

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MARCH 5, 2015
6:30 P.M.

(Recording problems were experienced. The following items A1, 2, 3 & 4 were included from notes given to the transcriptionist from the meeting.)

A. ROLL CALL

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

Others Present: Mr. Eric Snowden, Planning Adm.

2. APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 8, 2015 MINUTES

Minutes were approved.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Chairman Comeaux administered the oath to those who were planning to speak at the DRB Meeting tonight.

B. NEW BUSINESS

(Item B1 is missing from the recording. From this point forward the minutes were taken from the recording provided to the transcriptionist unless otherwise noted.)

2. **2290 AYERS DRIVE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO; APPLICANT: ROBERT MILLER, JR. ROBERTSON TRUCK SALES (#168363) MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW.**

Mr. Snowden: -- for the March – the applicant is in process for the March 19th BZBA meeting to receive variances for the signage and a fence setback and a parking setback that fronts onto I-70. There is a section of Code, 1103.13 that restricts the Board's ability to grant variances and you can see I gave a detailed report of what that means. Although the section of code does typically require this Board to table anything that requires a variance, it's staff's view that is some-

thing that is designed to prevent the appearance that the DRB can grant variances and, given that the applicant is in process and given that the BZBA is already aware and they already have an approved major site plan, staff's view is that this process can continue, provided that the Board provide a conditional – make the approval conditional upon on getting said variances.

The site plan: The building is seated on the southern portion of the site. It's seated near the previous location. It's an 8,250 square foot building. There is no specific code requirement for parking for a structure of this size. Similar uses such as warehousing or wholesaling require one space for every 200 or one space for every 300 square feet of building, which would have put roughly 27-41 spaces would have been considered appropriate based on that calculation. Staff calculated the applicant provided 35 spaces, plus two additional handicap accessible spaces, plus multiple spaces for truck displays. So staff's comfortable that they're meeting their parking requirements.

Lighting: The staff inspected the photometric plan that was provided and found that there wasn't a danger of light shining either into the eyes of drivers as they were passing the site along either street frontage, or crossing over at a high foot candle count into the residential that's adjacent. Staff would like a clarification from the applicant as to what the finishes will be on the fixture materials. There were multiple finishes listed, so staff would just like to know they're LED fully cut-off fixtures.

Building exterior: Most of the building is clad in sheet metal. There were two separate color configurations, one for the main building and one for the office area. The roof had a pretty significant slope to it that staff felt kind of broke up the monotony of a significant structure. It also – the entrances, if you look, are flanked by columns and staff thought that was an appropriate way of not only protecting the structure, but just giving it a little bit of depth. The entrance was articulated with an entryway and had a canopy over it, so that gave people on foot on the site an indication of how to enter the building.

Landscaping: There is already mature landscaping on the site and the applicant proposes, on the landscape plan, to keep the screening landscape that's required by code that fronts the residential and the applicant's going to be adding a fence and some plant material along the northern side, so I would just like Mr. Miller to take us through exactly what we're going to be doing there and staff would just like a clarification on the fencing materials. Dan also told me there's going to possibly be additional fencing, so if you gentlemen would just explain that during your report.

Signage: There was a 636 square foot monument sign at the Ayers Drive West entrance of the site, which is an appropriate place because it shows people how to enter the site. There is also a 480 square foot pole sign. It's a different location, but there was an existing non-conforming sign on the site. The City

zoning code doesn't really recognize the need for signage along a freeway frontage. Staff's view is that given the significant screening, landscaping concessions that have been made and the maintenance of all the existing trees which I should have mentioned under landscaping and screening, staff was comfortable that although the sign is large, you can see the detail called out, staff felt that that was appropriate given the type of use of the site and the fact that the property doesn't have any direct access. It's more of a destination property. It doesn't have direct access off of Brice Road. So staff was comfortable-- This is another thing they'll be requesting a variance for coming up in the BZBA on the 19th.

So staff recommended that the Board approve the Major Site Plan with the condition that the applicant secure any needed variances. If, for some reason, the variances were to be denied, the applicant would probably have to return to this Board just to confirm any details that were outstanding.

Mr. Comeaux: (Mr. Comeaux is speaking off-mic.) Is there anything you all would like to add to the presentation. (Applicants responded that they did not.) What do they have the variance for? For example, it's currently zoned to sell trucks and automobiles.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, in the CC District of the City, automotive sales, which is what this would be classified as, is a Special Exception Use. They received a Special Exception Use permit from the BZBA. They then took a Major Site Plan approval to the BZBA which was approved, on condition of variances being granted. So the administrative issue is that this body is not empowered by the city code or charter to grant any variances and my view is that the specific section of code that delineates that is designed to prevent the appearance that this Board might be doing that by granting a Major Site Plan application prior to the BZBA hearing from the applicant at all. During the Major Site Plan process with the BZBA, it was determined that the applicant would need some variances in order to accomplish what they wanted to accomplish and the applicant actually later made a decision to pursue those variances. However, they still haven't approved Major Site Plan without the variances. This plan simply recognizes that those variances will be had.

Mr. Comeaux: (Chairman speaking off mic.) Well, expressing my own personal concern here, I can't remember a time when we -- so we would be approving it subject to the approval or granting of variances. Is that what you would suggest we do?

Mr. Snowden: My suggestion to the Board is that the Board do that in order to allow the applicant to move forward and get the variances from the BZBA, given that BZBA has already approved the Major Site Plan, but this Board is not approving said variances. It's simply approving a plan that will require them.

Mr. Comeaux: Just personally, I can't recall a time where we approved something in anticipation of granting of a variance. I just don't recall that.

Mr. Beougher: What's the opinion of the City Attorney?

Mr. Snowden: His opinion was not gotten for us, but if the Board-- All I would say, Mr. Beougher, is simply if the Board's not comfortable with it, the Board tables it.

Mr. Beougher: When I read 1103.13 it says, "Any application which would require a variance shall not be considered until final determination has been made and shall suspend further action on the application until such time as the variance has been approved. It doesn't give us any flexibility. I mean if the code says you can waive the rules, you can waive the rules. But if it doesn't specifically state you can waive the rules, you can't waive the rules.

I mean I think that's where I feel most comfortable to be honest with you. Now I think we can -- there's a lot of stuff we can do for you tonight. We can go through what we think about it and tell you that if you come back with these-- You know, we can tell you -- we can treat this like it was that and then we'll table it and after you get your variances you come back here and it should be a real easy process. We could give you feedback on what we think so that it's all smooth as silk so that when you see them later on March 19th, some-body would have to come back here and have -- if you get the variances like you expect, a very perfunctory, hopefully, meeting in April assuming things go, or not. I mean if we debate it now and get our concerns out, they may not have to come back.

Mr. Miller: That's what I think. Our main variances are pretty-- I mean if we get them, that's our goal obviously, but the owners are willing to work on some of those items. Construction season coming up, and schedules, that's what I'm trying to help him out if at all possible.

Mr. Comeaux: And I think what Mr. Beougher's saying is if we get all our stuff ironed out here, you go get your variances on the 19th. If you talk to Mr. Snowden and given that you have these variances and given our discussion at the beginning of March, then you just have to wait, officially, until April-- I don't have a calendar in front of me, but the first Thursday in April.

Mr. Miller: So that won't hold up building permits and civil—

Mr. Comeaux: It would hold up building permits, yeah.

Mr. Miller: Cause that's our concern about ordering buildings and still—

Mr. Comeaux: Well, instead of having March 19th, you'd have April 2nd. Again, the way I read the code is just such that we've got to wait to get those

variances, because on the one hand, what would happen if something changes in the variance process and it would change something on here, then that's a problem for us.

Mr. Miller: My previous experience has been getting approvals conditional, that's just from other communities, and not having multiple meetings, I think that's our concern if just time is being spent.

Mr. Comeaux: I definitely understand your concern and I definitely understand that as soon as the snow starts to melt, you're going to want to put a shovel in the ground.

Mr. Beougher: You could call a Special Meeting at the adjournment of the BZBA. I won't be here though.

Mr. Comeaux: We could call a Special Meeting, that's true. They meet on the 19th which is a Thursday. If we could get a quorum together there, which would mean four of us there, I'm available on the 19th. Could you meet for a perfunctory meeting on the 19th?

Mr. _____: I'm assuming I can.

Mr. Comeaux: Thank you very much for that suggestion. If that helps you all out, we could do that, assuming our schedules don't change between now and then. So let's go ahead and have a conversation here real quick about concerns we have. We don't try to make things difficult. Let's go ahead and have the discussion about what we think here. Are there any questions from the Board about this? Let me ask a couple questions real quick, Mr. Snowden. Can you bring a Google image up of the surrounding area just as it is now?

Mr. Roberts: Initially we located this property and thought it was excellent property for what we were looking to do, but I wasn't going to be able to purchase the property for the business that was intended, so we started this process last year, probably the middle to end, August or September maybe, somewhere in there. We went through the meetings and were able to get it approved for our Special Exception use in that district.

Mr. Comeaux: So just for my edification, the neighbors were notified and things of that sort?

Mr. Snowden: Well, there isn't a specific notification that the neighbors receive via mail, but the applicant actually went through three additional City Council hearings in addition to the initial BZBA hearing, so staff's view is that the public has been informed.

Mr. Comeaux: Are there any other questions about the materials then? They're pretty thorough. (No response.) When you say trucks, you're talking like semis, cabs, or—

Mr. Miller: What we normally deal in is medium and heavy-duty trucks and equipment. So most of our trucks wouldn't be necessarily pickup trucks, although we do sell some pickup trucks. They're predominantly going to be like a Ford 550 and larger. I don't sell combination over-the-road sleeper trucks with trailers. That lot wouldn't be conducive for that. My bread-and-butter, I guess, would be a lot of single axle dump trucks, flatbed trucks, some box trucks, some utility trucks. So that's what we do in Mount Vernon. That's predominantly 90% of the trucks that I do sell would be in the 26,000 to 33,000 GVW range which is the Gross Vehicle Weight rating.

Mr. _____: What are your proposed hours?

Mr. Miller: Currently in Mount Vernon we operate from 8:00 until 5:30, Monday through Friday. Saturday would be 8:00 until noon. That would be roughly the same hours as this particular business. I know there was some talk, since there's school throughout part of the year, possibly suspending those in one of the meeting we talked to to possibly an 8:30 start time as opposed to 8:00. That way it's not a conflict with the traffic flow. But as far as anything past that 5:30-6:00 time, it's not very conducive for this business. It's a retail business, but we're not selling to a retail customer so-to-speak. We're selling business-to-business, so that's why those hours work out well. And on weekends, you know, Saturdays are usually a "by appointment" kind of thing. We don't have a lot of foot traffic on Saturdays and then we don't operate on Sundays.

Mr. _____: One other question. Orient me on the former building's pad. Where is the front of your building? Is it going to follow that line where it's square of, or how are you going to position in that lot?

Mr. Miller: The north side of the building is roughly going to be where you see the — that's kind of a ceramic tile. The north side is going to be roughly on that same footprint. Lengthwise you're roughly in that same footprint as well. On the south side of it, we can't see — the office actually extends 15' farther past. So where that pad is right there, it'll be 15' north of there for most part of the building. We cut the building size back from what it was originally intended. It was to be roughly 83' wide. We've cut that back due to the fact on the front of the property, the swing radius of trucks when you pull them out, they can be up to 40' long. So on the swing radius with having trucks parked along the road, we weren't having that distance we needed and it wasn't a hardship to cut the building back 15'. The shop is not designed for everyday truck and mechanical heavy wrenching use. This shop is designed — it has a wash bay in it and the wash bay's not for major cleanup work on the trucks. The trucks are going to be prepped in Mount Vernon. That's our campus. That's our hub. This is going to

be a retail sales facility. So when trucks get down here, they're going to be washed. They'll get dust and debris on them. Then the shop itself is designed for light up-fitting. So a customer possibly wants to have a toolbox installed on the truck or we need to change a tire or battery, it's not going to be a fully employed mechanical shop outside. There's no outside work. It's only for our own use.

Mr. Hudson: What's the sign going to look like on Brice and Eastgreen? Is it – what is it going to look like? Is it on a base? Do we have a picture of it?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hudson, it should be on the very first page of your material.

Mr. Hudson: Oh, I see. Where's it going to sit? And because of the traffic on that road, if you're coming up Brice Road, is that going to block the view of people coming off of Eastgreen?

Mr. Miller: That particular sign on the front page is actually the monument style sign for when you drive into the property.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hudson-- Excuse me for cutting you off. The sign that you're looking at there, the monument sign, the location is approximately right here. If you look on the screen where my cursor is, that's the location right there. So it's on this property.

Mr. Hudson: All right. I saw over here, I was looking at Brice and Eastgreen and I saw a sign easement.

Mr. Miller: There is a spot – there's several spots to direct traffic back in there. One of the signs that was in agreement, and this dates back to 1960 something, there was an agreement with that property through an archdiocese and we did the research back on it, off of the Brice Road intersection, there's multiple signs on the north side of the road there when you turn in and take a right, and there's several signs there. We're looking to work with them as far as getting a partial sign put on that to direct traffic back. Once you get back from there, there is a variance in place for the property. When you head directly into it, you'd about dead end into the parking complex there, there is a sign variance or easement, I'm sorry, in place for that particular sign, which would be a similar sign to that sign face. It's not going to be a lit sign. It's just going to be that similar style with an arrow to the right incorporated into it, no heavy uplighting or anything. The same thing on the next corner as you drive back in there. There's a spot for that as well.

Mr. Comeaux: I'm sorry, that sign you're talking about there on Eastgreen and Ayers, I guess it would be, that box is still there? That sign exists or is it something you're going to put in?

(Man speaking off mic.)

Mr. Miller: There's an old case there. It's somewhat dilapidated. It's been graffitied and looks like baseball bats taken to it.

Mr. Comeaux: There is an old base and sign frame, if you will, and you're going to use that existing frame or are you replacing that?

(Man speaking off mic.)

Mr. Miller: We'll refurbish it.

Mr. Comeaux: Do we have a rendering of that? Do we need a rendering of that?

Mr. Snowden: Staff is-- I remember the discussion about, "Hey, maybe there's a sign easement." This is the first that I've heard of that, "Hey, the box and things still exist down there for this." That's something that we should probably sit down and look at because there's nothing in the code that would permit that today.

Mr. Miller: As far as the?

Mr. Snowden: Off premise signs, which is what this would be, and the code probably didn't permit it back then either; however, there may have been variances granted. If we can determine that, we could present to this Board additional signage. If we can't determine that, we're in a situation where the signs may not be able to be put back up. What I would suggest to the applicant is that we move forward with what's here and we broach that as a kind of separate project afterwards once we have time to research it.

Mr. Miller: I'm fine with that.

Mr. Snowden: That could involve staff getting minute books from other previous years, finding it and it may not be possible to find.

Mr. Miller: Oh, I understand. The conditional on the purchase is where I had them dig out all this, because it's very beneficial to have that to guide a customer back there so they're not driving around the neighborhood. We were able to find two out of three. We figured out where the third one, the original one which is off of Brice right there and it was an agreement. The other two are actual easements, I believe, associated with the property itself for a sign placement there. We were able to locate where one of the signs was originally, where you would dead end actually. There's still an electrical hookup there. I have no problem coming back for those particular signs.

Mr. Comeaux: If you're talking about an agreement with the one that's on the corner of Eastgreen and Brice and it's just a matter of you putting in a panel or something like that, that's something that shouldn't be too difficult. If you're talking about the one that's dilapidated and everything like that, we would either need to look for the records or address that. That might be something more challenging to deal with on the 19th, but we can certainly—

Mr. Miller: Oh, I understand. I'm more interested – I obviously need the signage, but I'm more interested in the building process and the permits. This building is going to take several months to construct, so I don't mind coming back to meetings.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to suggest on this particular issue that we continue to research it, the applicant meet with staff. There could be some deeper issues there again with these easements and also if the signage were to be under a certain size and were to be directional in nature, there is a provision of the code that does permit directional signage without additional – in fact, even without a sign permit, from staff. So we'll look into it and we'll present to the Board. I will be happy to present whatever the final findings are, whether or not they return, I will present that to the Board in detail.

Mr. Comeaux: Sure, that's fine. Notwithstanding the need for a variance on the pole sign, the dimensions, characteristics of the monument sign, are they consistent with existing zoning?

Mr. Snowden: The monument sign is a permitted sign. The entire characteristic size – not the colors, because the colors aren't specifically regulated, but the size and everything to do with the freeway scale pole sign is what the variances would be required for. I have those sections of code notated on their application for the said variance.

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Beougher, may I ask you a question? The monument sign – I know along Main Street and some other thoroughfares, we've asked for brick bases. I don't know about in that place whether it's something we need to even discuss. I know it's something we've talked about with applicants before.

Mr. Beougher: My opinion is, since this is not a thoroughfare, we wouldn't be as concerned, even though there's a brick base on a sign at the back of the property somewhere.

Mr. Comeaux: I ask because those are the kinds of things I don't necessarily have an eye for. I'm much more process oriented. Well, okay, great. Any other questions about the signs before we move on?

Mr. Beougher: So one of the variances is for the pole sign?

Mr. Snowden: First of all, the existence of the pole sign in the first place, the size of it.

Mr. Beougher: What are the other variances related to?

Mr. Snowden: The setback of the – there's a 15' landscape setback that's required on all freeway frontages by our landscape and buffering code.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so the location of the building structure is dependent on that variance.

Mr. Snowden: If it's within 15', then it is.

Mr. Beougher: Okay, so are the variances required for you to proceed with building the structure?

Mr. Miller: No, not for the structure. What the three variances are for, one is for the movement of the sign. Currently the sign is entangled in several power lines that are in there and Custom Sign Company's deemed that it's not even safe to go up there to hang a new face on that because of the way the high wires are coming across. I would assume when that sign was put up, they probably weren't – that heavy electric wasn't put there at that particular time for the old sign pole. So we're looking to move it from it's current location, which is roughly – you can see one of the poles coming across there, kind of the southwest corner of that building if you were to draw it out there. That's where the sign's somewhat entangled. We're looking to move it to the southeast corner of the property to get it as far away from the power lines as possible and when we're looking to go up with it because we have several other obstacles.

The second variance is due to the setback. If you look at the lot drawing on one of the pages, one actually was an error on there, but they were between 10-15' setback off of the property line itself where the state fence is down there along the freeway. We were trying to have the property go directly abutting to the fence. We found out that it wasn't able to, so they were in discussion – they were unsure by the code whether it was 10 or 15' setback buffer from the property line for where I can start my lot at and that was discussion between the Board itself. They were actually unsure of it. They thought it was 15', but another person thought it was 10'. I was trying to go for the 10' setback due to get the landscaping buffer there with the grass out front but, in order for my building placement on the property itself – we're trying to reutilize as much of the underground utilities and everything that's already in place. So by cutting back the building to 65' versus 83', we've gained some but an extra 5' would be very nice for the swing radius with trucks being parked along the front for visibility.

The third variance was, as you see at the top of the screen, the northern part of the property, you can see several trees there. There's already curb cuts

in as far as curbing for the property itself on the south side of that landscape mound. That's an actual mound of dirt and then there are several trees planted in there. They were saying that the fence setback had to be, I believe, 40' from the property line back and that would actually intersect roughly all of those parking spots back there would be taken up with that fence. What I was proposing is to be right off of the back side of that curb if you can see just north of the curb-- Does everybody understand where I'm talking? To be able to put the fence right there. It's a 6' tall fence and then we were trying to show with the landscaping – the earthen mound is already 2' high, so by planting shrubbery that at its infancy is roughly 3-4' tall and they'll grow 6-8' tall, maybe a burning bush or a Viburnum of sorts, so it'll offer ample screenage. So the fence won't be seen as you drive by it. I want the property to look presentable and I'm in a neighborhood. I understand a chain link fence, what it looks like. So by screening that whole area, the only spots you'll see fence would be for the gates themselves where you go in and out and we're proposing the fence to be around the property for liability issues for my insurance company as far as children climbing on trucks, getting hurt; but not to mention the facts that trucks inherently have a lot of valuable items on them and other truck dealers have had quite a few filters stolen off them, tires get stolen, fuel gets siphoned out of them, batteries get taken. When you have a lot of trucks, a lot of these trucks have 2-3 batteries in them, not to mention diesel tanks are full of 50, 60, 80 gallons of diesel fuel. That's a big target for thieves to come in. So it's twofold: to protect the property, but also to protect anybody coming onto the property to get hurt. So those are several of the reasons why we're looking for the fencing around the property.

Mr. Beougher: I was just trying to figure out if there was a way to table the signs and approve the rest of it, but with the fence it's all tied together.

Mr. _____: It's a 6' tall chain link fence, so you're going to try and use vegetation to screen it for the most part except for the entrances?

Mr. Miller: As far as for the north and east side, which is abutting residential area. So, yes, we were using – the existing screening is already there and we actually are going to be planting several more trees. There are several trees that have died, some stuff needs taken out, it needs cleaned up. The property's – it was pretty let go as far as just the general grooming of everything. Along the front there will probably be a couple more trees and there was an actual landscape plan on the last page in there, showing some of the landscaping features, what we're looking to do. But with the fence along Ayers Drive there, yes, I was trying to screen that out, not only for aesthetics for my business, but for the neighborhood as well. So there is a fence there, but you won't necessarily see it when you're driving by. It'll be screened. Even in the winter a burning bush, you guys have some planted out front, it's a really dense bush. You can see through it, but it's not very easy. A viburnum, it has big leafy fat leaves on it and they create somewhat of a mess in the fall when they shed,

because they like to pack up on the fences. A burning bush is a little small leaf and they tend to blow away and disappear. That's why we're looking for the burning bush as opposed to a viburnum.

Mr. Comeaux: The curb cuts themselves, I mean this was made for kind of smaller vehicle traffic, but you're comfortable with the existing curb cuts for your vehicles and all?

Mr. Miller: For where they are, it's actually – it's actually somewhat beneficial having the islands in there to divide up trucks – you know, we all run on the same roads, but they're dimensionally larger than cars as far as on length and width. They're, within reason 8'6" is the widest you can go, 40' long is the longest. Most of my trucks are going to be in that 20-30' long range. But, yeah, the way the trucks will be parked – I think they have some of the diagrams – we can back trucks in and we can make a nice driving area with still having ample parking spots on that property itself. The way that it's designed now, it's almost a change to try to change that. They have the whole lot pretty much as a parking lot since it was designed for a retail food facility. So actually a lot of the infrastructure's already in place which made the property very attractive to begin with.

Mr. Comeaux: Any other questions for members of the Board? (No response.) I do want to take this opportunity to give them a full vetting so when we come back on the 19th that it's not pro forma, but it is something that we're not revisiting things we could have talked about tonight. So while you certainly can reserve your questions until the 19th, I would much prefer us to go ahead and get it out in the open now.

Lighting? What about the lighting concerns? I mean I can see on here where the lighting is and things like that. But in terms of – you had a question about lighting bleeding over into the residential to the southeast?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, that was not staff's concern, because the photometric – staff was comfortable with the provided photometric. The question was what are the finishes of the material, of the lighting material, because there were four different indicated there by the manufacturer, so that's what I'd like to know.

Mr. Miller: The current light poles that are up, we're going to be keeping those as far as decorative purposes mostly and they're in kind of a blacky-gray, kind of faded now. Everything will be repainted black to match with the new light poles that we'll be putting up to be uniform lighting, but black would be the color.

Mr. Comeaux: Did that answer your question, Mr. Snowden?

Mr. Snowden: Staff didn't have any concerns, we just wanted the Board to know what the finishes were.

Mr. Comeaux: Any other questions or concerns from the Board? (No response.) Mr. Beougher, you're not going to be here on the 19th, right? So we'll be deprived of your insights into some of these things. I look at the building and it looks like a very nice building, but I don't know architecture.

Mr. Beougher: It's an attractive structure. And just to comment, we were very frustrated back 10 years ago when I was on Council with this property because Bob Evans was continuing to pay the rent on it and blocking development and it was frustrating to have it sitting there vacant. The building was falling down. So I'm pleased to have a business come in. I wish our code was written differently so we could take care of this tonight. The package looks fine. I have no concerns.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay, well, thank you for that. Mr. Burd.

Mr. Burd: I was just going to concur with that. They've been kind enough to stand at that podium numerous times over the course of the past year in front of BZBA and Council and they addressed every concern that was raised by our elected officials. Also, as a former Council member and Service Director, I'm thrilled something's going in there. I think it looks great. I like the signage. I like the building and I think that, from my perspective, on the 19th there won't be any issues with getting this passed. That's at least how I feel about that.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay, appreciate that. We do need to make a motion to table. So we understand, we're going to have Mr. Snowden do whatever he needs to do to call a Special Meeting on the 19th. Right, Mr. Snowden?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, what I'll do is I'll provide a Special Agenda for a Special Meeting. I'll notify all the members as a reminder. Obviously you're all here, so you all know, but I'll formally remind you and I'll contact the applicant and I'll basically provide a staff report summarizing what we discussed here and what the rationale was for the tabling and if there are any other concerns at that time.

Mr. Comeaux: So we have to have a motion to table and we'll take a vote on that, but then we'll see you again on the 19th.

Mr. Miller: Okay, sounds good.

Mr. _____: So moved.

Mr. _____: I'll second.

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

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, before we move on, I'm going to assume, given that they need to have the variances first, that this body needs to meet following BZBA specifically. So if it's okay with you and the remainder of the Board, I will notice the meeting as immediately following BZBA. I have two other applications other than Mr. Miller's application on the BZBA.

3. **6748 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO;**
APPLICANT: RED CONSULTING, LLC. GBS MAIN, LLC. (#168414) MINOR/
EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Address is 6748 East Main Street, GBS Main, LLC. The main business on the site is Marathon. It's a request for minor exterior modifications. Application #168414 for Certificate of Appropriateness, located on the north side of East Main Street between Rose Hill and Briarcliff Drive. The existing zoning district is CC, Community Commerce and it's also within the Community Commercial Overlay. Applicant's requesting Certificate of Appropriateness for building or exterior modifications. Current use, as I stated, main use is gas station. There's also a childcare center, a vacant retail space and an accessory use to the gasoline station is a unused car wash facility. When the applicant was Red Consulting, Kim was the architect.

Ms. Kim Mikanik: Yes, I'm Kim Mikanik with Red Consulting.

Mr. Snowden: Existing site, it's currently an existing gas station. It appears to be an original building, an addition to the east and an addition slightly to the west and to the north of the original structure. So there's sort of three sub-structures here. Again, there's a childcare center and a vacant retail space which, I believe, was a pizza shop.

The applicant is not proposing any landscaping or buffering changes. Staff did visit the site and found that there is a mature tree line on the north side of the property which screens it from residential. Traffic circulation, the applicant's proposing to add six spaces and reconfigure the service lane around the rear of the property and the applicant also proposed to add traffic control signage. As stated previously, traffic control signage falls in under our code as signs that do not require specific administrative permit, however the Board can review their location and how they lay on the site. The applicant proposes to extend the majority of the building details throughout the structure. The existing roof will remain in place, which is a shingle roof. The existing building fascia will remain and be repainted in the existing colors. The existing brick facades and accent pieces will remain and all mechanicals are screened at the rear of the property by a privacy fence and that privacy fence will remain.

The applicant proposed awning, on the rendering staff thought that the awnings were black, but it was pointed out to me that there is a note that says

the color is Marine, so staff would like a clarification of the color of the awnings to be added. Staff felt that was good, because it articulated the entrances to the structure and sort of broke up the façade. The storefront system that had aluminum access pieces was going to be extended to the three existing car wash bays that would match – on the west side is where the car wash is. On the east side it would match the existing storefront systems on the east side. And the applicant also proposed removing the garage door and relocating a window system on the rear of the property and staff just wanted clarification of exactly what the applicant was thinking that space was going to be used for, because currently the garage doors allow vehicles to pull through and the applicant indicated that that area was going to be used for retail space, so staff wanted a clarification. And the building mounted signs above the existing car wash were to be removed and staff noted on their visit that some of the signage from the site has already been removed.

Generally staff was satisfied and just would like more information with how the garage door area would be used and what exactly would be going on at the rear of the property; but staff recommended generally approval as long as the Board was comfortable with those clarifications.

Mr. Comeaux: Do you have any comments, corrections, additions to that presentation?

Ms. Mikanik: The doors that are remaining in the back, we don't have a specific tenant in mind. They've had a couple people express interest. The reason they were remaining and not becoming storefront as well is a couple companies, I think one was, let's say a security company and they thought, well, if they could have the materials and easily access it through a garage door. So they're anticipating more of a business than a true retail tenant being in there. So I guess they wanted to keep that flexibility with those doors at the back. It would all be storefront in the front.

Mr. Comeaux: When you say it's going to be storefront—

Ms. Mikanik: Well, just the storefront system and no garage doors at the front of the structure.

Mr. Comeaux: So you'll set up an entry door or something like that/

Ms. Mikanik: Uh-huh, yeah.

Mr. Comeaux: Staff had a question about the coloring.

Ms. Mikanik: It's like a navy blue. It's called Marine. It's a Sumbrella color.

Mr. Comeaux: So it was a dark blue rather than a black?

Ms. Mikanik: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Marine is the new black.

Mr. _____: So the gas station awning, are you doing anything to that, or is that going to remain the way it is?

Ms. Mikanik: That's just going to remain. If anything, if any of the exposed metal needs painted, at least clean up and take care of any maintenance, but they're not changing that.

Mr. Comeaux: Can you go to the left again on this image here? So as I look at this, and it might just be – it's probably just the shading. It looks like – is that just the shingled roof rather than a blue? It looks blue to me.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, I think what you're seeing there is a reflection from the beneath of the – but it is shingled and the shingle material was consistent throughout, although the roof's tile is different. I think you're just seeing a reflection from beneath a canopy there.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay, that's fine. Are there any other questions from the other members of the Board? (No response.) And the signage is remaining the same essentially?

Ms. Mikanik: At this point. I mean when they have a tenant—

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah, right. Right. But you're not here to tell us.

Mr. Dan Havener: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to bring your attention to when the daycare was permitted to go into the gas station in the adjacent retail space, the one-way drive with revised parking was a requirement that be done prior to the opening of the daycare. I would recommend that the Board suggest that that be done immediately and be taken care of now in lieu of waiting until this inspection takes place.

Mr. Comeaux: So currently is it two-way back there?

Mr. Havener: Yes.

Ms. Milanik: It is now, but you are correct, it's supposed to have—

Mr. Comeaux: It's supposed to be one-way? Yeah. Yes, I think that's a fine point. I think we addressed this site in the last few years. Although I say that and it could have been eight years ago now. Time flies. Okay, so that is

certainly something we'll bring up in the motion. Any other questions from the Board? (No response.) So can I get a motion from someone on the Board, please, reflecting now only our discussions but Mr. Havener's point about the uni-directional drive in the back.

Mr. _____: I'll make a motion that we approve this item as submitted with the condition of Mr. Havener's comment about the one-way drive being adopted as well.

Mr. _____: I'll second that.

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Snowden, can we please call the roll.

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

Mr. Snowden: So I'll issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for this as soon as possible. What I'll do is, when you get your zoning clearance to be in the work there, you can submit to me a site plan that shows how the one-way parking will be configured and I'll approve it.

4. **6785 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO:**
APPLICANT: MICHAEL ZENISEK; CJT PROPERTIES LIMITED.
(#168423) MINOR/EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Michael Zenisek: My name's Michael Zenisek.

Mr. Snowden: It's our fourth item tonight, members of the Board. It's 6785 East Main Street. EZ Thru is the applicant's business name, dba name. The application is for Certificate of Appropriateness, Exterior Modifications, Application #168423. It's the property located – it's actually located almost directly across the street from our previous applicant, south side of East Main Street, west of Hentz Drive and it's in the CS Community Services District of the city and also in the Community Commercial Overlay. The request by the Applicant is for this Board to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for a sign reface, new signage and other exterior modifications. The current use is drive-thru retail and the applicant's representative, Mr. Michael Zenisek.

This property is an existing drive-thru facility and it was granted a Special Exception Use Permit by the BZBA at the Board's last meeting on February 19th. The adjacent businesses include an eating and drinking establishment with drive-thru services, a car wash, an auto sales establishment and, members of the Board, it's come to my attention that that auto sales site is currently empty.

You should have on your desk an updated signage and exterior modification plan from the applicant. Let me take you through the review and then I will point out a specific situation.

The applicant did – although I noted it in my report because I was going off the old plan, the applicant did submit a plan showing some exterior modifications such as painting of the exterior. In the code, all redeveloped facades – that's the code's language – are required to be 40% or more, at least 40% is the terminology used, of natural materials. It was staff's view that since there aren't any door, window, additional architectural details being added, that it was hard to meet – it did not meet what staff – although there isn't a specific definition in the code of what "redevelopment" means, it was staff's view that allowing an applicant to paint an existing structure did not qualify as redevelopment. That was my view.

A note about the monument sign: The applicant's proposing to reface an existing 25 square foot monument sign on site. You can see it on the screen in front of you and the applicant showed the existing on his sign plan. The applicant's proposed sign on the plan includes changeable copy. The applicant included that because staff, in error, told them that that would be acceptable. Staff has reviewed the section of code with some assistance, and found that the changeable copy, as the Board members know, is not permitted. Therefore, staff is going to recommend that the applicant remove that from their proposal and staff did discuss that and apologized to the applicant prior to this meeting for that incorrect information.

Rooftop mechanicals: The applicant's not meeting the threshold that would require a parapet wall to be constructed or concealed, but staff just wanted to bring to the Board's attention, and asked the applicant if they would be willing to paint the rooftop mechanical structure, that's not in very good condition there as you can see, if possible. There may be a mechanical reason that would prevent that from being painted as part of a proposed façade repair, but staff just wanted to bring that up.

The Special Exception Use Permit has been granted. Staff is still waiting on official notification from City Council, but all indications are that there will be no changes to the Special Exception Use Permit as it was approved. Staff feels that the proposed changes will improve the character of the site and, that being said, I listed several conditions. But given the mistake that was made in giving the applicant the incorrect information, I would probably just turn it over to the Board and let the applicant address what exactly needs to happen there. So my apologies to the Board for the information that made it to the applicant.

And, lastly, the wall mounted sign, the applicant originally proposed two wall mounted cabinet signs, neither of which – only one sign is permitted and they cannot be cabinet signs. The applicant is proposing two – excuse me, one

large cabinet sign, so I would just turn it over to the Board to discuss signage that would be appropriate and meet code.

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Zenisek, is there anything you would like to add before we start?

Mr. Zenisek: I understand what Eric is kind of getting at in terms of the ability to letter the sign on the pole. It would just be an extension of the logo you see, so nothing crazy there other than that kind of change. And I'm open to whatever you guys think or whatever Eric prefers in terms of on the building itself above the door. And I'd like to paint it, because it needs painted.

Mr. Comeaux: If I could just ask a question, so right now, and I don't know the correct architectural term, but it looks like a red awning. Are you proposing to remove that awning?

Mr. Zenisek: Yes, I was going – it's too expensive for me to reface it. I looked at that and the sign people that I'm working with prepared a proposal for me and it was pricey.

Mr. Comeaux: Is it structurally deficient? Could you repaint it so you have your green and white coloring or is it—

Mr. Zenisek: In order to use it, it would need to be taken down. I guess the skeleton of it, I supposed could be used, but the price to re-awning it, for lack of a better term, was, in my eyes, excessive. There's not a lot of – the way I see it the sign on the street is much more important, causing you're taking across traffic eyes versus straight on, so I didn't see it as essential and it was very cost prohibitive to pursue it.

Mr. Comeaux: So you're going to remove the awning, you're going to paint the building and then your choices for the sign would be like channel lettering, right?

Mr. Snowden: Channel lettering or external illumination, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Comeaux: Have you given any thought to which of those two might—

Mr. Snowden: I hadn't. Eric and I met prior to coming here. So I'm fine with working with him in terms of what he thinks is best within the rule of the Board and the City, of course. I'll just explore it in terms of cost and visibility and then kind of come to a conclusion that way.

Mr. Comeaux: So both of them are permitted in this part, right?

Mr. Snowden: They are, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Comeaux: So they're both permitted and so you'd like to explore the cost side, right?

Mr. Zenisek: You know, channel lettering, between that and the external illumination, and just kind of figure out which works best. Whatever is ultimately going to look nicer is probably what I'll do within reason of cost. So if they're comparably priced in terms of the change, then I would go for whatever looks aesthetically better.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, does the Board, looking at the updated plans that were provided and everyone should have received an updated plan, was the Board comfortable with the size of the signage that he was proposing?

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Snowden, let me ask you, it's within the permissible parameters, right, the sizing of the sign?

Mr. Zenisek: We had it at 36, Eric, if I remember. So hopefully that's right around.

Mr. Snowden: Based on my reading and my measurement of the site, it's the exact size wall sign that would be permitted. It could not be larger by code.

Mr. Zenisek: For whatever it's worth, my sign buy had it at 38. So hopefully it's smaller and if it needs to be, of course, we can adjust the size.

Mr. Comeaux: I know less about signage and design than anybody in this room, but my guess is that if you did the sign externally illuminated, you could actually do that sign. Whereas if you did channel lettering, you'd have to find a channel – I'm just not sure you'd get the detail you want on it, which is not to lead you in either direction necessarily. But if you're infatuated with this design, it's probably—

Mr. Zenisek: Yeah, this was something – you know, as I saw the cost of the replacement of the awning, this was kind of an alternative. So this is something that's certainly flexible and you can see here, in terms of what goes above the door, was just something—

Mr. Snowden: I have a question for the Chairman or other Board members. In the past, and remembering that I'm new to Reynoldsburg, how have externally illuminated signs typically been lit in Reynoldsburg? Have they been lit-- There's not a lot of room there for the applicant to install a rounded lighting system. It would be above the line of the building, which I think would look somewhat strange. That's just my view. How have these sort of things been addressed previously?

Mr. Comeaux: Most of the time we've seen them they've been in strip malls and things of that nature, so they've provided for gooseneck lighting from above and things like that. We're open to-- Mr. Beougher?

Mr. Beougher: We've seen gooseneck point sources, we've also seen linear fixtures suspended from above.

Mr. Zollars: One thing I think we need to -- I don't know if anyone's looked -- once you take that awning off of there, how much room do you have between the lintel and the top of the building? That may answer the lighting questions, number one. And then, number two, that may impact the size of your lettering.

Mr. Zenisek: Yeah, no question. My sign guy was out there and whether the two feet is exactly accurate -- I don't know if it's 4' up there. I believe there's room.

Mr. Snowden: Members of the Board, we've established that the monument sign, the applicant is comfortable with simply removing the changeable copy on both sides and extending the graphic and centering the graphic. So my first question would be would the Board be comfortable with just approving that sign and allowing Mr. Zenisek to submit to me plans that reflect that change that the Board made with his secondary sign permit. And then the second question to that is with regard to the wall sign, or the building mounted sign, does the Board want to see Mr. Zenisek again to confirm that they like the design? Is the Board comfortable with the sign cabinet sign just becoming an externally illuminated sign and me approving the lighting system? You know, I'm certainly willing to do that, but at the end of the day, it's the Board's decision.

Mr. Zenisek: I'm looking for uniformity from both color and logo and style. So whatever, if we're okay with the monument sign, I'm looking for essentially the same thing. I'm not looking to get crazy. If the monument sign out front makes sense, then I would carry that over stylistically to whatever was on the building if you guys are cool with it.

Mr. Beougher: So you're interested in exploring a channel letter sign that has the arrows and the logo?

Mr. Zenisek: Really the only reason are on the arrows on left and the right is just because, you know, depending on how big the sign is, you kind of had to fill space. That's really the only reason the arrows are even in there. So if push came to shove, to get to the 36 square feet, we kind of elongated the box rectangularly, if that's a word, and then you kind of had empty space there, so the arrows are in there.

Mr. Beougher: The same of the lettering is a little small for that size building and what I was contemplating is what would happen if you painted the top portion of the building all the way around the green.

Mr. Zenisek: Oh, I would be very open to that. I'm looking for eyes and obviously attention from Main Street. Wendy's is dominant next door.

Mr. Beougher: And then your channel letters can be of sufficient size to draw people's attention.

Mr. Zenisek: I think that's a great idea. Then obviously just sticking with the same theme of color, the exact same shades.

Mr. Beougher: I think that actually gets – when I was concerned about you taking the awning down and, again, my eye is not as good as some other peoples', but there was nothing to break it up.

Mr. Zenisek: I kind of spoke with Eric about this. You can't see it in these pictures, unfortunately, but on the side of the building you can kind of see the two-tone that comes above the doorway and the window and around the sides of the building there's actually like a strike and that kind of breaks things up. I was going to explore maybe just the green theme to break up the white. But your suggestion of doing that at the top makes absolutely perfect sense for me as well.

Mr. Beougher: And one of the reasons I'm suggesting that is because the awning extends across the full width of the façade. We've all gotten used to it. So kind of pushing the ends in is going to make it look odd for a while until we get used to it again. If you do that band, then that kind of emulates the awning concept.

Mr. Zenisek: I think it's a great idea. I would love to do that. It also kind of breaks up the monotony of the white.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Beougher, then it's your view that if the applicant were to put approximately a two-foot green band around the top of the entire structure it would then – the could be white channel letters that would show up on that green. So the green would be, in some ways, functioning as like a sign board behind it that wasn't illuminated. Is that what you're getting at?

Mr. Beougher: Make no mistake. The green would be paint. It would not be sign band.

Mr. Snowden: Yes, but it would be functioning as such despite that.

Mr. Beougher: Well, that's your interpretation and that's fine. But the

size of the text then – and I would suggest it be a little larger than 2', because that looks a little narrow. You could go the full width from the top of the garage door to the top of the coping of the parapet wall and make your sign fill the space and be as – if the proportions are the same – I would leave a nice equal spacing top and bottom, but I think it would give you a nicer effect. And you could then illuminate it behind the channels.

Mr. Comeaux: So we could probably approve either with your consultation with Mr. Snowden.

Mr. Beougher: As long as he's not looking for variances.

Mr. Comeaux: As long as he's not looking for variances, right. So you would have kind of a choice. But if you do the green band along the top and did externally illuminated would that still make sense or would that be more problematic? If you painted the green strip along the top, does that mean channel lettering is better than the externally illuminated sign, or would either work at that point?

Mr. Beougher: Either would work at that point.

Mr. Zenisek: So would that kind of leave it up to me to pursue that in terms of cost and then maybe get with Eric?

Mr. Snowden: So, Mr. Chairman, what I'm hearing is that the Board is comfortable with either and that the Board would like me to approve a plan submitted by Mr. Zenisek that reflect that, is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. Comeaux: We would approve it. We don't necessarily have to see it again. If it's consistent with what we're shown, then we can delegate to you to say, "Yeah, that's what they were shown," with some small degree of variation, right? But if he comes back and he's got a new color scheme, if he's got – instead of taking the lettering from the middle of it he's got it all the way out to the ends so the perspective is different or whatever else, that would be more problematic.

Mr. Snowden: I understand. We're talking about the same thing. My questions is how much latitude—

Mr. Comeaux: We're trying to make it so he can walk out of here, go talk to the sign guy, get with you, put a sign up.

Mr. Snowden: I understand that, Mr. Chairman. My question is how much latitude does the Board want me to take? I'm just trying to get a clarification.

Mr. Comeaux: Some, not a lot.

Mr. Snowden: I have one final question for Mr. Beougher. We are clear that the band would extend around the entire structure?

Mr. Beougher: I think that's reasonable. I think that's probably the best way to have continuity around the entire building.

Mr. Comeaux: And then on the monument sign just real quickly, are you going to add any other verbiage or are you just going to have EZ Thru, or are you going to put drive-thru, beer, wine?

Mr. Zenisek: Eric had mentioned that. Unless it looks silly, I guess, which I don't think it would because it's not a lot of letters and I'm just looking for bang in your face and simple. So, if anything, whether it's beverage center, or beer/wine, it would be minor. My initial thought after we kind of discussed not having the building, you know the bottom half, was just to extend the whole

Mr. Beougher: Yeah, otherwise you've got people driving through looking for pet food.

Mr. Comeaux: Again, I wouldn't have a problem if he said EZ Thru Beverage Center. All right. Any other questions from the Board members? (No response.) Can I get a motion, please.

Mr. _____: I make a motion to approve as presented with the modifications we discussed.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay, so a green band along the top, he can have either with consultation with Mr. Snowden.

Mr. Beougher: Second.

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

Mr. Comeaux: So you need to consult with Mr. Snowden about channel lettering versus externally illuminated.

Mr. Snowden: That will be when you secure your final sign plan or your final sign permit from me. Remember that once the final sign permit is granted, you'll also have to get a permit from Building if you're actually hanging things. That should be something your sign contractor's helping you with, but we just like to be clear about exactly what the expectations are..

C. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Beougher: I received a phone call from – and I don't have the application number or anything like that, but the development at Waggoner and Broad Street south of the access road and west of the retention pond, this is the area where Lowe's is. This abuts the farm owned by Helen Trotter. If the Board members recall, I asked the developer to contact Mrs. Trotter and make sure she was happy with whatever buffering. The gentleman called her and asked if she would like to meet with him so he can present her his plans and discuss her concerns and she said, "No, thank you." So as far as I'm concerned and the Board should be concerned, I think that closes the matter.

Then moment of personal privilege, my term ends either this month or next month, but this will likely be my last meeting. My brother is retiring from the Air Force after 30 years, so I'll be at the Pentagon on the 19th watching him. Anyway, last hurrah. So this is my last hurrah and I think, even if I'm on the Board for the next meeting, I'll probably not show up if you have a quorum. If you find you're in trouble, let me know. It's been a privilege the last six years and I think I always like to leave things better than I found it and I like to think we left the City of Reynoldsburg better than we found it. So thank you all for your support of me and my crazy ideas sometimes and my long windedness.

Mr. Snowden: I have one more announcement before we leave and that is since this body last met, it has come to staff's attention that both Marlene Wirth and Charles McGrath, who are on Planning Commission, have passed away in January and December respectively. I made that announcement at our last BZBA meeting, but I wanted to make that announcement in front of this group as it had not been made.

So, lastly, thank you for your tolerance of me as well. It's a pleasure to serve you.

Mr. Comeaux: I would like to say thank you for your service. Your eye will be missed if nothing else. A lot of other things will be missed, but your eye certainly will be.

D. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

James Comeaux, Chair

Eric Snowden, Planning Adm.