

Ms. Amorose Groomes recalled a previous application lacked what the Commission thought was sufficient foundation plantings, and staff had informed them that would happen at the time of permitting.

Jennifer Rauch said that Code does not require foundation plantings, but if the applicant agreed, additional landscaping could be added around the perimeter as a condition.

Joe Hoelker, 9715 Sycamore Trace, Cincinnati, Ohio 45242, the applicant said he had hoped that the two existing trees could be planted outside the enclosure wall, if possible.

Ms. Rauch said that Dublin's Landscape Inspector would assist the applicant to locate the wall to maintain the trees if possible, but if they were removed, they would have to be replaced on site, per Code.

Mr. Fishman asked what kind of opaque screening was suggested.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said since it was going to be a brick wall, a foundation planting would likely be sufficient, perhaps a boxwood hedge or spirea, some deciduous or evergreen shrub. She said even if the two trees were lost from the interior portion, there was still sufficient room on that corner to add the two required replacement additional trees.

Amy Kramb asked what was being done with the 4,000 square feet at the south end of the building.

Mr. Hoelker said it was currently leased, but the lease expires on May 31st. He said they may move due to concerns about employees' allergies to animals and the ventilation. He said the space may be used by the hospital in the future.

Ms. Rauch said should they want to convert the 4,200 square-foot space; they would have to return to the Commission for approval. She said the application could be combined with a sign proposal coming to the Commission.

John Hardt asked if the applicant was going to acquire the property and would own it and not be a tenant.

Mr. Hoelker said that they would be acquiring the property and leasing it.

Richard Taylor said he agreed with Ms. Newell's suggestion about foundation planting. He said a seven-foot wall essentially becomes a foundation for the building and should be treated the same way. He asked why this was next to the tenant space that was not the hospital and why was it not at the other end of the building.

Mr. Hoelker said that there was an existing common entrance where the gate was located. He said that was a brick paved exit from the 8,400-square-foot facility.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that the tenant, if it was not the hospital, will be looking out at a seven-foot brick wall instead of landscaped street.

Mr. Hoelker said they would have to put in another door and sidewalk there.

Mr. Taylor asked if the brick style and mortar choice would match the building materials.

Mr. Hoelker said that was his intention.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see in the condition, that the wall be offset towards the inside so that there is an inside corner and the outside corner of the building is exposed.

Mr. Taylor asked about the proposed gate and if there were restrictions in this area.

Mr. Hoelker said the gate would be the same height as the wall, and be either wrought iron or plastic, a look alike.

Claudia Husak said that Planning had not reviewed the gate detail, but had discussed that it would be allowed to be either the same as the wood enclosure or a wrought iron material.

Mr. Taylor commented with other animal hospitals the Commission has reviewed, noise has been a concern. He asked if they should be concerned about noise in this commercial area. He asked if the pets were kept overnight. He recalled that for the Muirfield Animal Hospital, that the Commission made a big deal about sound control.

Mr. Hoelker said that the pets would be kept in cages overnight.

Ms. Rauch said that the closest residences were located about one-quarter of a mile away on Bradenton Avenue in Llewellyn Farms.

Mr. Taylor asked if the applicant had any plans to deal with sound issues coming from the building.

Mr. Hoelker said animals would be taken outside to eliminate only. He said he did not think there would be any sound heard from the outside.

Mr. Taylor said for the record, he wanted to make sure that is addressed.

Mr. Hoelker said there was a cage central area where the animals are kept.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the animals were there for boarding or just monitoring.

Mr. Hoelker explained that there would be injured or sick animals coming out of post surgery there just for observation before they go home.

Mr. Fishman recalled that another animal hospital was required to clean the outside area daily.

Mr. Hoelker assured that there would be cleanup after every incident.

Mr. Taylor asked if there was any sign associated with this use.

Mr. Hoelker said he thought they would come back to the Commission within the next three months.

Ms. Rauch said there is an existing sign has the previous and existing tenant listed. She said Planning has discussed with the applicant what they could do.

Mr. Taylor asked for a condition stating that the brick is going to match the style, coursing, and color; and that they will offset the corner towards the inside by at least eight inches.

Ms. Newell pointed out that it would be more advantageous to be standard course masonry. She said that six inches would be more difficult.

Motion #1 and Vote – Conditional Use

Mr. Taylor made the motion to approve this Conditional Use application because the proposed complies with the conditional use criteria and the applicable development standards of the Suburban Office and Institutional District. Ms. Kramb seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion #2 and Vote – Amended Final Development Plan

Mr. Fishman made the motion to approve this Amended Final Development Plan application because the proposed complies with the development text, the amended final development plan criteria and existing development in the area, with four conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with Planning to ensure the location of the outside enclosure has minimal impact on the existing trees;
- 2) The applicant incorporate additional landscaping around the perimeter of the enclosure that is compatible with existing landscaping, subject to approval by Planning;
- 3) The proposed enclosure be offset eight inches to the inside of the building; and
- 4) The proposed brick and mortar, and design utilized on enclosure shall match as closely as possible the existing building materials.

Mr. Hoelker referred to Condition 4, and asked what ‘matched’ meant.

Mr. Taylor said it meant to match the brick as closely as possible to the existing building.

Mr. Hoelker agreed to the four conditions.

Ms. Newell seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

**2. Dominion Homes PUD – Sarnova Sign
12-023AFDP**

**5000 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard
Amended Final Development Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting review and approval to reface an existing ground sign for an office building within the Dominion Homes Planned Unit Development (PUD) District, located on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 400 west of the intersection with Frantz Road. She said the application contained two components, and the Commission will need to make two motions. She swore in those intending to address the Commission regarding this case, including the applicant, Christine Benadum, 5000 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, and City representatives.

Victoria Newell, who pulled this consent item from the Agenda, said she did not require Planning presentation. She said she thought the ground sign should have perimeter landscaping around the base of the sign. She said they typically ask for it, and she thought it was appropriate and would like to see it added as condition. Ms. Newell referred to Planning’s recommendation that the applicant did not have to return to the Commission for approval if the sign face was changed. She said it appeared in the case history that the original provision for that was because this parcel was granted extra signage for some extenuating circumstances. She said she felt that provision should remain on the site. She said she was not sure that sign remained on the site.

Claudia Husak explained that additional signs were granted at the original zoning, and when the existing sign was approved by the Commission, the applicants removed the extra sign and one sign exists on the site now.

Richard Taylor asked if this sign were reviewed with the new Sign Code and not the PUD, how it would impact it. He recalled this sign with the yellow swish specifically being referenced when the Commission reviewed the proposed Code.

Ms. Husak explained that the sign was allowed to be 50 square feet. She said they are actually using the inside as their sign face, and it is a lot less than that. She said they are allowed to have 20 percent of the allowable size of the sign, which is 50 square feet, to be used as a logo. She said they could have 10 square feet of logo. She said typically, they would just snap a rectangle exactly around the logo, and it could be up to 20 percent or ten square feet. Ms. Husak said color wise, in this instance, they would count the star-shaped logo as one of the colors, which because it is yellow and blue does not exceed the Code as it is today. She said the type would be one additional color. She said in this instance, they would not count the background as a color.

Mr. Taylor noted that the PUD text as it exists aligns with the Code before there was the logo change.

Ms. Husak said that was true, but this PUD text is not so specific to the types of colors that they could use other than the background that they still could do the colorful logo if they wanted. She said if, for example, they had the black background that the text requires, then Planning is suggesting that the Commission remove the condition that they no longer are required to have a black background. She said if they did the black background, they could still have a colorful logo and have one color left over for the copy of their name.

Mr. Taylor said if the development text did not include anything about signs, the signs would default to Code. He asked if that were the case here, how would that change the signs and would it open the door to much larger signs on this site.

Ms. Husak explained that under Code, it would allow one sign because it has frontage only on one street and 50 square feet is the size that Code would allow. She said the structure is 5 by 10 feet, what they are using as the sign face is a lot less.

Mr. Taylor asked if under the current development text, if they decided to make that sign larger, they could without changing the development text because they could make it up to 50 square feet.

Ms. Husak said that they could fill in the entire inside of the existing sign structure.

Mr. Taylor noted that if it were only under the Sign Code and not the PUD, the result would be the same.

Ms. Husak reminded that this sign was approved by the Commission and Planning only administratively approve sign face changes which would still mean in this PUD that they have to come back for sign face changes. She said she knew of no other PUD that requires that. She said however, if they want to take the entire 50 square feet as their sign face, it would still have to be approved by the Commission, because Planning is only allowed to approve what is inside the box administratively under the development text. Ms. Husak said that in all Planned Districts, the Commission has to approve all kinds of sign changes other than if they are just the face of the sign already approved by the Commission.

Christine Benadum, Sarnova, 5000 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, said she was fairly certain there were flowers or shrubs planted by the sign now.

Ms. Newell said if the landscaping existed, the condition could remain and Planning could verify it so that it would not be an issue.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she observed landscaping in this location. She said that it was normally an annual planting. She asked if the concern was on the ends or was that sufficient.

Ms. Newell said her concern was that the landscaping was not in the photographic image and she thought it should be. She said she no longer had a concern.

Ms. Husak explained that one text modification would allow a light color background which is really just the inside of the sign to be permitted for this particular site. She said the other was not to require the applicant to come back to the Commission for another change such as being seen tonight.

Motion #1 and Vote – Minor Text Modifications

Mr. Taylor made the motion to approve this Minor Text Modifications because the modifications to the development text are minor in nature and will continue to result in high quality sign designs, the two modifications are:

- 1) To modify the development text to allow light colored background (stone inset) for a tenant sign within the Dominion Homes PUD; and
- 2) To no longer require sign face changes be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Benadum agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, Yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion #2 and Vote – Amended Final Development Plan

To approve this Amended Final Development Plan application because the proposed sign face change complies with the amended final development plan criteria and existing development in the area, with one condition:

- 1) That the sign base be landscaped in accordance with Code, subject to approval by Planning.

Ms. Benadum agreed to the condition.

Mr. Hardt seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

4. Wendy's International – Corporate Campus Signs 12-027CDDS

1 Dave Thomas Boulevard Corridor Development District

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting review and approval of modifications to the existing ground sign and the installation of a new wall sign for the Wendy's Corporate Campus located on the north side of West Dublin-Granville Road at its intersection with Dave Thomas Boulevard. She swore in those intending to address the Commission regarding this case, including Paul Orban, BHDP Architecture, representing the applicant, Dave Feusner, Wendy's International, and City representatives.

Victoria Newell, who had pulled this consent item from the Agenda, asked to hear the Planning presentation.

Jennifer Rauch presented this request for a Corridor Development District sign review for the Wendy's International Corporate Campus. She said the applicant is proposing to modify the existing ground sign located at the vehicular entrance along West Dublin-Granville Road and add a wall sign at the new lobby entrance recently approved by the Commission. She said the existing 89 square foot ground sign is proposed to be faced with the stone base and cabinet remaining. She said the new sign background will be brushed steel with black lettering, incorporating the secondary image and logo associated with their branding. Ms. Rauch said the existing sign size exceeds what Code permits, which is 50 square feet, and the number of colors meets the pending Code requirement, but does not meet the current Code. She explained that in the Corridor Development District, the Commission is granted the authority to approve such deviations from Code as it relates to signs, so the applicant is requesting those particular deviations related to the ground sign. Ms. Rauch said there is external illumination of the sign, ground lighting, to light the sign at night.

Ms. Rauch said with regard to the proposed wall sign, the site has frontage on two streets and would be permitted to have two signs. She said currently, Code would permit two wall or two ground signs and the applicant is asking for a combination, which is another deviation. She said the size of the sign is 16 square feet as proposed, and the secondary image and logo, as with the ground sign do meet the Code requirements, but the number of colors exceed the maximum permitted under the current Code. Ms. Rauch said that no illumination is proposed for this sign, as it will receive light from the lobby entrance. She said the wall sign meets the height requirement of 15 feet to the top of the sign.

Ms. Rauch said that Planning is recommending approval of this application with three deviations:

- 1) An increased height and number of colors for the ground sign;
- 2) The combination of wall and ground signs; and
- 3) The wall sign exceeding the permitted number of colors with the addition of the logo.

Victoria Newell complemented Ms. Rauch on her presentation.

Ms. Newell said that she realized that they were allowed two signs, but typically that provision for those two signs is so that the signs are facing either of the streets, and in this instance, her take from what was presented to her, both signs were actually focused upon SR 161 and both are visible at the same time with each other. Ms. Newell said that Dublin has text within the Zoning Code with relation to ground signs, that you can have a wall sign when you can see both at the same location, so she did not feel that the wall sign was appropriate. She said she was totally supportive of the ground sign, but she thought the applicant was getting dual signage on SR 161.

Ms. Newell said another concern when she drove past this property, was that there was a very large illuminated digital screen on the lobby of that that can clearly be seen in the evening, and she thought that compounded the issue on the signs. She said she was really uncomfortable with the wall sign. She said she was grateful to have Wendy's in the City and she liked the new development, but she was just not a fan of the wall sign.

Paul Orban, BHDP Architecture, representing Wendy's International, explained that the sign along SR 161 was meant to identify the main entrance to the campus versus this sign, because it really faces east, perpendicular to SR 161, it is meant more to mark the access off Shamrock Drive to the main lobby entrance.

Ms. Newell said she thought that they had a very large red feature on the front of the building which clearly drew attention to that was where you wanted to go, so she thought the added sign there was not

really appropriate. She said she thought directional signs would be totally permissible, but when drive into the entrance, they are in so close proximity with each other, someone will automatically go to that main structure before progressing through the site to go to the secondary buildings that are behind it.

Warren Fishman said that he realized for years that the original sign was not per Code because it was too large. He asked how far out of Code was it to the new Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) Code.

Ms. Rauch explained under the BSC Code, two ground and two wall signs would be permitted for the site, although the ground sign would not be permitted to be almost 90-square-feet in size. She said Planning calculated that 24-square-feet would be the largest ground sign permitted.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for the calculation for the wall sign.

Ms. Rauch said the wall sign was one-half of a square-foot based on the linear square feet, a 50-foot maximum size.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked how large was this wall sign.

Ms. Rauch said as proposed, the wall sign was 16-square feet.

Mr. Fishman said his concern was precedent. He said the Commission labored over the new BSC Sign Code, and now, before it is even approved, they are deviating from it.

Ms. Rauch clarified that at this point, they are under the current Zoning Code.

Mr. Fishman noted that this did not meet the current Zoning Code, and his concern was that across the street, those businesses will want to do the same thing. He said he was in favor of them meeting the Code.

Amy Kramb said Wendy's is just changing the sign face now, and she was okay with that. She said if they want to change the size of the sign, they have already. Ms. Kramb said the wall sign, under the new Code, will be allowed anyway. She said one sign is facing south and one is facing east, they are allowed two signs, and she was okay with that.

Ms. Newell said she thought you would always going to see the one sign being on SR 161, but on the other street, you are so far back when you are at the street frontage, she did not think it was that visible from the secondary street. She said it was really visible from SR 161.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if this was one parcel.

Steve Langworthy pointed out that the future plan is for another street to be on the Wendy's campus which may change the visibility of the sign.

Ms. Rauch said the street would be located in front of where the new addition was recently approved.

Ms. Newell suggested that at that time, it might be appropriate to entertain the wall sign, but as she saw it now, she did not think it was appropriate when the provisions of other corporations and businesses within the City have been made. She said she thought everyone should be treated fairly. She asked if there were other locations where there is a similar situation where a ground and wall sign were approved in close proximity such as this that are both focused to the same street frontage.

Ms. Rauch pointed out that Germain has a ground and a wall sign on the same Banker Drive frontage.

John Hardt asked when the new Sign Code would be in effect.

Ms. Husak said that the new Sign Code would become effective May 23rd.

Mr. Hardt said he understood that this proposal met the new Sign Code in every respect, except for the size of the ground sign and the combination of the wall and ground signs. He said he thought that the Code stated that if you have two street frontages, you can have two signs, but it was silent on where they need to go.

Ms. Husak explained that the Code is divided into Wall Signs and Ground Signs. She said under Wall Signs, it says you can have two if there are at least 100 feet of frontage on each of the public rights-of-way. She said regarding ground signs, the Code says if the use has no visible wall sign from the public right-of-way, you can only have a ground sign.

Ms. Newell asked if it would be appropriate that the applicant's signs match the new signs that the City is trying to place along the Corridor.

Ms. Husak pointed out that the BSC Code which will be applicable to this site next week would allow them to have two ground and two wall signs.

Mr. Hardt asked if the BSC Code superseded the Zoning Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said next Tuesday, they would be permitted two wall and two ground signs. She asked what sizes would be permitted for two ground signs and two wall signs in the BSC Code, the prevailing code on this site.

Ms. Rauch said 24 square feet per ground sign and up to 50 square feet per wall sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that what sizes being proposed were 89 square feet for the ground sign and 16 square feet for the wall sign.

Mr. Hardt said if the BSC Code was about to become effective, and it would allow vastly more sign than is being proposed on this site, the only issue was which sign is big and which sign is small. He said the BSC Code gave the Commission the authority to review those kinds of questions, and given the quality of these signs, which is exactly what they talked about a lot, he thought these signs do that. He said setting aside the issue of Code compliance and text, he thought the quality of what is being proposed is great.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this is exactly what the Commission asked for when reviewing cases for exactly this purpose for anything that might be outside the bounds.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that this application is a little different because if the BSC Code were in effect, it would not require a waiver because it is only a sign plan and it does not have to be gauged against the waiver criteria. He said however, the other deviations would have to go through the waiver process.

Mr. Hardt said that he saw the quality that the Commission was after, a total sign package that was far less than what Code would require, and that he was okay with the proposal.

Mr. Fishman said he changed his mind and said this does not set precedence, because they will have the review of the next applications. He said however, he was a little concerned about seeing both signs at the same time. He said he visited the site during the day and he did not see the screen in the lobby.

Mr. Orban said the employee communication screen is only used during business hours.

Mr. Fishman said if the screen could be seen at night, it would be considered a sign.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that fluorescent lights inside could be seen at night from the outside and they were not limited by Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that the proposed signs are in compliance to the BSC Code, but out of balance in terms of which sign is getting how much square footage, but the net sum met Code.

Joe Budde said he agreed that given they already have the existing ground sign that size, and all they are doing is replacing the face of a much higher quality, he liked the proposal.

Richard Taylor said the Commission also has the ability to look beyond that and it was important when discussing potential precedent-setting issues that their discussions are included in the meeting minutes so that future Commissions understand where they came from. Mr. Taylor said with that in mind, he probably would not approve the proposed wall sign if it were on a location on the brick somewhere on the building where it was obviously intended to be signage for the public. He said for him, this sign is really more part of the architecture of the new entrance than it is just a standalone sign. Mr. Taylor said it would have been nice if when the Commission previously reviewed the addition that they would have known that there was going to be a wall sign. He said the Commission had the same problem with the Germain sign. He said he assumed the wall sign was not over 15 feet tall.

Ms. Rauch said that it met Code at 15 feet high.

Mr. Taylor said in the future, that the Commission needed to make sure that signs are considered at an early stage. Mr. Taylor said he had no problem with the refaced ground sign. He asked if it was intentional that the fonts differed on the ground and wall signs. He said he thought the font proposed for the ground sign was boring. He asked if the letters were projecting, pin mounted or backlit.

Mr. Orban said they originally matched the font, but Wendy's requested to keep it neutral because they were changing their brand and evolving and they did not want to keep changing the signs. He said the letters were pin-mounted off about half-inch standoffs off of the stainless steel face. He said that the existing ground lighting will be used.

Mr. Taylor asked if the 'Wendy's' image was screen printed.

Mr. Orban said that the one-half inch thick image was pin-mounted on the red wall and dimensional.

Ms. Newell asked if the sign would be illuminated during the evening.

Mr. Orban said that there was general lighting on the canopy already and they were not adding any special lighting to highlight the sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what was happening to the old ground sign face.

Mr. Orban did not know.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was completely out of the Commission's purview, but the sign was kind of an icon of the community as one of Dublin's original corporate citizens and part of who we are, and suggested that Wendy's might donate it to Dublin. She said she thought sign was beautiful and asked that it not be destroyed.

Mr. Orban agreed to share the suggestion with his client. He said he thought if it did not end up in the public, it would end up in the museum which he understood would be part of their new store.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this case. [There were none.]

Ms. Newell said she appreciated Planning, as well as the other Commissioners entertaining her questions the new changes to the Code are new to her as a new Commissioner. She thanked them for letting her hear the full case and the comments.

Mr. Fishman said the Mr. Taylor's comments were very well spoken about keeping a good record of why the Commission makes decisions, because being around the Commission for a long time, precedence is a real concern of his. He said to make sure that the meeting minutes show all the reasons they gave for making the decision.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion to approve this Corridor Development District application because the proposal meets the applicable review criteria for the Corridor Development District requirements of the Zoning Code, with three deviations from the Zoning Code requirements including the combination of wall and ground signs, a ground sign exceeding 50 square feet in size and more than three colors per sign due to the logo.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows Ms. Krumb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Administrative Business

Ms. Amorose Groomes announced at 7:48 p.m., that the Commissioners would take a quick recess and reconvene for the Work Session to be held in Council Chambers. She invited anyone interested from the public to join them.

Work Session – Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report Update

This was a discussion item only. No formal action was taken by the Commission.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 17, 2012.