

on these drawings. As part of a freestanding signage standpoint we are allowed up to 72 square feet and an overall height of 18 feet. The owner's goal is to have no more than 2 freestanding signs in keeping a monument-style sign. Also included are two sign options for the monument signs which are in the draft stage. A request for directional signage was not included in the package, but is requested with staff approval of the details. Two of the tenants have received conditional use approval for drive-through services. They will have directional signage for those drive-through lanes; this is a safety issue for using entrances and exits and processing through the entire property. The limit on directional signs is 3 square feet and we ask for approval for 6 square feet of directional sign for the drive thru service. Also, the final locations and designs approved at staff level. Wall signage requires comprehensive design review because of where they are placed, not because of the size of the signs. The square footages of the signs all comply with the exception of Taco Bell with two signable areas for them; a Taco Bell logo, which is an oversize sign and an above canopy sign. Staff noted that the restriction relative to 4 feet over the roof line was developed to prevent people from building extremely tall parapets. In this case when UDC approved the architecture, it resulted in an increase to the height of the tower. In regards to ground signs, two are allowed but the intent is one sign but don't want to come back to you for a second one if needed. Potentially will use both signs but developer wants options. The Commission noted that the ground signage seems a little redundant and should have the street address listed on it. Concern was expressed about having the same size or larger signs facing the parking lot as facing East Washington Avenue as really necessary. Are we putting these signs in the view shed of the residential folks on the northwestern property line? It was noted that the neighbors were here earlier when we were discussing the view and it has come up in the neighborhood. It was noted that sign placement was desired based on the size of the building. Too small can look very bad. Street graphics face streets and face parking. Prefer monument sign option without additional signage for the tenants given the size of the signage and the fact that buildings are pushed up to the sidewalk and close to the street which we like; prefer a plain Lake City sign with the address there.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** with permission for two monument signs with just simply Lake City Plaza but not boxes for the tenants with front and rear wall signage as shown with directional signage to go back to staff and as needed to come back to the Commission for review if appropriate with the address to be placed visibly for safety on the one monument sign for the center. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4120-4208 East Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	5
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Nicely presented as usual – seems like a lot of signs to me.
- We need to be observant as to how sign packages affect adjacent residential properties.