

1 **Highland City Planning Commission**
2 **October 14, 2008**

3
4 Present:

- 5 Commissioner: Jennifer Tucker
6 Commissioner: Brent Wallace
7 Commissioner: Tony Peckson
8 Commissioner: Elizabeth Macfarlane
9 Commissioner: Melissa Wright
10 Commissioner: Roger Dixon
11 Commissioner: Don Blohm

- 12
13 City Planner: Lonnie Crowell
14 City Engineer: Matt Shipp
15 City Planner: Carly LeDuc
16 Secretary: Jill Stewart

17
18 Excused: Kelly Sobotka, Abe Day

- 19
20 Meeting convened at 7:00pm
21 Pledge given by: Elizabeth Macfarlane
22 Prayer given by: Tony Peckson

23
24 Visitors: Chris Dalley, Joe Kelley, Tom Hulbert, Keith Hansen Frank Tusieseina

25
26 **Item 1: Approval of Meeting Minutes for August 12, 2008**

27
28 **Motion by Elizabeth Macfarlane, Planning Commission to approve the Meeting**
29 **Minutes for August 12, 2008, as amended.**

30
31 **Seconded by Tony Peckson.**
32 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

33
34
35 **Item 2: Alpine Credit Union Sign Application ~ Sign Permit Approval**

36
37 Carly LeDuc explained Alpine Credit Union has requested a monument sign on the
38 southeast portion of their lot. Typically staff can review this at the counter with the
39 new ordinance, but since this is a different monument sign that has not been
40 approved as of yet, the Planning Commission will want to look at it, specifically the
41 trusses on top. Just to verify, on the previous site plan they said they were not going
42 to have a monument sign. The square footage of this sign is well under the permitted
43 42 square feet. Something that the Commission will want to look at is that they have
44 proposed the sign to be internally lit, but according to the ordinance it needs to be

1 externally lit. They are also required to provide additional landscaping around the
2 sign and they have proposed 50 square feet.

3
4 Joe Kelley, from IG Sign, is here to represent Alpine Credit Union. He explained
5 the sign is to tie in with the building design.

6
7 Brent Wallace asked if there is a problem with external lighting.

8
9 Joe Kelley said because the letters are so small it makes it difficult to light the letters
10 externally.

11
12 Brent Wallace explained that as it stands now we would have to change the
13 ordinance to consider this option of an internally lit sign. He asked if lighting from
14 above, below, or on the sides that reflects up onto the sign could be considered as a
15 lighting option for the applicant.

16
17 Joe Kelley said they could do that.

18
19 Brent Wallace stated that the proposed sign is not even allowed in the ordinance as it
20 stands now and therefore it is not within the Planning Commission's authority to
21 approve that. He asked for clarification on the sign as it looks now with what
22 lighting options could be used.

23
24 Carly LeDuc explained that pan channel letters that are individually lit could be used
25 and also they can have external lights that shine up on the sign.

26
27 Lonnie Crowell explained that cabinet style back lit signs, such as the one proposed
28 here, are not allowed by ordinance. Therefore, as stated by Commissioner Wallace
29 we would have to do a code amendment to change the sign ordinance to allow this
30 sign.

31
32 Joe Kelley asked for clarification that they could either have pan channel letters or a
33 sign that is lit externally.

34
35 Lonnie Crowell clarified by stating that the monument sign must be externally lit
36 with individual letters as required by the sign ordinance.

37
38 Jennifer Tucker asked if the pan channel letters are okay on this sign.

39
40 Lonnie Crowell said yes, the individual letters must be lit externally and may not be
41 internally lit.

42
43 Tony Peckson asked if the location of the sign had been moved further to the south
44 than the applicant's proposed location.

1 Carly LeDuc stated that is correct. The location that is proposed was never
2 approved; Alpine Credit Union stated they were not going to have a monument sign
3 at the time of the site plan approval. The location outlined in red on the site plan in
4 the Planning Commission packet is where staff is recommending the monument sign
5 be located. She stated that Joe Kelley, IG Sign, was fine with this location.

6
7 Brent Wallace asked if the sign is there to help prevent light from going across the
8 street from headlights coming through there.

9
10 Carly LeDuc stated no that there is the Town Center sign on the corner and this is
11 the best place to put this sign. She clarified that the landscaping needs to be 79.08
12 square feet.

13
14 Joe Kelley asked if grass was considered to be enough landscaping.

15
16 Lonnie Crowell stated that they were required with site plan approval to have
17 shrubbery to block the headlights coming out of the drive thru. Therefore there
18 should be some more significant landscaping than grass. Staff will have to review
19 that.

20
21 Jennifer Tucker asked if that should be included in the motion.

22
23 Lonnie Crowell stated that would help. He said the sign ordinance states what
24 landscaping is required around a sign and that will just need to be followed by the
25 applicant.

26
27 **Motion by Brent Wallace, Planning Commission to grant approval of the Alpine**
28 **Credit Union Monument Sign Application as per the recommendations of staff**
29 **and Planning Commission as follows:**

- 30
31 **1. That the applicant construct a sign consistent with plans approved by Planning**
32 **Commission; and**
33 **2. That the monument sign does not exceed forty-two (42) square feet in size or**
34 **six (6) feet in height; and**
35 **3. That the monument sign be installed at least 100 ft from the intersection of SR-**
36 **92 and SR-74; and**
37 **4. That the monument sign be located outside of the vehicle safety sight triangle;**
38 **and**
39 **5. That the monument sign's operational hours be between 6:00 am and 12:00 am;**
40 **and**
41 **6. That the monument sign be located outside of the parkway detail easement on**
42 **the southeast end of the property; and**
43 **7. That all building inspections and landscaping be completed according to the**
44 **monument sign landscaping plan before final approval is granted by the City; and**
45 **8. That the applicant include 79.08 square feet of landscaping around the sign; and**
46 **9. That the sign be externally lit, not internally.**

1
2 **Seconded by Roger Dixon.**
3 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

4
5 **Item 3: Highland Marketplace Lot 10, Building H ~ Site Plan Review &**
6 **Recommendation**

7
8 Lonnie Crowell stated that the applicant, Tom Hulbert, is back and has requested
9 that what was previously approved as a drive thru on the west portion of Highland
10 Marketplace along SR 92 be amended and approved to be identical to the two
11 buildings existing along SR 92. The only differences are in the recommendations
12 from the staff report, specifically awnings. The landscaping looks pretty accurate; it
13 was received with very little time to review. The parking along the south side of SR
14 92 is consistent with the previous approval of Walgreens. The building could not be
15 rotated; if it was rotated 90 degrees it would block not only the parking and drive
16 access, but also the main access to the Marketplace to the west. Whether it could be
17 flipped north and south would have to be asked of the applicant. As the Planning
18 Commission may note the dumpster is now on the north side of the building as
19 opposed to the original location along SR 92 in the landscaping area.

20
21 Melissa Wright asked if there is an increase of 5% to the building.

22
23 Lonnie Crowell explained that the ordinance allows staff to approve a change in site
24 plan if it is less than 5% of what was originally approved. This is a little more than
25 5% and that is the reason it is going back through this process.

26
27 Melissa Wright asked if it affects any of the percentages.

28
29 Lonnie Crowell stated that overall if the proposal after this item is included then the
30 percentage is probably lower than what was originally approved.

31
32 Melissa Wright asked if large trees would be planted along the west side of the
33 building.

34
35 Tom Hulbert explained that he was not certain of their exact size, but commented
36 that previously the drive thru lane and equipment were going to be along this side
37 and they felt eliminating the drive thru was a real positive thing.

38
39 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission to recommend that City Council**
40 **grant Site Plan Approval of the Highland Marketplace Lot 10, Building H as per**
41 **the recommendations of staff and Planning Commission as follows:**

- 42
43 **1. That the applicant include additional and substantial landscaping along the**
44 **west building side; and**
45 **2. That the applicant include additional and substantial landscaping around the**
46 **dumpster enclosure per the requirements of the development code.**

1
2 **Seconded by Elizabeth Macfarlane.**
3 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

4
5 **Item 4: Highland Marketplace Lot 10, Building H ~ Architectural Review &**
6 **Recommendation**

7
8 Lonnie Crowell explained that this building is identical to Building G and the
9 concern was that the proposed elevations do not include the same awnings that are
10 along Buildings F & G along SR 92. With the trees along the west side, it is not
11 certain whether other comments are necessary, that is up to the Planning
12 Commission to decide. This is a pretty prominent building as you head east on SR
13 92. The awnings are probably the only real concern.

14
15 Jennifer Tucker asked if additional windows are a concern.

16
17 Lonnie Crowell said there were discussions of putting faux windows along the west
18 side, but the trees are pretty close to the wall. It would be up to the Planning
19 Commission to decide and whether the applicant is willing to participate.

20
21 Tom Hulbert said this was thought a lot about on Buildings F & G when we asked
22 for those to be approved. He explained that Little Caesars got broken into just this
23 morning along that back side and his concern had been and would be putting more
24 glass on the back side of the proposed building from a security standpoint.

25
26 Brent Wallace said there has to be a back of a building that has to be the utility part
27 and generally it is not as beautiful. How these building are displayed as kind of an
28 island, you see all four sides, which is not typical of all businesses. He feels that
29 seeing the ladder sticks out and looks like a maintenance type of thing.

30
31 Tom Hulbert explained that the HVAC is on the roof and there is a need to get on
32 top to change the filters and service the units. Also, if there is a restaurant in the
33 building they have their own air handling equipment which will have to be cleaned
34 periodically and has to be accessed from the roof by the servicemen.

35
36 Melissa Wright asked if there is going to be a point of interest for this corner such as
37 a monument that the corners of Parkway East & West and Highland Blvd. are all
38 going to have Town Center monument signs announcing you are entering into the
39 Town Center.

40
41 Lonnie Crowell said no, a monument marker is not proposed or approved. There
42 will be a tall freestanding sign just to the west of this building that was approved for
43 this project. He said he believes the sign is located across the right of way.

44
45 Roger Dixon clarified that it is on the west side of the entrance.

46

1 Lonnie Crowell said that is correct.

2

3 Jennifer Tucker stated her concern with the flat roofline. She said she does not
4 necessarily have any solutions, but thought it may be something for the Commission
5 to discuss.

6

7 Tom Hulbert explained he is here to sell this building and he will do his best to do
8 justice to the building due to his architect being unable to attend this evening. As
9 mentioned the back of the buildings need to be the service side and we have done our
10 best to add elements to make it unique. Some of those elements are the stone work
11 that is along the bottom of two of the storefronts there, to create the look of three
12 separate buildings each with their own entrance, and the parapet roofline was done
13 to create the look of the three separate buildings. We created a lot of visual interest
14 on the front so people would identify it as the storefront. The rear was toned down a
15 little bit, there were reliefs as well as divisions added.

16

17 Jennifer Tucker said that does help. She said she could see how the awnings would
18 help too.

19

20 Melissa Wright asked where the awnings would go.

21

22 Tom Hulbert explained that they would go over the doors.

23

24 Melissa Wright asked how far the landscaping comes out from the building.

25

26 Lonnie Crowell said that it looks like the planting is done in two to three feet.

27

28 Brent Wallace asked if there are only a few feet there, would you not need a
29 columnar tree so it does not protrude into the sidewalk.

30

31 Tom Hulbert said he does not think the proposed trees grow super tall, but simply
32 fills out.

33

34 Brent Wallace stated that may be the problem though; it may be infringing on the
35 sidewalk, therefore columnar oak may be a better tree to go with.

36

37 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission to recommend that City Council**
38 **grant Architectural Approval of the Highland Marketplace Lot 10, Building H as**
39 **per the first recommendation of staff and Planning Commission as follows:**

40

41 **1. That the applicant include awnings above the entrances on the West Elevations**
42 **to be consistent with the previously approved elevations for buildings G & F and**
43 **to add architectural interest to this elevation.**

44

45 **Seconded by Brent Wallace.**

46 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

1
2 **Item 5: Highland Marketplace Lot 1 & 2 ~ Site Plan Review & Recommendation**
3

4 Lonnie Crowell explained that the CR Zone went through a lengthy process for
5 approval and the original site plan and original zone that was approved for the
6 Highland Marketplace was for the two buildings then known as the anchor building
7 and inline building existing on the northwest corner of this property. That property
8 together was approved originally for just over 118,000 square feet; in December 2007
9 the applicant returned to the Planning Commission with the possibility of an anchor
10 and requested additional square footage. The Planning Commission recommended
11 to City Council that they allow 97,000 square feet in that particular site for the
12 anchor building. The applicant has obtained an anchor; this use is permitted in the
13 CR Zone, just as all of the others in Highland Marketplace are. The use is not at all
14 in question. The square footage was originally limited to 70,000 square feet because
15 of the concern of a big box store. The applicant returned and asked to combine those
16 two sites with 100,000 square feet. There is a substantial increase in landscaping
17 versus what was originally approved. In addition, the square footage includes an
18 outdoor swimming area. Currently there are some shops on the west side with the
19 main use is on the east side. The applicant can address this, but with the approval of
20 Walmart and Smiths and the presence of Kohlers there is not an option for a grocery
21 store out there.

22
23 Melissa Wright stated that in the development code that the square footage is limited
24 to 70,000 and she is wondering if that ordinance has been changed.

25
26 Lonnie Crowell explained that the City Council did not see it after the Planning
27 Commission's recommendation and the city administrator was waiting to have an
28 applicant before an amendment was proposed to the City Council.

29
30 Brent Wallace asked if that was not to hinder possibilities of what might be an
31 anchor and see what might be there before anything was put in print.

32
33 Lonnie Crowell said that is correct, staff was uncomfortable with changing the code
34 without an actual tenant.

35
36 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked what the height of the building is.

37
38 Lonnie Crowell said the ordinance allows 40 feet.

39
40 Keith Hansen, an architect for this project, said it is between 35-40 feet. The highest
41 part is for the basketball court.

42
43 Melissa Wright asked if along the north side of the property there is anything we
44 need to require to set this building apart from the adjoining property.
45

1 Tom Hulbert clarified that in the original approval there was a wall along the west
2 and north sides of the property. That is what is being planned for both of those sides.
3
4 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked if the fuel island is being done away with.
5
6 Tom Hulbert said that is correct.
7
8 Jennifer Tucker said she saw that the only staff recommendation was that there
9 needed to be substantial landscaping on the west side of the building and around the
10 dumpster enclosure.
11
12 Lonnie Crowell clarified that trees need to be planted along the north and the west.
13 He also stated there is another significant staff recommendation which is that the
14 sidewalk heading south be aligned with the previous site plan.
15
16 Tom Hulbert said in regards to the landscaping that was on the previous site plan it
17 was pretty specific as far as what was to be done with the landscaping.
18
19 Lonnie Crowell said there were some specifics as far as spacing and types of trees.
20 He said that he could verify those things.
21
22 Brent Wallace expressed that on the plan he saw a future playground shown and
23 questioned the noise that may be generated from it and suggested that a significant
24 sound barrier be put in there, such as pines.
25
26 Tom Hulbert explained that there is the 8 foot high wall there which has a 2 foot
27 addition to the usual 6 foot height which will help mitigate the sound.
28
29 Roger Dixon said it is his recollection that on the west side of that wall that there
30 was an agreement with the residents to do 25 feet of landscaping. He said there will
31 be the landscaping, the wall, and the trees on the other side so visually and with the
32 noise hopefully it will be sufficient.
33
34 Tom Hulbert agreed, he said the homeowners are very happy.
35
36 Roger Dixon asked if the landscaping on the west has been completed.
37
38 Tom Hulbert said that is has.
39
40 Chris Dalley asked what impact the outdoor pool will have on the surrounding
41 neighbors.
42
43 Tom Hulbert explained the outdoor pool is more of a lazy river that comes from the
44 indoor pool.
45
46 Melissa Wright asked what the parking spaces are along the back side.

1
2 Tom Hulbert said they are for employee parking.

3
4 Don Blohm asked how the number of 600 was arrived at for parking spaces.

5
6 Tom Hulbert stated that the ratio is pretty much at retail use or just slightly under.
7 He explained that they are already feeling a lack of parking at lunch time from the
8 existing establishments. We have to plan for those few times a year when everyone
9 shows up to and needs parking. There will also be some public activities that will
10 require large amounts of parking for participants and family attending.

11
12 Frank Tusieseina, Newport Sports, explained the large building has a gymnasium
13 that houses 3 large NCAA basketball courts and 5 volleyball courts. If there was a
14 volleyball tournament, there could be anywhere from 700 to 1000 attendees. That
15 parking lot will fill up very quickly and they will stay all day and into the night. The
16 most important thing about parking is you do not want to have complaints from
17 residents that parking is flooding out onto the streets.

18
19 Don Blohm asked if it would make sense to put an island or two in the middle there
20 to break up the parking lot.

21
22 Tom Hulbert said that is a possibility.

23
24 The Commissioners recommended placing at least 3 sidewalks with landscaping in
25 the parking lot to break up the immense expanse of asphalt.

26
27 Tom Hulbert said that is something that can be looked at; it may be more than 3.
28 The number will have to be determined.

29
30 **Motion by Brent Wallace, Planning Commission to recommend that City Council**
31 **grant Site Plan Approval of the Highland Marketplace Lot 1 & 2 as per the**
32 **recommendations of staff and Planning Commission as follows:**

- 33
34 **1. That the main sidewalk heading south (which is shown directed right at the**
35 **vehicle driveway between buildings G & H then turns east and ends) be aligned**
36 **per the previous site plan and connected to the main pedestrian system between**
37 **buildings F & G or shown connecting and connected somehow, and**
38 **2. That additional trees be planted along the west wall property line to assist in**
39 **mitigating the impact of the commercial center now that there is room for**
40 **additional landscaping, and**
41 **3. That additional trees be planted along the north wall property boundary to help**
42 **mitigate the visual impact of the proposed use from the properties to the north**
43 **now that there is room for additional landscaping, and**
44 **4. That a minimum of three landscaped sidewalks be installed and stagger east to**
45 **west, running north to south to connect the shops on the south with the sports**
46 **complex, and**

- 1 5. That trees be planted along the west side of the property line, equal to those
2 that were approved on the original site plan, and
3 6. That trees be planted along the north side equal to the west side of the property,
4 and
5 7. That the wall on the north side of the building meet the requirements of the
6 original site plan.

7
8 **Seconded by Roger Dixon.**
9 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

10
11 **Item 6: Highland Marketplace Lot 1 & 2 ~ Architectural Review &**
12 **Recommendation**

13
14 Lonnie Crowell stated that a little over a year ago the CR Zone was approved with
15 inline shops as shown on the overhead, the anchor building was not proposed at the
16 time. Elevations were not approved. The proposal is fairly consistent; the shops on
17 the west have a little less detail. There is quite a bit of fenestration on the front of
18 this building. There are some graphics on the south side and if there is a desire for
19 that it will certainly need to be approved by the Planning Commission, otherwise the
20 sign ordinance would make that very difficult. The building is fairly consistent with
21 the CR Zone; it is pretty monotone in color though. It will need to be consistent
22 with previous recommendations of staff and Planning Commission. The roofs are
23 fairly straight and the addition of some parapets might be in the Planning
24 Commission's interest. There are some awnings; they are all uniform in color and
25 shape.

26
27 Brent Wallace suggested breaking up the roofline where the Newport sign is and a
28 little further to the west. He stated that when looking at the 3D view it looks pretty
29 good, but when looking at the elevation view it looks like a lot of really flat line
30 there.

31
32 Keith Hansen said it would be feasible to break up the roofline.

33
34 Brent Wallace clarified that on the west end that there are retail shops that could end
35 up looking like individual buildings.

36
37 Keith Hansen said that is correct. He asked if Commissioner Wallace is asking to
38 add some type of arch or architectural feature in the area of where the Newport sign
39 is.

40
41 Brent Wallace said that is correct.

42
43 Lonnie Crowell stated that an arch would be great because the projecting sign is not
44 allowed.

1 Don Blohm asked what type of mosaics or graphics of the athletes are painted along
2 the south wall.

3
4 Keith Hansen clarified that they are just silhouettes of athletes; which will probably
5 be inset into a piece of metal, it is not a painting.

6
7 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked how tall the front of the building is.

8
9 Keith Hansen said it is about 28 feet.

10
11 Melissa Wright said that this building looks fairly similar to what is there already.
12 She said the Barbacoa building looks different than the buildings on the east and she
13 was not sure if we are trying to match the other buildings or the Barbacoa building.
14 The color scheme seems to match, but she is not certain if we want to break that up
15 and she wondered where the stone elements are on this building.

16
17 Keith Hansen explained that some of the elements that are going to match are in the
18 retail areas and there will be stone at the main entrances, as well at the pool area.

19
20 Melissa Wright clarified that the stone will go beneath the roof and windows and
21 picks up again at the entrance.

22
23 Keith Hansen said that is correct. He used the overhead projection to finish
24 explaining the areas of the stone locations.

25
26 Jennifer Tucker asked if we could see a materials board.

27
28 Lonnie Crowell said one could be requested.

29
30 Keith Hansen explained that the colors of the renderings printed off a lot differently
31 than they looked on the computer screen.

32
33 Elizabeth Macfarlane said she would like to see an arch over the swimming pool
34 area, a relief on the east side, have renderings more accurately reflect colors and
35 materials, and possibly a materials board.

36
37 **Motion by Elizabeth Macfarlane, Planning Commission to request that the**
38 **applicant provide additional renderings with the specific requests of the Planning**
39 **Commission listed below in addition to the five staff recommendations. The**
40 **additional renderings shall show:**

- 41
42 **1. Different rooflines on each of the retail shops, and**
43 **2. That the inline retail shops are consistent with what was previously approved;**
44 **and**
45 **3. An arch to where the Newport sign is, and**
46 **4. The addition of the three sidewalks, and**

- 1 **5. Different elevations to break up and relief the flat roof, and**
- 2 **6. Reliefs on the upper story windows; and**
- 3 **7. Information on the metallic silhouettes of athletes,**

4
5 **Staff Recommendations:**

- 6
- 7 **1. That the applicant add simple parapet elements such as half-domes or gables**
- 8 **above the main 2 story structure as well as above the shops on the west consistent**
- 9 **with existing structures, and**
- 10 **2. That the applicant include awnings of various shapes and materials along the**
- 11 **ground floor openings similar to what was proposed with the previously approved**
- 12 **architecture for the in-line buildings, and**
- 13 **3. That the applicant use different materials and colors for each “shop” tenant**
- 14 **space to break up any monotony similar to what was submitted and approved**
- 15 **with the previously approved structure, and**
- 16 **4. That the applicant consider the use of more rock where possible to be consistent**
- 17 **with recent and previously approved buildings in Highland, and**
- 18 **5. That the applicant include artist paintings, etc. of athletes along the south wall**
- 19 **per the rendering with this application, or return with an additional application at**
- 20 **a later date.**

21
22 **Seconded by Melissa Wright.**

23
24 Brent Wallace asked if this is something that could be presented again in two weeks.

25
26 Tom Hulbert said that staff will need it before two weeks to prepare the item and it is

27 feasible to have it to staff by Monday for the next meeting.

28
29 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

30
31 **Item 7: Awning Signs - Discussion**

32
33 Carly LeDuc explained that the Planning Commission previously discussed awning

34 signs and she has created a draft ordinance based on the discussion. She explained

35 that she is looking for comments on what the Commission does or does not like.

36
37 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked if awning signs will go on the Newport Sports Club.

38
39 Jennifer Tucker said not necessarily Newport Sport Club, but Carly has said that

40 Highland Marketplace has had tenants request awning signs.

41
42 Carly LeDuc stated that as the ordinance is written now, you may not have an

43 awning sign as your primary sign.

44
45 Melissa Wright brought up the fact that Dear Lizzie has awning signs.

46

1 Lonnie Crowell said in fairness to every other business in Highland, the other
2 businesses have been required to have their primary sign be pan channel, which are
3 significantly more expensive than awning signs. We believe the awning signs are
4 architecturally interesting and provide character, but we believe the primary sign
5 should be consistent with all other businesses.

6
7 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked for clarification on why an awnings cannot be the
8 primary sign.

9
10 Carly LeDuc said the reasoning is primarily that smaller businesses do not have as
11 much frontage as others therefore we do not want an awning sign for each small
12 business.

13
14 Lonnie Crowell explained that this is a way to legally address the concern where
15 some businesses may only have one sign.

16
17 Elizabeth Macfarlane said she does not want to create any undue burden to any
18 business at this time.

19
20 Lonnie Crowell explained that staff is just responding to the Planning Commission's
21 comments and recommendations from the previous discussion on awning signs.

22
23 Don Blohm asked about the color and whether or not it can be controlled.

24
25 Lonnie Crowell said that we had spoke about possibly adding some text regarding
26 the color and requiring it to be earth tone in color. That will probably need to be
27 added.

28
29 Tony Peckson asked in regards to the sign being safe and durable if we can specify
30 that it meet certain standards in regards to the sign needing to last a certain amount
31 of years and that it be UV resistant to resist fading and fraying.

32
33 Lonnie Crowell stated that the materials can be specified. Everyone is usually
34 worried about the material. He said an option would be to require awning signs to
35 come back for review after a certain amount of time to look at the wear and tear of
36 the sign. He said he would recommend the Commission request to review cloth
37 signs every 1-2 years. Staff will come back with some specific language regarding
38 cloth.

39
40 Don Blohm mentioned there is an international organization called the IFAI that
41 qualifies materials for architecture and certain things like this.

42
43 Lonnie Crowell stated that the ordinance specifies the signs need to be structurally
44 sound to handle winds up to 90 MPH.

1 Brent Wallace asked how long we have had the current sign ordinance and if it is
2 known how it was decided on.

3
4 Lonnie Crowell explained the current ordinance was approved about 2 years ago.
5 The one before that was approved about 1 ½ years before that. The one before that
6 was around forever and there was a different sign ordinance for every zone and it
7 was in multiple places of the development and municipal codes and that is why it
8 was consolidated about 4 years ago. The sign ordinance was originally created to
9 prevent any sign from being built and has slowly evolved into what it is now.

10
11 Brent Wallace stated that the sign ordinance may be something that needs to be
12 reviewed in 5-10 years as times and styles change.

13
14 Elizabeth Macfarlane said that as she has looked around at awning signs in different
15 states that as long as they are looked at every 1-2 years, or as staff determines, that
16 they look awesome.

17
18 Jennifer Tucker asked for direction on where the Commission would like to see this
19 draft ordinance go.

20
21 Lonnie Crowell said a reason for the primary sign issue is whether we are willing to
22 allow every business to have an awning sign. We cannot allow one business to have
23 an awning sign, but not another. It is an all or nothing thing.

24
25 Melissa Wright asked for Lonnie Crowell to clarify number 2 of the draft ordinance,
26 pertaining to the size.

27
28 Lonnie Crowell explained that typically the ordinance will state that an awning sign
29 is allowed over an opening, a door or window. That is the purpose of an awning.
30 To regulate the size, the ordinance will state the maximum is ½ of what opening the
31 awning is over.

32
33 Brent Wallace asked if an awning is considered to be a sign if only the bottom corner
34 of it has the business name, or is just that corner calculated as the sign.

35
36 Lonnie Crowell explained that will be up to the Planning Commission to determine.

37
38 Melissa Wright clarified that an awning is not considered a sign unless it has lettering
39 on it.

40
41 Lonnie Crowell said yes, that is how he would define it.

42
43 Don Blohm asked if background color can be regulated.

44
45 Lonnie Crowell said yes, you can specify the background colors are earth tone or
46 neutral.

1
2 Don Blohm expressed that with the Milosport sign he does not like the red
3 background.
4
5 Lonnie Crowell explained that if those are their trademarked colors nothing can be
6 done about that, but if they are not trademarked then you could do something.
7
8 Jennifer Tucker asked if as a compromise it could be required to have a certain
9 percentage of the sign be the earth tone or neutral colors.
10
11 Lonnie Crowell said that could be done.
12
13 Brent Wallace said he recommends that the portion of the sign with text be
14 calculated as the sign, not the entire awning.
15
16 Roger Dixon suggested that number 3 have a word change from “complimentary
17 and compatible” to “harmonious with the color”.
18
19 Jennifer Tucker asked Roger Dixon if he wanted to see earth tone colors as had been
20 previously discussed.
21
22 Roger Dixon said it could state “be harmonious with earth tones”.
23
24 Melissa Wright asked for clarification where it states in the ordinance that lighting of
25 the sign should be illuminated above or installed without lighting, does that mean we
26 do not want any lighting.
27
28 Lonnie Crowell said that is correct, it would basically turn it into a big cabinet sign if
29 it were lit.
30
31 Jennifer Tucker said she thought the external lighting looks nice.
32
33 Carly LeDuc said that it will depend on the applicant as to whether or not they want
34 lighting.
35
36 The Planning Commission requested to see more information on materials, changes
37 to the text of number 3, and calculations of the sign lengths.
38
39 Meeting adjourned at 9:54pm