



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 20, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F
18-060BPR** **PID: 273-000867**
Informal Review (Discussion Only)
- 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block G
18-061BPR** **PID: 273-012471**
Informal Review (Discussion Only)
- 3. Perimeter Center, Subarea E – McDonald’s Sign Modifications
18-035AFDP** **6830 Perimeter Loop Road**
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)
- 4. Community Plan – Thoroughfare Plan Map
18-051ADM** **Administrative Request – Other (Recommended for Approval 6 – 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, Warren Fishman, Kristina Kennedy, William Wilson, and Jane Fox. Bob Miller was absent. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Thaddeus Boggs, Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, Richard Hansen, 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: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the minutes from August 23, 2018, as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said there were no cases eligible for this Consent Agenda and determined the cases would be heard in the order as published on the regular meeting agenda. She explained the first two cases were Informal Reviews and would be considered together.



- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F
18-060BPR | PID: 273-000867
Informal Review |
| 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block G
18-061BPR | PID: 273-012471
Informal Review |

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the two applications were proposals for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure, residential units and a future office building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, north and south of Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for informal feedback on two proposed Basic Plan Review applications prior to a formal review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Lori Burchett presented the Bridge Street District (BSD) application process that includes a Basic Plan Review and a Development Plan Review followed by a Site Plan Review. She said if a project includes a Development Agreement, City Council serves as the reviewing body and designates a final reviewing body for future applications. She explained the Basic Plan outlines the character and nature of the development including general massing and any open space locations. She said the Site Plan provides the final details of the proposal, including: materials, landscaping, and additional Code requirements.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted the two blocks are located south of Tuller Ridge Drive, north of Banker, east of Mooney Street and west of Dale Drive with Bridge Park Avenue dissecting the two blocks. She presented a graphic of the two blocks in context of the overall Bridge Park Development. She said Block D was the most recent block reviewed by this Commission.

Ms. Burchett presented the Basic Plan for Block F that consisted of three new buildings with office, commercial, hotel, restaurant, and open space on the 2.31-acre site. She pointed out a private access drive located between buildings F1 and F2, connecting Mooney Street and Dale Drive. She indicated staff had expressed concerns with the access drive and pedestrian mobility through this block.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the massing that represented the scale and height within this block as viewed from the northwest corner of Banker Drive and Dale Drive. She said the general layout of the buildings were represented on the site with the street network represented throughout.

Ms. Burchett said one of the discussion questions for the Commission's consideration this evening is whether the proposal effectively meets the intent and purpose of the walkability standards and promotes the principles of walkable urbanism. She presented another massing view of the future hotel with its access drive and canopy drop-off area. She presented the western elevation that faces Dale Drive that showed an unlined portion of the parking garage. She said a second discussion question asks the Commission if there are additional design considerations that should be made for the unlined portions of the parking structures, particularly as it faces Dale Drive - the principal frontage street.

Ms. Burchett presented images that illustrated the general character of contemporary design for this block with multiple angles and a mix of panels, brick, and glass, which is very similar to the established character of the overall development.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant has proposed to provide 0.35 acres of public open space on Block F where 0.09 acres would be required and presented a graphic to illustrate the locations of the open spaces.

Ms. Burchett presented the Basic Plan for Block G that consisted of three new buildings with office, commercial, residential, 0.43 acres of open space, and associated site improvements on the ±2.28-acre site.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the massing that represented the scale and height within Block G. She pointed out that building G1 is the proposed office building and the applicant is requesting a Waiver to allow for a seven stories. She presented more graphics illustrating general massing and noted the east elevation reflected the unlined portion of the parking garage.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed uses would require a minimum of 435 parking spaces for Block F and 669 for Block G. She reported the applicant proposed 288 structured spaces and 11 on-street parking spaces. She explained the applicant intends to use 136 spaces from Block C garage to help close the deficit for Block F and 355 spaces from Block C garage for Block G. She reported there is a preliminary study on the uses of the garages that is on-going as the development fills. Based on that study, she said, there is an excess of parking within Block C, even at the highest use.

Ms. Burchett presented inspirational images for Block G that included brick, glass, and metal details. She said the design is best described as contemporary with multiple projections and a defined first floor. Overall, she said, these images show glass as the predominant material with a complementary brick or stone. She asked the Commission to consider if the provided images achieve an appropriate design direction and if they had any architectural design suggestions. She also requested suggestions from the Commission on the variety of materials and colors that should be applied to Blocks F or G.

Ms. Burchett said ± 0.43 acres of on-site open space is proposed for Block G with 0.16 acres proposed as an off-site public open space on Block F, to meet the open space requirement of 0.59 acres. Additionally, she noted, 0.18 acres of private amenity space is proposed for residents of Block G. For feedback to the applicant as design advances for these areas, a recommended discussion question asks the Commission if the proposed open space treatment was appropriately located, sized, and designed. She presented a graphic to illustrate the locations of the open space proposed for Block G.

Ms. Burchett said Staff has identified potential Waivers for this Basic Plan Review including:

- Allowance for a 7-story office building (G1)
- Front property line coverage
- Occupation of corner (G4 & F4)

Ms. Burchett presented the discussion questions in their entirety for the Commission to consider:

1. Does the proposal effectively meet the intent and purpose of the walkability standards and promote the principles of walkable urbanism?
2. Is the proposed open space treatment appropriately located, sized, and designed?
3. Do the provided images achieve an appropriate design direction; and are there any architectural design considerations or variety in materials and colors that should be applied to these two blocks?
4. Are there additional design considerations that should be made for the unlined portions of the parking structures, particularly as it faces the principal frontage street (Dale Drive)?
5. Are there any other considerations by the Commission?

Ms. Burchett concluded her presentation and stated the applicant was present to address any questions or concerns, as well.

Victoria Newell asked about the height of the AC Marriott Hotel. Ms. Burchett answered that it is eight stories in height.

Steve Stidhem asked if the new buildings would appear taller than the AC Marriott Hotel, due to the increased elevation change. Ms. Burchett answered the same question was raised at the ART earlier in the day and the applicant had said the new buildings would not be taller.

Jane Fox asked for height, story-wise to put in context to across the street. Ms. Burchett answered corridor buildings are five stories tall.

Warren Fishman asked how wide the buildings are on the sidewalk front. He said there is an amenity space on G4 that is private. Ms. Burchett clarified there would be open space between buildings G2 and G1. Mr. Fishman asked if the open space would be green. Ms. Burchett said, overall, the proposal at this point, would be similar to other passageways we have seen in developments. She said the applicant is requesting feedback from the Commission this evening. Mr. Fishman asked if these areas would be considered walkable since the buildings were so wide.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, explained parking is driving how the applicant is looking at these two blocks. He said the most cars they have ever counted on C Block is 373 and there were 506 spaces left open. He indicated the applicant does not see B Block being remarkably different. Given these outcomes, he said, the applicant is re-evaluating the need for parking in this part of the development.

Mr. Hunter referred to the site plan for Block F. He said the hotel will be the first building to come forward as a final site plan as it is the most 'baked' on their end. He said it is a Marriott hotel and the units lining the parking will be like an extended stay. He said these units are almost apartment size. He said they would be managed out of the F1 hotel. Mr. Hunter stated the F4 office building will not be considered until the future.

Mr. Hunter explained the reason the applicant is requesting a Waiver for a seven-story building for G1 is due to the market forces. He reported there are 150,000 – 200,000-square-foot office users out there that want to be in Bridge Park and currently they cannot be accommodated. He indicated if they design a 200,000-square-foot office building from scratch, for a user that may or may not emerge, that is a great way for the applicant to go bankrupt. He said they have to ensure they are nimble enough to be able to respond to those market forces; if they are not able to go taller, that is not the block for a large user so they need to know that now. He said their architect for this project, Chris Meyers, and their team have taken this through the Basic Site Plan and they desire feedback about the seven stories. For the G1 office building, he said, there will be a different architect to take them through the schematic design and that is to ensure the applicant is keeping everything fresh and authentic.

Chris Meyers, Meyers and Associates Architects, 232 N. Third St., Columbus, Ohio, said only diagrammatic massing and basic footprints were presented this evening. He said there will be a lot more detail and articulation forthcoming in the Final Site Plan. He said the applicant's objective is to enhance the community even further. He said walkability and approachability comes with that, especially at the street level. He said the increased grades will affect the access points to the buildings.

Mr. Meyers asked Ms. Burchett to present some photographs of buildings where the heights range from four stories to seven stories. He said the architecture for hotels is always repetitive as the rooms are stacked with a grid façade. He indicated their intent is to get away from the typical hotel design. He said they welcome the Commissions' feedback to help drive the direction the applicant takes.

Mr. Stidhem said he liked the artistic neatness and the photos presented were interesting. He asked if the garage will be flat or sloped. Mr. Hunter answered the garages would be sloped, similar to the garages on Blocks B and C.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about electric plug-ins for vehicles in the parking garages as he has seen some but wondered if more were coming, which Mr. Hunter confirmed.

Mr. Stidhem asked the applicant if they had considered roof access for any of the buildings. Mr. Hunter said they plan at least a portion of the rooftop of G1 to be accessible.

Mr. Stidhem asked if solar had been considered for G1. Mr. Hunter said the applicant has in the past and believes they will continue to do so. Mr. Stidhem suggested the applicant at least wire for it so solar could easily be installed in the future.

Ms. Fox inquired about the space between F1 and F2/F3. She said it appears as a driveway but asked about sidewalks, bikes, or scooter accommodations. Mr. Meyers said the entire F1 building is wrapped.

Mr. Fishman suggested the amenity/private space for the residents of Block G be instead open to the public. Mr. Hunter emphasized they have had this conversation many times about these particular spaces. He explained G4 has an interior space that has units aligned around the four sides and up against the parking garage. He said that amenity space would not be seen from the street. He said they look at those open spaces as residents' backyards. He said everyone's front yard is accessible but the people that live at Bridge Park also deserve to have something that is kind of their own. In many cases, he explained, if those spaces were public, anyone could approach the sliding glass door and knock on it so it becomes a security issue.

Mr. Hunter said, speaking from a developer's standpoint, they do not believe they have enough grass on Blocks B and C as there is a lot of hardscapes with beautiful plantings. He said they are taking that into consideration as they are developing these open spaces for Blocks F and G. Mr. Fishman emphasized he will be looking for green.

Kristina Kennedy clarified Block F is meeting the green space requirement but the G Block is not. Mr. Hunter said together they meet the requirements.

William Wilson said he has witnessed an issue with delivery and asked if food trucks would be coming onto the scene. He asked if these situations were being analyzed.

Mr. Hunter said Crawford Hoying is living that daily as well with their office in Bridge Park. He said he likes the little bit of activity on the street, making it feel urban in a way that is not typically seen in Dublin. He said when vehicles cannot get down the street, it is an issue. He said he hears him and the applicant agrees and that is something they will need to address, especially with this block because there are two major office buildings. He said food trucks are permitted to park in those public parking spaces so the developer cannot tell them to leave. He said they do not have an answer to that yet. He said the studies determining if the on-street parking should become paid parking would effectively fix that problem. Maybe, sometimes food trucks are okay in certain areas and that is a discussion to be had. He said he is torn between the two because again, they help make the development feel more urban.

Vince Papsidero added, in the larger Code update that is underway now, food trucks are being addressed as a land use so there are regulations staff is proposing. Currently, he explained, the food trucks are regulated as any other vehicle in Bridge Park from a parking standpoint. For vehicle loading/unloading delivery, the City has designated locations and times of day when those trucks are allowed. Mr. Hunter said right now, that issue is magnified because of the construction.

Mr. Wilson said we have talked about not filling all the parking spaces for the current programming but he asked if they had considered parking for the park across the street. Mr. Hunter said the Parking Plan will address everything, holistically.

Mr. Wilson indicated there a quite a lot of residents in Bridge Park now. He asked if pets were allowed. Mr. Hunter answered pets are allowed in certain buildings on certain floors. Mr. Wilson asked if sidewalk staining is being addressed given the lack of green grass.

Mr. Fishman asked if pets can even be controlled in condominiums. Mr. Hunter indicated the condominium association probably could but he cannot say that for certain as he is not the lawyer on this issue.

Mr. Fishman reported he has been spending a lot of time in this development and complimented the applicant; the energy is fabulous and it is fun to be there. He said he visits the market on Saturdays and has noticed a lot of people are walking dogs. He said that is his concern about providing enough green space and having rules about the dogs. Mr. Hunter indicated they have taken a real cautious approach. He said pets are allowed in buildings on the lowest floor. He said as much as they try to police the dog activity, the guys cleaning the grounds have to clean up after the dogs sometimes. He concluded people love their dogs – it is the way it is.

Ms. Newell inquired about the stacking of cars at the drop-off area for the hotel. Mr. Hunter said the stacking number is six. Ms. Newell asked if the hotels will have a certain quantity of parking spaces reserved for their guests. He suggested when they do the study, the answer is absolutely yes. The Marriott says they need about 80% a piece but it depends on the environment.

Mr. Wilson said wide sidewalks can be attractive and make an area more walkable; it is an opportunity to add benches so people have additional places to sit/meet outside of those little green spaces. He suggested adding drinking fountains for both humans and pets and by adding these things, the result can be an enriched community.

Ms. Kennedy said she loved the design proposals and they coordinate and fit with the other buildings in the development while also adding character. She said she is concerned about having room for bicycles as that is becoming more popular in Dublin. She said she loved the Bocce Ball Court in D Block and would like to see more little pocket parks like that. She said it would be so nice to have something more to do outside besides walking and 16-Bit that is inside entertainment.

Mr. Fishman said he agreed with both of his colleagues. He said it is important for sidewalks to be wide enough as now there are a lot of scooters flying by. He said couples on benches makes a lovely scene. He emphasized green, green, green; “everything grows here” is the City’s tag line.

Mr. Stidhem said he is not against grass but there is going to be an amazing park across the street and that will take care of a lot of issues that were discussed this evening. He said in general, he likes the proposal and would love to see something that is a little bit different, especially in terms of the details and character with the new architect. He would like to see something “just a little bit out there”, something that is unique. He said he thinks of Chicago and how all the architecture is different. He stated the proposal is absolutely walkable. He said he is not passionate about parking because the trends show not as much parking will be needed.

Ms. Fox stated the applicant has done a really good job with walkability and connecting the green space notes and the corridors. She indicated placemaking is missing on the corner of G4. She said there is nothing on Tuller Ridge Drive that would stop a pedestrian.

Ms. Fox asked if Bridge Park is still considered the designated shopping area. Mr. Papsidero clarified it is Bridge Park Avenue.

Ms. Fox said she loves the area between F1 and F2/3 and if designed correctly, can become a little individual oasis. If landscaped correctly, that just might be a hub of activity there for those walking, riding bikes or scooters.

Ms. Fox asked if an interesting archway can be created for the parking garage there and allow for a peek at the plaza park/backyard that is hidden for G4 residents. She also suggested something interesting be

created for the southwest corner of F1. She stated she loved the separation of the buildings as it allows for some very interesting things to be created.

Ms. Newell said generally the proposal meets the intent of walkability. She said she was concerned about the access drive and pedestrians only permitted to walk on one side because the other space is completely green. She suggested the applicant treat the whole access drive area with some very upscale amenities so it appears as its own pocket park. If it was very well landscaped, it would encourage walkers to want to walk on just one side of the street.

Addressing question #2, Ms. Newell said the proposed open space treatment was appropriately located and sized but there is not enough design details yet to comment. She said she was concerned about the height of the buildings and the shadows they would cast on the open spaces as she wants to see any plantings truly survive.

Ms. Newell said she was completely supportive of the sharing of the parking. She said right now, she has had no issues with trying to find a parking space, even on a Friday night, going to a restaurant at peak times, which has been wonderful and convenient.

Ms. Newell said the added height to the structure to achieve seven stories creates another amenity. She recalled originally on this Commission fighting hard and had lengthy discussions holding to the six-foot height but things change as the City develops. She said when all of the buildings are going in at four and five stories, it is nice to have that change in elevations. She said she is a little concerned about going up that hill, as the proposed building may overshadow the AC Marriott Hotel.

Ms. Newell said she liked the images for Block G a little bit more than those for Block F but overall she liked the architectural design considerations.

The Chair asked the applicant if the Commission had provided enough direction and answered all the questions to which the applicant responded that this meeting was perfectly wonderful.

Mr. Fishman asked to address the seven-story building. He said he did not have a fundamental problem but it should be a unique building. He referred to the Leveque Tower downtown as an example as it is certainly different from the other buildings downtown. Mr. Hunter agreed; he would love it if a large corporation went in there and their corporate logo would be great to make it more notable. Mr. Hunter confirmed the buildings would be roughly about the same height, even with the increased height of the grade.

The Chair invited anyone from the public that wished to speak in regard to this case. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Fox asked to make a few more comments. She referred to G2/3 and said if the applicant did not create an archway there, G3 could have an interesting architectural frontage as it would be so visible from the park across the street. She said she liked the L-shape of the hotel and liked the variety of massing elements.

Ms. Fox asked to refer to the inspirational photographs. She said the photo on the bottom, left-hand side is much more interesting than the bottom, right-hand side. She noted the projections, some of the walls, the transparency of the glass, and other materials found in the BSD. She said it was more interesting than typically seen in a lot of structures like that. She restated that the space between the parking garages could be an absolutely unbelievable space. She said Dale Drive is an important, district connector so the building elevations on Block F should have a notable presentation on the street. She asked the applicant what those elevations would be like and if they had any thoughts they had been considering.

Mr. Meyers said the first approach, F3 is to mask the F2 garage and have it be a discreet veil in front. The uniqueness of the building type, the conversation of the hotel is a breakdown of mass, material, and form. That is going to translate to these other buildings; they have not gone through the planning exercise to create the real form. He said being on Dale Drive will be different than being on the access drive. He indicated they are considering an outdoor garden and a roof terrace to get that activity to that corner, not just an amenity for the tenant but also for what is visible from two miles away. He said the whole community has branched to a greater vista. He said he can see it from I-270 and the Historic District. He said the rooftop bar on the AC Marriott Hotel can be seen from miles away and those kinds of effects are being considered here, too.

Ms. Fox said that was a great idea. She hears people talk all the time about Vaso, the rooftop bar. She said the variation of architecture is very important on the residential building. She said she liked the idea shown in some of the pictures of projections off the wall so there is interest in the street, whether that is balconies or the offices but not grid-like projections. She indicated that overhangs of awnings above the ground floors enables the pedestrian to feel warm and safe.

Mr. Wilson referred to the pictures for Block G; the bottom left is the most dramatic. He noted there is not a building like this yet in the whole development. Everything is pretty much a block shape, he said, but this becomes several pieces put together with different materials in it and brings a lot of design features to it. He said seven floors could be a win-win since some large corporations are looking for that to house all their employees under one roof.

The Chair said if there are no further comments, she thanked the applicant for coming forward and is looking for development in the near future.

3. Perimeter Center, Subarea E – McDonald’s Sign Modifications
18-035AFDP **6830 Perimeter Loop Road**
Amended Final Development Plan

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said this application is a proposal for the installation of a digital menu board sign for an existing McDonald’s restaurant located in Perimeter Center, Subarea E, which is northeast of the intersection of Avery-Muirfield Drive and Perimeter Loop Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She said the Commission is the final authority for this case and witnesses would have to be sworn in.

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

Logan Stang reminded the Commission the Amended Final Development Plan is the last stage in the Planned Unit Development process and is to allow for any modification to the approved Final Development Plan from August, 1995. He noted the graphic showed some of the dates from the original rezoning in 1988.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site along with the site plan. He pointed out the applicant requested to remove and replace the existing menu board sign with an approximately 18-square-foot digital menu board sign. He said the existing menu board sign is located along the northern edge of the building, adjacent to the drive-thru.

Mr. Stang presented a photograph of the existing conditions that included a view of the menu board for reference. He described the proposed sign as containing two digital screens that allow for the display of pre-set content with the ability to adjust light levels based on the surrounding ambient light. He said the

proposed sign would have the same orientation away from the public right-of-way and would be screened by perimeter landscaping on the north and east sides of the site.

Mr. Stang presented a graphic of the proposed menu board sign and explained the content would automatically change based on the time of day.

Mr. Stang stated menu board signs are subject to the requirements of the development text and the general standards of the Sign Code. He said menu board signs are regulated under Zoning Code Section 153.161(N) that states:

A drive-thru menu board sign is permitted only when all of the following conditions are fulfilled:

1. The sign is located on the property to which it refers;
2. The sign is not visible from the public right-of-way; and
3. The sign does not exceed 32 square feet in size.

Mr. Stang noted this would apply to all properties, unless altered by the development text and the proposed sign meets all three of the requirements. He presented the three design screens depicting menus for breakfast, lunch, and dinner that would display over the two screens.

Mr. Stang noted the Perimeter Center development text contains sign regulations established to provide uniform standards applicable to all subareas; these include regulations for dimensions, graphics, landscaping, and other similar items. He said the text contains two sub-sections which; prohibit the use of any electronic sign that meets the definition of flashing, animated, or traveling as defined in the Sign Code, and that no billboards, or electrical or other advertising signs shall be allowed other than a sign carrying the name of the business occupying the site or "for sale" or "for lease" signs.

Mr. Stang add the proposed menu board sign violates both of the provisions listed, which were included to ensure high quality sign standards were upheld for the zoning district. He reported the application was reviewed against the Amended Final Development Criteria and found not to meet the criteria. He said Staff is therefore recommending disapproval of this application to permit a digital menu board sign. He stated he was available to answer any questions.

Steve Stidhem asked if there was anything else like this in the City. Mr. Stang said he did not believe there were other digital menu board signs. He noted Starbucks may be the only digital sign.

Jane Fox asked how often the sign would change. Mr. Stang answered three times, once in the morning for breakfast, once in the afternoon for lunch, and later for a dinner sign. She asked if the existing sign is illuminated, to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively.

Mr. Stidhem asked for the lumens for the existing sign versus the proposed sign. Mr. Stang said that information was not provided.

Kristina Kennedy asked if there are any other examples of the changing of the colors or the brightness. She asked if there would be animation. Mr. Stang indicated the applicant stated there would only be the three, pre-set boards. He said part of staff's concern, since they cannot look at signs for content, is that the pre-set menus could change later on as to what specifically is being displayed. He stated the sign could at a later point contain flashing, animated, or traveling features which are specifically prohibited throughout the City.

William Wilson asked why menu boards are considered signs. He said the information communicated is more for the customer. Vince Papsidero answered a menu board becomes a form of commercial speech and subject to any sign code in any municipality.

Ms. Kennedy reported she drove by the site and what she liked about the electronic format was that there will no longer be display boards on the back of the menu board.

Ms. Fox agreed the City does not want flashing signs but she reiterated it is a menu board for a particular kind of business. She indicated technology is being introduced into almost all of our signage. She reported she drove to the site and others in the area. She found a hand-written note stuck on the front of one of the signs reflecting a change in price for an item. She suggested menu boards are certainly worth discussion.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Rebecca Green, Permit Solutions, said she is working with McDonald's on their sign. She said the applicant has requested to replace one existing menu board and the intent is to reduce the drive-thru sign area and to reduce the amount of light that may be entering adjacent properties and roadways, and to provide crisper and more legible text for their customers. She presented the existing menu board; it gets some glare and there are limitations with the graphics because it is a physically, change-out board. She provided images showing heavy landscaping on both roadways and pointed out this sign is located in the rear of the restaurant.

Ms. Green said they proposed reducing the sign area by at least 50%, with an 18.4-square-foot board. She said the digital nature of this board allows the applicant to use all of the sign area much more effectively. She said this would enable them to use images and crisp, legible text and arrange that in a more efficient way to better communicate with their customers. She said the content would only change three times per day. She said it will not flash, there is no video or scrolling, and it fades between the two screens as to not distract drivers. She said the sign has a feature where it automatically adjusts to the brightness of the day and at night the screen will appear much dimmer. She said there are no additional speakers or sounds and it provides more open space on the site because it is a smaller sign and can be placed closer to the customer.

Ms. Green presented the regulations for a menu board as mentioned earlier by Staff but felt it had met that standard. She noted the Perimeter Center Development Text allows for internally, illuminated signs and this is what they are presenting. She reported there has been an internally, illuminated sign at this site since 1995. She said the applicant has a different position in terms of the electrical sign provision that Staff has discussed. She indicated the applicant had interpreted the provision of off-site sign advertising for example if Walmart was advertising on McDonald's site - that is what this is a prohibition for. She restated this proposal has met the standard. She said even though it may be an electronic sign, an electric sign exists there. She said the board will remain illuminated, 24-hours per day at various levels of brightness, depending on the ambient light.

Ms. Green summarized they are reducing the sign area, opening up the site, minimizing light, making easier text for all customers to read, and they are hoping, by having an easier to read sign, they can move traffic on that site a little better.

Mr. Stidhem asked how bright the proposed sign will be as compared to the existing sign. Ms. Green answered she did not have that data. She noted the existing sign does not adjust the brightness to the ambient light.

Ms. Fox asked if there is a limit of brightness for the existing sign. Mr. Stang said there is nothing in the Zoning Code that speaks to the lumens per sign. Ms. Fox said, if the applicant decided to replace the existing sign with a like-for-like sign, no matter how bright, they would be permitted to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively.

Mr. Stidhem asked what the capability is for changing the graphics and how it is controlled.

Jacob Alber said he was the area construction manager for McDonald's over Central Ohio. He referred to one of the images showing the proposed sign graphics and pointed out the pricing and promotions can be changed as each McDonald's can vary. He said the information is set and very controlled. He explained the current signs need to be changed manually three times a day, no matter what the weather so this would benefit the crew.

Mr. Alber said the brightness can be controlled by changing the parameters to meet Dublin's Code; it is fully customizable. Mr. Stidhem affirmed the graphics and the content, except for the pricing, are set by corporate and they are not modifiable at the store level.

Ms. Kennedy asked if there were complaints from customers about readability of the current menu. Mr. Alber said the operator of that store would have to answer that question.

Mr. Alber explained they typically install a pre-browse board, which is half that size and it would have advertising that could be changed to show five, ten, or twelve different advertisements in an hour, but if a municipality has a restriction whereas the information could only be changed twice per hour, then they can limit it to those two times. He said that mainly applies to the pre-browse boards but that would also apply to the promotions across the top of this board. He said he does not know the frequency at which those change.

Warren Fishman said the Commission is always concerned about precedent but he asked if conditions of approval could be placed on this such as prohibiting flashing and animation. He said the proposed sign will be thinner, smaller, and only have information and graphics on one side so it is actually an improvement.

Thad Boggs indicated he did not think Staff's position is against whether this is a good sign or not, it is concerning the process undergoing to get to that result. He said the development text already prohibits, flashing, traveling, animated and electric signs. He said in the Code, the concept of an electric sign, like this, and an illuminated sign are different. He stated if the Commission was inclined to approve this sign, the method to do that would be to amend the development text to allow an electric sign. He recommended while amending the Final Development Plan, conditions can be imposed.

Ms. Newell clarified that what is before the Commission tonight - just an Amended Final Development Plan so the applicant would need to table that and bring it back as a request to do the amended text.

Mr. Stang said, as part of the Amended Final Development Plan process, a Minor Text Modification can be approved. He indicated if the Commission decided to approve this application, Staff has already prepared an example of the appropriate text modification. He said there would be two motions of approval this evening. He said the first motion would be for the Minor Text Modification that states McDonalds at this property is allowed to have a menu board sign per the application. He said the second motion would be for the Amended Final Development Plan itself, which can have any number of conditions tailored to what the sign can and cannot do.

Ms. Fox referred to the Code where it refers to drive-thru menu board signs and asked that these changes be made specifically for menu board signs or she would anticipate anyone wanting an electric sign. Mr. Stang said Staff's recommendation would be for the Minor Text Modification to be specific to this application and to this site, within Perimeter Center. He explained moving forward, if another site were to come forward requesting a digital menu board sign, they would have to go through this same process as McDonald's. He said Staff can then work through a potential city-wide amendment to the menu board signs regulations to ensure proper regulations are in place.

Mr. Papsidero added that the overall Code is not being changed for this provision and anyone coming forward, the Commission would determine on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Boggs said there has been discussion about revisiting the sign code at the end of this year, not just for this issue but a number of subjects.

Mr. Wilson said this digital menu board would be a benefit to the customer; it cleans up the area and it would bring us up to modern times.

Mr. Alber stated that was the applicant's goals also.

Ms. Newell said technology has changed tremendously and changed since the original sign code was established. She reported she has visited McDonald's with these types of signs and she found them much easier to read. She said the McDonald's at this location is terribly congested and if customers could be moved through the drive-thru just a little bit quicker, she sees an added benefit. She referred to the applicant's checklist in their presentation that listed all the things this sign can do.

Ms. Newell suggested that if the Commission is inclined to approve this application, she would definitely like to see conditions of approval added such as never being able to play videos, have continuous movement, or be flashing. She noted the applicant stated this sign would run 24 hours per day but this McDonalds is not open 24-hours per day nor is it permitted. Mr. Alber said they could turn the sign off when the restaurant was not open.

Mr. Stang proposed four conditions, which the Commission and the applicant discussed.

The Chair, Victoria Newell, asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve the Minor Text Modification as follows:

Sign and Graphics:

3. *Menu Board signs for 6830 Perimeter Loop Road are permitted per case 18-035AFDP in lieu of the requirements previously listed and general sign requirements under Zoning Code Sections 153.150-153.164. Any changes to the menu board sign requires review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.*

The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve an Amended Final Development Plan to allow for the installation of a digital menu board sign to replace the existing with four conditions:

- 1) 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;
- 2) That the menu board sign be turned off during non-operational business hours;
- 3) That the menu board sign shall not contain any additional speakers or sound; and
- 4) That the menu board sign change pre-set content no more than three times per day.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

**4. Community Plan – Thoroughfare Plan Map
18-051ADM**

Administrative Request - Other

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said this application is a proposal for Amendments to the Community Plan and the Thoroughfare Plan Map to address street connections based on recent developments. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for proposed amendments to the Community Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

Logan Stang recalled the Thoroughfare Plan was discussed at the previous Commission meeting. He presented an overview of the type of review process. He said amendments to policy documents such as the Community Plan are encouraged to ensure proper strategies are in place to guide future development proposals.

Mr. Stang presented the Thoroughfare Plan Map for the community that classifies and identifies roadways throughout the City along with planned improvements or extensions. He noted the location of the amendments proposed with this application, which fall within the Bridge Street District. He presented an aerial view of the BSD. He said the two major changes to the Thoroughfare Plan that are being requested are the removal of a portion of Rock Cress Parkway and the update of the street network based on as-built conditions such as John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive.

Mr. Stang stated, based on the standards of the Dublin Code of Ordinances and Community Plan, Staff recommends approval to City Council for the requested amendment.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or comments for Staff. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for an Administrative Request for Amendments to the Community Plan and the Thoroughfare Plan Map to address street connections based on recent developments.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Recommended for Approval 6 - 0)

Communications

Claudia Husak said Staff provided the Commission with proposed meeting dates for next year, starting in March 2019. She asked the Commission to review the dates and let Staff know at the next meeting if there are any conflicts. She indicated that only if three Commissioners would be absent on a certain date, would the date be changed.

Ms. Husak reported the meeting scheduled for October 4, 2018, was cancelled so the Commission will conduct a regular meeting just once in October on the 11th. She said there is a conference in Cincinnati, Ohio over that time period and almost all of the Planners are attending.

Vince Papsidero said there is a Joint Work Session planned with City Council on October 15, 2018. He announced the agenda items and asked the Commission if there were any other items they wanted to address. He said the dinner is from 5:30 – 6:30 pm in these Council Chambers.

Jane Fox said she wanted to add the opportunity to discuss the differences of intentions and goals of Council versus the Commission. She encouraged the Commission to bring all kinds of questions to the table as it would be a good time to understand perspectives.

Mr. Papsidero announced that Lori Burchett is leaving the City of Dublin to return to Seattle, WA for a very impressive opportunity.

Lori Burchett said she will miss all of the Staff and her last day is October 1, 2018.

Steve Stidhem asked if the electric scooters will be coming to the City of Dublin. Ms. Burchett answered that our City Ordinance does not currently allow for the use of motorized vehicles of any kind on shared-use paths. She reported that City Council has directed the Community Service Advisory Committee (CSAC) to look into this for any conflicts or concerns and see what options may be available. Mr. Stidhem recommended getting on this as soon as possible as alternative types of transportation are here. He said the scooters have proven to be exceptionally popular in the City of Columbus and they are super prevalent in San Francisco and San Diego, CA.

Adjournment

The Chair, Victoria Newell, asked if there were any further items to discuss. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 8:58 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 1, 2018.