

**4. Bridge Street Corridor – Code Modification
11-020ADM**

Administrative Request

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this administrative request for review and recommendation to City Council of proposed amendments to the Zoning Code to establish a number of new zoning districts and regulations for the Bridge Street Corridor (BSC). She stated that the Commission is scheduled to continue the review with §153.065(H), Signs.

Rachel Ray stated that at the November 10 meeting, the Commission requested that the sign regulations be reviewed at this meeting, and that they be provided graphics to illustrate the requirements. She pointed out that Planning had included graphics with the meeting packets, but Planning also took the opportunity to reorganize the sign requirements in response to the Commission's comments made on some of the other Code sections on user-friendliness. She noted that a memo had been included in the packets highlighting the changes to the Sign requirements.

Ms. Ray prefaced the discussion with Planning's overarching approach to crafting the sign regulations for the Bridge Street Corridor. She explained that each building type would generally be permitted more signs than would be permitted elsewhere in the city, and that has to do with one of the main principles of the BSC, which is creating walkable, pedestrian-oriented environments and moving away from more auto-oriented designs. She stated that, just as we regulate building form and placement to produce a more walkable pattern, signs are also treated a little differently in form-based codes to produce more pedestrian-oriented places. Ms. Ray noted that the Commission had discussed the importance of integrating signs into the architectural design of buildings in other sections of the Code; the Signs section will define how many signs of each type are permitted, and generally, how they should be sized.

Ms. Ray explained that signs are not intended to be geared toward vehicles as much in the BSC, because one larger sign would probably suffice in an environment where vehicles go by at 45 miles per hour. She said one or two smaller signs are more effective in a pedestrian-oriented environment, because they will create more visibility for pedestrians walking down the street, arriving from across the street, or pedestrians who arrive at a building and park behind it. She said that all of these requirements are intended to create a pleasurable walking, strolling, and window shopping experience.

Ms. Ray explained that to start, Planning combined the sign requirements for several of the Bridge Street zoning districts, the BSC Residential, Office Residential, Office, Commercial, and Public Districts. She said they also addressed each major type of sign, and noted that whenever a sign is not specifically addressed by the BSC Code, that the requirements would default back to the Zoning Code requirements for signs.

Ms. Ray presented the "menu" of permitted sign types. She said that typically one ground sign will be permitted per building, per street frontage. She said however, since the Code will require ground signs to be set back eight feet from the minimum setbacks, the public right-of-way, or the minimum required building zone, the use of ground signs is probably going to be fairly limited in the BSC, based on the limited setbacks of most of the buildings. Ms. Ray said where they are used, ground signs are permitted to be up to a maximum of 24 square feet, whereas the Zoning Code currently allows most commercial ground signs to be up to 50 square feet.

Ms. Ray said the BSC Code provides for a combination of two building-mounted signs per storefront, per street frontage. She explained that if there was a tenant space that turned a corner, an additional two signs would be permitted. She said the maximum permitted areas of each building-mounted sign are typically smaller than what the Zoning Code currently would permit, but that is effectively in exchange for allowing an additional sign, allowing for greater visibility for people arriving from different directions.

Ms. Ray said in addition to these primary building-mounted signs, the code would also allow a secondary, smaller sign, limited to six square feet, that would be located on the back of the building to orient people arriving from the parking lot.

Ms. Ray said other signs addressed in the Sign Code include directory signs, which generally provide generally information for people coming up to a building for upper story tenants, and display signs, which are placed on storefront windows to advertise goods, services, sales, restaurant menus, etc. She explained that Display Signs are intended to be changed frequently and should not entirely cover the windows. Ms. Ray said sandwich board signs will continue to be permitted only in the Historic District.

Ms. Ray said the third category of sign types are the major tenant signs, which are similar to corporate office signs on buildings fronting on I-270 that are intended to call attention to major corporate entities. She said that for the purposes of this Code, "major tenants" have been defined as a tenant that occupies at least the equivalent of the gross floor area of one full floor of a building that is three stories or greater. Ms. Ray said one Major Tenant Sign is permitted per frontage, up to a total of two, and they may be located higher on the building façade.

Ms. Ray explained that the Code allows the Commission to approve special sign plans that would accommodate a wider variety of signs than what the Code currently allows. She presented images from a mixed use development called Crocker Park, which has a very extensive sign plan that allows for a wide variety of signs. She said that in Crocker Park, all signs are highly coordinated with the particular architecture of each building. Ms. Ray said it is this level of detail that could not be anticipated up front to be included in the sign regulations, but the master sign plan provisions would allow for enough flexibility in the future to allow a developer to come in and make a special request, particularly for the shopping corridors in the special parts of the Neighborhood Districts.

Ms. Ray concluded her presentation and offered to answer any questions.

John Hardt asked for confirmation that the intent was to allow master sign plans only in the Neighborhood Districts.

Section 153.065 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (H) SIGNS (1) Intent and Purposes (Page 1 of 9)

Amy Krumb said she did not know why an entire page was needed to state the intent of a sign, because they all know it is for navigation and identification. She thought it needed to specify what is *not* wanted. She said, for example, nowhere in this code does it say whether or not neon, scrolling banner signs, or flashing lights are permitted to be used, and she did not think those sign types would be acceptable.

Ms. Ray clarified that the restrictions on neon signs and changeable is included as a general regulation in the Zoning Code, and there is a reference that states that items that are not specifically addressed in the BSC Code would default back to the Zoning Code regulations.

Ms. Krumb said she would be more comfortable stating what types of signs are not desired.

Steve Langworthy said that the problem with that approach is that you cannot say everything you do not want, and if something is left out, that would make it permitted. He stated that at some point, we would need to discuss new sign technologies and how they should be regulated, perhaps at a future work session.

Section 153.065 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (H) SIGNS (1) Intent and Purposes (c) BSC Office, Office Residential, and Commercial Districts (Page 1 of 9)

Mr. Hardt referred to *...to provide simple and clear visibility and awareness of larger office, commercial and residential uses...* He suggested that rather than the word *uses*, 'residential development' should be used instead, because the intent is to allow a sign for the overall development, not individual residences.

**Section 153.065 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (H) SIGNS (2) General Provisions (c)
(Page 2 of 9)**

Mr. Hardt asked about registered corporate trademarks. He said he understood the paragraph and supported it, but he thought for example that the intent was if Company 'X' from a national brand came to Dublin, and they want to put their logo on the sign, we want to let them do it. Mr. Hardt said he was concerned about how easy it is to establish a corporate trademark. He said for \$75, someone could file a trademark the day before they submit a zoning application and create a logo with 64 colors in it, expressly for that purpose. He asked if there was a way that language could be crafted that would limit the regulation to allow more colors for corporate trademarks that are well established in some way.

Jennifer Readler said that would be tough, but they would give it some thought.

Mr. Hardt said that stating *regardless of the number of colors* obviously has infinite possibilities, and he wondered if it was appropriate for all of the colors in a trademark to count toward one color in the sign, or if all of the colors in the trademark ought to count as colors in the sign. He said for example, if a logo had four colors in it, they could use the logo, but those would be the only allowable colors, as opposed to saying that the logo only counts as *one* of their allowable colors.

Ms. Ray noted that the background itself is also counted as a color, so if you want the logo and copy to stand out from the background, one additional color may be necessary.

Mr. Hardt said he supported the concept, and he agreed that signs should be treated differently in this part of the city; however, he said he was uncomfortable with how open-ended it seemed. He thought that the colors in the logo plus a background color should be enough to solve anyone's problem.

Richard Taylor said he tried to imagine conditions in which this is going to exist. He said he was okay with allowing a wider variety of sign shapes, because we need that variety. He said he understood why the limitation on secondary image size should be eliminated in this area as well. He said he was not however in favor of a sign with too many colors on it, regardless of whether it is a logo or not. He thought the Code should establish what we want, and allow people to see restrictions and design to them.

Mr. Taylor said, for example, if a Home Depot with an orange and white sign came in, he assumes that they would know that they are going to be building stores all over the country with all types of sign requirements, and they would decide to make their sign as simple as they can. He said when there is a local business not looking at the broader, nationwide application of their logo, then that is when he thought they might end up with the "mom and pop" stores wanting to do something really bold on their sign. He thought there should be something in place to keep that from getting out of hand.

Mr. Taylor stated that what he thought would make everything lively in the BSC in terms of signage is the potential variation *between* signs, not so much variation *within* a sign. He said if there is a round sign with just two colors, and 30 feet away at the next storefront is a square sign that is 20 percent larger with one color, that would be great. He said allowing one sign with lots going on would actually have the opposite effect. He noted that Crocker Park had a lot of interesting signs, none of which had a lot of different colors in any one sign.

Mr. Langworthy said that he did not know how to write language that would accomplish that variety among different signs.

Mr. Taylor said he did not know that regulations to require that variety would be necessary. He thought allowing variety in terms of the size of the sign, the shape of the sign, in the amount of the sign that is occupied by the logo, in the fonts, and in the colors, as long as those individual things are limited within each individual sign, that would result in variety.

Warren Fishman stated that there might be some signs that look similar, but he thought most businesses will want their signs to be different. He said that was why colors needed to be limited.

Mr. Hardt said noted that sign size, shape, and color are the fundamental limitations on signs in Dublin. He thought what Mr. Taylor was suggesting was that the sign in and of itself should have a relatively small number of colors and be fairly simple and clear, but the business next door does not have to do what the other business next door did. He said currently, the Code text does not provide any of the "guardrails" within which a single sign needs to stay, and you can have any shape, any logo size, and any number of colors wanted.

Mr. Langworthy clarified that was true, as long as it was within the logo.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that the entire sign could be the logo.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the Commission was stuck on three colors.

Mr. Hardt said a relatively low number of colors would be preferred.

Ms. Krumb suggested four colors because most company logos did not have more than three.

Joe Budde said the Nationwide logo and sign they reviewed tonight was attractive, even if it did have a lot of colors. He suggested that if the trademarked logo is limited to a certain percentage of the sign size and allowed an unlimited number of colors, he thought that could be attractive with the remainder of the sign limited to the background and the graphics. He said for a Starbucks-type sign that is two or three colors, and the logo is the entire sign, perhaps the number of colors should be more limited.

Mr. Langworthy said that could be written.

Ms. Krumb said if the logo took up more than one-third of the sign, it would be limited to a specific number of colors.

Mr. Hardt agreed, and said then the sign should be limited to three or four colors.

Mr. Taylor said he did not think they will find that many, if any, big national companies that have a logo that contains more than two or three colors.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that the old Apple logo had the rainbow colors in it.

Mr. Hardt suggested they could have all their colors and limit the size of the logo, relative to the sign, or they could limit their colors and have their logo occupy the entire sign.

Ms. Krumb clarified that 20 percent of the sign could be a logo of unlimited colors and if it was larger than 20 percent, they would need to stick to four colors for the whole sign.

Mr. Langworthy said he thought that planning could work on language to require something like what the Commission was suggesting.

**Section 153.065 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (H) SIGNS (2) General Provisions (d)
(Page 2 of 9)**

Mr. Hardt referred to subparagraphs one through four, regarding how signs should be measured, while subparagraphs five and six seem out of place because they switch to specific numeric regulations for particular types of signs.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to subparagraph one and asked about signs that are tethered to a building, using something like cables, and would therefore end up exceeding eight feet in height. She asked if they would be excluding something that might be desirable.

Ms. Ray explained that the measurement was only for ground signs, so something tethered to a building would probably be considered a building-mounted sign, which would be measured to the top of the sign itself, not including the tether.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she hoped for great creativity among signs in the Bridge Street Corridor, and she wanted to make sure that we do not create restrictions that would limit interesting designs.

Mr. Hardt referred to subparagraph four regarding sign areas for multiple-tenant buildings and noted that the language in the paragraph relates the size of a sign to the front wall of the building as opposed to relating it to the storefront. He said he was concerned with that method because, for example, we might see a retail building designed in an organized orderly way with multiple storefronts that may or may not be the same size. He said that over time, as tenants change out, the landlord could move interior walls for the purpose of creating a certain square footage for the tenant. He said tying the sign area to the wall frontage would end up creating all different sizes of signs depending on how large the tenant space was in a single building. He suggested tying the sign size to the size of the storefronts rather than wall frontage of individual tenant spaces.

Ms. Ray presented an example building and explained how the measurement was figured. She said that part of the intent was to consider the vertical façade divisions, tying the sign design to the building's architecture. She said they would look at the language to address Mr. Hardt's concern.

Mr. Taylor also referred to subparagraph four as something that has been discussed on multiple occasions. He said this requirement, at least for a multi-tenant building, seems to assume that we are only talking about signs for the tenants on the ground floor. He said they need to think about how they are going to address upper floor tenants because there is some precedent in Historic Dublin for upper floor tenants to have signs on the upper floors of buildings.

Ms. Ray said that they tried to deal with Historic Dublin a little differently for that very reason. She said 'storefront' is defined specifically as applicable only to ground floor tenants as opposed to upper story tenants. She said for most other BSC districts, they would intend for upper story tenants to be identified either through a major tenant sign or a directory sign approach. She explained that the intent of building mounted signs for tenants with individual storefronts is to allow two building mounted signs per street frontage. She noted that perhaps part of the problem was that it said 'tenants' and 'multi-tenant building tenants' instead of 'storefronts.' Ms. Ray said that Planning could clarify the intent.

Mr. Taylor asked if one of the two building mounted signs could be used for an upper floor tenant.

Ms. Ray said that that was the purpose of the directory sign, if there is a ground story entrance to get upstairs. She said beyond that, the only other permitted sign would be a major tenant sign.

Mr. Taylor stated that in the case of a professional office, only being identified by a directory sign would probably be less of an issue, but there might be concerns for business that do have a lot of walk-in traffic and may want to have some more significant sign presence on the outside of the building. He said he

would not expect anything close to the amount of signs that a storefront would have, but he could see a situation where someone might build a large multi-tenant building where there is some type of a small galleria or mall that is accessed through a single entrance, and there are multiple tenants accessed from the interior. He said if those tenants are only identified on the interior, they would have no exposure on the outside of the building other than the directory, which would make them difficult to find. Mr. Taylor was concerned that the directory sign would not be very much in the way of identification until you are actually at the building, and therefore upper floor tenants needed to be better accommodated.

Todd Zimmerman suggested a blade type of sign for upper story tenants.

Mr. Taylor said blade signs were often used for second floor tenants in Historic Dublin, and he liked them.

Mr. Hardt referred to subparagraph five regarding wall sign height and asked if the roof eave or top of the ridgeline was considered the roofline on a gabled roof.

Ms. Ray said if it was a pitched roof, it would be the eave line.

Mr. Hardt understood the intent to keep signs on the vertical building façades, but he said he could interpret the roofline as being the highest point on the roof.

Ms. Ray noted that *roofline* was defined as *the uppermost line or point of the façade or parapet of a flat roof structure, or the lower edge of an eave, gable, or rake of a sloped roof structure.*

Mr. Hardt said 14 inches was fairly deep for channel letters and asked about the logic behind the number.

Mr. Langworthy explained that the mounting cannot push the letters out more than 14 inches, because after that point, the sign becomes a projecting sign. He said 14 inches was not a magic number, it is just a number that has been used in other communities.

Ms. Ray explained that 14 inches would also allow some lighting behind the letters.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that 14 inches would be nothing for a major tenant sign on the fourth floor.

Mr. Langworthy said that at some point there has to be a differentiation between wall signs and projecting signs.

Mr. Hardt referred to subparagraph six regarding projecting signs. He thought 10 feet apart was not very far for signs projecting six feet out from a building.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there would not be more than one projecting sign on any given storefront.

Ms. Kramb pointed out that there could be two doors next to each other for storefronts extending in opposite directions, or if there were two upstairs tenant spaces close to two other storefronts, they easily could be located within ten feet of one another.

Mr. Hardt said it seemed like tying the distance between signs to the divisions in the architecture or the rhythm of the building would make more sense than an arbitrary number like 10 feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed with Mr. Hardt.

Mr. Hardt referred to subparagraph seven, regarding different sign types permitted on the same frontage, and said that he guessed this means that one tenant in a building might choose to have an awning sign and a blade sign, and the next tenant might choose to have a wall sign and an awning sign.

Ms. Ray said a tenant could also have a wall sign and a ground sign if the site configurations allowed a ground sign, which is a combination not currently permitted by the Zoning Code.

Mr. Hardt asked the other Commissioners if that was what they wanted, or if two storefronts with the same architectural treatment should have the same signs.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if the example of the mixed use building on the screen was consistent, that configuration did not bother her.

Mr. Langworthy said that allowing different types of signs goes back to achieving the variety of signs the Commissioners said that they wanted.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to Mr. Hardt's earlier point, she thought those signs did not bother her because they are located in architecturally appropriate places.

Mr. Hardt said he understood, but he was maybe only half way there. He said that if there is a building with four architecturally identical storefronts and then one different storefront on the corner, he thought that one should have a special sign treatment.

Mr. Taylor noted that the sign treatments are likely going to be similar within the allowable sign types, so the awnings are going to be about the same size and position, they can just choose different types.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that as it is written here, the only real restriction is the size, because the colors, fonts, and everything else are not limited.

Ms. Krumb said she would be okay with all of the signs being different.

**Section 153.065 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (H) SIGNS (2) General Provisions (e)
(Page 2 of 9)**

Mr. Zimmerman asked what was meant by, *A non-commercial message may be substituted for a commercial message on any sign regulated by this chapter.*

Ms. Readler explained that this provision allows for First Amendment protection for freedom of speech.

Mr. Hardt asked if this was something they had to allow in the code.

Ms. Ray explained that the consultants had recommended this provision in the initial draft of the code. She said that it was just intended to confirm that the sign requirements are not intended to regulate content, rather than time, place, and manner.

Mr. Hardt asked about a Whole Foods or a Trader Joe's who wanted to have their store name at their main entrance, in addition to their six other storefronts down the sidewalk, and over those, if they wanted to put phrases like 'Choose Organic,' 'Buy Local,' 'Live Healthy,' etc. He stated that those were not commercial phrases, which would be permitted by this regulation. He said if that was not the intent, the requirement should be clarified.

Mr. Langworthy stated that those phrases would be considered commercial phrases because they are advertising the business itself. He said something like, 'Get Out of Afghanistan' would be a non-commercial message example.

Ms. Readler said she thought that subsection (f), Required reviewing bodies shall not address the content of the sign message, would be sufficient.

Section 153.065 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (H) SIGNS (3) BSC Residential, Office Residential, Office, Commercial, and Public Districts (a) Ground Signs (Page 3 of 9)

Mr. Hardt said he concluded from the presentation that there were at least significant parts of the BSC where ground signs are not likely to be appropriate. He said initially, he questioned ground signs being permitted at all, but after he thought about it, he decided that there are some areas where they seemed to make sense. He asked if it made sense to narrow down where ground signs should be permitted.

Ms. Ray clarified that ground signs are likely going to be limited because the draft regulations require them to be set back eight feet from the *minimum* required build zone (RBZ) or setback. She said if you have a building with high a front property line coverage building requirement and a fairly narrow RBZ, there just might not be enough space for a ground sign. Ms. Ray said a building with a courtyard or a greater setback like the commercial center building type, ground signs could be permitted, and those might be the circumstances where they would be more appropriate.

Mr. Hardt said he thought that if there is a required build zone in effect, then that struck him as a site where a ground sign would not be appropriate in the first place. He said that his concern was that in a dense, urban, walkable environment, ground signs do not seem like the right kind of signs.

Mr. Langworthy said the best example was if there is a courtyard, and the sign is set back from the RBZ, a ground sign could make a nice entry feature, and at that point, it would be more pedestrian-oriented anyway. He noted that 24 square feet, the maximum size permitted for ground signs, is not very big.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that in places like German Village, Grandview, or Georgetown in Washington, D.C. you will rarely see ground signs, because it is too dense. He suggested that one solution would be to take the entire notion of a ground sign and define which parts of the BSC where they are appropriate, and which they are not. Mr. Hardt said this seems to say that they are allowed everywhere if you can figure out how to make it happen.

Ms. Ray suggested that allowing ground signs in these limited circumstances goes back to trying not to prohibit some more imaginative sign designs. She said if someone really wanted to do something really cool for a ground sign and could figure out a way to do it, they would want to allow that to happen. She said they are most likely to be used with buildings where there is a greater setback like the public building type, perhaps for a library or something along those lines, where a ground sign would be appropriate, as opposed to the mixed use building, where it was expected to be more urban and probably less appropriate, and not always even possible based on site configurations, anyway.

Mr. Taylor agreed that there generally should be a blanket acceptance of a variety of signs in the Bridge Street Corridor, and noted that there will be practical limitations on sign type based on the location of the building in the RBZ or its particular setback.

Table 153.065-I: Ground Sign Requirements (Page 3 of 9)

Mr. Hardt referred to the requirement stating, *Ground Signs may be landscaped where appropriate*, and asked if it should be *shall be landscaped* instead.

Mr. Langworthy said that Planning had had a long discussion about that because they thought about if you had one that was in a courtyard, that you might want to allow a sign that was located within a hardscape design feature, and then putting landscaping around it would look odd.

Mr. Taylor noted that it did say *where appropriate*, so if it is in an environment where it is appropriate to landscape, then it should be required.

Section 153.065 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (H) SIGNS (3) BSC Residential, Office Residential, Office, Commercial, and Public Districts (b) Building-Mounted Signs A. (Page 3 of 9)

Mr. Taylor said he was confused by the phrase, *In addition to a permitted ground sign*, which seemed out of place and redundant. He asked if the intent is that all Building-Mounted signs shall comply with the provisions of Section 163.065-J.

Ms. Krumb said the way it is written, the sign types seem to be cumulative, such that you can have a ground sign, two additional building signs, and so on.

Ms. Ray explained that the intent was that a site could have a ground sign if it can fit onto a site, and in addition, it could also have building-mounted signs.

Ms. Krumb said that subparagraphs B. and C. under (b) Building-Mounted Signs conflict with each other.

Ms. Ray explained that buildings are permitted a maximum of two building-mounted signs, but if the building has multiple-tenant storefronts on the ground floor, each storefront is permitted a combination of any two of the four building-mounted sign type options.

Mr. Hardt reiterated that he did not understand subparagraph C, *Buildings with two or more ground floor storefronts are permitted up to two different building-mounted signs for each ground floor tenant*. He asked if that meant each tenant could pick two types of building-mounted signs, but not all four.

Ms. Ray clarified that an individual tenant cannot have all four types, but there could be all four types on one building associated with different tenants.

Mr. Hardt said he was okay with that, but the intent was unclear. He said the only thing he would object to is that display signs in the windows ought to be one of the types in the menu that you choose from.

Ms. Ray said the concern was that if there was a restaurant menu sign, it would be part of the 20 percent limitation for window signs. She said that a retail '50% off sale' sign, for example, was intended to be changed frequently, different from what the window sign would be to identify the name of the business.

Ms. Krumb asked if a window sign was defined based on content, meaning the name of the business or address because then it could be a display sign in the window.

Ms. Ray explained that a window display sign could be up to 10 percent of the window pane area, or 8 square feet, whichever is smaller. She added that a business could also have 20 percent of the area of that window pane for your building-mounted window identification sign. She said in theory, up to 30 percent of one window could be used.

Mr. Taylor asked if a display sign could be anything three feet behind a window.

Ms. Ray clarified that display signs are anything located *within* three of a window; anything more than three feet from a window would not be counted.

Mr. Taylor said that cleared up something he thought should be changed on **page 5, Table 153.065-L: Requirements for Other Permitted Signs, Display Signs – Location: *If not affixed to the window, display signs shall be located at least 3 ft. behind the window.*** He said if it was not affixed to the window, it was not a window sign. He suggested striking the sentence.

Ms. Ray explained the intent was that if it was a poster not attached to the window, but hung in front of it to obscure the view of the interior, it would be counted as a display sign.

Mr. Fishman pointed out that a lot of restaurants in urban areas have a framed menu behind glass on a wall beside the door. He asked how that would be handled in the draft BSC Code.

Mr. Hardt said that it would be considered a display sign and that it was defined as advertising goods or services, is intended to change frequently, and may or may not be attached to or adjacent to a window. He said as written, the Code allows these signs in addition to two of the four building-mounted signs.

Mr. Langworthy said that a menu could be a directory sign because it does not say what has to be on the directory sign.

Ms. Krumb asked if a building could have two wall signs, plus a directory sign, plus a display sign, which would add up to a total of four signs.

Ms. Ray agreed, and clarified that two of the signs would be the primary signs identifying the business, while the other two would be secondary, usually identifying goods or services offered by the business.

Mr. Hardt said the key is the term 'building-mounted sign,' which ought to be defined. He confirmed that Table 153.065-J has four building-mounted sign types, and you get two, while display signs are outside of the table, and therefore they are not a member of the building-mounted sign "family."

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the only note she had on the Table was with regard to legibility, because it is very difficult to understand how many of each sign type are permitted, and in which combination.

Ms. Ray said that Planning could look into clarifying the regulations; however, ultimately, she said it was Planning's intent to have a "user guide" or something similar to help clarify how to use the BSC Code.

Ms. Krumb suggested something up front to state how many signs are permitted for each property. She said that she thought allowing a ground sign *and* two building-mounted signs *and* a directory sign *and* a display sign would be a lot of signs.

Mr. Hardt said that was why he thought display signs ought to be a member of the building-mounted sign family. He said he understood that there were four different kinds of building-mounted signs, including wall, awning, projecting, and window signs, and as a retailer, he could pick two; but if he was a retailer that sold cell phones and he knew that as part of his business he wanted to put stickers on his window advertising cell phone sales, he did not think it was unreasonable to say he could do that, but it would count as one of his two permitted signs, and if he put up stickers on the windows, he had to give up one of his permitted building-mounted signs.

Mr. Fishman said he was worried about sign clutter. He said in nice areas, there is usually a sign over the door, and a menu sign, and that's it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said in downtown Naples, there are signs everywhere, and it is still a very nice place.

Mr. Hardt said any given developer has two options available to them, they can comply with the BSC Code as it is written, or they can submit a sign plan in the two neighborhood districts. He said he would not be opposed to telling the development community in general that they have fairly narrow choices; they can play within the rules if they want predictability and want to know exactly what they are getting, and if they want to do something different, they have the option of showing the Commission the whole picture and getting a sign plan approved.

Mr. Langworthy explained that there were actually two options. He said the sign plan is specifically for the two neighborhood districts, but there is also the waiver provisions, where an applicant can come before the Commission and ask for something different.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not a fan of signs attached to windows. She said she did not mind banners as long as they would be at least three feet behind a window. She suggested that perhaps the regulations should consider the signs that are affixed directly to the window itself.

Mr. Langworthy noted that the hardest thing to enforce in the Zoning Code are the temporary window sign limitations because they are so easy to change in and out. He said he would rather have some allowance for temporary window signs, so the Code can say that they would be permitted some amount, but not allow them to go overboard.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thought it would be easier to say they could have nothing.

Mr. Langworthy said he wished that it was, but from an enforcement standpoint, retailers will then argue that they should have something, and at least they can have 10 percent.

Mr. Hardt said he thought display signs should be permitted, but the business owner should be able to choose what they want. He said if they want window display signs, they would have to give up one of the two permitted building-mounted signs.

Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Fishman said they agreed with that approach.

Table 153.065-J, Building Mounted Sign Requirements (Page 4 of 9)

Mr. Hardt said under **Wall Signs**, the table referred to *building or storefront*. He said again, those lead to different conclusions, so he thought 'storefront' was the right word to use. He said also, under **Location**, it referred to storefront signs, which is a term not used elsewhere. He confirmed that it meant a wall sign associated with a storefront.

Mr. Hardt referred to **Awning Signs**, and said he thought it meant to say, *only 1 sign permitted per awning*, instead of *for an awning*.

Section 153.065 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (H) SIGNS (3) BSC Residential, Office Residential, Office, Commercial, and Public Districts (c) Major Tenant Signs (Page 5 of 9)

Mr. Hardt confirmed that the intent was that a major tenant was anybody that occupies an area at least as large as the ground floor of the building.

Ms. Kramb confirmed that a business could get two building mounted signs, one ground sign, and a major tenant sign, and a directory sign.

Ms. Ray said if a business tenant was large enough to meet the definition of a major tenant, then that would be the case.

Mr. Hardt said conversely, if there was a building with a 20,000-square-foot footprint, and he was a tenant that occupied 16,000 square feet of the second floor, he got no signs except identification on a directory sign.

Mr. Taylor said he did not think there was adequate provision for businesses in denser areas, where significant businesses will be on upper floors.

Ms. Ray suggested a projecting sign or a blade sign over the entrance, or one window sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that if upper floor tenants are permitted an additional sign, the area should come out of the area permitted for first floor tenants; otherwise, we are just getting more signs on a building, and more is not necessarily better.

Ms. Ray pointed out that another objective to keep in mind is that all of the permitted signs are intended be visible from different vantage points, such as people coming from different directions, and whether they are pedestrians or arriving by car. She said that one would be very unlikely to see every permitted sign from any single vantage point.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thought there needed to be a maximum number of signs on a building.

Mr. Taylor suggested that if someone wanted to have a sign for an upper floor tenant, they would be required to obtain a sign plan for the entire building, allowing for some negotiation to maintain balance.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not know how that would be legislated.

Mr. Hardt said that would turn the Commission into a sign review commission. He suggested that if a landlord leased out the second floor, they could have a major tenant sign on the building, and if the third floor was leased they could have another major tenant sign (one each).

Ms. Ray explained that if there were two frontages, they could have two major tenant signs; otherwise they got one major tenant sign per building.

Mr. Hardt said as a landlord, he could theoretically tell the second and third floor tenants which sign they could have. He confirmed that the two major tenant signs, if permitted, did not have to be the same, and stated that by having this discussion, the Commission has already seemed to agree that signs on the top of a building are okay. He said these signs are permitted as long as a large enough space is leased, but if the threshold was lowered for what it took to earn a major tenant sign, and the landlord was told that they got two major tenant signs, and they can be given to whichever tenants the landlord wanted, one could be allotted to the tenant on the second floor from an earlier example that had 16,000 square feet.

Mr. Langworthy asked if major tenant signs should just be regulated by building size; that they are permitted whenever they are associated with a building that is three stories or greater.

Mr. Taylor said that addressed a large part of the issue, but the other part was that it did not change the orientation of other signs on the building and the overall accumulation of signs.

Mr. Hardt said there could not be a total cap on the number of signs permitted, because you can never state exactly how many retail spaces there might be for a single building.

Mr. Fishman suggested limiting the total number of square feet permitted for signs on the building.

Ms. Ray said that when buildings come in for review, they will be required to show where all of their permitted signs are going to be located, since signs are required to coordinate with architectural design, and therefore the number of signs will be identified up front.

Mr. Fishman reiterated that there needed to be a limit on the number of square feet permitted for signs for each building, depending upon the size of the building.

Mr. Hardt said that there were already provisions that said larger buildings get one, two, or on rare occasions, three major tenant signs. He suggested a provision be added that said that in no case, shall major tenant signs outnumber the number of stories.

Mr. Langworthy said that major tenant signs require buildings with three stories to start with.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Mr. Hardt if he was comfortable with the quantity of signs.

Mr. Hardt said yes, but he thought he would actually lower the threshold of what was just said, which is to say if you have a substantially sized two-story building, he thought that a major tenant sign to identify the upper floor tenant would be appropriate. He said that he liked the way the major tenant sign provisions had been set up, but he thought in a two-story building, there should be some way to identify second-floor tenants. He said that perhaps it did not need to be a major tenant sign, but a larger sign.

Mr. Langworthy said they would have two thresholds. He said obviously, a single-floor building has a set number and a two-story building would have some means of identifying somebody on the second floor, but you could not take that same mechanism or package to a three-story building. He said when you get to a building with three or more stories, you are now into the major tenant sign provisions. Mr. Langworthy said they might have something that has some sign allowance for second floor tenants on a two-story building, and once you go to three and above, you are limited to major tenant. He asked if that would work.

Ms. Krumb thought that was a start, but she thought they should still limit the total number of signs.

Mr. Langworthy said that he had no way to do that, because there are too many different circumstances relating to building type, street frontage, possible number of tenant storefronts, or stories, for example.

Mr. Fishman thought that architects could design a building so that it could end up with a ton of signs, simply by putting doors on the first floor that lead to upper floor tenants.

Mr. Langworthy said that would not be a storefront, as defined, and therefore they would not be permitted the two building-mounted signs.

Mr. Taylor said he was less concerned with the example of an upper floor tenant that did not qualify for a major tenant sign, because he was more worried about small office tenants who cannot rent first floor tenant spaces, yet still experience a lot of walk-in traffic and want to be part of the action in the Bridge Street Corridor. Mr. Taylor pointed to an example of a doctor in his building that sees a lot of business and also has a small sign on a multi-tenant sign on the building. He said he did not know the solution, but that was why he suggested that perhaps a solution is that if a building owner wants to allow upper floor tenants to have a sign separate from a major tenant sign, that crosses the threshold into requiring the whole sign package for the entire building.

Mr. Langworthy said he would rather try to come up with a straight-forward provision for a two-story building with upper floor tenants, and then allow the major tenant provisions to come in at three or more stories.

Mr. Taylor said you could still have the major tenant sign provisions for buildings with three or more stories, but it still does not take care of the need for a sign for small or large tenants on the second floor.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not really like the idea of a major tenant sign on a two-story building because she could not see a major tenant sign on the existing buildings in Historic Dublin.

Mr. Taylor said he was talking about the blade signs on the second floor. He acknowledged that allowing each upper floor tenant to have a sign could result in too many signs very quickly, and that was the question. He asked if there was a way to allow second floor tenant signs without cluttering the building.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked about the types of office clusters, where a building provides reception services for rented out offices. She said technically, they would all be tenants, and there could be 20 or more of these offices on a second floor.

Mr. Taylor said it depended how the signs were regulated. He suggested if there were second floor tenants, perhaps they could be limited to two signs and a total of so many square feet, and that way there could be 30 tenants, but they only had so much space for signs.

Mr. Fishman and the other Commissioners agreed that they did not think there should be major tenant signs on two-story buildings.

Table 153.065-L Requirements for Other Permitted Signs (Page 5 of 9)

Mr. Taylor referred to **Display Signs – Intent**, and said because he was aware of signs that would fit into the display sign category which are images with no text whatsoever, he thought the last part of the sentence should say, *...and signs that show or describe goods or services*, instead of just *describe*. He said that way, a big picture of something like a wedding dress for a bridal shop would be covered.

Section 153.065 Site Development Standards (H) SIGNS (4) BSC Indian Run Neighborhood, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and Vertical Mixed Use District Signs (Page 6 of 9)

Mr. Hardt referred to subparagraph (b) Master Sign Plans, A: *The Planning and Zoning Commission shall be permitted to approve master sign plans that depart from the requirements of this section for sites with an approved Development Plan...* He pointed out that development plans apply to sites with five acres or more, and he asked if master sign plans are intended to only be an available option for sites with more than five acres.

Mr. Langworthy explained that master sign plans were intended to apply to larger development sites, and also for sites with more than one building.

Mr. Hardt thought a master sign plan ought to be an option for anybody. Ms. Amorose Groomes, Ms. Kramb, and Mr. Taylor agreed with Mr. Hardt.

Ms. Ray explained that the intent was to allow carte blanche only for these very specific, very special parts of the BSC in the neighborhood districts to allow these areas to be something different, a destination, as opposed to other parts of the BSC.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said five acres was huge and that there were many places in the Corridor where this could apply.

Ms. Ray agreed that there are some areas where a development site may be five acres, but the buildings themselves come in one or two at a time, with a general concept for the larger area.

Mr. Taylor stated that creating a master sign plan is something that should be optional because it gives a developer the option of coming to the Commission and proposing something special or different.

Ms. Ray clarified that master sign plans were actually required for shopping corridors, which are required in the neighborhood districts.

Mr. Hardt confirmed that master sign plans are required in shopping corridors, but are optional in some other places. He asked about what would happen if he wanted to develop an entire block with one large retail building with residential and office uses that only ended up being three-quarters of an acre, but he still wanted to a sign plan to accommodate special signs for the anchor tenant, and a sign plan for all of the others. He asked why not have the option to do that, because it gives the City the opportunity to

make sure that the signs meet the high standards we have in Dublin, and it also establishes a plan so that when the next tenant comes in, there is already a sign plan in place.

Mr. Hardt referred to the last sentence in subparagraph (b) Master Sign Plans, A: *The Planning and Zoning Commission shall be permitted to approve alternative requirements for sign number, type, size, height, location, and lighting*, and said that because that seemed to cover just about everything related to signs, he did not know why the sentence was needed.

Ms. Ray said it was intended to specify and even encourage vibrant, imaginative sign types and varieties.

Mr. Hardt referred to subparagraph (b) Master Sign Plans, B: *A master sign plan is required for a planned shopping corridor*, and said the sentence was important enough to stand alone with the remainder, *The master sign plan shall be submitted prior to approval of a Site Plan in a shopping center*, in another paragraph. He asked why a sign plan and a Site Plan application could not be submitted simultaneously.

Ms. Ray said they could, but they wanted to ensure that the master sign plan coordinates with the architecture and all of the other site elements that are part of a Site Plan application, but they can clarify.

Mr. Hardt referred to **Table 153.065-M: Gateway Signs, 1 for each frontage along a corridor connector street**. He asked if that was intended to mean that if he had a shopping corridor, and a corridor connector street ran along the edge, he got only one gateway sign along that frontage.

Ms. Ray said the intent was to identify where these key gateway locations might be, and perhaps Planning could look at a better way of doing that.

Mr. Hardt suggested that a gateway sign might be permitted in places where a corridor connector street is perpendicular to the shopping corridor frontage, so gateway signs would be located in places where streets intersect the shopping corridors.

Ms. Krumb asked if this was intended to refer to lot or building frontage.

Ms. Ray said it was intended to be frontage for the neighborhood *district*, and agreed to look at a better way to word the requirements for gateway signs.

Section 153.065 Site Development Standards (H) SIGNS (5) BSC Historic Core and Historic Transition Neighborhood District Signs (Page 6 of 9)

Mr. Taylor referred to subparagraph (a), and said he appreciated that it addressed some of his previous concerns with regard to the Architectural Review Board's review authority in the Historic District, but he would like to clarify the first sentence to read: *All new signs in those parts of the BSC Historic Core and Historic Transition Districts that fall within the Architectural Review District boundaries...*

Table 153.065-N: BSC Historic Core and Historic Transition Districts (Page 7 of 9)

Ms. Krumb referred to **Number** and suggested that it say, *provided that they are all the same type*.

Ms. Krumb referred to **Location**, (first block, last sentence): *Minimum setback of 8 feet from the right-of way or any property line*, and asked if that meant they could choose which property line to use.

Ms. Ray said it was intended to say *...and any property line* to address side property lines.

Ms. Krumb referred to **Size and Height**, and suggested that the word *maximum* should be added before the dimensions since that is the format used elsewhere.

Table 153.065-N: BSC Historic Core and Historic Transition Districts (Page 7 of 9) and Table 153.065-O: Other Signs Permitted in the BSC Historic Core and Historic Transition Districts (Page 8 of 9)

Mr. Taylor said his comment had to do with the conflict with the requirements, especially in Table 153.065-N and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, which are different. He explained that if Table 153.065-N refers to those parts of the BSC that are outside of the Architectural Review District boundaries and therefore the *Guidelines* would not apply, that makes sense because at least the same requirements apply to separate areas that are close together; however, below Table 153.065-O, (c), in the Historic Residential, it says, *The requirements of 153.150 through 153.163 shall apply in the BSC Historic Residential District*, but that section contains a reference back to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, so he thought that there may be a conflict.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that the *Guidelines* are expected to change in 2012, with any of the regulatory language in the *Guidelines* to be removed. He explained that as one of their objectives for the upcoming year, the Architectural Review Board has directed that the *Guidelines* be made into more of an "Applicant Guide" than a regulatory document.

Mr. Zimmerman referred to **Sandwich Board Signs**, which are required to be constructed with subdued colors, and he asked what this meant.

Ms. Ray said sandwich board signs would have to be a natural color; they could not be a bright blue or yellow, for example.

Mr. Taylor asked if display signs were currently permitted in the Historic District.

Ms. Ray explained that they are currently permitted to cover up to 10 percent of the window area.

Mr. Taylor referred to **Sandwich Board Signs – Location** (second block), *Signs shall be placed within 6 feet of the primary ground floor public entrance of the business*. He pointed out that in Zoning Code Section 153.155 (Prohibited Sign Locations), it says that *Temporary signs cannot be in the right-of-way*, and he thought those requirements might conflict.

Mr. Langworthy said that was the reason why they need to call out specific provisions like this, so that it is clear when there are intended to be exceptions from the Zoning Code to the Bridge Street Code. He said the specific requirements override the general.

Mr. Zimmerman referred to **Sandwich Board Signs – General**, *Sandwich Board Signs may include chalk and whiteboard elements*. He recalled seeing a sandwich board sign with a realtor's picture on it and asked if that would be permitted.

Mr. Langworthy explained that it was the realtor's marketing piece and so it was okay.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was a way to regulate where sandwich board signs are located, since several signs could narrow the sidewalk down to two or three feet.

Ms. Ray pointed out that the signs have to have a minimum of 5 feet of unobstructed clearance.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thought that all the sandwich signs needed to be located on the same plane.

Mr. Langworthy said he could write the requirement that way, but he would not be able to regulate it, because someone would have to be in the Historic District at all times to enforce it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like it written that way, so that way they can choose to enforce it if it becomes a problem.

Ms. Krumb asked if they could say the signs had to be within one foot of the building wall.

Ms. Ray said it depended upon how wide the sidewalks were in the Historic District, which could vary.

Mr. Fishman said he thought that a couple of sandwich board signs in the Historic District would have been ok, but now he sees them everywhere, and in a high density area, he thought there would be one sandwich board sign after another.

Ms. Ray pointed out that sandwich board signs are currently only permitted in the Historic District, and the BSC Code keeps it that way.

Mr. Taylor said his favorite sandwich board sign was the Jeni's sign, because every day, a different ice cream is listed, and in his opinion, that was the correct way to use these types of signs.

Mr. Fishman asked if the Code could require that sandwich board signs have to provide additional information beyond just the business name.

Ms. Readler reiterated that the sign requirements could not regulate content.

Section 153.065 Site Development Standards (H) SIGNS (6) Other Signs Permitted in the Bridge Street Corridor Districts (Page 8 of 9)

Ms. Krumb asked if street address signs were an additional permitted sign.

Ms. Ray explained that the Zoning Code currently allows up to 12-inch street address numbers, and instead of a major tenant sign, where applicable, a building could have their address numbers be that sign instead, but because the size of the address numbers would exceed what is currently permitted by the Zoning Code, it needed to be clarified here.

Ms. Krumb asked if a sign permit was required for addresses. She referred to subparagraph A: *Street address numbers shall not require a permit, provided the requirements of Section 153.157(H) are met.*

Ms. Ray explained that typically, address numbers are incorporated on the sign itself if it is a ground sign, which would require a permit.

Ms. Krumb said it made her question what other signs required a permit. She said this was the only time a permit was mentioned.

Ms. Ray said there was a Zoning Code section that lists signs that do not require permits or have special conditions.

Mr. Hardt said he interpreted this as small address numbers on storefronts not requiring a permit and not considered signs, but numbers greater than 12 inches really function more like a sign and would require a permit.

Ms. Ray agreed they could make that clearer.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was any public comment with respect to the proposed sign requirements for the Bridge Street Corridor. [There was none.]

Mr. Langworthy provided a brief overview of BSC Development Code Section 153.066, Review and Approval Procedures for development in the Bridge Street Corridor as it relates to the Planning and Zoning Commission to set up the discussion for next week's meeting. He explained that the process begins with a mandatory Pre-Application meeting with the Administrative Review Team (ART), as requested by the Commission, which must be completed within 14 days of request. He continued that after the Pre-Application Review, the Commission had asked for a means of obtaining public input, so the next step is the Basic Plan Review. He said that the Basic Plan Review has to be completed within 28 days, and the public will have ten days notice of that meeting. He pointed out that there is a time limit placed on the basic plan review of one year, so that if a Development Plan or Site Plan application is not submitted within that specific period of time, another Basic Plan Review would be required.

Mr. Langworthy stated that after the Basic Plan Review, the applicant would be able to submit a Development Plan and/or a Site Plan approval application, each of which begin with the ART. He explained that when the ART reviews the Development Plan and/or Site Plan application, they must make a decision to approve or deny it within 28 days. He noted that if all aspects of the Code are met, then it moves along to building permitting. He said the applicant would have the ability to request a Waiver from the Planning and Zoning Commission to allow them to avoid having to meet a specific Code provision, or the ART can elect to send the Development Plan and/or Site Plan application up to the Commission for their review, still within the 28-day time limit. Mr. Langworthy said that once the decision is made on the Waiver and/or Elective Review, the application would then move forward to building permitting. He pointed out that the Commission still maintains review and approval authority for Conditional Uses, the Open Space Fee-in-Lieu Determinations that they discussed in Section 153.064, and Rezoning and Preliminary and Final Plat approvals.

Mr. Langworthy explained that the ART Pre-Application Review is mandatory for applications in the Historic District as well, with the same 14-day timeframe. He said that the Basic Plan Review has been made optional, since there are so many Architectural Review Board (ARB) approvals, like changing paint color, that would have to be approved by the ARB anyway; however, he thought they may want to consider whether or not the ART ought to be able to require perhaps a basic plan review for special circumstances, and not just leave it as an option of the applicant. He said that from that point, the process is the same for submitting a Development Plan and/or a Site Plan application, which would first be reviewed by the ART, who would then make a recommendation to the ARB for their final review and decision. Mr. Langworthy said that the ART has 28 days to make a recommendation to the ARB, who would also review any Waiver requests, before moving on to building permitting.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that the ARB maintains the same review authority that they have always had, and pointed out that the normal Planning and Zoning Commission approvals for Conditional Uses, Rezonings, and Plats would still apply in the Historic District as they do currently.

Mr. Langworthy concluded that there are other administrative reviews, including the Minor Project Review, which required ART review and decision within 14 days as well, in addition to Administrative Departures. He noted that anything that does not qualify or is not approved for an Administrative Departure can be submitted to the Commission as a Waiver Request.

Mr. Hardt asked if the Waivers can be requested at the applicants' discretion.

Mr. Langworthy stated that the applicant can choose whether to request a Waiver, but it would need to meet certain criteria; otherwise, the applicant would need to meet the BSC Code.

Mr. Hardt confirmed that if an applicant submitted a project, and the ART were to review it find that it was not consistent with the BSC Code, the ART would have two options available – they disapprove the application, or they can kick it up to the Commission for review. He asked if there would be an

opportunity, hypothetically, if the ART were to disapprove an application, for the applicant to say that they would rather pursue a Waiver request.

Mr. Langworthy said that was an option, or they could take the disapproval and leave.

Mr. Langworthy added that there are also provisions for Minor Modifications to approved applications, which includes language that is nearly identical to the language used for Minor Modifications in Planned Districts. He confirmed that the Board of Zoning Appeals would still review Administrative Appeals to administrative decisions.

Mr. Langworthy stated that the Commission's ability to monitor the implementation of the BSC Code is still included. He said that time extensions have to be agreed upon by both the applicant and the City before the extension is granted.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that an abandonment clause has been added. He explained that once a final approval is granted, if an applicant is not actively pursuing completion of the project, or the Director of Building Standards finds a project that has been abandoned, which is defined as when the Building Permit expires, then the approval for that application will lapse.

Ms. Amorose Groomes announced that at the special Planning and Zoning Commission meeting scheduled for December 8, the Commission would review Section 153.066, the Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria in more detail.

Ms. Ray pointed out that some discussion on the BSC Area Rezoning would also be necessary, since notices had been sent out to property owners indicating a possible decision at that meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what there was to discuss, since the Commission did not intend to make a decision on the Area Rezoning until they had concluded their review of the BSC Code.

Claudia Husak clarified that when the agenda for the meeting on December 8 was set, Planning had assumed that the Commission might be a little further along with the Code, and that there may have been a potential vote on the Code and Area Rezoning, and that is why the notices were sent that way. She said that since there were over 400 property owners and that the meeting was only a week away, they did not have enough time to send out an amended agenda. She suggested that if residents came on December 8th wanting to hear the Commission's discussion, that they be informed that they would be notified when the Commission was ready to take a vote.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that the public notice did not say the Commission *would* vote, but that they had *scheduled* a vote.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she believed that the Commission still had some things to talk about with regard to the Code and the proposed Area Rezoning, and she still wanted to hear from staff and the other Commissioners about some of the changes that had been discussed at the past several meetings. She added that she did not believe it would be fair to vote on the Code and then immediately follow that with a vote on the Area Rezoning, because she thought that if she was someone whose property was being rezoned, she would not feel like she would have enough of an opportunity to digest the new requirements and comment on it, if necessary. She thought the votes should be at least a meeting apart.

Mr. Langworthy noted that two City Council readings are built into the process for that reason.

Ms. Amorose Groomes, Mr. Hardt and Ms. Kramb agreed that the votes on the Code and then the Area Rezoning should occur at separate meetings.

Mr. Langworthy said he would discuss the Commission's recommended schedule with the City Manager, and he would relay the Commission's concerns regarding adequate opportunity for public input.

Mr. Hardt said he expected to see was a clean, finished, edited, completed draft of the Code before they begin their final review.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that the Commissioners had the first half of the revised Code, and a complete draft would be sent to the Commission as soon as possible after December 8 so that they have adequate time prior to January 5 to begin their review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she wanted to be clear about expectations. She stated that the Commission is committed to an aggressive schedule for both the Code and the Area Rezoning, but they are categorically opposed to rushing and thereby compromising any of the quality. She concluded that the Commission would review Section 153.066, the Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria at the special meeting on December 8 and also take public comment on the Area Rezoning.

Mr. Hardt asked if there should be another special meeting scheduled for January 12th since it has taken this long to get through the initial draft of the Code.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that he would confirm the schedule with the City administration.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor made a motion, seconded by Todd Zimmerman, to establish January 12, 2012 as a Special Meeting if needed, for further review of the final draft of the Bridge Street Corridor Development Code.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 10:34 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.