



## MEETING MINUTES

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 9, 2018

### AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN – H Block  
18-041WR** **PIDs: 273-012751 & 273-012752  
Waiver Review (Tabled 4 - 0)**
- 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C Amendment  
18-043MSP** **6515 Longshore Loop  
Master Sign Plan (Approved 4 – 0)**
- 3. PUD, Perimeter Center, Subarea L – Panera Bread Roofing Modification  
18-047AFDP** **6665 Perimeter Loop Road  
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 4 – 0)**

The Vice Chair, Steve Stidhem, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Warren Fishman, William Wilson, and Bob Miller. Kristina Kennedy and Jane Fox were absent. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Thaddeus Boggs, Lori Burchett, JM Rayburn, Richard Hansen, and Flora Rogers.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 4 - 0)

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the minutes from the meetings on June 7 and June 21, as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 4 - 0)

The Vice Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated case 18-041WR - Block H was requested to be tabled prior to the meeting. He added the other two cases were on the Consent Agenda but were pulled off as several of the Commissioners wanted to hear them in their entirety before voting vote. He determined the cases would be heard in the order they were published on the agenda.



**1. BSD SRN – H Block  
18-041WR**

**PIDs: 273-012751 & 273-012752  
Waiver Review**

The Vice Chair, Steve Stidhem, said the following application is a proposal to allow an alternative material on the exterior elevations as architectural detailing for Block H of the Bridge Park Development. He said the site is southwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Dale Drive and is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Vice Chair called for a motion to table the Waiver Review at the request of the applicant, prior to the meeting.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Wilson seconded, to table the request for the Waiver Review. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Tabled 4 - 0)

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C Amendment  
18-043MSP**

**6515 Longshore Loop  
Master Sign Plan**

The Vice Chair, Steve Stidhem, said the following application is a proposal for amendments to the Bridge Park Development, Blocks A, B, & C Master Sign Plan, specific to the A1 office building zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. He said the site is east of Riverside Drive, north of the roundabout with SR 161 and West Dublin-Granville Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of amendments to a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines. He said the Commission has final authority on this application and witnesses will have to be sworn in.

The Vice Chair swore in witnesses.

Lori Burchett said the Master Sign Plan (MSP) allows for flexibility to sign regulations based on cohesive sign design for a single building or group of buildings. The plan encourages creative sign design to warrant deviation from the Code. She explained the review process begins with the Administrative Review Team (ART) who makes a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a determination. After the MSP has been approved, applicants are eligible to file for a Building Permit Review and any subsequent sign applications would go straight to Building Permitting, provided it met the requirements in the MSP.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site, which encompassed Blocks A, B, and C of the Bridge Park Development for this review. She pointed out the site is south of Tuller Ridge Drive, east of Riverside Drive, west of Mooney Way, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road.

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant proposed sign locations within two levels on Building A1, which is consistent with the other blocks within the approved MSP. She explained Levels do not correspond to floors, but sections of structures where certain sign allowances are provided.

Ms. Burchett said Level 2 permits wall signs at a maximum of 60 square feet in size for Building A1 and the ART has recommended that wall signs be limited to a maximum number of five for the building within Level 2. She noted Level 1 permits wall, projecting, and window signs based on the number of frontages and sizes are outlined in the General Regulations Matrix.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed amendments include permitting full-coverage vinyl window covers for screening with an approved Waiver. She said this is to satisfy a condition of approval for the Fado application requesting a transparency Waiver as well as any future requests. She said a minor update is requested as well to clarify that window signs may permit metal as a permitted material.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the proposed south elevation to show the general locations of permitted sign types within the two levels facing SR 161. The corresponding table, she noted, outlined the quantity of each of the sign types permitted for this elevation, including window signs that would be permitted for non-office tenants on Level 1.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the proposed east elevation to show the permitted sign types within the two levels facing Mooney Way. She said two fascia/wall signs are proposed for Level 2.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the proposed west elevation that faces the open space plaza where one fascia/wall sign would be permitted on Level 1 and two fascia/wall signs would be permitted on Level 2.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the proposed north elevation that overlooks Longshore Loop. She said one each of fascia/wall, projecting, and window signs would be permitted in Level 1 and no signs would be permitted on Level 2.

Ms. Burchett stated Staff and the ART have reviewed this application against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines and have determined that the intent has been met. Additionally, she said, Staff and the ART have reviewed the MSP provisions outlined in the Zoning Code and have determined that the intent has been met.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for the amendments to the Master Sign Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the Master Sign Plan to reflect the total number of signs for building A1 within Level 2 not to exceed five signs for separate individual tenants;
- 2) That the applicant update the details regarding approval and administration of the Tenant Window Screening sign type to reflect the process;
- 3) That Window signs for building A1 be permitted only for non-office tenants located within the first story; and
- 4) That the applicant provide an approved Master Sign Plan containing all approved amendments to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

Ms. Burchett concluded her presentation by stating she was available to answer any questions as well as the applicant who was present.

William Wilson inquired about the blue bands on the elevations. Ms. Burchett said the blue bands signify general locations for signs that would be permitted within that location but would also have to meet the size requirements. Blue bands on the edge of building elevations, she explained, signify areas for projecting signs.

Claudia Husak said the MSP also has provisions to allow staff to make slight modifications to the locations for the projecting signs.

Steve Stidhem asked why this application could be placed on the Consent Agenda when there is so much content. Ms. Husak answered the Consent Agenda is for when staff is in agreement to the application that has been submitted and with the conditions staff has provided as well as having received agreement from the applicant for the conditions of approval prior to the meeting whereas there is no conflict.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the yellow highlighted areas in the documents they received for review. Ms. Burchett explained those were the changes proposed. He asked how the signs for the tenants compare to Bridge Street District (BSD) signs in general. Ms. Burchett answered many of the requirements for the BSD are less than what is required for that multi-tenant building; a greater number of signs would be permitted per building but overall it is very consistent with what has been approved as far as the MSP. Mr. Stidhem asked if the square footage would generally be about the same. Ms. Burchett indicated total square footage would be less.

Ms. Husak reported there were several discussions held internally that this is one of the buildings that is very singularly used past the first floor so there is not a single use office building anywhere else yet in the BSD. She said this building is unique in terms of the rest of the BSD and therefore the allowances are slightly different.

The Vice Chair asked the applicant if they had a presentation to which they answered they did not. He then called for public comment [Hearing none] he opened the floor to the Commission's discussion.

Warren Fishman requested clarification on the window signs. Ms. Burchett noted the window signs shown in the south and north elevations, are the general location on the first floor. She explained the window sign/graphic is mainly for two, low-chroma colors permitted and only 30% of the window can be covered.

Matt Starr, 6640 Riverside Drive, Ste. 500, Dublin, said window signs/graphics would be vinyl and are intended for if a restaurant tenant lands in Building A1. Ms. Husak added the window graphic requirement covers what is unique to Bridge Park as well as the development on the west side of the Scioto River. She said it is not necessarily a sign per se that states "Starbucks" for example. She noted The Avenue did outlines of the windows, which were also considered to be window graphics, not necessarily a sign that states "The Avenue." She said a coffee shop may have a coffee bean or a coffee cup on their windows. She said that is the intent of why staff limited window graphics to non-office tenants..

Mr. Stidhem said Fado was mentioned. He asked for clarification that what the PZC is reviewing will cover Fado's issues. Ms. Burchett explained this sign type would be combined with a Waiver for transparency. Mr. Starr indicated they wrote the regulations in the MSP in such a way so he cannot approve it; the PZC would have to approve it. Mr. Stidhem said if an applicant wanted to block off the whole window with some graphic - that was concerning him as well.

Mr. Fishman indicated what he pictures are graphics with no background. Mr. Starr answered generally yes but not exclusively. Ms. Husak said it is not the type of window signs seen in the windows of Giant Eagle or Kroger, where they are advertising their weekly sales. Mr. Starr explained he is the first line of defense and he would not allow those types of graphics to go to permitting.

The Vice Chair asked if there were any more questions or discussion needed [Hearing none.] he called for a motion to approve the amendments to the Master Sign Plan.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Miller moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the request for amendments to the Master Sign Plan with the four conditions as presented.

- 1) That the applicant update the Master Sign Plan to reflect the total number of signs for building A1 within Level 2 not to exceed five signs for separate individual tenants;
- 2) That the applicant update the details regarding approval and administration of the Tenant Window Screening sign type to reflect the process;
- 3) That Window signs for building A1 be permitted only for non-office tenants located within the first story; and
- 4) That the applicant provide an approved Master Sign Plan containing all approved amendments to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 4 - 0)

### **3. PUD, Perimeter Center, Subarea L – Panera Bread Roofing Modification 18-047AFDP 6665 Perimeter Loop Road Amended Final Development Plan**

The Vice Chair, Steve Stidhem, said the following application is a proposal for the replacement of the existing cedar shake shingles with replica asphalt shake shingles on an existing restaurant zoned Planned Unit Development District, Perimeter Center, Subarea L. He said the site is west of Perimeter Loop Road, approximately 350 feet northwest of the intersection with Mercedes Drive. He 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. He said the Commission has final authority over this application and witnesses will need to be sworn in.

The Vice Chair swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission with regard to this case.

J.M. Rayburn said the Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District initially was adopted and passed in 1988 and the Final Development Plan was approved in 2001. He said tonight the Amended Final Development Plan is being reviewed to replace the existing cedar shakes with asphalt shingles. He presented an aerial view of the site that is south of the Shell and Get-Go stations, southeast of Walgreens, and east of the Dublin Methodist Hospital.

Mr. Rayburn said Staff has documented the existing conditions with photographs for each elevation, which he presented. He said the applicant said the roof is in need of repair. Due to maintenance issues, he said, the applicant is proposing to replace the existing cedar shakes with a light color chestnut presidential shake that is an asphalt shingle design made to look like cedar shingles. He said the shingle preservations state 355 pounds per square foot, which exceeds the 325-pound weight requirement specified in the development text.

Mr. Rayburn reported Staff has concluded that this proposal is consistent with all the applicable review criteria; therefore, approval is recommended for the Amended Final Development Plan Review with no conditions. He concluded by stating the applicant was present to answer any questions.

Steve Stidhem indicated there is a lot of history with this development in terms of the shake shingles. He said he wanted to ensure this tenant makes the modifications to appear like the other tenants. Mr. Rayburn said they selected the Chestnut because it is a lighter color that appears most like a cedar shake shingle. And it looks very similar to what is on Key Bank, which was approved in 2012.

Claudia Husak said through a site visit, Staff found one roof to be the old and one with the new and it was surprising how close it was in terms of color matching.

William Wilson was concerned about the quality and if that was the same. Ms. Husak said Staff was not requesting a certain brand but for the shingles to be cut to look the same.

Warren Fishman said he could not be convinced that asphalt shingles look like cedar shake shingles. He indicated that cedar shake has been replaced around Dublin with asphalt and it certainly does not look like cedar shake. He reported he was on the Commission when this center was originally built. At one time, he said that area was one of the entrance ways to Dublin. He said he also has a shake roof on his brick house, which is an appealing aesthetic. He referred to the Planning Report that stated maintenance was an issue. He said it looks like it is 41 years old this year. He said every seven years or so, he hires someone to fix and maintain in order to preserve it.

Mr. Stidhem said the Commission has wrestled with this for quite some time. He mentioned that a previous Commissioner had stated that if cedar shakes are properly installed and maintained, the shake will last longer than asphalt. He agreed with Mr. Fishman that is one of the things most of the public will not notice. He said he is torn on this due to the history of the development. He said it is obvious that this roof needs work and he is okay with the proposal.

Bob Miller said he would absolutely not put cedar shake on his house because he does not prefer that style. He said asphalt does not cost as much. He said he did not think the perception is worth the money for cedar and clarified that was his personal preference.

Mr. Fishman said, one of the things he has noticed in Columbus is that most of the time, shake is not installed properly. He said he lived in a house in Kansas City with a beautiful shake roof and it is still there, 50 years later. Cedar shake should not be placed on plywood because it cannot breathe and mold forms from the moisture. He said he respected Mr. Miller's preferences.

Mr. Miller said he just wanted Mr. Fishman to know where he stood. He said the roof on the Shell gas station looks in poor condition. He said that could be the result of how it was installed and that is probably why he does not prefer shake roofs.

Ms. Husak said as big as Perimeter Center is, the subareas are very small so the rules are different for certain areas. McDonald's for example, she said, has the same requirements in the development text as this subarea does but that is one of the flattest, non-dimensional roofs in the City and that was approved under the same rules as this was. She indicated this is a quandary because there is not consistency. She noted Craughwell Village had to go through a more extensive process and Council to ask for that roof because that was one of subareas that only allowed cedar shake shingles. She stated cedar shake is the only permitted roof material at the shopping center at Giant Eagle. She said we are left with that subarea that only allows one single roof material; all the other subareas allow an asphalt shingle.

Mr. Fishman said he hates to see downgrading. He said Kroger across the street did not want cedar shake and went with a slate material and that is what he would like to see since it is a higher quality material than the asphalt. He said there are other roof alternatives other than asphalt shingles. He noted the Commission has always said modifications should not be made for economic reasons but could be changed for improvement, etc.

Mr. Miller said he likes the aesthetic of slate roofs. He said Mr. Fishman makes a good point that the applicant is trying to use a lower cost material and the Commission could have shifted away from the shakes towards the slate or standing seam roof, etc. He indicated that since this particular structure, has a small roof, he still liked the proposed asphalt shingle and does not think people will notice it is changed. He said he does not think the product will downgrade the quality of the overall development, to which Mr. Fishman agreed.

Mr. Wilson said he agreed with Mr. Fishman but at the same time, if we are looking for any different type of roof, asphalt might be the appropriate alternative. He said people might notice if standing seam metal or slate is used. While asphalt is not as high quality, he said, it will not be noticeably different. He said he sees both sides.

Mr. Stidhem said he is not a fan of cedar shake shingles but that is probably because he has seen them in deteriorating condition. He suggested the Commission request consistency whenever they possibly can. He said the asphalt shingle has been permitted in other areas and believes it would be an improvement of the current conditions.

Mr. Fishman questioned setting a precedent. Mr. Stidhem said the Commission has that discussion quite often.

Thadd Boggs said every parcel is unique so while past actions can be illuminating in terms of thought processes, even subtle distinctions between different parcels makes a difference and certainly it makes a difference legally in terms of whether "precedent" might be set versus examples of other things that have been done.

Mr. Fishman concluded this building is not a significant enough building to have much concern and there are two out of four members here tonight that do not like cedar shake shingles.

The Vice Chair called for a motion to approve the Amended Final Development Plan Review.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Miller moved, Mr. Wilson seconded, to approve the request for the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 4 - 0)

#### **COMMUNICATIONS**

Bob Miller asked why Block H was requested to be tabled. Claudia Husak answered it was based on the installation of the sample. She said they sent out an email yesterday where they had provided a small section of the material they proposed to be used on Tuller Ridge Drive, and it ended up the developer did not love it so the applicant is taking a step back to consider other options.

Mr. Miller asked why development was going so slow on that site. Lori Burchett indicated that the developer had said it was the shortage of construction materials and labor. Vince Papsidero indicated there was a county-wide shortage for masons.

Mr. Papsidero presented the Commission with the binders containing the Amendments for the Bridge Street District – the Administrative Chapter 153.066. He said this is a clean version for the Commission to read between now and August 23 when it will be introduced and discussed. He said a red-line version would be available at the next meeting.

Claudia Husak said there might be two smaller cases to be reviewed on that same evening but the majority of the meeting will be devoted to discussing these proposed amendments.

Mr. Papsidero said the PZC's recommendation will not be expected until one of the September meetings.

Ms. Husak said the next meeting will be held on August 16<sup>th</sup> at the 5800 building on Shier Rings Road. She said Chair and Vice Chair training will be offered at 4:30 pm and then everyone will gather for dinner at 6 pm with training to commence for all at 6:30 pm. She said the folks from IT will be present as well to upgrade iPad devices.

Steve Stidhem inquired about the public comments received about Riverside Crossing Park. Mr. Papsidero said the public meeting was held and there was an excellent turnout as well as additional comments online. As a result, he said, minor tweaks will be made to the plan. He said the pedestrian realm along Riverside Drive will be expanded with clusters of varied seating areas including swings, fire pits, benches, and more wood seating.

Mr. Stidhem asked when Riverside Crossing Park is expected to be finished. Ms. Husak answered some elements have to be completed in the not so distant future but some are planned a couple of years out.

Mr. Stidhem asked for a presentation about the park for the Commission and Mr. Papsidero fully supported that idea; he just was not certain when a presentation could go on an agenda.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the pond at the Shoppes of River Ridge that runs along Riverside Drive. Mr. Papsidero reported the concerns brought up at the last Commission meeting were forwarded to Engineering and he would follow up with them.

Ms. Husak said in October, meetings will be held back to back. She said an error was found in Staff's calendar as the Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana Regional Planning Conference is taking place Wednesday through Friday in Cincinnati, Ohio this year so some of the Planners are presenting and some are attending so Staff has been considering consolidating the two October meetings by cancelling the October 4 meeting and just meeting on October 11, 2018. She said when the dates get closer, more details will be forthcoming.

The Vice Chair, Steve Stidhem, asked if there were any further items to discuss. [Hearing none] He adjourned the meeting at 7:32 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 23, 2018.