

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 13, 2016

7:00 P.M.

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Darby.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Richard Bauer, Don Darby, Tom Hall, Lawrence Hawkins, Dave Okum, Joe Ramirez

Members Absent: Marjorie Harlow

Staff Present: Anne McBride, City Planner; Don Shvegza, City Engineer; Gregg Taylor, Building Official

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF AUGUST 9, 2016

Chairman Darby: The Chair will accept a motion to adopt the Minutes of our previous meeting held on August 9th.

Mr. Hawkins: Move to adopt.

Mr. Okum seconded the motion. With six "aye" votes from the Planning Commission members, the August 9th, 2016 Minutes were adopted as submitted.

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Mr. Hawkins: Council met on August 17th at 7:00 p.m. All seven members were present. We had, as far as legislation goes, Ordinance # 18-2016, approving the preliminary development (PUD) of approximately 6.86 acres located at the northeast corner of Tri-County Parkway and Jake Sweeney Place, specifically the Atrium Hotel and Conference Center. Obviously they came before us and presented last month, I believe it was, to this body. That matter failed with 3 affirmative votes and 4 votes against it.

We also had Ordinance # 19-2016, which was also related to the Atrium, amending the zoning code and zoning map of the City of Springdale, Ohio to provide for the rezoning of approximately 6.86 acres located at the northeast corner of Tri-County Parkway and Jake Sweeney Place from General Business to Planned Unit Development, again involving the Atrium Hotel and Conference Center. That failed with 1 affirmative vote; 6 votes against it. Again that was the situation where they were trying to convert the hotel into a nursing home.

We had before us Ordinance # 24-2016, authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/ Finance Director to enter into a cost-sharing agreement with the Greater Cincinnati Water Works for the Cloverdale Area Pavement Rehabilitation Project, and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 7-0 vote. Some of that was going to also involve, I believe, changing over fire hydrants.

We had Ordinance # 25-2016, authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into an agreement with the Nextstep Networking for technical support services, and declaring an emergency. This is the IT service the Administration receives, the City receives. That passed with a 7-0 vote.

Ordinance #26-2016, accepting a bid and authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/ Finance Director to enter into a contract for asbestos removal and disposal project at the former Sheraton Hotel, and declaring that an emergency. The accepted bid was for \$113,490. That passed with a 7-0 vote.

We had Ordinance #27-2016, reducing and recertifying the special assessment levied for the purpose of constructing certain improvements, and declaring an emergency, and that also passed with a 7-0 vote.

There was some discussion with regard to a resident coming forth having some concerns about a skunk problem in Heritage Hill. We had some discussions on that, and had further discussions at the next meeting.

The next meeting was September 7th, 2016. We had six members present, and we had Ordinance # 28-2016, enacting and adopting the 2016 S17 supplement to the Code of Ordinances of the City of Springdale, Ohio, and declaring an emergency. This is basically the update of our Code to match the Ohio Revised Code. Things such as outlawing photo-monitoring traffic devices. Also the Statute of Limitations for rape and sexual battery were increased from I think 21 years to 25 years. That passed with a 6-0 vote.

Resolution R11-2016, authorizing the City Administrator to file an application with the Ohio Public Works Commission for Local Transportation Improvements Funds and State Capital Improvement Program Funds, and authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to execute all contracts and other documents. This was for Beacon Hills and Kenn Road. This passed with a 6-0 vote. This was basically 50% funding that we'd get from SCIP funds and LTIP funds. The total for that project was \$2,449,618.

We had Resolution R12-2016 and R13-2016, similarly dealing with LTIP and SCIP funds. The R12-2016 dealt with Glensprings. That was also 50% funding. The total of that project is \$976,364. The Resolution R13-2016 dealt with Jake Sweeney Place, also 50% funding. That total was \$939,676. These are going to be funded with a 20 year no-interest loan for the portions that are unfunded by the LTIP and SCIP funds.

We also had Resolution R14-2016, imposing a Moratorium for a period of 180 days for the granting of any permit allowing retail dispensaries, cultivators, or processors of medical marijuana within the City of Springdale. That passed with a 6-0 vote. Obviously with some of the legislation coming out of Columbus, there are things that are happening with regard to medical marijuana. Part of the thought process behind the Moratorium was to wait for some of these things to ferret themselves out in terms of how the application is actually going to take place before the City starts making decisions on if we're going to allow, how many we're allowing, and where.

Resolution R15-2016 directing the Hamilton County Board of Elections to submit to the electors of the City of Springdale, Ohio at the November 8th, 2016 General Election, a revision to Article 2 Section C Paragraphs 4 & 5, Article 3 Section B Paragraphs 3 & 5, Article 3 Section G Paragraph 3, and Article 9 Section C Paragraph 8 of the Charter of the City of Springdale. Basically this was replacing "municipal election" with "general election", so it limits some confusion for what we have versus in comparison what the Board of Elections has. That passed with a 6-0 vote, so that will be a Charter Amendment that will be on the ballot for this November.

We had Resolution R16-2016, directing the Hamilton County Board of Elections to submit to the electors of the City of Springdale, Ohio at the November 8th, 2016 General Election, a revision to the Article 6 Section A Paragraph 1, and Article 6 Section B Paragraph 1 of the Charter of the City of Springdale, regarding Council Members, Board of Zoning Appeals, and Planning Commission terms. The request was to have Council Members' terms on BZA and Planning reduced from four years to two years. That Resolution failed with 4 affirmative votes and 2 votes against it. A Super Majority was needed for that to pass to go on the ballot, so that will not be on the ballot this November.

We also had some more discussion with regard to animal control, specifically skunks. It was informally decided without any legislation to have the Administration explore further assisting residents that have issues with wild animals, skunks, coyotes. There's a list of six of them that the City will assist them in some way in removing those animals. That concludes my report unless there are any questions.

Chairman Darby: I would like to raise one question. With the asbestos removal having been addressed, do we have at this time any kind of tentative timeline for the hotel?

Mr. Hawkins: In terms of them going through, I don't know beyond that. That was the hold up for a while, but...

Mr. Thamann indicated off-mic that the asbestos removal had started, but O'Rourke has been pushed back a month or two.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE - none

VII. OLD BUSINESS

Proposed Zoning Code Text Amendments

Chairman Darby: I'd like to make a few comments on this, and then if there are any questions I'll let Staff comment also. We had planned to bring to discussion the proposed Zoning Code Text Amendments. As we call recall, when we entered into this process many, many, many months ago, our consultants advised us that once the adoption of the Code was made, that there would be kind of a shake-out period, and they would be coming back to us with, in most cases, minor changes that would need to be codified. That was what we proposed to do, however, we are not prepared this evening to have the intelligent discussion about these because we kind of got our wires crossed last week, so materials we'd need as far as the presentation and what have you are not with us. Also, there will be some additional changes that'll be in the product that'll be submitted to us next month. So, was that good enough? You guys want to add?

Ms. McBride: Yes, I think that was good enough.

Chairman Darby: (Laughs) Okay.

Ms. McBride: The Text Amendments that were included in your packets addressed a number of the concerns, minor revisions, that we have been discussing, and then at the Staff Meeting one month ago, the issue came up of food trucks and also mobile medical facilities, and so we decided to be proactive with both of those and we made some revisions to the Text Amendments, provided definitions for those two uses, and then set up a series of criteria for each of those two uses: where they could be done, under what hours, and so forth. So all of that information is included in the packet. At the Staff Meeting last week, it was decided that we would look at a further amendment to the Code that would deal with the process of Zone Map Amendments and how they're handled in terms of processing. And in order to give Mr. Forbes and myself enough time to do that, then we would ask that you would continue the Public Hearing or the Text Amendments in progress again so that we can keep all of the Text Amendments together when they go to Council. So what we would anticipate then is at the October meeting, we would be providing the Commission with a PowerPoint show going through each of these and again, some of them are just simply clean-up items that should have had a "no" or an "un" or a whatever. We can address each one of them at that point in time.

Chairman Darby: So at this time the Chair will accept a motion to table this item, continue, I'm sorry, continue.

Mr. Okum moved to continue; Mr. Hawkins seconded. The Public Hearing regarding Text Amendments was continued with a 6-0 vote.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

TCP Wimbledon, LLC (Wimbledon Plaza), 11770 Springfield Pike, Springdale, OH, Minor Improvement Requiring Planning Commission Approval (Route 4 Corridor), Ground Sign (Application #31031)

Chairman Darby: Presenters please come forward.

Mr. Novak: I'm Ron Novak. I'm with Drawing Department, so we're the Architect for Chris McCrea and we're working on Wimbledon. We've been here before, but this is for the signage specifically that we want to accomplish around the property on the street.

Chairman Darby: Good evening.

Mr. Novak: Does anyone need an 11"x17" copy of the drawings? We brought some if anyone wants one, and I also brought some larger ones. Specifically what we're interested in is the two signs on the property. There's three signs over there have Wimbledon's name on it. The one that belongs to the apartment building is actually not one of our signs, so we're not dealing with that sign. We're mostly focusing on the one at Glensprings and Springfield Pike, where they come together, and also on the southern side of the entrance of the property, there's sort of a horizontal low-slung one that's out of masonry and we want to address that one also. So those are the two signs that we're looking at tonight. And I think originally when we came before Council, we showed a sign and it had a height, a mean height of about 11'. We went back and sort of redesigned the sign that will be at the intersection of Springfield and Glensprings to take the midpoint of the sign and where it is located across on that corner ten feet away from it, after we got a survey we were able to determine that the midpoint or the mean average of the sign to the top of any signage element, meaning the text at the top of it that says "Glensprings Plaza", the top of that signage is what the dimension in this first drawing on sheet 1 of 4, detail 3 of 1, that elevation shows that 7'. That is measured from the mean average of the midpoint of the existing slope, and what that equates to is the top of our parking where cars park above that spot elevation, or that elevation is actually at 714'. The top of this is actually at 719', so it creates a five foot tall sign where the top of the sign is at 5' when you're standing on the parking lot. When you're down at the corner on the sidewalk, if you take that mean average, you know we've stepped the sign down as you head toward the corner so that we could, again, fall towards 7' in height. If we don't have any text down there, you see the actual top of the monument that holds all of our signs in the signage, marquees for each of our individual tenants. There's twelve tenants there with, in painted aluminum internally-lit box that has a back-painted acrylic fascia in it that will have a consistent font for every tenant that's located in the plaza. Same height. The kerning obviously will change based on the length of that name, but the goal is to unify the text and the branding in those twelve marquee boxes, and we're also planning to use that mesh that we have that we're wrapping the building in as sort of the foil on those also. So that's what those boxes are made of. So you'll see that sort of cross-hatch coming through the acrylic from the internally-lit boxes. That is the only illumination on the sign down there, and it doesn't require cut-offs or anything like that due to its translucent nature. That's what we've tried to accomplish and we've tried to keep the signage in the spirit and the intent of the Ordinance. So that's what we're presenting tonight for that sign. We've used the materials from the building to enhance that corner, so we provided landscaping around it. There's a landscaping plan that we've attached. It talks about our species and what the breadth of that endeavor's going to be on the corner, and the second sheet that you'll notice is that survey that we got which allowed us to sort of turn the screws on this. The last sheet, sheet 4 of 4, represents the southern sign and what we would like to do to address that. So the drawing 3 of 4, at the top left of that sheet, represents what it looks like, or looked like, and directly across the page to the right and at the top shows what we would like to accomplish there, and it's basically just a marquee stating that you've arrived at Glensprings Plaza. So again, it borrows

materials from the buildings. It's stand-off lettering just like the top of our main sign down at the corner so they are aluminum stand-off letters and they're 12" tall and they sit on a backer that stands off of the same metal mesh that we're using, so just to give it a little more height. The overall height of that sign is 4'9" and that's really what we came to present. We wanted to show you more detail about the sign because that's what you asked us for.

Chairman Darby: Okay. We'll go to our Staff Report at this time.

Mr. Taylor: Ron, we don't seem to have the same information that you're... we have, what we were presented was three sheets, so the back, the smaller sign was not included in the packet that we had a chance to look at.

Ms. McBride: Nor was the landscape plan.

Mr. Novak: We have nine copies there right now, so we made nine copies. We took the commentary that we got and we made those drawings from that.

Ms. McBride: Oh, okay, so this isn't...

Mr. Novak: This is in response to ...

Ms. McBride: Oh, okay.

Mr. Novak: So we did get commentary and came prepared to talk about those items, so I apologize if you don't have that information right now.

Chairman Darby: So Staff is comfortable that the review has taken place?

Ms. McBride: What the applicant is saying is that the drawings that they are passing out now are in response to our Staff comments, so we really haven't gotten to review for example the landscaping and that kind of thing, because obviously one of the comments that we had made was that they needed to submit a landscape plan which they have just handed to us.

Mr. Novak: I apologize. I didn't mean to spring this on you now, it's just we brought in a response, so.

Mr. Okum: You don't have sheet 4 of 4, is that correct? You never saw 4 of 4?

Ms. McBride: We didn't see, we saw what you saw in your packet which is different than what we have here.

Mr. Okum: It would be difficult for us to act on something that hasn't been reviewed.

Mr. Novak: Certainly.

Mr. Okum: So, you're okay with us going with your responses to Staff's review of your sheets 1 to 3 and then leave that other sign, which appears to be on sheet 4, I guess we'll have to push that item to the next agenda.

Mr. Novak: Yes, what I would suggest is that if we could review the comments that were asked, I could explain what is different from our original application and I will tell you that the landscaping plan was turned in with the building permit plan for the overall project originally, so I feel like this is not, we did not add to that plan. It was a, it matches what was previously put in, so I, however you want...

Mr. Okum: And we approved the landscape plan conditional upon Staff's review?

Mr. Novak: Everything was, we were asked to come back with the signage specifically, as we, after our first hearing here. So that's what we're here with tonight. The landscaping plan is purely in this package again just because it was brought up in the Staff comment. So however you want to deal with that.

Chairman Darby: Well we'll move through the Staff Reports and see where we wind up if Staff feels comfortable with that.

Ms. McBride: Yeah, that's fine. So at your April 12th meeting this year, the Commission approved modifications to what was then called Wimbledon Plaza, now Glensprings Plaza, which included as you'll recall, changes to the elevation of the building, some site improvements in terms of lighting & landscaping, dumpster enclosures, and those types of things. At that time, the applicant did not have enough detail about the sign that the Commission felt comfortable approving it, and so the motion to approve the proposed revisions to then Wimbledon Plaza in April excluded any free-standing signage with the understanding that they would come back to the Commission with those details and that is what they've done. Currently as I indicated in my Staff report, they have three free-standing signs. I stand corrected if one of those is not yours. They all obviously say Wimbledon, but the main ones obviously are the ones at the corner of Glensprings and Springfield Pike, and then the one at the southern access point into the center from Springfield Pike. The Submittal that the applicant gave us was very general in April, but that did include the installation of 165 square foot ground mount sign at Springfield Pike and Glensprings, and that sign at the time was to be 8'2" tall, and we really didn't have any other, and there were also some setback issues on that sign, and we didn't have any real details on any additional free-standing signage. The request that's before you this evening as you've heard features an anodized aluminum sign box. Staff had asked some questions about were the tenant panels to be the plastic panels that go in, or were they to be routed out panels, because it wasn't very clear. Also there was a note on the submittal that says signs shall be located at one side only, and whether or not there were going to be, one tenant was only going to be on one side, or whether there's only going to be signage on two sides, the note was just very confusing at least to this part of the Staff. The signage that they're proposing was just the one sign. It has the development name on it, which is 11.4 square feet, and then it would have the twelve tenant ID panels, and this is per side. Each tenant panel is 7.11 square feet, for a total of 85.32 square feet of tenant panels. The total sign area that they were proposing is 96.72 square feet of sign area. The Corridor Review District allows up to a maximum of 100 square feet, so they are within the square footage that is permitted by the CRD district. The sign itself, by the definition of our code, is 9' on Springfield Pike and 8' to the parking lot, and specifically our Code measures it from, let me just read this exactly, where did I have this, it's to the highest point of any sign from grade. "Shall not exceed 7 feet as measured from the existing grade to the top of any feature of the sign." So that's where we're getting the difference in the sign height. So based on that, it's 9' on Springfield Pike and 8' from the parking lot. Again the CRD district allows the sign to be 7', but that is obviously something that the Planning Commission can modify. They do have a grade change there, so it is understandable that the sign is probably going to be higher on the Springfield Pike side than it is on the parking lot side. The CRD district does require that ground-mount signs be located on a brick or stone base, and they are proposing that it would be on a brick base with a brick support that would match the brick of the building. They are proposing that the sign would be illuminated and we had some questions about was that all going to be one color? That was a question that had come up in our Staff meeting. Signs are allowed within the Sub-Area B to be obviously illuminated. The metal is a permitted sign material in Sub-Area B of the Corridor Review District if Planning Commission chooses to approve that and again as the applicant has indicated; it carries over the building theme that Planning Commission approved in April, so I would suggest that it would be appropriate. Signs are also required to be located in landscape beds, and I don't see a landscape plan. I understand that they submitted a landscape plan for overall for the site. At that point in time, the sign was located in another location. It was too close to the right-of-way, so I would still suggest that a

landscape plan be submitted just for the landscape bed that is required to be around the ground-mount sign if Planning Commission chooses to approve that. So I think the issues then that are before the Commission this evening then, has to deal with the height of the sign. Is the 9' and 8' height, which is over the 7' that is permitted; is that appropriate? Again given the topographic change of the sign location, that a landscape plan would be submitted for the bed only to surround the proposed ground-mounted sign. That the Commission make the determination that the aluminum mesh and aluminum panels are an acceptable material in this particular location, given the improvements that are being made to the rest of the center. And then that they get a satisfactory answer in terms of how many sign panels are being constructed, how many sides are those panels to be on the sign, and then in terms of the uniform coloring of the illumination for the sign. Any questions, I'd be happy to answer those.

Mr. Hawkins: Ms. McBride, you feel, is there anything else lacking in terms of the landscape plan that Staff need or wants to see, or does Staff feel comfortable with what you have?

Ms. McBride: Yeah, in terms of looking at the sign, the ground sign only at Springfield Pike and Glensprings Drive. If the Commission wants to proceed on with that and just require that the applicant submit that for Staff review and approval, we've done that on a number of occasions. We have already seen the overall landscape plan; we just need to see it for the bed that the ground-mount sign is in.

Mr. Okum: Just a question in regards, just so we understand that the applicant's total was 96 square feet, right? IS that the right number? 96 plus some percent, something like that, of 100 square foot. Would, if the applicant were to submit in subsequent submission and additional sign on Glensprings, which we have a sheet for, that would increase it over their 100 square feet, is that correct?

Ms. McBride: Yeah, that's correct, and we would have to look at the separately based on...

Mr. Okum: I understand and I just want the Commission to understand that the applicant's application here is for almost 100 square foot, which is the allowable under the CRD, but the additional sign would be down the street further at a different location. Frankly, if that were to come in, I can state that I'd be concerned about the size of it, but on the other hand, you can't see both pretty much at the same time. You'd have to be pretty rubber-necked to be able to do that, so I'd be more understanding about a secondary sign at a different location considering the location access point is down there where those big old' rocks are. I hope we have to do something about that, but anyway.

Mr. Novak: I mean it's an existing sign. I think the nature of the property, we're allowed to have two ground-mounted signs. We're renaming the property, so...

Mr. Okum: I understand that, it's just...

Mr. Novak: We can deal with it.

Mr. Okum: This one sign in your application's for almost the 100 square feet that's permitted.

Mr. Novak: Sure.

Mr. Okum: Which is the permitted signage permitted for your street signs.

Mr. Hall: I have a question for the applicant. On your sign which is divided into twelve equal parts here, it was my understanding that the font will be consistent on each one of those panels. Is that correct?

Mr. Novak: That is correct.

Mr. Hall: What do you do if there's a condition where the wording or the lettering would take up more than one spot?

Mr. Novak: I don't think that we would, I don't know if "Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious" is going to come and be a tenant there, but obviously I said earlier that the kerning and all that would have to change to accommodate a tenant that has a long name or whatever. The goal is to have it be consistent and have it be about the whole plaza, rather than individual marquees for tenants and branding. So, not know exactly who all the tenants will be, hopefully they're all like "Outback".

Mr. Hall: Thank you. I had one other part. What's going to be the provisions if a tenant takes two or three spots? How do you handle that with this sign? Is it going to, say they're "XYZ Tenant" takes 4 boxes; will their name be on 4 boxes, or how do you propose handling that?

Mr. Novak: I mean, I would ask our landlord, but I don't imagine that we would, he would want 4 name placards to be given to one person. Everyone would get equal billing with one sign box, and if there was, happened to be only 4 of the 23 used, the rest would just be illuminated boxes and it would probably be the ones down low versus the ones up high.

Mr. Hall: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bauer: Just a question about the height. 7' was the median, the mean?

Mr. Novak: Yes, it was the midpoint of our sign once we placed it on the existing topography.

Mr. Bauer: And is there a reason 7' tall per the Code couldn't be used, and the sign adjusted to fit that?

Mr. Novak: I guess it comes down to what is considered sign and what is considered holder, because the 97.47 or 96.47 square feet of signage that we have, that would suggest to me that that's where our sign is. So we've measure to that item, not to the uphill mast that we anchor the sign to. So I guess it's almost semantics about it. Before when we came in here originally with the whole, the whole property, it was much taller, by literally about two feet, and once we had some real metrics of the site because we got a survey, we tried to work with where the parking lot is, where the sidewalk is, and be good stewards toward what that height is. So we tried to be as democratic as possible about it and choose midpoint of the hill and midpoint of the sign and the top of the Glensprings part, not our tenants. So it equates to a 5' height at the top and about a 8'11" height at the bottom at the sidewalk, if you're looking for the real metrics of it, like that's what we're dealing with.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you. The other question, I don't know, did you answer are tenant signs going to be on both sides?

Mr. Novak: Yes, they will be on both sides. They're all it the same way with 3,500 Kelvin internally-lit LED boxes, so they will be uniform. They will be consistent. They're the same size. They're the same font. It wants to unify and homogenize it versus make it this giant billboard with inconsistency.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. McBride: I appreciate the applicant's explanation on the height measurement, but I just want to make sure that the Commission is clear that height is defined in particular in the CRD district as measured from the existing grade to the top of any

feature of the sign, not just where the sign text, so to speak, is. So I just wanted to point that out.

Chairman Darby: While you're at that, do you want to also, would you also comment about the topography?

Ms. McBride: Yeah, I mean the site has a topographic change. The parking lot is higher, so it would stand to reason that the sign would be higher down, as I said before, on the Springfield Pike side. I don't think it's significantly higher, given the situation, but it is something that would require the Commission's action to deviate from the 7'.

Mr. Ramirez: We've determined that the font will be consistent on all the signs. Do we know what the panel, the color of the panel and the text on those panels, those colors would be?

Mr. Novak: We are planning that the panel is a translucent white panel and that the color of the font is going to be black, and I don't think we have determined exactly what the font is, right yet.

Mr. Stehura: Century.

Mr. Novak: It is Century? Okay. I take that back. It is Century. So it's the same as what is listed at the top of the sign for the overall plaza name.

Mr. Ramirez: So nothing out of the ordinary, just black...

Mr. Novak: No, nothing cursive, no calligraphy, no serifs. None of that.

Mr. Ramirez: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Okum: So these will be white panels with black letters.

Mr. Novak: Correct:

Mr. Okum: With an aluminum-color perimeter.

Mr. Novak: Correct.

Mr. Okum: How do you maintain consistency in color of your, obviously they're LED-lit, but I've seen LEDs that vary in color, and lighting tones.

Mr. Novak: Ah, the 3,500 Kelvin should be our consistent metric we're going to use. We specified we want that temperature, so that should give us the same whiteness and the same color rendition for all of them.

Mr. Okum: On the Kelvin scale, 3,500 is...

Mr. Novak: White.

Mr. Okum: Pure white?

Mr. Novak: Ah, it's a little bit less than pure white. Pure white is 4,000. Once you get over 4,000 it starts to go a bit blue. Once you go under 3,000 it goes yellow. So it's whitish.

Mr. Okum: It's whitish?

Mr. Novak: Yeah.

Mr. Okum: If you look at the site plan that the applicant provided, there's topo showing the parking lot level at 714', sidewalk level is approximately 709'. So

there's a five foot slope for the average. My mic is not on. Sorry. Thank you for giving me that. I thought it was. I talk loud enough. It's 714' at the parking lot and it tapers down to 709', which is a five foot slope in grade. The Corridor Review District clearly is stated that the sign unit, not the sign panels, is at 7'. We're, sign panels on this, we're talking the top of the Glensprings from the sidewalk is 9'10", is that what your request is?

Mr. Novak: Uhhhh, I don't have the drawings.

Mr. Okum: There's no measurement on your drawing. It shows measurements at your parking lot, but unfortunately...

Mr. Novak: If you add up...

Mr. Okum: ... that's not what we measure from.

Mr. Novak: I'm sorry, if you add up all the dimensions that are down to there, that is where the cut is. That is 8'11", so if there's an extra foot from there to the sidewalk, I'd be surprised. It's, I don't have it off hand.

Mr. Okum: 7'10" and then you have 1' base, so that's 8'10" to the top of Glensprings. It's almost 9'. Is that pretty close?

Mr. Novak: Yeah.

Mr. Okum: That's what you're sort of getting too? There's no way you can get that sign, I mean this is going to be a pretty significant element sitting 10' off the sidewalk right there, considering the sign that's currently there's about 4'6" or something of that nature. And certainly we need to help the business survive, but on the other hand, I don't know if, you know, the sign unit, you could bring your elements together a little bit between your spaces of your sign. I know you want to give it dimension and not look like a sign board, and I appreciate that. I understand that logic as well, but I think there could be a little bit of compression on that and you could bring it down just a little bit, instead of being at that 9'0" to the top of Glensprings. I'm not as particularly concerned about the top of the physical masonry cap that's back towards the parking lot side, because that's 32, 42' back, so it's significantly back from the street line, so that 7' would be basically fall away. I mean at that distance you could have a building almost sitting there structurally. I'm more concerned about the physical presence of the sign, and I'm not quite sure, maybe you can help me though. There's a vertical line. Is that a pipe or a rail that runs around the outside perimeter? That black line that's at 1'5-1/4"? What is that vertical element there?

Mr. Stehura: This one?

Mr. Okum: Yeah, what is that?

Mr. Stehura: That's just the edge of the sign. That's created by the (inaudible) which is same material that is on the (inaudible)

Mr. Novak: So there's a vertical backer that all of our illuminated boxes get.

Mr. Okum: So we understand clearly then, the space that's between all the signs is a vertical element, a physical element? It's not shaded in.

Mr. Stehura: Right there (inaudible)

Mr. Okum: Right, that...

Mr. Novak: (Inaudible) the top of the backer of the sign (inaudible) sidewalk

Mr. Okum: And what's that material?

Mr. Novak: That is made of the same metal of what the roof (inaudible)

Mr. Okum: So it is a physical element.

Mr. Novak: Correct.

Mr. Okum: Then I am even more concerned about that elevation height. 10' off that sidewalk.

Mr. Novak: You were, that's why we did, we held Glensprings back toward, we justified it to the left of the sign further away from the corner so that we drop that height another 12" as we headed out toward the sidewalk. That is, for whatever that's worth.

Chairman Darby: Excuse me. Sir, could you give us your name please, for the Minutes?

Mr. Stehura: My name is Adam Stehura and I'm with Drawing Department.

Recording Secretary: Last name?

Chairman Darby: Last name?

Mr. Stehura: Stehura.

Recording Secretary: Spell it please.

Mr. Stehura: S-T-E-H-U-R-A.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Additional questions, folks?

Mr. Okum: Right now, I'm sort of torn on massive element on that corner. 10' from the public right-of-way. Is there any way that could be architecturally driven that it doesn't have that corrugated metal element and those signs are sort of architecturally integral with a rail system of some nature, so that you don't have that physical feature there?

Mr. Novak: Umm, I mean we can skin the cat a thousand ways.

Mr. Okum: I'm not trying to design it for you.

Mr. Novak: Of course.

Mr. Okum: I've got a physical element issue here that's I'm trying to deal with.

Mr. Novak: I think that the physical element of the standing seam background that we see 3" between illuminated sign boxes and 6" around the perimeter is exactly that. It's meant to be background, not a foreground element as the sign boxes and the marquees will be. So I feel it's downplayed. It is over 7' because of the scale and the massing and the proportion of it. It worked when we were just trying to deal with the existing grade of 7', so I'm sure we can adjust it to make that at 6' if, I mean if we're talking about the top of Glensprings has to be at 7' in order to not require a variance, that means that point would have to be 6' from existing grade. It's just not, the definition what existing grade I guess would be what we would want to know to see if we can make that less of a foreground element for you.

Mr. Okum: Well, the existing grade could actually weight against you if you went to the center point of...

Mr. Novak: Sure. That's what I mean.

Mr. Okum: If you want the center point, that's really unfair in my opinion, and I've always felt that the grade should be based upon where it's at the public right-of-way edge so that you get a real true representation of where that sign sits. CVS is a good example. They have a sign down in a pit because of the elevation issues that they had, so my feeling is that we want to be fair, but on the other hand, this is a massive, this is 32' of basically sign here sitting there that's going to be 9' plus a few inches tall. That's a pretty significant structure. I mean it's like the side of a truck almost. So we have to consider that.

Mr. Novak: Sure.

Mr. Okum: So my feeling is, I certainly I'd like, at this point I'll be honest I don't think I can support it until it sort of ties down to a least of the Corridor Review District standard. I'll be, like I said, the masonry element that's back at the parking lot element, it's 30, it's 42' back basically from, yeah 42' back. It's not a factor, but what's at that curb line is.

Mr. Novak: So just so I understand, the height of that corner at the curb line out there.

Mr. Okum: Yes sir.

Mr. Novak: Where

Mr. Okum: I would use that as a rule of thumb, and that would give the advantage over 7' from center where it kills you on the upside. But that would also make it taller there on the ground side. If you hold the sign back to the center point of the hill, then you don't have the issue because the sign height would be based upon center point. But right now you're at 9' at basically the sidewalk.

Mr. Novak: To the top of Glensprings Plaza. Yeah, exactly.

Mr. Okum: And I understand you want to carry the feel through with the back panels being the corrugated metal that matches the, or the steel or whatever, wasn't there a grate or a stainless steel has material that you were using on the building elements?

Mr. Novak: The mesh...

Mr. Okum: The mesh.

Mr. Novak:... is here also. It's on the sign.

Mr. Okum: Where's the mesh on there?

Mr. Novak: It's on the sign. It's inside the light boxes.

Mr. Okum: So you see it?

Mr. Novak: You see it behind the...

Mr. Okum: Oh, behind the light boxes but not around the perimeter.

Mr. Novak: That is correct.

Mr. Okum: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bauer: Couple more questions. The twelve – is that the number of tenants you have now? The number of stores available?

Mr. Novak: Twelve was the number that we were wanting to get so that we could have twelve opportunities there for renting spaces or leasing spaces.

Mr. Bauer: So there's twelve spaces.

Mr. Novak: Correct.

Mr. Bauer: In the plaza? What happens to those tenant signs if they're not occupied?

Mr. Novak: They're white.

Mr. Bauer: they're white. Are they lit when they're not, when they're white?

Mr. Novak: Yep.

Mr. Bauer: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Hawkins: I don't want to design your sign either. And I don't recall if I had referenced this before or not; there's some concern I have with regard to those individual placards. It's great to have for everybody getting some exposure. The downside is, and I'll preface this by saying I hope and am optimistic that all twelve of those storefronts will be filled. In the alternative, when they're not filled, it's glaring that there are vacancies there if you just have a bunch of white boxes there with no tenants. And so instances where there are other signs in other communities where you have that, it almost is a I think detraction, a negative for that place. It's obvious. You may drive by a place and may or may not be able to see from a distance how full it is or not. When you have a marquee like that there, if you're sitting there with half of them full and half of them empty, it may not be as appealing. Just saying. Obviously it's important if you're going that route that the lighting is maintained and what have you for those boxes. You can't have boxes going dark and not lit. What, if you guys can tell me, what is the difference, how much space is between the top of the third light box and that railing?

Mr. Novak: The top box as in the top of the backer?

Mr. Hawkins: Horizontal. Yeah. Backer. How much space is that?

Mr. Novak: I believe that is six inches. Seven inches.

Mr. Hawkins: Seven inches.

Mr. Novak: Yes sir.

Mr. Hawkins: And then is there any structural need for that space to be there between the top railing and the top of the highest box? Just esthetics?

Mr. Novak: No, I mean it doesn't. the esthetics as far as what you see as backer and void between boxes is just to try to make it somewhat serviceable so that you can remove things and it's, I'm sure we could squeeze nearly a foot out of it without even changing the size of the boxes if we really just crushed it down, but that seven inches looked good and it allowed us to get our standing seams sort of bent and broken around it and maintain it.

Mr. Hawkins: Gotcha. In terms of how this sign would look at night, is the idea that that railing is not going to be seen or show at all, that back railing? Is that the idea?

Mr. Novak: That is correct. It is painted the same color as the building, so it recedes and it's background.

Chairman Darby: You said, did I understand you to say that currently there re twelve spaces? That's why the twelve signs?

Mr. Novak: We talked to Chris and his crew, and they said we want twelve tenable spaces so we need twelve marquees there.

Chairman Darby: So that includes if a current tenant, that's who occupies a rather large space? That wouldn't be broken out into smaller spaces? The question I'm getting to is what happens if you would have more than twelve tenants?

Mr. Novak: That's a good question. I mean it's...

Mr. McCrea: I'm Chris McCrea and I'm the landlord.

Chairman Darby: Yes, sir.

Mr. McCrea: What we would typically do is the twelve largest tenants would have space on the sign. I think we'll have more than twelve tenants. But the twelve largest tenants would have the sign.

Chairman Darby: But we wouldn't anticipate you coming back for more boxes.

Mr. McCrea: I would not come back for more boxes.

Chairman Darby: Okay.

Mr. Hall: Is it my understanding that the tenants name will be on the top part of the building over each one with the area that's there? (Mr. Novak nods) So then if the tenant's name is on there and an individual is driving down the road at thirty-five miles an hour, are they going to know the tenant is in Glensprings Plaza, or are they going to try to sort hat out on those twelve boxes rather than just look up on the side of the building?

Mr. Novak: Well, that's, this is accessory to what happens on the building, obviously. This corner marquee, and this is to again create place and plaza. We did studies on this size of the boxes and actually placed them on Madison Road and drove by and did studies for at what distance you could see what. So that's how we arrived at the actual size of each individual box, so that we could see if you could actually discern and study what was there.

Mr. McCrea: And one of the limitations of the building because it was pre-fab metal roofing and we can't do much to the sign bands, we feel that where Outback is there's a huge area where they can have their signs, but if you look at the other tenant, they only have about a two foot sign band across the front, and so their signs are so small that you can't see them if you're driving by, which is why one of the important elements for our redevelopment was this sign, so that the smaller tenants could have visibility to traffic.

Mr. Hall: Thank you.

Mr. McCrea: And we did actually cut down the sign more than a foot from when we presented last time.

Mr. Novak: Two.

Mr. McCrea: Two feet.

Mr. Novak: But it's based, it' two feet shorter than what it was.

Mr. McCrea: Right.

Mr. Novak: We also have some real metrics of what the site does. That 5' fall between sidewalk and parking lot, we had anticipated it was 4' back then. So it's about a foot.

Mr. Okum: I just for comment went by your topo showing 709' and 715', so that's where I got 5'.

Mr. Novak: Sure. Yup.

Mr. Okum: Going back to the sign, and Mr. Hall's point's valid in regards to, you know, your change of the fact and the sign bands, and the signage potentially could be a little larger with your redesign with the grates on the front, and it would enhance businesses but those would be the businesses going south on Springfield Pike. There is very little opportunity for someone going north on Springfield Pike to identify any of the businesses in the center, and the trips per day obviously, in the morning obviously a lot of it goes north and in the afternoon a lot of it goes south. You haven't adapted for that at all, and I was sort of wondering why.

Mr. Novak: Umm, I...

Mr. Okum: For the northbound.

Mr. Novak: Considering what is there now, right now the plaza is labeled as Wimbledon Plaza. There's no description or opportunity to even understand anybody that's in there, other than the building, and the building is challenged by how high the band available is right now. We can do very little with this pre-engineered building. What we're doing is as much as we possibly can. The new signage that we're proposing on the corner is the first opportunity we've historically ever had to be able to even illuminate a tenant down there, other than Wimbledon Plaza. So, we are doing what we can do to give exposure and give success, in that with this new sign it's different than what historically is up on the hill right now.

Mr. Okum: But the cars going northbound on Springfield Pike will see the back butt end of the, sorry to say it that way, but the back end of the sign.

Mr. Novak: They will see the same sign as the, the sign is identical on both sides.

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Mr. Novak: We have illuminated boxes on both sides of the sign.

Mr. Okum: Well, okay. I just needed to make sure of that because...

Mr. Novak: Yes.

Mr. Okum: Ms. McBride had that questions earlier...

Mr. Novak: Sure.

Mr. Okum: ...and I'm looking at the drawing here and the drawing says proposed sign and the arrow's pointing on that side.

Mr. Novak: Well the panels are on both sides.

Mr. Darby indicates something on the drawings to Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: You're right. I should have seen that. I didn't look at that. That's covered over by my paper. Okay, so how, obviously we've got to deal with the other sign on Glensprings, and I know you've got a time table to deal with. Instead of us bringing this to a vote tonight, I'll be happy to make a motion to bring it to the floor, but on the other hand, if you've got to get the other sign done, Staff still

needs to review the other sign which I think is important to the development, You're going to be back next month anyway. Do you want to take the comments that you've heard from us tonight and talk with Staff in regards to the review of your secondary sign?

Mr. Novak: We need to move forward, so we will, I think we need to deal with the secondary sign.

Mr. McCrea: I think this sign is going to determine the timing of the project. The secondary sign isn't going to have any effect on when we start.

Mr. Novak: Would we consider taking the secondary sign out altogether?

Mr. McCrea: (Inaudible)

Mr. Okum: I don't think you're going to get approval on the secondary sign tonight without Staff's review.

Mr. McCrea: Yeah, I'm not (inaudible)

Mr. Okum: And I'm not in a position to make that motion, so.

Mr. Novak: Yeah, that secondary sign is new information based on the commentary we got, so I wouldn't expect you guys to vote on that tonight.

Mr. Okum: So we can bring it to the floor tonight; we can amend your plan, say that sign Glensprings shall not exceed so many feet from the ground, from the sidewalk and leave it at that, and you design around it; or you can back and redraw it and we can...

Mr. Novak: We'd love to know at what height this would be approvable by Council. That's what we would love to know. So we'd be happy to work inside that parameter. 7' is the mean of the hill; just tell us where 7' should come from.

Chairman Darby: Well the Code gives a figure, but we're not, in this particular situation, we're not bound by that. And I want to make it clear also, you're on the agenda for action on this, and you've heard the discussion but we haven't taken any kind of straw pull, so sitting here myself I can't tell you what the results would be. So, it's your decision. If you feel that further consultation with Staff would work for you, and we go that direction quite often...

Mr. Novak: I would, if this could be, if we could work in the parameters that you set forth with Staff to get an approval for this corner sign and allow us to move forward with a permit for it, I think that's what we're looking for.

Chairman Darby: Well I've heard, I think, personally I think I've heard two people speak out about the existing height, and do you guys want to give them some guidance as to what would be acceptable to you?

Mr. Okum: I'm more in line to think to not hold the Glensprings Plaza channel-lit letters as a benchmark, but the case and the box as more of a benchmark of that closer to the 7' mark, and because Glensprings Plaza is further back off the right of way and it's not a physical, a massive element like the sign box is, and basically the sign frame is. So if I were to take a straight line off the head of that person and carry it straight across the sign, I don't know what the number, what that height is, but that's pretty much where I'm thinking the sign should be, somewhere between 7' and I would be little bit flexible on that, but I think that that would bring it in line. Does everybody follow what I'm saying? Straight line off the head.

Mr. Novak: If I may, I'm going to go to the drawing, I just want to make sure...

Chairman Darby: Sure, please.

Mr. Novak: So we're just less than (inaudible)

Mr. Okum: That, yes, right.

Mr. Novak: The solid backer, if we treated that at 7' rather than the top...

Mr. Okum: That is correct.

Mr. Novak: Right now, this is sitting at 8', that right there (inaudible). Correct?

Mr. Stehura: Correct.

Mr. Novak: The strange thing is existing grade (inaudible) across here; I think the middle of this which is that X representing (inaudible). This dashed line represents where that falls. Top of Glensprings, that's the 7'. Changing the height would have drastic effects on (inaudible).

Mr. Okum: I understand, and it's because of the element that makes it, and the Corridor Review District took the elevations and the grades along Springfield Pike into consideration and the reason that 7' was set as the element of height, was set specifically to eliminate mass along the public right-of-way that was generated by signs.

Mr. Novak: Sure.

Mr. Okum: And by where CVS ended up with a sign down in a valley in order to get the height of the sign that they wanted because of height, and you're in a position where you're elevated which gives you prominence and ability to get the vision, but it also is a negative in the fact that the Code, they understood that when they set it at 7', and it would be no different than for the old Perkins across the street. It'd be no different than BP across the street. You know, those are all factors that drive basically why there's conformity in zoning so you keep things consistent.

Mr. Novak: It's really, I mean it's a really strange corner as far as topography and the direction that goes, because I could sit there and think if I turned the sign 90 degrees and run it parallel with the street and I push it up onto where the parking lot is, I can actually make the sign 3' higher than anything down here, and I'm like that's crazy to me.

Mr. Okum: Because you're 30 feet from...

Mr. Novak: Right.

Mr. Okum: You're 30 feet from that right-of-way.

Mr. Novak: That's just crazy for me to think, we're trying to be low-slung and responsible.

Mr. Okum: I understand. That's just my opinion.

Mr. Novak: Sure.

Mr. Okum: I'm not all the members of this Commission, but...

Mr. Bauer: Just to add my thoughts, I mean I'm looking at what you've got here on the drawing, and I'm struggling with the term massing and how big that is. I look at that car and I see that car, if that's to any kind of scale, that sign is twice the size of that car lengthwise and almost height wise if you put it down at the grade below, so that's... Then in turn I hear what you're saying about 7' and you design signs to some degree, you designed this sign and I'm struggling with that. I go back to what the Code says.

Mr. Novak: Sure.

Mr. Bauer: That's my guide. That's my, and I'm a rules person, so..

Mr. Novak: We go by the...

Mr. Bauer: I'm going to default to that and I hear Mr. Okum's comments and I'm willing, we have some leeway here and I'm willing to give some of that leeway, but I think that 7' number is something we have to, and it's give off of a grade. It's not give off a mean. So that's where I default to.

Mr. Novak: Yeah that definition of the existing grade is what we need to know. Where would we want to take our grade from, right at each corner of the sign? What is existing grade? That's what we need to know, and the Code. We're a Code people too. We like to design by right, because then we're being good stewards and we don't have to ask to be exceptions or be variances. The height of this, we read the Code and it talks about excluding structure, it talks about sign and what a sign is, and this drawing represents what we believe the spirit and intent of that Ordinance holds. So the 7' is measured how we would, we just need to know at what, what is existing grade?

Mr. Taylor: I guess I just have an observation in the "for what it's worth" category, and I wonder if the applicant might want to address this. (Gestures to drawing) Can you take a look? The elevation at the top of the box here, what is that? If it's 719' to the top of the letters, what is it there?

Mr. Novak: These letters are a foot tall.

Mr. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. Novak: So it's a little bit less than, or a little bit more than that.

Mr. Taylor: So this is like 718'?

Mr. Novak: Correct.

Mr. Taylor: And the existing ground at this face of the sign, because this is what we're talking about, correct? This is where, this point is here, correct? So what, I can't read that. What's the existing ground elevation there?

Mr. Novak: I'll be right back. 711'.

Mr. Taylor: So I guess the reason I'm asking the question, and I'm trying to understand where we're, you know, the questions. It seems like, if the concern is the top of the box, not the top of the letters, it looks like to me, that that's about 7' from the existing ground at that point to the top of the box. Now that, it still doesn't comply with what the Code says. I'm not trying to indicate in any way that it does, because it doesn't, but if the concern of the Commission is the height of the box compared to the 7' limitation, I'm just pointing that out.

Indistinguishable discussion

Mr. Novak: The grade at the front corner of that sign, closest to the street, the existing grade is 711'. The top of the backer that Mr. Okum is concerned about is about 718' currently as drawn, so that is 7' difference between existing and the top of where that sign currently is drawn. The difference would be that it's cut out a little bit here to make the base.

Mr. Okum: I'm sorry, say that again.

Mr. Novak: Our grade is changed there by about 8" or so because we're putting the base and the foundation in, so as we're cutting and creating the landscaping, we're making that circular landscaping bed, we're establishing a new grade around it.

Mr. Okum: Which will be at 709'.

Mr. Novak: I think it's about 710'.

Mr. Stehura: 710.5'. (Inaudible)

Mr. Okum: Ms. McBride, would they be at 7' to the box based upon your observations and Mr. Taylor's?

Ms. McBride: yeah, I mean if, as Mr. Taylor indicated, if they're at 711' to 718', obviously that's the 7'. I mean again as he said, that's not what the code says, but you know, we kind of have two issues here. One is how the Commission...

Mr. Okum: Interprets where the ...

Ms. McBride: ...feels about the appearance of the sign, and then we can deal with what the strict requirement of the code is.

Mr. Okum: But in essence, the applicant could cut away all that ground, okay, and be at 711' all the way across, instead of the sloped hill.

Ms. McBride: Yes.

Mr. Okum: And be compliant. And do we want them to cut away the ground, and have a wall there? We already got rid of a wall. Am I right?

Mr. Novak: You're right.

Mr. Okum: To be compliant, they could cut it away and be at 711'. And be compliant at 7', unless we consider Glensprings Plaza. As long as Glensprings Plaza is 20 some feet back from the right-of-way, it's relative to distance, in my opinion.

Ms. McBride: Yeah, I mean they wouldn't be compliant with the Code if they cut it away, because there are portions of that sign that exceed 7', and that's how the Code reads.

Mr. Okum: And I understand, but we're talking a 32' sign width that goes along the face of that property, and you have a physical element that is 4' wide by 7'10" tall on the backside, that basically could be a physical building at that distance from the right-of-way. I mean our setback along, I don't know what our setback is on Springfield Pike, but it's probably 35' or maybe it's 50', but it's pushing it back pretty far. Because if that sign's 32' and you add another 10', you're at 42', you're almost at 50'.

Ms. McBride: It's actually at, it's 50'.

Mr. Okum: It's 50'. So it's the better part of a, you could actually have a physical building there at that distance from the public right-of-way. If the Commission is understanding what I'm saying.

Chairman Darby: You said 711' versus...?

Recording Secretary: At some point, someone said something about 719', and I'm just wondering for my purposes, that doesn't make sense to me in feet and inches. How is that?

Mr. Okum: Oh, they are using terms that I didn't know where that term was coming from either.

Mr. Stehura: It's above sea level. That's...

Mr. Okum: Oh, the 719' is the above sea level number.

Recording Secretary: Okay, so it's just written as...

Mr. Novak: If you look at the second sheet of your packet that we handed out tonight, has the...

Mr. Okum: It shows topos with odd topography levels

Mr. Novak: ... survey that lists sea level elevations.

Mr. Okum: Yeah, I was using, I did, started it with 709'.

Mr. Novak: And so...

Recording Secretary: I just wanted to make sure that I...

Mr. Okum: Because I was going...

Mr. Novak: We listed those on that front elevation on that first sheet, we tied it to that so we could talk about it.

Recording Secretary: Thank you.

Mr. Novak: Sorry.

Mr. Okum: So in essence what the applicant is saying is that he is compliant, except for the Glensprings Plaza marquee and the physical element. If we would use the streetline of 711' as the basis for the face of the sign. Is everybody on the same page as that?

Chairman Darby: And Staff is in agreement.

Mr. Okum moved to approve the request with modifications; Mr. Ramirez seconded. The request was approved with a vote of 6-0.

IX. DISCUSSION - none

X. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT - none

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Darby: We will accept a motion for adjournment.

Mr. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. Hall seconded the motion and the City of Springdale Planning Commission meeting concluded at 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2016 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2016 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary