

SIGN CODE BOARD OF APPEALS
Meeting Minutes of January 7, 2016 –6:35 p.m.

Members present: Holley, Gardner, Kimzey, Mahoney
Staff present: Cargill, Crick, Guntert, Walthall

ITEM NO. 1: MINUTES

Consider approval of the minutes from the December 3, 2015 meeting.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Holley, seconded by Mahoney, to approve the minutes from the December 3, 2015 meeting of the Board.

Motion carried 2-0-2 with Kimzey and Gardner abstaining.

ITEM NO. 2: COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications to come before the Board.

No Board members disclosed any ex parte contacts and/or abstentions from the discussion or vote on any agenda item under consideration.

There were no agenda items deferred.

ITEM NO. 3: MONUMENT AND WALL SIGN VARIANCES FOR A NEW OFFICE BUILDING; 4205 W. 6TH STREET

SV-15-00582: Consider a request for variances from the Sign Code found in Chapter 5, Article 18, in the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition. The requests are from the specific provisions of Section 5-1840.3 B which regulate monument signs and wall signs in Single-Dwelling Residential-Office (RSO), Multi-Dwelling Residential-Office (RMO), Commercial Office (CO), and Planned Office District (POD) districts. The code allows either one (1) wall sign up to ten (10) square feet of surface area per building or one (1) monument sign, limited to sixteen (16) square feet and four (4) feet in height, may be installed on a tract of property having a size of one (1) acre or larger. If a monument sign is used, any wall sign is limited to no greater than two (2) square feet of surface area per building. The applicants request is to allow one illuminated monument sign eight (8) feet overall height and not exceeding 36 square feet in area; and, up to three (3) illuminated wall signs twelve (12) square feet in area on the north facing building elevation. The requests are submitted for a new office building located at 4205 W. 6th Street. Submitted by Tammy Moody with Luminous Neon, Inc., for Rochelle Tramp with Summer Tree Office, LLC, the property owner of record. *Deferred from the December 3, 2015 meeting.*

STAFF PRESENTATION

Walthall presented the item.

Gardner asked if the duplex across the street has windows facing the sign.

Walthall said there are windows but there's a screening fence on the property. He didn't feel the sign would be an issue for the duplex.

Gardner said the fence and trees provide a screen.

Walthall said it is pretty well screened.

Gardner asked if the signs are only going on the north side.

Walthall said that is their proposal this evening.

Gardner asked if that changes staff's view of the project.

Walthall said the signs are presented as wayfinding type signs, and the illumination during business hours does promote that. He doesn't feel illumination after hours is necessary and omitting that feature will minimize the impact on the neighborhood.

Kimzey asked if the bank sign across the street is illuminated.

Mahoney said he believes it is. He said many banks are illuminated after hours, and they may have had a variance in the past for such a request.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Ms. Tammy Moody, Luminous Neon, Inc., said the customer feels strongly about illuminating the sign after hours due to the nature of the street and the general area. She presented photographs with the view from the proposed sign. She said the internally illuminated signs emit very little light, so she doesn't feel illumination after hours is an issue.

Mahoney asked if the wall signs will illuminated after hours as well.

Moody said yes, they would like to have those illuminated as well. She said they tried to minimize the size and height of the signs based on what was approved for the Capital City Bank sign.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Kenneth Click, owner of Summer Tree Apartments, said he doesn't feel the proposed signs will affect anyone who lives in the complex.

Mahoney asked if the complex is located to the west.

Click said they have buildings on the south, west, and east of the proposed sign.

ACTION TAKEN

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

Unanimously approved 4-0.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Mahoney said they've had similar variances in the past and found reason to approve those. His only concern might have been the illumination of the wall signs, but it doesn't appear these will affect neighbors. He is in favor of granting the variance with no conditions.

Kimzey asked if they need a condition to limit illumination to the north only.

Mahoney feels that would be thoughtful for any future signage proposal. He thinks the proposed illumination is in keeping with the surrounding area.

Holley said his only concern is balancing the spirit of the Code and the changing nature of the area. He said there are so many non-compliant signs.

Mahoney feels the applicant is trying to do the right thing.

Kimzey supports the variance as long as illumination remains on the north side facing 6th Street.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Kimzey, seconded by Gardner, to approve the variance as requested with the condition that illuminated signage is restricted to the north side facing 6th Street.

Unanimously approved 4-0.

ITEM NO. 4: **MISCELLANEOUS**

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

Walthall said the Lawrence Cultural Arts Commission is contemplating Sign Code changes as they pertain to works of art. He said those changes may be presented to the Board in the near future.

ADJOURN 6:58