



**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
April 4, 2024**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Furst, Barnhart, Benner, Alabi, Kleckley, Brusk
ABSENT: Ward

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers for the evening were sworn in by Mr. Furst.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

App# 2023-5486; 7305 E. Main Street; Richard Holmes; Variance

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. I'll now invite the applicant to the podium and add anything they'd like to. For anyone who wishes to speak. The applicant included. Please state your name and address for the record before speaking. Mr. McCash, did you swear in?

Mr. McCash: Do you ask attorney's to swear in?

Mr. Shook: We have, in the past, asked attorneys to swear in if they're presenting evidence, in the form of testimony. If the attorney is only speaking in terms of arguments or to ask questions of a witness, then the attorney would not need to be sworn in.

Mr. McCash: Argument and asking Questions. I am here representing 1833 French House, LLC, and the tenant, Profilers Grooming Company. They purchased this property in August 2021, and he is proposing a high-end spa barbershop here. What we have asked for and what we have presented to staff are two signs on the front. Main Street is the main thoroughfare, but he also has other signs on it. So he would like to have the two signs on the front, the projecting sign and the wall sign. Both those signs are actually because of city projects partially obstructed. One wall sign at the top is partially obstructed by the streetlight that's on there. The projecting wall sign is also partially obstructed by the traffic light itself. While he used to have a ground projecting sign for this site, when the adjacent property owner put their sign up, they took the ground sign out, and he really can't put a ground sign anymore. So he stuck with actually doing a projecting sign on it. It's also obstructed. As I said, Main Street is the main thoroughfare, the main advertising component. Everybody else has their signs on Main Street. That's what they're advertising their businesses on. So that's why he would like to have the two signs on the Main Street side to give him the same economic advantage as everybody else on Main Street. Having the projecting sign and the wall sign that's on it. The lighting. While it technically doesn't meet the way that it is in the zoning code, it provides the external illumination, and it's hidden up in the soffit area itself. So you don't see the lighting, but it gives you the same effect as the external lighting component itself. So from a permitted sign standpoint, if we were standing here with just the two signs in the front. We would be meeting the zoning code requirements. What we have in this particular instance is because of all of the work that's been done along Main Street the renovations, the sidewalk work and things like that. His entrance is actually on the backside of the building to meet ADA. He can't meet it in the front area itself. Doesn't have enough space to put any of the ramping components. It's not tied into where the handicapped parking is at, which is in the back. So his handicapped access is in the back of the building. That is his main entrance. What we run into in this particular instance is the revised code for barbers requires that he will have a sign or a barber pole at his main entrance, specifically says at his main entrance. So that means he has to have a sign or a barber pole at the back door. It doesn't really give him any advantage as far as marketing, because that's a pretty much a dead end area back there, and there's not a lot of high traffic back there. But he needs that because that's what the state regulation is. So he's proposed a barber pole, not a sign. The revised code actually says sign or barber pole. So he's not proposing you put a sign that says Profilers Styling Salon or anything back there. He's just proposing to put a traditional barber pole back there, which is basically a symbol. I don't necessarily treat it, as a sign, and I don't think the revised codes, looking at it necessarily as a sign. I know your zoning code treats it as a sign, but it's really an iconic symbol of a profession, just like, scales of justice for lawyers. It doesn't say which lawyer. It just says this is a lawyer. In this case, this is saying this is a barber, but didn't say which barber that's on it. The barber pole itself is similar to an open sign. The only time that it would be

internally illuminated is when the barbers open. When the barbers closed, it's turned off. It's a 60W, I think. So it's no real different than a porch light from an illumination standpoint itself. It's unique to a barber itself. If he moves out, this sign goes away. Nobody else is allowed to have it. It's unique to a barber. So setting precedent, I don't believe that you would be setting precedent, because I think you could tie it directly to the barbershop or the barber itself, and the requirement of the revised code that he has it. He is trying to be as esthetically pleasing as possible with his other signs. He could have up to 79ft² in the front for the wall sign. He's nowhere close to that. He can have, I believe it's six square feet for the projecting sign, and he's only proposing four square feet, so he's not trying to maximize all of his signage along the Main Street area there. He's trying to do it very esthetically, integrated into the building itself. So we believe that he needs to have the sign in the back. That's a given. He has to put that sign back there because that's his main entrance. What we feel is that by him giving up a sign on the front puts him at a different level of economic marketing along Main Street than any other of the other properties along Main Street that have and are allowed to have the two signs on Main Street, which is the main marking. That's where you want to spend your marketing dollars. So we believe that he should be allowed to have that same economic advantage of the two signs on Main Street, and that this barber pole is not advertising his business. He's advertising a profession with an iconic symbol that used the historic symbol for barbers. In addition, it is required by the revised code. Again, it goes just with the barber use itself. It's not going to be there as a precedent for anything else. Because that his rear entrance. I think you can clearly put this to a point where. It doesn't set precedent for other people in the area. That's kind of, where we're at.

Mr. Furst: Before I open up the board for questions, Mr. Cash, did you state your name and address for the record?

Mr. McCash: I believe I did, but I'll say it again. Thomas McCash 0059079 55 South High Street, Dublin, Ohio.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak in support or against this application? If so, I invite you to come forward now. Please state your name and address for the record and you may speak your piece.

Mr. McCray: Alexander McCrary, 7305 East Main Street. I wanted to add that the wall sign is blocked by the traffic light, which we can't do anything with that. The projecting sign, traveling east on Main Street is blocked by the front of the porch. I was forced to put a projecting sign up on the building because my sign when I bought the building, I had like a real estate sign on the bottom half that was four foot by three foot. I also had a 46 diameter sign that was citywide on the sidewalk. They took my sign up while I was going through the process to get my COA. My

neighbor put his realtor sign right next to mine. The ideal thing would have been for us both to have sign, like one on top of the other, but I couldn't do that. So I had to do what I had to do to put it on the building itself. I wouldn't be asking for two signs if I still had my realtor sign in the front. Like I said before, the wall sign is being blocked by the traffic light itself and the projecting sign. So you are looking at like 45%. Even though I'm asking for two signs, I'm getting to like 55%. Then traveling west going east bound, you can see the sign clearly, but west going east the porch blocks a portion of the sign until you get past the porch on my projecting sign.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. I will now open up the floor for questions or comments from the board.

Mr. Brusk: One of the things you didn't address that I think you might want to is the fact that it's only a rear entrance, and that rear entrance is very difficult to figure out where you are, at because the building back doesn't look like the building front and other buildings that are there. I think it's the only way that you'd be able to identify that, that's the main entrance is through that. And I understand the need for two signs in the front. If you had a parking lot on the side or parking lot in the front, you wouldn't need to worry about the backside.

Mr. McCash: All of our parking is in the back. There used to be a curb cut off Main Street to get to the back, but that was all taken away with the cities, improvements along there. They have to go around and go through; I want to say what the Wall Street. The alley behind it is the only way to get to the parking area. From there you don't see the door because it's slightly around the corner. So that's why he's put it up a little higher on the back section. This is to say, hey, this is where the entrance is. You did mention that the last thing something about barber poles being stolen and things like that. Yeah, sometimes they get stolen. One, that's why he has it high, you also mentioned something about putting it in the window. We could put it in a window there. Then it becomes a window sign, which we're not allowed to have except for out on Main Street. So that would change our variance around to a completely different variance.

Ms. Barnhart: Just to confirm, back in November we approved the barber pole in the rear, correct?

Ms. Buathier: You approve the internal illumination of the barber pole only. You approved the external illumination in the front. The different type of external illumination, the front lit, and you approved glass as the material. The only think you denied was increasing the signs from two permitted signs to allowing three permitted signs.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay.



Mr. Benner: Should you get this open anytime soon? What kind of marketing plan do you have for that?

Mr. McCrary: So my marketing scheme, this is the new going thing now, where men want to be pampered these days. Women have always done it kind of sort of situation. It's a new where men want to be pampered. They want to come lounge, hang out, and get a manicure, pedicure. I got guys to get their hair braided, dreaded or got longer hair and they go over here to go to this spot. They want like a one stop shop. You come you get braided; you get edged up, camouflage your beard.

Mr. Benner: I appreciate you. I don't mean to cut you off, but I'm not really interested in the actual operation. I'm talking about marketing. What is your plan to get customers? How are you going to let them know that you're there when you open up? You're going to open and just hope they come in because they see a sign on Main Street?

Mr. McCrary: I'm the barber guy. I've been doing this for three decades. My daddy was a barber.

Mr. Benner: Do you have a clientele already?

Mr. McCrary: For sure. I have another locations; this is my second location.

Mr. Benner: So, word of mouth?

Mr. McCrary: Word of mouth, social media, Facebook, LinkedIn.

Mr. Benner: I guess my point would be the. Whether or not they see a sign out on Main Street or not, they're going to know that you're there.

Mr. McCrary: Well, when I meet contractors there, they park in the animal clinic and they park in cigar bar. They never park in my lot because they couldn't find the right location. It's been done more than ten times. You know what I mean?

Mr. McCash: Other business along Main Street also use social media and things like that. They have the two signs.

Mr. Benner: I think we've covered that. Those two signs for any other business on Main Street were done under a different law, a different code.

Mr. McCash: There still allowed to have two signs under your current code.

Mr. Benner: Yes, two. Not three.

Mr. McCash: We're talking about a third sign on the back that's not necessarily a sign it's a symbol.

Mr. Benner: It's still math. It's two or three.

Mr. McCash: This is specific to this type of use. I understand where you're coming from.

Mr. Benner: Good. I guess my problem is I understand it'd be great if you could have a projecting sign in the front, and your barber pole in the back, or a sign, whichever, the code doesn't make it be a barber pole. I guess is your contention that someone someday will be driving down the street and see your sign and stop to be pampered and get a haircut? Or you have a clientele already? I'm trying to figure out how denying you the third sign, which is a law passed by our city council, not by us. We don't pass laws. We enforce them or we decide whether they're right or wrong. Is that really something that's going to happen?

Mr. McCrary: I mean, to be truthful, honest with you, I would go with the one realtor sign and put it right next door to his realtor signs right here and mine right here, but that'd be tacky. So I'm trying to be neighborly. Or we could do two signs. I would just have one sign in the front, east and west and leave it alone. However, due to the situation I can't put a realtor sign up there. I can't put an awning sign because it sits too low. I went to all signs I'm allowed to do and even choosing these signs, I'm telling you, you still have obstacles that were facing that you can't see a clear sign, even with the signs that we're choosing. You have traffic light that's blocking partial sign. I have portion that's blocking a sign also.

Mr. McCash: The sign in the back you don't see at all from the front.

Mr. Benner: I understand that. I appreciate that.

Mr. McCash: It's his required sign. He's going to have to put that one up.

Mr. Benner: A barber pole or a sign, correct?

Mr. McCash: A barber pole or a sign, right. He is choosing a small barber pole.

Mr. Benner: So the hardship that you have is that everybody else has one?

Mr. McCrary: No, the hardship we have is it's being partially blocked by the porch

and the traffic light.

Mr. McCash: He is allowed to have two signs. He would put two signs on the front of the Main Street, if his entrance was on Main Street, and we wouldn't have necessarily the issue here. Because his entrance is on the back. He's required to have a sign back there, which means if he loses a sign on Main Street and doesn't have the same economic advantage to advertise his business along Main Street as everybody else that's allowed to have two signs on Main Street. Because the revised code requires him to have a sign or a barber pole at his main entrance. His main entrance, unlike others along Main Street, his main entrance is in the back of the building.

Mr. Benner: I have one more question. When did this all start in 22 or later?

Mr. McCrary: July of 2021.

Mr. Benner: Were you aware of the code at that time?

Mr. McCrary: When I bought the building, I had a realtor sign in the front of my building already. That had been there for years. When the City of Reynoldsburg came through with the improvement and widened the sidewalk, they removed my sign. So I'm thinking I'm going to use that sign, at that time. But when my neighbor put his realtor sign out, on the property line, I can't put a sign next to that.

Mr. Benner: I understand that completely. Thank you. I don't have any further questions.

Mr. Furst: So I understand your argument is that the rear entrance is functionally the main entrance. It is that how it is defined under the Ohio Revised Code? Are you just treating it for argument's purpose? How does the Ohio Revised Code define main entrance?

Mr. McCash: The main entrance that the public goes in, and that would be the rear.

Mr. Furst: How are we to know what the main entrance of the public would go in? Are we just presuming that it's because parking is adjacent to it?

Mr. McCash: No. It is required to have that entrance be handicap accessible and that is the only entrance that is handicapped accessible under the Americans with Disabilities Act and federal law. That's also required to be part of the accessible route from the parking spaces under the building code requirement. So he's complying with both federal law and the building code by having that entrance at the back be his main entrance.



Mr. Furst: The main entrance is required to follow those requirements or a entrance?

Mr. McCash: Which thing? The barber pole?

Mr. Furst: So if we're treating the rear entrance is the main entrance. You said it's required to be handicap accessible. Is it that the main entrance is required to be handicap accessible, or an entrance is required to be handicap accessible?

Mr. McCash: The accessible route has to coincide with the route that the general public takes, that's the entrance, that the general public would take, that's the entrance that has to be handicapped accessible under the federal law and under the building code.

Mr. Furst: Okay. So your argument is that because most patrons are going to be arriving by vehicle, they will be parking in the lot at the rear of the property and therefore entering via that route?

Mr. McCash: Yes. If anybody is walking on the sidewalk, they're going to have to; A - get over the curb that the city put in and walk to the entrance that's at the rear corner of the property.

Mr. Furst: Oh, so you won't be utilizing the entrance that fronts Main Street in any way?

Mr. McCash: You mean to drive? There is no way. The front entry that's on Main Street, no, we can't cannot make that handicapped accessible. That's not being used.

Mr. Furst: Right, I understand you can't make that handicap accessible, but not able to be functional use as an entrance for pedestrians?

Mr. McCash: No, that is not going to be used as an entrance.

Mr. Furst: Okay.

Mr. Benner: He's not planning to use that door, but the front door to that building does work, does it not?

Mr. McCash: So do the windows. (People talking over each other and unable to hear all the comment.)

Mr. Benner: If someone was walking down the sidewalk from one of the parking spaces that Reynoldsburg provides public for businesses on Main Street. They could enter through the front of that door, though? Is that accurate or not?

Mr. McCash: No, they're not going to be entering through that. The way his salon is set up on the inside. That is one of his salon workstations. That are on those areas right there.

Mr. Benner: That was my question. Thank you.

Mr. McCash: It's not a door that's going to be an entry. His reception area and all that is back in the back area.

Ms. Alabi: I have a couple questions. Looking at the, sketch that you showed us earlier. The one of the back. Okay, so I'm a little confused as to which entrance is the usable entrance in the back.

Mr. McCash: The entrance is not on the back back. Just around the corner there where you see the note that says new standing seam, aluminum awning, nil finish, non-glare silver, which is going to be black. That awning is over the door where the main entrance is at.

Ms. Alabi: Like Mr. Banner said that looks to me like that's the side entrance, but you're putting the barber pole on the second floor window. Is that correct according to that

Mr. McCash: Yes.

Ms. Alabi: My next question is with the front signage. You stated that the wall sign is blocked by the stoplight and the protruding sign is also blocked while driving west.

Mr. McCash: East.

Ms. Alabi: Driving east, okay. Also confuses because I'm seeing these images and I also drive by there quite frequently, I'm not seeing how it's blocked. So do you have some other images that support that better, or are we just using these renderings.

Mr. McCrary: From the renderings right here you can see where Styling Profiles Men's Grooming Lounge is partially blocked just in this image right here.

Mr. McCash: When you're driving down Lancaster and you're looking at that wall

sign, you do have that partial blockage.

Ms. Alabi: The top sign? Driving down Lancaster?

Mr. McCash: Lancaster driving east on Main is partially blocked by the porch. If you are sitting at the traffic light right now, you couldn't see my projecting sign. If you looked at the building, you would see the porch. You might see a portion of the sign, but you won't see the whole thing. If you are traveling west, going towards downtown, you can see everything. That's the image that you see. If you go back to where you can see the two renderings, you can see everything clearly on the top half. If you are traveling east, it is blocked. The porch will block the projecting sign and the arm of traffic light will block the wall sign.

Ms. Alabi: That's all. Thanks.

Mr. Furst: I'm not convinced of the hardship here. I think there are other remedies available, such as incorporating a barber pole into the signage the applicant wishes to place on the building frontage. The Ohio Revised Code would allow that. However, you have chosen to not use an entrance, and therefore, this seems like a self-created hardship to me. Additionally, I feel like you could have selected any other site that would not suffer these alleged hardships, and therefore this should have been factors that were known to the applicant before the purchase of the property. As I'm sure you're aware, our code does not allow self-created hardships to be a factor.

Mr. McCash: It is not a necessarily a self-created, hardship. This is, in part, hardships created by the city's own improvements along Main Street. The revised code requires the sign to be at his main entrance, the sign of the barber pole, his main entrance, in order to comply with accessibility requirements, is at the rear.

Mr. Furst: Demonstrably, it's not at the rear. You just did, or, I'm sorry it may have been Mr. McCrary.

Mr. McCash: It's in the rear corner of the side. It's the back section. I mean, it's right where the door that was made handicapped accessible.

Mr. Furst: I'll be honest, Mr. McCash, I live in this neighborhood. I walk past the property very frequently. I was not aware that there was a door where you're proposing to place the barber pole. I don't know that your clientele would know that either. I don't know that anyone parking in that parking lot would necessarily see the barber pole and think to themselves that must be where the door is.

Mr. McCash: That's your opinion.

Mr. Furst: Yes.

Mr. McCash: They would be parking back there. They would get out; they would have to walk down that side to see the barber pole is the symbol that's supposed to be at the main entrance.

Mr. Furst: I hope, for the sake of the business and for Mr. McCrary that would be how things would function. I am just not convinced that that would be the case. I yield the floor for any additional questions, comments, or obviously would entertain a motion.

Ms. Kleckley: I have a question. Is there only one way in and one way out? Is there other entrances since you blocked the one in the front?

Mr. McCash: For vehicles the only way in is off...

Ms. Kleckley. No, for customers.

Mr. McCash: For customers, yes, that door itself.

Ms. Kleckley: Because you blocked the other one. I was looking for a report from the fire department about blocking the main entrance.

Mr. Meyer: Ms. Kleckley, this is a Certificate of Appropriateness, there's not a site plan. They have to meet all building codes and thing of that nature. The fire departments review is part of a building permit being issued. So that would be looked at and obviously, the applicant would have to meet while doing renovations or site work as part of that process.

Ms. Kleckley: I'm sorry. I brought that up because you brought up the fact they are setting up to block those double doors.

Mr. McCash: There's a requirements for travel distances and things like that that are in the building code. So we'll be addressing that through the building code process.

Mr. Brusk: My feeling is that because of this unique situation and the uniqueness of this is you can't get to the lot without knowing where it is. You can't get to the barbershop without knowing that there's something there. And that's only because there's no parking on the side or in the front that where you would know it. Every other does this. At least all the businesses I've seen. You get to the business from the parking lot and that's what you expect. And that's why I see how you set that

up. I'm not going to make any comments on the side or back. It's the back corner at any rate. So my feeling is this is a special, unique situation and that such a situation needs to be addressed. I think an exception of variance would be appropriate because it is a hardship if you can't have the third side because that means, like you say, the hardship there is, and you don't have the ability for people to know that you're even there from Main Street. No one would realize what was going on. I know if you look on Facebook, it says the address, fine. But that doesn't tell you anything without those two signs in front.

Mr. McCash: We specifically chose the barber pole as opposed to a sign so that it is unique to a barber. So if somebody else goes in here, there is no precedent for a third sign. This is really a symbol of a barber.

Mr. Brusk: Even if it wasn't, if it was just the sign, or considered a sign, that's immaterial. I'm not arguing that at all. I understand why you have to have either the barber pole or big sign. A big enough sign that people in the parking lot would identify the place. I'm not arguing the fact that it's a barber pole or not. That's your decision, and I don't have any say one way or the other on that.

Ms. Barnhart: I will make a motion. I make a motion that we approve the variance. To section 1105.03.c.v to allowing a third sign, that is a barber pole. So that being the condition for this applicant.

Ms. Buathier: Just so you know, approving a third sign that is a barber pole in perpetuity that sign will always have to be a barber pole, even if the barber shop is not there any longer.

Ms. Barnhart: So they wouldn't be allowed a third sign if it were not a barber pole?

Ms. Buathier: No, a barber pole would then have to be there for forever based on the wording. The third sign would always have to be a barber pole.

Mr. McCash: You want to clarify that the third sign is there only because of it being a barber. Nobody else can have that sign. If there's no barber there, that sign can't be there

Ms. Barnhart: Yes, that's my intent.

Ms. Buathier: Okay. That is the intent. So you're requesting to approve section 110503 CV to permit a third sign that is only a barber pole, while there is a barbershop there?

Ms. Barnhart: Correct.

Mr. Furst: We have a motion on the floor. Is there a second?

Ms. Kleckley: Second.

Ms. Buathier: One more thing. Are we voting on each one individually?

Ms. Barnhart: That's the only one that's outstanding, right?

Ms. Buathier: All four of them are up for consideration.

Mr. Meyer: We voted to reopen the case previously. So there are, I believe four variances on here that were submitted. So you could vote on each variance individually if you would so choose.

Ms. Barnhart: Let's vote on this one by itself.

Mr. Furst: Could you please call the roll?

Mr. Meyer: I apologize just because we had some discussion there. Could we just, for a clean record restate the motion that was made?

Ms. Barnhart. The variance is that we approve a third sign for section 1105.03.c.v. We approve the use of a barber pole while the property is being used as a barbershop.

Ms. Buathier: For an additional third sign.

Ms. Barnhart: For an additional third sign.

Mr. Shook: So here's what I'm going to do. I'm going to state the motion as intended. Then if I state it correctly, you can say, then I so move, as stated by the city attorney.

I believe the motion here is to approve a variance for a third sign. Pursuant to section 1105.03 cv2 for a barber pole, so long as the premises is used as a barbershop.

Ms. Barnhart: So moved, as stated by the city attorney.

Ms. Kleckley: Second.

Mr. Furst: We have a first in a second. Would you please call the roll?

RESULT:	Failed - Third sign to be used as barber pole while the premises is used as a barber pole
MOVER:	Barnhart
SECONDER:	Kleckley
AYES:	Brusk, Kleckley, Barnhart
NAYS:	Benner, Alabi, Furst

Ms. Barnhart: Being that there are three yeses and three no's, that motion fails. Open it up for a second motion or discussion.

Mr. Furst: There are three other variances that the applicant has requested. I will respectfully request that someone else make the motions as I am in the habit of doing so.

Ms. Buathier: Before we move on, Mr. City attorney. Because there was three yeses and three no's, does there need to be another motion for a denial or is it officially denied?

Mr. Shook: The application did not receive, or at least that particular portion of the application for that specific variance did not receive sufficient votes to pass. Therefore, it fails. It does not require a second motion.

Mr. Benner: Since we're doing these separately, I will make a motion according to section 110503 C3 to permit internally illumination based on the lights that we deny that variance also.

Mr. Furst: We have a first. Is there a second?

Ms. Alabi: I'll second.

Mr. Furst: Would you please call the roll?

RESULT:	Passed - To deny Internal Illumination on sign
MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Alabi
AYES:	Benner, Furst, Alabi
NAYS:	Kleckley, Barnhart
ABSTAIN:	Brusk

Ms. Buathier: Three yeses, two no's, and one abstain.

Mr. Shook: That's not going to be a clean way to deal with that particular variance.



So it sounds like we had two votes of no on that particular motion. Correct. The cleaner way to deal with it is that one of the individuals who voted no makes a motion to approve, and then we revote.

Mr. Furst: Would any of the members who voted no care to do that?

Ms. Barnhart: I'm confused at what we are trying to do here.

Ms. Buathier: Mr. Benner made a motion to request denial of internal illumination of the of the sign. At which point you, Ms. Barnhart and Ms. Kleckley, voted against it. It's my understanding the city attorney is asking that somebody who voted opposite of that motion to then make a motion for approval.

Ms. Barnhart: Can I ask a quick point of information question? Was this one of the ones that was approved in November?

Ms. Buathier: Yes. The other three were approved by the board in November. The external illumination, the external down lit and the glass.

Ms. Barnhart: That's what I thought.

Mr. McCash: You had one member that abstained. Usually you abstain because you have a conflict and you wouldn't be hearing the case.

Mr. Furst: Our rules require no reason for abstention.

Mr. Shook: Let's stop for just a second. This is part of the reason we're going to be doing a training. If this board is inclined to vote differently than it had voted on this particular variance in November, there's going to need to be some articulation on the record why they are voting differently now, as opposed to how they voted then, because otherwise that's a very difficult thing to explain to a reviewing court.

Mr. Brusk: That was the reason that I abstained on it because I don't understand exactly what would happen on this, because the barber pole unfortunately is not an issue anymore. That's the only thing that was internally illuminated, as I understand.

Ms. Buathier: Mr. Brusk, they are permitted two signs. Whichever two signs they choose to do. That could be a barber pole and a wall sign, a barber pole and a projecting sign, a projecting sign and a wall sign.

Mr. Brusk: I'm talking about the motion here where internally illuminated, is it moved because the other was voted down?

Mr. McCash: No because you voted to not allow three signs. He has to agree sign in the back. You've just made him make a choice between a wall sign or a projecting sign on the front.

Mr. Brusk: Can I revise my vote?

Mr. Shook: Let's not revise the vote. So the vote to deny it did not have a majority support. A vote to deny does not necessarily need to have a majority support. A vote to approve does. Because we appear to have members of the board who voted against the denial. The cleaner way to handle at least this specific variance request would be to have one of those members make a motion in the affirmative to approve of the variance, and then we can revote.

Ms. Barnhart: Okay, I'm with you. I will make a motion that we approve the variance for 1105.03.C.3. Allowing the interior illumination of the Barber pole sign. Do them all?

Mr. Shook: You could make a motion to approve the remaining three variances in one bundle, recognizing, of course, that there could be members who support one of those, or two of those, but not all three. And they may vote against that motion. But that is a proper motion if you want to make it so.

Mr. McCash: Mr. Chris, when that was approved in November, it was also conditioned upon it only being lit during the time that the barbershop is open.

Ms. Barnhart: I do recall that.

Mr. Furst: If we're going to bring that up, there is also an additional condition that glass, as it relates to the sign material, only apply to the barber pole as a sign. That was an additional condition that was in our previous motions.

Ms. Barnhart: All right. I make a motion that we, and I'm going to go ahead and tackle all three of these variant requests. The remaining three. 1105.03.C.3. Regarding the internal illumination. That that be allowed for the barber pole. With the condition that the illumination only takes place during times where the business is in operation. Business hours.
The next variance. 1105.03.C.V.2. That the glass is appropriate for the barber pole. And what's the third one?

Ms. Buathier: It is 1105.03.C3 for what we consider front lit external lighting. As an approved external illumination type.

Ms. Barnhart: So moved, as Ms. Buathier stated.

Mr. Furst: Before I ask for a second I'll ask that you restate them please Mr. City Attorney.

Ms. Buathier: Mr. Attorney, before you start, two are 1105.03.C3.

Mr. Shook: The motion is. I'm going to start with the glass. The motion is to approve, glass as a material for the barber pole. Pursuant to section 11055.03 CV2. Second is to approve the internal illumination. Pursuant to 1105.03 C3. During hours in which the business is open. For the barber pole only. Third is for the exterior illumination pursuant to 1105 .03 C3. and that is for the front sign. Is that correct?

Mr. McCash: Yes.

Ms. Barnhart: So moved, as stated by Mr. City Attorney.

Mr. Furst: We have a first. Do we have a second?

Mr. Brusk: Second.

Mr. Furst: Would you please call the roll?

RESULT:	Denied
MOVER:	Barnhart
SECONDER:	Brusk
AYES:	Brusk, Barnhart
NAYS:	Alabi, Benner, Kleckley, Furst

Mr. Furst: Thank you. I believe that concludes item C1.

App# 2023-5487; 7305 E. Main Street; Richard Holmes; Certificate of Appropriateness

Item C2 is also for the property located at 7305 East Main Street. A certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Shook: I'm sorry. Mr. McCash, we still have the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness.
(Talking in the background, but not recorded.)



Mr. Meyer: You wouldn't be able to do any other exterior modifications to the building. The COA covers more than just the signage.

Mr. Furst: I'll also ask if you'd like to withdraw your Certificate of Appropriateness application to step up to the podium, and please do so.

Mr. McCash: You can take a vote on the Certificate of Appropriateness as presented. The only condition they had was to change the, awning to black, and we agree to that.

Ms. Buathier: Can I present? Would you like me to present?

Ms. Buathier read the staff report and presentation into the record.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. Is there anything the applicant would like to add?

Mr. McCash: My client will be providing the black metal roof. As far as signage, he has no external illumination of his wall sign. There's obviously no projecting sign. We don't know what we're going to do as far as the barber pole.

Mr. Furst: So do I understand that you would be supportive of staff's recommendations as it relates to this application.

Mr. McCash: As it relates to the metal roof?

Mr. Furst: Yes.

Mr. McCash: Yes.

Mr. Furst: As it relates to metal roof. I will, open up the floor for questions or comments from the board.

Ms. Buathier: Staff does have obey clarifying question in terms of the signage. Are you requesting that any of those signs be considered as part of the Certificate of Appropriateness?

Mr. McCash: We're not sure what signs we're allowed to have, because it sounds like we're not allowed to have a barber pole, so he may be out of business.

Mr. Furst: Would you like to withdraw your Certificate of Appropriateness application and resubmit at a time when which you'll have more information available?

Mr. McCash: No, we would like to vote on this tonight.

Mr. Furst: I am not certain how we can vote for signage, not understanding exactly what signage is being proposed. Therefore, I would suggest that if anyone is inclined to submit a motion for this application, that they do so removing the signage portion of staff's recommendations, if they are inclined to support such recommendations.

Mr. Benner: Without reading through the entire thing. Leaving the signs out I would recommend that we would, approve the Certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions already agreed to by the applicant that the metal roof on the porch side, and entrance have a finished

color of black. To provide a photometric plan meeting all lighting requirements found in section 1105-09 for exterior lighting. To provide a hold harmless letter with regards to the porch overhang and to the City of Reynoldsburg right away that the city attorney's office deems acceptable. And to revise your drawings and any other materials to show the final set of plans that meet the approved Certificate of Appropriateness. I left out the signs.

Mr. Furst: We have a first. Do we have a second?

Ms. Barnhart: I will second.

Mr. Furst: Would you please call the roll?

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Barnhart
AYES:	Alabi, Barnhart, Benner, Brusk, Kleckley, FurstNone

NEW BUSINESS

App# 2024-0120; 6672 E. Main Street; Prestige Signs for Chase Bank; Varaince

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Mr. Furst stated he is in agreement with staff's recommendations to deny this variance. Additionally, he stated that rejection of this variance for the purposes they identified would be consistent with previous votes that this board has held for similar sites that have occurred in other and this district.

Ms. Sherry with Prestige Signs was present for the applicant.

Ms. Sherry: We are proposing that there are going to be an additional wall sign. That is what we're asking to be added as the west elevation, which would be the public entrance of this business. I would say that being able to see the wall sign, you'll be able to see the wall sign at a further distance than saying the monument as proposed by the staff, that the monument sign would be enough. For that elevation. This is a corner lot. So, therefore, preparing to turn to this business. The main entrance will be from the Kroger parking lot off East Main Street. So there is not a main entrance off of East Main Street or Rosehill Drive or Rosehill Road. This will allow eastbound traffic to be able to see where they are going for Chase. They will either need to turn quickly, once they see the monument sign at that elevation, or they will have to go down, turn left onto Rosehill Drive, heading north, and there is an entrance if turning left. So we're going west, from Rosehill Drive and then coming in from the north side of Chase, where there is not a wall sign being asked on the north elevation for Chase. I would propose that this wall sign be added because it is a public entrance and being able to see it. We don't see any hardships of illumination or disturbance of residential areas due to it being surrounded by commercial

businesses. I would propose that the wall sign be added. Due to better visualization and being able to see it from a distance, heading east on East Main Street. I would like to propose that if this being at a higher elevation, you do not going to have obstructions from the road. I would propose that we are allowed to have a wall sign there. From the allowed two signs to allow proposing to have a third wall sign on this elevation. Therefore, my hardship is traffic. It is a busy intersection. Therefore, this will allow customers to be able to see where they're going and where they need to turn ahead of time.

Mr. Furst explained that our code requires the applicant in a variance application to articulate how the hardship about traffic concerns is unique to this site, and not surrounding properties. Ms. Sherry explained that this site would suffer due to not having an entrance off East Main Street, or off Rosehill Road. Having a wall sign would better prepare customers and clients. In order to get to the main entrance of Chase. They do have to turn into the Kroger parking lot or gas station parking lot.

Mr. Furst asked how this is not a self-created hardship, given the applicant chose this site layout. Ms. Sherry explained this is due to the corner lot and obstructions at the corner, such as the brick wall, city plantations and a bus stop. Mr. Furst was asked to clarify how this is unique to this site and not self-existing. Ms. Sherry explained this is a corner lot and the wall already exists.

Ms. Barnhart asked if the third sign was denied if they would keep the signage over the entrance on the west facade. Ms. Sherry said they would have to talk to the client, but they would ask to use the east and west elevations instead of the east and south elevations. Ms. Buathier wanted to clarify that they are permitted a wall sign along the two public roads, not the western elevation. If the variance was denied, it could not go there. Where a building is located on a corner lot. One additional wall sign may be permitted on both walls, which parallel the intersecting streets. That is only the south and the east elevation would be permitted. Unless the variance is approved.

Ms. Sherry moved onto the monument sign where they are asking for an increase in size, to withhold Chase brand visibility and their branding. The sign meets the six-foot height requirement and has a brick base. The sign is acrylic that is internally illuminated. She feels, as this is necessary to withhold the brand because when you start shrinking channel letters, it gets harder to read. The hardship is for branding and visibility.

Mr. Benner: I would like to make a motion that we deny both variances in accordance with 1105.03C 7.1 and 1105.03C 7.4.

Mr. Brusk: I will second.

RESULT:	Denied
MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Brusk
AYES:	Alabi, Barnhart, Benner, Brusk, Kleckley, Furst

App# 2024-0121; 6580 E. Main Street; Zoning Resources for Kroger Co.;

Variance

Ms. Buathier read the staff report into the record.

Ms. Green explained that the proposed wall sign is a newer part of the Kroger business. The pickup business began during Covid, and continues to be very popular today. At this location, the pickup is in the northwest corner of the building. The small indicators tell staff what lane you are parked in and where to bring the groceries. That indicator is the proposed wall sign. This sign would not have a blue backer, just a white illuminated sign. This is just to keep the flow of traffic for the pickup on the west side of the building and not in the front of the building.

Mr. Furst asked if the applicant contemplated any other remedies such as placing the sign on a parking lot pole. Ms. Green was not sure if they contemplated other signage, but this was the sign chosen for this site largely due to the western parking area.

Mr. Benner asked about the previous set precedent for this and Mr. Meyer referred back to the 2022 BZBA meeting for the Target signage.

Mr. Brusk feels as if this is a self-generated hardship because they chose to put this parking there and does not see a compelling reason to allow this variance.

Ms. Green explained that the nature of the market has changed. This store was built in 2019 for in-person shopping. Now we have a new demand on us for pickup. Thankfully, this store has parking on the side that to prevent the store from putting these spots in the front. They do not feel as if they generated this hardship, that this is just the nature in the change of the business. Additionally, the refrigeration units are in the back, so it makes sense to have this near the back. They also want to keep the site safe.

Ms. Alabi explained that she uses this service weekly and does not see how this sign will help because you cannot see it from many places. Ms. Green said it is more of a wayfinding to guide people to that part of the store to pick up their groceries.

Ms. Barnhart wanted to note that when they looked at the Target previously it is worth noting that this service was not required when the building was built. The code has changed and this is a very large building. This size building could have 18 different storefronts, and each storefront could have a sign. With this large of a storefront, she feels as if we should allow adjustments to keep up with businesses as they evolve and change.

Mr. Brusk is still concerned about the precedent this sets. Mr. Benner explained that the precedent has already been set by allowing Target to do this exact thing.

Mr. Furst agreed that this is functionally similar to any other large format grocery and ones we have previously approved.

The board confirmed the Target was approved with the same zoning code, with minor modifications.

Mr. Shook: The concern that the board has to have when you make your decisions is that they cannot be arbitrary or capricious. Unless you can articulate a functional difference between this specific application and one that was approved in the past, it probably is going to be an arbitrary decision to deny it.

Ms. Alabi asked if there had been any thought to amending the drive-thru sign in the front of the building. This sign was intended for the pharmacy. Ms. Buathier explained that these signs are legal nonconforming and if they were to remove or alter that sign they would need to come before the board for a variance.

Mr. Benner: I am going to make a motion that we approve this variance, based on staff's recommendation.

Ms. Barnhart: I will second.

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Benner
SECONDER:	Barnhart
AYES:	Barnhart, Benner, Brusk, Kleckley, Furst
NAYS:	Alabi

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Planning and Zoning Administrator

Chairman