



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2016 6:30 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Burd, Cullinan
ABSENT:

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Design Review Board – Regular – February 4, 2016

Mr. Bowman: I have one change. I believe I was the one that nominated Mr. Burd for Chairman. I do not know if that is important, but I feel proud to have done it.

Chairman Burd: Does anyone else have any changes?

Mr. Snowden: We just want to approve them as amended.

Chairman Burd: I will make a motion to approve as amended by Mr. Bowman.

Mr. Zollars: I will second that.

(Voice vote was unanimous.)

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Chairman Burd: If you are here tonight, to speak to an item that is on the Agenda, please stand, raise your right hand, and, do you swear or affirm that the testimony that you give to the Board tonight will be truthful? If so, say, "I do."

(Audible "I do's")

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **8097 E. Broad St.; Application #172886; Applicant Grant Giltz; Shoppes at East Broad; Major Site Plan Review - Phase 2**

Chairman Burd: If you are here to speak on this, please come to the podium and give us your name for the record.

Mr. Giltz: Good Evening. Grant Giltz, 4835 Munson Ave., Canton Ohio

Mr. Snowden: 8173 (8097) East Broad Street - Shoppes at East Broad, Phase II - Major Site Plan. Application: #172886 - Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located on the south side of E Broad Street, east of Waggoner Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services/Limited Overlay. Request is for certificate of appropriateness for a major site plan. Current Use: Retail Sales. Actually, the property is under construction as I am sure the applicant can discuss with you. Applicant: DN Reynoldsburg LLC. The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for a major site plan. The site plan is for a proposed commercial shopping center located in CS Community Service District. Phase I of the project was approved by the Board in 2015. The applicant is proposing to modify that original site plan to create additional building sites for a second phase. The site consists of an existing 120,000sf commercial building (under construction) with related parking improvements and neighboring out lots. Neighboring uses include commercial business along the north side of E. Broad Street in the City of Columbus. To the south, the property abuts agricultural land in Jefferson Township. The site was last rezoned in 2006, and in conjunction with that process, a limited overlay was placed over the site. The overlay text is on file in the Planning & Zoning Division office. The applicant was previously approved for a major site plan in March of 2015, and is now proposing to revise that site plan to add additional in-line tenant spaces. The applicant is proposing to increase the total building area on the 24.94ac site to 200,550sf, which is an increase to 78,650sf from their Phase I. The applicant is proposing to utilize materials that are consistent with the materials that were approved in Phase I. Staff's only concern is that the amount of painted concrete on the Hobby Lobby tenant space is too high. Staff's position is that another contrasting material is needed to breakup this facade, and we did discuss this with the applicant in the pre-application phase. Parking: The applicant is proposing 200,550sf of retail space. The limited overlay requires that the applicant provide 1 parking space for every 250sf of retail space. This would require the applicant to have 802 parking spaces on site. The applicant has provided for 928 spaces, so Staff is comfortable that there is adequate parking. The applicant has connected a previously constructed sidewalk along the south side of the main entrance drive from Waggoner Road to the front pedestrian area of the development, and that was at Staff's request. The applicant's previously approved landscape plan is still in effect. The proposed site plan revision reflects an adequate amount of landscape area within the additional parking lot area. The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed site plan and building improvements enhance the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness on the following condition: That the applicant revise the building rendering to add a contrasting material on the Hobby Lobby that extends at least 10'

from the finished grade. I think what they are showing there is approximately four feet, so it is sort of like a water course. With that, I will turn it back over to our Chairman.

Chairman Burd: Alright, thank you. Anything you would like to add to that?

Mr. Giltz: Sure. In general, the overall development of the center has expanded, which is always a good thing, to show the demand for the retail that we are seeing at the site, which is always a good thing. Our exterior elements of the shopping center is more of a carry forward from what we have already been previously approved. I wish we were two weeks further into the project, and you could start seeing some of these elements come to light, and get in the center, especially on the TJ Maxx side. And, as you look at the site, it is TJ Maxx to the end of the shopping center. That is how the development is going to flow. And so, as we get down to the Hobby Lobby side, right before Hobby Lobby, just on the other side of Dollar Tree, is where the transition of phase two begins. So, phase two, again the exterior with the stone, the brick, and the earth tone efface and metal, is what we coupling. It is very hard to put this on a banner so everyone can see. We did put together a larger banner. I don't know what is best for you guys to look at. But, we have it here for your review.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Giltz, if you give me a second, I will try to display the electronic version that Sara sent to us.

Mr. Giltz: Sure. But, as it pertains to Hobby Lobby, Mr. Snowden brought up Staff's recommendations. Hobby Lobby originally came before us, and the initial presentation did not have the columns that you see. The columns that you see here were originally consecrated on Hobby Lobby's prototype plans. Staff had recommended some form of break-up of the wall. We went back to Hobby Lobby, they agreed to do so. In this picture, since we don't have all of Hobby Lobby's signage, and they will be coming back before you, they actually have signs that go in between the panels. So, it does break up the wall, and it fits in between the columns. It is home decor, crafts, floral, and a few other things. So, we do not have the exact signs to show you, but they will be done for you at a later time. Our goal here is to show you the elements of the building products that we are using that go from west of the shopping center, all the way to the building before Dollar Tree, that was already previously approved. With that, I will open it up to questions and comments.

Chairman Burd: Thank you for bringing that in, as well as all of the materials. And certainly, if any member of the Board would like to get up and go down and look at the materials, you certainly are welcome to before we take a vote.

Mr. Snowden: What is on the screen in front of you, is what is in front of them right now.

Chairman Burd: Thank you very much. I will open it up for questions from the Board, if there are any.

Unknown Speaker: Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions. The exterior facade, is that the sample that you have here? I was just curious. I thought it was more of a stucco.

Unknown Speaker: Yes, the cement panel will have ultracrete by Sherwin Williams. So, it will give the appearance of a stucco, or efface finish.

Mr. Giltz: What it is, is a stamped wall that gets poured and tilted up.

Unknown Speaker: And then painted per your schedule?

Mr. Giltz: A lot of times they inject the color into the concrete.

Unknown Speaker: Will it have dividing lines like panel squares, so you can see individual panels, or will that all be kind of raked smooth like a stucco wall would be?

Mr. Giltz: You will see individual parts of it.

Unknown Speaker: And those will be 3x3, or how large are these panels?

Mr. Giltz: It is the standard size block, so it is a 16 inch block is what it looks like.

Unknown Speaker: So we are talking like a split-faced block?

Mr. Hicks: If you had any presentation on the landscape plan?

Mr. Giltz: The current landscaping plan, is a continuation of the existing landscaping.

Unknown Speaker: Is it ok Mr. Hicks if I ask one question regarding the facade.

Mr. Hicks: yeah, I wasn't sure how we wanted to handle this, but I some point I did want to talk about the landscaping plan.

Mr. Bowman: The coloration, is it going to be uniform throughout the transition to Hobby Lobby from the rest of the current construction?

Mr. Giltz: What we are trying to do, it is the same color. We are not trying to give you a starky one color, and that's it. We are trying to give you the different elements, this is Hobby Lobby, this is Dollar Tree, this is TJ Maxx, this is Sports Authority. We are trying to give their individual identities as well. Again, we have multiple colors going in there, but all within the same color tones.

Chairman Burd: Any additional questions about the facade, before we move onto the landscape?

Mr. Hicks: I have some questions and some comments about the landscaping, and pardon me for not knowing all of the history here because I was not here during 2015 when the phase one was approved, and I don't know as far as the zoning package, what is approved, if landscaping is a part of that or not. There is a retention pond to the west of your building site, and it is not really shown on your landscaping plan, it is shown on other plans, and that is another one way entrance, very visible from Waggoner, and your landscaping plan does not incorporate that at all. There is some landscaping over there, but I do not know if that is considered finished or if that was finished previously, or if there are any plans for around that pond area. And then, I also had a few comments about the parking lot landscaping. My overall feeling is it is rather light on the trees. For example, your sort of main drive where you are separating this phase one from this phase two, where this drive comes north to south, you know you have got four trees on one side and three trees on the other. So, it is just kind of a sprinkling here and there that maybe some additional trees could enhance the site. And then, my third comment would be, and again this is something that maybe I do not know the history of, is the buffering between this property and the property to the south, which I believe is in the township. But, I don't know if there is any requirements for buffering, if any of the previous phases have had any buffering, if the zoning requires any buffering, if they

are just counting on existing buffering, and if so, is existing buffering on each side of the property line, or on the township side of that line.

Mr. Snowden: Let me jump in here to bring Mr. Hicks up to date. We are very glad to have him on the Design Review Board. This a project that has been around since 2007, so there is definitely some history to it. The original rezoning text had a fenced or screening requirement along the south portion of the property. The reason for that is because at the time the intention was, the City's view was, hey that is probably going to be developed someday into single family homes, so there needs to be some screening. Since then, that area was actually put into what is called a farmland preservation, which means that is probably going to remain farmland for the foreseeable future if not indefinitely. So, that is not going to be developed. When the applicant came back last year originally to BZBA and, I can't remember if it was Design Review Board, but I feel like Mr. Comeaux was there and he was on DRB, but basically both Boards at the time felt that given that information which was a change from the original plan, and the fact that the applicant was proposing to maintain the existing sorta tree line that is along the bottom, that was sufficient given that requirement, it was meeting the intent of the code, and that the trash and load areas were all adequately screened along the back, that was not really an issue. In addition, Mr. Hicks, just to bring you up to date, the area you see along the north side of their main entrance drive is an EPA conservation easement that was required because there was originally some wetlands on this site, ten or fifteen years ago when development first started to move into the area, and that conservation easement was entered into either by Mr. Giltz's organization or a predecessor property owner, in order to mitigate those wetlands and allow for a developable site, they did some sort of stream corridor preservation. Although you do not typically see preservation at the front of the property, there is a portions that has to be maintained. The applicant has to do some removal and they have removed some dead wood and cleaned up the area, but there is a specific corridor easement of conservation that they must maintain, in that area.

Mr. Glitz: Mr. Hicks, just to follow up what Mr. Snowden had to say on the conservation portion. On the corner of Waggoner and Broad Street, there is a little stream that runs underneath Waggoner, and follows along in front of our property, and then goes underneath Broad Street onto the other side. So, on our side, the EPA had explained to us that if we want to do the development that we want to do, mitigate the wetlands that we have on our property, they wanted us to preserve as much of the stream as possible. So, we were instructed to maintain a fifty foot buffer of trees, at the corner. At the stoplight, that is a key component for any retail development, especially this end of the development. And so, to your point, the trees on our side, we did comply with Reynoldsburg's requirement for landscaping. It was sort of a hard fought battle with some of the temps that we have on this side of the development. Obviously we started from lows and work down. There are not as many trees and obstructions of view from the view corridors, or from the out lots that are already up and existing. So, when it comes to the furthest part of the western site, we still have a challenge with views and corridors, with the trees that the EPA mandated that we

keep on our site. Across the street, they do not have any trees, but we have a substantial amount of green space that we are maintaining on the property, and also trying to keep our tenants happy because of different views and things they want that are sensitive to them. Also, you touched on the pond. The pond, again, we would love to dress up that pond as much as we can. The EPA is very very sensitive on that pond as to what we can do around there. We have grasses. We have shrubbery. We have things to maintain the grounds. There comment was, some of those things cause trash and debris to get hung up, and ultimately get hung up in the pond. So, they want it to be natural, but natural enough where we can clean it and maintain it, and also do the things we need to do for the EPA requirements.

Mr. Hicks: I appreciate your explanation and I think that section of trees and conservation area really kind of improves the overall view. I know it blocks your views and that is a hard sale to try to get retail in there, but it also adds a lot to the atmosphere and the feeling of that area. I guess specifically regarding the pond, and I understand keeping ponds natural, sometimes I think it is kind of silly that we have so many retention, not necessarily in this area, but around time there are a lot of retention ponds that are so well neat and kept. But, I guess my comment would be direct to the areas that are finish mode, that are currently bordering Waggoner Road where you have a sidewalk. Area that have already been improved that have already been touched. I guess I don't see why we can't add a half a dozen trees or so along that area that could in ten or twenty years also contribute to the atmosphere and the environment of the entrance to that shopping center.

Mr. Glitz: Mr. Hicks, we would not be opposed to put a few trees along Waggoner, along that edge of the pond, on the far west side. I will say that as the developer, we would not be opposed to put a few of those trees there, if we could get something worked out with the EPA.

Mr. Hicks: I think that would be something that I would be in favor for as far as a conditional approval. Maybe we conditionally approve with maybe a half dozen trees over there around that side of the pond. If the applicant is agreeable to that.

Mr. Giltz: I would be concerned if it was a condition of the approval when I don't have anything.

Mr. Hicks: If it is permissible by the EPA.

Mr. Glitz: Fair enough.

Chairman Burd: Anyone else have questions or comments? Mr. Snowden, were you satisfied with what was shared about the Hobby Lobby and the contrast?

Mr. Snowden: Yes. I don't want to belabor the point. When you first look at it, it is quite a large area. I think the signage will break up the facade, so I do take their point. I still support what I said, but ultimately, the decision is the Board's

Chairman Burd: I think we should entertain a motion, and if we are going to request trees, it needs to be specified that it is with the EPA approval. We don't want to put on a requirement that they can not ultimately meet.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, if I could just interject, whoever makes that motion, I would say EPA or other State or County level environmental agencies. If you want to get into environment, there are a bunch of them.

Chairman Burd: With that I will entertain a motion.

Mr. Hicks: I would like to move to approve the plans as presented with one condition, that they add quantity six, two inch caliber shade trees to the western most portion of the site, around the retention pond, bordering Waggoner Road, and the entrance off Waggoner Road, pending approval from the Ohio EPA or any other State level environmental agency permitting the installation of the trees there.

Mr. Snowden: Very well, it stands approved. As you know, I will send a letter stating what remains, but it is basically following up from your last BZBA level approval. In that case Sara, I would just state, revise the landscape plan to reflect that. If there is any push back from it, just give me a letter, or email, stating that you can not, from the proper authorities, and I will share the result of that with the Board, when their final zoning certificate is approved.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
SECONDER:	Eliot Bowman
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Burd, Cullinan

2. 8097 E. Broad St.; Application #172830; Applicant: Melody Ward; Business: Half Priced Books; Signage

Chairman Burd: Is the applicant here? Could we have your name for the record?

Mr. Hartley: Jim Hartley with Signcom.

Chairman Burd: Thank you. Mr. Snowden will give a brief presentation and we will talk about the item.

Mr. Snowden: 8097 E. Broad Street - Half-Priced Books - Signage Application: #172830 - Certificate of Appropriateness, for the property located on south side of E. Broad Street between Waggoner Road and Taylor Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales. Applicant: Signcom Inc. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a new wall mounted sign on the front facade of a commercial building that is currently under construction. The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building and related improvements that are currently under construction. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS district, so you have some out lots, you have Lowes, there is a bank use. To the south, the property abuts agricultural land in Jefferson Township. The Board and the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals approved the site plan and

building architecture for the development in 2015. In addition to the wall sign, the applicant has provided plans proposing to reface two existing multi-tenant ground signs. The locations of these signs were approved in conjunction with a comprehensive sign plan, and the Board is technically not required to review face changes in this location. Essentially, we are doing it because they are in front of us, but I wanted everyone to know that it is technically not required in this case. If you want to know why, give yourself an hour and come talk to me. The applicant is proposing to install a new 158.28sf wall sign. The proposed sign consists of internally illuminated channel letters mounted to a red aluminum sign board. The sign does not exceed the 160sf of signage permitted by code and was shown on the conceptual building renderings when the certificate of appropriateness for the building architecture was approved. The proposed wall sign is consistent with the panels proposed for the multi-tenant signs. One thing we like to see is if the signs are internally consistent and are they consistent with one another. In this case, they are. The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. With that, I will turn it over to our Chairman, and I will be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Snowden. Mr. Hartley, did you have anything to add to that?

Mr. Hartley: Staff has done a fine job with their recommendations.

Chairman Burd: Very straight forward signage. I will open it up to questions. I do not have any. Does anyone else have questions or comments? Yes, Mr. Hicks.

Mr. Hicks: Is the overall scale of the sign compliant with our rules regarding the size of the facade?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, that is a great question. What the code says, in this location, is that they would get two square foot of signage for every one square foot of tenant linear space parallel to the street. So basically, for the front facade, in this case, and the idea is to keep signage proportional with the size of the building. All signs with a setback of eighty linear feet or more from the public right-of-way. As you can see, that is more than eighty feet and that is why they are considered a Type B signage. They are a little bit under what they are permitted. I do not find it to be overwhelming given the size of the fascia. The fascia was well designed. It was designed with this tenant in mind. It was designed with some of their colors integrated into the building structure. As far as new signage on a building, it really does not get much better than that.

Mr. Hicks: I would agree, I think the fascia of the building looks great. I guess one of my pet peeves is if you ever see a center that has a sign that is just a little bit too small, it does not do the tenant any favors. There is one place in retail that you do not want to cheap out on and that is your sign. So, I do not know if there is any possibility of maybe enlarging the scale of the sign, proportion to the facade, a little bit.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, not without a variance, per the code.

Mr. Hicks: So, they are at the max?

Mr. Snowden: They are about two square feet under.

Mr. Hicks: Then nevermind.

Mr. Snowden: The signs for these national retailers come in different scales, so this is probably the closest scale that was immediately under the code requirements of our code.

Mr. Hicks: Second comment would be on the east pylon of the monument sign that we technically don't have authority to tell you what to do, you have the Sports Authority sign on one panel, and directly below that panel would be the Half Priced Book panel, and the two signs, and the company colors and logos are very similar, and I would recommend that those panels not be put right next to each other on the pylon, and separated some, so they do not look like they are one pylon sign, but rather separate stores.

Mr. Snowden: The good news is that Staff gets to review that, and I will certainly take that into consideration.

Mr. Burd: Thank you Mr. Hicks. Other questions?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: I always provide a written action notice following all of our meetings. You will need to submit a zoning sign permit application for the proposed sign reface, and for the two reface panels. And definitely, I will take into consideration Mr. Hicks comments, so I would suggest that you and the property owner figure out how that multi-tenant sign panels are going to be delegated. You want to show me the exact dimensions of the panels. You did not give that to me, so please do that. And once that is secured, you want to submit building plans for the new sign, secure permits, and complete the required inspections. Our building division number will be listed in the record of action letter.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Pat Zollars
SECONDER:	Tyler Cullinan
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Burd, Cullinan

3. **6573 E. Livingston Ave.; Application #172840; Applicant: Signs Up, LLC; Business: Nails by Ali; Signage**

Chairman Burd: Sir, May I get your name for the record?

Mr. Turell: Lawrence Turell

Chairman Burd: Thank you for being here.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. 6573 E. Livingston Ave. - Nails by Ali - Signage Application: #172840 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Location: Property is located on south side of Livingston Ave between Baldwin Road and Briceton Drive. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales. Applicant: Sign Up LLC/Signsmith. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface an existing internally illuminated cabinet sign. Existing Site & Context The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building. The other tenant spaces include retail sales and office uses, as well as a childcare center. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City. To the south and east, the property abuts multi-family dwellings in the AR-1 and AR-2 districts.

The applicant is proposing to reface an existing 48sf wall mounted sign. The proposed sign panel contains one logo and three colors. The proposed white background matches the majority of signage on site. The existing sign cabinet is black and matches the other existing wall mounted sign cabinets. The applicant should clarify the proposed material for the sign panel. This is something we like to know. The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. With that, I will turn it back over to our Chairman.

Chairman Burd. Thank you. Mr. Turell, do you have anything to add to his presentation?

Mr. Turell: No, not really. It is a typical sign.

Chairman Burd: Do you know what the material is for the sign?

Mr. Turell: Lexan

Chairman Burd: Alright, good deal.

Mr. Snowden: This is the tenant space here. It kind of faces Baldwin, even though it has a Livingston mailing address.

Chairman Burd: Any questions?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: It is nice to see tenant spaces in this center getting leased. Anyone that is familiar with it knows that it has had some challenges. Sir, I will provide a record of action. The applicant should submit a zoning sign permit application for the proposed sign reface. Staff will require two copies of plans to confirm compliance with the approved certificate of appropriateness. If you would write on there, "this is Lexan", that would be great. Thank you very much.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Richard Hudson
SECONDER:	Pat Zollars
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Burd, Cullinan

4. 8231 E. Broad St.; Application #172870; Applicant: Anchor Sign Inc. - Amy Thomas; Business: Dollar Tree; Signage

Chairman Burd: Is there someone here to speak to this item? No? Okay, Mr. Snowden, I will let you give the presentation, and then we will discuss it.

Mr. Snowden: Well gentlemen, we are back to the Shoppes at East Broad. As you can see, this is typical, we have tenants getting on line, their sign contractors are getting signage approved. 8231 E. Broad Street - Dollar Tree - Signage Application: #172870 - Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located on the south side of E. Broad Street between Waggoner Road and Taylor Road. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales Applicant: Signcom Inc. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness for a new wall mounted sign on the front facade of a commercial building that is currently under construction. Existing Site & Context The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building and related improvements that are currently under construction. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS district of the City. To the south, the property abuts agricultural land in Jefferson Township. The locations of these signs were approved in conjunction with a comprehensive sign plan, and the Board is not required to review face changes in this location. Staff would like to clarify that the color change to the EIFS on the building fascia and the green material on the building's cornice were, one, not included on any previous certificate of appropriateness application, and two, not shown on any of the building renderings for any of the Shoppes at East Broad. It is not unusual for a sign company to do some branding. It would just be a matter of them following

the procedures. We will discuss that with them and if they need to come back and get that approved, we will deal with that when it comes. I wanted the Board to be clear we are approving the signage. The applicant is proposing to install a new 129.06 sf wall sign. The proposed sign consists of internally illuminated channel letters with green face panels mounted to a raceway. The sign does not exceed the 140 sf of signage permitted by Code and was shown on the conceptual building renderings when the certificate of appropriateness for the building architecture was approved. The sign assembly extends 12" from the building facade, which is the maximum distance permitted by code. The proposed wall sign is consistent with the panels proposed for the multi-tenant signs. Again, I think it is pretty similar to the *Half Priced Books* signage that we saw. The fascia was designed for this applicant. I think Mr. Hicks' question was great, it is based on the linear length of their facade. With that, the Board should apply the Standards of Design Review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is that the Board Approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Chairman Burd: I do not have any comments or questions. Would any member of the Board like to ask a question of Mr. Snowden? Seeing none, I understand Eric that you will reach out to the applicant about the items you spoke about?

Mr. Snowden: I just wanted them to be clear if they were present here. And, I didn't want any future confusion. We will reach out to them.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Pat Zollars
SECONDER:	Tyler Cullinan
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Burd, Cullinan

5. 6324 E. Livingston Ave.; Application #172887; Applicant: Moussa Alsharaqa; Business: Diva's Hair & Beauty Supply; Signage

Chairman Burd: Are you here for this item Sir? If you could come to the podium and give us your name for the record.

Mr. Myers: My name is Andrew Myers and I am here to represent Diva's.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Myers. Mr. Snowden, if you are ready to give us the presentation...

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. 6324 E. Livingston Ave. - Diva's Hair and Beauty Supply - Signage Application: #172887 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the north side of E. Livingston Avenue between Brice Road and Steckel Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales. Applicant: Moussa Alsharaqa The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to install a new wall mounted channel letter sign.

The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses and a charitable bingo game use. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City. To the north, the property abuts multi-family dwellings in the AR-3 district. That would be the Century City apartment complex to the north. The applicant is proposing to install a 56sf internally illuminated channel letter sign. The proposed sign contains two colors. Staff has calculated that the applicant is entitled to 64sf of signage per the Code. The proposed sign style is consistent with the requirements of the Community Commercial Overlay for new signage. The applicant's plans did not provide any information regarding materials, or information about the letter return colors or dimensions. A lot of times, the applicants don't do that. I don't feel the need to make that a specific condition, but it is something they should include on their plans when they submit for the zoning sign permit. What colors are those letter returns, and what the distance is? Just so I can confirm that they meet code. The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Snowden. Mr. Myers, did you have anything to add?

Mr. Myers: Just one question. We did submit an actual rendering of the actual signage.

Mr. Snowden: They received it, Sir. Mr. Myers, what I was commenting on was, the Code actually has a requirement of how far letters can extend from its 12". You did not necessarily state what the colors would be. It looked like it could be black. You can verbally state that in a statement, on a revised plan, when you submit for the Zoning Certificate. I am just trying to confer that it meets code, and that we have it documented. The sign overall is meeting our design requirements and code, and that is why I am not overly concerned.

Mr. Myers: Ok. So that can be stated as we are applying for the Zoning Sign Permit?

Mr. Snowden: It is procedural, rather than stylistic, Members of the Board. That is why I am not asking for a condition.

Chairman Burd: Mr. Myers did you have anything to add about the sign? Ok. Questions or comments from the Board?

Mr. Hudson: I thought maybe the "Diva's" was very small, and it seems it should be larger in case I was looking for it if I was driving down the street. That is just a comment. It is not something that you would have to do. I just thought it looked very small.

Mr. Myers: I would agree with that, and let me explain. My client is not from Columbus, from the west coast and the east coast, New Jersey and New York area. They promote what the store is before they promote whose store it is. So, if it is going to be Chinese food, that is what they promote. That is what he is accustomed to, and that is what he insisted on, although I did try to get him to emphasize the name of the business a little larger. I guess I kind of understood his point, in an area that is so overwhelmed in population, like New York,

nobody cares that it is Diva's, they just care that it is a beauty supplier. That is why it is done that way.

Mr. Hudson: That explains it. I understand.

Mr. Snowden: There are also places where local or state regulations require something like "LLC" to be placed on signage.

Chairman Burd: Any other questions? Seeing none, would anyone like to entertain a motion?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Very well, your sign is approved. I will send a letter of action out and you are going to want to submit for a zoning sign and revise your plans, as we discussed. Once you make that application, you can also submit building plans and secure permits for the new sign. They will need to be engineered stamped plans for the new sign. That will probably take two to three weeks for that to go out for plan review.

Mr. Hudson: Thank you.

Chairman Burd: Thank you.

Mr. Snowden: Have a great evening.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Board Member
SECONDER:	Richard Hudson
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Burd, Cullinan

6. 1749 Brice Rd.; Application #172888; Applicant: Sign Shop Inc.; Business: Miss Chrissy's Plus Size; Signage

Chairman Burd: Can we get your name for the record?

Mr. Masters: Timothy Masters

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Masters. And Mr. Snowden, whenever you are ready.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. 1749 Brice Road - Chrissy's Plus-Sized Consignment - Signage Application: #172888 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Property is located on the west side of Brice Road between Astor Avenue and Radekin Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay Request: Request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales. Applicant: Sign Shop Inc/Signarama Reynoldsburg The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface an existing internally illuminated stencil-style cabinet sign system. The site is developed with an existing multi-

tenant commercial building. The other tenant spaces include retail sales and office uses, as well as a childcare center. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City. To the west, the property abuts single family dwellings in the City of Columbus. The applicant is proposing to reface an existing 27.96 sf wall mounted sign. The proposed sign consists of a stenciled aluminum sign face with a board that allows light to pass through and the letters to appear illuminated. A blue graphic will be applied on the letters. The sign as proposed is consistent with the aluminum sign cabinet system that extends around the entire front façade of the shopping center. The applicant did not provide information regarding the sign materials, again it is procedural. I would just suggest that you state that on your plans from now on because technically it is relevant to the Code from time to time. Gentlemen, you may recall that there was an applicant that made an application to reface this and the Board turned it down due to information not being provided properly and the applicant did not attend the meeting. Since then, that tenant has left and a new clothing shop tenant has gone through the approvals process to open and now they are getting their signage. The nice part about it is it is consistent with the entire sign system on the building.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Snowden. Mr. Masters, do you have anything to add.

Mr. Masters: No, it is going to be aluminum face with plexiglass backing. We have made several signs for this center in the past so we know exactly what is going to match.

Chairman Burd: It looks very nice. I do not have any questions. Any questions from Members of the Board?

Mr. Bowman: So I am seeing this in my mind right, when it is illuminated, the letters look illuminated?

Mr. Masters: Correct. The aluminum blocks all the light, so basically it looks like a channel letter at night. So, only the letters are illuminated. Again, as the previous guy stated, we put "Miss Chrissy's" small, with "Consignment Shop" because that is the most important part. We could care less what her name is. She liked that idea as well.

Mr. Bowman: Would Miss Chrissy agree with that.

Mr. Masters: Miss Chrissy completely agreed with that. She has had a successful business on the west side of Columbus for years. I think she is just moving east because she got caught up in the casino area. This should be a business that is here for many years to come. I have been shopping her shop for ten years on the west side.

Mr. Bowman: Just a question for curiosity. Thank you very much for answering that.

Chairman Burd: Any other questions or comments?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: I think Signarama Reynoldsburg knows the drill better than anyone but you are going to want to submit for a zoning sign permit. Bring me two copies of the plan showing compliance with this approval, and like I said, you are probably going to want to make a note of what the materials are. We will send you a written notice of that as well.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tyler Cullinan
SECONDER:	Eliot Bowman
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Burd, Cullinan

7. 1468 Brice Rd.; Application #172890; Applicant: Sign Shop Inc.; Business: Atrium Personnel; Signage

Chairman Burd: Mr. Snowden, would you give the presentation?

Mr. Snowden: you can see that Signarama applied for two clients at the same time. 1468 Brice Road - Atrium Personnel - Signage Application: #172890 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the northeast corner of Brice Road and Rygate Drive. Existing Zoning: NC - Neighborhood Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request for certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Vacant (Proposed: Business Office). Applicant: Signarama of Gahanna The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to install a new cabinet style ground sign on an existing non-conform ground sign assembly. Existing Site & Context The site is developed with an existing commercial building with two tenant spaces. The other tenant space is a barber shop/personal services use. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the NC district of the City. To the east, the property abuts single family dwellings in the R-3 district. Administrative - This is a rear case where I think building and zoning are going to be at odds with one another. For building purposes, our Chief Building Official is going to require a building permit because this portion of the sign was in such poor repair that the applicant actually took it down. Correct?

Mr. Masters: To have it repaired at our shop. So, within our facility, we just removed it to repair it so that we could put the exact sign back up.

Mr. Snowden: We will discuss the details, but it is actually going to be a reface. What you have here is a non-conforming sign that has been maintained. It was previously removed to comply with an order for repairs issued by the Code Compliance Division. Because of this, staff is classifying this a sign reface for the purposes of zoning review, but a building permit will be required, I can discuss that with you and our Building Official next week. The applicant to install a 24sf panel on an existing non-conforming ground sign. The proposed sign consists of two separate sign panels, each are approximately equal in size, which means the entire sign is no larger than 50sf. That would be permitted by code, when the sign was built. In style, this sign would not meet the requirements of the Community Commercial Overlay today. But, when it was built, it did meet the Code requirements. The sign is a Type A ground sign per the Zoning Code, and 50sf is maximum size. The proposed sign face panel has white background and contains 3 colors. Staff's position is that the proposed sign face is in harmony with the existing face and the colors of the sign support structure. The

applicant did not provide any information about the sign materials. The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. With that, I will turn it over to our Chairman.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Snowden. Mr. Masters, do you have anything to add?

Mr. Masters: No.

Mr. Hicks: Chairman, I have one question. Looking at the actual sign panel. There is a lot of blank space above and below the sign. Is there some way to reorganize or change the actual log or some of the graphics, or the lettering, in order to better fit the size of the actual sign?

Mr. Masters: Atrium Personnel is a national brand. This is the only logo that they are permitted by corporate to use. I even discussed with the customer of putting a few bullet points of types of individuals they are looking for, phone number, anything, and they said that according to their corporate by-laws, the logo is the only thing permitted on the sign. I did the best I could with what I had.

Chairman Burd: Mr. Hicks, any other questions? Does anyone else have other questions. If they wanted to add more, we could encourage that, but if this is what they are stuck with, I think that is fine. I think it is a nice looking sign, and it is definitely an upgrade. I understand that national brands like to keep their brand.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: The application is approved. I will send out the written notice. You want to get a building sign permit. We have a new Chief Building Official that will be with us on Monday. Because this cabinet has been down, it is going to have to be remounted. He may require a building permit for that. It ultimately is going to be up to him. Once you get organized, come in and chat with us and we will figure out the game plan. Thanks Mr. Masters.

RESULT:	APPROVED [6 TO 1]
MOVER:	Richard Hudson
SECONDER:	Pat Zollars
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Carr, Burd, Cullinan
NAYS:	Hicks

8. **7643 E. Main St.; Application #172892; Applicant: Randy Hering; Business: Densie Hering, DDS LLC; Historic District**

Chairman Burd: Can we get your name Sir, for the record?

Mr. Hering: My name is Randy Hering.

Chairman Burd: Mr. Snowden, would you give your report?

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. 7643 E. Main St - Exterior Modifications - Hering DDS LLC Application: #172892 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Location: Property is located on south side of E. Main St just east of Waggoner/Graham Road. Existing Zoning: CC - Community Commerce / HCO - Historic Commercial Overlay. The request for the Board to issue a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications. Current Use: Business Office - Dentist Applicant: Randy Hering, who is with us this evening. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to make a building addition to an existing commercial building in the historic district. The site contains a small commercial office building that was originally constructed as a single family dwelling. The proposed addition will be within an existing porch area at the front of the building. Neighboring uses include other commercial business also within the historic district. The lot immediately to the east contains a single family dwelling, which is a non-conforming use. To the south, the property abuts single family homes in the R-3 district. The applicant is proposing to an addition within an existing front porch that is approximately 200 sf in area. Although this was the original entrance to the home, the area is no longer used for customer access. The applicant is proposing to maintain an 18" area at the front of the porch and the original handrail assembly in order to maintain the look of the original front porch. Materials - The current building is clad clapboard siding and wood trim which will be extended to this addition. The applicant is proposing to reuse the existing window and use a door that matches the characteristics of the existing door. You can clarify this Mr. Hering, the applicant is not proposing to maintain the existing screen door. Staff's recommendation is that the Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the propose exterior modifications enhances and protects the characteristics of the Historic District. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. This is a case where you have a single family dwelling that is now on a main street. It has been zoned commercial since approximately 1955. And, finding ways to have it continue to be a viable small office use, while still maintaining the look that we mean in the Historic District is a challenge. We have not seen porch additions like this in Reynoldsburg before, but I can tell you that there are places that it has been done and it can be effective if it is done properly, to maintain the look while still allowing that to be additional usable space. The good news is the applicant is proposing to reuse materials and extend materials, and that is the most positive thin in my opinion. With that, I will turn it over to our chair.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Snowden. Mr. Hering, did you have anything that you would like to say or add?

Mr. Hering: Yes, there is a note here about reusing the existing window, that is not what we were planning. We are planning on using a similar shape. But, because of the shape of it, the existing window goes below where the railing is, and we did not want to put a window directly in front of the railing. It is also hard to reuse an eighty year old window.

Mr. Snowden: I should have clarified and said a window in an extremely similar style, based

on your drawing.

Chairman Burd: Did you have anything else you would like to add? I will open this up to questions and comments from the Board.

Mr. Hicks: I have a few questions. The exterior materials of your new walls that you are building here, you are proposing siding to match the house? What is the intended use of this additional couple hundred square foot?

Mr. Hering: We are trying to add enough space for another dentist. It will kinda be an office space for the dentist. We are going to do a remodel inside, move walls around and things. So we needed a little more space to make it work. The easiest that we could see within the concept of the building to come up with that extra space.

Mr. Hicks: Is there any additional space on facades of the home that are not as visible from the street, that you could add additional space to instead of building out on the porch.

Mr. Hering: The only other option is to build a addition coming out of the center of the building coming into the side lot lawn. We thought that would be less attractive on the overall concept.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, one of the challenges that you really would have with a side addition... Mr. Hering, you have had a rear addition at one point, correct? And that was a situation where the DRB at the time required this sort of gabled roof look to be extended into the addition. The challenge you are going to have there is extending that gabled roof because it truncates at that wall because it is steeply gabled. You would have a small area with a very tight gable. That is where he would run into challenges to do something like that.

Mr. Hicks: One of my comments would be that generally historic areas have front porches. Historic homes have front porches. And, a front porch is definitely within the character of this area, and I think it is very important that we work as hard as we can to try to maintain that character of the area. We do not build houses with front porches anymore. You have two feet of space to put a decorative bench and that is generally good enough for most people anymore. I think preserving front porches in a historic area should be a great importance. I would not be opposed to building out some usable space on the front porch if there was a way that we could perhaps build out on the front porch that would be more historically accurate, with maybe more windows, maybe a three seasons kind of look. I know that there was a lot of porches that have been build out on older homes, in which it is more windows, that may you could do something that you would have privacy for an office, but also maintain the exterior facade that it is still a porch, and not just more vinyl siding, going down Main St.

Mr. Hering: The real problem with that is that the sound from the road, as people accelerate up that hill, is so loud today that it is actually irritating inside the building. If we are ten feet closer, it would be almost unusable with that much window space. I was planning on doing a sound deadening wall design, and if we put all windows up, it would be unusable as an office

space. So, we are kind of stuck between the terrible road noise. So that is where we were with enclosing it with a three season look.

Mr. Snowden: I think that is a really great observation, Mr. Hicks.

Mr. Hicks: Thank you. I guess my final comment or question or statement would be that I would not be in favor of a building out on the porch. I foresee some building code issues that obviously are not really in our frame of footers and insulation, and all of that. Trying to do a porch, that is not built for a structure. I am not in favor of building out onto a porch unless it was done, especially one this visible in the downtown historic area, unless it is done in a way that still maintains a real porch look, and is historically accurate for the building in the area. Those are just my comments.

Chairman Burd: Any additional comments or questions for the applicant or for Mr. Snowden.

Mr. Snowden: I think they are all great observations. So everyone understands Staff's view, Staff's goal, in a lot of cases, is to try to find a compromise that allows the applicant to do and still maintain some of the items. I think Mr. Hicks comments are very good. Ultimately, the reason why a lot of these items come to Design Review Board, and this is a great teachable moment for the Board, because there are different opinion, and the Board has to collectively make a decision. In this case, my feeling is that building into porches, or glassing them in, is something that is not really consistent with our Historic District. There are multiple ways to do it. In this case, I do not have another solution that allows this applicant to move forward with a project. This is probably a lesser of two evils. Otherwise you are looking at a building side addition and I feel that is even more disjoining within the historic characteristics of the site.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Snowden. We have heard a lot about the road noise from other businesses along that area, so I certainly know where you are coming from.

Mr. Hering: From the gas station, or the strip mall?

Mr. Snowden: So the Board has a great idea, this Board was founded because of the issues that were happening back in Reynoldsburg back in 1994. 1996, they put in some of the first regulations within the Historic District. And frankly, Reynoldsburg was sort of late into the game. Although a rather large historic District, it has taken a lot of abuse from suburban development working its way in. For example, here you have this historic home, here you have a sixty foot setback small shopping building over here. Our fabric of Reynoldsburg has been damaged a little bit further, and that is why it is sometimes hard to come to these decisions.

Mr. Cullinan: With the points that Mr. Hicks brought up, the railing along the front of the building, would it go along with what you were saying if the railing was wrapped around to give that idea from the side of the building, that there was still a porch, even though you know there is the siding up against it? Like a false railing, or something.

Mr. Hicks: I think that maintaining the railing, the woodwork, the columns, the handrail going up the steps, if all those elements could be maintained, and then you build within a smaller, you have the 18" setback from the front, if you did the same thing on the three sides, maybe not even 18, and then chose some different material other than vinyl lap siding, in order to offset it, you know they make cemented spore that would also help you with your sound deadening, almost in a board and batton, you know some type of other material, so that it doesn't just look like the front of the house just magically grew and it is sticking out there.

Mr. Hering: We have thought about that. I have talked to a few people, and the difference between making it look like a flat white surface, versus making it, it is so far back from the street anyway. The top of the porch is eight feet above the sidewalk. It is a trade off between putting the siding on there so that it almost looks like the porch is there, versus making it a flat white cement board surface of some sort that looks completely out of character with the rest of the building. I think the siding makes it disappear more by making it blend in. I have seen porches that are just a flat surface, and even if it has bead board or something.

Mr. Bowman: So there would be 18" between that front railing and the addition?

Mr. Hering: It is actually the front of the railing. It would be just enough to make it visually...

Mr. Bowman: Not enough to put a rocking chair on there to give it a little bit more character?

Mr. Hering: No rocking chairs. That puts me down to a little over a seven foot wide room.

Mr. Bowman: I am just thinking of ways, if you have the addition, to still give the porch a look like it is being used, as a compromise, where Mr. Hicks' point is, and still letting you build your addition and run your business, while also trying to maintain that historical overlay.

Mr. Hering: We bought the building almost years ago or so. We had this concept that it would be really nice to sit on the front porch after work and sit and relax, but with the noise, and the amazing amount of dirt that comes in from the street also, that porch is filthy all the time. That was our idea.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Bowman, to address all the questions and be clear, the applicant on the front is proposing an 18" setback between the new proposed wall and the existing railing. I think Mr. Hicks' point, if I can summarize properly is that he feels that should be on the other side. If I misspoke, but I think Tyler's point was that you could also do that on one or both of the other sides. I think that is a good idea. If the Board felt that would be an improvement, my suggestion would be to give them a range. So say, between 18 ft and 12" or something. Give him some sort of range on that side so we do not commit him to one specific number in case he needs to do that, but that seems to be addressing portion...

Unknown speaker: My recommendation, if I could make just one note here, that the 18" distance is not necessarily the critical item here. But, that the current wood trim facade railings, columns, are all maintained. And that, whatever structure you build is up to those items, and not removing those items. And that, whatever wall structure that you do build has some kind of facade that appears to be a screened in porch, because I think it would blend in better, rather than the vinyl lap siding.

Mr. Hering: We can not go ahead with the expansion if we have to put in windows or screens because it would be unusable. I could not do that. That would be a waste. I can certainly put the railings on the side.

Unknown speaker: That is what my point was.

Mr. Hering: That was one of my original designs, and one of my architect friends said, "No, you want to make it that way."

Mr. Snowden: My recommendation to all the Board Members would be, whoever decides to make the motion write down what you would be proposing so that Staff can make sure that the plans are revised. I think they are all great observations.

Chairman Burd: They are all great observations. I also think we have to rely on the business owner's logistical expertise of this particular building as well. If there is a motion made that is over restrictive on what he can do, I will oppose it. I think we have to be careful not to put something out there that is going to be very hard for him to meet. Or, as he just said, be unusable, and that would be a waste of his time and ours. I would open the floor to a motion, but I think we should be careful as to what types of requirements we are putting on it. We can have more discussion if you would like, but I would be careful not to back him into a corner with the motion.

Mr. Snowden: You could have more discussion on each motion as we make it.

Chairman Burd: We could entertain a motion, if there is more discussion, that is fine too.

Mr. Zollars: I make a motion to approve as presented unless there is further discussion.

Chairman Burd: So, before I ask for a second, would anyone else like to propose anything different?

Mr. Hudson: I will second.

Chairman Burd: We have a motion and a second. Mr. Snowden, if you would take the role please.

Can we have one brief, procedurally, for a second, and then discussion. I want to make one point. I appreciate you bringing this issue up, and I respect the applicant. Thank you for bringing this. I just want to make one point. This is the Historic District. It is a front porch.

Its current use, and the look of it, fits the character of the area already. And, once this front porch is changed, and no longer is turned into a front porch, despite the applicant's assurances they are sensitive to the issue and are trying to maintain its character, it won't be a front porch anymore, and it will be one last that this community will have, and that's it, nobody else is building any new ones anywhere else. So, I will vote no on the motion, and I will encourage other members to vote no, as they may. Thank you.

Chairman Burd: Thank you. Mr. Snowden.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, before I call the roll, this is a good time for us to get in this habit. Anyone voting mo, you want to state either the Code section you are basing that on, if any. Or, make a general statement, for example, this is changing the unique characteristics of this district, or this is not consistent with the characteristics of the Historic district. It is best to say that immediately after you cast your vote. In the event that an application were to be denied, it would be appealed to City Council and then could be appealed on through the court system, and all that. So, we want to have record to present at further meetings. That is just a good habit. If you have any questions about that, feel free to let me know.

Mr. Hicks: Is this like an original intent?

Mr. Snowden: Exactly. It is a "why are you being denied" type of thing. So, for example Mr. Hicks, in your case you just stated it very well. You would say, "I feel this changes the historic character of this area, and I vote no." With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will call the role. Mr. Bowman.

Mr. Bowman: I am going to vote yes because I do believe that you are maintaining, even though it is not a functioning porch, I believe your right to run a business, while still following the laws, is important. I think it is great that you are trying to expand and bring another dentist in, and I believe you have a right and do not want to impede that.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Carr.

Mr. Carr: Yes.

Mr Snowden: Mr. Cullinan.

Mr. Cullinan: Yes.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks.

Mr. Hicks: No, because I do not believe it fits with the general character of the Historic District.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hudson.

Mr. Hudson: I vote yes, and I think there have been so many changes to the Historic District

that I really believe this works very well.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Zollars.

Mr. Zollars: Yes.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Burd.

Chairman Burd: Yes.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hering, I will provide a written record of action. You should apply for a zoning certificate. Staff will require two sets of drawings showing compliance with the certificate of appropriateness. And then you will need to contact the Building Division at 614-322-6802 to submit building plans for review, secure permits, and complete the required inspections for your project. Good luck to you, and thank you very much. And thank you to all the members of the Board for a very interesting conversation.

RESULT:	APPROVED [6 TO 1]
MOVER:	Pat Zollars
SECONDER:	Richard Hudson
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Carr, Burd, Cullinan
NAYS:	Hicks

9. **7041 E. Main St.; Application #172912; Applicant: Buckeye Express Wash; Business: Goo Goo Car Wash; Minor Modifications**

Chairman Burd: Sir, thank you for your patience, and could I please have your name for the record?

Mr. Beck: Roger Beck.

Chairman Burd: Ok. Mr. Snowden will give his report, and then we will have some conversation.

Mr. Snowden: I believe Mr. Beck wins the award tonight because he came all the way from Georgia to be with us this evening.

Mr. Beck: The other Columbus.

Mr. Snowden: 7041 E. Main Street - Exterior Modifications - Goo-Goo Express Wash. Application: #172912 - Certificate of Appropriateness. Location: Property is located on the south side of E. Main Street between Braircliff Road and Haft Drive. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request is for the Board to issue a certificate of appropriateness for exterior modifications and new signage. Current Use: Auto Services Applicant: Buckeye Express Wash, LLC. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to make exterior modifications and add signage to existing commercial building. The site contains an existing drive-thru car wash structure and related improvements. The property is bordered along the east and west by other commercial businesses in the CC - Community Commerce District. The properties immediately to the south are single family dwellings in the R-3 District. The existing building exterior is finished with a metal roofing system on the north and portions of the west facade. The applicant is proposing to paint the roofing material to match their brand. Staff finds the proposed earth tones and maroon roof to be a good match to the existing streetscape. The applicant is proposing to reface an existing 50 sf monument style ground sign. The proposed sign panel contains the applicant's logo with integrated text on a red background. The design of the panel contains 5 colors. The applicant is also proposing to install a 25 sf internally illuminated channel letter wall sign on the north facade of the building. Due to the sloping design of the roofing system, the sign will be mounted to a raceway assembly. Staff has calculated the applicant is entitled to 30sf of wall signage, this is a Type A wall sign because it is less than 80 sf from the right-of-way and in this case it is one sf of sign area for one linear foot of tenant space. They have about a thirty foot wide

building there. You have 30 sf of signage. Therefore, none of the proposed signage exceeds the Code requirements. The signage is consistent with itself in terms of text, style and color. However, the applicant did provide two drawings showing the wall signage with different colors. Staff would like the applicant to clarify that all of the proposed wall signage has yellow face panels. I think what happened here is the sign contractor was probably not aware that the applicant was proposing to have a maroon roof, so they proposed some red lettering for part of the signage.

Mr. Beck: It is actually a red roof. They have done some other signs for us here in town, and they have the red and yellow graphics, but it is on a tower element. And, the letters on this sign will be yellow so that they show up against the red.

Mr. Snowden: All they need to do, in my opinion, unless the Board is overly concerned with that, would be to make sure they have exactly what they are proposing on all the plans when they get their zoning sign permit so we don't run into any hang-ups. The applicant should also add dimensions to their plans that show the distance that the signage extends from the wall. Again, just tidying up their sign application. The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage and exterior modification enhances the characteristics of the Community Commercial Overlay. Staff's recommendation is it that the Board approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness as submitted. And with that, I would be happy to answer any questions and I will turn things over to our chairman.

Chairman Burd: Mr. Beck, anything you would like to add?

Mr. Beck: No Sir. I just hope to be a good neighbor in Reynoldsburg.

Chairman Burd: Well thank you for traveling here. You clarified that they are yellow face panels?

Mr. Beck: Yes Sir.

Chairman Burd: Alright, questions from the Board?

Unknown speaker: This has nothing to do with your design, but I noticed the pylons next to it, which the little war between the Hickory House and the car wash...

Mr. Beck: I have made peace with the Hickory House. Evidentially, they did not have a very good relationship. We have already talked.

Mr. Bowman: The red on the photos, is it that dark? Is that how dark it is going to be? Because, it does look maroon.

Mr. Beck: It is more of a red.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you.

Chairman Burd: Any other questions or comments for the applicant?

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, I have one. I do not know if you are also the other franchisee of the other GooGoo car washes around central Ohio...

Mr. Beck: I am the owner of all of them.

Mr. Hicks: The three other locations out on Broad St., Morse Rd., and Polaris Pkwy., do not have a cartoon on the monument sign. It is just simply text and I was curious, one, as to why the cartoon automobile was added to this sign, and two, whether you felt it was necessary.

Mr. Beck: Yes, I do, and I will let you folks know why. This is the newest one we have, as opposed to our express wash. And, every customer that comes in is given the air freshener that is in your packet. Everyone gets those and that is going to be our new logo. The front page of that is showing that logo on the building sign. We can't do that here because you only allow channel letters in this district here. But, that will definitely be our full serve. We have the logo at other locations and it distinguishes the full service from the express.

Mr. Hicks: So, your logo is no longer the goose on the top of the GooGoo.

Mr. Beck: It was a duck. That is where the actual name of the car wash came from a long time ago.

Mr Snowden: I have to say this on the record, Shelly, our Building Department Secretary thinks that the car logo is cute and she wanted the applicant to know that. I have to be able to tell her that, yes, I said it in the meeting.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Beck, I will provide a written statement, in the mail, that will state what you need to do. I know you have already pulled some building permits to get things moving along. You will just want to submit a zoning sign permit application for the proposed sign reface, and then submit a building permit for the actual new signage being attached. I assume that DayNite will want to do that. If they have any other questions, they should give me a call.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Beck.

RESULT:	APPROVED [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Eliot Bowman
SECONDER:	Pat Zollars
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, Carr, Burd
ABSTAIN:	Cullinan

E. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Burd: I do have one item that I wanted to address. Some of you know that my circumstances have changed dramatically. My last day with the City is tomorrow and I will be moving out of state on Monday. So, my reign as Chairman is only going to last two meetings.

So, I would recommend that Vice Chairman Zollars run the April meeting, and at the end of that meeting have another discussion about organizational items.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, ultimately it is the decision of the Board. We have a few new Members and I would like to see Mr. Zollars run the next meeting. So that we do not hold up the applicants at the next meeting, at the end of the meeting we will open up the floor for nominations, if that would be acceptable, and elect a new Chairman, and new Vice Chairman, depending on the needs.

Chairman Burd: Mr. Zollars, are you comfortable with that plan of action?

Mr. Zollars: Yes.

Chairman Burd: Thank you all very much. The new Service Director, whomever that may be, will be on this Board.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning Administrator