

STAFF REPORT

January 10, 2002

No. 01PD064 - Major Amendment to a Planned Commercial Development to revise the sign package **ITEM 29**

GENERAL INFORMATION:

PETITIONER	Bryan K. Gonzales for Pride Neon, Inc.
REQUEST	No. 01PD064 - Major Amendment to a Planned Commercial Development to revise the sign package
EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTION	Lot 2 Revised of Blocks 14-15, South Boulevard Addition, Section 12, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota
PARCEL ACREAGE	Approximately 2.49 acres
LOCATION	640 Flormann Street
EXISTING ZONING	Shopping Center-1 District (PCD)
SURROUNDING ZONING	
North:	Office Commercial District (PD)
South:	Medium Density Residential District
East:	Medium Density Residential District
West:	Shopping Center District
PUBLIC UTILITIES	City water and sewer
DATE OF APPLICATION	12/14/2001
REPORT BY	Lisa Seaman

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Major Amendment to a Planned Commercial Development to revise the sign package be continued to the February 7, 2002 Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant time to provide an "as built" site survey and further information with respect to the color of the proposed signs.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The subject property is located east of the Mt. Rushmore Street Safeway Store and lies between Flormann and St. Anne Streets. Seventh Street has been vacated in the area west of the property. The site involves 2.49 acres of land. On May 1, 2000, the City Council approved a Planned Commercial Development #00PD007 on the subject property with 18 stipulations. The Planned Commercial Development allowed a 76,000 square foot medical facility to be located on the eastern portion of the property. The stipulations of approval for the Planned Commercial Development addressed drainage, the replacement of broken and displaced sidewalks, grading, water and sewer installation, building height, building materials and color, signage, lighting, air handling, landscaping and parking.

STAFF REPORT

January 10, 2002

No. 01PD064 - Major Amendment to a Planned Commercial Development to revise the sign package **ITEM 29**

The City Council approved a Major Amendment to the Planned Commercial Development on July 24, 2000 to reduce the size of the medical facility from 76,000 square feet to 67,840 square feet. Reducing the size of the structure resulted in a reduced parking requirement.

One of the stipulations of approval of the original Planned Commercial Development required that the applicant provide a complete sign package for review and approval. The applicant is now requesting a Major Amendment to the Planned Commercial Development to revise the sign package that was previously approved.

STAFF REVIEW: The applicant had originally proposed to construct two wall mounted signs measuring 16 feet X 1.5 feet, one on the east side of the building and one on the west side of the building. The applicant has since revised the proposed sign package replacing the originally proposed signage with the following:

One (1) three foot by twenty foot back lit wall mounted sign and one (1) two foot six inch by fifteen foot back lit wall mounted sign on the south side of the building

One (1) three foot by twenty foot back lit wall mounted sign and one (1) two foot six inch by fifteen foot back lit wall mounted sign on the north side of the building

Two (2) two foot six inch by fifteen foot back lit wall mounted sign on the east side of the building

One (1) six foot by nine foot back lit wall mounted sign on the west side of the building

The original sign package allowed for 48 square foot of sign area on the proposed structure. The revised sign package identifies 369 square foot of sign area to be constructed on the building. The Rapid City Sign Code allows properties to display signs having a total square footage equaling two times the property frontage. The subject property has a frontage along Flormann Street, St. Anne Street and Sixth Street totaling 1,022 feet allowing for 2044 square feet of signage on the property. The applicant has noted that the aluminum sign faces will be painted to match the color of the existing building. Staff is requesting that the applicant provide further information with respect to the color of the proposed signs.

As mentioned previously, the original Planned Commercial Development was approved with eighteen stipulations. The stipulations of approval required that the developer provide plans for grading, parking and landscaping for review and approval. In addition, concerns were expressed about the impact of the three story building and large parking areas on the adjoining residential development. The stipulations of approval required that the applicant provide a minimum of 117,280 landscaping points, that deciduous trees be provided within the parking lot area and a buffer of a minimum of six fifteen foot tall honeylocust trees be provided along the east lot line. Staff have conducted site inspections and noted that the landscaping, parking, circulation and grading have not been completed as shown on the approved plans. It even appears that the 2,300 square foot building located on the east side of the subject property is larger than approved. Staff is concerned that the applicant may need additional Major

STAFF REPORT

January 10, 2002

No. 01PD064 - Major Amendment to a Planned Commercial Development to revise the sign package **ITEM 29**

Amendments because of revisions made to the site that were not in compliance with the approved Planned Commercial Development and Major Amendment to the Planned Commercial Development. Staff is recommending that the applicant provide an "as-built" site plan to evaluate what actions may be necessary to bring the subject property into compliance with the approved Planned Commercial Development. The Building Inspection Department has noted that the temporary Certificate of Occupancy that was issued for occupancy of this building expired on November 1, 2001.

As of this writing, the receipts from the certified mailings have not been returned. The required Planned Development sign has not been posted on the property. Staff has received one call regarding this proposal. The caller asked about the brightness of the proposed signage and if the signage would be illuminated all night long.