

MINUTES
CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MARCH 3, 2011
7:00 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Mr. Scott Baker Mr. James Comeaux Mr. Richard Hudson Mr. Patrick Thompson
Members Absent:	Mr. Kevin Bainter Mr. Lane Beougher Mr. Jim Miller
Others Present:	Mr. Matthew Hansen, Planning Administrator

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 3, 2011 MEETING

Chairman Baker: Does anybody have any additions or deletions to those minutes?

I have a few comments, yeah. I notice this one apparently was hard to record. On page three, almost all the way to the bottom, it says Mr. Baker stated he would rather not see the Board used at all. The B for board is capitalized and it kind of makes it sound like I'm talking about the Design Review Board. And then the last two items on page six, I'm not sure who said those but that was not – those weren't my statements. It talks about the sheet metal sign and drooling rust which was probably dripping rust, but those weren't my statements. Other than that, I have nothing else. Anybody else? (No response.) Do we need to vote on revised minutes or do they just stand as revised?

Mr. Hansen: Approved as revised.

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Baker: You guys should have received a copy of that in your packets. Is there any amendment to the agenda tonight?

Mr. Hansen: No.

Mr. Baker: Seeing none, they will stand as distributed.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Baker: This would be the chance for anybody to step forward and speak on any item that's not on tonight's agenda. (No response.) Seeing none, we'll move on.

5. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

(Mr. Baker administers the oath.)

B. NEW BUSINESS

1361 BRICE ROAD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT:
TEMPTATIONS, SIGN-A-RAMA, JEFFREY BRILL (5486DR). WALL SIGN FACE
CHANGE.

Mr. Baker: Is that applicant here? You can state your name for the record and he'll give us an overview.

Mr. Jeffrey Brill: My name is Jeff Brill, the owner of Sign-A-Rama.

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

Mr. Hansen: Mr. Snowden is going to present the case.

Mr. Baker: Okay.

Mr. Snowden: The case is for the wall sign at Temptations Indian Cuisine, 1361 Brice Road and this is case 5486DR. Here you can see an aerial of the site. It's on the western side of Brice Road, south of East Main Street, across the street from the K-Mart Shopping Center. Here is the applicant's provided rendering of the proposed sign for the wall sign at Temptations. This is the current status of the cabinet. You can see the shopping center signage that's existing above as well as part of the next-door business. Here you can see a different view. This gives you a view of the sign cabinet. It's about 6 inches from the building and that's permitted by our code. The existing cabinet will be reused with a face change. You see some adjacent uses in the same building and there's the east side of the street, the K-Mart shopping center and some adjacent outlots. After review of the consideration, staff finds that the sign meets the zoning code requirements for placement and dimensions and the sign is consistent with area and dimensions of the neighboring sign and will not detract from the character of graphics found in the surrounding area.

Mr. Baker: Do you have anything to add to the staff's report?

Mr. Brill: Sounds good. Other than--

Mr. Hansen: Just to note, this applicant submitted – sorry, you weren't around when this happened, but the applicant submitted the face change for the ground sign. It matches exactly with the wall sign basically and staff doesn't see any issues with that particular face change, so this approval will take into consideration exhibits submitted for that.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you.

Mr. Baker: Any questions from the Board?

Mr. Comeaux: So, will there be illumination in the box and then also on the ground sign or—

Mr. Brill: The box is illuminated.

Mr. Comeaux: But on the ground sign, is it or is it not? I mean, is it—

Mr. Brill: I don't know if they have—

Mr. Comeaux: You don't know if there's – what they're—

Mr. Baker: I just know that box is real old because we had a discussion with the owner when he came through a year, a year-and-a-half ago, now. Anyhow, okay, that's fine.

Mr. Hansen: It's not illuminated.

Mr. Comeaux: It's not illuminated? Okay.

Mr. Baker: Any other questions, comments? (No response.) Before we vote tonight I should mention that since we are only four we must pass all of these unanimously or they will not pass. Can I get a motion?

Mr. Hudson: I'll move to approve.

Mr. Baker: Can I get a second?

Mr. Thompson: I'll second.

(Mr. Snowden called the roll. Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Thompson voted "yes.")

2. 7820 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT:
SHELL, KESSLER SIGN, LARRY NEWMAN (5487DR). NEW WALL SIGNS AND
GROUND SIGN FACE CHANGE.

Mr. Baker: Is that applicant here? State your name for the record and Mr. Hansen will give us an overview.

Mr. Larry Newman: Larry Newman with Kessler Sign Company.

Mr. Hansen: Thank you. So, proposed is a change to the existing canopy at the Shell station on East Main Street. They are re-branding from Sunoco to Shell. They'd like to change the colors of the canopy and add signage on the south and west sides of the canopy. Also proposed is a face change to an existing ground sign. They'll be re-branding it and then replacing the changeable copy, which is a manual letter change, to LED cabinet change. So, this is what you saw in your packets. The applicant was proposing these two signs on the south and west side of the canopy. Staff took a look at it and noted that the signs are not allowed to project taller than the canopy roof, per code, and that the wall sign on the west side of the canopy would probably not meet code – well, it does not meet code requirements that it faces a public street or a primary public drive. So, we asked the applicant to reconsider the signage on that side and I think they have exhibits--

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Hansen: --showing a revised canopy arrangement. So now they'll just be including signage on the south side. It has been resized so that it doesn't extend beyond the roofline and also what was proposed is to have lighting – up-lighting on the canopy through the red portion and it would up-light to the yellow portion and that has been removed from the application as well. So, they'll just be putting vinyl graphics on the canopy face, a vinyl film, instead of doing the illuminated bars. So the same will carry through on the east and north sides of the canopy and then here are details for the canopy signage execution. On the ground sign face change, it'll have the new logo and then two product displays done in LED for 'Regular' and 'Diesel' and then down at the bottom is a reference to the Kroger gas station savings at the site. The applicant provided a detail of the illumination, so the white parts of the sign will be opaque and then only the graphics and lettering will be illuminated. Here's a picture of the cabinet as it exists and then here's the other side. It's a picture of the existing ground sign and a picture of the building. So, as staff has reviewed the latest submission from the applicant today, it meets all zoning requirements because the other proposal that you had in your packets did not meet our zoning code requirements. So with this recent submission, staff recommends approval of this design.

Mr. Baker: Thank you. You have anything to add?

Mr. Newman: No, sir.

Mr. Baker: Any questions from the Board?

Mr. Hudson: So the ground sign's going to look just like the one that's – the Shell station, south at the corner of McNaughten and Main? Similar?

Mr. Newman: Similar, yes, sir.

Mr. Hudson: Okay. So, that's the LED? That's what it projects? Okay.

Mr. Newman: That is correct.

Mr. Hudson: Okay.

Mr. Baker: Do you know – I mean, I imagine that they're changing these but the gas dispensers themselves, the four individual gas stations, I assume they'll be changing those out as well.

Mr. Newman: I believe that is correct, yes.

Mr. Baker: I'm sure they don't want it to say 'Sunoco' anymore when it should be 'Shell.'

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Mr. Baker: Anybody else have any questions? (No response.) Can I get a motion?

Mr. Thompson: I'll move to accept with the two requirements of the new packet that had been met with the west elevation signage removed from the canopy and then the wall sign has been revised to stay flush with the top of the canopy.

Mr. Baker: Can I get a second?

Mr. Hudson: I'll second.

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

(Mr. Hansen called the roll. Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Thompson voted "yes." Mr. Baker voted "yes.")

3. 6300 EAST LIVINGSTON AVENUE, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: CENTURY CITY, RED RAIDER CAPITAL LLC, JEFF STAVROFF (5489DR). NEW GROUND SIGN.

Mr. Baker: Is that applicant here? Have you signed in yet?

Mr. Jeff Stavroff: No, I have not.

Mr. Baker: Yeah, if you could sign in. Great. You weren't here earlier when I administered the oath, right?

Mr. Stavroff: No, I was not.

(Mr. Baker administers the oath.)

Mr. Baker: You can state your name for the record and Mr. Hansen will give us an overview.

Mr. Stavroff: Jeff Stavroff with Red Raider Capital.

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

Mr. Hansen: The applicant is proposing a new ground sign at what was known as the Century City Shopping Plaza. They're replacing an existing ground sign that fronts onto Livingston Avenue. The existing sign is a tall monument style sign and the applicant is proposing a smaller sign, but it's still necessitated a variance from the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals. So they received a variance to increase the height from a maximum of 6 feet to 10 feet and the area from 50 square feet to 84. In your packets you received the design of this sign and the applicant has since revised the signage and is proposing to simplify the sign, remove the name of the shopping center on top, increase the area of the two-tenant sign panels, and kind of make it all flush and level on top. But generally, staff is okay with this proposed change. The sign is still an attractive sign and should add to the character of Livingston Avenue.

Mr. Baker: Thank you. Do you have any comments to add?

Mr. Stavroff: No.

Mr. Baker: So, on the existing sign – or I should say the one that was previously submitted, there were four tenants and now there's just going to be signage for two?

Mr. Stavroff: That's correct. What we have there is we have 100,000 square foot building and currently Valu King occupies 49,000 which leaves us about 52,000 left over. The likelihood of us splitting this space up for additional tenants is highly unlikely, so we don't foresee any more than two tenants on our site.

Mr. Baker: Okay. Yeah, this signage looks a lot better than the last one.

Mr. Stavroff: Yeah. Thanks.

Mr. Baker: Any questions or comments from the staff or Board?

Mr. Comeaux: I was just curious, why was the Century City removed from the top?

Mr. Stavroff: Well, Century City, not to bore you, but originally Casto made a deal with the tenant verbally and not the landowner, which was the Keller family, to put a sign on that site and they really had no permission in order to do that.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay.

Mr. Stavroff: What we tried to do is we approached Casto and asked them if they would like to share in the cost of a new sign and trying to clean that corner up there by the light and they didn't want to participate in that so, with that being said, I don't know that Century City really has anything to do with our center. I think it really has something to do with more – when I hear Century City I think of the apartments. So we're just trying to get away from that. That was the thought of it. We kicked around trying to rename the center and we thought it would probably be best to just not name – yeah.

Mr. Comeaux: What about – I'm guessing the tenants that are further down the area, I guess it would be east – those aren't what considered part of the--

Mr. Stavroff: (inaudible)

Mr. Comeaux: --shopping center or anything?

Mr. Stavroff: That's correct.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay.

Mr. Baker: Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Hansen: So, also as part of this approval I'd like to recommend the transfer of any existing graphics that apply to the shopping center onto the new sign, just to make that clear.

Mr. Comeaux: You mean like, specifically the Valu—

Mr. Hansen: For the Valu King, yeah.

Mr. Baker: Okay.

Mr. Comeaux: Matt, can I just ask you a question? On our package we have two little purple indications, like on the site plan. One of them says the proposed monument sign, the other ones abuts to Brice Road. Is there anything we're dealing with on that?

Mr. Stavroff: I was trying to show that there is a sign there as well. It's not going to be a new sign.

Mr. Comeaux: But it's not going to be – there are no changes to it that we're dealing with here then?

Mr. Stavroff: That's correct.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay. Great.

Mr. Stavroff: Yeah, I just thought I had to denote where all signage was on there.

Mr. Comeaux: That explains why I have another color on my paper. And one of the things you included in the packet is, when you had gone or proposed to make other changes to the sign and you have notes regarding vegetation around the sign. Are you doing anything with vegetation here or is there—

Mr. Stavroff: Yes. Last spring we actually did some plantings around that sign as well as the one on Brice and that – we're going to try to save it but, if we don't, we will be doing additional plantings similar to what's out there, yeah.

Mr. Comeaux: Great.

Mr. Baker: Anybody else? (No response.) Can I get a motion?

Mr. Comeaux: I'll move we approve with the acknowledgement that we're going to move the faceplate for the Valu King onto the new sign, so that's the motion.

Mr. Baker: Can I get a second?

Mr. Thompson: I'll second.

(Mr. Hansen called the roll. Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Thompson voted "yes." Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes.")

4. 6445 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: APPLICANT: AUTOZONE, BURKHARDT ENGINEERING, JONATHAN D. BURKHARDT (5488DR). BUILDING ADDITION AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. Baker: Please state your name for the record and Mr. Hansen will give us a review.

Mr. Jonathan Burkhardt: Jonathan Burkhardt here for Burkhardt Engineering and Autozone.

Mr. Hansen: The applicant is proposing an addition to the existing Autozone site. The addition will encompass exterior modifications – sorry, I'm at the wrong

presentation. There'll be exterior modifications, relocation of signage, approval of landscaping and elevations. The proposed addition is roughly over 5,000 square feet to the existing structure which is a little bit over 10,000, bringing it to 16,000 square feet. The addition will be on this east side, so the applicant is moving the dumpster location from the east side to the west side. They'll also be relocating a service door from the east side to the west side and eliminating four parking spaces that are lined up on that east side there. A major site plan approval to do this was approved by the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals at the February meeting and there were no conditions placed on that. So the plans that you see today, as far as the arrangement of the parking and the building, the service structure and the landscape areas, were approved. So there are going to be two new detention ponds on the site, one in the northeast corner next to the driveway entrance and then one on the south side of the building. Here's a proposed landscape plan and I know that the applicant has submitted an updated landscape plan with some additional plantings in the area just north of the addition. Here's a view of the detention pond area in the northeast corner of the site. Here's an additional view during the summer. Here are the proposed elevations for the Autozone. Here's the addition here. The addition was taller than the existing structure and so the applicant is adding a parapet to the existing structure so that the height matches. The parapet will be EFIS and the same split-face block will be carried through on the addition also. The updated elevations that you see in your packet includes an updated entry to what exists now. There will be no changes to the entry and then they are wrapping the parapet around the corner of the existing building just to provide any closure and so that it hides any bracing from the new parapet.

Staff had significant concerns about the appearance of the addition, especially that elevation along Main Street. It's a rather featureless façade and I know there'll be some color changes and some material changes, but the horizontal nature is really something that's not promoted as part of the overlay. But part of the recommendation from the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals is that they add landscaping in front of the Autozone in order to soften that façade. Their proposed landscaping includes a couple of trees in front. Here's a picture of the existing site and so the parapet will be added from here up. It will be EFIS and the sign will also be relocated higher than it is now, but they'll utilize the existing sign. Here's the area of the proposed addition. This is on the other side. Here's an image of the rear where the proposed detention will be located. Here's an image of the other location for the detention pond. Here's another view of that pond area.

Looking at the landscape plan, staff had a few concerns regarding the choice of tree screening that they were providing along that north elevation. The color of the tree was a deep purple and we saw that as drawing more attention to that building when we're trying to actually mitigate the façade. Also, we had concerns that the detention pond up by Main Street is not a feature which is common to Main Street and so we would like to see additional screening provided around that pond. The applicant has provided some exhibits showing that there'll be some screening, but if you go out here during the winter, all of those perennials are gone and there's no vertical screening to hide where that depression would be. So staff is really looking for some landscape

screening along the Main Street side and then down along the parking lot area also. In addition, the applicant has chosen a different species for the trees used out in front. They've gone from the plum tree to a red maple, though I think additional tree plantings would much benefit that elevation and if we can see a couple additional trees it'd be greatly appreciated and then some better organized landscape plantings at the foundation of the building. The proposed updated landscape plan has a few shrubs, but probably will not provide much impact to provide substantial screening for this addition. We'd like to further work with the applicant to get a landscape plan which we would see more fitting to provide screening along that north elevation.

Mr. Baker: Thank you. Anything to add to the staff comments?

Mr. Burkhardt: No.

Mr. Hudson: I have a question. The retention pond that's behind the building, what's it for? It doesn't look like there's any room back there and everything's sloping down as it is, and I don't know where the property line is, but it just seems like water is going to run off anyhow. What's the pond for?

Mr. Hansen: Because they're increasing the impervious surface on the site with the addition, they're required to mitigate that storm water that would be created from the addition and so it requires the two ponds to be constructed in order to slow down the water.

Mr. Hudson: It's not going to be very big though, is it?

Mr. Comeaux: Did they do a calculation as to whether that detention pond's sufficient to – I mean—

Mr. Burkhardt: Yes.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay.

Mr. Hudson: I don't see any space back there. That's why I'm trying to figure out what—

Mr. Hansen: It'll have to be re-graded and I think the slopes that they were proposing on the rear property line would be a 3-to-1 slope which is pretty standard.

Mr. Hudson: Okay.

Mr. Baker: Is code dictating that you have two as opposed to just one bigger one across the back there?

Mr. Burkhardt: There's just not room in the back to get one large pond. There's not enough slope across the land to get it and then we can't go any further west because of the sanitary sewer.

Mr. Hudson: Okay.

Mr. Burkhardt: So, the pond in the rear actually grabs runoff from the entire existing building, both the initial building and the building addition and then the pond on the northeast grabs the runoff from the proposed building addition.

Mr. Comeaux: How deep is the one that's going to be up near the road, the Main Street pond?

Mr. Burkhardt: 2 feet.

Mr. Baker: 2 feet?

Mr. Hansen: Looks like it bottoms out at 879-- Oh, yeah, 2 feet. My apologies.

Mr. Burkhardt: And the one in the rear is also 2 feet.

Mr. Hudson: Okay.

Mr. Baker: And I don't think I saw any landscaping planned around any of that retention pond either. Was that a concern at all of staff?

Mr. Hansen: Around which one?

Mr. Baker: The one in the front, close to East Main Street.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, and I guess the applicant had said that they didn't think they needed landscaping there and that if we did add landscaping it would encroach upon the existing landscaping that's there. But looking at where the location of the pond is, it looks like we've probably got 3 feet or so. We could at least get some shrubs in there before the existing landscape bed starts for Main Street.

Mr. Baker: Um-um.

Mr. Hansen: Between the edge of the pond and the edge of that Main Street Streetscape landscaping.

Mr. Baker: Realistically, assuming not extreme weather, how often is that going to have water in it visible?

Mr. Burkhardt: Should never have visible water in it unless, you know, there's a storm.

Mr. Hansen: Sure.

Mr. Burkhardt: I think Mr. Haire also recommended the last meeting we were here that we put an under-drain in to make sure that there is no water standing in it and there're non-flooding conditions and we're willing to do that.

Mr. Baker: Yeah, I think that would be good.

Mr. Comeaux: You'll excuse my ignorance, just visually what does a 2-foot deep – will the average person even realize that this is like an artificial feature or will it just look like a small grade?

Mr. Baker: Well, I mean, it's not a small grade, but it's not a huge one either. What are those intervals from 881 to 885 feet? No, 3 feet?

Mr. Burkhardt: Yeah, I think the entire thing is like 15 feet across. So if you think about 2 feet down over 6 and then about a 3-foot base and then 2 feet up over 6, 33% slope basically.

Mr. Baker: I mean, it's not a big one. It's just right up against East Main Street. I'm not sure people driving in their cars are going to see it, but certainly the pedestrians on the sidewalk are going to see it, which is why I think some landscaping should be required, at least along East Main Street if not also between parking there and the pond. It looks like there's room there, too. There is probably 5 feet there, close to.

Mr. Comeaux: And so, what would you propose, like a small shrub or like an evergreen, or—

Mr. Baker: I would think shrubs, they're lower.

Mr. Hansen: An evergreen shrub. I guess it could be deciduous, too.

Mr. Comeaux: I guess if you want to you could have the shrubs but you'd also have – I would guess that even the groundcover would be like the mulch or the dirt would be somewhat mounded around the front part of the – around the actual pond itself, too, so that might add a little height to it.

Mr. Baker: These aren't huge eyesores. I mean this is just a dip in grade basically.

Mr. Hansen: Right.

Mr. Baker: But, you know, it's just a dip in grade that's not there now.

Mr. Comeaux: Is it going to be like cement in nature or is it going to be just—

Mr. Hansen: Should be grass.

Mr. Comeaux: Grass? Okay. All right. Then it won't be that noticeable.

Mr. Hansen: Right.

Mr. Baker: Okay. So, that's probably the big ticket Item number one. Big ticket Item number two would probably be this front façade. We're adding 55 feet here and basically a 3-foot door on the front, again along Main Street, and I don't know if Autozone's had discussions or thoughts with their design professionals, whoever's doing the architecture, for what else could be done to break up that façade a little bit. And they're basically – and those two front facades are lining up with each other.

Mr. Burkhardt: The only other thing they mentioned doing is putting in false windows, but staff preferred the landscaping over false windows. They can't put in real windows obviously, because it's a warehouse within the building.

Mr. Baker: Yeah. I mean, I don't mind the idea of false windows. The problem is the existing windows are so big and if we were to put false windows in they'd be big false windows.

Mr. Hansen: That's what we were concerned about.

Mr. Baker: Okay. And I guess as we get into this discussion, is the addition to match the existing identically? It looks like at least on this front elevation the detailing along the bottom is different in terms of probably the concrete block detailing.

Mr. Burkhardt: I think it's all split face from the bottom of the EFIS down to the ground.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Hansen, can you go back to the front shot of the building?

Mr. Hansen: So you're wondering if they're having that relief in the—

Mr. Baker: Right. Yeah, there's almost a water table of sorts along the bottom. It's probably 2½ feet tall that protrudes from the building, maybe 4 inches, kind of slopes away and then comes down. You can see that detail on sheet CE1 right where the existing breaks to the new.

Mr. Burkhardt: Yes, I see a little—

Mr. Comeaux: It looks like it's about, I don't know, like an inch above it.

Mr. Baker: It just looks different and, likewise, in the existing windows there's a horizontal red band that looks like it's kind of indented into the existing CMU of the existing Autozone and that doesn't look like it's carried into the new addition.

Mr. Burkhardt: Which band are you referring to?

Mr. Baker: It's almost a – it looks like it's a recessed – you know, it's not a recessed band. It's just a – basically a horizontal band that lines up with the red horizontal band of the existing windows.

Mr. Hansen: The next band down from the water table?

Mr. Baker: Basically, yes. You can see it on the drawings. You can see it in the photo, too, but you can see it in the drawings on the existing, but you don't see that carried through to the new. I guess I'm wondering if the intent is to match identically the existing store or if there is going to be some detail -- I'm sure there's not material change, but detail change.

Mr. Burkhardt: Yeah, I'm not sure. I thought the intent was to match it identically.

Mr. Baker: And you can see them on the rear elevation as well. It changes. From the architect's standpoint of view, it's probably easier to draw the existing again onto the new as opposed to change the new to not match the existing. I'm not sure if it's an oversight or if it's an intentional change. And are they sold on that new door on the front there being red as well?

Mr. Burkhardt: Yes, I think so. They don't have a whole lot of color palettes to choose from on this door.

Mr. Baker: No, but as a side door, it's pretty red.

Mr. Hansen: Would you prefer that it be painted out to match the split face?

Mr. Baker: Yeah, I'd prefer it would match the wall behind it to almost to make it go away. I'd prefer that it would move to the side elevation, but I'm guessing they have it there for a reason. It also exits near the ADA ramp, so I can understand its location. Yeah, but preferably, I'd rather see it just go away in terms of the color. I'd rather see it just blend into the building as opposed to being that red. Anybody else have any comments?

Mr. Comeaux: Yeah, I'm looking at the same page you are. The second elevation down, that's for the rear, correct?

Mr. Baker: Correct.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay, even though it's the right side, okay.

Mr. Burkhardt: Yeah, they're labeled incorrectly.

Mr. Comeaux: Oh, yeah, I was just trying to make sure that that wasn't the right side. So, what kind of trees were you proposing to put in front of the new addition?

Mr. Burkhardt: We were proposing the purple plum trees, but we've switched it to—

Mr. Hansen: To red maple.

Mr. Burkhardt: --red maple.

Mr. Comeaux: So, what kind of profile do you expect out of that from fall through spring? Do you expect, and I don't know my trees – maple is deciduous, so it's going to drop its leaves, right? And so, I guess, how full do you expect it to be when you plant it? Will it give coverage or will it just kind of be like, oh, there're some trees there?

Mr. Burkhardt: Initially, it's just going to be like, oh, there're some trees there, because the plantings are only 2½ caliper I think.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay.

Mr. Burkhardt: So, it's not going to be a mature 10-year-old tree.

Mr. Comeaux: Right.

Mr. Burkhardt: But red maple trees do have a semi-rapid growth rate per year. It's like, 18 inches a year I think and then the full spread on them is 40 feet once they're mature.

Mr. Baker: When you guys discussed false windows was there any size of windows that were discussed in terms of providing similar -- even if they're 4 by 4 to match the -- say, the new door height?

Mr. Hansen: No, we didn't.

Mr. Baker: And has any discussion been given to pushing the new addition front wall back 2 feet just to give it some kind of break from this existing façade, any kind of relief?

Mr. Hansen: We didn't discuss that, no.

Mr. Baker: I assume Autozone's trying to get this warehouse as big as they can.

Mr. Burkhardt: Yeah, and I mean it is within code, the size.

Mr. Baker: I'm sure. All right. Let me chew on that for a minute and I'll get a couple picky things here. Are we not required to have a van-accessible handicap spot? I see two standard ones and I see to the east of the one on the east, it looks like there could almost be enough room to put a 5-foot striped area.

Mr. Burkhardt: Yeah, the ADA requirement goes we need two spaces for this whole site.

Mr. Baker: Right.

Mr. Burkhardt: One of those is required to be van-accessible. The one on the east side is van-accessible. There's an 8-foot hatch to the west of it.

Mr. Baker: Shouldn't there be another 5-foot hatch?

Mr. Burkhardt: It's not required, no.

Mr. Baker: Okay.

Mr. Burkhardt: We've got open space shown between the curb line and that parking stripe which we could hatch, but it's not required--

Mr. Baker: Right. Okay.

Mr. Burkhardt: --as part of ADA.

Mr. Baker: And then the dumpster enclosure is wood?

Mr. Burkhardt: Yes.

Mr. Baker: All right. I notice on detail 9 on C3A it's calling out for a masonry wall. The details on the other side of the page are wood, but it's noted as a masonry wall in detail 9.

Mr. Burkhardt: Yeah, that's incorrect. They want to use cedar.

Mr. Baker: And I assume there'll be no need for site lighting anymore on the east side of the building. I noticed there were some wall lights on the east side of the existing. I assume we're not illuminating the east side anymore.

Mr. Burkhardt: There's no new lighting proposed for this site. We'll actually be removing one of the lights because it encroaches where the building's going to be, but there won't be any wall packs or anything added to the west side.

Mr. Baker: Would Autozone be willing to explore doing anything with this addition in terms of false windows or pushing the front wall back 2 feet?

Mr. Burkhardt: I don't know about pushing the front wall back 2 feet, but the false windows, yeah, they'd probably be okay with that. They actually suggested that initially.

Mr. Baker: How do we do that, Mr. Hansen? Do they need resubmit elevations and come back here with something we'd look at?

Mr. Hansen: That's up to you. It could be a part of your condition of approval and we could do a staff review on it, or you could provide some direction and then have them return.

Mr. Baker: Get everyone else's thoughts, but I'm not opposed to the staff review and you could email out the elevations to us and let us comment if we have comments.

Mr. Hansen: I could do that, too.

Mr. Baker: I'd also like to make sure that the addition matches the new -- just what the CMU reliefs are and—

Mr. Burkhardt: Okay.

Mr. Baker: It's basically -- it looks like it's only at the base, just that bottom water table and then maybe two courses about that there's another CMU band that's just slightly darker.

Mr. Burkhardt: Any more thoughts on that fire door?

Mr. Baker: On the front?

Mr. Burkhardt: Um-um.

Mr. Baker: I'd like to see it painted the same color as the building.

Mr. Burkhardt: Okay.

Mr. Baker: I know you'll still be able to see it, but I think it'll blend in a lot better. I think it'll be pretty noticeable when it's red. And I assume any new false windows, the frames will match this red that's on the existing windows.

Mr. Burkhardt: Oh, because they're—

Mr. Baker: Are they reusing that existing sign, the Autozone, they're just moving it up? It's the same one, same size?

Mr. Burkhardt: Yeah.

Mr. Baker: Okay.

Mr. Hansen: Is there a preferred color choice on the false window?

Mr. Baker: Well, I think the window is going to actually be glazing with just a blacked-out panel behind it.

Mr. Hansen: It's blacked-out?

Mr. Baker: Right, yeah.

Mr. Hansen: I didn't know if you wanted something a little smokier.

Mr. Baker: It would be nice if the tint of the window, kind of match what was there. A lot of times we put in false windows, it's just a black panel, something behind it basically just looks like the lights are off.

Mr. Hansen: Okay. But you don't necessarily want them to install _____?

Mr. Baker: They could. That'd go either way. Anything would look better than 55 feet of concrete block as long as it's glazing, it's far enough away and it's a different size, too. I think they could black it out from behind _____. Either way they're not seeing in. Can I get a motion?

Mr. Comeaux: Before we do, can we get some sort of resolution on whether – on what you want to do about the landscaping in the first instance around the detention pond in the front and, again, because visually I can't tell whether this is something that I would look at my neighbor's yard and say it's just kind of sloped or whether it's a feature. And then also what, if anything, does the addition of the windows do to any landscaping in front of the building?

Mr. Baker: Do we have the most recent landscape plan in these smaller packets?

Mr. Hansen: Yeah.

Mr. Baker: Okay. I think I'd be okay personally with the landscaping as shown on the new packets if we had some glazing options across the front of this thing to help, just provide some relief.

Mr. Hansen: Do you think the tree coverage is sufficient?

Mr. Baker: Yeah, with an approved glazing layout, sure. And then I think some smaller shrubs, some lower shrubs around the retention pond at least to help block some view from the sidewalk and potentially from the parking would be nice as well. Again, it's just grass, it's just depressed.

Mr. Hansen: With some landscaping.

Mr. Baker: Yeah.

Mr. Comeaux: And something you don't think would be a problem, Mr. Burkhardt?

Mr. Burkhardt: Not the landscaping.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Hansen, you mentioned an additional drain in the retention pond near East Main?

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, that was requested at the BZBA meeting.

Mr. Baker: Okay. All right.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay. Well, then I think I can make a motion if that's okay. I'll move that we approve with the caveat that we need to add false windows. Is that the right terminology?

Mr. Hansen: Yes.

Mr. Comeaux: With some glazing that will be approved through Matt and that the banding at the bottom matches -- on the new portion matches what it is in the existing portion. Mr. Baker referred to the water table.

Mr. Baker: Um-um.

Mr. Comeaux: Okay. And so you know what he's talking about there? Good. The door on the front should be colored to match the paint on the front of the building and we need to add a few landscape features around the detention pond that abuts Main Street, certainly to the Main Street side and if possible -- and also to the parking side and I believe that captured our concerns. That's my motion.

Mr. Baker: Can I get a second?

Mr. Thompson: I'll second.

(Mr. Hansen called the roll. Mr. Baker voted “yes.” Mr. Comeaux voted “yes.” Mr. Hudson voted “yes.” Mr. Thompson voted “yes.”)

C. OTHER BUSINESS

1. RECOMMENDATION OF THE OLDE REYNOLDSBURG STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr. Hansen: So we passed out the draft plan to you guys last month and hopefully you had a chance to review it. In the meantime, we’ve had two meetings. One was with the Steering Committee which has been guiding this process as we’ve been drafting our ideas and they had one final review of the plan and three comments on it. One, they’d like to see more emphasis provided for strategies that promote the local arts and specifically getting that geared towards Olde Reynoldsburg, whether it be kind of a pop-up art gallery in one of the vacant storefront buildings or coordinating some street art through the high school or something of that nature, so we’d like to include that in the plan. The other one was to create a zoning strategy which insured the preservation of the existing residential neighborhood in Olde Reynoldsburg. Since we’re recommending a number of land use changes along Graham Road and Lancaster Avenue and there was some concern that that may, in the future, carry on to other portions of Olde Reynoldsburg such as Broadwyn Avenue. And, so, they wanted it to be more clear in the plan that that was the intent, that the residential was going to remain residential in the core neighborhood of Olde Reynoldsburg. We are recommending land use changes along Lancaster Avenue from residential to commercial.

Then the last strategy was to recommend a new route for truck traffic from Jackson Avenue to Graham Road and that was done, recognizing that the middle school is located on that road and we’re going to be gearing that road more for off-street parking for Olde Reynoldsburg by doing improvements along Jackson Avenue in the future with on-street parking and using that street to connect people from Main Street to some planned public parking areas that’ll be located off of Jackson. And so we wanted to make the street as pedestrian-friendly as possible and having the heavy truck traffic along that road would inhibit that. So that was a recommendation to change that.

We also had a public open house on February 23rd and we had a number of individuals show up for that meeting. We presented the concepts and then had a question and answer session. There were really no significant concerns over the plan. There were a lot of questions which we were able to answer as staff, concerns over traffic which – the concern was that with the additional development in Olde Reynoldsburg, is that going to bring significant amounts of new traffic to the area and part of that is it’s we are planning for new development, but the extent of that development probably would not significantly impact the traffic in the area that’s already found there. There were questions over what the office recommendation along Lancaster and Graham Road, the details of that and explaining that we’re

recommending small scale office uses that could redevelop some of those residential parcels or be incorporated in some of those existing structures.

There was a question about Graham Road Elementary. We have always shown in the future a land use plan that would remain institutional though the school is being used currently as a charter school. It may not in the future and the superintendent, Steve Dadkin was present at the meeting. They really have no future plans for that structure as of yet, so we're just going to continue in the future land use plan showing it as an institutional use and if we need to update the plan in the future because the school has other plans, then we can cross that path once we get there. There was a timeframe question on when certain components of the plan were going to be implemented, specifically the development portions at Lancaster and Main and we just recognize that this plan is still very much a market-based plan. We have certain tools that we can go out and incentivize development but we're still going to need to market this to development partners in order to get the plan moving and recognizing that the current state of the economy is not as strong development-wise. It'll probably need to be phased in through a 20-year timeframe to get a lot of the plan recommendations. But we have simple things that we can do immediately such as signage in the area, start on improving the parking capabilities on Main Street and on some of the side streets through striping and signage, and enhancing the image of Main Street through seasonal plantings, addition of pots and public art and stuff.

This plan, just to note that it's a recommendation. It doesn't change any existing zoning code ordinances that we have in place now and any future changes that will move forward with the strategies will go through the same process, adoption process as this plan did. We'll go to the Planning Commission and the BZBA to get recommendations for any zoning code changes and then it will go on to Council for further consideration. But this is really a tool that allows us to base our decisions on when it comes to new development, new zoning policy changes and any programs that we'd like to implement in the future. So the Design Review Board is not charged with approving long-range planning concepts, but we'd like to get your support through a recommendation that we can then pass on along to Council that the Board supports the plan and the concepts within it and that can come in the form of a letter. I could draft a letter and it could come from Mr. Baker, but if we'd like to just kind of give a verbal confirmation through a motion or a vote, that'd be much appreciated.

Mr. Baker: I assume you mean tonight.

Mr. Hansen: Tonight, yeah.

Mr. Baker: Real quick, talking about this promotion of local arts, what the – I see included in the display of public art, like you said, potentially an art studio somewhere. Have they had much discussion on any of this?

Mr. Hansen: No, not really. It was a concept that they recognize as not being fully present in the plan and if we're working on branding strategies to promote, then

having an arts component be part of that branding strategy they saw as important and so we definitely want to mention that as part of a brand that we could start to develop upon and it'll take some work. We don't really have any details of it yet, but they know as a brand they want to promote Olde Reynoldsburg as an arts destination.

Mr. Baker: Yeah, I can see the desire to do that.

Mr. Thompson: There's even an art academy right next to Connell's Hardware. It's been there for many years.

Mr. Hudson: Really?

Mr. Thompson: Yeah.

Mr. Baker: East or west?

Mr. Thompson: It's just south of it, right there—

Mr. : Literally next door.

Mr. Baker: So, it's not on Main?

Mr. : It's on Lancaster.

Mr. Thompson: It's at the corner of—

Mr. Hansen: It'd be Broad Alley.

Mr. Thompson: Yeah, at the corner of Lancaster--

Mr. Baker: Okay. Well, can we get a motion to support the Olde Reynoldsburg Strategic Plan final input as distributed today?

Mr. Thompson: I move to support the Olde Reynoldsburg Strategic Plan.

Mr. Baker: Can I get a second?

Mr. Comeaux: I'll second.

(Mr. Hansen called the roll. Mr. Baker voted "yes." Mr. Comeaux voted "yes." Mr. Hudson voted "yes." Mr. Thompson voted "yes.")

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

Mr. Hansen: All right. Thank you, guys.

Mr. Baker: Yeah, meeting adjourned.

Mr. Hansen: We'll be going to Council in March, probably in a couple weeks.

Mr. Baker: I meant to ask about this before we voted.

Mr. Hansen: Well, the Steering Committee narrowed it down to the six options that I gave you last time to add those two and just like your input on them.

Mr. Baker: Of these two, this bottom one kind of reminds a little bit of a wild, wild west, little swirls going on and stuff like that. That top one, though – I like the top one a lot. And as I think about that – whose famous house do we have here?

Mr. Hansen: The Livingston?

Mr. Baker: Yeah, it does. It's got some of the similar style. Of course, it's not that far off in color either. It's a little darker but I think that top one fits pretty well.

Mr. Hudson: Wasn't it the bottom one, though, voted by the public as their first choice?

Mr. Hansen: It was, actually pretty unanimously.

Mr. Hudson: They didn't even vote for the top one.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah – no, and at the Planning Commission the members preferred the top one, but I think it says something to have something that's representative of what Olde Reynoldsburg is and we've included the tomato leaf, whereas the bottom doesn't. It's kind of a nondescript design.

Mr. Hudson: I think the comments I heard were kind of the leaves on the top one, the public didn't like it and I admit I can take the leaves off as far as I'm concerned. Aren't those tomato leaves or—

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, and we can work on the design of the leaves also. They're not really final.

Mr. Hudson: I think that was what was kind of offensive to them. They didn't like the leaves on it. It looked like it was too busy.

Mr. Baker: Yeah, they do have a lot of detail for a simple sign.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah.

Mr. Comeaux: (inaudible)

Mr. Hansen: Well, this would – we’re thinking that it would be used for the gateway signs in Olde Reynoldsburg, any sort of marketing that we do for the district.

Mr. Comeaux: Right.

Mr. Hansen: Business owners can then also utilize it in their marketing, so it would really be the logo that is carried through for any print signage.

Mr. Baker: I like the top one better.

(someone speaking off mic)

Mr. Baker: I don’t mind the leaves. I can see their comment, though, of being a little busy. Everything else is pretty simple.

Mr. Hansen: Yeah, I think the leaves could use some tweaking to make them look more basic in a way.

Mr. Baker: I think that upper sign has just a little more class. It’s a little more simple, little less flashy. Yeah, I think it’s nice. Okay.

Mr. Hansen: Thank you.

Mr. Baker: Meeting adjourned. For the record, the handicap signage does not “Van Accessible” signage on it. It only says, typical handicap sign.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 o’clock p.m.

Scott Baker, Chair

Matthew Hansen, Planning Administrator

This document was transcribed by:
Area East Secretarial Service
7668 Slate Ridge Blvd.
Reynoldsburg OH 40368