



**LAWRENCE SIGN CODE BOARD OF APPEALS AGENDA
OCTOBER 4, 2018 – 6:35 P.M., CITY COMMISSION MEETING ROOM, FIRST FLOOR OF
CITY HALL, SIXTH AND MASSACHUSETTS STREET, LAWRENCE, KANSAS**

CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

TAKE ROLL CALL TO DETERMINE IF THERE IS A QUORUM OF MEMBERS PRESENT

ITEM NO. 1: MINUTES

Consider approval of the minutes from the July 5, 2018 meeting.

ITEM NO. 2: COMMUNICATIONS

Acknowledge any communications to come before the Board.

Board member disclosure of any ex parte contacts and/or abstentions from the discussion and vote on any agenda item under consideration.

Announce any agenda items that will be deferred.

**ITEM NO. 3: WALL SIGN VARIANCE FOR KAW VALLEY CROSSFIT; 5150
CLINTON PARKWAY**

SV-18-00437: A request for a variance as provided in Section 5-1828 of the Sign Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2018 edition. The request is for a variance from the requirements of Section 5-1818.2 (b) of the Sign Code for Permanent Wall Signs in the RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District. The applicant is seeking to be considered for CS zoning district parameters. The property is located at 5150 Clinton Parkway. Submitted by Kaw Valley CrossFit on behalf of Superior Property LLC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 4: MISCELLANEOUS

a) Consider any other business to come before the Board.

ADJOURN



**LAWRENCE SIGN CODE BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES DRAFT
MAY 4, 2017 – 6:35 P.M., CITY COMMISSION MEETING ROOM, FIRST FLOOR OF CITY
HALL, SIXTH AND MASSACHUSETTS STREET, LAWRENCE, KANSAS**

Members present: Clark, Gardner, Gascon, Wilbur, Wisner
Staff present: Cargill, Crick, Walthall

ITEM NO. 1: MINUTES

Consider approval of the minutes from the March 2, 2017 meeting.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wilbur, seconded by Clark, to approve the minutes from the March 2, 2017 meeting of the Board.

Motion carried 2-0-3. Gardner, Gascon, and Wisner abstained.

ITEM NO. 2: COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications to come before the Board.

Gardner and Gascon disclosed ex parte contact with the applicant but only verified their membership on the Board and no information was exchanged.

There were no agenda items deferred.

**ITEM NO. 3: MONUMENT AND AREA MARKER SIGN VARIANCES FOR VAN GO
INC.; 715 NEW JERSEY STREET**

SV-17-00207: Consider a variance request from the Sign Code found in Chapter 5, Article 18, in the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition. The request is from the specific provisions of Section 5-1841.6, which regulate maximum size, height, illumination and materials of signage of ground sign/surface mounted (monument sign) to be installed on industrial zoned property. The requests are for the existing arts center located at 715 New Jersey Street, zoned IG (General Industrial) District. The variance request was submitted by Van Go, Inc., the property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Walthall presented the item.

Gardner asked for clarification as to which signs as proposed meet the criteria.

Walthall explained that none of the signs meet the criteria as a monument sign, but any of them could be modified with a wider base or by adjusting the grade to be level with the ground. He clarified that the main problems are the number of signs (they're allowed one) and that the signs are spread over 110 lineal feet.

Gardner asked what staff's response would have been in the absence of a grant for the project.

Walthall said the only way to comply with the code is to consolidate the sign into one structure.

Wilbur asked if Van Go's status as a non-profit, as opposed to perhaps a for-profit restaurant, is a factor in the sign permit process

Walthall said no, both would be reviewed the same.

Gardner pondered whether the sign could have been submitted as piece of art.

Gascon asked if, theoretically, the sign would meet code standards if the letters were on the same base and the appropriate width.

Walthall said they would likely have to go up in height to reduce the width.

Gascon asked what prevents the sign from being considered an art installation.

Walthall said the definition of a sign is basically anything that promotes a business, and whether it is also art is not necessarily relevant to the board. He added that Porter Arneill, City Cultural Arts Director, explained that the proposed sign is considered a graphic design, not art, although the applicant might have a different opinion.

Gardner noted that the business has an existing sign on the building.

Walthall said they have a wall mounted sign, and are allowed signs on the two walls facing the right-of-way.

Gardner said there are drawings on the wall facing 7th Street.

Walthall said that wall does contain art. He added that they are allowed one ground sign.

Gascon asked if the zoning would allow an accessory structure, such as a bike rack, if it was incorporated into the proposed sign.

Crick said a bike corral would be subject to sight triangle measurements, but it's possible one could fit there.

Gascon asked if the sign letters would be allowed as sculptures under zoning regulations.

Crick said that anything requiring a permit would also need a variance to locate within the setback.

Gascon asked if sculptures would require a permit.

Walthall said a sculpture would not fall within the parameters of the Sign Code.

Gascon asked if it would be allowed at all.

Walthall said yes, potentially. He said the height and setbacks could be a deciding factor.

Gascon asked whether the letters alone are making it a Sign Code issue.

Clark and Gardner noted that it's promoting a business.

Wisner asked what differentiates word art from a sign.

Walthall explained that a sign is any structure or design that promotes, advertises, or brands a business, organization, or person.

Wisner clarified that non-profit organizations are included.

Walthall said many community service organizations have signage.

Gascon asked if a cross is considered a sign.

Walthall said it could be because there is intent. He also thanked the applicants for being so cordial throughout the review process.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mr. Dan Rockhill, applicant, talked about the Van Go organization and the “gateway” sign to Lawrence that is similar to the proposed. He talked about the grant application process and the design for the sign. He said they agree that it’s a sign but it is also art.

Wilbur said it’s a really bold design. He asked if Van Go is open to a re-design.

Rockhill said the grant was predicated based on the proposed sign. He said it was their hope to have the sign installed in time for their 20 year anniversary celebration in three weeks.

Ms. Lynne Green, Van Go Director, explained that the purpose of the grant was to brand the organization. She said the existing sign is not highly visible due to the placement in relation to the street. She said they might be open to stacking the letters or making them smaller. She said the grant was awarded by the Kriz Charitable Fund, and was not sure whether the money would be awarded if the design must change.

No public comment.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Gardner, seconded by Wisner, to close public comment for the item.

Unanimously approved 5-0.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Wisner asked if the sign photos the applicant presented are actually in Lawrence, and if so, whether they are subject to the Sign Code.

Walthall said he was not sure when the signs were installed and what process they may have undergone.

Wisner asked if the signs would be subject to the sign code if constructed today.

Walthall said yes.

Wisner said the existing signs presented as examples are no different than the sign requested by the applicant.

Wilbur said that’s true, but questioned whether it’s appropriate for any business to do the same.

Wisner said his real issue is with the definition of a sign.

Wilbur noted the purpose of the sign code in this situation.

Clark said he reads the proposed letters as one sign, and not as eight individual signs.

Gascon asked if the sign base must be exposed.

Walthall said a base isn't required, so no. He said they could sink the posts down 6 inches and put the signs at grade.

Gascon asked whether the posts could be connected underground.

Walthall said that technically a connection by concrete would be considered a footing and not a sign base.

Gascon argued that all art is a sign, based on definition, and vice versa.

Clark said the glass art on the side of the building speaks to represent the organization just as well as the sign.

They discussed the art on the building as an architectural element and whether the incorporation of bike racks would make the sign a similar feature.

Gascon felt there were several factors that make the property unique, including the street curve and proximity to railroad right-of-way.

Gardner said he couldn't consider the use of the word "inc" as art.

Wisner said it doesn't matter what type of business it is, a sign is a sign.

Gascon discussed the criteria that the sign should not impact the public health, safety or welfare. He did not feel the proposed sign was "detrimental".

Wilbur said they could be setting a precedent whether they intend to or not.

Wisner asked if financial loss or disadvantage can be considered an unnecessary hardship.

Walthall said financial hardship cannot be considered.

Gardner said he doesn't like the "inc" because they're trying not to set a precedent for something similar.

Clark said the new Sign Code is based on the idea that a sign can't be judged for its content.

Walthall said that's correct.

Gascon felt the concern about precedent was valid and discussed the intent of the Sign Code. He did not feel the request violates the intent of the code and could even enhance the surrounding environment.

Gardner asked if location within an arts district or elsewhere should be a factor.

Crick said no, the Land Development Code recognizes industrial, commercial, or residential areas but does have the ability to grant overlay designations.

Wisner asked what the property is zoned.

Crick said it is likely IG.

Wilbur pondered how many galleries would constitute an arts district.

Gascon said the area is already defined as a cultural arts district, but there is nothing in the code that applies advantages to the district.

Gardner asked where the district is defined.

Gascon explained the boundary for the arts district.

Gardner asked if the City has defined that district.

Gascon said yes, and it could be argued that the subject property is the gateway to the district. He talked about some signage being more significant than just a sign.

Crick said the aesthetics of the sign are not within the Board's purview.

Wilbur agreed that it would enhance the area but struggled with meeting all criteria for a variance.

Wisner and Gascon said they both feel there is uniqueness.

They discussed the uniqueness and whether the request meets the intent of the code.

Gardner asked how the variance can be approved without setting a precedent.

Gascon said he doesn't know many business with signage facing a railroad right-of-way. Addressing Criteria#3, he felt it was unnecessary to not allow some creativity in breaking up the sign, and argues that the sign is less intrusive as proposed than it would be as one sign.

Gardner asked about the hardship argument.

Clark said the hardship is their inability to take a creative approach to their signage.

Gascon said it could also be a hardship that the grant may not be awarded.

Wisner agreed, noting that the code doesn't explicitly say they can't consider financial factors.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Clark, seconded by Wisner, to grant the variance request based on findings in the staff report, the applicant's presentation and Board discussion, and find that the location within the budding cultural arts district, the sweeping curve, and the proximity to the railroad are unique; that the proposed sign will be an enhancement to the public; and strict adherence to the code would present an unnecessary hardship.

Unanimously approved 5-0.

ITEM NO. 4: **MISCELLANEOUS**

- a) Consider any other business to come before the Board.

Crick said training will be held at next month's meeting.

Walthall added that the new sign code will be presented next month as well.

ADJOURN

Motioned by Wilbur, seconded by Clark, to adjourn the meeting.

ADJOURNED 8:12 PM.



**LAWRENCE SIGN CODE BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES DRAFT
JUNE 1, 2017 – 6:30 P.M., CITY COMMISSION MEETING ROOM, FIRST FLOOR OF CITY
HALL, SIXTH AND MASSACHUSETTS STREET, LAWRENCE, KANSAS**

Members present: Clark, Holley, Gardner, Gascon, Mahoney, Wilbur, Wisner
Staff present: Cargill, Crick, Larkin, Schroeder, Walthall

ITEM NO. 1: MINUTES

Consider approval of the minutes from the May 4, 2017 meeting.

The minutes were deferred.

ITEM NO. 2: COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications to come before the Board.

There were no ex parte contacts or abstentions.

There were no agenda items deferred.

**ITEM NO. 3: STAFF PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED NEW SIGN CODE
REGULATIONS**

Receive staff presentation on proposed new sign code regulations that would replace the current standards found in City of Lawrence Code Chapter V, Article 18 in their entirety. Consider recommendation of proposed new sign code regulations to the City Commission.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Kurt Schroeder presented the item.

Gardner asked if staff looked at sample legislation from other places.

Schroeder said staff used resources from a municipal lawyers' organization, the national sign code council, and another city that drafted a new code based on the legislation.

Gardner said he appreciated that staff took into consideration the most frequent variance requests. He asked if staff also looked at the most frequently requested variances after the new regulations were established.

Schroeder said they tried to address what historically have been the most frequently requested and approved variances. He noted some additional sign opportunities in the proposed code.

Larkin said the goal was to lower the potential for variance requests.

Schroeder mentioned they may continue looking at language to address signage on properties along the highway.

Holley asked if one continuous (non-illuminated) sign could be placed inside a building that was primarily storefront

Schroeder said yes, staff discussed that at length, and determined it would be more enforcement effort than it was worth and they wanted to focus more on illuminated signs.

Gascon asked if a window applique would be regulated.

Schroeder said no.

Wilbur asked if it's correct that pole signs are not allowed.

Schroeder said they haven't been allowed new for some time, but in the current code they can be replaced as is.

Gascon said his biggest concern is the purpose stated on Page 1 of the proposed code.

Larkin said that would all be re-written.

Gascon said it's difficult to analyze whether the code is appropriate if the purpose is not clear.

Larkin said the purpose of the code is to protect the public health, safety, and welfare and to protect the aesthetics of the community.

Gardner asked if there were any disagreements throughout the process of writing the code that could not be solved.

Schroeder there was nothing that couldn't be solved, but staff received a lot of constructive feedback.

Holley asked about existing pole signs on historic properties.

Schroeder said there is language that addresses signage in overlay areas and historic structures.

Walthall said the most common overlay district is Downtown, and those signs are oriented toward pedestrian traffic, so typically a ground sign would not be used. There may be a few properties that will be a unique situation that staff will work through as the need arises.

Schroeder added that historic resources would likely have a role.

Larkin said anything considered contributing or within environs to a historic property would go to the Historic Resources Commission (HRC) for review.

Schroeder said the design can be changed on an existing pole sign without altering the structure of the sign.

Larkin the main purpose is to amortize pole signs throughout the City.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Tammy Moodie, Luminous Neon, mentioned the Sunfire Ceramics sign they were allowed to refurbish. She asked if they would be able to continue maintaining that sign under the new code.

Larkin said that if it's in a historic district it would go to the HRC for review.

Gascon asked if an overlay district supersedes the sign code.

Larkin said usually overlay districts have developed their own standards and would be exempt from these standards.

Schroeder said overlay districts typically include guidelines, not code language.

Walthall noted that the overlay districts are more strict requirements.

Gascon asked if the overlay district guidelines might be out of compliance with the new legislation.

Larkin said staff would have to look at all of the guidelines to be sure they only mention dimensions, color, and style as opposed to sign content.

Schroeder said the code does refer to historic landmarks, structures, and overlay districts, and are almost always more restrictive than what the sign code allows. He mentioned that they added code language for mixed use developments.

Gascon said he plans to apply for a sign permit for a downtown mixed-use building and would like to recuse himself from the vote, but he wondered whether the new sign code would apply to his property and said it creates some confusion as to whether the overlay guidelines are advantageous.

Mahoney felt that the proposed sign code addresses many of the issues they encounter and will reduce the number of variances before the Board. He said he appreciates that art will be removed from their purview and also appreciates staff's time spent on the new code.

No additional public comment.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Gascon, seconded by Gardner, to close public comment for the item.

Unanimously approved 7-0.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Wilbur, seconded by Gardner, to recommend the proposed Sign Code as currently drafted to the City Commission.

6-0-1. Gascon abstained.

ITEM NO. 4: MISCELLANEOUS

a) There was no other business to come before the Board.

ADJOURN

Motioned by Mahoney, seconded by Holley, to adjourn the meeting.

ADJOURNED 7:19PM



**LAWRENCE SIGN CODE BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES DRAFT
JULY 5, 2018 – 6:35 P.M., CITY COMMISSION MEETING ROOM, FIRST FLOOR OF CITY
HALL, SIXTH AND MASSACHUSETTS STREET, LAWRENCE, KANSAS**

Members present: Gardner, Gascon, Mahoney, Shipley, Wilbur, Wisner
Staff present: Dolar, Crick, Walthall

ITEM NO. 1: MINUTES

Consider approval of the minutes from the June 1, 2017 meeting.

The minutes were deferred.

ITEM NO. 2: COMMUNICATIONS

All communications were included in the agenda packet.

There were no ex parte contacts and/or abstentions.

There were no agenda items deferred.

**ITEM NO. 3: MONUMENT SIGN VARIANCE FOR PHILLIPS 66; 2815 W 6TH
STREET**

SV-18-00273: Consider a variance request from the Sign Code found in Chapter 5, Article 18, in the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2018 edition. The request is to allow digital gas price information on an existing ground sign/pole mounted sign. The property is located at 2815 W. 6th Street. Submitted by KC Sign Express Inc., for Haig Properties, L.C., property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Walthall presented the item. He mentioned that the LED components were installed prior to application for a sign permit.

Gardner clarified that leaving the sign as is will be safer than constructing a monument sign that could obstruct view.

Barry said that is staff's opinion. He explained some conflicting objectives of the code.

Wilbur asked if the size of the sign has changed.

Walthall said no.

Wilbur asked if the variance transfers to the next property owner.

Walthall said the variance stays with the land but could be conditioned upon no change in use.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Ms. Robin Hurshman, KC Sign Express, said they did their best to come into compliance but ultimately required a variance to satisfy the project.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Gardner, seconded by Wilbur, to close public comment for the item.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Gardner said he supports it and would make a motion to approve.

Mahoney agreed.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Gardner, seconded by Wilbur, to approve the variance based on findings in the staff report with the following conditions:

1. The variance does not transfer with a change of use of the property.
2. The variance does not transfer upon any redevelopment of the property that would require site plan approval, as specified by City of Lawrence Code Section 5-1823(c).

Unanimously approved 6-0.

ITEM NO. 4: MISCELLANEOUS

- a) There was no other business to come before the Board.

ADJOURN

Motioned by Gardner, seconded by Mahoney, to adjourn the meeting.

ADJOURNED 6:41 PM

Memorandum

City of Lawrence

Planning & Development Services

TO: Sign Code Board of Appeals

FROM: Janet Smalter, Plans Examiner

C: Barry Walthall, Building Codes Manager
Kurt Schroeder, Asst. Director of Planning & Development,
Development Services

Date: September 25, 2018

RE: 5150 Clinton Parkway Wall Sign Variance Request

PROJECT SUMMARY

The requested variance is:

1. To allow wall signs in accordance with regulations for the CS zoned district for wall sign size and illumination. The property is zoned RM12.



Aerial Photograph

GENERAL INFORMATION

Zoning Designation: RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential District)

Sign Code Reference:

5-1818.2(b) **Wall Signs in RM Zoned Districts**

For permitted principal non-residential land uses or multi-dwelling structure land uses (not including duplexes and attached 2- to 4-unit dwelling structure land uses):

- **Number of Signs:** 1 Sign per tenant on Wall with exterior public entrance to tenant space (multi-tenant building) that fronts a street right of way or shared parking area; or 1 Sign per public street frontage (single tenant building), regardless of the number of buildings having Street Frontage.
- **Sign Area:** 5% of building Wall area to which the Sign is attached, maximum.
- **Sign Size:** 32 sq. ft. per Sign maximum.
- **Sign Illumination:** Internally illuminated Wall Signs are not allowed; Externally Illuminated Wall Signs are allowed, provided they are indirectly lighted with white light only and are not constructed of reflective or luminous materials. Reverse channel letter Wall Signs are considered to be Externally Illuminated Signs provided they are illuminated with white light only.

CODE ANALYSIS

Comparison of sign regulations to requested variances:		
Code Section	RM Zoned District (Allowed)	(Proposed)
5-1818.2(b)	<u>Number of signs:</u> 1 Sign per tenant on wall with exterior public entrance to tenant space (multi-tenant building) that fronts a street right of way or shared parking area; or 1 sign per public street frontage (single tenant building), regardless of the number of buildings having street frontage.	<u>Number of Signs:</u> 2 wall signs, 1 each for 2 tenants. This complies with the maximum number of allowed signs for the RM Zoned District.
	<u>Sign Area:</u> 5% of building wall area to which the sign is attached, maximum. <i>Sign Size:</i> 32 sq. ft. per sign maximum.	<u>Sign Area:</u> Wall sign 1 (Kaw Valley Crossfit) = 63.3 sq. ft. Wall sign 2 (Top Tumble) = 66.7 sq. ft. Total area for wall signs 1 and 2 = 130 sq. ft. Both signs exceed the allowable area for wall signs in the RM Zoned District.
	<u>Sign Location:</u> Signs are allowed on a wall with an exterior public entrance to tenant space that fronts a street right of way or shared parking area	<u>Sign Location:</u> Signs are proposed for the south wall of the building which provides exterior public entrances to both tenant spaces. Sign location complies for both proposed wall signs.
	<u>Sign illumination:</u> Internally illuminated wall signs are not allowed; externally illuminated wall signs are allowed, provided they are indirectly lighted with white light only and are not constructed	<u>Sign illumination:</u> Both signs are proposed to be internally illuminated.

	of reflective or luminous materials. Reverse channel letter wall signs are considered to be externally illuminated signs provided they are illuminated with white light only.	Neither sign is permitted to be internally illuminated.
--	---	---

CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF VARIANCE

Per Section 5-1828, the Board may grant variances from any person seeking a sign permit that cannot meet the restrictions or standards of the sign code upon the determination that all of the following findings have been fully met:

1. At the time a variance is granted by the Board, the Board shall find that the variance request arises from conditions that are unique to the location in question, which are not ordinarily found in the same zoning district, and that the unique conditions are not caused or created by an action or actions of the property owner or applicant.
2. At the time a variance is granted by the Board, the Board shall find that the granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare, including the visual appearance of the area, or injurious to property or improvements in such zoning districts or the neighborhood in which the property is located.
3. At the time a variance is granted by the Board, the Board shall find that the strict application of the requirements of Article 18, Chapter 5, of the City Code would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships to the owner or applicant, inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the sign code. Such practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships may include compliance with amended provisions of the sign code that were not in effect at the time a predecessor sign was installed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff opinion is that the request does meet the criteria for the granting of a variance:

1. In the opinion of staff, conditions do exist which are unique to the location and which are not ordinarily found in the same district zone.
 - The property is located adjacent to a busy principal arterial street (Clinton Parkway) where speed and volume of traffic warrant larger signs.
 - The building is set back approximately 100 feet from the south property line, 120 feet from the Clinton Pkwy frontage street, and 230 feet from Clinton Pkwy. These setback distances also warrant larger signs.
2. In the opinion of staff, the granting of a variance would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements to the neighborhood.
 - The property is bounded by the Parkway to the South, the Pinnacle Woods Apartments to the East, Genesis Health Club to the West and Lake Alvamar to the North. The wall signs are proposed to be located on the south wall facing the parking lot and Clinton Parkway.

- There are no adjacent residential uses to the south, west or north, and the apartments to the east would have minimal exposure to the wall signs in their proposed locations. Landscaping should provide sufficient screening to mitigate any illumination that may be visible from the east.
3. The strict application of the requirements of the sign code may result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the code.
- The requested signs are similar in type, area, and illumination to a sign that has been approved for a commercial business in the immediate vicinity; a wall sign to identify tenant space directed south to the parkway is appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the requested variance to allow two (2) internally illuminated wall signs, to be located on the south wall of the building, with total combined area of 130 square feet, and maximum individual sign area of 67 square feet.

Date: 8/16/18

Zoning Classification: RM-12

Name of Business: Kaw Valley CrossFit / Top Tumble

Address: 5150 W. CLINTON PARKWAY

\$350.00 Non-Refundable Fee Required with application – Date Paid: _____

APPLICATION FOR A SIGN VARIANCE
(Chapter V, Section 1828 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas)

Variance Request:

To be considered for CS zoning sign code parameters for permanent wall signs. Specifically pertaining to size dimensions & illumination. (Sign Area: 10% of the building Wall area maximum, or 150 sq. ft., whichever is less. For each 100-foot increment the building Wall is set back from a Public Right of Way, the base maximum area may be increased by 50%, provided the total area of building Wall Signs shall not exceed 10% of the Wall area or 450 sq. ft., whichever is less.)

City Code (Municipal Law) States:

RM Permanent Sign Code

Sign Area: 5% of building Wall area to which the Sign is attached, maximum.

Sign Size: 32 sq. ft. per Sign maximum.

Sign Illumination: Internally illuminated Wall

Signs are not allowed; Externally Illuminated Wall Signs are allowed

The Lawrence Sign Code Board of Appeals may hear and authorize in specific cases a variance from the sign regulations of the City of Lawrence (Chapter V, Article 18). Any such variance shall be authorized ONLY upon an affirmative vote of majority of board members present. Any applicant for a variance must respond to the following circumstances, EACH of which must be found by the Sign Code Board of Appeals to apply prior to granting any variance:

- A. That the variance request arises from conditions that are unique to the location in question, which are not ordinarily found in the same Zoning District, and that the unique conditions are not caused or created by an action or actions of the property owner or applicant.

See attached Page

- B. That granting the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare, including the visual appearance of the area, or injurious to property or improvements in such Zoning Districts or the neighborhood in which the property is located.

See attached Page

- C. That strict application of the Sign Code would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships to the owner or applicant, inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the Sign Code. Such practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships may include compliance with amended provisions of the Sign Code that were not in effect at the time a predecessor Sign was installed.

See attached Page

Note: Applicant must provide a completed sign permit application for the proposed sign, along with all information, details, graphics and plans as required by City of Lawrence Code Section 5-1805

ALEC BAROWKA
Applicant Name

ALEC.BAROWKA@KAWVALLEYCROSSFIT.COM
Email

(913) 907-9519
Phone Number

[Signature]
Applicant Signature

[Signature]
Property Owner Signature
(If other than Applicant)

A. 5150 Clinton Parkway is a 11,740 sqft warehouse on the west side of Lawrence, KS. The building has a façade square footage of 1,716. Under current zoning code (RM-12) this would require a sign area max of 5% (85Sqft) of the façade square footage and a max of 32 sqft for the actually sign size, per tenant. Due to having a large façade size and also being located on a surface street off the main public traffic way, Clinton parkway a larger sign would be beneficial to reach the traffic way in question.

B. The building location also offers nominal affect on residential areas and has limited exposure to any inhabited structures.

We will have a **South** facing sign:

East: Pinnacle Woods Apartments

South: Clinton Parkway, K-10 highway, Clinton Lake Softball Complex

West: Genesis Health Clubs, Lake Alvamar Levee

North: Lake Alvamar

C. Current code creates a sign that is not visually large enough to be affective marketing tool to the traffic way in question. Creates a large disparity between neighboring business sign dimensions.