

BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
November 5, 2020
Video/Audio E-Conference

Attendees:

Committee: Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Carla McConnell, Kevin Yoshida
CK Signage Team: Branden Bird, Danielle Conover, Mike Doody, H McNeish
Developer: Nick Kitaef

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (10/15/20)**

A motion by Steve Lane and seconded by Carla McConnell was passed to approve the minutes from the October 15, 2020 meeting as presented.

- **CK Development**
Commercial Comprehensive Signage Plan
Ground and Office Tenant Signs

Comprehensive Signage Plan Follow up: (H McNeish)

H McNeish referred to the CSP seen and approved in August with focus being on the Target portion at that time. Comments being responded to in the current presentation are for the ground signs and the office tenant signage.

Mike Doody showed renderings of the design of the ground (G.1) signs:

- Material - blackened aluminum 12'6" H x 6'3" W x 2' D containing:
 - Merchant names in white in the merchant's font
 - Exchange at Boulevard One logo (EX)
 - A narrow blue line running vertically along one side

A lengthy discussion followed with the following points being voiced by the BDRC members:

- G.1 signs in the ROW are prohibited in the design guidelines and questioned if the two signs in the Quebec ROW were necessary, especially the one on Quebec near 1st Ave. If developer still desires to keep these two signs a "variance request" process to be followed.
- Design Guidelines requirement for this type of sign at a distance of at least 300' apart.
(Confirmation that the signs are 336' apart)
- Trees in the tree lawn need to be consistent with the landscaping plan and not trade one for a G.1 ground sign.
- Seems more suburban than urban design approach.
- Concerns of signage bringing bright lighting to the area.
- Question readability of the sign content from vehicles going 30-40 mph.

- The number of names on the sign and the branding creates visual clutter in the ROW that doesn't contribute to the public realm in a positive way.
- Consistent generic font might limit clutter and make it easier reading rather than using variety of merchant's fonts.
- Do merchants with a presence on Quebec need to be mentioned on the sign?
- Appropriateness of wayfinding and place-making without every merchant needing to be listed on a sign. Does CCD differentiate between advertising a merchant and way-finding signage? **(No, they do not)**
- Not sure the branding logo is understandable and might be confusing in conjunction with the merchant's names.

Responses from design team:

- It was difficult finding a location for the signs on Quebec. Due to lot boundaries and utility easements the ROW was the only option. Tenants desire exposure on a major street, and there is also the use of the G.1 signage as way-finders to entry points. There were attempts for placement within the set-back area but didn't look compatible with the structure and sightline for vehicular traffic. Customers will come to the site from the four points where G.1 signage is proposed. Will the two signs in the ROW be fatal to the G.1 proposal of four signs?
- Renderings showing names are samples only and will be fine-tuned later to specific merchants to be listed.
- Exposure through signage on busy thoroughfares is very important to merchants.
- The team does think the information provided on ground signs is important and the four signs have been kept to a scale appropriate to the scale of the structure and a 5-acre site. With only two signs on Quebec it is not unreasonable to meet information expectations of those passing by. There is a real purpose and experience going into the design and studies that support the size and readability at various distances.
- Feel the G.1 signs are eye-catching and attractive. As to clutter, would be four names be more acceptable than six?
- Page 51 of the presentation specifies the dimming standards that will be incorporated into the CSP. A night vision of the G.1 signs was shown with lighting subtlety and being non-obtrusive.

More discussion led to the conclusions of the BDRC:

- The two signs at the 1st Ave and Pontiac entry points can be given consideration for approval today.
- The materials, colors, size are acceptable at Design Development level.
- The design is tasteful and compliments the architecture and site plan.
- Content and placements of the signage within the CSP is not under the purview of the BDRC and should be left to the experts on the design team. The BDRC is to determine that there is a thoughtful consistent plan for the entire site that is well planned and provides the necessary and appropriate information for users of the site.
- The conflict with the design guidelines with signage in the ROW will need to follow a "variance request" procedure to justify consideration of those two G.1 signs.
- Provide installation and fabrication details in a future presentation for Final (Construction Drawing) review.

- Carry over of the office tenant signage presentation to a future review.
- Resubmittal of the CSP for the file that removes the two G.1 signs on Quebec so there is no confusion of what is being approved today.

A motion by Carla McConnell and seconded by Steve Lane was passed to approve the design of the two on-site G.1 signs at the 1st Ave. and at the Pontiac St entry points that are consistent with the previously approved Comprehensive Signage Plan.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.