

## XENIA TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION

### MEETING

December 30, 2014

**THESE MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF THE EVENTS OF THE MEETING AND ARE NOT A WORD FOR WORD ACCOUNT OF THE DISCUSSIONS WHICH TOOK PLACE.**

The Xenia Township Zoning Commission held a meeting on December 30, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. at the Xenia Township Trustees Office, 8 Brush Row Road, Xenia, OH, 45385 with the following members present:

Virgil Ferguson, Kent Harbison, Alan King, Willie Washington, Jeffrey Zweber, alternates Donna Randall and Harold Snyder, and Alan Stock, Zoning Inspector/Clerk.

Chairman Alan King called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

A motion was made by Virgil Ferguson to approve the November 18, 2014 Zoning Commission Meeting, seconded by Jeffrey Zweber. All voted aye. Minutes were approved.

Mr. King said they are still trying to determine the number of signs on a property, how far apart signs need to be from each other and a definition of sign face.

Mr. King asked the status of the text amendments sent to the Trustees. Mr. Stock reported that the Trustees had passed the Mobile Home Park District text amendments and Kennel text amendments.

Mr. Zweber provided sign text suggestions to discuss. (Black font designated original text, red font showed working copy text, blue font showed his suggestions.) Mr. Zweber first looked at road frontage in Section 517.4 and suggested using the sentence "For purposes of determining the allowable square footage of all signs on corner lots, the frontage on all public roads can be included." Mr. King wondered if this should be put in the Definitions section. Mr. Stock said in the Definitions the road frontage deals with building sizes and placement of buildings on a lot and it could be confusing to put the frontage for signs in the same place. He will do a search on frontage elsewhere in the Zoning Resolution.

Mr. King found a typo in the Definition for Frontage and requested that it be fixed. Number 2 should read "In the case of a corner lot where frontage will be measured along the shortest front lot line. Property lines which abut **limited** access roads shall not be construed to be included within any calculation of frontage."

There was discussion about owning several narrow lots in a row and not being allowed to put a sign on each lot. Mr. Snyder asked about campaign signs. Mr. Zweber said signs they are talking about are content-neutral signs. Mr. Zweber said under our current zoning ordinance a sign for a business cannot be on any land other than that owned by the owner of the business—the Zoning Commission would like the signs to be allowed on other parcels. The Greene County Highway Department gave permission to Rivers Metal for their signs along the roads. The Zoning Commission looked at the definition of Sign (Face) that said "The area of a sign containing a single message. If a message area can be divided in such a way that the messages in

each sub-area have the same meaning when viewed in isolation as when viewed with the full area, then each sub-area is a separate sign face.”

The Zoning Commission talked about the verbiage in 517.4.1 A, E and RM Districts, “No more than two (2) sign faces larger than thirty two (32) square feet shall be placed within 1,320 feet of each other on a single parcel.” Mr. Zweber said with this you can have as many thirty one (31) square feet signs as you want. He said in order to limit the amount of large signs he added this verbiage-- “For purposes of determining the distances between large signs parcels adjacent to, contiguous with, or directly across the street from the parcel in question and owned by the same owner shall be treated as one parcel.” Mr. King said for reference the 4-H signs and signs on the side of barns (for barn art) are two (2) sheets of plywood which are sixty four (64) feet. Mr. Zweber talked about the billboards located north of the Township Office. He said the two billboards furthest away are 650’ apart. The goal is to keep the countryside from being overrun by billboards. There was a question about why they would restrict larger signs and not smaller ones and how close they can be. The answer was to try to keep from having all kinds of billboards stacked against each other. Mr. Stock said they need to keep in mind the difference between the temporary signs and permanent signs. He said the original thought was to say what the size could be based on frontage and the second thought was to know what the distance is between the signs. Mr. Zweber said the Fairgrounds falls in the IG District and can put up as many thirty two (32) square feet signs as they want. Mr. Stock said right now the Township zoning does not legislate the IG District. Mrs. Randall questioned whether proposed legislation could be problematic for the organizations making the quilt signs. She asked if quilt squares could be painted directly on the barn and not be considered as a sign. There was discussion about painting on barns such as the Centennial and Mail Pouch. Mr. Harbison said a person should be able to put on the barn what they want since they own the land and pay taxes on it. Mrs. Randall can see separating a billboard from the side of a barn. Mr. King said the Commission is trying to loosen up the text and still keep some restrictions. Mr. Zweber said he can see the quilt squares are not signs by definition because they do not direct attention to an object, product, place, activity, person, institution, organization or business. He said if it said “Mail Pouch” or “Ohio Caverns” it would be a sign. Mr. Stock said the Zoning Commission has tried to reduce the standards, increase the freedoms substantially and still have parameters-- where there is an absence of parameters there is chaos. He said once you release the standards, it is very hard to get it back.

Mr. Zweber said more signs are allowed in IG. Mr. King said the R-1 District is the most restricted. The minimum road frontage in R-1 is 150’ so it would permit 75 sq. ft. of signage. Going back to both sides of a sheet of plywood being 64 sq. ft., this would give 11 sq. ft. more to work with. The proposed verbiage restricts larger signs but not smaller signs. It does not restrict the number of signs but it restricts spacing of large signs. Mr. Zweber said he used 1,320 feet as a distance between signs because it is 1/4 mile. Billboards can be 1/4 mile apart, double sided or stacked or single faced every 1/8 mile. Mr. Stock said several churches are waiting on the text amendments to be approved to know what kind of signs they are allowed. Mr. Zweber said in his proposed text large signs are larger than thirty two (32) square feet in A, E, RM and IG; whereas large signs are larger than sixteen (16) square feet in R-1. After discussion it was decided to add a sentence at the end of each district stating what a large sign is. In A, E and RM Districts the sentence could read “a large sign is larger than thirty two (32) square feet.” In the R-1 District the sentence could read “a large sign is larger than sixteen (16) square feet.” In IG District the sentence could read “a large sign is larger than thirty two (32).” They can keep the

sentence “No more than two (2) sign faces shall be placed within 1,320 feet of each other on a single parcel.” These qualifiers were not placed in the B-1, B-2, B-3, M-1, M-2 and M-3 Districts.

There was a discussion about 517.1.9 which read “Maximum height above grade at sign shall not exceed forty (40) feet.” Everyone was okay with keeping it.

The Commission decided to keep 517.4.2 and the definition for Sign (Face).

The Commission looked at 517.1.8 about content restriction and decided to eliminate it. They wanted to delete the whole section and renumber the list.

With the proposed text amendments they have eliminated content restriction of signs in Xenia Township. With that in mind they are allowing billboards, signs with advertising of any nature on any section of property as long as it falls within size limitations and spacing of large signs.

There was discussion about billboards and using semi-trailers for signs. The largest billboard they want to allow is one hundred (100) square feet. Using the example of the electronic sign in Beavercreek they considered the electronic part that changes as the sign and the part that says “Welcome to Beavercreek” as a face. They considered the base of that sign as a structure. Mr. Washington suggested leaving the size of the sign as is until the public hearings where they will get input.

Mr. King asked Mr. Stock to find out the size of the Bob Evans sign and other signs around the Township.

The Commission still plans to look at Home Occupation signs, commercial signs in R-1 and permits for temporary signs.

The next meeting will be January 27 at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Ferguson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Washington seconded. All voted in favor. Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

ATTEST:

---

Alan D. Stock, Zoning Clerk