



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 17, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Newell called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Newell led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Ms. Newell, Mr. Stidhem, Mr. Fishman, Ms. Fox, Ms. Kennedy and Mr. Wilson.

Staff members present: Mr. Papsidero, yes; Ms. Husak, Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Boggs and Mr. Stanford.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Wilson seconded to approve the January 3, 2019 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Newell stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property is under consideration. For those cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. For other cases, the Commission has the decision-making responsibility, and anyone who wishes to address the Commission on any of those cases must be sworn in.

AGENDA ORDER

1. **BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F, PID: 273-000867, 18-065FP, Final Plat**
2. **BSD C – McDonald's, 337 W. Bridge Street, 18-036MPR-MSP-WR, Minor Project Review/Master Sign Plan/Waiver Review**

Ms. Newell stated that the agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. Although BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F, PID: 273-000867, 18-065FP, Final Plat is eligible for the consent agenda tonight, one Commission member has already requested that

it not be placed on the Consent Agenda. That case will be heard first. The Rules and Regulations of the Planning and Zoning Commission state that no new agenda items are to be introduced after 10:30 p.m.

1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F, PID: 273-000867, 18-065FP, Final Plat

Ms. Newell stated that this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Background:

Ms. Husak stated that this is the seventh final plat for Bridge Park East, which is all of the development on the east side of the river under the ownership of the City of Dublin and the developer, Crawford Hoying. City Council approved the Preliminary Plat for Block F on March 9, 2015 and the Basic Plan Review for Block F on October 22, 2018. This review is under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations, City Code, Chapter 152. The intent is to subdivide land into lots for future development as well as designation of rights-of-way, if applicable. PZC ultimately makes the recommendations to City Council, and City Council approves the Final Plat, which is recorded by the County.

Site:

The site has right-of-way on all sides: Mooney Street is to the west, Banker Drive to the south, Bridge Park Avenue to the north, Dale Drive is to east.

Proposal:

The applicant is requesting a subdivision of 2.55 acres for two lots for future commercial development and one reserve to accommodate a future private drive. The F-1 area (outlined in red) has been anticipated and reviewed for future development for the hotel site; that plan will be scheduled for PZC review in the near future. The reserve area (outlined in blue) that extends from Mooney Street to Dale Drive is intended to accommodate the private access drive between the garage and the hotel. The larger area (outlined in yellow) will likely be further subdivided in the future for the garage and the office building; this was included in the Basic Plan. Hatched areas on the map indicate the vacation of existing Dale Drive right-of-way, as well as some associated easements. One of the Conditions of the Plat requires the applicant to change the title to also include the vacation of Dale Drive for the purposes of future record-keeping.

Criteria Analysis: Preliminary & Final Plat Review Analysis [§152.202]

- *Plat Information and Construction Requirements:*
Criteria met with conditions. The proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations. The applicant will be required to make any minor technical adjustments prior to City Council review. The plat title needs to be revised to add the vacation of portions of the Dale Drive right-of-way.
- *Street, Sidewalk, and Bikepath Standards:*
Criteria met. The majority of the infrastructure is existing and any additional standards have been provided for review as part of the proposal of the Final Development/Site Plan.

- *Utilities:*
Criteria met. The plat releases previously necessary easements and construction and maintenance of all utilities in accordance with applicable standards will be part of the Final Development/Site Plan.
- *Open Space Requirements:*
Criteria met. Open space as part of this application is regulated in the Zoning Code, as is standard for commercial development in the Bridge Street District and will be reviewed and verified with future applications.

Recommendation:

The proposed Final Plat is consistent with all applicable review criteria; therefore, staff recommends approval to City Council with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
2. That the plat title be revised to add the vacation of portions of the Dale Drive right-of-way.

Representatives from EMH&T and the City Engineer's office are present to respond to any questions.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Wilson inquired if there is an existing precedent that whenever a road is intended for the development that it not be dedicated to the City.

Ms. Husak responded that because it is not a public road, it is not platted as right-of-way. A similar situation exists between the AC Hotel (in A Block) and the garage. A portion of that road looks and functions as a road, but it is a private drive. A portion of Mooney Drive further south, on the east side of the Acura Dealership, is also a private drive and was platted as a reserve.

Mr. Wilson inquired, if the intent is that it be private, was there a plan that the Commission saw previously that indicated it as such. The Concept Plan showed an intended road that would serve as one of the main entrances to the hotel.

Ms. Husak responded that is correct. The vehicle entrance and drop-off area will likely be on that side of the hotel.

Mr. Boggs stated that the statement addressing the private maintenance of Reserve B is found in Note (i) on page two of the Plat, which states that Scioto Tuller or their successors will be responsible for maintaining the private street that will be constructed on Reserve B.

Ms. Fox inquired if the plat would show F1 as one full parcel and the divisions thereof. Similarly, F2 is a full parcel and F3 and 4 are parcels.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. They are all full parcels and each has an individual parcel I.D. number.

Ms. Fox inquired what would be the consequence if the Commission were then to take a look at the placement of the Site Plan as it comes back and determine that the Reserve needs to be adjusted in size. That would require changing lot lines. For instance, if it was determined that the area was too narrow or would not meet the

purpose of servicing the hotel and the adjacent building on F2 properly, what is the recourse? There are already some preliminary site plans; where is the leniency for the Commission to make adjustments?

Ms. Husak responded that staff has been reviewing the application for the Final Development Plan and Final Site Plan for the F1 hotel, and the manner in which the lot is laid out is in accordance with the Basic Plan that was approved by City Council. If adjustments were required, there are administrative processes for lot line adjustments.

Ms. Fox stated that the Final Development Plan and Final Plat can be done simultaneously. Would it not be advantageous to see both before we are expected to recommend it to Council for approval? It would seem better for the Commission to understand how the Site Plan is laid out beforehand and ensure there will be no need for administrative changes to be made later.

Mr. Papsidero responded that the Final Plat is consistent with the preliminary plat that has already been approved by City Council. The Final Development Plan for F1, which includes the Reserve, is consistent with the Basic Plan that has been approved. Legally, a Final Plat is a document that permits the recording of these properties and the creation of the parcels. Any discussions regarding the boundaries would have occurred with the Preliminary Plat. The window for modifications to be made to a Final Plat is extremely limited. Because it is consistent with the Preliminary Plat, State law does not allow latitude to change the Final Plat. Worst case scenario -- if it was found that there had to be an adjustment, the Planning Director can approve an administrative change made under the Subdivision Regulations. That rarely occurs, and if it did, it would be a very minor change. At this point in the process, the expectation is that there will be no changes. Planning and Engineering staff conduct extensive reviews with the applicant to work out the details of the Development Plan and the private street. Staff ensures that all the standards are met.

Ms. Fox responded that the criteria suggested that the plat adheres to the open space requirements and the preliminary plat regarding how the reserve area would be used, and the discussion would indicate if there is room for adjustment or suggestions. Yet, we have seen no open space.

Ms. Husak responded that the subdivision regulations require open space dedication for single family platted lots. Within the Bridge Street Code, open space is required for commercial and residential development, but it is regulated under the main code.

Ms. Fox stated that she recognizes the site is subject to the Bridge Street Code, which was adopted later.

Mr. Papsidero noted that the Reserve consists only of the street. There is no other element in the reserve. The street geometry is defined by Engineering standards. Therefore, the street design could not substantially change, given that it meets Engineering Standards.

Ms. Husak stated that it is somewhat confusing for Commercial Plats to have a Reserve dedicated. Reserves are typically seen in Residential Plats as open spaces.

However, it is also the appropriate terminology for setting aside this parcel of land for the access drive.

Ms. Fox stated it is confusing that, although it is not a public street, it is being treated as if it were – it makes it appear questionable.

Mr. Boggs responded that it is not entirely being treated as if it were a public street, because the maintenance responsibilities are designated otherwise on the plat.

Although it is referenced as a Reserve, conceptually it is entirely different than the open space that is required under the Bridge Street Code and the open, greenspaces that are typically considered Reserves when developing residential subdivisions. This reserve will not be greenspace but a private drive to access the hotel.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the maintenance of this street would be the responsibility of the owner of these buildings.

Ms. Husak stated that she is unsure how the developer has set up the entities, but ultimately, there will be maintenance agreements with the property owners defining that responsibility.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the maintenance would include snow removal.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the City of Dublin maintains the property surrounding the reserve, such as the sidewalk, and would be responsible for related safety issues.

Ms. Husak responded that she is unsure where the landscaping maintenance is divided, but the City is responsible for all the public streets.

Ms. Kennedy stated that if it is only the public streets, it would not be responsible for any of this.

Mr. Wilson stated that the plat is shown as extending onto Banker Drive. Currently, there is an easement, but eventually, there will be a street on that easement.

Ms. Husak responded that Banker Drive extends further east than as depicted here – between Lowes and some of those parcels. It changes from being in the right-of-way and a private street. It is in the City's ownership but not as right-of-way.

Ms. Fox requested clarification. Will Banker Street extend from Riverside Drive over to Wendy's? There is no overlap?

Ms. Husak responded that there is a piece missing at Banker Drive.

Ms. Fox inquired if the Final Plat would extend into the middle of Banker Drive, as it appears to do here. Will Banker Drive have the capability of being connected?

Ms. Husak confirmed that it would.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the easement section along Dale Drive that is being vacated.

Ms. Husak responded that several hatch marks depict where Dale Drive originally curved behind the shopping center that once existed there. That hatched marked area is the right-of-way that is being vacated. Two different types of hatch marks are used – one for the easement, the other for the right-of-way.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if Banker Drive would extend to connect to the Wendy's site.
Ms. Husak clarified that it does so currently.

Mr. Papsidero stated that on the aerial, Banker Drive deadends into the Wendy's site. It is a public street up to that point. In the future, if the Wendy's site ever were to redevelop, there would be the expectation that the road would extend east through the site, consistent with the block pattern.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if Banker Drive would extend all the way from Riverside Drive and deadend into the Wendy's site.

Mr. Papsidero responded that it does so today. If the Wendy's site ever redevelops, Banker Drive would be continued further east.

Ms. Fox stated that the actual parcel line appears to extend into the middle of the street.

Ms. Husak responded that is correct. It is a public access easement that allocates Banker Drive.

Ms. Fox stated it would be a straight-through street – could that cause any issues? By approving this final plat, the Commission will be indicating that there are no issues with the alignment of Banker Drive that could impact that site.

Ms. Husak responded that the plat sets aside the easements that could be used.

Mr. Boggs stated that the access easement is continuing the easement as it exists today. It is in the current plat governing this parcel. The right-of-way boundary line is not necessarily the same as the boundary line of the pavement that is seen as Banker Drive. Even though, it appears to be based on the parcel boundary, it would not result as a "straight through" Banker Drive, as it is today. The pavement of the street is within right-of-way. The public access easement is pedestrian.

Ms. Fox stated asked if it is usual to see parcels extending out into the middle of the roadway. Typically, there is right-of-way, then the parcel lot lines start.

Mr. Papsidero stated that she is referring to the easements. The parcel line is underneath the easement. If we look at the interstate system, particularly downtown, all of the parcel lines run underneath the interstate. The State acquired easements, not right-of-way, when they built the roads. This is a similar situation. We do not know the history of why it is sitting in an easement and is not dedicated public right-of-way. It is an existing condition that allows a road, which will be a public street. An easement is simply the legal instrument that creates the space for a road.

Ms. Newell invited the applicant to comment.

James Peltier, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus Ohio, stated that he had no additional comments, but would be happy to answer any questions.

There were no further questions.

Mr. Stidhem moved to recommend approval of the Final Plat to City Council with the following two conditions:

1. That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
2. That the plat title be revised to add the vacation of portions of the Dale Drive right-of-way.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.

Approved 6-0.

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

Ms. Newell stated this application is a proposal for exterior modifications and signs for an existing restaurant (McDonald's) zoned Bridge Street District – Commercial. The site is south of West Bridge Street, approximately 250 feet southeast of the intersection with Frantz Road. 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 stated that this a request for a Minor Project Review, a parking plan, a waiver review and a Master Sign Plan, all governed under the Bridge Street District Code. The Planning and Zoning Commission is the final reviewing body of these applications.

Site:

The site is located on the south side of West Bridge Street, approximately 250 feet east of the intersection with Frantz Road. The existing McDonald's restaurant is an outparcel to the Dublin Plaza Shopping Center. The parcel is approximately .47 acre in size, which is extremely small. The restaurant is located centrally on the site with the drive-thru circling the store. Parking is located on the south and east sides of the parcel. Access is granted via the Dublin Plaza parking lot. The existing structure is brick with a mansard roof. There is an existing pole sign along West Bridge Street, and access to the restaurant is provided on the east elevation from the parking lot.

Background:

The site was originally developed in the 1980s, when Dublin was a village, with a free-standing McDonald's restaurant. The site was zoned CC, Community Commercial District. Developable parcels with standard zoning that met the development standards were permitted to obtain a building permit without Planning and Zoning Commission review and approval. Subsequently, signs were approved. Over time, the property owner has requested a number of variances to attempt to rectify the non-conforming conditions. Many of the variance requests were disapproved, but in 1990, a request for a parking space reduction from 22 spaces to 20 spaces was approved.

Proposal

In May 2018, this application was submitted. It is an attempt to modernize an aging structure and site while also rectifying non-conformities through the existing BSD zoning review process.

The proposal has the following components: site improvements, architectural modifications, comprehensive sign updates, and parking plan.

Site Modifications:

These site improvements are intended to review some of the existing concrete walks and concrete ADA-accessible parking stalls, as well as the patio, to ensure a safe access to the building. Landscaping compliance is also confirmed with these site modifications. Trimming of all of the existing landscaping is proposed as well as some additional landscaping to screen the drive-thru.

Parking Plan:

Today, there are 19 parking spaces (inclusive of 2 ADA spaces) on the site. In 1990, the BZA approved a Variance to allow a total of 20 parking spaces, which was the number the applicant was providing at that time. This parking plan would document the actual 19 spaces existing today.

Architectural Modifications/Waivers:

The existing restaurant is a single-story brick building, approximately 3,700 square feet in size, with a mansard roof. The applicant is proposing to retain the existing brick base and remove the mansard roof. The roof will be replaced with new brick (to match the existing) and a fiber cement siding (Nichiha Vintage Wood Cedar) parapet for a total building height of 18 feet. Two tower features are proposed: one on the east elevation denoting the restaurant entrance, and one on the north elevation, Bridge Street, as an architectural feature. The towers will be finished in a Eurowest E-wood Black tile. It is not a permitted material in the Bridge Street District, so the applicant is requesting a waiver to permit its use.

A waiver is also required to permit the combination of permitted primary materials to be less than 80% (78% is proposed). Staff supports both waivers given that the applicant is retrofitting an existing structure in a sensitive manner consistent with the architectural style and detailing of the Bridge Street District (BSD).

Master Sign Plan:

With the building and site modifications, the applicant proposes to improve the existing sign package to integrate better with the modified structure. The existing signs were approved via sign permits, and it is ambiguous as to how the sizes and heights came to be. Currently, the restaurant has a 38-square-foot McDonald's roof/wall sign facing West Bridge Street; two 20-square-foot window signs; a 47.5-square-foot pole sign, 15-16 feet in height, along West Bridge Street; and a static menu board sign.

The applicant has reviewed the BSD Sign Guidelines and has worked with McDonald's Corporate to develop a sign package that is architecturally coordinated with the palette of the building and uses a brick identical to the existing brick. The applicant has worked with staff and ART to reduce the number of signs requested from six to four. The proposal consists of the following:

- Wall Signs – 2

Two new "M" arch wall signs, each 14 square feet in size. The signs are proposed to be mounted on the tower features located on the east and north elevations. The signs will face the parking lot and West Bridge Street, respectively. The signs are internally illuminated as well as externally illuminated with down-lighting from the top of the tower. The signs are proposed to

be mounted at 18 feet, 1 inch as measured to the top of the sign. It is recommended that PZC reduce the height to the top of the sign to 15 feet.

- Ground Sign -1

Removal of the existing pole sign on the north elevation is proposed. To replace the pole sign, a new, architecturally integrated, modern monument sign with a neutral background with a masonry base is proposed. The total sign area proposed was 56.25 square feet and total sign height of 10 feet and 11 inches. Staff recommended that the area of the sign be reduced to 50 square feet in size, and the masonry base not exceed two feet in height. As indicated, the sign size would be reduced to 39 square feet with a gray background.

- Menu Board - 1

This proposal is for the removal of the existing menu board sign and installation of a new approximately 18-square-foot digital menu board sign at approximately six feet in height. The menu board is located in a landscape island along the west edge of the building and is oriented with the display facing the northwest. The proposed menu board sign contains two digital screens that allow for the display of pre-set content with the ability to automatically change depending on time of day. Light levels of the screens can also change based on surrounding ambient light.

The applicant has updated their plans so that the Commission has all the information needed tonight to make an informed decision. Their updated plan shows the wall signs in alternative height positions: one at the applicant's preferred height of 18-feet-1-inch; the second at an intermediate height of 17-feet-3-inches; third, the Code required and staff recommended height of 15 feet [showed signs at the three different heights]. Their proposed ground sign is 11 feet tall and 56 square feet in size. The maximum size that Code permits is 50 square feet, although the Commission has the latitude to approve what it deems appropriate. Staff had recommended that the size of the ground sign not exceed 50 square feet with a base no greater than two feet in height. Staff has learned that McDonald's Corporate produces signs only in specific sizes. The next size down is 39 square feet, and they have indicated that sign would have a gray background, not red, as shown on the images.

The applicant also upgraded their Site Plan to provide a bicycle parking facility. Staff has added some proposed conditions that are listed in the staff report. The proposed bicycle parking facility currently is located in an existing landscape island. The applicant is working with staff to eventually locate it onsite, a little farther to the south.

There are several project types represented: a Minor Project Review, a Waiver Review, a Master Sign Plan, and a Parking Plan. ART's recommendations include:

ART Recommendations

- Parking Plan -Approval of a Parking Plan to permit the following deviations from Code:
 - 1) Parking Plan to permit 19 parking spaces where 20 parking spaces are required.
 - 2) Parking Plan to permit 12 drive-thru stacking spaces where 24 stacking spaces are required.
- Minor Project Review - Approval with 4 conditions:
 - 1) That the applicant update the landscape plan to reflect the new plantings associated with the new monument sign;
 - 2) That the applicant provide the required number of bicycle parking spaces;
 - 3) That all the new windows meet the maximum reflectiveness permitted by Code and 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.
- Waiver Review – Approval of Waivers to permit the following deviations from Code:
 - 1) Waiver to permit the combination of permitted primary materials to be less than 80- percent (78-percent proposed).
 - 2) Waiver to use an alternative, high-quality synthetic material – tile (Eurowest E-wood Black) – covering nine percent of the total building.
- Master Sign Plan - Approval with 9 conditions:
 - 1) That the applicant update the application prior to Commission review 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 two 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 eight 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) The applicant provide an approved Master Sign Plan containing all approved amendments to Planning,

Ms. Martin noted that Conditions 5-8 are conditions that the Commission has previously written and approved for digital menu board signs. The other conditions are specific to this proposal.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Kennedy stated that the waiver related to the material is requested because that material is not an approved exterior material. Why is the material not approved in the District? Is there an issue with color or material integrity?

Ms. Martin responded that the Bridge Street District (BSD) Code is a form-based code, which regulates all of the exterior character and finishes of the buildings. When the BSD Code was approved in 2012, limitations were put in place for permitted primary materials – glass, brick and stone. The Code also included a variety of permitted secondary materials, including the fibrous cement and hardboard proposed with this application. However, tile is not one of them. Perhaps because there is a variety of tile on the market, a case-by-case review was preferred.

Mr. Wilson requested that the materials board be passed around. He has no other questions at this time.

Ms. Fox stated that this site is an out-lot. The Bridge Street elevation has a great presentation, and the entrance is on the east elevation. The site has a greater presentation to the east, as that is where the entrance is. The south is where the drive-thru is, and this side faces the remainder of the shopping plaza. The west elevation faces the Heartland Bank. Was there any discussion about a variation in materials on either the west or the south sides of the building? Ms. Martin responded that with the applicant's initial submittal in May 2018, some brick variation on the south elevation around the drive-thru was proposed. ART's initial feedback was that there was no reason to accentuate the drive-thru with an architectural accent. If the Commission has a different view, they can certainly discuss it.

Ms. Fox stated that ART also discussed a potential parking agreement in case the other out-lots were to be utilized and would have a need for parking. Where did that discussion end up? Ms. Martin stated that there was much discussion at ART regarding parking. It is typical to see parking agreements that address shared parking needs. Staff is not aware if the McDonald's Corporation has such an agreement with Casto, the owner of the Dublin Plaza. She is unsure if the applicant's representative present tonight has that information.

Ms. Fox stated that as Bridge Street develops, development of these out-lots will become popular. Typically, 38 parking spaces would be required; the number has been reduced to 19 – half of the preferred amount. Are there concerns that there will be insufficient parking in the future?

Ms. Martin responded that there are no concerns. The site has operated with these conditions for 30 years; of course, conditions could change in the future. However, development pressure would typically provide opportunity to partner with other property owners and build a new structure. That would be consistent with the vision of the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Fox stated that ART questioned the height of the tower sign and the fact that there is a light bar at the top of the tower that has down lighting. Is there a way to tell how that light bar would affect the signs at the three suggested heights [3 images shown]? At the 18-foot height, the light would shine onto the "M". At the heights of 17-feet-3-inches or 15 feet, it is uncertain if the light bar would have any impact on the sign -- would it even be necessary? Ms. Martin responded that staff's recommendation to lower the height to a 15-foot height was from a consistency standpoint. Historically, the Commission has required that existing structures and uses are limited to what the Code allows. There may be an opportunity to adjust where the light bar shines. Also, since the sign is internally illuminated, potentially, the light bar could be removed from the plans.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if 15 feet is staff's recommendation or is it a Code recommendation.
Ms. Martin responded that it is both.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the pole sign meets current Code?
Ms. Martin responded that it does not.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the Commission has any desire to make it meet Code.
Ms. Martin clarified that this application proposes to remove the pole sign and replace it with a monument sign.
Mr. Fishman inquired if the monument sign would meet Code.
Ms. Martin stated that with this application and approval of the Master Sign Plan, the Commission does have the opportunity to bring the site into conformance.

Ms. Newell inquired what is the Bridge Street Code height limitation for ground signs.
Ms. Martin responded that for existing sites and buildings that were developed prior to the BSD, it is a maximum of 15 feet. A fairly tall ground sign is permitted.
Ms. Husak noted that new development in the District is limited to ground signs no greater than six feet in height. However, existing development defaults to the old Code requirements.

Ms. Fox stated that in regard to the landscape plan, Mr. Earman had requested that McDonald's work with the City on the Bridge Street Landscaping Design. When the serviceberry plantings were included, did McDonald's corroborate with the City's landscape architect?
Ms. Martin responded that as part of staff's review, there is landscape review; therefore, the additional landscaping was staff's suggestion.
Ms. Fox requested confirmation that it coordinates with the greater landscaping design for Bridge Street.
Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Wilson stated that it is indicated that the new brick to be added would be very similar to the existing brick. Will that brick material be presented to staff for approval?
Ms. Martin responded that obtaining staff approval is not required, but if the Commission desires, that can be added as a condition.
Mr. Wilson stated that it appears some brick will be added near the top and around some of the windows. It is important to ensure the old and new material do not clash. There does not seem to be a sample of the material that will be used.

Mr. Wilson inquired if directional signage has been presented to staff, as well.
Ms. Martin responded that directional signs do not require sign permits, as long as they meet a certain size standard and do not contain any business names or logos. The applicant would be eligible to add those, as well, if they'd like.

Ms. Newell invited the applicant to add comments.

Rebecca Green, Permit Solutions, 175 S. Third Street – Suite 170, Columbus, applicant representative, stated that McDonald's goal is to freshen that building, which has become dated. They have been working with staff, who have provided helpful suggestions for the best

materials to use in this District. The intent is to achieve their goal using the materials that are approved for this District.

Ms. Kennedy stated that it is time to update this building and she was happy to see this application. She inquired what is the applicant's perspective regarding the sign heights – the 18 feet versus 15 feet.

Ms. Green stated that this particular structure sits a little lower than the grade of the road, and the design is intended to be minimalist. The sign is to be a prominent feature, but not too prominent. It is only a 14-square foot sign, so it is not large. It is internally lit, and the downlight is intended to highlight the sign at a height of 18.1 ft. height. She is unsure if the downlight is an adjustable feature; she would need to look into that. There is a concern about a 15-foot height, as it could appear to be almost on top of the canopy feature and no longer make any sense. It would be hidden by the canopy, in part, and the tower feature would be illuminated, but there would not be anything to illuminate. As requested, they did provide examples at the different heights for the Commission's review. However, their goal is to make the building both minimalist and appealing within the Bridge Street District concept, and they believe the 18.1-foot height for the wall sign is the best.

Ms. Fox referred to the applicant's original proposal for the drive-thru side of the building. She believes the drive-thru is very noticeable. What were the original suggestions?

Ms. Green stated that her recollection is that a variation in color was suggested – perhaps the Iron Mountain Gray, that would highlight a certain portion of the façade.

Ms. Martin confirmed that the original proposal was that a second shade of brick would be used over and beneath the window areas.

Ms. Fox inquired if it is anticipated that shade variations in the brick will be noticeable. As Mr. Wilson noted, the existing brick on the building is at least 20 years old. Will it be possible to match it, or will there be a different shape, size or color in the newer portion?

Ms. Green responded that their goal is to match it. Other jurisdictions have required retrofits for their brick restaurant facades, and they have been very successful in ensuring matching bricks.

Ms. Fox inquired if any other suggestions were made earlier for the other elevations, other than what is provided here.

Ms. Green responded that there was only that one suggestion, which was replaced with a less-detailed, all brick design.

Ms. Fox stated that because Ms. Green is involved in McDonald's remodels across the country, would she say that this is a typical renovation design, or is it unique to Dublin?

Ms. Green responded that this plan is unique in that it retains the brick material. Many jurisdictions allow them to use a facing material that hides the brick. They did not attempt to do that here. This plan is also unique in that they did not use the standard brand signage that is typically used in their rezoning applications. It is the only site she has ever seen where the applicant has voluntarily removed their pole sign; typically, the applicant wants to retain that particular sign.

Ms. Fox inquired if the canopy and the tower designs are typical with their renovations across the country.

Ms. Green responded that she has seen the tower design at other locations, one of McDonald's brand elements; however, this site is using a higher-end tower. Usually, the tower is red with a stucco finish, or perhaps a lighter-color gray with a stucco finish. This tower consists of a much nicer material than typically seen.

Mr. Stidhem stated that when they are contemplating redesign of a restaurant that experiences a significant amount of vehicular access, some consideration must be given regarding the nature of future vehicular access and ways in which people will get their food. In the future, there will be significantly more deliveries. How will this design accommodate that trend?

Ms. Green responded that at this particular location, that drive-thru component has worked well for 30 years, and that is essentially what is proposed today. Regarding future use, to date, the projected numbers McDonald's has received is that some Uber drivers are replacing today's regular drive-thru customers, but they are not seeing any significant difference. More customers are placing their orders via phone, then picking them up. She is not aware of any other anticipated changes.

Mr. Stidhem stated that he inquired because of the recent trend of grocery stores to change their layouts to support a delivery service. Regarding future plans – several months ago the Commission saw a 30-year or 50-year long-range plan for this area of the City. Parking could be dramatically different in this area. He is actually very surprised that McDonald's does not control the traffic to the east of the site, because there is a marked waiting area for customers waiting in their vehicles for their drive-thru orders. Is she aware of that? If so, how might that impact this site's design?

Ms. Green responded that she did look into that. She contacted the Corporate office to see if the applicant had any legal rights related to that area of the parking lot. However, she was unable to learn anything, and did not aggressively pursue an answer at this particular time. This is a leased property, so unless parking is addressed in the details of their lease, she is aware of no other legal rights.

Ms. Fox stated that she frequents this shopping plaza a great deal. She believes the area will become more walkable. McDonald's customers do use those parking spaces on the right, especially commercial trucks, vans and workers' vehicles. They do not pull up to the building but prefer the out-lots that offer more space. Drive-thru waiting is located there, as well. McDonald's has a satisfactory level of parking at this time because it is using that overflow area. As this area is developed and gets really busy, parking will become an issue. If Casto should decide to build an Applebee's in the out-lot next to McDonald's, and they want parking, there may be insufficient parking here. Those are just her observations.

Mr. Fishman stated that the trend in northwest Dublin is that vacant parking lots are becoming filled with outbuildings. Most of the strip centers now have some businesses located in the out-lots. Regarding this particular site, he has noticed that vehicles speed across the parking lot in all directions. At many other sites that is not possible due to curbing and landscaping that have been added to provide some level of control. There is a lot of parking surface here. Would it be possible to "beef up" the landscaping for that purpose without sacrificing any parking spaces? He concurs with Ms. Fox's observations. In this City, these out-lots will be developed and the current parking will not remain indefinitely.

Mr. Stidhem stated that the challenge for the applicant is that they do not own any of the property he is referencing.

Mr. Fishman responded that he was referring only to the McDonald's site.

Ms. Newell stated that according to the site plan, they have maxed out what they have.

Mr. Stidhem stated that McDonald's cannot even control the parking that is outside the immediate rectangular area of their site. While he agrees with Mr. Fishman, McDonald's has no control of any of that other area. It is controlled by the owner of the shopping plaza.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the applicant has attempted to contact the owner of the shopping plaza.

Ms. Green responded that she concurs that curbing and landscaping are effective ways of addressing traffic safety issues. However, she has no information regarding whether or not McDonald's has contacted Casto.

Mr. Stidhem stated that the Commission has no ability to address that issue at this point. He is more concerned about the drive-thru traffic, because he believes that trend will increase, and perhaps a delivery service access might be needed on the east side of the building. In 15-20 years, there will be no concern about parking; it will be a waste of space.

Ms. Green stated that on this site, because of the mansard roof, there is not an awareness of the level of drive-thru traffic McDonald's is experiencing. There is a comfortable stacking of approximately 12 vehicles.

Ms. Newell stated that during high-peak hours, the line of vehicles extends well off and outside the McDonald's site.

Mr. Fishman stated that it would be better to solve the problem now via an agreement with the owner of the shopping center.

Ms. Newell stated that the applicant currently has a variance for 20 parking spaces, so there is no justification for asking them to provide any more than those 20 spaces.

Ms. Husak stated that if any redevelopment of outparcels were to be proposed, it would be subject to Planning and Zoning Commission review. They could not build out the site without meeting Code requirements for parking.

Mr. Papsidero stated that most likely, the Kroger lease controls most of that parking. Therefore, it is unlikely that there will ever be any redevelopment to the east of this McDonald's – not as long as Kroger is located there, and they have a 50-year lease.

Mr. Stidhem stated that in regard to the Master Sign Plan, he is pleased to see the pole sign removed. A monument ground sign is preferable. In regard to the size of the signs, Dublin's sign size regulations are specific, and the Commission attempts to require conformity to the City's Code. The options are 39 square feet and 56 square feet. Is it essential to obtain the signage from the Corporate office, or is there any option for a sign that is 50 square feet or something only slightly smaller?

Ms. Green responded that they were asked to identify a unique sign for this location. None of these signs are brand signs that are approved for this region. It was necessary for them to extend a much greater reach to find these options. The larger sign was pulled from the Chicago area; it is a flat sign that offers no dimension. The smaller sign does have a dimension to the "M" arch, if a dimensional sign should be more attractive. They attempted to find something that is not typically used other places and bring that to the Bridge Street area of Dublin.

Mr. Stidhem stated that the Code would restrict the size to 50 square feet for a new building, although this is not a new building. Could the proposed size of 56 square feet be reduced to 50 square feet and 6 feet in height?

Staff indicated that the proposed height is 10 feet-11 in., including a three-foot base.

Mr. Wilson stated that the existing pole light is 15 feet in height, so the proposed sign is shorter. Currently, there is a significant amount of vegetation at the base.

Ms. Green responded that with the removal of the pole sign, the surrounding existing landscaping would be adjusted subject to staff's review.

Ms. Stidhem stated that the proposed monument sign is a significant upgrade, only too large.

Ms. Green stated that the second sign would be much smaller, and would have a gray background, and it would have a brick base.

Mr. Stidhem inquired what would be the total height of the smaller option.

Ms. Green responded that the height of the sign is 6.3 feet, but the base is 3 feet. Staff had recommended 2 feet.

Ms. Newell stated that she would be comfortable with the smaller square footage sign with a 2.0-foot or 2.8-foot base.

Mr. Stidhem stated that he believes lowering the wall signs to 15 feet would result in their visibility being blocked. However, the signs are internally lit, so is there a need for the downlighting?

Ms. Green stated that is primarily an architectural feature. The towers are intended to break up the long space of that elevation. The downlight adds another dimension to break up that long expanse of space. It adds an element of interest to the building, by highlighting the towers.

Mr. Stidhem noted that it highlights the "M", as well.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is very happy with the sign package, except the size needs to meet the Bridge Street Code. Although he would prefer not to have the downlighting, he does not have an issue if it meets the purpose of highlighting the sign. He could approve this sign package, if the smaller ground sign is used.

Ms. Newell stated that the applicant would need to indicate acceptance of the requirement to use the smaller ground sign.

Ms. Kennedy requested staff to clarify the Code requirements related to this sign.

Ms. Martin responded that the Code that is applicable to this building requires a ground sign not greater than 50-square-foot, not to exceed 15 feet in height. The Code that applies to new structures in the Bridge Street District would be a 24-square-foot ground sign, not to exceed 6 feet in height.

Ms. Husak noted that the Code that is applicable to this site allows them to have one sign. The applicant is asking for three (3) signs – 1 ground sign and 2 wall signs.

Ms. Kennedy stated that one of the things that makes Dublin "Dublin," is that signage in this community is tasteful, and not offensive. She concurs that the signage needs to comply with Code.

Ms. Fox stated that in looking at the depiction of the north elevation, she sees not only a downlight fixture above the "M" sign, but four small horizontal downlights along the canopy. The same thing occurs on the south elevation, except there are five of those lights. There is

additional illumination occurring across the face of the building other than on the "M" from the downlight bar above it. The illumination along the canopy does not illuminate the signage but the façade itself.

Ms. Green stated that the illumination is just under the canopy. Its purpose is solely to highlight the doors and provide a needed element of safety to the doors on the west side.

Ms. Fox inquired if, on the east elevation – in addition to the light bar at the top of the tower, is there another light bar at the bottom of the tower.

Ms. Martin stated that there is uplighting around the structure, as well as downlighting. The Bridge Street Code does not permit uplighting, so elimination of that has been added as one of the conditions to this application.

Ms. Fox inquired if, although uplighting is not permitted, this would be like a light bar across the bottom.

Ms. Martin responded that any lighting would need to be shielded; it cannot project out or up. Downlighting is permitted.

Ms. Fox inquired if no light bar would be seen at the bottom of the tower.

Ms. Martin responded that a light bar would not be seen there.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she does not understand why the lighting under the canopy are not light bars.

Ms. Fox stated that they are simply smaller downlights.

Mr. Fishman stated that because the backlighting in the signs would add dimension, he would support eliminating the downlighting over the "M" wall signs. It appears that there will be a large amount of lighting on the building. We don't want that structure to be an overly bright spot along SR161.

Ms. Newell stated that when the "M" is internally illuminated, plus another light is shown on top of it, the purpose of the "M" being internally illuminated is negated. She would support elimination of the light bar.

Mr. Wilson noted that from an architectural standpoint, the lightbar does define the tower. Although it may add some highlighting to the sign, primarily, it defines the tower. At night, if there is no lightbar to define the tower, all that will be seen is an "M." With the lightbar, a tower with sign would be seen. He has seen this situation before, and there are some examples in the area. There is a Wendy's in Powell where they added this type of downlight. That downlight washes down the building and creates an effect. He does not believe its purpose is to light the sign; as the light washes down the tower, it highlights the tower on the building. At night, it adds an interesting feature, not just ability to see an "M." It is his perspective that the value of this lighting is evident at night.

Ms. Fox inquired if that were the case, could that effect be dependent on the brightness of the light.

Mr. Wilson responded affirmatively. However, the downlighting depicted here appears bright for only two-three feet, and continues to wash down the tower more lightly to eventually disappear. It does highlight the top part of the tower. When we see buildings with these types of features, the effect, at night in particular, is interesting. He would encourage the Commission members to observe some examples within the area – he is aware of the one in Powell.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if the building in Powell sits by itself.

Mr. Wilson responded the Wendy's building is a free-standing building.

Mr. Stidhem stated the McDonald's building is in a shopping plaza with other lighting in the parking lot. He wonders if the effect might be lost due to the other illumination in the parking lot.

Ms. Newell stated that she would concur with Mr. Wilson, if there was no signage here. Lighting can be interesting architectural features for buildings, when used appropriately. In this instance, she believes it is being used to highlight the signage, not the towers.

Ms. Newell referred to the alternative heights of the wall signs and inquired if previous variances have been made to the Bridge Street Code 15-foot height requirements.

Ms. Martin noted that in 2017, the Bridge Street Code requirements for existing structures and uses was amended by Council. Council did not believe it was appropriate to allow older structures or uses to have the taller signs or the diversity of sign types that the Bridge Street Code permitted. Coldwell Banker, the Goodwill store, Big Sandy's and Party City were held to 15 feet.

Ms. Newell stated that the requirement has been that the signs be well integrated into the structure of the building. With either the 18-foot or the 17.3 foot heights, there is little difference from an aesthetics standpoint. However, the 15-foot height is closer to the canopy and becomes less visible. She believes the 17.3-foot height is a compromise that continues to integrate well with the building structure.

Mr. Stidhem stated that he has no objection to the 18-foot, 1-inch height. It fits well there and is visible. Are two wall signs needed? For which elevation does the applicant see a need for an additional wall sign.

Ms. Green stated that an arch is needed on each tower feature. Their goal was to limit the amount of square feet of signage put on this building. Initially, 6 signs were proposed, and they have worked to meet the City's expectations. The "M" arch is desired on the east side, because that is the main entrance to the building. Initially, there were two signs on the east side. The other "M" arch sign is on the north side tower, the elevation facing Bridge Street.

Mr. Stidhem inquired what was the purpose of that sign.

Ms. Green responded the north façade is the front of the building along Bridge Street.

Mr. Fishman noted that perhaps a ground sign is not needed. Signs are for the purpose of identification. One sign on that side is all that is needed.

Ms. Green stated that the intent was to replace the lollipop sign and reduce the overall amount of signage. Initially, there was large window sign; this is a much smaller sign.

Mr. Fishman inquired what are the current Code requirements.

Ms. Martin stated that Code permits one sign, either a wall sign or a ground sign, each with different size requirements. A wall sign is permitted to be at a size of one-square-foot per linear foot of building wall at a height not to exceed 15 feet; the ground sign can be 50 square feet at a height not to exceed 15 feet.

Mr. Stidhem stated that these are very tasteful signs and are a significant upgrade to the existing signage. He is simply attempting to understand the logic for the proposed locations. He understands a sign is needed on the east elevation because the main entrance side of the building is there. However, what is the logic for both a wall sign and a ground sign on the north elevation?

Ms. Green responded that the intention was to provide wall signage to the front of the building and to reduce the overall signage to the front of the building. This is the smallest sign that McDonald's offers for signage – a 14-square-foot arch sign, and it also complements the tower feature.

Ms. Newell noted that they are asking for a Master Sign Plan. Without a Master Plan, they would not be permitted to have this number of signs. The applicant has met the four criteria for a Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is concerned with setting precedents, and would prefer to require that the application meet the Bridge Street Sign Code.

Ms. Green stated that by using a Master Sign Plan and meeting the criteria thereof, that they would be able to meet the unique needs of the District, reduce their signage, and use signage that complements the architectural structure itself. It was hoped that the City would consider the fact that the lollipop pole sign was being eliminated and replaced with a more tasteful ground sign along Bridge Street. Those were their goals, and she is hopeful they have met the District's intent.

Mr. Stidhem stated he supports the three signs, using the 39-square foot ground sign with a 2-foot high base. The wall sign at even 18.1 feet would be acceptable to him, if the downlighting at the top of the towers is eliminated.

Ms. Fox stated she would concur with the 39-square foot ground sign with a 2-foot base, and two wall signs at the Code-required height of 15 feet on the towers, with elimination of the downlighting at the top of the towers.

Mr. Fishman expressed support for the 39-square foot ground sign with a 2-foot base, one wall sign on the east elevation, and removal of either the downlighting or the "M" sign on the tower on the north façade. He prefers the plan be as close to Code as possible.

Ms. Newell inquired if the Commission believes there is a compromise all would support. Consensus of the Commission was that there was.

Ms. Newell requested clarification as to the compromise specifics.

Ms. Fox indicated support for: the 39-square foot ground sign with a 2-foot base; two "M" wall signs, one on each of the two towers. A large volume of Bridge Street traffic travels past the site, and if a driver misses the ground sign, they would see the "M" logo on that front tower. That "M" does not bother her at all; it is a significant upgrade to the existing McDonald's sign. Therefore, she believes the compromise would permit the two wall signs, but require that they meet the Code required height of 15 feet; in addition, remove the light bar at the top of the towers. She wants this building to continue to succeed on this site. It is important to remember that they are removing the lollipop sign, and also adding some very nice architectural features to the building.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she would approve the two "M" wall signs but remove the ground sign on the front façade. "Dublin is greener..." she loves the way the City maintains its greenspace along the roadways in the community, and a sign there would be a deterrent to that.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would support only two signs, not three. So, he would permit the two wall signs at the Code-required height, if that is the consensus of the other Commission members, but remove the ground sign and the downlighting on the towers. This building does not suffer a visibility hardship, as do some businesses.

Mr. Wilson inquired if there are any other monument ground signs along Bridge Street on the Casto property, from the bank site to the east.

Ms. Martin responded that there are other ground pole signs. Kroger has a four-sided pole sign; the bank has a pole sign; and Embassy Suites has a ground sign.

Mr. Wilson inquired if the other hotel on the corner between Embassy Suites and Frantz Road has such a sign.

Ms. Martin responded that they have a projecting sign on their building plus a ground sign.

Ms. Newell stated that she is in agreement with having the two signs on the front elevation. In the interest of fairness to McDonald's, the ground sign gives them better identification for the travelers on SR. 161 who are not aware of where McDonalds is located. A ground sign at that location is a fair request. She is in agreement with highlighting the tower feature on the front of the building with either the "M" or the downlighting, one or the other. She could compromise on the Code-required height of 15-feet, because the slightly higher elevation aesthetically fits the structure better than the signs with a 15-foot elevation.

Ms. Newell stated that this case requires four different motions. Does the applicant want the Commission to proceed with the votes or perhaps want to request that the Master Sign Package be tabled to permit the applicant to work on the signage issues?

Ms. Green responded that she would request that the Master Sign Plan be tabled, as she will need to obtain additional direction on what McDonald's is willing to do.

Ms. Kennedy stated that what she is looking for is the logic behind the proposed signs. For instance, if the applicant were to state that 80% of its customers are coming from this direction or off the highway, and if they are not made aware of their location that is a significant problem. It would be helpful to have the need perspective or customer recognition perspective stated.

VOTE:

- Master Sign Plan

Mr. Stidhem moved to table the Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Fox seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.

Motion to table carried 6-0.

- Parking Plan

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Parking Plan.

Ms. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.
Motion carried 6-0.

○ Minor Project Review

Mr. Stidhem inquired if the applicant is in agreement with the five proposed conditions.

Ms. Green indicated that the applicant concurs with the conditions.

Ms. Martin indicated that if the Commission were to approve the Minor Project Review for the structure with no condition added pertaining to the downlighting on the towers, the Commission would not later have the latitude to eliminate that with the Master Sign Plan review. Either the Minor Project Review can be tabled or a condition added to not allow downlighting on the towers.

Mr. Boggs suggested the following condition: "There would be no downlighting on that tower if a sign is located on that tower. The decision whether a sign will be located on the tower would be addressed later with the Master Plan Review."

Ms. Green stated that she believes the applicant would prefer to also table the Minor Project Review and have it considered at the same time as the Master Sign Plan Review.

Mr. Stidhem moved to table the Minor Project Review.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes.

Motion to table carried 6-0.

○ Waiver Review

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the two Waivers to permit the following deviations from Code:

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.

Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.

Motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Stidhem stated that he believes this plan is near completion. Ms. Green responded that she concurs. She will be sharing the Commission's input and concerns with McDonald's Corporate, so that they may address them in an updated plan, which will be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

Ms. Newell thanked Ms. Green for her input. The Commission appreciates the effort McDonald's is making to improve this structure, and looks forward to reviewing a revised plan.

Communications from Staff

New Planner 1

Mr. Papsidero introduced Chase Ridge, recently hired as a Planner I. Mr. Ridge is an Ohio State University graduate and a recent intern with the City of Upper Arlington. Dublin is happy to have him join the staff.

The Commission welcomed Mr. Ridge.

Bridge Street District Code Update Stakeholder Meeting

Mr. Papsidero thanked Ms. Newell and Mr. Wilson for volunteering to serve on the Stakeholder Committee for the Bridge Street District Code Update. The first meeting is 8:00 a.m., Tuesday, February 5, at the 5800 Building.

Planning and Zoning Commission Education Binders

Ms. Husak noted that in response to Ms. Fox's request, new commission education binders have been compiled and provided on the dais. These first materials provide information regarding the Planned Unit Development Process; however, the intent is to continue to update and add relevant information to the binders. She would suggest that the Commission members bring their binders to Commission meetings, so they can add any additional information.

Ms. Newell requested that if there are materials to be added, that staff send Commission members a request to bring their binders.

Ms. Husak stated that a reminder would be sent, and a folder with copies of the additional materials can be added to the electronic meeting packet, as well.

Cyber-Security Training Requirement

Ms. Husak reminded Commission members to complete the required Cyber-Security Training before the January 31 deadline.

Mr. Papsidero noted that if it is not completed, the staff or Commission member would lose City electronic connection.

Technology Use Policy

Ms. Husak requested that as a follow-up to the recent Technology Use Policy presentation, I.T. staff has requested that Commission members sign the forms provided on the dais. She will return completed forms on the members' behalf.

National Planning Association Spring Conference, April 13-16, 2019

Staff has begun booking hotel accommodations for the upcoming conference in San Francisco. There is an early bird registration discount. Typically, the Commissioner educational track offered is very robust.

Ms. Fox thanked staff for compiling the binder, which she anticipates will be very helpful, especially for new Commissioners. She will forward staff some other suggestions for additions. Recently, the new ARB appointee contacted her to request materials, and she assured her that information would be available soon.

Ms. Husak noted that new board and commission training would also be provided in May or June.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.


Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission
Deputy Clerk of Council