



## MEETING MINUTES

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 8, 2017

### AGENDA

- 1. The Hamlet on Jerome  
17-053INF** **9341 & 9351 Jerome Road  
Informal Review (Discussion Only)**
- 2. Oak Park, Subarea D  
17-028Z/PDP/PP/FDP/FP** **Oak Meadow Drive  
Rezoning - Preliminary Development Plan  
Final Development Plan  
Preliminary and Final Plats (All Tabled 7 – 0)**
- 3. PUD – Llewellyn Farms – Parking  
17-043AFDP** **4930 Bradenton Avenue  
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 4. Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C  
17-045MSP** **Riverside Drive  
Master Sign Plan (Approved 3 – 2)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Chris Brown, Cathy De Rosa, Stephen Stidhem, and Bob Miller. Amy Salay and Deborah Mitchell were absent. City representatives present were: Phil Hartmann, Vince Papsidero, Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, Nichole Martin, Logan Stang, Michael Hendershot, Cameron Roberts, and Flora Rogers.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

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

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated that none of the cases this evening can be approved by consent. She determined that case 3 would be reviewed first, followed by cases 2, 1, and 4. The minutes will be recorded in the order that was presented on the Agenda.



**1. The Hamlet on Jerome  
17-053INF**

**9341 & 9351 Jerome Road  
Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a request for a residential community including 19 new single-family homes on 8.7-acres on the west side of Manley Road, 550 feet north of Corazon Drive. She said this is a request for an Informal Review and feedback of a potential future rezoning and development application.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted that direct access is provided to the site by the existing Roma Drive. She pointed out: the land to the south, west, and east is part of the Tartan West, Planned Unit Development, Subarea "D" and consists of single-family residences; adjacent to the south of the property is common open space for Tartan West, owned by the City of Dublin; and to the north is unincorporated Jerome Township.

Ms. Burchett presented the Community Plan and noted the Future Land Use Map designates the parcel as Mixed Residential Rural Transition that allows for a typical density of 1.5 units per acre with a mix of housing types on smaller lots to provide for greater provisions of open space. At this typical density, she stated a maximum of 13 lots would be permitted on this site.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and explained that the residence on the northern parcel is proposed to be demolished and the home toward the rear of the large southern lot is proposed to remain. She said the proposal includes 19 new home sites geared toward empty-nesters located toward the front of the property. She summarized the conceptual proposal is for 20 lots located on 8.6-acres, at a density of 2.3 units per acre.

Ms. Burchett presented the conceptual proposed architecture and lot layout. She reported the applicant has indicated the style will incorporate traditional architectural themes with colors, materials, and details that are reflective of a traditional English Cottage style.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed floor plan and site layout. She indicated the lot coverage for this type of development pattern appears to exceed the Code limit of 45%. However, she said empty-nester type developments with common maintenance have been approved with higher lot coverage allowances through the PUD process.

Ms. Burchett said the Commission is asked to provide feedback to the applicant based on the following discussion questions:

1. Is the proposed land use and overall density appropriate?
2. Is the proposal appropriate to the character of the surrounding development pattern?
3. Does the common open space provide a functional and usable space for future residents?
4. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Bob Miller asked if we have any indication as to what might be developed across Manley Road in unincorporated Jerome Township. Phil Hartmann said Kroger still owns the property and Ms. Burchett said she is not aware of any development moving forward.

Cathy De Rosa asked how much wooded area would be lost. Ms. Burchett said the common area is 2.72 acres along Manley Road and the common area with the stormwater pond and remaining lot is 2.32 acres.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Dan Lorenz, 9341 Jerome Road, said he is a civil engineer and he would be the developer. He introduced Dwight McCabe who is the architect. He said Mr. McCabe's grandparents owned the property at one point. He indicated he and his wife moved here 20 years ago and built on this property and that they had a lot of privacy before the Tartan West development. He said they excavated the pond, the field, and had a great time raising their four kids there and they are empty-nesters now. He explained he has friends that are looking at places in Dublin where they can down-size and have less maintenance. He indicated he is trying to find a solution for everybody and wants to know if this would work.

Mr. Lorenz pointed out that he wanted a public road, not a private one he has to worry about. He reported they conducted a residential meeting at Tartan West about a month ago and nobody showed up despite all the emails and letter notifications that were sent out.

Mr. Lorenz said they took the architecture from a neighboring site and added it to their proposal. He pointed out the road that he plans to extend across for connectivity. He said storm drainage goes into the pond, and noted where the sanitary sewer lines are located. He said there are very few trees and that they would probably add trees. He thought his property was set up to include everything that Dublin would want and they would be able to keep the residents in the community as they are looking for an alternative solution. He said the layout incorporates a large first floor master suite with full bath and walk-in closet with privacy off the back, an additional bedroom or den, 2,500 square feet, plus there is an option to build bedrooms upstairs and there is a basement. He believes the density makes sense.

Dwight McCabe, 7361 Currier Road, Plain City, Ohio, said he lives about halfway between Dublin and Plain City. He confirmed this property was his grandfather's so he is very familiar with it and the property back towards Dublin was his uncle's.

Mr. McCabe indicated he does not like small parcels of land that are left between developments as they usually become unsightly. He said they are proposing that these homes will function like there is a zero lot line and the idea here is to maximize the use of the footprint. He said they propose the building wall to have windows in it but they would be translucent for bathrooms and utility rooms located behind. As the occupant is looking out the living room windows, and covered patio, he explained the space would be owned by the occupant. He said the great room would have a cathedral ceiling and there is an oversized kitchen with an island. He reported they have a model built out in Tipp City, just north of Dayton, and one does not feel crowded in the house even with 50 guests in there at one time. He said it is an extremely flexible plan and the expectation would be a product for empty-nesters and who will have space for the kids or grandkids when they come home. He said the architecture is not cast in stone and could go many directions.

Chris Brown said he definitely picked up on the setback idea. He asked about parking for guests that come at the holidays because he said that was the only thing that stuck out for him needing to be addressed. He stated he liked the architecture. He said it seems dense plunked into the middle of everything but relative to other communities going on, it is very similar and fits that niche.

Ms. De Rosa asked what would happen in the common area. Mr. McCabe said the homeowners could deal with that. The pond area itself, he restated, is a retention pond. He said the area along Manly Road would be a great place for grandkids to run off some energy as it is safe with sidewalks and a landscape buffer.

Ms. De Rosa indicated this concept is really interesting as she likes the English gardens but thought the area along Manley should be developed along with this theme instead of leaving it as a field.

Jon Kirk, Remax Real Estate Agent, 8136 Flynn Lane, Dublin, Ohio, said this is not just a field of houses. He said the east end of the property is very high and the water drains down to the pond so the houses on the east end will have an overlooking view of this small little hamlet and there will be a tiered look to

the houses, there will not be a direct line, which will provide a great view of the gardens as they venture down the street.

Mr. McCabe added for the houses that sit up, they could have walkout basements. He said this group is not looking for clubhouses and pools but maybe a fire pit where they can all congregate perhaps and drink a beer.

Ms. De Rosa said this is different from proposals the Commission has seen, the covered patios and theme are very interesting, but thinks there are some opportunities here for the empty nesters, and fits quite nice in this setting.

Mr. Lorenz asked if a 50-foot right-of-way has been approved in Dublin but there is still that 26 – 28-foot wide road that we could park cars on.

Mr. Brown said the trick becomes the spacing of the driveways and how many cars can fit in between; that is the issue. He said it becomes a problem when cars stack up at the holidays or someone is having a party and that needs to be considered. Mr. Lorenz asked if he should consider the turnaround at the end.

Mr. Miller indicated parking is not going to be as bad as at the Moors.

Ms. Burchett suggested that Engineering be involved in this conversation.

Mr. Miller asked how many walkouts could be built on this parcel. Mr. McCabe answered at least five could be possible. Mr. Miller indicated that is very attractive.

Steve Stidhem said he loves it and cannot wait to see them be built because he is an empty-nester. He said fire pits or benches for the common area rather than just an open field is the way to go. He suggested a path around the pond would be interesting and maybe a small dock or areas for people to sit and fish.

Mr. McCabe said he has received solid feedback from cyclists; they would love the idea to get out here.

Victoria Newell said the overall density can be appropriate. She said the English Tudor style architecture is lovely but she just sees one model and no variety. She said the plan is very rigid, there is no change in the setback between houses, it is not staggered in any way, very rhythmic as one goes down the street so having the same building façade again and again is not going to provide the sense of character the applicant is pursuing. She said it might be nice for the pathway that goes across the driveway is treated differently as one is walking through a neighborhood with driveways followed by more driveways.

Mr. McCabe answered that they are getting to a place where they are figuring out the marketable product for this location, those types of issues would definitely be addressed. He said there are multiple options they could consider.

Ms. Newell said the back common area is great, currently there is no way for the residents to get to the front common area so for that to be usable, there needs to be a path of travel and amenities need to be developed. Lastly, she said parking is an issue.

Mr. Miller inquired about the prices. Mr. Lorenz answered a range of \$500,000 - \$650,000.

**2. Oak Park, Subarea D  
17-028Z/PDP/PP/FDP/FP**

**Oak Meadow Drive  
Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan  
Final Development Plan  
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for Rezoning 2.94-acres from PUD (Oak Park, Subarea D for Townhomes) to PUD (Oak Park, Subarea D for single-family lots) to convert six, three-story townhome buildings with 36 units to 20 detached, single-family homes and all associated site improvements. She said the site is on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road, approximately 700 feet southwest of the intersection with Brand Road. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She said this is also a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

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

Logan Stang presented the PUD process consisting of three steps. He indicated this application is unique as it encompasses the two formal steps of establishing a PUD, which are the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan that establishes the development standards and the Final Development Plan with the Final Plat that verifies conformance with the development standards. He said once this application receives final approval, the applicant will be able to record the plat and begin filing for building permits as this covers all of the public review.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and noted the application for Rezoning pertains to the townhome section of the Oak Park PUD or Subarea D of the development. He said the proposal is to rezone the site to allow for 20 single-family residential lots where 36 townhome units in six buildings was permitted.

Mr. Stang presented the Community Plan – Future Land Use Plan. He explained that the Community Plan has two future land use recommendations that this site overlaps. The first is for Mixed Residential – Low Density, he said, which is intended to provide a mix of housing options at a typical density of 3 units per acre. He noted the second is for the Mixed-Use Neighborhood Center providing retail uses and personal services in a commercial center integrated into a residential neighborhood. He stated the proposal meets the Mixed Residential Land Use by providing smaller single-family lots than what the existing residential development has and will help support the commercial that is intended to be developed within Subarea E, the two larger vacant properties of the Oak Park development.

Mr. Stang pointed out that the site is located within a Special Area Plan for the Northwest/Glacier Ridge area. He said as the Oak Park development was approved, just prior to the Community Plan update in 2007, many of the recommendations of the Community Plan had been met with this development such as the larger setbacks along Hyland-Croy Road and the connections to Glacier Ridge Metro Park. He presented the conceptual layout that is identical to what Oak Park is today, including the townhomes and commercial elements. Additionally, he said any right-of-way dedication and infrastructure improvements were made with the original development and due to the decrease in overall density, no additional improvements will be required as the existing street network is capable of handling the demand.

Mr. Stang presented a graphic of the Development Standards. He said these were proposed for Subarea D that are substantially similar to the standards used for the existing residential homes. Due to the smaller lot depth, he explained the front and rear yard setbacks have been modified to allow for similar style homes. He said the clustering of homes created more dense pockets throughout the development to allow for a greater amount of open space with these standards continuing the character that has been

produced. Additional standards include the continued hedge treatment along the public roads, architectural requirements, and fence regulations he said.

Mr. Stang reported that Staff is requesting that the front yard setback be increased from six feet to nine feet to allow for additional open space in the front. He said that a landscape treatment should also be provided for any fence located along the rear of the properties to soften the view from Hyland-Croy Road and Oak Park Boulevard until the commercial properties develop.

Mr. Stang said the original development applied the Conservation Design Principles, which sought to achieve 50% open space based on the entire acreage being rezoned. He reported that Oak Park was approved with approximately 51% of open space with the majority being dedicated for public use.

Mr. Stang said the proposed rezoning includes the removal of two private reserves located in front of the club house, which amounts to a loss of roughly a quarter of an acre. Although this open space is not being replaced, he explained the connectivity to existing open spaces and achievement of 50% gross open space is more than adequate for the community at large.

Mr. Stang presented a graphic of the Final Development Plan and restated it is for the re-subdivision of 36 townhome properties and two reserves to 20 single-family lots. He noted the lots will use the existing infrastructure to have frontage on one of three public streets with rear access along the private drives. He said the sites have access to existing utilities and were cleared of any vegetation during the original site work. He pointed out that the commercial properties are not included with this application and will still permit commercial uses under the original zoning approval.

Mr. Stang said the applicant has provided examples of six architectural models for Subarea D, which he presented. He indicated that most planned districts do not provide architectural examples for review; however, the proposed development text requires that the Commission approve elevations with the Final Development Plan. In the future, he explained that Planning Staff can approve additional models or elevations using the standards outlined in the development text to allow for more architectural diversity. He pointed out the two models on the right, the Ashbourne and Castletroy, were approved for the existing residential areas while the remaining four are new models. He said all of the models continue the architectural theme of the community using various materials such as brick, stucco, and shake siding and architectural elements such as towers and cupolas. A diversity matrix has also been provided he reported to ensure that no adjacent homes that are next to, or across from one another, will use the same model or elevation.

Mr. Stang presented the Landscape Details that the applicant has included in a landscape plan containing a continued streetscape with additional lot requirements being determined and reviewed with the building permit. He said the text also allows for a six-foot privacy fence installed along the rear of the homes with one of three designs that were approved for the existing single-family sections; a side yard abutting a public street is allowed a four foot fence of a consistent design.

Staff is conditioning that a provision be added to the development text, he said, requiring a fence treatment along the private drives to help soften the appearance, which would be reviewed with the fence installation, depending on whether a property owner chooses to install the fence.

Mr. Stang said the final component of this application is a Preliminary and Final Plat required for the re-subdivision to the single-family lots. He presented a graphic and noted the plat identifies or establishes necessary easements for the development of the lots and does not include any right-of-way or open space dedication.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to City Council for the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the development text to require a minimum front yard setback of nine feet from the public right-of-way, prior to City Council review; and
- 2) That the applicant revise the development text to require continuous landscaping along all fences constructed next to an alley or private drive, prior to City Council review and subject to staff approval.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the Final Development Plan with five conditions:

- 1) That the existing curb ramps be replaced with curb ramps meeting standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) That the proposed sidewalk connections at the intersections be built with the site;
- 3) That the non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 4) That the proposed landscaping be removed from within the intersection sight distance triangles in accordance with Policy 08-013 at the time of building permitting, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and
- 5) That the applicant revise the landscape plan to provide a diverse selection of street trees at the time of building permitting, subject to staff approval.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to City Council for the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:

- 1) That the Preliminary Plat be revised to contain the information required by Section 152.018 of the Subdivision Regulations, prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Steve Stidhem asked for clarification on fencing along the rear of the properties. Mr. Stang explained it is a privacy fence to help screen from the commercial area if the homeowner would like to install the six-foot tall fence. He said it is not required and they can run it from their house to their side property line.

Cathy De Rosa said when this was reviewed before, the Commission was given three options (A, B, or C). She asked if this is option 'B' to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively and clarified it is the one option that did not include the commercial properties at all.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the lot coverage comparisons. Mr. Stang said the existing homes were designed in a cluster to allow for more open space so they have a maximum lot coverage of 60%. He said the reason this is increased to 70% is because there is a loss of about 20 feet from the depth of each of the properties due the existing conditions. He indicated that other areas in the City have been approved for up to 70% for lot coverage for smaller lots.

Chris Brown asked if there would still be parking on the street in front of the homes. Mr. Stang confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Miller inquired about the setback from 6 feet to 9 feet. He asked how a nine-foot setback compares to other patio homes in the City. Mr. Stang indicated it is larger because typically, there is a very small front setback so six feet is average for some of those that come to mind. He said there are some developments that have larger or deeper lots so they can implore a larger front yard setback. He referred to a section of Tartan West as being an area comparable to this proposal in terms of lot size.

Mr. Miller asked what the rationale was for going from six to nine feet. Mr. Stang answered it was the result of working with the applicant and meeting their configurations.

Victoria Newell asked about the clipped corners for Lots 119 and 118 as there is no setback at Oak Park Boulevard. She noted there are several lots that are that way and asked if staff was supportive of that. Mr. Stang said staff was supportive given the nature of the lots themselves.

Ms. Newell asked if the heights of four and six feet for fencing was part of the original text. Mr. Stang answered the original submission did not state that was permitted. He reported that staff had encouraged the applicant to have fences at four feet in height to be consistent with the rest of the City.

Ms. Newell noted that when the Zoning Code limits fence heights to four feet and asked how staff can support six-foot fences. Mr. Stang indicated it was due to the commercial components and they are viewing it as if the commercial area gets developed.

Claudia Husak said the Commission has approved that fence height for other small lot developments such as at the Villas of Ballantrae and Greystone Mews).

Chris Cline, Blaugrund, Kessler, Myers & Postalakis, Worthington, OH, said he is representing the applicant, Oak Park Dublin LLC. He pointed out a lot of his team was present to answer any questions. He indicated that he learned the day before that the intent is for the commercial component to be developed. He stated the applicant has agreed to all of the conditions presented this evening. He reported the applicant has met with the residents twice since the informal review with the PZC.

Mr. Cline said they have not asked the Commission to cut them a break on materials or architecture with this plan so they are going forward with the same quality development as is already in place. He indicated these homes will need to appeal to a demanding and educated clientele. He anticipates the prices will be \$375,000 - \$450,000. He said the lot depth of 104 feet makes it difficult to deliver a successful single-family residential design with an attached garage in the rear and there is a connector between the house and the garage. He suggested that the variety of floor plans that could appeal to multiple demographics be used. He said the architectural models they have proposed tonight are ready for approval versus the placeholder conceptual homes they presented before. He said they do not have a lot of experience with rear access products in Central Ohio and selling the alleys for high quality homes could be a challenge including the lack of safety factors in the back.

Mr. Cline presented a graphic showing the conceptual plan superimposed onto the existing conditions plan and pointed out that all the other homes in Oak Park have a secure back yard and none of these homes will have that protection. He said the privacy fences along the commercial lot are essential as anything could go into the commercial property.

Mr. Cline said even though the fences are not required and could be a choice for the occupant, the applicant is making it mandatory that all the fences are installed as each house is built for consistency. He said the only caveat he would have to commit to that is a condition or safety net whereas if the commercial boundary were to develop residentially before they completed development of this site, they might want to revisit that as to whether or not they still need the six-foot privacy fence if there was a similar land use on the other side of this property. He said any condition the Commission would like to impose on that point, he would appreciate being left a back door where staff could approve the removal of that fence, if the applicant determines it is not necessary.

He said they are going from 36 units down to 20 so they are challenged economically but believe they brought a good plan to the City. He indicated they are trying to fix a problem that others created.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, presented a diagram that was in the packet. She said she wanted to touch on just a few points and restated that on-street parking currently exists. She said it is possible to adjust some of the lots to accommodate nine-foot setbacks. She pointed out where the chamfer is and the sidewalk is actually inside of the lot on an easement when it is adjacent to this public street so they have smaller tree lawns and shrubs. She restated they went to the 70% lot coverage because these are smaller lots and they do not know yet the designs of the patios or how much room they will take up from the yard so they allowed themselves flexibility. From a stormwater perspective, she said they ran the calculations as if they were doing the full 70% lot coverage. She provided a graphic with the private alley on the rear and pointed out the area where the six-foot fences would be installed. She said the homeowner would have the option to put a four-foot fence up for all four sides but then a two-foot lattice would be added as a nice detail and to have heights consistent.

Mr. Miller inquired about lawn maintenance. Mr. Cline said the deed restrictions state that the maintenance will be provided by the HOA but if the HOA decided to do that the homeowners would have to pay more money; he indicated that is a detail they need to sort out.

Brett Cantrell, project manager for Oak Park, said each individual homeowner takes care of their own lot; the builder takes care of some of the common areas and some of it is split with the HOA. Mr. Cline said that as they move forward they will need to fix that discrepancy by working with the residents.

Mr. Stidhem asked about the inconsistency on the fence. Mr. Cline said the builder is going to require that the six-foot fence be a mandatory option.

Ms. De Rosa asked what the distance is from the garage door down the driveway or the back to the alley. Mr. Stang answered the distance would partially depend on the model chosen. He said there is a 10-foot easement between the property line and the garage but the models stagger a little bit. Mr. Stang confirmed there would be landscaping behind the fence portion within the 10-foot easement.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about landscaping buffers for the commercial side of that property. Mr. Stang answered there would be additional screening requirements for vehicular use areas for the parking lots themselves. He anticipates the resident seeing a landscape island that would run along the other edge of the private drives but there will be access points to the private drives but there will be additional landscaping required like a single row to help shield the parking lot from the rear of these homes. Ms. De Rosa asked what the height would be. Ms. Menerey said there would be a three-foot continuous hedge fence with trees one per 40 feet. She added there would be a layering effect to the plant material.

Ms. Newell suggested she would like to see the two fence heights treated aesthetically better.

The Chair invited public comment.

Melvis Houseman, 7134 Snow Drop Court, said she is one of the residents in the community. Prasad Vempati, 7031 Greenland Place, said he is also a resident of the community. Ms. Houseman said they were here speaking on behalf of many of the homeowners in the community. She said they prepared a PowerPoint presentation to express their concerns. She said the three primary concerns are how crowded the areas are with big homes on smaller lots along with the shorter setbacks, designated open space that has been removed, and the fence because it will be in view as one enters the community and since the commercial property development timeline has not been established, they would like the fence not to be installed until the commercial property is developed.

Mr. Vempati said because the look and feel of the community is starting to change.

Ms. Houseman said because the sides of these homes will be placed so close to the sidewalk, there will not be any privacy for those homeowners and with the smaller setbacks there, there will also be less

green space. She suggested one of the homes be eliminated. Mr. Vempati said there is no space for a tree on some of these lots in the back of the house.

Ms. Houseman said fences require maintenance and do not look good over time and that is why a lot of communities do not permit fences. Mr. Vempati said additionally there is hardly any space for a lawn mower to maneuver between the homes due to the small side setback.

The Chair invited additional public comment. [Hearing none.]

Ms. De Rosa said she wanted to address the architecture.

The Chair requested the review criteria be posted again and pointed out that the Final Development Plan is in conformance with the Preliminary Development Plan as well as the final details for the site itself.

Mr. Brown asked if there was green space in the original development where currently Lots 118 and 119 are being shown. Mr. Stang answered yes, which was located in reserve B & C for the townhomes.

Mr. Brown said this case is so difficult because looking at the original developers' intent, two separate ownership groups, and current residents that have invested in the community. He indicated the intent of the developer is to try and make it right somehow in a way that is economically feasible. He said he also has to consider the people that will live there in perpetuity. He said he does not have a problem with the density. He indicated he has to consider the long term picture and is assuming the commercial area will be developed nicely. He said he has a problem with the reserves being taken up with these two lots. He questioned whether it is logistically possible to hold off building the fences until the commercial component is developed.

Mr. Stidhem said he is fine with the proposed density. He suggested that fencing consistency should be written into the deed restrictions. He said he agreed with Mr. Brown about the two lots taking up green space. He said he likes the architecture and the houses closer to the street, and the garages in the rear are going to be interesting.

Ms. De Rosa said the Commission loved the way the townhouses were going to look in the original plan and had expressed that one of the most important things was that the feel and character continue. Referring to the four elevations out of six, she said they are flat and feel tighter in that very condensed space. Mr. Cline said he is not the architect but when the new designs were put together, they pulled the garages off the front placing them in the back and they took elements from approved models. He mentioned that staff has not been critical of the architecture so they took that to mean they hit the target in terms of having the right kind of look.

Ms. De Rosa said she is not critical of the elements, she asked that the look and feel of the current community be considered for consistency. Mr. Cline stated he did not think the houses in this development will be distinguishable from anything in Oak Park.

Ms. Menerey added there are three models with porches, which provides relief along the frontage. She restated that there will be the requirement of architectural diversity. In terms of the front setbacks, she said they are set; the existing parking is in, the sidewalk has to be where it is, the right-of-way is there and established, and the three foot difference was determined to be the maximum give. She said, side-to-side, these units are probably less crowded due to the footprint they have.

Ms. De Rosa agreed with her fellow Commissioners about having the green space at the entrance because that will create a feel of openness, even if it is relatively small.

Ms. De Rosa said the struggle with the fences in the back is going to be inconsistency.

Bob Miller said he is very empathetic with the residents. He said this is a tough situation given the owner of the commercial property is not being as cooperative as we would like. He said he believes the applicant has done an outstanding job with this difficult situation. After reviewing all the criteria the Commission uses to apply to a case, he said that applicant has checked just about all of the boxes: the density has been brought down; the green space has been met as Mr. Stang has pointed out several times; and the setback has been increased in deference to improving the look of the community. He said the only thing he struggles with is the view from Hyland-Croy Road until there is commercial development. He suggested the fences be installed later, which could appease the residents but he does not know how to accomplish that. For the most part, he said the applicant has his full support. He concluded he would eliminate the four-foot fence on Oak Park Boulevard to which Mr. Brown and Mr. Stidhem previously agreed. He suggested that if the fence was made of stone, it might look better.

Ms. Newell said the density is about half of what could be permitted on the property and that alone makes this a very viable application. She said she struggled with the criteria for adequate open space. She said she found that everything appeared to be an improvement with this application as to what could be on this property until she got to the elimination of that green space. In terms of the fencing, there are other options that could be explored because we cannot control when the commercial gets developed and we cannot even be certain it will ultimately be commercial development but we have to look at the way it is zoned today.

Mr. Brown said he is questioning how to solve this problem temporarily and make those two commercial lots look bigger and the solution is street trees on Oak Tree Drive North and Oak Park Boulevard along those undeveloped lots. He said it would make the whole entrance more pleasing and tempers the backyards of all of these villas. He stated the depth to the street does not bother him and he referred to neighborhoods in New Albany, Ohio. He indicated those neighborhoods are stunning and beautiful and provide a sense of community.

For clarification, Mr. Stang asked if Mr. Brown is proposing that 2-inch caliper street trees be planted on the opposite side of the alley on the commercial lots. Mr. Brown answered on the commercial property on Oak Tree Drive North and Oak Park Boulevard to soften the whole area which gives an actual boulevard; it would help screen the back of all these developments as those grow just because it changes the focus. He added the trees can be removed once the commercial property starts its development. He concluded it would help the entry to the whole community.

Mr. Cline said the main entrance is a public street so there may be right-of-way we can work with there; the street to the east is owned in fee by the commercial property owner. Mr. Brown said he understood that but thought maybe there was a way to work with them. Mr. Cline said doing something with the City is feasible; he does not think it is feasible to work with the commercial developer.

Mr. Stang said Oak Tree Drive is not part of this application and we cannot require that the property owner do anything with that property as it is all private and they have full ownership and we cannot hold this applicant to do something on property they do not own.

Mr. Brown said he is tired of that commercial land being in purgatory and he is looking for a solution.

Claudia Husak said with all the outstanding issues, this application is not ready to move forward.

Mr. Cline requested that the application be tabled.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Newell seconded, to table this application at the request of the applicant. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0)

### **3. PUD – Llewellyn Farms – Parking 17-043AFDP**

### **4930 Bradenton Avenue Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a request for an Amended Final Development Plan to reduce the total number of parking spaces required for a medical office. She said the site is northwest of the intersection of Frantz Road and Bradenton Avenue. She 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.

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

Nichole Martin presented an aerial view of the site. She indicated this PUD is one of the older developments in the City and does not have a development text to accompany it; therefore, the standards for the site refer to the most similar zoning district and in this case it is the Suburban Office and Institutional District. She said the site was developed under those standards being parked for general office. She said the 20,000-foot building that exists on the site requires 80 spaces. She said the applicant is requesting parking for a medical office that would require 90 spaces on this lot. Additionally, she said the proposal is to maintain 79 spaces and staff has determined there is adequate space to provide the 80<sup>th</sup> parking space.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for a Minor Text Modification that allows the building to reside on the site in the current condition parked at an office rate of one space per 250 square feet of floor area equating to 80 spaces. She said the following is a condition of approval:

- 1) That the applicant provides one additional parking space to comply with the general office parking requirement.

Bob Miller said at 20,000 square feet, 10,000 is proposed to go from general office to medical. He asked if staff took into consideration the possibility of the other 10,000 square feet being impacted by all the medical parking. Ms. Martin answered staff was comfortable with that change as this has been seen elsewhere in the City and the medical parking does not utilize the full extent of the parking that is required.

The Chair invited the applicant to speak.

Aaron Greene, Hplex Solutions, owner's representative, said he wanted to point out that they have long-term leases with the second floor architectural firm. He said a third of the first floor is housed with mechanical spaces and a large data server and the other half that will be occupied by medical use is for surgery space where the cases run 6 – 8 hours so it is not high turnover like a traditional surgery center.

The Chair invited the public to speak with regard to this case. [Hearing none.] She called for discussion amongst the Commissioners.

Chris Brown asked if the applicant was in agreement with the one condition to which he answered affirmatively.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. De Rosa moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve this Minor Text Modification to allow for the office building, existing at the time of this application at 4890 Bradenton Avenue in Llewellyn Farms PUD, to be parked at the general office rate of one parking space per 250 square feet of gross floor area. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approval 5 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant provide one additional parking space to comply with the general office parking requirement.

\*Aaron Greene agreed to the above condition.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approval 5 – 0)

**4. Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C – Master Sign Plan  
17-045MSP**

**Riverside Drive  
Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a request for an amendment to the Master Sign Plan for Blocks A, B, and C within the Bridge Park development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with SR 161 and W. Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.

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

Nichole Martin said the MSP for A Block is specifically for the approval of those signs and the MSP approved for B & C Blocks was more general in nature and addressed the character of the mixed-use building types in a holistic manner.

Ms. Martin said the proposal this evening is for amendments to the A Block sign design. She said the signs originally approved by the Commission in May 2017, were supported by the ART and approved by the PZC at 100 square feet and 40 square feet respectively for Riverside Drive and Longshore Loop. She explained the reason why the ART supported the larger sizes was due to architectural integration of the design of the sign as it related to the building. She presented the graphic for the approved sign for The Exchange, which is a thin, modern font that speaks to the clean lines of the character of the structure. She said the sign the applicant is proposing this evening is a more fluid serif cursive font at 103 square feet. She said the BSD Code with respect to the MSP clearly emphasizes they are not simply intended to allow for larger signs without consideration of creativity and integration, especially when signs are being approved specifically for single buildings as they are in A Block.

Ms. Martin said the proposed sign on Longshore Loop is 41 square feet, which is slightly larger than the approved sign. She reported the ART and staff shared this proposal with a graphic consultant that the City has used on previous applications within the BSD; furthermore, they reviewed the Building Permit MSP documents in B and C Blocks and they noted the more fluid font is less legible from a distance than the alternative modern font; therefore, the increased size is required with the more fluid font as the legibility is diminished.

With respect to the B and C Blocks' MSP, Ms. Martin said, these modifications are proposed more as a clean-up; these are items that have been discovered through the leasing process as well as the sign permitting process. She said the proposal is to add to additional sign types as well as provide more flexibility in the MSP. She said a new sign type, a leasing window cover, is proposed to generate excitement as new businesses come in; currently, they are not permitted to have any sort of identification during their tenant fit-up period. She noted this sign type would be consistent with the leasing window covers that Crawford Hoying is permitted to have on the ground story. She said the size of the logos permitted would be consistent at less than 30% of each window, there would be a maximum of three colors, and the background would be required to be a solid color. The example the landlord has provided happens to be gray, she said, but this could be any color consistent with that tenant's brand. She said these signs would be permitted no longer than 180 days and would not require a sign permit.

Ms. Martin said a logo or name on a public entrance to a tenant space is proposed to be permitted. She pointed out this is language directly out of the BSD Code; the landlord is just choosing to memorialize it in the MSP as it is an addendum to the lease of these tenants and a one-stop-shop reference as they work through sign permitting. She said one staff condition is that the document be amended to clarify that these signs will only be one-square-foot whereas in another column in the Code it states the sign will cover less than 30% of the window.

Ms. Martin said the last provision is that a tenant is permitted to license a sign of theirs to a tenant that is located within their tenant space. An example of that would be if a gym had a coffee shop and they wanted to give one of their signs to the coffee shop. She said the actual physical tenant space would be permitted no more signs than the MSP already stipulates and all numerical sign requirements would need to be met but the sign could serve as identification for a business located within a business.

Ms. Martin restated the Code identifies some intent statements for the MSP and it is that they are intended to allow for additional flexibility and creativity in sign design and display but she reiterated it is not simply to permit larger signs, more visible signs, or additional signs. She said the intent is to maintain the standards of the BSD zoning as well as the sign guidelines adopted by City Council. She stated signs are to be pedestrian oriented and remain focused on bicycle traffic; although in some cases, the signs will need to be visible by motor vehicles but really emphasizing the pedestrian-oriented nature of the BSD.

Ms. Martin reported the ART reviewed this application and is recommending approval to the Commission this evening with three conditions:

- 1) That the Master Sign Plan be revised to eliminate the proposed revisions to the signs related to the event center;
- 2) That the proposal be updated to clarify the maximum allowable size of a Logo/Name on Storefront Door is 1 square foot; and,
- 3) That the applicant provide a revised, approved Master Sign Plan to Planning prior to the filing of additional sign permits.

Ms. Martin said based on the Code requirement for architectural integration of this sign, the ART found that the revised design did not meet the criteria in the same fashion and requested a greater size, even though it is only slightly greater. The support for the original increase in size was because the sign met the intent of the MSP and this design does not.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6604 Riverside Drive, Suite 500, said the clean-ups in blocks B and C are just some things they have started to see as they talked with tenants throughout the process. He said the leasing window covers are just a miss. He said if you have visited the site, you have

seen the covers on spaces that are either not yet leased or the tenants are not ready to get started with their construction because they are in the design and permitting process. He said the example shown was one that they would have put up before this was approved but he said he had not thought of it so here they are, asking to do the same thing. He indicated leasing window covers will create more visual interest as more people come into the site, especially with tenants opening up soon.

Mr. Starr said the second modification is just a clarification on the door and getting the tenant's name and logo on the door. As Ms. Martin mentioned, he said when they put these in the sign plans they were a complete exhibit to a one-stop-shop, but people review that as being one of the signs when it is clearly allowed on the door.

Mr. Starr said the final modification was the license tenant. He said Mesh Fitness has a Bubbles Tea and Juice Company in there now so that was permitted as part of that permit set. He noted that under the MSP, Mesh Fitness would be permitted four signs and they only put up three so they could give one of those signs to Bubbles Tea and Juice Company. He indicated there is another circumstance where they are seeing this type of request and thinks they will continue to see this as retail evolves over the years where tenants are co-branding. He emphasized the number of signs would be no more than what the main tenant would be allowed otherwise.

Mr. Starr concluded he sees these requests as minor in nature and they help create clarity for their tenants. He addressed the A Block request as they just recently had that approved. He said the revised sign is the logo of the business so this will be on the marketing materials. He said this is the preferred sign of their operator, who is here to speak to that, if necessary.

Chris Brown said he attended their Open House and at a quick glance, noticed they changed their logo. He said he does not have a problem with the revised sign but requested that the sign be reduced from 103 square feet to 100 square feet to which Mr. Starr agreed.

Mr. Brown inquired about the 180-day limitation on the vinyl. He said as it is presented at the Cap City Diner, it is great and descriptive. He indicated he is a little fearful of "up to three colors" and asked for clarification. Mr. Starr answered first there would be a solid background color and the logo would be on top of that. Ms. Martin added "up to three colors" was to obtain some diversity in the streetscape and also to be consistent with the sign Code in the BSD and throughout the City that would typically permit up to three colors for a sign. She stressed that she had a conversation with Mr. Starr to make sure the signs would not be overwhelming.

Mr. Starr asked if more colors would be permitted if a registered logo or trademark were used. Ms. Martin answered a logo can count as a single color.

Mr. Brown said as he looks at this big long storefront on the bottom of the building and it is orange and that is not subtle. He indicated it is important to build excitement and tell people what is coming but he does not want to see this big brand orange, yellow, or bright red stripe on an otherwise non vibrant streetscape. He said there should be a compromise like what they did for the unleased or pre-tenant space with just the subtle gray vinyl with the logo as it still appears very good. He clarified there should be moderation and does not want these signs to overwhelm any other good architecture or tenant spaces that are open for business.

Victoria Newell said that was a fair comment by Mr. Brown.

Cathy De Rosa said she disagrees because one of the nice things about it is there is a limit of 180 days and it creates excitement and interest. In urban settings, she said, there are going to be pops of color, which is really important. She said neon colors are not right but most tenants are not necessarily going to want to do that. She said if all the signs have black or gray backgrounds, that excitement is not going to

be achieved. She concluded that for 180 days on a very big building, this is acceptable to build interest and excitement.

Mr. Starr addressed the orange color issue as Orange Theory Fitness is going into the Kroger Plaza and they have that on the door. He indicated he would never have paid attention to the new business if that sign was not there.

Ms. De Rosa affirmed that people are very excited to see what is coming into these spaces. She said the whole co-branding issue is going to be an important element in the future as retail struggles to attract people in a service world. She indicated retail matched with food will be seen in a much bigger way so it makes sense to recognize that.

Ms. De Rosa asked to see again the sign that was previously approved for the event center. She recalled that the emphasis to the Commission was that the sign integrated so well with the architecture and the Commission was sold that that sign was going to be really terrific and she agreed. She indicated when she looks at the revised sign as it is the brand's logo, it becomes more of a challenge. Aesthetically, she stated there is no comparison between those two signs. She said one feels like it is exactly current and belongs there and the other one not so much. She pointed out that the intent of the Code is to create scale when excitement and variety happens; she does not see it so much in the revised sign. She added she has trouble reading the font.

Steve Stidhem said he can support either version. He stated the Commission approved 100 square feet based on that font, layout, and materials but asked what the Code requirement was before they did that. Ms. Martin answered without a MSP approval, the Code would permit a half a square foot per linear foot up to a maximum of 50 square feet. Mr. Stidhem said the Commission approved the sign to be twice the size that Code allows because of the font and the way it looked. Now, very quickly after that, he said the applicant decided to completely change the font and size because that is what their branded logo. He asked why the Commission did not see this font when the application was presented before when the applicant was trying to get the size of the sign to 100 square feet to begin with.

Mr. Starr said that was a fair question by Mr. Stidhem. He said as they talked about it after the fact and looked at the sign in context with the hotel, they are trying to create a separate and distinct brand for the event center to let people know it is not part of the hotel but rather a stand-alone operation. He said the operators will work together as premier events will be sold together but one business can run without the other.

Mr. Stidhem suggested that if the applicant proposed the revised sign at 100 square feet, it might not have passed so that is why he is struggling with this in general. He stated he is fine with everything else except neon yellow on the temporary signs.

Bob Miller said he is okay with all of it. He encouraged the applicant to bring the revised exchange sign down to 100 square feet. He said the original sign was more appealing but that is a personal preference.

Steve Weiss, Cameron Mitchell, said the revised sign design has been their logo for about a year and a half and they have been promoting it, it is on their website, and it has always been their focal point. He said he does not know how the first design ever appeared so they are asking why the original sign proposal happened and the Commission is asking why the revised sign is being proposed. He said he was not here for the first proposal and was caught by surprise. He agreed that the architecture on the building contains a lot of linear lines but the building actually curves and the hotel curves and he agrees that in this rendering, this revised sign might be harder to read. He stated they have built over 85 restaurants and the hardest part is to name a restaurant, event center, or name anything so this was a really long and difficult process. He explained that once they landed on the name "The Exchange", they were concerned that it would come across as too much of a business. He said they believe the first

proposal, since it is so linear, will not appeal to people that want events such as weddings and believe more fluidity would be better. He apologized for the misunderstanding and wanted to ensure the Commission realized what their real intent is and that they are trying to do the right thing by using something they have been using for some time now.

Mr. Brown asked if the makeup of the sign was going to be the same color of metal and if it is still backlit.

Earl Lee, Moody Nolan, 2879 Ashcreek Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, 43219, said the revised sign will have the exact same structure with a perforated face that allows the light to come through the face.

Mr. Brown said how the sign scales on the building has always been important to him and always will be. He said vehicles will be coming around that roundabout, looking for a place that they do not normally go to and they have to be able to find it. He said GPS or not, he does not care, they still want that visual when fighting that traffic circle.

Ms. De Rosa recalled how convincing Earl Lee was with the first proposal. She said the word “the” is much smaller than the main brand and that creates a visual interest.

Mr. Starr said they discussed the tag line “the Events at Bridge Park” amongst themselves and how the whole sign is measured, which allows it to become bigger but they still want to keep it in line with that railing for architectural symmetry.

Ms. De Rosa said the Commission is trying to get a more interesting sign and that is why they were so excited about the first proposal. She said this is going to be a marquee building in a really prominent location to which Ms. Newell agreed. Ms. De Rosa said she understands the applicant wants to use the brand but asked if they could make it as dynamic as the first sign since this is a premier location.

Mr. Brown asked if the cool sculptural element is going on in that plaza. Mr. Starr indicated they are engaging with Dublin Arts Council to come up with a solution there. Mr. Brown said he likes the one they have and Mr. Starr said that one is very, very expensive. Mr. Brown said he bets that it is but it is cool and that is what they want – something cool in a prominent location. Mr. Starr indicated they are going to achieve something pretty spectacular there and will have a great story to tell.

Mr. Stidhem said he is not going to argue with the logo. He said he was frustrated with the sign designs but if the applicant gets the signs to the size they voted on the first time, he would vote yes.

Mr. Starr apologized to the Commission for causing any frustration.

Ms. De Rosa said she is seeing a lot of head nodding here to making this sign a little more creative. She asked the applicant if this is something they would be open to doing. Mr. Starr answered he absolutely would.

The Chair asked Mr. Starr what he would like to do this evening. She said if the applicant is talking creativity, they will have to sell the creativity. She said there is something in place that received a consensus of the Commission to double the square footage of the sign Code and it will not be fair to staff to make this a condition to try to have more creativity within the sign.

Ms. De Rosa said she thought the head nodding meant that the Commission wants the applicant to come back with some variation on that theme but with more creativity.

Mr. Starr said he is happy to come back but there is a little bit of a timing issue – the sign will not be installed until after the building is finished.

Mr. Brown asked what the reason is for rejection and said that needs to be stated. He said if the applicant reviews the BSD Sign Guidelines that has cool elements such as the structural bicycles going up and down the building - that is what this Commission keeps waiting to see. He referred to a cool sign/sculpture he saw in another city where there is a fish that is diving through a corner of a building and the bricks kind of half explode on the outside of this real sculptural element so you know that is a place to get some seafood. He emphasized that is what the Commission is looking for.

Mr. Brown explained that when the applicant brought the first sign and the Commission saw the linear patterns and the fact that it reflected the architecture, to him, the reason for the increased size was that it blended in with the architecture, but it had to be bigger because the font was so tiny to which the Chair agreed. Mr. Brown said he is not opposed to the revised logo at all, but the Commission is still searching for something creative, particularly at that corner that starts to set the benchmark for Bridge Park as one approaches from the south or the west. He emphasized, that is the first thing they are going to see as they round the corner so it is important to the Commission. He concluded he would be a yes vote if the sign was 100 square feet but there are five Commissioners present.

Phil Hartmann clarified, with five Commissioners present, the applicant would need three out of the five yes votes for approval.

Mr. Brown said the sculpture was mentioned; he said an investment is needed there. He said Dublin is all about landscaping and trees but at some point, the City needs to have some elements, some excitement and dynamic pieces that say this is Bridge Park, this is Dublin; this city is unique and special and it will take more than just that (future) pedestrian bridge to get tenants in and draw people in to make this whole thing work. He said that would include sculptures, signs, and character through and through. He indicated he was even disappointed with the bike racks that are just circles repeated one after the other.

Ms. De Rosa said she saw some willingness to do that and she wanted to make sure that while the sign will not be installed before the building is finished, it would be installed before the business is open.

Mr. Starr said the first event is September 5th but he does not know at this point the sequencing of the construction of this building including where they would need to get electric to for the sign installation.

Ms. De Rosa said most logos have horizontal, vertical, different variations on how they present themselves.

Mr. Lee said the Commission needs to consider the façade creating that logo versus a sign creating a logo. In this case, he said considering the face of that building, since it is a cursive font, and kind of starts to be reminiscent of art. He said to do that at a scale where it does not look like a solid wall, it is going to be well above 100 square feet because then it becomes part of the building. He indicated he was not sure this is being understood without a visual.

Mr. Lee inquired about the sculpture or piece that might go in the roundabout as he has not seen it. He said he would hate to make a piece on the outside of the roundabout that starts to complement the hierarchy between what goes in that center. Mr. Brown said the sculpture they were speaking of is actually for the plaza. Mr. Lee said if the size of this logo is kept within a proximity of 100 square feet or so then installing it by that timeline would be possible. He said changing the design will all depend on making sure it is approved on time and how in depth it is going to go with construction on whether they could still meet their deadline.

Ms. De Rosa said Mr. Lee convinced the Commission how well the first sign would be integrated but if this logo is kept and within this size, she is not convinced he can make it the dynamic statement that warrants 100 square feet.

The Chair again asked the applicant what they would like to do this evening.

Mr. Starr asked if there is a way they can get the B and C Blocks' vote achieved but table A Block, even though it is part of one application.

Ms. Martin said the application before the Commission this evening is for a comprehensive package.

Mr. Starr said he is going to ask for a vote this evening and deal with the consequences as a result of the vote.

Ms. Husak said the condition needs to be revised that the size of the event center signs would be as approved previously at 100 and 40 square feet respectively.

The Chair cautioned the applicant is not before a full Commission and that could negatively impact how this vote comes out.

Mr. Starr clarified that if the vote does not pass, he will have to resubmit and come back.

Ms. Husak said the applicant also has the option of requesting reconsideration by the Commission and a Commission member would have to vote to reconsider so at the next meeting. Mr. Hartmann clarified that a member voting against this application would have to request that it be reconsidered again.

Mr. Brown asked the applicant if he was in agreement with the condition that the sign be limited to 100 square feet to which he answered affirmatively. Mr. Starr said he was in agreement with all of the conditions.

Ms. Martin said she modified the first condition to state "The Master Sign Plan be revised to limit the event center signs to 100 square feet for Riverside Drive and 40 square feet for Longshore Loop". She said conditions two and three would remain the same.

Mr. Brown said 50 square feet as written in the Code for that location is just wrong and this is our opportunity to amend that. Ms. Newell disagreed. She said we are to look at these signs individually and it is the purpose of the sign code to charge the applicant with convincing the Commission on creativity to make concessions. She said in this instance, she is looking at what they were presented with before and what they are presented with now and she believes they are getting something less this time. She said she understands they want to keep their logo but the effort should have been made to bring that in at the original submission.

Mr. Starr asked for a vote.

The Chair asked that the Master Sign Plan guidelines be put back on the screen.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the application for amendment to the Master Sign Plan for Blocks A, B, and C within the Bridge Park Development as stated with the three conditions:

- 1) That the Master Sign Plan be revised to limit the event center signs to 100-square-foot sign for Riverside Drive and 40-square-foot sign for Longshore Loop;
- 2) That the proposal be updated to clarify the maximum allowable size of a Logo/Name on Storefront Door is 1-square-foot; and,
- 3) That the applicant provide a revised and approved Master Sign Plan to Planning, prior to the filling of additional sign permits.

\*Matt Starr agreed to the above conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, no; Ms. Newell, no; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approval 3 – 2)

The Chair asked if there were any additional comments. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 10:19 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 10, 2017.