

# Minor Project Review

## 14-050MPR – BSC Commercial District

### Red Roof Inn – Wall Signs

### 5125 Post Road

This is a request to modify two existing 68.25-square-foot wall sign for an existing hotel building on the south side of Post Road, approximately 1,100 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. This is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

#### **Date of Application Acceptance**

Wednesday, May 28, 2014

#### **Date of ART Recommendation**

Thursday, June 19, 2014 (time extension requested)

#### **Case Managers**

Rachel Ray, AICP, Planner II | 614.410.4656 | rray@dublin.oh.us

Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant | 614.410.4663 | acrozier@dublin.oh.us



## PART I: APPLICATION OVERVIEW

<i>Zoning District</i>	BSC Commercial District
<i>Development Proposal</i>	Two building-mounted (wall) signs
<i>Building Type</i>	Existing Structure
<i>Waivers</i>	None
<i>Administrative Departures</i>	None
<i>Property Address</i>	5125 Post Road
<i>Property Owner</i>	Buckeye Lodge LLC
<i>Applicant</i>	Jim Dooley, Morrison Sign Company
<i>Case Managers</i>	Rachel Ray, AICP, Planner II   614.410.4656   rray@dublin.oh.us Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant   614.410.4663   acrozier@dublin.oh.us

### Application Review Procedure: Minor Project Review

The purpose of the Minor Project Review is to provide an efficient review process for smaller projects that do not have significant community effects. The Minor Project Review is necessary to ensure that applications for development meet the requirements of Chapter 153 of the Dublin Zoning Code.

Following acceptance of a complete application for Minor Project Review, the Administrative Review Team shall approve, deny, or approve with conditions the application based on the criteria of §153.066(F)(3) applicable to Site Plan Reviews. A determination by the Administrative Review Team is required not more than 14 days from the date the request was submitted, unless a time extension is requested.

### Site Background

In 1985, Red Roof Inn received the following variances for two wall signs (facing Post Road and US 33/Bridge Street):

- Size: 70 sq. ft. each (Code permitted 1 sq. ft. per lineal ft. of building façade, or approx. 30 sq. ft. each)
- Height: 19 ft. above grade (Code permits max. 15 ft.)
- Lighting: Permitted red neon tubing

Red Roof Inn installed two new wall signs in 2005 that reflected the change in the company's logo. The signs were approved at a height of 19 feet above grade and 62.59 square feet. The new signs contain face lit letters illuminated with LED lights.



**Existing Wall Sign  
(North Elevation facing Post Road)**



**Proposed Wall Sign  
(North Elevation facing Post Road)**

## Zoning Code Analysis

### *§153.065(H) – Site Development Standards – Signs*

This site, which contains two single tenant buildings, is permitted wall signs in accordance with variance V85-006 and the provisions of §153.065(H). The applicant is proposing two 69.9-square-foot internally illuminated wall signs. One of the wall signs is proposed for the north building’s north elevation facing Post Road, and the other is proposed for the south building’s south elevation facing US-33/Bridge Street. The buildings currently have two existing wall signs in the same locations with ‘Red Roof Inn’ formed by individual channel letters. The proposal for the new signs is to remove the text ‘Inn’ and replace it with the text ‘Plus+’. The current sign is a uniform color of red but the proposal calls for the new text to be installed in yellow.

Proposed Wall Sign			
	Permitted	Proposed	Requirement
Size	Max. 70 sq. ft. (variance V85-006)	Two signs; 69.90 sq. ft. each	Met
Location	On walls facing a public street; not extending more than 14 in. from the face of the structure.	Facing Post Road and US-33/Bridge Street; lettering is 8 in. deep	Met
Height	Max. 19 ft. (variance V85-006)	North-facing sign is 19 ft. 6 in. above grade; south-facing sign is approx. 20 ft. 6 in. above grade.	Not Met
Colors	Max. 3, except that registered trademarks less than 20% of total sign area may have unlimited colors, provided that sign copy and background use one of the colors within the trademark; or Max. 5 for the entire sign, where a registered corporate trademark exceeds 20% of the sign area.	2 total (Existing red #2793; proposed yellow #2016)	Met
Number of signs	Max. 2 wall (variance V85-006)	2 wall signs	Met
Sign Design	All permitted sign types shall be designed to fully integrate with the building architecture and overall site design, and to enhance the pedestrian experience in the Bridge Street District.	Addition of the yellow text does not integrate into the building architecture.	Not Met

## PART II: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM COMMENTS

### Planning

The proposed sign meets the applicable zoning regulations for sign size, number, and location. However, additional adjustments are necessary to meet requirements for sign design provided in Code Section 153.065(H).

The BSC Development Code has regulations that deal with sign design and integration with the building’s architectural character. Code Section 153.065(H)(4)(a) states that “All permitted sign types shall be designed to fully integrate with the building architecture and overall site design, and to enhance the pedestrian experience in the Bridge Street District. Signs attached to principal structures shall be coordinated and fit appropriately with the architecture of the building in accordance with §153.062(M).”

In this case, the addition of yellow text to the currently monochromatic sign is inconsistent with the color of the existing sign (single shade of red) and the building materials, which include architectural elements with neutral colors with a red undertone (such as the roof shingles and balcony walkways).



**Existing sign**



**Proposed yellow lettering**

While the Bridge Street District zoning requirements calls for signs that contribute to the uniqueness and visual interest of the Bridge Street District, the proposed sign design is poorly integrated with the architecture and does not adhere to the "high level of design and construction quality expected by the community," as stated in Code Section 153.065(H).

Planning has recommended that the applicant consider installing the "Plus+" lettering in red or an alternative non-internally illuminated material as alternatives that would better integrate the design of the sign with the building's architectural character.

### Building Standards, Parks & Open Space, Fire, Engineering, Police, Economic Development

No comments

## PART III: APPLICABLE REVIEW STANDARDS

### Applicable Minor Project Review Criteria

The Administrative Review Team has reviewed this application based on the review criteria for Minor Projects, which include the following:

#### (c) Meets Applicable Zoning Regulations

*Criterion not met.* The proposed sign is not consistent with the Zoning Code requirements for signs with regard to height and design. The height of the south-facing sign must be lowered to a maximum of 19 feet to remain consistent with the approved variance, or receive additional approvals through a master sign plan by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The sign design fails to meet the intent for signs in the Bridge Street District as required by Zoning Code Section 153.065(H)(1)(a).

(j) **Consistency with Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report, Community Plan, and other Policy Documents**

*Criterion not met.* The Community Plan notes that “Dublin’s built environment contributes positively to the community’s character. This image is characterized by high quality office buildings, well-landscaped areas and streetscapes, *tasteful signs and graphics*, appropriate lighting standards and quality architecture.” The proposed sign design fails to contribute positively to the community’s character through incompatibility with the building’s architecture.

**PART IV: PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM DETERMINATION**

Recommendation of **disapproval** of this request for Minor Project Review.

## REVIEW CRITERIA FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

Each required reviewing body shall make its recommendation or its decision on an application for Site Plan Review approval based on each of the following criteria and the recommendation of the required reviewing body during the Basic Plan Review:

- (a) The Site Plan Review shall be substantially similar to the approved Basic Plan.
- (b) If a Development Plan has been approved that includes the property, the application is consistent with the Development Plan;
- (c) The application meets all applicable requirements of §153.059 and §§153.062 through 153.065 except as may be authorized by Administrative Departure(s) pursuant to §153.066(H);
- (d) The internal circulation system and driveways provide safe and efficient access for residents, occupants, visitors, emergency vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians;
- (e) The relationship of buildings and structures to each other and to other facilities provides for the coordination and integration of the development within the surrounding area and the larger community and maintains the image of Dublin as a high quality community;
- (f) The application is consistent with the requirements for types, distribution, and suitability of open space in §153.064 and the site design incorporates natural features and site topography to the maximum extent practicable;
- (g) The scale and design of the proposed development allows the adequate provision of services currently furnished by or that may be required by the City or other public agency including, but not limited to, fire and police protection, public water and sanitary sewage services, recreational activities, traffic control, waste management, and administrative services;
- (h) Stormwater management systems and facilities will not cause alterations that could increase flooding or water pollution on or off the site, and removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties;
- (i) If the development is to be implemented in phases, each phase is able to be considered independently, without the need for further phased improvements; and
- (j) The application demonstrates consistency with the BSC Vision Report, Community Plan and other related policy documents adopted by the City.