



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 22, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Parks and Recreational Department Director; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Marie Downie, Planner I; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Katie Dodaro, Planning Assistant; Mike Altomare, Deputy Fire Marshal; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Craig Snider, Signarama (Case 1); Mark Rubcich, DaNite Sign Company (Case 2); Kevin Noble, BHDP Architecture (Case 3); and Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Case 4).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 10, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSD SCN – Functional 45 Training – Sign
15-126MPR**

**6585 Dublin Center Drive
Minor Project Review**

Katie Dodaro said this is a request for the installation of a new wall mounted sign for an existing tenant space on Dublin Center Drive, approximately 640 feet southeast of the Village Parkway and Dublin Center Drive intersection. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066.

Ms. Dodaro presented the 35-foot storefront illustrating the sign as proposed. She said the proposed wall sign meets the requirements for number/type, size, location, height, and colors. She said the three colors are midnight blue, red, and white. She explained the sign will be constructed in three separate channel pieces totaling 17.5 square feet. She said "F45" is in the middle section flanked by "flags" on either side.

Craig Snider, Signarama, clarified the background building color has been painted brown, which is not the same exact color in the rendering.

Jeff Tyler asked how much of the sign would be illuminated. Mr. Snider answered "F45" and "flags" are front and back lit pan channel letters with a white acrylic face, translucent vinyl overlay, and midnight blue trim cap and returns. He said the entire sign is internally illuminated with white LEDs providing a halo effect.

Ms. Dodaro said Staff is recommending approval with no conditions.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions with regard to this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

**2. BSD C – The Golf Room – Sign
15-124MPR**

**6807 Dublin Center Drive
Minor Project Review**

Nicki Martin said this is a proposal for the installation of a new sign for a tenant in the Dublin Village Center shopping center west of Dublin Center Drive and Tuller Road intersection. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the storefront elevation, which is an existing tenant space of 30 feet wide. She said the applicant is proposing a 15-square-foot wall sign at a height of 10 feet, 10 inches. She described the sign as having internally illuminated flush mounted channel letters with black trim and cap overlaid with perforated green printed vinyl with a logo shape. She said this proposal meets the requirements for size, color, location, height, and number/type.

Marie Downie asked if a true color of the background was represented. Mark Rubcich, DaNite Sign Company, answered the background color on the building is gray until a new tenant comes on board and then it is painted a tan color.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions with regard to this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

**3. BSD C - Wendy's International – Basketball court
15-121MPR**

**1 Dave Thomas Boulevard
Minor Project Review**

Logan Stang said this is a request for site improvements to install a basketball court to an existing office building west of Shamrock Boulevard and north of W. Dublin-Granville Road. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Mr. Stang said a proposed sports barrier will enclose the entire court at a height of 8 feet and would include one gate for employees. He said the key card only accessible gate entrance would be located on the west side of the court along with the benches and proposed landscaping.

Mr. Stang said approval was recommended with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to determine the most suitable method and design for installing landscaping to screen the basketball court, prior to building permitting;
- 2) That the applicant relocate or replace all trees that will be removed during construction; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Staff to determine the most appropriate method for installing lighting as to minimize the impact to adjacent properties, which could result in no lighting at all.

Claudia Husak asked the applicant if he envisioned the need for lighting. Kevin Noble, BHDP Architecture, answered the lights would be installed, if at all, at a future date.

Rachel Ray asked if the ART would be supportive of no lighting. The ART agreed that no lighting would also be acceptable.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions with regard to this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

**4. BSD SRN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B&C
15-099MSP**

**Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Master Sign Plan**

Nicki Martin said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new 9.2-acre mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with West Bridge Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the site and addressed issues with specific sign types in the report. She presented a table to illustrate the comparison between what is permitted in the BSD and what is being requested as part of this MSP and noted the number of signs permitted per tenant. She noted the proposal permits 'Anchor Tenants' one additional sign and Staff recommends this provision be eliminated from the MSP since a definition is not provided. She said the MSP illustrates how the locations and height are regulated by level and requested clarification as the two "levels" do not coincide with stories or floors. She indicated the height of signs varies based on the sign type. She said the placemaking art signs will be at a height of at least 15 feet, but wall signs are limited to the first floor for retail tenants. She added Staff has concerns with the definition of levels as they vary based on the building elevation within the blocks, which are not consistent. She requested clarification on plans and suggested this be completed in order to avoid having to amend the MSP in the future.

Claudia Husak said the text and the graphics in the MSP do not match and asked that the applicant clarify the discrepancies.

Ms. Martin said the applicant is proposing new sign types in the MSP that included: placemaking art; parking marquee; canopy edge; and umbrella signs. For the sign types not already detailed in the MSP, she asked the applicant to provide definitions and examples in the document. She said other proposed permitted sign types include: wall; projecting; awning; window; address numerals; building directory; and sandwich board. She said Staff recommends permitted sign types be reorganized to provide additional clarity. Staff suggests address numerals, building directory, and parking marquee signs be considered 'Signs with Special Conditions' and not be counted toward an individual tenant's total allotted signs since these sign types would not include tenant specific information or branding. She said Staff also suggests a category be created for 'Temporary Signs' to include sandwich board and umbrella signs where these sign types would be permitted by the landlord not the City like Temporary Signs in the rest of the City.

Ms. Martin said Staff recommended that window signs be counted toward the total number of signs permitted. The ART discussed and decided that there should not be numerous business name or logo window signs permitted, but those that are simply graphics could be on the windows as part of the design. Jeff Tyler requested a definition be added for "window graphics" which would differ from window signs and ultimately be part of a tenant's graphics package, but not count toward their total number of permitted signs.

Ms. Martin said the materials permitted in the MSP for wall signs provide a very narrow scope that only include wood and metal. She said Staff suggested that the list of permitted materials be expanded and specific awning materials be listed so amendments are not needed in the future.

Ms. Martin said the MSP also includes additional details: review process; size computation; and prohibited sign designs. She said Staff is recommending that additional details regarding review process be finalized prior to sign permitting. Ms. Husak said zoning review will take place at Staff level and the current thinking is that a multi-departmental team will be formed meeting weekly to review signs for compliance with the MSP.

Ms. Martin said the purpose of the Master Sign Plan is:

- a) To allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display.
- b) To ensure sign work is in a coordinated fashion to meet the general intent of signs in the District.
- c) Not intended to permit larger signs, more visible signs, or additional signs than permitted, without any consideration for unique sign design and display.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan to permit a consistent sign package of an appropriate design and scale of the Bridge Park development and the approved shopping corridor along Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive with three conditions:

- 1) That the general regulations matrix outlining the sign types and allowances should be updated to clarify the permitted building mounted sign types from other sign types, subject to approval by Staff;
- 2) That the graphics should be updated to:
 - a. Clarify they are part of the MSP's regulatory framework
 - b. Provide definitions for Level 1 and Level 2;
 - c. Denote where Level 2 signs are permitted for Level 1 tenants; and
- 3) That the MSP should be updated to:
 - a. Delete the provision for additional signs for Anchor Tenants;
 - b. Clarify the number of signs counting toward the total number of signs permitted per tenant;
 - c. Include additional sign type definitions;
 - d. Add permitted materials to allow for greater flexibility and creativity; and
 - e. Revise the zoning review timeline graphic to accurately reflect the review and permit process following the approval of the MSP.

Ms. Husak said when three or four building mounted signs are permitted for tenants with two and three frontages, they have to be of at least two different types so she questioned the permitted signs presented in the MSP for Level 2 tenants. She said the MSP allows for the possibility of an additional sign for anchor tenants, however, no definition is provided for anchor tenants, which may result in up to five signs for such a tenant if there is frontage along three streets. She said the provision should be eliminated.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, explained how the levels were used in the MSP and said he would provide clarification for retail, restaurant, and office use. He stated the General Regulations Matrix is primarily for ground floor tenants. He stated the number of signs per tenant is only intended for retail and restaurant tenants and office tenants will only be permitted one wall sign – if any at all, which will be at the discretion of the landlord. He stated that the intent of the MSP is to be consistent with the character of Dublin and to not permit too many signs or too large signs.

Mr. Starr said the MSP was prepared differently for the Historic District as the signs would be smaller in nature – consistent with the BSD Code. He reported the ARB determined not to count window signs toward the total number permitted because a sign might have a graphic not associated with identification.

Mr. Starr said the ARB realized they are not going to see individual signs like they do in the rest of the District after approval of the MSP, which they were not fully comfortable with. He said the MSP process of “after the applicant met the letter of the law would be permitted to go directly to sign permitting” was met with consternation. He explained the MSP is part of the lease agreement. He indicated the MSP makes it easier for tenants to comply. He said this document has been shared already with prospective tenants, even in its draft stages.

Mr. Starr said he is only envisioning placemaking art signs for Level 1 tenants in Level 2 and the "sign" has to be unique. He said he did not want to place a restriction that they are permitted only for tenants with 5,000 square feet or above, but wanted to it to be at the discretion of landlord and requiring a sign permit from the City meeting the MSP regulations. He indicated he does not envision any office tenants having a placemaking art sign; it would be meant for retail tenants. Ms. Husak asked the applicant to note that in the MSP. Ms. Husak asked if it would be appropriate for a tenant on a corner.

Mr. Starr said he had told the ARB that the applicant tried to find all the logical locations for signs but that may change as tenants come on board. He emphasized that this exhibit is included in the lease. He said other floors could have 3, 4, or 5 tenants and they would not be permitted to have signs.

Ms. Martin asked for clarification about parking marquee signs as it is not denoted in the plan. Mr. Starr responded for each garage, there is a primary and a secondary sign. He said the primary sign would be ±8 feet by 15 feet and the text would read "PARK" and would include "Longshore Street" or "Mooney Street". He described the secondary sign as a "P" letter only. Ms. Husak suggested that each have a clear definition. Mr. Starr said parking marquee signs are to enhance wayfinding.

Ms. Husak said the MSP could be recommended for approval today if the applicant agreed to the conditions.

Vince Papsidero said he wanted to limit window signs as he did not want to see multiple logos. He asked that window signs be separate and distinct from window graphics.

Jeff Tyler recommended that the applicant define "window graphics".

Donna Goss asked how all this sign information is articulated in the lease agreement. Mr. Starr said the MSP is an exhibit to the lease. He said it was discussed at the ARB meeting how there is a refresher allowance, particularly for awnings and window signs. He said one of the lease provisions is a 'refresh of the sign' every three years that the tenant would pay for new signs. He said the reality is these tenants will probably turn over every ten years and they could replace the sign at that time also.

Mr. Tyler asked the applicant to consider super graphics. Mr. Starr indicated the applicant was not bold enough to present that idea. He said the north side of building C1 has the opportunity for a super graphic. He said it is a blank wall today but when building B gets developed the wall will be less visible. Mr. Tyler said the super graphic could be art oriented or a mural to liven up the architecture. He indicated super graphics were pretty unique but did not want the applicant to change this document now.

Rachel Ray asked the applicant that when he is having a discussion with the tenants about signs, how he is encouraging them to be innovative.

Mr. Starr said the tenants first ask about the rent and then what kind of signs they are permitted. So far, he said this MSP has been received really well and that the tenants understand that high quality signs are required. He agreed that broadening the scope of materials was needed. Ms. Ray said natural durable materials such as thick acrylic is suggested in the *BSD Sign Guidelines*. Mr. Papsidero said super graphics could be made out of foam or other materials and act as public art.

Mr. Starr agreed to clarify the General Regulations Matrix. He said it is possible he could have a tenant that leases a whole building, which would prompt them to request more signs but this would happen in the future and he would come back to request revisions to the MSP at that time.

Ms. Martin asked the applicant how he was administering this document and how Staff would know when Level 2 office tenants are permitted a sign. Mr. Starr said the sign language will be in the lease and all tenants will provide the City with a landlord approval during sign permitting.

Ms. Martin questioned how Staff should respond when asked about signs from a tenant when we may not know the specifics. The ART determined the answer is to "defer to the landlord".

Mr. Starr noted building C2 has an opportunity for four signs total and three have been spoken for by different office tenants. He indicated signs will be an economic decision even if the tenants are permitted a sign.

Ms. Husak indicated a question may come from the PZC about how the applicant will be able to encourage and achieve the edgy, clever, unique, and creative signs desired in the BSD.

Mr. Starr indicated the opinion of whether a sign is good or bad is not as subjective as for architecture for example.

Ms. Husak asked the applicant if he approved of the conditions 'as is' and asked that the MSP be revised per comments and recommendations in preparation for the PZC meeting on January 7, 2016. She said the materials will need to be received by December 29th for Staff's review and to be distributed on December 31st.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation to the PZC for the January 7, 2015, meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.]

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 2:50 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on January 7, 2016.