



City of Dublin Administrative Review Team

Planning Report

Thursday, August 4, 2016

Goodwill, ToysRUs, Big Lots – Dublin Village Center – Master Sign Plan

Case Summary

Agenda Item	1
Case Number	16-041MSP
Proposal	A Master Sign Plan for an existing multiple-tenant building in the Bridge Street District located in the Sawmill Center Neighborhood.
Request	Review and a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H)(2)(e) and 153.066.
Site Location	Located east of Sawmill Road, west of Dublin Center Drive, north of Bunker Drive, and south of Village Parkway at 6525, 6547, and 6569 Sawmill Road.
Applicant	Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development LLC.
Case Manager	Nichole Martin, Planner I (614) 410-4635 nmartin@dublin.oh.us
Planning Recommendation	Approval The proposed Master Sign Plan is consistent with previously approved variances and surrounding signs. Approval is recommended, with two conditions. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The provision permitting a second wall sign for future tenants be eliminated; and2) The Secondary Image/ Logo provisions meet the Standard Sign Code Section 153.158(C)(2).



 City of Dublin	16-041MSP Master Sign Plan Goodwill, Toys "R" Us, Big Lots 6525, 6547, 6569 Sawmill Road	0 150 300 Feet
---	---	-------------------

Facts	
Site Area	±11.0 acres
Zoning	BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District – Sawmill Center Neighborhood
Surrounding Zoning And Uses	<p>All surrounding properties are zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District – Sawmill Center Neighborhood</p> <p>North: Commercial – Retail South: Commercial – Office/ Retail West: Commercial – Large Format Retail East: City of Columbus – Commercial</p>
Site Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Multitenant building located on three separate parcels• Linear building, auto-oriented site layout with the building significantly setback from Sawmill Road and parking located in front of the building.• Structure is setback 425 feet from Sawmill Road• Site has full access to Bunker Drive, Village Parkway, and Dublin Center Drive, and limited right-in-right-out access on Sawmill Road
Existing Conditions	<p>The existing structure and site were approved and subsequently developed as a single project on a single parcel. Today, there is a single structure located on three separate parcels permitted through variance approvals to allow for the ownership of individual tenant spaces. There are four tenants located on three separate parcels. The tenants are located north to south as follows: Quilt Beginnings, Big Lots, Toys 'R' Us, and Goodwill (formerly Billiards Plus).</p> <p>Each tenant has one wall sign with the exception of Toys 'R' Us, which has a second wall sign on the rear of their tenant space. The existing signs were approved by variance and under the previous Community Commercial District zoning. The previous sign provisions permitted larger, but fewer signs than permitted under the current Bridge Street District provisions.</p>
Previous Approvals	<p>The site has a complex approval history including variances and Corridor Development District (CDD) applications regarding sign allowances. The requests for each parcel with respect to signs are summarized.</p> <p><u>Entire Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1988, BZA approved a variance to permit signs to exceed 15 feet in height, at 18 feet above grade, with a condition that the sign background be the same material as the building façade. An exhibit showed a second wall sign on the east elevation for Toys'R'Us and Glick Furniture although there was no record pertaining to the

Facts

approval of these signs.

6525 Sawmill Road – Billiards Plus

- 2008 – PZC approved a CDD application for Billiards Plus to permit a wall sign on the east elevation at a height of 21 feet-1 inch.

6547 Sawmill Road – Toys 'R Us

- 1988 – BZA approved a variance to permit a second wall sign on the west elevation.

6569 Sawmill Road – Big Lots (formerly Circuit City and Glick's)

- 2001 – BZA approved a variance to permit the sign on east elevation at 20 feet tall for Big Lots. BZA tabled a request for second wall sign (never brought back).
- 1996 – BZA approved a variance to permit Circuit City a second wall sign, and an increase in height of west wall sign to 15 feet-6 inches and east wall sign to 23 feet. BZA disapproved a third wall sign, an increase in size of signs, and a ground sign for site with wall signs.
- 1993 – BZA disapproved a variance to permit Glick's Furniture for a third wall sign.
- 1988 – BZA approved a variance to permit Glick's Furniture a second wall sign on the west elevation.

Details	Master Sign Plan
Master Sign Plan (MSP)	The purpose of a MSP is to provide an opportunity for greater flexibility and creativity in sign design. The MSP provision of the BSD Code accounts for the unique nature of commercial developments and provides a comprehensive and flexible approach for review and approval of appropriate sign plans that are consistent with the BSD Sign Guidelines and may vary from the BSD Sign Code.
Proposal	<p>The submittal includes a MSP text outlining the permitted sign types, standards, lighting and locations as well as drawings showing permitted multiple-tenant ground signs. The proposal includes regulations that preserve previously granted variances and CDD approvals as well as requests for additional wall and ground signs that the applicant indicated allow the auto-oriented development to remain competitive within the Sawmill corridor.</p> <p>Generally, the MSP text follows the standards of the general sign provisions within §153.150 with respect to size, but provides additional allowances for ground signs and number of signs, which generally follow the BSD sign provisions within §153.065(H)</p>
Wall Signs	The proposal permits each tenant an up to 80 square foot (1 square foot per linear foot) wall sign. The proposed area provisions are consistent with the general sign provisions of the Zoning Code that were applied to the site

Details	Master Sign Plan
	<p>prior to the Bridge Street District. The proposed text states wall signs must be individually mounted letters affixed directly to the building above the tenant's space. The proposal allows the wall sign height no taller than 22 feet-3 inches to the top of the sign, which retains the previously approved height allowances for the center.</p> <p>The proposal includes the provision of a second wall sign for tenants with a second façade facing a street or parking lot with the same size allowance and the primary wall sign.</p> <p>Secondary images including logos are permitted to be up to 20% of the maximum permitted sign area.</p> <p>Signs are limited to three colors including white and black. A registered trademark or logo is permitted to count as one of the three permitted colors. Proposed permitted lighting includes internal or halo-lit illumination.</p>
Ground Signs	<p>The MSP proposes three multiple-tenant ground signs; one located on Sawmill Road south of the entrance drive, one located on Bunker Drive west of the entrance drive, and one located on Village Parkway east of entrance drive. The proposed MSP text permits only the ground signs as shown in the drawings submitted as part of the plan. Since the current condition is that the tenant spaces are located on separate parcels, the ground signs as proposed would be classified as "off-premise" for two of the three tenants. Under the code, a MSP is the only avenue to approve off-premise signs.</p> <p>In detail, the proposed ground signs are shown as a rectangular cabinet mounted on a brick base with a limestone cap. The brick base is proposed to match the existing building. The graphic area of the sign is 20 square feet with white, pin-mounted, halo-illuminated letters on a large Metallic Silver metal panel. The metal panel is integrated into the primary cabinet to create a 3D effect. The primary metal cabinet is proposed as Charcoal Gray.</p> <p>The drawing shows the three of the four existing tenants. In the event a new tenant occupies the space, the names of the tenant would be permitted to be switched out; however, any deviation in design or size of the ground signs would require future review and approval by the required reviewing body.</p>
Additional Details	<p>The proposal permits additional sign types, which are temporary in nature, would not require a sign permit, or are intended to provide information regarding hours of operation and accepted methods of payment. Respectively, these include Window Display Signs §153.057(K), Directional Signs §153.057(L), and Informational Window Signs §153.057(M). These provisions are consistent with the Code.</p> <p>The plan prohibits changeable copy signs, and stipulated in the event of</p>

Details	Master Sign Plan
	conflicting standards that the more restrictive of the two standards shall apply.
Administrative Review Team Comments	<p>The applicant has worked with ART to propose a complete and comprehensive MSP submission. ART recognizes the unique nature of the site particularly with respect to the existing development pattern located within the Bridge Street District. ART recommended the applicant take a coordinated, consistent, and creative approach in preparing their MSP submittal. ART recommended the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminate the provision allowing unlimited colors for Corporate Brand Identities and limit signs to a maximum of 3 colors.• Explore high-quality, creative ground sign designs meeting the intent of the MSP provisions and Zoning District.• Consider options for integrating the structure with the signs.• Secondary Image allowances for the proposed auto-oriented signs meet the standard City sign code (20% of permitted sign area).• Limit the layering of allowances (i.e. additional signs at heights not already granted by previous variances), and limit the mixing and matching of code provisions, and; therefore eliminate the allowance of a second sign and provision of BSD sign types for the second wall sign. <p>The applicant has worked to address ART's comments and made the following updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited signs to a maximum of 3 colors.• Proposed unique, coordinated, dimensional ground signs.• Requested a Minor Modification (not part of this application) to integrate the building's vehicular canopy and fascia with the ground signs.• Eliminated substitution of BSD sign types for the proposed second wall sign.• Limited Secondary Image provision to the standard sign code (20% of permitted sign area). <p>The applicant has proposed a comprehensive MSP to meet the intent of the BSD Code; however, the application was prompted by tenant turn over within the center. The applicant has indicated they are working to balance the interests of their tenant with the requirements of the City. Due to the unique nature of the site, complex history, and current proposal the applicant requested the Commission reconsider the following three components for appropriateness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A second wall sign for tenants,• Substituting BSD sign types for the second wall sign, and• Secondary Image allowances that are greater than 20% (16SF) of the permitted sign area <p>Permitting a second wall sign for all tenants through a MSP approval,</p>

Details	Master Sign Plan
	<p>proposed to preserve previous variance/ CDD approvals, creates a condition where allowances are layered. Therefore, the center would be permitted more signs at taller heights than permitted by Code. Therefore ART recommends the second wall sign provision be eliminated from the MSP text.</p> <p>The applicant previously proposed to provide the tenants with an option to allow the second wall sign to be substituted for an awning sign or a projecting sign in accordance with the BSD sign provisions in order to maintain the creativity intended in the BSD; however, removed this provision at Staff's recommendation as it mixes regulations from both sign codes and therefore permits more signs with more variety in type of signs.</p> <p>Additionally, the applicant has requested PZC consider the appropriateness of Secondary Images/ Logos that are greater than 20% of the sign area. Staff has worked with the applicant to structure the regulations in a manner than are consistent with what has historically been approved for the center. Under previous zoning, signs that are predominately logos were not permitted. Therefore ART recommends the secondary image and logo provisions be eliminated from the MSP text.</p>

Analysis	Master Sign Plan
Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines	<p>The Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines provide a variety of examples of one-of-a-kind, context-sensitive, memorable, and forward thinking signs that are appropriate for the Bridge Street District. The guidelines also emphasize the following for Master Sign Plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Signs and graphics should contribute to the vibrancy of the area. 2) Placement of signs and graphics should assist with navigation, provide information, and identify businesses. 3) Sign locations and designs should be properly coordinated with architectural character.
Master Sign Plan	<p>Section 153.065(H)(2)(e) of the Zoning Code identifies the purpose of a Master Sign Plan. Following is an analysis by ART based on the standards outlined in the Bridge Street District Code.</p>
<i>1. Allow a greater degree of flexibility in sign design and display</i>	<p>Criterion met: The proposed sign plan addresses an existing development pattern that differs from the (future) development pattern the BSD Code targets. The proposed plan allows for the flexibility to deviate from the BSD Code requirements.</p>
<i>2. Intended for multiple signs</i>	<p>Criterion met: The proposal includes a comprehensive solution to the sign provisions for the entire shopping center where multiple parcels and multiple</p>

Analysis	Master Sign Plan
<p><i>for a single building or a group of related buildings to ensure the requested signs work in coordinated fashion</i></p>	<p>property owners exists and ensures the existing and future signs are consistent and coordinated.</p>
<p><i>3. Not intended to simply permit larger or more visible signs, or additional signs without consideration for unique sign design and display</i></p>	<p>Criterion met with condition: The applicant has proposed context sensitive signs that strive to meet the intent of the District, but is appropriate with the existing auto-oriented development pattern on the site and preserves previous approvals. ART recommends the second sign provision be eliminated from the MSP text and the secondary image and logo provisions meet Code. The applicant requests the Planning Zoning Commission consider further the appropriateness of a second wall sign for tenants, of substituting BSD sign types for the second wall sign, and of Secondary Image allowances that are greater than 20% of the sign area.</p>
<p><i>4. Maintains the purpose and intent of the sign and graphics standards for the applicable BSD Zoning District.</i></p>	<p>Criterion met with condition: The Sawmill Center Neighborhood standards require that the sign and graphics standards contribute to the vibrancy of the district and contribute to the creation of a high quality environment. The applicant has worked to reconcile the intent of the District and the existing development pattern. Should the site redevelop, the applicant shall install signs that meet the intent and requirements of the Bridge Street District Code, or submit a new Master Sign Plan for review and approval by the required reviewing body.</p>

Recommendation	Master Sign Plan
Approval	The proposed Master Sign Plan is consistent with previously approved variances and surrounding signs. Approval is recommended, with two conditions.
Conditions	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The provision permitting a second wall sign for future tenants be eliminated from the MSP text; and2) The Secondary Image/ Logo provisions meet the Standard Sign Code Section 153.158(C)(2).