

Staci Johnson

From: Eberly, Dale R. <DALE.R.EBERLY.II@saic.com>
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 8:43 AM
To: Thomas Paschke
Subject: RE: Walmart MSP
Attachments: Site View 1.jpg; Site View 2.jpg

Mr Paschke-

Our response to your comments from yesterday follow below. Please note that our responses are in **red**. Please also note that the referenced images are also attached. To this message. Please feel free to contact me with any comments or questions you may have.

-Dale

Dale Eberly II

Architectural Job Captain, LEED AP
SAIC Energy, Environment & Infrastructure, LLC (SEE&I)
office: 651-771-2222 | direct: 651-209-2836
60 E. Plato Blvd, Ste. 300
St. Paul, MN 55107

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email and any attachments to it are intended only for the identified recipients. It may contain proprietary or otherwise legally protected information of SAIC. Any unauthorized use or disclosure of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and delete or otherwise destroy the email and all attachments immediately.



From: Thomas Paschke [<mailto:thomas.paschke@ci.roseville.mn.us>]
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 1:29 PM
To: Eberly, Dale R.
Subject: Walmart MSP

Dale;

On February 19, 2013, I received the initial Master Sign Plan for Walmart and two outlots.

On March 1, 2013, I provided comments to you regarding the initial submittal - specifically that wall signage would be limited to a ratio of 1.75 which translated into an overall building wall allowance of 900 sq. ft. of signage. Further, that freestanding signage exceeded the maximum 150 sq. ft. allowed and that the Committee would not support a pole sign.

On March 20, 2013 you sought clarification regarding freestanding sign allowances, specifically number, location and size. I responded that the Committee would support two freestanding monument or similar signs up to a maximum of 100 sq. ft. each.

This brings us to the most recent submittal regarding freestanding signs. I have sought comments from MSP Committee members and discussed signage for the area, Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area (Twin Lakes), with the Community Development Director. While we are open to creative design and flexible

standards, our goal through the MSP process is to achieve consistency, attractiveness, and address complex signage situations. That said, the following are our generalized comments:

Our understanding of going through the MSP process (this specific case) is to seek greater signage, location, and height flexibility, and to limit the number of signs on the three lots. To address the multi-tenant and limited sign items, the proposal seeks to construct a single freestanding multi-tenant sign. The revised proposal recently submitted for consideration meets the maximum thresholds of the Sign Regulations, but our determination is that the signage area shall have a more even distribution of signage between the three tenants. Currently, each of the out lots will receive approximately 16.5% of the sign face area. This is proportional to the amount of the land in the individual out lot compared to the overall parcel. Lot 1 (Walmart lot) is 80% of the development, each out lot is 10% of the overall development. Additionally, Walmart is the initial developer and the “anchor” of the development and it is reasonable that they should be allowed a larger portion of the sign for this.

Regarding the freestanding sign height, the Committee would support a 30 foot tall freestanding multi-tenant sign, however, 40 feet is too tall, especially when the base allowance is only 25 feet. Should Walmart desire to justify the increased height via illustrations of the view-shed and why increasing height is necessary, we can take that into consideration. The goal of this sign is to attract traffic from not only the immediately surrounding community, but also from I-35W. The optimum view to I-35W north bound will be at a point shown by image Site View 1. At this point there is a sign for Burger King that we are trying to provide a view around while still allowing the drivers reasonable time to see the sign and prepare to exit safely. The increased height would also allow the Walmart sign as well as the tenant signs under it to be more visible to the southbound lanes of I-35W over the trees around the wetland to the Northwest of the site (refer to image Site View 2). Again, we are trying to provide a view to the sign while still allowing drivers time to plan their exit safely.

It is worth noting that the Walmart site development area (deemed a unified development) may be only one of a couple developments required to proceed through the MSP process. Knowing this and the fact that the standards for other properties will potentially be less than that approved for Walmart, the Committee aspires to create signage that is uniform, attractive, and not out of character with buildings or other multi-use development areas. After a review of city zoning ordinances, it is our interpretation that signage is intended to be allocated based on building and lot size. A larger sign is not out of character for our building as it is a very large building, likely to be one of the largest single-tenant buildings in the area.

Should you have any questions or comments, please feel free to email or call me.

Thomas R. Paschke
Roseville City Planner
2660 Civic Center Drive
(651) 792-7074

Confidentiality Statement: The documents accompanying this transmission contain confidential information that is legally privileged. This information is intended only for the use of the individuals or entities listed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or action taken in reliance on the contents of these documents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this information in error, please notify the sender immediately and arrange for the return or destruction of these documents.