

FARRAGUT VISUAL RESOURCES REVIEW BOARD - Minutes

The Farragut Visual Resources Review Board met on Tuesday, November 27, 2012 in the Board Room at the Farragut Town Hall. Marty Layman presided. Members in attendance were Duane Winkler, Cindy Hollyfield, Marty Layman, Jeanie Stow, and Linda Johnson. Tyler Mallison was absent.

1. Minutes:

The September 25, 2012 minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Ground Sign Applications:

- a) **Krispy Kreme** – 11208 Kingston Pike
40 square foot internally illuminated sign

The staff reviewed this item and noted that this sign is the same sign that was informally and favorably reviewed by the VRRB a few months ago. The staff recommended approval subject to the address number being corrected to reflect the current assigned address of 11208 Kingston Pike and the setbacks and overall height being verified with Town staff to ensure compliance.

A motion was made by Hollyfield to follow staff's recommendation. Motion was seconded by Stow. Motion passed unanimously.

- b) **Capital Bank** (formerly Green Bank) – 136 Concord Road
24 square foot internally illuminated reface of existing sign

The staff reviewed this item and recommended approval subject to the address numbers being re-installed to the top portion of the sign. A motion was made by Winkler to follow staff's recommendation. Motion was seconded by Stow. Motion passed unanimously.

- c) **Ingles** (Starbucks tenant panel) – 11801-11847 Kingston Pike
7 square foot internally illuminated tenant panel replacement for the Starbucks in the eastern ground mounted sign at the Ingles shopping center

The staff reviewed this item and recommended approval as submitted. A motion was made by Stow to follow staff's recommendation. Motion was seconded by Johnson. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Sign Ordinance Text Amendment Request:

The staff provided an overview of this item and noted that it involved a text amendment request from Costco related to how square footage for wall signage is determined. The staff explained that the primary issue in this matter is the size of the wall sign that is placed on the angled portion of the building at the main public entrance. The Town's sign ordinance

provides for one square foot of sign area for each linear foot of building elevation on which the sign is mounted (a 1:1 ratio). The angled portion of the Costco's building elevation is roughly 50 feet wide. Consequently, the sign that was approved and installed on this elevation is roughly 50 square feet.

Representatives from Costco are requesting that the sign ordinance text be revised in order to provide them with a 125 square foot sign on this angled building elevation. The staff explained that they could not support the requested amendment for a number of reasons.

First, an amendment to provide what Costco is wanting would represent a very significant variation from Town practice. The 1:1 ratio would be modified to a ratio of over 2½:1. Such a ratio would greatly compromise the proportionality component of the Town's sign ordinance. Second, if the issue is the size of wall signage, Costco could, in lieu of a sign on the angled building elevation, have a wall sign of nearly 280 square feet on the building elevation that is parallel with Lovell Road. Also, related to this, in terms of identifying the Costco for someone traveling southbound on Lovell Road, a monument sign, which would double as a gas price sign – like the Kroger and Ingles – would be the most effective for wayfinding because such a sign could be seen as you approach the Costco development going south along Lovell Road. Due to grade differences and the distance of the Costco building from Lovell Road, the building itself is not very visible from Lovell Road. A monument sign would be much more effective for identification purposes than a larger sign on the angled portion of the building that doesn't directly face either Lovell Road or Kingston Pike. Third, in terms of the Kingston Pike frontage, the 276 square foot wall mounted sign on the west portion of the building elevation that faces Kingston Pike is the primary building identifier and it very visible from Kingston Pike. Similar to Lovell Road, a larger wall sign above the canopy would add very little in terms of wayfinding due to its orientation and the fact that the existing wall sign that faces Kingston Pike is so visible. Due to the fact that the angled portion of the building does not directly face Lovell Road or Kingston Pike this sign essentially functions as an entrance identifier for the benefit of patrons that are already in the parking lot and are looking for the main entrance. In this regard, the sign, as approved, more than serves its purpose.

Jeff Rudder of Costco and one of Costco's architects were present to discuss their request. Board members asked a number of questions and, in general, felt that a monument sign along Lovell Road would be the most effective for Costco in terms of wayfinding. Mr. Rudder indicated that Costco does not approve of monument signs and that the larger sign that they want above the angled portion of the building is intended to help make the entrance area more prominent and add some increased signage along the eastern portion of the building where no other wall sign is currently permitted. Mr. Rudder showed a photograph from another basically identical Costco building where the desired 125 square foot sign has been installed. The staff and board members felt that this sign was too large for such a limited building frontage. Most board members did, however, feel that a somewhat larger wall sign above the Costco entrance would be a visual enhancement because it would be more in scale with width and height of the Costco building as viewed in its entirety.

Chairman Layman and other board members expressed concern about broadly altering the 1:1 ratio in such a manner that would provide for a 125 square foot sign on a 50 foot section of building elevation. In this regard, Chairman Layman moved to deny the request as stated on the text amendment application and instead recommend to the planning commission that a different option be considered. This option would provide for a larger sign than would be permitted from a 1:1 ratio only where a large building has a smaller angled elevation where a sign is desired in lieu of a sign on a longer adjacent building elevation. Some parameters would need to be established for the width of the angled portion and the length of the longer building elevation and perhaps a percentage of the total width of the angled portion of the building and the longer building elevation would be applied to the size of the wall sign on the angled portion of the building. The motion was seconded by Winkler and motion passed unanimously.