



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.Dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 11, 2014

AGENDA

1. **Building Materials – Bridge Street District** **Presentation**
2. **Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District**
13-095ADMC **Zoning Code Amendment (Discussion)**

The Chair, Chris Amorose Groomes, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Victoria Newell, John Hardt, Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Amy Salay, and Todd Zimmerman. City representatives present were Gary Gunderman, Yazan Ashrawi, Rachel Ray, Jennifer Rauch, and Jeff Tyler.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair, Ms. Amorose Groomes, said no formal cases would be heard this evening. She explained there are two items on the agenda: 1) presentation with regards to building materials; and 2) review of the Zoning Code.

1. **Building Materials – Bridge Street District** **Presentation**

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced the presentation and facilitated discussion regarding fiber cement siding as a primary building material for Bridge Street District buildings.

Rachel Ray provided a brief introduction. She said at the August 25th City Council meeting, as Planning forwarded the Bridge Street District Scioto Neighborhood District for Code Amendments and Area Rezoning, Council discussed the use of fiber cement siding materials and requested additional information regarding whether it should be used as a permitted primary or secondary building material. She said Mark Ford, with Ford and Associates Architects will provide a presentation on the different types of fiber cement siding, as well as the different installation techniques, for the Commission to discuss. She indicated she included in the Commission's packets, the revised Code as it has been approved by City Council for the building materials and building type tables. Ms. Ray asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Hardt asked for clarification on the Code change made by City Council regarding the use of fiber cement siding as a primary to a secondary material. He asked if that pertained just to that newly created District or was it global. Ms. Ray said the Code Section applies to the entire Bridge Street District.

Mark Ford, Ford and Associates Architects, said he wanted to provide a neutral view on the variety of uses, different applications for it, informing the Commission on what he has learned and seen regarding

fiber cement siding. He said in the field, he has been involved with these types of materials for his projects and also as a reviewing architect for other projects. He said there is an overarching description for fiber cement wall panels but there are a lot of different types and manufacturers.

Mr. Ford began with residential style lap siding that comes in two varieties: the prefinished and the field finished. He said the prefinished versions are becoming more prevalent in the marketplace. He said the wall panel systems are becoming more popular primarily in multi-family commercial projects. He explained there are two types of wall panels: concealed fasteners and exposed fasteners.

Mr. Ford's first slide showed the lap siding, typical in a residential setting. He pointed out the variety of patterns and colors in the color-fast product that are factory applied in the body of the cement matrix. He said four or five manufacturers online provide a 15-year warranty on the material itself against rot, cracking, and chipping, etc. He said the advantage of this product over wood is they are dimensionally stable, rot resistant, and they will hold color for 15 years.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the material was paintable. Mr. Ford confirmed the material is paintable but the cement fiber material does fade. He said it can be purchased as a primed board to be field-painted but he is seeing more of the prefinished material. He explained the corner boards would come in the same prefinished material. He said trim sizes can be ordered like lumber.

Mr. Ford showed illustrations of different building types with a variety of textures. He pointed out the lap siding made to look like wood shakes. He explained it is nailed on with a galvanized nail.

Amy Salay asked if the fiber cement is available for railings. Mr. Ford said he has not seen it in 2-inch by 2-inch or 2-inch by 4-inch sizes. He said he has seen it as 1-inch by 4-inch or 1-inch by 6-inch sizes.

Mr. Ford showed a residence with lap siding and the corner boards, which showed the product used in a variety of building scale and types. He pointed out an apartment building done in brick and lap siding of different colors. He said the cement fiber material will take the abuse of weather.

Mr. Hardt asked if the shake would come both in its authentic shape and in panels to which Mr. Ford confirmed.

Mr. Ford said the panel lengths can change. He said the danger is getting a repetitive seam or pattern, which is not normal with the shake style.

Mr. Ford showed an illustration of board and battens and confirmed the product comes in a variety of shapes, sizes, and textures. He showed a large multiple-family building where the product width was varied with mixed-in overlay. He pointed out a contemporary library building and others where a combination of lap siding and other materials were used.

Mr. Ford explained that wall panels are the bigger flat sheets and come in a variety of widths and colors. He showed an illustration of exposed fasteners and zoomed in to show the specific pattern whereas the fastener is the size of a button.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was an advantage to seeing the fasteners and if it was an architectural feature.

Mr. Ford said it could be an architectural feature. He said the fasteners are very visible, even at street level. He said there is a considerable cost difference between exposed and concealed fasteners. He said the joints are a critical element. He said the quality of appearance with fasteners and joints is in the execution of the product.

Mr. Ford said large panels are considered rain screen products as a veneer on the face of a building but not used as the final barrier and he showed some examples on the slides.

Mr. Ford said concealed fasteners provide a cleaner look as far as pattern and color and shared several photos with prefinished corner trim. He noted the use of panels with different corners on several buildings. He explained colors can be matched to the PMS colors and the prefinished corner seaming is very tight so no sealant is required, meaning no caulk joints. He showed an illustration of an aluminum corner and how it snaps into the track.

Mr. Ford said the wall panels are used primarily on commercial projects but can be used in residential buildings of a larger scale.

Mr. Ford discussed a few projects where he acted as the owner's representative and not the architect. He said the project used cement fiber to look like cedar shake and was pretty successful as it was stained to look like wood but the surface can chip, requiring touch up. He reiterated the importance of proper installation for a quality look. He said if the installer tries to muscle in the product it will chip or break, which is one of the negatives if the installer is not familiar with the product. He said that is the same way with any product if it is improperly installed, using brick as an example. He said it comes down to quality control and specifying it correctly. He suggested that as a reviewing board the Commission needs to ask the right questions: 1) how do you deal with the edge boards; 2) how do you deal with the edge trims; and 3) is the color applied in the factory or in the field, etc.

Mr. Ford brought samples of material from a recent job site, explaining it was a bigger piece of panel to be used in a breezeway as it is quite durable and then he showed the sample in a picture where it was used.

Richard Taylor referred to Mr. Ford's comments about chipping and the quality of the install and he said those were related in the experience he has had. He said the complaint he hears about the prefinished product is it gets nailed up and then you have to patch all the nail holes. He said he had a number of contractors state they would prefer to put up the unfinished product and field-paint because they have been unsuccessful getting the patch color to match exactly.

Mr. Ford said there is a kit for patching from the manufacturer but it was not 'spot on'. He agrees with the contractors, and recommends field painting to get consistency of color overall but then there are maintenance issues, repainting in seven to nine years.

Mr. Ford cited James Hardie where the product has been commonly referred to as HardiePlank. He said this manufacturer will warrant the color for 15 years, the product itself for 50 years, and have a series of different finishes and patterns from which to choose. He said Nichiha, the other manufacturer was used on a project for the larger panels and HardiePlank was used for the trim. Again, he said the issue is maintenance, having to repaint it over time.

Mr. Taylor asked about the product being thin and painting the ends.

Mr. Ford said when the prefinished material is cut and if the blade is dull the material gets 'burrs' like wood and would cause a slight discoloration on the ends.

Todd Zimmerman inquired about the types of nails used and if they caused a dimple effect that would need to be filled in. Mr. Ford said you would have to whack the material pretty hard to create dimples.

Mr. Ford said his biggest negative about this product is the cutting. He said he did not know if it was because the installer was not using a sharp enough blade or if by the end of the day the blade was becoming dull and tearing the board.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the manufacturer had blade recommendations. Mr. Ford answered they did and downloaded some of the different specifications from the two manufacturers mentioned above on how they install it.

Amy Kramb asked for the biggest reason for using cement fiber instead of wood.

Mr. Ford said it is not cheaper. Ms. Kramb said it was three times the cost than wood cedar.

Mr. Ford said he liked the versatility of the product in terms of color and pattern for a commercial building. He said a wall panel from Nichiha is going to range (depending on the style) \$16 - \$20 a square foot installed and a brick wall is \$18 a square foot (depending on the quality of the brick and how much is being used). He said the durability, the maintenance free nature of it, dimensional stability, it does not rot, are all attractive qualities.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked about the interaction of the product with people at corners and near sidewalks where people might bump into it. Mr. Ford said the product is pretty durable but it depends on the quality of the finish if it is going to chip or not. He believes the bigger issue is chipping during installation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if fiber cement had a fire rating. Mr. Ford answered it is fire resistant and helps with sound dampening because of the density of the product. He said it is sustainable and can be a regional product, not using natural resources, and cement is plentiful.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for the negative points. Mr. Ford responded it was the application. He said like anything, you can have beautiful brick but if it is not installed correctly, it is a bad brick job. He said it comes down to having a quality person install the product, who understands the product and will take the care when there is a problem to address.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Mr. Ford how the installation is monitored and if he knew of any 'bodies' or 'entities' that monitor the quality of installation. Mr. Ford said it is self-monitored by the architects and the owners and up to the project team.

Mr. Ford said he sees this product being used all over and cited Baltimore, MD and Washington, DC. He said sometimes it is used for 80 percent of the buildings or in other cases for 50 percent in combination with other products. He said the long-term economics and the versatility of the product must attribute to the choice to use it because it is more expensive.

Mr. Taylor said this is a nice material to have in our palette to use for Bridge Street District. He said the quality of the building does not come down to the amount of this product being used on a project. He indicated he was impressed with some of the corner treatments, which is important in an urban setting.

Mr. Hardt reported he has one of these products on the home that he owns. He reiterated the quality of the installation issue and was fortunate to get an installer who knew more about the product than he did and managed to tuck all the cut ends under the trim so there is not a cut edge visible, anywhere. He reported it made for an outstanding installation and could not be happier with it.

Mr. Hardt was asked how you ensure that quality. He said on a large scale commercial project, the architects and the owner representatives are the 'police' but the way that is often done is by having all the contractors participate putting a mockup of the panel together. He said usually it is a 4-foot by 8-foot wall section, where all the products being used on the project are applied to one place and the whole project team reviews it, comes to an agreement that this is standard, and that becomes the model. He said that is just one element that happens in the development world. He questions if there is a scenario whereas the City has the opportunity to review such a 'model' before it goes up on an entire building. He

said he has seen some rare instances where communities, for a certain element of construction, will require it be completed by an approved list of contractors. He said this is common in the engineering world for water lines, etc. that are of public interest but has seen it in other areas too, such as landscaping but it is not as common.

Mr. Ford said he has been asked to review on a project in New Albany for a highly detailed brick for a building and they did a mock-up panel to establish the aesthetic and identify who is responsible for what part of the installation. He said they also used this panel as a barometer to measure quality but the problem is who becomes the judge of what is acceptable or not. He said he thinks the responsibility should fall to the architect.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was highly unimpressed with the product and how it appeared on a new project they toured that was brand new.

Mr. Ford indicated multiple-family projects can be tricky and suggested a way to monitor the various installers of the products. He said setting the expectation from the beginning is key.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not speaking to the architectural nature but more of the application of materials. She asked if a mock-up could be required or if there is a process the Commission can begin developing regarding this review process. Amy Salay asked if there could be steps during the inspection processes where installation could be reviewed.

Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director, said this was a zoning issue more than a building issue as far as enforcement is concerned. He referred to 108.2.10 of the Building Code that allows for other inspections to be done. He said there is a list of standard inspections that all building departments are required to complete and siding is not one of them. He said in addition to inspections specified in the Code, the building official is authorized to require other inspections to be made to ascertain compliance with the provisions of this Code. He reiterated it is in the Code and he does have the authority to require inspections of siding/brick, etc. but his issue would be to require that to be a special inspection rather than by a building inspector. He indicated he could require an inspection, if necessary.

Mr. Hardt said playing the devil's advocate, if he was the sophisticated, out-of-town architect, who came to discuss this with you, would argue that you are reading from the Building Code, which is concerned with life safety, and water tightness, and all the things that pertain to the performance of the building, not the aesthetics.

Mr. Tyler replied, only to a certain extent. He said the fiber cement siding as stated in the Building Code, states the industry standard but also the manufacturer's installation instructions, which he does receive.

Ms. Salay said attention to detail is what they are all concerned with when looking at construction. She said she would like to consider how we get at this in terms of the quality of the installation and finish because it makes a difference when speaking to quality of this product, or any product for that matter. She indicated Mr. Ford showed the Commission a picture of a bad brick job. She is concerned with the amount of activity that will be happening when the construction on the east side of the river starts. She told Mr. Tyler she is very interested in his ideas and asked how building and zoning are 'married'.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Commission really has the authority to do this, having a short list of architects to pick from that are going to act as the owner's representative or the City's representative.

Ms. Salay asked if the Commission hires an individual who could handle the review process.

Mr. Tyler said the discussion has to take place because if he were to do this, it would start a precedent. He explained Building Standards does not normally do exterior (siding) types of inspections. He said they

are not intended to be the quality police. He said if the conclusion was the Building Code does allow him the authority to do special inspections, at that point, he would have to follow the strict language of the Special Inspections Section of the Code, which means the owner has to hire the design professionals to perform those inspections on that half of the building. He said it would not be the City hiring those individuals.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there could be a list of approved inspectors. She said when she had her backflow inspection by the City of Columbus she was given a list and told she could pick anyone on that list to inspect her backflow. Mr. Tyler stated that was different, because it was by City Ordinance.

Mr. Taylor said the backflow was a 'black and white' issue and the inspector is not asked to judge the color or the finish of the backflow. He indicated this was a slippery slope for him when the Commission steps into the role of the architect or the builder. He said the power they have is with the process and the different zoning reviews that occur with a given project that is approved to move forward. He said the more the Commission knows about these materials, the installation, and potential problems, the more they can anticipate when they see a preliminary sketch, to know that the corners are going to be an issue, and they can see at the end in the final development drawings, how the details work. He said as long as the contractor is competent, then we will get a good product, or at least acceptable.

Victoria Newell said with special inspections, an inspection agency would be hired to ensure the product is installed per the manufacturer specifications and will do nothing associated with aesthetics. She said for every product out there you can find something good to say about it and you can find something negative.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there is an aesthetic issue with the wall panel on a large commercial style building versus using a small panel on a residence. He said it seems the commercial panels are installed easier and look cleaner. Mr. Hardt agreed it was a totally different product but the installation quality issues are the same. Mr. Zimmerman thought there would be more issues with a 10-inch board than the large rain screen panels.

Ms. Kramb said there are installation issues with the wood plank. Mr. Zimmerman said it was no different than with aluminum and vinyl siding.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated the Commission knows the challenge and Planning in conjunction with Building Standards can help look for ways to resolve the challenge with the help of Mr. Ford.

Mr. Ford cited an example where holes were found in the siding and he asked that it be repaired. He said the holes were filled with the kit but was still unacceptable to him. He said a debate ensued because the installer said he patched it to the manufacturer's instructions. He asked if he then has the authority to make the installer take it off when he followed the manufacturer's instructions, but it just was not installed well. He said the Commission, when evaluating the materials, now have a basis of questions to ask. He said the critical questions about the install need to be asked by this Commission and asked if the Commission could make stipulations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone from the general public that would like to comment with respect to the issue discussed thus far. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Salay referred to Mr. Ford's comment that this product is not inexpensive and comparable to brick. She asked why someone would choose to use this and would the reason be for more architectural interest.

Mr. Ford answered architecturally. He said opposed to brick, this can clip to the face of the building and not require additional foundation to support the weight, which is a savings for overall construction. He

said the look could not be achieved with brick. Ms. Salay said they received a lot of push back when they determined the limitation of use of this product to 20 percent.

Mr. Hardt said Mr. Ford's point is amplified exponentially on taller buildings when there are large openings to span over, which becomes a significant structural problem.

Mr. Ford agreed and said there are weather protection needs during installation of brick, but fiber cement products can be installed any time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said two manufacturers were mentioned by Mr. Ford and asked if there were "knockoffs" to be concerned with. Mr. Ford said it comes down to ASTM standards that are listed in the Code and as long as they meet those standards, it would be hard to deny them.

Ms. Salay said when she looks at downtown Columbus, the Short North, and all the new construction of all brick and stone, it is at that level of quality that she wants for Dublin and not sure this fiber cement product meets those expectations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Ford for his time and asked that he leave the samples for Council's review.

**2. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District
13-095ADMC Zoning Code Amendment (Discussion)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced the review and discussion of a future recommendation to City Council regarding proposed the Zoning Code Amendments to the Bridge Street District Zoning Code focusing on Code Sections 153.062 through 153.066.

Rachel Ray said the first half of the Code was reviewed in July 2014. She reported she is working on the final drafts and will be back in a few weeks with those. She said Planning has also completed their preliminary review and identification issues of the second half of the Code. She said the building type tables through the review and approval standards are before the Commission this evening. She explained Planning has provided the red line version of the Code as well as identified a few comments for Commission's consideration.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested the Commission review the Code page by page.

Ms. Ray confirmed they would begin their discussion with **Section 153.062 (O) – Table Requirements.**

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated the first Staff comment on this Section **153.062(O)(1) Building types – Single-Family Detached** was noted on page 2 of 33.

Ms. Ray asked the Commission to take another look at the upper story transparency. Mr. Hardt asked if applicants have brought this up. Ms. Ray replied a couple of applicants in the Historic District have with regard to how the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* apply when considering the appropriateness based on architectural style.

153.062(O)(2)(2) – Single-Family Attached

Mr. Hardt asked to be educated on the intent of the change for landscaped courtyards. Ms. Ray said Planning wanted to encourage this as an opportunity to meet one of the required open spaces and make it useable space if the developer is allowed to count the area as a pocket park or pocket plaza.

Mr. Hardt said this has been discussed in review of applications and can imagine some scenarios where he would support it and not support it. He said one of his concerns is a "courtyard" in an apartment

building or condominium building where a wrought-iron fence or gates are located around the area or fully encloses the area with the building, making it no longer a public space. He said he has seen a couple of cases where that argument was attempted. He said he is not opposed to allowing a space when it is nestled into a project to count toward open space but it has to be public space.

Ms. Ray said by requiring it to be an open space then they could not put a fence around it and call it public to meet their required open space criteria.

Mr. Hardt suggested changing the language to "Do not allow to be fenced off or privatized."

153.062(O)(2)(3) – Single Family Attached

Mr. Taylor questioned the intent of the word "adjacent" and asked if that was both horizontally and vertically. Ms. Ray said the intent was horizontally but she would review the implication for vertically as well. She clarified the intent is to avoid having a long span of attached units.

153.062(O)(4) – Loft Building

Mr. Hardt asked what problem was trying to be solved within the Principal Entrance Location portion of the Loft Building table. Ms. Ray said Planning wanted to clarify that requirement would not apply to individual entrances as opposed to an apartment building with doorways to the sidewalk outside, or if the door is inside with no direct access outside.

Ms. Salay referred to the Mid-Building Pedestrianway requirement and asked how many units fit within 250 feet, such as a townhouse. Mr. Hardt responded 10 – 15 units.

Ms. Salay said only a maximum of 8 units are allowed. Ms. Ray clarified this requirement is for townhomes across the street from a single-family detached. She said Planning was concerned with the relationship between the uses and a single-family attached building becoming too massive. Ms. Ray said this did not previously require a mid-building pedestrianway and Planning thought it was appropriate.

153.062(O)(7)(d) – Commercial Center Building

Mr. Taylor referenced the blank wall limitations in the table and asked whether the Code previously stated there were some instances where a blank wall was allowed and the proposed Code states there are no instances where blank walls are allowed. Ms. Ray answered that was correct.

Mr. Hardt said presumably an applicant could request a Waiver to the requirement. Ms. Ray agreed.

Mr. Hardt added in a perfect world the entire Code is intended to generate street fronts where two facades would not be seen. He said the required penetrations and windows in all those cases could be creating Code problems in the future. Ms. Salay agreed.

Ms. Ray said the blank wall limitations do not require the detail to be a window or an opening. She said the intent is to provide more interest to the building.

153.062(O)(12)(a) – Podium Apartment Building

Mr. Taylor noted the incorrect Code reference at the very bottom of the table under **Parking Location & Loading** of §153.02 when it should state §153.062.

153.062(O)(12)(d)

Mr. Hardt noted a typo on the **Transparency** section of the table stating it should read "all other portions of the building."

153.063 – Neighborhood Standards

Ms. Ray reiterated the newly approved Scioto River Neighborhood District is treated as approved text and not shown as track changes.

Mr. Hardt inquired about the Bridge Street District (BSD) abbreviation used in some areas of the document and spelled out in others. Ms. Ray said in the second paragraph on page 1 of 16, Planning was clarifying to anchor BSD and not BSC for Bridge Street Corridor.

153.063(C)(4)(c) – Commercial Center Building Types

Mr. Taylor referenced “the east/west-oriented portions of Sawmill Road as depicted on figure 153.063(A).” He said this was redundant because the figure shows them on east/west and suggested leaving out the “east/west-oriented”, allowing an opportunity to change the graphic and not validate that Code Section.

Ms. Ray said Planning’s concern was identifying the area where Village Parkway extends past Greystone Mews to Tuller Road and the intent is not to allow that building type on that portion of Village Parkway.

153.063(C)(3)(c)

Mr. Hardt referenced the **Mid-Block Pedestrianway** section. He said he is not sure he is in favor of the new language, if interpreting the intent correctly. He said he read it as if there is a residential building with number of entrances into residential units then the mid-block pedestrianway can be eliminated. Ms. Ray clarified except on visible frontage streets.

Mr. Hardt said there was a project before the Commission that has not been built, where we had that exact concern. He said it was one large building occupying the entire block with no breaks and the Commission did not like the building for that reason. He said if the proposed amendment is allowing that, he is not supportive of it. Ms. Ray said it is a condition where we expect this potentially to happen again in the future, but it might not be quite as large as the project to which Mr. Hardt referred. She said the previous proposal took up two blocks. She stated a block could be 400 feet and if the requirement is one per 250 feet, then another pedestrianway would have to be incorporated. She said Planning recommends that if the condition exists on a principle frontage street it would be required, but if it is on a side street then it is not.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said there is an opportunity for Waivers. Ms. Ray agreed. Ms. Amorose Grooms said the Commission should have the opportunity to look at this condition and determine whether a Waiver is appropriate.

Mr. Hardt said he has been very opposed to large monolithic buildings and thought the Commission should be encouraging smaller, broken-up masses.

Ms. Krumb said she thought it was unnecessary because it said they “may be exempt” by the reviewing body. She said the second sentence could be a reason why we might exempt it, if necessary. She does not believe the new blue language should stay in. Ms. Ray said it could be taken off. Mr. Hardt said sometimes the “why” language comes back to haunt us. Ms. Ray concluded the section should remain as it exists in the current Code.

153.063(C)(5)(b) – Placemaking Elements

Mr. Taylor referenced the **Master Sign Plan** section. He said he did not object to the changes that were made but said what defines a Master Sign Plan, when it is needed, and what it should contain needs to be improved. He said the idea he had in mind when this was first discussed was a document prepared for a private development that guided the location, number, detail, style, etc. of signs for multiple buildings or connected buildings. He said the Code applies a Master Sign Plan to a single building, which he finds different. He said the Bridge Park project would need a Master Sign Plan that is comprehensive and

detailed, which would inform an individual tenant about where their sign could be installed and the design details for that sign. He said his perspective was the Commission would be able to review the details for a whole development and determine whether the overall concept of the signs was extraordinary prior to approving a Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Taylor said an individual building or multi-tenant building might be more appropriate to have a *Building Sign Plan*. He said when he was on the Architectural Review Board they had that problem in the Historic District. He said a Building Sign Plan for a single building would allow individual tenant that move into a building to have clear rules for the appropriate signs. He said the only question is the color and the text on the sign itself. He said if you have multiple buildings in an overall development, you have Building Sign Plans and together, they are part of a Master Sign Plan. He said this seems to read to him as the Master Sign Plan is any document that says anything about any signs for any project, which is misleading.

Ms. Ray said Planning agreed with the intent and can clarify the language.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed with Mr. Taylor and cited Perimeter Center as an example. He said when the development was first approved, there was a document outlining all of the possible locations, how a sign is mounted, centered over the storefront, and the approximate size. He said there was no rule about the content. He said the sign plan was a “road map” and by the time Baskin Robbins occupies a space and wants to install their sign this has been determined.

Mr. Hardt said when State Bank was reviewed, it was called the Master Sign Plan but in his mind, it was not a Master Sign Plan. He said he is not sure what the solution is but agrees with Mr. Taylor about separating the process.

153.063(C)(5)(b)(2)

Ms. Krumb stated the proposed language did not read correctly and the word “provided” is awkward. Ms. Ray agreed to reword it.

Mr. Taylor said he thinks there should be language that states when Master Sign Plans are required. Ms. Ray said the intent is an applicant is only required in these shopping corridors within the neighborhood districts but that can be modified.

Mr. Taylor suggested something as simple as “any development of multiple buildings, whether they are principle or not, require a Master Sign Plan and any development with a single building requires a Building Sign Plan.” He said it would also apply to multiple tenants in a single building.

153.063(D)(3)(c)

Mr. Hardt said he had the same comment about Mid-Block Pedestrianways.

153.063(D)(2)

Mr. Taylor said the last sentence added seemed redundant and obvious. Ms. Ray said it was intended to be redundant and obvious to the developers, too.

153.063(E)(6)(e)

Ms. Krumb said she had the same comment about signs. Mr. Hardt asked what the intent was for this edit under paragraph 2. He asked if Planning was trying to clarify what Mr. Taylor was talking about or was there another objective. Ms. Ray said Planning wanted to clarify when it was required and that it is crystal clear that we expect Master Sign Plans in neighborhood districts.

153.064(E)(4)(d) – Open Space Types

Mr. Hardt referenced the **Fee-In-Lieu of Determination** section. He said he thought there would be developers that had a different definition of “That providing the required open space would hamper an efficient site layout”. Ms. Ray said one of the things Staff has looked at with projects is if a development provided the required amount of open space on their site it would no longer be an urban site. She said Staff is asking if there are other opportunities to count other open spaces but still get a fee-in-lieu of determination. Mr. Hardt agreed.

Mr. Hardt said he would rather see a small number of open spaces that are real gems than a thousand little spaces that are afterthoughts and in the corners of sites because developers had to do it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission had that conversation with the State Bank project. She said they determined a park does not make any sense where it was proposed; it needed to be in conjunction with the adjacent property. She said the Commission tried to begin to cross the hurdle of what are the options of not making the applicant do this at this time. She recalled they suggested a “bank” they could put this “fee-in-lieu” in so the open space could be constructed when the adjacent development happened. She asked if any of those problems had been solved. Ms. Ray said there was an opportunity with that application to create a space that did not require the fee. She said the proposed amendment will allow for a more objective look at the request and make sure they are legitimately providing those gems and not just acreage.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there wasn’t really a “fee-in-lieu” and it was more of a “savings account”. Mr. Hardt said in that case, the Commission was suggesting that they defer construction of it until the rest of the site develops. He said the problem from a developer’s standpoint is when and they try to sell off that parcel of land next door and it has a restriction associated with it. He said a developer would rather put some bushes in and be done with it than have that restriction.

Ms. Ray said we still need to make a determination that it is a quality open space and there are still provisions and considerations for that within the Code.

Mr. Hardt referred back to Ms. Ray’s comments that these are “and” provisions and he does not believe it is written that way. Ms. Ray said it should be. Ms. Kramb said they are all written as a negative except for (a) and suggested to make (a) parallel with the rest, you need to change the word “a greater” to “lesser”. Ms. Ray admitted she contradicted herself as it begins with “at least one” is met and need to make it state “all have to be met”. Mr. Hardt said then maybe (d) would be more palatable to him. He said it has to be Commission’s opinion, not the applicant’s. Ms. Ray agreed.

153.064(G)(4)(c) – Improvements

Mr. Taylor referenced the **Site Furnishings** Section. He said unless this is covered somewhere else in the Code, he would like to add “including but not limited to” add high quality before benches...”. Ms. Ray said she could but asked if there was something in particular he was looking for as “high quality” is a term difficult to define.

Mr. Hardt asked if “standards” could be stated. Ms. Ray said the City has some models they use consistently and add to them all the time to get variety.

Mr. Hardt asked the language be changed to “City Approved”. Mr. Hardt asked if the City had a catalogue of benches and bike racks that are used in City sponsored projects, even if it is a constantly evolving catalogue. Ms. Ray said the one push back she had with that was if an applicant proposed a unique building and wanted to propose furniture to coordinate. Ms. Amorose Groomes brought up Jeni’s Ice Cream as an example with the orange furniture.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there was a bike rack that had to take a certain bike lock. Ms. Ray said the bike rack had to have two points of contact.

Ms. Ray said she would investigate whether the City has quality standards regarding site furnishings.

Mr. Taylor said his concern was these are things the public will come in direct contact with on a daily basis and we have trash receptacles in downtown Dublin that are very high quality that the City provided. He said he wanted to make sure all the street furniture is addressed and asked if this was the right place in the Code to do this. Ms. Ray confirmed it could be stated in this section.

153.064(G)(4)(d)

Mr. Hardt referenced the **Public Art** Section. He said it seemed we are trying to now define art by the revision. Ms. Ray said, if they just said 'public art' then people might think a statue. She said Staff wanted to have people think it could be a mural, a mosaic in the pavement, light fixture, or landscaping, etc. She added Staff wanted to encourage a developer to think outside the box and that art could be two and three-dimensional.

153.064(G)(4)(h)

Mr. Hardt remarked on the **fencing height**. He asked if it was appropriate to modify this to say "if a developer wants a fence greater than 42 inches, it needs to be necessitated by some other regulation". He said applicants have told the Commission the State Regulations for daycare centers require a certain height. He clarified if there is some other regulation that is driving it, we should open that door.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested this is an item an applicant could request as a Waiver. Ms. Ray agreed and said part of this too is for open spaces (athletic field or park amenity) where there needed to be a different type of fencing.

153.065(B) – Site Development Standards, Parking and Loading

153.065(B)(1)(b)(1)(B) – Parking Location, On-Site Parking

Mr. Taylor referenced the comment in the margin. Ms. Ray explained that was a direct outgrowth of a discussion with State Bank, allowing parking within setbacks to facilitate coordinated site design and continuous parking areas.

Mr. Hardt requested a brief explanation of the strikeout on paragraph 7 above that. Ms. Ray said Staff relocated that section to the existing structures provisions of 153.062.

Ms. Ray referred back to the comment in the margin, and asked for the Commission's feedback.

Mr. Hardt answered it has to be reviewed when it is appropriate. He said the proposed building and parking lot would logically flow into the site next to it when it was developed. He said he had a concern that if the setback was left as proposed, the two parking lots could never be one continuous shared parking lot. He said the Commission was back to a mode of development where there is a building and a parking lot on one site and a building and a parking lot on another site, which continues with a suburban design and it not integrated.

Ms. Newell asked what happens when that future project does not develop or is proposed very differently. She said our goal is to ensure the parking lot looks nice and with the proposed amendment we removed landscaping that would have been there with that particular parking lot, as a buffer area, even though there was a good reason behind it. She said she is concerned with the result if this is carried from project to project to project.

Mr. Hardt said that is why this needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. He said in that previous instance it was two lots. He said the parking on the other side of the lot should not go all the way to the property line. He said he is supportive of the change but it has to be reworded.

Ms. Salay said she is concerned and does not want to get into a situation where the Commission is approving projects that are half finished in anticipation of what is coming next.

Ms. Newell said she does not want to see a lot of parking with no landscaping associated with it.

Mr. Hardt said in the case of the State Bank site it was not about half finishing a proposal, but more about the position.

Mr. Taylor stated the way the Code is written, setbacks are not an arbitrary line up to which the parking can reach but are flexibility.

Mr. Hardt said Code said “may” extend across continuous lots when there is a coordinated site design.

153.065(B) – Site Development Standards, Parking and Loading
Table 153.065 – A: Required Vehicle Parking/Commercial/Exercise and Fitness

Mr. Taylor asked why this was different from Entertainment/Recreation, Indoor.

Ms. Ray said this is a catch-all category. She said the Exercise and Fitness provision applies elsewhere, to gyms and personal training but she would look into this change.

Table 153.065 – A: Required Vehicle Parking/Commercial/Shopping Center

Mr. Hardt asked what the difference is between a shopping center and retail.

Ms. Ray said it was included here to deal with existing shopping centers in the BSD such as the Kroger shopping center on Bridge Street, The Shoppes at River Ridge, Dublin Village Center, Trader Joe’s, where the standard calculation within Zoning Code does not apply in the BSD and calculating parking by each tenant is cumbersome. She said adding a shopping center parking requirement makes calculating the requirement easier to administer.

Mr. Hardt asked why Kroger would not be calculated under retail general. Ms. Ray explained there are different uses in the shopping center than retail and calculating parking becomes very difficult.

Mr. Hardt suggested adding a category “retail general” (including shopping centers) as the ratio is the same in both cases.

Ms. Ray said Planning is concerned when a tenant space for a dentist office or personal services is located in the center, which is not retail. She said the proposed amendment would apply to the entire shopping center. Ms. Ray said the categories could be explored again.

Ms. Newell asked if this was always going to apply to something that is established, and stated that if so, it should simply say that.

Mr. Hardt said the problem with ‘being included but not limited to’, no matter how long that list is, you are leaving something out.

153.065(B)(5) – Transportation Demand Management

Mr. Hardt asked how this could be administered. Ms. Ray said Staff wanted to anticipate.

Mr. Hardt asked if anyone had tried to utilize this as a tool. Ms. Ray said it had not happened, yet. She said once there is more transit service in the district, it could in the future, but not as of yet. Mr. Hardt asked what kind of feedback was needed here. Ms. Ray said it was noted to make sure Staff reviewed it and it could be a future Code Amendment.

153.065(B)(3)(a)

Mr. Hardt said he does not agree with the modification “that allows use of bicycle shared spaces be counted toward required bicycle parking.” He said COGO, exists in downtown Columbus and those racks are electronic digitized racks that people check their bikes in and out of and they are of no use to anyone else as a bike rack. He does not believe these are overlapping functions.

Ms. Ray thought if you are living in or visiting BSD and you wanted to use that to get from one place to another, and they have multiple throughout the district, then you could use that as a transportation option.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested “available for public use”.

Mr. Hardt said the bike sharing is for public use. He said in the Arena District and elsewhere, the bicycle sharing racks and system are for public use and people do use them but it does not preclude someone from owning their own bike. He said people that have their own bicycle for exercise or roundtrips will still use the COGO bikes to go one-way to lunch. He said other than the two wheels, he does not think they have anything in common.

153.065(B)(3)(d)(6)

Mr. Taylor noted the comment that stated “Evaluate whether special provisions for the Historic District are appropriate, here site conditions may not always allow for additional bicycle parking facilities (but City bike racks may be located close by).” He suggested that be discussed with ARB.

153.065(B)(6)(d)(1)

Ms. Krumb suggested flipping the sentences to make it clearer.

153.065(B)(6)(d)(2)

Ms. Krumb suggested rewording the paragraph to make it clearer.

153.065(B)(7)(b)(3)

Mr. Taylor asked where the waste storage went. Ms. Ray said Staff did not require something else, just wanted to see how they would be providing it on the plans. She said Staff did not want the applicant to designate one of the spaces but said she would double check. Mr. Taylor said the Code still requires waste storage and pick-up areas.

Mr. Hardt said the paragraph used to say there had to be a separate truck loading zone and separate waste pick-up and forbade them from being one and the same.

153.065(B)(7)(d)(3)

Mr. Hardt referenced the **truck loading and unloading** design, stating the requirement states spaces cannot interfere with traffic on public streets or off-street parking when vehicles are parked in loading/unloading spaces. He said he thought about urban spaces, and asked if it truly is a problem if a truck is in a parking lot at 6:00 am unloading in a location that would otherwise block parking spaces. He said it probably depends a lot on the use. He said he thought of examples where separate designated loading zones arguably are unnecessary. He stated who would care if a business gets its deliveries in the middle of the night and the truck sits in their parking lot.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if that would be an enforcement type of issue. Mr. Hardt said the way the language is written, it becomes a site layout issue, whether they operationally use the space or not, they are required to build it, having a significant impact on site arrangements.

Mr. Taylor said trucks in spaces unloading and blocking traffic is a reality of urban life, to which everyone agreed.

Mr. Hardt said he was not arguing in favor of public streets. Mr. Taylor agreed we cannot provide a single space for every possible activity that does not interfere with traffic. Ms. Ray agreed and stated the Code has hourly restrictions relating to blocking the public right-of-way. Mr. Hardt said it makes sense to provide some flexibility.

153.065(C) – Stormwater Management

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if this was solving stormwater problems and if this could apply to other infill developments like a smaller housing development where there are 20 lots or less. Ms. Ray said City Council approved the overall amendments to the Stormwater Code, including an updated *Best Practices Manual* that applies citywide, including the BSD.

Mr. Hardt asked if that manual contained a statement similar to this. Ms. Ray said the language is pulled directly from the manual.

Mr. Hardt asked if it would be cleaner to refer to that manual. Ms. Ray said not everybody will necessarily look at both.

153.065(D) – Landscaping and Tree Preservation

153.065(D)(3)(c)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission has talked about tree wells of planting zones. She said this came up during the State Bank case. She said she was in Nashville, TN, and in downtown Nashville there is the old portion and the new residential district called “the Gulch”. She said they are trying to save the trees. She understands structural soil is expensive, and in some places it may not be necessary. She said you cannot ever go back and add that in; you cannot dig up a large established tree and replant it in structural soil. She said if the Commission really believes in themselves and really hopes this district is truly going to become urban, people are going to start using little corners of places for new things never intended to have asphalt over top of it but now it does. She said the mature trees will be sacrificed. She said when new development happens, as it will in this district, those trees are going to be lost. She said she disagrees with not requiring structural soil in all of the areas. She said the only shot for beautiful trees to mature is when it is planted; and the trees will make this place special. She indicated she wants her grandchildren to walk down this area under a beautiful tree canopy.

153.065(D)(2)(e)

Mr. Taylor asked if that included street trees. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for clarification. Mr. Taylor said 10 percent represents a low number, which will result in a lopsided canopy if there is not consistency, block by block.

Ms. Newell said she lives on a street with nothing but ash trees. She said they had a beautiful canopy of very mature ash trees before it was destroyed by the ash borer in one season. She said the neighborhood is left with stick replacement trees, all up and down the street now. She said the City of Dublin has struggled with watering. She said some replacement trees are doing better than others based on the resident’s willingness to water.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said you cannot have a beautiful street canopy with different varieties of trees.

Ms. Newell suggested alternating the trees.

Ms. Salay said the City Forester has said the same thing; we do not ever want to pick a single species of tree and have an entire street lined with it. She suggested three in a row or five in a row of the same type. She said there is a rhythm to it, a plan, and asked Staff to consult with the City Forester.

Mr. Taylor concluded that was his concern with limiting this to 10, 20, or 30 percent as it encourages hodgepodge.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about the issue of the cost of structured soil. He asked what the cost is to replace that tree when it dies. Ms. Amorose Groomes told about the mature ash that used to guard the bunker at Muirfield Golf Course. She said it was determined that the tree was worth \$43,000; there are equations that factor these things.

Mr. Taylor said he did not think money was the biggest issue because you cannot replace a mature tree.

Mr. Zimmerman said when a tree dies in five years, you dig it up, put in a new one; by the time you add the labor and the cost of the tree, it would have been cheaper to put the structured soil in the hole.

Ms. Newell admitted when structural soil was discussed before, she knew nothing about it and deferred to Ms. Amorose Groomes who made a very compelling case. She said when she asked Staff why they were supporting soil, she said her 'takeaway' was that initially the soil is better for the health of the tree but long term, the answer was, structured soil was better.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said Staff remarked that if it is not under a paved area, structural soil is not necessary. She argues the paved areas can change over time and we do not know what those changes are going to be. She said she did not want to *not* have the soil in the appropriate locations because it was one step too many for developers and then we start losing tree canopies.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed. He explained it is not the structural soil under the tree; it is the structural soil under the pavement around the tree, which is key. He said getting water in/out is significant and read about a number of different systems for tying the whole thing together that have stormwater harvesting in the sidewalk to allow water to drain down there, which allows a smaller hole in the sidewalk and at the bottom starts drainage pipes to carry water away.

Ms. Amorose Groomes explained structural soil is a two-part component: 1) soil; and 2) microbial component beneficial to building nitrogen and things to make available nutrients to the tree. She said you may have a lot of nutrients in clay but because it is bound very tightly, it is not available to the tree. She said structural soil has a microbial content that will pull those elements out of the tightly bound soil and make it available for the tree.

153.065(D)(4)

Mr. Taylor asked why all the language was struck from the Code. Ms. Ray answered this is where BSD meets the adjacent properties and because there would be so few instances of this, would prefer to deal with this on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Taylor thought there were too many words in (b). He asked to keep it the way it was.

153.065(D)(5)(a)(6)

Ms. Krumb said she did not understand what the writer was trying to say; the wording was awkward.

Ms. Ray said this was based on the State Bank discussion where Banker Drive curves; based on the way the road curves and the way the parking lot lays out, it falls within two different categories. She said they applied the one that the majority of the parking lot falls into.

Ms. Kramb said it gets long and run-on and suggested striking “rather than multiple types of street frontage screening”, that is implied by saying that.

153.065(D)(6)(c)

Ms. Kramb said the Commission had a lot of discussion about the extension of the public sidewalk. She asked if the “streetscape with the walkways” was where we have a requirement that the sidewalk had to be four or five feet.

Ms. Ray said this was more about clarifying the design intent and a consistent sidewalk material transition. Ms. Ray confirmed this is not where we are trying to make a wider sidewalk than the four feet required.

Mr. Hardt said the portion of the developer’s property has to be consistent with the portion that is in the public realm, what appears to be one long sidewalk. Ms. Ray agreed and said it could transition but it should be a logical transition and not abrupt. She said the right-of-way line should be defined.

Mr. Taylor suggested “compatible” instead of “seamless”.

153.065(D)(9)(b)(3)

Ms. Kramb said when the part was added about trees in the public street, she asked if that applied to private streets built to public standards or purely the City’s public streets. Ms. Ray confirmed it is just the public streets.

153.065(E) – Fencing, Walls and Screening

153.065(E)(1)(c)

Mr. Hardt said he reads it as a fence or wall could be located almost anywhere you want, except street frontage. Ms. Ray said yes, and part of that goes to the parking lots. She said in an urban district, there are not arbitrary setbacks and development will be located up to the property line. She said the language clarifies this.

Ms. Ray said a series of townhomes could be proposed with fencing between them and the Code does not currently specify where a fence can go and it would have to meet the setback. She said in that environment it makes sense to have a fence on the side property line.

Mr. Hardt agreed but he would feel a lot better if this could be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not think any fence in the district should be given, it all should be earned.

153.065(E)(2)(b)(4)

Mr. Taylor commented on street wall height. He said street walls are often used for impromptu seating and 30 inches is too tall. He said 22 inches would be more appropriate for a minimum height for walls intended for seating. Ms. Ray agreed to the 22 inches.

153.065(F) – Exterior Lighting

153.065(F)(3)

Mr. Taylor asked what the requirements of 153.065(F) were that were exempted in the street lighting provisions. Ms. Ray said Engineering had standards for public street lighting and not regulated by the Commission.

Mr. Taylor said he was concerned as this is an important component of total streetscape. Ms. Ray said height, lumens, and wattage are strictly regulated by Engineering. She said this is being reviewed as part of the streetscape design process that is currently underway.

Mr. Hardt said in public realm, in the right-of-way, the streetscape is determined by the City and we will have a City selected fixture. He asked if a developer will be required to install the same fixture for private streets that have the look and feel of public streets. Ms. Ray said Staff is starting to address these questions but assumed if it were not the same, it would need to be compatible.

153.065(F)(10)

Mr. Hardt said he did not object to the changes that have been made but suggested the language be massaged more in response to past conversations by the Commission. He suggested stating “lumens” instead of “watts” would be more appropriate to measure brightness. Ms. Ray agreed. He asked the language be changed to refer to the total lumen output of the fixture and not of individual lengths.

Ms. Ray said the original intent was to revise the Code to do that but a consultant recommended it does not make sense to modernize this tiny portion of the Code, but should apply citywide. She said it could be made more flexible for the time being.

Mr. Hardt said that approach made sense. He said maybe the appropriate thing to say would be “wall lighting in the district shall be in conformance with that other document”. Ms. Ray said the problem is that document needs to be updated but would consider an interim solution to address the brightness.

Mr. Hardt said even the existing lighting provisions in the Zoning Code are no worse than this and he does not see the harm in referring back to that even if it is not yet updated.

153.065(H) – Signs

Mr. Taylor said all of his comments were on the Master Sign Plan section and believes they need to start over with that, start defining what a Master Sign Plan is and when it is to be used.

Mr. Hardt had a question about the memo, which stated a consultant has been engaged and assumed that advice was not included in this Code Amendment request so far. Ms. Ray said the completed review has not been received from the consultant.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission will like to hear the advice from the consultant.

153.065(H)(4)(d)(2)

Ms. Kramb asked about the registered corporate trademark and the new one that was added (3). She asked if there was a 20 percent restriction on the size of the secondary image. Ms. Ray said that was the intent.

Ms. Kramb said she did not see a size restriction. She said it sounds like they are the same thing, both allow five colors, whether it is a registered trademark or a secondary image, and the logo is limited to the 20 percent that the secondary image there is no percentage. She said if they are treated the same way, number 3 does not need to be added.

Ms. Ray said she would double check.

Ms. Kramb said she would hope there is a percentage restriction on the secondary image. Ms. Ray said (d)3 is dealing with colors whereas (d)2 is dealing with both colors and area. Ms. Ray said she would review how all three of those work together.

Mr. Taylor said the two paragraphs could be simplified. He said a baseline needs to be established.

153.065(H)(4)(e)(2)

Ms. Kramb said she thought a new word should be found for “incidental” in the second line. She said it is arguable that the frame itself would be incidental to the sign. She said the frame could be a pretty, integral, important part.

Ms. Ray said the consultant was asked to review the quality and design standards since they have expertise on how to build signs well.

Mr. Taylor asked if the consultant would essentially be rewriting that paragraph.

153.065(H)(4)(e)(1)

Ms. Salay said highest quality of materials and fabrication is in the eye of the beholder and asked how that can be defined. She suggested the Commission be more discerning when it comes to signs. She said if the Commission allows everybody to have what they want, within reason, she said we could end up with a really jarring environment. She said there is the visual interest, and we want the streetscape to be lively and engaging in the pedestrian realm but then this could be really tacky and to the point of eye clutter where it cannot be appreciated. She recommended applying our Dublin standards when it comes to signs. She appreciates folks wanting their own logo and company colors but believes there is a way to “Dublinize” this and hopes that is the focus. She believes this can make or break a streetscape.

Mr. Hardt agreed wholeheartedly and said there is a very fine line between dynamic, exciting, creative and interesting. He said we have seen good and bad examples. He said the challenge is how ‘highest quality’ is regulated with words. He said the way successful communities accomplish that is with Graphics Commissions. He said this is achieved by taking signs out of this setting (PZA) and put somewhere else (Graphic Commission) to have people who are versed in the visual arts and construction of signs to judge the signs on their merits on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Salay asked if this is a public body like the Planning Commission. Mr. Hardt said it would not be an additional hurdle but a different one.

Ms. Newell said she views that as an additional hurdle and has mixed feelings on that. Mr. Hardt said it could be done in parallel.

Ms. Newell said for every sign that comes in front of the Commission they have to make an aesthetic decision about it and there is nothing in the Code that is really giving them an opportunity to say an applicant cannot have a particular sign. She said she does not see great signs proposed. She said as much flexibility as Code gives, she is not seeing any new signs that make us say “wow”. She said she has seen several signs come in that Staff could not say no to that she thinks are awful. She said the reverse to this is existing Code used to be written very strict, but it put everyone on an equal playing field.

Mr. Taylor said talking about BSD it is a separate different entity than the rest of Dublin.

Ms. Newell said she did not think we are all going to get what we each envision in our heads. She said if we got all the signs in at one time and you got to play with them, and had the creativity, you would probably get that exact mix of what we are looking for and all that energy. She said the problem is the signs are going to come in in pieces or one at a time and it is going to be hard to make a decision.

Mr. Taylor said that is why we are asking for a Master Sign Plan so we see an initial document that covers everything.

Mr. Hardt said Hilton Head Island has a Design Review Board to review signs.

Ms. Salay said she was trying to put herself in a merchant's shoes or a developer's shoes and going before a Graphics Commission, who really knew what I was trying to do, and could give me constructive feedback, that might not be a bad thing. She said if I am not talented that way or I do not know where to find a good sign person with artistic flair, when I need to identify my business, people to be able to find me, etc., and I want to stand out but not in a gaudy way, be part of this community I know there are expectations of what can I do. She said that might be a real opportunity to have some collaboration.

Ms. Ray said Staff has tried to meet halfway until we have different standards or have different language, by engaging graphic design consultants to try and talk through that but there is always that hesitation of actually designing the sign for the applicant.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was a Graphics Commission at Easton. Mr. Hardt said it is not a Graphics Commission because it is not a public body; you have a developer who has an iron fist. He said it is the same with the Arena District where there are some really creative fun signs. He said there is a dentist that has a giant toothbrush over their storefront but Nationwide Realty is a singular body that has control over all that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Rusty Bucket sign at Easton is one of her favorite signs that she has ever seen. She said there is no way that would get through here. She said the Commission needs to be more "cool" just in the BSD. She said it does not have any plastic in it; it does not check many of those boxes. She said the Commission thinks they are setting the bar high and actually it is too low.

Mr. Hardt said he has worked with plenty of developers and understands the concern about making things more complicated and adding extra steps but honestly thinks most developers when they go through the process to get a project approved, first and foremost, they are concerned with getting the site plan established and the building approved so they can start construction. He said graphics and signs are not shown to the Commission because they do not want to get the project tripped up over a sign color at this stage of the game. He said we have seen people come in here and say they will bring that back to the Commission, later. He said you have 6, 12, or 18 months while the project is under construction to work on sign details. He does not think asking someone to park that issue and not even talk about it at this stage of the game would be a bad thing in the eyes of the developer. He said they would probably see it as an opportunity to focus on the critical issues so they can get underway.

Ms. Amorose Groomes interjected that the developer may be still lining up tenants.

Jenny Rauch said that brings up another point we have discussed regarding several existing shopping centers as an example of how a developer did not plan well with the architecture for where their signs were to be located and paid the price.

Gary Gunderman said we have people that come in with projects that they have not thought about the sign yet, or maybe they have and are afraid it is going to be a problem, but most of them have not really thought it through, they do not want to hold up the project, so they are willing to push it off and come back and let you have a second bite at it. He said there are other businesses where you have one business driving the project and if they cannot have a certain type of visibility, they do not want to be here.

Mr. Hardt said that is what the Master Sign Plan is for and that happens here.

Mr. Gunderman said he likes that part of what we have going, the Master Sign Plan, the idea tonight of a Building Sign Plan because that is what they really are in a lot of cases we deal with. He said applicants are pretty forceful in some cases when they have a certain image they want, a message they want to convey.

Mr. Hardt said some applicants have said, “if we cannot have our sign, we are not going there” but there are enough mechanisms to allow that to happen and nothing stopping someone from going through a Graphics Commission in parallel.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested like an informal.

Mr. Taylor disagreed. He said the main thing he wanted to see accomplished with a Master Sign Plan is that developers, architects, and builders, think about signs when they are designing the building. He agreed with what Ms. Rauch stated. He said he wants the building to be designed with integrated signs and the carrot he would hold out would be if a development does a good job of integrating the sign, which is three-dimensional graphic as opposed to just letters, etc., then the Commission would open the door wider but it has got to be great signage. He said he went back to the Crocker Park development, which is superb in terms of the detail and it had some outrageous signs but the buildings look fantastic. He said he would not want to say to somebody, do not worry about the signs until the building is well underway because then we do not know that it is going to be well integrated under the architecture. He said at the same time, he did want us to say, give us every detail of your sign before we will approve the whole project. He said a Master Sign Plan would give the Commission a nice outline and grid to apply the final details to.

Mr. Hardt said these kinds of details, whether plastic is acceptable and what gauge the metal has to be, and all that and whether a sign is creative in a good way or creative trash, can be made in a different setting by people with a different set of skills.

The Chair recommended the Commission look into that.

153.065-G – Sign Types Permitted in BSD Zoning Districts Table

Ms. Kramb noted the addition of the intent for **identification plaques** and thought she understood but there is no other mention of the identification plaques anywhere. She assumed one of the things you have on the intent section is to denote significant historical or other building characteristics. She asked if that would not be the National Register Plaque on the building in the Historic District but they are not permitted.

Ms. Ray said the issue is identification plaques need to be addressed in a completely different manner. She said they would not count as a window sign or a building mounted sign, or one of the other ones in the table, it would be something else unto itself.

Ms. Kramb confirmed it needs added to the Table today and Ms. Ray said standards are needed for it.

Mr. Taylor asked if a size limitation of the identification plaque was needed for on the building.

Ms. Kramb said she had another comment as they talk about ground signs and how many are permitted and the word “street frontage” is used. She asked if that was whether it was a public street or a private street, an alley, or any roadway. Ms. Ray said it is a public street; alleys do not count.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said a lot of our streets may not be public. Ms. Ray said that is why we would have Master Sign Plans to deal with those unique circumstances. She said as a standard Code provision, Staff would just look at the public right-of-way.

Ms. Kramb said she does not know if it is going to be a “unique situation in BSD” because it sounds like the majority of the streets are going to be private streets. She said there are going to be buildings on a block where every street around it is private.

Ms. Ray said she did not necessarily know that would be the case everywhere. She said there are a few instances Staff is running into but the intent, especially for ground signs, street frontage is for public streets and if it is not, then it would be a Master Sign Plan.

153.065(H)(6)(c)(4)

Ms. Newell asked why this was added. Ms. Ray said it is one of those signs a lot of businesses put up, a little decal with their address and business name on it. She said adding into the Code puts parameters over what is allowed and keeps it consistent.

Ms. Newell said one square foot does not strike her as being really big but then there was no color limitation, the Code just limits the graphic to one color. She was concerned about what that color might be. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested "neutral" be inserted there.

153.065(H)(7)(a)(2)(table)

Mr. Taylor suggested rewording the **General Section** for clarity.

153.065(H)(7)(b)(2)(B)(table)

Mr. Taylor said he had the same issue under **Awning Signs**, Size. He suggested rewording for clarity.

153.065(H)(7)(c)(1)

Mr. Taylor said zoning areas of the BSD that overlap with the Architectural Review Board boundaries are mentioned.

Ms. Ray said Staff wanted to clarify that since the rest of the Code deals with zoning district.

153.065-K – Requirements for Other Permitted Signs Table

Mr. Zimmerman noted under the **Sandwich Board Signs**, number permitted is 1 per ground floor storefront tenant. He asked for clarification that sandwich signs are not permitted if the business was on the second floor. Ms. Ray confirmed that was true.

153.065 – Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria

Mr. Taylor said everywhere the Commission has a decision, City Council has Administrative Appeal. He said when he looks further in the Code, the definition of Administrative Appeal goes directly to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Ms. Ray clarified it goes to the BZA first and then can go to Council from there.

Mr. Taylor then asked why Table (A) is under Council and should it not be under BZA. Ms. Ray said she agreed and would review.

Mr. Hardt suggested a footnote be written to better explain the table on the appeals process.

The Chair asked if anyone from the public would like to comment with respect to this case. [Hearing none.] She summarized the Commission has had their discussion and no vote is required.

Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested communications updates from Staff.

Ms. Rauch said Special Meeting Dates were proposed for October 21 and 29 as an opportunity but could be canceled as needed.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve Special Meeting Dates to be held on October 21 and October 29, 2014. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor. (Approved 7 – 0)

Commission Roundtable Discussion

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable issues to be discussed. Rachel Ray said she wanted to follow up on the discussion on cement fiber siding. She asked if the Commission wanted to discuss anything further or if some of Mr. Ford's recommendations could be incorporated in the revised Code update.

Richard Taylor said the issue was 20 percent/80 percent. Ms. Ray said it was also the quality, installation, and measures, etc.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if the applicants want more siding, it can be accomplished through Waivers.

Amy Salay said she liked the idea of an applicant requesting a Waiver, especially when the Commission does not have the experience.

Todd Zimmerman said if these are Waivers, it puts the ball in the Commission's court.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on October 21, 2014.