



DUBLIN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 6, 2009

CITY OF DUBLIN..

Land Use and
Long Range Planning
5800 Shier-Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600
Fax: 614-410-4747
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

Agenda

1. **Perimeter Center – Subarea I – Crown Mercedes and Chrysler**
09-053AFDP **6350 and 6500 Perimeter Loop Road**
(Approved 5 – 0) **Amended Final Development Plan**
2. **Germain Lexus Car Dealership** **3855 and 3885 West Dublin Granville Road**
09-069AFDP/CDDS **Amended Final Development Plan**
(Approved 5 – 0) **Corridor District Sign Review**
3. **Lowell Trace PUD – Dublin Professional Center** **6805 Avery Muirfield Drive**
09-068AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan**
(Tabled 5 – 0)
4. **Thomas Kohler PCD – Subarea E** **4040 Woerner Temple Road**
09-070AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan**
(Approved 5 – 0)
5. **The Meaning of Land Use Principles 1 & 5** **Team Presentation**
6. **The Meaning of Land Use Principles 2 & 8** **Team Presentation**
7. **Annual Items of Interest List** **Administrative Request**

Chair Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Todd Zimmerman, Warren Fishman, Richard Taylor, and Amy Kramb. Mr. Walter was absent. City representatives were: Terry Foegler, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Jennifer Rauch, Rachel Swisher, Eugenia Martin, Jamie Adkins, Jennifer Readler, Adam Anderson, Grant Shiring, Amanda Mahar, Ryan Pilewski, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor made the motion to approve the June 18, 2009 meeting minutes as presented. Todd Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Mr. Taylor amended Page 4, paragraph 9, of the July 9, 2009 meeting minutes, changing the word “echoic” to “bucolic” and Page 6, paragraphs 8 and 9 changing the speaker from “Mr. Taylor” to “Mr. Walter.”

Motion and Vote

Warren Fishman made the motion to approve the July 9, 2009 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made a motion to accept the documents into the record as presented. Todd Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Administrative Report

Claudia Husak said that there were no Administrative Approvals to report.

Ms. Husak reported that Planning prepared an exercise for the Dublin Teen Corps high school students and LEED middle school students and said that more information about these programs was included in the Newsletter. Todd Zimmerman pointed out that he thought it was fascinating to work with the students and see how they laid out the proposed developments.

Steve Langworthy introduced City Manager Terry Foegler to report on the Bridge Street Corridor Study by Goody Clancy.

Council Report

Dublin City Manager Terry Foegler reported on the Bridge Street Corridor Study currently underway by the City’s consulting firm, Goody Clancy and Associates. He explained that the study is partly related to a series of goals that City Council had adopted over the years in addition to the work that has been done by the Commission during the last year or two. He said that the study will examine the opportunities for connections between Historic Dublin and opportunities emerging east of the river as well as redevelopment opportunities that exist at Dublin Village Center. He noted that OCLC is looking at opportunities with regard to its property, and there are opportunities that may exist with the eventual redevelopment of the school site. He described the importance of looking at all of these areas together while looking for potential connections and compatible development types that mutually reinforce one another. He stated that the consultants will be looking at market potentials to support some of the place-making capabilities to maximize the City’s increasing desire for a more significant core.

Mr. Foegler said that the consulting team, Goody Clancy and Associates, was a firm he had worked with in the past, and some of the Commissioners may recall that in the early 1990s, they were a sub-consultant to Mt. Auburn and Associates who worked on the City’s original economic development plan. He stated that they are very good at understanding economic development implications given the breadth of their experience and knowledge and understanding. He said that they are very grounded in understanding development issues, market demand, place-making, community development, and a series of other planning principles, in addition to the financial aspects of implementation.

Mr. Foegler said the process that City Council has laid out is one that from the earliest stage engages all of the key stakeholders, which is a process that will continue as this project moves forward. He noted that the stakeholders reported to him and that Goody Clancy listened very well, and all the folks have been appropriately impressed with the skill set that Goody Clancy has brought to the table.

Mr. Foegler said the goal is to look at this not just as a planning exercise, but as something that creates a framework for implementation. He thought this study would help guide decisions with regard to some near-term activities impacting Historic Dublin. He said that one thing the consultants are being pushed to do is to identify a series of short-term strategies identified through previous planning processes that they can quickly analyze and potentially go ahead with, regardless of how the other pieces of the plan may come together.

Mr. Foegler stated that there will be various degrees of detail, with aspects of Historic Dublin getting a closer scrutiny than perhaps some of the redevelopment sites where the work will be relatively conceptual. He reiterated that the product will be detailed enough to provide a framework to guide community design going forward.

Mr. Foegler announced that a series of speakers of national stature will be speaking to some of the issues that we expect to emerge from this project as part of the process. He said tentatively, there has been acceptance from Christopher Leinberger, who wrote the book, *The Option of Urbanism*, who he heard speak and was impressed with at the Urban Land Institute conference on mixed use developments. He added that David Dixon will also speak to the issue of density so that it can become a little more tolerable, as it relates to these kinds of mixed use redevelopments here.

Mr. Foegler said his commitment in this process is to engage key stakeholders and he wanted the Commission to be heavily engaged in this process. He said they will soon start to share some of the common themes of what they have heard through their interviews with the stakeholder groups, but this will change a lot as it goes through the process and is reviewed and commented upon by different folks as we apply more of the Dublin-based knowledge. He added that at the same time they will propose ideas that may go well beyond the Dublin-based kind of development that we are used to here.

Mr. Foegler said the City is really excited about this group. He explained that he is taking the lead with regard to the management of this effort, given his interests and experience. He assured that they viewed the Commission as a vital part of this process moving forward and they want the Commission to be actively engaged along the way and would be happy to answer any questions that the Commissioners might have about the process.

Todd Zimmerman asked if the meetings would be held during the day. Mr. Foegler said that they would meet with individual stakeholders around their schedules but there would also be a series of evening meetings. He said there will be community charrettes and a variety of venues and forums for this project as it moves forward. He said he did not want to get too rigid with the scope based on what they think they know today so that they do not somehow forgo an opportunity. He described the three-stage process, with the first stage being very much about confirming what they think the scope ought to be and initial analysis. He suspected there would

be some tweaking of the later phases as it moves ahead, and he wanted the scope to be a result of the input they get from all the various people involved in the process.

Richard Taylor asked for an estimate of the timeframe of the three phases. Mr. Foegler said an aggressive six-month schedule had been proposed, and he would like to keep it there, knowing it will probably be a little longer. He said there are some things they need feedback on sooner than others, such as some projects in Historic Dublin and some potential road relocations. He said it depends upon how much consensus emerges versus the different types of ideas they want to explore. Mr. Foegler said if it becomes clear that certain things need to be rethought or looked at differently, or if there is a transportation alternative that looks incredibly exciting but needs to be tested and analyzed further, they will do it. Mr. Foegler said he wanted it to be right more than just getting it done, so it is the combination of being as aggressive as they can be, but at the same time making sure that the end product is one that the community embraces and becomes a policy document and a framework for moving forward.

Mr. Foegler said that they would keep the Commission updated as this moves ahead.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Foegler.

Administrative Business

Ms. Amorose Groomes reported that she and Mr. Taylor met with Mr. Foegler and had some dialog about the rewrite of the Zoning Code, and to fix a target of where they are headed before they begin on their journey. She said that Mr. Foegler would share the discussion with City Council and there may or may not be a the joint meeting with City Council, it may just come back to the Commission as a memo from them indicating what the specifics of their desire is in response to the rewrite of the Zoning Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that Cases 1, 2, and 4 were Consent items. She said that Mr. Taylor had requested that Cases 1 and 2 be pulled, therefore since there were no Commission comments regarding Case 4, it would be heard first, and then they would proceed through the balance of the Agenda order. [The minutes reflect the order of the published Agenda.]

**1. Perimeter Center – Subarea I – Crown Mercedes and Chrysler
09-053AFDP 6350 and 6500 Perimeter Loop Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

Chair Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures for this case. She swore in those wishing to testify in regards to this case including the applicant's representative, John Oney, Architectural Alliance, and City representatives.

Rachel Swisher presented this request for review and approval for architectural modifications to an existing car dealership located within Subarea I of the Perimeter Center PCD. She described the site and surrounding development. Ms. Swisher explained that the Crown dealership campus consists of three auto dealerships, with the 5.8-acre Crown Mercedes site located to the west, Crown Kia in the center, and Crown Chrysler to the east. She said the main Mercedes Benz sales

facility is centrally located on the site, with the main building entrance located on the west side of the building with modifications proposed on the north, west and south sides of the building.

Ms. Swisher said the proposed modifications includes an overhang, which will wrap the glass storefront portions of the building on the north, west, and south elevations and a light blue EIFS entry feature over the existing doorway on the west side of the building. She continued that the proposal also includes modifications to the roofline, which includes silver roof edging and a decorative silver aluminum paneling. She said the overhang is supported by seven cobalt blue columns with silver capitals.

Ms. Swisher said the development text for this planned district states that all buildings shall be designed to reflect the architectural quality and coordination between existing development in this subarea and surrounding development, and it is Planning's opinion that the proposed modifications are consistent with the existing contemporary character of the Crown dealership campus. She explained that since two additional colors of blue are being proposed, Planning recommends that the proposed blue columns be modified to match the color used for the existing blue monument sign faces, as shown on the photograph presented.

Ms. Swisher said that Planning has reviewed this proposal based on the review criteria for amended final development plans, and Planning recommends approval of this application with one condition:

- 1) That the blue columns for the Mercedes Benz facility utilize the same color of blue (Pantone 3025C) as the monument sign faces.

Amy Krumb asked if there was a new awning. Ms. Swisher said that the new silver paneling is going to be affixed to the existing roofline, so there will not be any increase in height to the building, but the awning would be new.

Ms. Krumb asked if they were connecting the two new masonry wing walls with the proposed awning. Ms. Swisher clarified that the two masonry wing walls are not connected to the building and would not be connected to the awning.

Ms. Krumb requested clarification regarding what the blue columns would be supporting. Ms. Swisher said the columns would support the silver aluminum panel overhang on the roofline, which was new.

Richard Taylor asked about the difference in color that the applicant was proposing for the columns and the color of the existing sign that Planning was suggesting they change.

John Oney, Architectural Alliance, representing the applicant, Dwayne Hawkins, Hawkins Family Partnership, LTD, said there was an existing blue sign, and they were proposing two additional shades of blue. He said the entry feature is a light blue and the columns were a darker blue. He presented a sample of the colors.

Mr. Taylor asked if either blue matched the existing blue sign. Mr. Oney said they did not match, but they were okay with the condition that the columns match the sign color.

Mr. Oney presented renderings of the building with and without the existing wing walls, and asked for the Commission's feedback regarding the walls. He noted that the wing walls are a continual maintenance issue because they needed caulking every few years and were somewhat deteriorated, and he asked if the Commissioners thought that there was any merit to removing them. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she liked the wing walls and was not in favor of their removal. She said the Commission needed to make a decision regarding the different colors of blue on the site. She suggested using the same color of blue on the portal and the posts.

Ms. Krumb said she preferred that the posts and door match, and she did not care if they matched the sign. Mr. Taylor said that he assumed the goal of having the portal positioned the way it is shown and using a different color was intentional to call it out as the entrance.

Mr. Oney said they used a dark cobalt blue for the columns accented with a silver base and capital. He said the entry portal was meant to be a softer, lighter color.

Mr. Taylor said that the color was their decision to make, not the Commission's. He clarified that the color of blue recommended by Planning was just slightly darker than what was originally proposed, but the light blue was the same.

Mr. Oney said their preference would be to have a lighter color at the entry portal with darker columns which would either be the cobalt blue as originally proposed, or could match the darker blue of the sign as Planning had recommended.

Mr. Zimmerman agreed to having the columns the same color as the sign with a lighter portal. Mr. Oney agreed and said that the color is woven throughout the campus on the other signs too, so it would be consistent.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to speak in regards to this case. [There was no one.]

Mr. Oney confirmed that he agreed to the condition.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because it is consistent with the preliminary development plan and the final development plan criteria with one condition:

- 1) That the blue columns for the Mercedes Benz facility utilize the same color of blue (Pantone 3025C) as the monument sign faces.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Krumb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**2. Germain Lexus Car Dealership 3855 and 3885 West Dublin Granville Road
09-069AFDP/CDDS Amended Final Development Plan
Corridor District Sign Review**

Chair Amorose Groomes swore in those who intended to speak in regards to this case including the applicant's representative, Jack Reynolds, Smith & Hale and City representatives.

Claudia Husak presented this request for changes to signs for the Germain Lexus car dealership, located on the west side of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this PUD was specifically created for the car dealership that allowed two buildings to be developed on two parcels. Ms. Husak said the smaller building is for pre-owned vehicles and the larger building is for new vehicle sales. She presented an aerial photograph with the May 2008, approved final development plan overlaid on it. She said that plan included changes to the function of the new car sales building that had service up until that point also in this building, and then the service moved across the street to the service center recently built. Ms. Husak said the main point of that application was architectural changes and modifications to both buildings that then made those buildings match the architecture for what was approved for the service center.

Ms. Husak said that when the sales facility was reviewed by the Commission for site and architecture modifications, the Commission discussed the height of the signs since the applicant had requested signs at a higher height to match what was approved at the service center and to be more cohesive for the approved architecture at that time. She said the Commission did not find favorable for that request.

Ms. Husak said that in the meantime, the applicant installed the signs for the new vehicle sales building, and they are at the 17-foot height allowed in the development text. She said that photos were included in the Commission packet. She said they are installed right underneath the ribbing band, a Lexus signature item, and they are located on the darker red brick shown. She said it was an internally illuminated black routed sign. Ms. Husak said all of the elevations approved by the Commission in 2008 included the signs for the new car sales building at 17 feet. She said there were two signs because the lot is a corner lot, and there is the sign for the pre-owned building which is at a 17-foot height as well.

Ms. Husak said that the applicant is now proposing to relocate the signs. She said there are no design, color, size, or type of sign changes proposed. She said the sign is 22 feet, 3 inches high for the new vehicle sales building, and 19 feet, 6 inches for the pre-owned building. Ms. Husak presented an elevation showing what that would look like along SR 161.

Ms. Husak said in April, the Commission discussed signs and found that there were signs appropriately located higher on a building, particularly when the architecture calls for it, in instances when there is a sign band or something like that. She said this is one of those instances where really the architecture calls for the sign to be located logically in that space. Ms. Husak said the same has been approved by the Commission for the service facility which is located at a height of 21 feet and the Trader Joe's Center has some signs also located higher than 15 feet, which is what the Code allows or 17 feet which is what this PUD allows.

Ms. Husak said that Planning has looked at the architecture and how the signs fit within it, and even though they do not meet the text, they are supportive of this request and are recommending that the Commission would look at approving a text or Code deviation which would allow signs to be 22 feet 3 inches high, or 19 feet 6 inches tall for the pre-owned building. She said Planning is also recommending approval of the request for this Amended Final Development Plan and the Corridor Development District Sign Review which requires two motions. Ms. Husak said there are no conditions.

Jack Reynolds, Smith & Hale, referred the Commissioners to the color photographs of the signs instead of the black and white drawings. He pointed out the color contrast between the dark red brick and the black plastic letters affixed to the building and said that they became almost invisible to passing traffic. He said the taller building having the sign band higher necessitates the location of the sign at 22 feet, 3 inches and 19 feet, 6 inches. He said the aim of signage is to identify the site. Mr. Reynolds said that he thought Mr. Germain was at a disadvantage in terms of the sign for his site. Mr. Reynolds said in this circumstance, Mr. Germain has to primarily rely on the signage and for all practical purposes, this looks like an office building because the cars are hidden by the wall. He pointed out that they did listen to the Commission's comments in 2008, and it was not as if they did not go forward and try to adhere to what was requested. He said the new car building is complete and the pre-owned car building is almost done. Mr. Reynolds said they are looking to locate the signage on that building and they would love to be able to put it up on the band instead of below.

Warren Fishman disclosed that Mr. Germain and he had a brief conversation several months ago about this sign and he had told him to contact Mr. Langworthy.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak to this case. [There was no one.] She asked Richard Taylor, who pulled this consent case to begin the Commission's discussion.

Mr. Taylor said it was a very attractive building, and he agreed that in a vacuum the upper band, area is certainly the appropriate place for the sign to go.

Mr. Taylor referred to the Commission's sign panel and building discussion in April. He said part of that discussion was regarding specifically the Billiards Plus building. He said the older buildings on Sawmill Road are designed to be seen from a distance and there is a clearly designated area for the signs. He said to the credit of that building, unlike some more recent buildings in this community, the place for that sign was part of the architecture which he thought was very important

Mr. Taylor said his concern here is that this was a significant remodeling of the building. He said he could not, because he was not on the Commission when it was originally approved, figure out how an obvious sign panel was designed on this building that is 22 feet above the ground, and then not be allowed to use that as the sign panel. He said it seemed to him that the appropriate thing to have happen at the beginning was to design the sign panel to meet the 17-foot height, and that was where the signs went. Mr. Taylor said he was a little reluctant at this point, given that there was certainly an opportunity when this building was redesigned several years ago, to put the sign panel in the right place so that the sign would meet the Code, and now

because it was agreed that it would look better up there, it does not look as prominent as it would where it is that the Commission would want to move that up. He said it would be more appropriate to move that sign panel down, but he realized that was totally impractical. However, he said in a philosophical sense, he thought that was where they would rather be. He reiterated that was his primary concern.

Mr. Taylor said that when the Commission has buildings that come in for approval, that they need to make a much stronger effort to make sure that the sign panels are designed early-on as part of the architecture of the building. He said on some of the retail projects it is very obvious where the signage goes and it was just a matter of approving one sign over the other and the placement was without question. Mr. Taylor said on a building like this, the location of the sign panel is an integral part of the architecture, and again it is the integral part of the architecture is outside of the Zoning Code, and at this point, given that to approve raising that up just because it was not done right the first time through.

Amy Krumb clarified that this Amended Final Development Plan PUD text remaining is just for these two buildings. She asked if the Corridor Development District Sign Review should have a separate motion.

Ms. Husak said the Corridor Development District Sign Review could be combined with the Amended Final Development Plan motion, especially since there are no conditions tied to either one of those two. She said the second vote would be the text modification.

Ms. Krumb confirmed that the Amended Text for the PUD was just for those two buildings, and the Sign Review was just the fact that the Commission is obligated to review the signs because they are in the Corridor Development District, and the Commission is not setting a precedent for other signs in this area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they were not legally, but other signs were cited that the Commission has changed that do not meet the text. She said although legally, they are not setting that precedent, that they are indeed continuing a precedent that the Commission has set.

Ms. Krumb clarified that the Corridor Development District was east of Riverside Drive and included Trader Joe's Center and the Dublin Village Center.

Todd Zimmerman recalled that the Commission reviewed signs for Digital Interiors on Riverside Drive, and they kept that sign exactly where it was supposed to be located. He said it was not so much the sign height as it was the physical sign color placed on the brick that kept the sign from being visible. He said if they had used beige in the upper section or a lighter color for their signage, it would stand out more. He said it was jumbled together because of the darker background of the brick. He said at the service garage, it was more distinctive and from a distance, you know something is there, but as you get up to it, the thing that caught his eye was the ground sign. He said by the time the trees develop, it does not matter how high the sign on SR 161 is located because some day it will be covered. He said it was the same thing at Billiards Plus on Sawmill Road, because the way the trees were in the lot, you would not be able to see the sign. Mr. Zimmerman said the sign height is being changed, but he asked if it was the height of

the sign, or was it because you cannot read the sign because of the color of the sign on the darker brick meshed together so well that it is hard to tell.

Warren Fishman suggested ground signs would be a solution. He asked why the building was designed so that the sign band was not in Code. He said it seemed to be designed so that they could come back later and ask to raise the sign. He said when the building was remodeled the sign band could have been anywhere.

Mr. Oney said the building was basically new, and he thought from a remodel standpoint, they started over when they did the building. He said from the comments he heard and when they looked into the corridor and what they wanted to service in this facility being the architecture, they went round and round in those discussions. He said they definitely changed the architecture into something that he thought everyone was comfortable with. He said originally that they had a higher band. He said the original building was very low; about 20 feet to the top of the building and the sign was at 17 feet. Mr. Oney said with the architecture agreed upon, it went away from that look and the standard Lexus look and went to a very tall 30-foot building with parapets, arches, and canopies. He said they had the sign at 21 feet on the 30-foot building, and proportionately on the top band and it looked appropriate when they presented it. However, he said in the end, they lowered it down to 17 feet. Mr. Oney said the only thing left of the Lexus identity is really the signs. He said the logo, fonts, heights, and colors are standard for all the Lexus dealerships. He said they looked at a red brick and a black sign and in black and white the contrast looked good, but in reality when it was up, there really was a problem with using the Lexus individual letters in that color on that brick. He said it would work much better on the lighter band. He said that was how they arrived at the whole process.

Mr. Fishman said they could have done anything they wanted to do because the building was in steel. He said he did not understand why the building was not designed so the sign band would meet Code. He said it just appears what they did was design the building, and then put the sign band too high on purpose and came back to raise the sign. Mr. Fishman said he would like the answer to his question, just to make him comfortable in voting. He asked when they started from scratch essentially and they had the direction of the Commission and the Code, why did they put the sign band in the wrong place.

Mr. Oney said if the sign band referred to was the top white portion, that white dryvit band with a little banding was the only thing they had to reiterate the Lexus brand. He said that band is really more than a sign band; it is a part of the Lexus brand. He said with the service center and this, it was really leaving a little bit of the identity or recognizable features of all the Lexus stores. He said when they moved the sign down, they left the band on as a Lexus feature on the top, and that was how it happened. He said they moved the sign down to the brick in the final architecture.

Mr. Zimmerman rephrased Mr. Fishman's comments and question, and said when they first came with the architecture for this building; Mr. Oney knew that height was going to be at 17-feet. Mr. Zimmerman said the 17-foot height was always in play. He said it was never lowered. He said that was the starting number from day one. Ms. Husak confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Fishman recalled that when the Commission approved the building, the sign height was 17 feet. He said the Commission did not tell them where to put the sign band. He said when the building was under construction the sign band could have been lowered if they wanted to do so. Mr. Fishman said what it appeared was that it looked like the building was designed so that the sign would be out of Code. Mr. Fishman said it would look better in the sign band; no one disagreed with that. He said what is being said is the Commission cannot understand and does not want to set a precedent. He said he was in full agreement that the sign looked better in the sign band but he thought the sign band was in the wrong place. He suggested that rather than tear the building down and start over, that Mr. Zimmerman's suggestion that they are allowed to have a ground or a wall sign, that maybe they should go back and design mound signs that are much more appropriate that people can see much better. He said the goal is also to have the trees fill out and have the Dublin look, so that in ten years, you probably would not see the sign and the sign band.

Mr. Zimmerman said when looking up SR 161, Planning may be looking for a cleaner look without the signage along the roadway, ground signs, but going with the wall signs to cleanup the look of SR 161 along there to the point. He said basically, the answer is they designed the building and the signage was actually forethought and to him they always knew the sign height because they were working with the original 17-foot sign height. He said to him, this was an afterthought.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agreed that the sign needs to go on the sign band. She said that is where it belongs and where it was really designed and intended to go always. She said the Commission should have seen this coming, collectively as a Commission and Planning because clearly, in the design of this building, this is the intent of where that sign needs to go. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was really torn because she drove through the site today, and the sign cannot be read; you would have to know that it was a Lexus dealership. She said she hated to see a monument sign because she did not think that was appropriate and what was want to be seen on SR 161. She said she hated to continue to bend the rules, because the next time Ms. Husak comes with a Planning recommendation, she is going to add this to the list of signs that the Commission did not do their job on, and she is going to read this one into the record also. However, she said when she looked at the beautiful building they built across the street with the sign in the sign band, and it looks good and it would provide some consistency to have this sign in the same location that it is on that building. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was inclined to put the sign where it belongs because she did not know if the Commission made them come back with cream-colored lettering on brick that it would give them something that was better than what was being requested. She said the Commission needs to do more of their homework upfront, and they need to get the job done so that when people come back, the Commission has firmer ground to stand on.

Mr. Fishman said he was not trying to blame staff, but he did not know that it was the Commission's responsibility, but that it was staff's responsibility to know where the sign band is going to be when it is presented to the Commission. He said he did not have the expertise to say a sign band was too high. Mr. Fishman said it was Planning's responsibility to present to the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said when she said 'we' it was we, collectively.

Eugenia Martin presented this request for review and approval of an amended final development plan to replace one sign and construct a second sign for an existing office building. She said the 2.54-acre site is located on the northwest corner of Avery-Muirfield Drive and Post Road. She said the site is part of the Lowell Trace PUD and described the surrounding uses. Ms. Martin said the building is situated near the corner of the intersection and parking is located behind the building. She said there is a right-in and right-out access to the site from Avery-Muirfield Drive and a full access driveway located off Post Road. Ms. Martin said the Final Development Plan for this site included a multi-tenant sign, located along Avery-Muirfield Drive and an address sign located off Post Road, to the east of the full access entrance drive. She said the Lowell Trace development text specifies the sign type, material, and illumination, but defaults to Code on the number, height, area, and setback.

Ms. Martin said the proposed modifications include altering the sign area and increasing the height of the multi-tenant sign on Avery-Muirfield Drive, and adding a second multi-tenant sign on Post Road.

Ms. Martin said the existing Avery-Muirfield Drive multi-tenant sign is five foot, six inches in height and has a sign face area of approximately 30-square feet. She said the proposed sign will increase in height to eight-foot, seven inches, and the sign face area will increase to approximately 33-square feet. Ms. Martin said the existing address sign on Post Road is two-foot, six inches in height and has a sign face area of approximately five feet. She said the applicant is proposing to remove the address sign and construct a multi-tenant sign to the east that matches the proposed Avery-Muirfield Drive multi-tenant sign, both in height and sign face area. She said it was the same sign for both locations.

Ms. Martin said the overall size and location of both signs meet the development text and Code requirements. She said while the overall height of the signs meet Code, Planning is recommending that the sign on Post Road be reduced to six feet in height to be more compatible with the existing signs along Post Road which are typically no taller than six feet. She said the proposed landscape plan depicts blue rug juniper located in a three-foot wide bed surrounding the signs. Ms. Martin said while the information provided does appear to meet Code, Planning is requesting a new landscape plan be submitted that shows continuity and connection with the existing plant material onsite.

Ms. Martin said the proposal complies with the amended final development plan criteria, and the original intent of the final development plan and Planning recommends approval with two conditions:

- 1) That the Post Road multi-tenant sign be reduced in height to six feet to be consistent with the height of the existing signs along Post Road; and
- 2) That a revised landscape plan demonstrating continuity with the existing landscape on the site be submitted for Planning approval prior to submitting for a sign permit.

Amy Kramb confirmed that only the Post Road sign was asked to be six feet. She asked where the one-foot, eight inches was coming from. Ms. Martin said that Planning recommended that it come off the stone base because the cabinet height needed to be fixed in order to address all the tenants.

Chris Testa, 6805 Avery-Muirfield Drive, the applicant, agreed to the two conditions listed above.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that there were only five tenants today. She asked what would happen if there were six tenants. Mr. Testa said there were only five office condominiums within the building. He said if two tenants wanted to share an office, they could segment a panel horizontally.

Ms. Amorose Groomes could not recall any other office condominiums in Dublin that had every tenant named. Ms. Kramb recalled the Dale Drive multi-tenant sign with all the doctor's names had been approved by the Commission.

Todd Zimmerman asked if they had talked about putting the 6805 address on the building to make it easy to locate. Ms. Martin said they had discussed placing the address on the building sign with the applicant, but the applicant decided to go with naming the building 'Dublin Professional Center'. Ms. Martin presented some existing multi-tenant signs where all the tenants were listed.

Mr. Fishman asked if the multi-tenant sign met Code. Ms. Martin said the height and sign face area meets Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes recalled the gas station request to raise the height of their sign just to meet Code. Claudia Husak explained that their development text referred to Code.

Ms. Martin said that because this application has frontage on two rights-of-way, they are permitted to have a combination like one and one-third of the total height. She said in this case, the total combined height would be 20 feet, so each sign can be ten feet or one eight feet and the other 12 feet, and so forth, as long as it meets the Code with combined height.

Ms. Amorose Groomes recalled that the gas station request for a taller sign was disapproved. She said this was almost like a billboard. She said the building is right up on the street and the sign is going to be placed out onto the street.

Mr. Testa pointed out that the Panera sign was roughly eight feet, nine inches tall, so they were under that. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Panera sign was setback farther off the road.

Mr. Testa said the reason they were changing the sign and investing about \$18,000 to do so, is that they are having problems with tenants' patients not being able to find the building in emergencies. He said they were dealing with people visually impaired not finding the building. He said the mature trees would interfere with any address on the building. He said also, the roundabout hindered the visibility of the sign because of the height of the center.

Mr. Testa said they were fine going with a six-foot tall sign on Post Road because it conforms with the other signs and because that was not where their major issue was.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked to see the photograph of the existing signs. She confirmed that the sign would be internally illuminated.

Mr. Zimmerman clarified that the cabinet size was the same, it was just that 'Dublin Professional Center' was added on the top.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what was the distance off the curb of the Avery-Muirfield Drive sign. Ms. Martin said it was outside of the right-of-way.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if they felt 'Dublin Professional Center' was necessary. Mr. Testa said that they needed either to have the '6805' or the 'Dublin Professional Center' on the top. He said they absolutely needed an identifier which they were missing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the 'Dublin Professional Center' portion could be removed at the top and make the letters of '6805 Avery-Muirfield Drive' in black or something at its current placement so that it would be more legible and cut down the billboard nature of the sign. Mr. Testa said that would still be too low off the ground to be able to see.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if Mr. Testa was happy with the '6805' on the Dublin Professional Center sign, or did it need to be a tad bigger. He said he did not look at it as a marketing tool, but as an identifier of the location. Mr. Testa replied that he would take it as big as they could get.

Warren Fishman pointed out that the sign could not be read now from the roundabout. He said the suggestion to leave the sign the size it was and put directional signs when they get into the building. He said he never looked for the name on a sign for a doctor's office; he looked for the address. He suggested this application be tabled so that the applicant could come back with a redesign of the original sign.

Richard Taylor asked which sign was more of an identifier for the building, 'Dublin Professional Center' or the address. Mr. Testa said currently, the address.

Mr. Taylor questioned if there were other buildings in Dublin called 'Dublin Professional Center' or something similar.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said setting the precedent to permit all tenants names on a sign all through the area was not something they wanted to continue. Mr. Zimmerman noted that Jamie Adkins had indicated that there are signs in Dublin now that list doctors in professional buildings.

Mr. Fishman said they were not on the road, the doctors' names were on signs within the parking lot. He reiterated that this could be tabled so that the applicant could redesign and re-size the sign with the address and Dublin Professional Center or whatever they wanted.

Ms. Husak agreed a tabling would give Planning a chance to investigate what types of signs are on Perimeter Drive and Post Road office developments. Mr. Fishman suggested that Bradenton should be visited.

Mr. Testa reiterated that his issue was sign height because there is no access to the building from Avery-Muirfield Drive going north, you have to use Post Road which is not identified until you

are in the roundabout. He said the Avery-Muirfield Drive/Post Road roundabout was not signed as the Brand Road one.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the entrance issue was present when the building was built and that has not significantly changed. Mr. Testa pointed out that people are not used to the roundabout. He said the roundabout landscaping height has changed the ability to see their sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like the sign to be clean and neat. She said the current '6805' sign on stone was not helping to find the building. She suggested if the building is to be identified by Dublin Professional Center that the names should be removed and the address should be located there.

Mr. Testa said if they raised the five-foot, six inch sign to six-and-a-half feet, put '6805' Muirfield on the stone base, taking the names off as suggested, they would still ask for an additional sign on Post Road. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that the same sign could be on Post Road in a smaller scale. She said either put the name on as the identifier or put the address as the identifier.

Mr. Testa asked if Ms. Amorose Groomes was open to a multi-tenant sign on Post Road. Ms. Amorose Groomes said personally, she would like to see the two signs the same. She said they could be of different scale, but she would like them to be complementary to one another.

Ms. Kramb said she understood trying to make the sign higher, but now it was an advertisement for the people working there. She said what the Commission was saying was to make it an address sign to find the building.

Mr. Testa said if patients could see who was in the building, that would be fine, but if ultimately, they could not find the building, that would be a problem. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the sign proposed does not accomplish his task.

Mr. Taylor asked what the building tenants would say if their street signage was taken away. Mr. Testa said specifically, the dentist received walk-in traffic, so that was an issue for him. He said the dentist had indicated that it was a requirement that his name be on the sign.

Ms. Kramb thought perhaps that was a professional requirement. She said she could easily find her doctor who was on Bradenton by the number address. Ms. Kramb indicated that she was okay with a little a taller sign for the Avery-Muirfield Drive sign.

Mr. Zimmerman said he had no problem with listing the tenants, as it was just part of doing business. He said he understood what the dentist was saying. He said '6805' does not pop out enough on the existing sign. He said the color of the numbers is wrong for the traffic speed. Mr. Testa asked if black lettering was permitted for the address. Mr. Fishman explained that Code limited the number of colors. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that the colors be worked out with Planning.

Mr. Testa requested a tabling.

Ms. Husak asked if the Commission would be inclined to waive the 15-day Rule as part of the tabling motion. Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman made the motion to table this Amended Final Development Plan application and to waive the 15-day Rule.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in regards to this case. {There was no one.]

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes called a short recess.

**4. Thomas Kohler PCD – Subarea E
09-070AFDP**

**4040 Woerner Temple Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those intending to comment in regards to this case, including the applicant Todd Dillon, Director of Development, Anchor Companies, and City representatives.

Mr. Dillon agreed with the contents of the Planning Report. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone from the audience wished to speak in regards to this application, and no one replied.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because it complies with the applicable review criteria and the existing development standards within the area. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

5. The Meaning of Land Use Principles 1 & 5

Team Presentation

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this team of Land Use Principles 1 & 5 consists of Jamie Adkins, Claudia Husak, Carson Combs, Adam Anderson, Todd Zimmerman, and Flite Freimann.

Mr. Zimmerman introduced the team. He said they met twice to discuss the two principles and their meaning. They exchanged information and experiences in Dublin from places they have traveled.

Jamie Adkins thanked Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Freimann for their participation and their wonderful ideas and dialog and Planning was encouraged with the kind of discussions they were

having and the points they were making. She explained how they were going to present the different points.

Ms. Adkins said the first Land Use Principle is “*High quality design for all uses recognizing density has important economic implications, but is an outcome and not a determinant of creating a quality place*”. They discussed what this meant and broke it into two parts; high quality design for all uses; and the idea that density does relate to economics, but only as one determinant and not the main reason not to approve a project. She showed examples of different areas around the country that focused on design details and the importance of quality design in creating place.

Ms. Adkins said we want human scale design, and details that create uniqueness and character. The key was pedestrian safety in design with wider sidewalks, designing clear paths for pedestrian travel and the interrelationship of uses.

Ms. Adkins said the front of the building is not the only view, design character, detail and quality has to continue around all sides, from multiple views especially in a walking environment because you see things much closer.

Ms. Adkins said the design should always be visually pleasing. There are basic characteristics of design, quality and materials that should be incorporated in every project that the city does to ensure good character.

Ms. Husak showed an example of Iris Hollow in Boulder Colorado. She said they looked for a neighborhood that had all the things and she heard of this development at the American Planning Association Annual Conference. She said the buildings have color and have more visual interest. There are only 40 residential units on a small infill site with developments around. She said the interesting point is the density is 5.7 units to the acre with open space and walkability and it works all together. She said this neighborhood sums up Land Use Principle 1.

Ms. Husak said Land Use Principle 5, “*Creating a wide range of housing choices in the community as well as in new neighborhoods*”, is something that Mr. Foegler mentioned in his presentation of work force housing for our businesses. It is also something that throughout the Community Plan Update we noticed is missing and is not just necessary in new developments, but when looking at redeveloping or within existing developments there maybe opportunities to include it. They looked at what it means to have a wider range of housing choices, what it means to be all over the community and what does it mean in newer neighborhoods as well.

Mr. Anderson said one of the things they recognized from the beginning is that population projections show that Dublin will need to have different housing types as time goes along with varying sizes and styles including traditional single family houses, mixed generational housing and multi-family. He said diverse housing should still mean quality and innovation, and should be seamless and fit within the context of the City and the developments. He said they have to prepare for the new professionals and baby boomers becoming empty nesters.

Mr. Anderson explained that new professionals would be looking for unique and more urban environments, to feel close and have a sense of movement and excitement that the urban

environment offers. This includes walking from home to work, and close proximity to walk to dinner, get to a store and then to a bar and then return home.

Mr. Anderson explained that empty nesters want less maintenance of their home and down sizing without a reduction in quality. They want a sense of walkability and access services much closer, and they do not want to have to move.

Mr. Anderson discussed how they could encourage diverse housing. He said that it is important to ensure that development plans have wide variety of housing types and uses, amenities and high quality uses. He said when looking into the future, they need to make sure developments contain an array of uses of residential, commercial and retail. Diversity can include different types of lots including small and large next to each other, in cases such as Westhaven and the example in Alabama, there is a lot of different styles and lot types. This must fit within the development and within the context of the city and fit within a fabric much more beyond itself.

Ms. Adkins said in conclusion they hope they have given the Commission a lot to think about and have given good ideas. The key is with the future land use map and the Community Plan which contains a lot of these great ideas. The key is also going to be incorporating into the city as they move forward and make sure they maintain high quality design, maintain pedestrian scale environment and address changing demographics and make sure we have a well rounded community that reaches out to all ages of the population to ensure everyone has access to high quality of life, and the great community and character here in the City. She said the main idea with housing and design is to focus on who we are and not what we are developing, the “who” is key and needing to be flexible in the future with the Zoning Code update and with Developers to do diversified housing and high quality development.

6. The Meaning of Land Use Principles 2 & 8

Team Presentation

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this Team of Land Use Principles 2 & 8 consists of Jennifer Rauch, Rachel Swisher, and Grant Shiring, and she had the privilege of joining this group.

Grant Shiring began this presentation with Land Use Principle 2, which is creating places to live that have a stronger pedestrian environment, connections to convenient services, and conducive to multi-generational living and social interaction. Mr. Shiring said that the group broke down the principles into three elements that they researched in order to gain a better understanding of the principle itself.

Mr. Shiring said that what their group believes is meant by a “strong pedestrian environment” are places that are comfortable, safe, well-defined, and aesthetically pleasing. He presented examples of commercial and residential areas with weak pedestrian environments.

Mr. Shiring explained that “strong pedestrian environments” are places that people instinctively understand are good and feel comfortable walking in. He described the visual cues to great pedestrian environments, which include well-defined spaces for pedestrians and traffic, buffers with vegetation, and on street parking.

Mr. Shiring said the second element, “connections and convenient services” relates to proximity of use, variety of use, and the amount of available paths, such as streets, sidewalks, and bikepaths. He stated that one tool to demonstrate these connections is a walking map that measures walking time, while another tool is walkscore.com, which is a website that measures the amount of convenient services in an area.

Rachel Swisher said that regarding the third element, “conducive to multi-generational living and social interaction,” the group discussed multi-generational housing, which provides places to live for people of all age groups. She said that the group thought that this would contribute to the creation of an interesting neighborhood and a great place to live. She presented examples that could be well-integrated into existing single family neighborhoods.

Ms. Swisher said that another example of multi-generational living is accessory dwelling units or “granny flats” added to larger homes which are great for older children or aging parents that no longer have the ability to have a place of their own. She concluded Land Use Principle 2 and said that in addition to multi-generational housing, great places to live have amenities that cater to all generations and facilitate interaction among all age groups.

Ms. Swisher said Land Use Principle 8 is “creating better connected places in part to improve the function of the street network and also to better serve neighborhoods.” She stated that Land Use Principle 8 creates the foundation for Land Use Principle 2 through creating a street and path network that facilitates social interaction and convenient connections. She said that “better served neighborhoods” facilitate the creation of a street network that reduces headaches for drivers by giving lots of different travel options, but also gives people a reason to go out on the street and take their kids for a walk or walk their dogs and meet their neighbors or allow their kids to walk to school. She concluded that this Land Use Principle helps transform the street into a public place.

Ms. Rauch summarized that the group illustrated that the Land Use Principles are very interconnected, and for Principles 2 and 8, it is not only about providing connections and efficient movement of traffic but also about creating a great *place*. She said that their group talked a lot about creating a sense of place and what a great place feels like and the environment that you can create through implementing the Land Use Principles. She concluded that creating a stronger pedestrian environment and providing connections to convenient services are all part of creating better places and better neighborhoods that fit with Dublin while taking into account what is appropriate for the community.

7. Annual Items of Interest List

Administrative Request

Ms. Husak said that she had made the changes from the previous meeting and since this was published, they have been invited to a meeting with the City Manager’s Office to give a status update and will take this listing to that group and get feedback from them and defer this discussion until after the meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to take it and get feedback and find if there are changes and is so they will and if not they will move it down the pike.

Other Comments

Mr. Fishman said that the sandwich board signs are all over Dublin now, particularly at Wendy's on Tuttle and asked how does this pertain to the sign ordinance? Mr. Langworthy said they will check out and the sandwich boards that have been allowed in the Historic District. Mr. Zimmerman said the Wendy's location on Tuttle is in Columbus. Mr. Langworthy said if you are seeing others outside the Historic District let them know.

Mr. Fishman said the other is enforcement on signs at the two gas stations on Perimeter, the Shell and the BP, one of the conditions is that there is no signage on the pumps and he had noticed that there are signs on the pumps. Mr. Langworthy said they will look at it.

Mr. Langworthy said there is a hotline number to call when they have concerns (410-4673).

Mr. Fishman said the MJ's candy place had an ice cream cone out front and now the top is off and the velvet ice cream sign is on the sidewalk. He said they work hard here to enforce the regulations. Mr. Langworthy said when you call the number you get right to an inspector and they can go out more quickly.

Mr. Zimmerman said at LaScala there was a lower sign advertising their specials and then it was removed and now it is back painted shiny and new announcing the buffet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 9:04 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.