



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 10, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Newell led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Victoria Newell, Jane Fox, Kristina Kennedy, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman and Rebecca Call

Commission members absent: William Wilson

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Claudia Husak, Phil Hartmann, Zachary Hounshell and Kenny Ganter.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

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

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

(Motion passed 6-0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the September 19, 2019 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

(Motion passed 6-0)

PROPOSED COMMISSION MEETING DATES 2020-2021

Ms. Kennedy moved, Ms. Call seconded to approve the proposed meeting dates.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

(Motion passed 6-0)

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

Ms. Newell stated that the agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. Although Case 2: 19-079AFDP – Perimeter Center, Subarea E, was tentatively scheduled for consideration by consent, two Commissioners have requested that the case be considered under the regular agenda. Therefore, tonight's cases will be heard in the order in which they were originally listed.

CASES

1. McDonald's Exterior 19-077

337 West Bridge Street Minor Project Review

Ms. Newell stated that this application is a request for an alternate exterior material for an existing restaurant and modified landscaping. The site is on the south side of West Bridge Street, approximately 250 feet southeast of the intersection with Frantz Road and zoned Bridge Street District Commercial.

Ms. Newell swore staff and members of the public who intended to address the Commission on this case.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project with Waiver Review for an existing McDonald's restaurant, located at 337 W. Bridge Street. The McDonald's project was before the Commission in January and February of this year for approval of extensive exterior and site modifications. The Commission is requested to review several items that have changed since their previous approval. The earlier review was of site improvements related to landscaping, ADA accessibility, and comprehensive exterior materials including brick, fibrous cement siding, and for review of a new sign package. That approval was based upon the applicant's intent to use the existing brick and find a match for replacement in areas where the roof and other sections were being removed. During construction, the applicant selected and installed a different brick in the brick portions of the building. The original brick was a full-depth brick, which the Bridge Street Code requires; however, a thin brick veneer was installed, which the Commission has approved before by waiver. [Material sample shown]. It is staff's understanding that once a portion of the original brick was removed, it was discovered to be significantly deteriorated, and because they were unable to find a matching brick, for aesthetic purposes, a brick veneer was installed over the entire building. Unfortunately, this occurred without consultation with Planning staff and without the Commission's approval. For that reason, the case has been scheduled for the Commission's review and determination. The new material application has a nice, cohesive appearance. Because there is precedence, staff recommends approval of a waiver to permit use of the material. Other modifications made that are also different than originally approved by the Commission include requests for tree removal and for the installation of river rock instead of hardwood mulch in certain areas. Staff has concerns about the aesthetics of that. In addition, the bollards have been painted a bright yellow. Typically, a more subdued color is required. The applicant is also requesting to move the three trees located along the edge of the drive aisle. Staff is supportive of that request with the condition that three trees are planted in their place, and any inches removed that are not replaced in that location are either added elsewhere on the site or a fee paid in lieu of. The bigger concern is the river rock. The landscape plan that was approved earlier by the Commission provided for a typical hardwood mulch. However, the applicant has installed a large size river rock, primarily along the western

property line. The applicant has indicated there were concerns about drainage or stormwater runoff that they were attempting to mitigate. Staff has concerns about the use of the rock in such a significant amount of area. Staff recommends that they target where the runoff issue is occurring and use a smaller size rock only in that area. City landscape inspectors have expressed concern about the plant material surviving with the larger rocks. Staff is requesting that the larger rocks by the drive-through window and at the other end of the drive-through be removed. The applicant has indicated concern about drive-through patrons tossing lit cigarettes from vehicle windows and setting wood mulch on fire. Staff recommends that a cigarette receptacle be placed before the drive-through window. The goal is to maintain the aesthetics of the site. The proposal has been reviewed against the various criteria and staff recommends approval of the waiver for the brick veneer and approval of the Minor Project Review with six conditions, as outlined in the report.

Board Questions:

Ms. Fox inquired if there were always bollards on the site.

Ms. Rauch responded that she believes the plan is to refresh existing bollards, but the applicant can confirm when they address the Commission.

Ms. Fox stated that this particular site would require a tree of sufficient height for a vehicle to pass under.

Ms. Rauch stated that City landscape inspectors would consider that factor when making their recommendations.

Ms. Fox stated that she noticed the landscaping around the signs was not completed.

Ms. Rauch stated the applicant would speak to that, as well.

Ms. Fox inquired if the City provides recommendations when bike racks are required.

Ms. Rauch responded that, typically, they are not specified. There are some more creative versions in Bridge Park. Because no changes to the bike racks on this site are proposed, that is not part of this consideration. The Code makes no style specifications.

Ms. Fox inquired how and when staff became aware of the differences between what was proposed in January and February and what has been implemented.

Ms. Rauch responded that it was Ms. Newell who brought the difference in the brick material to staff's attention. Although staff would have discovered it during their inspections, Ms. Newell noticed its installation earlier. Staff met with the applicant to discuss the reasoning behind the change that was made, and to inform them that staff could not approve that change; only the Commission could do so. It is unfortunate this occurred, given the level of scrutiny required for their original approval. Subsequently, City landscape inspectors notified Planning staff that river rock had been delivered to the site, although staff had recommended that it not be installed. Unfortunately, it was installed against staff's recommendation. Staff requested that the applicant submit the list of changes that had been made for the Commission's review.

Ms. Call inquired if nothing was approached proactively with staff.

Ms. Rauch responded that it had not.

Ms. Newell stated that the photographs indicate the existing trees are not in the best of health. Has the City's forester officially made that determination?

Ms. Rauch stated that the City landscape inspectors would not require dead or dying trees to be replaced. If staff has recommended that the trees be replaced, it is their judgment that they are sufficiently healthy to survive.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, attorney, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, OH, representing the applicant, stated that Jacob Albers, McDonald's US, is also with him. Mr. Underhill stated that he was not part of the initial process. It is a case in point where hiring local consultants who are familiar with the jurisdiction in which the project is occurring would have helped. Obviously, if he had been aware earlier, they would have sought approval through the proper channels. In Mr. Albers' defense, after the project was approved earlier in the year, he was out on paternity leave for several weeks. That is when this situation occurred. Decisions were made in the field that were not vetted and approved appropriately. The operator in charge on this particular site made these decisions, including the alternate brick installation. When they attempted to order the brick, they discovered that brick was no longer manufactured. Verification of the brick availability had not been verified before their earlier application to the Commission, and, unfortunately, that brick was deemed inferior long ago and manufacturing discontinued. They attempted to find a similar brick, but that was unsuccessful. The disruption of business with the remodel had caused the project to be expedited, and contractors, operators and Corporate made decisions without Mr. Albers' involvement, skipping the normal process. They now recognize the applicant should have come before the Commission at that time and sought approval. At the end, it was the right move; the aesthetic is very good. A better project may have resulted than with the earlier intent to match the existing brick. He showed earlier photos of the building compared to the new building and photographs of brick replacements within the shopping center. He noted that brick matching attempts were not successful. Ultimately, making the brick uniform was the right thing to do, although the process was not completed appropriately. They are before the Commission tonight to "make things right." This was not a cost-savings move; it was a \$50,000 change order for the project. Removing the brick veneer and starting over would result in an additional cost of \$100,000, which would not be insignificant. In regard to the landscaping concerns, the applicant has no objection to most of what the Commission has requested. In regard to the river rock, again, a field decision was made. The next-door neighbor to this site is Heartland Bank, which has a more elevated site. Using river rock was intended to deal with a stormwater management situation, which they believe is being caused offsite. However, they will abide by the Commission's decision. In regard to the four trees at the front of this project, Mr. Albers has indicated that three of the four are diseased or dying. The goal is to have a unified look. The existing crabapple trees have been dropping fruit, which creates a maintenance situation.

Ms. Fox requested that the applicant provide an update on the incomplete landscaping around the sign.

Jacob Albers, McDonald's US, 2 Easton Oval, Columbus, stated that installation of the monument sign has been a challenge. The original application provided for the installation of a new foundation along with the approved sign. When digging began, they discovered the existing underground utilities, some of which were unmarked. Consequently, they have submitted a revised plan for the installation of a transition plate on the existing foundation, rather than

installing a new foundation. With the installation of the approved sign in its existing location, the remainder of the landscaping will be installed.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Ms. Newell referred to the earlier comment about the condition of the original brick on the building. Why was it considered deficient?

Mr. Albers responded that there were a couple of situations with that brick. One was that the original brick was a poured manufacture. The shopping plaza's brick that was exposed to the elements has all been replaced. The brick that is under their mansard roof on the storefront, which is not exposed to the elements, is fine. Only the brick that was weathered did not hold up. Additionally, there were large sections of trim that had been covering up issues -- for instance, raw CMU (concrete masonry unit) block rather than brick. Consequently, the team decided that a better finish would be achieved by entirely re-facing the store than attempting to cut into and replace CMU.

Ms. Newell inquired what was done with the existing brick.

Mr. Albers responded that the existing brick was covered with the brick veneer by using a special Hilti anchor to fasten the thin brick to it.

Ms. Newell stated that she is familiar with the product and has used it previously on building projects. With that process, they would have attached a rain panel to the existing brick, and the thin brick would have been attached to the panel. When the shopping center completed some brick replacement, it was with a full-depth brick. Previously, the Commission consented to the use of thin brick on the taller apartment buildings in the Bridge Street Corridor due to an aesthetics issue. Cement pane siding had been proposed for that particular area of the buildings due to a provision in the Building Code prohibiting the installation of brick veneer on wood frame structures above three stories in height. Due to that precedent, when the Home2 Suites applied to the Commission, thin brick was approved for that building as well. Unfortunately, the product that was used on that building is inferior compared to other thin brick systems that were available. It has tremendous effervescence on the outside of the building and multiple thin bricks are falling off the building. Approving a thin brick material at ground-floor levels is a concern. She assumes their assessment was that, although damaged, there was sufficient integrity to the existing brick to permit attaching Hilti anchors to it. It is possible to place an entire brick veneer on the building. There is a cavity space between it and the block, so it can be removed. There is a foundation for the building on which the brick would sit.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it is her opinion that the system used on the McDonald's structure is inferior.

Ms. Newell responded that she does not believe it is inferior. She has used the same panning system on buildings. The difficulty is that there is nothing by which to gauge the quality of the proposed materials. The more often the Commission accepts the use of thin brick, the more difficult it will be to push back if we do identify an inferior product.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if there are other examples of first-floor thin brick in the community.

Ms. Rauch responded that the Home2 Suites has portions, not all, of the walls that are thin brick, especially the corner tower section at Frantz and Post Roads.

Ms. Newell stated that any of the materials on that building that appear to be brick are all thin brick across all stories of that structure.

Ms. Call inquired if there are any examples where the thin brick has not fallen off.

Ms. Rauch responded that she is not aware of any, but this is a new product. It is under a higher level of scrutiny than it typically would have been, because the Bridge Street Code specifically requires that full depth brick be used as the primary material. Although most of the discussion has been related to that District, it probably exists elsewhere in the City, as well.

Ms. Newell stated that thin brick is a permissible material in the Building Code. The thin brick situation is similar to that of vinyl windows – not all products are created equal. There is a difference in the quality and strength of the materials. The thin brick that was applied to the Home2 Suites building was essentially stuccoed to the building. It has no rainscreen behind it. The coursing of the brick on the building is uneven. On the McDonald's building, there is a rainscreen back panel with ledges made to support the thin brick veneer. The courses on the building are even.

Ms. Fox inquired what the Commission should look for in gauging good quality construction of this product – a rain system panel instead of "lick and stick?"

Ms. Newell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox inquired if there is ability to gauge the quality of the thin brick itself.

Ms. Newell stated that thin brick is manufactured to the same standards as full-depth brick; it is just not the same depth. However, there are also thin brick-like concrete materials.

Mr. Supelak stated that there are many sophisticated rainscreen systems in the City. For instance, the alucobond panels on the MAG buildings have a rainscreen system. Rainscreen systems permit a veneer to be applied, and with the McDonald's building, the veneer is thin brick.

Ms. Newell explained that rainscreen systems provide a small space for water to drain out.

Ms. Call stated that she trusts the applicant does not perceive the Commission is singling him out. It is a matter of precedence and its impact on the City.

Mr. Underhill responded that he understands. It appears that the better form of installation was used. Hopefully, that factor will distinguish this consideration.

Mr. Albers stated that McDonald's has a gold standard for its products. Not only do they use the best products, they have a constant review and maintenance process. If damage were to occur to the side of the building, it would be repaired in a timely manner. They also have strict standards for addressing issues of effervescence.

Mr. Underhill stated in regard to the issue of precedence, perhaps the issues that have been captured and clarified in the meeting record will set a standard that any future considerations must also have this type of installation.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the applicant was aware that if there was a need for any revisions to the original approved plan that it was necessary to come back to the Commission.

Mr. Albers responded that he was aware.

Mr. Underhill stated that the people who made the decisions in Mr. Albers' absence did not realize it, or they would have done so. Their reputation is important to this corporation. It was an unfortunate result of Mr. Albers' absence.

Mr. Albers stated that his biggest fear is plan deviation. He dislikes changes being made to approved plans. It happens too frequently, sometimes on a whim. As an example, with this same store, the operator decided to discard and replace most of his kitchen equipment after they were under construction. This required additional revisions, resubmissions, re-approval, and finally, inspections, delaying the project three weeks from opening. The four-week project took seven weeks. He prefers to do a project by the book.

Mr. Fishman stated that he understands the situation. However, he is always concerned about precedence. There is an expression -- "I'd rather ask for forgiveness than permission." Dublin does not want to have the reputation where developers can go ahead and build as they choose, because Dublin will not make them tear down the building. He concurs with staff's recommendations for them to change what easily can be changed.

Mr. Underhill stated that he appreciates the statement regarding forgiveness versus permission. He wants to clarify that the applicant would rather have done this the right way.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the City has penalties for noncompliance, or is this the correct way -- returning to the Commission essentially to request a waiver from the previous terms.

Ms. Rauch stated that this is the appropriate method. If this had been presented to staff originally, it would have been reviewed to determine grounds for acceptance. With the brick issuance, it seemed onerous to make the applicant remove all the thin brick and apply another material. If they had asked staff, that might have been required, but at this point, it is a new application. There are no penalties.

Mr. Supelak inquired when and where thin brick is allowed.

Ms. Rauch responded that the Bridge Street Code specifies primary materials for the Bridge Street District (BSD). Full-depth brick is a permitted primary material. If an applicant wants to use thin brick, they must request a waiver from the required reviewing body. There are Planned Unit Districts (PUDs) elsewhere in the City, so there are likely other buildings throughout the City that have thin brick because their PUD texts permit it. The City's Zoning Code does not address it other than in the BSD.

Mr. Supelak stated that it would appear that even if they had been planning to use thin brick, a waiver would have been required. Where is the appropriate place to control this issue to avoid a "lick and stick" installation?

Ms. Newell stated that the Bridge Street Code and some PUDs prohibited thin brick due to problems experienced with the product. The system with the metal panels behind the brick is newer and better. That is what led her to suggest it as an alternative to the fibrous cement material. It appeared to be a viable solution to improve the appearance of the buildings being built to Code, which permitted wood frames.

Ms. Rauch noted that the Bridge Street Code permits the applicant to request use of an alternative material with successful installation on other projects. The Code permits the Commission to have that conversation for future projects.

Mr. Supelak responded that there are good or bad installations with all products. However, the Commission has some aversion to the use of thin brick in place of full-depth brick. The question is where and how to control it effectively the next time the issue arises.

Ms. Call stated that the Bridge Street Code language to which Ms. Rauch referred states, "Other high-quality synthetic material may be approved as permitted primary or secondary materials by the required reviewing body with examples of successful, high-quality installations in comparable climates." That language would appear to cover the issue adequately.

Mr. Fishman stated he assumed the entire building was block. Is there also wood frame?

Mr. Albers stated that there is wood frame behind the brick.

Mr. Fishman inquired if over the frame, there was full brick and then the veneer system.

Ms. Newell stated that the full brick is only on the lower level of the building. The upper half of the building originally was roof.

Mr. Fishman stated that there is some concern in this case about potential reuse of buildings. When buildings are framed and a veneer applied, it is difficult to reuse the building. The buildings downtown that are being reused/repurposed are full brick. When it is framed and a veneer applied, it is difficult to reuse the building.

Ms. Newell clarified that veneer is on all types of construction. Brick veneer over a cavity wall space is considered better construction than having a full wall of masonry. There are historic buildings in downtown Columbus on which this form of thin brick construction was not utilized. They have very thick, solid masonry walls that have their own issues.

Mr. Fishman stated that what he observed as it was being constructed was that the McDonald's building is framed and has a veneer. It would be easier to reuse that building in the future if it were block with space, then the veneer, or full brick.

Ms. Newell stated that in either instance, the exterior of a building can be re-bricked. It would not have an impact on future use. Per the Building Code, all buildings can be multiple types of uses.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is concerned about the durability of thin brick on a framed building.

Ms. Call inquired if Mr. Fishman's observation is that the shell in a full-depth brick building holds up better than a shell with different composite materials. Is it his observation that a full-depth brick building holds up better?

Mr. Fishman responded that is correct.

Ms. Fox inquired if the bollards were there previously.

Mr. Albers responded that they were, but they did not have a plastic sleeve over them. The yellow sleeve is that particular contractor's trademark. He likes to make sure the bollards are seen; he places blue sleeves on the handicapped parking bollards.

Ms. Fox stated that it is quite colorful, which she does not believe was anticipated. When she drove by today, the bollards appeared to "shout" their presence. Her preference is that something be done to soften that impact significantly. Perhaps they could be removed and replaced with a more decorative bollard.

Mr. Albers responded that the yellow plastic sleeve would be replaced.

Ms. Fox stated that the shape of the bollards has a "highway look." The building is beautiful, but the bollards are aesthetically incompatible. She inquired if other styles of bollards were available. Mr. Albers responded that the bollard is a steel tube filled with concrete. The plastic cover is over the steel tube. This bollard is part of McDonald's gold standard.

Ms. Fox inquired if a black sleeve could be placed over the bollard.

Ms. Rauch responded that is staff's recommendation.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Kennedy stated the McDonald's building has received a great facelift. She is impressed with the results, despite the deviation. The great design and aesthetics work is evident.

Mr. Albers stated that it also reflects the work done in these meetings.

Mr. Fishman stated that he believes the details in the record will address any future precedence questions. He has no further objections, if the applicant is willing to comply with the recommendations for changes.

Mr. Underhill expressed agreement with the conditions for approval.

Ms. Fox stated that the concern about precedence is important. The Commission has to be open to the possibilities of new materials. Installation procedures, durability and a high-quality appearance are very important. Although mistakes can occur, she is concerned that the contractor installed river rock after staff made it clear it should not be installed. Therefore, her recommendation now would be that special attention is paid to the landscaping, and that as much mulch as possible be used. An attempt should be made to control water runoff in a more aesthetically attractive way than with large river rock. Every drive-through has some customers who discard cigarettes as they pass through, and river rock does not belong anywhere in the periphery of the building. She understands they may have no other options for the bollard. However, in the Historic and Bridge Street Districts, Dublin has some more attractive bollards, which would give the McDonald's building a better feel, as well.

Mr. Albers requested the location of some of the more attractive bollards. He could look into that option.

Ms. Rauch responded that staff could provide that information.

Mr. Supelak stated bike racks, bollards and benches are more modern or sophisticated in the Bridge Street District, but with an existing pipe, a cover is needed. There is more than one option; however. In addition to plastic, stainless steel covers are available.

Ms. Fox suggested that finding an alternative to the yellow sleeve would be a nice gesture.

Ms. Call suggested in view of the earlier point about run-off stormwater, it would be better to state as much mulch as reasonable (rather than as much as possible), to avoid impacting the neighboring property.

Mr. Albers stated that is correct. Too much mulch would wash into the driveway.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is an attractive building. He believes the rainscreen they used is the correct construction method. Although the process was not followed correctly, the current building may have been the result, regardless. There have been previous unsuccessful attempts to match brick when making wall or column repairs in that shopping center.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the following waiver from Code:

- 1) Waiver to use an alternative, high-quality primary material – think-brick Veneer (Endicott Clay Products Co. – Sahara Sands).

Vote: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
(Motion passed 6-0)

Ms. Kennedy moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following six conditions:

- 1) The applicant provide a cigarette receptacle prior to the drive-thru window, subject to staff approval;
- 2) The applicant update the landscape plan to eliminate all river rock mulch with the exception of a defined critical area along the west property line, subject to staff approval;
- 3) The applicant provide a river rock specification, and two smaller alternative specs, subject to staff approval;
- 4) The applicant replace the three Crabapple trees with three Butterflies Magnolia or Winter King Hawthorne at a minimum size of 2 caliper inches per tree, and pay a fee in lieu for the remaining inches;
- 5) The applicant replace all the yellow bollard covers with more decorative bollard covers, subject to staff approval; and
- 6) The applicant provide an “as-built” landscape plan that reflects all the site modifications, subject to staff compliance review.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.
(Motion passed 6-0)

2. Perimeter Center, Subarea E - Shell Gas Station, 6695 Perimeter Loop Road 19-079, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this is a request for the replacement of an existing, cedar-shake shingle roof with replica, asphalt-shake shingles on a gas station. The site is west of Perimeter Loop Road, approximately 525 feet southeast of the intersection with Avery Road and zoned Planned Unit Development District

Ms. Newell swore in any individuals who intended to address the Commission on this case.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is an application for an Amended Final Development Plan for the Shell Gas Station located at 6695 Perimeter Road, north of Avery-Muirfield Drive and US33. The site is located within Subarea E of the Perimeter Center PUD, fronting Perimeter Loop Road and backing up to Avery-Muirfield Road. The existing roof has cedar shake shingles, which are beginning to peel. The applicant is proposing to use new asphalt shingles that will look very similar to the existing cedar shingles. The asphalt shingles will be more durable. This application is similar to previous applications of surrounding businesses in the same or adjacent subareas,

such as Panera Bread and Key Bank. Staff has reviewed the application against the appropriate criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox inquired if a material sample was available for the Commission to view.

Mr. Hounshell responded that it would be very similar to the shingle that Key Bank has [displayed image].

Ms. Fox inquired if no physical sample was provided.

Mr. Hounshell responded that none were provided. The image is all that he has to share.

Ms. Fox requested that with all future applications, physical samples be provided.

Applicant Presentation

Fawzi Hidmi stated that he has been part owner of the Shell Station, 6695 Perimeter Loop, Dublin, since it was built approximately 20 years ago. They are anxious to replace the roof, which is leaking.

Ms. Call inquired the age of the roof.

Mr. Hidmi responded that it is 19 years old.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission has approved roof replacements for Panera Bread and Craughwell Village. The cedar shake roofs in this area have not appeared to hold up well, although the material met Code standards at the time they were installed in 1999.

Ms. Newell stated that is partially due to the way in which the materials were installed. Ms. Fox can speak to that, because she has replaced her cedar shake roof. After 20 years, an asphalt roof also could need to be replaced. Asphalt roofs are not always installed properly, as well. Asphalt shakes will curl as they are fatiguing, the same as the cedar shake.

Mr. Fishman stated that the roofs installed in Craughwell Village and the Shell Station were to have hand-cut dimensional shakes. However, the roofs in Craughwell Village were a factory-cut, very thin shake shingle, which is probably why these roofs are not holding up. A $\frac{3}{4}$ " dimensional shake that is installed properly will hold up. That is the material that was installed on his gazebo roof, which is 43 years old and looks like new. They require a little care, but they will last for years, if installed properly.

Mr. Hidmi responded that the cost difference is significant; the wood cedar shakes are almost three times the cost.

Mr. Fishman stated that is why inferior shakes were used. When the applicant came before the Commission for approval of the Craughwell project, they indicated that the material would be the hand-cut shake. However, that did not occur.

Mr. Hidmi responded that he was unaware of the difference at that time.

Mr. Fishman responded that he would not have been.

Ms. Call inquired if the proposed material is dimensional asphalt.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Newell stated that she is opinionated on this topic. At one time, this center was intended to be a shopping mall. When the plan was changed to the center that it ultimately became, residents

fought very hard for certain materials to be used on the buildings. Concessions were made to ensure that wood shake shingles were installed on these structures, and most of the outlots were required to install them. Concerns were expressed that eating establishments, such as McDonald's and Panera, produced grease, so concessions were made on the materials for those businesses. Over the years, owners of other buildings in this area have requested approval to replace their wood shakes with asphalt shingles. The Commission did not approve those requests. She has been consistent in her position. When the center was developed, the owners were aware that cedar shakes were required. Giant Eagle and Bob Sumarel have re-roofed their buildings with wood cedar shakes.

Ms. Fox inquired if this PUD requires wood shakes.

Ms. Husak responded that different subareas have different requirements regarding that item. Craughwell Village was the only subarea that required wood shakes, which is the reason that application had to go before both the Commission and City Council to amend their PUD text to permit asphalt shingles. All of these subareas on the outer edge state "either/or" in regard to the roof material. Consequently, Chase Bank and McDonald's never had cedar shakes.

Ms. Fox stated that she believes in precedent, but she also believes if the Code or PUD permit either/or, then the applicant can have either/or. Due to personal experience, she is very knowledgeable regarding shakes. They have cedar shakes on their home and they took all measures to replace the original roof exactly per the Cedar Shake International Bureau requirements. The problem is that cedar is now new wood. It is not aged wood, which will endure for 50 years. She installed 3/4" dimensional shakes with a cedar breather. The shingles were obtained from a Canadian source located as far north as she could find. A 100-year warranty came with the material, and yet, it curls. At three times the expense of another material, it is too burdensome to require the same material to be re-installed. She loves the look of it, but it is very expensive to replace. Insurance coverage on the wood shingles is more costly. The wood shake material must be preserved, and workers who apply the fire retardant are exposed to toxic chemicals. Cedar shakes are too burdensome, so she concurs with the asphalt shingle replacement.

Ms. Newell stated that there are other products that could be used to produce a similar look to cedar shakes. Recently, a Muirfield project was required to install cedar shakes. Throughout Dublin, there are buildings with slate roofs or even metal roofing materials that are more expensive. If we are considering the cost factor, any applicant can come before the Commission and make that argument. If at the outset, someone fought for the project to have a slate or synthetic material, which costs more, those projects should not be able to come before this Commission later and argue that the Commission should accept asphalt shingles on their buildings because they are less expensive than the material the Commission originally required for aesthetic reasons. With some of the previous structures in Dublin, the primary design and aesthetic element of the buildings was the wood shake roofs. Changing those roofs to other materials will forever change their appearance. She is concerned that gradually will occur throughout the City.

Ms. Fox stated that she does not disagree, but an and/or shingle was originally permitted in this case. The proposed shingle will be consistent with what is on the Panera Bread building. She is disappointed that the Commission was not provided context photographs to assist it in making its decision. The reason that the recent Muirfield project was required to install cedar shakes is because Muirfield requires the wood cedar shakes. If the Commission had approved another product, it would have required granting a waiver. However, that is not the case.

Ms. Newell stated that several years ago, she represented Bob Sumarel with their building application. Although the applicant requested asphalt shingles, the Commission required them to install wood shingles on their building.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the PUD permitted a choice of materials for this building.
Mr. Hounshell responded that the text permits either/or for Subarea E.

Ms. Rauch inquired if his inquiry relates to the Giant Eagle building.
Mr. Fishman stated that his inquiry relates only to the gas station.
Ms. Rauch responded that staff is checking the information on Giant Eagle, but the gas station is in the outer perimeter, so it is permitted an option with the roof material.

Ms. Newell stated that Giant Eagle was required to use wood shakes as part of an original concession. She has an issue with reversing previous decisions of the Commission. That will begin to erode what has been built in this community.
Mr. Fishman stated that in his experience, the shake roofs were the "payment" for other concessions that the City made to the applicant. For instance, the Commission could have agreed to the use of stucco on the top half of the building if a wood shake roof was installed to maintain consistency within an area. That has occurred throughout various areas, including Muirfield. Now, thirty years later, they are arguing that the replacement cost is too much.

Ms. Newell stated that she always points out that there are other synthetic, engineered materials that replicate wood shakes, but they are also costly. Asphalt shingles do not resemble wood shingles.

Mr. Fishman stated that the Commission should not be involved in the economics component. Recently, the Commission received a request for approval of a synthetic material that closely resembled cedar shakes for a project located within Muirfield. Because Muirfield requires its homeowners to use cedar shakes, the Commission did not approve the synthetic material. In this case, an either/or material is permitted in the text, and the Commission has approved the use of an alternative shingle for other buildings within that subarea. Therefore, he would support consideration of some other synthetic shake-like material, rather than asphalt shingles. Although the cost of asphalt shingles is less, they also will need to be replaced in 20 years. The Commission cannot consider the economics factor. If it had done so in the past, the City would not look like it does today.

Ms. Newell inquired if staff discovered any information in the records they were searching.
Ms. Husak stated that the Giant Eagle Shopping Center is in Subarea F4, which is required to use cedar shake. Because Triple A and Sumarel Tire are in that subarea, as well, cedar shakes were also required for those buildings. They are the only remaining buildings in Perimeter Center required to have cedar shakes.
Mr. Fishman inquired if the Shell Station is required to have cedar shakes.
Ms. Husak responded that they are not.

Ms. Newell stated that previously, however, the Shell Station consented to a request from the Commission to use cedar shakes.

Ms. Call stated that she has no objection to the dimensional asphalt shingles; however, the members of this body serve terms. When a Commission does make certain concessions in lieu of the required material, she would recommend that staff document those concessions, so that later Commission members do not have to work with assumptions about those projects.

Mr. Fishman stated the Commission minutes document all the concessions made, so there is already a record.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she appreciates Ms. Newell's comments, because they gave her perspective in making her decision. However, because the Code permits a choice, she concurs with the applicant's request.

Ms. Call moved, Ms. Fox seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, no; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

(Motion approved 5-1.)

3. Dublin Village Center, 6561-6815 Dublin Center Drive, 19-088, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for Dublin Village Center, which is located west of Dublin Center Drive, approximately 1,000 feet west of the intersection with Sawmill Road and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Ms. Newell swore in members of staff and the public intending to address the Commission on this case.

Staff Presentation

On August 22, 2019, the Commission reviewed and provided feedback on an Informal Review of the Master Sign Plan (MSP) for Dublin Village Center. The Dublin Village Center site is located south of I-270, west of Sawmill Road, and approximately 1,000 feet west of the Dublin Center Drive intersection with Sawmill Road. The Commission reviewed a new brand idea for Dublin Village Center. The Commission expressed appreciation for the investment in the shopping center, commended the quality of the sign package, but suggested some modifications. The applicant has prepared an update of their MSP (Master Sign Package) in response to the Commission's recommendations. The brand vision has been incorporated into sign designs for the clock tower, monument identification sign and wayfinding signs to create a consistent, cohesive design standard for the center. The updated MSP also includes the art piece and the banners, which would change seasonally. All Center sign faces are proposed to be updated to a dark gray and cream color scheme with halo lighting. Four existing signs will undergo major refurbishment; specifically, the clock tower, two large monument entry signs, and one raised monument directional sign. Six new interior directional signs, seven new aisle banners and updates to the AMC Theater signs are proposed. Reflective of the Commission's earlier direction, on the west façade of the theater, the applicant has created a sign that is more consistent with the monument signs. Staff has reviewed the application against the available criteria and recommends approval with one condition:

- 1) That the clock tower roof match the existing center, subject to staff approval.

Ms. Fox stated that earlier today, she visited the site and took photographs of the clock tower, which she will ask staff to display. She believes the proposed new black roof looks better than the old roof. For what reason did staff recommend the new roof match the old?

Ms. Newell responded that staff's modifications reflect some comments she had made. She agrees that the black roof would look nice and that color would complement the signs. However, the rest of the center has another color of roof. She has an issue with piecemeal renovations that are not consistent with the whole aesthetic. If they should renovate the remainder of the structures in the future, there would be nothing prohibiting them from requesting that all the roofs be black.

Ms. Fox responded that she views this item as part of a sign or monument, not as a building roof. Ms. Newell stated that this structure has always been required to be integrated into the design aesthetic of the complex. The same brick was used on the tower as on the Dublin Village Center buildings. Its roof was also the same synthetic slate material that is on the roofs of the other buildings. Until a renovation of the roofs on the other buildings was brought before the Commission, she thought it was preferable to keep the roof on the tower consistent with the existing roofs.

Ms. Fox stated that can be discussed. However, she wanted to provide a photo of the existing versus what is proposed.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the proposed Condition is that the tower roof match existing.

Ms. Newell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox stated that the reason she believes the roof material can be changed is that there are other elements on that particular monument that match the buildings that are changing as well - for instance, the limestone. Because some of the existing brick and limestone on the sign faces are becoming darker, she believes there should be a cohesive appearance from the top to the bottom of the monument. It is more important that the monument look cohesive with the rest of the signage than its roof match the top of the other buildings. For that reason, she would permit the darker roof color. A lighter color would not fit with the rest of the monument itself or the other signage.

Ms. Newell stated that she is not opposed to an updated sign aesthetic; however, she is concerned the sign proposal is a piecemeal approach. This occurred with the Big Sandy project. That building now lacks cohesiveness with the rest of the development. It was anticipated that the entire development would follow through aesthetically with the Bridge Street Code. Big Sandy was the first piece to be presented. The Commission approved that renovation; now it does not match the rest of the Center.

Mr. Fishman noted that there is a different owner for that building.

Ms. Newell responded that although this particular project is subject to the Bridge Street Code, at this point, it does not fit the overall Bridge Street aesthetic. Yet, they are proposing a sign plan. This approach will not improve the appearance overall. It will become worse as a result of not retaining cohesiveness. This would be approached slightly different if a sign plan was not involved. A similar situation occurred with some of the other buildings, such as the KFC building. They requested more signage, but Council determined that their signage needed to remain consistent with the existing zoning text for that site. In her view, a piecemeal approach will not produce the expected results of the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Supelak stated that he understands her concern about retaining a cohesive look for the Center. However, proximity of the elements matters, and this sign element is located very far from the Center. Other buildings along Sawmill are much closer, even the Lowe's store. The sign element appears to service more than just the Center; therefore, he believes the black roof is appropriate for the sign. Tethering it to the Center, which is located a distance away, is attempting to make a connection that cannot be experienced.

Ms. Newell responded that because she recalls that all these structures originated as Dublin Village Center (DVC), she perceives them as connected. The clock tower was originally the primary entrance to DVC. Lowe's occurred later, but as part of the same complex. The Center was very active when it was originally developed.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the Big Sandy and AMC Theater signs would be illuminated, or only the Dublin Center sign at the top.

Applicant Presentation

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Inc., 6689 Dublin Center Drive, Dublin, OH 43017, responded that those signs are internally illuminated today and will continue to be.

Ms. Newell inquired if the Celtic Knot would be illuminated at night.

Mr. McCauley responded that originally, only the signs were illuminated, but the Commission requested that the Celtic Knot be lit. Ultimately, the signs and the knot will be illuminated. He noted that they have presented a holistic sign package, and the tower is viewed as one of the signs -- not a building. It is located a distance away from any visible roof within the Center. It is the major entry into the Center and the only signage on Sawmill Road for the Center. This entry element is consistent with the master sign plan, including use of the same colors. Its roofing element is not treated as a roof, but as a sign component. It will be the Caviar color, a soft black shade, which will be used on all the sign panels throughout the Center.

Mr. Fishman stated that as the minutes of the earlier meetings will reflect, originally, this element was not considered a sign, but a monument with a clock identifying the new Center. The original developer committed not to hang signs on the monument. He indicated it would be a well-known clock tower in the community. Now, it is a sign.

Mr. McCauley inquired if they recalled, however, how the signs on the tower came about.

Ms. Newell responded that, over time, applications come before different Commission members. Mr. McCauley clarified that the original sign package permitted a sign on I-270 that then was not permitted. Later, there was a lawsuit, and in exchange for the sign, Dublin permitted signage to be attached to the clock tower.

Ms. Fox inquired if other revisions were made to the original sign package the Commission reviewed on August 22.

Mr. McCauley invited Mr. Bull, designer of the master sign plan, to respond.

Dave Bull, 2357 Abbington Street, Upper Arlington, identified the items that were revised, as reflected on the following pages in the document:

- Page 14 - sign instruction details were added.
- Page 34 - adjustments to the clock tower, specifically the backlit items.

- Page 37 - the original number of ten banner locations for the interior aisles was reduced to seven locations. The banners would be either seasonal or event banners, incorporating the Celtic knot into their design.
- Pages 39-40 - wall sign specifications. Of note, the wall sign panels will be the dark caviar color, reinforcing the use of that color on the monument sign roof.

Ms. Fox inquired if there is no difference in the signage for inline tenants and major tenants. A 36-inch maximum letter height was specified for both.

Mr. Bull stated that staff requested consistency in size.

Mr. McCauley stated that the smaller sign panels for smaller square foot inline tenants will also permit the use of 36-inch letters.

Ms. Fox referred to page 40. What is the height of that sign panel from the bottom of the roof to the bottom of the sign panel frame?

Mr. McCauley responded that it is a 36-inch panel; actually, 36-inch letters would not meet an 80% maximum coverage requirement.

Ms. Fox stated that there did not appear to be enough space for 36-inch letters. She requested that the size be corrected appropriately.

Mr. McCauley stated it would be corrected. A 30-inch letter would be more appropriate.

Ms. Newell referred to page 44 of the sign package, and inquired if the Celtic knot detail shown on the building façade was also a sign element.

Mr. Bull responded that at the August 22 meeting, the Commission suggested that the Celtic knot be provided in as many places as possible.

Ms. Newell inquired of what material the knot would be made.

Mr. Bull responded that it would be a high-density urethane (HDU).

Mr. McCauley responded that the logo detail provided on page 18 indicates it will be a painted, routed-out Celtic knot. It was originally provided in one location, but the Commission requested that they identify additional sites, as well.

Ms. Call asked for details about HDU material.

Ms. Rauch responded that HDU is a hard, molded plastic. It is a permitted sign material in the District, and has been used frequently.

Ms. Newell stated that in her observation, that element is not complementing the additional buildings.

Mr. McCauley stated that these are the additional locations they were able to identify where the logo could be applied; however, he and Mr. Bull are not convinced it works there. The logo on the clock tower was their original site.

Ms. Newell agreed that the logo works well on the tower elements. It fits the structure and scale of the building. She would prefer the others be eliminated from the application.

Ms. Fox concurred.

Mr. McCauley stated that it would be applied only on the tower-type elements.

Ms. Fox stated that she would also have no objection to the knot element on the tower being illuminated at night.

Ms. Call stated that she loves the change reflected on page 58, regarding the AMC "dot" sign. Previously, it appeared to hanging off the edge of the building. Now, it is integrated into the holistic design. She agrees that the Celtic knot feature on the tower is appropriate, but the other locations could be eliminated. Their attempt to meet the Commission's previous recommendations is appreciated. She agrees with the previous point about the need for cohesiveness. If this sign package were part of a new project, she would agree with the need for all the roof materials to be consistent. However, this could be a master sign plan, and nothing else. Is the Commission willing to approve this sign plan if the buildings in the Center never change? If redevelopment of the Center is anticipated, this Commission's direction on this sign package should be documented and included in the consideration for that future architectural review. This proposal is a significant improvement over what exists, and she likes the direction. The applicant has listened to the Commission's recommendations and has met all the criteria. The proposed sign package is very attractive.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is satisfied with the revised package. She appreciates that they have incorporated the Commission's recommendations. At the previous review, she expressed objections to the banners. However, she understands the applicant's intent is to connect as much as possible to Bridge Park and to encourage traffic between the two sites. There are banners that hang between Bridge Park and Historic Dublin. Upon reflection, banners in the Center may make a connection to that part of Dublin, which are used there for festivities. For the record, she has no objections to banners being included in the sign package. Although the banners are not her favorite element, it makes sense if it makes a connection to other parts of Dublin.

Ms. Newell stated that she cannot waiver on the banners. There is too much signage, more than is necessary, and banners obscure the tenant signage. The banners do not benefit wayfinding within the Center.

Mr. Fishman concurred. The sign package is outstanding. However, the intent of the signs in a sign plan is to provide wayfinding, and that is not the purpose of the proposed banners.

Mr. McCauley stated that their purpose is to add fun to the Center. They are not providing additional signage for their tenants.

Ms. Newell stated that the intent of the banners is to advertise the Center.

Ms. Fox inquired if the Bridge Street Code addresses banners.

Ms. Husak responded that she does not believe the Code addresses banners.

Ms. Fox inquired if any other shopping centers utilize banners.

Ms. Husak responded that there are none.

Ms. Fox stated that her first thought was that banners would add color and life to the parking lot, but so would some new landscaping. The existing landscaping is fatigued, and the parking lot is vast. As some of the store windows reflect, sign clutter is an issue. At this point in time, she would recommend that the applicant focus on the other signs for the Center and refresh the landscaping. Perhaps later, a need for banners could be re-considered.

Mr. McCauley stated that the signage text also addressed window front signs.

Ms. Fox noted that there are some store windows, J. Tiger Martial Arts for instance – where their sign comprises 25% of the window space and is below the defined level. Although the text permits it, she questions if that is what is desired.

Mr. McCauley stated that they provide limits, but do not want to deny signage to their tenants. These are small square footage tenants, so they need signage.

Ms. Fox agreed. However, perhaps more thought could be given to the in-tenant sign package allowance. Some tenants in the Center do this beautifully; others do not.

Mr. McCauley responded that the sign package provides examples of tenant signage done well and tastefully. The written text attempts to capture that, as well.

[Discussion continued regarding existing tenant signs within/near the Center.]

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to defer the banner discussion until the window front signage issues are resolved. She indicated that she likes the revised AMC blade sign. However, the sign is nine feet in height and appears to be too large for that corner.

Mr. McCauley stated that the height of the building is 25 feet.

Ms. Newell noted that there is another entrance sign, a ground sign, which is in very close proximity. That will provide another wayfinding sign for the AMC Theater.

Ms. Fox stated those are future major entry signs.

Mr. McCauley responded that is correct. If John Shields Parkway were to be extended through the site, they would like to add two bordering ground signs at that point to indicate the driver has entered the DVC site.

Ms. Fox inquired if "Dublin Village Center" is all that the signs would say.

Mr. McCauley responded affirmatively.

Ms. Newell indicated that she had misunderstood that they would be AMC signage.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees that the blade sign provides necessary wayfinding to the AMC Theater; however, she is concerned that the size not be too large.

Mr. McCauley stated that they relied upon Bruce Sommerfelt, Signcom, Inc. for assistance in designing and scaling that sign.

Ms. Newell stated that having the scale of the sign elevation in proportion to the height of the building would be helpful. It is difficult to gauge when the image is not "to scale."

Ms. Fox stated that the "dot" sign on the side of the building would not be seen due to the trees.

Mr. McCauley stated that a dot on the east façade is the furthest point at which it can be seen when turning from Sawmill Road onto Dublin Center Drive. There is a limited visual corridor. If the dot is moved slightly to the left, the trees will hide it. That is the purpose of its exact position.

Ms. Newell stated that sign appears unnecessary.

Mr. McCauley stated that the other frontage AMC sign is completely hidden by the trees. The only point at which a sign can be seen from the entrance to Dublin Center Drive is this proposed location.

Ms. Newell stated that she does not perceive that to be an issue in regard to people finding the Theater.

Mr. McCauley stated that, in his opinion, this sign is extremely important. Banners and other items might be debatable, but this AMC sign is critical. People are consistently looking for more wayfinding in the Center. They express difficulty in finding locations within the Center. The AMC Theater is the most vital site within the Center, and this is only one 25-ft. square sign.

Ms. Newell stated that she doubts that anyone is having difficulty finding the Dublin AMC in that Center, which already has a very large sign on the front of the building.

Ms. Call stated that she has a different perspective. She and her family moved to Dublin three years ago. They were not aware that there was a movie theater, so they did not know they could look for a movie theater in Dublin. They "happened" upon the AMC, because it is not currently signed well. They attended movies theaters outside of Dublin until then, but have been avid AMC patrons since they discovered the theater. It is a destination. People go there to see a movie, but they must be aware that it is there.

Ms. Newell stated that might also be a result of the Center being empty for so long. Without visiting other businesses within the Center, visitors may not become aware of the Theater. When entering the Center, none of the Center tenants are visible from Sawmill Road.

Mr. McCauley responded that is why the sign for the AMC Theater is vital. They draw 800,000 visitors to the Center annually.

Ms. Newell stated that fair signage is important. One business should not have more signage than another business.

Mr. McCauley stated that 15 signs could be provided to one of the other businesses, and they still would not draw 800,000 visitors to the Center. The AMC Theater is the business that is vital to the Center.

Ms. Newell stated that the red dot lacks creativity, and does not fit aesthetically.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it could be smaller.

Mr. McCauley responded that it is as small as possible to still be visible. The dot is only four feet in diameter. To clarify, with this proposal, they are replacing the existing large sign on the south façade with a ground sign. They are adding only one sign -- a four-foot diameter circle, to the AMC Theater sign package. Essentially, the existing signage is being relocated and one dot sign added.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she has no objection to the dot sign, after hearing the explanation about the only point of sign visibility for drivers entering the Center. If that is truly a wayfinding sign to the Theater, it serves an important purpose.

Mr. Fishman indicated he has no objection. It is important that people are able to find the Theater at that point. He loves the sign package, and he is hopeful it indicates an evolution to bringing back a clean, contemporary and uniform appearance to the Center.

Mr. McCauley responded that they have spent over \$7 million on this Center since 2009. There is not a similar investment in a center within Dublin. It was nearly empty at one point. Today, the Center is nearly 100% leased. The one piece that is missing is the signage. This will fill that gap. He believes the sign package that has been designed is exceptional and will set a standard for other businesses.

Ms. Newell stated that she recognizes and appreciates their effort. Overall, she likes the sign package, minus the banners.

Ms. Kennedy inquired about staff's position on the banners.

Ms. Husak responded that staff has no objection to them.

Mr. Fishman inquired if Mr. McCauley would have any objection to removing the banners. Mr. McCauley stated that if the banners are the Commission's only objection, they could be eliminated. Their purpose was to provide light and fun to the Center, but they do not provide essential wayfinding.

Ms. Fox inquired about the public art piece. [Requested that staff display a photograph of the site she had taken earlier.] She inquired if the power lines, as seen in the photo, could create a potential static issue with the metal art piece.

Mr. McCauley stated that he is aware of no potential issues, but they will be looking into all the site factors.

Ms. Fox stated that she likes the design of the art piece and the sitting area next to it. The parking areas are to the sides of the site. There are very few trees around the site, and the overhead lines seem intimidating. Perhaps if they surrounded the public art site with trees so that the view from the parking lot was through parallel trees, people would be drawn to that focal point in front of the Theater. The challenge in this Center is the vast, intimidating parking areas. If they could create a "room" where the sculpture lives, surrounded by a sitting area and greenspace, they would be creating a front lawn for the AMC Theater. People will be invited to walk up to it, rather than intimidated by the long walk across the parking lot in the dark. Without trees, the art piece will look like a ball that was just dropped in that location.

Mr. McCauley stated that, unfortunately, the tree opportunities are limited. They planted four, large pine trees there at a cost of \$1,000 each. They were taller than 25 feet, which is not permitted under power lines, so AEP removed two of them. They will need to use smaller trees, such as crabapples. The public art piece is a commitment on their part, and they will develop that concept. Their intent is that "The Knot" become a destination point, similar to the Ballantrae Dancing Hares.

Discussion continued regarding the conditions for approval.

Mr. Fishman noted that, currently, the Center seems over parked. Are there plans to replace some blacktop surface with greenspace?

Mr. McCauley stated that they are working on conceptual ideas for that. They envision that some of the existing parking area will be replaced with a new building that will be part of the Bridge Street District. The large area north of the AMC Theater would be a good site for their first project. He anticipates the Commission reviewing an application for the first project in the near future. They do envision more greenspace or more density, similar to Bridge Park.

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant had any objections to the proposed conditions.

Mr. McCauley indicated that they had no objections.

Ms. Call moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the MSP to accurately reflect the lighting for the signs on the clock tower;
- 2) The applicant revise the materials to limit the letter height for inline tenants to 30 inches;

- 3) The MSP be revised to limit the logo application to the tower interior to the center and the clock tower; and
- 4) The banners be removed from the proposal.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
(Motion carried 6-0)

Communications

Ms. Kennedy indicated that she would miss the next two Commission meetings due to personal commitments.

Ms. Fox reported that she has requested that Council meet with the Commission and ARB on a quarterly basis. Would that be too frequent? The joint meetings would provide the Commission and Board an opportunity to better understand the positions and policies of Council. Commission members expressed no objections to quarterly joint meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council