

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 7, 2016

AGENDA

1. **BSD SCN – Big Sandy Superstore** **6825 Dublin Center Drive**
15-090 MSP **Master Sign Plan (Approved 4 – 3)**
2. **BSD SCN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B & C – Master Sign Plan** **Riverside Drive**
15-099MSP **Master Sign Plan (Tabled 7 – 0)**
3. **MAG PUD and Perimeter Center, Subarea D – MAG, Land Rover, Jaguar, Porsche**
15-113Z/PDP **6335 Perimeter Loop Road**
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
4. **BSC SCN – Bridge Park, Block A** **Riverside Drive and SR 161**
15-117PP/FP **Preliminary Plat/Final Plat (Approval 7 – 0)**
5. **Dublin Service Center PUD – Expansion** **6555 Shier Rings Road**
15-125AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Amy Salay, Christopher Brown, Robert Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, and Stephen Stidhem. City representatives present were: Philip Hartmann, Vince Papsidero, Claudia Husak, Laura Ball, Joanne Shelly, Tammy Noble, J.M. Rayburn, Nicki Martin, Alan Perkins, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the December 3, 2015, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair, Ms. Newell, read the case procedures and determined that Cases 1, 3 and 5 are eligible for consent. Amy Salay said she had questions for Cases 1 and 3.

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said she wanted to take Case 5, the remaining consent case first and then would hear the other cases in the order they appear on the agenda.

PREVIOUSLY TABLED CASE

**1. BSD SCN – Big Sandy Superstore
15-090 MSP**

**6825 Dublin Center Drive
Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new retail store to occupy an existing building on the south and west sides of Tuller Road to be coordinated with proposed façade and site renovations. This is a request for review and approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She said the Commission is the final authority on this application and we will need to swear-in.

The Chair, Ms. Newell, swore in anyone intending to address the Commission with regard to this case.

Ms. Shelly said last time the applicant had requested an informal review and in response to requests from ART and the Commissioners, staff presented comparisons to the other big box retail stores in the vicinity. She said the Big Sandy design team stated their reasoning for using their brand typeface as the sign font style. She said they provided details regarding the proposed streetscape furnishings to be fabricated by a local sculptor, the planned interior sculpture panels and details regarding fabrication of the proposed signs. She said the Commission gave feedback, which included support for use of the Big Sandy brand typeface, recommendations to reduce the size of the primary signs by approximately 15% and the secondary signs to the minimum possible within fabrication standards.

Ms. Shelly said revisions to their request for a Master Sign Plan have been made based on the Commissions comments. She said the location is within the Bridge Street District in the far east portion of the District. She said the approved site improvements include the creation of two secondary entrances to complement the primary entrance on the existing commercial building. She said the three entries are glass and metal structures that step away from the brick façade and the new glass entrances are centered and balanced in their placement across the 424 lineal feet of the building's front façade.

Ms. Shelly said the review of the site improvement identifies that the proposed addition of two entries brings the existing building closer to meeting the intent of the entry requirements for a large format commercial building in the Bridge Street District, breaking the building façade into to a pedestrian scale by increasing the number of entrances. She said the two metal benches, designed and fabricated by a local sculptor, will flank the main entry and complimentary sculptural bollards will also be placed at each entry to enhance the streetscape experience and the addition of the sculptural benches and bollards also addresses the BSD Code recommendations for public art in Open Spaces to create visual interest.

Ms. Shelly said the renovations include new atrium entries, additional wing walls, and landscape changes that will continue throughout the spring as trees bloom out or need to be replaced and the landscape beds will be installed. She said they continue to work with the applicant on the landscape improvements through the permit site inspection process.

Ms. Shelly said the applicant is proposing three wall signs that are architecturally integrated into the proposed entry modifications, but exceed the permitted number of signs and the maximum allowable size and depth. She said the proposed primary entry sign was sized to be proportional to the scale of the entry, the entry atrium is 3,760 sq. ft., the sign is 374 sq. ft. in size, which equates to 10% of the atrium entry area. The Code allows 1/2 sq. ft. of sign for each lineal foot of building wall with a maximum size of 50 sq. ft. She said the "Big Sandy" text is proposed as red channel letters and is attached to the main entry curtain wall system and the "superstore" is proposed as a script font, with open face channel letters with LED tube outline, mounted to the entry canopy. She said both type face styles are part of the Big Sandy trademark and due to its placement above the entry canopy, the proposed sign height is 20'-2", which is 5'-2" higher than the allowable 15' height. She said the applicant has made a request to allow two additional wall signs, one each over the two new secondary entries, the 40 sq. ft. secondary entry sign left of the primary entrance is placed on the edge of the entry canopy, centered along the 140 lineal feet of front façade for this portion of the building and the 47.40 sq. ft. secondary entry sign (right of the

primary entrance) is placed on the edge of the entry canopy, centered along 124 lineal feet of front façade for this portion of the building. She said the letters vary in height with a maximum height of 26.75 inches and the signs are internally illuminated, white, LED, channel letters. She said the channel edge is aluminum and the letters are attached to an aluminum contour backer panel. She said the secondary entrance's letters are mounted on an aluminum raceway along the arc of the canopy edge and due to its placement along the edge of the canopy, the sign depth exceeds the code allowance of 12", the top of the sign is proposed at 14'-4" above grade.

Ms. Shelly said although all the signs are channel letters, the designer has used different techniques, which in conjunction with the sculptural benches & bollards as well as the metal panel sculptures provide a unique visual experience for a large format commercial entrance. She said the applicant is permitted to have one ground sign on their parcel and there is a pre-existing ground sign, which is part of the Dublin Village Center development and is not part of this application. She said at the last review there were some questions about what the signs looked like and the applicant has an example to show.

Logan Dilts, Danite Sign Companies, 1640 Harmon Avenue, said the icons inside the atrium walls are a halo lit channel letter that are large with brush aluminum face and sides on stand offs and the back of it lights and shines on the wall and give a halo effect. He demonstrated the light effect for the internal display with a lighting sample panel.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone from the public that wanted to speak on this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Salay said she continues to struggle with this application and it does not have anything to do with Big Sandy. She said she does not understand staffs approach to this applicant and curious as to why they are so far past what Code allows and looking at the Bridge Street Sign Code they are making this an interesting sign package for the pedestrian. She said they are going to have a sign that is so much bigger than anything else in Dublin located on a big box retail. She said she is concerned what this will be like when John Shields Parkway eventually is in front of this location and will be much closer than the current roadway. She said they are not talking about a pedestrian environment they are dealing with a big box auto oriented retail. She said the Lowes store received a BZA waiver to go to 78 square feet.

Ms. Husak said the Lowes applicant was allowed to have an 80 square foot sign and the BZA variance granted was for a combination for Lowes was a combination of a ground and a wall sign. She said the wall sign was 78 square feet and was within the Code that was in place at that time.

Ms. Salay confirmed the variance.

Ms. Husak said it was permitted for the two different types of sign.

Ms. Salay said they dialed back the Code Bridge Street to 50 square feet from 80 and yet this is at 374 square feet and she cannot get passed it and fears they are setting a dangerous precedent for this area and this is so far from what she thought they were trying to do with Bridge Street and the Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Shelly said the reason they believe that the signs work is due to the scale of the building. She said when the original signs were submitted they were nearly 300 square feet larger and they knew the concerns and asked that the applicant scale down them. She said there was a discussion as to what is the appropriate scale for a sign of this size of a building. She said they also reviewed where the location of John Shields Parkway will be and she showed the current mapping showing the pedestrian experience showing a large distance between the greenway and the building and they felt that the distance covered some of the issues of the "up close and personal". She said the applicant has done things at the street scape level with the sculpture with a local sculptor and they felt they were doing thing to enhance the street scape and pedestrian environment and that the signs would be visible from the street or would not

be in the total frame of vision because they are directly above the pedestrian and on the canopy and the building. She said there is some playfulness to the signs to the extent possible for the product that they are providing. She said they are asking applicants to be more creative and felt that they have taken some time to be more creative. She said they are going to see more signs that are of a larger scale as the buildings become larger. She said no one is asking that this becomes the norm, but they are asking that for each product that comes that they look at the scale of the product and the building and whether this is a tenant or a site. She said that there is going to be street scape amenities where people are going to be fun and alive in the space and what is overhead might not be so important.

Ms. Husak said staff had a lot of the discussion about the length of the building, massing and what is appropriate for that particular building. She said in the review of the application and where ART felt comfortable was looking it at a holistic standpoint and Mr. Brown touch on it at the December meeting that there might be places within the City where signs are a little out of scale today and that is where ART and staff felt comfortable recommending approval with the mass and the length of the building and proportionate.

Mr. Papsidero said they tried to balance the physical aspects of the site and the building with the intent of the design guidelines and trying to understand how to balance those and also to acknowledge the fact that this is an interim condition that the expectation under the Bridge Street District planning that this will be redeveloped at some point in time at a denser five story mixed use buildings and not a big box at some point in the future. He said it is a challenge when it's a interim condition where Big Sandys may occupy this building for 30 years but they do know over time as land values increase this area will redevelop and they are balancing the same issue with some of the other retail centers much like Dublin Plaza trying to capture their existing standard even though it exceeds the Bridge Street to deal with the tenant situation of today. He does not believe this sets a precedent because it is unique to the building and the site and even the setback is different from other like buildings. He said there was a sense of comfort that this site and building are so unique that it is a unique application. This is not a precedent as nor is it opening the gates for future application, and that is not any ones intent.

Ms. Husak said they are sensitive to the idea they are allowing something in this circumstance or in this situation means others may want to ask for larger signs, however; just because they did it once she does think there is validity to this being a precedent for other applications.

Ms. Salay said she appreciates building the record with what they are saying and respectfully disagree because it is too much of a departure for her and appreciates all the applicants have done in buying the building and adding the street furniture with the design of the artsy part of the signs with the cutouts and thought that would be exciting.

Mr. Brown said this is appropriate that the whole Bridge Street District Design Code is up for discussion tonight because trying to quantify sign sizes and projections and type faces and all the elements that are part of it, it is tough to codify. He said they should write the Code where it is restrictive and then you end up with a situation where there is a huge broad store front and what do you do with it and make it responsive to the environment. He said there are situations where you cannot codify and this is one of them where scale matters. He said the Big Sandy element is big and it red, the Super Store part is a lighter element that is projected out and overlaps each other. He said they reduced the side entrance signs and thanked the applicant for doing so. He said this is responsive to the site and it is reasonable to what was asked and the site and scale of the building and the distance form the future John Shields parkway is a tough balance and he understands where they are locating here and with the intent to be successful. He said the sign package is responsive to his feelings and the inside art is out of their prevue but it is there and he likes the superstore script and that they have reduced the scale and reduced the side element scale of the signs.

Ms. Mitchell said the big tension in this situation is that the big box retail is not consistent with the walkable environment and they are trying to match two things that do not go together causing the tension with retail walkable urban environment is not worried about those things. She said she appreciates the playfulness at the street level and the feeling that people will not be looking up at the sign while they are walking, but if there is anything they can do to add queues and break it up and make it not like big box retail. She said the Commission is saying that the Bridge Street District is supposed to be a walkable urban environment so how do they bring the two together in a marriage that will make everybody happy and allow them to be successful. She said the size of the sign is one element and that they need to be creative and they have already done a lot of creative things with the playful elements at the ground level but at the same time the size of the sign makes her think of Easton. She thinks they need to think about it in terms of the two and it is a challenge.

Ms. Shelly said previously there was façade with a fairly large dark cover and the applicant has removed the canopy and added the glass atriums and the architectural details of the insets and with the insets they have added lighting. She said as you walk along the facades it is not a window but there is a step back with lighting along that is not a post lighting but more of a human scale lighting providing elements along the way that they are trying to have pedestrian elements, which they were asked to do during the site improvement process.

Ms. De Rosa said she is pleasantly surprised at the changes that have been made. She said the specific issues is weight to the large red sign feeling heavy compared to the other contemporary playful things that are going on that they have done nicely. She said the layout is good but with the large red sign it is unbalanced. She said color and lighting is such an important aspect of the sign and it feels out of place with the heavy block of the logo knowing it is their brand but it feels out of place. She said the Bridge Street requirements are about fit and balance and those are the things that she feels out of place with the rest of the work that is really quite good.

Mr. Miller said thank you for the effort that has been put into this and where he is stuck is the plaza and the entire development has struggled for a large number of years and because of the state of it and the interim place and as a resident his hope is that Big Sandy's is very successful he thinks it is something that can be approved as it is proposed because the setback from John Shields Parkway is still a long way away and since they have bought the structure they are going to be there a while and that is not going to change and if they can help with their success he is not offend by any of the proposal. He said it is appropriate for the condition of the overall center and the scale of the building.

Ms. Newell said she is struggling with this proposal. She loves the street and pedestrian amenities that they are installing and thinks the sign is playful with the two dimensional location but is struggling over the area of the sign although it is a large façade it is still an incredibly large sign. She said if the red letters were white it might make it not so heavy feel.

Ms. De Rosa said if they were white it would give it a different feel if white or metallic or something with a playful feel because it would not have the heaviness. She said best case would be a smaller sign more integrated with the rest.

Ms. Mitchell said from a branding stand point it would be better to make the sign smaller than to change the color or the font.

Ms. Newell said they are entitled to a sign but with the sign package they are asking for a variance from what the Code is allowing. Also they are asking for more than allowed by Code and with not very many previous applicants having been reviewed for sign variances. She said with their proposal of things that are not anywhere else in Dublin such as the faux neon sign, this will be the first. She said no one has objected to the LED neon mimicked graphics that is in this sign but it is a large sign.

Ms. Salay asked for the comparison to the 78 square foot Lowes sign to Big Sandy's sign at 374 square foot and doesn't see how that can be scaled properly because the Big Sandy's doesn't look almost five or six times the size of Lowes.

Ms. Shelly said there are less letters and the Lowes sign is taller and the problem is that one is a photo and the other is a sketch up model. She said she measured from the building and counted parking spaces to make the examples the same distance back from the building and when she did the screen capture of the sketch up model and it is as good as a comparison they could get. She said she was trying to show that when you are at the back street edge of John Shields Parkway or at that distance from the Lowes sign and the tree canopy and at the same distance from the Big Sandy's sign the size of the sign seems smaller.

Ms. Salay said that this Big Sandys' sign has to be much larger than the example because of the difference in size and it is just not accurate.

Ms. Shelly said they perhaps because they are not seeing the full Big Sandys' sign because portions are blocked by the tree canopy at that distance and also they are not seeing the script, because it fades into the canopy.

Mr. Brown said the human element and interpretation comes in where they are trying codify a big rectangle and read the rectangle it is not an accurate measurement of the actual sign. He said they are trying to create an urban walkable district with the reality of the AMC 18, Lowes and Big Sandy exists currently, but as land values appreciate from the future plans that might change as the market reacts to what is built and created. He said there are transitional spaces and as far as big boxes and urban and the world's largest department store is Macy's in Manhattan and it fits in fine but they have introduced window shopping and other elements that have been introduced over time. He said everybody reacting to market forces is an evolution. He said he does not have an issue with the way they have presented the sign.

Mr. Stidhem said there is nothing in the proposal that is offensive and believes it is a fit for its location specifically because the competition is the Sawmill Area.

Ms. Shelly said the size of the actual Big Sandys' text is 128 feet and that is what makes the difference in the visual effect because that is the only part you see from the street and is much closer to the size of the Lowes sign.

Ms. Newell asked how tall the letters are on the Lowes sign.

Ms. Shelly said is 4ft by 16 ft.

Mr. Brown asked for the size of the Big Sandy's element.

Ms. Newell said the Big Sandy portion is 6.5 ft. and scales down to 4.2 ft. at the end and the superstore is 7 foot 10.5. She said the very biggest span is 11.4.

Ms. Newell asked if there were any more comments. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan, with one condition that the applicant obtains all required permits prior to beginning work. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, no; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa no; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, no. (Approved 4 – 3)

2. BSD SCN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B & C – Master Sign Plan **Riverside Drive**
15-099MSP **Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new 8.2 acre mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the intersection with (future) Bridge Park Avenue. This is a request for review and approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. The Commission is the final authority on this application and we will need to swear-in.

The Chair, Ms. Newell, swore in anyone intending to address the Commission with regard to this case.

Nicki Martin said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for the Bridge Park development, Blocks B & C located off Riverside Drive. She said there are two documents to review Master Sign Plans the Bridge Street District Sign Code Section 153.065(H)(E) and the newly adopted Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines which provides some direction on Master Sign Plans. She said the Administrative Review Team has made a recommendation of approval to the Planning Zoning Commission. She said the ART recommended that the applicant make some changes to the final document prior to their submission to the Commission and the changes were highlighted in the staff report. She said after the Commission's determination the approved Master Sign Plan will be administered by City staff and at a staff level they have discussed having a standing staff review meeting to process these sign permits as they come forward.

Ms. Martin said the site is located north of West Dublin-Granville Road and east of Riverside Drive. She said they are specifically talking about Block B to the south and Block C to the north. She said the applicant is required to designate a shopping corridor as part of their Site Plan approval, which has been done. She said Master Sign Plans are required for designated shopping corridors which is why they are requesting this Master Sign Plan. She said in addition, they are looking to having a cohesive sign plan for both Blocks B & C in their entirety which why all signs for these blocks are included in this proposal.

Ms. Martin said the application was submitted to the ART for concurrent review with the Bridge Park West Master Sign Plan, which was recently approved by the Architectural Review Board on December 16th.

Ms. Martin said the text is generally consistent with the Bridge Street District Code as well as the BSD Sign Guidelines and generally there are definitions and illustrative examples as well as lighting and prohibited designs and a regulation matrix. She said there are building elevations that are included for each building in Blocks B and C.

Ms. Martin said the signs are permitted based on use of each tenant, retail tenants are permitted signs based on the number of frontages. She said retail tenants with one frontage would be permitted two signs, two frontage equals three signs, and three frontage equals four signs. She said only building mounted signs are permitted in the Master Sign Plan where as in the normal Bridge Street District Code would also permit ground signs for all tenants. She said office tenants in this Master Sign Plan are only permitted wall signs and not every office tenant is permitted a wall sign - it is at the discretion of the Landlord. She said that there is a provision in the Master Sign Plan allowing anchor tenants an additional sign at the Landlord discretion and the ART is recommending that this provision be removed from the Master Sign Plan as anchor tenants are not specifically defined.

Ms. Martin said the building elevations call out proposed locations and heights of the signs and designate levels. She said the graphics and the boxes shown in the plan generally show where signs are to be permitted on the buildings. The boxes show all the permitted sign locations and not the total permitted signs for a given tenant space. She said the levels do not correspond to the floor levels, such as the ground story is in level one, but how large level two is based on the use, whether it be residential or office. The levels also dictate the height at which the sign is appropriate. She said the only sign types

allowed in level two are office tenant wall signs or place making art signs which are permitted for retail tenants only.

Ms. Martin said there are three sign types with three regulatory categories: signs with special conditions, building mounted signs, and signs not requiring a permit. She said the signs with special conditions are signs for a building and are non-tenant specific and are only related to building information including address numerals and building directory or a parking marquee sign which would be used for a parking garage. She said buildings would be permitted a canopy edge sign in the event that they wanted to have an address or a building name. She said the remaining signs are generally tenant signs and are permitted for retail tenants with wall signs being the only sign type permitted for office tenants. She said the building mounted signs would require sign permits and for tenants just the building mounted signs would require sign permits excluding the window graphics which does not required a sign permit.

Ms. Martin said the signs that are building signs are address numerals, building directory and parking marquee signs which do not exist within the Bridge Street District Code. The applicant is proposing sign sizes and locations for these sign types. She said the parking garage signs are permitted to be 150 square feet maximum, the building directory signs are permitted next to the entrances of an office or apartment building and are permitted not to exceed six square feet and the address numerals are not exceed two square feet and are required by the Fire Department.

Ms. Martin said the office tenants are permitted up to one sign at Landlord discretion so not every office tenant will have a sign. She said the office tenants are permitted signs in level two up to a maximum of 80 square feet where the Bridge Street District Code would only allow signs within the first level at a size up to 50 square feet.

Ms. Martin said retail tenant signs include new sign types including place making art signs and canopy edge signs which currently do not have a definition in the Bridge Street District Code. She said the retail tenant permanent signs include fascia/wall sign which the text states is to be a layered construction and high quality materials. She said retail tenants are permitted one square foot per lineal foot of frontage which is more than what is permitted within the Bridge Street District Code and up to a maximum 80 square feet where 50 would be permitted in the Bridge Street District. She said retail tenant signs are generally only permitted within level one which is consistent of the Bridge Street Code. She said projecting and awning signs are provided definitions as well as illustrative examples for tenants to use as guidance when submitting sign permits. She said the regulations for projecting signs and awning signs are consistent with the Bridge Street District Code.

Ms. Martin said the window signs and window graphics are also included in the application and the distinction is between a window sign and a window graphic is that a window sign includes a business name or logo and a graphic, which is a new sign type, is not permitted to include a business name or logo. Window graphics as the examples show are simply a feature connecting multiple windows, stating business hours or featured products. She said Planning is requesting the applicant clarify the difference in the Master Sign Plan between a window sign and a window graphic as they are in the same category for the general regulations matrix and in the sign permitting process it would not be clear how much area is devoted to each type. She said the applicant is proposing that window signs and window graphics not exceed 30 percent of the window area, where in the Bridge Street District Code they would be permitted 20 percent of the window area at a maximum of eight square feet.

Ms. Martin said the place making art signs is intended to contribute to the character of the street. She said this sign type is permitted for retail tenants only but the sign would be permitted at a height in level two. She said these signs are at the Landlord discretion so not every retail tenant would be permitted this sign type it would be only in cases that they are truly unique and appropriate to the streetscape. She said these are permitted at a maximum of 100 square feet.

Ms. Martin said canopy edge signs is a new sign type that the Bridge Street District Code does not consider and are for retail tenants, parking garages, and apartment address numerals. She said a maximum of 50 square feet is permitted and based on architectural character it would be less in some cases and in that case staff would refer to the graphics included in the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Brown asked if the address sign should be two square feet and would that relate to canopy edge signs.

Ms. Martin said the distinction is that if the address is on the canopy it would be considered a canopy edge sign whereas if the address numeral sign is simply to identify an individual tenant space and not the entire building it would be an address numeral sign required by the Fire Department for fire safety. She said they would be permitted to put an address numeral on the building at the size of two square feet with pin mounted letters, but if they were identifying an entire apartment building the applicant would be permitted to do something similar to the street number and the street name and they would sum those characters to get the entire area of the canopy edge sign.

Ms. Husak said in this example they have the canopy edge sign in the illustration and below the example there is an illustration of an address sign in the sign plan.

Ms. Newell said it was not clear in the packet in the way it is presented in the sign package that there is a distinction or that the area was to be summed.

Ms. Martin said the text in the Master Sign Plan and the elevation graphics are designed by the applicant to go hand in hand and equally regulate the Master Sign Plan so one cannot stand without the other and it will require Staff to reference both during the reviewing process.

Ms. Martin said retail tenant temporary sign: sandwich board signs and umbrellas signs are called out in the Master Sign Plan. She said sandwich board signs are existing in the Bridge Street District Code and the applicant is asking that these not require a permit and be double hinged, professionally designed in a dark color. She said umbrellas signs are a new sign type not existing in the Code and would also not require a permit and would be at the Landlord discretion. Only 20 percent of the umbrella awning would be permitted to have a logo on it and would be required to be brought inside in the evening and stored while not in use.

Mr. Miller said he read that sandwich boards are allowed within six feet of the building and who enforces that placement.

Ms. Martin said that Code Enforcement works with the tenants and in some instances draws a box with chalk on the sidewalk temporarily for the proper placement. The intent is to have the sandwich board signs close enough to the retail tenant that is operating the sign and to maintain a clear distance on the sidewalk for pedestrian use.

Ms. Husak said they had discussions with the applicant that as a Landlord they are going to have to be vigilant to help with adherence to the requirements that they have set forth in the lease agreements. She said there are two Code Enforcement officers on staff and it is not realistic that their entire day will be spent on enforcement sandwich board sign placement.

Ms. Martin said that the applicant will address the reason for the Master Sign Plan and tenants will be agreeing to the Master Sign Plan set forth upfront so many of the regulations will be known to them when the leases are signed.

Ms. Martin said there are a variety of lighting options that are permitted for tenants. External, internal, and indirect illumination are all permitted. She said the Master Sign Plan strongly encourages modern

lighting that is architecturally appropriate and discourages any vintage or “cutesy” lighting. She said awnings, umbrellas, and sandwich boards are not permitted to be illuminated. She said the Master Sign Plan includes additional details regarding the review process for their tenants and how to commutate size of signs and also gives a few examples of prohibited sign types.

Ms. Martin said the applicable Master Sign Plan Criteria are as follows:

- a) Allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display.
- b) 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 the applicant is requesting this Master Sign Plan because of their shopping corridor provision as well as the unique location, scale and architecture of the buildings they have had approved.

Ms. Martin said the Bridge Street District Guidelines review criteria is as follows:

- a) Signs and graphics should contribute to the vibrancy of the area
- b) Should be highly pedestrian-focused while remaining visible to those traveling by car or bicycle
- c) Placement of signs and graphics should assist with navigation, provide information, and identify businesses

Ms. Martin said the Administrative Review Team used the guideline criteria to shape their analysis. She said the applicant has touched on contributing to the vibrancy of the area and there are a variety of options to activate the streetscape. Additionally, the Master Sign Plan assists with navigation providing information that identifies the buildings and businesses.

Ms. De Rosa asked if banner and flag signs are permitted.

Ms. Martin said anything that is not covered in this Master Sign Plan would revert to the Bridge Street District Sign Code and therefore anything not permitted in the Code would also not be permitted in this Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Martin said ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission and recommended the applicant make a few modifications prior to their appearance before the Commission and that any remaining conditions be forwarded on to the Commission for their review. She said the conditions are as follows:

- 1) The general regulations matrix outlining the sign types and allowances should be updated to include all applicable sign type regulations;
- 2) The MSP should be updated to:
 - a. Delete the provision for additional signs for Anchor Tenants;
 - b. Include additional sign type definitions and examples including address numerals, building directory, and umbrella signs;
 - c. Include that window graphics require landlord approval; and, to differentiate window graphics and window signs in the general regulations matrix; and
- 3) The applicant provide the revised approved MSP to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

Ms. Martin said the applicant has a presentation and she is happy to answer any questions regarding the ART analysis and recommendation.

Matt Starr, 555 Metro Place, Dublin, said he doesn't have a presentation other than the package. He said his role at Crawford Hoying is Director of Development and most of his time is spent working with tenants to sign leases. He said this is one of the first questions that comes up with prospective tenants. It is location, rate, and signage opportunities. He said it is important to address these questions up front and create some certainty for them. He said they have worked on this for many months, nearly a year in

collaboration with Kolar Design who is working with the City on the City wide way finding efforts. It made a lot of sense for them to work with Kolar on the sign package so there is cohesiveness of thought and how they approach this plan.

Mr. Starr said they are trying to meet the needs of everyone especially pedestrians and automobiles. He said they have to create a balance with the four sided buildings and they thought about that when they created this package. He said they did their best to identify where they thought all the spaces were and where the signs would want signs knowing that all the spaces have not been leased there will be changes. He said the most important is the quality of signs and this plan shows to people and they understand what is expected. He said they have been giving the plan to people for the rules they will have to follow to get a permit. He said if they have something creative and outside the box they will have to come back and amend the document.

Mr. Starr said they may have not identified all the places and in his review he realized they missed a sign that they want to make sure they add as a condition which is the garage sign on the B garage and is very similar to the sign on the C garage on page 48 or 49 of the plan. He said the sign location 2A in the C garage has similar signs to the B garage as well as parking marquee along Banker Drive and a smaller sign on the Long Shore side and they will identify them on the final document.

Mr. Starr said the canopy edge sign is seen as identifiers for the buildings and mainly residential and office lobbies and that is how those buildings will be identified. He said the tenant signs would most likely be above the door or to the right of the door depending on the approach. He said the sandwich boards will be monitored every day because their offices will be there and they will be making sure those are where they should be as close to the door as possible.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone from the public would like to address the Commission. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Brown said that he hopes everyone speaks up and speaks their mind on this application. He said he likes the package as a whole. He said the way the Commission reacted to the first go around on some of the images and elements presented they loved the creative and outside the box and understands that people are trying to bring things to the table that can be expedient and passed through easily. He wondered what methods they can use to encourage people to be creative and not feel like they have a huge cost of presentation and drawings so that they can put some money into some creative elements and unique and bring it for review that is not costing a fortune.

Mr. Brown said he doesn't want this to be generic vanilla development where there is no urban excitement and they fail if that occurs and he thinks Crawford Hoying recognizes that but it is not always the easy and expedient method, but would encourage staff to figure out a someway to make it expedient and economical for someone that is signing a lease to bring something creative to the table.

Matt Starr said they did not arrive there quickly and they started with the base code because it is what was put into place and there are some deviations.

Ms. Newell said since they are making a deviation between the 20 percent window signage and they have come up with 30 percent. She asked why the increase.

Mr. Starr is was because of the scale of the first floor. He said Building C1 there is a 20 foot clear height so there a larger window. He said standard is 16 feet and this building has 20 feet. He said Building C3 and B3 that climb up the hill at the lower level is close to 20 feet so there are large windows and to get the appropriate scale they ended up with 30 percent.

Ms. Newell said it was physically analyzed and are they able to present or provide information with better pictorial graphics.

Mr. Starr said they did have Building C2 rendered but it was not included in the package.

Ms. Newell asked that they clarify the difference the window graphics and the window signs in the 30 percent limitation if it covers both of those components.

Mr. Starr agreed it is 30 percent in total.

Ms. Newell said she is more comfortable with 30 percent total.

Mr. Brown said it is interesting in the way they define signs and the size of signs but part of it is the opacity of any given sign. He said the pie whole and the makers café have a much more solid sign and there are some with hours and the surf club there is a very light opacity and asked how they gauge that because you can see through more of it, it is more acceptable than if it is a big block of white.

Mr. Starr said they do not distinguish but they are only covering 30 percent of the window and there is an enormous amount of opacity coming through the window and all the signs that are reflected in the package are well done even they have the different characteristics as described.

Ms. Newell said the artistic place making signs are being put in the second level but could not see them extending to the top of the second level especially when they are to be more pedestrian oriented and would be more comfortable if there was a maximum elevation defined as it relates to each of the buildings because they are envisioning signage at the top of each of the buildings.

Mr. Starr said he envisioned the bottom of the signs is at the floor of the second levels.

Ms. Newell said it needs to be defined at that level. She said each tenant with a street frontage is allowed two of any type of sign, so if they have an art place making sign that would count as one sign.

Mr. Starr said it would be correct but it is not likely that a tenant that has one street frontage would have a place making sign and agreed it would be one of the two signs.

Ms. Newell said the umbrellas signage graphics is not necessary to put signage on umbrellas in addition to all the other signage that they get with the buildings. She said no one is going to want to see fast food logos on umbrellas and would like to have it eliminated. She asked if the parking signs are defined in the package and if they know what they want they will begin to set the precedence for the creativity and would like them finalized within the sign package.

Mr. Starr said they are at the development level of the parking signs and analyzing the costs because the Parking Garage B and C are financed through the City they have to fit within the context and will include them in the sign package.

Ms. Newell said the building directory signs should be uniform throughout the buildings especially with locations on the buildings as a point of wayfinding.

Mr. Starr said they will be next to the doors and it made sense to have consistency.

Ms. Martin said the Text requires that they are located on the exterior wall next to the entrances.

Ms. Newell asked what their review process will be for the tenant graphics.

Mr. Starr said Russ Hunter and himself will be reviewing the signs as part of the sign package and have been giving the document to tenants upfront so they are aware of the rules as part of the design of their

space and the signs will be submitted to them and it will be reviewed for quality, color, adherence to the plan before any permits are submitted.

Ms. Martin said the City will require a letter from the landlord with every sign permit application.

Mr. Miller asked if the number of signs on the offices is at the discretion of the landlord and for examples of the office signs.

Mr. Starr agreed and said examples were in the package.

Mr. Miller asked if every tenant could have a sign on one side of the buildings.

Mr. Starr said there are specified locations for the signs and the locations are limited and there will be more tenants in the buildings than exterior sign locations.

Ms. Salay said she echoed Ms. Newell's opinion about umbrellas signs and multiple tenants with lots of patios it can be busy with a lot of graphics on the umbrellas and is not necessary with all the other opportunities for signage.

Ms. Husak asked if it could be considered as a sign option out of all the permissible options or do they want to eliminate it completely.

Ms. Salay said it should be eliminated altogether because umbrellas could be designed separately or in groups at varied sizes and coverage of them could get out of control.

Ms. Mitchell said many of the alcohol manufacturers provide umbrellas with their logos on them which are tacky.

Mr. Starr said they would not allow those types of umbrellas.

Ms. Martin said that the Text requires the graphics to be an approved corporate logo for the business approved by the landlord.

Ms. Newell said it is cleaner to eliminate umbrellas signage.

Mr. Brown agreed.

Mr. Stidhem agreed and asked to see the Bridge Street Sign Code verses to proposed master sign plan variances.

Mr. Starr said the variances are the windows and a wall sign type combination is a total of 80 square feet and is what is architecturally appropriate and the size of the sign and the scale of the building and balancing the pedestrian and the auto views, especially considering it's a new development. He said the other variance is the number of signs and the quality of signs.

Ms. Martin said the number of signs for each tenant within the Bridge Street District Code tenant within the first story of any structure is permitted two building mounted signs of a different types, plus one additional building mounted sign should they have an entrance to a public parking space to the rear or the side of their building, which up to three building mounted signs for a tenant. She said across the board within the Bridge Street District any tenant is permitted one ground sign per street frontage up to two signs. She said this applicant is not permitting any ground signs. She said the most consistent guideline is the retail with two frontages would be permitted three building mounted signs which is similar to what is permitted within the Bridge Street District today. She said for three frontage it would

take a large tenant especially within this type of building to meet that requirement and in that case staff felt it appropriate to permit four building mounted signs because this development does not permit any ground signs. She said that the ART is recommending that the anchor tenant provision be eliminated because it is unclear and difficult to enforce.

Mr. Stidhem asked to clarify the 50 feet versus the 80 feet wall signs.

Ms. Martin said the wall signs within the Bridge Street District tenants are permitted at a sign area of ½ a square foot per lineal foot of frontage and this application is proposing one square foot per lineal foot of frontage which is consistent with the standard City Sign Code. She said the maximum size of a permitted wall sign in the District is currently 50 square feet which the applicant is proposing 80 square feet which is consistent with the standard City Sign Code and the height of the signs is consistent across the board with the Bridge Street District Code.

Mr. Stidhem asked why they dialed the Bridge Street District back and if logical why they are deviating that from that in this package.

Ms. Martin said the idea for signs within the Bridge Street District is that more signs are permitted but they would be smaller and in more diverse combinations than the standard City Code would permit and in this case given the scale of the buildings with respect to height and number of stories it is unique from any other redevelopment project in the City and the additional sign size is appropriate.

Ms. Newell said the proposed 80 square foot sign would fit the span of the tenant spaces and she is comfortable with the size.

Ms. Martin said the building architecture, especially the tenants not on the end cap, would limit sign size because they would not have enough frontage to max out the 80 square feet size regulation and just the second story office tenants are the main tenants that will be hitting the maximum and they are elevated off the road and is not meant to be a pedestrian scale.

Ms. De Rosa said there was a lot of dialog about size, dimension, fit, and feel and makes her concerned to make that big a jump from 50 to 80 square feet. She said you can't get the scale or context in this particular illustrations.

Mr. Starr said it is true with the renderings and they will not know until the buildings are up. He said the buildings are deep at around 100 feet deep and for frontages of a certain size the tenant will not be able to max the size out.

Mr. Brown asked who governs Crawford Hoving signs for location and size and when there is an empty store front and there is advertisement for space. He asked what will be put in the windows or the doors or during tenant improvements but he understands that they have the opportunity to advertise the space is for lease.

Ms. Martin said the applicant will occupying a tenant space in one of these buildings and will have an office tenant appropriate wall mounted sign and the temporary signage is governed by the Bridge Street District Code and in no case are temporary signs permitted to exist longer than 30 days, so those would have to be changed out and they would have to file for a temporary sign permit through the City with a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval. She said the tenant spaces changing out has not be considered.

Mr. Starr said they would defer to the Code.

Mr. Brown said there are going to be empty store fronts and there will be a level of advertisement for lease and at what level of opacity and covering a space that is no longer there maybe there should be a package that covers the windows in a respectful non-attention calling manner.

Mr. Papsidero said it would be a good topic to address in the Master Sign Plan. He said there have been issues Downtown with the way the empty storefronts have been treated with plywood and the graphics that are attached to them has caused some issues and by that example it makes sense to try and figure it out as part of this package.

Mr. Stidhem said he thinks the wall signs are too big. He said the examples of huge gaudy signs on the sides of the buildings in Dayton and he fears there will be big gaudy tacky signs on the sides of these buildings.

Ms. Newell said in the areas the signs are proposed and developing the 80 square feet is by the length of someone's name so if there are a lot of letters in the name of the company the square footage would be longer or shorter based on the letters. She said they could put a limitation on the height of the text or control it because any square foot sign would be 8 x 10, but the building is not designed to support 8 foot of width of a sign, which is why she was comfortable with the 80 square foot in this instance.

Ms. De Rosa said they could dial it back and if there are exceptions bring them in because there are other ways to do it and thought the size makes them uncomfortable because it is hard to envision.

Ms. Mitchell said it is a big increase and 80 square feet could look different depending upon the orientation horizontally or vertical and is hard to say it can be bigger without the text.

Mr. Stidhem said the sign package has great work and commended the time that has been involved in the Master Sign Plan stating it represents awesome work.

Mr. Brown said there are elevations of every building and they have defined given areas and he agrees 80 square feet is big if it is tall and not long, but it is about proportion and aesthetics and asked that they show these examples on the buildings indicated the permitted areas.

Ms. De Rosa said they should still push back on the dimensions because that will create the conversation and it will be difficult if one is approved. She said they want signs that are smaller and more interesting and diverse and not take normal signage and place on the building. She said they want to encourage diversity and there are ways to do that and they will get more of the conversations they just had with a previous case.

Ms. De Rosa said she loves the examples in the plan and asked for the parking garage slide to be displayed. She said they have an opportunity with the parking garage to set an example and not sure what is proposed sets the example with the large round circle with a letter "P" nor do they have to spell out the word parking. She said they have not arrived at the example they really want to set and encourage them to take the opportunity to do something unique.

Ms. Salay said they can do more with the buildings with the types sign and need to do something that is unique and more interesting and make it worth it with quality and detail and not glowing plastic letters on a building. She said the signs should be depending on the other graphics along the block and what the tenant are achieving.

Mr. Starr said this case is a new development and is a new place with structured parking behind so the identification for the tenants are important and the branding they are going to have to push for creativity. He said he hears them being uncomfortable with 80 square feet and thought 50 square feet is too small.

Ms. Newell said there is potential with the limitation of the height of the graphics in terms of placement on the buildings. She said the point of the deviation is to get creativity in exchange for the larger sign and suggested they do more presentation work showing how the height of the sign will fit within the area on the buildings.

Mr. Starr said they will bring more dimensions of signs and images from other places that will help show the appropriateness on the buildings.

Ms. Mitchell said people learn and recognize brands and not based on the size of the logo or sign but by the distinctiveness and certain elements that are creative. She said the size is not the determining factor of what makes a great sign and they should find a way to think about other dimensions other than just size that would be very helpful.

Mr. Stidhem said they should keep the signs at 50 square feet and then if they go outside the 50 square foot they would come back for further approval.

Ms. Husak said the Bridge Street District provisions were conservative on purpose. She said they are not here asking for a sign plan for bigger signs they are required to come to the Commission with a sign plan because the Code has built that into the Shopping Corridor that has been designated for their location. She said the 50 square foot they were being conservative to the sign provisions knowing that there are certain areas it was too conservative and knew that there was another layer of scrutiny added to those provisions.

Ms. Newell asked what action the applicant would like them to do with the application.

Mr. Starr asked to table the application and come back with information to address the questions that have been brought forth.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to table this Master Sign Plan application at the request of the applicant. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0)

3. MAG PUD and Perimeter Center, Subarea D – MAG, Land Rover, Jaguar, Porsche 15-113Z/PDP 6335 Perimeter Loop Road Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a Rezoning for approximately 30 acres from Planned Unit Development District (Midwestern Auto Group plan) and PCD (Perimeter Center, Subarea D) to PUD for the expansion of the Midwestern Auto Group (MAG) campus to incorporate an additional 5.4 acres into the PUD to accommodate the construction of a combined showroom for the Jaguar and Land Rover brands. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a rezoning with preliminary development plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Ms. Husak said she could do a presentation but it seemed there might be a few questions that would not require a full presentation.

Ms. Salay said she wanted to talk about architecture.

Ms. Husak said this is a rezoning and preliminary development stage and they are looking at an entire site that is now 30 acres by trying to incorporate 5.5 acres of vacant land on the eastern side of the

campus. She said when the applicant was here in October with the concept plan which is a requirement of the rezoning to the PUD for this particular application, they had presented the Porsche development in the northern portion of the site to take the place of the existing Land Rover building to the north and expanding the main campus building across the pond for their Lamborghini franchise and specifically to talk about Jaguar and Land Rover on the vacant parcel. She said there were conversations of shifting some of the buildings around and looking at switching Porsche with Land Rover or Jaguar building and they talked about it after and they were concerned with the lack of size that the Porsche building would have on that particular parcel and the applicant has more information on why they chose that locations are they are presenting. She said the application is ahead of the programming schedule for Jaguar and Land Rover and Porsche is lagging behind in programming.

Ms. Husak said Subarea A and B are existing and creating a third Subarea C for the additional five acres which is currently an office subarea within Perimeter Center and would take it out of and incorporate it into the MAG PUD which the applicant has been asked to do to create one large PUD for MAG specifically. She said the Community Plan shows this parcel as proposed as well as Subarea B more as an office and Intuitional District and less of a Commercial District. She said they have had conversations at the Commission and City Council on the merits of having a more commercially oriented use on this site and in the Planning Report they gave more detailed analysis as to why the applicant thought it made sense here and staff thought it was an appropriate land use on that site. She said office is always a permitted in the PUD for MAG so if anything were to happen for redevelopment that would still be an option.

Ms. Husak said the details show a continuation of car display with the finger like arrangement, which is unique to MAG. She said there are two storm water retention ponds that are wet ponds on site. She said access is shared with Nationwide Children's Hospital in the top which was a requirement when Children's Hospital went in and the easement for cross access was already in place. She said the main change is that they have made the service area at a lower level because of the concerns of the overhead doors being visible from US33/161. She said the landscaping is in line with what exists today with a lower screening along the highway but having trees in a symmetrical pattern along the are display.

Ms. Husak said the architecture has not changed significantly from the concept plan except for changes to the side elevations. She said the architecture is very modern and simple in terms of the form and the elevations show how recessed the doors are and how the angles are created with the windows and how it flows with the campus as a modern and innovative design using a lot of metal and grey color schemes like the remainder of the campus.

Ms. Husak said there are some allowances in the proposed development text for the signs essentially allowing wall signs which the Commission had approved for Audi as well as for BMW and Mini along the US33 frontage and the applicant is requesting an overall allowance of 100 square feet to be divided between the two signs where one is proposed to be larger than 50 square feet, but the other is smaller so together they are still at 100. She said the other signs being proposed are in line with what is approved on the campus in terms of a campus identification sign on Venture Drive at the access point and the smaller lower brand signs that they have now and are visible for the users of site as they are driving in to make sure they know where to go for service. She said they are not requiring logos to adhere to logo size requirements. She said the height is at 20 feet across those buildings, where the Commission held steady at 15-foot requirement for BMW, Mini and Audi.

Ms. Husak said there are some conditions for the storm water management requirements and the applicant has been working with Engineering to make sure that they have all the information needed and there is more information to come at the final development plan, which is required to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the traffic study there are comments as the expansion of the site on vacant land there is a traffic study component required and they had some comments the applicant is to address prior to Council review.

Ms. Husak said they are recommending approval to City Council with the following nine conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to ensure replacement trees are not counted to fulfill other requirements;
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to relocate as many newly planted trees as possible and to find appropriate locations for replacement trees on site;
- 3) That the Traffic Impact Study be updated to address Engineering comments, subject to approval by Engineering, prior to introduction of this rezoning Ordinance at City Council; 4) That the applicant update the proposed plans to accurately indicate the required setbacks along the southern property line;
- 5) That the proposed development text be revised to address the sign allowances in Subarea A to more accurately reflect the sign needs for the single brand building anticipated;
- 6) That any site modifications to Subarea A include the analysis and any necessary modifications to the current storm water management plan to ensure storm water requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are satisfied;
- 7) That the applicant work with staff prior to the Final Development Plan stage to identify and incorporate appropriate safety measures along the south side of the proposed western retention basin to protect vehicles traveling on westbound US33/SR 161;
- 8) That all technical comments associated with storm water management and civil plans are addressed prior to filing a Final Development Plan application, and;
- 9) That the applicant submit additional information and details for the proposed retaining wall along the eastern retention basin as part of the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Newell wanted a clarification for what is envisioned for the safe barrier along SR161 and the retention pond.

Ms. Husak said for the BMW and Mini site, there is a pond that is not a storm water management pond and is close to the roadway and with the unfortunate incidents where vehicles have driven off the road in other areas of town, they have been working with Engineering to provide a barrier that is aesthetically pleasing and cannot be seen because it blends in and will not be noticed.

Mr. Miller said the entrance to Children's Hospital space between the entrance to MAG and to the road is only about 20 feet and asked if it could be moved farther from the main road because he witnessed a fire truck accessing the drive and was surprised by the speed of traffic along the roadway making the maneuver into MAG unsafe. He asked that Engineering take a look at it to make the access safer.

Ms. Husak said Venture Drive is not considered a front door for the MAG campus and ideally it is not where patrons will enter the site and she will have Engineering take a look at it.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, said Jaguar and Land Rover National decided to change their prototype and they were 90 percent complete on construction documents ready to submit to start the building that was approved last year. He said they turned off 40 projects across the country and that is why they are back. He said during this process with Audi, BMW and Mini coming online MAG's business has grown substantially. He has the opportunity to master plan some of the other brands that are available with Porsche that they did within the Volvo addition and now that is growing into their own facility being proposed for the north side of the campus. He said in the Land Rover deal he is able to get Jaguar as a new brand to Dublin. He said the question last time was could the buildings be flipped and after that meeting he did a site plan and because of the scale of the buildings Audi is such a small gem between two larger building that are close enough that it works, where this site is a bit removed from the BMW because of the display fingers. He said they felt the scale of this building needed to be larger to accommodate the displays. He said the area behind become the employee and overflow inventory lot for the MAG campus, with a larger building on this site it would take away from the operational side of MAG and is why they didn't want to have that inventory employee lot along the SR161 corridor and kept it confined to the Venture Drive side which is not the main entrance to the campus.

Mr. Parish said this is a new prototype for Jaguar and Land Rover and they are very excited about bringing this to the market with the hope that this location to be one of the first in the United States for this prototype. He said MAG is very excited about the opportunity to bring this online.

Mr. Parish said the concerns from last review was that service drive was on the side which is uncharacteristic MAG campus and he redesigned with the sunk in service drive, two tiered much the same experience that exists which was not approved by Jaguar/Land Rover National and he had to redesign it with it in the middle of the building and tucked it around the side much like the Audi facility and removed the service sign that was above. He said the other concern was that the front elevation was a flat elevation and they tried to do additional moves and design ideas on the front elevation and being that this is their first new prototype going nationally across America they wanted to stay with the current design and could not give leeway on their first facility that they are building in North America.

Mr. Parish said they did allow to drop the signage down from the second panel from the top which exceeding current conditions on campus. He said the two proposed signs go to 20 feet and is a matter of the proportion of the building. He said the prototype has six blocks as a base and six blocks as a top. He said if they shrink the building it would be by two bands across but the building becomes smaller against the context on the corridor, so BMW and Audi buildings are over 30 feet tall and with taking two bands away they would be the stepchild to those buildings at 24 feet. He said in an effort to give the scale of the front elevation it is flat with beveled display window on the first floor, to give a scale that is equal to the Audi they did the entrance in the center has been recessed back an additional five feet from where it was to create two jewel boxes that have the cars aligned in the front. He said it was an opportunity that with speaking with Jaguar/Land Rover that they were willing to compromise on setting it back and dropping the elevation and getting the service drive around and keep the new prototype as a flat elevation.

Mr. Parish said they removed the car wash component from this building to reduce it down and removed one of the display fingers to handle the placement of the pond for retention and they are working with Engineering with final civil requirements. He said he will be back for the Lamborghini and Porsche in the next coming months with further details on those two buildings.

Mr. Brown asked what the building materials are.

Mr. Parish said composite panel with a closed system with metal in the back and is a dark mat gray finish and will bring samples at the final development plan.

Mr. Brown said the service drive has a large expanse of blank wall and in that evaluation there is showing many trees in front of it, though he does not have a problem with it, the view from SR161 and angle of the service drive exposes the wall. He said it is the angle and the way they enter the service drive it will not effectively screen from SR161 because the trees will not be layered in front and if they bring the service drive parallel then they could put trees in front.

Ms. Husak said they had asked that they break up that elevation somehow.

Mr. Parish said they are doing further articulation on the service area blank wall and is happy to accommodate that with sliding it over to get it less down the middle of the finger.

Ms. Salay said the architecture is a prototype and they do not want to change it because it is the first one out of the box and so they are getting the plainest vanilla of the buildings that will be built because they are the first and going forward they may be willing to deviate, but this is what they will roll out for the initial example that will be shared with everyone across the country. She said she is concerned that this

is not going to be as spectacular as the rest of the campus and not in keeping with what they have done out there. She said this is the entrance as they drive east to west.

Mr. Parish said the discussions with them they were steadfast on the sloped roof, the green color and they feel they have gotten rid of those things that was not preferred and created it more about the vehicles and less about the architecture so that this can be a jewel box much like the competitors. He said they are going to be more steadfast on this is the prototype and this is what they are keeping because they are not asking for a lot of the out of the box elements such as towers etc., they are just keeping the architecture simple and the only deviations are if the service is on the side or in the middle of the building.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone from the public would like to address the Commission. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Newell said she is fine with the architecture of the building and it is going to be their out of the box prototype but the finishes on the building with the overall campus she likes this proposal better than the previous applications that were submitted for the architecture with the building. She said the plainness and simpleness of this can complement everything else that is on the campus. She said in whole congress with this campus is probably one of the finest designs auto dealership she has ever seen anywhere that she has traveled. She said they have done a fantastic job. She said it will look nice when it's done and she would have liked to see more play with the two front jewel boxes so that there was a bigger recess or maybe a little wider separation but she still likes the architecture of the building.

Ms. Newell said the proportion of the buildings are not going to look right if they squash down the glass or building so have the signage at that location and the deviation in height it fits the architecture of these buildings. She said she would like to see the condition of where the sum of the signs to the 100 square foot, because they could have a potential 100 foot sign and they need to limit one of the signs at the maximum of 55 square foot and the condition needs to include that no sign can exceed the 55 square feet.

Ms. Newell asked Ms. Husak to revise the conditions and read them into the record.

Ms. Husak said there are two additional conditions added requesting approval with 11 conditions as follows:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to ensure replacement trees are not counted to fulfill other requirements;
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to relocate as many newly planted trees as possible and to find appropriate locations for replacement trees on site;
- 3) That the Traffic Impact Study be updated to address Engineering comments, subject to approval by Engineering, prior to introduction of this rezoning Ordinance at City Council; 4) That the applicant update the proposed plans to accurately indicate the required setbacks along the southern property line;
- 5) That the proposed development text be revised to address the sign allowances in Subarea A to more accurately reflect the sign needs for the single brand building anticipated;
- 6) That any site modifications to Subarea A include the analysis and any necessary modifications to the current storm water management plan to ensure storm water requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are satisfied;
- 7) That the applicant work with staff prior to the Final Development Plan stage to identify and incorporate appropriate safety measures along the south side of the proposed western retention basin to protect vehicles traveling on westbound US33/SR 161;
- 8) That all technical comments associated with storm water management and civil plans are addressed prior to filing a Final Development Plan application;
- 9) That the applicant submit additional information and details for the proposed retaining wall along the eastern retention basin as part of the Final Development Plan;

- 10) That the applicant work with staff to provide either additional articulation, landscaping or layout changes for the service drive for the southern elevation of the service area at the final development plan stage, and;
- 11) That the text be revised to limit the sign size of a single wall sign in Subarea C to 55 square feet.

Mr. Parish agreed to the revised conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with 11 conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

4. BSC SCN – Bridge Park, Block A 15-117PP/FP

Riverside Drive and SR 161 Preliminary Plat/Final Plat

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a Preliminary and Final Plat for a development of approximately 3.75 acres into four lots, one reserve and associated easements for the future development of a hotel, parking garage, office building and event center as part of the Bridge Park development. This site is located northeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and SR 161. This is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary and Final Plat under the provisions of Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Downie presented the Preliminary and Final Plat for Block A of the Bridge Park development. She said the Development Plan and Site Plan have been submitted and are beginning the Administrative Review Team process. She said the area identified on the Acura site for future Mooney Way will require separate easements.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended with two conditions.

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.
- 2) The final plat will require a note to address the ownership and maintenance of the proposed Reserve A.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development, said they wanted to share what had been presented to City Council. He noted that these are not the final renderings nor what will be submitted for their final submittal.

Mr. Hunter presented slides showing the overall development including Longshore Drive, the hotel building, event center, parking garage and future office building along Riverside Drive.

Mr. Hunter said the event center, parking garage, and hotel will be a part of the Development Plan and Site Plan that the Planning Commission will be reviewing in February. He said the office building will be submitted separately. He said the intention is that these three buildings will be constructed and operational by the Memorial Tournament 2017.

Mr. Hunter said the differences from what was presented to City Council is that the parking garage has been reduced by one story due to conversations with Staff that they are over parked. He said they also modified the roof structure on the event center to be angled instead of flat to make it appear taller next to the eight hotel. He said this is a jewel building and it made sense to be creative with the shape and massing. He said they lifted a side up and added a clear story providing some natural light into the event

spaces. He said they have developed the entrance to the parking garage to creating something unique that would be visible from the event center patio.

Mr. Hunter said the hotel brand is AC by Marriott. He said that Marriott gives a lot of latitude to how the buildings are designed. He said they want their buildings to be contemporary and let it be a reflection of the place it is located and the architecture that surrounds them. He said Moody Nolan has done a fantastic job at creating a building that is truly unique. He said the inspiration is from the river with ripples of water in the façade as it transitions from the south to the north.

Mr. Hunter said the hotel is 150 rooms with ground floor hotel services including the lounge, bar, and breakfast areas along Riverside Drive with floor to ceiling glass opening the space up to the river. He said there are covered patios on both the north and south sides. He said there is a dedicated elevator that will access the roof top bar which will occupy the eighth story creating a truly unique setting with stunning views. He said all of the mechanics are hidden inside the architecture on the roof.

Mr. Hunter said the event center will be run by Cameron Mitchell Premier Events. He said there will be seating for 500 for a wedding or 700 for a lecture style event. He said there is a pre-function space which is a glass box that faces the open space to the north which is the park/plaza land between the hotel and event center. He said it will be set up similar to Columbus Museum of Art's new garden, with permanent stakes in the ground for a 40 by 60-square-foot tent for the intention that an event will be able to use the space.

Mr. Hunter said the garage entry consists of metal panels sitting at different angles with some transparent, glass, and solid to create an urban mosaic to be seen from the roundabout through the plaza. He said Moody Nolan has come up with interesting materials for the hotel building with a cementitious panel that appears to be wood, giving an organic feel. He said that the landscaping for the event center will include a pleached trees which will create a canopy with the tree cut high to enable pedestrian activity under the canopy.

Mr. Stidhem said he is looking forward to the rooftop bar and asked if they had considered green roof materials such as plants for the roof of the event center to improve the visual looking down from the hotel and office building.

Mr. Hunter said they changed the roof material of the event center to be sloped metal.

Ms. Newell said there are vegetated roofs on sloped roofs.

Mr. Hunter said the rooftop equipment will not be seen from the street level and they are taking care to plan for them as appropriately as possible.

Mr. Brown said they can see the excitement about the hotel and hopes it becomes the standard for "Dublinesque". He said event centers generally are not fancy because there is not a lot of revenue in them. He said he likes the parking garage and would like to see special attention to the design of the event center tent. He said the event center on the circle is an important element because it is an initial exposure for Bridge Park and hope it reads well. He said the hotel is very unique, insightful and outstanding.

Ms. Newell said it is very exciting and shares the same concern for the tent structure and how it will interplay with the buildings.

Mr. Hunter said the tent will not be the highest element in the space. He said there will be canopy lighting which will act as the roof of the space with a pavilion and band stand which will work together.

Ms. De Rosa said the project is fantastic and asked what he meant by the event center being a jewel.

Mr. Hunter said they looked at the design of the as a jewelry box with the focus on what happens on the inside. He said it is envisioned to be used mostly for weddings and the visitors' bureau has high hopes for trying to attract trade shows. He said the smaller building needs to take on a different vibe that is well proportioned and stands out in a good way.

Ms. De Rosa said they anticipated that there will be some carryover with the dramatic part of the hotel onto the events building.

Mr. Hunter said the window patterns match which does not read the same at this scale.

Ms. De Rosa suggested they get the lighting and flooring correct which can make the difference in a trade show experience.

Mr. Miller asked the name of the wood like material being used for the hotel.

Mr. Hunter said it is Oko Skin.

Mr. Brown asked that they research Battelle Hall on their LED scheme which can be varied in color and match an event. He said JW Marriott has a glass entrance that is done extremely well. He said to look at Dry Design for the multi-faceted element on the parking garage.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone from the public would like to address the Commission. [Hearing none.] She asked if the applicant had agreed to the two conditions.

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.
- 2) The final plat will require a note to address the ownership and maintenance of the proposed Reserve A.

Mr. Hunter agreed.

Ms. Salay asked for clarification on Mooney Street.

Ms. Downie indicated it provides one way right-in access from SR 161.

Ms. Salay asked why the streets are ultimately proposed as private drives.

Mr. Stanford said the decision was based on the street character especially on Longshore Loop. He said the emphases is on pedestrians and a large area of the street dedicated for valet and drop-off for the hotel which did not fit what is a typical public street. He said the custom elements with the bollards would not be something the City would want to maintain.

Mr. Brown emphasized the importance of what happens in the future round-about. He asked that when the final landscape design is planned, that it is not looked at two dimensionally. He said this will be a very important entrance to Bridge Park and asked that it be given a lot of consideration.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a preliminary plat/final plat with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**5. Dublin Service Center PUD – Expansion
15-125AFDP**

**6555 Shier Rings Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a two-story addition to the rear the Dublin Service Center building located on the south side of Shier Rings Road, between Eiterman Road and Avery-Muirfield Drive. This is a request for review and of amended final development plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and will require two votes. The Commission is the final authority on this application and we will need to swear-in.

Ms. Newell said because this is on the consent agenda there is no need for a formal presentation.

The Chair, Ms. Newell, swore in anyone intending to address the Commission with regard to this case.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve this Minor Text Modification. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve this Amended Final Development Plan with six conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Husak introduced Megan O'Callaghan the Public Works Director and Brian Ashford the Facilities Manager who has been working on this application and are on City staff getting the application moving forward to shuffle people around from all the City buildings.

Planning Items

[There were none.]

Communications

Ms. Husak introduced Logan Stang and said this is his first week as a full fledged planner, full time staff member and said they are beyond excited to have him on board.

Ms. Husak said there are flyers being sent out for registration to Phoenix Arizona which is the site of the National Conference for American Planning Association being held April 2 – 5, 2016. She said they have heard a lot of fun items from other planning folks that they are professional and friends with so this may provide some opportunities such as a panel discussion that Vince is doing. She said to think about it and asked that they move on registration and reservations for lodging quickly.

Ms. Salay asked the value of the training opportunity to what they are looking for the community, because in Seattle there were many things that were relatable to the Dublin Community in terms of their neighborhoods and parks and the Bridge Street District like developments that was very relevant.

Mr. Papsidero said there has been a lot of redevelopment in their downtown trying to urbanize plus some of the suburban communities, so there may be some good lessons learned. He said they can look into that and share more in an email or at the next meeting.

Ms. Husak said if there is any interest we could do a block of rooms and finalize later.

Ms. Newell said she is interested in going again to the conference but because she is up for reappointment that would happen after the registrations.

Mr. Brown agreed and said he is in if he is reappointed.

Ms. De Rosa said there is probably a fair amount of thinking in the area regarding senior living which is something they have thought a lot about.

Mr. Papsidero said he had seen articles in the planning magazine as part of the conference issues and is sure it will be a theme at the conference.

Mr. Papsidero said at the next meeting there will be more planning items on the agenda and going to be doing a preview of the Bright Road Area Plan Study and introduce it before they complete the process and it comes formally.

Ms. Salay asked for a summary of the public input.

Ms. Husak said they are also going to have the GIS staff give an overview of what they have been working on and how it might be beneficial for them to use in their analysis of cases or sites.

Mr. Papsidero said they will be asking what their thoughts are in terms of training later in the year with Greg Dale.

Mr. Brown said this Commission finally had one of the most dissension on any one issue they have had before and he hopes no one is offending by a strong opinion because that is what they are here for and he is influenced by all the opinions and comments and loves a good debate on every issue and encourages it and love that they finally didn't have a vote 7 approval vote.

Mr. Brown asked for Mr. Hartmann to touch on precedent because he thinks they may be worried about passing something that sets a precedent.

Mr. Hartmann said the biggest issues that comes up on precedent on a legal perspective is when you are doing the administrative tasks such as sign issues. He said it is not nearly as important as they might think when it comes to a court case because there is a lot of times where they knew they were making a mistake and they are fixing it now and courts are very deferential in the 2506 Appeals. He said as long as they are articulate to sticking to the criteria and layout based on the criteria why they think it's different the courts recognize land is different everywhere and the precedential value gets over played. He said it is not a huge issue as long it is articulated out. He said he can never guarantee what a court is going to do but they have run into that being an issue.

Mr. Papsidero agreed.

Ms. Salay said that is why she wanted to make sure there was a thorough dialog and wanted staff to articulate the thought complete thought process to have the record built.

Mr. Papsidero said someone may try to use a case against them and beat up staff, but he is not too concerned because it is case specific and they did not set a precedent and it can be easily defended.

Ms. Husak said in the second meeting in January they will get the list of things that have been files and potential applications. She said they have been engaged by Ohio University to work with them on their Master Planning for the western portion and will kick off next week with an outline four month process to get a Master Plan in place. She said they have been asking for this and attached some conditions to that when they built their buildings. She said this will be coming to the Commission and City Council because they anticipated that they will need to amend the zoning district that they are in to make sure it works for a campus, because when they created the West Innovation District they did not anticipate university to be a use on that site.

Mr. Papsidero said the Master Plan itself would serve as the foundation for the zoning district specific to their campus so that it will be legalized through the Code and secured through the Code and implemented over time the way the rest of the West Innovation District is supposed to be implemented and facilitate their investment.

Mr. Papsidero said they are interviewing for a Planner II position so they hope to have a candidate selected shortly and it will be very exciting for Current Planning to have one more person to help.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 19, 2016.