



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 16, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD C – Home 2 Hotel
17-006MSP** **Upper Metro Place
Master Sign Plan (Approved 6 – 0)**
- 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block A
17-012MSP** **6540 Riverside Drive
Master Sign Plan (Approved 6 – 0)**
- 3. PUD – Ballantrae Woods – Patio
17-013AFDP** **7650 Cosgray Road
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)**

The Vice Chair, Chris Brown, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Cathy De Rosa, Stephen Stidhem, Bob Miller, Amy Salay, and Deborah Mitchell. Victoria Newell was absent. City representatives present were: Phil Hartmann, Vince Papsidero, Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Vice Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said all three cases this evening are eligible for the Consent Agenda but they were all pulled at the request of the Commissioners. He determined Ballantrae Woods – Patio application would be heard first followed by Home 2 then Bridge Park, Block A but they will be recorded in the minutes in the order in which they were presented on the agenda.

- 1. BSD C – Home2 Hotel
17-006MSP** **Upper Metro Place
Master Sign Plan**

The Vice Chair, Chris Brown, said the following application is a Master Sign Plan for two wall signs and a monument sign for a hotel on a 2.57-acre parcel, south of SR161, at the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.



Claudia Husak recalled the Commission had reviewed this application at the March 2017 meeting and how the proposed colors would fit and complement the existing architecture and approved building materials was discussed. She said the Commission also requested halo-lit lighting for the proposed wall sign; therefore, the applicant has provided minor modifications since the previous review. She reported the Home2 Hotel is under construction at Frantz and SR 161. She said the applicant is requesting approval for three signs including a projecting sign on the northwest elevation, a wall sign on the northeast elevation, and a ground sign at the entrance of Metro Place.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has provided graphics showing the signs at nighttime, including the halo lighting for the wall sign and Planning has brought all the samples of the materials approved for the building itself.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended for the Master Sign Plan with no conditions.

The Vice Chair invited the applicant to add to Ms. Husak's presentation.

Tracey Diehl, 6487 Hilliard Drive, Canal Winchester, 43110, said the applicant has reviewed all of the comments from the Commission from the last meeting and implemented all of those comments. She restated material samples are present to demonstrate that the colors work well with the building materials. She noted that dimensionality was added to the letters but it is hard to demonstrate with drawings.

Cathy De Rosa asked for clarification of the location of colors.

Amy Salay asked about the height of the structure to which Ms. Diehl answered 49 feet and the top of the sign reaches 40 feet above grade. Ms. Husak added the dimension to the very top of the tower is 52 feet.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the bottom of the ground mounted sign. She recalled that brick was requested but did not see that change called out. Ms. Diehl said she recalled the request was for the bottom of the base to be constructed with materials to match the building. She pointed out that the textured material matches the building but the base will also be hidden by landscaping. Ms. De Rosa said she recalled the request was for some type of stone work and not have it match necessarily. Ms. Diehl stated the applicant had requested a list from Staff for what was requested for the ground sign and the applicant complied with that documentation. Ms. Diehl referred to her notes and it appears Staff did not address that particular element.

Ms. Husak offered to write a condition of approval to have masonry for the base of the ground sign and Ms. Diehl said they would comply for this one-foot base.

The Vice Chair invited the public to speak with regard to this case. [Hearing none.]

Ms. De Rosa indicated she was the one concerned about the brown color at the last meeting but seeing the actual color proposed she determined the color will blend nicely per the materials proposed.

The applicant agreed to the condition.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Mitchell motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the proposed ground sign base be clad in matching brick as approved for the building.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block A
17-012MSP**

**6540 Riverside Drive
Master Sign Plan**

The Vice Chair, Chris Brown, said the following application is a Master Sign Plan for the AC Hotel, Event Center, and Parking Garage located within the Bridge Park Development, Block A, that includes a variety of signs. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the Bridge Park Development and noted the various Blocks. She stated this is a Master Sign Plan for three buildings in Block A, which has frontage on Riverside Drive and Banker Drive –both public streets, and also on Longshore Loop a private road. She said the AC Hotel is at the northwest corner of the block with frontage on Riverside Drive and Banker Drive. The Events Center she said is to the south of the hotel and the parking garage is to the east.

For the AC Hotel, Ms. Burchett said the applicant is proposing seven signs on three different elevations. She noted the main entrance off of Longshore Loop includes three signs she presented: a 28-square-foot Canopy Edge sign; a 9-square-foot internally lit fascia/Wall sign; and a 15-square-foot Window Graphic. She stated the style, design, and type are all similar to the approved Master Sign Plan (MSP) for Bridge Park, Blocks B and C. She presented a rendering of the proposed signs as they would appear together at the hotel entrance along Longshore Loop. She said the applicant is proposing a 30-square-foot Canopy Edge sign on a street wall fronting Riverside Drive and presented a rendering of said sign in both daylight and evening. She added the Wall sign is proposed to be internally lit with aluminum channel letters, painted to match the wall. She continued that the applicant is proposing an 88-square-foot, internally illuminated fascia/Wall sign at the top level of the hotel facing Riverside Drive and the sign is proposed to be ±100-feet from grade to the top of the sign. She presented a graphic during the evening hours. For the Building ID signs visible from Riverside Drive, she said the applicant is proposing two options for the Commission’s consideration: Option 1 is proposed to be a 144 –square-foot fascia/Wall sign with a frame around the logo on the north and south elevations; and Option 2 is proposed to be a 100-square-foot Wall sign on the south elevation with a 70-square-foot Wall sign on the north elevation. She presented graphics of each option. She explained both options consist of perforated, face-lit, illuminated channel letters painted “Status Bronze”. She pointed out that the applicant prefers Option 1; however, the Administrative Review Team has recommended approval of Option 2.

Ms. Burchett said a future Hotel Bar is associated with the hotel; the MSP proposes general locations for the future bar signs of which she presented graphics. She explained for Area A1 - Canopy Edge sign; for Area B1 - Window Sign; and for Area C1 - Projecting sign. Only two building mounted signs would be permitted for this Hotel Bar she reported and all signs would need to be consistent with the size, area, color, and style that was approved as part of the MSP for Blocks B and C of Bridge Park. She described each sign that could be selected:

- Canopy Edge: less than 50 square feet, individual channel or pin-mounted letters in basic graphic element, with overall height less than 36 inches
- Window graphic: less than 30% coverage of each window
- Projecting: Less than 16 square feet between 8-15 feet in height

Ms. Burchett presented the two fascia/Wall signs proposed for the Events Center, which would be placed at the east and west entries of the structure. She explained the sign for the west elevation facing Riverside Drive would be 100 square feet in size and the one for the east elevation facing Longshore Loop would be 40 square feet in size. She said both signs would be internally-illuminated with aluminum dimensional, pin-mounted letters.

Ms. Burchett said the third structure in Block A is the Hotel Parking Garage and she presented the three proposed Blade signs and two Canopy Edge signs. She explained the Blade signs are of the same design approved as part of the amended MSP for Blocks B and C. The two 22-square-foot Canopy Edge signs she said would be located at the vehicular entrances on Mooney Way and Longshore Loop. She presented a graphic showing the locations of the three Blade signs at locations off of Banker Drive, Longshore Loop, and Mooney Way and the rendering also shows the proposed Blade sign.

Similar to the proposal for the Hotel Bar, Ms. Burchett said the applicant is requesting approval for general locations for specific sign types permitted for the Garage Tenant spaces, of which there are two tenant spaces - one at the west/north corner and one at the northerly location. She said A1 - Canopy Edge signs; B1 - Window signs; and C1 - Projecting signs and each tenant space would be permitted a total of three signs. Address identification is also included for the entrances on Longshore she added. She specified that all signs would be consistent with the size, area, color, and style that was approved as part of the MSP for Blocks B and C of Bridge Park and with the proposed Hotel Bar signs, described previously.

Ms. Burchett reported the Administrative Review Team has reviewed the application against the Master Sign Plan criteria and finds the proposal consistent as follows:

1. Allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display;
2. Intended for multiple signs for a single building or group of related buildings to ensure the requested signs work in a coordinated fashion;
3. Not intended to simply permit larger signs or more visible signs, or additional signs without any consideration for unique sign design and display; and
4. Maintains the purpose and the intent of the sign and graphics standards for the applicable BSD Zoning District.

Ms. Burchett added the ART has reviewed the proposal against the BSD Sign Guidelines and finds it is consistent and that it contributes to the vibrancy of the area, is pedestrian focused, and assists with navigation and identification.

Ms. Burchett concluded approval is recommended from the ART with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the height of all signs on the site plan; and
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure all sign information and references are consistent among the Master Sign Plans.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 664 Riverside Drive, Dublin, thanked the Staff for all the hard work and thought that all the work that was put into the B & C Blocks made the process for this application much easier. Seeing some of these signs coming to life that they have put into the MSP including addressing happening on the garage and their buildings, he said he is really excited about it all. He noted there are not a lot of tenant signs yet but Crawford Hoying and Mesh Fitness signs are up.

Mr. Starr indicated that this block has a different context to it and so he would really like to see it stand on its own. He said this block is going to be primarily visitor oriented, people that are not used to coming to our community whether it is for a wedding, business conference, or hotel stay because they are visiting Wendy's or Cardinal Health, etc. He emphasized identification is going to be critical on this block. He said they also considered the pedestrian experience as well as the vehicular experience. He added all these approaches need to be satisfied while dealing with four-sided buildings. He concluded the signs are all high quality and Moody Nolan is here with some samples.

Mr. Starr addressed the Marriot's needs; it is typical for this brand to have a green box but he had the team come up with a sign that was appropriate with the architecture but would also maintain the box, which is the Marriot's preference, to retain some as semblance of that logo but without the colors.

Mr. Starr reported they are still working through some logo development for the rooftop bar. He indicated the sign for the rooftop is not completely settled yet and there should be some samples in the Board's packet of either internally-illuminated or halo-lit letters up there because there is concern about people sitting up there and having the experience of the sign; they plan to do further analysis to understand it better.

The Vice Chair invited public comments. [Hearing none.]

Deborah Mitchell indicated she liked a lot of the signs including the concept of the Canopy Edge signs, the way that is being executed. She said she really has a problem with the big signs up top. She said this is an iconic building in a very unique location so there is not a functional need for those kinds of signs and the signs detract from the beauty and the impact of the building. In Chicago she noted, there is not a big sign on the Hancock Building that states "Hancock"; people just know it is the Hancock Tower as it is iconic. She said there is a hotel near there (she could not recall the name), and it is made to look like the city opera house sails on a sailboat; the name of the hotel is not on the building, people just know what hotel that is. Therefore, the signs proposed for this application at the top of the hotel are not needed and is overkill she said.

Amy Salay said she agreed completely with Ms. Mitchell. She said the types of signs to "glow" over the guests is being considered and she said there should not be any signs up there. She said she appreciates all the ground level signs but the upper signs are gratuitous and she could not be supportive. She said the people enjoying the rooftop bar will know where they are. She stated the residents in Historic Dublin should be considered as they have welcomed all of the development across the river with a lot of trepidation and rightfully so. Through their experience looking out at the river, she noted they will now see a whole new neighborhood. She indicated that this hotel's architecture is gorgeous and the location is such that signs are not needed all over the walls; it will be a beautiful building essentially without billboards all over it.

Cathy De Rosa said she has researched the AC Hotels around the world and she has even stayed in a few of them – they are lovely. She understands that the box is an important element to the brand. She agreed with her fellow Commissioners that people will know where they are going.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the window graphics. She said she is so underwhelmed and finds there has been some creativity in what happens for other AC Hotels. From the ground floor walking in from the parking garage, she suggested this is an opportunity to create some interest. She said from a brand perspective that happens.

Ms. De Rosa called out the Events Center sign and was surprised that it appears bland. Again, she stated there is a lot of room for creativity and this sign can barely be seen. She said she is not opposed to the design but suggested more intrigue in that sign, especially the license given in this part of the development.

Ms. Salay stated she liked the halo aspect of that.

Steve Stidhem said the big sign on top of the hotel will be visible in Plain City; it is way too large. He said the box around the AC signs looks classier but still a little too big. As a frequent traveler, he indicated he likes to look up and see where his hotel is but in this case, he would look up and see exactly where the hotel is without a sign. He said if he has to choose an option, he would opt for Option 1.

Bob Miller said he is not a fan of the bar sign and does not have a problem with Option 1 or 2. He said he could go back and forth, which is not helpful for the applicant. He stated he is opposed to the bar sign but the rest below are very appropriate.

Chris Brown said he likes all the lower signs and does not like the one over the rooftop bar as it dominates the location and the AC Hotel has an identity of its own. He said he prefers Option 2 for the end cap signs; he does not like the box at all. He indicated he is not opposed to the signs but putting the text "hotel" on there, appears redundant.

The Vice Chair called for comments on the Garage or the Event Center.

Mr. Brown asked the applicant why "Hotel Garage" is used. He said if he needs to go to the Event Center, will he know it is okay to park in the Hotel Garage. Mr. Starr indicated there has been a long debate over garage naming as they are all on the same street.

Ms. Salay asked if this garage is also for the Event Center and free to the public. The applicant answered that it was.

Mr. Brown asked if the proposed signs on the garage are within our standards. Ms. Burchett answered they would be within the same standards that were allowed as part of the MSP for Blocks B & C with some minor variations from BSD zoning.

Ms. De Rosa said one of the challenges as a traveler is to know where to park for the Hotel. She said she understands why the parking is for everybody but questioned how the traveler knows where to park when arriving at night. She emphasized hotel guests need to know that.

Ms. De Rosa asked the applicant if they entertained other options for the Event Center. Earl Lee, Moody-Nolan, 300 Spruce Street Columbus, Ohio, said they looked at different options for that sign and because of its location, they did not want to overwhelm that roundabout with too many graphics because it is already a challenge for some to make it around to reach the intended destinations. He said they wanted a sign large in scale so they are messing the stone with an actual reflective metal panel for contrast. He explained it is not very high but contains five-foot, very thin letters. He described the sign as light, airy, with a very modern clean feel to go with the hotel. He said there is an internal light and the face of the letters are perforated. He said the sign will not be 'in your face' but it goes well with the architecture of the building, while being big and legible. He said the size was determined by aligning it with some of the mullions, the glass, and the edge of the stairway to feel 'in place'. Originally, he said it was a lot larger, which also worked, but this size aligns with a lot of the lines in the building, is scalable for pedestrians, and not a distraction for drivers in the roundabout.

Mr. Brown commented it is a 'driving situation' but he likes the fact that the letters are so minimalistic that it balances the overall size by treading lightly on what is a large sign. He said he understands that elevation needs something.

Mr. Lee explained with that metal at different angles it is going to undulate its contrast depending on the light. He added there will be a drop shadow and contrast to the building and push it off a little further. Technically, he said it is not an entry whereas one would stop in the roundabout and get out.

Ms. De Rosa said the materials for the sign sound more dynamic than it appears in the rendering.

Mr. Lee said the same would actually happen for the hotel sign letters at the top. He said the renderings make it appear a lot more intrusive than it is actually going to look when you see the materials proposed. He explained the sign would fade a lot further back into the architecture and will not appear as bold. He added with letters that have a perforated face, the perforation will not appear in the daytime, one will

only see the metal but at nighttime, the light actually comes through the perforation and trumps the metal, and all that is seen is the light. He indicated they plan to undulate the light on the Event Center signs so some parts will be brighter than others; the horizontal bars will be 100% but the rest of the letter will feel like a whisper versus a bright, beaming sign as one passes.

Mr. Brown stated that was a nice solution for the Event Center signs because the Commission is always debating sign size. He added the design balances the thickness, size, and subtlety in a nice way.

Mr. Brown requested to see materials proposed for the Hotel sign.

Mr. Lee explained the top of the sign was not face-illuminated originally so they would prefer to halo light it. He said they are considering the same on the end cap Hotel signs. Obviously, the Marriott standard is the big box lighted he noted so they are considering the rim of 3 inches. He presented the materials to the Commission of the metal panel of the building and the metal panel of the letters, which show a difference in contrast. He emphasized it is not as strong as it appears in the renderings in its own reflection and contrast will trump it so it will not appear as bold; it will fade a whole lot better and give a great crescendo to the top at that scale. He said at the height of 7 or 8 stories, contrast levels are going to start to minimize themselves very quickly but it is all about it being a whisper at the top of the building and not a bold stamp. In the evening, the sign will be internally illuminated similar to the other signs with the perforated face so the brightness can be dialed in per the elevation.

The Vice Chair asked if those descriptions changed any of the Commission's minds on any of the signs or if a compromise be reached or suggestions made for the applicant. He indicated three members support the plan and three are opposed.

Ms. Mitchell said, with high level signs, a whisper is not needed but appreciates that a whisper was proposed and not a shout. She restated people will know this building and do not need to see it from the road, or Westerville, or Plain City.

Mr. Starr stated he does not know that people will know this building, necessarily.

Ms. Salay said every single person that is going to be staying in that hotel is going to have a GPS, which will guide them turn by turn to the address and when they get close, they will see the ground signs. She suggested adding a sign lower on the southern exposure wall at driver height; this is just billboards at that height and not for the person driving in. She reiterated the building is just too beautiful, cool, and iconic.

Ms. Salay noted in downtown Columbus, once one business put up a huge sign, many others followed and now she only sees signs and cannot appreciate the architecture of the buildings for all the sign clutter.

Mr. Brown agreed they are "billboard-ish" but that is what is allowed on every other hotel and building and it seems we are punishing the applicant for finally giving us a really pretty building and he hates that.

Mr. Starr asked if there were just the signs in the north and south elevations and not one on the west elevation, if that would be acceptable. He asked if that would change any of the Commissioner's perspectives.

Ms. Salay indicated the members are all in agreement that the sign on the bar is not going to happen, to which the Vice Chair agreed.

Ms. Mitchell indicated this building will become famous; and people will identify it as the glass building right on the turn. She added it will be as iconic as the footbridge over the river and one of the defining

elements in Dublin. She concluded people will not mistake this for Home2 Hotel or some other hotel in Dublin. She restated, the high signs are not functionally needed and at that point it is just advertising and not helping wayfinding.

Mr. Brown expressed part of his issues with the whole thing is that through all the preliminary approvals of the building, even though there was not a sign package, signs were always represented on those sides of the building. Ms. Salay said she cannot remember seeing signs. Mr. Starr added he cannot recall if signs were there or not.

Ms. De Rosa confirmed there is a contrast now on these two materials and the contrast appears significant. She said there is no way for the Commission to see how light will have an impact on that sign because at this level she agrees that it's overwhelming to the gorgeous buildings. She said she did not know if what they are seeing is actually a true representation.

Mr. Lee said the sign is going to look different on different projections and different screens just like everything looks different on a different print. Mr. Lee presented material samples to the commission. He offered to bring bigger samples of materials and take them out in the sun so the Commission can see how close they are going to move together. He said they could also bring the colors even closer together so it feels like you are actually pushing and pulling the material itself architecturally; at those color levels the applicant believes it is going to do that already because of the sheen and shine. He indicated that here it looks old and older than the two materials in front of the Commission. He stated that the Marriott wanted one sign at the top of the building and the applicant was trying to do bookends and where they should be placed, architecturally.

Ms. Salay requested the dimensions of the signs. Ms. Husak said sign 1, facing north, is 70 square feet and 70 feet high and the sign on the south side is 100 square feet. She concluded that was too big.

Mr. Lee said a lot of that is the added box.

Ms. De Rosa said the idea of the sign actually being pushed from the building, so it feels as if it is part of the building or molded from the building, so if the contrast got very close, it is going to have a feel and not satisfy any sort of wayfinding criteria. But if added dimension to the building that was artistic in that regard, that could be interesting but she is not sure how that is accomplished.

Mr. Lee explained if the darker metal was taken down another level that it will still be visible but it is going to feel like it is almost the same material either pushed or pulled in the actual context so it will not be as bold. He said when that is out in the daylight with a larger piece the Commission would not notice a lot of contrast difference. He added ADA standards call for 70% and anything less than that a person may not see it. He said they are probably not even at 50 or 40% so the idea of getting below that for a logo this large, these illustrations should probably be re-rendered and with a couple of options for comparison.

Mr. Lee said several Commissioners have stated people will know what this building is. In the context of a lot of large buildings, to someone that has never been in the area, and as one that had trouble finding his new office, they may not know which building is the hotel. He said we can assume this building will be iconic but realistically, people coming into this area in a wayfinding sense, are not looking for iconic; they are looking for a sign.

Ms. Salay restated the travelers will have GPS that will guide them turn by turn to this location to which Mr. Lee answered – "sometimes". Ms. Salay stated everyone has this technology and everyone uses it. She added that people that are going to be staying in this hotel that are used to using that technology. She said she understands the Marriott wanting a sign up somewhere in the skyline but this is Dublin and

this will be one of our signature buildings. She recalled it was a stretch for a lot of folks to approve a building this tall in Bridge Park.

In the context of these signs, Mr. Lee said for any building above six stories is not for wayfinding when you are at the base of it. The context is for when you are just trying to find it and locate it because you might be a half-mile away or just trying to quickly scan to find the building coming down Riverside Drive seeing big building after big building questioning which building is the correct destination.

The Vice Chair asked the applicant what he would like the Commission to do. Mr. Starr answered that he would like to take a vote and the Vice Chair affirmed the applicant did not want to table the application. The Vice Chair said Option 1 or Option 2 have to be chosen before the vote of up or down.

Ms. Salay said if she has to vote on the whole sign package, she has to vote no. She said it appears the applicant has support for the sign package with the exception of the three signs at the top of the building.

Ms. Husak answered, unless the applicant would agree to eliminate those three signs, facing north, south, and the bar wall sign, she does not see a way to disseminate this motion into pieces.

Mr. Brown asked if the applicant chose to eliminate those now, if they could bring them back as a different case at a later date to which Ms. Husak answered affirmatively.

Mr. Starr indicated they would have the same discussion if they brought it back. Mr. Brown said the presentation may be slightly different using different colors, etc. and there would be seven Commissioners voting instead of six and who knows which way that seventh person would go. Mr. Starr said the suggestion by Mr. Brown was acceptable to leave those three signs out of this application.

Ms. Husak explained the Commission's motion would be to approve the Master Sign Plan with the elimination of the three wall signs for the Hotel at the upper level, to which the applicant agreed.

Mr. Starr asked if he would need to bring the three signs back as a new case or as an amendment to this application. Ms. Husak answered she was not 100% sure but would work with the applicant.

Matt Starr agreed to the three conditions as revised.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Miller motioned, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the height of all signs on the site plan;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure all sign information and references are consistent among the Master Sign Plans; and
- 3) That the applicant eliminate the three proposed wall signs on the upper story of the AC Hotel.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**3. PUD – Ballantrae Woods – Patio
17-013AFDP**

**7650 Cosgray Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Vice Chair, Chris Brown, said the following application is a minor Text Modification to permit side yard patios/outdoor amenity areas on 15 home sites. He said the development is south of Churchman Road, approximately 800 feet southeast of the intersection with Cosgray Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Text Modification and an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Claudia Husak said she was filling in for Logan Stang this evening. She began her presentation by showing an aerial view of the site and then the two Subareas, A & B, but this application is only for Subarea B, the multi-family section. She recalled that the Commission previously approved a Preliminary Development Plan and a Final Development Plan for this development. She said the applicant has discovered that there is one particular model of home that is quite popular and she presented a map where this home could be located. She explained it has a patio area that is more towards the interior of the home rather than the rear so it has a cut-out space that can be a patio or three-season room. In the original development, she noted all patio spaces were anticipated to be to the rear of the home so the development text language and accompanying graphics currently reflect that limit of patios just to the rear. She said the applicant is requesting approval of the extension of this space for approximately eight feet on the side of certain lots. She noted the homes on the map, which would be permitted these patios for. Planning is supportive of that request she said as the applicant meets all the setback requirements and there is additional detail provided for landscaping. She referred to the concern as stated in the Planning Report for one particular unit (Lot B22) as it is right at the entrance and the patio space would be facing Churchman Road, which is not ideal.

Ms. Husak stated there are two motions before the Commission this evening – one for the text modification that really just details all the site patio amenities with the exception of Lot B22, which would not be permitted this side patio and the other motion for the Amended Final Development Plan requesting unit B22 be removed.

Chris Brown asked if the landscaping would still occur on Lot B22 if the patio is not there. Ms. Husak said it would depend on whether it would be a patio or a more enclosed space like a three-season room.

The Vice Chair invited the applicant to speak in regard to this application.

David Parsley, 140 Mill Street, Gahanna, Ohio, 43230, said he is the VP of Marketing and Sales.

Mr. Parsley confirmed Lot B22 would have landscaping if there was a patio there or not. Mr. Brown said he was concerned since it is right at the entrance. Mr. Parsley said it is not a requirement but a homeowner would purchase that exact design on that lot. He added if they do not have the patio, that design comes with an interior covered porch and 100% of their owners have requested transitional space off of the covered porch. He said the applicant thinks this is a great addition to the community based on the people in contract to purchase homes and folks that are prospective purchasers. He said they want a place to sun bathe and an area for potted plants, etc.

Bob Miller asked why Lot B22 would be removed. Ms. Husak explained staff was originally slightly concerned about 4 or 5 lots in terms of it is a patio that will contain a lot of patio furniture, etc. She noted a couple of the lots are in a similar location in terms of the patio space facing north/Churchman Road, but the sidewalk is on the other side so there is a bit more privacy. She emphasized that the entrance to the community comes right in to Lot B22 from Churchman Road, if one is seated on a patio.

The Vice Chair invited public comment. [There were none.]

Mr. Miller said he is fine with Lot B22 being included as this is a great enhancement for the entire development. Deborah Mitchell said she agreed with Mr. Miller. Cathy De Rosa said she agrees with Planning because it would make for a more pleasant entry. Steve Stidhem said he would agree with Planning as well for the reason Ms. De Rosa just stated. Amy Salay said she also agrees with Planning's recommendation.

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa motioned, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Minor Text Modification as follows:

1. To outline side yard Patios/Outdoor Amenity Areas that shall be permitted only on the following homes: B6, B7, B10, B18, B19, B22, B30, B41, B64, B70, B72, B82, and B86. Side Yard patios/outdoor amenity areas shall be setback a minimum of 14 feet from any private drive and a minimum of 10 feet from any adjacent home and any adjacent patio.
2. To require Patios/Outdoor Amenity Areas to not be greater than the width of the home and shall not extend greater than 15' from the rear building façade nor 8' from the side building façade.

The applicant agreed to the Text Modification.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa motioned, Ms. Salay seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That Unit B22 be removed from the permitted side yard patio/outdoor amenity area list; and
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to determine an appropriate depth for the side yard patio/outdoor amenity areas and the development text be revised to include that requirement prior to filing for building permits.

The applicant agreed to the two conditions as stated.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Planning Items

Vincent Papsidero said the April 17th joint Work Session will be very full including West Bridge Street Framework Plan, sharing a big development concept based on the work that has been done to date, proposed changes to the West Innovation District Zoning Code, and the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, and the Bridge Street District Code update, which has required work from a consultant. He said there will be a great deal of material to cover in a two-hour timeframe but the goal is to get the green light from Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council relative to all these pieces to answer if we are moving in the right direction or not. It is an important meeting he said so we can move forward to get these ready for adoption later in the year.

Amy Salay requested the volume of materials be delivered earlier to permit more time for review.

Mr. Papsidero answered Planning would shoot for a week in advance. He stated most of that material is summarized already in a PowerPoint presentation so written Code language will not be included.

The Vice Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:49 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on April 20, 2017.