



RALEIGH PLANNING COMMISSION CERTIFIED RECOMMENDATION

CR#13313

CASE INFORMATION: SSP-1-23 VILLAGE DISTRICT COMMON SIGNAGE PLAN AMENDMENT

Location	Village District (former Cameron Village District) Shopping Center near Oberlin Road and Cameron Street Link to iMaps
Adopted Year of Plan	1990
Last Amendment Date	2008 (and prior in 2003)
Area of Request	28.52 acres
Property Owner	Columbia Village District LLC
Applicant	Jennifer Ashton, jashton@longleafip.com 919-780-5433
Council District	District D
Current Zoning	CX-5-UG; CX-5-UL; and CX-7-UL

SUMMARY OF KEY CHANGES PROPOSED

1. Renames the Cameron Village Common Signage Plan to Village District Common Signage plan to reflect current nomenclature of the shopping center.
2. Brings the adopted 2003 Village District (formerly Cameron Village) Common Signage plan up to current City of Raleigh UDO standards. The amendment will not require existing tenants to change signage.
3. Allows tenants the option to upgrade their signage to include:
 - more colors allowed by the UDO,
 - additional materials (neon tubes and bare/mill finished metals),
 - trademarked logos,
 - additional sign types such as projecting signs; awning, marquee, and gallery signs for basement and second floor units (which may include internally illuminated box signs for tenant logos); limited changeable copy signs for theatres and entertainment venues that meets current UDO standards.
4. Offers additional options to tenants to upgrade their signage to reflect the Village District's historical mid-century modern signage design.

No changes other than signage allowances to the 2003 Streetscape and Parking Plan are proposed in this request. Except as modified in this request, the 2003 Streetscape Plan and Common Signage Plan shall remain in full force and effect.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GUIDANCE

Consistent Policies <i>Key policies are marked with a dot (●)</i> <i>Area Specific Guidance policies are marked with a square (□)</i>	●	UD 1.3 Creating Attractive Facades
		UD 1.5 Pedestrian Wayfinding
		UD 1.14 Community Identity
		UD 7.2 Promoting Quality Design
		UD 5.4 Neighborhood Character and Identity
Inconsistent Policies ● Key Policy □ Area Specific Guidance		NA

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Required Neighborhood Meeting	Planning Commission	City Council
10/23/2023 No attendees	2/13/24	

STREETSCAPE AMENDMENT ENGAGEMENT PORTAL RESULTS

Views	Participants	Responses	Comments
11	0	0	None
Summary of Comments: No comments			

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

The proposed streetscape plan amendment is **Consistent** with the relevant policies in the Comprehensive Plan, **Consistent** with the standards of the Street Design Manual and UDO, furthermore **Approval** of the proposed amendment is reasonable and in the public interest.

Reasonableness and Public Interest	<p>The action taken is reasonable and in the public interest because:</p> <p>The request would rename the Cameron Village Common Signage Plan to the Village District Common Signage Plan to reflect the current nomenclature of the shopping center.</p> <p>The request would update the Village District Common Signage Plan to current UDO standards.</p> <p>The request would encourage a visually cohesive street frontage in the Village District.</p> <p>The request would allow current and future retail tenants to choose from a wider variety of signage, which would enhance the pedestrian environment.</p>
Change(s) in Circumstances	N/A
Recommendation	Approval
Motion and Vote	<p>Motion: Fox</p> <p>Second: O'Haver</p> <p>In favor: Bennett, Fox, Miller, McCrimmon, O'Haver, Otwell and Peeler</p> <p>Opposed: None</p>
Reason for Opposed Vote(s)	N/A

ATTACHMENTS

1. Staff Report
2. Amended Streetscape Plan Draft

This document is a true and accurate statement of the findings and recommendations of the Planning Commission. Approval of this document incorporates all of the findings of the attached Staff Report and Analysis.



Bynum Walter
Planning and Development Assistant Director

Date: 02/13/24

Staff Coordinator: Dhanya Sandeep, dhanya.sandeep@raleighnc.gov, 919-996-2659.



STREETSCAPE PLAN STAFF REPORT

SSP-1-23

OVERVIEW

Streetscape plans offer a tool to create a unique character for an area while enhancing pedestrian experience and allowing for sign ordinance modifications. The Cameron Village Streetscape and Parking Plan was first adopted in 1990 as required and part of a Pedestrian Business Overlay District rezoning. In 2003, the Plan was amended to add additional streetscape requirements and a Common Signage Plan. The Streetscape and Parking Plan was amended again in 2008 with changes to the streetscape requirements. In 2013, the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) was adopted that updated the city's sign ordinance and regulations.

The proposed amendment seeks to amend the Common Signage Plan adopted in 2003 and rename it to Village District Common Signage Plan. The amendment seeks to move away from narrow and restrictive language found in the current Plan by increasing flexibility and aligning better with the adopted signage regulations of the Unified Development Ordinance, while honoring and encouraging the Shopping Center's mid-century modern architectural style. Currently only certain colors, materials, and sign types are allowed in the 2003 Common Signage Plan, and this amendment would expand signage design options to tenants of the Village District. Amendments proposed include materials such as exposed neon tubes and bare/mill finished metals; an expanded color pallet; trademarked logos; and additional sign types, that would provide greater flexibility for tenants to remain competitive and maintain long-term viability of the center.

The proposal also addresses basement level and second story tenant signage allowances that would allow additional sign types (awning, gallery, marquee signage, and wall signs) and formally define maximum square footage allowed for these types of signs.

The amendment also requests to reintroduce mid-century style signage to the site, to highlight the historic context and unique identity of the shopping center while it evolves to meet to the needs of current day retailers. The Village District was the first shopping center to be built in North Carolina in 1947-1949.

The requested changes are summarized below:

1. Renames the Cameron Village Common Signage Plan to Village District Common Signage plan to reflect current nomenclature of the shopping center.
2. Brings the adopted 2003 Village District Common Signage plan up to current City of Raleigh UDO standards. The amendment will not require existing tenants to change signage.
3. Allows tenants the option to upgrade their signage to include:
 - more colors allowed by the UDO,

- additional materials (neon tubes and bare/mill finished metals),
 - trademarked logos,
 - additional sign types such as projecting signs; awning, marquee, and gallery signs for basement and second floor units (which may include internally illuminated box signs for tenant logos); limited changeable copy signs for theatres and entertainment venues.
4. Offers additional options to tenants to upgrade their signage to reflect the Village District's mid-century modern signage design.

No changes other than signage allowances to the 2003 Streetscape and Parking Plan are proposed in this request. Except as modified in this request, the 2003 Streetscape Plan and Common Signage Plan shall remain in full force and effect.

SIGNAGE REGULATIONS SUMMARY

Sign Types	2003 SP Plan	UDO	2023 SP Plan Proposed Amendments	IMPACTS
Wall	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Slight variation in standards requested
Projecting	Permitted (under canopy)	Permitted	Permitted	-
Awning Gallery Marquee	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Slight variation in standards requested
Window	Permitted (painted)	Permitted	Permitted	-
Ground Low Profile	NA	Not Permitted	Permitted	Variation from UDO
Ground Medium Profile	NA	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	-
Ground High Profile	NA	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	-

Sign Types	2003 SP Plan	UDO	2023 SP Plan Proposed Amendments	IMPACTS
Tract I.D.	NA	Not Permitted	Permitted	Variation from UDO
Roof	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	-
Changeable Copy	NA	Permitted	Permitted	-
Directory Signs	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	-

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SUMMARY

The request is consistent overall with the Comprehensive Plan. Bringing the Village District's Common Signage Plan up to current UDO standards would help ensure a visually cohesive street frontage in the shopping center, which is recommended in Chapter 11-Urban Design.

CODE ANALYSIS

CURRENT VS. PROPOSED STREETScape STANDARDS

Sign Types	Existing Streetscape Standards	Proposed Streetscape Standards	UDO Regulations	Impacts of Proposed Amendments
Ground Signs				
Low Profile	Not Identified as Allowable Sign Type	Low Profile Ground signs will only be allowed on a limited basis for tenants with a separate ground lease of at least 75,000 sf.	Low-profile signs are not permitted in the -UL and -UG frontages but are permitted in the -PL frontage. (Section 7.3.2)	Variation from UDO.
Medium Profile	Not Identified as Allowable Sign Type	Not Permitted	-	No Change
High Profile	Not Identified as Allowable Sign Type	Not Permitted	-	No Change
Tract ID Sign	8 Existing Tract ID signs	Permit Tract ID signs	Tract signs are not permitted in the -UL and -UG frontages but are permitted in the -PL frontage. (Section 7.3.2)	Variation from UDO. The property has 8 existing Tract ID signs.
A-Frame	Not Identified as Allowable Sign Type	Allow A-Frame signs as a permitted sign type per the Raleigh UDO criteria.	A-Frame signs are allowed in -UL and -UG frontages. Tenants are allowed one A-Frame sign per establishment, and they must be located within 5' of the main entrance. Signs are a	Sign regulation is in alignment with the UDO.

Sign Types	Existing Streetscape Standards	Proposed Streetscape Standards	UDO Regulations	Impacts of Proposed Amendments
			maximum 6 sf in area and 5' tall. (Section 7.3.12)	
Building Signs				
Wall	<p>A tenant is permitted one wall sign per building front elevation.</p> <p>Tenants with two or more fronts (building corner) will have multiple signs specific to the individual tenant.</p>	<p>Apply 2 sf of signage area per linear foot of street facing frontage (maximum of 300 sf of signage) equally to basement and second-level tenant spaces.</p> <p>Allow internally illuminated box letter signs for tenant logos and/or letters with a letter height limitation of 2'.</p>	<p>Maximum wall sign area allocation is based on the total elevation, with no distinction between stories.</p> <p>The area is calculated as 2 sf per linear foot of each building wall facing a public street or a private drive if lot has no frontage on a public street.</p> <p>No portion of a wall sign may extend 2' above the roof line of a building with a parapet wall, provided no portion of the sign extends above the parapet.</p> <p>(Section 7.3.4)</p>	<p>Variation from UDO.</p> <p>Historical records demonstrate use of box letter signage on the property.</p>
Projecting	<p>Each tenant may provide a blade sign with maximum of one per tenant.</p> <p>Signs must extend perpendicular no more than 5' from the surface it is mounted on.</p>	<p>Allow projecting signs per current UDO regulations</p>	<p>Projecting signs are permitted per current UDO regulations</p> <p>(Section 7.3.5)</p>	<p>Sign regulation is in alignment with the UDO.</p>

Sign Types	Existing Streetscape Standards	Proposed Streetscape Standards	UDO Regulations	Impacts of Proposed Amendments
	<p>Signs must not extend below 9' clearance between the finished floor.</p> <p>Signs are limited to certain materials, prohibited from being illuminated, and may include tenant logos.</p>			
Awning, Gallery, Marquee Sign	A tenant is permitted to use canopies (including fabric awnings) as an opportunity to identify their store name, logos, and crests.	<p>Allow basement-level and second story-level tenants 2 sf of signage area per linear foot of street facing frontage (maximum 300 sf of signage area).</p> <p>Maximum letter height shall be 2'.</p> <p>Internally illuminated box letter signs are permitted for tenant logos and/or letters.</p>	<p>Maximum wall sign area allocation is based on the total elevation, with no distinction between stories.</p> <p>The area is calculated 2 sf per linear foot of each building wall facing a public street or facing a private access way if the subject property has no frontage on a public street.</p> <p>The maximum height of letters is 18". (Section 7.3.6)</p>	<p>Variation from UDO.</p> <p>Historical records demonstrate use of projecting signs.</p>
Window	Not Identified as Allowable Sign Type	Allow window signs as a permitted sign per the Raleigh UDO criteria.	<p>Maximum sign area is per tenant and based on the side of the building facing along any street per floor.</p> <p>(Section 7.3.7)</p>	Sign regulation is in alignment with the UDO.

Sign Types	Existing Streetscape Standards	Proposed Streetscape Standards	UDO Regulations	Impacts of Proposed Amendments
Special Sign Type				
Changeable Copy	Not Identified as Allowable Sign Type	<p>Allow changeable copy signs as a permitted sign per the Raleigh UDO and limited to theaters and entertainment venues.</p> <p>Excluding changeable copy time and temperature signs, no changeable copy sign may change more than 4 times in any 24-hour period.</p>	<p>Changeable copy is allowed sign type with size standards and limits on the amount of allowable information and the amount of times it may be changed.</p> <p>(Section 7.3.13.C)</p>	Sign regulation is in alignment with the UDO.
Digital Signs	Not Identified as Allowable Sign Type	Digital signs for advertising of any type are prohibited..	Digital signs are prohibited except for those that meet the standards as listed in Section 7.3.13.N of the UDO.	Sign regulation is in alignment with the UDO.
Directory Sign	<p>Directory signs may be either changeable copy signs or fixed professional nameplates.</p> <p>Signs are to be affixed to private sidewalk locations and not visible from</p>	No proposed changes.	<p>Directory signs are limited to 1 per unified project or site.</p> <p>Outdoor directory signs may be either changeable copy or fixed professional nameplates.</p> <p>(Section 7.3.13.E)</p>	No change requested.

Sign Types	Existing Streetscape Standards	Proposed Streetscape Standards	UDO Regulations	Impacts of Proposed Amendments
	any public right-of-way.			
Roof Signs	Not Identified as Allowable Sign Type	Roof signage is prohibited at the Village District.	Roof signs are a prohibited sign type. (Section 7.3.15)	Sign regulation is in alignment with the UDO.



Property

Village District

2000 Cameron Street, 2016 Cameron Street, 2105 Cameron Street, 416 Oberlin Road, 400 Daniels Street, and 422 Woodburn Road

Size

28.52 acres

**Current
Zoning**

CX-5-UG, CX-5-UL, CX-7-UL

Historical Photos of Proposed Signage Used on the Property



Existing Signage on the Property



Existing Signage on the Property



Proposed Signage Samples



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ANALYSIS

Comprehensive Plan Consistency

The request is: ☒ **Consistent** ☐ **Inconsistent** with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

The request is consistent overall with the Comprehensive Plan. Bringing the Village District's Common Signage Plan up to current UDO standards would help ensure a visually cohesive street frontage in the shopping center, which is recommended in Chapter 11-Urban Design. The amendment seeks to enhance attractive and functional needs of the site to meet the needs of the current retailers. Approval would also allow current and future retail tenants to choose from a wider variety of signage, which could activate the frontage and pedestrian environment and enhance the pedestrian experience.

Policy Guidance

The proposed amendment is **consistent** with the following policies:

Consistent Policies <i>Key policies are marked with a dot (●)</i> <i>Area Specific Guidance policies are marked with a square (□)</i>	●	UD 1.3 Creating Attractive Facades
		UD 1.5 Pedestrian Wayfinding
		UD 1.14 Community Identity
		UD 3.5 Visually Cohesive Streetscapes
		UD 5.4 Neighborhood Character and Identity
		UD 7.2 Promoting Quality Design

● Policy UD 1.3 Creating Attractive Facades

Well-designed and articulated building facades, storefront windows, and attractive signage and lighting should be used to create visual interest. Monolithic or box-like facades should be avoided to promote the human quality of the street.

Policy UD 1.5 Pedestrian Wayfinding

Support the creation of a unified and comprehensive system of pedestrian wayfinding signs, kiosks, and other environmental graphics to provide directions to the pedestrian.

Policy UD 1.14 Community Identity

Raleigh's diversity is reflected in a range of architectural and landscape design traditions and styles. Public and private development should be consistent with and incorporate the aesthetic identities of the surrounding populations, including, but not limited to, neighborhood branding and wayfinding.

Policy UD 3.5 Visually Cohesive Streetscapes

Create visually cohesive streetscapes using a variety of techniques including landscaping, undergrounding of utilities, and other streetscape improvements along street frontages that reflect adjacent land uses.

Policy UD 5.4 Neighborhood Character and Identity

Strengthen the defining visual qualities of Raleigh's neighborhoods. This should be achieved in part by relating the scale of infill development, alterations, renovations, and additions to existing neighborhood context.

Policy UD 7.2 Promoting Quality Design

Promote quality urban design through the use of design standards, zoning regulations, promotional materials, design awards, programs, and competitions.

OTHER STAFF TRADE REVIEWS

The following key reviewers identified no potential negative impacts specific to this request:

☒ Historic Resources

Reviewer	Comments	
Historic Resources	Impact: No adverse impact.	The Leif Valand designed Cameron Village Shopping Center (WA2672) opened in 1949. The result of collaboration between Valand, J. Willie York, R.A. Bryan, and Ed Richards, the Shopping Center revolutionized development practices in Raleigh in terms of a master-planned, mixed-use community of shops and housing at a scale previously unimagined. While the general site plan and building footprints largely remain the same, the building facades and design have very little resemblance to the original design. The elevations and exterior design have routinely been updated to reflect the shopping trends and desires of the day. This proposed Streetscape plan has no adverse impact on the Shopping Center.

☒ Current Planning

Reviewer	Comments	
Current Planning	Impact:	The request seeks signage allowances that vary from current UDO regulations. However, modifications from UDO are permitted as part of Streetscape plans that help create unique identity and preserve historic character and context. The amendments requested update the signage to current UDO regulations.
	Mitigation:	NA

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable adopted plans.

The request is consistent overall with the Comprehensive Plan. Bringing the Village District's Common Signage Plan up to current UDO standards would help ensure a visually cohesive street frontage in the shopping center, which is recommended in Chapter 11-Urban Design. The amendment seeks to enhance attractive and functional needs of the site to meet the needs of the current retailers. Approval would also allow current and future retail tenants to choose from a wider variety of signage, which could activate the frontage and pedestrian environment and enhance the pedestrian experience.

2. Consistency with adopted street design manual standards.

The proposed amendment is consistent with the Street Design Manual as no changes are impacting the streetscape elements on the public rights-of-way. The amendments are limited to modifications to the signage regulations aimed to enhance the pedestrian level experience and signage visibility for retailers. All proposed signage will be located on private property and not within the public rights-of-way.

3. Consistency with the stated purpose and intent of the UDO and/or in response to attaining compliance with recent amendments in the UDO.

The proposed amendment is generally consistent with the purpose and intent of the UDO. Most of the modifications requested better align with the current UDO regulations, while a few seek slight variation from the current UDO regulations. Streetscape plans offer the tool to allow for modifications from the UDO to create unique streetscape and district identity. The proposed signage modifications seek to maintain the historical context and identity of the Village District shopping center while striving to meet the signage needs of the current tenants and prospective future tenants.

4. Compatibility with existing infrastructure and established development patterns;

The proposed amendments apply to the shopping center for which there are custom streetscape elements and plan already in place. The signage modifications apply to the entire streetscape plan boundary and thus attempts to maintain a cohesive and unified pattern and design for the entire development.

5. Contribution to the unique character or identity of an area through use of public art, landscaping, and/or other treatments;

The proposed request to modify the common signage plan adopted in 2003, seeks to reintroduce mid-century modern architectural style into the signage plan of Village District. The request reintroduces signage for basement tenants, mid-century lettering, and materials such as neon tubes.

6. Corrects an error or meets the challenge of some changing site or market condition, trend or fact;

Proposed amendments seek to adopt and align with the current UDO sign regulations that offers more flexibility than those included in the 2003 Common signage plan of the streetscape document. The applicant notes that the shopping center needs these changes to remain competitive in attracting and maintaining top quality retail tenants, while allowing for long-term viability of the center and to enhance visitor experience.

7. Impact on properties in the vicinity of the streetscape plan area;

The proposed amendments limited to signage modifications apply to the interior of the shopping center and within the streetscape plan boundary. The proposed allowances appear to be consistent with the existing character and overall aesthetics of the development pattern in the area.

8. Significantly impacts the natural environment, including air, water, noise, stormwater management, wildlife and vegetation;

No impacts.

9. Impact on safety of roadway and streetscape users;

No impacts to safety of users.

10. Impact on the maintenance responsibilities of the City;

No impacts. Signage is privately owned and will be maintained privately.

11. Provides a benefit to the City as a whole and is not solely for the good or benefit of a particular landowner or owners at a particular point in time; and

The proposed amendments to the common signage plan seek to update the sign regulations for the shopping center to better align with UDO standards offering more flexibility and design options to current and future tenants. This could better meet the needs of current retail market and ensure long-term viability of the historical shopping center. The proposed new signage options could enhance the pedestrian and visitor experience to the shopping center with better visibility and wayfinding.

12. The application is reasonable and in the public interest.

The proposed amendment to update 20-year-old regulations for an active and historical shopping center appears reasonable. The modifications will better serve the evolving needs of the current and future retail tenants who in-turn will serve the needs of the community at large. Renovation and improvements are critical to maintaining the viability of older developments and to serve the needs of visitors to the shopping center.