



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2017 7:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, King, Sampson
ABSENT: Carr

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Design Review Board – Regular – February 2, 2017

Minutes stand approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Chairman Zollars: If you are speaking tonight, please sign in. Would everyone addressing the Board tonight please stand and raise your right hand? Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are giving before the Board tonight will be truthful? If so, please answer, "I do." ("I do" heard.) Thank you.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **7578 E. Main St.; Application #176472; Applicant: Evans Capital Investments, Ltd.; Business: Reynoldsburg (E. Main) DG (Dollar General), LLC; Major Site Plan, Historic District - New Commercial Building.**

Mr. Snowden: 7578 E. Main Street - Dollar General - Major Site Plan. Application: #176472 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the north side of East Main Street, just west of Waggoner Road. Existing Zoning: CC Community Commerce District / HCO Historic Commercial Overlay. The request is for a review of a major site plan in order to construct a new commercial building and related improvements. Current Use: Vacant Land. Applicant: Evans Capital Investments, Ltd. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a major site plan in order to construct a new, freestanding, commercial building. The proposed site consists of a 4.3 acre commercial shopping center with various commercial business uses. The applicant intends to split a portion of that parcel off, in order to construct this proposed free-standing commercial building. To the north, the

property abuts an apartment complex (multi-family dwellings) in the AR-2 zoning districts. All adjacent properties that front E. Main Street are within the Historic Overlay District. The standards and considerations for site plans are listed under considerations. The applicant has already been granted variances from several sections of Chapter 1193 by the BZBA. The variances allow the building to be setback from E. Main Street. The applicant claimed hardship due to the presence of underground sanitary sewer lines near the front of the parcel, which are indicated by the easements on the Site Plan. Basically there is a city owned sanitary easement near this area.. The applicant received approval for a variance from Section 1193.08(b) of the Zoning Code, in order to place parking spaces in front of the main structure. This was required due to the related variance of the build-to-line requirements. The applicant has provided a defined pedestrian path between the E. Main Street frontage of the property and the main entrance of the proposed structure. The sidewalk is separated from the traffic circulation and parking. The applicant's design places bike racks and a seating area along this path, in order to comply with the pedestrian amenity requirements of Section 1193.09. Staff has reviewed the application for compliance with the requirements of Chapter 1180. Generally speaking, the applicant meets those minimum requirements, in terms of new material planning. Per Section 1180.10, fences can be used to screen dumpster, but Section 1193.07 requires all fences to be decorative within the Historic District, and lists iron or metal as approved fence types within the History District. Staff recommends that the dumpster be screened with masonry walls that match the building materials. The applicant has provided a lighting plan indicating the location of proposed fixtures, as well as a cut sheet of their technical specifications. Lighting levels along all property edges do not exceed the 0.5 foot candle required by Section 1182.03. The proposed lighting fixtures are black aluminum finish and match the existing site lighting. You can see that the lot already has some decorative fixtures and the applicant is proposing to match that. This style and finish color are appropriate to the Historic District. The applicant provided architectural elevations showing the proposed building. The applicant applied for and received a variance to allow the proposed building to be setback from the street. The front façade of the proposed building is not on the same plane as the existing shopping center to the east, that includes both the wall of the building and the overhang where the walk is. So, it is not on either plane. In that case, the applicant proposes to clad their building in brick veneer. The proposed veneer meets the requirements of Chapter 1193 for natural materials, but neither color matches the brick color used in the existing shopping center. The applicant has provided a small screened area on their front sidewalk. Staff understands that this is to be used to vending, but the applicant should clarify when activity that propose here. The Board should apply the standards for design review and determine if the proposed signage and exterior modifications enhance the characteristics of this commercial district. If the Board determines that the application meets those standards, Staff recommends the following conditions: That the applicant shall submit revised a landscape plan indicating a change in the dumpster screening to a masonry wall. That the applicant shall submit a revised site plan

showing the front façade of the proposed building parallel to the façade of the existing shopping center to the east. One note, this application does not approve any signage, except the general location of the ground sign. This is because the applicant needs to secure variances for the size of the signage, possibly some materials, and then the applicant will need to come back to the Board and get the signage approved. The applicant is aware of that is in process. The sign you are seeing there is conceptual, other than the general location of the sign on the front of the building and the spot for the ground sign. It is not approving the specific details and materials of the sign. That will come to the Board at a later time. With that, I will turn things back over to our chairman.

Chairman Zollars: Are you the architect? Would you please identify yourself?

Mr. Frazier: My name is Alex Frazier. I am with Hurley and Stewart. We are the Civil Engineers for this project. *(Mr. Frazier made presentation partially off mic and was inaudible.)*

Chairman Zollars: Any comments or questions?

Mr. Hicks: I will try to be brief here, but I have a few questions and a few points I would like to make. But, I am adamantly opposed to the proposal. Mainly, for two reasons. One, part of our task is to weigh and measure the overall impact of a proposal of the surrounding neighborhoods. And I am adamantly opposed to the use. The second, would be the appearance and character of the building as it fits in with the surrounding buildings. In regards to the use, the first point, I did a quick search for the surrounding areas to see how many other like uses of the Dollar General that there are. There is a Family Dollar on E. Main, another one at 6340 E. Livingston, 6225 E. Main. I understand some of these are technically out of the City. Another Dollar General at 1310 Brice, 950 E. Livingston, 8915 E. Broad, a Dollar Tree at 8067 E. Broad and 6225 E. Main, Dollar Tree 7691 Farmsbury. All of these within a three mile radius of this exact site. The market is over saturated. I think the community is over saturated with these dollar type stores. I don't think that it is providing an additional amenity to our residents. I think it is exposing more retail/more square footage of developed space in our community, to an over saturated market that could one day go belly up. What happens when the dollar type concept that is booming now, Dollar General is building 1000 new locations every year, what happens when that turns to bust? How many vacant dollar type concepts are we going to have around town? And so, in regards to the use, I am opposed to it. And, in regards to the way it is fitting on this site, I understand it is a space and technically you can fit it in there, but you have a retail center on the left, a retail center on the right, and they look the same. Now you are going to put a building in the middle of it that sticks out and does not look like the buildings on the left or right. There may be some of navigating the building aesthetics part of this, so I will just end my comments at that.

Chairman Zollars: Very good, Mr. Hicks. Thank you for your comments. Any other comments?

Mr. Bowman: I am assuming your client is aware this is in the Historical District of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Bowman: It seems to me like it is trying to force a big box concept into a very local type of setting here. I can't help but think that the way it is designed that it will look strange there, almost out of place. What type of steps is your client willing to take to really make sure that it fits in with the Historical District? Personally, that is my biggest concern. I want it to look like it could belong. There is an economic concern that Mr. Hicks has, and in my opinion there is some validity to that. My concern is I want it to look good in my community. The citizens are obviously counting on us to make sure that you have plans for that. Do you have further ideas or concepts that are not included here to make it blend in better?

Mr. Frazier: That is something we can definitely revisit with the architects. Again, I am a civil engineer. We rely on the architects to match the surrounding buildings as best as possible. So, I am definitely going to have them revisit that. Probably stop out there and take some pictures of what that brick really looks like.

Mr. Bowman: I think matching brick would be a start as far as having some kind of uniformity.

Mr. Frazier: We are also looking at having some old fashioned type lighting existing on site. We are trying our best to match that. Putting in some pedestrian amenities that match the current bench, trash receptacle, also a little planter box. We are really trying to match it as best, I get what you mean that it is not a ma and pa shop. We will try to make the building look a little more like that. Again, with the windows, that is kind of like a historic district where you have storefront windows where you can shop. We are trying to emulate that look. Unfortunately, the floor plan does not yield it to actually be see thru. There is just no other area to put shelving in a very strategically laid out store. But again, that is another thing I really think they are trying to enhance.

Mr. King: You just mentioned that it is a very strategically laid out store, and I think that it shows. Understanding that it is in a Historical District, to me, looking at what has been presented, is done everywhere else. So, even to the point of not moving the items that are inside of the store, I really am struggling to understand how this is really going to fit and what is being done the area that they would like to put this in. I am not seeing that. Did they look at existing locations, existing available space that is in that Historical District? Was that taken into account at all?

Mr. Frazier: Like other sites to develop?

Mr. King: Pre-existing.

Mr. Frazier: They have a very pre laid out floor plan that they use. This is an urban prototype and they have their traditional, so to retrofit into an existing building it is very hard for them to fit all their items inside the store. *(Off mic and inaudible.)*

Mr. King: So is it fair to say that the goal is to make a historical area non-historical to accommodate their needs?

Mr. Frazier: I would not say that. We are really trying to match the architecture, especially with the brick comment I agree with. They are do their best to be in a commercial area where they feel like they can do very well. Addressing your economic comment, Dalgren has a marketing department with demographics all over the globe. They look in an area and say, "Are we going to be successful here?" They are not going to want to go on E. Main in the Historic District if they do not believe they will be successful and that there is a need for it. It may seem like there is over saturation but they keep building these stores, and since I have worked for five years on these Dollar General projects, and since I have worked there, every single store that we have opened is doing very well, thriving. Real Estate Reps that have been working for Dollar General for longer than that can speak top that and in further detail, that they are doing very well. A lot of the stores in this area are exceeding their goals.

Unknown Speaker: I am not opposed to the concept, necessarily, my main concern besides what is matching already there, this is a 21FT building. And, everything here that is existing, is 16FT, maybe 14FT. I think the height of the building sticks out like a sore thumb. You have a hot dog stand here, a neighborhood bar, and a pizza shop. It is very mellow. I think the height is one thing. And, I think the look is another, and it doesn't seem to fit the character.

Mr. Frazier: The reason that parapet wall sticks up, is to screen the HVAC on the roof. Again that is an architecture. I will bring that to them and see if there is any way we can put the HVAC on the ground and screen it, and lower that to better align with the roof line of these properties.

Mr. Sampson: You are not an architect, and I think that is what everybody's issues are with the actual structure. Being a Civil Engineer, with the parking, this is the Site Plan, there is a Plot Grade Utility, with the drainage, and the landscaping, it is a very basic plan. I don't see from the plan, again this is our Historic District, and the combination of what you proposed in terms of hardscape/landscape, and in relation to the parking lot. But, you can address the storm drainage first.

Mr. Frazier: What we are doing for the stormwater is *(inaudible)*. We would like it to go underground due to a lack of space. *(Inaudible.)*

Mr. Sampson: Is there any thought to pervious pavement, anything that would add some sustainable elements to the site?

Mr. Frazier: Yes, that is something that we could look into to do. *(Inaudible.)*

Mr. Sampson: How about landscape plan.

Mr. Frazier: In regards to the landscape, I am not a landscape architect, unfortunately. We have one in house. She reviews the City's requirements for types of shrubs, street trees, etc... But, we do not have any actual pictures right on the plan. Is that what you are looking for?

Mr. Sampson: Which is identified when it doesn't match the surrounding environment. Again, I think the physical structure is going to stand out. But, from a site standpoint, it is also going to be significantly different from what we have presently.

Mr. Frazier: You are talking what is adjacent on the other side?

Mr. Sampson. Yes. Eric, is this the largest available parcel that we have in Old Reynoldsburg at this time?

Mr. Snowden: It is the largest site of vacant land like this, even though this is part of the existing parcel and they are going to be doing a lot split to the site. Yes, for all intensive purposes, this is the biggest undeveloped parcel without something significant on it.

Mr. Sampson: And again, it is our goal, we have a vision, I have nothing against a dollar store type product, but we are looking for something that is a little more current in terms of sustainability. You know, taking advantage of the available green space, storm water drainage. I do like pervious pavement. I don't agree that it is more expensive, and I just don't see it on the Site Plan. I see a very basic parking lot.

Mr. Frazier: I guess from my standpoint, I had the idea that a very basic utility plan for this stage was warranted. I did not go into very much detail for this plan, but I certainly can if it would sway your decision and give you more information on what we are doing.

Mr. Hicks: Some comments about the Site Plan, I see some newer sites that Dollar General is doing and are very judicious in the use of curbs. I think we would like to see a few more curbs in these parking areas. You have it around the peninsulas and the island, but along the eastern boundary, I don't thin there is any curb, or along the southern boundary there is no curb in the parking lot. This existing site has some issues that the proposal does not work to address at all. The existing center on the right side has a very narrow rear loading area, rear access drive that just dead ends back there. If we were to approve something new, it is ideal for a shopping center to be able to get all the way around, for emergency vehicles, deliveries, or trash service, and this site plan does not address that, obviously. Also, on the main entrance where you are coming out, there is a drive thru lane, and you even showing the truck coming out here in your model. I would assume that use is still approved for that drive thru lane there, I just think some striping or something would help address potential kind of traffic issues there. You are going to be increasing traffic into the center, and you have people coming out of the Dollar General, and they are going to have to get over to the right, and they are maybe stacking. I know it is not being used as a bank drive thru, but it is still there. It is kind of an awkward place and it is really not being addressed on this. I think the Staff mentioned it, and in the report also. The dumpster enclosure is just a dog-eared pressure treated fence. Especially with how visible it is on the site, you look down at the proposed Dollar General, one of the first things you are going to see off to the right, it is not behind the store, it is right next to the store, and clearly visible from the street. I think we would want to see some kind of masonry walls with brick or a facade that matches the building. Something that is not going to be an eye sore in a few years, which most of those fence enclosures do. So, those would just be a few of my comments on the site, in addition, as I mentioned before, my opposition.

Mr. Sampson: You bring up a good point. Where are the deliveries made? Are they made at the front entrance, or is there a back?

Mr. Frazier: Deliveries are made right here in the side. The truck will pull through. The west side of the building, the truck will actually come through. We have a mutual access easement with the owner of the property to the east and the west. We have a mutual access easement that will come in from Waggoner, pull down as you can kind of see on that plan, and pull right up next to the building. There will be typically one to two deliveries a week, depending on the store. Some of them make a little bit more.

Mr. Sampson: What size truck?

Mr. Frazier: It is a full size semi, a WB67. We have driven that through with some vehicle assimilating software to ensure that it fits on the plan and that it will sit right next to the building while they are unloading. Again, we are not exactly sure what time. It could be early morning before business hours, or it could be middle of the day. It just depends on their schedule of deliveries in the area.

Mr. Sampson: For semis, it is a challenging area, and it does block the other traffic ingress/egress out of that.

Mr. Frazier: And again, we have made sure it can get in and get out. We are already proposing some drive improvements along Waggoner. We are also having a traffic access study done right now to determine if there are any more driveway improvements.

Mr. Sampson: I understand that. I am just saying if a family is getting ice cream, they are going to want to get in and out as well.

Mr. Frazier: I guess that is something the driver needs to be respectful of the other consumers in the area. Again, there are only going to be one to two deliveries a week.

Mr. Sampson: That is all I have.

Chairman Zollars: Anything else from the Board?

Mr. Snowden: No other comments from Staff other than, it seems there are additional concerns, maybe if the applicant is willing to provide some updated plans. Is that accurate? In that case, I recommend tabling and letting the applicant resubmit. Those who know me know that I am never one to recommend we take extra time, but it seems the applicant is receptive to what the Board is saying. That is a typical part of the process in many communities.

Chairman Zollars: I would like to entertain the motion to table.

Mr. Hicks: Before a motion, I would like to make one final comment that if the applicant did want to do things to try to earn my support for the project, I would list out that first, it makes the most sense if you put new retail into vacant retail space within the existing center. If that includes refreshing the existing center, I would be supportive of a sign proposal, or front facade proposal on the existing building to put an end on some of that vacant space that is right next to them. The second option would be if they would either attach the building, or make the building continuous or seamless with a fake wall or something like that in between, and make the existing building match the new building with a renovation, or make the new building match the old building. I just want to lay out that I am not 100% opposed to Dollar General making it onto the site, but I think that what is presented, I can not support. I just

wanted to lay out those three options as reasonable ways I thought we could make something work.

Mr. Snowden: Whoever is making the motion should table to the next regular meeting of the Board, and that is on our schedule so that Mr. Frazier and his team would know what to expect, and when to have revised plans into staff, and all that good stuff.

Mr. Bowman: I think you can see that there is a lot of apprehension here. We don't want to infringe on their floor plan but I think most importantly in our role is to make sure that it fits our community. That is what takes precedent with us. I am going to motion to table this to the next regular meeting.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Very well, the item is tabled to the next meeting of the Design Review Board which will be April 6th. Mr. Frazier, I will need the plans that are to go to the Board, no later than March 29th. I would prefer to have them before then so that I can look them over in case you and I need to go back and forth. You can send those to me via email.

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 4/6/2017 7:00 PM
MOVER:	Richard Hudson, Eliot Bowman	
SECONDER:	Bill Sampson	
AYES:	Hudson, Zollars, Bowman, Hicks, King, Sampson	
ABSENT:	Carr	

E. OTHER BUSINESS

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning and Zoning Administrator