I've got about 40 projects going right now.

Mr. Robbins: That would be one of my suggestions, I think, would be if that's the case-- So we have the front façade right here and then you're proposing the red rim board to the bottom. Then if it were to swing around and continue down the east façade, I think that would be a better move than just kind of deadending it there, It would be a little bit of an awkward transition between the two if it didn't carry on.

Mr. Beatty: Okay, so you just want it to turn on the right side for a portion, not all the way though?

Mr. Robbins: I think it really matters on how visible this thing is from the road and then how far, as well, you're going to carry the new façade material on the east side. Obviously I think the red board should match the extents of the new siding or the new material extent.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Now my recollection is that there's a private road along the western edge of that building, correct?

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

Acting chairman Comeaux: So it'll be more visible as you're traveling down Main from the west to the east. You'll see that return, if you will, down the building side. The other side, I can't remember what there is on the other side.

Mr. Robbins: If we look at the façade, it does continue on basically until about halfway down the façade which, I mean, I think it makes a fair amount of sense, because that's where the block stops. This is an image from Google

Maps and you can see, as the façade comes around it is visible from the road, but it is blocked by trees. I think if you are planning on replacing this amount of the façade, the red board should match.

Mr. Beatty: Okay, and about the same distance?

Mr. Robbins: I think so. The third thing I wanted to mention would be the materials. The Wear Code is written for the overlay. It says a certain percentage of traditional, natural materials, I believe it's 40%, and those materials are defined as brick, stone and then the very last of the approved materials is says wood or cement board siding. And I did notice that you had changed a note on the drawing to say, "Proposed painted concrete fiberboard." The material, I think, it matches what the code says. What I'm asking about is that the existing building is a siding and I'm curious to see your take on that if it were replaced with something Hardy Plank siding that were a little more keeping with the existing. Is that something that you'd be amenable to?

Mr. Beatty: Didn't our note say concrete siding?

Mr. Robbins: It did and we were given a page that shows like a panel system.

Mr. Beatty: Oh, you want more of a lap siding?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, something that doesn't necessarily have to match the existing, but I think it could complement it a lot better than possibly a panelized system. So that would be my only suggestion. I'll leave the rest of the discussion up to the Board. I just wanted to get that on record as saying and you guys can get some feedback from the applicant.

Mr. _____: I work in a lot of different municipalities and a lot of them accept EFIS. What is your take on not accepting EFIS?

Mr. Robbins: The way the code is written, it does require 40% traditional, natural material.

Mr. _____: Hardy plank's not a natural material.

Mr. Robbins: It counts cement board siding as one of those things. I think the reasoning is that it looks and it feels so much like a natural material that—

Mr. _____: More like wood siding.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, exactly.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Are you in the process of getting your permit?

Mr. Beatty: No, I think we're waiting on zoning to make sure everything's okay. We can't finalize our drawings because we don't know what's acceptable.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: With respect to this, and I'm terrible with the terms, this new thing that you're putting on the front roof-- What's it called? Parapet? Can you give me a sense of what the profile would look like? If I were looking at that from like the corner out, is it just going to be a straight up and down thing? What's it going to be supported by?

Mr. Beatty: Did he send you one of the side?

Acting Chairman Comeaux: I don't see it. The question basically is if you were looking at from that side there and I was just looking and saw it—

Mr. Beatty: It's kind of like that.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Okay, but what is going to be supporting it so that it doesn't just fall back on the building?

Mr. Beatty: Oh, studs. Then they're tied back to the roof.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Is that consistent with what we're looking for in parapet roofs?

Mr. Robbins: There's a portion of the code that addresses that.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: So that was my one question. Then the other, do you think there'll be a problem returning that red band along the eastern side at all?

Mr. Beatty: No.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: At this point the only signage you have is the Rent-2-Own thing here, right?

Mr. Beatty: I think we had some other signage, but we were only allowed this and make it smaller.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Yeah, but no directional signage or anything? Right, okay. That's the extent of my questions. The materials you talked about, not the EFIS but the concrete panels, you're comfortable with those in terms of—

Mr. Beatty: Uh-huh, yeah, we've used them before. It does kind of go back to that EFIS look where you put the scores in it. It kind of looks – it does look like wood siding.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Does it maintain pretty easily?

Mr. Beatty: Yeah.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Are there any other questions from Board members? (No response.)

Mr. Robbins: Section 1195.07(h) of our overlay code addresses parapets. I'm just going to read it off verbatim and let you folks discuss what it says. "Gables shall have a minimum depth of 8', parapet walls that abut a corner extend around to the side of the building to a minimum depth of 12'." I think we came across this with Key Bank that did some redevelopment years ago. We asked them to bring that parapet back a little bit. I guess that's a question for the applicant: If that parapet were to return to the roof, basically a parapet that is a façade and then it's a straight return back, so from any angle it doesn't look like a wild west storefront façade that's kind of one-dimensional, would that be something acceptable?

Mr. Beatty: Not really, cause that's not our brand look. That's what all of them look like right there. We're not close to the corner, and what you were reading said "if it's at a corner and turns." We're not at a corner. We're inside.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: What's the depth of it?

Mr. Beatty: It's like 2'. And then we have a – because the roof's coming down, we have a saddle behind it for the water. A saddle just saddles the water out. If you have something standing like this, you can't have a roof going like that, so you build a saddle right here, like behind a fireplace, so the water sheds away. Otherwise your water would stand right there and cause a leak. But the saddle's not really that visible.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: So would the studs be visible?

Mr. Beatty: No, no. They're covered with the siding. You don't see studs.

Mr. _____: I've got a question. Is that 40% natural product there, whatever term we're using, is that the entire surface space or could it be 40% of the front for instance, 40% of the two sides; where's that 40%?

Mr. Robbins: Okay. I'll go ahead and read those portions of the code off. As for the definition of it, it says, "Traditional natural materials consist of clay

brick, full or thinset; if thinset, corners must have full brick appearance, stone; cultured stone, samples must be provided; wood or fiber cementboard siding.” So that’s our definition of traditional natural materials within the overlay. As far as the 40%, it says, “Any new building or redevelopment of a building façade shall include, at a minimum, 40% traditional or natural materials.” And that is Section 1195.07(j).

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Are there any other questions or concerns or comments we want to raise with the applicant? (No response.) Is there somebody that would like to make a motion? Just to recap, the only item we’re really kind of deviated from in any way from the diagrams, I think, was that the red banding would return along the eastern side to approximately the distance that it is along the western side.

Mr. Burd: I make a motion that we grant the Certificate of Appropriateness with the addition that the red banding length on the east side match the west side, and we’ll just say that any other potential tweaks to this be handled through staff.

Mr. Zollars: I’ll second that.

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Zollars voted “yes.” Mr. Burd voted “yes.” Mr. Comeaux voted “yes.” Mr. Hudson voted “yes.”)

Mr. Robbins: A couple things I just want to go over real quick. Every sign that’s erected in the city has to have a sign permit and that’s different from the Certificate of Appropriateness. In addition, since it is a change to a commercial property, it does involve electric work and mounting hardware, it does require stamped engineering drawings and a building permit that are approved through the Building Department. So two extra steps with just the signage. In addition, if you have not done so already, any new business within the city has to have a zoning certificate to basically verify compliance with our code, both for the use and coming through the Design Review Board. Off the top of my head, I’m not aware if one has been submitted or not, so it could be that that’s already been done. I also want to make you aware that the Building Department does require a building permit for any new businesses coming in as well, just to verify the layout of the space and all safety equipment and all regulations through Ohio Building Code have been met.

Mr. Beatty: Yeah, we have the drawings ready to submit.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. I just have to say that for the record.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. 6144 E. MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: MICHAEL COX/DANITE SIGN/FOR DOMINO'S PIZZA. SIGNAGE. (#164441)

Acting Chairman Comeaux: If you could state your name for the record, please?

Mr. Michael Cox: Yes, Michael Cox, Danite Sign Company.

Mr. Robbins: Again, this is Application #164441, Certificate of Appropriateness at 6144 E. Main Street, Domino's Pizza. The property's located on the north side of East Main Street west of Brice Road. The property is zoned CS, Community Services, and it is within our CC overlay district. Applicant is requesting Design Board approval for a new wall sign and one new projecting pickup window sign. The current use is vacant. For the Board members who aren't aware, this is the old Dunkin' Donuts. The new wall sign is to measure approximately 10.5' by 2-1/2'. The new projecting window pickup sign measures 2' in diameter and is circular and it's held off the building a little bit.

Some existing site and context: Again, the property is zoned CC. The properties to the north are zoned AR-1, Multi-family residential; properties to the east are zoned CS, Community Services; the property to the west is City of Columbus, so don't know the zoning for that one.

Two variances were granted to the property: one in March 2008, a variance from Section 1181.03 to allow a wall sign on a wall not facing a primary street and, in June 2012, a variance from section 1127.06(a) to allow the creation of a lot that does not abut a dedicated street. That one basically was the property behind if the Board recalls. It was a housing development that never occurred, so not necessarily mattering at this point.

As for the signage, the proposed wall sign measures, again, about 21.84 square feet and will be comprised of individual internally illuminated blue and white channel letters and a raceway painted to match the existing building. The sign includes a logo that is proposed to be the color blue, red and white placed to the left of the company name. It will be placed on the south side of the building. Table 1181 of the code states that the area requirements of the wall sign are – this is a Type B sign, meaning it's over 80' away from the right-of-way, basically 2 square feet per one of linear foot of length of the wall. So the linear length of the wall is 20 and the allowable sign area is 40' and they are proposing 21.84', so they're well within those measurements. Directional signage for the menu.

There's a couple things going on here that I want to mention as well. We have refacings for some directional signage. These are not necessarily covered by Design Review. This is something that can be approved by staff. They are proposing to reface an existing menu board. The code isn't necessarily clear on that. I feel that we should make an allowance for them to do that and there's the

wall sign. When I say wall sign, I mean the projecting wall sign. It's a small little circle that says "Pickup" on the side. The only issue with that is that our code does state that those projecting signs cannot be internally illuminated. Our recommendation is that it be granted, but with the stipulation that you remove the internal illumination on that.

Following determination by the Board, it is the recommendation of staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted with the condition that the proposed projected pickup sign be externally illuminated and not internally illuminated to conform with section 1181.02(c)(2) which states that internal illumination in projected signs is not permitted.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: I'm not sure if you just got that thrown on you at the end, but, I guess, how do you feel about the projected sign? One of the things we constrained by certain things. If it says in the code we can't do it, we can't approve it.

Mr. Cox: The code is for projecting signs?

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Yes, so signs coming off perpendicular to the building.

Mr. Cox: Does it allow external illumination then?

Mr. Robbins: Yes.

Mr. Cox: So we'll put the sign up and then some type of flood lighting on it.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah.

Mr. Cox: I guess that's code, but it seems kind of counterintuitive. You can add it, so you can add two lighting fixtures instead of one.

Mr. Robbins: I'm going to go ahead and read verbatim just so we're all clear on what the code actually says. "Section 1181.02(d)(2) Projected Sign. A projecting sign, including its mounting structure, shall be mounted upon and perpendicular to the wall of a building and shall not extend beyond any other dimension of the wall. It shall not project more than 4' from the wall and shall not use a guy wire or angle iron support structure unless within the pane of the sign. Internal illumination is not permitted." I'll stop there because that's what matters.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: But the rest of the guidelines of that section are satisfied by that sign?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. I think the sign looks nice.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: I personally might prefer an internally illuminated sign, but—

Mr. Cox: Yeah, well, signs are meant to be seen. So that's part of the purpose of it is to have it back there so it does draw attention to it.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: So you guys are going to have a menu board?

Mr. Cox: It's an existing menu sign, yes. It's a little bit different for Domino's and it's really for this franchise it's the first time he's done this, but he thought since it's there, he's going to have it. It's really not – it really is a pick-up window, it's not so much as a drive-thru. You're not going to really go and place your order, though they are going to use the menu and they do have half a dozen quick order items like wings; or some of their competitors have already made pizza, it's this size and this kind and you can pick it up and go. So they have pick-up items like that that they're going to sell, or you order ahead of time and drive through and pick it up. They're going to try it and see what happens with it. The window's existing, so they're going to use it. It was there with Dunkin' Donuts and the menu was there with Dunkin' Donuts.

Mr. Hudson: Is this replacing the Domino's down the street in the strip mall on Main Street?

Mr. Cox: You know, I'm not sure. I don't know. I haven't been told that they were going to close that one and I have not – I don't know if they're the same franchisees. Every time I turn around there's an other franchisee in the Columbus area. So I haven't been told that that's this fellow's store.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Do they have delivery still?

Mr. Cox: Yes.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: So taking a left from there onto Main is going to be a bear, but that's a problem for Mr. Burd, I suppose.

Mr. Cox: Well, yeah, a majority of their business, because they do not have seating inside. If they do, it's a couple small little tables. It's not a dine in. It's more of a pick up and go or delivery type of business.

Mr._____: This is for Nathan. Nathan, isn't there possibly going to be a traffic light at Harbor Freight?

Mr. Burd: It's being discussed and studied, so that could be a solution. It's not going to be immediate. There's a chance that that issue gets resolved soon, but no promises yet. We're working on it.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Are there any other comments or questions or concerns by members of the Board?

Mr. _____: If you have a comment, I think it would be appropriate for you to ask, but I think that indication was it's not really part of what we approved as a package, correct?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct. I mean you can ask the applicant if there's any concerns or suggestions.

Mr. _____: No, I'm fine.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: Any other questions or concerns for the applicant?

Mr. Cox: Is there a process – I suppose because it's part of the code, it would have to – if the franchisee would want that to be internally illuminated, is there a process to ask for that through-- I assume it's probably a long, drawn out process.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, it wouldn't be the most pleasant of things to get an internally illuminated sign.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: That would be BZBA, right? It's kind of like killing an ant with a sledgehammer, but if that's what they want to do, that's the process.

Mr. Cox: I just wanted to ask the question for him.

Mr. Robbins: Just a brief overview, it's called a variance. We're basically changing the code on that particular property because of some sort of hardship that's being placed on the applicant by a full administration of the zoning code. The fee for that is \$450. You'd have to come through Design Review again because the sign would be changing. So it would be a little more of a process than-- My guess is they might like to and I think externally illuminated it's still going to be visible.

Mr. Cox: Yeah, but the point is you'd have to show the hardship and what that would prove.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, and even then it's questionable. It would be up to the Board to make that determination.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: So for instance, on this building, if you go back or forward, there are two variances that we already talked about, right? So one part of the code says if you have one of the sides of your building that doesn't face a public road, you can't have a sign advertising your business along that side. So whoever applied before, went through the variance process for that because they said, "Hey, \$450." I think they probably determined, given the specifics of it, so, anyway. But that is the process.

Mr. Robbins: If you or your client have further questions, you can definitely call us and we can speak with them about it.

Acting Chairman Comeaux: So does anyone want to make a motion on this item? As it was presented it was consistent with all the diagrams. The only change was to the internal illumination of the projecting sign.

Mr. Zollars: I'll make that motion with the exception of the illuminated sign.

Mr. Hudson: I'll second

(Mr. Robbins called the roll. Mr. Zollars voted "yes." Mr. Burd voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes.")

Mr. Robbins: Every sign that goes up in the city has to get a sign permit, so those are basically saying that the signs that you're submitting have been approved through the Zoning Department. They also require, for the new projecting sign and for the new wall sign, a building permit, because they do deal with mounting and electric work. So those are issued through the Building Department and I can tell you they do require stamped engineering drawings for those. So just so you're aware.

D. OTHER BUSINESS – None

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

James Comeaux, Acting Chair

Justin Robbins

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

