



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 6, 2020

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, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman,
Rebecca Call, Kristina Kennedy

Staff members present: Claudia Husak, Nichole Martin, Chase Ridge, Thaddeus Boggs

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

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

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes, Ms. Call, 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. In such 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. The cases will be heard in the order in which the agenda was published

CASES

1. Columbus Oncology at 6700 Perimeter Drive, 19-110FDP, Final Development Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this is a request for the construction of an approximately 32,000-square-foot, two-story medical office building and associated site improvements. The 3.27-acre site is north of Perimeter Drive, 250 feet northeast of the intersection of Perimeter Drive with Hospital Drive and zoned Planned Commerce Development, Perimeter West, Subarea 1.

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

Case Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan to permit the construction of a 32,000-square-foot, two-story medical office building. The site is located north of Perimeter Drive, approximately 250 feet northeast of the intersection with Hospital Drive, just south of Post Road. Columbus Springs–Dublin is southwest of the site, and Avery Square Shopping Center is southeast of the site. There is an east-west private access drive across the southern portion of the site. The approximately 3.28-acre property is the last undeveloped site in the Perimeter West District.

Background/Proposal

The site was annexed into the City of Dublin in 1981 (Ord. 13-81) and originally rezoned in 1999 (Ord. 45-99) to PCD, Planned Commerce District, as part of the 83 acres in the Perimeter West plan. There are three subareas. The site is located within Subarea 1 of the Perimeter West PCD. The development text refers to the Suburban Office and Institutional Use section of the Code for permitted uses in the district, including Professional Services, Administrative Offices and Medical Offices. For reference, the site to the east is the PNC Bank; the site to the west is a medical office building; and the site to the north is a mix of professional and medical services. The site is relatively flat, with little to no vegetation. The 32,000-square-foot building is situated centrally in the northern end of the site. The majority of the parking will be located in the southern end of the site. A landscaped amenity area is proposed to the west of the building, between the building and the drive. A dumpster is in the far northeast corner. The development text requires that parking calculations meet the City of Dublin Zoning Code provisions. A medical office use requires one parking space for every 200 square feet of the building. Per Code, this proposal is required to have 160 parking spaces; the proposal meets this requirement. Three access points are proposed. One is located centrally on the east side of the site, and two are proposed on the west. Pedestrian access from Perimeter Drive is provided via a sidewalk that runs northward through the center of the site. Sidewalk circulation is provided around the building and meanders through the healing garden.

Architecture

The applicant is proposing an approximately 33-foot tall, two-story building with two different brick materials. Glen-Gery Rustic Burgundy brick is shown for the majority of the building and Cloud Ceramics Midnight Iron brick is proposed along the southwest portion of the building and for the soldier course on the burgundy brick facades. The applicant is also proposing a stone accent wall (Glen-Gery Landmark Collection Stackstone in Color Cashmere) at the front entry. The windows in this portion of the building will include an Arriscraft Cast Stone header and sill in a gray color. The brick soldier course of the large entry window needs to be updated to match the other windows on this portion of the building. The applicant is proposing to use a prefinished aluminum break metal panel in a Charcoal Gray color on a portion of the southwest corner of the building, as well as for the majority of the drop-off overhang. The applicant has proposed two roofing materials for the building. The majority of the building will have a Certainteed Patriot asphalt shingle roof in a Graystone color, but the southwest portion of the building will have a standing seam roof in Charcoal Gray.

Landscaping

A mix of shrubs and trees is proposed throughout the site, along the perimeter of the site and within the landscape islands in the parking lot and the bulb along Perimeter Drive. A healing garden or amenity space, located to the west of the building, will be heavily landscaped with a mix of low-growing plants, shrubs and ornamental trees. Several benches will be provided along a meandering path through the landscaped area to be used by visitors, patients and employees. Staff is recommending that the applicant continue to work with staff on plant/tree species, as well as with the number of trees provided for screening purposes.

The application was reviewed against all applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval with five conditions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Call requested clarification of the section in the history report about lock-down procedures and doors that closed automatically.

Ms. Husak stated that information is related to the Columbus Springs–Dublin facility, which is located south of this site. That is a different use than is proposed here.

Ms. Call inquired if the information in the packet about lockdown procedures, fire safety and swing arms would not apply here -- she was attempting to understand the context.

Mr. Ridge clarified that he provided history for recently developed, surrounding properties to assist the Commission in understanding the density in the area, which is calculated in an aggregate.

Ms. Fox stated that in looking through the extensive history provided, there was also an earlier mention regarding window detailing. Was that issue remedied?

Mr. Ridge stated that he reviewed the history and the development text and was unable to find specific discussion about windows. However, the development text does state that this district is to be developed to Class A standards, which would include architectural details. The applicant is proposing a soldier course on the windows, which would meet that need.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the HVAC units in the rear corner would be screened.

Mr. Ridge responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there was a reason there is no access to the service drive on the south.

Ms. Husak responded that there is pedestrian access. The access point is from the internal east-west drive.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there was a reason the additional access was not provided.

Mr. Ridge indicated the applicant would provide more information.

Applicant Presentation

Todd Sloan, Daimler Group, 1533 Lakeshore Drive, Columbus, Ohio, 43204 stated that in regard to the access point along that access drive, for a facility of this size -- 32,000 square feet, three access points to the site were considered sufficient. They did not believe there was a need for an additional access point in that location. Without it, they were able to keep the greenspace, but still provide access on both sides of the facility, which addresses the patient and staff flow perspective.

Ms. Fox stated that she likes the healing garden. Her understanding is that this will be a comprehensive oncology facility, offering all services necessary for cancer patients. She does not see a doorway from the west side of the facility into the healing garden. How do they anticipate that space being used?

Mr. Sloan responded that one of the primary activities that will take place in the facility along that west property is chemotherapy infusion, which takes several hours. The healing garden is intended to provide a visual amenity for patients while undergoing their infusion. That is the reason that the plant material will be more delicate than typically seen in a commercial application. The thought was to make it look more like a backyard setting. Although there will be benches for family members, its primary purpose is visual.

Ms. Fox suggested adding an active visual element, such as water or bird feeders – something for the patient to watch during those long hours.

Mr. Sloan indicated that he would share that suggestion.

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that the community will appreciate the opportunity for a close to home facility. However, the intent is to look at perpetual uses versus a single use for a building. The rear elevation is bland. The development text specifies high quality and upscale structures. This is an attractive, acceptable building, but we are looking for more than acceptable. While the healing garden is a great feature -- it is not something every oncology facility offers, the building also should be something more than what is architecturally typical. There is an opportunity to “dress up” the building and meet the intent for a quality, upscale structure. She challenges them to look for those opportunities.

Mr. Supelak stated that he concurs with Ms. Call's suggestion. The architecture and materials are good; however, the detailing does not appear finished. The roof is in need of some detail in choice spots. In the roofline, dormers could be used to break up the monotony. The canopy is nice. Tiebacks to the building would add a layer of detail. The low-lying bushes next to the building are disappointing. There is potential to add landscaping with some height to provide a more finished appearance. That layer of detail appears to be pending and will need to be addressed.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she concurs with fellow Commissioners' comments about the rear façade of the building looking bland. She likes the healing garden. Providing that outside visual appeal is a thoughtful consideration for the patients and in keeping with the City's desire for a green appearance. This facility will be a great addition to the City of Dublin.

Mr. Fishman concurred with the positive comments. The building looks fantastic. On the rear façade, would there be room to provide landscaping between the building and the parking area?

Mr. Sloan responded that the renderings do not do justice as to how this elevation will look. There is an elevation change within the rear façade, and soldier courses of brick – darker brick above lighter brick -- will be incorporated. A darker mullion is used on this building. There is also a significant amount of glass, which will allow a large amount of natural light into the building. Although more detail could be added, it is important to balance the cost versus the need. They have been cognizant of the visual aspects of this building and attempted to make it a little different from what exists in the community. Using white stone will make it feel modern. In regard to the

roof, they have worked hard and purposely provided a significant amount of variation with the roof design. Some other buildings in the area are beginning to look dated. Their architects have attempted to achieve a timeless design.

Mr. Fishman stated that he likes the architecture. He does not believe the rear façade is an issue, but did wonder if there might be opportunity to add another landscape island.

Mr. Sloan responded that to meet Code, they need to provide a certain number of parking spaces, and they have struggled to meet that requirement. Due to the length of the patient stays in the facility, all those parking spaces will be needed. They ensured that greenspace was provided in front of the building to make sure it was as inviting as possible.

Mr. Fishman suggested using taller trees instead of ornamental trees in the landscaping islands. Mr. Sloan stated that the building sits a distance from the street. The challenge was how to draw pedestrians' eyes to the building. It was important to have the walkway that extends to the street be centered on the entrance, not the edge. Pedestrian traffic will be drawn through the parking lot. The concept was to provide a visual column of trees, so all those trees will be columnar. Mr. Fishman stated that he has no issues with the landscaping on the front of the building. His suggestion was to add taller trees in the landscaping islands at the rear of the building. Mr. Sloan stated that the columnar trees used in the front could be used at the rear, as well. However, there is room for only the one island, which is next to the building.

Ms. Newell stated that she likes the building. It is consistent with the text and comparable to other buildings in the development. Although she agrees that it would be nice to have more relief provided at the rear of the building, overall, she likes the building.

Ms. Fox stated that that the rear of the building will not be viewed significantly, and the landscaping will soften its appearance. Glass provides variation to the building. The Commission is interested in pedestrian access, and she likes the front walkway to the building. Perhaps it could be broadened to give it more substance. The people who will need to come to this site will be struggling with their circumstances, so anything that can be added to make the exterior of the facility appear attractive and welcoming would be encouraging elements. Perhaps adding more comfortable seating than a typical bench next to the entranceway would be nice for those having difficulty making it to the front door.

Ms. Call stated that she sees the downspouts and some positive/negative space, but is unable to discern if past the second, larger window there is an architectural bumpout.

Mr. Sloan responded that the center section is bumped out to break up the expanse.

Ms. Call stated that this is a nice building, but the breadth of that wall is challenging. It would not require another architectural change, however. There are wireframe landscape boxes that permit vertical growth that cannot occur without support at the base. Perhaps adding that type of element on each side of the window would provide a visual breakup.

Mr. Sloan responded that there is space there to add a vertical planter. Because it is the north façade, the type of plantings are limited. Although an ivy wall would not do well in this environment, another planter element could be added.

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the conditions.

Mr. Sloan responded that they are in agreement.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the Final Development Plan with the following five conditions:

- 1) The plans be updated to accurately show the headers for windows on the stone façade;
- 2) The applicant continue to work with staff to relocate the proposed ground sign so that it meets the Code required setback and any encroachment within public easements would require an easement encroachment agreement, subject to the approval of the City Engineer;
- 3) The applicant extend the landscape island immediately south of the dumpster enclosure, subject to staff approval;
- 4) The applicant continue to work with staff to select more appropriate plantings for the site, subject to staff approval; and,
- 5) The applicant continue to work with staff to ensure that the Vehicular Use Area section of the Code is satisfied with the number of trees in and around the parking lot.

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

2. Bridge Park, D Block at Riverside Drive, 19-121MSP, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this application is a request for an amendment to an approved Master Sign Plan to include sign provisions for the Block D development of Bridge Park, including an anchor tenant. The site is southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway and is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood.

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

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan for signs for Bridge Park, D Block. Block D is the fourth block of development located within Bridge Park. Bridge Park is located at the intersection of Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road. This particular block is the northernmost block and is located at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. Previously, sign plans have been approved for Blocks A, B and C.

Background

In 2015, the Commission adopted the original Sign Plan for Blocks B and C, establishing the framework from which all of the other Master Sign Plans are modeled. That approval included the general regulations matrix, which is the backbone of the Master Sign Plan, as well as elevations depicting where signs may be located on a building. The 2015 approval also established the variety of sign types that are unique to this Master Sign Plan as opposed to the regular Code requirements. In 2016, parking garage signs were approved for the B and C Block garages. In

2017, the Commission approved an amendment to the Master Sign Plan (MSP) to accommodate user-specific signage for the AC Marriott and The Exchange events center. In 2018, the Commission approved an addendum to the MSP to permit signs for the A1 office building, which recently opened along W. Dublin-Granville Road at Dale Drive, and a unique sign for the Vaso Rooftop Bar. The latter is an example of a placemaking art sign. The sign is approximately 100 square feet. [Existing examples of canopy edge, projecting, pedestrian art and wall signs within Bridge Park were shown.]

Site

Bridge Park, D Block is comprised of four buildings -- D1, D2, D3 and D4/D5. Building D1 contains first floor retail, second floor office, and residential on floors 3-5. Building D2 contains only office tenants. D3 will be residential use. Building D4/D5 is a parking garage integrated with a mixed-use. In addition to the parking garage, it will contain an anchor retail tenant – the North Market, and residential. D Block will also include the extension of Longshore Street to the north and Larimer Street to the west. Tuller Ridge will be the southern boundary. Longshore Street is one of the primary internal circulators in Bridge Park. [Views of existing streetscape character on Longshore Street shown.]

Master Sign Plan Proposal

The proposal is to permit amendments to the MSP previously approved for Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, and C to incorporate Block D. The approval would not only expand the area of applicability, but also approve signs for the North Market, a tenant with unique conditions.

Buildings D1, D2 and D3 Signs

The sign provisions for Buildings D1, D2 and D3 will be an extension of the existing MSP sign standards for Blocks A, B, and C. Staff has requested one condition for Building D1 -- that the projecting signs on the second story of the building be eliminated as, currently, they are not permitted on level 2 of buildings for other office tenants. It is anticipated the majority of the signs will be located along Riverside Drive and Longshore Street, as the primary tenant entrances for retail and office are located along Longshore Street.

Ms. Fox stated that the guidelines regarding window sign graphics is 20% per window. Has 30% been approved previously?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox inquired if anything different in that regard has been requested.

Ms. Martin responded that everything is consistent with what has been previously approved.

The plan includes building elevations for each building. The intent is to depict the general locations where a given sign type is permitted.

Building D4/D5 Signs

This one structure has two designations due the form-based building type requirements. D4 is the retail and residential portion of the structure and D5 is the parking portion of the structure. Building D4/D5 is located behind Building D1. The North Market is the only retail tenant space located in Building D4. The tenant's primary frontage is along Longshore Street and the corner of Larimer, where there is a patio. There are three primary entrances along Longshore Street: one located to the north, one centrally located, and one located to the south. There are three secondary entrances, as well as garage doors to provide a connection between the street and the merchants. The proposed signs are exclusively along the Longshore Street elevation. A total of

12 signs is proposed, including three building-mounted signs, which in general, conform with the existing MSP regulations; three placemaking art signs, which generally exceed the existing regulations for those signs; and six placemaking art banners, which are not currently included in the MSP.

North Entrance:

One circular projecting sign is proposed on the north façade of the building at the intersection of Larimer Street and Longshore Street. The proposed sign is 12.25 square feet in size. Staff recommends the size be reduced to 12 square feet to be consistent with the MSP regulation. The wall sign is proposed to be 10 square feet and adjacent to the entry at a pedestrian height.

Central Entrance:

This is the primary entrance of the market. A 60-square-foot, wall-mounted sign is proposed above the entry. Staff recommends that the size be reduced to 50 square feet, which is consistent with first-level wall signs for other blocks in Bridge Park. Also proposed is an iconic North Market logo applique. The sign fabrication details are not provided; however, the sign appears to be a vinyl window and building sign. The sign is circular and depicts the iconic North Market rooster. The sign is proposed to have a diameter of 36 feet and an overall area of 1,296 square feet, which exceeds the size of other placemaking signs within the District.

South Entrance:

Two placemaking art signs are proposed. One is a dimensional red rooster with vinyl applique extending onto the façade of the building. The rooster is perched on the canopy of the south entrance. The sign is approximately 36 square feet in size. The second is a North Market wordmark sign that is 160 square feet in size.

Placemaking Art Banners:

The applicant is proposing six placemaking art banners, each to be 84 square feet in size. The banners would be distributed across the west façade of the building to add visual interest along the street and identify the North Market from a distance. The Commission has previously eliminated banner signage in the District.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the proposed banner signs would be permanent.

Ms. Martin responded that they would be permanent with the opportunity to be changed seasonally.

Parking Garage:

The D5 parking garage signs are consistent with what has been approved for previous blocks. The signs will be illuminated projecting signs that vary in size based on hierarchy of entrance and exit locations. One 32-square-foot parking marquee would be on the south elevation along Tuller Ridge Drive, as well as additional wayfinding signs for entries and exits.

Staff has reviewed the application against the Master Sign Plan (MSP) criteria and the Bridge Street District Sign Design Guidelines and recommends approval with nine conditions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the North Market would be using only the first/ground level.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. North Market, which is the retail use, will be on the ground level. In the upper levels -- residential use will be on the north side, and the parking garage will be on the south side.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if parking is located in the space behind the windows on which the large placemaking art sign (the Rooster) is located.

Mr. Ridge noted that the applicant would address her inquiry in his presentation.

Ms. Call stated that it has been indicated that the placemaking signs exceed the requirements for other placemaking signs; however, this is a single tenant building. If this space were divided among multiple tenants, what would be their placemaking art sign allowance?

Ms. Martin responded that with placemaking art signs, the tenant does not have the flexibility to move them. Most buildings do not permit more than two placemaking art signs. Typically, they are limited to the area next to the intersection of two major streets.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Starr, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, Ohio stated that the Master Sign Plan regulations that were put in place for Bridge Park have served the development well and, in general, have successfully restricted tenants to those guidelines. However, because this is a unique building for the City, some unique signs are proposed. In response to the question of what is located behind the window on which the Rooster placemaking art sign is located, it is the stairwell for the parking garage. Five levels of parking are located on the southwestern side of the building. Residential use is located on the southeastern side of the building. The projecting sign on level 2 of Building D1 has been proposed because, architecturally, there are no other opportunities to provide signs for those tenants. This particular floorplate of offices is approximately 25,000 square feet. Although they have been working with four potential tenants, it is anticipated that the space will be divided between two tenants. Having a sign is important to each tenant. Perhaps the signs would not need to be located in the middle on the front elevation, but on the ends of the building. In regard to the D2 building, it will not be office use only. The ground floor will accommodate retail. They recently signed a lease with Hagerty Insurance, which will have a showroom for classic cars on the ground floor. There will be other uses on the ground floor of that building, and their signs would be governed by the sign matrix.

Ms. Fox inquired where the projecting signs on the building would be located.

Mr. Starr pointed out the potential locations; however, he anticipates using no more than two of the potential locations on the office level.

Ms. Martin noted that the general regulations matrix is regulatory. The building elevations shown depict signs in logical locations.

Ms. Fox stated that the projecting sign at Pins Mechanical Company activates the street. Traveling further down Riverside, the signage does not capture the public's interest. As she viewed this sign proposal, there seemed to be a lack of creativity to draw interest at the pedestrian level, such as that provided by the Cap City sign and The Pint Room placemaking sign on the corner. Other than the North Market sign, there are no other interesting placemaking signs in this proposal.

Mr. Starr responded that those signs would be seen later when the users are identified. The architecture will dictate what can occur there to some extent. Much of the pedestrian activity will be on the interior street. That may change very quickly when the pedestrian bridge is opened on

March 13. Most of the signs will be tenant driven, however. For the most part, no storefronts have been incorporated into these buildings, because the intent is that the tenants will personalize that experience. When that begins to occur, it will elevate the interest experience. Recently, they viewed the preliminary drawings for the Hagerty Insurance showroom, which will be spectacular. He believes the Commission's concerns will be addressed.

Ms. Fox inquired if the anticipation is that the flexibility provided by not having defined storefronts would enrich the pedestrian experience. A wall sign, which is a shopping center look, would not do that. The hope was that creativity, texture and uniqueness would begin to occur, but to date, that has been seen in only a few places.

Mr. Supelak stated that one tenant has been identified -- the North Market, so there is a specific sign proposal for them. As more tenants are identified, will they be providing sign proposals, as well?

Ms. Martin responded that would not be the case. The MSP provides flexibility from the Code sign guidelines, but is also intended to expedite sign permitting. Any tenant in A, B or C blocks can submit a sign permit application to the City, along with a letter of property owner approval. The City will forward the permit application to a consultant to review for creativity, fabrication and placement. Any consultant recommendations are provided to the applicant, who after submitting a revised application responsive to the recommendations will receive a sign permit.

Ms. Newell stated that process does not involve the Commission. A good example of that approval process is the Cap City signage, which was not approved by this Commission.

Ms. Martin stated that the MSP proposals that come before the Commission are user specific, such as The Exchange event center, the AC Hotel, the North Market and parking garages.

Mr. Starr clarified that as the applicant, they would have to seek a MSP amendment for anything that was outside the MSP boundaries. However, the MSP boundaries provide sufficient flexibility to enable most tenants to have creative signage that complies with the MSP.

Mr. Supelak inquired if Ms. Fox is advocating for more creativity and potentially fewer wall signs and more projecting signs.

Ms. Fox stated that the applicant has the ability to utilize all the sign types permitted by the MSP in these locations. Now that there is a built environment, the walk down the street needs to have more inviting and interesting signage. Although that has been provided in a few places, as the environment develops, there is the opportunity to make it richer. There has been opportunity to evaluate what works and what does not. She has noticed many wall signs but an insufficient number of creative, textural signs consistent with the sign characteristic calling for "works of art." More of that character is needed to enrich the environment. When the applicant has a MSP, the responsibility lies with the applicant to make that happen.

Mr. Starr stated that to some extent that is true. He can encourage that direction to be taken as much as possible.

Ms. Newell requested clarification of the graphics on the glass.

Ted Orr, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, Ohio, stated that many of staff's questions regarding the North Market signage are specific to the materials. Some of those are not yet known. One of the most iconic signs in central Ohio sits above the current North Market. As they have worked with Rick Harrison Wolfe and his staff on bringing another North Market to Dublin, the intent was to do something equally iconic. That means pushing the boundaries a little.

To that end, they want heirloom quality of materials and finishes with this signage. Because North Market is a public entity, they must be purposeful and judicious with the dollars they invest. They have pushed the boundaries somewhat with what they are asking the Commission to approve. Should the Commission agree with the proposed direction, they would immediately begin engaging with sign vendors who understand what heirloom quality means and work on identifying those materials. They anticipate that much of it will be hand-painted, crisp and clean from Day One. Over time, they will see how it wears and whether the preference is to maintain the hand painting to maintain its quality and attractiveness. They anticipate that vinyl will be an application, depending on the distance that the end user will interface with that sign. That is part of being judicious with the money invested. Vinyl stickers on the window are not the initial preference, but it is necessary to vet the options.

Ms. Newell inquired if the Rooster could be recessed behind the glass to provide a dual perspective along with the painted graphics on the building.

Mr. Orr stated that option was explored.

Ms. Newell stated that she would recommend that a condition be added ensuring that staff is satisfied with the materials that will be used. She has another question in regard to paint. She is excited the North Market is coming to Dublin and certainly anticipates it will succeed. However, if the business does not survive here, there will be painted graphics on the building that will need to be removed. How could they be removed?

Mr. Orr responded that they have explored that issue. He has been assured that the graphics can be permanent until a particular device is used to remove them.

Ms. Newell stated that there are particular cleaners that can be used. She would request another condition be added that the building not be sandblasted to remove the graphics. That process destroys the face of the brick.

Mr. Orr stated that they would be in agreement with that condition.

Ms. Newell inquired about the fun grass that is near the Rooster. Will those be vegetated roofs?

Mr. Orr responded affirmatively. They would be live roofs.

Ms. Newell inquired if this is considered part of the signage package.

Ms. Martin stated that the red awnings and the vegetated roofs were approved as part of the tenant fit-up.

Ms. Newell stated that she asks because she would want to ensure that item occurs.

Mr. Orr responded that there is a load issue that they are attempting to evaluate to determine how best to execute the live roofs.

Ms. Newell stated that suspension cables would help support the awning and the weight load of the vegetated roof.

Mr. Starr responded that the weight load of the soil, water and drainage components are much heavier than may have been anticipated. It may need to be executed with trays or pots.

Ms. Newell noted that there are tray systems that work well for vegetated roofs. Cameron Mitchell has used this type of system.

Mr. Starr stated that if pots are used, they may be hand-watered, but there would not be continuous irrigation.

Mr. Fishman stated that it would be important that the vegetation not be brown during hot summer months.

Ms. Newell stated that vegetated roofs expand through all seasons. If they use a tray system, care will be taken as to which plants are used. This system has succeeded on The EDJE facility, and is a very fun and creative element. The only signs she has an issue with are the banner signs.

She does not believe the Rooster sign on the North Market will be overlooked. The issue with using banners is that too much signage begins to compete with the good signage. Banners are not provided for in the sign code. That said, she very much likes the Rooster, the painted graphics and the vegetated roof. She finds the North Market signage proposal very creative.

Mr. Starr stated that they believe the banner signage is important. This market is located on the ground floor of a parking garage. Looking down the street, the banners will provide wayfinding assistance for pedestrians. A pedestrian entering Bridge Park from the pedestrian bridge and looking for the North Market would see the banners down the street. They have not figured out the angle for the Rooster. The banners can also be rotated seasonally. It is an element that will provide diversity in the neighborhood. They believe they are an important element to add visual interest on that street to describe the pedestrian experience on the street, which is not a straight street.

Ms. Fox stated that the Bridge Street District sign guidelines ask for characteristics geared toward a pedestrian experience. She likes the red awning and the projecting sign. This is a long stretch of street. Would the garage doors be open during the summer months?

Mr. Starr stated that this will be a very vibrant street. There will be a variety of experiences at those door openings. There will be a repeating pattern of bifold doors, exterior counter seating and storefronts.

Ms. Fox stated that she recognizes there will be much happening along that expanse. However, the Rooster applique is flat and high; it is not a sign that pedestrians will notice unless they look up. Signage along the narrow street would add more interest for pedestrians, but banners are not sufficiently creative. She agrees that there should be something that quickly identifies the North Market area, but it should be more creative than banners. The existing North Market signage in the Short North stands out; it is funkier. With the proposed signage, the Rooster is fun, but more is needed.

Mr. Orr stated that they anticipate the Rooster will have a neon, LED lighting component. They believe the pedestrian element down Longshore Street will be interesting. Approximately every second window space will provide vibrancy, including a different tile finish beneath the vendor counters. With the angle of the building, the large Rooster graphic will be visible.

Ms. Fox stated that from the front, that might be the case. However, her concern is that when the doors are closed and the countertops and outdoor seating are not be visible, there will be a straight line with very little visual, pedestrian interest at the street level.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the Commission would be seeing the North Market sign proposal again. There seem to be some issues that are not yet defined, such as the potential neon component and paint versus vinyl materials.

Ms. Martin stated that would be at the Commission's discretion.

Mr. Supelak stated that, in general, he likes this MSP proposal, which is already "above and beyond" the standard signage. However, the Commission is suggesting that they push it even further. Although the Rooster may not be immediately visible from a direct approach, it does have significant presence. He would like the signage to be heavily artistic, using a mix of media, including lighting. The street experience is important. Are there planters and benches that may not be part of the sign package but would add to the total context? Could the sandwich boards be more creative than those depicted in the graphics?

Ms. Martin responded that, in general, they could not. There are fabrication requirements – wood, metal, chalkboard or whiteboard; they may not be fabricated from plastic.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the number of sandwich board signs permitted. The individual vendors will animate the street level. That is a level of information that is currently missing and likely would be even if the applicant returns.

Ms. Martin stated that each vendor with frontage on Longshore Street would be permitted a sandwich board sign.

Mr. Starr noted that sandwich board signs probably would not be permitted. There would be a significant amount of activity occurring along the street, and having a number of those signs along the streets would impede pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Supelak inquired if vendors would have storefront signage.

Mr. Starr responded affirmatively. It would be provided primarily from the inside.

Mr. Fishman inquired how much bigger the Rooster placemaking sign is than is typically permitted. Mr. Orr responded that it is significantly larger – perhaps 20 times larger.

Mr. Fishman stated that if this is approved today, that same type of signage could be placed on any building in Block D.

Ms. Martin stated that there are two components to this package. The first component is extending the regulations that apply in other blocks to the three other buildings in this block. The second component is this building specifically. Theoretically, the Commission could approve signage for three of the four buildings.

Mr. Fishman inquired if in the scenario that the North Market leaves this site in ten years, would the next tenant in this space be permitted to have a sign the same size as this Rooster sign?

Ms. Martin responded that they would not. The approval is tied specifically to this user. For the user specific signs that have been approved in Bridge Park, if the user goes out of business and departs, the new users will be required to submit new sign proposals to the Commission.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the North Market departs, would all of the signs in this proposal cease to be.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she loves the placemaking art sign, which is amazing. However, it is disappointing that pedestrian bridge users and people traveling down Riverside Drive will not be able to see it. It is such an attractive, impressive sign that it is disappointing that it will not be visible from all directions. From the consumer's perspective, the projecting sign and placemaking art sign will be visible from this end. From the other end – the south end, the red Rooster will be visible. Could that potentially be confused with the Hen Quarter, which is a few blocks down? Overall, she loves the sign proposal. However, this Commission is typically negative regarding sign banners. The number of banners proposed seems excessive, especially if not needed for wayfinding. She believes the number of banners should be reduced or removed completely.

Ms. Call stated that the banners would not provide wayfinding, so she is not particularly supportive of the banners. Previously, Pins had a very interesting sign that they were unable to execute due to cost constraints. With that premise in mind, she does not want to lose the vegetative roof in this signage package due to a similar reason. It is important to find a way to execute that element, perhaps through the tray system described. It is important not to lose the elements that will set these signs and users apart. Although later, vendors will help activate the streetscape, starting

out with these sign features will help facilitate that long-term goal. She requested clarification of the sign request for the Building D1 second floor office tenants.

Mr. Starr responded that the window signs are only for the first floor, retail tenants. There is a need to provide signs for the second floor office tenants. There is only the location in the middle labeled 1B where it might be possible. Residential is located on the level above.

Mr. Orr stated that the two tenants would each take half of that floor. From a wayfinding perspective, putting both signs in the middle would not work. The columns do not allow wall signs.

Ms. Call inquired if currently, no signs are permitted on the second level.

Ms. Martin responded that is correct. Their request is only for Building D1, and only for the elevation facing Riverside Drive. The request is to permit projecting signs within the office level. Currently, projecting signs are not permitted within office floors elsewhere.

Ms. Call requested clarification of how office signs are permitted in Bridge Park.

Ms. Martin stated that as the MSP is currently written, office signs are permitted at the discretion of the landlord, and a maximum number of office signs are permitted for the office buildings in A and C Blocks. For the A1 office building, five signs are permitted; on the C2 office building, four signs are permitted. The applicant has indicated that they would be willing to have a maximum of two office signs on Building D1.

Mr. Starr stated that, currently, they have eight office tenants without signs, so approximately one in three tenants has a sign. Typically, the tenant must have more than 10,000 square feet or a full floor to be eligible for a sign. If they went only by that rule, there would be more than eight, but the signs must be architecturally appropriate and attractive, as well.

Ms. Martin responded that it has been a collaborative effort between the City and the applicant to regulate these signs. The applicant has the first right of refusal, then the application is sent to the City consultant for critique.

Ms. Fox stated that if projecting signs were to be permitted on the second story of D1 on the Riverside Drive façade, they would need to be visually appealing. In Bridge Park, the intent is not to have signage that could be seen anywhere. It must be unique and comply with the required sign characteristics. It is the uniqueness that will set this area apart from Polaris or other areas of Columbus. Having a projecting sign that is not unique on a building across from the Riverside Crossing Park would be a mistake. Similarly, North Market wayfinding signs down Longshore Street should be something more artistic and unique than banners.

Ms. Newell suggested that something creative, such as cutout signage, could have the Commission's support.

Mr. Supelak stated that the banner signs would be vertical signage on the sides of the building. Could another vertical, fun installation – a vertical fork, for instance -- be a possibility?

Ms. Fox stated that something artistic, such as a bicycle design hanging from the building would be more interesting than a banner, although it would not permit a seasonal change. The North Market signage is not where it needs to be yet. The Rooster placemaking and projecting signs are attractive, but the wall sign is not as imaginative as the one on the North Market in the Short North, nor is the signage at the pedestrian level where it needs to be.

Mr. Fishman stated that six banner signs are requested. He likes the whimsical look of fabric banner signs blowing in the wind. However, many signs are proposed, so he agrees that it is important that they be creative. Sign character is preferred over sign clutter. When there is clutter, even a creative sign loses its appeal.

Ms. Newell inquired the applicant's preference regarding the Commission's consideration
Mr. Starr stated that he would prefer that the Commission approve everything but the North Market signs. Those signs would be brought back separately.

Ms. Call requested the Commissioners' preference regarding the second floor office signs. There is a condition to eliminate those signs, as they are not permitted currently by the MSP. She believes that if the Commission permits the two projecting signs, they should be required to have an artistic component.

Mr. Supelak suggested that the conditions clarify that something "a cut above" is expected for those two projecting signs.

Ms. Kennedy suggested that the verbiage request "special character."

Ms. Fox suggested that the condition require a strict adherence to the four or five Bridge Street Sign Design characteristics that should be considered by the City's sign consultant for these two signs.

Ms. Call suggested that the language request "one of a kind," edgy, memorable, eclectic or sophisticated signage. The proposed condition language of "in accordance with the BSD Sign Design Guidelines" would not achieve the extra that is desired. The Commission is looking for something more than what the BSD Sign Design Guidelines require.

Ms. Martin stated that, actually, the characteristics the Commission expressed are from the Bridge Street Sign Design Guidelines, hence the reference to the Guidelines.

Ms. Call stated that she is satisfied with the condition as written, with the specific direction to staff to advise the sign consultant to emphasize those requirements.

Ms. Fox stated that the intent of the Commission needs to be shown, so she shares Ms. Call's concern. There is a difference between a simple projecting sign that may meet the BSD Sign Design Guidelines and a sign that is edgy, one of a kind, eclectic and artistic. The condition should clearly state that the intent is to emphasize those qualities.

Mr. Starr stated that what he could do is include the minutes from this meeting with the lease. That is how the Commission's intent is captured.

Ms. Fox inquired if the applicant had received much resistance to the sign requirements.

Mr. Starr responded that they have lost a couple of tenants due to the size requirements of the sign matrix. Although the requirements are mentioned to prospective tenants early in the process, they often fail to address them until late in the process. Prospective tenants inquire about the rent and the signage requirements. Most tenants expect the sign requirements to be restrictive, as they are elsewhere in Dublin. These requirements are not typical, however, so it is essential to go through the MSP with them. This entire sign package becomes an addendum to the lease, along with additional clarification of the steps involved.

Mr. Orr stated that some tenants have been willing to embrace the sign matrix and developed creative signage, such as Cap City and also Rebol, which is on a prominent corner.

Mr. Supelak stated that in the past, the applicant has put in the storefronts for the tenants. With this proposal, the tenant will add the interest.

Mr. Starr stated that one place they specifically did not add a storefront is the corner of the building near the pedestrian bridge landing. Because it is such an important corner, they have been very sensitive to leasing that space – it has to be the right tenant. He stated that they are pleased with this MSP proposal. There is a significant amount of flexibility for tenants to identify very creative signage, and they will be encouraged to extend effort beyond their comfort zone.

Ms. Call stated that when the North Market signage returns, she concurs with staff on the reducing the size of the projecting sign from 12.25 square feet to 12.0 square feet, and the size of the centrally-located wall sign from 60% to 50%.

Mr. Starr indicated that has been so noted.

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant is in agreement with the four conditions as shown.

Mr. Starr stated that they are in agreement.

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Call seconded to approve the Master Sign Plan with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant update Building D1 to permit a maximum of two (2) projecting signs for office tenants with additional sign quality standards, in accordance with the BSD Sign Design Guidelines.
- 2) The applicant update the General Regulations Matrix to limit Building D2 to a maximum of five (5) signs within the office levels.
- 3) The applicant provide staff an updated plan reflecting all conditions of approval prior to issuance of sign permits.
- 4) The applicant return to the Commission for review and approval of all North Market signs including sign fabrication details.

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

COMMUNICATIONS:

- Ms. Husak reminded the Commission that the joint Council-PZC-ARB meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 13, 2020.

Ms. Fox stated that this is an opportunity to look at how to create a more sustainable system for educating, training and communication between the Commissioners, Council and staff. Consultant Greg Dale will facilitate the joint work session.

Mr. Fishman and Ms. Kennedy reminded the Commission that they had indicated previously that they would be unable to attend a work session on that date due to commitments.

Ms. Newell noted that both members were available the following Thursday, February 20.

Ms. Fox stated that Council has another commitment on that date -- the Council Retreat.

- Ms. Husak noted that the February 20 PZC meeting is cancelled, as no applications will be ready for review. The next PZC meeting will be March 5, 2020.

- Ms. Martin stated that the Central Ohio Planning and Zoning workshop is scheduled for May 8, 2020, and encouraged Commissioners to attend, if possible. The theme of the workshop is, "Creating Great Places."
- Ms. Fox noted that the Council Retreat is scheduled for February 20-21, 2020.

OTHER ITEMS:

Mr. Supelak stated that the previous meeting discussion regarding Block G identified the need for the Commission to re-assess placemaking standards for outdoor spaces.

Mr. Boggs stated that in 2019, there were stakeholder discussions regarding the need for updated BSD design guidelines, and many placemaking elements are addressed in those guidelines. Implementation of those guidelines is anticipated to move forward in 2020. It has been delayed due to staff turnover and workload.

Ms. Husak stated that any specific direction for the Commission to address a topic would be initiated by Council to the Commission.

Ms. Fox inquired if it would be appropriate for the Commission to request the draft section of placemaking prepared following the stakeholder meetings for the purpose of discussing the placemaking topic. That would not need to be directed by Council.

Ms. Husak stated that from the aspect as a training exercise, it would be appropriate to have at the end of a meeting.

Mr. Boggs stated the discussion could be the last item on a meeting agenda.

Mr. Supelak noted that the discussion that occurred with Block G revealed that the proposed pedestrian-friendly, aesthetically designed outdoor spaces were acceptable but lacking. However, if the open spaces could be supplemented with a use or a character piece, they could be more interesting.

Ms. Newell stated that he is speaking about the topic in general.

Mr. Fishman stated that when the Bridge Street zoning was developed, outdoor art was expressed as an element that was desired. That has essentially been ignored. A piece of art would be a placemaking feature, and it would add identity to a park.

Mr. Boggs stated that the concept of outdoor art is a challenge from a regulatory perspective. It involves making content distinctions -- what is a City-endorsed message versus what is not. There is no issue if the City is providing the public art. Placemaking signs, however, lend themselves more to a time, place, and manner type of regulation versus outdoor art.

Mr. Supelak stated that if the City commissions public art, that would not create an issue, but it would be difficult for the City to attempt to control what others commission.

Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively.

Ms. Newell stated that it would be acceptable in limited cases, such as the Dublin Village Center outdoor art piece – the Celtic knot, which reflects its new sign graphic. Ms. Newell stated that art is public speech; it cannot be regulated.

Mr. Boggs stated a monetary exaction for public art could be used instead. However, the City has mechanisms in place to fund public art, i.e. the hotel-motel tax fund. Tying a monetary exaction to a particular piece of art could become problematic if the entity from whom the exaction is made disagrees with the art the City selected.

Ms. Fox stated that she would inform Council of the PZC's discussion on the need for more discussion and clarity regarding placemaking.

Ms. Call noted that she would be out of town and unavailable for the May 21, 2020 PZC meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

[Adopted 3-05-2020]

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council