

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, December 4, 2001**

Mr. Treffinger called the meeting to order at 7:30 P. M.

Attendance: Mr. James Treffinger, Chairman; Mr. Charles Graham; Mr. Paul Clark; Ms. Heidi Miller; Mr. Jack Gramann, Mrs. Laverne Stebbins. Absent: Mrs. Martha Sheley. Also present: Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner.

Motion to Excuse:

MOTION: Mrs. Stebbins moved to excuse Mrs. Sheley from the meeting as she gave prior notice to staff. Mr. Graham seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Graham moved to approve the minutes of the Board of Architectural Review meeting of November 6, 2001, as written. Mr. Clark seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Morning Sun Florist - Sign

Mr. Shrimplin reviewed the application submitted by Morning Sun Florist located at 11 South Main Street requesting approval of their proposed wall sign. He stated the applicant is relocating her business to Centerville and would like to use the sign from the previous location.

The sign has an ivory background color, two shades of purple used on the flower, one of the same purple colors used on the "Morning Sun" lettering, black used on the word "Florist", and a dark green color on the flower stem. The framework is also black and a silver accent color is used on the sign. Accent colors are permitted and it is, therefore, not considered a copy color. Mr. Shrimplin stated staff was unable to approve the sign based on the four (4) copy colors requested as the ordinance only permits two (2) copy colors. The sign satisfies all other standards in the ordinance.

Mrs. Stebbins asked if the purple color was included in the approved color chart.

Mr. Shrimplin stated purple is not on the color chart, however, it has been used on other signs in the APD which were approved by the Board.

Mr. Graham stated he was inclined to approve the sign since it was a sign used at a previous location and would be familiar to existing customers of the business.

Ms. Miller stated the purple shades of color used on the sign seem to be hues of color acceptable to the historic district. She asked if the sign was in good condition since it had been used previously.

Mr. Shrimplin stated the sign appears to be fairly new and shows no deterioration.

MOTION: Mr. Graham moved to approve Application #BAR-01-74 submitted for Morning Sun Florist, 11 South Main Street, to permit the sign with four (4) copy colors as requested. Mr. Gramann seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Review of BAR Sign Color Chart

Mr. Shrimplin explained that the existing BAR Sign Color Chart for the APD was adopted twelve (12) years ago and staff felt it should be reexamined to determine if is still appropriate. The ordinance allows a sign to have one (1) background color and two (2) copy colors. If sign applications are submitted that meet the standards in the ordinance, the BAR has made a policy to allow staff to approve them even though the ordinance states it will be reviewed by the BAR. Some signs, as in the case of the previous agenda item, are appropriate for the APD, but staff must refer them to the BAR for review. Mr. Shrimplin asked the members to review the BAR Sign Color Chart and give direction to staff as to any possible ordinance amendments that should be considered to make the approval process as simple as possible for business owners.

Mr. Clark stated the use of neon signs on the interior of the business seem to be increasing and certainly affects the character of the APD.

Mr. Shrimplin stated it is difficult to regulate interior signs, however, because they are visible from the public right-of-way, we could control them if the City so desired.

Mr. Graham asked if there are any types of signs that the existing ordinance does not regulate.

Mr. Shrimplin stated signs on vehicles are not regulated. Staff has researched this issue previously and regulation of this type of sign would be extremely difficult.

Ms. Miller asked if a new business located in the APD, could the design of signage on vehicles be regulated.

Mr. Shrimplin stated the approval could provide conditions to regulate any sign. The rules of procedure was amended to allow one half (1/2) square foot of "open" signage to be displayed during hours of operation only.

Mr. Shrimplin stated an additional issue to be considered for review is the time a temporary sign can be displayed. Currently, an APD property can have a temporary sign for 30 days each quarter. Some businesses split the 30 days throughout the quarter which makes enforcement difficult. He indicated the members may want to be less flexible and require property owners to display temporary signs for 30 consecutive days to better regulate the situation.

Mr. Gramann stated that should a business display a sign on days other than those approved should be given notice that the temporary sign privileges will be revoked. Notice of not displaying a sign as approved will terminate that approval should be given at the time of approval.

Ms. Miller volunteered her expertise in sign design to assist in the review of types of signs, materials of signs, etc., to consider as changes to the ordinance should staff want her help.

Ms. Miller agreed to prepare a presentation with staff to be reviewed by the BAR during their next regular meeting.

Mr. Shrimplin asked if the members would consider internally illuminated signs in order to alleviate the maintenance problems with external lighting fixtures and lack of screening.

Mr. Gramann indicated he felt internally illuminated signs should be permitted.

Ms. Miller recommended researching the external illumination and methods to maintain and preserve the placement of the light fixtures. She stated internally illuminated signs require bright primary colors in order to be affective and those types of colors would not be appropriate for the APD.

There being no other issues of discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

James L. Truffinger, Chairman

