



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 21, 2019 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**1. Midwestern Auto Group – Porsche
18-016AFDP**

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

Proposal: A new Porsche showroom approximately 16,000 square feet and associated site improvements. The 15.53-acre parcel is in Subarea A of the Midwestern Auto Group Planned Unit Development District.

Location: South of Perimeter Drive, approximately 250 feet southwest of the intersection with Venture Drive.

Request: Review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.050.

Applicant: Midwestern Auto Group represented by Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance.

Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-016

MOTION: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Wilson seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with 5 conditions as amended:

- 1) That the applicant updates the application materials to correct the building square footage discrepancies with the building permit submittal;
- 2) That the applicant verifies and updates, if applicable, the building square footage listed within the traffic memo and provides any required site mitigations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 3) That the approval of this application does not include the proposed sign package and that the applicant be required to submit a future application for the approval of the sign package;
- 4) That the applicant pays a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches with the building permit submittal; and
- 5) That the applicant continues to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance

VOTE: 4 – 0.

RESULT: The Amended Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes
Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Absent
William Wilson	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION


Logan Stang, Planner II



1. Midwestern Auto Group – Porsche & Ferrari, 6325 Perimeter Loop Road, 18-016AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this application is a proposal for a new car dealership building and associated site improvements. The 15.53-acre parcel is in Subarea A of the Midwestern Auto Group Planned Unit Development District. The site is south of Perimeter Drive, approximately 250 feet southwest of the intersection with Venture Drive. The Commission has the final authority on this application and witnesses will have to be sworn in. This is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.050.

Ms. Newell swore in individuals wishing to address the Commission on this case.

○ Site:

Mr. Stang stated that this application is a request for an Amended Final Development Plan for the MAG Porsche showroom. The site is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Venture Drive. This site falls within Subarea A of the MAG Planned Unit Development, and the work is proposed in the northernmost portion of the property. The application includes the removal of the former Land Rover building to allow for a new 19,000-square-foot Porsche showroom along with modifications to the interior of the site for parking and on-site circulation. The proposed work is located inside the private service drive, and no modifications are proposed to the display fingers located in the northwest corner of the site. A new display area is proposed northeast of the showroom with a service drive located along the southern façade. Based on the proposal, Subarea A of the MAG campus is deficient 14 parking spaces from the Code-required minimum. However, both Subareas B and C have excess parking available allowing for shared parking across the entire campus.

○ Architecture:

The applicant has also proposed a detailed landscape plan including replacement of missing or deteriorating plantings located throughout the site. The applicant will be required to pay a fee in lieu of replacement for any outstanding caliper inches with the building permit submittal. The proposed architecture continues the modern theme of the campus, using a curved front façade and overhangs on the north and south sides to allow for a customer drop-off and pickup area and a display area. The rear of the structure contains the service area with overhead doors oriented towards the interior of the site, similar to other showrooms on the campus. Proposed materials include glass, corrugated metal and perforated metal panels and aluminum composite material, which are all permitted primary materials.

○ Signs:

The proposal includes a mixture of ground and wall signs for the showroom based on the types permitted by the MAG Planned Unit Development. The applicant is proposing a directional sign south of the service drive for the customer drop-off and pickup area, and a brand sign that is on the south side of the main entrance adjacent to the building. Both signs contain the Porsche logo with supplemental text near the base of the sign. Both signs meet the applicable standards of the MAG development text and are consistent with the campus-wide sign character. A wall sign is also proposed on the front elevation and is comprised of the word "Porsche" in red channel lettering. The sign is proposed at a height of 14 feet, 5 inches and is 33 square feet in size. The sign meets all applicable requirements of the development text for wall signs; however, the proposed red color is not consistent with wall signs throughout the campus. The

majority of the wall signs throughout the campus are primarily silver for the manufacturer's name and also have color incorporated into the logo, if a logo is incorporated on the wall sign. Staff is requiring that the applicant replace this red color with a complementary color that is used throughout the campus subject to staff approval, as the proposed sign is inconsistent with the other signs on campus.

Staff Recommendation:

Based off of the criteria, staff is recommending approval of this application with the following five conditions:

- 1) That the applicant updates the application materials to correct the building square footage discrepancies with the building permit submittal;
- 2) That the applicant verifies and updates, if applicable, the building square footage listed within the traffic memo and provides any required site mitigations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 3) That the applicant revises the wall sign to replace the manufacturer color with a complementary color used throughout the campus, subject to staff approval with the filing of sign permits;
- 4) That the applicant pays a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches with the building permit submittal; and,
- 5) That the applicant continues to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance

The first two conditions are clean-up items to address discrepancies in the square footage of the building. The third condition pertains to the wall sign; the fourth condition is for the outstanding caliper inches in the fee in lieu of; and the fifth is for the applicant to continue working with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater compliance.

Commission Questions:

Mr. Wilson inquired if the applicant had submitted a materials board.

Mr. Stang responded that a materials board has not been provided.

Applicant Comments:

Brad Parish, President, Architectural Alliance, 49 E. Third Street, Columbus, Ohio, stated that the MAG campus continues to be expanded, and this proposal is consistent with the informal discussion that occurred in 2018 for this project. The material on the building is consistent with the other buildings on campus. He would like to briefly address Condition 3, which relates to the wall sign. He spoke with Corporate Porsche regarding this item, and they indicated that the red color is very important to their corporate branding across the world and they would very much prefer to remain consistent with their brand. The campus does have a consistency – the Land Rover originally had the green oval on campus, and there is blue in the BMW logo, as well as some of the other ground signs. The ground sign here has a red color, and the wall and ground sign need to be consistent.

Commission Comments:

Mr. Stidhem stated that he thought the design was great, and he has no problem with the red color, which reflects their brand identity.

Mr. Fishman stated that the Commission has had previous discussions on the sign topic. Previously, MAG's ground signs have been permitted to have the regular logos, but not on the wall signs. The City needs to remain consistent; otherwise, there would be a different color for every logo. The campus looks great with its silver wall signs. He visited the campus today and was unable to view any cars being loaded or unloaded, either on or off the property. He is hopeful MAG is addressing the vehicle loading/unloading issue. He has observed another car dealer in this neighborhood who is creating a problem for drivers -- causing them to slam on their brakes to avoid a collision. In summary, he believes this sign should be consistent with MAG's other signage.

Mr. Wilson stated that the building is attractive, and he has no issue with the red sign, since it is part of the Porsche brand. The color actually provides a good contrast with the building; it brings some modernity. This is a nice design for the project.

Ms. Newell stated that she does take exception to the red color. Many other corporations within the City have been required to keep their signs monochromatic, including the Crown dealership. MAG's other signage has maintained that, as well. This site has more signage than most of the surrounding properties, so exceptions have already been made. Of note, only four PZC members are present today, and if a split vote should occur, that would effectively be a "No" vote. The applicant has the right to have their request heard by a full Commission.

Mr. Parish inquired if it would be possible to remove the wall sign from this request and reschedule that for a later consideration by the full Commission.

Mr. Boggs responded that if this application were to proceed without the sign package, the sign package could become a new application.

Mr. Parish responded that would be satisfactory.

Ms. Newell requested that staff revise the language accordingly.

Mr. Stang revised Condition #3 to state:

- 1) That the approval of this application does not include the proposed sign package and that the applicant be required to submit a future application for the approval of the sign package.

Mr. Parish confirmed that he is in agreement with that condition.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the sign package now meets Code.

Mr. Stang responded that all the proposed signage meets the requirements of the development text with the exception of the red color.

Mr. Stidhem moved and Mr. Wilson seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the five conditions as amended.

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

Motion approved: 4-0.

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

~~Ms. Newell stated that this application is a proposal for exterior modifications and a Master Sign Plan for an existing restaurant zoned Bridge Street District – Commercial. The site is south of~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 7, 2018 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2. PUD – Midwestern Auto Group – Jaguar & Land Rover Signs 5775 Venture Drive
18-031AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

Proposal: New signs for the Jaguar and Land Rover portion of the Midwestern Auto Group campus, zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District – Midwestern Auto Group, Subarea C.

Location: South of Venture Drive, approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the intersection with Perimeter Drive.

Request: Review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance.

Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: <http://dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-031>

MOTION: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan, because it is consistent with all the applicable review criteria, with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant address the comments in this staff report regarding utility separation and landscaping with the submittal of each sign permit.

*Dave Kaldy, representing the applicant, agreed to the above condition.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: This Amended Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes
Jane Fox	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
William Wilson	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION


Logan Stang
Planner I



Motion and Vote

~~Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Conditional Use for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage in building D5 with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)~~

Motion and Vote

~~Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)~~

Motion and Vote

~~Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Development Plan Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)~~

Motion and Vote

~~Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and nine conditions:~~

- ~~1) That the applicant not use highly reflective glass, spandrel, or heavily tinted glass to meet the minimum transparency requirements;~~
- ~~2) That if gated entries are proposed, the applicant will work with staff to provide the required stacking spaces without encroaching the public right-of-way;~~
- ~~3) That the applicant work with staff to ensure that all off-street loading spaces shall be at least 12 feet wide and meet the minimum requirements;~~
- ~~4) That the applicant work with staff to provide required building foundation landscaping along all sides of a building not otherwise occupied by entrances, sidewalk, parking, loading areas, or similar areas;~~
- ~~5) That the applicant work with staff to ensure ground-mounted mechanical equipment is properly screened and is consistent with the design throughout the development;~~
- ~~6) That the applicant work with staff to include lighting within the pedestrianways;~~
- ~~7) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;~~
- ~~8) That the applicant revises the building plan to ensure all door-swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4); and~~
- ~~9) That the applicant continue to maintain and seal the wood paneling to maintain quality of the design.~~

~~The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)~~

2. PUD, Midwestern Auto Group – Jaguar & Land Rover Signs 5775 Venture Drive 18-031AFDP Amended Final Development Plan

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for new signs for the Jaguar and Land Rover portion of the Midwestern Auto Group campus, zoned Planned Unit Development District – Midwestern Auto Group, Subarea C. She said the site is south of Venture Drive, approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the intersection with Perimeter Drive. 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 has the final authority on this application so witnesses will need to be sworn in.

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

The Chair asked the case manager, Logan Stang, if the applicant had agreed to the one condition to which he answered affirmatively.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant address the comments in this staff report regarding utility separation and landscaping with the submittal of each sign permit.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

3. BSD SRN -- Bridge Park East, Section 6 (Block D) 18-038FP

**PID: 273-012703
Final Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the subdivision of 5.296 acres into five lots and rights-of-way for Longshore and Larimer Streets to facilitate the mixed-use development for Block D of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site. She reported that previously the Commission recommended approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat and City Council approved it 2017. For the Final Plat, this will create the development and blocks and lots. She presented the proposed Final Plat and noted the dedication for the public street extensions of Larimer Street onto the west to intersect with the newly created Longshore Street, which will extend from Tuller Ridge Drive to the south and John Shields Parkway to the north. She said Lots 13 and 16 are for the John Shields Parkway Greenway space and the other lots will accommodate the Block D development, which will be reviewed later this evening.

Ms. Burchett reported that Staff has reviewed this application against the Final Plat Criteria and found that all criteria had been met or met with condition. Therefore, she said Staff is recommending approval to City Council for the Final Plat with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

That concluded Ms. Burchett's presentation and she said she could answer any questions and the applicant's representative was also present.

Jane Fox said when Planning was working on the block configuration, she asked if there was any discussion about service streets or alleys. Ms. Burchett said Larimer Street is an extension of Block H and the other streets were created with the original Development Plan back in the early phases. As far as the

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

March 19, 2018

Page 5

~~these events have approved liquor permits. They must obtain City approval before securing liquor permit approval from the State of Ohio.~~

~~Mayor Peterson moved to approve the alcohol waiver for the Fore!Fest event.
Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.~~

~~Mayor Peterson moved to approve the alcohol waiver for the Italian Heritage Summer Festival.
Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes.~~

• **Comprehensive Sign Plan for Midwestern Auto Group** (Case 18-003AFDP)

Ms. Husak stated that this is a request for approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for a comprehensive inventory of existing signs permitted for the MAG Campus.

- This process meets a condition of Ordinance 03-16, the rezoning approved by Council on February 22, 2016. At that time, Council approved the rezoning request to incorporate an additional 5.4 acres into the MAG PUD to accommodate the construction of a combined showroom and service area for the Jaguar and Land Rover brands. At the time of approval, Council members expressed concerns regarding the sign provisions proposed in the development text and requested the applicant to provide an inventory of the campus signs to Council. Although there is no development application process that exists for a comprehensive sign review by Council within a PUD, the applicant agreed to Council’s condition to subject the site to a holistic sign inventory.
- The new showroom is currently under construction with completion anticipated in summer 2018. For the opening of the showroom, the applicant is prepared to have signs installed for that particular building. The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) reviewed the sign inventory at their March 1, 2018 meeting and recommended approval of an Amended Final Development Plan with five conditions to City Council.
- The signs for the campus are distributed among Subareas A, B and C. Subarea A is the original MAG campus that was developed with Perimeter Center in the late 1990s. The development text has unique sign requirements that identify special sign needs for this automotive campus that includes multiple vehicle franchises. The development text follows similar sign requirements for each subarea, with Subarea A reflecting the original sign standards.
- Staff has worked with the applicant closely since 1997 to create appropriate sign categories for the different wayfinding needs of a multi-brand campus. The existing signs on the campus today are the result of their approved PUD zoning. The majority of the signs have been approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
- The development text permits five different types of signs for the MAG campus:
 - Dealership identification: Only one ground dealership identification sign facing US 3/SR 161 is permitted for the campus. It is located in Subarea B.
 - Campus identification: One ground campus identification at the northern and one at the western Venture Drive curb cut, and one at the Perimeter Loop Road access point. This sign type may be up to 15 feet high and 30 inches wide with up to six sign panels for vehicle brands. Logos are permitted to be displayed and may exceed Code-required size limitations. Only the Perimeter Loop road sign and the northern Venture Drive sign are currently installed. Approval of this sign type in Subarea C was delayed pending the application for the comprehensive sign plan.
 - Directional: These signs are permitted throughout the site to provide wayfinding to the various sales and services areas internal to the site. There is no specified number; two types are allowed. The original signs of

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

March 19, 2018

Page 6

Subarea A and unique to that subarea, and a sign that is less than three square feet and interior oriented/not visible from surrounding public streets; primarily for the main building where service areas are below ground.

Note: there are two existing directional-type signs, temporary in nature and of more inferior quality. The Land Rover sign, specifically, was never approved by PZC nor is it interior-oriented. The request is that those signs be removed before the applicant proceeds with any additional signs.

- Brand: These are unique to the site because several different automotive brands are sold across the campus. Signs between the front façade of the building and the parking lot identify the vehicle brand. The applicant will be required to remove the blank sign panel adjacent to the VW brand sign, one of the two Bentley brand signs, and one of the two Porsche brand signs, as the text limits one sign per brand.
- Wall: Permitted in each subarea, the regulations vary greatly per the development text.
 - Subarea A: There are two existing signs, for which removal is requested: (1) the Land Rover wall sign, as Land Rover is moving to Subarea C; (2) the MAG Welcome sign on the main dealership building, which does not meet the development text.
 - Subarea B: One sign permitted per brand; Audi, BMW and Mini each have a sign. They are requesting that the Audi service sign be removed as it does not meet the materials requirement of the text.
 - Subarea C: Permits two wall signs along the façade, one each for Jaguar and Land Rover. PZC approved the wall signs, which meet the Final Development text in terms of height and size, pending Council’s approval of the comprehensive sign plan. None of the other signs for Subarea C were approved, as the details weren’t known. The applicant is aware that PZC approval is required. What is included in this comprehensive sign plan does not meet the text, but the applicant has been informed of the need to decrease the size to obtain approval.

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Amended Final Development Plan to City Council on March 1, 2018 with the conditions listed below.

Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan Conditions:

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

Planning recommends City Council approval of an Amended Final Development Plan with one additional condition:

- 6) That one of the Porsche brand signs be removed from the campus and this comprehensive sign plan.

Ms. Husak noted that Mr. Parrish, from MAG, is present to respond to questions.

Council Discussion:

Mr. Reiner stated that she indicated that the service signs will be removed. How will that directional need be met internally?

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

March 19, 2018Page 7

Ms. Husak responded that the request is that they remove only the directional service signs that do not meet the quality standards. Staff can work with them to install directional signs for the service area that are of a more permanent nature.

Mr. Reiner responded that his concern is that their customers continue to be able to locate the service areas.

Ms. De Rosa stated that her understanding was that all of the service signs would not be removed. The intent is only to make the signs consistent.

Ms. Claudia confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Keenan noted that there was a previous lengthy discussion by Council on this subject.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Parrish for undertaking this effort. There was a lot of signage to inventory. This campus has been in an evolutionary process for 15 years or more. Council appreciates that they have taken the time to make sure that the campus meets the desired appearance standards.

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the Midwest Auto Group (MAG) amended final development plan comprehensive sign plan.

Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.

• **Naming of Park in Tuller Flats**

~~Mr. Earman stated that Dublin's 61st park will soon be open to the public, but is in need of a name. At the October 23, 2017 City Council meeting, Council requested staff to conduct an internally driven process to obtain a recommendation for naming the park. Through the internal process, several nominations were received. The criteria to be considered for a name included: the location within the Bridge Street District, the geographic shape of the park and the relevant history of the Tuller family within the area. The Tuller family was among the early settlers of Dublin in the early to mid-1800s. The first family members owned and farmed land within the area and were business owners, including an ashery in Historic Dublin and a flour mill on the Scioto River. In addition to the Tuller family history, the park is located in the Bridge Street District in close proximity to Tuller Flats, and the shape of its area is square. Hence, the recommendation of Tuller Square Park. The park will be programmed for small events, programs and entertainment.~~

~~Ms. De Rosa inquired what type of signage would be used for the park.~~

~~Mr. Earman responded that work continues on the Bridge Street District signage, including both Bridge Street District parks. The Riverside Crossing Park is also in development. In the meantime, the typical City park sign that is used throughout the City will be used for this park, as well.~~

~~Mayor Peterson stated that may be the best idea. would make it easier for the public to recognize that this is a public park, not a private park.~~

~~Ms. De Rosa stated that the City has discussed at length creative signage for the Bridge Street District. Perhaps there is the opportunity to combine the traditional with the newer creative signage.~~

~~Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired if the intention is not to have internal walkways. The park will consist of turf only.~~

~~Mr. Earman stated that the current design is for turf only. The future design will include an iconic, educational or interactive feature, perhaps related to stormwater management in that area. That concept is in the discussion stage only. Any suggestion or direction would be welcomed.~~

~~Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that a traditional street grid network is being used in this district, and this will be a traditional urban park, even though it is surrounded by more contemporary architecture. Looking at those aspects, she believes a traditional, urban grid street network type of signage would be most appropriate. In New York, a~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 1, 2018 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

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

Proposal: A consolidated inventory of signs for the existing Midwestern Auto Group campus. The 30-acre site is zoned Planned Unit District.

Location: South of Perimeter Drive, approximately 250 feet south of the intersection with Venture Drive.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Midwestern Auto Group represented by Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance.

Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

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

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

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: The Amended Final Development Plan was recommended for approval to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes
Jane Fox	Absent
Robert Miller	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Fishman and Kristina Kennedy both agreed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Motion and Vote

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

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

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

3. Dublin Corporate Area Plan 17-093ADM

Introduction Administrative Request

Postponed prior to meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

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



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 20, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. Midwestern Auto Group – Land Rover and Jaguar 6335 Perimeter Loop Road
17-014AFDP Amended Final Development Plan

Proposal: An amendment to the previously approved Land Rover and Jaguar building to reduce the building footprint. The site is on the south side of Venture Drive, approximately 600 feet south of the intersection with Perimeter Drive.

Request: Review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance representing Midwestern Auto Group.

Planning Contact: Logan M. Stang, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. Mitchell seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan because it complies with the amended final development plan criteria, with seven conditions:

- 1) That the approval of this application includes only the Jaguar and Land Rover wall signs and that they be included for review in the future cohesive sign package and that no permits may be issued for these signs until the cohesive sign package is reviewed and approved by the Commission and City Council;
- 2) That the plans be revised to provide seven foot landscape islands from the inside of curb to ensure interior landscape requirements are met, prior to building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to continue the 2:1 grove design along SR 161/US 33, subject to staff approval;
- 4) That the landscape plans be revised to ensure all existing and proposed plant materials are identified, prior to building permitting;
- 5) That the landscape plans be revised to include an additional deciduous tree behind the pond along SR 161/US 33 to satisfy the one tree per 40 feet requirement, prior to building permitting;
- 6) That the applicant work with Engineering to demonstrate continued compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and
- 7) That the applicant comply with the maximum allowable slopes along the retention basins as defined in the Stormwater Design Manual to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.



**2. Midwestern Auto Group – Land Rover and Jaguar
17-014AFDP**

**6335 Perimeter Loop Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

VOTE: 6 – 0

RESULT: The Amended Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Absent
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Logan M. Stang, Planner I



~~complex but they also have back loaded garages so if guests come, they end up parking in front of the garage door.~~

~~Mr. Suiter pointed out there are two-car garages with each of the single-family units and there is 'grandmother' parking behind them. He said there is some 'buddy' parking but the majority of the streets are not the alleys of the area but rather yield access so folks can park on one side of street still allowing for two-lane traffic. He said while Columbus is still a driving community, people will have to walk a little farther, similar to German Village.~~

~~Ms. Mitchell restated the people that will be drawn to this type of community will not have any trouble with that type of parking arrangement.~~

~~Ms. De Rosa again referred back to similar communities she has seen and noted parking is not right across the street but it is closer to some of the amenities she brought up earlier. She said you want people to be able to park to participate in some of the amenities so the parking does not need to be in front of each house to be effective; we will want people to come to the little farmer's market, etc.~~

~~Ms. Newell said she loves the fact that one will be able to drive down Shier Rings Road and see the front of the residences; she said she hates to drive around Dublin and see people's backyards and sideyards.~~

~~Ms. Newell concluded the architecture for the single-family residences are wonderful, but she does not quite see the same character for the multi-family units. She again encouraged the applicant to combine garages for better walkability.~~

**2. Midwestern Auto Group – Land Rover and Jaguar
 17-014AFDP**

**6335 Perimeter Loop Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is an amendment to the previously approved Land Rover and Jaguar building to reduce the building footprint. She said the site is on the south side of Venture Drive, approximately 600 feet south of the intersection with Perimeter Drive. 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.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission in regard to this case. She determined a formal case presentation was not needed. She said approval is recommended for the Amended Final Development Plan with the following seven conditions:

- 1) That the approval of this application includes only the Jaguar and Land Rover wall signs and that they be included for review in the future cohesive sign package and that no permits may be issued for these signs until the cohesive sign package is reviewed and approved by the Commission and City Council;
- 2) That the plans be revised to provide seven-foot landscape islands from the inside of the curb to ensure interior landscape requirements are met, prior to building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to continue the 2:1 grove design along SR 161/US 33, subject to staff approval;
- 4) That the landscape plans be revised to ensure all existing and proposed plant materials are identified, prior to building permitting;
- 5) That the landscape plans be revised to include an additional deciduous tree behind the pond along SR 161/US 33 to satisfy the one tree per 40 feet requirement, prior to building permitting;
- 6) That the applicant work with Engineering to demonstrate continued compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and

- 7) That the applicant comply with the maximum allowable slopes along the retention basins as defined in the Stormwater Design Manual to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

The applicant agreed to the above conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the seven conditions as written above. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Communications

~~Claudia Husak said there should be invitations for the Commissioners to attend the Central Ohio Planning Zoning Workshop that is normally held in May that the Ohio APA puts on. She explained it is a whole day of really good learning opportunities.~~

~~Ms. Husak said there is a Work Session that Council is having June 19; not a joint work session but the Commission is invited.~~

~~Cathy De Rosa requested more education or overview at some point about how annexation works with regard to timing. Amy Salay said the annexation laws have changed significantly and there are two different tracks people can take to get their property annexed.~~

~~Thaddeus Boggs said it would be easy to confuse someone about all the laws of annexation. He suggested that projects that have been worked on recently could be reviewed.~~

~~Ms. Husak noted this application applies to just two acres that are not in the City yet. She said it is new for staff to be permitted to take informal applications to the Commission without sites being annexed as it that was not the case a few years back. Apparently, she said it is common in other municipalities so city management determined that would be appropriate since no formal action is taken.~~

~~The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:36 pm.~~

~~As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 18, 2017.~~

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

APRIL 21, 2016

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**3. MAG, Subarea C – Land Rover/Jaguar Expansion 6335 Perimeter Loop Road
16-017FDP Final Development Plan**

Proposal: An approximately 30,000-square-foot showroom, service area, non-retail car wash and all associated site improvements for the Land Rover and Jaguar brands within the MAG Planned Unit Development on the north side of US 33/SR 161 and the south side of Venture Drive approximately 600 feet south of the intersection with Perimeter Drive.

Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Brad Parish, President, Architectural Alliance.

Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #1: Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded to approve the Final Development Plan with six conditions:

- 1) That the applicant pay a fee in lieu of tree replacement prior to filing for building permitting;
- 2) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to include deciduous trees every forty feet adjacent to the east property line prior to filing for building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant provide a 4:1 maximum slope along the west edge of the proposed retention basin as well as a flat buffer zone between the drive aisle and top of bank of the retention basin;
- 4) That the applicant provide details for the proposed location and construction of the landscaping wall, in the event a retaining wall is required around the retention basin, subject to Staff approval; and
- 5) That the plans be revised to incorporate a retention pond along the southern boundary of Subarea C and that the applicant continue to work with Engineering to meet all stormwater management requirements outlined in Chapter 53.
- 6) That the approval of this Final Development Plan includes only the Jaguar and Land Rover wall signs and they be included for review in the future cohesive sign package and that no permits may be issued for these signs until the cohesive sign package is reviewed by the Commission and City Council.

VOTE: 7 – 0

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was approved.

**3. MAG, Subarea C – Land Rover/Jaguar Expansion
16-017FDP**

**6335 Perimeter Loop Road
Final Development Plan**

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

MOTION #2: Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded to approve the Minor Text Modification as the proposed pavement setback change is appropriate for the campus expansion:

"Decrease the pavement setback from SR 161/US 33 within Subarea C from 45 feet to 40 feet for the MAG Planned Unit Development District."

VOTE: 7 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Text Modification was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Logan Stang, Planner I

~~Victoria Newell said the same thing. She asked what the doors would be proposed for the wash bay as she assumed the applicant will need an overhead door. Ms. Cabral answered the applicant had not explored that yet but she would recommend an aesthetically pleasing door that the PZC could approve.~~

~~Ms. Newell said the Code requires so much back up space. She asked if the applicant can provide a plan that reduces the number of parking spaces. She said she does not like to add asphalt in an area that is not going to get used. She said she understands the circulation from an operational standpoint. Ms. Cabral indicated the number of parking spaces could be reduced as the employees will not need that many.~~

~~Ms. Cabral stated that she threw everything in this proposal just to see what could be attained as this is just an Informal Review.~~

~~Deborah Mitchell said she is very excited about a car wash as she loves them. She said she agreed with Ms. Salay about the landscaping; landscaping should not be removed. She indicated that if this car wash is not being used it is not because it is hidden behind landscaping it is a marketing problem. She said people will find it if they know it exists. She suggested digital tools can be used to get the word out. She stated there was definitely a use for this in Dublin and should be in high demand. She encouraged the applicant to rethink their model by making it more of an assembly line.~~

~~Ms. Cabral said the tunnel will take a lot of cars through fast. She said she always advises her clients, from a number of different kinds of businesses, to call the Postal Service and sign up for the route-by-route postcard campaign for a lot less than the cost of postcard stamps.~~

~~Ms. Mitchell said her bottom line is that the applicant can have a very successful business model with a low impact on the neighborhood to which Ms. Cabral agreed.~~

~~Mr. Brown said he knows what the Code says but encouraged the applicant to apply for a modification so they can get a good stack up on the tunnel and semi-automatic and to also do more landscaping.~~

3. MAG, Subarea C – Land Rover/Jaguar Expansion 16-017FDP

6335 Perimeter Loop Road Final Development Plan

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a proposal for an approximately 30,000-square-foot showroom, service area, non-retail car wash and all associated site improvements for the Land Rover and Jaguar brands within the MAG Planned Unit Development on the north side of US 33/SR 161 and the south side of Venture Drive approximately 600 feet south of the intersection with Perimeter Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She stated the Commission is the final authority and anyone intending to address the Commission will need to be sworn-in.

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

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site and a graphic showing the third and final phase of the PUD process. He said the campus, with the addition of Subarea C, was reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission in October of last year for a Concept Plan. After receiving feedback, he said the applicant applied for the rezoning of the entire campus along with the Preliminary Development Plan which received approval from the Commission in January and City Council's approval in February 2016.

Mr. Stang said the campus consists of three subareas marked A thru C, which he highlighted. He presented the Proposed Subarea C Site Plan and explained the proposal is for a 30,000-square-foot showroom and service center for the Jaguar and Land Rover manufacturers along with the creation and

reconfiguring of a retention basin that services this site, Subarea B, and the finger like display areas that are common throughout the campus. He said part of this application includes a minor text modification with regard to pavement setbacks from US 33. Due to right-of-way takes for the 270/33 interchange project, he said a number of properties including MAG required revisions to their respective development standards. At the time of rezoning the development standards, he said Subarea C mirrored Subarea B to the west, which included this text modification from a previous application. He stated the right-of-way impacts for Subarea C were much greater than in the other two subareas and therefore a text modification is required to address this issue by decreasing the pavement setback from 45 feet to 40 feet. He concluded this will create a consistent setback and treatment along the US 33 frontage.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed elevations. He said the proposed architecture for the building compliments the contemporary look of the existing campus. He noted the south elevation on the top of the slide is the front of the showroom, which faces US 33, similar to buildings located in Subarea B. He stated the primary materials consist of glass, metal, and concrete masonry units that wrap various portions of the building and the architecture provides a number of recessed windows and entrances, which enhance the aesthetics of the site and provide a visually appealing gateway to the campus. He presented additional renderings that showed the changes in material and potential viewpoints when traveling through the site. He noted the top image is a view for the entrance to the service center looking northwest; the bottom is looking northeast from the parking area.

Mr. Stang presented the Proposed Landscape Plan. He said the applicant has provided a tree preservation plan as part of this application, which indicates that all existing trees, with the exception of 3, will be transplanted throughout the site as part of the proposed landscape plans. He indicated the existing retention basin and landscaping were counted for previous Code requirements; the transplanted trees cannot be counted for requirements with this application. He stated the applicant will be required to pay a fee-in-lieu of replacement for 79 trees and to add deciduous trees along the eastern property line **adjacent to Nationwide Children's Hospital**, as part of this approval.

Mr. Stang presented the Proposed Signs. He explained the proposal includes five signs chosen from the five different sign types permitted in the MAG development text. He noted there are two wall signs and two brand signs (which are monument signs) one for each manufacturer and one campus identification sign. He said the first wall sign is the Jaguar sign that sits in the upper left corner of the south elevation fronting US 33. He said the second wall sign is for Land Rover and sits in the upper right corner of the south elevation. During the rezoning application, he said a condition was added that permitted one wall sign up to 55 square feet as long as all wall signs do not exceed 100 square feet. He said this proposal meets this and all other applicable standards. He said the next proposal is for the brand signs, which are located at the service drive entrance. He stated the applicant is proposing two brand signs next to one another due to the development text regulating only one manufacturer is permitted on a brand sign. He said the last sign is a campus identification sign that is permitted along Venture Drive and is located near **the shared access with Nationwide Children's Hospital. This sign** he said is identical to the existing campus identification signs. He concluded the entire sign proposal meets the standards outlined in the development text, however during City Council's review of the Preliminary Development Plan, concerns were brought up regarding the number of permitted signs for the entire campus. He said Council added a condition that the applicant provide a Master Sign Plan for the campus subject to review and approval by the Commission and City Council and this proposal will be included as part of the Master Sign Plan approval.

Mr. Stang presented a Stormwater Management graphic. He explained the site currently contains a retention basin for the campus that is being moved and modified to service this proposal as well as portions of the existing campus. He said the proposed retention basin is located near the shared access with **Children's Hospital**. He indicated staff is requesting that the applicant continue to work with Engineering in order to ensure all stormwater management regulations are met. He stated the City also requires that the slope of retention basins cannot exceed a 4:1 ratio; the applicant will need to meet this

requirement and may need to install a retaining wall along the display and parking areas to address the grade change. If a retaining wall is needed then, he indicated the applicant will also need to provide the construction details and location for the retaining wall, subject to Staff approval. He said that during the Preliminary Development Plan Review, the applicant provided two options for the site with one containing a second retention pond along US 33. He said City Council had concerns with the second pond and requested that it be removed from the proposal; the applicant would like to discuss the second pond tonight as part of a future application.

Mr. Stang said Staff is recommending approval of a Minor Text Modification to decrease the pavement setback from 45 to 40 feet within Subarea C.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the Final Development Plan with five conditions:

- 1) That the applicant pay a fee-in-lieu of tree replacement prior to filing for building permitting;
- 2) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to include deciduous trees every forty feet adjacent to the east property line, prior to filing for building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant provide a 4:1 maximum slope along the west edge of the proposed retention basin as well as a flat buffer zone between the drive aisle and top of bank of the retention basin;
- 4) That the applicant provide details for the proposed location and construction of the landscaping wall, in the event a retaining wall is required around the retention basin, subject to Staff approval; and
- 5) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to meet all stormwater management requirements outlined in Chapter 53.

Ms. Newell inquired about the Master Sign Plan. **Claudia Husak explained City Council's condition, which** was that no sign permits could be issued until this MSP gets through PZC and City Council. From a Staff perspective, she indicated it is confusing as there is a Development Text in place which the applicant is meeting with this proposal. She clarified that the Commission is being asked to vote on the signs this evening but permitting cannot go forward until this sign plan has been through the process that Council requested.

Ms. Newell asked about the two signs side by side. Mr. Stang explained, for the brand sign, the applicant is permitted to have one logo that displays the manufacturer on it but they can only have one manufacturer per brand sign so on some of the other portions of the site they have similar brand signs for the manufacturers that are placed next to each other because it can be considered one sign. He said the alternative would be to separate those and have two separate brand signs next to each other but not one sign specifically.

Ms. Newell asked for the definition of a brand sign. Mr. Stang said it is a ground sign that is located on the service center. He said there are five permitted sign **types for MAG's campus. He said each subarea is** permitted these five different sign types.

Amy Salay said given the City's desire to have a sign plan for the entire campus due to the amount of different signs, she asked if it is possible for the PZC to delete the signs from this application and then have the applicant bring back the plan to then get the signs for this portion of the program.

Ms. Husak said staff is struggling with the fact there is no sign plan requirement within the PUD. She explained there is a zoning text in place that has standards for sign types on the campus.

Ms. Salay asked why this was not brought up at Council. Ms. Husak indicated it was discussed as far as the applicant bringing forward all the signs that were on the campus as a sign plan.

Ms. Salay asked for further clarification.

Philip Hartmann said he is struggling - if information is in the text then there is an underlying right to the signs. He said it sounds like the applicant agreed to have an overall review by Council.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, 165 N. Fifth Street, said the discussion with City Council was that he needs to get the signs a part of this package approved but is willing to bring back a total Sign Plan for the site so we can make a cohesive sign package. He said even though we are approving the sign within the package, he is not able to build the sign but is able to go to the manufacturer and go to the next step with them because he would have this sign package approved.

Mr. Parish said they are not going to break ground until September and it will take 10 - 12 months for construction so the sign process will align with the ending of this building.

Mr. Parish emphasized the proposed wall signs are his biggest concern. He said Council's concern was the hodgepodge of ground signs.

Mr. Brown was contemplating approval for the wall signs tonight but asking the applicant to come back for the ground signs.

The Chair asked the applicant if he had a presentation, which did not include signage.

Mr. Parish asked to have a brief conversation regarding the pond in the front along SR 161. He recalled the conversation of City Council was not that the applicant must remove the pond but more of work with Staff to explore removing it or not. He said they did that and approval tonight is important for that in order to meet their next steps with Jaguar. He asked if he could bring back the pond conversation when he brings back the Amended Final Development Plan for Porsche and Lamborghini. He indicated it is the desire of the owner of MAG to have that pond in front for a few reasons: 1) display windows at the tips of the "fingers" in Subarea A at 25% whether it was achieved that way or not; 2) Subarea B comments were about the execution of the "fingers" and MAG agreed to give up the vehicular display requirement for the pond in front 3) as the application is now we have a three-foot berm across the length of the site and part of the Zoning Code of Dublin, would at least allow a 25% display window for vehicles but they said they were going to block the display window and provide a window to the building over the pond. Mr. Parish wanted to know if the pond is appropriate or not.

Ms. Newell said she has always liked the pond. She said she understands the 25%. She said this site has always had a very artistic display, nicely landscaped, and is attractive to look at down SR 161. She said she views the pond as a landscaping amenity.

Ms. Salay said the conversation was mixed amongst Council members regarding the mounding and the pond. She inquired about the Honey Locust trees that appear to have been lopped off at the top. She said she is okay with the pond but would like to see all the trees on the plan as shown.

Ms. Salay said personally she was okay with the pond but did not know where City Council had landed.

Ms. Husak indicated she did not sense that the majority had a problem with the pond. She said staff left **the condition loose and said "work with staff to the extent possible". She said staff originally advised Mr. Parish to go without the pond and that is the plan they have reviewed and before the Commission tonight but he wanted to get feedback.**

Mr. Brown said his impression is drives at US 33 currently sits with that big concrete divider going down the middle so #1 the building signs have to be that high in this case. He said coming the other direction, they are still doing that dedicated lane from I-270 so vehicles can exit on Avery Road. He indicated it is going to be a lot of cold, harsh concrete. He said the MAG campus as a composition has been terrific and

anything that continues the current rhythm, scale, and composition of what is established is a bonus so having that pond there, if it is important to that rhythm of the trees, pond, fingers, and well-designed buildings it is a bonus. He said he leans towards the people that created this aesthetic that he enjoys and is one of the best looking car dealerships he has ever seen.

Ms. De Rosa said she liked the pond and not quite sure why some do not as it really adds to the campus and continues the theme. She said she is in favor of the pond.

Ms. Newell said there was a lot of discussion in past history in terms of nobody ever wanting to see an auto dealership on SR 161, period. She said it all started with the Mercedes dealership; it was heavily screened and still is.

Ms. De Rosa said the MAG campus is the most interesting architecture in the City.

Ms. Newell inquired about the branding signs. She said it is awkward that the two are sitting right next to each other. Mr. Parish explained it is more about denoting the entrance to the service drive. He said he really does not care about those signs until they submit their sign plan.

Ms. Newell recalled a very lengthy discussion last time and in agreement about the wall signs being proposed on the building and thought he brought back exactly what the Commission had agreed upon last time so she does not have any issues with the wall signs.

Ms. Newell asked for **staff's recommendation on the sign package** because she is not sure if the Commission should be voting on it or not.

Mr. Parish asked if a condition can be included to add the pond in and work with staff so he does not have to bring it back.

Mr. Stang said Engineering would need to review the pond portion more thoroughly to ensure what is being proposed meets all the requirements since it is a new pond in addition to the underground storage. He said it would be a large element to condition.

Mr. Parish emphasized it is Engineering versus the design side. He said he is prepared to accommodate any of the requirements.

Michael Hendershot said if the pond is added back in, he would imagine that the underground storage proposed would be reduced.

Mr. Parish restated it is Engineering versus aesthetics and desire.

Mr. Hendershot said from his standpoint he would need to be comfortable with it before he approves for permitting so he thought it could be conditioned.

Mr. Parish said the applicant would not be pursuing permits for another two months so there is lots of time for discussion.

Ms. Newell stated she was supportive of adding it as a condition if staff is comfortable and they can work it out as she has no doubt that **staff will make the applicant's engineering perform properly. She said this** applicant has been before the Commission a number of times and if we can make this process go a little bit quicker for something we all pretty much agree that we are happy to see then we should do it.

Mr. Parish emphasized he needed the wall signs approved. He said he has two years to build a building. He said Jaguar is coming May 9th and he has to walk away with a building with wall signs.

Mr. Brown asked if there was a big objection to the wall signs as opposed to all the ground signs. Mr. Parish said it is just what they agreed upon. He said he is not building it tomorrow, but with his check box with the brand he needs to have that checked off.

Ms. Salay said if the applicant were to get approval for just the wall signs tonight, Mr. Parish could go to his client and say he has approval but what if Council and PZC say they do not like wall signs when the Master Sign Plan is submitted. She said Mr. Parish might get what he needs this evening but not going forward.

Mr. Parish indicated the discussion from Council about the sign package was more relevant to directional, interior, and signs as a collective thing. He said he even emphasized to Council that these wall signs are what he needs for the brand but other signs were up for play.

Ms. Salay agreed with Mr. Parish but recalled the concern was for the amount of different signs overall and not the wall signs as being a problem. She also noted the internal signs that function as signage.

The Chair asked if the Commission could approve only the wall signs.

Mr. Hartmann said Council did not take away the right to approve signs separately; they just wanted to applicant to return with a cohesive package. He said what is awkward is Commission could approve this and Council could see the whole plan and feel strange because now they are taking away something that was recently granted.

The Chair asked if it can be done in such a way as to not keep the applicant from moving forward but part of the issue is the full quantity of signage that this text permits for the applicant. She said she would be in favor of voting for the two wall signs with a condition that there is no other signage being permitted. If the applicant wants to come back and gain the other signs then they could with the whole package presented she said.

Mr. Brown agreed. He said he cannot fathom Council or anyone else objecting to the wall signs, basically because all you have to do is drive east on US 33 and that is the only identification that is visible on the whole campus.

Ms. Newell said she understands the text states that it is permitted but to move past that she is suggesting the two wall signs get approved and add an agreement that the Commission is not approving any other signs.

Ms. Rauch proposed condition 6 that states that only the wall signs would be approved but still part of the review by Council in the overall package. Mr. Parish agreed that made sense.

Ms. Salay confirmed the applicant would not need to pull permits for two years. Mr. Parish added until the building is ready to go and they are not ready yet. He said getting the wall signs will satisfy the next step for him.

Ms. De Rosa recalled the discussion about the size and height of the signs. She asked if those issues are contingent with his partnership with the manufacturer. Mr. Parish recalled it was more about the proportion of the building and noted the most appropriate location for the wall signs.

Ms. Newell said technically this proposal is at a higher elevation than what is permitted and the Commission supported that because aesthetically, it makes sense to this building. Mr. Parish said if he had to lower the signs, he would have to lower the building to keep the scale proportionate.

Ms. De Rosa said she thought the Commission agreed they like the proposed signs but asked that if this comes back as a problem as part of the whole package, if that would be a problem for the applicant.

Ms. Salay said height is always a discussion at Council. She said the community standard is for lower and smaller signs. She said she did not understand the proportions and aesthetics. Mr. Parish explained it to her as it related to this building. Ms. Newell, as an architect, agreed with the applicant and added if the sign were kept within the 12-foot requirement, the building would look worse and not better and the goal is to have a really attractive looking building so the signs should be properly integrated. She said it was important to keep it consistent with the other buildings.

Mr. Brown said it is very evident with the concrete barrier heading east it is amazing you read that line of signs above the concrete wall.

The Chair called for all six conditions to be placed on the screen for viewing. She noted there was not anyone from the public present this evening. She asked the applicant if he was comfortable with all six conditions of approval for the Final Development Plan. Mr. Parish agreed to the six conditions.

Mr. Stang recommended approval of the Minor Text Modification as the proposed pavement setback change is appropriate for the campus expansion:

"Decrease the pavement setback from SR 161/US 33 within Subarea C from 45 feet to 40 feet for the MAG Planned Unit Development District."

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Minor Text Modification. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with six conditions:

- 1) That the applicant pay a fee-in-lieu of tree replacement prior to filing for building permitting;
- 2) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to include deciduous trees every forty feet adjacent to the east property line prior to filing for building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant provide a 4:1 maximum slope along the west edge of the proposed retention basin as well as a flat buffer zone between the drive aisle and top of bank of the retention basin;
- 4) That the applicant provide details for the proposed location and construction of the landscaping wall, in the event a retaining wall is required around the retention basin, subject to Staff approval;
- 5) That the plans be revised to incorporate a retention pond along the southern boundary of Subarea C and that the applicant continue to work with Engineering to meet all stormwater management requirements outlined in Chapter 53; and,
- 6) That the approval of this Final Development Plan includes only the Jaguar and Land Rover wall signs and they be included for review in the future cohesive sign package and that no permits may be issued for these signs until the cohesive sign package is reviewed by the Commission and City Council.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS • DAYTON, OHIO

Form #101

Held

February 22, 2016

Page 5 of 23

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Pipeline Relocation Agreement with Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. for the Relocation of a Three-Inch Pipeline located along Rings Road and Churchman Road in Connection with the Construction of a Roundabout at the Intersection of Rings Road and Churchman Road.

- Approval of Final Plat – Coffman Reserve (14-044FDP/FP)

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING/VOTE – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 03-16

Rezoning Approximately 30 Acres, Located on the East Side of Perimeter Loop Drive, North of US US33/SR 161, South of Perimeter Drive and Venture Drive from PUD, Planned Unit Development District (existing MAG plan) and PCD, Planned Commerce District (Perimeter Center, Subarea D) to PUD (Midwestern Auto Group PUD) to Incorporate Approximately 5.4 Acres into the MAG PUD to Expand the Automobile Dealership Campus to Accommodate the Construction of a Combined Showroom for the Jaguar and Land Rover Brands, the Future Demolition of the Existing Land Rover Showroom, a New Showroom for the Porsche Brand, and the Addition of an Elevated Showroom Addition to the Main Building for the Lamborghini Brand. (Case 15-113Z/PDP)

Ms. Husak updated Council regarding issues discussed at first reading. The applicant's representatives, Brad Parrish and Jack Reynolds are present to respond to questions as well.

- She provided a quick overview of the site. The applicant is proposing to create a new subarea, Subarea C, to accommodate Land Rover and Jaguar as a franchise building/showroom/service area within the MAG PUD as well as accommodate display areas, stormwater management and parking for employees and customers.
- She shared a slide depicting the entire campus and described the various components.
- The applicant has provided a revised site plan that shows a more curvilinear entry drive into the service area. It also includes additional articulation with windows and landscaping along that portion of the building.
- She shared the remainder of all of the elevations.
- She shared pictures, as requested by Council, of the existing campus area. This includes the Audi building in the center of the site, the Mini portion of the combined BMW/Mini building, and just to the east off the screen is where the new Land Rover and Jaguar building would be located.
- Moving to the west, she shared a view of the Volvo showroom. Currently, Porsche is housed in this part of the building as well. The owners' penthouse suite is on the second level.
- Another question related to signage. The applicant has provided a sign inventory, which showcases all of the five sign types permitted within the development text today. These include Dealer Identification signs, Campus Identification signs, Directional signs, Brand signs and Wall signs. The location of the existing signs is marked in red on the drawing as well as the proposed signs included for this application.
- She provided a quick overview of the signs on the campus that exist today. As discussed at the last hearing, the applicant is proposing wall signs on the south elevation of the building for both Jaguar and Land Rover. Staff has found in the inventory a sign that does not meet the development text and has therefore recommended a condition that requires the sign to be removed or to meet the development text. There are directional sign standards within the text.

Staff recommends approval with the 11 conditions of P&Z and this additional 12th condition.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 22, 2016

Page 6 of 23

The applicant is present tonight to respond to questions.

Mr. Lecklider noted that he continues to have concerns regarding the need for a master sign plan. He believes the record reflects that sentiment was expressed by the Planning and Zoning Commission in 2014. This new application presents an opportunity for an inventory of the signs and to make sure that, to the extent that Council is satisfied with the existing and the proposed signage, that this is memorialized going forward.

Ms. Salay agrees with having a master sign plan. She noted that on page three of the photos shared by staff, signs D10 and D11 appear to be temporary in nature as is the Volvo sign. Those should be added to the new condition. With US33 signs on the site and no one being certain if they were added over time, it is appropriate to review this as a master sign plan now that the campus is being completed. Whenever cases are brought to the Commission, the more photos that are provided of existing conditions the better. The Commission's discussion may have been different if these photos had been available.

Mr. Lecklider stated that his suggestion for a master sign plan review includes the internal signs that are visible from the right of way, as discussed at the first reading. Perhaps there was more detail about the height of internal signs. He knows that there are internal signs that are lighted and are visible at night from westbound US33. His suggestion is to include that in the larger master sign proposal.

Ms. Salay responded that at this time, those internal signs are not regulated under the City's Code. Any business could have these. She proposes that the City needs to regulate these, as they are signage and as such should be regulated throughout the community.

Mr. Reiner thanked the applicant for addressing the problems with the elevation. In terms of the signage, he agrees that any consolidation would be great. Most of the signs are directional and are beneficial in terms of visitors finding their way through the campus. He understands why they have added signs over time, but agrees that the City does limit signs for purposes of aesthetics.

Mr. Keenan stated that his own experience in visiting this campus is that it is difficult to navigate through it. He is not suggesting anything the City would not impose on itself, such as the wayfinding for Historic Dublin, but an overall comprehensive sign study would lend itself well to the entire project.

Ms. Alutto agreed. They also are customers and visit this campus. The only issue she sees is with the variety of the signs, and that they do not appear to be contiguous across areas. Renderings are needed where photos are not available for review. Dublin's high sign standards are an identifier for the City, and it is important to stay consistent.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if staff has a calculation of the square footage of signage on the campus. That would be an important number to have for this discussion.

Ms. Husak stated that she does not have this information available.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she is a proponent of having a master sign plan for this campus, and would like to have the total square footage of signage for the property for future review.

Mayor Peterson asked if the applicant wants to respond to the signage issues at this point. There is obviously unanimous concern about the signage.

Brad Parrish, Architectural Alliance, representative of MAG noted the following:

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 22, 2016

Page 7 of 23

1. He, too, reviewed the signage on the campus and found three signs that are non-conforming – D2, D11 and D10. He has addressed that with the owner and they have intentions to remove them and somehow incorporate them into the blade signage on the site.
2. He emphasized that MAG campus is an automotive shopping mall representing 16 brands. Every brand needs to be represented in the internal workings of the campus. Over the time he has worked with this client and the City, they started a categorization of directional, brand and campus signs. He did speak with the owner about signage in totality. They would like to bring back a master sign plan. However, that will require some period of time to complete for this unique campus. He does not want that to hold up the approval of these last five acres and the wall signs that are associated with the Jaguar and Land Rover facilities. If that can be addressed through a condition, he will submit a master sign plan for the entire site at a later date.

Mayor Peterson asked staff about the best way to accomplish this.

Ms. Readler responded that a condition can be added that requires the applicant to return for a master sign plan approval, which can be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission for recommendation to Council.

Mayor Peterson responded that seems consistent with the City's standard procedures. He asked if all would be satisfied with this condition related to the signage issues. It was the consensus of Council to proceed in this manner.

Mayor Peterson asked Mr. Lecklider about any remaining issues he would like to discuss about signage.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he wants to clarify, with the consent of Council, that this master sign plan would include the interior signs as well.

Mayor Peterson responded that the applicant seems to be cooperative about all of the signage issues, and it can certainly be discussed.

Mr. Lecklider stated he would like to have this discussion, including whether it should be grandfathered or not. He would like to ask staff, apart from the MAG application, to review regulations citywide going forward for that particular issue.

Mayor Peterson stated that he notes that the dealership turns on the car flashers in the showroom. It seems this would not be allowed for any other business. Perhaps that should be discussed as well.

Mayor Peterson stated that the additional condition would include submission of a master sign plan, and working with staff and Planning Commission on a recommendation for Council.

Ms. Amorose Groomes commented:

1. The last time the campus was finished, mounding was installed related to the setback along US33. In this iteration, they want to remove a section of the mounding in order to provide a greater vista into the facility from the US33 frontage. There are a series of car dealerships in the community that began as one dealership and changed to another dealership. Examples are the Cadillac dealership on Sawmill that is now Honda; the Hummer dealership on SR161 that is now a Cadillac dealership; the Porsche dealership on Post Road that is now used cars. The City does not have future control over what type of cars will be sold at this facility. She wants to ensure the maintenance of the aesthetics along the US33 corridor. The City indicated it did not want it to be full of car dealerships, yet that is what has occurred. The City wanted consistent mounding along that area so that the view would not be a "sea" of cars for sale. Each time areas of the mounding are removed, the vistas into the car dealerships are opened. She has concerns, not with the cars being sold

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 22, 2016

Page 8 of 23

today and the high quality of the buildings, but with removing some of the mounding and making this a pond. It seems the size of the pond nearby could be extended, the "fingers" could be moved, and the mounding could be continued that has been in place previously. She would like to hear input about this.

2. She is aware that the City asked the applicant to hold the hedge plantings five feet off the back of the curb. Are these hedge plantings being held five feet off the back of the curb for this portion as well?

Mr. Parrish responded that the landscaping along the new "finger" replicates what was done in the BMW portion.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that some of the older hedge plantings are growing close to the cars and the hedges are being pruned very hard and are not as attractive.

Mr. Lecklider agreed with these concerns. From the beginning, he was not able to reconcile these raised "fingers" as compared to Crown and the City's requirement for Crown to mound and thereby screen their cars. Everywhere else in the community, the cars would be screened. In this case, the attraction for MAG is obviously the visibility along US33. This is achieved to a large degree with the buildings and their distinctive architecture.

Ms. Amorose Groomes added MAG was permitted to have signs at a height much higher than anywhere else in the community.

Mr. Lecklider stated that with respect to the water basins, if there were an option of combining the two, that should be considered. He is not a big supporter of the water features that were included in the last expansion – he does not believe they are substantial enough. He understands there is a practical need for these as well, and he does not have engineering expertise.

Mr. Reiner noted that he understands the desire to tie together the water features. If mounding can be installed and the secondary area still work for retention and detention, that would be fine. However, trying to engineer this tonight is problematic. He agrees with Ms. Amorose Groomes about the future auto dealers that could come to the site, and wondered if that is addressed in the contracts that Council is not privy to. Can amendments be made at this point?

Mr. Parrish responded that he would need to study this further. He knows that sliding the "fingers" to the west would begin to cut down on the building area just by the nature of the finger design. Are there other supplemental underground systems that could be used in lieu of the ponding? He would have to explore that further with staff and the engineers.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there is a possibility of enlarging the existing pond along SR33, making it deeper. It does not seem to have the volume of water to be a functional ecosystem.

Ms. Husak stated it is not a stormwater management pond, just a feature.

Mr. Parrish stated that this is located on the highest point on the site so it could not serve as a stormwater detention pond. Both ponds along SR161/US33 are fed by an underwater well that keeps the water level high at all times. The ponds are used to filter the water that is then used for sprinkler water on site.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the new pond along SR161/US33 is therefore a decorative pond.

Mr. Parrish responded that is correct, adding that the pond furthest to the east near Children's Hospital is a detention pond.

Ms. Salay stated that mounding could therefore be added if this is a decorative pond.

Mr. Parrish responded that the owner of MAG desired to create vistas and a rhythm along the US33 corridor.

Ms. Husak stated that when Subarea B was brought forward in 2012, at the time BMW and Mini were moving from Post Road, the staff recommendation was to increase the

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS • DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 22, 2016

Page 9 of 23

mounding in that area because it was such a concern with the existing main building. However, Council believed it would be appropriate to continue the view, feel and look of the design along SR/161/US33. With Subarea C coming online, staff did not make the recommendation for mounding. Additionally, the Zoning Code does allow for a lowered screening along display areas for vehicles.

Mr. Lecklider thanked her for pointing out the staff recommendation for Subarea B. He does recall the staff recommendation, but also recalls the applicant was not in agreement with that and Council accepted that, albeit not unanimously.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if Council could add a condition to remove the second aesthetic pond and to continue the mounding that is consistent with the balance of the development.

Ms. Readler stated Council can do so. She suggested that the condition include Engineering review and staff consultation to determine if it is feasible.

Ms. Husak added that some clarification would be needed about the extent of the mounding – is it for the entire length of the southern boundary of Subarea C?

Mr. Parrish stated that they are allowed a display window of 25 percent along that frontage. Is this mound for the entire length?

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked about the height of the mound at this point.

Mr. Parrish responded that at the pond it is three feet in height and it increases to six feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that some undulations might be appropriate in that mounding.

Ms. Salay asked about the 25 percent display window mentioned. What percentage of that frontage? Is that the 25 percent?

Ms. Husak responded that in the Zoning Code, the vehicle display areas are allowed to have a lowered screening of two feet for 25 percent of the frontage that is used for vehicle display. It relieves the applicant of the vehicle use area screening requirements that are in place for parking lots and drive aisles, etc. What MAG has been permitted to do on Subarea A and Subarea B is to have a lowered screening along the entire length – they were not held at the 25 percent.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated this is similar to what happened at the Lexus dealership on Dublin-Granville Road. The stonewall was very low in front of the cars to achieve that 25 percent.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that, currently, there are plantings in the previous parcel that will grow to four feet in height. By the landscape code, there must be 3.5 feet of mounding. If they build the mound, they will need to remove the planting screen. He is trying to determine the best benefit aesthetically while helping the client accomplish his mission.

Mr. Parrish stated that is what was done in front of the BMW building. Along the drive, there is landscaping. They have continued that and added some larger trees on this application. They do not have a vehicular display in that area. The display is 50, 60, 70 feet deep from that point, just in front of the showroom. They are not really displaying the cars, but the building.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that the issue is with putting mounds in and whether it is a gain aesthetically.

Mr. Parrish stated that his assumption is that if the mound is to be done, there would just be a grove of trees across there and not the additional three to four foot hedge that lines the drive at this time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that there has been a decline in the hedging material on the original section over time. It will occur in this case as well over time. With the mound, there is something attainable.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 22, 2016

Page 10 of 23

Mr. Parrish responded that the hedges were on the first "fingers" on the development, back in 1997. The 25 percent is only junipers in front at the tips of the fingers. With BMW, they did not have a vehicular use display.

Mr. Lecklider agreed with Mr. Reiner's analysis of the net/net gain. With respect to the westernmost new pond or water feature, the objective was to create a view shed to the building, correct?

Mr. Parrish confirmed this.

Mr. Lecklider stated that the landscaping on the perimeter of the lot there should achieve some screening of the parking or display.

Mr. Parrish stated that it is for the most part the drive aisle. They are screening the drive aisle adjacent to it. He pointed out the areas on the slide.

Mayor Peterson asked if all of this was reviewed at the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Salay responded that she was not present at the first Commission meeting where this was discussed. She was present for another hearing where the architecture of the building was the focus, the sign height and the need for articulation on the back piece. The Commission did not spend a lot of time discussing the mounding. They felt staff had thoroughly discussed that aspect with the applicant. The Commission likes this campus – the architecture, its feel, and the fact it is a dynamic, "cool" car campus unlike any other. There was discussion of a pond repeating the other, and the water element and view shed, screening the drive aisle, and having landscaping on the fingers. The mounding versus the pond was not discussed at the Commission.

Ms. Husak stated that staff did not raise this issue. From a staff perspective, they viewed it as a continuation of the existing character of the campus. It had been approved by Planning Commission and Council in the two prior iterations.

Mayor Peterson stated that he believes the general sense is it is a great project on balance. There are issues identified now related to the pond, screening and signs. Council added a condition related to signage. Is the applicant willing to accept a condition about revisiting the pond and mound in order to move forward?

Mr. Parrish responded he would be willing to look at this from an engineering perspective and from the view aspect from US33.

Mayor Peterson asked staff if another condition could be added to address this issue.

Ms. Readler asked if Council wants the applicant to work with staff or work with staff and return to Council for final approval related to exploration of removal of that pond. Mr. Reiner acknowledged that this is somewhat a subjective matter.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the pond in place has not lived up to the expectations. This new pond is quite a bit smaller and will be less dramatic than the existing one.

Ms. Husak shared a condition she has drafted to address the comments:
Condition 12 – that the applicant revise sign D2 to meet the development text requirements.

Condition 13 is proposed - that the applicant return to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council for a comprehensive review and approval of a master sign plan prior to the issuance of sign permits for Subarea C.

Condition 14 is proposed – that the applicant work with staff to eliminate the aesthetic pond along the west side of the southern boundary of Subarea C and provide undulated mounding in its place.

Mayor Peterson asked for clarification about whether the pond and mounding issue would come back to Council for review.

Ms. Husak stated that the Commission would review that as part of their Final Development Plan approval and would have the record of this Council meeting in hand.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 22, 2016

Page 11 of 23

Mr. Reiner suggested that they should investigate both solutions and determine the optimal solution.

Mr. Lecklider agreed. He appreciates Ms. Amorose Groomes' point with respect to the newer pond being less substantial than the one in Subarea B. That is a concern to him. He acknowledged that each member's views are probably subjective. He agrees that the best option is to have the applicant explore the undulated mounding in good faith and present those options. The better proposal would then prevail.

Ms. Salay stated she would appreciate renderings of the view from US33, and how that will appear. It is a matter of details and execution. The plant material in the first fingers installed did not result in something attractive. Perhaps that needs to be reworked. It is not meeting expectations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes added that she is confident that Mr. Parrish will do a great job. The campus is beautiful. There are some details to review more closely prior to moving forward. He has done a very nice job with these plans.

Mayor Peterson asked the applicant if he accepts the conditions as amended.

Mr. Parrish asked about Condition 13 related to the master sign plan. What does that do in terms of the proposed signage in the package for the Jaguar/Land Rover franchise – at least for the wall signs? They are unique to this brand, and he would like to move forward with that portion.

The consensus of Council was that the wall signs for this new application are acceptable; the goal of the condition is to have an inventory of all signage on the entire site.

Ms. Salay noted an addition to Condition 12: signs D10 and D11 need to be added.

Mr. Parrish agreed.

Mayor Peterson asked if there are any other concerns not addressed by the additional conditions.

Mr. Lecklider thanked Mr. Parrish and noted he concurs with Ms. Amorose Groomes regarding his efforts and his patience.

Ms. Salay stated that when the master sign plan is reviewed, it should include the internally illuminated signs as discussed.

Mr. Parrish clarified that none of those are internally lit. There is a spotlight on them, but they are not internally lit.

Mayor Peterson asked the Clerk to call the vote on the Ordinance with the conditions as amended tonight.

Vote on the Ordinance with amended conditions: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

Ordinance 04-16

Authorizing the Appropriation of a 0.066 Acre, More or Less, Fee Simple Right-of-way; a 0.004 Acre, More or Less, Permanent Drainage Easement; and a 0.550 Acre, More or Less, Temporary Construction Easement from Columbus Industrial Owner I, LLC, from the Property Located at 4353 Tuller Ridge Drive, for the Public Purpose of Constructing a New Roadway and Related Public Improvements.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the new roadway is John Shields Parkway and related improvements between Dale Drive, formerly known as Tuller Ridge Drive and Village Parkway. Staff has been in discussions with the owner and remains hopeful that an amicable agreement can be reached. This is also in reference to using quick take procedures in accordance with Chapter 163 of the Ohio Revised Code, should those

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form #101

Held

February 8, 2016

Page 8 of 19

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.

INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING - ORDINANCES

Ordinance 03-16

Rezoning Approximately 30 Acres, Located on the East Side of Perimeter Loop Drive, North of US 33/SR 161, South of Perimeter Drive and Venture Drive from PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Existing MAG plan) and PCD, Planned Commerce District (Perimeter Center, Subarea D) to PUD (Midwestern Auto Group PUD) to Incorporate Approximately 5.4 Acres into the MAG PUD to Expand the Automobile Dealership Campus to Accommodate the Construction of a Combined Showroom for the Jaguar and Land Rover Brands, the Future Demolition of the Existing Land Rover Showroom, a New Showroom for the Porsche Brand, and the Addition of an Elevated Showroom Addition to the Main Building for the Lamborghini Brand. (Case 15-113Z/PDP)

Mr. Keenan introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Husak stated that this is a request to incorporate an additional, vacant 5.4 acres on U.S. 33 into the MAG PUD. Nationwide Children's Hospital is to the east of the site.

- The main MAG building, encompassing 122,000 square feet, includes the majority of the franchise brands.
- Later, a 7,800 square feet building for Land Rover was added to the site.
- In 2010, the City approved a Volvo, Porsche and penthouse addition to the eastern side of the building.
- In 2012, City Council approved an expansion of the campus to incorporate eight acres for the addition of the BMW and Mini franchises to the MAG campus. Also approved was a freestanding show room for Audi within this Subarea.
- The Community Plan Future Land Use map designates the western portion of the site as General Commercial. The central portion and the vacant parcel to the east are designated as Standard Office and Institutional District. This includes many of the sites with frontage along US33 and is intended to be an area where medical, dental, professional, and large scale offices are to be located. Much of the land within Perimeter Center is designated by the Future Land Use map as Standard Office and Institutional, including WD Partners, which is more of an industrial use.
- Council has previously expressed concerns regarding numerous car dealerships fronting along US33, due to the view presented to those entering Dublin. As a landowner, MAG has a history of working with Planning to achieve a high quality campus appearance with appropriate mounding, landscaping and site layout. Planning believes this is an appropriate expansion of the campus. The permitted uses within the proposed development text include office and retail uses, which would fit within the Standard Office category.
- The applicant is proposing to create a Subarea C, which would be a continuation of the campus. The development text is provided in the packet. The applicant has ensured that Subarea C standards are aligned with the standards of existing Subareas A and B. Also included, is some "clean up" on Subareas A and B to better reflect what is existing as opposed to what was contemplated at the time they were rezoned.
- Staff has requested that the applicant rezone the entire 30 acres as opposed to just the five-acre Subarea C. From an administrative standpoint, it is desirable to have one MAG PUD with all of the uses, standards, and regulations aligned. The applicant has agreed to do so.
- In the future, the applicant is also contemplating to demolish the existing Land Rover building and creating a new building for the Porsche brand within that area, as well as an elevated showroom for Lamborghini. This could be approved by PZC as part of a Final Development Plan.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 8101

Held

February 8, 2016

Page 9 of 19

- For Subarea C, the proposal is for a building for a combined showroom for Land Rover and Jaguar. This is a new concept on which those franchises are working – the first in the country.
- Subarea C includes a main access point off Venture Drive through a shared access with the Nationwide Children's Hospital site to the east. This shared access was provided for in the approval of the development of that site. Many of the MAG patrons currently access the site through Perimeter Loop.
- Two stormwater management ponds are shown -- one along the US33/SR161 frontage and the other in the northeast portion of the site.
- The proposed building includes the two showrooms for Jaguar and Land Rover, office space, a service reception area, and the potential for a non-retail car wash.
- The site plan includes the unique finger-like vehicle display areas on US33 and a plaza vehicle display in front of the proposed building. Extensive landscaping and screening will be incorporated along all vehicular use areas.
- Architecture and Building Materials. The proposed development text requires "contemporary and innovative architecture." The applicant is extensively using glass and metal, and providing angles and recesses to give the building depth, shadows, and interest. PZC required the addition of more articulation on the east side of the southern elevation.
- Wall signs were approved by PZC for BMW, Mini and Audi, which is a continuation of the current theme. The allowance is 100 square feet for both signs. The total combined sign size of 100 square feet will potentially permit a single sign to exceed 50 square feet (the Land Rover sign is shown at 53 square feet). PZC requested that the development text require that a sign could not exceed 55 square feet, with the total square feet for both signs not to exceed 100 feet. The permitted height of the signs is 25 feet.

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan to City Council on January 7, 2016 with the conditions listed below.

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to ensure replacement trees are not counted to fulfill other requirements;
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to relocate as many newly planted trees as possible and to find appropriate locations for replacement trees on site;
- 3) That the Traffic Impact Study be updated to address Engineering comments, subject to approval by Engineering, prior to introduction of this rezoning Ordinance at City Council;
- 4) That the applicant update the proposed plans to accurately indicate the required setbacks along the southern property line;
- 5) That the proposed development text be revised to address the sign allowances in Subarea A to more accurately reflect the sign needs for the single brand building anticipated;
- 6) That any site modifications to Subarea A include the analysis and any necessary modifications to the current stormwater management plan to ensure stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are satisfied;
- 7) That the applicant work with staff prior to the Final Development Plan stage to identify and incorporate appropriate safety measures along the south side of the proposed western retention basin to protect vehicles traveling on westbound US33/SR161;
- 8) That all technical comments associated with stormwater management and civil plans are addressed prior to filing a Final Development Plan application;
- 9) That the applicant submit additional information and details for the proposed retaining wall along the eastern retention basin as part of the Final Development Plan;

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form #101

Held

February 8, 2016

Page 10 of 19

- 10) That the applicant work with staff to provide either additional articulation, landscaping or layout changes for the service drive for the southern elevation of the service area at the final development plan stage, and;
- 11) That the text be revised to limit the sign size of a single wall sign in Subarea C to 55 square feet.

Brad Parrish, Architectural Alliance, 165 North Fifth Street, Columbus, stated that he has been the architect for MAG since the Volvo addition. Mr. Brentlinger is excited to bring the Jaguar franchise to Dublin. Following approval, the Jaguar brand will be brought here prior to the construction of the building. There will be two years to complete that for the brand. The expansion of Audi and BMW prompted rapid growth within this business. The other brands – Porsche, Jaguar, Land Rover and Lamborghini began to take notice that this market wants to expand the volume of sales to the community. The expansion of these 5.4 acres is pivotal to the continued growth of MAG in Dublin.

Mr. Lecklider stated that in the past, he has voted against requests by this dealership. He agrees that it makes sense, under the circumstances, to do this comprehensively, as staff suggests. He does have several concerns.

- Signage - Signs of 25 feet in height exceed Code. What is the Code requirement?

Ms. Husak responded that a sign may not exceed 15 feet.

Mr. Lecklider stated that one of the things that has frustrated him is how many exceptions exist throughout this campus and have existed over the years. Council is told that it is required by these brands, but in virtually nowhere else in the community would that be acceptable. The proposed text provides for interior signage. Not only is there illuminated exterior signage, but signage that is at least 15-20 feet high and affixed to the interior glass wall, essentially achieving double the signage. This is for the Land Rover and Jaguar brands. He believes that the Code's sign height requirements have been exceeded elsewhere on this campus.

Ms. Husak responded that there is an allowance in the development text for Subarea A to have the existing Land Rover sign on a green panel at 25 feet, as well.

- Raised finger display that would be continued. As he recalls, the rationale is that potential buyers need to be able to see the wheels of the vehicles. Conversely, the City requires those to be screened. Typically, six feet of mounding would be required for an office building, but with a recent application, mounding was not required, opening up the viewshed in Subarea B.
- Fence row – There was a tree row that was mistakenly mowed down, which was apparently the fault of a contractor. Has that been remedied with the installation of landscaping?

Ms. Husak responded that occurred at the time that Subarea B was in the development plan stages, and those replacements were included in that Subarea. The applicant was required to replace them all.

- Elevated Lamborghini showroom - The City does not have Code that addresses that.

Ms. Husak responded that the Planning Commission actually approved the elevated showroom in 2014. At that time, it was elevated at the level of the existing building and sloped down to meet the proposed Jaguar and Land Rover building. However, the needs changed for the franchises. At this point, the proposal is eventually to have only this showroom cover the pond on support structures.

Mr. Lecklider stated that it would therefore remain elevated, but in a different manner. Ms. Husak stated that it will be elevated, but it won't meet the building to the north.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 8, 2016

Page 11 of 19

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the Planning Commission had requested that the applicant provide a complete sign package for the site, because, to date, the approach has been piecemeal. She has not seen a master sign plan for the entire facility. There was a request to have some signs on the building, and they were going to forgo ground signs. The net result is that now there are both.

Ms. Husak responded that when the Land Rover and Jaguar building was approved by PZC in 2014 in the northern portion of Subarea A, there was significant discussion concerning appropriate signage on that building. Ultimately, PZC approved signage on the building at the proposed height -- 20-25 feet -- with the request that the applicant remove any green metal material. There was not actually a request for a comprehensive sign plan, but the City does have that as part of the final development plan. The development text defines the five different sign types permitted on the campus. There was discussion about tabling the application, and addressing the sign issue later. However, the proposed signs were approved, minus the green panel.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that part of the difficulty with that condition is that it applied to parcels not under review, and PZC did not have the ability to place that condition on a neighboring parcel -- this parcel. The request was made that a master sign plan be provided that would encompass the entire campus.

Mr. Parrish stated that the current text provides five categories, and the current signs adhere to that text. There was never a discussion of quantity. It is defined in the development text that one wall sign or one ground sign is permitted for each brand. The ground sign that they are proposing falls within another category -- directional signage. Through the years, Planning has required specific classification of the requested sign. In that manner, the development text does quantify the amount of signs permitted, or at least which types are permitted.

Mr. Lecklider inquired how the interior signage issue could be addressed. Does the language on page 6 of the development text, "interior signs not being readily visible from rights-of-way that are adjacent to the site," apply to the example he described? When driving west on US33, looking into the building through the glass, the sign is very prominently displayed. Is that an oversight in the Dublin Code?

Mr. Keenan stated that this also came up in the discussion regarding the hotel on the previous Cooker restaurant site.

Ms. Husak responded that the City does not regulate anything that is three feet or more from the wall. The same situation existed with the Chevrolet dealership on Post Road. If a sign is a certain distance from the wall, it is not regulated by Code. It is neither a window nor an exterior sign addressed by Code.

Mr. Parrish stated that the sign they are speaking of is 15 feet away from the inside face of that glass.

Mr. Lecklider suggested that at some point, the City might want to consider addressing that issue, as it is signage. That is its purpose. He has to give credit to MAG for taking full advantage of the opportunity.

Ms. Salay stated that it would be helpful to have photos of the campus for the second reading. She recognizes it would be difficult to capture the view from US 33. It is easy to perceive a situation incorrectly without actual photos. What is the height of the Audi sign?

Ms. Husak responded that Audi, BMW and Mini signs are 15 feet high.

Ms. Salay noted that the proposed sign under review tonight is 25 feet in height.

Mr. Parrish stated the elevation is only 20 feet. The reason for that elevation is the design concept of the front -- the bottom and the top portions are equal. If the sign were to be lowered to 15 feet, the building itself would have to be reduced by nine

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form #101

Held

February 8, 2016

Page 12 of 19

feet. Within the context of the BMW and Audi site, this building will be significantly diminished on the site. The BMW and Audi buildings are 30 feet in height and this building would be 21 feet. There are six bands at the bottom and six bands above the glass. If the Land Rover – Jaguar sign is lowered, one band must be removed at the bottom and one band at the top, as well, to be proportional. That would result in a smaller building, which would be greatly diminished on the site.

Ms. Salay inquired if they could have a smaller sign without shrinking their building.

Mr. Parrish responded that a lower sign would have to fit within the 15 feet.

Ms. Salay stated that she was not present for the first PZC discussion on this application, and the second discussion was much shorter. There are many honey locust trees on this site. They had grown significantly, but now are not thriving. Will all those be replaced?

Mr. Parrish responded that as part of this process, they are evaluating some of the landscaping. The construction has damaged some of the front row of trees. They will address the issue of trees that did not survive.

Ms. Salay stated that on the eastern portion of the top elevation, the Commission suggested some changes to landscape that elevation, integrating it to reduce the appearance of a stark, blank wall.

Ms. Husak responded that what is depicted is the first attempt to give articulation to that wall. Previously, there were no windows or landscaping.

Mr. Parrish stated that the site plan before Council shows an original rendering for the service drive. Per PZC comments, the angle on that drive has been amended to make it a meandering drive. They will be able to heavily landscape the service wall and doors from a view from SR161.

Ms. Husak stated that the view should have been replaced on the site plan shown tonight.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if garage doors are necessary on three sides of the building.

Mr. Parrish stated that the service doors for customers to enter and depart are on the left and right sides of the building. On the west elevation is new car delivery, and on the back side is the service area. The building is planned to differentiate between the customer and service interactions, so the doors on three sides of the building are necessary.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that MAG had been requested previously to address the new car delivery problem of where the cars are unloaded. Presently, the cars are frequently unloaded on the street. This final phase does not appear to provide that solution.

Mr. Parrish stated that is addressed. The intent is to improve the shared drive with Nationwide Children's Hospital. Carrier vehicles would enter through that curbcut and park along the back road.

Ms. Salay stated that she would like to comment on the general signage issue, not just in relation to this proposal. PZC has had a number of discussions about signage and community standards. It is very important that Council discuss its expectations regarding signage for the benefit of staff and PZC. Many members recall a time when the signage standards in Dublin were inviolate. Over the years, different applicants have persuaded PZC and Council, for different reasons, that different standards could be applied. Sometimes there are valid arguments, but Council needs to have this discussion so that there are clear expectations, removing some pressure from the Planning staff and Planning Commission.

Mayor Peterson asked about the best way to accomplish that.

Mr. McDaniel suggested a joint work session between Council and PZC. Staff would be present and would then understand the parameters going forward. It could be scheduled for an upcoming work session topic.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 8, 2016

Page 13 of 19

Mayor Peterson stated that some of these discussion topics can become larger than originally intended. He would like to restrict the scope to the five most important issues, such as Mr. Lecklider and Ms. Salay pointed out.

Mr. Reiner complimented the architecture of the site. It is unfortunate the Lamborghini building isn't more visible, because it is a very nice piece of architecture. There is a uniformity in the overall design. At what point did Architectural Alliance enter into the design process for this facility?

Mr. Parrish responded that his firm entered into the design process with the Volvo expansion. In 1997, Karlsberger designed the original diamond-shaped building. In 2007, with the desire to create a unique Volvo showroom for the main facility, his firm continued the "language" that was already there – the diamond shape. His firm subsequently designed the Audi and BMW facility.

Mr. Reiner inquired if the height and scale of the signage was determined by: (1) the architecture and (2) the necessity to be seen from US161.

Mr. Parrish responded affirmatively. The Jaguar and Land Rover brand prototype is to place the signage at the second band from the top. Because they recognize the importance of this dealership and the constraints of Dublin's sign code, they approved lowering the sign down to the second band from the glass. This plan deviates from their prototype to achieve this compromise.

Mr. Reiner stated that this has been a high quality product. He would not have wanted it changed to brick or another material on this site. This concludes the appearance of the entire parcel. This architecture has been integrated well into what was previously conceived, and it is attractive. It makes sense for MAG to conclude their design on this last parcel. He believes their firm has created attractive and interesting architecture. An earlier proposal for this site, which Mr. Lecklider alluded to, was not as attractive. He is proud of what MAG had created on this site.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she has said on numerous occasions that Mr. Parrish is a tremendous architect. However, he probably would agree that in the past, the City has "pushed" him a bit, and the projects became even better. That is what she would like to see in this case, as well.

Mr. Reiner stated that in the wing to the right, they have indicated there would be some different articulation to the building. Is that to be accomplished through the landscaping?

Mr. Parrish responded that it would be accomplished more through the landscaping. There is a service area on one side of the building, which they want to camouflage from view. There will be windows at an elevation above where the work is being done. Mr. Reiner noted that the south elevation does not match the front elevation. Perhaps, they can remedy this with landscaping or an architectural feature. Mr. Parrish concurred.

Mayor Peterson thanked Mr. Parrish for the information. There will be a second reading/public hearing at the February 22 Council meeting.

Ordinance 05-16

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Real Estate Purchase Agreement and Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Acquire 73.650 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest Located at 6600 Shier Rings Road from Jon P. Riegle, Trustee of the Robert W. Rings Charitable Remainder Unitrust and RBG Properties, LLC, and Appropriating Funds Therefor.

Mr. Keenan introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Goss stated that this legislation provides authorization to proceed with a real estate purchase agreement in the amount of \$5.9 million to acquire property located at 6600 Shier Rings Road for the purpose of economic development. This site is

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JANUARY 7, 2016

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**3. MAG PUD and Perimeter Center, Subarea D – MAG, Land Rover, Jaguar, Porsche
15-113Z/PDP 6335 Perimeter Loop Road
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

Proposal: A rezoning for approximately 30 acres from Planned Unit Development District (Midwestern Auto Group plan) and PCD (Perimeter Center, Subarea D) to PUD for the expansion of the Midwestern Auto Group (MAG) campus to incorporate an additional 5.4 acres into the PUD to accommodate the construction of a combined showroom for the Jaguar and Land Rover brands, the future demolition of the existing Land Rover showroom, a new showroom for the Porsche brand, and the addition of an elevated showroom addition to the main building for the Lamborghini franchise.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a rezoning with preliminary development plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Brad Parish, President, Architectural Alliance.

Planning Contact: Claudia Husak, AICP, Senior Planner.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan because it complies with the rezoning/preliminary development plan criteria and the existing development standards, with 11 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to ensure replacement trees are not counted to fulfill other requirements;
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to relocate as many newly planted trees as possible and to find appropriate locations for replacement trees on site;
- 3) That the Traffic Impact Study be updated to address Engineering comments, subject to approval by Engineering, prior to introduction of this rezoning Ordinance at City Council;
- 4) That the applicant update the proposed plans to accurately indicate the required setbacks along the southern property line;
- 5) That the proposed development text be revised to address the sign allowances in Subarea A to more accurately reflect the sign needs for the single brand building anticipated;
- 6) That any site modifications to Subarea A include the analysis and any necessary modifications to the current stormwater management plan to ensure stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are satisfied;
- 7) That the applicant work with staff prior to the Final Development Plan stage to identify and incorporate appropriate safety measures along the south side of the proposed western retention basin to protect vehicles traveling on westbound US33/SR 161;
- 8) That all technical comments associated with stormwater management and civil plans are addressed prior to filing a Final Development Plan application;
- 9) That the applicant submit additional information and details for the proposed retaining wall along the eastern retention basin as part of the Final Development Plan;

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JANUARY 7, 2016

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**3. MAG PUD and Perimeter Center, Subarea D – MAG, Land Rover, Jaguar, Porsche
15-113Z/PDP 6335 Perimeter Loop Road
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

- 10) That the applicant work with staff to provide either additional articulation, landscaping or layout changes for the service drive for the southern elevation of the service area at the final development plan stage, and;
- 11) That the text be revised to limit the sign size of a single wall sign in Subarea C to 55 SF.
- 12) *That the applicant revise Signs D2, D10 and D 11 to meet the development text requirements;*
- 13) *That the applicant return to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council for a comprehensive review and approval of a Master Sign Plan prior to the issuance of sign permits for Subarea C; and,*
- 14) *That the applicant work with staff to explore the elimination of the aesthetic pond on the west side of the southern boundary of Subarea C and provide undulated mounding in its place to the extent possible.*

**Conditions in italics were added by City Council at the public hearing and approval of Ordinance 03-16 on February 22, 2016*

*Brad Parish agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan was forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Senior Planner

Ms. Newell said there is potential with the limitation of the height of the graphics in terms of placement on the buildings. She said the point of the deviation is to get creativity in exchange for the larger sign and suggested they do more presentation work showing how the height of the sign will fit within the area on the buildings.

Mr. Starr said they will bring more dimensions of signs and images from other places that will help show the appropriateness on the buildings.

Ms. Mitchell said people learn and recognize brands and not based on the size of the logo or sign but by the distinctiveness and certain elements that are creative. She said the size is not the determining factor of what makes a great sign and they should find a way to think about other dimensions other than just size that would be very helpful.

Mr. Stidhem said they should keep the signs at 50 square feet and then if they go outside the 50 square foot they would come back for further approval.

Ms. Husak said the Bridge Street District provisions were conservative on purpose. She said they are not here asking for a sign plan for bigger signs they are required to come to the Commission with a sign plan because the Code has built that into the Shopping Corridor that has been designated for their location. She said the 50 square foot they were being conservative to the sign provisions knowing that there are certain areas it was too conservative and knew that there was another layer of scrutiny added to those provisions.

Ms. Newell asked what action the applicant would like them to do with the application.

Mr. Starr asked to table the application and come back with information to address the questions that have been brought forth.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to table this Master Sign Plan application at the request of the applicant. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Tabled 7 — 0)

3. MAG PUD and Perimeter Center, Subarea D – MAG, Land Rover, Jaguar, Porsche 15-113Z/PDP 6335 Perimeter Loop Road Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a Rezoning for approximately 30 acres from Planned Unit Development District (Midwestern Auto Group plan) and PCD (Perimeter Center, Subarea D) to PUD for the expansion of the Midwestern Auto Group (MAG) campus to incorporate an additional 5.4 acres into the PUD to accommodate the construction of a combined showroom for the Jaguar and Land Rover brands. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a rezoning with preliminary development plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Ms. Husak said she could do a presentation but it seemed there might be a few questions that would not require a full presentation.

Ms. Salay said she wanted to talk about architecture.

Ms. Husak said this is a rezoning and preliminary development stage and they are looking at an entire site that is now 30 acres by trying to incorporate 5.5 acres of vacant land on the eastern side of the

campus. She said when the applicant was here in October with the concept plan which is a requirement of the rezoning to the PUD for this particular application, they had presented the Porsche development in the northern portion of the site to take the place of the existing Land Rover building to the north and expanding the main campus building across the pond for their Lamborghini franchise and specifically to talk about Jaguar and Land Rover on the vacant parcel. She said there were conversations of shifting some of the buildings around and looking at switching Porsche with Land Rover or Jaguar building and they talked about it after and they were concerned with the lack of size that the Porsche building would have on that particular parcel and the applicant has more information on why they chose that locations are they are presenting. She said the application is ahead of the programing schedule for Jaguar and Land Rover and Porsche is lagging behind in programing.

Ms. Husak said Subarea A and B are existing and creating a third Subarea C for the additional five acres which is currently an office subarea within Perimeter Center and would take it out of and incorporate it into the MAG PUD which the applicant has been asked to do to create one large PUD for MAG specifically. She said the Community Plan shows this parcel as proposed as well as Subarea B more as an office and Intuitional District and less of a Commercial District. She said they have had conversations at the Commission and City Council on the merits of having a more commercially oriented use on this site and in the Planning Report they gave more detailed analysis as to why the applicant thought it made sense here and staff thought it was an appropriate land use on that site. She said office is always a permitted in the PUD for MAG so if anything were to happen for redevelopment that would still be an option.

Ms. Husak said the details show a continuation of car display with the finger like arrangement, which is unique to MAG. She said there are two storm water retention ponds that are wet ponds on site. She said access is shared with Nationwide Children's Hospital in the top which was a requirement when Children's Hospital went in and the easement for cross access was already in place. She said the main change is that they have made the service area at a lower level because of the concerns of the overhead doors being visible from US33/161. She said the landscaping is in line with what exists today with a lower screening along the highway but having trees in a symmetrical pattern along the are display.

Ms. Husak said the architecture has not changed significantly from the concept plan except for changes to the side elevations. She said the architecture is very modern and simple in terms of the form and the elevations show how recessed the doors are and how the angles are created with the windows and how it flows with the campus as a modern and innovative design using a lot of metal and grey color schemes like the remainder of the campus.

Ms. Husak said there are some allowances in the proposed development text for the signs essentially allowing wall signs which the Commission had approved for Audi as well as for BMW and Mini along the US33 frontage and the applicant is requesting an overall allowance of 100 square feet to be divided between the two signs where one is proposed to be larger than 50 square feet, but the other is smaller so together they are still at 100. She said the other signs being proposed are in line with what is approved on the campus in terms of a campus identification sign on Venture Drive at the access point and the smaller lower brand signs that they have now and are visible for the users of site as they are driving in to make sure they know where to go for service. She said they are not requiring logos to adhere to logo size requirements. She said the height is at 20 feet across those buildings, where the Commission held steady at 15-foot requirement for BMW, Mini and Audi.

Ms. Husak said there are some conditions for the storm water management requirements and the applicant has been working with Engineering to make sure that they have all the information needed and there is more information to come at the final development plan, which is required to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the traffic study there are comments as the expansion of the site on vacant land there is a traffic study component required and they had some comments the applicant is to address prior to Council review.

Ms. Husak said they are recommending approval to City Council with the following nine conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to ensure replacement trees are not counted to fulfill other requirements;
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to relocate as many newly planted trees as possible and to find appropriate locations for replacement trees on site;
- 3) That the Traffic Impact Study be updated to address Engineering comments, subject to approval by Engineering, prior to introduction of this rezoning Ordinance at City Council; 4) That the applicant update the proposed plans to accurately indicate the required setbacks along the southern property line;
- 5) That the proposed development text be revised to address the sign allowances in Subarea A to more accurately reflect the sign needs for the single brand building anticipated;
- 6) That any site modifications to Subarea A include the analysis and any necessary modifications to the current storm water management plan to ensure storm water requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are satisfied;
- 7) That the applicant work with staff prior to the Final Development Plan stage to identify and incorporate appropriate safety measures along the south side of the proposed western retention basin to protect vehicles traveling on westbound US33/SR 161;
- 8) That all technical comments associated with storm water management and civil plans are addressed prior to filing a Final Development Plan application, and;
- 9) That the applicant submit additional information and details for the proposed retaining wall along the eastern retention basin as part of the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Newell wanted a clarification for what is envisioned for the safe barrier along SR161 and the retention pond.

Ms. Husak said for the BMW and Mini site, there is a pond that is not a storm water management pond and is close to the roadway and with the unfortunate incidents where vehicles have driven off the road in other areas of town, they have been working with Engineering to provide a barrier that is aesthetically pleasing and cannot be seen because it blends in and will not be noticed.

Mr. Miller said the entrance to Children's Hospital space between the entrance to MAG and to the road is only about 20 feet and asked if it could be moved farther from the main road because he witnessed a fire truck accessing the drive and was surprised by the speed of traffic along the roadway making the maneuver into MAG unsafe. He asked that Engineering take a look at it to make the access safer.

Ms. Husak said Venture Drive is not considered a front door for the MAG campus and ideally it is not where patrons will enter the site and she will have Engineering take a look at it.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, said Jaguar and Land Rover National decided to change their prototype and they were 90 percent complete on construction documents ready to submit to start the building that was approved last year. He said they turned off 40 projects across the country and that is why they are back. He said during this process with Audi, BMW and Mini coming online MAG's business has grown substantially. He has the opportunity to master plan some of the other brands that are available with Porsche that they did within the Volvo addition and now that is growing into their own facility being proposed for the north side of the campus. He said in the Land Rover deal he is able to get Jaguar as a new brand to Dublin. He said the question last time was could the buildings be flipped and after that meeting he did a site plan and because of the scale of the buildings Audi is such a small gem between two larger building that are close enough that it works, where this site is a bit removed from the BMW because of the display fingers. He said they felt the scale of this building needed to be larger to accommodate the displays. He said the area behind become the employee and overflow inventory lot for the MAG campus, with a larger building on this site it would take away from the operational side of MAG and is why they didn't want to have that inventory employee lot along the SR161 corridor and kept it confined to the Venture Drive side which is not the main entrance to the campus.

Mr. Parish said this is a new prototype for Jaguar and Land Rover and they are very excited about bringing this to the market with the hope that this location to be one of the first in the United States for this prototype. He said MAG is very excited about the opportunity to bring this online.

Mr. Parish said the concerns from last review was that service drive was on the side which is uncharacteristic MAG campus and he redesigned with the sunk in service drive, two tiered much the same experience that exists which was not approved by Jaguar/Land Rover National and he had to redesign it with it in the middle of the building and tucked it around the side much like the Audi facility and removed the service sign that was above. He said the other concern was that the front elevation was a flat elevation and they tried to do additional moves and design ideas on the front elevation and being that this is their first new prototype going nationally across America they wanted to stay with the current design and could not give leeway on their first facility that they are building in North America.

Mr. Parish said they did allow to drop the signage down from the second panel from the top which exceeding current conditions on campus. He said the two proposed signs go to 20 feet and is a matter of the proportion of the building. He said the prototype has six blocks as a base and six blocks as a top. He said if they shrink the building it would be by two bands across but the building becomes smaller against the context on the corridor, so BMW and Audi buildings are over 30 feet tall and with taking two bands away they would be the stepchild to those buildings at 24 feet. He said in an effort to give the scale of the front elevation it is flat with beveled display window on the first floor, to give a scale that is equal to the Audi they did the entrance in the center has been recessed back an additional five feet from where it was to create two jewel boxes that have the cars aligned in the front. He said it was an opportunity that with speaking with Jaguar/Land Rover that they were willing to compromise on setting it back and dropping the elevation and getting the service drive around and keep the new prototype as a flat elevation.

Mr. Parish said they removed the car wash component from this building to reduce it down and removed one of the display fingers to handle the placement of the pond for retention and they are working with Engineering with final civil requirements. He said he will be back for the Lamborghini and Porsche in the next coming months with further details on those two buildings.

Mr. Brown asked what the building materials are.

Mr. Parish said composite panel with a closed system with metal in the back and is a dark mat gray finish and will bring samples at the final development plan.

Mr. Brown said the service drive has a large expanse of blank wall and in that evaluation there is showing many trees in front of it, though he does not have a problem with it, the view from SR161 and angle of the service drive exposes the wall. He said it is the angle and the way they enter the service drive it will not effectively screen from SR161 because the trees will not be layered in front and if they bring the service drive parallel then they could put trees in front.

Ms. Husak said they had asked that they break up that elevation somehow.

Mr. Parish said they are doing further articulation on the service area blank wall and is happy to accommodate that with sliding it over to get it less down the middle of the finger.

Ms. Salay said the architecture is a prototype and they do not want to change it because it is the first one out of the box and so they are getting the plainest vanilla of the buildings that will be built because they are the first and going forward they may be willing to deviate, but this is what they will roll out for the initial example that will be shared with everyone across the country. She said she is concerned that this

is not going to be as spectacular as the rest of the campus and not in keeping with what they have done out there. She said this is the entrance as they drive east to west.

Mr. Parish said the discussions with them they were steadfast on the sloped roof, the green color and they feel they have gotten rid of those things that was not preferred and created it more about the vehicles and less about the architecture so that this can be a jewel box much like the competitors. He said they are going to be more steadfast on this is the prototype and this is what they are keeping because they are not asking for a lot of the out of the box elements such as towers etc., they are just keeping the architecture simple and the only deviations are if the service is on the side or in the middle of the building.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone from the public would like to address the Commission. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Newell said she is fine with the architecture of the building and it is going to be their out of the box prototype but the finishes on the building with the overall campus she likes this proposal better than the previous applications that were submitted for the architecture with the building. She said the plainness and simpleness of this can complement everything else that is on the campus. She said in whole congress with this campus is probably one of the finest designs auto dealership she has ever seen anywhere that she has traveled. She said they have done a fantastic job. She said it will look nice when it's done and she would have liked to see more play with the two front jewel boxes so that there was a bigger recess or maybe a little wider separation but she still likes the architecture of the building.

Ms. Newell said the proportion of the buildings are not going to look right if they squash down the glass or building so have the signage at that location and the deviation in height it fits the architecture of these buildings. She said she would like to see the condition of where the sum of the signs to the 100 square foot, because they could have a potential 100 foot sign and they need to limit one of the signs at the maximum of 55 square foot and the condition needs to include that no sign can exceed the 55 square feet.

Ms. Newell asked Ms. Husak to revise the conditions and read them into the record.

Ms. Husak said there are two additional conditions added requesting approval with 11 conditions as follows:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to ensure replacement trees are not counted to fulfill other requirements;
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to relocate as many newly planted trees as possible and to find appropriate locations for replacement trees on site;
- 3) That the Traffic Impact Study be updated to address Engineering comments, subject to approval by Engineering, prior to introduction of this rezoning Ordinance at City Council; 4) That the applicant update the proposed plans to accurately indicate the required setbacks along the southern property line;
- 5) That the proposed development text be revised to address the sign allowances in Subarea A to more accurately reflect the sign needs for the single brand building anticipated;
- 6) That any site modifications to Subarea A include the analysis and any necessary modifications to the current storm water management plan to ensure storm water requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are satisfied;
- 7) That the applicant work with staff prior to the Final Development Plan stage to identify and incorporate appropriate safety measures along the south side of the proposed western retention basin to protect vehicles traveling on westbound US33/SR 161;
- 8) That all technical comments associated with storm water management and civil plans are addressed prior to filing a Final Development Plan application;
- 9) That the applicant submit additional information and details for the proposed retaining wall along the eastern retention basin as part of the Final Development Plan;

- 10) That the applicant work with staff to provide either additional articulation, landscaping or layout changes for the service drive for the southern elevation of the service area at the final development plan stage, and;
- 11) That the text be revised to limit the sign size of a single wall sign in Subarea C to 55 square feet.

Mr. Parish agreed to the revised conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with 11 conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

4. BSC SCN—Bridge Park, Block A 15-117PP/FP

Riverside Drive and SR 161 Preliminary Plat/Final Plat

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a Preliminary and Final Plat for a development of approximately 3.75 acres into four lots, one reserve and associated easements for the future development of a hotel, parking garage, office building and event center as part of the Bridge Park development. This site is located northeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and SR 161. This is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary and Final Plat under the provisions of Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Downie presented the Preliminary and Final Plat for Block A of the Bridge Park development. She said the Development Plan and Site Plan have been submitted and are beginning the Administrative Review Team process. She said the area identified on the Acura site for future Mooney Way will require separate easements.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended with two conditions.

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.
- 2) The final plat will require a note to address the ownership and maintenance of the proposed Reserve A.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development, said they wanted to share what had been presented to City Council. He noted that these are not the final renderings nor what will be submitted for their final submittal.

Mr. Hunter presented slides showing the overall development including Longshore Drive, the hotel building, event center, parking garage and future office building along Riverside Drive.

Mr. Hunter said the event center, parking garage, and hotel will be a part of the Development Plan and Site Plan that the Planning Commission will be reviewing in February. He said the office building will be submitted separately. He said the intention is that these three buildings will be constructed and operational by the Memorial Tournament 2017.

Mr. Hunter said the differences from what was presented to City Council is that the parking garage has been reduced by one story due to conversations with Staff that they are over parked. He said they also modified the roof structure on the event center to be angled instead of flat to make it appear taller next to the eight hotel. He said this is a jewel building and it made sense to be creative with the shape and massing. He said they lifted a side up and added a clear story providing some natural light into the event



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohio.us

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

OCTOBER 1, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2. MAG PUD – Jaguar, Land Rover, Porsche Expansion 6335 Perimeter Loop Road
15-091CP Concept Plan**

Proposal: An expansion to the Midwestern Auto Group (MAG) campus to incorporate an additional 5.4 acres into the PUD for an approximately 29,000-square-foot showroom for the Jaguar and Land Rover franchises, the demolition of the existing Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 9,000-square-foot showroom for the Porsche franchises, and the addition of an elevated showroom addition to the main building for the Lamborghini franchise and all associated site improvements.

Request: Review and non-binding feedback for a Concept Plan prior to a formal rezoning application under the provisions of Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Midwestern Auto Group, represented by Jackson Reynolds and Brad Parish.


Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission provided non-binding feedback on a proposal for a future expansion to the Midwestern Auto Group (MAG) campus to incorporate an additional 5.4 acres into the PUD for an approximately 29,000-square-foot showroom for the Jaguar and Land Rover franchises, the demolition of the existing Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 9,000-square-foot showroom for the Porsche franchises, and the addition of an elevated showroom addition to the main building for the Lamborghini franchise and all associated site improvements.

The Commissioners agreed that an extension of the MAG campus to the east was appropriate particularly given the company's commitment to high quality architecture, landscaping and site design. Some Commissioners requested the applicant investigate whether or not the Porsche building and the Land Rover/Jaguar building could be switched and encouraged a less flat design for the latter. The Commission encouraged the applicant to place less emphasis on the proposed wall signs.

STAFF CERTIFICATION


Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Planner II

**2. MAG PUD – Jaguar, Land Rover, Porsche Expansion
15-091CP**

**6335 Perimeter Loop Road
Concept Plan**

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request for an expansion to the Midwestern Auto Group (MAG) campus to incorporate an additional 5.4 acres into the PUD for a showroom for the Jaguar and Land Rover franchises, the demolition of the existing Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new showroom for the Porsche brand, and the addition of an elevated showroom addition to the main building for the Lamborghini franchise and all associated site improvements. She said this is a request for review and informal, non-binding feedback for a Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Claudia Husak said this is a concept plan for MAG. She said the campus is approximately 30 acres north of US33 and south of Perimeter Drive with Venture Drive wrapping around the northern portion of the site to the east. She said approximately 24 acres is currently developed with the MAG campus.

Ms. Husak said the Planned Unit Development process consists of three steps, the first is Concept Plan review and are required when the site is over 25 acres and when the proposal does not meet the Community Plan as is the case with the application tonight. She said since the applicant is requesting feedback on an expansion of five acres, the Community Plan is determining the review by the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the comments and feedback as part of this application is non-binding and very similar to an informal application.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is able to take a concept plan application to City Council for their feedback as well. She said the next step would be a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan with more details and a development text with the applicable development standards. She explained that the third and last step is the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Husak said the proposal includes the two existing subareas, Subarea A is the largest of the subareas and includes the main MAG building which is the first building built for the campus and houses the majority of the automotive brands sold by MAG. She said, in 2010, the applicant had an expansion approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council to add the Volvo dealership which was a new dealership to the MAG campus. She said Porsche is currently in the rear of the Volvo portion of the main building, which also includes the penthouse suite. She said Subarea A also includes the 7,300-square-foot Land Rover/Range Rover building, which was approved to be demolished in 2014 with a new building to house Jaguar and Land Rover in its place. She said it included a sky bridge connection **between the main building to the new building, which as part of tonight's proposal is no longer a complete bridge connection but rather the elevated showroom for the Lamborghini brand.**

Ms. Husak said Subarea B is in the center of the site, which was included into the MAG campus in 2012 to move BMW and Mini from Post Road to this campus. She said at that time there was a reluctance to any additional expansion of the campus specifically concerning car dealership land use and the view of cars along US33 and the applicant mentioned that the BMW/Mini expansion as their last. She said any kind of expansion of this campus would have to go through all of the approval processes. She said during the approval of Subarea B with the BMW/Mini building, the Audi brand made a plea for their own free-standing, 11,000-square-foot building which was then incorporated into the campus expansion as part of Subarea B.

Ms. Husak said that Subarea C would be created if approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. She said it is currently a vacant 5.5-acre site owned by the applicant. She said the adjacent **neighbor to the east is Nationwide Children's Hospital. She said there is currently a large stormwater management pond on the western edge of the site that handles stormwater management for the**

neighboring sites. Ms. Husak pointed out that this pond is eliminated as part of this proposal and stormwater management will need to be addressed in more detail to the satisfaction of Engineering if this case moves forward.

Ms. Husak said the expansion of the campus and creation of Subarea C is being driven by Land Rover and Jaguar requesting a new building creating a new showroom and with Jaguar a new brand at the dealership.

Ms. Husak showed the Future Land Use Map from the Community Plan which was approved in 2013. She said the Subarea A portion of the site is designated as General Commercial on the map and the remainder is a Standard Office Institutional District which the proposal would not adhere to with Subarea B or C.

Ms. Husak said MAG has always been great in working with staff and figuring out creative ways to create architecture and interest on the campus with landscape screening and site layout. She requested **feedback from the Commissions regarding the Future Land Use designation and the applicant's wish to** expand the campus farther east. She said in all the subareas office is a permitted use, however, the office areas within each of the showrooms are small.

Ms. Husak said the proposed access point conflicts with the existing Nationwide Children's Hospital access point off Venture Drive and being immediately adjacent to this access is not something that would be supported by Engineering. She said in the northern portion of the site, the Land Rover building will be replaced with the Porsche building, which is slightly larger than the existing building. She said there is currently a test track for Range Rovers that will be eliminated creating more display area.

Ms. Husak said the main building does not have wall signs and the Land Rover building has a sign on the green panel and three wall signs were approved at heights higher than 15 feet stipulating that the green panel would be eliminated. She said the applicant is proposing one wall sign above 15 feet.

Ms. Husak said the sky bridge was approved in 2014 in a similar design, but this proposal eliminates the connection between the two buildings and only includes the elevated showroom.

Ms. Husak said Subarea C includes a proposal for a 29,000-square-foot building for Jaguar and Land Rover to be set in the center of the site at an angle and taking advantage of the views that might be provided from this location traveling along US33. She said the applicant **has continued the "fingers"** design of display spaces within the campus and provided landscape screening. She said the Code allows for a lower screening for vehicle display areas as opposed to parking lots where the screening has to be higher. She said there are display areas near the building as well as visitor and employee parking spaces. She said the building would include a non-retail car wash to the rear and there is a portion of the building that includes vehicle service areas that front onto US33. She said MAG has done a good job in lowering those types of uses or placing them along the sides of the building and this is a different design with having them in the front.

Ms. Husak said the building incorporates both brands with a main entry door in the center and the details related to height and size of the signs has not yet been submitted. She said the Planning and Zoning Commission allowed wall signs for the BMW, Mini, and the Audi dealerships but required them to be at the 15-foot height that Code would require. She said in the northern portion of the site the Planning and Zoning Commission did allow taller signs and staff has requested feedback related to those details. She said there are two signs proposed in addition to the brand identifications, **one says "Dublin" over the central door and then there is a "service" sign. She said that service signs have typically been low to the** ground and not required permits. She said the Service and Dublin wall signs seem unnecessary in this particular instance.

Ms. Husak read the proposed discussion questions:

1. Is the proposed land use appropriate?
2. Is the proposed layout sensitive to the previous concerns?
3. Does the Commission support the proposed architectural concepts?
4. What sign allowances would the Commission consider appropriate for the proposal?
5. Other considerations by the Commission.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, said he has been the architect for MAG for several years. He said they were here back in 2014 and asked for approval of the Jaguar and Land Rover on the north side of the campus. He said they were working on construction documents with hopes of breaking ground in August when Jaguar and Land Rover stopped 40 projects countrywide because they redesigned their image and brand to be more competitive in the US market. He said the building design being proposed is their new **prototype that will be rolling across the country soon and it is MAG's goal to be the first of this prototype** of 2017 Jaguar/Land Rover line of cars. He said it is that motivation for MAG to be the first to get the dealership done. He said he comes before the Commission humbly because he knows the history of the last five acres. He said it is important to Mark Brettlinger and MAG that his business keeps growing and he is seeing the growth potential with adding Jaguar to MAG by an immediate impact to his business being able to sell Jaguars having two years to build the facility. He said through this process he wants to look at the high line brands with Rolls-Royce, Bentley, Porsche, and Lamborghini and try to grow those within the Dublin market as well. He said this master plans takes all the cars and brands and shuffles them up and gives them a new home and identity so that he can grow his business.

Mr. Parish said the high line would all be interior modifications without any exterior modifications. He said the new architecture of the Jaguar prototype fits the style that is consistent along the corridor with BMW and Mini as well as Audi with a clean line, modern, and innovative with glass and metal. He said they began by orienting the building to give a three-quarter view to the building adding interest and help with the internal workings of the showroom to work better with the finger design that is common to the MAG campus. He said it was an artful way of creating display space. He said they are proposing some additional ponding in the front to handle some of the storm water and does have other means working through the engineers to provide details.

Mr. Parish said the curb cut conflict has been resolved by finding the shared access agreement with Nationwide Childrens Hospital that is in place and they tie into the existing drive and clean up the elevations. He said they will continue with the grove of trees along SR 33 to create a nice campus. He said the architecture is consistent across the frontage and the display fingers.

Mr. Parish said they proposing to tear down the existing Land Rover and slide the Porsche facility to be more on center with middle finger display and create more displays. He said they chose to put Porsche on the northern edge to continue with the curved edges of the front façade with the keyhole slot that plays nicely with the existing MAG massing where there is the concourse spin going down the center, which made Porsche a better fit. He said he does not know the exactly heights but would like to conform to Code.

Mr. Parish said he has changed the Lamborghini because of the concourse spin which is a CMU wall that is curved is going to continue on past to create an adult version of a Match Box car display as seen in the **grocery store where there are Lamborghini's hanging out over the water. He said instead of creating the** back concourse area that connect downward, he wanted to create a showroom and cut behind the wall that he created off the concourse wall that is a cantilevered elevated showroom with some structural post underneath. He said they are creating an outdoor vestibule space that will host Lamborghini events where the customer can go in and outside during the events creating a unique space.

Mr. Parish said he would like to get feedback on the staff questions, specifically on the remaining 5.4 acres and adding the Jaguar franchise to the MAG campus.

Ms. Newell asked if they are re-working in the test track.

Mr. Parish said it is not a requirement any longer and they have opted not to do it.

Ms. Newell asked if there were anyone from the public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Newell said she likes the design of **the elevated "Match Box" design of the building and it will be a** spectacular part of the campus. She said she is not concerned about the extension of the campus and knows that City Council may have different priorities, but from a planning stand point if the same level of architectural detail continues through the site and it remains well developed and unified across the whole site she is comfortable with expanding the territory to provide new business opportunities and to expand the business operations that are here.

Ms. Newell said she agrees with the curve of the building for Porsche, but when she looks at the mass of the plan she would like to reverse the two buildings because of the size difference. She said because the Porsche building is smaller in scale, it could potentially be more palatable on that smaller area of the site. She said because the retention ponds are squashed in around the fingers and not well integrated into the design, having a smaller building on that location could provide more opportunity.

Ms. Newell said the east elevation of the Porsche as the drive through area returns around at the east side of the elevation it abruptly short and with the massing of the building she would want to extend that element further across that particular façade.

Ms. Newell said regarding the height of the signs, the previous concession allowing a change in height worked with the architecture of the building which is why they allowed the higher signs and in exchange for getting away from the green which was out of place given the whole campus grey, white and black scheme that goes on with all the architectural elements. She said when she looks at all the elevations of the new signs it does not hurt the building to lower them to a 15-foot height. She said keeping the aesthetic appearance of how the signage works on the façade will be important.

Ms. Newell asked for the Land Rover building service entrance to be explained.

Mr. Parish said at the backside of the Audi dealership there is a service drive around the corner with the high-speed doors that open and close quickly. He said this will be a service reception and is a single story building so that the customer could exit their car at the service drive and enter immediately into the showroom and enjoy the shopping experience where the existing MAG campus they enter below and have to climb steps which is problematic for ADA requirements. He said they tried to provide some screening for the western view and there is an opportunity at the fingers to provide additional landscape screening against the overhead doors.

Ms. Newell said they are using the space similarly to new car delivery. She said the adjacent site (Crown) has a similar arrangement on their site with glass doors with some screening, where the doors appear to be windows on the building and asked what MAG is proposing for the opening for the doors.

Mr. Parish said the new service reception is typically tiled and finished almost like a showroom finish when done. He said the doors proposing are **"Rytec"** high-speed doors that are two seconds up and two seconds down. He said they are the same doors on the Audi building with a full vision panel that are approximately four inches.

Ms. Newell said she agrees with staff on the signage of the service that is proposed over top, that it can be handled more discreetly. She said the elevations of the building with the materials that are being

proposed do match within the campus. She said she is struck with the flatness across the front of the building and would like to see more play in the elevation.

Mr. Brown said it is appropriate on the proposed site stating that is what the area is and their buildings are superior to any other along that road. He said there is a certain vocabulary that goes on with the established block and it works. He said he assumes the panels are a dry joint rain screen, nice crisp, **clean panels. He said he shares Ms. Newell's notion that it appears flat with nothing dynamic going on.** He said in the Mini/BMW building there is the two opposing colors that is dynamic and striking and then the Audi after that is a wonderful presentation. He said he would hate to see anything that does not live up to the standard. He asked for the color of the panels.

Mr. Parish said the darker panels are a dark grey material with a dry joint with a more contemporary linear fashion and the other is a bone color that demarks the entrance to the facility. He said the inside is a different color grey that looks chiseled back to the butt joint glass system with mullions behind the glass similar to Audi. He said so that it looks like a clean sheet of glass.

Mr. Brown said he shares the opinion of staff and Ms. Newell about the service area. He said there is a certain signage vocabulary on this site that has a nice rhythm on this campus and this would be different and progressive in logic to the signage and they should maintain that as best you can as they have with the layout. He said he loves the Lamborghini site.

Mr. Brown said he appreciates the nice manicured screening being provided along US33 and he said the Porsche building and the signage fits the vocabulary of the rest of the campus and integrates well with the rest of the campus.

Mr. Brown agreed that they have to figure out the pond issues.

Mr. Miller said he agrees with the land use. He said if they move the Porsche building over to where the **Land Rover building is it would soften the impact on Children's Hospital by making it smaller and would** provide a transition into the building. He said the campus is awesome. He said he agrees the building on the Land Rover is too flat. He said to soften the signs and he asked if the Porsche building were moved would the Land Rover building fit on the Porsche site on the plan.

Mr. Parish said the reason they chose this site for Porsche was to provide some employee/overflow parking in the corner towards the back away from US33 and they like to have the pool of parking in the back because the vegetation has heavily grown. He said from a site strategy it does make sense to move the buildings but they lose the parking function if moved.

Mr. Miller said it would be easier to gain his full support if the building sites were switched.

Ms. De Rosa said she loves this campus and likes to drive by and loves the Audi building as it is her favorite. She said they have done a nice job on the campus so an additional five acres to this is more attractive than an office building. She said she is a huge Jaguar fan and is glad it is coming to Dublin. She said driving down into a service area and walking into a showroom is a nice experience and there has been a nice job done interior that makes people want to look at the new cars and she thought it works well. She said she agrees that the building looks a little less interesting then the other ones but may be hard to see on a rendering. She said she is supportive of the land use and looks forward to what they bring back.

Mr. Stidhem said he is in support of the land use and is a great fit on the land and he does not have a problem with the building locations. He said the signage and all the discussion is surprising since the cars are their advertising and he knows where the Porsches are because they are there and he does not need

to see a sign to know they are there and he does not understand the issue with the signage. He said he is in complete support of the building and the campus.

Mr. Brown asked if the Land Rover and Jaguar rollout is the unified building.

Mr. Parish said they have had a prototype on that for years with Jaguar and Land Rover, but they had two sacred items of the slopped roof and the green pylon was Land Rover and Jaguar had a round rotunda, which was collaborated in the last design. He said the signage is not a problem while on the campus. He said it is the 70 mph traffic getting to the campus from US33 to pull them in that says there is a Porsche or Jaguar showroom to the interior.

Ms. Newell said the presentation that is being shown went through several times to get it down to the version that was approved. She said she has worked for car dealerships before and car manufacturers love their signage and branding and always they always what they want presented to a Commission first before they will yield to something else.

Mr. Brown said he has seen plenty of dealerships and looking at the Porsche sign is to scale and appropriate with the building. He said it is interesting about the branding about the Jaguar and the Land Rover because next to the other buildings, it is flat and they are trying to do something with the glass and the jewel box will look cool but those are dynamic buildings that are next to it. He said the returns and terminates on the ends have been handled gracefully on campus by a taller wall or something to demark the front elevation or the presentation how it returns to the service. He said there has always been isolation as they catching different elevations there is not an abrupt transition from the clean sleek panels to stucco or block or corrugated panels, it is always an important concern especially how the building are rotated slightly off axis.

Ms. Newell asked if there were any more questions for the Commission and if they had provided enough direction.

Mr. Parish said it has been a great dialog and he hopes to have a similar dialog at City Council. He said it has been an ongoing process of the MAG campus and it has evolved and is bigger than they had envisioned through the years. He thanked the Commission for their comments.

**3. NE Quad PUD, Subareas 5A and 5B, Kroger Marketplace and Northstar Retail Centers
15-093AFDP
Sawmill and Hard Roads
Amended Final Development Plan**

~~Ms. Newell said the following application is to modify a previously approved final development plan to include black as an approved awning color for retail centers located at the northwest corner of Sawmill and Hard Roads, east of Emerald Parkway. This is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. The Commission is the final authority on this application and we will need to swear in. She swore in those who intended on addressing the Commission.~~

~~Ms. Newell said this is on the consent agenda and did not need a formal presentation.~~

~~Ms. Newell asked if there were anyone from the public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]~~

Motion and Vote

~~Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because the proposal complies with the applicable review criteria and the existing development standards.~~



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

SEPTEMBER 18, 2014

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**1. MAG PUD, Land Rover/Range Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini 6325 Perimeter Loop Road
14-046AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

Proposal:	Demolition of the Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 30,000-square-foot showroom for the Land Rover/Range Rover and Jaguar franchises; a sky bridge connecting the proposed building to the main MAG building; and associated site improvements at the southeast corner of the intersection of Perimeter Loop Road with Perimeter Drive with a text modification to decrease the pavement setbacks.
Request:	Review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan application and text modification under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.
Applicant:	Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance; and Jack Reynolds, Smith & Hale LLC.
Planning Contact:	Claudia Husak, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #1: Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend **approval** of the following Minor Text Modifications:

- 1) Decrease the pavement setback to 45 feet along US33/SR161 for the display areas impacted by ODOT right-of-way takes as part of the US33/I-270 interchange project;
- 2) Provide parking at a ratio of one space per service bag in Subarea A; and
- 3) Permitting three wall signs in Subarea A as proposed as part of the Amended Final Development Plan (14-046AFDP).

* Brad Parish agreed to the above modifications.

VOTE: 5 – 2.

RESULT: The Minor Text Modifications were **approved**.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	No
Victoria Newell	No
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

SEPTEMBER 18, 2014

- 1. MAG PUD, Land Rover/Range Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini 6325 Perimeter Loop Road
14-046AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

MOTION #2: Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend **approval** of the Amended Final Development Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That the plans be revised to address building material inconsistencies on sheet 4.01;
- 2) That the applicant work with Planning to identify additional areas for replacement trees, prior to submitting for a building permit;
- 3) That the size of the brand identification sign be reduced to 40 inches; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the application to remove the green building materials from the application and replace the material with a material and color reflecting existing characteristics on campus.

* Brad Parish agreed to the four conditions.

VOTE: 6 – 1.

RESULT: The Amended Final Development Plan with four conditions was **approved**.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	No
Victoria Newell	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia Husak, AICP, Planner II

1. MAG PUD, Land Rover/Range Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini

14-046AFDP

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

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for demolition of the Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 30,000-square-foot showroom for the Land Rover, Range Rover and Jaguar franchises; a sky bridge connecting the proposed building to the main MAG building; and associated site improvements at the southeast corner of the intersection of Perimeter Loop Road with Perimeter Drive with a text modification to decrease the pavement setbacks. The Commission is the final authority on this application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in anyone who intends to address the Commission on this case.

Claudia Husak said this application will require the Commission to make two motions. She said there are three Minor Development Text Modifications proposed for this application. She provided a quick overview of what has since changed since the Commission last reviewed this application informally in June.

Ms. Husak explained the site was rezoned in 2010 to incorporate the entire MAG campus. She said it accommodates a multitude of auto franchises within the City. She said the zoning district is divided into two subareas, where Subarea B was created specifically for Audi and BMW/Mini and Subarea A on the west side includes the Lane Dealership building with several automotive brands such as Saab, Aston Martin, Bentley, Porsche, Volkswagen, and Volvo. She noted the existing Land Rover and Range Rover building to the north on the subarea map, which is about 7,500 square feet. She said within that Development Text, it was written to take that building as it existed into account.

Ms. Husak said the proposal includes the demolition of the existing 7,335-square-foot Land Rover building and replace it with a new 34,000-square-foot building to house the Land Rover, Range Rover, and Jaguar franchises and provide the connection between the new building and the existing main dealership building via a sky bridge across the pond. She said the sky bridge is intended as a showroom for the Lamborghini brand.

Ms. Husak reported Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) is working with its design consultant and the City of Dublin to complete the plan design on the US33/I-270 interchange upgrade. She explained that ODOT is in the process of acquiring rights-of-way to align pavement setback requirements which will decrease due to the right-of-way takes. She said there are a lot of parcels within the City that will be impacted and MAG is included going as far west as the Crowne Kia site. She said Staff has been working with ODOT in determining zoning impact compliance of right-of-way takes in terms of sign location, setbacks, landscaping, and tree removal, etc. She said MAG has been informed that required right-of-way takes impact compliance with the pavement setbacks required in the development text.

Ms. Husak reported the taking of right-of-way will make the site non-compliant and Planning suggested the applicant request a minor modification to the development text that slightly decreases the pavement setback requirement from 60 feet to 50 feet to ensure zoning compliance. She added that ODOT has said the setback encroachment will be less than four feet but 10 feet is suggested to allow ODOT some flexibility but is concerned that 50 feet might not be enough so she now recommends 45 feet. She said one area impacted is in front of Volvo where the vehicle display area is designed with a unique finger-like arrangement along US33 at the southern boundary and the other is on the very eastern portion of the campus where again there is vehicle display fingers for BMW and Mini. She pointed out the black line to illustrate the existing right-of-way and the red line is the new right-of-way.

Amy Salay asked if there was a condition attached to that, which would state they are not allowed to change anything basically ODOT is doing the changing but MAG is not, now or in the future.

Ms. Husak clarified as in the site remains as approved and offered to tighten up the language for the text modification.

Ms. Husak said the pond that is located along the Perimeter Loop frontage is decreasing in size, which was discussed in June. She said the pond is increasing in depth to manage stormwater. She said the applicant at the building permit stage will also be required to demonstrate they area meeting quality and quantity for stormwater management. She reported the building increase in square footage would require some removal of parking. She said in June, the Commission was generally supportive of allowing a development text modification that provides less parking. She recommended the applicant provide parking spaces at a ratio of one space per service bay in Subarea A as opposed to requiring an overall number for the site.

Ms. Husak said there was a lot of discussion in June about the elevations to evoke more of the MAG style/character, where the development text requires striking and modern architecture. She said building materials were discussed providing what is on the remainder of the campus, creating angles, sharp edges, and points of interest within the elevation. She reported that overall, the applicant has changed rooflines to create more of these angles; increased the glass along the front elevation to provide transparency; provided some horizontal metal accents; diminished the overall beige material originally proposed and only focusing that on the Jaguar entrance; and the stone water table is only one of the more rugged pieces within the Land Rover and Range Rover portion of the building. She presented some perspective drawings to show what that would look like.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is proposing a lot of glass and metal for the sky bridge which serves as a showroom, suspended over the pond which requires concrete and metal support legs that extend to the ground. She presented an illustration which showed more industrial and modern materials for the front façade with floor to ceiling windows, corrugated metal and light and dark grey stucco for the rear, and a fiber cement rain screen with visible fasteners to provide a connecting element between the two portions and is the material used on the Audi service write-up area.

Ms. Husak said the proposal includes three wall signs on the north elevation. She explained the development text did not anticipate this new building and sky bridge and currently only permits one wall sign identifying a single brand on the north façade of the northernmost building in this Subarea, permitted at a height of 25 feet. She stated this proposal requests a 33.5-square-foot wall sign of the Land Rover oval logo and a 21.65-square-foot wall sign for the Range Rover franchise. She explained text limits the size of wall signs to 35 square feet. She reported that both signs are proposed along the metal accent band on the north elevation at a height of 23.2 feet. She said a third sign was proposed for above the entrance to the Jaguar showroom which has chrome letters and the chrome Jaguar logo, 35 square feet in size and at a height of 24 feet.

Ms. Husak said the proposed signs would require a development text modification. She said Planning suggests the applicant eliminate one of the three proposed wall signs and supports a development text modification to permit one additional wall sign at a size of 35 square feet and a height of 25 feet. She presented some images of the campus as it is proposed. She said the applicant is allowed a brand identification sign which is shown at most of the entrances to most of the dealership buildings but should be limited to 40 square feet. She said the plans call out a green metal material in this area near the Jaguar entrance but believes that is a mistake.

Ms. Husak stated the plans show the removal of 354 inches of healthy trees about six inches in diameter and 224.5 inches are shown to be replaced. She said Planning recommends additional areas where trees could be replaced, particularly in the detention basin.

Ms. Husak summarized the conditions for this proposal to be approved.

The Chair invited the applicant to state his name and address for the record.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, 165 N. 5th Street, set up samples for the Commission and thanked them for the opportunity to speak on behalf of MAG. He indicated that Jack Reynolds was also present to assist.

Mr. Parish said since the June meeting, he has tried to make Jaguar and Land Rover understand MAG as a campus and be given the opportunity to mold their prototype building into something significant on MAG's campus. He indicated he sent the June meeting minutes to them to review the Commission's comments and they gave him the opportunity to come up with something creative, thinking outside the box. However, he said, there are three sacred cows that must be adhered to: 1) Land Rover tower with the sloped roof; 2) Jaguar portico; and 3) the associated signs on each of those elements.

Mr. Parish started with the Land Rover sloped roof and tower as this was the most foreign element to the campus, creating a vernacular form in a contemporary way. He explained the long showroom body is a long bar with a low sloped pitched roof providing a very thin profile, much like BMW. He added he went from grade to roof with storefront, allowing heavy beam trusses to be visible, marrying the traditional and contemporary element from inside out. He said this gave purpose and scale to the Land Rover tower on the building elevation. He explained the Jaguar portico is the hinge-point to the three fragmented boxes that contain the new car delivery, the showroom, and the service reception area, providing organization and purpose on the site.

Mr. Parish addressed the comments from the June meeting, which spoke to the service area on the backside of the building and provided a design reminiscent of the original MAG building and also addressed comments made about the sky bridge. He explained that corrugated metal was used throughout the campus: as equipment screening up on the roof adjacent to the sky bridge; above each of the entrances into each one of the diamonds; and on the sky bridge. He explained his design for the ramp, windows and back elevation. He provided a story about how he was inspired to create the Lamborghini suspended showroom, based on a matchbox car display in a store. From a site standpoint, he addressed issues with the test track. He said he would like to relocate the one that exists, creating more of a forest around it, so the test drive was redesigned to simulate going through a rocky mountain which enhances the experience. He said this will also help screen the overhead doors on the service write-up, too.

Mr. Parish recalled a phone conversation with the owner of MAG (Jaguar/Land Rover) and he told him the history of when Land Rover came to Dublin when the tower and emblem were a hot button in 1997. Mr. Parish indicated that without that tower and emblem, Land Rover would have never come to Dublin. He said it has been discussed as to who can have wall signs and who cannot and explained that they have three brands, much like BMW and Mini. He said they want the right to be competitive in the market, being that BMW/Mini/Audi are of the same. Mr. Parish said he had told MAG that there is a difference between Subarea A and Subarea B for signs but MAG wanted Mr. Parish to show all three signs proposed and as they exist today per their corporate branding globally. He conveyed that each brand dealer must have a sign to be an authorized dealer for Jaguar, Land Rover, and Range Rover.

Mr. Parish said he reduced the text for the Jaguar sign so it was fall within the conformity of the square footage requirement. He said Jaguar is new to the campus and is expected to bring in \$20 million in annual revenue for a total between these two franchises of \$36 million annual revenue to the City and 10 additional employees. He said this design is more expensive but MAG believes this is an investment back into Dublin.

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public that would like to comment with respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

Victoria Newell asked what color materials are proposed for Jaguar cylinder and confirmed the only green on the building is the Land Rover tower.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Jaguar portion was stucco or manufactured panels. Mr. Parish said they do have an option for EIFS.

Ms. Newell said she appreciated all the effort Mr. Parish had put into the design of this building. She said she has always liked the sky bridge as it is really creative and a welcome addition to the building. She stated she is struggling with the Range Rover green element and requests for signage. She said she perceives that whole column, being highlighted in green, as the whole sign. She indicated she understands that is what the dealership is looking for but it stands out more than everything else on the campus that is a nice neutral gray palette. She said she finds the overhang awkward in proportion to the rest of the scale of the building. She indicated she was a lot more comfortable with the Jaguar component and the way that it is presented this time. She said she has not completely studied the test track but would appreciate an attempt at making it more integrated into the design of the building. She indicated she still struggles with the signs proposed.

Amy Kramb said she was ok with changing the setback because of the ODOT takes and agrees that a condition be written whereas MAG cannot alter the layout and extend their pavement 10 feet closer in those areas. Ms. Kramb indicated she was still supportive of the reduction in parking. She agreed that the Land Rover sign with the green looks like the whole space is the sign. She said she understands that is the color they want and would be more apt to give the applicant a sign for Land Rover and one for Range Rover if that whole tower was not green. She said she would prefer a brushed metal or something different. She asked that the Land Rover and Range Rover signs were reduced so combined, they would meet the 35-square-foot requirement and noted there is a smaller version in the ground sign. She indicated the height is what the text allows. She said she could be persuaded if the applicant wanted to change the text and remove the ground sign to have three wall signs; otherwise, two wall signs would be the limit. She believes there are options available to the applicant to achieve their logos, just smaller. She said the architecture looks better than the original proposal. She suggested if that green had to be used, she would prefer it be repeated somewhere else. She stated she likes the sky bridge over the water that is allowed to go right up to the building. She concluded her biggest concern was signage.

Todd Zimmerman asked about the Jaguar sign. Mr. Parish explained the individual letters would stand off. Mr. Zimmerman said he could live with the way the signs are now. He asked if Lamborghini would be coming in for a sign for the sky box. Mr. Parish reported that Lamborghini provided a proposal that was turned down. Mr. Zimmerman said he likes the architecture and understands how the test track can be better integrated to hide the doors, which would be an improvement he could support. He indicated he understands the setback is more for ODOT and is fine with a minor text modification. He said he can see how this proposal will blend into the existing buildings and campus.

Richard Taylor said he appreciated Mr. Parish's efforts trying to design a building where every occupant is an individual client. He said this proposal is better than the previous design and said the long low pitched slope roof better integrates into the building. He indicated he does not have a problem with parking or setbacks. He said the only thing that bothers him about that elevation is that symmetrically placed entryway, but that is his personal preference. He said the number or placement of the signs on the entire campus is not unattractive or inappropriate, but reviewing this in the context of all the other businesses in the City and especially the ones across the street from this that are also car dealerships and are restricted on signs for multiple brands. He stated he would be in support of two signs but not three as he has to consider other applicants that come in and hard to explain why MAG would get all the signs when someone else does not.

John Hardt said he is appreciative and sympathetic to the work Mr. Parish has done. He stated he had no trouble at all with the test track, especially if it is integrated into the landscape. He said the display by the

front door is out of place, effectively becoming a sign when they park cars on it, elevated into the air. He said there are no other dealerships in town that the Commission gives that courtesy. Mr. Hardt requested clarification when Mr. Parish was speaking of a new location.

Mr. Parish explained that both still exist in the new proposal. He said the test track is relocated but there is a Jaguar and a Land Rover display, and if there is a six-inch grade difference; it is like sitting up on a curb but would be happy to minimize it.

Mr. Hardt said he was ok with it as long as the height is measured in inches, less than 12 inches. He said the current one is every bit as tall as he is, which he has an issue with. He recalled a lot of discussion about the treatment of the edge of the pond the last time. He said with the current proposal, it seems to be primarily a concrete edge/the retaining wall. He asked if there was a system proposed/or already there today to maintain that water level both up and down.

Mr. Parish explained the current pond is regulated by a well in that area and there is a proposed fill way so it can and will keep it at a constant level. He said it obviously has to handle the stormwater and will bump up to handle that and if it exceeds, it goes over the spillway.

Mr. Hardt said this is obviously a PUD and there is development text that is agreed upon that allows for certain things to occur that often times are outside the bounds of Code but there are tradeoffs to allow for that. He said Code is the underlying foundation on any given site. He noted in this case, Code allows the wall signs, typically facing the highway, which gave him a comfort level for approving the BMW and Mini signs. Conversely, he said, Perimeter Drive has no wall signs anywhere. He stated the only way he would support this application would be if there was a holistic look of the campus. He said when the original project was approved, there was a very well done Master Sign Plan that described the collection of signs with high quality and purpose. He said since then, another building was added and the request for a sign was reasoned to be because this building was not anticipated at the time the Master Sign Plan was created. He indicated now there is a sky bridge and a third building we did not anticipate. He said in each case, the solution was to add more signs. He said that is a trend he grows increasingly uncomfortable with. He said if there was an attempt to go back and take a fresh look at everything, and anticipate, not only this project but what is coming next based on what we know today as compared to 1990. Mr. Hardt said Mr. Taylor referenced the "neighbors" across the street, he had the same concerns but is also concerned about this property and not altogether convinced, a year from now, Volvo or Porsche is not going to say we want a sign on our showroom, too.

Mr. Hardt summarized that the architecture and building is great, and fundamentally he does not have a problem with the project but signage he is not comfortable with.

Mr. Parish said the Code we are talking about was done in 2009, during the Volvo project. He said prior to any knowledge of BMW, Mini, Audi, rezoning that site developing new text for that site. He reported that he and Ms. Husak took pictures of all the signs and wrote the text to conform to the **signs that were there. He said the text was written based on existing conditions.**

Mr. Hardt said that was his point. He said we have existing conditions that evolve from individual projects and individual needs and continually revising the text to allow for those conditions to continue to exist.

Mr. Parish said the adjacent property is a PCD, part of the Commerce area, so it has stricter guidelines than what our PUD has, which is a fundamental difference. He said in 2004, when he first came with the first sign for Jaguar and Land Rover, Volvo was part of the brand, that building was approved with this signage (with a larger Jaguar leaper). He said revisions were made in 2010 and now we have a new body in 2014 but what has fundamentally changed in the Code that disallows this proposal.

Mr. Hardt said he believes it is time to create a careful, thoughtful, and comprehensive Master Sign Plan for the whole campus. He said it is not just the proposal in front of us that is of concern, it is the unknown of what comes next.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said we have heard “we are done on this property”, no less than three times.

Mr. Hardt suggested a conversation with all the brands on the campus.

Mr. Parish said he would be happy to do that but where does that leave us today with this application and moving forward with this project.

Ms. Salay said she likes the changes. She said the “pile of rocks” does not belong and is happy the test track is going to be a drive through a forest. She said one thing that has not been said is in Dublin, it is more about identification and not advertising. She said signs are needed to find the dealership and there is a balance between a certain look with the leaper and the green for Land Rover, however, we balance that with our community standards. She agrees there is probably not a better location in Central Ohio for these dealerships. She indicated she is comfortable with Land Rover and Range Rover but if the green could be removed and back it with stone or something that matches would be preferable. She said great work has been done on this impressive, modern, architecture but all of the green comprises the sign. She noted when you look at the boards here it is easy to see ‘what does not belong’. She said a lot of times there is a choice between wall signs and ground signs, ground signs being much more directional in nature versus advertising. She indicated there is way more good here than bad and appreciates all the changes and material boards but she is just not comfortable with the green tower.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the architecture is fantastic, outstanding, and impressive. She is really impressed with the way the water treatment is up against the building. She believes this will be really cool at night with fantastic lighting options and is thrilled. She said her only concern is with the sign and not particularly the Jaguar sign. She said the ground sign graphics and colors were appropriate. She indicated she could get comfortable with both Land Rover and Range Rover being on there but the way this sign is treated with this small portion in green and then these letters mounted on this much muted color, if the tower were of a muted color, and these were imposed here, she could probably support this application tonight. She said she really appreciated how Mr. Parish integrated this element that they had to have, exceptionally well done. She said she likes the rooflines, glass, Lamborghini showplace but the only thing she is not thrilled about is this green tower as it stands in isolation. She noted she would not want to see any more green on this building. She said just as your client has pointed to the others, everyone else is going to point to you that comes in here after you and we have to have a good reason to defend the position that we took here this evening. She said what we see before us does not give us a very sound perspective to defend our decision.

Mr. Parish said the color green is very important to the brand.

The Chair said the green within the sign is probably palatable to the Commission but the green tower is not.

Mr. Parish said in this proposal the green element is a climax between the contemporary and the traditional design and heightens that experience.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the applicant could defend this all day from an architectural perspective and would probably be right because he an architect but to the Commission it is a sign.

Mr. Parish said the client is committed to bringing Jaguar to this campus and he is willing to remove existing signs on-site to get these wall signs specifically at the curb cut entrance on Bencher Drive and Perimeter Loop. He said he is willing to remove a 15-foot pylon sign that has every brand indicated along with MAG to get these brands here in Dublin.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said maybe it is appropriate to do an inventory and a vision of what we want to pass. She asked the applicant to look back and forward and come holistically with that. The Chair said she believes he could walk out of here tonight with approval on the building with no problem and the only exception she has heard strongly is this green tower and the only part of that is the greenness of the tower and not the signs themselves.

Mr. Parish said we are committed to our new brands coming out in 2016 so the clock is ticking on our side to make that happen.

Mr. Hardt said it is not uncommon at all for the Commission to review a project for its architecture and site layout approval that with a condition the signs have to come back later for approval.

Mr. Parish said the project does not move forward unless the signs are approved. He asked if there were additional compromises we could make here to get additional signs onsite.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission will give you the signs we just will not give you that architectural feature behind the signs.

Ms. Salay said for this proposal that is honestly a compromise.

Mr. Parish said he would like to pull the signs from the application for the Commission to vote on the building itself and will come back. He said there would have to be a caveat about the "greenness" of the building.

Ms. Newell said she loved the architecture of the building; it has a distinct color palette, and green is not one of those elements. She said she would not support the architecture of the building from the viewpoint of having green on the façade.

Ms. Salay said it belongs on the sign and not on the building like that.

Mr. Hardt said he could not guarantee any outcome but suggested the applicant ask for approval tonight of the architecture and the signs, minus the green; realizing that is a sacred cow, it potentially allows the applicant to get going. He explained there are a lot of weeks of construction and things that have to happen before that material goes on the building. He suggested the applicant use that time to come back with a revised Master Sign Plan after looking at the site holistically. He said at that point, it would just be an issue of materials.

Ms. Amorose Groomes interjected the color of the materials would be the issue.

Mr. Parish asked if the color green was pulled from the proposal, could a straw poll be taken.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to have a condition that the green is not there to then come back with a Master Sign Plan, later.

Ms. Kramb suggested Mr. Parish could return to the client in the meantime and say that he successfully obtained three signs.

Mr. Hardt said his suggestion is predicated on the assumption that the applicant wants to put shovels in the ground.

Mr. Taylor said to be clear, according to Ms. Amorose Groomes, the applicant would still retain the green background in the oval.

Mr. Parish clarified the materials. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it could be the same materials, just a different finish; she said the commission is really talking about a color change.

Mr. Zimmerman said, as a non-architect, he offered the suggestion of lowering the sign for Land Rover and Range Rover, to the size that the green is a base.

The Chair said she wanted to see what the applicant comes back with.

The Chair told the applicant she thought he could get an approval with the exception of the background color of this particular architectural element. She recommended that the applicant return with a Master Sign Plan to request approval. The applicant, Mr. Parish agreed.

While Ms. Husak was rewriting the conditions, Mr. Parish asked for clarification on the ground sign to be 40-inches as in the development text.

Ms. Husak clarified three wall signs have been requested. Ms. Amorose Groomes noted as proposed in the application.

Ms. Husak said she changed the first development text modification to state the following:

- 1) Decrease the pavement setback to 45 feet along US33/SR161 for the display areas impacted by ODOT right-of-way takes as part of the US33/I-270 interchange project;
- 2) Provide parking at a ratio of one space per service bay in Subarea A; and
- 3) Permitting three wall signs in Subarea A as proposed as part of the Amended Final Development Plan (14-046AFDP).

Ms. Kramb requested that the applicant not be allowed to increase parking to meet the new setback or do anything different than what is on the Final Development Plan.

Jack Reynolds, Smith and Hale said nobody can change it without first coming back to the PZC and requesting it so this appropriately reflects that. Ms. Kramb agreed.

Ms. Husak said the change to the conditions for the Amended Final Development Plan are as follows:

- 1) That the plans be revised to address building material inconsistencies on sheet 4.01;
- 2) That the applicant work with Planning to identify additional areas for replacement trees, prior to submitting for a building permit;
- 3) That the size of the brand identification sign be reduced to 40 inches; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the application to remove the green building materials from the application and replace the material with a material and color reflecting existing characteristics on campus.

The Chair called for two motions and two votes.

Ms. Newell asked for height limitations before voting. Ms. Husak responded, 24 feet is the height limit.

Ms. Newell asked what the standard height that is proposed in the City of Dublin. Ms. Husak responded, 15 feet.

Ms. Newell clarified that the development text was being modified where the limit is one sign at the 23 foot height and three signs are being proposed. She said she thought it was only fair for other businesses that are limited to 15 feet for height and is sorry for being a stick in the mud for signs for an otherwise beautiful project.

The Chair said when the applicant returns with the Master Sign Plan, all of those things would be up for discussion.

Ms. Newell clarified the text actually said they were allowed one wall sign so these two items are actually together in that because the applicant is asking for more signs, which she is willing to support but not willing to support going above that 15-foot sign regulation that the Commission is enforcing citywide.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was willing to let that go until the Commission sees the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Hardt said he remains uncomfortable with the signs.

The Chair asked the applicant if he agreed to the three conditions as written. Mr. Parish said he did.

Ms. Husak said most of the Commission is ok with the signs as they are proposed today if the green goes away. She said she did not catch the 'coming back for a Master Sign Plan' portion of the discussion.

Mr. Hardt said he suggested if the applicant wanted to get the green back, they could come back and make an argument for a Master Sign Plan but there is nothing that says the applicant has to come back with a Master Sign Plan, although that is what he would like to see. He said if the client decides they can live without the green, it can be built as approved.

Mr. Parish said not necessarily because he still needs to submit material for the green.

Ms. Husak said the condition was written that the applicant select a material already existing on campus and it stands approved.

The Chair said she needed to take a quick straw poll. She said she was comfortable with what Ms. Husak stated. Mr. Hardt said he was not and the irony here is he is suggesting an approach that he does not support but he believes gets the votes. Ms. Kramb said she was ok with that because the whole tower will not appear as being the sign.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval of the Minor Text Review with three conditions:

- 1) Decrease the pavement setback to 45 feet along US33/SR161 for the display areas impacted by ODOT right-of-way takes as part of the US33/I-270 interchange project;
- 2) Provide paring at a ratio of one space per service bay in Subarea A; and
- 3) Permitting three wall signs in Subarea A as proposed as part of the Amended Final Development Plan (14-046AFDP).

Brad Parish agreed to the conditions earlier. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, no; Ms. Newell, no; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 2)

The Chair asked the applicant if he agreed to the modified conditions for the Amended Final Development Plan. Brad Parish agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That the plans be revised to address building material inconsistencies on sheet 4.01;

- 2) That the applicant work with Planning to identify additional areas for replacement trees, prior to submitting for a building permit;
- 3) That the size of the brand identification sign be reduced to 40 inches; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the application to remove the green building materials from the application and replace the material with a material and color reflecting existing characteristics on campus.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, no; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 1)

**2- Deer Run PUD, Subarea C-Cortona
14-062FDP/FP
Plat**

**Dublin Road and Memorial Drive
Final Development Plan/Final**

~~The Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request to plat and develop 37 single-family, cluster lots with 7.3 acres of open space and associated site improvements for Subarea C within the Deer Run Planned Unit Development, at the northeast corner of the intersection of Dublin Road and Memorial Drive. Three motions are required, one for the Development Text Modification, one for the Final Development Plan and one for the Final Plat. The Commission will forward their recommendation to City Council for the Final Plat.~~

~~Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in anyone who intended to address the Commission on this case.~~

~~Marie Downie pointed out that there were some public comments that were provided to the Commission, prior to the meeting.~~

~~Ms. Downie presented the site and said the Rezoning, Preliminary Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat were approved by PZC and City Council in 2011, including a tree waiver due to the large number of trees planted by the owner. She said Subareas A and B have both been approved for Estate Lots. She said Subarea C was approved for cluster lots and is the first subarea in the Deer Run site to continue with the Final Development Plan and Final Plat.~~

~~Ms. Downie reported the applicant did arrange a public meeting with the surrounding Amberleigh neighbors a few weeks ago, however, there was zero attendance.~~

~~Ms. Downie stated the site is approximately 17.6 acres at Dublin Road and Memorial Drive, surrounded by PUD residential areas as well as the Amberleigh Community Park to the south. She said the proposed Final Development Plan includes 37 single-family lots, clustered behind two main tree preservation areas along Memorial Drive and Dublin Road to preserve the surrounding trees. She said there are 7.3 acres of open space proposed that will be owned and maintained by the Homeowner's Association. She explained that access is provided from Memorial Drive by Sapri Boulevard, a gated private drive aligned with the intersection of Autumnwood Way. She said the streets are all proposed to be private drives which was previously approved by City Council at the time of the rezoning. She said there were no internal sidewalks proposed, which was also approved at the time of the rezoning, however, there is a five foot sidewalk proposed to the north of Memorial Drive and a four foot path that connects Pesaro Way to the Amberleigh Community Park.~~

~~Ms. Downie reported that the text has specific requirements for each lot. She said there are four lots that are not meeting the minimum 120 foot lot depth or the 60 foot minimum lot width requirements and there is a text modification included in this application for those lots. She explained the minimum width and depth requirements are to ensure that houses will be able to fit on these lots, while providing space for other amenities. She reported the applicant has provided examples of lot configurations in~~



City of Dublin

**Land Use and Long
Range Planning**
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 5, 2014

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2. MAG PUD, Subarea A, Land Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini Informal Review
14-046AFDP Amended Final Development Plan
6325 Perimeter Loop Road**

Proposal: An informal request for review and feedback for a proposal for the a proposal for demolition of the existing Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 30,000-square-foot showroom for the Land Rover, Range Rover and Jaguar franchises, a sky bridge for the Lamborghini franchise connecting the proposed building to the main MAG building and all associated site improvements.

Request: This is a request for informal review and feedback prior to the formal review of an amended final development plan application.

Applicant: Midwestern Auto Group, represented by Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance and Jack Reynolds, Smith & Hale LLC.

Planning Contact: Claudia Husak, AICP, Planner II.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission commented informally on a request for review and feedback for a proposal for the a proposal for demolition of the existing Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 33,000-square-foot showroom for the Land Rover, Range Rover and Jaguar franchises, a sky bridge for the Lamborghini franchise connecting the proposed building to the main MAG building and all associated site improvements. The Commissioners complimented the applicant on the development of the MAG campus. Commissioners largely agreed that the proposed building for Land Rover, Range Rover and Jaguar does not exemplify the same innovative and distinct architecture and massing as the existing buildings. The proposed materials were another concern in terms of proposed colors and number of materials and how they differ from materials currently used on the campus.

The Commissioners requested additional details regarding the proposed sky bridge including details regarding the area below the bridge, the pond edge treatment and the rear of the bridge where some Commissioners were concerned about the heavy block proposed for a large portion of the elevation. The Commission agreed that a reduction in the required parking may be appropriate but did not support the request for additional wall signs for this Subarea. Commissioners requested the applicant work with Planning to provide as many replacement trees as possible.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Planner II

Ms. Salay said she likes the alternative design and seeing that there are 12 spaces for stacking but the real world events shows that there is a need for more and a solution needs to be prepared prior to bringing this back as a formal application. She said knowing that Starbucks now sells food this will be a business that will have business through the noon hour and wanted them to be prepared for the increase. She said this is a better location for Starbucks and is glad to hear about the parking agreements with surrounding businesses.

Ms. Newell said she has reservations for using this site with a drive-thru and the layout proposed in response to staff's comments is the best arrangement that they could accommodate. She said she would like to see screening using low stone wall features or a combination of landscaping nicely integrated with the building. She said she is concerned with stacking and that they will not just busy during morning hours they serve lunch fare and expects this location to be used frequently especially with students after school hours. She is concerned with changing the text to allow a drive-thru to certain uses and asked for operational details for a Starbucks drive-thru as well as stacking data and peak time use data.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said losing the entrance to the east is not a hurdle, but it would be interesting to see how traffic patterns would circulate through the parking lot and would not want access to the drive-thru lane from the adjacent parking area. She requested operational details for comparable Starbucks for busy times of the day. She said the building is well done. She said she thought it would be nice if this location would have outdoor seating.

Mr. Ghidotti said it will have some outdoor seating with two or three cafe type tables but they have not shown it and would welcome feedback on where it could be located.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is not opposed to the drive-thru concept, but felt it had to be the right user and should be a conditional use type of application and limited to a coffee shop type use and not an ice cream or fast food type user and with the university coming there might be some opportunities in the area.

Mr. Ghidotti said they have good feedback and hoped to be back in the next 60 days with a formal application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant and said they will look forward to seeing the application.

**2. MAG PUD, Subarea A, Land Rover/Range Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini
14-046AFDP Amended Final Development Plan - Informal Review
6325 Perimeter Loop Road**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is a request for an informal request for review and feedback for a proposal for the a proposal for demolition of the existing Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 30,000-square-foot showroom for the Land Rover, Range Rover and Jaguar franchises, a sky bridge for the Lamborghini franchise connecting the proposed building to the main MAG building and all associated site improvements.

Claudia Husak said the applicant has filed an amended final development plan application and wanted to get some informal feedback from the Commission first on a couple of issues. She said this application is focusing on Subarea A of the MAG PUD, which was created in 2009 to accommodate the expansion of the

main building to accommodate Volvo on this site and there was a subsequent rezoning to create Subarea B to allow for the BMW/Mini building and the Audi building to be constructed.

Ms. Husak said the Land Rover building to the north of the site is 7,335-square-feet and includes a test track and display area along the Perimeter Road frontage. She said main dealership building which accommodates a majority of the franchises for the MAG campus is about 111,000-square-feet. She said there are approximately 96,000 square feet of display area on the campus within Subarea A which is generally located in the fingers in the northwest and southwest corners of the site. She said the site also has 472 parking spaces for employees and visitors. She said the evergreen screening to the east of the pond that has grown substantially since the inception of the campus. She said there is a detention basin in the northwest corner of the site with mature landscaping all around the pond, street trees, as well as vehicular screening trees and landscaping along US 33.

Ms. Husak said the proposed site plan calls for the demolition of the existing Land Rover building and in its place the construction of a new building that is approximately 30,000 square feet and to connect the new building to the existing building with a 6,000-square-foot sky bridge. She said a similar proposal was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission in 2005 and actually went through building permitting as well but was never constructed. She said with the rezoning of the site, the creation of the MAG PUD specifically, those approvals have become invalid. She said the development text does not have a limit on square footage for buildings for this site and the intensity is regulated by setbacks, lot coverage, and parking and landscaping requirements.

Ms. Husak said the display area is proposed at 82,000 square feet with this plan and provides 405 parking spaces which is less spaces than currently on site. She said the approval of this plan would require the Planning and Zoning Commission to make a minor modification to the development text to decrease required parking for the site. She said the owner wrote a statement regarding inventory requirements and customer behavior as far as how many people are really shopping on site. She said they have discussed with the applicant is the amount of parking spaces required for the amount of displays spaces on-site which is 83 parking spaces. She said the existing pond will be shortened in the area where the Land Rover building will be with increasing depth of the basin as part of the stormwater management which will require some removal of substantial trees.

Ms. Husak said the proposed building is to accommodate the Land Rover, Range Rover, and Jaguar franchises with the sky bridge as a connection between the two buildings on the second floor of the main building which will go to grade at the new building and include a showroom for the Lamborghini brand that will hover over the pond. She said the building materials are EIFS and glass with stone proposed at the bottom of the building that is beige or natural color tone. She said the portico for Jaguar is beige EIFS and she would like feedback if the proposed architecture of the mass and scale of the building as well as the materials are complementary to what exists on the campus and also meets the development text which calls for modern striking and innovative architecture.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is proposing four wall signs for this portion of the site. She said the development text was written with the existing Land Rover building in mind so it permits one wall sign, which is essentially the existing wall sign, a 35-square-foot wall sign at a height at 24 feet. She said the front elevation of the building that faces north proposes two wall signs for the Land Rover/Range Rover portion of the building located on the green metal accent panel and the Jaguar entrance on the portico shows a sign with the Jaguar copy and the logo which is three-dimensional and affixed to the entrance at a height of 24 feet. She said there is a fourth sign proposed which is the sign for Lamborghini on the sky bridge which is also exceeding the size and height requirements. She said the signs as proposed would

require a few development text modifications from the Planning and Zoning Commission, one for the number of signs, height, and size of proposed signs.

Ms. Husak reviewed the discussion items as follows:

- 1) Are the proposed architectural elevations consistent with the rest of the MAG campus?
- 2) Are the proposed building materials complementary to the campus?
- 3) Does the Commission support the proposed signs for the franchises and the required text modifications?
- 4) Would the Commission support a reduction in the required amount of parking spaces for this site?
- 5) Other considerations by the Commission?

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, 165 North 5th Street, said he is joined with Andy English from Plan-It Studio to expand upon some of the landscape question that they have. He said they are proposing a 33,000-square-foot multi-brand facility that will include Land Rover, Range Rover, and recently acquired Jaguar franchise. He said the new brand will bring about 20 million dollars annual revenue to the City and create 10 additional employees. He said in 2005 they presented an 18,000-square-foot addition to the existing facility plus the connector bridge from the main building, they received approval, pushed through construction documents, received a permit and they were one week away from putting a shovel in the ground and they has internal problems with the Ford Company and the project stopped. He said in 2008 Jaguar and Land Rover were sold. He said MAG signed an LOI at the beginning of 2014 with Jaguar and Land Rover and they have committed to open a show room before the fall of 2015 and hoped to break ground early fall of this year and hopefully open 12 months later.

Mr. Parish said his goals are to present the project, identify concerns, and focus on the sky bridge and he said he is looking for some feedback. He said since they are not adding to the existing facility, it allowed him to adjust where the building is located in relationship to the site and he centered on the display fingers which allowed them reduce the length of the bridge and create a shorter connection between the two and allowed for some additional parking on the northeast corner of the site. He said the Jaguar/Land Rover building design continues the curb service area. He said the front of the building depicts elements that are important to the multi-brand facility which are the Jaguar portico, the multi-brand entry at the center part, and the Land Rover landmark tower and sloped roof.

Mr. Parish said the sky bridge is planned to be the Lamborghini showroom on the campus and the design was intended to create a glass showroom elevated over the current pond. He said behind the showroom the floor drops down toward the grade and is designed to slowly reveal a glass box showroom where cars would be displayed as it went down toward the Jaguar/Land Rover facility. He said the sky bridge is really a collaboration of all the materials found across the campus. He said his goal is create one last signature piece for the MAG to set them off from other dealers in town.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Hardt said he is thrilled that MAG continues to grow and congratulated the architect for being able to create another example of dynamic contemporary architecture. He said the landscaping replacement of trees should be per Code. He said the only concern is design in landscaping for underneath the sky bridge. He said he does not have an issue with parking as proposed and as a customer of the business he has never had a hard time finding a place to park. He said this is a unique business with a unique need that does not fit into a Code box and would refer to the owner on that issue.

Mr. Hardt said as the campus has evolved they have reached the proliferation of signs significantly and they need to pay some attention to signs. He said he cannot support the new wall signs on the elevations as proposed although there are signs along US33, which is different in character and of a much different nature than the side facing Perimeter Drive. He said there was no information about the proposed height of the signs and it was mentioned heights of 24 to 25 feet but in the text is limited to 15 feet.

Ms. Husak said in Subarea A there is an allowance for a wall sign to be at 24 feet, which is what exists and was written specifically for the existing sign.

Mr. Hardt said the Jaguar sign does not appear to be measured per Code in the proposal. He said the text limits it to 40 inches in height and he would not be supportive of the ground sign.

Ms. Husak said that was written for the brand identification signs that they have at the entrances.

Mr. Hardt said the quantity of signs that are providing wayfinding guidance to doors and entrances, and the main building has four showrooms that house different brands that do not have this kind of identification that is being proposed. He said it causes significant concern with the quantity and the location of those signs.

Mr. Hardt said the architecture is generally pretty good and they have done a nice job on the campus with the recent buildings and the original building. He said there is concerns with the underside of the roof overhang, EIFS is a material proposed but the original building was completed with stucco which is a better material of higher quality with more character, he said he will reserve judgment of the block being used under the sky bridge along with the landscaping choices for the underside, and the broader architectural themes with the two entry porticos for Land Rover and Jaguar although he is sure of the brand standards and prototypes, they are the weakest part of this proposal and the whole campus. He said branding the entrances based on what is on the inside is a foreign approach to the campus and feels not cohesive with the other buildings. He said he agreed with the concerns of staff comment in the planning report of the beige Jaguar entry while the rest of the campus is grey which contributes to the concern.

Mr. Hardt said he would be very cautious of the materials on the campus, with an eloquent existing building with simple clean lines and contemporary materials and expanded nicely which is running the risk of adding more materials to the campus and encouraged them to simplify the palette.

Mr. Taylor agreed with Mr. Hardt's critique. He said he appreciates the 3D elevations in the packet. He said the two existing signs have room for additional branding and would like focus on those areas and not on signs on the building.

Mr. Taylor said he likes the sky bridge and the two towers of the building are the weakest part of the building. He felt the Jaguar tower could be resolved with the colors but the Land Rover is out of place and is a traditional architecture stuck on a modern building. He said the stone base does not exist anywhere else on the campus and is out of place.

Mr. Taylor said the signs of the Jaguar and Land Rover work against the building and for the existing buildings the architecture speaks louder than the signs do and it reminds him too much of the Porsche addition that no one liked that was proposed a few years ago which seemed stuck on as entrance pieces.

Mr. Taylor said that the building on the Perimeter side needs to be a signature building at a different scale and the end of the building falls apart and he would be thrilled to make a stronger statement with the building that does not need the signage.

Mr. Budde said he agrees with the comments as stated and complimented Mr. Parish on the great work and quality of the proposal. He said he thought the parking plan made sense and would agree with the proposal.

Ms. Kramb said she agrees with the parking plan with fewer spaces but would like to determine a ratio rather than stating in the text a number of spaces. She said she likes the sky bridge and is concerned with the footing and landing near the pond and the landscaping on the underside. She is supportive of not replacing the pine trees because of the bridge and the reason they were planted in that location but would want others replaced by Code.

Ms. Kramb said she would like to see the placement of the bridge and the building so as not to reduce the existing pond size because she would rather see the wet pond over a dry detention.

Ms. Kramb said she is okay with adding new brand signs but not the way they are being added and would not exceed the height code.

Ms. Kramb thought the entrances would be more appropriate if they mimicked the main building.

Ms. Kramb agreed with the architectural comments already stated and thought the rear was boring and she would like to break out with texture and colors matching the other buildings.

Ms. Salay said the sky bridge needs to have something better than the black block and could be more interesting. She said to stay consistent with the rest of the campus architecture this proposal needs to be brought up into the existing standards of the existing campus. She disagreed with the proposed stone. She said the signage that will be on the inside of the Lamborghini showroom is still a sign and should be regulated with a more creative way for all the branding.

Ms. Salay agreed with the parking proposal and felt it was a business decision but agreed with a ratio requirement.

Ms. Newell said the sky bridge is unique and she said she loves this campus and the design of the existing buildings. She said she would like to know more about the retention pond and the design of the edges related to the building.

Mr. Parish said there will be a more natural edge with the use of stone with an interesting modern look and would be bringing back renderings at the next review.

Ms. Newell said the colors of the building should stay within the grey scheme and the features for the Jaguar and Land Rover are used for signage and are not integrated well within the overall building as proposed with the width and proportions being very thin and the ends should be wider across the end of the building and not used as signage elements.

Ms. Newell understands dealerships desire to brand their buildings and have their names on them but this wall signage is not appropriate along Perimeter because other existing buildings have been held to monument signs. She said the heights of the signs are limited to 15 feet height elevation and the 24 foot height is only remaining because of an existing sign and should be consistent with the other areas.

Ms. Newell said she is concerned with the back areas because the landscaping provides screening and asked that the back of the buildings look great and not use landscaping as a screen for a weaker part of the building structures. She said the CMU on the sky bridge should be considered in lieu of the split face or sand blasted or polished face to add some interests like the rain screen.

Ms. Newell said she supports the reduction of parking and asked for available visitor spaces and that every vehicle is parked in a designated parking space and not on the test track which should not be used to display vehicles.

Ms. Amorose Grooms thought that the water abutting the building such as done at the Sutphen building could be an appropriate way to treat this pond with the building and that there is a number of ways to regulate the height of the pond with spill ways and make up wells.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said architecture should be simple and consistent with the existing campus.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said they should spade the existing trees out and store close by this site and spade them back in because it is difficult to plant trees with the needed size of the ones being removed and bring them back, they are beautiful trees and you cannot buy them like they are currently on site.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the existing entry feature needs to be improved as part of this package and the existing plants are past their useful life span and the entry feature needs to be brought up to speed because there are really nice landscape displays on the balance of the new buildings. She agreed with the comments regarding the back of the building should not be just screened with landscaping and the stone water table is not appropriate. She said the signs to be well done and meet Code. She said to explore with the staff the tree replacements and looked forward to a tree survey and suggestions of their horticulturist for the plants that are required reach maturity. She suggested that there is no limit to the informal review and if he would like to return with material options or proposals that the applicant was welcome to return for further comments.

**3. U-Haul
14-038CU**

**6419 Old Avery Road
Conditional Use**

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the "The following application is a request for the use of an existing building as a retail space, warehouse and storage space for U-Haul, located on the south side of US 33, west of Avery Road.

Gary Gunderman presented this application for a conditional use for U-Haul and proposed to utilize the Hilliard's Furniture store with their current location to the west along Old Avery Road. He said the plan divides the building and is looking to provide a showroom area with a nicer entrance with support facilities at the northern end with individual storage type units in a climate controlled area indicated for medical records. He said the last space will be general warehouse left as an open area.

Mr. Gunderman said the site was revised when the building was expanded in 2003 when the site improvements were brought up to Code at that time and there are few changes proposed to the site. He said the addition is a drive way connection relocating the dumpster and removing a few parking spaces to provide the second access. He said the proposed elevations of the building are unchanged except for repainting the building.