



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, January 3, 2019 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager served as Chair; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal.

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; Hunter Rayfield, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: McDonald's represented by Rebecca Green, Permit Solutions (Case 1).

Jennifer Rauch called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

RECOMMENDATION

**1. BSD C – McDonald's 337 W. Bridge Street
18-036MPR-MSP-WR Minor Project Review/Master Sign Plan/Waiver Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications and signs for an existing restaurant (McDonald's) zoned Bridge Street District – Commercial. She said the site is south of West Bridge Street, approximately 250 feet southeast of the intersection with Frantz Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review, Master Sign Plan, and Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site that was established in the 1980's with the drive-thru lane that wraps the north, south, and west elevations of the building. She said access is provided along the south and east property lines through a shared access agreement with the Dublin Plaza shopping center. She said a Parking Plan is requested as part of the Minor Project Review (MPR) as well as a number of waivers to rectify the non-conforming conditions and modernize an aging structure and site through the BSD Zoning Code.

Ms. Martin presented a photograph showing the existing conditions of the site including the single-story brick building with a mansard roof at a total height of 16 feet, 5½ inches, which incorporates yellow stripe accents. She said the existing brick base will be retained but the roof will be removed and replaced with a new brick, to match the existing, and a fiber cement siding parapet for a total building height of 18 feet. She said two tower features are proposed comprised of a black wood tile: one tower element is for the east elevation denoting the restaurant entrance and the other is for the north elevation. She noted the black tile will require a Waiver as it is not a permitted primary or secondary material. She said an aluminum trellis system is proposed with white and gray finishes with charcoal building tie-backs that will surround the building delineating the building's base and parapet. She said the applicant has requested to replace all but two windows, which will need to match the new windows in reflectiveness and tint. She said the applicant had proposed a variety of lighting but all up-lit fixtures shall be eliminated as they are not permitted in the BSD. She presented images of the architectural modifications proposed and noted the north elevation faces Bridge Street, the east and south elevations face the parking lot, and the west elevation faces Heartland Bank.



Ms. Martin presented the site improvements and explained the existing walks, patio, and 11 existing parking spaces along the east will be removed and replaced with new concrete to ensure ADA accessibility compliance across the site. She said there are a total of 19 parking spaces on site but 38 are required for a 3,732-square-foot facility along with four bicycle parking spaces. She said the applicant is providing the maximum number of spaces (including ADA spaces) on site given the size of the parcel. She said additional parking is available in the adjacent shopping center parking lot depending on any agreements between the two property owners. She indicated Staff is supportive of the requested Parking Plan provided the applicant shows documentation of a shared agreement with the shopping center for the use of the shared spaces.

Jennifer Rauch asked if the demonstration of an agreement for off-site parking should be included in the conditions of approval. Colleen Gilger said she would be more comfortable knowing there is one in place. Donna Goss recommended the applicant ensure there is parking reserved if/when the out lot is developed. She encouraged the applicant to protect herself by having a written agreement or there could be issues in the future.

Ms. Martin said since the existing building has two drive-thru windows, a minimum of 24 stacking spaces are required but the site can only accommodate 12 stacking spaces. She said this site has sufficiently demonstrated 12 stacking spaces are sufficient for their operation over the last 30 years.

Ms. Martin said the plan for the landscaping to be modified is acceptable.

Ms. Martin said the BSD Code only permits a single wall or ground sign that does not exceed 80 square feet or 50 square feet, based on the selected sign type for an existing commercial building and no sign may exceed the height of 15 feet, as measured to the top of the sign. She stated a combination of sign types and variations in size and number of signs is not permitted without the approval of a Master Sign Plan. She said the applicant has proposed a simplified sign package to coordinate with the proposed clean-line, architectural modifications. She said the applicant has proposed two new wall signs that are the "M" golden arches, each at 14 square feet in size to be mounted on the tower features. She indicated the signs would be internally illuminated, as well as externally, with down-lighting from the top of the tower.

Ms. Martin said the applicant has proposed to replace the existing pole sign with a new, architecturally integrated, modern ground sign with a neutral background. She noted the masonry sign base coordinates with the building. She said the sign cabinet is comprised of a single, push-through acrylic letter, which is the yellow "M" arches.

Ms. Martin said the two wall signs are proposed to be mounted at 18 feet, 1 inch, as measured to the top of the sign and Staff has requested the height of the sign be reduced to 15 feet in height to be consistent with Code. She reported Staff also recommended the ground sign include the "M" on both sides of the sign face with 1.5 inches of dimensionality, a reduction in the area of the sign to 50 square feet instead of the proposed 56 square feet, and a reduction to the height of the masonry base to two feet.

Matt Earman asked how far the ground sign is proposed from the right-of-way and if there was any landscaping proposed around the base. Ms. Martin answered 8 feet from the right-of-way is required by Code and no landscaping is currently proposed but is required around the base. Mr. Earman encouraged Staff and the applicant to coordinate with Parks & Recreation Staff as they are in the process of designing a streetscape treatment for this portion of W. Bridge Street.

Ms. Martin said the proposed digital Menu Board Sign will replace the existing to be identical to the others recently approved in the City. She reported the Commission had specific conditions added to the approval of the digital menu board signs, which are also included in this application.

Ms. Martin presented the MSP details for each of the signs as well as the wall sign placements on the north and east facades. She said the *BSD Sign Design Guidelines* state the ground sign must be integrated into the design of the building. Rebecca Green, Permit Solutions, reported she worked with Staff to develop a sign that is a non-standard sign for McDonald's. Ms. Martin said the ground sign still needs dimensionality added to the cabinet portion.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Parking Plan:

1. To permit 19 parking spaces where 20 spaces are required; and
2. To permit 12 drive-thru stacking spaces where 24 stacking spaces are required.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant updates the landscape plan to reflect the new proposed planting associated with the new ground sign;
- 2) That the applicant provides the required number of bicycle parking spaces;
- 3) That all new windows meet the maximum reflectiveness permitted by Code, are non-tinted, and all old and new windows match, subject to Staff approval; and
- 4) That the applicant eliminate all up-lit light fixtures from the proposal.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for two Waiver Reviews:

1. §153.062 — Building Type Requirements (E)(1)(a) – Materials - Percent of Primary Material Building Coverage. Minimum 80% primary building material coverage is required; 78% primary building material coverage requested.
2. §153.062 — Building Type Requirements (E)(1)(h) – Materials - Alternative High-Quality Synthetic Building Material. Permitted primary or secondary material required as defined in §153.062(E)(1)(c-d). Alternative secondary material – Tile (Eurowest E-wood Black) with textured wood grain is requested.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan with nine conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update their application prior to PZC to show both wall signs in alternative positions at a reduced height, as measured to the top of the sign;
- 2) That the ground sign area not exceed 50 square feet, the base not exceed 2 feet in height, and the sign design be dimensional with 1.5-inch relief on both sign faces;
- 3) That the ground sign be a minimum of 8 feet from the right-of-way;
- 4) That the applicant provide planting at the base of the ground sign, subject to Staff approval;
- 5) That the menu board sign contain no continuous movement, flashing, scrolling, video, or animation, except for the customer order image, which shall not exceed more than 20% of the menu board sign area;
- 6) That the menu board sign be turned off during non-operational business hours;
- 7) That the menu board sign shall not contain any additional speakers or sound;
- 8) That the menu board sign change pre-set content no more than three times per day; and
- 9) That the applicant provide an approved MSP containing all approved amendments to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

Ms. Martin added the applicant requested the MSP because they are requesting three signs of different sign types when only one is permitted. She said the first four conditions are needed for slightly better alignment with Code and the final five are in relation to the menu board sign, specifically.

Ms. Gilger inquired about the two wall signs. Ms. Martin said they are designed for an internally lit channel letter and externally lit by a lighting bar providing down lighting. Ms. Gilger indicated that if the wall signs on the two towers were to be lowered three feet to meet the Code requirement of 15 feet in height, they may not be aesthetically pleasing. Ms. Green inquired about the wall sign external lighting because if the wall signs were to be lowered but the bars stayed in the location as presented, they would be lighting a blank space instead of the "M".

Ray Harpham said for the wall signs to be architecturally integrated properly he said he could support moving the signs to somewhere that may be closer to meeting the Code but still being aesthetically pleasing on the façade. Mr. Earman encouraged the applicant to show what the signs would look like if they were lowered per Code requirements and if that is not aesthetically pleasing, an alternative height can be proposed.

Ms. Martin said the ground sign is proposed at 11 feet that includes the masonry base and the sign cabinet. She restated the area of the sign cabinet is proposed at 56 square feet but needs to be reduced to 50 square feet in order to meet Code. She reported that Staff recommended the applicant might also reduce the height of the base. She said there is no external illumination for the ground sign.

Donna Goss said she was concerned about the location of the ground sign and its visibility due to the sloping topography. She said the existing pole sign is not visible until one is next to the site. Ms. Green said there is just the one location on the property where the ground sign could be installed and that is why it is proposed in this corner.

Mr. Harpham encouraged the applicant to show three versions of renderings to the PZC: one rendering of the proposed signs, a rendering demonstrating how the signs would appear as permitted by Code, and lastly a rendering of how they could be installed as an alternative to the original proposal, which would be somewhere in the middle.

Ms. Green said she was concerned with the ground sign as there are just certain signs they are permitted per the McDonald's brand. She said this region has standard signs approved by McDonald's so she cannot confirm at this time if she could get the size to 50 square feet.

Ms. Gilger asked if McDonald's prefers their prefabricated brand standard signs to be used. She said Staff is asking for the ground sign to be reduced from 56 square feet to 50 square feet to meet Code but if the next size down provided by McDonald's is too small then the applicant's request for the larger sign makes sense. She inquired about the size of the signs used at Perimeter Center and if they were the brand standard.

Ms. Rauch said the application was wholly reviewed by Staff against the Minor Project Review Criteria, the Waiver Review Criteria, and the Master Sign Plan Criteria and determined the criteria had been met for all. She asked if there were any questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] She asked the ART if they were in favor of recommending approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Parking Plan, the Waiver Review, the Minor Project Review, and the Master Sign Plan and the ART was unanimously in favor of all four recommendations.

ADJOURNMENT

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 2:30 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on January 17, 2019.