



BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Work Session
Tuesday, August 5, 2008

Ms. Miller called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

Attendance: Ms. Heidi Miller, Chairman; Mr. Charles Graham; Mrs. Laverne Stebbins; Mr. James Treffinger; Mr. Jaime Garrett; Mr. Bill Etson; Mr. Frank Holloway. Also present: Mr. Ryan Lee, Planner.

Mr. Lee stated the focus of the Work Session is to review the changes to occur in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) regulations as they relate to temporary signs in the Architectural Preservation District (APD) as well as the creation of a new Design Review Criteria to supplement the base district standards.

The proposed changes include the reduction of sign face area, sign height, placement, and the time of display. The intent is to allow the BAR to have stricter control of the design, placement, and styles of temporary signage and provide the ability only to vary from the approved types by the BAR on a case-by-case basis. Further, the display of temporary signs could occur during the regular business hours of each individual business with the APD. The size of temporary signs has been reduced by 50% which would now allow a sign face area of 6 sq. ft. or a total of 12 sq. ft. and a sign height of 4 ft. The location of temporary signs would be restricted to the area of the front porch, stoop, or within 15 ft. of the main entrance to the business. Should the applicant request something other than what would be provided in the standards, the request would be forwarded to the BAR for consideration. If approved by the BAR, there would be a display period of only 30 days per 6 months of the year.

Ms. Miller stated the idea is to approve specific styles of temporary signs that would be permitted with the APD in order to keep the display of such signs uniform with creating identity to each individual business.

Mr. Lee stated staff intends to invite some sign makers that work with business owners within the APD to a future BAR work session to discuss style options and what the demand is by their clients.

Mrs. Stebbins agreed it would be beneficial to have representatives of sign companies attend a work session to help the members understand what is available on the market and what would best reflect the needs of business owners and the City.

Mr. Lee stated once a sign style structure is approved for a business, the owner would have permanent approved for that sign. The only reason to return to the City for approval would be to change elements of the sign face.

Mrs. Stebbins asked if the number of colors permitted on a temporary sign would remain as the current standard.

Mr. Lee stated the colors permitted would remain as one (1) base color and two (2) copy colors, however, additional colors could be introduced to the sign at an amount not to utilize more than 5% of the color scheme.

Ms. Miller stated allowing display of this kind will have the potential of doubling the amount of signage within the APD. She stated her concern was the increased amount of visual clutter which is something the Board has always tried to avoid. She suggested temporary signs be restricted to the same colors and visual design as the permanent sign so there would be no rainbow of colors for one (1) business.

Mr. Lee stated there are some of those provisions in the document including standards to have signs compliment the building in which the business is occupied.

Mr. Graham asked if consideration should be given to the relationship of signs throughout the area concerning their visual appearance.

Mr. Lee stated consideration of the entire block face could be reviewed in terms of compatibility of the surrounding properties for signs as the City has done for building design.

Mr. Garrett suggested in the case of multiple tenants on a property perhaps the amount of sign area per tenant could be divided evenly to avoid sign clutter particularly during holiday sale times.

Mr. Lee stated the amount of sign area for temporary signs could be limited per property as suggested by Mr. Garrett.

Mr. Garrett asked if the amount of spacing for temporary signs between businesses could be regulated on individual properties and an alternative spacing formula be created for strip centers.

Ms. Miller suggested the color of the sign structure should be regulated as well. Once the sign structure styles are selected as a permitted style, the Board could research the colors available and determine which are appropriate in general or for that particular building.

Mr. Garrett stated an erase or chalkboard sign seems to be an application that has a hometown feel.

Mr. Lee stated comments provided by the members would be incorporated into the Design Review Criteria and discussed at a future work session.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.