

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 3, 2015

#### AGENDA

1. **Perimeter West PCD, Subarea 2 - Dublin Springs Hospital** **7625 Hospital Drive**  
**14-059AFDP** **Minor Text Modification (Approved 5 – 0)**  
**Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
2. **BSD R – Tuller Flats Apartments** **4313 Tuller Road**  
**15-110SPR/WR** **Mechanical System Louvers Waiver (Approved 5 – 0)**  
**Mechanical Rooftop Screening Waiver (Approved 5 – 0)**
3. **BSD C – Dublin Plaza** **225-373 West Bridge Street**  
**15-111MSP** **Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
4. **Barronsmore Park** **5701 Barronsmore Way**  
**15-114AFDP** **Amended Final Development Plan (Approval 5 – 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 and Cathy De Rosa. Deborah Mitchell and Stephen Stidhem were absent. 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.

The Chair read the case procedures and determined that Cases 3 and 4 are eligible for consent. Amy Salay said the Homeowner's Association will choose the art but asked who will provide the final approval determining the art is suitable for a City park. Claudia Husak said the art has been chosen. Laura Ball said the art was brought to Parks and Recreation Department as a HOA initiated project. She said the artist is the same that created "Daily Chores". She said the sculpture again will involve children playing on rocks.

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

#### Administrative Business

##### Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

##### Motion and Vote

Mr. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the November 5, 2015, meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**1. Perimeter West PCD, Subarea 2 - Dublin Springs Hospital 7625 Hospital Drive  
14-059AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a 10-foot galvanized steel, security fence to be installed around the rear portion of an existing hospital facility at the southwest corner of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Hospital Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval for a Minor Modification to the Development Text and an Amended Final Development Plan under the Planned District provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and will require two votes. She said the Commission is the final authority on this application and we will need to swear-in.

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

Ms. Noble presented the site and illustrated the fence details. She said the approved six-foot wooden privacy fence interspersed with stone columns is behind the existing building directly south of the walking path. She said the site has been developed for an outdoor facility that is located at the center portion of the rear of the building, accessed directly from the mid portion of the building and courtyard and extends to a gazebo. She explained this is the only outdoor area for all patients and both staff and patients use the walking path. She said the applicant is intending to expand the area.

Ms. Noble said in the original Final Development Plan, the applicant planned to extend the fence to the rear of the building 10 feet into the setback and segregate four areas for outdoor activity. She said since then, the Commission has identified several issues for a fence of this height and location. She said the purpose of this application is to ensure the patients no longer are leaving the facility without proper protocol for release. She said the applicant is trying to address the elopements of this facility as it involves the community and the police department as well.

Ms. Noble explained the gates are not locked, therefore an easy access for patients to leave the facility. She indicated the patients were using the gazebo and furniture to elevate themselves up and over the fence. She said the Commission had proposed other forms of monitoring and instructed the applicant to address these issues and report back to them. She reported the furniture has been secured and personnel is located at the gates to monitor activity in and out of the yard. She said patients admitted involuntarily are restricted from this area. She said the applicant has not been able to lock the gates per the Code.

Ms. Noble said the current proposal includes a fence to run along the entire length of the building and located on the existing building line setback with the exception of two areas that are required to be located within the setback based on the Building Code. She said the two sections will be accessed separately from the existing building.

Ms. Noble presented the existing six-foot, board-on-board fence separated by masonry columns approved with the Final Development Plan that is now slightly worn. She described the proposed 10-foot privacy fence as galvanized steel in the "Monroe 3-Rail Fence Style" with locked gates that are identified as "Merchants/Metal Turf-Guard" pre-hung security gates. She said the proposed fence will require a text modification to permit the height of 10 feet. She explained Staff determined this fence correlates with other fencing elements on the site and visually opens up the area. She said safety is driving the applicant's request and Staff determined the proposed fence provides a safety component. She said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Cathy De Rosa asked what happens in the case of an emergency with the gates locked. Ms. Noble said in case of a fire, patients would be gathered in those two sections that go beyond the building line and secured there until a safe exit is provided.

Ms. De Rosa indicated that it seemed like the patients would be confined there.

Chris Brown said the proposal to extend beyond the building line is so there is a safe distance away from the building in case of an emergency.

Victoria Newell said when it comes to a fire emergency at correctional facilities, the exact opposite happens. She said instead of doors automatically being released, they automatically lock for building safety factors to contain the inmates.

Amy Salay said she is concerned with the conditions today if there was a fire emergency since they have been in operation for several years and nothing has been established to safely contain the patients in case of an emergency.

The Chair called upon the applicant to address these concerns.

Brian Zets, Isaac Wiles, 2 Miranova Place, Suite 700, Columbus, Ohio 43215, said the gates are not locked at the facility as it exists today, and that is why patients are able to elope. He said the proposal is that the gates will be locked and only accessed by card readers, which is how the whole interior of the facility is operated beyond the main lobby of the building. He said the safe dispersal areas are there based on Code and allow for the outside gates to be locked.

Ms. Salay asked how many people can fit in those intended safe dispersal areas.

Mr. Zets stated the Ohio Building Code requires a safe dispersal area.

Ms. Salay asked if the whole patient population could fit into the two proposed areas. Mr. Zets confirmed the entire facility could empty out into those two areas and be a safe distance from the building.

Ms. De Rosa asked what the procedure was for an emergency if it happened today. Ms. Newell said the gates are unlocked so the areas are sufficient because the population could just vacate the area.

Mr. Zets said this is a 72-bed facility on-site and they are more than just a hospital integrated behavioral health system. He said this is the fourth one built in the country. He said the proposed outside area is important to the hospital, patients, to the treatments they receive, and the surrounding community. He said the current six-foot fence, etc. does not work. He explained that 62 beds are usually filled at any given time and good patient-to-staff ratios are provided. He added 80% of the patients are there voluntarily.

Mr. Zets said they have alarmed the outside gates, secured the furniture, and staff has been provided with additional training to prevent elopement. He reported there were six elopements in 2015 and the gazebo was not a factor and in 2014 there were nine elopements. He said data from their other facilities with a 10-foot fence and locked gates is an effective method to help prevent the majority of the elopements. He said the current configuration is not optimal because patients need to be brought to the center of the facility to exit the building. He said patients are segregated by wings, based on how and why they are being treated and those patients should have as little interaction as possible.

Mr. Zets said with this proposal, the applicant has added a landscaping plan. He said the ten-foot proposed galvanized fence will look better than the current six-foot fence. He said this unique facility requires a fence of that height.

Mr. Miller said if the gazebo provides any opportunity for an unwanted departure, perhaps it should be removed. Mr. Zets answered the proposed fence would be located 10 feet beyond the gazebo.

Mr. Miller said he is concerned with patients being put in a caged area. He said emergencies are no longer just weather or fire. He inquired about the position of the Dublin Police in the case of a mass shooter.

Mr. Zets said the Dublin Police have been involved in these discussions since 2014; he said there will be evacuation plans in place.

Ms. Newell asked if the gates are monitored and can be released remotely if a staff member is not there with a key card to open the gate.

Garry Hoyes, Dublin, Springs Hospital, said there are remote cameras surrounding the entire facility. He said it is possible but not something they have contemplated.

Mr. Miller confirmed that if someone entered the building that were not authorized, they would not be able to move from area to area as each would be locked.

Ms. Salay questioned why there are so many elopements. Mr. Zets replied a six-foot fence is equal to no fence.

Mr. Hoyes said according to the existing Code, the existing fence cannot be locked as there is no dispersal area.

Ms. Salay asked if the applicant did not anticipate this issue with this facility or were Dublin fence requirements followed against the applicant's better judgment. Mr. Hoyes answered this was the fourth facility built and every one built after has a ten-foot fence.

Ms. Salay inquired about the landscape plan. Ms. Noble explained the proposal but would adjust per the Commission's recommendations.

The Chair invited the public to speak. [Hearing none.] The Commission discussion was started.

Mr. Brown said he was supportive of the application but cautioned that the galvanized material be treated with care when assembled.

Ms. De Rosa asked if this was the same fencing material used at other locations. She said she was still concerned about the release mechanisms on the doors. She said more landscaping would be welcome.

Ms. Newell said she was supportive of additional landscaping.

Mr. Zets said he could add landscaping for better screening. He said stone piers would act as ladders so they will not be replaced.

The Chair asked that the landscaping be added as a condition for approval.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Minor Text Modification to permit a 10-foot tall galvanized steel fence. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa yes; and Mr. Brown. (Approved 5 – 0)

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan, with one condition to require linear landscaping along the entire rear of the fence. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

## **2. BSD R – Tuller Flats Apartments 15-110SPR/WR**

## **4313 Tuller Road Site Plan and Waiver Reviews**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for Waiver to construction details on the previously approved multiple-family residential development consisting of 29 three-story apartment buildings and a community clubhouse located on public streets east of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Tuller Ridge Drive. She said the waiver request is to allow additional façade locations for the mechanical system louvers, and to waive the requirement for screening of rooftop mechanical systems. She said this is a request for review and approval for a Site Plan Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and will require two votes. She said the Commission is the final authority on this application and we will need to swear-in.

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

Joanne Shelly said the following criteria must be met for consideration for approval of Waivers:

- a) Request is caused by unique site, use or other circumstances.
- b) Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience.
- c) Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District.
- d) Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality.

Ms. Shelly presented the site location, project plan, and two Waiver requests:

1. §153.062(N)(4)5 - Façade Requirements – Vents (mechanical systems) shall not be part of street-facing facades. Request is to allow mechanical louvers on street-facing façades for all building types and on all blocks.
2. §153.062(D)(1)(a) - Roof Type Requirements – Parapets - where a six-foot parapet is insufficient to screen rooftop mechanical equipment, a screening structure shall be required as provided in §153.065(E)(3).

§153.065(E)(3)(b) - Screening - Roof Mounted Mechanical Equipment shall be screened from view at ground level on all sides and to the extent practicable from adjacent buildings. Request is for all building types D, E & H and on all blocks.

Ms. Shelly presented the louver locations in relation to the street layout as well as on a typical elevation to demonstrate the need for a Waiver. She also presented completed projects in Columbus to demonstrate the actual size of louvers and how they are integrated or hidden architecturally.

Ms. Shelly explained the Code analysis for the rooftop screening Waiver and presented diagrams that seek to demonstrate that the mechanical systems will not be visible from the street or adjacent buildings of similar height and will meet the intent of the Code requirements.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects, 309 S. Fourth Street, Columbus, Ohio, explained the parapets are nine inches shorter than the height of the equipment. He said they can either raise the parapets or rooftop screening could be provided.

Amy Salay asked what Staff's preference was since there was a recommendation of disapproval. Ms. Shelly answered there are two parts to the disapproval. She explained the first part of the Code that states "equipment must be screened that is visible from the street level" - no equipment will be visible from the street level. She said the second part of the Code states "this is required where practical". She noted that can be interpreted a number of different ways. She said there are nine inches that might be visible from certain vantage points. She said it is a question of whether we are strictly interpreting the Code and enforcing it or if we are allowing a Waiver. She said a portion of Staff thought that the Code should be enforced consistently and that the applicant should have the opportunity to provide their rebuttal to the ART's recommendation of disapproval. She said it is the applicant's preference to not provide this screening for the nine inches that may or may not be seen.

Mr. Sullivan added Staff had concerns about this being a precedent setting issue. He said Code does not take into consideration the location of the equipment in relation to the geometry of the building. He said the BSD Code varies from the standard Zoning Code as it requires varying heights of parapets to break down scales of buildings and when there are multiple buildings, the BSD requires there be a variety of styles to meet the diversity requirements of the architecture. He said the applicant has presented four different building designs with this application. He said they were not able to raise the parapets on two of the four designs to meet the literal interpretation of being in line with Code without compromising the aesthetics of the project. He said if they raise all the parapets, while keeping the same scale and proportions, the buildings would all appear top heavy. He said if screening were provided, there is a potential for maintenance issues in the future for something that will not even be visible.

Mr. Sullivan addressed the Waiver for louvers by stating the fire walls determine where exhaust fans for the units can be located. He said some of these issues did not become apparent until working through the building permitting stage.

Victoria Newell inquired about the dryer vents on the front elevation of building C. She asked if these could be relocated.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.] She opened the discussion for the Commissioners.

Chris Brown demonstrated how the visibility of parapets differ from different vantage points.

Ms. Shelly said she agreed with Mr. Brown. She said from an architectural standpoint, the screen would be hard to see, let alone the unit behind the screen. She indicated the way to make something fade away is to not draw attention to it, but that is her personal opinion. She restated that there was a concern with Staff, working through the ART that this is setting a precedent.

Mr. Brown said he cannot emphasize Ms. Shelly's points enough.

Other Commissioners questioned visibility from the road on the hill. Mr. Sullivan confirmed the rooftop mechanicals would never be seen from the ground because they are placed in the center of the building's roof and the front facades would screen them.

Vince Papsidero said the ART wrestled with this and the majority came to the conservative conclusion that it would be best to be consistent with the policy as opposed to maybe considering the actual practical application in this instance.

Mr. Brown said precedence setting has been discussed but in this instance, we are saying the mechanicals are not visible, hence the Waiver.

Ms. Newell said she agreed with Mr. Brown. She indicated she would hope that Staff would always enforce the Code and then if the applicant wanted to ask the Commission for a Waiver, and they could

demonstrate to the Commission it is warranted, that is part of the process for the BSD. She said therefore, this is not setting a precedent. She stated she did not believe the nine inches would be visible and increasing the height of the parapet would not benefit the design of the structure. She said if the Commission is not fully comfortable with that, they can request a screen.

Cathy De Rosa asked the Chair if approving the louvers would set a precedent.

Ms. Shelly said that requirement is being considered for revision in the Code because it is an issue not anticipated.

Ms. Shelly reviewed the Waiver requests. She asked if any of those original recommendations needed to be changed. [There were no requests for changes]

#### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Mechanical System Louvers Waiver. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

#### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Mechanical Rooftop Screening Waiver. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

### **3. BSD C – Dublin Plaza 15-111MSP**

### **225-373 West Bridge Street Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a Master Sign Plan for an existing shopping center southeast of the intersection of W. Bridge Street/SR 161 and Frantz Road. She said this is a request for review and approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.065(H)(e). She said the Commission is the final authority on this application and will need to swear-in anyone intending to address the Commission.

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

Nicki Martin presented the existing shopping center location that was developed in the late 1970s – a suburban style in-line design. She said under the previous Zoning Code, the tenants in the center were permitted larger signs for each tenant space than is permitted in the BSD. She said the MSP has been requested to ensure the signs are a consistent style and size. She the applicant provided a master sign plan text and sample design panels to guide the tenants. She said the applicant has proposed standards for in-line tenants (the majority of the tenants in the shopping center) as well as a standard for an anchor tenant (in this case - Kroger). She presented the proposal below and explained the requests as well as what is permitted in the BSD:

#### *In-Line Tenants – Wall Signs*

Size: 1 square feet per lineal foot - Maximum 80 square feet  
Number: 1 per tenant space, 2 for western most tenant space  
Height: 19 feet and 22 feet  
Colors: 1 of 3 SW colors for background with tenant choice for copy color  
Design: Oval or rectangular with scalloped corners  
Material: Aluminum with 1" returns, ½" thick individually stud mounted, 3-D characters  
Illumination: External with gooseneck fixtures

*Anchor Tenant – Wall Signs*

Size: Cumulative area of the two signs shall not exceed 95 square feet and the primary sign shall not exceed 80 square feet  
Number: 2  
Height: 22 feet  
Colors: 1 muted color (no logos or secondary images permitted)  
Illumination: Internal

*In-Line Tenants and Anchor Tenant – Window Signs*

Size: Maximum 10% window surface area or 10 square feet combined (whichever is less)  
Number: 2 maximum per tenant space; 1 maximum per window  
Location: Ground floor only  
Colors: 1 low-chroma

Ms. Martin said the following is required for approval of a Master Sign Plan:

- 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 approval is recommended by the ART for a Master Sign Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That all signs are limited to 15 feet in height;
- 2) That the applicant provides gooseneck lighting fixture details prior to sign permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
- 3) That the applicant provides the approved Master Sign Plan package to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

Charlie Fraas, Casto, said they own the shopping center. He explained this all came up by accident as a tenant had left and a new tenant was applying for a new sign to match the existing signs. Because of the new BSD zoning requirements, he said the new tenant would only be permitted a sign half the size of the existing signs. He said the applicant is asking to permit what is already in place, not to increase the sign proposal except for: 1) the second sign on Frantz Road and 2) the increased height to address the various tower elements.

Victoria Newell asked if there were examples of the oval sign designs as only the rectangular sign design was presented.

Mr. Fraas said the oval sign was requested because under the previous zoning, Jason's Deli was permitted an oval sign and he did not want them to be found non-compliant with the BSD Code.

Ms. Martin said anything not considered at this time in the MSP would require the applicant/new tenant to request approval from the PZC, which can be a lengthy process for a simple request, which is why the applicant chose to request oval sign panels with this application.

Ms. Newell indicated she did not want to see oval signs for this center due to the architecture. Mr. Fraas was in agreement. He said he was concerned with protecting his lease obligation with Jason's Deli. He said in a situation where the sign blows off the building and they want to erect another, he questioned whether or not they would be permitted to put up the sign design they had because of the new BSD restrictions. Ms. Martin said the tenant could replace the sign with what was existing in that case.

Ms. Newell inquired about the window signs. Ms. Martin confirmed it applied to the primary tenant and not for use of sub-tenants.

Phil Hartmann said window signs for sub-tenants has been an issue in the past. He asked that the sign plan text be clear in terms of window signs being permitted solely for the primary tenant.

Mr. Fraas restated his came about because a tenant wants to move into the center and they cannot obtain a sign like every other business in the center. He said the applicant is just requesting the opportunity for any new tenant to match what is existing and a MSP would codify it.

Ms. De Rosa said with this MSP there could be three signs that are green and one could be red, etc. She asked the applicant how they envision that aesthetically. Mr. Fraas replied those three colors are already there.

Ms. De Rosa said one of the things the Commission is excited about for the BSD are the new sign opportunities that allow for updating, refreshing, or innovative, creative designs.

Mr. Fraas said this is an 'about face' from what has been requested in the past, which was that signs were to be as muted and small as possible. He said with the BSD regulations, pizzazz and energy is being requested, which is refreshing and indicated there will be many people wanting to move into the area because of that. He said graphics are a very important part. He said if the applicant ever decides to do a major remodel sometime in the future, they would come in requesting both site modifications and graphic plans that would update everything.

Mr. Fraas explained he has been with Casto for over 20 years and their properties range in age from one year to 50 years old. He said they spend a lot of time with renovations to bring centers back to life, just like what is anticipated for BSD.

Ms. De Rosa asked the applicant if consistency was the goal at this point more than anything else. Mr. Fraas affirmed.

Ms. Salay inquired about the fonts. Mr. Fraas said different fonts are used currently and there has not been a restriction on that as these were all previously approved.

Ms. Salay encouraged the applicant to work on the center identification signs because they are so dated and are not integrated with the nice architecture of the center. Mr. Fraas agreed to have a conversation with Kroger.

Claudia Husak said the cube-shaped Kroger sign is not on the applicant's property and not covered by the MSP at all.

Ms. Martin said in 1990, the BZA conditioned the applicant consider voluntary removal of the four-sided cube sign at SR 161 and Corbin Mills Drive.

Ms. Salay stated she was supportive of the application if the sign height was kept to 15 feet.

Ms. Newell said she was supportive of the MSP if the oval shape was omitted.

The Chair asked if the applicant was in agreement with the amended conditions:

- 1) That all signs are limited to 15 feet in height;

- 2) That the applicant provides gooseneck lighting fixture details prior to sign permitting, subject to Planning approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides the approved Master Sign Plan package to Planning, prior to sign permitting;
- 4) That all signs be rectangular in shape with scalloped corners in shape; and
- 5) That window signs shall be limited to the primary tenant for each tenant space.

Mr. Fraas, agreed.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with five conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**4. Barronsmore Park  
15-114AFDP**

**5701 Barronsmore Way  
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for the installation of art work in a City-owned open space within the Ballantrae Subdivision within Barronsmore Park, on the east side of Cosgray Road, west of Barronsmore Way. She said this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the Planned District provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She said the Commission is the final authority on this application and those intending on addressing the Commission would need to be sworn-in.

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 stated conditions.

Laura Ball, agreed to the two conditions:

- 1) That the proposed gravel path from the northwest seating area to the art installation be removed from the plan; and
- 2) That the HOA work with Staff to execute a maintenance agreement for the sculpture prior to installation.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve this Amended Final Development Plan with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**Planning Items**

1. Vince Papsidero introduced JM Rayburn as a newly-hired Planner.
2. Mr. Papsidero referred to a monthly report included in the packet that is a format that is evolving working with our Development Director, Donna Goss. He said in terms of a final format at the department, which includes Planning, this provides a background of all the cases in the system as well as a minor update in terms of the Planning projects that will be coming to the Commission in the next few months. He said this document will be shared with the Commission on a regular

basis. He proposed reviewing one or two of the Planning projects at the January or February Commission meetings depending on the case load.

3. Mr. Papsidero referred to the memo Planning prepared about signs. He said that issue was brought to us by City Council member, Amy Salay. He reported that the background work was completed and options were presented in the memo in terms of moving forward. He asked the Commission if they wanted to discuss signs this evening. He said the memo summarized the BSD sign regulations, the existing sign regulations that apply city-wide, and noted the large format retail design guidelines, which do not address signage per se but provide background in terms of large format retail. During this benchmark analysis, he said Staff estimated 62 signs to-date that have been granted for the particular retail uses in the district – a significant number. He indicated that was relevant because if the decision is made to modify the sign Code as it applies to those 62 uses then they become non-conforming and become an issue for us from a case management standpoint and could as part of a process, generate a lot of discussion from property owners and tenants if we decide to change the rules. He said they presented four different options that could be pursued:

- Keep the regulations as they are
- Look at modifying them as it applies to existing building types
- Look at a more specific modification relative to retail uses
- To repeal the BSD sign regulations as they apply across the board, therefore, applying the standard or previous zoning requirements relative to signs to all uses in the BSD

Mr. Papsidero said he had image samples of the existing signs if the Commission wanted to view specific ones because they are categorized by business.

Ms. Salay asked if the dimensions of the various signs could be produced. Mr. Papsidero answered Staff could obtain that information.

Ms. Husak asked if the Commission wanted dimensions of all the signs or if they were interested in certain ones.

Ms. Newell thanked Staff for taking all the requested photos.

Mr. Papsidero said the mapping and gathering all the data was a large task, also.

Ms. De Rosa asked Staff how cities go from where they are to making these important big changes. She referred to the example of the shopping center reviewed this evening. She said there is the opportunity for that center to do so much more but there will be other cases that will not have the same opportunity. She asked if there were 'good practices' for minor modifications and signage.

Mr. Papsidero said tonight's case was an interesting one like those in Dublin Village Center because in each case there is an existing condition and there is goal those properties will be redeveloped over time. He said it is partly based on the market and opportunity. He said tonight's example showed where the new standard does not quite fit the condition and they have the practical reality of dealing with tenant change-outs. He added it is driven by policy and the goals of the community. He said in this example, so many signs existed that would create a large number of non-conforming situations. He said our goal in the coming year is to look at a major tweak of the BSD Code.

Ms. Salay said this has also been discussed on City Council as the BSD sign package is an important issue to her. She said Council has questioned her about the *BSD Sign Guidelines* because Dublin has always been very strict with signs. She said the BSD was introduced as this really cool idea but the challenge has been to marry the BSD ideas for signs into existing auto-oriented businesses. She indicated the drive

up/down Sawmill Road shows the variety of signs permitted but recognized this is not a walkable neighborhood. She said Council envisioned the BSD sign regulations for redevelopment but it becomes a problem from an appearance standpoint. She said she understands this would be difficult to administer from Staff's perspective. She said if the change is not producing results envisioned, the fact that little administrative headaches will be created is not a good reason to continue down that same path.

Ms. Salay said that means everyone else is going to have the same right. She said we are not dealing with a huge area. She said most of the 62 signs are not that offensive really. She said she is interested in the dimensions and what is permitted in the other parts of Dublin versus the BSD.

Mr. Papsidero indicated that strategically it would be great for the BSD sign standards to be another incentive to encourage reinvestment. He said that is what we are about in the BSD, even for Dublin Plaza. He said this a key parcel that has huge development potential.

Mr. Brown said this was such a complex issue. He referred back to his earlier question of how signs are measured. He said drawing a big rectangle around Studio J's sign reflects a big sign but it is not really; it is a different sign and he likes it. He said it does not jump off the page as a great sign but at least it is not the usual standard, little block rectangle. He said we measure everything by drawing a box around it. He questioned how to codify signs that are so subjective. At the same time, he suggested we give latitude to some form of measurement that can be applied that is practical and not a huge exercise.

Mr. Papsidero said a square is drawn for measurement, industry wide.

Ms. Salay said the Studio J sign was a great example of creativity on Staff's part and on the part of the business. Ms. Newell said the Studio J sign is her least favorite sign and the reason is it does not fit the architecture of the building and is out of proportion to the façade. She added she has that same feeling with the signs in River Ridge. She said she understands Staff is struggling with this because the signs are meeting the Code. She asked if the solution could be that a Master Sign Plan is requested because it worked very well this evening.

Ms. Husak said Ms. Martin was very successful in getting this MSP together in a quick timeframe but it also carries a fee. She said a small business that has to spend \$400 for a sign permit may not be able to also spend \$875 for a MSP.

Ms. Husak said signs in River Ridge have always been a challenge because of the architecture. Ms. Newell said the center was designed as a cohesive unit and unfortunately, the signs are not a cohesive unit.

Mr. Brown said every building has a logical place for a sign but it is not necessarily under 15 feet. He said there are a multitude of considerations for every sign and questions how to codify those considerations.

Mr. Papsidero said the *BSD Sign Guidelines* will help Staff be more informed for reviews.

Ms. Salay asked how to move forward on this issue and suggested a sub-committee be formed like when the Residential Appearance Code was being created.

Mr. Brown questioned the subjectivity of the process and suggested more PZC informal reviews.

Ms. Newell said a lot of the signs have been approved by the ART. She questioned permitting both a wall sign and a ground sign in the BSD.

Ms. De Rosa said a lot of these issues were discussed with the creation of the *BSD Sign Guidelines*.

Ms. Husak said a Master Sign Plan will be brought forward for PZC's review in January for the B & C Blocks in Bridge Park in the BSD. She said that applicant has been working with our City sign consultant to draft the document.

**Communications**

Vince Papsidero said there were no communications to discuss.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on January 7, 2016.