

FARRAGUT VISUAL RESOURCES REVIEW BOARD – Minutes

The Farragut Visual Resources Review Board met on Tuesday, August 28, 2018 in the Board Room at the Farragut Town Hall. Marty Layman presided. Members in attendance were Marty Layman, Jeanie Stow, Brittany Moore, Cindy Hollyfield, Randy Armstrong, David Freeman, Kaivon Kiumarsi, and Youth Representative, Alex Butler.

Chairman Layman called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

1. Minutes:

A motion was made by Stow to approve the July 24, 2018 minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Moore and the motion passed unanimously.

2. Ground Mounted Sign Applications:

a) Farragut Gateway Development – 101 Campbell Station Road (Kingston Pike Site Frontage)

25-square foot (sign face, exclusive of surrounding brick) ground mounted sign for the Farragut Gateway Development (Kingston Pike Frontage) located at 101 Campbell Station Road.

Staff reviewed the item and questioned the legibility of the “Farragut Gateway” element of the sign on the brick background. Staff also noted that according to the sign company, the two tenant panels shown on the sign were for illustration purposes only and were not part of the approval request. The five actual tenant panels would be permitted separately by individual businesses. Staff recommended approval subject to field verification of the external lighting plan by staff and on-site verification of the setbacks by a surveyor.

The board members discussed the legibility of the “Farragut Gateway” wording on the proposed brick background. Mr. Pat Boles, Signco Inc., was present and noted that he thought the wording would be legible against the lighter brick on the actual sign support structure. He noted that it was hard to show the actual contrast on a flat color illustration. It was also noted that the brick being used in the sign matched the buildings within the development.

A motion was made by Stow to approve the sign subject to the lighting being verified by staff for compliance, the setbacks being verified by a surveyor, and a sample of the brick being supplied to ensure that the signs lettering is visible against it. The motion was seconded by Kiumarsi and the motion passed unanimously.

b) Farragut Gateway Development – 101 Campbell Station Road (Campbell Station Road Site Frontage)

13-square foot (sign face, exclusive of surrounding brick) ground mounted sign for the Farragut Gateway Development (Campbell Station Rd. Frontage) located at 101 Campbell Station Road.

Staff reviewed this item and again noted that the two tenant panels shown on the sign were for illustration purposes only and were not part of the approval request. The actual tenant panels would be permitted separately by individual businesses. Staff recommended approval subject to field verification of the external lighting plan by staff and on-site verification of the setbacks by a surveyor.

A motion was made by Moore to approve the sign subject to following staffs' recommendation. The motion was seconded by Hollyfield and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Wall Sign Applications:

a) International Flair Jewelers – 11124 Kingston Pike, Suite #113

International Flair Jewelers is requesting approval for a wall sign at its new location at 11124 Kingston Pike. The staff explained that they had identified several compliance issues with the owner's plan and couldn't approve the sign administratively. Staff also noted that they had been working with the applicant to address the issues and were seeking input from the VRRB regarding architectural compatibility before moving forward. The issues involved the sign's lighting, it's proposed location on the building, and the compatibility of the material/color of the sign with the building and other signs in the complex. More specifically, the individual characters of the applicant's channel letter sign were made of stainless steel with perforations that allowed light to shine through the sides. The color of the sign could also be changed by means of an electronic controller. Staff pointed out that the other signs in the complex were "canned" internally lit channel letters, where only the letter face is illuminated. The sign, as proposed, was also to be mounted on the building across a recessed architectural feature. Staff explained that the Town's sign ordinance requires wall signs to be architecturally compatible with the principal structure and consistent in terms in terms of style, color, and illumination with other signs in the complex. The ordinance also prohibited flashing, chasing, pulsating, twinkling, dancing, scintillating, and or oscillating lights. Staff then noted the Town's adopted Architectural Design Standards also addressed the design, illumination, and location of signs.

The Board discussed the various issues at length. The applicant and a representative familiar with the sign and its lighting were present and answered questions regarding the plan and potential modifications. Of significant note was their description of the lighting and the side perforations creating a twinkling effect as a person moved



passed the sign (viewing the perforations from different angles). The board members felt that the stainless-steel construction of the sign was reasonably compatible with the building and other signs in the complex. This was based on a daytime picture of the sign at another location provided by the applicant. The membership agreed that the sign could not be located across the recess in the building's wall. They also felt that the applicant's proposal to brick-up the recess was preferable to trying to squeeze the sign into the space for legibility reasons. Staff noted that the applicant would need Planning Commission approval to alter the building. The Board also agreed the sign's lighting plan was not consistent with the other signs in the complex and would violate the Town's prohibitions against twinkling. The ability to change the color of the sign light was also recognized as a potential issue. The membership felt that the sign would need to be modified to eliminate the side lighting and twinkling. They also agreed that the applicant should select a lighting color for the sign. The applicant indicated they would like to use a white light for the sign.

A motion was made by Layman to approve the use of the stainless-steel letter bodies with the side lighting perforations being covered/blocked, and white face lighting. The motion also included bricking-up the recess area on the wall to accommodate the sign. The motion was seconded by Stow and the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.