



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 5, 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 virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to conduct virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government and will be holding our meetings online and live streaming on YouTube until further notice. 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. Those questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. We welcome your comments on cases. Please provide a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments. We appreciate your patience."

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Leo Grimes, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Jane Fox, Kristina Kennedy
Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Thaddeus Boggs, Chase Ridge

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the minutes of 10-15-20 as submitted.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, 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 are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on 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

3. Indian Run Meadows Subdivision – Fencing, 20-160AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for an allowance of a 4-foot-high, split-rail fencing in the Indian Run Meadows subdivision, zoned Planned Unit Development District. The site is northeast of the intersection of Avery-Muirfield Drive with Avery Road.

Public Comment

Michael Welsh, 6857 Fallen Timbers Drive, Dublin, OH 43017:

"As a resident of Indian Run Meadows and member of the Association board, I did vote to update our fence guidelines with respect to height and distance between posts. However, I want to stress that the "meadows" in our name refers to the greenspace formed behind the houses, as irregularly shaped lots blend. This confluence of property lines in the absence of structures gives the illusion of a meadow, instead of backing up to another house. I trust P&Z will scrutinize each application to ensure the split-rail fences are kept to the very narrow confines of the build zones to continue to preserve this special feature."

No Commission member requested to move the case from the Consent Agenda for discussion purposes.

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded:

1. Approval of the Minor Text Modification as follows:

Modification of the Development Plan text for Indian Run Meadows, Section (C)(a), that: A split rail fence, not to exceed four feet in height may be installed on any single-family lot. Said fence shall be constructed in accordance with the specification appearing on page 8 of said document.

and

2. Approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

NEW CASES

1. Primrose School, PID: 273-009147, 20-147PDP, Preliminary Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for a two-story, 15,000-square-foot daycare facility and associated site improvements on a 3.58-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Office. The site is located south of W. Dublin-Granville Road, approximately 450 feet west of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive.

2. Primrose School, PID: 273-009147, 20-148PP, Preliminary Plat

Ms. Call stated that this a request for recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary Plat for the construction of a new day care facility and new neighborhood street located on a ±3.53-acre site located within the Bridge Street District (BSD).

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan and recommendation of City Council approval of a Preliminary Plat for the construction of a new day care facility and new neighborhood street located on a ±3.53-acre site located within the Bridge Street – Office District (BSD-O). The site is located south of W. Dublin-Granville Road, approximately 340 feet west of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. An AEP high-tension power line runs along the western edge of the property and requires a 100-foot easement on the western portion of the site. It is the primary reason this site has been vacant for some time. There is minimal existing vegetation other than a natural tree row along the western property line.

Site

The site has frontage on W. Dublin-Granville Road (400 feet) to the north. Code requires a Neighborhood Street connection, and this project will include design and construction of a new north-south Neighborhood Street and create a new block. The proposed Neighborhood Street will partially subdivide the existing block defined by W. Dublin-Granville Road to the north, the new neighborhood street to the east, Stoneridge Lane to the south, and Shamrock Crossing Boulevard to the west. The BSD Code includes standards for maximum block dimensions. 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. Both the north and south sides of the block exceed the 500-foot maximum and the perimeter significantly exceeds the 1,750-foot maximum; therefore, a waiver is required for the dimensions of the newly created block. A waiver for this block would be required with any application for this site, given the creation of the required Neighborhood Street.

History

In August 2020, the Commission approved a Concept Plan that included an approximately 15,000-square-foot, two-story child daycare center, which replicated the requirements of a loft building. The applicant also proposed addition of a neighborhood street to the east of the site, as well as a lot split into two lots. The applicant would develop and occupy the southern lot, which would contain 38 parking spaces. Per the BSD Code, the applicant was required to provide a parking plan with the preliminary development plan.

Proposal

The applicant has provided a parking plan with this application, which indicates that in addition to the 38 on-site parking spaces, there would be an additional 24 on-street spaces along the new neighborhood street. Other Primrose locations within central Ohio have 38-46 parking spaces, so the proposed number is typical. Also proposed is a 12,900-square-foot playground containing four separate age group areas. The perimeter of the playground will be contained within 4-foot tall black aluminum fence; the individual areas will be split by a 4-foot tall chain link fence. Because the BSD Code prohibits chain link fences, staff recommends the black aluminum fence also be used for separating the individual play areas. Currently, the playground will extend to within three feet of the southern property line. The minimum side-yard setbacks within this district for this loft building type is five feet. It is recommended that the site plan be revised to meet the minimum setback requirement. The applicant is required to provide 1-square foot of open space per 50 square feet of building space; consequently, 318 square feet of public accessible open space would be required. The location of that open space is not indicated on the site plan. Based on the layout of the site, staff is concerned that any required open space on the site would not meet the intent of open space; therefore, it is suggested that the applicant consolidate an open space with the future development of the northern lot. Staff and the Law Director are working with the applicant on a way in which to memorialize any open space consolidation arrangement for the future development of the northern parcel as part of the Final Development Plan.

Architectural Details

Proposed is a two-story contemporary building with parapet roofs. Each story of the building is 12 feet in height, with varying parapet walls between 2 feet and 6 feet. The main entrance to the building is located at the northeast corner of the building. Loft buildings require a minimum of 80% primary building materials per façade, excluding windows and doors; primary materials are stone, brick and glass. The applicant is proposing 72% primary materials on the north elevation, 65% on the south elevation, 70% on the east elevation, and 56% on the west elevation. Because the required percent is not met, the applicant is requesting a Waiver to the Primary Materials requirement for all four elevations. There will be two finishes of brick, natural stone, and glass as primary materials for the building and cementitious horizontal siding and two finishes of metal panels as secondary materials.

The applicant is also requesting a Waiver to the Vertical Increments requirement for loft buildings. Loft buildings require vertical increments (distances on a vertical plane without breaks in the plane) not to exceed 40 feet on any elevation. The south (63.91 feet), east (64.93 feet), and west (62.21 feet) elevations all exceed this requirement. The applicant is also requesting a Waiver to the Front Property Line Coverage. For loft buildings, 75% of the front lot line coverage is required to be occupied by the building or permitted additional streetscape. The applicant is proposing 50.5 percent of the front property line coverage to be met. Most of the proposed architecture has not changed since the approval of the Concept Plan in August.

Preliminary Plat

The applicant is proposing to subdivide and re-plat the site to create the Neighborhood Street right-of-way and two new lots. The new lot line is proposed from east to west, creating a north lot and a south lot. The southern lot (Lot 1) is a 1.370-acre lot, and the northern lot (Lot 2) is a 1.632-acre lot. 0.528-acre of the site is being dedicated for right-of-way dedication of the new neighborhood street. The proposed neighborhood street results in a corner lot condition for the north lot and provides public street frontage for the south lot, as required by Code. The applicant is proposing to develop the southern lot, with future development taking place along S.R. 161. The Neighborhood Street will be required to be built prior to or concurrent with the construction of the proposed daycare facility. The applicant shall provide a street name for the proposed neighborhood street prior to the submission to City Council for approval.

Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval of the four waivers; of the preliminary plat and parking plan with four conditions; and of the preliminary plat with two conditions.

Applicant Comment

Alena Miller, ALT Architecture, 2440 Dayton-Xenia Rd, Ste. B, Beavercreek, OH 45434, stated that they understand the conditions and have no objections.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes stated that the report mentions the elimination of the sidewalk on the other northern lot. What is the purpose of doing so?

Mr. Hounshell responded that a sidewalk connection is shown running through the northern lot. To prevent any land lock to the future development of that northern site, staff recommends that the connection be removed, as they will have the sidewalk connection along the neighborhood street. No development on the northern lot is being considered at this time.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the public open space requirement has not been met. Are any special considerations being given in view of the fact that this is a daycare school facility, and there will be young children on this site? As a parent, she is uncertain if she would want the public in close proximity to her children.

Ms. Call inquired if the City has a mechanism for fee in lieu of or for bonding, since the recommendation of staff is to consolidate the open space.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the applicant will address this issue in detail. Staff and the Law Director's office have been in discussions regarding possible agreements to address this understanding. The intent is not to provide open space just to meet the open space requirement. The intent is that it be a valuable asset for the property owner and to pedestrians.

Mr. Boggs, Assistant Law Director, stated that they have discussed the appropriate mechanism for this situation. There is a potential fee in lieu permitted by Code, but the preference is to have an agreement in place, to which the City is a party, for provision of a consolidated open space on the northern lot. That document has not been drafted at this time.

Ms. Fox stated that there is an eight-foot slope on the west side of the parcel. Is there any concern about stormwater runoff into the parking lot to the west?

Mr. Stanford, City Engineering, stated that they did not identify an issue in their initial review. Staff will hone in on that factor as construction drawings are developed. However, if there should be a concern, there are possible solutions to remedy it.

Ms. Fox inquired about the vertical elements for which a waiver is requested.

Mr. Fishman stated that the City is receiving numerous waiver requests for the Primary Materials requirement of 80%. Those standards were set with much forethought, and recently, we seem to be permitting frequent variances. Typically, a building's appearance is improved with a greater percent of the primary materials. He also is concerned that the signs on the play equipment carry the name of the sign company, which is visible from the street.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the vertical elements requirement relates to breaks in the plane along the building façade. The requirement is that there be no spans greater than 40 feet without a break in the plane. The southern façade of the building is approximately 60-62 feet without a break. There is lack of articulation. Although a waiver allows for deviation from Code, the intent is that it allows the applicant to be more creative outside the guidelines of the Code. It is the Board's task to determine if the variation in design results in a product that is equally good or better. The applicant has requested these waivers to complement the design of their building.

Mr. Fishman stated that he has no objection to the proposed appearance of the building, but he is concerned about setting precedents. With some buildings, it is difficult to meet Code, but that does not seem to be the case here.

Mr. Supelak stated that the requirement is for 80% primary materials; what qualifies as primary materials here?

Mr. Hounshell responded that per the BSD Code, primary materials include stone, brick and glass. Secondary materials would be metal panels and cementitious siding. The calculation is exclusive of windows or doors.

Mr. Fishman stated that the goal is that the buildings be able to withstand the test of time. The primary materials are quality materials.

Ms. Kennedy inquired what the response is to the question raised about the signs on the playground equipment. The Primrose logo and name appear to be noted on the canopy equipment.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the accessory details concerning the playground equipment, fencing, trash enclosure will be addressed in the Final Development Plan. At this point, any details are conceptual. The signage shown on the building will not be approved with this application. The signage on the playground equipment has not been discussed, but the applicant may be able to provide some information.

Ms. Kennedy stated that if there is a proposal to have the applicant's name and logo on the playground equipment, she assumes it would be necessary for them to meet the sign requirements.

Ms. Call inquired if the sign details would be reviewed and approved with the Final Development Plan application.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that the Commission has reviewed the earlier Concept Plans for this project, and he has no objections to the requested waivers. This is a good development and addition to the community. He appreciates that flexibility is permitted; that the Code is not strictly required, if there is opportunity for a better outcome. He has no concerns with the proposal.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is an attractive project. He has no qualms about the waivers or the conditions. The details regarding the canopies and signage will be provided with the Final Development Plan (FDP).

Ms. Kennedy that she is satisfied if the signage details for the facility will be provided with the FDP. She agrees that this is an attractive project and a great addition to the community.

Ms. Fox thanked the applicant for considering the Commission's earlier suggestions about the connectivity and appreciates the changes made. She agrees that the sidewalk in the northern site will need to be removed, but when that northern parcel is developed, it would be nice to have a sidewalk connection to the south parcel. She would like to see more architectural interest at the entrance, such as an awning; more detailing would break up the flat plane. That is important, particularly on the street side. Other than that suggestion, she likes the project.

Mr. Grimes expressed agreement with Ms. Fox's comments. He is impressed with how the project has been laid out and the use of the land. He is supportive of the requested waivers. Because the building will be located near the back of the parcel, the waivers are justified. He is pleased with the project, which will encourage future development to the north.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with Commission members' comments. He would encourage architecture that will not become dated. However, the placement of the building is good, although the pedestrian connection will be important.

Ms. Call stated that she appreciates that staff will be working with the applicant on the open space arrangement. The building envelope on this parcel is a challenge, but they have made it work. She appreciates that AEP has loosened its restrictions and is permitting parking to be provided on the western side of the parcel. However, if there were a future need for AEP to use that area, it would greatly impact the amount of available parking for the business. Although the on-street parking would mitigate the issue somewhat, most of the parking is located on the parcel interior. She appreciates the fence change from chain link to black aluminum. In regard to lot coverage, she anticipates development of the front parcel will be a challenge in regard to lot line coverage. However, this is a great project.

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were received.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following four waivers:

- 1) Waiver to Zoning Code Section 153.062(O)(4)(a)(1) — Front Property Line Coverage (Approximately 50.5% coverage).
- 2) Waiver to Zoning Code Section 153.062(E)(1) — Façade Materials (72% primary materials on the north façade; 65% primary materials on the south façade; 70% primary materials on the east façade; 56% primary materials on the west façade).
- 3) Waiver to Zoning Code Section 153.060(C)(2) — Maximum Block Size (W. Dublin-Granville Road = ~1,200 feet; Stoneridge Lane = ~1,218 feet; Perimeter = ~3,325 feet).
- 4) Waiver to Zoning Code Section 153.060(O)(4)(d)(4) — Façade Divisions – Vertical Increments (South Façade = 63.91 feet; East Façade = 64.93 feet; West Façade = 62.21 feet).

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant remove the sidewalk connection across Lot 2;
- 2) The applicant revise the site plan to meet the 5-foot setback requirement for the proposed fence;
- 3) The applicant replace the chain link fence with the proposed black aluminum fence used on the perimeter of the playground, and;
- 4) The applicant provide landscaping around the perimeter of the playground to provide additional screening from the street and adjacent properties.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy moved approval of the Preliminary Plat with two conditions:

- 1) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council, and;
- 2) The applicant shall provide a street name for the proposed neighborhood street prior to the submission to City Council for approval.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

4. Turkey Run Apartments, 219 Perth Drive, 20-168AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for the installation of a 20-square-foot ground sign for an apartment complex zoned Planned Unit Development District. The site is southeast of the intersection of Perth Drive with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for a ground sign for an existing apartment complex. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Perth Drive and Frantz Road. The applicant is proposing the installation of a monument sign at the northwest corner of the site near the intersection of Frantz Road and Edinburgh Road. The monument sign would be considered an Entry Feature Sign in the Zoning Code. Entry feature signs are permitted to be 20 square feet in size and shall not exceed 6 feet (72 inches) in height.

The applicant is proposing an approximately 15.2-square-foot entry feature/monument sign with a 3-square-foot leasing sign below the main sign. The total height of the sign, including the base, is 51.5 inches. The base of the sign is clad with a synthetic stacked stone. The signs are proposed to be attached to the sign base by two 4-inch thick aluminum square tubes painted black. The proposed sign faces are to be made from one-sided Aluminum Composite Material. The copy and logo of the sign will be constructed of PVC that are individually attached to the sign. The sign will have three colors, which meets the standard zoning Code requirement for signs. The logo is proposed to be Gold; the primary copy will be Green; and the background will be White. No illumination is proposed. Staff recommends that the applicant remove the "Now Leasing" secondary sign from the monument sign; that the height of the stacked stone base to the base of the sign be increased; and that a sign cabinet be provided, rather than the tubes. The applicant has also provided a sign landscape plan with the submitted materials. Landscaping is a requirement for all monument signs within Dublin. Monument signs are required to be landscaped up to a 3-foot perimeter around the monument sign. The applicant should continue to work with staff to finalize the required landscape plan.

Applicant Presentation

Darrin Gray, Sign Vision Company, 987 Claycraft Rd, Columbus, OH 43230, stated that when the customer approved the sign, which met City Code, his shop was unaware that formal approval was needed from the City; therefore, the sign has already been constructed. He would request that the Commission consider their need to mitigate changes. They worked with Crawford Hoying extensively on this design, which is similar to other signs they have made for them, with a few changes. There are similar signs within the City, including those at La Chatelaine and Indian Run Elementary, although they have wooden, not aluminum posts. In Metro Place, nearly every property has a permanent monument sign in addition to a large 4-ft. x 8-ft. "Now Leasing" sign. Two signs are not desired here; the property owner would prefer a simple, "Now Leasing" panel located below the primary sign.

Commission Questions

Mr. Schneier inquired of what material the sign would be constructed. Because it is two-faced, it should be sufficiently opaque. He prefers the proposed "Now Leasing" panel as opposed to a larger, stand-alone "For Lease" sign.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the signs will be made of aluminum composite. Two separate panels would be installed onto the four-inch posts; nothing can be seen through the panels. Should the Commission decide the "Now Leasing" panel is not appropriate, the applicant could obtain temporary sign permits for a leasing sign.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox stated that she likes the suggestion to encase the signs within a frame to avoid having open ends.

Mr. Gray responded that they have no objection to enclosing the signs on all sides. Although that is more typical with illuminated signs, which this is not, they can do so.

Ms. Fox inquired what options exist to eliminate the space between the sign and the base, which is already built.

Mr. Gray stated that he is unsure at this time. Reworking the sign base to eliminate the gap created if the leasing sign panel is removed would be difficult. Could the secondary panel be considered a temporary sign, and covered or removed, as required? Although if it were to be removed for a period of time, the gap would exist for that period of time.

Ms. Fox stated that it appears to be 12 inches of space from the bottom of the primary sign to the sign base.

Mr. Gray confirmed that it would be approximately 12 inches.

Ms. Fox inquired if the top panel could be lowered to 6 inches above the base.

Mr. Gray responded that he is uncertain if Crawford Hoying would be willing to reduce the overall height, but it would be easier to lower the top panel than to raise the height of the stone base.

Ms. Fox stated that on this visible corner, the lower height should not impact the sign's noticeability. In her view, the Now Leasing panel would need to be eliminated; the top panel lowered 6-8 inches to fill the gap; and a quality frame constructed around the signs.

Ms. Kennedy, Mr. Fishman and Mr. Schneier expressed agreement with Ms. Fox's suggestions. Mr. Fishman stated that he assumes the property owner could obtain a temporary leasing sign, which could be placed near the manager's office.

Mr. Boggs stated that the leasing period signs, which were addressed with the recent Temporary Sign Code revision, were intended to accommodate these types of situations. During periods of the year when there are vacancies, the property owner is able to put up leasing signs on a temporary basis; they would not be permanent signs.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the proposed "Now Leasing" panel could be a removable panel.

Mr. Gray responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak stated that if the primary sign height were lowered, and the removable "Now Leasing" panel is treated as a temporary sign and removed as required, the intent for a lower monument sign and a temporary leasing sign would be achieved with the least impact.

Mr. Grimes stated that the leasing office is only a short distance from the corner, so there would be opportunity to place a temporary leasing sign there. He would prefer to eliminate the "Now Leasing" sign strip permanently. The sign should appear to be for a residential community, not a commercial community.

Mr. Fishman stated that he concurs with Mr. Grimes that the proposed "Now Leasing" sign panel should be eliminated entirely. They can add a "For Lease" sign near the office.

Ms. Call requested legal opinion regarding whether the secondary sign panel, which states "Now Leasing," could be addressed separately under the temporary sign process, not included in the Amended Final Development Plan proposal.

Mr. Boggs stated that he would need to look at the specifics of the regulations. The intent of the City's Temporary Sign Code was that when space is being advertised, the sign is permitted for a certain number of days at a time. The concerns relate to not only the applicable Sign Code but the application type, which in this case, is an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) within the PUD process. The AFDP review considers whether the sign is appropriate for the adjacent development in terms of size, scale and design, not in regard to its content. He believes Commission members are concerned that the panel is questionable in terms of its appropriateness, design and relationship to the other area. The second question raised was whether the secondary panel temporarily affixed to the sign would qualify as a temporary sign itself. He believes that either the sign panel added to the monument sign or a stand-alone sign would be appropriate temporary signs.

Mr. Schneier stated that as he understands it, the Commission's direction is to remove the proposed "Now Leasing" sign panel as part of the Turkey Hill entry-way sign. However, if that secondary panel is eliminated, sufficient space would remain that it could re-appear on a temporary basis. If the sign does re-appear, it would not be permanent; it would be treated as a different kind of sign covered by a different Code provision. Is that correct?

Mr. Boggs responded that is correct.

Ms. Fox stated that the Temporary Sign Code revisions were intended to address the large leasing signs that were creating clutter along the roadway. However, the proposed leasing panel is a more slim, discreet and aesthetic manner in which to achieve a temporary sign than requiring Crawford Hoying to place a 3-ft. x 4-ft. sign on the property instead.

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were received.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with four conditions:

- 1) The "Now Leasing" secondary sign be removed from the monument sign;
- 2) The edges of the sign be enclosed to replicate a cabinet, subject to staff approval;
- 3) The height of the stacked stone base be increased or the main sign be lowered to eliminate the large gap between the base and the sign face, subject to staff approval; and
- 4) The applicant continue to work with staff to finalize the required sign landscape plan.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

5. Bridge Street District – Amended Final Development Plan, 20-177ADMC, Administrative Request – Code

Ms. Call stated that this is a proposal to add an Amended Final Development Plan to the review process in the Bridge Street District (Zoning Code Section 153.066) to align with other processes.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated that staff is seeking informal feedback on a potential future Zoning Code amendment regarding the inclusion of an Amended Final Development Plan option in the Bridge Street District review process. This was discussed previously at the October 1, 2020 Commission meeting. Included in the meeting materials are: the current criteria for the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) in the PUD process; the criteria for the Final Development Plan (FDP) in the BSD Code; and the Minor Project review criteria in the BSD Code. The intent is that the AFDP process would exist between the Minor Project and the existing Final Development Plan. Staff is requesting the Commission's input on the two review criteria in the PUD vs. the BSD as well as the eligibility criteria for the Minor Project. In the PUD provisions, any application, regardless of how major or minor, that has previously been reviewed as a Final Development Plan is eligible for an Amended Final Development review. In the BSD provisions, this option only exists if the modification can fit within the Minor Project criteria. Under the current standards, a substantial site or building modification to an existing commercial site would require the same level of review as new construction, which is very cumbersome, time consuming and costly for the applicant and staff. That may deter owners from making improvements. In order to ensure the scope of the review process matches the scope of a proposed project, staff recommends the inclusion of an AFDP process in the BSD review process.

Public Comment

No public comment on the case was received.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that she believes this process change is warranted.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is generally in favor of the recommendation, but further refinement of the process might be needed.

Ms. Call stated that if the Commission is supportive of staff proceeding with developing the proposed BSD Code language, there would be opportunity to refine the process when the proposed language is presented for the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Grimes stated that the proposal is common sense. It will make it easier for staff, developers and property owners to make needed improvements, decreasing the time and cost of doing so. They can invest their money in the property rather than in the process.

Ms. Fox stated that she is interested in seeing the property improvement process in the BSD made easier and less costly. However, the AFDP language mentions development of open spaces, lighting, driveways, signage and landscape plans; it does not mention the intent of the BSD for pedestrian connectivity and street vitality. Consequently, property owners' plans for renovation would not include that element. The intent of invigorating of streetscape needs to be emphasized repeatedly; otherwise, the Commission is not going to get what is desired in the BSD.

Commissioners were supportive of staff drafting a proposed amendment for the BSD Code review process for Commission consideration, with inclusion of the intent for invigorating the streetscape.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Proposed 2021-2022 PZC meeting dates will be revised and provided at the next meeting for consideration.
- The next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 10 at 6:30 p.m.
- A joint meeting of Council/PZC/ARB/BZA is scheduled for December 14 to provide an update re. policies, challenges and issues.
- A tentative second PZC meeting date in December 2020 to accommodate the number of cases (perhaps following the 12/14 joint meeting) will be recommended by staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council