



## MEETING MINUTES

### Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 7, 2019

#### CALL TO ORDER

In the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair, Ms. Fox called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Fox led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Jane Fox, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman, Rebecca Call

Commission members absent: Victoria Newell, Kristina Kennedy, William Wilson

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Claudia Husak, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell.

#### ELECTION OF INTERIM CHAIR

Ms. Call moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to elect Ms. Fox as the Interim Chair for the November 7, 2019 Commission meeting.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.  
(Motion passed 4-0)

#### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

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

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.  
(Motion passed 4-0)

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Fishman moved, Ms. Call seconded to approve the September 5, 2019 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.  
(Motion passed 4-0)

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Call moved; Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the October 10, 2019 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.  
(Motion passed 4-0)

Ms. Fox 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. Fox stated that the agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. Although Case 2, 19-098MSP – Master Sign Plan for Ohio Health Primary Physicians was tentatively scheduled for consideration by consent, she has some questions, so it will be considered under the regular agenda. Therefore, tonight's cases will be heard in the order in which they were originally listed.

## **CASES**

### **1. Mango's Place, 5600 Rings Road, 19-097INF, Informal Review**

Ms. Fox stated that this application is a request for informal review and feedback for the potential construction of a daycare facility and associated site improvements. The site is northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Rings Road and zoned Planned Commerce District.

#### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review of an Informal Review application for Mango's Place daycare. The Commission will provide non-binding feedback for the applicant so that they may move forward to a Final Development Plan. The rezoning and preliminary development plan for this development site occurred in 1996.

#### Site

This particular site is located in Subarea E of the Thomas Kohler development site in the same subarea as Emerald Town Center. It has remained undeveloped since the site's original rezoning, primarily due to natural features on the site. Emerald Town Center is located just north of the property. Mango's Place daycare is currently located within the Center. Because the proposed site is within the same subarea as Emerald Town Center, the development text requires consistency in architectural themes between adjacent buildings. The site features include a tree line that extends from the north end to the center of the property, and one mature tree to the south of the tree line. The site has many natural features that prevent utilization of the entire site. The Cramer Ditch runs across the northern portion of the lot, which prevents development on the top half of the site. The site also has a large floodplain that limits development. [Diagram of floodplain specifics shown.] The applicant is currently pursuing a request for adjustment of the floodplain with FEMA. The application is moving forward with the expectation that FEMA will approve the adjustment.

#### Concept Plan

The concept plan is for a 7,800-square-foot daycare facility with a 1,200-square-foot enclosed playground to the east of the building. Although the Code requires 43 parking spaces, 45 parking spaces are provided. The Commission is requested to approve a reduction in the number of parking spaces required for this site. In the past, the Commission has approved similar requests for other daycare facilities. This will permit provision of needed parking spaces versus provision of parking spaces per Code. Staff also is concerned about the dumpster enclosure. Rather than positioned in front of the building facing Emerald Parkway, staff recommends it be located on the east side of the parking lot. The majority of the structure will have a brick veneer with stone or stucco accents. Façade improvements are recommended on the sides facing the major roadways. The west façade of the proposed structure will face Emerald Parkway; the east façade will face Woerner-Temple; the south façade will face Rings Road. The improvements will provide consistency with the buildings along Emerald Parkway. The main entrance to the building on the

south façade facing Rings Road is covered by a portico with cement siding on its face. Given that this building has frontage on three major roads, the applicant has improved the west façade facing Emerald Parkway to add interest to this façade; however, the east façade facing Woerner-Temple Road lacks architectural detailing. As discussed above, the applicant should take additional cues from the architectural character and details from the buildings in Emerald Town Center to provide a similarly high level of quality and character for this proposal. Similar features might include arched portico entrances, lighting fixtures above the entrances, and creative material uses throughout the building. A five-foot sidewalk will connect to the existing sidewalk along Emerald Parkway and extend to the west, northwest, and south sides of the building. Staff has concerns with the lack of sidewalk access to the west parking lot and around the entire building, including the playground. In the elevations provided in the packet, the applicant is showing egress doors from classrooms that do not have a concrete sidewalk extended to them in the site plan. That connection will need to be added per Code.

Staff recommends the following discussion questions:

- 1) Is the proposed site design reflective of the established character of sites along Emerald Parkway?
- 2) Does the Planning and Zoning Commission support a reduced parking requirement for the site?
- 3) Does the proposed architectural character sufficiently complement the established character of the Thomas Kohler Planned District, including the adjacent Emerald Town Center?
- 4) Other comments by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Fishman inquired if the proposed building has four-sided architecture -- brick and stone on all sides. Was siding also mentioned?

Mr. Hounshell responded that there is brick veneer on all sides. Siding is located only on the portico.

Ms. Fox stated the plan indicates a 40-foot easement for utilities and a bikepath, and the parking lot appears to overlay the easement. With the proposed parking layout, will there be sufficient room for a future bikepath?

Mr. Hounshell responded that Planning staff inquired if there would be sufficient room for a future bikepath, and Engineering indicated that it is unlikely that a bikepath would be located along the southern edge due to the existing sidewalk that connects to Emerald Parkway. There is an existing bikepath along Woerner-Temple, and a sidewalk would be the only connection to that bikepath. It would not impede the proposed parking for this site.

Ms. Fox responded that she was interested in future proposed connectivity. The City is interested in providing bikepath and pedestrian connectivity for every parcel. Was that a consideration in this site layout?

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff would discuss future connectivity plans with the applicant before submission of their application.

Ms. Call stated that it was indicated that the Commission has frequently approved a reduction in parking requirements for daycare facilities. If that occurs regularly, she would prefer to revise the Code requirements for daycare facilities than to approve a reduced number for each case.

Mr. Hounshell responded that there were three previous cases where the Commission approved a reduction in the Code-required number of parking spaces for similar-sized daycare facilities. However, the northwestern extension of the parking lot was added recently to show where the Code-required number of parking spaces could be added.

Ms. Husak stated that in terms of revising the zoning code, there was a previous unsuccessful attempt to update the parking code holistically for several uses where there had been a need to approve a reduction or addition of spaces. The PUD process allows the parking to be tailored to a specific user, based upon supporting data and/or experience.

Ms. Call stated that for this particular application, she would be supportive of looking at the parking requirements for each type of use permitted in the current zoning in addition to the proposed use, and basing the decision on all potential uses, not only on Code requirements.

Ms. Husak stated that often, the numbers that are approved meet the parking needs if the use were to be converted to Office.

Mr. Hounshell stated that staff would compile the information for the Commission's future consideration of this project.

Ms. Call stated that staff's report indicates the parking extension to the west would be inefficiently used. The inefficiency could be overcome if all 22 of the daycare employees parked on that side, and all remaining traffic used the parking spaces nearest the doors.

Mr. Hounshell stated that staff has had such discussions with the applicant, and the applicant will explain their parking expectations.

Mr. Fishman stated that uses can change, and there should be sufficient room to expand the parking, should that occur. He would prefer the space remain grass until additional parking might be needed.

Mr. Hounshell stated that is the reason staff asked them to demonstrate where the additional parking would be located if the current parking code requirement were to be met. Staff would compile numbers on what other uses would need for parking for a building this size.

Mr. Fishman noted that the parking need would be greater at times the facility might be hosting recitals and special events.

Ms. Call stated that the ingress and egress have a single point of entry/exit. There is an adjacent development with multiple buildings, and there appears to be a parking lot between the two structures nearest to this site. Have there been any discussions about shared use of their ingress/egress to provide more than a single point for this site?

Ms. Husak stated that there is a stub at the most southwestern end of the building. Originally, there was an intent for this parcel to develop along with Emerald Town Center with cross access from Emerald Town Center south to this parcel. However, it would have required extensive engineering work, including creation of a culvert and crossing the stream. With the site being in the floodplain, it was likely not financially feasible. At the time, the landowner wanted to be

included in the zoning, but not in the development. Staff has not encouraged that this be considered, due to all the natural features on the site.

Ms. Fox stated that a brick veneer is proposed. Is the adjacent development brick veneer, as well, or is it full-width brick?

Mr. Hounshell stated that staff is unsure. The staff report accompanying the Emerald Town Center approval in 2005 indicates use of stone and brick veneer, a Glen Geary brick, which is available in thin or full brick.

Mr. Supelak clarified that "veneer" does not mean that a full-width brick is not used. Veneer means the brick is applied to the structure with an air gap between.

Ms. Fox inquired if there are comparable materials on both sides of the development -- materials of the same thickness, style and quality. What is the reason the applicant has requested underground stormwater management? Normally, there would be a retention pond or the stormwater would flow out to the nearby creek.

Mr. Hounshell stated that there are site difficulties. It would be difficult to fit a retention pond on the site. The entire northern portion of the lot is unusable. Typically, City Engineering has no objection to underground stormwater management in order to maximize the buildable area.

Ms. Fox inquired if the stormwater would flow out to the creek.

Mr. Supelak responded that it would slowly release. There is no other option for this site. FEMA will have strict requirements on the side nearest the creek. Due to the impervious surface that will be added to the site, there is a need to accommodate the pace of the stormwater that will be draining from the site. Although much of it eventually will reach the creek, it must be accommodated on site, not just dumped into the ditch.

Ms. Call noted that she would be interested in having the applicant address this question.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the City has any plans to connect this portion of Rings Road to the other section of Rings Road or Woerner-Temple.

Ms. Husak responded that is actually the previously existing right-of-way; therefore, there is no such plan.

Mr. Fishman observed that it is preferable to have only one ingress/egress for a daycare facility. In the past, ability has been provided for the additional adjacent connection to be made if the use should change.

Ms. Husak stated that Emerald Town Center is twice the size of this site, yet it has only one right in/right out and one full access point. The City has no intent to extend Rings Road farther to the east. For the developable area of this site, a single point of access has been determined appropriate by Washington Township Fire and Emergency Services and by City Engineering.

Mr. Supelak inquired what was the reason for the recommendation to relocate the dumpster.

Mr. Hounshell responded that with the current site layout, the proposed dumpster enclosure would be on the front façade facing Emerald Parkway. Typically, they are required to be to the side or rear of the lot. The building has three road frontages, so the most aesthetically acceptable location would be the bottom right corner of the lot.



Ms. Call inquired if there were any concerns about its being located near the proposed transformer.

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff's intent was that there would be one enclosure for both the trash and transformer.

Ms. Fox stated that infants and toddlers will be cared for in this facility, so she would recommend the dumpster be located where its contents are not offensive to the children and teachers in the outside play area on a windy day.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Scott Curtis, owner and CEO of Mango's Place, 5601 Woerner-Temple Road, Dublin, Ohio stated they have attempted to match their current building in Emerald Town Center. In regard to the suggested connection, there is a six-foot grade drop between the Emerald Town Center site and this property, approximately 20 feet north of the ditch. Their current playground is located immediately next to their dumpster, and that has not been an issue. The stone enclosure is typical in Dublin. Their current dumpster is not co-located with the transformer.

Matthew Poindexter, EMH&T Project Engineer, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, Ohio stated that a question was asked about the underground stormwater management. There is no room for a retention basin on this site, and the stream cannot be used for stormwater management. Due to the impervious/pervious ratio, there is a need to slow down the release of water draining through the site. To accomplish this, an underground chamber is created to retain the stormwater and release it slowly to the stream, which will then move it away from the site. In regard to locating the dumpster in the bottom right corner – initially, that attempt was made. However, next to the right corner of the parking lot, there is a sanitary manhole. Placing the dumpster in that location would require either building it on top of the manhole or sacrificing ten parking spaces. Another issue with that location is that the garbage truck would have no place to turn around.

Mr. Curtis stated that in regard to the suggestion regarding parking spaces, at their current location in Emerald Town Center, staff parks at the side of the building, and clients park in the area directly in front of the facility door. This daycare has flexible hours, so traffic ebbs and flows throughout the day. They have never needed all of their existing parking spaces. Typically, special events are held off site, so no additional guest parking is ever needed. They do not anticipate ever needing the additional parking spaces depicted in the proposed space to the side of the facility. That area could remain grass until there is future need for additional parking.

Ms. Call stated that according to the Code, the Commission has the flexibility not to require the additional parking extension with 12 spaces. If the use should change, would the Commission review a full site plan for that future use, so additional parking spaces could be added, or could the approval of this application include a provision to permit an adjustment in parking spaces based upon the use?

Ms. Husak responded that if the use were to change, the Commission would not review that application. A change in use is reviewed in Building Standards, and an analysis of sufficient parking spaces for the proposed use is made. If the new use did not meet Code requirements,

the applicant would be required to add the additional spaces. Depending on the magnitude of that adjustment, there is a threshold for potential Commission review.

Ms. Call stated that in the case where an existing Dublin tenant has demonstrated that their use does not have a need for all the spaces required by Code, she would agree that the space should remain as open space until a future need for parking spaces.

Mr. Curtis clarified that although they do not need all of the additional parking in the west wing, they do need some of the spaces. There have been changes in the State regulations regarding staffing ratios.

Ms. Husak stated that staff would work with the applicant to identify the most efficient way in which to include extra parking spaces. Staff's concern was that numerous drive aisles would be created on this site to locate the parking in the available spaces. There is extra pavement that could potentially be avoided with a more efficient layout.

Ms. Fox stated that from Emerald Parkway, it appears that the site is circled with parking, which creates a visual impact. Dublin attempts to make all street frontage visually attractive. There appears to be sufficient space behind the dumpster to create double-bank parking, eliminating the length of the wing and creating a more condensed parking area. Has that been considered?

Mr. Poindexter stated that in part of the site, they are encroaching into the floodplain. With that, Dublin requires a compensatory cut. The area behind the dumpster is a low-lying area and is the most efficient area in which to place the compensatory cut. When they fill inside the floodplain, they have to remove dirt elsewhere to make sure that the same area is allowed there. The width of that space does not permit having additional parking there. Although they considered double-sided parking, a west parking wing was the only way in which to meet the zoning requirements.

Ms. Call inquired what would have been the parking space count if the parking wing were to be eliminated and the double parking continued.

Mr. Poindexter responded that it would have been 39 spaces.

Ms. Call inquired what their needs are.

Mr. Poindexter responded that they need 43 spaces.

Ms. Call stated that their needs match the zoning requirements, so there is no need to reduce the number of parking spaces.

Ms. Fox inquired if their needs meet the zoning requirements, did staff have a more efficient parking design in mind?

Ms. Rauch inquired if Ms. Fox was suggesting that the building be located more to the corner and additional parking placed to the rear.

Ms. Fox stated that she was not suggesting the building be moved. She was referring to the comment in the staff report that staff was interested in identifying a more efficient use of the parking. Due to the floodplain, the needed compensatory cuts and the topography, are there any other options?

Mr. Hounshell stated that he believes there may have been a miscommunication between staff and the applicant in terms of the parking needs. Staff's belief that the applicant needed less parking spaces than the Code required was the reason for their recommendation.

Ms. Husak stated that this is the smallest daycare facility in the City, but it has the highest parking ratio. Staff recommended reevaluating the needed spaces, in view of the fact that the northernmost spaces are unlikely to be used due to the distance from the entrance.

Ms. Fox stated that she assumes the expectation would be that employees park in those spaces, and families with children would park near the entrance. Is there any consideration about the ease of dropoff? Is it their expectation that all the double-bank parking and all of the parking spaces in front would be utilized by their clients? If the parking spaces were reduced by half in the west wing, would their clients be able to easily access the front of the building for dropoff and not experience unavailable parking due to employee parking needs?

Mr. Curtis responded that the 22 parking spaces on the south front façade are sufficient for their clients.

Ms. Call noted that it is her understanding that 43 parking spaces are needed for both clients and staff, so only two parking spaces could be eliminated.

There was no public comment.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Fishman stated that at this time, staff does not know what depth brick was used in Emerald Town Center. Could staff obtain that information so that a future structure could match what exists?

Ms. Husak responded that staff would check into that issue; however, she is confident that the brick veneers that exists on the majority of buildings in Dublin are full brick.

Ms. Fox inquired if Commission members have comments in response to staff's proposed discussion questions:

#### **1. Is the proposed site design reflective of the established character of sites along Emerald Parkway?**

Commission members indicated that they had no concerns with the design.

#### **2. Does the Commission support a reduced parking requirement for the site?**

Ms. Call stated that is not the applicant's request, so she would not support a reduction of any more than two spaces, as it would not meet the applicant's needs.

Mr. Supelak stated that the Code requires 43 parking spaces. Does the applicant also need them?

Mr. Curtis responded that they need 43 parking spaces, which is consistent with the Code's requirements. The current design shows 45 parking spaces.

Ms. Fox stated that although the reduction is minimal, she would be supportive of reducing it to 43 spaces. Her preference would be that be that the parking be condensed and the long parking wing be eliminated, but that might be very difficult to do. In that case, landscaping in the final design will be very important to reduce the visual impact from the street.



Ms. Call stated that the Commission would review the landscaping plan in the final site plan.

**3. Does the proposed architectural architecture sufficiently complement the established character of the Thomas Kohler planned district including the adjacent Emerald Town Center?**

Ms. Call stated that she had no concerns.

Ms. Fox stated that she believes some enhancements with use of stone are possible. Emerald Town Center shows variety in the detailing over entrances, use of arches and by combining stone in the porticos and use of lighting. She would encourage enhancements on the front and west facades. Perhaps more window framing could be used on the other sides of the building, creating a balanced improvement on all four sides. The Emerald Town Center buildings have more architectural interest.

Mr. Fishman concurred. The intent is to have an architectural design consistent with the Emerald Town Center. Perhaps dry-laid stone walls could add interest in the parking lots.

Ms. Call stated that she believes the applicant has provided good architectural relief, using columns, stone on the bottom, and brick on the top. The stripe two-thirds of the way up the building gives dimension. She believes the design does complement the other buildings. If there is additional opportunity for enhancements, however, that is always encouraged.

Mr. Supelak stated that only sides 3 and 4 are lacking in architectural character.

Mary Frances Curtis, applicant, 5601 Woerner-Temple Road, Dublin, Ohio stated that the rear of the building backs up to the wooded area. There is very limited visibility of that side.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees that side would not require the same level of architectural articulation as the other sides. In the Emerald Town Center, interesting framing of windows through use of molding gives a more finished appearance. The Commission is interested in avoiding flat-faced buildings having only stone veneer sides and windows. In the future, the landscaping could change, and the viewshed would be open and visual; therefore, the Commission prefers to have finishing on all sides of the building.

Ms. Call stated that she does not see how the backside of this lot could ever be landscaped differently, because of the natural features and the steep grade change.

Mr. Fox stated that the Code requires visual interest on all sides of the buildings, although expectations should be less on sides with no visual impact. On another point, it was noted that the sidewalks do not extend to the rear of the building. Wherever there are doorways, there should also be sidewalk connectivity.

Mr. Fishman stated that four-sided architecture is required in residential areas, even where there is a backyard that is not visible. The architectural design is fine, but perhaps some enhancements could occur when the application comes before the Commission.

Mr. Supelak stated that the design is very close, but perhaps adding a dormer in the roofline or a couple of columns could improve it.

Ms. Fox stated that she is hopeful that a location can be identified for the dumpster that is not on the west elevation. Due to the site limitations, landscaping will be very important in mitigating the sight impact on the street frontages. There is a need to create a beautiful street front to frame the entrances and elevations. The constraints should not become a disadvantage to the community's view.

## **2. OhioHealth Primary Care Physicians, 250 W. Bridge Street, 19-098MSP, Master Sign Plan**

Ms. Fox stated that this application is a request for a Master Sign Plan that includes a canopy sign, ground sign, and directional signage for an existing office building. The 2.2-acre site is northwest of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Shawan Falls Drive and zoned Bridge Street District - Indian Run Neighborhood.

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

### **Case Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a Master Sign Plan for OhioHealth Primary Care Physicians. Upon approval, the applicant would be able to proceed to Building Permit Review. The location of the site is within the Bridge Street District - Indian Run Neighborhood (BSD-IRN) District, north of the Dublin Plaza, where Kroger is located, and south of the U.S. Postal Service site. The South Fork Indian Run Creek runs along the west and south boundaries of the property. Access to the site is provided from Shawan Falls Drive. In September 2019, the Administrative Review Team (ART) reviewed and approved an application for a Minor Project Review (MPR) to permit minor exterior and site modifications. The approval included a 336-square-foot building entrance addition to an existing medical office building. The sign package application includes a building-mounted sign, which would be the awning sign; the building address numerals; and the ground sign replacement on the south side fronting West Bridge Street.

#### Building-Mounted Signs

The building-mounted sign is an approximately 16-square-foot sign mounted to the entrance canopy. Three-inch aluminum channel letters, painted Akzo Nobel Silver Satin with one-inch trim, capped with blue translucent vinyl. The "donut raceway" for the logo located to the left is one-inch deep aluminum, as well. The address identification sign is approximately three square feet located in the top right corner of the front façade of the building. The numbers will be four-inch aluminum channel letters painted Akzo Nobel Satin Silver with one-inch aluminum trim caps painted white.

#### Ground Sign

The existing ground sign, which fronts West Bridge Street, will be replaced with a monument sign of the same size. The sign face is approximately 43 square feet per side. The entire sign would be 10.5 feet in height. The sign face is approximately 3 feet, 9 inches in height; 9 feet, 6 inches in width; and 2 feet in depth, painted Akzo Nobel Blue Satin, with ½-inch, push through logo and lettering that is white translucent. The base of the sign will contain the 250 numerals for address identification, which will not be lit. The base of the sign is clad in brick to match the building. The sign will be located just west of the existing ground sign, which will be removed.

Staff has reviewed this application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

### **Commission Questions**

Ms. Call inquired about the placement of the ground sign.

Mr. Hounshell indicated that the new ground sign would be placed slightly to the west of the existing sign.

Ms. Fox inquired how the height and width of the ground sign would compare with the Bridge Street Code requirements. Does the proposed sign meet the standard Sign Code?

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. The standard code permits the sign to be 15 feet in height. The Bridge Street Code maximum is 8 feet.

Ms. Fox stated that the standard sign code requires landscaping at the base of the ground sign. Is there a landscape design for this sign?

Ms. Husak responded that, typically, that information is provided with the sign permit for Building Code review.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the canopy approval is part of this application.

Ms. Husak responded that the canopy was approved by the Administrative Review Team. It did not require Commission review and approval.

Ms. Call noted that she likes the Celtic theme of the new OhioHealth design.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the sign meets Code.

Ms. Rauch responded that the Bridge Street Code permits a maximum height of 8 feet; the standard Sign Code permits a maximum of 15 feet.

Ms. Husak stated that, in this instance, the Master Sign Plan can meet the previous Sign Code, which is based upon the combination of wall and ground signs. That is not something the current Code would permit. That is a deviation the applicant is requesting, and the only way in which to achieve it is through Commission approval of a Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Fox stated that she was surprised to see the number of other signs on this site, including the tobacco, e-cigarette signs and a stop sign. Are any of those signs located within the Shawan Falls right-of-way? The Sign Code does specify that the number of signs along the roadway be limited to reduce the visual impact. These signs are directly across from the park entrance and the old cabin. Per the Community Plan, a future pedestrian and bike path will be located here, which likely will be heavily traveled. Therefore, she is concerned about overloading the roadway with signage.

Ms. Rauch responded that, per Code, those signs must be located on their property. If the signs meet Code, they do not require Commission approval. They were included in the packet as reference information only for the Commission.

Ms. Fox stated that her concern is whether this number of signs on the site are necessary. She understands the need for directional and handicapped signage, but there are many additional signs here that, typically, are not seen on private property, such as the tobacco-related signs and

the stop sign. Because a heavily-traveled pedestrian and bikepath will be located here in the future, she questions the need for so many signs.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Jim Lytle, OhioHealth representative, Project Manager/Sign Consultant, 1665 West Case Road, Columbus, Ohio stated that whenever their company brands a campus, it is always common courtesy to add stop signs for the municipality that are the 7-foot regulated height for any major roadway. That was a token gesture. They also made the pole the City's preferred aluminum color. Stop signs are added to make sure drivers stop there rather than pulling straight out. The signs typically are added for all OhioHealth sites. The other two signs are located interior to their property. The 12 foot by 18 foot signs are low to the ground. The tobacco free signs are added on all OhioHealth campuses, consistent with their policy to encourage healthy living, and the handicapped signs are required. The signs near the back of the site are to replace existing signage with brand-standard signage. All OhioHealth signs have blue poles, excluding the stop signs. This is the basic OhioHealth signage packet, but if it is necessary to eliminate some of the signs, that could occur.

Ms. Fox stated that she appreciates the explanation. From her perspective, sign clutter should be avoided in the pedestrian areas; minimum signage is preferred. She has no issue with the physician signs, but perhaps they could be reduced to two signs with arrows in both directions. Mr. Lytle indicated that change could be made.

Ms. Fox stated that she assumes the existing signs on the walls of the building would be removed. Mr. Lytle responded that some of the signs are inherent with the building. It is an interesting building with its own quirks. He has not looked closely at some of the building-specific signs, but they will clean up the signs wherever possible.

Ms. Fox stated that she would also prefer the stop sign to be eliminated. Although Shawan Falls Road is traveled, it is not a principal road. She likes the design and the sign package but would like the sign clutter to be reduced.

Mr. Lytle inquired if it is the Commission's request to eliminate the stop sign.

Ms. Call stated that is not her request. She prefers safety over aesthetics. She is not in favor of eliminating the stop sign for a public right-of-way in the proposed sign package. She requested clarification of the signs for which Commission approval is requested. Does it include the stop sign, accessible parking and physician signs? Does it include the ground sign and canopy sign?

Ms. Husak stated that approval of the canopy and monument signs is needed. All the internal signage is shown for information only.

Mr. Fishman stated that he also is supportive of removing any unnecessary signs near the right-of-way. This is a scenic road, and that will be emphasized by the pedestrian and bikepath addition. Mr. Lytle stated that he can eliminate a few signs, but his direction comes from the OhioHealth organization. If the Commission is not supportive of the tobacco free campus signs, he will report that to OhioHealth.

Mr. Fishman responded that he has seen that signage located inside the buildings. He is not convinced that they are needed outside the building.

Mr. Lytle stated that there is similar signage on the entrance doors to the building.

Mr. Boggs requested clarification that the Commission's concern about the tobacco prohibition signage reflects a concern about the number and location of signs on the site, not the sign content.

Mr. Fishman stated that his concern is related only to sign clutter.

Ms. Call noted that the small signs in question are not part of the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it is possible for the Commission to add a condition that sign clutter be reduced.

Ms. Rauch stated that the Code permits the applicant to have directional signs, and the number is not regulated. The applicant can have the number of signs desired as long as they meet the size and height requirements.

Ms. Fox responded that tobacco free signs are not directional signs.

Mr. Lytle stated that they have no directional signs. They are regulatory signs.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is not supportive of approving the sign package without clarification that the applicant will clean up the sign clutter.

Mr. Supelak clarified that four types of signs are being provided by applicant choice: stop sign, tobacco free signs, "reserved for physicians" signs, and "do not block" sign on the dumpster. The handicapped sign is required. In summary, the Commission is requesting less signage. Elective signs should be reduced, if possible. In regard to the stop sign, he is supportive of eliminating it from the sign package. The majority of the ingress/egress points in the City do not have stop signs. Providing them would result in sign proliferation throughout the City.

Mr. Lytle stated that it is included in the OhioHealth sign package, but if the Commission believes it is unnecessary, he can relay that to OhioHealth.

Mr. Supelak responded that the Commission would request that occur, if it is an elective sign and can be eliminated. The Commission also is requesting an alternate for the tobacco free signs, and a reduction in number of "Reserved for Physicians" signs.

Mr. Lytle stated that it is human nature to park in the next parking space if it is not specifically reserved, as well, but he will attempt to minimize them.

Ms. Rauch stated that a condition for approval has been added that the applicant minimize the extraneous signage and ensure they are located outside of the right-of-way.

Mr. Lytle clarified the reason the new ground sign will be located slightly to the west of the existing ground sign location is that the existing sign foundation cannot be reused. Due to its height and the wind load, a steel beam must be run up the inside of the sign. A conventional masonry base will be used for the new sign.

Ms. Fox noted that the handicapped parking violation fine of \$278 appears odd.

Mr. Lytle stated that the fine listed is consistent with the City's recently adopted fee schedule.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with one condition:

1. That the applicant minimize the extraneous informational and directional signs and ensure their location is outside of the right-of-way, in accordance with the Commission discussion.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.  
(Motion approved 4-0.)

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

- Ms. Husak stated that on December 3, the City is hosting an Open House input session for the new City Council Chambers. In the lobby of the new City Hall at 5555 Perimeter Drive, there will be drawings for the proposed layout of the City Council Chambers addition. Staff will be present to respond to questions.
- Mr. Boggs introduced a new member of the Frost Brown Todd legal team, Olivia Greismyer, who joined the firm in October.
- Ms. Fox noted that a working group will be preparing a learning program for professional development of the City's citizen Commissioners and board members, which will include web-based learning, conferences, speakers and resource manuals. Consultant Greg Dale will be assisting the working group in their efforts to create an exemplary program that may be useful to other citizen commissions throughout the country. Two member volunteers will be sought from both the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board to serve on the working group along with Council and staff representatives. The working group likely will meet once before year end. Council is interested in strengthening its communication with its boards and commissions and empowering its citizen commissions. She will be forwarding to the Commission and ARB members the preliminary information topics. Members are requested to review the suggestions and forward any additional suggestions to her.

Ms. Husak shared that she has been working with professors at The Ohio State University and professionals within the region on ideas for a self-guided, online learning tool for Commissioners. The program has officially been rolled out and will begin in February 2020. Information on that new program will be included in the Commission's December meeting packet.

Ms. Fox noted that she has already registered for the 7-week online learning program provided by OSU, which will provide Commissioners with a certificate of completion.

- Mr. Fishman inquired when the next Community Plan Update would occur. Typically, it occurs every 10 years.

Ms. Rauch responded that in Council's November 4 meeting packet, a memo and analysis was provided on a potential Community Plan update to begin third or fourth quarter of 2020. Council was supportive of the project moving forward. The information provided to Council will be forwarded to the Commission, as well. The last Community Plan update occurred in 2013. Incremental updates in area plans, water and sewer services and the travel demand model have been made in the interim; however, a holistic review and update is recommended. Given the complexity, the update will take approximately two years. They are looking at ways to improve the usability of the Plan, as well.

- Ms. Fox reported that City Council has authorized the City Manager to engage Heritage Ohio to conduct a DART assessment. A Downtown Assessment Research Team will meet with a group of 20 stakeholders in the Historic District, conduct a community input session and compile an assessment report. Whatever occurs in the Historic District will expand



along SR161 west. The Commission will have an opportunity to make recommendations, so members are encouraged to attend the general input session to obtain a sense of the community's views and values in terms of continued economic development in that District. The intent is to encourage development and increase vibrancy in the District.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Interim Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy Clerk of Council