



## MEETING MINUTES

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 1, 2018

### AGENDA

- 1. BSD C – Gabe’s – Sign 17-115MPR** **6285 Sawmill Road**  
**Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 2. PUD, Midwestern Auto Group Campus - Signs 18-003AFDP** **6325 Perimeter Loop Road**  
**Amended Final Development Plan (Recommended for Approval 5 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:29 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Steve Stidhem, Bob Miller, Warren Fishman, and Kristina Kennedy. Jane Fox was absent as she was attending the Council Retreat. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Thaddeus Boggs, Nichole Martin, and Laurie Wright.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

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

The Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said both of the cases this evening were on the Consent Agenda and then removed for the Commission to have the opportunity to hear the cases in their entirety. She decided to take the cases in the order they were published.

- 1. BSD C – Gabe’s – Sign 17-115MSP** **6285 Sawmill Road**  
**Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a Master Sign Plan for an existing, auto-oriented, commercial tenant space. The site is zoned Bridge Street District Commercial and is on the west side of Sawmill Road, northwest of the intersection with Martin Road. She stated this is a request for a review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of the Zoning Code and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines. She said the Commission has final authority on this case and witnesses will have to be sworn in.



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

Nichole Martin presented an aerial view of the site and noted the ±3.3-acre site has a 40,000-square-foot structure on it with ±170 parking spaces located in front of the building, set back about 200 feet from Sawmill Road. She said the request for the Master Sign Plan is to permit deviations from the Code for the combination of signs as well as the additional height for the wall sign that is architecturally integrated with the building. The sign provisions, she said, applicable to an existing structure within the BSD are those of the standard sign Code. She reported that in early 2017, City Council found that those regulations were more consistent with the character of the buildings than the BSD Sign Code so the sign allowances are:

- Number of Signs: 1 sign per building or use; for corner lots with more than 100 feet of frontage – 2 signs are permitted facing separate public right-of-ways.
- Wall Sign: 80 square feet of area and 15 feet in height
- Ground/Monument Sign: 50 square feet in area and 15 feet in height
- Window: 10% of total window area up to 10 square feet; No additional sign area is permitted based on the use; therefore, area of window signs must be subtracted from the total allowance for the sign area

Ms. Martin presented the proposed 78-square-foot, wall sign mounted at 32 feet from grade. She described the sign as consisting of individually mounted channel letters in a royal blue with a teal swoosh. She said the proposed 28-square-foot ground sign is utilizing an existing ground sign base and the total height of the sign, including the base, is just shy of nine feet. She reported the ART recommended individually pin-mounted letters with halo illumination to replace the cabinet type the applicant had installed without approval from the City. She said the copy will be white with a solid royal blue background and teal swoosh.

Ms. Martin said the application was reviewed against the BSD Sign Guidelines, which was the impetus for the ART to request dimensional letters on the ground sign as that is installed within the pedestrian realm. She noted these guidelines have been found to be met with condition. She explained the MSP criteria in the Code specifically states that Master Sign Plans are to allow a greater degree of flexibility in sign design and display but not to simply allow a greater number of signs or larger signs without consideration of the sign design. She said the ART is recommending approval of the MSP with three conditions to memorialize the signs provided under the previous zoning:

- 1) That the ground sign design be modified to be individually, pin-mounted, dimensional letters with a two-inch relief and halo-illumination, subject to Planning's approval prior to sign permitting;
- 2) That the masonry base be repaired and cleaned to the satisfaction of the City's Zoning Inspector; and
- 3) That a plan be provided demonstrating Code required landscaping at the base of the ground sign, and approved by Planning, prior to issuance of a sign permit.

Bob Miller asked where the previous tenant's wall sign was located on the building. Ms. Martin said the Sportsmart wall sign was in the same general vicinity as the wall sign proposed, just slightly lower at 28 feet in height.

Warren Fishman asked if Code allowed two signs.

Ms. Martin explained the Code prohibits the combination of signs so the applicant would either need to choose one sign type or the other, but two signs are permitted.

Mr. Fishman said, the applicant should meet Code. Ms. Martin stated all of the signs on the site currently are illegal. Claudia Husak explained the applicant is allowed two signs but the Code does not permit the combination of two different sign types and the applicant is proposing a wall sign and a ground sign.

Mr. Fishman inquired why the case was required to be reviewed by the Commission. Ms. Martin said if the applicant would have chosen to do a Minor Project Review, which would be an Administrative approval, and not come before the PZC, then the applicant would be permitted two, 80-square-foot wall signs or they could have two ground signs, provided the separation was met.

Mr. Fishman said the Sportsmart sign he recalled was not as glaring as this one appeared. He asked if blue was backlit. Ms. Martin answered the design is consistent with what Sportsmart had but the colors may differ and this wall sign consists of individually mounted channel letters attached to the masonry face of the building. She pointed out that the sign she is presenting, is the one proposed, and not the one installed on site today.

The Chair explained that what the applicant is not proposing to match the sign currently in place and emphasized the applicant is proposing something different than what is on the building now. She added the ground sign will have pin-mounted letters with halo lighting, which provide a glow around the outside of each of the letters when lit and will create a shadow on the wall in the daytime. She also explained that in the straight Code, the applicant would not be permitted two different sign types but with a MSP, the Commission could grant that flexibility.

Ms. Martin explained the MSP provision does not appear anywhere else in the Code or the PUD process, just in the BSD.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Kevin Detroy, 255 E. Fifth St., Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202, said Ms. Martin has been a tremendous help to the applicant. He said he has done work all over Ohio but this was the first time he has been in Dublin and she has been a real pleasure to work with to help navigate this system.

Mr. Detroy said Ms. Martin presented the project very well and he is fine with all of the conditions. In terms of the first condition regarding the ground sign, an alternative design was submitted a week ago that meets the requirements staff had requested. He said the ground sign consists of two-inch, off-set pin letters on a perforated background that is halo lit. He said the wall sign has channel letters as well and back-lit. He said he thought they met the size and color requirements, as well. For the other conditions, he said, they will do whatever is requested in terms of maintaining the masonry base. He indicated that just today they found a landscape company to handle all the landscaping around the ground sign.

Mr. Detroy said if it is not as apparent, the trees that line Sawmill Road do not have any leaves on them currently but when those trees are in full bloom, it is very difficult to see the building set back behind and they have submitted quite a few photographs from various approaches at that intersection to demonstrate that. He said that is one of the reasons they have asked for the elevation in height; it will give them an opportunity for that wall sign to be visible. He said the building is set back pretty far from the roadway and the ground sign is critical in giving them notice to their clients and access, especially when the trees are full of foliage. He said even though they have not gone through the full analysis of showing hardship, he indicated he could easily do that if it were required to get this proposal approved.

Steve Stidhem asked if the applicant was in agreement that the masonry base for the ground sign needed repair and cleaning for which Mr. Detroy answered affirmatively. Mr. Stidhem said the same should be done to the masonry in the front of the building as it wraps around but he did not notice if it

also needed repairs. Mr. Detroy said Gabe's is interested in being a good neighbor here and a good corporate partner. He said he knows the stores Gabe's has open and he does not think they would allow a store to be an eyesore.

Mr. Stidhem said he understands the challenges with this location including being across the street from the City of Columbus businesses that adhere to different rules. He said he looks forward to seeing it all evolve. He said he was amazed to drive by and see there were already signs erected at Gabe's when the Commission had not seen any applications for them. He said he appreciated the applicant working with the City's staff, who are completely awesome, and is eager to see how the site transforms.

Mr. Fishman said when he drove down Sawmill Road, he found the sign box to really shine and stick out and he was referring to the ground sign. Mr. Detroy said he does not want to see a gaudy sign and he understands Mr. Fishman's point. He indicated the sign will be muted and will look more sophisticated rather than a lit box as he understands a lit box does not fit the community. He said a lit box amongst other lit boxes makes sense but it does not always and is more than happy to make the necessary changes.

Mr. Stidhem welcomed Gabe's to the community and believes this business makes a good use of that location. He indicated that when he has been by there a few times, there have already been plenty of people there shopping.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the audience to speak on this case this evening. [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Miller asked for confirmation that the applicant could apply for two, 80-square-foot wall signs to which Ms. Martin answered affirmatively and added that would just require an Administrative Review process. Mr. Miller confirmed the City would have less signage with the package that has been presented this evening.

Ms. Newell said because this is a request for less signage, she thinks this proposal fits the building and is comparable to what was in place and the applicant is in an unusual predicament because they were once a commercial plan development. She said they are pretty much allowed the signage they have now. She said she does not think the proposal fully fits to the letter of what the City has asked for in terms of creativity but the signs will still look nice and the halo effect is really attractive, which was a good suggestion by staff.

The Chair called for a motion as the applicant has already stated they are in agreement with the three conditions:

- 1) That the ground sign design be modified to be individually, pin-mounted, dimensional letters with a two-inch relief and halo-illumination, subject to Planning's approval prior to sign permitting;
- 2) That the masonry base be repaired and cleaned to the satisfaction of the City's Zoning Inspector; and
- 3) That a plan be provided demonstrating Code required landscaping at the base of the ground sign, and approved by Planning prior to issuance of a sign permit.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with the three stated conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

**2. PUD, Midwestern Auto Group Campus - Signs  
18-003AFDP**

**6325 Perimeter Loop Road  
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a consolidated inventory of signs for the existing Midwestern Auto Group campus. She said the 30-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District and is located south of Perimeter Drive, approximately 250 feet south of the intersection with Venture Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

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

Claudia Husak said that typically Amended Final Development Plans are at the authority of the Planning and Zoning Commission and would not go to City Council for final approval. She explained this case stems from the rezoning of MAG in 2016 when they added an additional five acres to the campus to accommodate for the Land Rover and Jaguar building. At City Council, she said there were some questions asked regarding the signs across the campus and the applicant ultimately agreed to subject themselves to this process to have an AFDP for a sign plan to be reviewed by the PZC and then Council.

Ms. Husak said MAG has a Development Text in place that was created in 1997 and has had many iterations since then as conditions on the site have changed and as additional brands moved there. She said what is before the Commission is an evolution of development that was initiated in 1997.

An aerial view from 2017 of the 30-acre campus was presented and Ms. Husak pointed out the pond on the east side is now where the Land Rover and Jaguar facility is under construction. She recalled the Commission informally reviewed the application for Porsche and Ferrari last month for the northern portion of the site where Land Rover is currently located. In this sign package, she said, Porsche and Ferrari are not currently shown because it has not been approved yet by the Commission. She emphasized the current conditions are what the Commission is reviewing this evening.

Ms. Husak presented the site plan as it was approved by the Commission that includes the Land Rover and Jaguar building in Subarea C, which was the latest addition to the campus in 2016. She said there are three subareas existing and the Development Text is divided into those subareas as well as the sign standards. She indicated they are fairly consistent throughout the Development Text but there are some slight variations as development occurred over time.

Ms. Husak said she was going to go over what the text permits and what the conditions are on the campus today but cautioned this is complicated. She presented a graphic of a map for the entire campus, which shows the dealership sign and the campus identification sign, which are the two permitted sign types within the Development Text. She explained there is one dealership sign permitted for the entire 30-acre campus and highlighted where the dealership sign is located. She stated the Development Text permits three campus ID signs and pointed out the one located at the main entry of Perimeter Loop Road, one at the intersection of Venture Drive and Perimeter Drive, and the last one is permitted at the other Venture Drive entrance for Subarea C, but does not yet exist. She said that sign will need to be approved by the Commission in the future along with the remainder of the signs for Subarea C.

Ms. Husak presented the directional signs, focused in Subarea A, which is the largest of the subareas. She said there are six installed in Subarea A and they are permitted to be this size and design and located for circulation purposes. Additionally, she noted there are directional signs permitted in the Development Text that would not require review and approval by the Commission or by Staff. She said the caveat to that is – the directional signs are to be internally oriented as well as be small in size per the Development Text. She highlighted three signs that are located at the underground drive as all the service activity is on a lower

level. She noted another one of these service oriented signs on the northern portion of the building, as well. She said there are two additional “directional” signs on the campus (which the applicant is identifying them as) the Land Rover/Jaguar sign at the entry on Perimeter, which was not approved by the Commission as part of any application. Since the sign is not internally oriented, she said, we would consider that one of the sign types that do require approval; and, staff’s recommendation this evening is that this sign be removed. She said there is a Volvo service sign on the eastern portion, near the Volvo showroom, which staff is also requesting to be removed because it does not meet the Development Text requirements for a sign of high quality in complimentary material.

Ms. Husak reported there is one wall sign currently permitted within Subarea A and exists on the Land Rover building on the green panel. Throughout Commission reviews, she said there were some other sign allowances approved specifically for Jaguar and Land Rover. She said since that application is now moving to Subarea C, those would no longer be valid. She explained that one sign on the wall is permitted currently in Subarea A; if Land Rover would be demolished and redeveloped, those signs would have to come before the Commission to amend the text to allow for wall signs.

Bob Miller asked for clarification; that sign does not move to one of the new buildings. Ms. Husak said the sign would not be moved.

Ms. Husak said there is also a MAG Welcome Sign on the wall where the office used to be but again, since only one wall sign is permitted in Subarea A, the sign will have to be removed.

Brand signs were presented. Ms. Husak said since there are so many different brands across the campus, allowances have been made to allow brands to be identified near the showrooms where they are being sold. She noted there were a couple different sizes permitted across the campus and she presented each sign. She said they all meet the Development Text for the exception of two signs. She pointed out that the Volkswagen sign is too wide since it has a big panel so staff is requesting that be removed so the sign would then meet the Development Text. She explained that the Development Text only allows one brand sign per brand and staff has discovered through this application that Bentley actually has two signs so one of them would need to be removed to be in compliance.

For Subarea B, Ms. Husak said she has presented all the signs on one graphic to address wall, brand, and directional signs. She explained there are two buildings located in Subarea B but they include three brands; there is a building for Audi and a building for BMW and Mini, which is a shared showroom service area. She said all the wall signs for each of the three brands in Subarea B have allowances in the Development Text for the 50-square-foot size and required to adhere to the height of 15 feet as written in the Zoning Code, which was approved by the Commission during the Final Development Plan and exist today. She said there are also the brand and directional signs within Subarea B. For Audi, she reported, the Commission had made an exception and allowed a wall sign to act as a brand sign that is a 2.7-square-foot sign near the entrance so Subarea B is the only subarea to have a brand sign allowance for a wall sign, specifically made for Audi. She said the applicant/developer has chosen to do directional and brand signs as a shared sign for BMW and Mini; individually they each meet the requirements of the Development Text. Additionally, she said, there is another directional sign for Audi service as well as for the BMW pre-owned vehicles. She said there is no maximum number of brand signs or directional signs. She said there is a sign for service for Audi, which staff has the same concern as with the Volvo service sign that seems temporary in nature, is not complimentary in materials, and staff is asking that the sign be removed from the campus.

Mr. Miller asked to see which one was being removed and Ms. Husak pointed the sign out.

Subarea C, Ms. Husak said, is a little unique mainly because the Commission approved the Final Development Plan and the building is under construction. She added the Commission also approved two

wall signs for this building, one for Jaguar, one for Land Rover, and there is a condition that the Commission had placed upon the applicant for those two signs, which stated the signs could not be permitted through the City of Dublin until this Master Campus Sign Package was approved through the Commission and Council. She said the two wall signs are permitted to be 24 feet in height and a size of 100-square feet in total. She said the Commission has not reviewed and approved any of the brand signs or a campus ID sign for Subarea C. She said the applicant has included those within this package knowing they would have to get approved at a later date; however, they do not currently meet the requirements of the Development Text as they are proposed to be too tall and the applicant did not limit the information strictly to the brands. Therefore, she said, staff has requested the signs be revised to meet the Development Text when they come forward for final approval for Subarea C signs.

Ms. Husak concluded her presentation and certain conditions have been identified to be cleaned up here as part of this application. She said staff is requesting the Commission recommend approval to City Council for their final review and approval, which she is tentatively scheduling for the end of March.

Mr. Miller said he thought there was no request for directional signs to which Ms. Husak answered affirmatively.

Kristina Kennedy referred to a service directional sign for Jaguar/Land Rover in Subarea A that is on a concrete block that looks really beat up and stood out to her. Ms. Husak said the sign is actually on a wall and she said there is no plan to refresh those signs as part of this proposal. Ms. Kennedy said it stood out to her because it was different than the other service signs and Ms. Husak agreed. Ms. Husak said it is most likely one of the very first signs installed on campus.

Ms. Kennedy asked if there were any plans to add any additional directional signs along Venture Drive or branding signs on the back side of the campus. Ms. Husak indicated there were no such plans. She said the directional signs that are of this nature, are only in Subarea A and not continued throughout the other subareas. She said on Venture Drive, the only proposal is to have this campus ID sign in this corner, which is a 15-foot tall, silver, slim sign. Mr. Miller affirmed the location proposed is on the road is where Children's Hospital is located. Ms. Husak confirmed it is a shared drive and pointed out exactly where it is going to go on the MAG property.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, 49 E. Third Street, said Ms. Husak did a great job presenting this. He restated it has been an evolution over the past couple of years and likewise the signage Code. Even with Jaguar and Land Rover coming on and the Porsche and Ferrari that this Commission knows, there are some internal shifts into the main building with the automotive brands we will be doing as well. He said this is a great time to go back and clean up and get all the arrows pointing in the right direction. He reported he reviewed the conditions with the owner and he has accepted the four conditions as they are so they will remove the signs that Ms. Husak requested. He clarified which Bentley sign would be removed as well as the Aston Martin sign because it is no longer a brand at MAG. He said when Porsche moves, that sign will be removed. Over the next 18 to 24 months, he said a lot of these signs are going to be moving around and he will be back for those individual new signs in the new locations. He explained right now, it is about taking stock of inventory to satisfy the request from City Council so they can get the Jaguar/Land Rover signs up. He indicated the facility is slated to open in September 2018 and they need to order the sign; there is a six-month lead time. He suggested they will probably take a leap of faith on the wall signs and proceed to get those signs ordered. He said there is time yet on the ground signs.

Ms. Kennedy reported she drove the property over the weekend and she had to say she was really confused with the signs, especially on the back half of the property, going down Venture Drive and she was surprised to see almost no signs except for one small sign in the middle. She said more importantly,

she was surprised by the lack of consistency within the signs when you think about some of the directional signs. Some of the signs just have the text 'service' by itself and some have the brand name plus the directional information. She reiterated the lack of consistency stood out to her, especially for the luxury auto market; the signs appeared to be mismatched.

Mr. Parish said specifically, for the brand signs there, the owner understands there is one monument sign per brand as a brand sign and what is important to him is if on this sign there is sign and service that pointed you to where it was, consistent across each drive, if service was down and sales was up and they all looked similar; that is the direction they are heading. He said they still have to move all these pieces around on site before they can get them all to be consistent. He indicated their intention with this project is to complete the inventory right now, to ensure the current signs comply, and then as new signs are brought back before the Commission, they can create a consistency across those. Again, he said that is probably a 24-month schedule. He needs this process completed so he can get the permanent wall signs for Land Rover and Jaguar in time for their opening.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public to speak on this case. [Hearing no response.] She invited discussion from the Commissioners.

Mr. Miller thanked Ms. Husak for her presentation as he found it very helpful. He said he is really comfortable with the approach the applicant has taken. He said he agreed an inventory needed to be conducted and it was done very well. He concluded he is very much in favor of this proposal with staff's recommendations.

Mr. Stidhem seconded that comment. He said it was a good time to re-evaluate what is there and he looks forward to more consistency over the next 24 months. He stated the campus is beautiful and the signs will get there as time is needed to tie them all together. He indicated that inconsistency is okay sometimes; you want people to meander around sometimes just to look at different things. He said the applicant is going in the right direction and he appreciates the effort that staff went through to make this proposal even better.

Mr. Fishman and Kristina Kennedy both agreed.

Ms. Newell said her comments parallel Ms. Kennedy's in terms of having some consistency between the brand signs. She said she understands every auto dealership has their own logo and they are really proud of it and understands marketing a brand as well but those signs could be consistent in height, width, and we limit what the square footages are so that we can control the uniformity across the site. She said that is why staff is always requesting the inventory and the Commission has asked for that inventory in the past. She said she can be comfortable the Bentley and Rolls Royce but she would like to get something written in the conditions that we are going to put seeing uniformity in the future as the other signs come through. She asked staff if that was possible. Ms. Husak said she is questioning what staff could tie it to. She said if the Commission approves this proposal, she is not sure how she would get the applicant to come back. Ms. Newell suggested that if the applicant replaces any of their signs, they would have to come before the Commission each time for approval. Ms. Husak said that if the applicant were to just replace sign faces, they could do that without this process.

In terms of height, width, and other dimensions, Mr. Boggs noted those were in the Development Text. He added the Land Rover signs that Ms. Husak mentioned, in the initial proposal, do not meet the Development Text so the applicant will be coming back with something that meets the text and is consistent.

Ms. Newell said she understands that and it is the brand signs she has a concern with; it is not the wall signs. Ms. Husak said those would be the brand signs; the upper ones are brand signs the applicant is

proposing to bring back to the Commission and staff is already telling the applicant not to bother because they do not meet the Development Text, as it is written today. Mr. Boggs added that is just a preview and it is not a part of this inventory. Ms. Husak affirmed approval for these signs is not being requested at this time. She said potentially there could be a condition written that would read something along the lines of - "if brand signs get replaced, they must be more uniform" but uniform to what, she asked. She noted the BMW and Mini brands are quite different than others.

Ms. Newell said she cannot remember when she read through the text because she had a hard enough time trying to follow what all these signs were. She asked if there is a limitation on what those brands signs are now in height and square footage. Ms. Husak answered the proposal was written based on Subarea A. She explained there is essentially two types and the types denote how tall and wide the signs can be. She stated Type A can be 40 inches tall and 70 inches wide or if there are several signs, they can be Type B at 40 inches and not to exceed 20 square feet. She pointed out each on the graphics provided. She clarified the entire sign is Type B and the text states "If multiple brands are identified, the sign is allowed something different".

Mr. Parish indicated the metal panels will get modified over time. Ms. Husak suggested that if we are under the assumption that Porsche and Ferrari are getting their own showroom, once Land Rover gets demolished, we actually have something to tie this to.

Mr. Parish asked if ultimately, where the applicant is going, Type A, all the brands, is that more directional in nature and fall under the directional sign requirements, which is smaller. He said that would really starts to help sales versus service and then all of the brand signs are more of the monument type, which can identify and be different across the campus to sort of show the individuality of each brand. He said there is a problem within the Development Text in the fact that two types of brand signs are permitted. Over time, he said, the applicant will phase out the plane and go to all monument types because that is probably what the dealers will want. He indicated then it satisfies both.

Ms. Husak said she is okay with the monument signs as long as they are kept in the same proportions and are internal. She stated it is a lot of signage across the whole campus but realizes the text allows the applicant to do that so she cannot object.

Mr. Parish said he wanted to make sure uniformity is not traded off for this same style – like they all have to have the same base and back and just the logo exists because from brand to brand, that might be more difficult as they continue to develop it as they saw with Jaguar. He said Jaguar is wanting the taller ones and he submitted them in order to get staff comments that the applicant cannot do that. He said it is the process of working with each one of these manufacturers. Ms. Newell said she thinks the applicant can have consistency with them, dimensionally. Mr. Parish said he could concur with that.

Mr. Stidhem asked if a fifth condition would be added. Ms. Husak said she just wrote it - "That the applicant provide updated brand signs within Subarea A as part of the future redevelopment application for the existing Land Rover building." Mr. Parish asked if that condition was consistent with the text as he thought he would have to do that, anyway. With any new application, he said, he has to bring signs through. Ms. Husak clarified she is referring to the existing signs, not any new signs and yes, he would have to bring back new signs but the Commission is concerned with any existing signs. Mr. Parish said that is requiring him to update the brand signs – the metal panels and stuff. He said that was not a problem as the applicant would be coming through with all of them. He said the only one he has is the Volkswagen sign. He stated Volkswagen is staying in its current location; all the other brands are shuffling around. By that statement, he said he would have to update that sign to be consistent with all of the future signs. Ms. Husak said she thought the Volkswagen sign was comparable with the new Bentley and Rolls Royce signs proposing because it is similar in height and square footage once it is reduced per staff's recommendations.

Mr. Parish started to ask about Volvo and then stated that is where the rub is with that statement Ms. Husak is asking him to agree to. He said there are signs existing that the applicant does not have any intention of changing that are grandfathered in per the current text. He emphasized he does not want to re-do signs that he does not have to re-do. Mr. Fishman brought up the Volkswagen sign. Mr. Parish said that is comprised of two signs and the panel on the right is blank. Lightheartedly, he offered to stop on his way home with a wrench and tear it out – it is not hard. He stressed from a consistency of the brand signs, that Volkswagen sign will remain as it is, which is a single blade sign. By that condition, he said he would have to re-do that sign, the Volvo sign, and the Porsche sign so there are signs that meet the requirements of a monument but they will not meet the requirement of consistency of proportions/dimensions.

Ms. Newell said only the multi one is the bother. Ms. Husak said staff can number the signs or they can state this is sign type B and it is the only sign type B there is in Subarea A. Ms. Newell said if everyone is in agreement with that, she is certainly comfortable.

Mr. Fishman said when he drove through there, he found a lot of signs, the building was fine, and the landscaping in need of updates and care. He encouraged the applicant to make sure he updates that. Mr. Parish said he would when he brings the new signs forward. He said Porsche and Ferrari will have all new, with the final development of that.

The Chair asked Mr. Parish to read the fifth condition that was added to see if he agreed. She confirmed he was in agreement with all of the conditions. She asked if there were any further questions or comments. [Hearing none.] She called for a motion.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for an Amended Final Development Plan with five conditions:

- 1) That the directional signs for Volvo Service, Audi Service, and Customer Parking for Land Rover/Jaguar be revised or removed from the comprehensive sign plan and the site;
- 2) That the MAG Welcome sign in Subarea A be removed;
- 3) That the Jaguar and Land Rover brand signs be revised and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of a future application;
- 4) That one of the Bentley brand signs be removed from the campus and this comprehensive sign plan; and
- 5) That the applicant provide updated brand signs for existing brand sign Type B within Subarea A as part of the future redevelopment application for the existing Land Rover building.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

### **3. Dublin Corporate Area Plan 17-093ADM**

### **Introduction Administrative Request**

*Postponed prior to meeting.*

### **COMMUNICATIONS**

Thad Boggs said the Motel 6 case was administratively appealed to the Franklin County Environment Court, which has jurisdiction over Administrative Appeals and zoning matters. He said a transcript of that

case, which consists of the minutes from these meetings and the submitted documents, was filed with the court this week and it will proceed forward on briefs, so that is on-going.

Claudia Husak reported there is a lack of cases ready for the March 15, 2018, meeting so that is being cancelled. She said staff is still planning on having training for all of the Commission as well as on-boarding for the new members at that first meeting in April, which is the 5<sup>th</sup>. She indicated she has a tentative agenda that she will send to everyone to review and request thoughts/ideas for whatever else members might want to have covered as part of that training. She said she hopes the newest member appointed will be sworn in on that day to do some on-boarding and provide some refreshers to the rest of the Commission.

Victoria Newell suggested review of the BSD Code, since it is so complicated and perhaps a verbal presentation walking through some of the provisions of the BSD Code, especially for the newest members, would be good. Vince Papsidero agreed that would be beneficial to all.

Based on our joint meeting from last week, Mr. Papsidero said staff is considering a date in May for a follow up joint meeting because April is looking busy and notice will be given at least two weeks in advance, as well as a detailed outline of the proposal based on the comments received and the work that has already been started. He said this will allow us to go in with some depth. He indicated an ARB meeting date might be considered, depending on their agenda.

Bob Miller reported he had asked a few weeks ago about what was decided for the shades for the Cap City Diner in terms of up, down and at what times. He said he cannot recall what the Commission settled on but the shades always seem to be down when he goes passed there.

Ms. Husak said the condition was that the shades would be up when the patio was not in use. The "in use" terminology is tough to define she said because the tables are up and set all the time and they are expecting customers to come. Having the shades up would not necessarily work because then they would have to redo everything as it is "dirtied" by the elements. Steve Stidhem asked if Cap City Diner was not using the shades to block out sun but more as a barrier. He said he was there for lunch today and the shades were down and they were not letting anyone sit outside for lunch, not that he would want to. Mr. Miller stated he has seen the shades down at 8 am on a Sunday and down all the time and he does not remember ever seeing them up, actually. Ms. Newell said the applicant clearly made a presentation that they did not have the intention of keeping them down/closed all the time during this type of weather. Mr. Papsidero said part of that challenge is the fact that the tables are always set up for a meal. Regardless, he said, he would send Code Enforcement over there to take a look. Mr. Miller suggested it is something the Commission has to keep in mind when they have a similar case come forward because using Code Enforcement is a challenge. Mr. Papsidero said it was not a challenge. He explained whenever the Commission has a question about something like that, to not hesitate to call staff because the City has the team to take care of that and is not an issue. Ms. Husak restated the terms of determining if the patio is "in use" is the issue. Mr. Papsidero said that might need to be negotiated with Cap City Diners and others.

Mr. Miller said when the Commission had the Informal Review for MAG, Mr. Fishman expressed concerns for congestion to the site. He said there is going to be some demolition and two buildings are going to be added over there and he was not real comfortable with how congested that is going to be with two buildings, even though there are two structures there today. He recalled a conversation about where they were going to off-load vehicles that came on to the site and it was going to happen in the back part of Subareas A and B. He reported that when he went to the MAG site yesterday, they were off-loading cars on Venture Way so he actually stopped and took a picture of it while he was waiting his turn in traffic. He said his question to the applicant when that comes forward is - are they off-loading those cars because they have too much congestion on the site or are they off-loading cars on the road for other reasons. He

asked if that was a fair question to pose to them before they come forward with a formal application. Ms. Husak recalled that was part of the discussion at the Informal Review so it is appropriate.

Mr. Miller said, the signage the Commission just reviewed, made it very clear as to where they are to be off-loading vehicles and that is not what he witnessed, yesterday. He indicated maybe that was an anomaly. Ms. Husak said she was aware of that at other dealerships. Mr. Miller said he has talked with others and they have said the same thing and that the drivers do not like to come on site. He said the situation was dangerous. Mr. Fishman said he appreciated Mr. Miller bringing that up as this has been an on-going problem for half the years he has served on the Boards/Commission. He agreed the situation is dangerous and the dealerships want to use their properties as densely as they can and they agree to conditions that they will off-load on their properties but they do not.

Victoria Newell said she did not think it was necessarily an issue for the applicant/owners of the dealership; it is an issue from the trucking companies that are delivering the vehicles. She said they have to be caught unloading in the street and cited to stop that. Mr. Fishman asked if she agreed the drivers are not comfortable unloading on site because they do not have the proper clearances and the ease of getting in and out. He suggested if the City plans these densities so they can do that then we probably would not have the problem. Ms. Newell answered she thought most of the sites are getting designed with the space and area to do that but the drivers were still not coming on site. Mr. Fishman concluded the City will just have to start citing the drivers because it is dangerous. Mr. Miller said he thought it was ironic they were doing what they were doing and he is pretty sure, even though it is not construction related, if OSHA had been out there, some citing would have taken place for how they were off-loading those cars; it was not safe for those guys.

The Chair asked if there were any further items to discuss. [Hearing none] She adjourned the meeting at 7:44 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission April 5, 2018.