



MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2016 6:30 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Design Review Board – Regular – December 3, 2015

Minutes stand approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Burd: I am going to make one suggestion. Under D, New Business, I think we are going to move number 1 to the end of that section so that the applicants that are here do not have to sit through our housekeeping items. So, we will have the Agenda amended as discussed.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Chairman Burd: If you are here in the audience to speak on the Agenda, would you please rise at this time and raise your right hand? Do you swear or affirm that the testimony that you will provide to the Board is truthful? If so, say, "I do." Alright, thank you very much.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **6308 E. Main St.; Application #172578; Applicant: Richard D. Bigham, Jr.; Business Name: My-Title Loan; Signage**

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. 6308 E. Main Street - My Title Loan for Signage was application #172578 for Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the north side of E. Main Street just west of Brice Road. Existing Zoning is CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request for certificate of appropriateness for new signage. Current Use is Administrative/Business Office. The applicant is Mr. Richard D. Bigham, Jr. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to erect a new wall mounted sign. The site is

developed with an existing commercial building which has two tenant spaces. The other tenant space is utilized by a dry-cleaning business. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CC district of the City. The applicant is proposing to erect a new 18.68sf raceway mounted wall sign. Staff estimates the tenant's space to have approximately 20' of frontage on E. Main Street, which would entitle the applicant to 20sf of wall sign per Table 1181 of the Zoning Code. A blue sign board will be mounted directly to the raceway, and internally illuminated channel letters will be mounted to that sign board. The Zoning Code prohibits signs that extend more than 14" from the building façade. Staff would like the applicant to clarify this dimension since their drawing is not to scale. Vinyls, acrylics and painted aluminum are among the permitted materials in the Community Commercial Overlay. The applicant's plans have two different indications for the color of the aluminum letter returns: white and green. Staff would like the applicant to clarify if this is an error in the drawing and state their requested color. Do you understand what I mean, Sir?

Mr. Bigham: I'm the installer. I don't know. I am going to say they are white, but I don't know.

Mr. Snowden: The applicant is purposing to utilize a blue backing sign board. It is an acrylic type of sign panel. This type of sign board is not utilized in the existing wall sign for the other tenant in this commercial building. In order to comply with the standard listed in Section 1103.12(a) that require buildings to be at variance with neighboring buildings, Staff suggests that the applicant remove the sign board and mount the letters directly to the raceway. The applicant's drawing also shows a blue sign panel board mounted directly above the entrance to the tenant space. Staff would like the applicant to clarify the purpose of this. Given that this type of detailing is not present anywhere else on the building, staff suggest it be removed from the final plan. 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 on the following conditions: 1. That the applicant clarify the distance the sign extends from the building façade. 2. That the applicant clarify the proposed color of the letter returns to the satisfaction of the Board. However the Board wants to handle this. If the Board wants to limit them to a certain color, that would be the choice of the Board. 3. That the applicant redesign the sign so that the channel letters are mounted directly to the raceway. 4. That the applicant provide Staff with new plans indicating these changes in conjunction with their application for a zoning sign permit. With that, I will be happy to answer any other questions, and I will turn things back over to Mr. Burd, our Chair.

Chairman Burd: Mr. Bigham, did you have anything to add?

Mr. Bigham: No, as I say, I am the installer. The reason for this blue, I do not know. I have done other work with these people and they use that blue background. I think that is what they were trying to do. What Mr. Snowden is saying makes total sense. I will recommend that we take that off. I can't make that decision, but I will make that recommendation. As far as the projection from the wall, it will be about ten inches. Normally those boxes are about

five inches, and the letters are five inches. So, we are talking about a projection of about ten inches.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Bigham, if you could just document that on the plan so I can document that it meets code.

Mr. Bigham: We can do that. I will get new plans. Again, I will say the returns are white, but I will have to verify all that. I can do that and have plans back to Mr. Snowden on Monday. I have a medical thing I have to take care of tomorrow so I will not be able to do that. Does that answer everything?

Mr. Snowden: I am comfortable, it is just if the Board is comfortable with approving it.

Chairman Burd: I think you addressed the key questions. Do you know what that blue panel is above the door on the design?

Mr. Snowden: You should be able to see on the screen in front of you.

Mr. Bigham: I don't know. I don't think that is part of us.

Mr. Snowden: It could also be a generation error on the part of the drawing. Those things certainly happen. Again, it was something that sort of raised my curiosity.

Chairman Burd: It may be nothing, it is just kind of odd. I will open up to the Board for any questions. No questions, ok. If we want to entertain a motion to approve taking into consideration what we have discussed. That may be appropriate. Would anyone like to make a motion?

Mr. Hicks: I would like to make a motion for approval upon the removal of the blue panel, and approval of the ten inch projection.

Mr. Bigham: I do not have any idea, but I will find out.

(Vote)

Chairman Burd: Do we have any other information for the applicant?

Mr. Snowden: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bigham, obviously you would need to check back with your client and confirm that is acceptable to them, but it is approved conditionally. All you would need to do from our standpoint is to submit to me the revised plans showing those modifications. In addition to that you will need to submit building stamped plans to our building division. That information is listed in our report and it will also be on the letter that we will respond to you after tonight's meeting.

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

2. 1719 Brice Road; Application #172674; Applicant Signarama of Gahanna; Business: Anthony's Pharmacy; Signage

Chairman Burd: Can you come to the podium and give us your name for the record?

Mr. Persons: John Persons, Signarama of Gahanna

Chairman Burd: Mr. Snowden, would you give your presentation.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you. 1719 Brice Road - Anthony's Pharmacy for Signage was Application #172674 for Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the west side of Brice Road between Astor Avenue and Radekin Road. Existing Zoning is CC - Community Commerce District / CCO - Community Commercial Overlay. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use is Retail Sales. The applicant is Signarama of Gahanna. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to reface an existing internally illuminated stencil-style cabinet sign. 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. That is immediately to the west. The applicant is proposing to reface an existing 27.6sf wall mounted sign. The proposed sign consists of a stenciled aluminum sign face with a red backing board that allows light to pass through and the letters to appear illuminated. The sign as proposed is consistent with the aluminum sign cabinet system that extends around the entire front façade of the shopping center. As you can see here, this is consistent around the entire top facade of this building here, and the applicant is proposing to stick with that. Staff's recommendation is that 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 be happy to answer any questions and I will turn it over to our Chairman.

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

Mr. Persons: No, Sir.

Chairman Burd: Ok. This is fairly straight forward. I am always in favor of trading blue for scarlet. I will open it up to the board for questions. Easy enough. Would anyone like to make a motion?

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Persons, we will provide a later, as we always do, stating what happened here tonight and that you are approved. You should submit a zoning sign permit showing the plans as you submitted. Also, as a note to you client, in order to be in compliance with our zoning and building codes of the City, they should submit a zoning certificate application and building occupancy application before the business begins to operate. I am not aware that they have done that. I am also not aware that they are in operation. It didn't appear to be that way when I visited the site. Just more of a note for your client.

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

3. **2412 Taylor Park Dr.; Application #172675; Applicant: Northstar Realty; Business Name: Al's Hobby Shop; Signage**

Chairman Burd: May we have your name for the record?

Mr. Reynolds: My name is Jack Reynolds.

Chairman Burd: Ok. Mr. Snowden, if you are ready to give your report...

Mr. Snowden: 2412 Taylor Park Drive - Al's Hobby Shop for Signage. Application #172675 - Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located on the west side of Route 256, just north of 70. Existing Zoning: CS - Community Services District. The request is for a certificate of appropriateness for signage. Current Use: Retail Sales, and the applicant is Northstar Realty. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a certificate of appropriateness to erect two new wall mounted signs for a new tenant in an existing commercial building. The site is developed with an existing multi-tenant commercial building. The other tenant spaces include retail sales uses. Neighboring uses include other commercial businesses in the CS district of the City. To the south and east, the property abuts the SR 256/IR 70 rights-of-way. People usually refer to this as the building that is in the Target parking lot. This is a multi-tenant building and you have two large power centers immediately behind it. This site consists of a building that does not appear to conform to many of the normal zoning setback requirements and regulations. I can see evidence of some setback variations from when the building was constructed. This building does not conform to the letter of our signage regulations, but it is consistently not conforming. What that indicates to me is that a comprehensive sign plan for this building when it was constructed, was probably approved by BZBA, but I do not have that record in my office to refer to. So, a Comprehensive Sign Plan would allow the applicant to show comprehensively all the signage for the structure and essentially functions as a variance package, to allow a group of signage only variances to the entire site. The idea being that it is best to show all of this consistently so that BZBA, and subsequently, the Design Review Board could confirm that it all works

together on the entire site, rather than have to approve individual variances for each sign. It is kind of a fast track to a sign variance, but it functions a little differently. The unique characteristics of this site, indicates to me that there was probably one approved for this and I just don't have it in my files. I don't know why that would be, but that is what is indicated here. The site fronts on the SR 256 right-of-way, and staff has measured the distance between the edge of street pavement to the building façade at over 100'. It is approximately 80' from the edge of pavement to the lot line. The applicant is proposing to erect two wall mounted internally illuminated channel letter signs. The proposed signs consist of internally illuminated channel letters. The proposed signs are consistent with the style and materials of adjacent signs on the building and on neighboring buildings. It appears that when the Comprehensive Sign Plan was approved. The front facade, or the 256 facade, was approved for what we would call a type B wall sign. We have type A and type B. Type A are for less than 80' setback and type B are for more than 80' setback. The applicant is asking that they be allowed to add a type B. They took down a type B from a previous tenant, and they are asking to put up a new type B for the proposed tenant. The Code basically assumes that a building would never be constructed in this manner. That is the complex part about this. What the code says about corner lots is that the applicant is entitled to an additional wall sign on the perpendicular street, when you have a corner lot. So, the example there would be if you had a public street here, you could have one wall sign here and one wall sign here, for your building. In this case, you have a public street in front, you have the stormwater feature, and then you have a public street behind. So, what the previous Planning Administrator, and previous Board have done, is basically assume that you have a wall sign back here two because this is a public street. It is not meeting the exact letter of the code, but as we stated, the intent of the code is to regulate signage and to prevent too much signage, the Code never envisions a building configuration such as this. So, if you can see from here, the rear of the property, here is a type 1 wall sign, and here is additional signage over here facing I70. So, what I would propose, since this is a type A sign, that we allow the applicant to have a type A sign. They are showing a type B sign which is 50 sq. ft. I am recommending the Board approve this conditionally to give them up to 30 sq. ft. Of signage, to be consistent with what is on the building. The reason why this is so complex is the code is written, street, building set backs. It never envisions a building built in this, this is why they did this comprehensive sign plan. That is why there are some gymnastics here to get to our answer. The take away from this is, number one, the signage as they are proposing with the red channel letters is consistent with the type and materials. Number two, there probably was a comprehensive sign plan approved for this. And, number three, since we don't have that comprehensive sign plan to see what they got approved for, what they are requesting is consistent with what everybody else on this building is doing. It is not giving this applicant any special privileges that anybody else or anyone else who has a comprehensive sign plan set up this way has. With that, I would be happy to answer any questions. The reason I have not been more insistent that this applicant go for variances for this is because I can see from the evidence that a comprehensive sign plan was in place because they never would have been allowed to do that with one, at the time. Any questions? With that, I will turn things back over to our chair. Thank you Mr. Snowden. Mr. Reynolds, did you have anything to add to that?

Mr. Reynolds: No. I appreciate the gymnastics. We are just looking for a little bit of relief.

Radio Shack left and we have had a hard time coaxing people to take over the spot, with the fact that they can only have 30 sq. ft., given the setback. If you are familiar with the site, that drainage has a lot of vegetation as well.

Mr. Snowden: Gentlemen, to interject here, the reason they would have done a comprehensive sign plan is because the code assumes that the street is right here. But in the case, you have over 50 ft. Of stormwater retention area for these highway right-of-ways, and over 100 ft. Between the building. That is what would have motivated the original people, who constructed the building to do this comprehensive sign plan, to address that.

Mr. Reynolds: I measured about 300 ft. From the middle of 256 back to the wall.

Mr. Snowden: That would be including the median and everything.

Mr. Reynolds: So again, in order to entice him to take over the space, we told him that we would come before you all. With what Eric has said, we can certainly with the type A, 30 sq. ft. On the back because all we are doing is advertising to the folks who are utilizing the Target center. Again, I do believe that we could see it to the tenant, if we had 50 out front. Which is comparable to what is there. Do members of the Board have any questions for Mr. Reynolds or Mr. Snowden?

Mr. Hicks: The sign on the back, we are talking that you are agreeable to changing that from 50 to 30, when you change it from 50 to 30, does it possibly fit in between the downspouts there better also? Esthetically, taking a look at it, you have the owl and the apostrophe "S" sitting on top of the downspout, it may work out a little bit better.

Mr. Reynolds: It may fit a little bit better.

Mr. Hicks: Maybe if you end up going like 29 sq. ft., or just a few less sq. ft., to make it fit on the back of that building.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, if the Board approves this conditionally, and empowers staff to complete that process, I can make sure that the applicant is being sensitive to the building architecture when they give a final sign plan. What they are proposing is generally good, it is just that there are some jumping jacks to get to as to why this is the case.

Mr. Reynolds: We can scooch it over and fir it in between the two downspouts.

Chairman Burd: Thank you. Any other questions on this item? We should entertain a motion and I believe that the motion should reference the appropriate sign size on the rear of the property.

Mr. Cullinan: I would like to make a motion to approve Application #172675 for Northstar Realty, contingent upon the rear sign being a 30 sq. ft. Sign, and also that the applicant work with Staff to have the sign between downspouts for architectural purposes.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Reynolds the steps for you to complete your review are listed there on the Staff report and I will provide that in a letter which will go to the applicant listed on the application form. Just be aware, before Al's Hobby Sop can open, and be in compliance with the Building and Zoning codes, they should submit for a Zoning Certificate and a Building Occupancy before they begin to operate. I am letting you know that so we are consistent.

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

4. **Annual Organization Meeting to Elect a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and a Secretary**

Chairman Burd: That brings us to our housekeeping item, our Annual Organization Meeting to Elect a Chairman, Vice Chairman, and a Secretary. I guess we will just go in order. As you all know, the Chairman works us through the Agenda each meeting. Sometimes works with Mr. Snowden and Staff a little bit closer. I would be open to a discussion. Is there anyone who would want to be Chairman? I would be happy to do it if that is what you wish, but I certainly do not want to preclude somebody else from being chairman as well.

Mr. Bowman: I would like to nominate Nathan Burd for Chairman.

Mr. Hicks: I will second that.

Chairman Burd: Do we need to take a role call on that Eric?

Mr. Snowden: Do you accept the nomination? I can temporarily chair the meeting for the purposes of taking this vote. Since Mr. Burd is the only candidate, and he has accepted his nomination, will all those in favor of electing Mr. Burd Chairman of the Board for 2016 please signify by saying Aye? (*Audible "Ayes"*) Any opposed? (*Silent*)

Mr. Snowden: Alright, Mr. Burd is our Chairman.

Chairman Burd: Thank you all very much. Vice Chairman will obviously serve in the role of Chairman in the Chairman's absence. Does anybody have a hankering to be Vice Chairman? Mr. Zollars is willing and that makes sense, he has been on the Board for a while now. Can I make that motion Eric?

Mr. Snowden: I do not see why not.

Chairman Burd: I know on Council, the Chairs make the motions for their Vice Chairs, so I will do the same thing. I will move that Mr. Zollars be appointed Vice Chair. A second by Mr. Hicks. All in favor of Mr. Zollars as Vice Chairman, please say "Aye". (*Audible*

"Ayes") Any opposed? *(Silent)* I am going to turn to you Mr. Snowden. I do not know what the Secretary does or if we need one.

Mr. Snowden: Gentlemen, I will explain. The Charter says that we have a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and a Secretary. It says that the Chairman and Vice Chairman must be members of the Board and that the Secretary can or can not be. That is what the Charter says about Board and Commissions in general. In being consistent with all of our other Boards and Commissions here in the Planning and Zoning Division, I am going to request, as has been done for many years, that the Board designate myself as the Secretary. In addition to that, supporting our Boards is an entire team effort between myself, Mr. Havener, and Rochelle from our Clerks Office who also works with us as far as taking some of the background, minute transcriptions, and all of that. But, for the purposes of calling the role, and the only other reason for that, this was brought up at the Planning Commission because there are cities that have someone calling the role and then planting staff at the front. Frankly, we are not equipped for that. To require Rochelle to be here would be adding a lot of burden that we are not really equipped to do at this time. So, I would just request that the Board designate me the Secretary, but know that it is a team effort, and anything you need, it is our pleasure to serve you.

Chairman Burd: Thank you Mr. Snowden. I think that sounds great and I just want to say on behalf of the Board, we know these are complex issues, so thank you for what you do and that last one was a little tricky but we got through it just fine. I will go ahead and make a motion that Eric Snowden be appointed the Design Review Board Secretary.

Mr. Bowman: I will second that.

Chairman Burd: All in favor of Eric Snowden as Secretary say "Aye". *(Audible "Ayes")*
Any opposed? *(Silent)*

Mr. Snowden: thanks Gentlemen. All those terms will be for 2016. And we will do the same thing the first meeting of 2017.

E. OTHER BUSINESS

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning Administrator