



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 21, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening remarks: "Good evening and welcome to the May 21 virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. We are living in extraordinary times. Both the State of Ohio and the City of Dublin have declared states of emergency. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to have virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government. For the duration of the Stay at Home Order, we will be holding our meetings online and live streaming those meetings on YouTube. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. In order to submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. These questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. We want to accommodate public participation and comment to the greatest extent possible. We welcome your comments on cases, please use a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments. This is not a perfect system, but we will do our best in these difficult times. We appreciate your patience."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Kristina Kennedy, Leo Grimes, Jane Fox, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier

Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Nichole Martin, Zachary Hounshell, Aaron Stanford, Thaddeus Boggs

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the minutes of 4-30-20.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

Ms. Call 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. Call swore in staff and members of the public who intended to address the Commission on this evening's cases.

CONSENT CASE

Ms. Call stated that Case 3 may be approved by consent if the staff, applicant and the Commission agree on all conditions.

Case 3. Amended Final Development Plan – Tartan Ridge Walkways, 20-079AFDP

Request for modifications to permit alternative materials for private walkways in the Tartan Ridge neighborhood. The 189.57-acre site is northwest of the intersection of McKitrick Road and Jerome Road and zoned Planned Unit Development.

There was no request that the item be moved to the regular agenda for discussion.

Public Comment

The following public comment was received:

Jennifer Storm, 6757 Burnett Lane, Dublin, stated the following:

"As a resident of Tartan Ridge (just a few doors down from the homes in question), I fully support the use of an alternative material for private walkways. The mandated brick pavers are challenging to maintain and I would appreciate an alternative."

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to: (1) approve the Minor Text Modification to revise the development text to require private sidewalks be as detailed as in the Amended Final Development Plan, and (2) to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

TABLED CASE

1. North Market, Block D, 19-121MSP, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for an amendment to an approved Master Sign Plan to include provisions for a 34,000-square-foot market in Block D of the Bridge Park development. The 1.77-acre site is southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway and is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan (MSP) for Block D of the Bridge Park Development. A number of Master Sign Plans have been approved in the past for this development, including for Block A, B and C, and in February 2019, for the three (3) other buildings in Block D, excluding the North Market. [Showed examples of existing signs throughout the Bridge Park development and streetscape views of Longshore Street.]

There are four buildings in Block D. The Commission has already approved signs for three of the four buildings. Signs for the North Market and parking garage are under consideration this evening. The applicant is seeking approval of 11 signs. When the Commission reviewed the application on February 6, 2020, 12 signs were proposed. The Commission reviewed and approved amendments to the previously approved MSP for Bridge Park to include Block D. At the time, the Commission approved standards for Buildings D1, D2, and D3 consistent with previously approved standards for other blocks of development. As part of the approval, the Commission conditioned the North Market proposal to return to the Commission with revisions for final review and approval. The proposal before the Commission is only for signs associated with the North Market tenant located within Building D4. The applicant has made revisions reducing the sizes of some signs, as well as the number of certain sign types. In response to the Commission's request that these signs be oriented to the pedestrian level, the applicant has revised the signs on the Longshore Street elevation, as shown this evening.

Proposal

The request includes a total of 11 signs:

- Four building mounted signs (2 wall signs, 1 ID sign, 1 projecting sign)
- Three Placemaking Art signs
- Three Placemaking Art metal blades
- One window sign

Building Mounted Sign - Projecting Sign (1)

On the West Façade – North Entry, one circular projecting sign is proposed south of the north entry. The proposed sign will be a 12 square feet, illuminated metal sign. Staff has recommended a condition that the sign face be dimensional, which will be confirmed with the building permit approval.

Wall Signs (2)

On the North Façade – North Entry, a new wall sign is proposed, adjacent to a public plaza. The 24-square-foot sign will be painted on the masonry façade above the entrance and non-illuminated.

On the West Façade – Central Entry, a wall sign is proposed above the central, primary entrance to the Market. The façade will be painted red. A 50-square-foot, illuminated metal sign with individually mounted letters will be affixed to the wall.

ID Sign (1)

On the West Façade – South Entry, a wall ID sign is proposed adjacent to the south entrance. The sign is 12 square feet with individual acrylic letters.

Placemaking Art Signs

At the Central Entry – Rooster Logo (1)

A Placemaking Art sign is proposed to be centrally located on the west façade of the building facing Longshore Street. At the request of the Commission, the size has been reduced from 1,200 square feet to 400 square feet and located within the first story of the building. The circular, vinyl applique sign will be non-illuminated and depict the iconic North Market rooster. The sign will complement the central entry and create a memorable moment for visitors.

Southwest Corner - Rooster with "North Market" (2)

Two complementary Placemaking Art signs are proposed at the southern end of the west façade of the building, at the intersection of Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive. A metal red rooster with painted wordmark will extend onto the west and the south façades of the building. The rooster is perched on the canopy of the southwestern corner, 40 square feet in size and illuminated from below. The non-illuminated, wordmarks are each 120 square feet in size, which has been reduced from the 160 square feet as proposed February 6, 2020.

Placemaking Art Metal Blades (3)

The proposal includes three Placemaking Art metal blades, which are proposed to be distributed across the west façade of the building. Originally, six fabric banners were proposed. The applicant has responded to the Commission's recommendation that the quality of the signs be elevated. The proposed design is perforated metal with individually-mounted letters. The applicant has indicated that the signs are critical given the interior location of North Market and the curvature of Longshore Street. Each blade is proposed to be 80 square feet in size and illuminated at night.

Window Sign (1)

One window sign is proposed on the south elevation, facing Tuller Ridge Drive. It will be a vinyl applique and not illuminated. The sign is a partial logo providing visual interest at the street level. It will cover 30 percent or less of the window, which will provide 70% transparency.

Staff has reviewed the application against the Master Sign criteria in the Code, as well as the Bridge Street District sign design guidelines and recommends approval with four (4) conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired if the lights are dimmed or turned off after the businesses close to avoid any issues for residents in the District.

Ms. Martin responded that the applicant will address the operational questions in more detail. Currently, no complaints have been received regarding light levels. As the businesses close at night, the lighting level does decrease. The parking garages, including the building in which the North Market is located, is illuminated throughout the night for safety reasons.

Ms. Fox inquired if staff discussed alternatives for the banner signs. Previously, the Commission had suggested cutouts or a more artistic blade sign.

Ms. Martin responded that staff did not have such a discussion with the applicant prior to this proposal.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the North Market should leave this site in the future, could a condition be added that the signs also disappear, and any future new tenant would need to re-apply for signage.

Ms. Martin responded that such is the anticipation, although a condition could be added as clarification. Mr. Starr will explain in greater detail, but in general, the lease terms require that if a tenant departs, the building and tenant spaces must be restored to their original condition.

Mr. Fishman responded that his concern is based upon previous experiences wherein the new tenant states that the sign terms have already been approved, so they install signs of the same size and number in the same locations. He would prefer a condition be added that if the North Market leaves, a new tenant would be required to re-apply for the appropriate signage.

Ms. Fox stated that previously, the Commission discussed that the vinyl banner be temporary to determine its effectiveness, but would eventually be hand-painted or made of a different material than vinyl. The applicant also had agreed that if paint were to be used, it would be removable and not need to be sandblasted, which would damage the building face. Has that been listed as a condition?

Ms. Martin responded that is not listed as a condition, but the applicant is prepared to describe the paint that is proposed.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Partners, Executive Vice President of Development, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, Ohio stated that it was apparent during their previous presentation that there was a lack of context for what they were attempting to accomplish. The streetscape is important, not only to this neighborhood, but also to this particular location due to the nature of this use. They have prepared a video of the sign proposal incorporated into the streetscape to provide context. [showed video] He stated that when the previous proposal was presented, they did not accurately represent the existing storefront conditions. The project is more developed and impressive now, with bifold doors, tiles of varying patterns and attractive wooden doors with pivot hinges. If the site were to be visited today, the quality of the development is becoming apparent. The last discussion revealed the Commission's desire for quality versus quantity and the importance of the pedestrian experience. This location is on the ground floor of a parking garage and on an interior street, so they have tried to achieve a balance in addressing those needs. They have reduced the quantity of the banners, which are not high-quality blade signs. They have reduced the size of the Rooster graphic at the center entrance, and utilized red paint. They have added a pedestrian-scale element on the north façade. This sign package has been compiled with the whole experience in mind. There is the garage experience -- the second floor and the elevator ties into the North Market. The interior regulatory wayfinding signage provides a complementary experience. Currently, they are working on an environmental package to vitalize this space.

He will try to respond to Commissioners' questions. In regard to Mr. Grimes's question about the lighting, it is anticipated that the illuminated signs will be controlled by a photocell, so that the lights will come on and off automatically with the change between day and night. Mr. Fishman inquired if the signs would be removed if the user were to depart -- these signs are specific to this user. They do not have an issue with that being made a condition for approval. In regard to paint removal, they will commit to using removal methods that would not harm the building materials. They agree that it is important the building materials remain intact, undamaged. Ms. Fox inquired if there were any other considerations for the banner or blade signs. They evaluated many options. They wanted to select a high-quality blade design. The vertical wayfinding blade signs throughout the City are high quality signs. These blade signs will have some of the same characteristics. Because the signs are in an elevated position, they must be able to withstand wind shear. The signs will be perforated metal, which is a more artistic design than a solid panel. The target date for the North Market to open is August 1.

Ms. Fox stated that the original proposal was that the Rooster sign on the glass initially would be vinyl, and possibly hand painted later.

Mr. Starr responded that it will be on glass and probably much easier to execute as vinyl, although potentially, it could be hand-painted. They are considering the incorporation of some painted

elements in the interior package, where more blank canvases are available.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox stated that she believes the sign package in general is fun. Many of the elements meet the criteria the Commission desires. The video revealed the activation that will occur at the street level, and the painted area around the entrance is attractive. Her remaining concern is with the blade signs. The first concept was colorful, which she really liked; however, there were too many of them. The second concept reflects a higher quality, but it is not as edgy and colorful. A blade sign on that side of the building is valuable – it gives dimension to the space and creates interest down the street. She is not opposed to blade signs. The perforated panel is definitely a higher quality than a cloth banner. Is the Rooster on the blade sign dimensional? She assumes these signs will be illuminated from the lights on the building. However, they do not add as many fun characteristics to the street view as artistic blade signs would. She does like the Rooster at the street level, as that is a fun element.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she loves this sign package, including the blade signs. The applicant has incorporated much of the feedback the Commission provided at the previous review, particularly engaging the public at the pedestrian level. She does not like the circular Rooster at the ground level as much as its previously proposed location. However, she recognizes the intent is to engage the pedestrian level. The video reveal was very helpful. She likes the Rooster on the edge of the corner building, as well as the red section on the building – it looks amazing! In general, her feedback is positive, and she appreciates the applicant's serious consideration of the Commission's previous feedback.

Mr. Fishman stated that his response is equally positive. He is eagerly anticipating the opening of the North Market in August. He reiterated that he does want the condition added that if this tenant departs, the new tenant would have to apply for their own sign package and meet Code. Other than that one concern, the applicant has created a wonderful sign package, and this will be an exciting place to visit!

Mr. Schneier stated that he is appreciative of the challenge with pedestrian traffic in this location having a building with a parking garage in front and on top. However, the applicant has done a wonderful job with this project, and he echoes the other positive comments. He is, likewise, eagerly awaiting the North Market's opening on August 1.

Mr. Grimes stated that the changes made have enhanced the quality of the sign package. The reduction from six banner signs to three blade signs provides the appropriate amount of directional signage. It will be a popular destination, and people will be aware of its location. He likes the large sign more oriented to the pedestrian level. He is happy with this sign package.

Mr. Supelak stated that he would echo many of the other Commissioners' comments. He liked the first MSP proposal and likes this second one, as well. The revised banner signs are an improvement, although he thought the Commission's previous direction was that the revised banner signs be playful, edgy or even quirky elements hanging from the building, which could

become signature elements for the Market and the City. These signs are an improvement over the canvas banners, although there may have been a missed opportunity. He is in agreement with Ms. Kennedy – he preferred the circular Rooster sign location that was higher on the building. However, that may have had some inherent issues. Adjusting it to the pedestrian scale has changed the 1,200-square-foot sign to 400 square feet, and he understands the merit of that. Extending the red color across that pedestrian level is a very nice touch and beneficial to wayfinding. He is generally supportive of the MSP proposal.

Ms. Call requested a straw poll on the blade signs, as there seem to be some varying comments. [Commissioners expressed general support.]

Ms. Fox inquired how the Rooster element is applied to the blade signs. Will it be seen on both sides, and will it be illuminated? Is it vinyl or metal?

Mr. Starr responded that it is a vinyl element with metal on its face.

Ms. Fox inquired if the Rooster and the lettering would be dimensional.

Mr. Starr responded that they would be dimensional and noticeable from ground level. [Reveal video re-shown.]

Mr. Starr stated that the Rooster graphic on the perforated panel is an inch thick. It will be noticeable from ground level. It is located on both sides; the tube runs through the center of the sign.

Ms. Fox inquired how these signs would be illuminated.

Mr. Starr responded that they would be illuminated from either the bottom or the top; they have not worked through the electrical detail yet.

Ms. Fox inquired if there is a blade sign on the side where the entrance is located.

Mr. Starr responded that there is a blade sign at the north entrance. Two blade signs will be north of the pedestrian bridge that connects at the building, and one blade sign to the south.

Ms. Fox stated that she likes the fact that there will be a dimensional element extending from the side of the building. She was anticipating that it would be a more edgy architectural element than a rectangular sign. Other than that, she believes the MSP package will be attractive for the Market and the area.

Mr. Fishman stated that there was an earlier comment about the lights turning off at an appropriate time. He would encourage them to experiment with the lighting levels. A certain amount of lighting is important 24 hours/day in that District, for safety purposes. There are some areas of town, where at 11 pm-midnight, there is no lighting, and the area is black. He understand that is a commercial site, and there are apartments nearby, but he would like to see them experiment with an appropriate level of lighting.

Ms. Call inquired if the signs would be controlled by photocell.

Mr. Starr responded that is the intent. There are streetlights throughout the neighborhood, lights under the canopy and a certain amount of ambient lighting from the parking garages. He does not believe it will be unsafe in this area, but he appreciates the concern about a need for some additional illumination. They will work through that element.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the Master Sign Plan with the following

five conditions:

- 1) The projecting sign be dimensional, subject to staff approval at permitting.
- 2) Final sign fabrication details for the central wall sign, and ID wall sign be subject to staff approval at permitting.
- 3) The lighting details for all illuminated signs be submitted, subject to staff approval at permitting.
- 4) The applicant provide Planning an updated plan reflecting all conditions of approval prior to issuance of sign permits.
- 5) The sign plan provisions only be applicable to the North Market tenant, and the signs shall be removed should the North Market cease operation.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion passed 7-0]

NEW CASES

2. Springhill Suites, 4475 Bridge Park Avenue, 20-056MSP, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Call stated this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a 145-room hotel and two tenant spaces in Building F1 in Block F of the Bridge Park development. The 0.57-acre site is southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street and is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a proposal for a Master Sign Plan (MSP) for a new, multi-story mixed-use building housing a Springhill Suites hotel and two tenant spaces in Bridge Park. The application contained images showing that the majority of the signs have a white illumination and individually mounted letters. The building is oriented with Bridge Park Avenue to the north, Dale Drive to the east, Mooney Street to the west, and Winder Drive to the south. Three types of signs are proposed, including:

- Three Wall Signs
- One Placemaking Art Sign
- Regulatory Signs for Future Tenants

Wall Signs (3)

The applicant is proposing three wall signs for the hotel, one each on the north, south and east sides of the building. Each wall sign is constructed of aluminum channel letters with aluminum backs. The channel letter returns and trim cap are proposed to be black. The sign faces will be a white acrylic. The channel letters will appear white during the day and will illuminate white at night with white LEDs. The east wall sign is 3 ft. in height and 23 ft. in width for a total area of 69 square feet. The sign faces Dale Drive and is situated in the top right corner of the elevation. The north wall sign is approximately 2 ft.-8 in. in height and 18 ft.-10 in. in width, for a total area of approximately 50 square feet, which is consistent with the maximum size permitted by throughout Bridge Park. The sign faces Bridge Park Avenue to the north, and is situated immediately above the entry into the hotel lobby. Staff is concerned that the channel letter design is not of an appropriate design quality at street level, and recommends that the design of this

pedestrian-oriented sign be revised to an individually pin-mounted letters, halo-illuminated sign. The south wall sign is 3-4 feet in height and 7 ft.-9 in. width, for a total area of approximately 26 square feet. The sign is located at the southern entry to the hotel lobby, within the designated drop-off and pick-up area accessed from Winder Drive.

Placemaking Sign (1)

In addition to the three proposed wall signs, the applicant is proposing a Placemaking Art sign on the north façade of the building. This sign is unique due to its vertical orientation, as well as the manner in which it is architecturally integrated into an architectural protrusion in the building façade. The area of the Placemaking Art sign is approximately 122 square feet. While larger than the maximum permitted size of 100 square feet, staff is supportive of the sign, as it contributes to the diversity of signs in Bridge Park and adds a unique vertical element.

Tenant Signs

There are two tenant spaces, each with two frontages. The tenants would be permitted at least one sign for each frontage and the option for a third sign. The tenant would need to select a frame from the four categories identified in the MSP. The tenant will work with the landlord on identifying an appropriate sign package, submit the landlord's letter of approval to the City, and the City will forward the plans to a consultant for a final review of the design before construction. Staff has reviewed the MSP against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with two conditions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox inquired if the Placemaking Art sign would be 22 feet larger than Code permits.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox inquired if it would be a white channel letter illuminated sign.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox inquired if this type of lettering is consistent with the company brand and consistent at all its locations.

Ms. Martin responded that it is.

Ms. Fox inquired if the sign is illuminated on both the inside and outside of the frame.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively; it is a two-faced sign and each side is 122 square feet.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the south sign in the drop-off area also was white with individual channel letters, illuminated sign. Is it backlit, or is the lighting incorporated into the letters and consistent with other illuminated letters?

Ms. Martin responded that all four proposed signs are individually illuminated channel letters. Channel letters are illuminated from the inside.

Ms. Kennedy inquired what type of guidance applicants receive in regard to Placemaking Art signs.

Ms. Martin responded that Master Sign Plans are intended to provide signs of quality and creativity. The Placemaking Art sign type was established for the Bridge Park development. The intent was to activate the public experience by creation of memorable visual moments.

Ms. Call inquired if there is a definition of a Placemaking Sign.

Ms. Martin responded that they are not defined in the Code. The sign type was created only for the Bridge Park development and has been used in Blocks A, B, C and D.

Mr. Grimes inquired if pin-mounted letters were not flat to the surface, but rather, pulled away from the building surface.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. Staff's recommendation was that the letters be pulled away from the building surface and halo illumination used.

Mr. Fishman inquired if there is a reason for permitting the vertical sign to be 122 square feet, which is larger than Code permits.

Ms. Call stated that although the applicant has requested it, the Commission could disapprove it.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the sign over the door also was larger than Code permits.

Ms. Martin responded that it is 50 square feet, which is consistent with the wall signs that have been approved for other buildings within Bridge Park.

Ms. Fox requested examples of other Placemaking Art Signs within Bridge Park.

Ms. Martin responded that some examples are the Urban Meyer Pint House silo sign, the VASO sign, and Cap City Fine Diner has a Pedestrian Art sign.

Mr. Starr stated that they are measuring the large sign per City Code, which is that a box be drawn around the entire sign including the tagline of Marriott. If a box were to be drawn around only the letters, the size would be 78 square feet, so part of the issue is how the size of the sign is calculated. The other point he would make is this particular sign consists of letters. The architectural component is already there. If these letters are not placed there, that architectural element of the building remains. That element was included in the building approval.

Brian McNally, senior associate, Meyers and Associates Architecture, 232 North Third Street, Suite 300, Columbus, stated that he can speak regarding the sign's relationship to the architecture of the building. Early in the design process of the building, they were aware of the need to design an area for the sign and not try to find a spot for a signage panel afterward. They looked at the uniqueness of Bridge Park, the scale of the buildings and the pedestrian activity. They developed the signage size and placement based upon that information early in the development of the concept. That is how a Placemaking Art sign was identified for this building. The attempt was to bring the vertical element of the building down to the pedestrian level, not necessarily engaging the pedestrian level. As Mr. Starr explained, if a box were to be drawn around the letters only, the square footage is actually under 100 square feet. However, they followed the Code's directive in measuring. The signage construction in general is based on the brand guidelines of Marriott, including text placement, the font and the proximity of the letters to one another. They are internally illuminated channel letters. Each letter has an aluminum frame; inside that frame is white reflective paint with internal LED lights. A white acrylic panel is on the face of the letters, which, during the day, will contrast with the dark façade. At night, it will glow white. All four signs proposed follow the same design, font and channel letters.

Ms. Call inquired the applicant's response regarding staff's recommendation that they be pin-mounted letters rather than channel letters.

Mr. McNally responded that recommendation was for the 50-square foot sign on the north elevation. There is precedence with Marriott to allow that sign type, as well, so it is not out of the question.

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, Ohio, stated that from their perspective, pin-mounted letters would be fine. They are present throughout the District. In regard to the Placemaking Art sign, it is more difficult to design an artsy form of script, than something artsy for a brewhouse. That has been accomplished, however, with how the sign is integrated with the architecture. It is not simply a blade sign suspended from the wall, but rather it envelopes itself around the entire façade. The form is there, whether or not the sign is there. What is unique is that it is not affixed to the building, but a sign that pays attention to the architecture. In the design process, they look at the entire elevation and identify something that feels “right” within the space.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Ms. Fox stated that she does not disagree that the architecture lends itself to having signage there, but the reference images are more impressive than the sign itself. The white channel letters look generic. A lighted border or other detail is needed to make the sign more unique than the typical, illuminated, white-channel letters.

Ms. Call inquired if Ms. Fox’s opinion of the interior and exterior views of the sign are the same, as they strike her as different. She agrees the interior view is somewhat lackluster, but she really likes the way in which the exterior view “pops.”

Ms. Fox responded that something is needed to give the sign a more striking uniqueness – add a little interest to it. Perhaps the issue is the white channel letters, which, regardless of the view, are not a very interesting sign type. Was an alternative to white channel letters considered?

Mr. McNally responded that the sign design was entirely based upon the brand standards. Marriott has strict brand guidelines. In regard to the reference images to which she refers, it was difficult to identify relevant vertical reference images, because they are looking at something unique for the Springhill Suites brand. This is not the typical blade sign, which would not mesh or integrate with the architecture. Because they have a good working relationship with Marriott, they were able to obtain their consent for what is a unique sign type for them.

Ms. Fox stated that that she does not know what is possible here, but there needs to be something more to make the sign unique.

Mr. McNally stated that the letters are mounted on an aluminum composite panel that provides some reflectivity. Particularly on the interior face of that sign, there will be some play with the light. That will provide some extra brightness.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is satisfied with his explanation and has no objection to the sign as it is. He believes they have achieved a great design.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the intent of a Placemaking Art sign is to activate the place, and this does not meet that intent. The sign consists of words only. Typically, this type of sign will add a more artistic grid around the word or something more than just the word. This sign does not meet the intent of a Placemaking Art sign.

Mr. Supelak stated that, in general, he is supportive of the MSP. He believes staff’s suggestion that the sign letters on the north façade be pin-mounted is a nice touch. The rendering of the sign, however, seems a little over-scale or crowded. A slight reduction in size could resolve that. He is in favor of the Placemaking Art sign. Integrating it with the architecture is creative; it takes a common building feature, turns it into something different, and creates a different type of

space. The Springhill Suites logo is really their name, not a logo. The sign is compelling and interesting. He agrees that it is somewhat over scale and would prefer a slight size reduction, but will defer to them on that topic. If the proposed illuminated panels were not lit, the sign and the building would be lackluster. It is the lighting integrated with the building and the sign that makes it striking. Overall, this is a nice MSP, and he is supportive.

Mr. Schneier stated that his first impression was that this was a 1940s type of sign reminiscent of the Humphrey Bogart era. He wonders if those staying in the rooms would have an issue if the lights were to remain on all night; however, that is not within the Commission's purview. He likes the signs' consistency with the brand and the illumination; he is supportive of this MSP.

Mr. Grimes stated that he likes the fact that the sign is in proportion with the space in which it is located; he does not mind that it is oversized by a few feet. It is a fine MSP, and he is supportive of it.

Ms. Call stated that the placemaking sign is 122 feet. Is the method of measurement used consistently across all sign applications?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox stated that, in regard to the Placemaking Art sign, she recognizes that a hotel would not have an edgy type of sign. This is a business that operates worldwide and must remain constant with their design. However, if there is a way in which to create a little additional interest, it would be appreciated. There also should be an element of uniqueness with the main entrance sign, although she does appreciate that a glow will be created from behind. Although the other signs are channel letters, the reference images portray more class at the entranceway. Perhaps the same font could be treated differently at the front door.

Mr. Fishman stated that although the Placemaking Art sign is a little larger than Code permits, he is comfortable with this MSP. Early in the development of Bridge Park, there was discussion about ground art. This would be a great opportunity for ground art at the front entrance. The intent was to integrate ground art throughout Bridge Park, but not much of that has occurred.

Ms. Call stated that she struggles with the 122-sq. ft. sign, preferring not to set such a precedent. She also has an issue with permitting a Placemaking Art sign that is simply the brand logo of the business. She appreciates the fact that the sign placement utilizes the architectural element. However, Placemaking Art signs are an exception to Code, and, as such, they are left to the Commission's judgement as to whether they establish or accomplish the intent of that sign type. If the intent was to use only the business logo, it is beautiful, but the intent of a Placemaking Art sign is to create interest. In comparison, the Placemaking Art signs in the North Market MSP have the "wow" factor. A Placemaking Art sign can also be larger than Code permits. She understands that measuring the signs may be handled differently here, but the City does so consistently. Because there are two sides to this sign, the size of the sign is doubled. Other than those two issues, the signs are beautiful. She is in agreement with staff's recommendation that the letters over the entrance on the north facade be pin-mounted.

Ms. Fox inquired about the possibility of approving the MSP with the exclusion of the Placemaking Art sign tonight, and the Placemaking Art sign could be redesigned and brought back to the Commission for review. She understands that the size of the letters may not be able to be reduced

due to the fixed size of the architectural element; it might not look proportionate. However, she would prefer the Placemaking Art sign be revised to add more interest. She has no objection to the other signs with staff's recommendation.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is agreement with Ms. Fox's comments. A Placemaking Art sign must provide something that warrants the Commission approving something larger than Code permit.

Mr. Fishman stated that he has no objection to the Placemaking Art sign as presented, although if it is going to be redesigned to add more interest, the size also should be reduced to meet Code.

Mr. Grimes stated that this site is at a different end of the development from the North Market. These signs are designed to be appropriate for a hotel, which should reflect more reserve than a market, where the goal is to attract significant foot traffic. In addition, what latitude does the applicant have with the corporate brand logo? For those reasons, he has no objection to the Placemaking Art sign as proposed.

Ms. Call inquired what is the applicant's preference – a vote by the Commission or a request to table to permit the Placemaking Art sign to be reevaluated.

Mr. Hunter responded that the key issue is one word – art. If this were a Placemaking sign, the scale would be sufficient. In regard to the need to be considered "art," he would point out that this is the only sign in the Bridge Park development, but also in the region, that literally hugs the building. Tabling the case may create an issue in regard to the project's timing.

Mr. Starr stated that the cladding of that architectural element is occurring the first week of June, and due to the status of the building, it is difficult to make changes. The earlier images of the signs did not include the brand's tagline, but were added later as part of their brand standards. He has no issue with the pin-mounted letters on the north wall. He also believes that in regard to the corporate brand restrictions, options may be limited. If the brand tagline could be dropped, he is unsure of how to keep the lettering proportionate to the architectural element.

Ms. Call stated that she has no objection to the tagline, "by Marriott;" it is very important to the brand, but perhaps it presents an opportunity to add extra interest in some manner.

Mr. McNally responded that the tagline is very important to the brand. He believes that the definition of Placemaking Art sign appears to be the issue, specifically the word "art." If it is defined as a sign that activates the space, he believes it does accomplish that; particularly, due to the vertical nature of the building, its location and the need for visibility -- there will be another tall building next to this building. If it must also be artful, then that is the issue. If it were called a building ID sign, there would be no issue. Building ID signs are allowed in addition to the typical signs, and the square footage thereof is increased 1/2 square foot per linear foot of the storefront. There is 400 square feet of storefront here, which would permit a 200 sq. ft. sign. It appears that everyone is satisfied with the design; it is the design type that is the difficulty.

Ms. Call inquired about the possibility of changing the identification of this sign from a Placemaking Art sign to another definition. She understands the Commission would still need to approve the size, which exceeds Code.

Ms. Martin responded that the Placemaking Art sign is the largest sign permitted in the Bridge Park general regulations sign matrix, which is 100 square feet for office tenants that have wall signs in upper stories. Ground floor tenants are permitted one square foot per linear foot up to 50 square feet of wall sign.

Mr. Starr inquired if it would be possible to vote on the MSP package, minus the Placemaking Art sign; then vote separately on that sign.

Ms. Call requested Mr. Boggs to respond.

Mr. Boggs responded that the Commission could consider those items separately.

Ms. Call inquired if the other signs were approved tonight, would the applicant be required to submit a new application for that sign.

Ms. Martin responded that she believes Mr. Boggs has indicated that the Commission could consider two separate motions tonight, and the Placemaking Art sign could pass or fail on its own. If disapproved, the applicant would need to submit a new application with a revised sign design.

Ms. Call noted that she recalls previously that Ms. Fox has stated that it is helpful to see all the items together, in context, rather than reviewing items separately and out of context.

Ms. Fox stated that she does not believe the Commission is opposed to the Placemaking Art sign, but is concerned that the design does not meet the criteria regarding interest. Is it possible to approve a sign to be located on that architectural element, but require them to revise the design for review and approval later?

Ms. Call noted that sign consultants have also been utilized in the review process, and the staff ultimately could approve it. The desire here is that the sign design provide more "pop" or interest.

Ms. Call conducted a straw poll; Commissioners expressed the following:

Mr. Fishman indicated that he is in favor of the proposed sign design, particularly if it were to be reduced in size to meet Code, but is supportive of voting for it as is.

Ms. Fox stated that, to her, the issue is not the size; if it were reduced in size, it could be too small for this space. Her concern is the lack of interest, but she likes a sign in the proposed location.

Ms. Call concurred regarding the need for additional interest, but she would also appreciate if the size were decreased to meet Code.

Ms. Kennedy stated that if this sign were to be approved, she would be concerned about setting a precedent that a logo can be considered a Placemaking Art sign. The intent is not that a logo or a company name may suffice as Placemaking Art.

Mr. Schneier stated that he has no objection to the current sign proposal. However, the other commissioners have expressed varying preferences regarding design and size, all of which are mutually exclusive.

Mr. Supelak stated that he likes the sign on this architectural element and is generally supportive of the sign as is.

Mr. Grimes indicated support, as well.

Ms. Call requested the applicant's preference regarding the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Starr requested a vote on the Master Sign Plan package with the condition requested by staff for pin-mounted letters for the north façade wall sign.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with the following two conditions:

- 1) The north wall sign be revised to a pin-mounted, halo-illuminated sign, subject to staff approval.

- 2) The applicant provide Planning with an updated plan that incorporates all conditions of approval prior to issuance of sign permits.

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

[Motion approved 4-3]

4. Primrose School, Parcel: 273-009147, 20-014CP, Concept Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for the development of a ±9,200-square-foot, two-story early childhood education facility. The 3.53-acre parcel is south of W. Dublin-Granville Road, ±450 feet west of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive and is zoned Bridge Street District Office.

Staff Presentation

Site

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Concept Plan for the Primrose School, located within the Bridge Street District. The Concept Plan includes the review of site layout, architecture style, building style, open space, building massing and street network. Concept Plans within the Bridge Street District, unlike those in other areas of the City, require approval before the project may proceed to the Preliminary Development Plan stage. The undeveloped site is located south of W. Dublin-Granville Road, approximately 340 feet west of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. An AEP easement runs along the western portion of the property, which limits a large portion of the developable land for the entire site. In 2017, the Commission reviewed an application for the construction of a hospital facility; that application has since been withdrawn. On the northeast side of the site is where the connection of a future neighborhood street from W. Dublin-Granville Road (S.R.161) is proposed. The Bridge Street District Street Network Map was developed with the Bridge Street District Code to create a comprehensive network of streets throughout and connecting the entire Bridge Street District. W. Dublin-Granville Road is a principal frontage street, and any development in the District is required to be located along a principal frontage street. The Code requires a neighborhood street connection to that principal frontage street. The proposal of the new neighborhood street re-defines the boundaries of the existing block. The proposed neighborhood street will partially subdivide the existing block defined by State Route 161 to the north, Shamrock Crossing Boulevard to the west, Stoneridge Lane to the south, and the neighborhood street to the east. In the Bridge Street Office District, any one side of a block may not exceed 500 feet in length, and the cumulative total of the perimeter of all sides of block may not exceed 1,750 feet in length. The newly created block will meet length standards for the east and west edges, but will be significantly larger than the maximum block dimensions along the north and south edges. The applicant has not provided information regarding the newly created block. Should the measurements prove to be larger than the maximum permitted, a waiver would be required. Three buildings and site improvements are anticipated on the site; however, the applicant is providing details on the southernmost building. There are no current plans for the northern two buildings along W. Dublin-Granville Road. The applicant is proposing a lot split from east to west. The applicant is proposing a daycare use, which is a permitted use within the BSD-Office District. The daycare use has specific use standards regarding any attached playground, one of which is the requirement that the playground be

located behind the front elevation of the building. The applicant is proposing approximately 43 parking spaces on this lot and will be required to submit a parking plan. Open space will be provided on the site; but with the lot split, no open space is dedicated on this lot. Code requires that there be one square foot of open space per 50 square feet of building footprint, so that would need to be reflected on the Preliminary Development Plan.

Architecture

The anticipated building type is a Loft Building Type, which is permitted in the BSD Office District. The applicant is proposing brick, stone, and glass as primary materials for the building and cementitious horizontal siding as a secondary material. Two towers are proposed -- one on the east elevation fronting the neighborhood street and one on the west elevation fronting the parking lot. Zoning Code only permits towers on facades located at terminal vistas, corners of two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type. No terminal vistas or principal frontage streets are present with this lot, and additional information regarding open spaces on the lot would be required to make this determination. As it stands, Code would not permit the use of the two towers on the building. Should the applicant wish to move forward with this design that does not meet the criteria, it would be necessary to obtain a waiver or revise the plan. Staff has reviewed the Concept Plan against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with ten (10) conditions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Kennedy inquired if this would be a traditional lot split. What type of guidance was provided to the applicant regarding how a lot may be divided?

Mr. Hounshell responded that without the development of the neighborhood street, the lot split could not occur. Each lot would need to meet the requirements of the proposed building type. It would be important to assure that the second lot would have an equal chance of development.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if staff believes there would be an equal opportunity for the second lot to develop on principal frontage, as the lot split currently is proposed.

Mr. Hounshell responded that because of the value of the principal street frontage on SR161, it is hopeful that development will occur soon, although the site is challenging. Because the applicant has the right to move forward with their site, staff is working closely with them to ensure that the lot split will work for both the northern and southern lots. Much work will be required for the Preliminary Development Plan, such as provision of the required rear-yard and side-yard setbacks, currently not met with the lot split. In addition, as proposed, the parking and underground stormwater elements encroach into the required setbacks. Planning is recommending that the applicant work closely with staff to determine the best layout for any proposed lot split to meet all necessary Code requirements.

Ms. Fox stated that it is a difficult lot to develop because of the AEP easement, as well as the required construction of a neighborhood street. The lot split appears to cut through a parking lot, which is not permitted. Her concern is that a lot split would severely limit the ability of the front of the site to be developed, due to the open space, frontage, and setback requirements.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the frontage along SR161 is challenging, as it is, regardless of the lot split. There is a minimum primary street frontage requirement for each building and also the 100-ft. easement running from east to west, so setback waivers will be necessary.

Mr. Fishman stated that the Commission does not know enough about the plan to approve it. The 5-foot setback is not being met with just the proposed daycare center, and we have no idea what will occur in the other lot in regard to the buildings or the tenants. What he has observed in the past is if the Commission approves a lot split and development on one lot, in a few years, the applicant will claim a hardship because the other lot is not developable. They are proposing two buildings on the second lot – how can they meet the setback requirements? He is not in favor of approving a building on SR 161 that does not meet the setback requirements. There is a problem with approving anything at this point.

Ms. Call reminded the Commission that at the Concept Plan stage, there are specific criteria to consider. The Concept Plan must outline the character and nature of the proposed development, including building massing, open space, location and the street network.

Applicant Presentation

Jim Alt, ALT Architecture, 2440 Dayton-Zenia Road, Dayton, Ohio 45434, stated that they have been operating under the assumption that they would have the opportunity to have the two other businesses function as one development, with cross easements for access and utilities, such as stormwater management. Those buildings would not be free-standing, functioning entirely on their own. They are aware of the history and challenges of this property. Despite its unique challenges, their client is very eager to make this development work. They have been aggressively marketing the SR 161 frontage property, assuming that there would be the opportunity to have a single entrance that would service the buildings with co-joined utilities and stormwater management. If the Commission requires each lot to be developed independently, then it would be necessary to have two entrances off the neighborhood street. They would like to have the Commission's position on that point. They are willing to work with staff on achieving what is required. Primrose Daycare owns and operates a number of schools, which provide premier early childhood education in the U.S. This would be the sixth location in the Columbus market.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission has seen previous site development plans with multiple buildings on a parcel, occasionally with shared parking agreements with adjacent parcels. What makes this application different from that type of holistic site plan?

Ms. Husak responded that staff has no information on what will be located at the front of the site in regard to uses and parking needs. There may not be a need for two, separate entrances from the neighborhood street; that arrangement may be possible with reciprocal easements. It is difficult to speak to the possibility of shared parking, without knowing more details about the uses, including peak hours of operation. At this point, there are too many unknowns. If the lot is split as depicted, it could negatively impact the second lot.

Ms. Call stated that the issue is not that the Commission does not support the daycare facility project, but it is impossible to judge only one portion of the parcel, when we have no idea what the other half would require. Judging it all under its own criteria, it would not meet the current requirements. Based on what we do know, the request does not meet the Concept Plan criteria.

Mr. Alt stated that the value of obtaining permission to build, either by purchasing the land or by having a land lease and not pursuing a lot split is a possibility. However, they have been endeavoring to create two co-equal lots. They have looked at the available alternatives for complementary uses in the District. There are opportunities for what would be considered a

Conditional Use, such as a medical or office building use. For those uses, there would be sufficient parking. If the Concept Plan is approved, they will provide additional details regarding the uses on the second lot, as details emerge. The client has had the opportunity to discuss this property with candidate purchasers or land leasees, and they would like to be able to pursue those.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman stated that, as he indicated earlier, there is insufficient information at this time to approve the Concept Plan. He is unable to support it, not knowing how the other lot would be developed meeting Code requirements. The City has a Code for a reason, and it would not be appropriate to approve a Concept Plan that does not even meet Code and with concerns the second lot would be unable to do so, as well. He is supportive of this initial use; however, perhaps there should not be a lot split. Perhaps they should use the entire lot. Over the years, he has observed the result of trying to place too much development on too little space. He is unable to support the Concept Plan with the current lack of information.

Mr. Boggs stated that he wanted to clarify a copy of points about the Concept Plan stage of this application. There has been some discussion about where the proposed lot split would occur. Often, Concept Plan applications provide information about the building placements and the geographical layout of the site, and some of that information has been provided. He would encourage discussing those criteria, as well. He believes there is another applicant prepared to present some information.

Ms. Husak clarified that a plat is required. The street right-of-way would need to be dedicated, and the lots would be created via the plat. The Preliminary and Final Plats would come before the Commission and Council for review and approval.

Mr. Boggs stated that if the Concept Plan were to be approved tonight or tabled to permit changes to be made and then approved, the next stage would be Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat approval. Those applications would be consistent with the Concept Plan but provide a greater level of detail.

Alena Miller, ALT Architecture, 2440 Dayton-Xenia Rd, Ste. B, Beavercreek, OH 45434, stated that she is the architectural representative. Team member, Steve Butler, is also present. The answers to many of the questions asked are solely dependent on the site layout. They are aware of the challenges, and the intent is to work closely with staff to meet Code requirements. They are seeking approval at this stage, in order to be able to develop the greater level of detail that the Commission is requesting. They are very confident with this prototype and know their brand well. The decisions made are intentional and specific. In regard to the site plan, there are questions about the open space and setbacks. Although those items are not currently compliant, the goal is to strategize and meet the requirements. Mr. Butler is prepared to provide more details regarding the site, and she is able to provide more details on the building, if that should be beneficial at this stage of the review.

Ms. Call stated that she does not believe Commission members have any objections to the daycare use. Their issues are with the front lot, about which there is currently no information. Information about the stormwater management, open space, utilities, and frontages are very important due to the presently unknown future development of the front lot.

Mr. Grimes stated that it is clear that there are many challenges with this site, and there are many requirements that would need to be met, even if a Concept Plan were to be approved. Staff is recommending ten (10) conditions. It appears that this is an attempt to force a lot into a very small space. While he agrees that the concept of the school is great, it appears that this plan severely limits the potential for the balance of the property. The Commission does not want to risk many years of that ground lying fallow because of mistakes made with this project. The applicant will spend a significant amount of effort, time and money trying to make this work. He believes the Commission needs to know what will be the look of the whole property. He is confident Council would want to see that before agreeing to a lot split. It is important to have all the engineering requirements met, or this plan will never be approved by City Council. The AEP easement will make this project an even greater challenge. In summary, he is concerned with the attempt to do so much in a very small space.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the Commission appreciates that Primrose Schools is interested in locating in Dublin, and that the applicant is willing to work with staff to address the challenges. However, there are currently too many unknowns for her to be able to support approval at this time.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would like the Commission to vote on the request at this time, or prefer to table it and work with staff to bring back a revised proposal.

Mr. Alt stated that there are some significant items that do need to be addressed. This is a peculiar lot. It is far deeper than it is wide and has the two unusual site challenges – the AEP easement and the requirement for the neighborhood street. However, they believe they have developed a strategy for the site that works. They have had discussions with AEP, who is demonstrating flexibility in regard to the use of the AEP easement for parking. To provide clarity, the traffic pattern and parking utilization associated with a Primrose school is more diffuse than that of a traditional elementary school. That makes a complementary use with a medical or office use more possible. They request that the case be tabled and that they have the opportunity to work with staff on addressing the needs.

Mr. Hounshell stated that if the case will be tabled, it might be beneficial for the applicant to receive Commission's feedback regarding the architecture.

Ms. Fox stated in regard to the architectural towers, there are three criteria for towers in the Bridge Street District, none of which the school meets. It would be necessary to provide a redesign that eliminates the towers. In addition, she is not opposed to shared-use parking on the site.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she agrees that this project does not meet the necessary criteria for towers within this space and in this District. Although the tower is not appropriate, she likes the logo at the top. The architecture seems simple, appropriate for this application, and not inconsistent with the surrounding properties.

Mr. Fishman, Mr. Supelak and Mr. Grimes indicated that they concurred with the previous comments on the architecture.

Mr. Supelak stated that he also concurs with respect to the tower, but would ask the applicant the reason they were proposed.

Ms. White stated that the tower feature will be revised. As they read the Code, a parapet height of two to six feet was permitted, and the intent was to meet that requirement. Initially, the towers were proposed for a functional, rather than aesthetic reason -- the space would house the mechanicals and avoid the need to screen them. However, they understand that the towers do not meet the criteria, and will comply. One of the case studies they reviewed was the Penzone Salon. They agree that material transition in a variety and diversity of materials is critical for a building of this size. In summary, they are excited to expand the Primrose brand with modern technology and innovative materials. This will be the first of its kind, which they anticipate bringing to Dublin.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded a motion to table the Concept Plan.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

5. Chase Bank, 6515 Sawmill Road, 20-041CP, Concept Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for the construction of a ±4,100-square-foot, one-story bank and associated site improvements. The 0.85-acre site is northwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road and Banker Drive and is zoned Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of Concept Plan for the Chase Bank located within the Bridge Street District. A Concept Plan for a Bridge Street District application is different from a traditional Concept Plan, as approval is needed to proceed to a Preliminary Development Plan.

Site

The site is located west of Sawmill Road, northwest of the intersection with Banker Drive, and is zoned Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. The site was originally occupied by Boston Market, but has since become vacant. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing approximately 2,850-square-foot restaurant building and redeveloping the site with a new, approximately 4,200-square-foot bank. On the south end of the site, there is a full access entrance from Banker Drive to the site. The Bridge Street District street network was developed with the Bridge Street District zoning code to create a comprehensive network of streets throughout the District to accommodate different modes of transportation and to create a street grid to connect the District. On the east, the site borders Sawmill Road, which is a Corridor Connector and Principal Frontage street, and Banker Drive is an established Neighborhood Street. Principal Frontage Streets are some of the most important streets within the District. Generally, buildings are required to meet an elevated character and quality standard for facades that face

Principal Frontage Streets. Any development or redevelopment of the site will require the building to occupy the corner of Banker Drive and Sawmill Road. This site is also included within the BSD-SCN, Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. The intent of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood, as outlined in the BSD Code, is to provide an active mixed-use environment and have improved streetscapes and entrances into the Sawmill Center Neighborhood. This site is located at a potential Gateway Location as identified on the neighborhood map. Additional details will be required with the Preliminary Development Plan to determine compliance with the requirements of the neighborhood standards.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing a bank use. This use is a permitted use within the Bridge Street Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. There are no additional use-specific standards for a bank in the Bridge Street District. However, the applicant is proposing an ATM drive-thru on the western portion of the site. The ATM drive-thru will require the approval of a Conditional Use application. The proposed building will require a minimum of 11 parking spaces and a maximum of 14 parking spaces. The applicant is currently proposing 30 parking spaces, which exceeds the maximum permitted parking spaces for a bank use in the Bridge Street District. A Parking Plan will be required with the Preliminary Development Plan should the applicant pursue the requested number of parking spaces. The site has two vehicular access points: a right-in/right-out curb cut along Sawmill Road to the east, and a full access curb cut along Banker Drive on the south side of the site. Staff is working with the applicant on the potential relocation of this southern access point to align with the Piada access point that is south of this access. Discussion with the applicant will continue regarding the feasibility of the relocation. Based on the building size, a minimum total of 83 square feet of open space is required for the proposed building. The applicant is proposing an approximately 740-square-foot open seating area north of the building, which exceeds the requirement.

Architecture

The applicant is proposing a one-story building with unique architectural features and details on all four elevations. Primary building materials of brick, stone, and glass are proposed, and metal panels as a secondary material is proposed. The building type is a Commercial Center outparcel building, which is a permitted building type in the District. The applicant also has submitted preliminary signage information, which includes four (4) wall-mounted signs. Code permits one wall-mounted sign per street frontage, so the applicant would need to meet Code or submit a Master Sign Plan proposal with the Preliminary Development Plan.

Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable Concept Plan criteria and recommends approval with six (6) conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired if there are any concerns about the number of proposed parking spaces. Could this be an opportunity to eliminate the right in/right out on the corner, as there is access from Banker Drive?

Mr. Hounshell responded that, initially, staff was concerned about the number of parking spaces; however, two other Chase bank sites are being consolidated to this site. In regard to the southern

access point, he would defer to Engineering staff regarding whether that would be acceptable. Currently, it is the only full access drive from the site.

Mr. Grimes clarified that he was not referring to the southern access from Banker Drive. He was inquiring about the opportunity of eliminating access from Sawmill Road.

Mr. Stanford stated that opportunity has been discussed with City traffic engineers and the City Engineer. However, that right in/right-out access on Sawmill Road has operated with that condition for quite some time, and due to the site circulation, it is preferable not to push all the traffic through the southern access point.

Ms. Fox stated that the goal is to provide pedestrian access along Sawmill Road in that area. If this site develops, and the large parking lot to the north becomes a developable parcel – pedestrians would be required to cross three in/out drives, which is not pedestrian friendly. Maintaining these drives may be vehicle friendly, but not pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Stanford responded that staff also looked at that factor. To help maintain a pedestrian-friendly condition, they would require the driveway to be narrowed. Currently, it is a very wide drive.

Ms. Fox inquired if the access from Sawmill were to be eliminated to provide the pedestrian element, could the site function well with just the Banker Drive access?

Mr. Stanford responded that from a traffic standpoint, it could.

Applicant Presentation

Tim Meseck, The Architects Partnership, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1020, Chicago, Illinois 60604 stated they brought this proposal to staff late last year and have come a long way in improving the site plan. They have achieved a middle ground, which is workable from a development standpoint and will provide a great benefit for their constituents in the area. This is a relocation of the existing Chase Bank that is one mile north next to I-270. One of the elements incorporated here will be a safety deposit vault. This bank will have dual access, also providing access from Sawmill Road. From a safety, security and efficiency standpoint, that will impact how the interior is laid out. The full service nature of this branch will include a walk-in entrance. There will be six offices for financial analysts, personal bankers, and loan officers. A shift is occurring from quick, ATM, teller or online banking to include more personal planning services. The teller line will be de-emphasized. The drive-thru component, for which they will request a Conditional Use, is located to the rear of the site, which will be L-shaped. It will work well with the existing infrastructure and curb-cuts for the site. Without the two access points, this site becomes less desirable and less developable. This is one of the items that was important that everyone support. For the public benefit -- sidewalk improvements, curbscut modifications and traffic signal improvements will be made to accommodate the pedestrian access. One of the other public benefits will be the large open space area, which is intended to provide a gateway element. They are requesting the Commission's considered of two items, one of which is the parking plan. They realize the number of spaces exceeds the development guidelines. The reason for the number of spaces is to accommodate the office component. Each financial consultant may be meeting two or more individuals, who drive to the site separately. Consequently, with the employees of the bank, there will be a need of 18-30 spaces, depending on the timeframe. Fewer parking spaces would impact the business. The other item is an architectural element. The northwest corner of the building will be where the cash safe, safety deposit vault and data room are located. They will work with staff on the architectural elements, but request that an exception to the clear glass glazing be permitted on that northwest corner.

Jennifer Carr, Chase Bank, regional signage lead, 1111 Polaris Parkway, 2A, Columbus, Ohio 43240, requested Commission feedback on the requested branding elements. They are requesting four signs, three of which are located on the east, south and north elevations. The west elevation sign is over the doorway, facing the parking lot. The letters will be 24 inches with halo illumination.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy stated Mr. Meseck has requested the Commission's feedback on the number of parking spaces and building architecture. She would like to commend the applicant for providing above the open space minimum. She believes the number of parking spaces requested makes sense and has no concerns with the proposed signage. She will defer to Mr. Supelak regarding the architecture.

Mr. Supelak stated that he likes the architecture. Due to the floorplan, he understands the need for the solid walls on the northwest corner. The signage is appropriate. He has no qualms with the site usage. If the one access were to be eliminated, it would drastically reduce the viability of the site for many uses, not just for Chase, but for the other uses, as well. He appreciates the fact that the applicant is willing to provide sidewalks and curbcut modifications to make the site work well. This is a lovely project.

Mr. Grimes stated that he fully understands the need for the access from Sawmill Road. Overall, there is an issue regarding the number of accesses along Sawmill Road, which he is hopeful Engineering can address. He likes the architecture, site layout and proposed signage. This is not a large parcel, and they are making good use of the site.

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees with the previous comments. The layout is great. However, is there one more sign requested than permitted by Code?

Mr. Hounshell responded that, per Code, single-tenant buildings are permitted one sign per street frontage. Technically, only two signs are permitted here; they are proposing four signs. Should the project proceed, a Master Sign Plan application will be required.

Mr. Fishman stated that more development/re-development is anticipated in this corridor, and it would be preferable not to set a precedent for signage in excess of Code. Other than that, he has no objection to the Concept Plan.

Mr. Schneier stated that he has no objection to the number of proposed signs; it seems appropriate for the way in which the building is laid out. He likes the architecture. He is concerned about the number of parking spaces. Although Chase Bank is the expert in retail banking, the trend does not appear to be going in the manner indicated. He is questioning the necessity of the proposed number of spaces. Finally, he is curious if the ATM driveway could be made wider; is there is a standard width?

Ms. Fox stated that although the discussion is focused on the building and site, she is also looking at the site from a different angle. The redevelopment of the Sawmill Center envisioned a walkable, mixed-use, particularly along Sawmill Road. This development will be the second bookend to an attractive development on the south side, which is Piada. Piada has engaged the pedestrian element by providing tables for sitting outside, which is consistent with the Bridge Street District intent. This proposed site is a gateway site that is the other bookend to a gateway. Could a piece of art be added to the open space to activate the streetscape? Materials or landscaping could be

used to create interest and provide an invitation to the site. Doing something unique on this corner could jumpstart something next door, north of the bank. There is opportunity to make this corner just as inviting as Piada. There is a significant amount of parking lot surrounding this parcel. She is not opposed to the amount of parking, but encourages that the entrance to/from Sawmill Road be designed in a manner to mask the parking. There are many opportunities with this corner site, and she would encourage them to do something unique. Other than those comments, she believes Chase Bank would be a welcome addition in the District.

Ms. Call stated that the proposed building is lovely. The orientation of the building, bringing it up to Sawmill Road, is inviting. It is much more pleasing to drivers to see an attractive architectural site than parking lot. In regard to parking, however, she does not like to see cars parked on roads, or every parking space taken; that looks congested, busy and not particularly pleasant. She prefers overparking; an open parking space next to her vehicle is preferable to tight parking spots. She prefers parking areas that are 60-70% full rather than 80-90% of capacity. She has no issues with the accesses. She concurs with Ms. Fox -- there may be opportunity to do something interesting on this corner, which may "kickstart" something else. She is looking forward to another great Chase Bank location. Their facilities are beautiful and inviting. She is looking forward to seeing more detailed plans. In regard to the applicant's inquiry about clear glazing on the northwest corner, she has no issue with the elimination of that, due to the intended floorplan.

Mr. Meseck thanked the Commission for their input, which will be incorporated into the future plan. They will work with staff to modify the curbcut on Banker Drive and how it relates to the drive-through movement. They are excited about the open space area. Landscape details on the corner, as a gateway element, will be provided. They will work with staff to make sure that meets expectations. In regard to the signage, they are attempting to identify what makes sense for this site. The ground sign permitted by Code was omitted in lieu of additional building signage, which they believe is more appropriate for this site. A Master Sign Plan and parking plan will be provided with the Preliminary Development Plan. They would like to break ground as soon as possible to regain the momentum that was lost during recent delays. If feasible, they are very interested in incorporating both the Preliminary and Final Development Plans in the next step, with the intent that all items be addressed to the Commission's satisfaction. Would the Commission have any objection to doing so?

Ms. Call inquired staff's input on the feasibility or precedence for that suggestion.

Ms. Husak stated that, per Code, that is a decision that can be made by the Planning Director. Ms. Rauch has indicated that this would be an appropriate step for this single-use building. A significant amount of analysis, per Code, has already been conducted for the Concept Plan application.

Ms. Call stated that due to the amount of detail provided for the Concept Plan and having no objection from the Planning Director, the Commission would have no concerns with incorporating the Preliminary and Final Development Plans.

Ms. Fox stated that, per Code, gateway sites are required to provide something interesting at the entrance, either a tower, piece of art, or visual vista. Her suggestion would be to condition this approval to include an art element on that corner, thereby creating the other bookend to the corner. What are Commission members' thoughts?

Ms. Call inquired if she is making a suggestion or asking that it be required.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to make an artpiece a condition for approval for this gateway site, which is the intent of the Bridge Street District Code.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would be amenable to that condition.

Seth Berk, Chase Bank, 1111 Polaris Parkway, 2A, Columbus, Ohio 43240, stated that as shown on the plan, there is an open space seating area. A reference was made to Piada's outdoor seating. Would something along those lines be acceptable?

Ms. Fox responded that she would prefer to see a design element at the corner that creates gateway interest, excitement and vitality at that corner.

Ms. Call stated that Chase Bank has a unique and interesting logo. If that were to be incorporated into an art piece, would that provide the interest to which she is referring?

Ms. Fox responded that she does not believe it should be a logo, but a design element on the corner to satisfy the intent of the Bridge Street District for something interesting and inviting to the gateway. However, Chase Bank architects or designers should decide what that would be.

Mr. Boggs stated that he believes the Code provision Ms. Fox is referencing with respect to the BSD-Sawmill Center Neighborhood indicates that if the applicant moves forward with simultaneous tracts for Preliminary and Final Development Plans, the Commission should see that option with the Final Development Plan. The Code speaks specifically to designs that are pedestrian-oriented in scale, including combinations of architectural elements, landscape features, or public open spaces. Gateway elements should enhance the character of the public realm, consistent with walkable urbanism and provide a sense of arrival to the area. That description is in the Code. A condition is not necessary to require a gateway feature, unless the Commission wants to be more specific than the Code already requires.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like Chase Bank to consider that an expectation as they proceed to the Preliminary and Final Development Plans.

Mr. Fishman stated that, as he has envisioned it, the gateway element should be a site where people stop to take a photo. He would also like the development to meet the sign code to avoid setting a precedent for other developments in the Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded approval of the Concept Plan with the following six conditions:

- 1) The applicant submit a Parking Plan with the Preliminary Development Plan;
- 2) The applicant submit a Conditional Use application with the Preliminary Development Plan;
- 3) The applicant continue to work with staff to finalize the building type analysis prior to the submission of the Preliminary Development Plan;
- 4) The applicant continue to work with staff to finalize open space details for the site prior to submission of the Preliminary Development Plan; and,
- 5) The applicant continue to work with staff to comply with the requirements of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood Standards.
- 6) The applicant work with staff to meet BSD signage requirements or submit a Master Sign Plan application.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion passed 7-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Husak stated that a Joint PZC/ARB meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 4 at 6:30 p.m.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Ms. Call stated that, in view of the preceding discussion regarding elements for gateway sites, this is not the skillset of building or landscape architects. Is there an opportunity for a fee in lieu of to be permitted? If so, perhaps the developer could dedicate the space for the feature, and the City could provide a desired feature. The Dublin Arts Council is available to make suggestions. Perhaps a fund similar to a bed tax fund would be an option, or some other funding mechanism. Although some applicants may be able to provide something in line with the vision of the City, others may be unable to do so. Providing an alternative method, if needed, would make it easier for the applicant and staff.

Ms. Fox concurred. Not all applicants will be asked to provide such an element, only those developments on gateway sites. The intent is for Sawmill Road to have an interesting streetscape in several years, but these elements must be requested now for that to occur. This topic is worth a discussion, and she will mention it to City Council. If we want to ask for art, it is essential to consider the practicality for applicants to do so. We need to be sure these gateways are substantially fun and interesting.

Mr. Fishman stated that he appreciates the suggestions; however, the missing link is money. Applicants may not want to hire someone to create a piece of artwork. It would not be desirable to have the Dublin Arts Council do this, as it could replace another public art piece project they would have done.

Ms. Call stated that her suggestion was a fee in lieu of. Instead of the applicant designing the element, they could pay into a fund set aside for that purpose. She mentioned the Dublin Arts Council and bed tax fund as examples only.

Mr. Fishman stated that is an excellent idea. Making these gateway sites memorable could change Sawmill Road from an undesirable roadway to an interesting roadway. He is supportive if it is funded by development.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Rebecca Call [Approved 7-09-2020]

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council