

1 **Member Nicholson:**

- 2 • While the Project meets all the City sign ordinance requirements for signage, the
3 proposed sign does not aesthetically complement the building. The proposed sign
4 essentially creates 'visual clutter' on the building.
5 • The existing monument sign is very tasteful and appropriately located.
6

7 **Member Thayer:**

- 8 • The existing monument sign is not clearly visible and the entrance/access to the building
9 is not readily understood and this is likely the reason the applicant is proposing a sign on
10 the building to advertise the business.
11 • 'Signage essentially tells the world that something is poorly designed.' If a sign is
12 necessary to advertise that a building exists, something is wrong with the building to
13 begin with or that the front entrance is not properly defined/oriented.
14 • Questioned whether the sign and/or letters for the sign should be of the size, scale and
15 proportion being proposed.
16

17 **Member Hawkes:**

- 18 • Building owner should question whether he actually needs the sign.
19 • Does not help locate the building.
20

21 **Butch Bainbridge:**

- 22 • The wall sign will require some modifications so that it works/fit on the building.
23 • Acknowledged that the access/entrance to the building is not clearly defined for the
24 building and this is the reason the applicant desires a wall sign.
25 • The letters will be lit; the background will not be lit.
26 • Having a sign at the driveway entrance is for the purpose of 'way finding' and may not
27 define where the entrance to the building is. As such, additional signage is often
28 proposed to more clearly define the entrance and/or actual location of a particular
29 building. This approach for signage is typically used to define a campus for a business.
30

31 **Member Liden:**

- 32 • Is of the opinion there should be a design that better fits the size and proportion of the
33 building.
34

35 **Chair Hise:**

- 36 • Also, acknowledged the proposed sign does not help locate the building.
37

38 **DRB:**

- 39 • Questioned whether the sign was really necessary. It may be that modifications could be
40 made to the existing monument sign and/or to the landscaping so as to provide for more
41 visibility of the existing sign.
42

43 **DRB consensus:**

- 44 • Was generally supportive of the proposed project. However, if the applicant would
45 consider enlarging the monument sign and not putting the sign on the side elevation of
46 the building they would be supportive of this.
47

48 **Staff:**

- 49 • Should the applicant proposed to enlarge the sign the Project would be required to go to
50 the Planning Commission for approval of an amendment to the original site development
51 permit that approved the monument sign.
52

53 **M/S Liden/Nicholson** recommends approval of the Project, as proposed. However if the
54 applicant would consider enlarging the existing monument sign and/or make modifications to the
55 existing landscaping allowing for better visibility of the existing monument sign and not installing

1 the wall sign, the DBR would be supportive of an amendment to the original Site Development
2 Permit that included the monument sign. Motion carried (5-0).

3
4 **7. OLD BUSINESS**

5
6 **8. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

7
8 **9. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

9
10 **10. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT**

11 The next meeting will be Thursday, December 12, 2013. The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

12
13
14 _____
15 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary