



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](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### MEETING MINUTES

MAY 1, 2014

#### AGENDA

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>1. Emerald Parkway Phase 8 – Office Building<br/>14-027INF<br/>(Informal Discussion)</b></p>                       | <p><b>Emerald Parkway<br/>Informal Review</b></p>  |
| <p><b>2. Conditional Use—Corporate Center-Fitness Edge<br/>14-030CU<br/>(Approved 6 – 0)</b></p>                         | <p><b>6250 Corporate Center Drive<br/>Conditional Use</b></p>                                  |
| <p><b>3. Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine – Signs<br/>14-025WID-DP/SP<br/>(Tabled 5 – 0)</b></p> | <p><b>West Innovation District-Development Plan/Site Plan<br/>6775 and 6785 Bobcat Way</b></p> |

Chris Amorose Grooms called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Amy Kramb, Richard Taylor, Victoria Newell, Amy Salay, and John Hardt. Joe Budde was absent. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Readler, Kristin Yorke, Alan Perkins, Marie Downie, Katie Ashbaugh, Dana McDaniel, Colleen Gilger, and Flora Rogers.

#### Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Amy Kramb seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Grooms, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6– 0.)

Ms. Amorose Grooms said they had meeting minutes for approval dated April 17<sup>th</sup>, but they were not placed into Dropbox for review, so they are not going to approve the meeting minutes until the Commissioners has the opportunity to review them. Ms. Husak said she will put them in for the next meeting.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said there are three cases this evening and one case is eligible for consent and said they will hear that case first. She said the order of the cases would be heard case 2, 1 and 3 on the agenda and briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>1. Emerald Parkway Phase 8 – Office Building<br/>14-027INF</b></p> | <p><b>Emerald Parkway<br/>Informal Review</b></p> |
|--|---|

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the following application is a request for informal feedback for the potential development of a 30,000-square-foot office building with the potential for a 20,000-square-foot expansion with associated parking and site improvements to be located on the north side of Emerald Parkway Phase 8, approximately 750 feet east of the intersection with Riverside Drive.

Ms. Husak presented this application that was intended to be heard at the last meeting in April but more time was requested for this request of review of an informal proposal for a potential office building on land that is owned by the City of Dublin just north of I-270.

Ms. Husak said the site is approximately five acres of an almost 20-acre parcel with access off Bright Road to the north and to the south Emerald Parkway has started construction and this will be the last phase of Emerald Parkway connecting Sawmill Road to Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to the south. She said the proposal is only for the southern portion of the entire parcel, the northern portion is a farm house and earth works intended to be a City park.

Ms. Husak showed a copy of the Future Land Use Map from the Community Plan and said the southern portion, south of the creek and the tree line is slated for a standard office and institutional land use which would allow offices at a density of 12,500-square-feet per acre and the northern portion of the site that the City owns as well as some land there adjacent to Riverside Drive is intended to be open space. She said there are existing residences on Grandee Cliffs and Jenmar Court which are shown in the Community Plan to continue to be a residential use. She said the area plan land use is shown as office with buildings along Emerald Parkway which is the road to the south with parking to the rear with access to the park as part of the Emerald Parkway access point for any future development.

Ms. Husak said the Bright Road Area Plan also includes some perspective drawings and as the case always is with the Community Plan and the Area Plans they are not intended to be prescriptive as in what the development has to look like, it is just a character idea of what development could look like within the area.

Ms. Husak said there is a Master Plan for the Holder Wright parcel that includes the land the City does not currently own and there is plans for retaining the farm house, creating a nature education center, and keeping the park passive and having an educational uses in that area with a general layout showing the southern portion with offices.

Ms. Husak said the City owns this land and there have been some interests from the development community to developing this site and staff is asking for feedback from the Commission so that they can potentially give some ideas of what the character would be appropriate on this site.

Ms. Husak said the proposal is a two phase approach with phase one for an office building that has a 15,000-square-foot footprint with two stories at a total of 30,000 square feet. She said phase two the footprint is 10,000 square feet with two stories would yield another 20,000 square feet for a total of 50,000 square feet. She said the plan shows a parking ratio of 5.7 spaces per 1,000 which exceeds Code. She said the Code would require a 4 per 1,000 parking ratio and they have heard from a lot of different office users that offices tend to get smaller with a lot more people that fit into buildings these days, so the ratio seems to be what is needed by the market.

Ms. Husak said the access point would be a full access off Emerald Parkway intended to be a public road to provide access not just to this office development but also to any potential development to the west as well as providing access to a visitors parking lot for the park with bike path and multi-use path connections from Emerald Parkway going north to the park with a potential to extend from Jenmar Court bike path to the park. She said the plan shows consolidated stormwater management possibility detention or retention shared with the site to the west located along the common property line.

Ms. Husak said one of the discussion questions that is outlined is whether or not the site and the building is designed and located appropriately in terms of the Area Plan and the Parks Master Plan.

Ms. Husak showed some examples of architecture along Emerald Parkway and said the buildings tend to be taller than what is being proposed with the example to the south not being in Dublin, but is a two-story office building using materials generally of glass, stone, and brick. She said they wanted some feedback from the Commission on what type of architecture and materials would be appropriate within this area.

Ms. Husak said the other discussion questions relate to signs. She included the IGS building because it has one of the interstate related signs for office buildings which the Code permits for sites with frontage along I-270 and the Code states it is for corporate offices of at least two stories. She said the Code would allow for a two story building with a 100-square-foot sign and a maximum square footage of a sign along the highway would be 300 square feet. She said they would like to get some feedback on whether or not the Commission would think it is appropriate to have the highway oriented signs for this site with Emerald Parkway between the highway and the site, but there is not any other developable land between this site and the highway. She said the other focus of the question is whether or not the Commission could see two of such signs for a building where the Code would allow one sign and what other signs would be appropriate in this area, whether being a combination of ground signs or wall signs at lower heights and smaller in size.

Ms. Husak showed a map with Emerald Parkway in its completed stage from Riverside Drive, past Bright Road toward the current stub by Lifetime Fitness. She showed a map of the Bright Road Area Plan in its entirety showing a couple more sites along future Emerald Parkway that would have similar conditions where there are frontage on Emerald Parkway and also frontage along I270.

Ms. Husak said they have had a meeting with some of the residents on Jenmar Court last week where they discussed the Community Plan and what it sets out for land use, character, and the screening being installed along Emerald Parkway south of Jenmar Court.

Ms. Husak said the discussion questions are outlined and Dana McDaniel is present for any questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this is a City application and asked if the applicant would like to come forward and share any additional thoughts with the Commission.

Dana McDaniel, Director of Development with the City of Dublin, 5800 Shier Rings Road, thanked the Commission for taking the time to let them bring this forward and said it is an unusual approach but given the activity on this site for the last five years they thought it would be prudent to bring it and get feedback on the potential development of this site.

Mr. McDaniel said this is not unusual that the City leverages City-owned land into economic development opportunities just as they did with Delta Energy at Perimeter and Emerald Parkway, and a companion building to Delta with Everhart Financial to build out the remainder of that site, and Ohio University next on the agenda is a great example. He said Nestle's Quality Assurance Center expansion was on City-owned land and in a transaction with the City they which allowed the expansion. He said there is another 100 acres that the City owns out at Houchard and Post Road that could be potentially used for commercial development.

Mr. McDaniel said the key points are that the development of a portion of this property be consistent with the Community Plan and the Park Master Plan. He said their intent is to be good neighbors as the City would want to be and to do this with a good level of quality and to set a good example on this new Phase 8 extension which could be one of the first sites to be built out based on the amount of recent activity. He thanked them for their feedback and said that there was a parking ratio study completed that is being shared with City Council on some of the competitiveness efforts that the City is undertaking

with Suburban Office to keep them competitive with results showing parking ratios are creeping up because of the amount of people per square feet that are going into buildings these days. He said they will be very conscious of the trees with consolidating stormwater on this site with the Thomas property to the west would be best for both sites. He said it is shown on the map but is not where it would necessarily be placed and they know of the tree issues that they will be very sensitive to the placement of the stormwater. He said relevant to the Thomas site to the west he has been in negotiations with them for Emerald Parkway right-of-way and has a relationship with the Thomas Family and had some level of discussion regarding access to their site and while staff has not been able to share this plan, but he knows their concerns. He said should an opportunity to consolidate the sites for an economic development opportunity arise the City would work together to entertain the options.

Mr. McDaniel said the proposal is only a reflection of the Ruscilli project that was being proposed and over the last five plus years they have several options of potential development of this site, in learning a lot through the discussions, they didn't get to a level for a formal application, but with the road going in and it has caused excitement for the possibilities of development on Emerald Phase 8. He said he would answer any questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there was a speaker sign in sheet and there are three folks that signed up to speak, but if anyone did not have the opportunity to sign in, it will not preclude anyone from sharing their thoughts. She said the Commission wants to hear what everyone has to say about this development and keep the community involved.

Ms. Amorose Groomes reminded the speakers that the meetings are recorded, so step forward and state your name and address for the record.

Donald Spangler, 3614 Jenmar Court, said he is the closest house to the Phase 1 building. He said there are a lot of things that the City of Dublin does very well, however he questions the size of the building as an office next to residential areas. He said they used to be a nice out of the way residential neighborhood and they would like to retain that and most of the residents have lived there for 10 to 35 years and several have retired to stay there and many have planned to stay. He said they have an established community of mostly single-story homes suitable for retirees where they all know each other. He said they accepted the original Bright Road Area Plan years ago and in the plan they felt it was not too destructive to their community and they like being in Dublin based on the original plan and being told that multi-story buildings would never be built on that site and that the multi-story buildings would be built near Sawmill Road. He urged the Commission to vote no on this big multi-story office proposal and said the Bright Road Area Plan originally called for single-story office, the plan respected the park, the neighborhood, and the natural beauty of the stream and the waterfalls. He asked if they consider placing a library on the site. He said this would be for Dublin residents and library traffic would be minimal at rush hour, moderate throughout the day, and relatively a low impact. He said walking connections to the historic park would be right over the bridge and if they build the elementary school on Bright with the library on the field under discussion, the students could walk to the library and park and enjoy field trips from the school to the library and park.

Sandra Taylor, 7143 Grandee Cliffs Drive, said she agrees with everything Mr. Spangler has said. She said her husband died in January but he would have been very much in favor of sticking with the original Bright Road Area Plan. She asked that they consider the greenness of Dublin and the changes to the original plan seem to be reducing the greenness that they have become accustomed to.

Carla Clifton, 3875 Inverness Circle, said their condominium is located on Bright Road at Sawmill and having a large office building with the current Sawmill Road traffic would clog up the entire city and no one could get anywhere and the I-270 intersection could not handle it. She said they have been there

for many years and like their quiet community. She said Bright Road cannot handle that extra traffic even with Emerald Parkway going through to Hard Road. She said the traffic pattern and the environment is not suitable for a large office building and it would more than just affect their neighborhood it would affect the whole quadrant and they would have a lot of unhappy residents.

Pat Terrell, 7243 Inverness Court, said she is a realtor and moved into the Village at Inverness in 2002. She said she has seen the property values go up in the good years but now they are below 2002 values, and even though the recession has ended, they are not recovering in the community. She said the units that back up to Bright Road currently are more difficult to sell and remain on the market more days and the values are decreasing. She said she compared 2000 – 2013 the values which are 13.2% lower and the average days on the market in 2013 was 167 days compared to 2002 at 18 days. She said this is because when people look at units they are concerned about the traffic on Bright Road. She asked the Commission to think about the people and the community that has existed there for a long time and the impact on their pocket books and lifestyle.

Julia Felts, 7187 Grandee Cliffs Drive, said currently the traffic to get to Sawmill is chaotic and if they increase the volume of traffic and they lose their draw as a charming historic, nature- and family-friendly, intelligent community. She said the original Emerald Parkway plans have one-story buildings to the west of Grandee Cliffs and Jenmar Court. She said keeping the office buildings low around the historic park and Indian Mounds, and their family homes, while maintaining the greenspace and retention ponds of the original design will ensure that they maintain their Dublin character of tree-loving, innovative, integrative, high class, professional, family friendly and historical. She said when you maximize the growth opportunities with the sole focus of financial gain they lose the integrated identity of the Dublin they all moved here for. She said if they allow those buildings to increasingly expand then it is going to ruin the neighborhood and bring the value of their homes and condominiums down.

Scott Clayton, 7239 Sawmill Road, said he owns a chiropractic office and is a business owner and he has been there for 25 years. He said his ability to do his business is affected by the current traffic, he loses patients because of the traffic and adding more is not a good business solution for existing and future business owners in the area.

Diane Armstrong, 6988 Grandee Cliffs Drive for the last 23 years, said they have a really cool neighborhood and used to tell people they are in Sawmill traffic and turn left in a corn field and then they are at their house. She said the last three months have been so depressing with the trees that came down, the blasting, but they knew it was coming. She said while they were fine with the original plan, they now feel that this new proposal will ruin their neighborhood, it already has and they knew I-270 was there but they could not see it, but now they can see it from their front porch and could give traffic reports in both directions along I-270. She said the plan is not prescriptive but it is what has been presented to their neighborhood for the last 20 plus years and asked the Commission to consider the impact on the neighborhood and on their property values.

Jay Simonds, 3570 Jenmar Court, said he is on the east side. He said he moved 7½ years ago with his new wife because of the trees, greenspace and the plan that they saw. He said they are expecting a greenspace not more businesses. He said he measured the traffic which is at 74 decibels tonight and it is a quiet night, and wondered what will it be like when Emerald is in and they add two more buildings next to their neighborhood. He said he moved here knowing that Emerald Parkway was going in and it is fine, he wants sewer and water, but he is worried what the effect will be.

Judy Long, 4345 Bright Road, said they can see the traffic on I-270 and she had never seen the traffic on I-270 from where she lives until they cut down all the trees to put in Emerald Parkway. She said they came in with Igel and put in drainage and messed up their water shed and now it floods. She said

everyone is talking about rush hour traffic but on a Saturday they cannot go anywhere. She said she sat there for three green lights to get onto Sawmill Road. She asked that they fix the current issues before they add to the existing conditions.

Neal Johnson, 7172 Grandee Cliffs, said he has lived there roughly 20 years and this is his third or fourth Community Plan and of all the Community Plans they have always called for protecting preserving the rural characteristic of their neighborhood. He said he has spent over 120,000 dollars improving his home based on that concept plan and he was lead to believe with the new plan it was going to be low density, single-story to relieve traffic. He said this proposal is not relieving traffic and by his estimates it will be 13,000 cars that will be in this area at one time from 8 to 5. He said he was concerned that this does not do anything but detract from their neighborhood and the beauty of Dublin.

Randy Roth, 6987 Grandee Cliffs Drive, said his house is real close and he could talk about the fun experiences with the blasting. He said he wanted to speak as a fellow commissioner serving as a member of the Community Plan Steering Committee from 1995 to 1997 and on the transportation subcommittee. He said he also served as a member and chair of CSAC. He said the plan presented is the Bright Road Area Plan, the tweaks and updates have been in terms of the zoning language, they turned the residential single family area to the east to medium density. He said it is the same basic plan and the version he wanted to share has bubbles on it that explains in detail what the plan still entails indicating going from one story to four. He said he would like to get joint ownership of Sawmill Road to get the timing of lights and pay half the maintenance if Columbus let Dublin plan Sawmill Road. He said in this area they need to go from one to four stories because they think that is survivable with the improvements they are making with Emerald Parkway.

Deb Allard, 7291 Macbeth Drive, said they moved here when her son was one and now he is 20 years old. She said they have seen the deer and wildlife and love being tucked away in the woods but able to get to the shops and restaurants. She said her kids have gone through Dublin Schools and she has a senior next year. She said they own a business in Dublin and understands why they have to have the businesses in order to pay for things. She said before she goes to her office south of Bethel and Sawmill, she does her errands and heads north from Bright Road and is shocked that at 8:30 in the morning, on a weekday, you cannot go south on Sawmill from Summer Drive just north of Hard Road. She said the wait is very long just to get to I-270. She said she wanted the Commission to think about hurting the businesses when they are not thoroughly thinking it through.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone else that would like to comment. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there are some discussion questions asked of the Commission and is sure there will be lots of other thoughts that they might have and anything else that might come up as a result of their discussion.

Ms. Kramb said she agrees with the concerns on traffic and that Sawmill Road is a mess and they have to remember that it is in the City of Columbus and that District 6 ODOT has a current program project that runs from I-270 up to Billingsley from the northbound lane and the studies are available and residents can get information from District 6.

Ms. Kramb said she drives in the traffic every day and is about a ¼ mile to the north of this site off Riverside and she sees the traffic. She said this building should not be seen from the Park because the mounds in the park are on the National Register of Historic Places and one of the criteria for those listings are the setting and environment of those particular things. She said she does not think they should harm the integrity of those sites. She said whatever gets developed on this site needs to stay below the trees so they cannot see it from the park. It is going to be a wonderful park and she is very

glad to see it as the first kind in the area that will have any type of mounds preserved. She said she is okay with something going on the site and understands the need to put something along Emerald Parkway. The development needs to be very sensitive to the wonderful waterfall and ravine. She said the parking lot cannot be lit or have a sea of lights like at Cardinal Health knowing that lighting is necessary for safety reasons but it needs to be sensitive to the park.

Ms. Kramb said the building is facing the freeway and she is okay with a freeway sign but only one per building with lighting restricted facing away from the park. She said a ground sign would be appropriate off Emerald Parkway.

Ms. Kramb said she does not have an opinion on the architecture. She does not feel it has to match what is on the other side because they are starting with a new phase on this site. She is fine with a new unique building but cannot distract from the park keeping below the trees and not visible from the park. She said it is a great opportunity to do some really neat buildings that are incorporated into a natural environment like Frank Lloyd Wright.

Ms. Newell thanked the residents for coming in and talking with the Commission. She said she feels their pain in terms of traffic, prior to this evening's case she drove through the area and it took 30 minutes to get through the intersection of Sawmill and Bright Road and she was concerned to arrive in time for the meeting. She said they have a beautiful neighborhood within the City of Dublin and is very respectful to their community and property.

Ms. Newell said this site is going to be developed but what is proposed can be done better. She said they are showing a building that is a box and that is the least innovative and is not appropriate for this site and they need something more respectful to the parkland and more integrated within the site. She said the best architecture to her is something that is integrated within its surroundings and needs a much better presentation of screening and there is none shown on the plan.

Ms. Newell said the architecture was supposed to have a residential feel and character with a building with varying roof lines. She said she does not think that a two-story building might be out of scale, but the scale can be tiered and played with so that they can be respectful to more residential surrounding properties.

Ms. Newell said the signage and frontage means just that, while she realizes that the land cannot be developed she can think of other properties that have the same conditions where it has been held against them and she is not supportive of that change. She said she does not know where they would stop using that for the other properties along Emerald Parkway. She said she is obviously not supportive of two signs, if she cannot support freeway frontage.

Mr. Taylor thanked everyone who came here tonight and said he is excited to see a large crowd that shows up for a meeting because this Commission is really about the public and the public input. He said when they get the planning reports they try to learn as much as they can about a project and a site, he never feels like he has a complete picture until he hears from the people and the comments from the ground level is really important.

Mr. Taylor said he wants to know what they are thinking when Emerald Parkway is completed and all the buildings are built out and Emerald Parkway ends at Sawmill Road, and are there plans for the traffic and how it is addressed.

Ms. Husak said they do not have anyone from Traffic Engineering here but within the Community Plan the land uses have not changed between the 2007 plan and the current plan. She said in 2007 they did a

City wide modeling where all the land uses were plugged into a traffic model that then generated appropriate densities for the offices, so it is something that has been looked at and studied at least as part of that plan. She said Sawmill Road is not within the corporate limits of the City but they are working with them on improvements on Sawmill and Hard. She said she has had conversations with Paul Hammersmith where he said Emerald Parkway needs to be there for a while for it to get established and for people to change their patterns.

Mr. Taylor said what he heard was a common theme in all the comments that when this gets done and developed if nothing else changes Sawmill Road will be a bigger disaster then it is now. He said he does not like the site plan finding it very un-imaginative, uninventive and it does not use the things that are here to take advantage of making this a better plan or the site better and he thinks there are elements of this that could be rearranged to help them out a lot.

Mr. Taylor said the access road dead ends on the far west and even when something is built to the west it is another office building that means all the traffic that comes into here has to turn around at some point to get back out. He said the park is going to be visited by school buses and the buses will not be able to get in here safely and turn around and get back, so that leads him to think the access drive is in the wrong place. He said if they were to move the access to where the detention pond is, it would make the traffic go the other direction and allow people to loop around and pull in the parking lot properly and visit the park. He was concerned that the detention pond is a real afterthought in this plan, and it could be an attractive visual thing but also be a buffer because the fountain would make noise enough to mask a lot of road sound and block other sounds.

Ms. Husak said there will be another access points planned on Emerald Parkway for those two sites and there is grading issues due to the natural flow of the water toward Riverside Drive and down toward Billingsley.

Mr. Taylor said the parking layout is un-imaginative and he is concerned about the straight line of evergreens along Emerald Parkway and there is an opportunity here to do something that presents a more attractive face to the street and visitors to Dublin then basically a hedge row along the front. He said that is reflective of the architecture as just a box and it needs to look at something far beyond that.

Mr. Taylor said they should be thinking about how these buildings are going to look from the freeway and they might be seeing the roofs of these buildings needing to take that into account. He said he is concerned about two-story buildings going in on this site and the overall Master Plan for this area being there is more appropriate places for that and he is concerned as they get closer to Riverside Drive and to the corridor that is very rural that they keep buildings as low as possible. He said he would prefer to see buildings lower and smaller.

Mr. Taylor said the signage issue on this particular site it is effectively on I-270 so he would not have a problem looking at this as meeting the criteria for the I-270 signs, however one sign per building is appropriate.

Mr. Hardt thanked the residents who have come tonight and said they are citizen volunteers that are also residents of Dublin and all too often they talk about cases trying to contemplate the impact on the City and unfortunately sometimes the room is empty. He said it is great to see so much interest in your community and neighborhood and to hear their feedback helps the Commission.

Mr. Hardt thanked the applicant for bringing this in for an informal review because they get cases that are fully baked when they land at the Commission and developers presentation is like it or not and seeing

something this early in the process so they have an opportunity to influence and provide feedback before considered amount of effort has been put into it is very helpful and is appreciative.

Mr. Hardt said he is familiar with this area of town and is sympathetic to the traffic problems and he does not pretend to know what the answer is, but there have been very valid questions that need to be answered and he looks forward to seeing details on traffic and other things like that when this is brought forward as a developed detailed plan.

Mr. Hardt said the overall building and siting is essentially the same as the area plan was showing but as he looked at it closely there are some items associated with this site that are different than in the Community Plan Area Plan. He agrees with Mr. Taylor about the street and the dead end and specifically there are two other streets like this in the City and that is Shawan Falls and the stub of Rings Road by the new post office and both are similar and extraordinarily awkward. He said Shawan Falls has a cul-de-sac to turn around and a park off to one side much like this site and both are confusing to.

Mr. Hardt said the Community Plan shows a building at the eastern edge of this site oriented north south with the parking toward the west which has the effect of providing some physical structure to screen the parking from the neighborhood and the architecture and the massing be broken up to serve as a bookend to separate the parking from the homes. He said there is an opportunity to do better.

Mr. Hardt said he understands that corporate users have asked for higher parking counts and unfortunately it puts an acute burden on the site to accommodate all that parking and before he can be comfortable he needs to know if they are trying to accommodate a specific identified corporate citizen with a specific need or are they just building this much parking because they think they might need it someday.

Mr. Hardt said he has some heartburn regarding the phase two approach, with a number of sites within the City that have greenspace adjacent to a building where a phase two was intended to be built and for a variety of reasons it never got built and they are left with an unfinished looking site. He said he understands the need to try and accommodate a flexible building footprint and would prefer to a site plan that puts parking up against the phase one building with the stormwater configured in a way that that the parking can easily be peeled out later or something that condenses the footprint on the site recognizing a phase two might be built but not look unfinished in the interim.

Mr. Hardt said two or multi-stories is not necessarily a problem but the overall square footage is the bigger issue and how much development and density is being put on this site and once that is established in many cases building multi-story building can be more attractive and a better option because it stacks occupied space on top of each other and reduces the footprint on the site and provides more greenspace and if done well. He said the overall square footage that they need to be cautious of and how it impacts the traffic and the other issues that have come up.

Mr. Hardt said the architecture of the building in the examples provided are very attractive buildings and brick, stone and glass is a good place to start as far as materials go but he was not prepared to give more feedback other than that the buildings are far larger in scale even higher or taller buildings so whether that fenestration is appropriate for that site he does not know until he sees some specific architecture for this building.

Mr. Hardt said the signage issue given the fact that there is not any buildable land on the south side of Emerald Parkway meets the definition of -I270 frontage, however he would want to see that addressed in a formal way within a PUD. He said it would also be appropriate to have a monument sign on the street side so that vehicles along Emerald Parkway can find the entrance and know where the building is as

opposed to the freeway frontage which the freeway signage which is intended more for corporate identity purposes.

Ms. Salay thanked the residents. She said she started out her civic career about 20 years ago as a resident worried about an office development adjacent to her neighborhood, so she understands what the residents are going through and how much heartburn they have when you think about your home, family, and how much you have invested in your homes and not the finances but with your heart and soul. She said the new tag line is Dublin is Home and they have talked a lot about this site and the good news is that the City of Dublin owns the site so Council has spent a lot of time talking what is appropriate to go on this site. She asked as this goes forward that the history of discussions about interstate-oriented signs be included.

Ms. Salay said she is missing the plan that Dublin has for traffic in this area and would like to see exactly how the roadways connect and traffic counts and what is anticipated in much more detail. She said they could do something creative with the stormwater and make it more of the park like setting.

Ms. Salay said the siting is preferred as indicated in the Community Plan with the buildings pulled up to toward Emerald Parkway. She said if they are going to have one business occupy the entire Phase 1 and Phase 2 then they get one sign if it is a two-story building.

Ms. Salay said she loves a backlit sign and likes the example of Graeter's on Bethel Road where you can see their corporate sign during the day and at night it is really attractively backlit and you can see their name is very visible. Ms. Salay also thought that a monument sign can be appropriate on Emerald Parkway. She said if this is done in a PUD, then they can tailor it to a specific a corporate customer that wants to go here.

Ms. Salay said she does not think a two-story building is the worst thing that can happen to this site, but she thinks it has to be placed in such a way on the site that they are really sensitive to the neighbors, the creek, ravine and the sacred ground to the north. She said the City chose to purchase that land to develop an incredible park.

Ms. Salay said the buildings have to take queues from the plan and use more stone than brick or glass, make this blend in with the park and make it a selling feature of this site.

Ms. Salay said they need to remain sensitive to lighting. She said she has an office building adjacent to her neighborhood with a really heavy screening that was planted way before the office buildings were built and would ask that they start as soon as they have the ability to go out and start planting the screening so the screening gets a head start especially since they have already cut down the trees to build Emerald Parkway and to get into replacement mode soon than later where they can do it and get the screening. She said the park will be closing at dusk and there would be gates thinking they do not want visitors in the park at night.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is very glad to see all the folks here because she grew up with them on MacDuff and really appreciates them coming because this is what makes Dublin the community that it is.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is not excited about the primary entry feature of this being on the east side of the property adjacent to the residential component and would like to see a more centrally located entrance feature that would "T" out and provide access. She said she understands the entrance to the Holder Homestead will not be from Bright Road and will be with this development so they need to think about the ease of which they can move through this space with about 600 cars with busloads of kids because they have spent too much time and energy to come up short on the safety of the transportation.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she does not see two stories as a bad thing and would agree that the overall limitation should be on the square footage particularly from the I-270 vista because it is very difficult to make a roof look very attractive and it is easier to hide roof mechanicals on a two-story building. She said she would like to hold the square footage less than what is contemplated and hold the parking and the intensity of the use down as well.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said that this site essentially has I-270 frontage because there is no buildable land between I-270 and the front of this property with one sign to the scale with the building.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is thankful to the City for bringing this in as an informal review so that they can get layout issues resolved. She said the layout is the more important thing is that they are making sure that they are not obtrusive onto the adjacent neighborhood. She said she agrees that the illustrations that were given in terms of architecture is not representative of what would be seen on this site, but would like to see them hold a different line because of the historic nature and its proximity to the park. She said the nearby Gelpi site is near and dear because Eleanor Gelpi was once Eleanor Amorose and all of this should look like it should come together fully with the use of stone and appropriate materials.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said Cardinal Health dealt with the stormwater on their property with having the creek come through the property with a water feature extending far beyond the detention portion. She said there is a creek bed that is primarily dry but is beautiful and she can see them doing a dry creek bed sort of thing that will mimic Cardinal. She said she is not in favor of the shape of the pond and would like to see it with more frontage to I270 and be more of an amenity than an afterthought.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is concerned with the lighting and there are so many options while being sensitive to the park and residents. She said this is an informal review and the City of Dublin has done the community a great service by bringing this as an informal review and that's why they brought this to get their thoughts and to make sure you were engaged in this entire process so that when it becomes developed, they are all as comfortable as possible.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is concerned with access onto Emerald Parkway and they are going to have to have a left hand turn out of there and her least favorite area of this part of town is Tuttle where there is a "U" turn to travel east on Tuttle to access I-270 and she does not want to create that near this site.

Ms. Husak asked that if any of the residents would like to sign the sign in sheets so that they can be added to the notification lists for future application and reviews.

Mr. McDaniel thanked the audience and apologized for causing any anxiety that this is a plan that pushes the envelope in density by design so that they can get the hard feedback before they go market it and be sensitive to the all the issues

[Ms. Amorose Grooms said this concludes their discussion for this case. She said they will take a short break at 8:22 pm.]

**2. Conditional Use—Corporate Center-Fitness Edge 6250 Corporate Center Drive  
14-030CU Conditional Use**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is a request for a 4,300-square-foot recreational use and a parking alteration for an existing building in the Technology Flex District, located on the north side of Corporate Center Drive 400 feet west of the intersection with Avery Road.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in the applicants and anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this case is on the consent agenda and they will not need a presentation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone from the general public here this evening that would like to speak with respect to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were no conditions in the planning report.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this Conditional Use application by consent. Mr. Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Krumb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Husak introduced Marie Downie and said she has been with Planning for two years and is the new Planner I and they are beyond excited to have her stay with Planning, and helping out and taking on her own projects, she said she wanted to extend a warm welcome.

Mr. Hardt said within the last couple of days he has had the privilege of joining a new employer that may have a business relationship with Ohio University and until he is able to figure out that relationship he will recuse himself from the discussion of the next case.

**3. Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine – Signs 6775 and 6785 Bobcat Way  
14-025WID-DP/SP West Innovation District-Development Plan/Site Plan**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is a request for three wall signs to exceed the permitted size and number per building for existing buildings for a college campus, located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Post and Eiterman Roads.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in the applicants and anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Ms. Husak said this is a request for review and approval of a site plan for requirements within the Innovation Districts that are different in the Zoning Code.

Ms. Husak said the site is about 14 acres located between Post Road to the north and Eiterman Road to the east and the site currently has three buildings and Ohio University is expecting to have students start attending classes in July. She said there are two signs proposed that the Commission is required to take action. She said the buildings have been addressed recently as 6775 and 6785 Bobcat Way where essentially they named the drive coming off Eiterman for the University.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is proposing wall signs for these buildings to identify them to the general public, students, and staff, which are a component to a larger sign master plan that is included but does not fall within the requirements of approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Husak said the site is in the ID-1 District within the Innovation Districts and the applicant is proposing a wall sign that faces north for the 6785 building and two wall signs that face east for the 6775 building. She said the Innovation District has Administrative Review Team review and approvals built in and anything that does not meet the District requirements requires also the approval of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the Innovation District has general sign requirements and allowances.

Ms. Husak said they are looking at a college campus that was not necessarily contemplated when those regulations were written. She said they are working on a Code Amendment as one of the many code amendments they are working for the Innovation Districts that would include college campus as a use and with that lacking they really only have school to go by as a category this would fit into. She said the Innovation District allows the ART to approve sign heights that are taller than 15 feet. She said 6775 Bob Cat Way has been approved for sign heights of 42 feet and 28 feet respectively. She said the 6785 building the ART has approved the sign height to exceed the 15 feet minimum to be placed on the building at 42 feet.

Ms. Husak said the Code has sign allowances for offices, research uses, industrial uses, warehouse uses, and schools. She said that is what they have used for their analysis and signs for schools are limited to 30 square feet. She said the applicants' proposal exceeds that number and that is why they are here asking for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Husak said 6775 Bobcat Way is being proposed to have two signs where Code would require it to one and the sign area for the two signs is 126 square feet and 53 square feet. She said the building is setback far from the parking area that relates to the students that would be going into this building and staff looked at the larger size of the signs being appropriate to give it the visibility that is needed and the copy of the sign reads "Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine" and is rather long name requiring a rather long sign as well. She said the ART has recommended that the Planning and Zoning Commission approve two requests for this building, one allowing two signs and to allow the signs to be at the sizes they are proposed. She said the second sign on this building will read "Ohio Health Medical Education Building One" and the applicant can discuss more of the use and the needs of the two fold identification.

Ms. Husak said the 6785 Bobcat Way building is the only sign visible on this primary navigation route that accesses the campus off Post Road. She said architecturally seeing from the road they have the area on the top of the building that the applicant is proposing to have the sign located at which the ART approved the sign that is not illuminated with channel letters attached to the building at the 126 square feet.

Ms. Husak said the ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission and Planning is as well with two items of the Code the Commission is being asked to take a look at which is the sign size and the number of signs to allow two signs on one of the buildings. She said the applicant and their team is here as well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant to step forward and state their name and address for the record.

Bill Burke, 6775 Bobcat Way, said he is Dean of the Heritage College Dublin and thanked the City of Dublin and the Dublin community for welcoming both the Heritage College and the Ohio University with open arms. He said they have continued to develop a mutually beneficial relationship with individuals

throughout the City Government, Commission, and Boards as well as within the City Schools and Dublin Methodist Hospital.

Mr. Burke said the presence of their medical school campus in Dublin provides a unique opportunity to showcase the relationship between Dublin and Ohio University. He said they recognize that when the Codes and Regulations were developed for this corridor that a medical school probably not in their sight. He said that this maybe the first and only time that the City of Dublin sees a medical school opening within its borders. He said the distance between buildings and Rt. 33 and Post Road make visual identification of these buildings challenging. He said if you drive around I-270 on the northwest side of Columbus and up and down SR33 you see prominent evidence of a significant health care presence from Cardinal Health, Dublin Methodist, to LabCorp and many others. He said the signage package before the Commission this evening recognizes the Heritage College, Ohio University, and their donors demonstrating to those traveling in or around Dublin that this community is home to a nationally recognized medical school.

Mr. Burke thanked the ART for its support for the signage package for the Ohio University's Dublin Campus. He said this package was approved for submission collectively by the University, College and generous benefactors without whose support this campus would not be a reality.

Mr. Burke said to address why two signs on one building, one clearly deals with the fact that this is the university and the colleges building and that they have donors that have put in amounts to have their recognition on these buildings as well. He said on the 6775 building the signs are looking toward SR33 and the one sign on 6785 is facing Post Road. He said they have been through about 20 sign packages as they negotiate back and forth between the university, the college, and the different donors to make sure they were going to come up with something that each one of the individual groups could support.

Mr. Burke said they would appreciate the Commissions support of the ART recommendation to approve this signage package as they look forward to welcoming their first class of medical students in just a little over two months. He thanked the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone in the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Kramb said she is comfortable with the first request for the 6775 building sign due to the fact that it is being seen from far away and being a big building it is proportional. She said she is not okay with two signs, she said it is a very large sign and they should get what they need to say done in that one large sign, whichever is most important. She said she has a yes vote for size, but a no vote for two signs. She said she is okay with the size of the other sign for the second building.

Ms. Newell said Ohio University should show their pride in the name of their school and is really happy they are coming to the City of Dublin and is excited to see students on that campus. She said she is okay with increasing the size of the square footage of the signage especially given the amount of space there is around the campus and they need to be able to read the signs from some distance and proportionally they need to be bigger. She said proportionally they work okay on the building.

Ms. Newell said the two signs on 6775 Bobcat Way are competing with each other because they are in such close proximity and it was awkward in the placement of the name because the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine is so large and expanding across such a large portion of the building and then the Ohio Health Medical Education building sign is just below that and she felt they were competing with each other. She said she could be supportive of two signs but it would be nice if the Ohio Health Medical Education sign was maybe down with the pedestrian level with the building.

Ms. Newell said she thought their goal was to identify the donor name of the building and generally is how the students will identify that building. She said she has not known many university campuses that will refer to a building as the 6775 Bobcat Way building but by the name. She said she would be more comfortable with a ground sound or a sign that was located on the entry feature and has no problem with the sign on the other building.

Mr. Taylor thanked Dean Burke for his comments and welcomed him to Dublin. He said he does not like his signs and does not like the height, size, the number or all the text. He said he has been struggling with this and the two things that jump at him are comments in the Planning Report and the ART minutes. He said there is something to be said about a practical model for this college campus where the signs need to be visible from a significant distance for vehicles to effectively serve as way finding and Planning recognizes the unique needs for identification as applicable for a college campus, he asked what are the unique needs for a college campus that are not the same for MAG campus or the Crown building campus or Perimeter Center or anywhere else.

Mr. Taylor said they are talking about a three building campus and when this is all done it will be a five building campus and unlike somebody who has to find a car dealership and may go there once in their lifetime, once a student has come to the campus once and found their building they will all know where it is for the whole time they will be there. He said regardless of the desire of the University to recognize their donors and to broadcast to the world that you are in Dublin, he does not think that signs that exceed the Code in size so significantly are appropriate. He said he would rather see more specifically some kind of signage that identifies the campus itself with a monument sign. He said finding this is not going to be that difficult, they are talking about medical students that have smart phones and mapping software and they are going to find it, it is at the southwest corner of Post Road and SR33 and when you get there they will find their building.

Mr. Taylor said they had spent a lot of time and effort over the years especially the 6½ years he has been a part of this Commission, trying to protect the 33 corridor from signage like this and they have had some extraordinary detailed discussions with some of the other folks along this road about their signs. He said the sign at the BMW was proposed to be a little bit higher than the Code allowed and they brought that down. He said they had discussion with the Audi Dealership on whether the space inside the circles of their logo counted as sign area, so they are very sensitive to that. He said they had similar discussions with the Crown campus and KIA who wanted to have a sign in a high contrast and it was rejected. He said he has no doubt that if KIA thought they could get a 42 foot sign in front of their building it would be on its way up tomorrow. He said he doesn't see the justification for the need here and it does not fit in the overall context that they have tried very hard to establish along SR33.

Ms. Salay introduced herself to Dean Burke as the Council Representative to the Planning and Zoning Commission and said she is excited to have their campus here and have Ohio University in Dublin. She said her son is a freshman Bobcat and has had an extraordinary experience at OU so she loves OU for more than one reason.

Ms. Salay said she understands why they need the signs and is okay. She said she would like to see the Ohio Health Medical Education building somehow called in a way that is a little different or special, because it is all jumbled together and she heard them say they want Ohio Health to be recognized for their partnership. She said they will have more donors and they will have to figure out ways to recognize those folks on this campus.

Ms. Salay said she knows OU from her time in Athens and she thinks about all the landmarks on the campus and how you can be there and you know you are in Bobcat country. She said this site needs

something for wayfinding, not so much signage, but something iconic that allows people to know that they are in this special place and on this medical campus that belongs to Ohio University that also belongs to Dublin so that they are not relying on the signs to do all the work. She said for tonight's purposes, when she sat on BZA they gave a Hotel a really extraordinarily high and large sign and she did not like it at all because it was a hotel and she felt awful and is not proud of that vote. She said this because it is Ohio University and because of what it means to the community she could support this because she can differentiate because this is not a car dealership, this is something so much more special and different and differentiated from other businesses that it deserves special treatment.

Ms. Salay said as a matter of practice she is not sure how she feels the ART ability to approve larger signs, but they do and in this case she is okay with it for now because they need to get this campus up and running and she is supportive of this sign package but would like to think to the future about how they might navigate when the five buildings and the other companion things that will be out on the campus and realizing the vision years from now what do they want this campus to be like. She said she learned from a colleague that a sign is not a bad sign because it is big or small or have color, it is all about the context on the building and the site.

Ms. Amorose Groomes welcomed OU to the City and said it is very exciting to have them as it is exciting to have anyone come into the City. She was excited to have the folks that just moved into a bigger space that was going to do the physical fitness and they would welcome them in the same way because they welcome all business into the City of Dublin. She said at the end of the day they are in the business of educating people and she is a big fan of the Ohio University because her sister went there and spent many little sib weekends there and it was delightful place to be.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is not in favor of these signs because it would be very difficult to tell the balance of our corporate citizens that we are not as excited about them as we are about Ohio University. She said that is not a statement that she is willing to make to anybody in the City. She said they held Ashland Chemical to a ground sign and IGS to three letters. She said they hold people to high standards and this is a community of high standards. She said the fact that they are an educational institution they value that greatly and she believes they should be held at the same standard as everyone else in the Community. She said there are none that are better and there are none that are worse. She said she is not in favor of these signs, height, content, or the multiplication of them.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she took her kids down to the Ohio State University Saturday and they saw all the little posts in front of all their buildings of great donors that have come to give and they all have 4x4 steel posts and there is a 5x3 plaque on them with the name of the hall and address. She said she appreciates the fact that you need recognize your donors, but do not want to do it at the expense of compromising the commissions' integrity for the next people that walk through the door. She said there have been great people that have made great contributions to all of our businesses within our community and it might be attractive to them to be recognized those on the exterior of their building and they would not be supportive of that. She said she is excited in OU coming and she believes in level playing fields and treating everyone fair and this is an unfair treatment to the balance of our community.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said when they talk about properties that are adjacent to major highways in terms of signage and special guidelines, this site does not have frontage because there is a buildable parcel that separates this site from SR33. She said no one will ever see this sign from SR33 because it is white letters on glass or brick and is very difficult to read even in the renderings. She said one day there will be a building between SR33 and the cluster of five buildings and that does not constitute highway frontage for O.U. in her opinion. She said she hopes they hear that there is no disrespect and she is very happy to have them in the City. She said for her it is a matter of principles and standards.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they are to the vote and asked if this would be one vote or two.

Ms. Husak said it could be separated to a vote for the size and a vote for the number of signs.

Mr. Taylor said he would love to see complete campus sign package.

Ms. Husak said they have that in their packet.

Ms. Kramb said they have that but they are not allowed to vote on the height or signage square footage.

Mr. Taylor said what he is referring to is the complete changes from their discussions.

Ms. Kramb said she thought it would be best for the applicant to come back with a smaller more appropriate sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if they would like them to vote on the application or table the application and give them the opportunity to respond to some of the things they have heard and come back with something they are comfortable with as well.

Mr. Burke indicated that he would like to request a tabling of this case.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Taylor move to table this Site Plan application at the request of the applicant. Ms. Salay seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant and said she knows staff will work diligently to be of help so that they can come back with something that will feel more palatable to the Commission.

#### **Communications**

Ms. Amorose Groomes welcomed Ms. Salay to the Commission and said she is thrilled to have a City Council person with the Commission and thought it will be a tremendous help to the Commission with communication and understanding.

Ms. Husak reminded the Commission that City Council has a work session scheduled for May 12<sup>th</sup> with the intent to have work session on off Monday's of which the Planning Commission is invited to the public meetings.

Ms. Kramb said it would be helpful to get an invitation prior to the day of the meeting.

Ms. Husak said Crawford Hoying will be presenting an update on their proposals for the sites they have and it is timely because of the agenda for the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 15<sup>th</sup>, the City has two applications related to the east side of Riverside Drive one is the proposed Code Amendment to create the Riverside Neighborhood District in which the Bridge Street Code will be similar if not the same as the neighborhood district that is in place for Sawmill Center and Indian Run Neighborhood Districts and accompanying that is an area rezoning for 20 parcels into that district.

Ms. Husak said these are parcels that Crawford Hoying has in control which was not the case back when the Bridge Street District was created or the intent would have been to create this neighborhood district

at that time but there were a lot different land owners involved at the time and wasn't consolidated ownership like there was in the Sawmill area and the Indian Run area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone has just talked to them about coming in as a PUD it would be so much easier. Ms. Kramb agreed.

Ms. Husak said it is the same approach as what is in place for Sawmill and Indian Run as a Neighborhood District, a capital 'P' Place that will have significance within the district and both neighborhood standards are being mirrored for this area.

Mr. Langworthy said if they knew then what they know now they would have created that neighborhood at the time, but they did not have a consolidated property ownership. And with a master developer for this site since they are coming in with a plan for the whole neighborhood at one time, it did make sense to create a neighborhood district.

Ms. Kramb asked if they are writing a Code Section to match what they are bringing in and questioned why they are spending all this time to change the Code.

Mr. Langworthy asked that the Commission wait until they get to the case to more fully discuss the details.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they are talking about process.

Mr. Hardt said some of the things that Crawford Hoying wants to do are not addressed in Bridge Street.

Ms. Kramb asked if they are going to make a Code for what the developer wants them to do.

Mr. Langworthy said it is the same thing they have done for neighborhoods such as the Sawmill Center which was based on what they knew at the time for the Stavroffs master plan, OCLC and their master was the Indian Run Neighborhood and the area plan for the Historic District, so this follows that same logic.

Ms. Salay said they can look at this as an opportunity to perfect what they have and if there are things that they have disliked about what they did, they can improve upon that, and if Crawford Hoying goes forward then it's fine, but if not they have standards they are happier with.

Ms. Husak said Monday May 12<sup>th</sup> is the work session at Council which might shed some light on these questions. She said the notifications for the work sessions come from the Clerk's office. She wanted to remind them that there are work sessions scheduled for Council's off Monday meetings and she will try to keep track of the topics and let the Commission know.

Ms. Kramb said she would like the agenda sent to them so they can know the topics.

Ms. Salay apologized for the lack of notification and said they are always thinking of the Commission and want them to come to the work sessions, but they were not included until she asked about it and they need to fix the notifications.

Mr. Hardt asked why the work sessions were not televised.

Ms. Salay said she thought it was an expense issue, but they have not been doing work sessions and realized at their goal setting that they have a lot of work to do and decided to use the off Mondays.

Ms. Kramb asked that maybe the audio be available.

Ms. Salay said the Clerk's office could provide the audios.

Ms. Newell said the presentation that was made to City Council with regards to the traffic in Bridge Street was how a roundabout would function and that was the one question that the Commission has been asking of staff. She asked for the presentation and noted that she was not expecting an apology from City Council for the Commission not being invited until the last minute. But there was a presentation specifically about the traffic issues that they have all been asking about, including how bike paths were going to be incorporated and there was an obvious decision made about bike lanes and it has never been presented to the Commission. She said they had a promise that they would get to see all of this and that was what she was taken back about and was really glad that she went to the City Council meeting because she got to learn something that they have asked for that they have not seen.

### **Roundtable**

Mr. Taylor said he would like express his displeasure in the strongest terms about the ART decision to administratively approve the sign height for Ohio University. He said that is an abuse of the Administrative rules on that.

Ms. Husak said it is in the Code.

Mr. Taylor said he understands that they can do it, but the purpose of that is if on that existing building they had the first available sign panel was 18 or 20 feet above the ground that would be an appropriate use for administrative approval. He thinks that 3 times the allowed height is not an appropriate use for administrative approval. He said he did not want to bring that up with OU in the room because he did not want to embarrass them on that issue, but he thinks that when they brought the rest of that to the Commission, of that being so beyond the Code, that is an appropriate issue to be discussed here and it goes way beyond what should be done.

Ms. Husak said they followed the Code because there are certain things that the Code says ART can approve even if it does not meet Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she does not think Mr. Taylor is saying they did something that they were not allowed to do, she thought he is saying is the intent of what is charged to ART is to look at sign heights supposed to be 15 feet and the first available panel that already exists is 18 feet and for the ART to say they understand there is nowhere else to put that sign at 14 feet the only available space on this building as it exists is 18 feet and certainly in terms of their intent she agrees they did not do anything wrong.

Mr. Taylor said it is the convenience of the applicant obviously that makes sense to do that instead of putting them through this process, but in that case it is so far beyond that.

Ms. Salay said they are saying the Code is a reach.

Ms. Kramb said they called it an escape clause, or something where the ART was allowed to send it to Planning and Zoning if it was appropriate.

Mr. Langworthy said the dilemma was they came in with the larger sizes that the ART did not have control over and if the idea was that they have those larger sizes where would they appropriately be located on the building, so at that large size the height was appropriate to the building which is the

standard that the ART looks at. He said if it came to the Commission and they said it has to be 30 square feet, then having them up at that height would be non-functional, so the idea was after that they would probably bring them down if the larger size was not approved. He said the idea was since it is a split decision between the size and height they thought if the size was approved it was appropriate at that height, if the size was not approved it would have to be appropriate at a different height.

Mr. Amorose Groomes said she thinks it is difficult to say to one organization over another that you are more important or you are different. She said if they went to Stanley Steemer and said there was far more value to OU than there is to you that would not be a message that she is willing to send to the corporate citizens of all sorts and at the end of the day OU is a corporate citizen of this community and she believes they need to be very careful in the way they treat their corporate citizens.

Mr. Taylor said he wants them to have the ability to have administrative decisions as it is extremely important in the overall scheme of things because it is a great thing to determine whether a sign is 10 percent larger on a building or a few more or less parking spaces, the Commission does not want that stuff in front of them, but when it goes 3 times the allowable base line that is beyond the point it should be allowed to be in the discretion of administrative approval.

Mr. Hardt said he had trouble with that aspect. He said there are lots of places in the Code that authority is given to the Planning Director or the ART to make decisions or tweaks with number of parking spaces can be adjusted or square footage adjusted in a minor way. He said it has been his understanding that those provisions are there so that when an applicant is in a bind and they need to get over the hump as they develop their project and that is the only issue they can get relief at City Hall and move forward. He said it has never been his understanding that the intent of those provisions was to take a case and split into two decisions, which is what happened tonight. He said the way he read the planning report is that half the decision was being made in one setting and the other in another setting and he does not think that is the intention of any of those provisions of the Code. He said his concern is sending an applicant to two different locations to get related decisions made.

Mr. Taylor said in this case it gave Ohio University the impression that they were at least halfway there and they are not.

Mr. McDaniel said the ART process as it related to the West Innovation District was really about staff being able to approve certain things and not bog down their agendas with the simple stuff, but there is a point of which an applicant will say to staff they want to try it and take it forward and the whole idea is they can approve things up to a point but then the applicant wants something else, he cannot sit there and tell them they cannot take it anywhere. He said he is addressing one part of the discussion, but the size piece and that it was a huge request. He said the with the kick up provisions they want to build on the trust between ART and the Commission that if something is starting to be out of our purview and they feel the applicant wants to take it, it should come to the Commission for a decision. He said that the fact that this is a campus is why we continually push them for a master plan. He said just because they do something in one area is not precedent setting in another and this campus situation is something that they would prefer a comprehensive plan with a master sign package. He said he knows it is tough to make those kinds of decisions in those kinds of vacuum and apologized but that is not something he controls. He said they are continually pushing the master planning.

Mr. Taylor said they have had discussions about precedent and know they are not bound by previous things but they have to deal with here. He said if both the height and the size had been on the table tonight they could have negotiated a solution this evening, but because they could not, it was off the table.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the difficulty is that it comes to them as approved height with a positive recommendation from staff to the Commission so that leads them to believe that is what the staff thinks is a really good idea.

Ms. Salay said they have identified a problem, and would it have been better to kick the whole thing to the Commission.

Mr. Langworthy said the kick up provision has to do with the entire development plan, this is one paragraph or phrase of the Code that is separate from anything else that allows an administrative process with the ART.

Mr. Hardt said the ART could have opted not to make that determination and it could have been settled at the Commission.

Ms. Newell said she thinks it should have been brought in as a complete package just like Ohio Health where there were unique issues that exist with this being a campus and wayfinding is real important to university settings and it is not just students, it is parents and businesses that go to the University. She said even if there are a few buildings it is hard for people to find their way when they are pressed for time. She said it would have been more appropriate brought in as a whole package.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the good news is that every day is a school day and the charge before them is that always in everything they do inside this room and outside this room is to be better tomorrow than we were yesterday and she trusts they will get there.

Ms. Amorose Grooms adjourned the meeting at 9:31 p.m.

As approved by Planning and Zoning Commission on June 19, 2014.