



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 16, 2012

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Infiniti of Columbus
11-040CDD
(Approved 6 – 0) | 3890 Tuller Road
Corridor Development District |
| 2. | Tommy’s Center – Buckeye Audio & Video – Sign
12-005CDDS
(Tabled 6 – 0)
(Approved 6 – 0 - Motion to Waive 15-day Rule) | 4271 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Corridor Development District Sign |
| 3. | Perimeter Center, Subarea E – Key Bank
12-006AFDP
(Approved 6 – 0.) | 6820 Perimeter Loop Road
Amended Final Development Plan |
| 4. | Beds ‘n’ Stuff – Sign
12-010CDDS
(Approved 6 – 0) | 6477 Sawmill Road
Corridor Development District Sign |
| 5. | Zoning Code Amendment
12-009ADM
(Recommended for Approval to City Council 6 – 0 - Exempting Section 153.158) | Administrative Request |

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Joseph Budde, Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Todd Zimmerman, and John Hardt. Warren Fishman was absent. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Jennifer Readler, Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Rachel Ray, Rachel Beck, Alexis Dunfee, Tori Proehl and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made a motion to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Mr. Hardt requested the following amendments to the January 12, 2012 meeting minutes:

Page 6, Paragraph 11, second sentence:

He asked what the intent was behind the materials not being the same.

Mr. Hardt clarified that the comment was a reference to the stucco finish not being the same as the existing building, and he would like to have that clarified.

Page 6, paragraph 13, second sentence:

He said he is not in favor of changing the finish materials on the outside of the building.

Motion and Vote: January 12, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve the January 12, 2012 meeting minutes as amended, and Mr. Zimmerman seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Kramb requested the following corrections/amendments to the January 19, 2012 meeting minutes:

Page 9, second paragraph:

Amy Kramb asked if the existing Tuller Road is being kept right-in/right-out, and if it is, is this going to solve the problem.

Page 9, fourth paragraph:

Delete sentence.

Page 14, fifth paragraph:

Ms. Kramb asked that her stamen be clarified because she was trying to say that the three-foot wall would help hide the parking lot, and would bring something up to the street since the building cannot come up to the street.

Page 17, last paragraph, last sentence:

She said that s as she reads the requirement,...

Mr. Hardt requested the following corrections/amendments to the January 19, 2012 meeting minutes:

Page 8, second paragraph from the bottom of the page, second sentence:

He said when the road network and the BSC are done, and the east/west road can be utilized to get to Sawmill Road then it would make sense for the intersection to be right-in/right-out, but not until then.

Page 9, twelfth paragraph:

Mr. Hardt said his main concern is where the traffic that heads southbound, traffic that comes from the northwest and comes across Emerald Parkway and makes the left turn to head up to Sawmill Road will go.

Motion and Vote: January 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve the January 19, 2012 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, abstain; Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 5 – 0 – 1)

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested the following amendment to the January 24, 2012 meeting minutes:

Page 11, fourth paragraph, last sentence:

She said they have to stay engaged for the Code to remain relevant and that is what the Commission has to do to is stay engaged.

Motion and Vote: January 24, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve the January 24, 2012 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Communications

Claudia Husak said that Planning was interested in hearing the Commission's thoughts regarding moving forward with the Vision Report update options for the Bridge Street Corridor at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that in the packets there was one Administrative Approval item for Heartland of Dublin.

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said that everything on tonight's agenda was eligible for the Consent Agenda, but Richard Taylor had pulled all the cases, except for Key Bank.

Ms. Kramb said she had a question regarding Key Bank and the way the condition was written.

Ms. Amorose Groomes announced the order the cases would be heard: Cases 3, 1, 2, 4, and 5. [The meeting minutes reflect the published agenda order.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes recognized the OSU students attending the meeting.

Ms. Husak said that Rachel Beck, a planning assistant prepared the Key Bank report for tonight. She said that Ms. Beck graduates in March with a Masters Degree in City and Regional Planning and will be back on Active Duty in Ft. Lewis, Washington and she will be dearly missed by Planning. Ms. Husak said that they are extremely proud of her.

**1. Infiniti of Columbus
11-040CDD**

**3890 Tuller Road
Corridor Development District**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this Corridor Development District application requesting review and approval of architectural and site modifications, including the demolition of the showroom portion of an existing car dealership building, the financial building, and construction of a new 6,045-square-foot showroom. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case, including Mark Ford, Ford and Associates Architects, 1500 West First Avenue, Columbus, and city representatives. She asked Richard Taylor who had pulled this consent item if a presentation was necessary.

Richard Taylor asked what things the Commission requested last time had been changed and how.

Claudia Husak said the Commission's issues were with the proposed architecture and landscaping. She said regarding architectural changes, on the original building, the applicant has removed the hipped roof portions on the eastern portion of the building that had slate on it and straightened out the roof, retaining the metal accent canopy pieces per the Commission's suggestion. She said the new building on the north has been decreased by about 400 square feet because easements were found on the site that restricted the building location more than originally anticipated. She said the setback to the south has increased from five feet to ten feet, the building and parking in that area has shifted slightly. Ms. Husak said concerns about the southern elevation have been addressed since the applicant has introduced brick on both ends and added windows in the center of the building and the two ends. Ms. Husak said for the north elevation, the applicant has decided to move forth with a painted, smooth finish hardie panel.

Ms. Husak said regarding the landscaping issues raised, the applicant has worked with Brian Martin, Dublin's Landscape Inspector to find additional locations for trees, so they all have been placed onsite. She said the revised plans show mounding in the car display areas which was not originally shown.

Ms. Husak said that Planning recommends approval with two conditions:

- 1) The plans should be revised to accurately indicate parking spaces in front of Building B.
- 2) That applicant work with Planning and Engineering to refine the sidewalk design, its placement, and the preservation of street trees.

Mr. Ford said the brick material proposed for the new building is a little redder than what is on the existing building. He recalled that the Commission had a concern about the pitched roof because they were removing part of the east part of that building. He said they are going to put the vertical parapet, consistent with the rest of the building around that corner that would face northeast, east, and then southeast as it turns that corner. Mr. Ford said they no longer are proposing the cut stone, but plan to use all brick, except for at the entrance where there is a small cut stone inset at the doors. He said the building will be primarily brick and hardie panel materials. He recalled the Commission was concerned about the lack of windows on the south elevation, so they have added windows to that elevation. Mr. Ford said the site plan has changed due to additional AEP easements found, some of which had not been used for years from old Tuller Road, some of which are still active. He said in that process, they lost 390 square feet of building area, but they were still able to provide Infiniti with a number of showroom and office spaces within the building that are required for this facility. Mr. Ford said they now have car display locations on the north side of the building. He pointed out that there was a typographical error indicating them as 'display spaces' and the spaces directly in front of the building at the west face of the building are for customers and not display.

Mr. Hardt said that they have found a creative answer to the issues and he thought what they had done was sharp and he appreciated that. Mr. Taylor dittoed Mr. Hardt's comments.

Ms. Kramb referred to sheet SD 1.1, and asked why pavement was shown in the 50-foot pavement/building setback.

Mr. Ford said he understood it existed from the original development plan when it was BMW.

Ms. Husak explained that it was an existing condition before the right-of-way was increased for the exit ramp for Sawmill Road. She said the Code has been changed to include driveways within things that cannot be within 50 feet of freeways. She said that driveways were not originally on that list, so it would have been conforming at some point.

Ms. Kramb asked if anything new was being constructed past that line.

Mr. Ford said no.

Ms. Kramb asked if all the parallel parking spaces would remain along the drive aisle, and if not, where all the extra vehicles would go since no parking spaces were being added and in theory, they were going to park now according to regulations and Code.

Mr. Ford said the operator/owner will have to manage the facility according to Code.

Ms. Kramb said there clearly was not enough parking on the site and parking was taken away by making Building B bigger. She asked if there was a shared agreement for employee parking.

Mr. Ford said no.

Ms. Kramb asked if Code was being met with the proposed number of parking spaces.

Ms. Husak explained that a variance was approved to not have to provide the spaces typically required for the service bays. She said however, having a plan that shows where display and parking occurs provides an enforcement tool not previously available.

Mr. Zimmerman thanked the applicant for listening to the Commission's concerns and addressing them.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone wishing to speak with respect to this application. [There was no one.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought most of the problems with the previous landscape plan were with labeling what existed and did not and it had been clarified.

Mr. Ford agreed to the two conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion to approve this Corridor Development District application because the proposed modifications are consistent with surrounding development and the Corridor Development District requirements of the Zoning Code with two conditions:

- 1) The plans should be revised to accurately indicate parking spaces in front of Building B.
- 2) That applicant work with Planning and Engineering to refine the sidewalk design, its placement, and the preservation of street trees.

Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

2. Tommy's Center – Buckeye Audio & Video – Sign 4271 W. Dublin-Granville Road 12-005CDDS Corridor Development District Sign

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this Corridor Development District Sign application for review and approval of a 44-square-foot wall sign for a new tenant within the existing shopping center. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case, including the applicant, Kelly O'Brien, Danite Signs, and city representatives.

Richard Taylor explained that he pulled this consent case because the red color on the proposed sign was quite bright and against the black background with the framed border was an obvious sign. He said however, he could live with the red color if they used channel letters instead of the box.

Adam McBrayer, 4271 West Dublin-Granville Road, the applicant said that individual letters were expensive.

Mr. Taylor explained that the Commission, in the Corridor Development District is charged with looking at not only what exists there now, but as the Code states, to look at the relationship of this to the future also. He said that it is known that the future of this is going to be the Bridge Street Corridor and it has a higher level of sign quality embedded in that. He said besides that, just for the purpose of where they are today with this area, it is a very highly visible location and this area is being called out specifically as an entrance to the city and as an area where we want to have addresses that are prominent. He said it was important to him that everything done along there from this point on is of the highest quality as possible. Mr. Taylor said he first thought he could accept the letter size and the color if channel letters were used, but perhaps there is another intermediate solution somewhere. He said he would not support a flat box panel sign at this location.

Mr. McBrayer asked if the individual letters were changed and another type of lighting was used could it be supported by Mr. Taylor. He explained that individual letters had to have their own lighting system. He asked if spotlights could be used.

Mr. Taylor said individual letters would be a huge step in the right direction as far as he was concerned.

Mr. McBrayer said he would do whatever was necessary. He said he just wanted to put up a sign.

Mr. Taylor explained that the goal should be a sign of as high quality as they can possibly get for this area. Mr. Hardt agreed.

Martyn Franko, 4271 West Dublin-Granville Road, pointed out that Tommy's Pizza had a box sign, and asked why it was permitted.

Mr. Taylor said he was certain if Tommy's came to the Commission with a similar proposal as this to replace that sign, his comments would be the same. He said the sign had not been done since he was a Commissioner.

Mr. Franko asked if they proposed individual lettering and spotlights that they might stand a better chance of approval.

Mr. Taylor said that individual letters would be the main thing that he would find an improvement over this proposal, as long as the lighting was acceptable.

John Hardt suggested an option might be external lighting downcast on the sign similar to that at Bridge Pointe shopping center could be used that was not typical gooseneck fixtures, but a thin bar.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that Planning staff would be their greatest advocate and can give ideas of things likely to be approvable. She suggested they come with a couple of proposals. She said it might increase the chances of approval if they were of a very high quality. She explained that normally, when there is an application not likely to get a favorable vote, the applicant is asked what they would like the Commission to do with their proposal, and sometimes, in order to not have to resubmit that, they will ask for a tabling to provide an opportunity to come back with something else.

Mr. Franko requested a tabling of this application.

Motion #1 and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion to table this Corridor District Development application, and Mr. Zimmerman seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor. (Tabled 6 – 0.)

Motion #2 and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion to waive the 15-Day Rule, and Mr. Zimmerman seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor. (Approved 6 – 0.)

**3. Perimeter Center, Subarea E – Key Bank
12-006AFDP**

**6820 Perimeter Loop Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application eligible for consent, requesting review and approval of an amended final development plan, changing the roofing material from slate to asphalt for an existing retail building of the Perimeter Center PCD. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case, including Scott Wallenhorst, Vocon, 3142 Prospect Avenue, Cleveland, representing the applicant, Stacie Flaisman, KeyBank National Association, and city representatives.

Amy Kramb asked if the text was being modified to state that the cedar shingles are no longer required for this specific address.

Rachel Beck explained that the text permits both asphalt and cedar, but with the final development plan, there was a condition that cedar shingles were required. She said if approved, this would remove that condition from the final development plan.

Mr. Hardt asked if they were changing the development text that applied to the land or the final development plan that applies to this particular building.

Ms. Beck pointed out that there were two buildings on the parcel. She said that Donato's has cedar shingles as a requirement because of the original condition of the final development bank, but the Key Bank would be able to have asphalt.

Ms. Kramb suggested a condition that the final development be revised to state that cedar shingles are no longer required.

Claudia Husak explained that the final development plan condition cannot be changed, but it could be clarified.

Mr. Wallenhorst agreed to the condition as amended.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment. [There was none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt made a motion to approve this amended final development plan because this proposal complies with the development text, the applicable criteria and existing development in the area, with the following condition:

- 1) That cedar shingles, as previously required in the 1998 final development plan, are no longer required at 6820 Perimeter Loop Road.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes, Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Budde, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

4. Beds 'n' Stuff – Sign 12-010CDDS

6477 Sawmill Road Corridor Development District Sign

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this Corridor Development District sign application requesting review and approval of a 48-square-foot wall sign for an existing business. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case.

Richard Taylor, who pulled this consent item, asked why the sign text was being changed from "Waterbeds 'n' Stuff" to "Beds 'n' Stuff."

Rachel Ray reported that the applicant had explained that the business name had changed.

Mr. Taylor confirmed with Ms. Ray that the proposed sign construction, color, projection from the wall, and everything else is identical to the sign that exists.

John Hardt noted that the Beds 'n' Stuff letters were illuminated and asked if the 'Waterbeds 'n' Stuff text was also illuminated.

Rick Monroe, 17553 Robinson Road, Marysville, explained that the individual letters stating "A Waterbeds 'N' Stuff Superstore" were lit with LED lights and include a plastic acrylic face to match the existing acrylic letters.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment regarding this case. [There was none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt made the motion to approve this Corridor Development District application because the proposed wall sign is consistent with the character of the existing building and surrounding development. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

**5. Zoning Code Amendment
12-009ADM**

Administrative Request

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this Administrative Request for review and recommendation to City Council regarding the addition of Section 153.237 Administrative Review Team, modifications to Sections 153.016 Designation of Zoning Districts, 153.038 District Uses, 153.042 Development Approval Process, 153.044(B) District Uses, 153.050 Purpose and Application, 153.173 Board Order Procedure, 153.158 General Requirements for Temporary and Permanent Signs, 153.232 Planning and Zoning Commission and 153.234 Amendments and the deletion of Sections 153.035 Historic Residential District, 153.036 Historic Business District, 153.044(I) Use Definitions (Innovation Districts) and 153.115 Corridor Development District, while retaining the Section numbers for future use.

Steve Langworthy said that there were actually two parts to this request, combined for convenience. He said at a City Council session, Planning was asked to prepare an amendment nearly identical to the one in the Bridge Street Corridor code that City-wide has to do with the logo color being considered one color, regardless of how many colors there actually are, and two additional colors besides that. He said that Council emphasized that it needed to be a registered logo. He said the rest of the provisions have to do with things that have to be done once the Bridge Street Code provisions come into effect. Mr. Langworthy explained that if the Bridge Street Corridor provisions are approved by Council on February 27, then this will follow. He said if for some reason, it is not approved then, this will be held after the Commission action until it is completed and it will be forwarded after that. He offered to answer questions.

John Hardt recalled that in the Bridge Street Corridor code sent to Council allowed a logo to have unlimited colors providing the logo is less than 20 percent of the sign. He asked if it was not now seen because there was no change and it still remained.

Claudia Husak said in Section 153.158 (C)(4)(2) it addresses the logo size and they are limited to 20%.

Amy Kramb requested that in the future, that the Commissioners have the whole section. She said the way it was presented was confusing to have the sections out of context. She explained that she did not read these with the Bridge Street Corridor code and everything with her. She said she reads her Planning Report alone.

Ms. Kramb asked if Section 153.042 Development Approval Process only applied to the EAZ.

Ms. Husak said that was correct.

Mr. Hardt agreed that it would be helpful next time to have the context because he too, typically read the packet information without the Zoning Code.

Richard Taylor said he was okay with the whole thing, except for the Sign Code. He said when the colors and logo was put into the Bridge Street Corridor code, it made sense because one of the goals was to make the signs in the Bridge Street Corridor more active, vibrant, and interesting. He said probably more important, that is now proposed to be a very highly controlled and very homogeneous district in a lot of ways. He said however, making that change for entire city was a big issue for him because there are many things going on and places where this will apply. Mr. Taylor said in addition, there are a lot of existing signs that have had a lot invested in them that the owners would have loved to had this, but it would be expensive to make the change. He said he did not know that he disagreed with the idea of having the logo colors in the rest of the city, but not this quickly. He said he thought they needed to look at the city, the signs, and what the potential impact of this might be. Mr. Taylor said he would like to see examples of the kinds of signs that might come about from this and then study this as a separate issue.

Ms. Husak said that Economic Development provided a list of company logos that have a large office or headquarters in the Dublin that exceed the color limitations. She presented graphics of the logos.

Mr. Hardt said he knew there were many PUDs with language that governs what they can do in terms of signs, and this is the underlying code, so he thought would happen as soon as this is approved, would be a parade of landowners who currently are under PUDs, come asking to have their text in part stripped away so that they can default to the more liberal underlying code. He said relaxing these standards is probably absolutely the right thing to do in certain parts of the city along interstate frontage, major commercial corridors and areas like that. He said on the other hand, there are some small scale, residential developments surrounded by neighborhoods where it may not be the right thing to do. Mr. Hardt asked if there had been any discussion about this being geographically linked as opposed to one blanket over the whole city.

Ms. Husak said it had not. She said Council minutes were attached to the packet. She said research had been done into the Planned District issue, and there are few that actually have something as specific as color. She said the buildings nearest Avery-Muirfield Drive in Perimeter Center are allowed to have four colors and the background colors are restricted and Midwestern Auto Group (MAG) has permitted the logos of the vehicle brands to exceed the color limitation. Ms. Husak said she could not recall another PUD that had anything as specific in their text as colors. She explained that most PUDs default to code when it came to the design of signs.

Mr. Taylor said he did not know that this will not be fine, but he was uncomfortable to the point of not being able to accept this at this point without really looking at this. He said this was a major change to a code that is, at best controversial and that is going to affect every single property in the city. Mr. Taylor said he felt making one small change has a big effect. He said he would like to pull this out of the document, and schedule it for a more thorough examination so that when the Commission makes this decision, they are certain that they have covered all the bases on it and that they are comfortable with all the potential problems with it. He said in his four years on the Commission, he could recall a couple of instances where applicants have asked for more than three colors, but it has not been particularly prevalent. He said if there is a demand, other than one particular known sign, he would like to know more about that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this could be a candidate for a joint meeting. She said it was high level and something that Dublin has differentiated itself from its neighbors. She asked if the logo was to be limited to 20 percent of the face of a sign. She asked about what portion of the sign was the Wendy's logo.

Ms. Husak said the entire sign was considered to be a logo.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if that could only be 20 percent of the sign for their eligible square footage.

Ms. Husak clarified that what she presented were just logos she found, not actual signs.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for example, what part of 'Nationwide Children's Hospital' was a logo and what part was the sign.

Ms. Husak said typically, for example on something like 'Nationwide Children's Hospital' a rectangle would be snapped around what is considered as a secondary image. She explained that anything that is not the registered name of the business would be considered a secondary image, so in the case of 'Nationwide Children's Hospital,' as shown, one large rectangle would be snapped around the butterflies and the blue square. She said the tag line would also be considered a secondary image and would have a rectangle snapped around it, so those two secondary images would count as the 20 percent allowable size of a sign. She said BP on Avery-Muirfield Drive has a sign with a giant logo and what they have done is on the 50-square-foot sign allowed, they have used their 20 percent just in the logo.

Mr. Taylor asked how to address signs for businesses where the name of the company written in a certain typeface is the logo.

Ms. Husak said Wendy's typically has letters in addition to the logo.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that Starbucks, while it was only two colors, had the round shape as part of their logo.

Mr. Hardt noted that Marriott had a certain stylized font for the word 'Marriott' and the whole name is their logo. He asked if they had a sign on the side of their building, their company name can only be 20 percent of it.

Ms. Husak explained that code said 'secondary image,' so they are using the word 'logo' simultaneously, but anything that is not the name of the business, secondary to the sign would be considered secondary image.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the definition of Secondary Image in the code, *Any and all text, graphics, or images displayed on a sign in addition to the name of the use or business, including but not limited to pictorial representations, taglines, products, and phone numbers.*

Mr. Hardt said that made sense, but that was not what this text said. He said the text referred to a registered corporate trademark or symbol. He said in the case of Marriott, he thought the entire word Marriott in that typeface was their registered trademark. He asked if they could separate that from a graphic.

Mr. Langworthy said that might be. He said for instance, a company had just block letters for their name and that was all and they did not have any logos. He said that was the name of their business, so that would not be a secondary image, but a primary image.

Mr. Taylor said that was the kind of things that they needed to look at and make decisions so that the Commission does not have to argue it for every single case. He said he thought the Marriott example would require them to use something other than their typeface on their name, and that is going to be more prominent than the logo and in the case of Wendy's, if that entire thing is their registered logo, he guessed that they have also registered Wendy as a logo, but if that was all they had, by the time that was done down to 20 percent, they have to write Wendy's next to it to make it readable, in which case it is not going to be in that font. He said he did not know if that was what they wanted.

Todd Zimmerman pointed out that Marriott would only come with a single color for the name, and that did not matter, because it was mute then.

Mr. Taylor said the point Mr. Hardt made was that if the word 'Marriott' is a registered logo and they put it on the sign, this code said that it could only be 20 percent as a secondary.

Jennifer Readler said that requirement only kicks in if they want to use a lot of colors.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what would they do with a sign for '1-800-Flowers' for an example, and every letter was a different color.

Ms. Husak said there had been that discussion with Toys 'R' Us because their actual business name has the letters each in a different color. She said the code amendment would not take care of them because they would still only be allowed to have the Toys 'R' Us name in three overall colors.

Mr. Taylor referred to the CenturyLink logo shown, and said it was a small step from what they had now, and he liked it. He said he hoped that this code would lead to that which was not much different from existing signs now with the logo added. He reiterated that he would like to schedule a time to look at this in more detail. He said he would like to know what other cities have done.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that in the City Council minutes she did not see a lot of clarity in the direction they were giving.

Mr. Langworthy said that City Council had just asked that an amendment be prepared. He said he thought they were leaving it up to the Commission to work out the details. He said he did not think it was an issue to pulling it out and sending the rest forward to City Council. Mr. Langworthy said he did not think Council was in a hurry. He said Nationwide would be delayed, but he did not think they were in a big hurry.

Mr. Hardt said he got the vibe that there was support on the Commission, they just wanted to make sure they knew what they were doing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there seemed to still be a lot of questions about what it would look like, how would this change the outer belt, and a lot of those places. She said to her, it seemed like a policy decision.

Mr. Langworthy said that City Council had made the policy decision that they want the language. He said he could not tell for certainty that there is support at Council for doing that. He said Council just wanted to see the language, so he thought they were looking to the Commission work out the details of how the language should read to get to that intent that they are wanting. Mr. Langworthy said they still will have to make the decision on the policy matter.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed that City Council had directed that the issue be explored and that it was the Commission's job to explore it.

Mr. Langworthy asked what kinds of things the Commission would like to see.

Mr. Taylor said they should look at as many as possible examples of what a registered logo may or may not be if it includes text. He said he did not know if the Marriott's text with stylistic lettering was part of their registered logo, for example.

Mr. Langworthy said for an example, OCLC was their trademark symbol, but it was also their primary name. He said that Planning would consider OCLC to be the name of the company and a primary image.

Ms. Kramb pointed out that the definition in the code did not mention at all the secondary image.

Mr. Langworthy said that they could bring back more on the secondary image at the next meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were some in her mind that were less offensive than others. She said that OCLC's does not speak very many volumes. She said she would like the Commission to see some worst case scenarios, as if the most horrific sign of what they might expect. She said she would like to see what the really ugly possibilities are.

Ms. Kramb said they should also think about signs in residential areas such as the UDF on Tara Hill and do they really want their pink, orange, and white UDF corporate logo illuminated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she wanted to see the good, bad, and ugly sign possibilities.

Mr. Langworthy said Planning would find a variety of actual sign examples to present.

Mr. Taylor said the sign examples should not just be those in Dublin.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that many times, the problem is with gradients.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that the CareWorks sign green square felt like one color, but technically, it was not.

Mr. Langworthy explained that staff had interpreted it to be a gradient. He said though he did not know how they count the colors, other than it is more than two.

Ms. Kramb suggested saying if the color was within a consecutive pantone range of so many colors, it was a gradient.

Mr. Langworthy agreed to prepare examples of signs to present to the Commission.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that what they had discussed for signs in the Bridge Street Corridor and what they did for the Tech Flex District were departures from what the city has traditional been, but that did not mean that they were right or wrong, but maybe it indicates that it is time to rethink the sign code, which is fine. He said they should rethink the sign code in its entirety, not just one piece of it.

Mr. Hardt said that even when he was on the other side of the room, he thought it was perfectly appropriate to have different signs standards in different parts of the community and that residential areas along Muirfield Drive probably warrant a different solution than does Sawmill Road or I-270. He said he had not thought enough about how that actually would work.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that it was complicated by the number of PUDs.

Mr. Hardt said that they did it in the Bridge Street Corridor in the sense that they took a large part of the city and identified areas that had different standards. He said maybe if that was done on a city-wide scale it would work.

Mr. Langworthy suggested it might be easier to do it by exclusion.

Mr. Hardt said an example of that is in the existing code where there is a height exclusion for interstate frontage

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they needed to decide if they wanted to pick this apart or wait on all of it.

Mr. Langworthy said he would like to send the other proposed amendments forward to City Council and just pull this section.

Ms. Kramb referred to page 6, Board Order Procedure, where text had been added to A, and the text added into B needed to say: BSC Historic Transition Neighborhood within the Architectural Review District. She asked if it needed to have the same language in B as in A.

Ms. Husak pointed out that if the Historic Transition Neighborhood District is amended, you amend the entire district, not just the district in the Architectural Review District.

Ms. Kramb asked if the Architectural Review Board (ARB) had authority to amend things in the Historic Transition Neighborhood that are not within the ARB's purview.

Ms. Husak said yes, in that portion of the code, they would have to take that to City Council and it would come to the Commission as well.

Ms. Kramb referred to C, and said it was her understanding that they can still receive planned development district applications for those under regular procedures.

Ms. Husak confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for a suggestion of how to get this where the Commission wanted.

Ms. Husak suggested a motion could be made to recommend approval to City Council of this proposed Zoning Code Amendment without Section 153.158.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor made a motion to recommend approval to City Council of this proposed Zoning Code Amendment without Section 153.158. Todd Zimmerman seconded the motion.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were comments from the general public who wished to speak with respect to this application. (There were none.)

The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Administrative Business

Mr. Langworthy said that Planning had been thinking about having some sort of work session with the Commission where they could talk about a more-detailed updated Vision. He suggested that the March 8, 2012 meeting agenda would be light and they could perhaps work around a table and fill them in on some of the development proposals seen and how they are shaping out, how Vrable fits into development, and put some of the pieces in place and talk about some of the areas that the Commissioners want to discuss. He said all that could be capsulated into a written format to give to City Council and they could review it.

Ms. Husak said the hope was to have multiple work sessions where they could work together on an on-going basis.

Mr. Taylor said he thought that was a great idea, and he recommended they start with goal setting.

Ms. Husak said it would be done as a work session item on the March 8, 2012 agenda so that it was public and advertised. She said the Commission could adjourn, and pull tables around together or if there was a lot of public present, the door would be left open in the Council Planning Room.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought that it would be great and they needed to start doing more work sessions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said Monday night's City Council meeting was difficult for her because the Commission does not have anyone on Council that hears the Commission's thoughts on any regular basis. She said she thought that in most instances, that meeting minutes are a very poor form of communication because words are captured, but not a lot of intent, importance, emphasis, and things like that. She said it was not her favorite thing to do to come to City Council to communicate the Commissioners' thoughts. She said when she scrolled through the volume of information City Council had, she thought there was no way that they knew what the Commission discussed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this is too important for them not to know and she only had five minutes. She said she would like to make a formal request to City Council to have a liaison. She said in the absence of having a Councilperson on the Commission, which was not a reality anymore because Council's workload is too great to add the Commission to that as well.

Mr. Langworthy said it was brought up periodically.

Ms. Amorose Groomes reiterated that she would like to make a formal request to have a liaison that would meet on a monthly basis with the Chair and/or Vice Chair in a face-to-face meeting to communicate any pertinent issues. She said there were too many things that come up and she felt like when she called a single City Council person, she put them in a difficult position because then they are forced to say, well the Chair called me and said this. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not want them to show any favoritism, it was just that some Council members pick up the phone quicker than others do. She repeated her request for a Council liaison to be appointed to say, look Commission, this is your go to person when you have issue, and we would like you to work through this Council member. She asked for the Commissioner's thoughts about the subject.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed. He said there had been a couple of times in recent memory, including to some degree tonight, where he thought the Commission had found themselves sitting and wondering what is the pleasure of City Council, what is their goals, and preference. He said having that conduit would be helpful to occasionally get questions answered, whether it is to find what predictability means to Council, or understanding what their priorities are concerning signs or what have you. He said he thought it would be beneficial for everyone.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it would be nice to have someone with a label so that you do not have the appearance of, not playing favorites, but just of having the ear of one single person. She said she did not care who it is. She said some of those meetings may be coffee for ten minutes and some may be significantly longer, depending on the month and the issue. She said she would really like it to be face-to-face because she thought that they have lost a lot of their ability to communicate and they need to start regaining that somehow.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed. He said the Charter charges the Commission as an advisory board in an advisory capacity to City Council, and right now, the only advice they give to them is through the Commission meetings, as well transcribed as they are. He said they are still the minutes and the record put out and they are not a substitute for having real communication. He said it could not do anything but help.

Mr. Zimmerman said there was a Councilperson on the Commission as they did for the first four or five years when he started, and they always knew there was a little feedback to hear. He said a liaison would be good.

Mr. Budde said he thought it was a great idea, but he thought there were times when they could tell what was happening and the best example he could give are these changes in the sign code that were proposed after Nationwide was tabled, and the Commission now has before them a change in the code that would allow them to do what they wanted to do and this is the Nationwide amendment, as requested by Council.

Mr. Zimmerman agreed with that.

Ms. Kramb said she thought it would be a good idea. She said the Commission has spent hours, weeks in a row, for the last several months, and she doubted 25 percent of that effort is going to get across out of all the time they spent on the code. She said to her, without that liaison, she felt like she was wasting that other 75 percent of time.

Jennifer Readler suggested that a motion could be made to ensure that the request is conveyed to City Council that they consider appointing a Council liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission to facilitate a dialogue and communication between the two bodies.

Mr. Hardt said the request should not be that Council considers but does it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes reiterated that she would like it to be an in-person meeting between the liaison and the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Commission scheduled monthly. She said if there were no issues, the meeting could always be cancelled.

Mr. Taylor asked that Ms. Readler read into the record the motion she and Ms. Husak suggested.

Ms. Readler suggested the motion, that City Council appoint a Council member as a liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission to facilitate an on-going dialogue and communication between the two bodies. She said the part about regular face-to-face meetings between the liaison and the Commission Chair and/or Vice-Chair could be left for inclusion in the memo. She asked if that was okay.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said sure.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made a motion that City Council appoint a Council member as a liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission to facilitate on-going dialogue and communication between the two bodies, with regular face-to-face meetings between the liaison and the Commission Chair and/or Vice-Chair.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Husak pointed out that based on City Council's schedule, the request and memo will be sent forwarded to them for their March 12, 2012 meeting.

Mr. Budde said that he may not be able to attend the March 8, 2012 Commission meeting because of a medical procedure.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.