

Susie Ross

From: Kevin Futryk [kevin@gov-advantage.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 3:26 PM
To: 'Bill Little '; blorenz79@yahoo.com; 'Chris Meyers'; 'Donald Emerick'; 'Jim Hrivnak'; 'Jim Hrivnak Work'; 'Joe Jester'; 'Richard Fusch'
Cc: Susie Ross
Subject: March 31st Meeting

Gentlemen,

As I noted previously, I am unable to attend Weds. P&Z meeting due to a conflict, however, I offer the following comments for your consideration:

1. My primary concern remains with the proposed digital signs/reader boards included in the text. Two displays at 20 square feet seems excessive and large. Per the submitted drawings, each sign will be 7'4" by 6'8" (E-10 & E-11). We have also gone from a discussed 30 minute time frame between message change to every 10 minutes, or 6 times per hour. Furthermore, the text doesn't indicate that these digital displays will be the latest generation "high tech/hi-resolution", which leads me to conclude that they might just be the standard "low tech" red on black displays we currently see at various locations around Central Ohio; not quite the image we advocate for Powell. I also raise again my concern with the use of "nits" to measure lumen output, rather than the more industry accepted "Footcandle" standard that has been embraced by the outdoor advertising industry for their digital displays. I know The Market wants to increase their visibility with these digital displays, but with the increased sign package we are approving, it just seems like overkill, especially on such busy roads as Sawmill Pkwy and Powell Rd. I am further concerned that we are setting a precedent here for large digital/reader board displays being "acceptable" for any developer considering annexation into the city. We know CVS is requesting it, and as the city pursues other commercial opportunities (Liberty Crossing, Zettler Hardware, etc.), are we setting the precedent here that "digital reader boards" are OK? I for one don't want this to be the "image" we project. In my opinion, low-tech digital reader boards are tacky and not in line with the high standard that we all seek to preserve for developments in our community. If the applicant wants to propose utilizing hi-resolution digital displays in a smaller size, it may be something worth considering, and can become a model for the future. We must remember that we are deviating from our existing sign requirements as part of the Pre-annexation Agreement, so the developer is getting more available signage than they have now. If as the applicant described it at our last meeting that The Market is a "soccer mom" destination, then most who visit will know the stores there, and upcoming sales and special events, as they visit the center with regular frequency. Finally, we also discussed at the last meeting having review of any digital reader boards/displays, along with any "branding signs" on the Silo's, come back to P&Z for review. I don't see any text to that effect in what we are being asked to approve, and would strongly recommend that be a part of the P&Z recommendation.
2. Since I just mentioned it above, we will also need a condition, that council will hopefully agree to, that the proposed Silo Signage needs to come back to P&Z for review and approval, not the zoning administrator as is currently described.
3. Map E-6 in our packet still shows the Sawmill Pkwy. Primary identification sign at the southern most right in/right out when we discussed with the applicant moving it opposite Galloway Drive.

I truly believe that the annexation of The Market at Liberty Crossing will be good for the city, good for The Market, and good for the community at large. However, without some changes to the items noted above, I am concerned that the excessive signage being requested will go beyond the well preserved image all of us try and project, and protect, in our work on the Powell Planning & Zoning Commission.

Thank you for considering my thoughts, and again I apologize for missing this meeting.

Kevin