

**SUGARCREEK TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF ZONING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2017**

This regular meeting of the Sugarcreek Township Board of Zoning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 6, 2017 at the Sugarcreek Township Administration Office, 2090 Ferry Road, Sugarcreek Township, Ohio at 7:00 p.m.

Everyone present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. Hellmann asked Mrs. Tilford to take roll. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mrs. Hellmann-present  
Mr. Betz-present  
Mr. Schleich-present  
Mr. Baldino-present  
Ms. Moore-present

Mrs. Hellmann opened with the approval of minutes from April 4, 2017. Mr. Baldino motioned to approve the April 4, 2017 minutes. Mr. Betz seconded.

Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Baldino-yes  
Mr. Betz-yes  
Mr. Schleich-yes  
Mrs. Hellmann-yes  
Ms. Moore-abstain

Mrs. Hellman moved to accept the minutes from the May 2, 2017 meeting. Ms. Moore seconded.

Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mrs. Hellmann-yes  
Ms. Moore-yes  
Mr. Schleich-yes  
Mr. Betz-abstain  
Mr. Baldino-abstain

Mrs. Hellman had Mrs. Tilford review changes proposed to Sections 8.01-8.09 of the Sugarcreek Township Zoning Resolution discussed at the last meeting on May 2, 2017.

Mrs. Hellmann stated that the Woodland Ridge sign is 40 square feet and exceeds the height requirement.

Mrs. Tilford stated that it was approved through the PUD process.

Mr. Baldino asked if it was obtrusive.

Mrs. Hellmann said that she did not find it obtrusive.

Mr. Betz stated that he did not understand why residential developments need signs. He stated that he feels they add more clutter and are not necessary.

Mrs. Hellmann suggested to allow temporary signs while the development is underway.

Mr. Betz would be in favor of a temporary sign. There would be less clutter.

Mrs. Hellmann explained that she understood the need for promotional purposes, but having signs leaves the responsibility of maintenance to the owners within the subdivision.

Ms. Moore asked if zoning had the authority to require an HOA to repair a sign that is in disrepair.

Mrs. Tilford said that, yes they could. There is a section on maintenance in the Resolution.

Mrs. Hellmann recapped the size limitations on signage as twenty-four square feet down from forty square feet.

Mrs. Tilford talked about permanent signs permitted in non-residential zoning districts.

Mrs. Hellmann asked if everyone was happy with a 6-foot limit for signs in the business districts.

Mr. Betz said he was okay with 32 square feet as opposed to 24 square feet for the residential districts.

Mrs. Tilford moved on to major development signage.

Mr. Betz asked where a major development could be built.

Mrs. Tilford stated that if there were a large office complex that decided to build and they were over 30,000 square feet, they could have a larger and taller sign.

Ms. Moore asked about the setback at 15 feet for the business district.

Mrs. Hellmann stated that 10 foot setback would be consistent.

Mr. Baldino said the Board of Zoning Commission has opted to provide consistent sign size throughout the township. For residential it would be 6 feet tall and 24 square foot, institutional and business it would be 32 square foot and 8 feet tall.

Mrs. Hellmann asked Mrs. Tilford where in the township were there examples.

Mrs. Tilford said that Plaza I and Plaza II and the Kettering Medical Center would qualify under this provision; the Kettering Medical Center sign was approved under the provision.

Ms. Moore asked if the square footage of the individual store is a factor in sign size.

Mrs. Tilford stated that it is a calculation of the entire plaza area individual stores.

Mrs. Baldino said he would take a 32 square foot sign just because it is consistent with the others but still feels it has no value and is a visual detractor.

Mrs. Hellmann said that the signs would help the general person who is going out shopping.

Mr. Baldino motioned to pause section C for now and come back at another point in time.

Mr. Betz stated that 12 feet is too high and he would like to change it to 10 feet.

Mrs. Tilford stated that the next section regulates awning signs, marquee signs and wall signs.

Mrs. Tilford said that Bed Bath and Beyond has applied for a sign 8 feet tall and 32 square feet.

Mrs. Hellmann asked if the rest of the signs in the plaza were proportionate to the frontage.

Mrs. Tilford stated that it is a one to one ratio.

Mrs. Hellmann asked how the Board could give the tenant more.

Mrs. Tilford said that possibly doing percentage of façade would allow additional allowance.

Ms. Moore asked which portion would be considered the façade.

Mrs. Tilford indicated that it would be the whole front face of the building.

Mr. Betz stated that Centerville calculates signs based on one half.

Mrs. Tilford indicated that she felt that was too small.

Mrs. Hellmann said she liked the idea of one for one or 10 percent, whichever is greater.

Mr. Betz stated that Kettering had a maximum for signs at 150 square feet.

Mrs. Tilford suggested that we leave it at one for one and see what the signs that the BZA approved look like once built and revisit the issue at that time.

Mrs. Hellmann stated that the marquee sign maximum at 4 square feet should be removed from the wall sign allowance.

Mr. Baldino, revisiting section C, recommends 32 from 60.

Mrs. Hellmann asked how temporary signs limits were enforced.

Mrs. Tilford said that they need to get a new permit once the time allowance has expired.

Mrs. Tilford announced a meeting is scheduled for July.

There was discussion regarding vinyl.

Mr. Baldino made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Schleich seconded.

All were in favor.