

FARRAGUT VISUAL RESOURCES REVIEW BOARD – Minutes

The Farragut Visual Resources Review Board met on Tuesday, April 26, 2016 in the Board Room at the Farragut Town Hall. Marty Layman presided. Members in attendance were Marty Layman, Cindy Hollyfield, Jeanie Stow, Brittany Moore, Edwin Anderson, and Randy Armstrong. Duane Winkler was absent.

1. Minutes:

The March 22, 2016 minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Ground Mounted Sign Applications:

- a) Water Into Wine Bistro – 607 N. Campbell Station Road**
Tenant panel on existing ground mounted sign

Staff reviewed this item and asked the board if they considered the words “bistro and lounge” legible. Board members liked the tenant panel and a motion was made by Hollyfield to approve the panel as submitted. Motion was seconded by Stow and motion passed unanimously.

- b) Off Broadway Shoes – 11449 Parkside Drive**
Tenant panel on existing ground mounted sign

Staff reviewed this item and recommended approval. A motion was made by Moore to approve the panel as presented. Motion was seconded by Stow and motion passed unanimously.

- c) Lonnie Jones Allstate – 620 N. Campbell Station Road, Ste. 8**
Tenant panel on existing ground mounted sign

Staff reviewed this item and recommended approval. A motion was made by Armstrong to approve the panel as presented. Motion was seconded by Moore and motion passed unanimously.

- d) Staybridge Suites – 11319 Campbell Lakes Drive**
Two trailblazer signs

Staff reviewed this item and noted that the applicant was requesting two directional trailblazer signs. One sign would be placed under the existing Hampton Inn trailblazer sign at Parkside Drive and Lakesedge Drive. The other sign would be placed on a new pole along N. Campbell Station Road north of Campbell Lakes Drive.

Teresa Montgomery was present as the applicant. Staff recommended approval but asked that the board take action on each sign separately. Staff noted that the placement

of the new sign along N. Campbell Station Road would need to be coordinated with Town staff since it would be within the public right of way.

In terms of the proposed sign at Parkside Drive and Lakesedge Drive, a motion was made by Hollyfield to approve the sign as presented. Motion was seconded by Anderson and motion passed unanimously.

In terms of the proposed sign along N. Campbell Station Road, a motion was made by Stow to approve the sign as presented with the placement being coordinated with the Town staff. Motion was seconded by Armstrong and motion passed unanimously.

e) McKinley Station Subdivision – off Everett Road
Subdivision entrance sign

Staff reviewed this item and recommended approval subject to verification of setbacks and lighting. Brain Mohny was present as the applicant. Motion was made by Hollyfield to approve the sign as presented subject to verification of setbacks and lighting. Motion was seconded by Anderson and motion passed unanimously.

f) Little Turkey Creek Commons – 12552-12572 Kingston Pike
40 square foot internally illuminated ground mounted sign

Staff reviewed this item and recommended denial for the following reasons:

1. The materials and boxy shape of the sign have no relationship architecturally with the building;
2. A scaled site plan is needed that verifies compliance with required setbacks;
3. A landscape plan is needed for the area around the base of the sign;
4. The height dimensions need to be revised to address the difference in elevation between the ground and the bottom of the sign cabinet;
5. The base of the sign must be consistent in material/design with the building; and
6. The tenant panels have grammatical errors and the Anytime Fitness panel would need to have a white background to match the other panels.

Motion was made by Stow to deny the ground mounted sign for the reasons noted by Staff. Motion was seconded by Anderson and motion passed unanimously.

g) Former Blockbuster Development – 11135-11151 Kingston Pike
40 square foot internally illuminated ground mounted sign

Staff reviewed this item and recommended denial for the following reasons:

1. The materials and boxy shape of the sign have no relationship architecturally with the building;
2. A scaled site plan is needed that verifies compliance with required setbacks;

3. A landscape plan is needed for the area around the base of the sign (the plan that was provided was for another project);
4. The height dimensions need to be revised to address the difference in elevation between the ground and the bottom of the sign cabinet; and
5. The base of the sign must be consistent in material/design with the building.

Motion was made by Anderson to deny the ground mounted sign for the reasons noted by Staff. Motion was seconded by Armstrong and motion passed unanimously.

h) First Baptist Concord (Kingston Pike east entrance) – 11704 Kingston Pike
18 square foot internally illuminated ground mounted sign

Staff reviewed this item and asked the board about the legibility of the lettering and the base of the sign. It was also noted that the address numbers were not the minimum 8 inches required in the sign ordinance.

Amy Barnett and Annette Hommel were present as the applicant. After a fairly long discussion, a motion was made by Moore to ask the applicant to send the Town staff, via e-mail, revisions to the ground mounted sign that could be forwarded to the VRRB members and that reflected the following modifications:

1. The “Christian School” lettering would need to be enlarged to meet the legibility requirements;
2. The address numbers would need to be at least 8 inches;
3. The base of the sign would need to be either brick or stucco to match the buildings on campus; and
4. The setback would need to be verified prior to installation.

Motion was seconded by Hollyfield and motion passed unanimously.

i) First Baptist Concord (Kingston Pike west entrance) – 11704 Kingston Pike
53.25 square foot internally illuminated ground mounted sign

Staff reviewed this item and a motion was made by Hollyfield to ask the applicant to send the Town staff, via e-mail, revisions to the ground mounted sign that could be forwarded to the VRRB members and that reflected the following modifications:

1. The sign face area must not exceed 40 square feet;
2. The lettering would need to be enlarged to meet the legibility requirements;
3. The address numbers would need to be at least 8 inches;
4. The base of the sign would need to be either brick or stucco to match the buildings on campus; and
5. The setback would need to be verified prior to installation.

Motion was seconded by Stow and motion passed unanimously.

- j) First Baptist Concord** (Federal Blvd entrance) – 11704 Kingston Pike
18 square foot non-illuminated ground mounted sign

Staff reviewed this item and a motion was made by Layman to ask the applicant to send the Town staff, via e-mail, revisions to the ground mounted sign that could be forwarded to the VRRB members and that reflected the following modifications:

1. The sign face area should be reduced since it fronts along a local street that serves a subdivision;
2. The lettering would need to be enlarged to meet the legibility requirements;
3. The address numbers would need to be at least 8 inches;
4. The base of the sign would need to be either brick or stucco to match the buildings on campus; and
5. The setback would need to be verified prior to installation.

Motion was seconded by Armstrong and motion passed unanimously.

3. Landscape Applications:

- a) O'Reilly Auto Parts** – 10870 Kingston Pike

Staff reviewed this item and recommended approval subject to the following comments being satisfactorily addressed:

1. Please make sure the tree fencing extends to the dripline of the trees, especially the red cedar and maple within the buffer area;
2. On page C6.0, within the Site and Landscape Data table, please revise the text to note that the plantings shall be per a 50' buffer, not the 100' noted;
3. The landscape plan being revised if any modifications are made to the site plan.

Annette Hommel was present as the applicant. A motion was made by Stow to approve the landscape plan subject to the remaining comments noted by Staff. Motion was seconded by Hollyfield and motion passed unanimously.

4. Sign Ordinance Amendments:

- a) Review a request for an amendment to Section 9-405(2)(e) of the Farragut Sign Ordinance, to allow for awning signs.**

This item involves a request to amend Title 9, Chapter 4, Section 9-405(2)(e), Prohibited Signs, of the Farragut Sign Ordinance to allow for awning signs.

Staff reviewed this item and indicated that they could not support the requested text amendment. Amy Barnett was present as the applicant. A discussion ensued regarding the type sign requested by the applicant. Though no drawing was submitted the sign the applicant described was determined to not be considered an awning sign. The staff explained that this sign might be considered a wall sign but this would need to be

verified. The staff suggested that a more visually appealing sign for this location may be a small freestanding sign mounted in front of the school entrance.

Since an awning sign was actually not requested board members did not view a text amendment to allow for awning signs as relevant to the specific sign envisioned. A motion was made by Stow to postpone action on this text amendment until the staff and applicant could review this together on site. Motion was seconded by Hollyfield and motion passed unanimously.

b) Review a request for an amendment to Sections 9-406(3)(e), (4)(d), and (11)(c) of the Farragut Sign Ordinance, related to the size and number of directional parking signs.

Staff reviewed this item and asked the board that if directional parking signage is expanded in some form as desired by the applicant, should such expanded provisions only apply to multiple building campuses with a certain minimum acreage similar to what is currently provided for on large medical campuses? Staff explained that, in light of a recent Supreme Court decision (Reed vs. Town of Gilbert), the distinction between medical vs. some other use should be removed from any future sign ordinance amendments. In other words, the staff noted that the sign ordinance must be content neutral. Consequently, any amendment to the Town's existing sign ordinance should be based on physical characteristics only and not content.

In the context of this discussion, this could mean creating a section for tracts that exceed 10 (or whatever is appropriate) acres and contain multiple buildings and provide for the following type of signage:

1. Principle signage (this would include main wall and main ground mounted signs)
2. Accessory signage (this would include any of your smaller signs – a development would receive a set number – perhaps on the building and freestanding - they could have and you could spell out the physical parameters for these so that you regulate their number, placement, size, etc.).

The staff acknowledged that there was much to consider in relation to this text amendment. The main question for the board at this point is whether they were open to expanding signage allocations for large multiple building entities. After a long discussion, a motion was made by Layman to recommend that the sign ordinance provisions for large tracts with multiple buildings be revisited and language provided consistent with the Reed decision to be considered by the board at a subsequent meeting. Motion was seconded by Anderson and motion passed unanimously.