

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
APRIL 4, 2013
7:00 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

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

Chairman Beougher: Thank you. And with four members out of six, we have a quorum?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 2013 MEETING

Mr. Beougher: Are there any corrections, blanks to fill in on the minutes?

Mr. Robbins: There are none from Staff.

Mr. Beougher: I went through them and I did find a couple places on Page 3 and 4 where I think Mr. Spalding was speaking and we didn't have a name there, starting with "Yes, I have a question.." the third line from the bottom of Page 3; and I think it continues on the next page. I think that's the same speaker. There were some other gaps which I could not recall, so those are the only amendments I have.

Mr. Burd: I have one, page 14 at the bottom, the blank was me. I was asking if the Plaza Center sign was navy blue at the top. It was not, but I asked that question, so page 14 at the bottom can be attributed to me.

Mr. Comeaux: Any other amendments to the minutes? (No response.)
Hearing none, the minutes will be approved as amended.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Beougher: Any additions to this evening's agenda?

Mr. Robbins: None from Staff.

Mr. Comeaux: Anything from the members? (No response.) Seeing none, they will stand as distributed.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Comeaux: If you're here to make comments to the Design Review Board on any item that is not – or on any topic that is not on this evening's agenda, you may please approach the lecturn. Seeing no one rushing toward the microphone, I will assume there are no public comments.

5. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Mr. Comeaux: If you are here to testify this evening on an item that is on the agenda, please stand and raise your right hand. (Mr. Comeaux administers oath.) As a reminder, if you haven't signed in, please do so after you testify.

B. NEW BUSINESS

1, **2835 TAYLOR ROAD SW, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: BRI BAILEY, SIGN VISION, HALLMARK (#158955). NEW WALL SIGN.

Ms. Ashley Queen: I'm Ashley Queen, representing Sign Vision.

Mr. Robbins: And just as reminder for the Board members, make sure that you hear the sound coming over the speakers. I think we've had some trouble technically speaking over the past few meetings.

Application #158955 is for 2835 Taylor Road, which is a Hallmark existing. They're applying for a new internally illuminated channel letter wall sign measuring 14'11" x 4'. The proposed business is within the Community Services District and the adjacent businesses include a Great Clips barbershop and a Payless shoe store. You can see it's in the Walmart strip shopping center right there at the end. So they have an existing sign, it's a yellow-goldish sign logo and then they have the red banners at each end of it and this is the sign that they're proposing to replace it with. The proposed sign is internally illuminated with about 59 square feet of area. The storefront measures 40' and the sign is Type B and the allowable area would be 80 square feet. The lettering for the sign is black vinyl during the day and I believe it is rear illuminated at night, is that correct?

Ms. Queen: It shows white illumination at night.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. It's 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 of the area. Here's a rendering of it on the storefront. There are store decals that go along with their signage application, but those are allowable under Code without sign permits, so we're not covering that in this meeting.

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

Ms. Queen: He covered it all. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer those for you.

Mr. Beougher: I do have a question. It looks like the shape of the sign is the same as what is there now, but you're adding "Gold Crown" and then taking off the ribbons to the sides. Is that the same—

Ms. Queen: They are the same size as what's currently out there.

Mr. Beougher: It's the same size, but it's a new fixture.

Ms. Queen: A whole new set.

Mr. Beougher: And is the size of the fixture that says, "Hallmark" the same size? Is it larger or smaller?

Ms. Queen: It's the same exact sign as what is currently out there.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, thank you. And how do you turn black to white?

Ms. Queen: We call it day-night.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Any questions from the members?

Mr. Comeaux: So with the ribbons that are coming off, do you know what's securing them now and do you have plans to fix whatever the façade's called – what's the façade called?

Mr. Beougher: Fascia, EFIS.

Mr. Comeaux: EFIS, fascia, what have you, but, regardless—

Ms. Queen: Our scope of work, we will pull those off and patch the holes and we paint the façade to match what's currently out there.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions? (No response.) Would anyone like to offer a motion?

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

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

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

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

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Robbins, do you have anything else?

Mr. Robbins: I do. As I tell all applicants, a sign permit is still required and a building permit is required as well, so I would make sure to double check with the Building Department to make sure all their requirements are met.

2. **6781 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: DON LAYMAN, INTERSTATE CONSTRUCTION, INC. WENDY'S (#158981). DEMOLITION AND REBUILD OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL STRUCTURE.

Mr. Doug Kincaid: I'm Doug Kincaid with Interstate Construction.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, sir. Mr. Robbins?

Mr. Robbins: As stated, this is application #158981, for the property at 6781 East Main Street, which is currently a Wendy's restaurant. The request is for Design Review Board approval for the demolition of the existing commercial structure and the construction of the new commercial structure. The proposed business is within the Community Commercial Overlay District and neighboring properties include a residential neighborhood to the south and west, a car wash to the east and a gas station and restaurant to the north. You can see it here. These properties are a little interesting, because these are actually not zoned residential, so it's still a commercial area, that little loop of residential that touches Main Street.

Mr. Beougher: And that's where the brick wall is that screens those residences from the streetscape?

Mr. Robbins: Yes. I'm going to throw up the Staff Report for a minute or two. I think there's some language that I want to make sure gets said. Okay. The Wendy's restaurants are in the process of remodeling/updating several of their stores and the existing building in Reynoldsburg has been proposed to be updated with their newest building model, to the best of my knowledge, something they call the “Ultramodern.” It incorporates large storefront windows, I would say quality materials and a modern appearance, the flat roof. The

applicant has applied for a variance to allow the building to be built a little more than 30' behind the right-of-way. We do have a portion in the Code that has a build-to line at 20' within the Community Commercial Overlay District. The difference with this site is that they have an existing brick sign in the front that would not allow them to build it to that build-to line. So the BZBA will be hearing the variance request at the next meeting along with the major site plan. The height of the proposed building is 17'6". The overlay does stipulate a minimum of 18'0" height, but Staff does believe that the design satisfies the intent of the Code. The signage bar on the side of the building is well above the 18' mark. I believe it's at 24, which, I think, would qualify the building as meeting that minimum height. One of the things I'd like to point out as well is the fact that the building – the parapet walls are virtually nonexistent. I mean it's 360 architecture all the way around, so you don't have a fixed storefront in the front. It's 17'6" minimum all the way around the building. The façade does incorporate a roof overhang and several materials that add to the visual interest to pedestrians; large storefront windows so you can see directly into the building as people dine. The materials and the treatment, as I mentioned, are carried out throughout all sides of the building.

Staff does have concerns regarding the side signage, as Code states that wall signage is only allowable on building frontages that face a primary street. My recommendation to the Board is that the commercial building be approved with the exception of the signage on the sides. Let me give you a better idea of what those area. You can see the side elevations there. The two that are outlined in red would not be allowable under current code. If they did allow – or if they did want to put that up, that would be something that would have to be considered by the BZBA for a variance. However, the signage on the front, we have the large red kind of column that says Wendy's on the front and that is something that's allowable, along with the existing monument sign. Then they've provided us with a rendering of materials that they're proposing to use and another side view from the side. You can see the signage that we would like them to either go through a variance or remove from the application.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so let me ask a question before I give you an opportunity to speak. The side signage would require a variance by the BZBA?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct. It only allows wall signage that's facing a primary street. There's a different condition for corners – corner streets, but this property wouldn't satisfy that requirement, so we don't want to get in a situation where Design Review approves signage that is not allowable under code. And, if the Applicant would like, oftentimes when people go through for commercial signage, or, I'm sorry, commercial properties, they will leave signage off of the application and let that to the sign contractor at a future date and that's something they could tangle with, depends on how you want to do that.

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

Mr. Hudson: One question I might ask about the side signage is if they Wendy's itself is removed, they do have the cameo. Is the cameo considered signage or would that be allowed on the sides?

Mr. Robbins: This is something I think we've struggled with in the past for the Design Review Board. I would say—

Mr. Beougher: We have an opportunity coming up to struggle with it I think we haven't done that yet on Charley's on the corner.

Mr. Robbins: You guys could be the precedent.

Mr. Beougher: And there it was painted onto the wall rather than a sign box, which speaks more to a sign.

Mr. Baker: I would agree with the Chairman that once it kind of takes the form of a box, I would definitely count that as signage. If it's a graphic that's painted on, I think that's the portion that we have to discuss.

Mr. Beougher: And I think we do have the opportunity here, because it appears that we have a "quality service that doesn't cut corners", is "our recipe" painted onto the tile to the rear of the drive-thru window, is that correct? It would be in the bottom photograph.

Mr. Robbins: It is something that shows up in the renderings. I did check and that is not on the elevation of the building.

Mr. Beougher: Well, right there it is on the top.

Mr. Robbins: Oh, excuse me. I apologize. You're absolutely right.

Mr. Kincaid: Right. It would be over here at the entryway and that typically is just lettering, applied lettering. It is non-illuminated.

Mr. Beougher: And is it applied as paint or is it—

Mr. Kincaid: It is actually aluminum lettering. It's like a PVC lettering with an aluminum color paint so that it stands out from the bronze finish and it's professionally done by a sign company.

Mr. Beougher: Similar to a window applique, sort of. And on Charley's we – I mean the "USDA approved" is kind of a graphic and I had kind of come to the conclusion in my own mind that that was more of a graphic than a sign.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, I think, like I said, when it becomes a sign box, that's in the mind of Staff when it's – that's the line where it's definitely a sign. I think

what we're talking about now is if you have an applied PVC lettering, it's a little more difficult. I think it would be probably easier for the Board to decide if it were painted on of some type. I think we've seen them around. In Huntington Park they have images and whatnot that are painted onto the brick without the actual lettering being applied as a different material.

Mr. Beougher: So "Quality is our recipe" here over the entrance is part of the PVC letters that you're talking about.

Mr. Kincaid: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: What I see in the bottom picture to the south, I guess, of the drive-thru projection, is the quality service?

Mr. Kincaid: Yes, there's also PVC-type lettering to the side of the drive-thru that talks about "Quality is our recipe – quality service." There is lettering there also just on applied lettering.

Mr. Beougher: I think the intent with that is that it's not visible, necessarily, from the street. It's speaking to people in their cars as they drive up to get their quality hamburgers.

Mr. Kincaid: That is correct.

Mr. Robbins: And it does look like the residential that's behind that lettering would be almost completely covered up by the fence that you can see along the east side and dumpster enclosure as well.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah, and the sign that is there, the monument sign, is that one that has the brick base that we did during the streetscape?

Mr. Kincaid: Yes.

Mr. Robbins: It does have a brick base?

Mr. Kincaid: Yes, it has a brick base and it's my understanding it was done during the streetscape project.

Mr. Beougher: And that remains, or are you refacing that?

Mr. Kincaid: It might – it would get their new Wendy's logo, nothing would change size-wise or anything, but, yes, it would get their new logo.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Any questions from the members? Mr. Comeaux?

Mr. Comeaux: Can you put this picture up real quick? When you look at that picture, the “Wendy’s” would then be facing the road, right? Exactly that.

Mr. Kincaid: Right. This would be facing the road.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay, all right. I just wanted to make sure I was clear on that. Okay.

Mr. Beougher: I spent some time this afternoon driving around town looking at signs and some exceptions are out there, notably McDonald’s surprisingly doesn’t have a sign facing Brice Road, but it does facing the parking lot drive to K-Mart, which isn’t a commissioned street, but, yet, that’s where they attract a lot of traffic, I’m sure.

Mr. Kincaid: And it does have the M on the one side.

Mr. Beougher: It does. And Taco Bell has Taco Bell over the canopy and things like that. So I see other locations where they may have applied for a variance and received it and so forth. And it looking at the two schemes, the tower scheme had two signs on one side which I kind of objected to. This one has one on each side, so from my perspective, I don’t find it terribly problematic, but the fact is we can’t approve it because it does require a variance. But we can approve the design scheme and the forward facing sign.

Mr. Kincaid: We would be willing to proceed with that at this time and then we could always deal with the side signage through a zoning review.

Mr. Robbins: So would you be willing to amend the application to remove the side signage?

Mr. Baker: Yes, we would. Do you know when the BZBA meets? I mean can they amend their application to include this as part of their application for that process?

Mr. Robbins: That would be another variance and the variance has already gone out into the local newspaper so it’s too late to get onto the upcoming meeting.

Mr. Kincaid: Now as far as the cameo, if we were not doing say an illuminated cameo or something, is that something that can be worked out through a sign permit then, or by removing this even trying to do the cameo then would have to be done through variance?

Mr. Robbins: Not necessarily the cameo I would like to say – I don’t mean in terms of a sign box, but if it were a graphic that were applied to the wall, it’s my feeling that that’s the way the Board is leaning.

Mr. Kincaid: Okay, that would be acceptable at this time.

Mr. Beougher: What's the opinion of the other members? If it's not in an illuminated sign box, would a graphic similar to the lettering be amenable, be appropriate?

Mr. Burd: To me, it would, just my opinion.

Mr. Kincaid: So you'd say a graphic about the size of the current cameo, like demonstrated on that picture up there, you know, about that size but not in an illuminated box?

Mr. Beougher: And when we say graphic, we're speaking about basically applied to the building. Some of Wendy's paper products like the bags and coffee cups that they're using at the new stores have kind of a silhouetted redhead figure outlined. Obviously you couldn't do all the colors that are in the cameo currently, I don't think, on an applique, or would you?

Mr. Kincaid: I think we could. I think it could be professionally done.

Mr. Robbins: Is that roughly what we're talking about, just the upper cameo?

Mr. Beougher: Right. And how would that – so that would go on the drive-thru side. That surface is relatively flat. I think that's an aluminum metal finish.

Mr. Kincaid: Right. So that is already a flat finish and what we might have to do over here is create a flat finish within the corrugated finish for the applique.

Mr. Beougher: So have a flat spot over the corrugation, but it would not be an illuminated sign box.

Mr. Kincaid: Right. It would be a part of, really, that metal siding.

Mr. Beougher: And what that would do is allow you to go forward with the construction and the front signage which is certainly necessary to their business. BZBA would meet again in six weeks?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, it would be the third Thursday of May would be the next scheduled meeting that you could get on for a variance.

Mr. Beougher: And after that you would have to come back to us in June.

Mr. Robbins: That would be correct, for signage.

Mr. Beougher: What's your construction schedule? Does that conform to your construction schedule?

Mr. Kincaid: Yes. Yes. And what you're talking about is if we would pursue a further variance for that – I mean for the cameo or something?

Mr. Beougher: I'm saying if you would go for a full variance on the side signage. What the Certificate of Appropriateness and including the front sign would do is allow you to get your building permit, which is the first step in your process obviously, and then the signs could be added later.

Mr. Kincaid: That would be fine. We can then decide how we'd like to proceed.

Mr. Robbins: So you would come back through Design Review again if you get the variance for the side signage.

Mr. Beougher: And, if you did not, then the applique signage on the aluminum panels, we can include in a motion along with the graphics that are also appliques. Any further questions, comments, concerns, discussion? Anything you'd like to add?

Mr. Kincaid: Not at this time.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Anyone like to craft a motion around that? Oh, one more question. The top of the building around the top of the storefront glazing, is that the part that's 17'6"?

Mr. Kincaid: Right. The entire top of the building here is 17'6".

Mr. Beougher: Okay and then it looks like that fin, if you will, is 24' and then the projection over the drive-thru is 20', so it has some nice variation. Personally I like this design better than the tower design. I had lunch a couple weeks ago at the Broad Street location, which is similar but different, but very nice inside.

Mr. Kincaid: East Broad Street? That is slightly different. It's somewhat similar, but it was different with the red silo. This is the ultramodern design that has become their main design now moving forward.

Mr. Robbins: Is this the same model that's on Bethel Road?

Mr. Kincaid: Very similar. Bethel Road was a prototype, but essentially that was the first.

Mr. Baker: And it's a complete demolition?

Mr. Kincaid: Yes, this is a complete demolition. We're looking to move the building forward to get closer to complying with the build-to dimension and that type of thing and bringing the building forward to give more visibility in the storefront and, you know, we think it would be a great addition to the Main Street.

Mr. Beougher: If the BZBA would deny your application for the variance of the build-to requirement, would you build it at 20' behind the right-of-way?

Mr. Kincaid: That is a good question. We really – the owner of this franchise is really having to put a lot of money into this new building and with the design this is a more expensive design naturally than like the tower. He had already put a good deal of money into that monument sign, so—

Mr. Beougher: So it would actually impede into the monument sign?

Mr. Kincaid: We would actually have to take that monument sign down and relocate it elsewhere on the site, one side or the other, so it would be a very good big cost for the owner for something that really he has not had there that long.

Mr. Beougher: All right.

Mr. Comeaux: I move that we approve the demolition and reconstruction of this new commercial structure, obviously pending BZBA approval of the location of the structure, as presented. The only caveat being that the signs that do not face the road will not be included in this. The applicant may include an applique of the cameo that should be affixed without being a sign box onto the sides; and if they wish to have that signage on the sides, they'll need to go through the BZBA approval and come back to us with that.

Mr. Burd: Second.

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

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

3. **2010 OFFICE VIEW PLACE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: JAY JOHNSON, JOHNSON SIGN CO., INC., RAINBOW CHILD CARE CENTER (#158990). NEW WALL SIGN.

Mr. Robbins: We had spoke with Mr. Johnson today. They are out of Michigan and he could not make the meeting. He spoke directly with Aaron who

said that it was unlikely that his presence would be significantly required at this meeting. Having said that, they don't have a representative here tonight. So, if I may, I can introduce the item. They actually have two signage packages going through, two daycares, and both the signs are very similar.

Again, this is Application #158990 and it's for 2010 Office View Place for Rainbow Child Care. The property is located a quarter mile north of the Home Depot Center at the corner of I-70 and Brice Road. The building sits behind the first row of properties fronting Brice. They're requesting Design Board approval for the construction of new exterior wall signage. This is the image where the facility actually sits and it's behind several office buildings along Brice.

The Design Board approval is for the following signage: A new non-illuminated wall sign measuring 28'10" by 1'5"; new non-illuminated logo measuring 6'10" by 5'2" and address sign 3'2" x 1'. The proposed business is within the Community Commercial Overlay District and neighboring properties include a dance studio to the north, office buildings to the south and west, and residential to the east. You can see here an image of the building as it exists and they've done a quick rendering of the proposed signage that they have along the front of the building and the logo. As proposed, all the signs are non-illuminated PVC lettering mounted to the building façade. All the signage would be considered Type B, with an allowable gross square footage of 166 square feet. The gross square footage of the proposed signage is at 81. It is the recommendation of Staff that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. Staff believes 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: Thank you. Any questions from the members?

Mr. Comeaux: So it's non-illuminated and in the Commercial Overlay they're permitted to have like gooseneck lighting or something like that, but they're not required to, correct?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: And one would imagine that most of their business is conducted during daylight hours, except when parents drop their children off at 6 a.m. on the way to work.

Mr. Robbins: My hope is people aren't finding the business for the first time at 9:00 at night.

Mr. Beougher: Do they occupy the entire building or is there another business?

Mr. Robbins: They do not. They have – I believe the portion where Rainbow Station starts, if you go to basically to the downspout to the left, I think that's the dividing line between the next tenant. I think what's in there right now is either a dance studio or it's vacant.

Mr. Beougher: I think it was a dance studio when I was dropping my son off 20 years ago – 19 years ago. So I'm looking at the lettering, "Rainbow Station" and it doesn't seem to fill that space quite as much. I mean it looks a little more comfortable in that sign band. And there is a light-- If you look at the old sign, there's a wall pack right there.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, it looks like that's not shown on the application.

Mr. Beougher: And that may be the only parking lot lighting they have, I'm not sure. It's been a while. Anyway, I guess I'm – I like the graphic sign. It just seems like there's a lot of words in the other sign and the fact that it's 29' long, almost 30' long just seems a little overpowering, but if it's within code, it's within code.

Mr. Robbins: It almost seems if they took "Center" off and just said Rainbow Childcare and maybe shrunk the text to 16 or 15", it might have a little more breathing room on the front fascia and then it would give them a little more room for the wall pack as well to the left.

Mr. Beougher: And if the applicant were here, we could ask them if they were intending to move the wall pack or if they were aware of the wall pack. Michigan, huh?

Mr. Robbins: The Rainbow Childcare, it's an outfit out of Troy, Michigan.

Mr. Beougher: And just looking at the next application out of turn, it appears that the graphic sign is the only sign that's going to be on the front elevation of that building on Taylor Road.

Mr. Robbins: Yes. They do have a monument sign as well.

Mr. Beougher: And this location does not?

Mr. Robbins: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: Any thoughts?

Mr. Comeaux: I'm just curious what they're going to do with the light pack, because comparing this one to the other one, at least as the windows go, they need to get – they want this to go all four windows and they can't do that with what they have there. And the other minor item is they have that downspout

it looks like separating in this instance Rainbow and Station and there I guess they're separating Care and Center.

Mr. Hudson: I don't see how they can take the child off of it. It is the Rainbow Childcare Center.

Mr. Beougher: You mean take Center off?

Mr. Hudson: Well, you're trying to reduce this sign and you change their name when you take child off of it. I think it has to stay there. I admit it does fill up all that fascia, but I don't know what you do to change it.

Mr. Beougher: Well, the title block of the drawing says "Rainbow Childcare" right there at the bottom left. Mr. Burd, any thoughts?

Mr. Burd: I personally don't have any issues with how it's presented. It does fill up the space but, to me, that's not a problem. I'm fine with it as it's presented.

Mr. Robbins: Would the Board be agreeable, if you're okay with this design, but also allowable for a design that shrank the lettering to allow for the wall pack, if we get in touch with the applicant and that's something they would be – at least maybe they were unaware of at the beginning, or willing to do?

Mr. Beougher: Well, my concern is they may be aware of it and just want to remove it, which would not comply with our requirement for illumination of parking lots at 6:00 a.m. when parents are dropping off their children and other parents are trying to run them down. It is a busy place before 8 o'clock.

Mr. Robbins: So kind of what I'm hearing is the wall pack kind of has to stay in that case and then the lettering can either shrink or they can drop "Center" if they would be agreeable to that.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. I just have questions about what happens on that panel and I know we can't separate this and table part of it and approve part of it. It has to come back with a new application for the other part of the sign if we say that we're not comfortable. We could table the whole thing and either ask them by correspondence what their strategy is or they could appear.

Mr. Robbins: There could be another option as well, if it were passed with conditions. At the very worst, if they did not agree with those conditions, they could come through Design Review again, which would basically be the same process they were looking at before, going through Design Review twice if we tabled it.

Mr. Beougher: But they would then have to pay a second fee. Anyone feel strongly about it one way or the other? (No response.) And it is behind the first row of commercial structures on Brice Road.

Mr. Comeaux: I think I'd prefer, in light of the fact that you suggested their presence here wouldn't necessarily influence it one way or the other, that if we could approve it and if they can't live by the approval, they can come back through.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, I think that would be – that's the position of Staff.

Mr. Comeaux: I move we approve it as presented with the caveat being that if that light box needs to be removed, that they ensure that parking lot lighting requirements are met.

Mr. Robbins: Can I just inquire a little bit into that? If they would be agreeable to shrinking the size of the sign, would that be included in that approval as well?

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah, in the alternative, they could shrink the size of the sign and include either all of the words "Rainbow Childcare Center" or just include "Rainbow Childcare," but, obviously, at that point they'd need to reduce it and deal with where that downspout is in terms of where it breaks.

Mr. Beougher: So your motion stands?

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah. It would be that they can do it as presented with the caveat being that if that wall box needs to be removed, that they need to make sure they're in compliance with lighting requirements, because we do have lighting requirements. And, in the alternative, if they need to shrink the size, they can do that in consultation with Staff either by significantly reducing the size or by removing the word "Center."

Mr. Burd: I'll second.

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

Mr. Robbins: And, for the record, the applicant does still need a sign permit and has to go through the building department for building permits to erect the sign.

4. **8315 EAST TAYLOR ROAD SW, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: JAY JOHNSON, JOHNSON SIGN CO., INC., RAINBOW CHILD
CARE CENTER (#158991). NEW MONUMENT AND WALL SIGNS

Mr. Robbins: This is application #158991, 8315 Taylor Road, another Rainbow Child Care, requesting Design Board approval for a new non-illuminated wall sign measuring 7'11" by 5'11" and a new non-illuminated monument sign measuring 8'4" by 3'1". And, to be clear, it's not a new monument sign, but rather a new applique onto an existing brick monument sign. The neighboring businesses include a dental office to the north, an elementary school to the west and a residential neighborhood to the south and the east. You can see on the plan here the building, and they do take up the whole building on this one. Here's a front image of the building and then you can see the monument sign just in the yard.

The wall signage would be considered Type B with a maximum allowable square footage of 156 and the wall signage as proposed is at 48; and the monument sign is existing and the applicant is proposing to place PVC lettering on the brick face. Staff does recommend that the Board request additional landscape planting at the bottom of the sign to soften that up a little bit, rather than just the brick meeting the lawn. Following an agreement by the applicant for additional landscaping at the base of the sign, it is the recommendation of Staff that a 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: All right, thank you, Mr. Robbins. Any questions? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Burd: I'll make a motion that we approve this as presented with the understanding that the additional landscape is to be part of that as well.

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

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

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

5. **1792 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:** APPLICANT: E.R. CIMILLUCE, SIGN SHOP, INC., R & S INFINITY 99 CENTS (#159079). NEW WALL SIGN AND MONUMENT SIGN REFACING.

Mr. Sam Cimilluca: My name is Sam Cimilluca, or Emanuel Cimilluca, Sign Shop Inc., Sign A Rama, Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Robbins: This is Application #159079 for 1792 Brice Road, requesting Design Board approval for the refacing of two existing wall signs and the refacing of an existing monument sign. This is the storefront that you can see right here and it's next to an old drive-thru carryout which has since moved

onto Livingston Avenue. It's right at the corner here. The proposed business is within the Community Services District – excuse me, that's Community Commercial District, and adjacent tenant spaces within the shopping center are currently vacant to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Cimilluca: I think there's a store around the corner that's a hair stylist.

Mr. Robbins: A hair stylist? I think there may be a church in there as well at some times and we have a restaurant going through Special Exception at the moment, so they would be occupying the space that's adjacent.

So the proposed sign is internally illuminated. It's a wall cabinet style with red acrylic lettering over the white background. Staff does have some concern over the graphics of the sign. The oval cabinet, the way it overhangs the fascia, I don't know how old these signs are and whether or not that was approved originally and I'm a little bit worried about that. I wrote in the Staff report that one sign is allowable, but I want to make sure that this is not two storefronts. Is that right? This is just a single storefront?

Mr. Cimilluca: It's just one storefront.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. I mean one cabinet sign within a storefront I think is what code says. The red lettering on the white background is a little bit of concern and Staff would encourage the Board to maybe recommend a different color for the background instead of white. As far as the lettering and the font go, as you can see the "99 Cent" portion on the sign is large and seems to be a little bit out of scale with the rest of the sign and I think we'd like to see that – Staff at least – shrunk down a little bit, at least give it some breathing room on the top and bottom of the sign, and this is speaking about the wall sign right now. And then the "Infinity" and the "Store," the font seems to be somewhat stretched. The shadows look a little bit odd and then those two are at a different scale as well. So I don't know if they'd be amenable to kind of putting those in the same size, just so it reads kind of clearly across.

Mr. Cimilluca: I think one alternative may be to get rid of the "Store," not put the "Store" in and maybe increase the size of the "Infinity" to the size of the "99 Cents" after we lessen the size of the "99".

Mr. Robbins: And I wanted to mention the monument sign as well. That one has kind of the same problem as the other one and the opinion of Staff is that it's crammed into the tenant panel and we're wondering if the lettering can be shrunk down a little bit on the "99" and maybe "R & S Infinity—

Mr. Cimilluca: We'll take off where it says "Store," take that out.

Mr. Robbins: Okay. It's just of concern because it's kind of jammed into the tenant panel there. There's not a whole lot of breathing room in between the text and the copy and the frame. But the recommendation from Staff is that the application be tabled to allow the applicant a little more time to respond to the opinions of the Board and I'd like to get your opinion on it.

Mr. Beougher: Anything you'd like to add before we ask you questions?

Mr. Cimilluca: Yes. With the other ellipse sign that's next to it, it's on the same fascia, you mentioned the fact that maybe that's two wall signs. Is it actually two just because there's a little separation there? I know the shape is different, of course.

Mr. Robbins: I think with cabinet signs it's – with just regular applied wall signs, I mean we typically look at the square footage and whether or not it meets that, but when you have a cabinet wall sign, the line is more clear cut. The fact that it is two separate cabinet signs—

Mr. Cimilluca: Well, I got a separate permit, so I did do that. I was thinking along the same lines as you are, but, after you mentioned that, you can't have two possibly on the same fascia, that kind of worried me. So I'd like you to look into, I guess, if we were allowed that sign. So what do we do if you say we can't have two of them? Do we have to take that down or just leave it like it's always been there?

Mr. Beougher: Well, let me ask. The oval sign is there now.

Mr. Cimilluca: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: What was in this location before?

Mr. Cimilluca: This may have been a grocery of some type. I don't know. It's been empty for a while.

Mr. Beougher: That's why I can't remember what was there. At one point this whole center was almost empty completely.

Mr. Cimilluca: It's starting to come back now. If you count this, there's three stores.

Mr. Beougher: So if we would approve the long sign, which I think gives you more space to work with – the rectangular box—

Mr. Robbins: It was the Sunshine Cleaning Center, Laundromat and Dry Cleaners.

Mr. Beougher: If we would approve the rectangular sign, that gives you more space to work with obviously. Do you think the owner of the business would be willing to take down the oval sign?

Mr. Cimilluca: I'll ask him.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so I think we have some questions. I am leaning towards Mr. Robbins concept of tabling this and getting some feedback from the owner.

Mr. Cimilluca: I know he's interested in having the "Infinity" maybe – you spoke about possibly having that bigger but take out the "Store." He wanted it bigger and we said, "Well, you know, we don't have that much room if you want 99 Cents to be that big."

Mr. Robbins: The owner, he's in California, right?

Mr. Cimilluca: No, he lives here.

Mr. Robbins: Ronnie Peters, right? We've been in contact with him.

Mr. Cimilluca: No, he's here. He's not out in California from my understanding, but his phone number has a different area code, so you may be right. It may be a California area code. We can redo the lettering and maybe not stretch it out.

Mr. Robbins: Part of it is I think the lettering has a shadow to it and I think it was stretched after that shadow was applied, so the perspective on that looks a little bit off.

Mr. Cimilluca: We like to put the shadows around these letters because they stand out better.

Mr. Beougher: What about the thought that the white background should be something other than white? Do you have any reaction to that?

Mr. Cimilluca: Then I'll have to cover it all. I'll have to take it off, bring it back to the shop; otherwise I don't have to take it off. I can just apply it right onto it, but if I have to cover it all with a different color, I would have to take it back to the shop to do it.

Mr. Robbins: What does the plastic look like now? Is it a white color or has it yellowed?

Mr. Cimilluca: No, it's not yellowed. It's Lexan, I think. I didn't see any breaks in it, so I think it's one piece of Lexan, polycarbonate. I think it's one piece if I remember correctly.

Mr. Comeaux: So at one point this was probably an abandoned sign, but we didn't pursue it and have it removed. So is it treated as a new sign or a reface? Because what I don't want to happen is they say, "Fine, we won't put anything on the oval," and then leave it blank.

Mr. Robbins: Right. We definitely – that's not something that we want to happen.

Mr. Cimilluca: Well, it's also this, I don't think the landlord's going to go with the colored one on there, because I think that was possibly – someone took the sign down and the landlord told them to put it back.

Mr. Robbins: Well, that's a good point. If this is a cabinet sign and it is existing, that would be a refacing. It would just be nonconforming existing, the refacing on it.

Mr. Comeaux: My preference is to have the rectangular sign and not the oval sign, but if the alternative would be to have a blank oval sign, then I would obviously prefer the way it exists now.

Mr. Burd: By taking the "Stores" off, you've got a lot more room now. You can put that R & S right in there.

Mr. Cimilluca: But the "Infinity" part will be increased from what it is now and the "99 Cents" will be decreased.

Mr. Beougher: What font is that?

Mr. Cimilluca: I don't know. I didn't see anything wrong with it. We may have tried to – I'll have to talk to my designer. Maybe he was trying to find something with the number that we have, something that fit that, letters that fit the font – the number font. He's usually pretty good at designing, so he gets leeway because he knows a lot more about the design aspect than I do. I just go up on the ladder and measure, do all those things, freeze to death while he's sitting down at his computer.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, any other questions or comments from the members? (No response.) I think Mr. Robbins is right. There's enough questions here that we think we need you to consult with your client and see what they're willing to change. Can we get Mr. Cimilluca a copy of the Staff recommendations, the list of items?

Mr. Robbins: Yeah. I did send you a copy. Did you get a printout of that? The Staff report?

Mr. Cimilluca: No. I didn't see it.

Mr. Robbins: Okay, I've got a Staff report that you can have. It has a list in there of some of the concerns that we had. Now I can think of signage in other areas of the city, specifically the gold buyer that just came through that does have a white background. I think that was – with the right font on there, it didn't look bad.

Mr. Cimilluca: But my idea is to eliminate the "Store," decrease the "99" some and increase the "Infinity" part of it and put the R & S on the other one. It was like an extension, you know, "R & S Infinity."

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, I mean to a certain extent it almost seems like the owner would want to have – cause his brand name is "R & S Infinity," have that kind of on the same signage panel, kind of one fell swoop.

Mr. Cimilluca: He's interested really in the "Infinity" and the "99 Cents." The "R & S" is important and "Store" is important, but not as important as the "Infinity" name is what he's really interested in.

Mr. Beougher: Would it cause a hardship to your client if we would table it and he has to wait a month?

Mr. Cimilluca: Well, I drove by there today as I was going to someplace else and I didn't see inside, but it's not ready to open, that's for sure, not now, but I don't know if it's going to be ready to open in a week or a month.

Mr. Robbins: Yeah, I don't know where he was. I think he had some trouble with some kind of water issues within the building, some plumbing work that was done without a permit or legally hooked up.

Mr. Cimilluca: He only has one guy, I think, working in there, so it's a slow process.

Mr. Robbins: I have a copy of the Staff report if you'd like to have it for your records. Then I think if the Board would be willing, I can work with Mr. Cimilluca throughout the next week or two and then we can send you guys kind of some mockups and get the Board's opinion before he comes back for the next meeting. Would you be willing to do that, just kind of off the record, and get it headed in the right direction?

Mr. Beougher: That would be fine. So is there a motion to postpone until the May meeting?

Mr. Burd: I'll make a motion that we table this for now with the intention of revisiting it at our next meeting in May.

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

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

Mr. Cimilluca: Can I ask a question? I think we can remedy this fairly quickly. I would show you the new design, the lettering. Who's going to decide about the oval sign? What are we going to do with that? If we knew what we were going to do with that, we could get this resolved pretty quickly, like by Monday.

Mr. Beougher: It might take some consultation with the City Attorney. Mr. Burd, any suggestions there?

Mr. Burd: It's something we can look into quickly. I don't know that we have an answer right now though. I think the sense is that we would prefer if the oval sign's not there, but is that fair?

Mr. Beougher: I think that's accurate. I think it doesn't quite fit. One of these signs is not like the others. It kind of hangs down below the band.

Mr. Cimilluca: I mean I looked at it and I said, "What's that doing there?"

Mr. Beougher: So if this were an application for a new sign, I don't think we'd be amenable to it. So what we need is an opinion from the City Attorney as to whether the two signs together constitute an existing condition. We need a legal opinion.

Mr. Cimilluca: Yeah, okay, but, actually I don't like it. If I was to recommend to this guy, "Can we just take it off completely," that resolves one of your concerns. And then, like I said, take "Store" away and shrink the "99 Cents", try not to stretch out "Infinity," but I'm going to make it bigger.

Mr. Robbins: And then the other question would be the background, whether or not—

Mr. Cimilluca: I don't think the landlord's going to go for it actually.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, well, you have the concerns and the Staff report. Work with Mr. Robbins and he'll contact us with the revised concepts and we'll provide some feedback over the next month. Thank you.

6. 6810 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: MIKE HOY, COLUMBUS SIGN COMPANY, DR. NEERO SHARMA, DDS, (#159044). MONUMENT SIGN REFACING

Mr. Mike Hoy: I'm Mike Hoy, Columbus Sign Company.

Mr. Robbins: This is application #159044 for 6810 East Main Street, Dr. Neeru Sharma, DDS. Design Review Board request for refacing an existing internally illuminated monument sign tenant panel. The proposed business is within the Community Commercial Overlay District and adjacent businesses include an attorney and a chimney sweep. You can see the property right there underneath the red star, and then the existing monument sign is within the tree lawn in front of the building. It's pretty straight forward. The applicant is proposing to change the position of the panel from the lower third to the upper third of the sign, to update the panel with the name of the new dentist. Staff believes that the overall design of the panel is staying consistent with the previous sign and it's our recommendation that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The proposed signage is in keeping with the existing character of the area and will not adversely affect the overall appearance.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, now.

Mr. Hoy: I couldn't have said it better.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, enough said. Any questions from the members? (No response.) Is there a motion?

Mr. Hudson: I'll move to approve as it is presented.

Mr. Comeaux: I'll second.

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

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

Mr. Hoy: I just have a question. Something like this it seems to me that it could just have Staff approval, or something.

Mr. Beougher: Unfortunately, the way the Code is written, we get to hear things like that. I noticed on the spelling, for the record, Neeru is the first name of the dentist with a "u" instead of an "o" which is in the agenda. So perhaps the minutes would reflect "Neeru Sharma, DDS."

Mr. Robbins: We will make sure that gets corrected.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Beougher: With no further business before the Board, we stand adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Lane Beougher, Chair

Justin Robbins, Planning Adm.

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