

**Town of Hilton Head Island
Design Review Board
Minutes of the Tuesday, February 12, 2013 Meeting
1:15p.m – Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers**

APPROVED

Board Members Present: Chairman Scott Sodemann, Vice Chairman Deborah Welch,
Jake Gartner, Tom Parker, Galen Smith and Todd Theodore

Board Members Absent: Jennifer Moffett, Excused

Council Members Present: None

Town Staff Present: Jennifer Ray, Urban Designer
Heather Colin, Development Review Administrator
Teri Lewis, LMO Official
Shawn Colin, Deputy Director, Community Development Department
Rocky Browder, Environmental Planner
Richard Spruce, Plans Review Administrator
Kathleen Carlin, Secretary

1. **Call to Order**
Chairman Scott Sodemann called the meeting to order at 1:15p.m.
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Freedom of Information Act Compliance**
4. **Approval of the Agenda**
The Board **approved** the agenda as presented by general consent.
5. **Approval of the Minutes**
The Board **approved** the minutes of the January 22, 2013 meeting as **amended** by general consent.
6. **Staff Report**
None
7. **Board Business**
None
8. **Unfinished Business**
None
9. **New Business**
(Mr. Parker and Mr. Theodore recused themselves from review of the following application, Shelter Cove Towne Center Phase 1-C Final Hardscape and Landscape, DR120030, due to professional conflicts of interest. A Conflict of Interest Form was completed and signed by Mr. Parker and Mr. Theodore and attached to the record.)
 - A. New Development

1) **Shelter Cove Towne Center** Phase 1C Final Hardscape and Landscape DR120030

Ms. Ray stated that the Board provided Conceptual approval of this project on November 13, 2012. The Board reviewed Final Architecture for the project on January 22, 2013, but action on Final Architecture could not be taken by the Board because staff had not received the required approval letter from the Shelter Cove ARB. The staff has received the required approval letter from the Shelter Cove ARB and action by the Board on Final Architecture may be taken today along with Final review of Hardscape and Landscape.

Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application. The applicant states in their narrative that this project contains enhanced streetscape elements such as on-street parking, ornamental street lights, specialty paving, canopy street trees, other plant materials and strategically located site furniture. The enhanced streetscape aids in bringing a pedestrian scale to the project through its connection with building mass, detailing, and materials. Local and regional materials such as oyster shell concrete, Old Carolina Brick, and tabby stucco preserve the island character and Low Country aesthetics.

Ms. Ray presented the key features of the Hardscape and Landscape plan. Ms. Ray reviewed the locations of Shelter Cove Lane, the entrance to Newport, the existing asphalt, the new asphalt parking lot, new concrete sidewalk on the park side of Shelter Cove Lane, and on street parking that is brick paver parking.

Ms. Ray then reviewed the Main Street area, the location of the Kroger building, the Belk II store, and the main pedestrian corridor. The streetscape includes angled brick parking, oyster shell concrete sidewalks with brick banding, accent features, street lights along Shelter Cove Lane as well as along Main Street, planters, pots and street furnishings. Ms. Ray also reviewed the location of standard asphalt paving along Shelter Cove Lane; Main Street is oyster shell asphalt with brick on-street parking.

Ms. Ray reviewed the back corner of Kroger including the service area, and the location of the new park with and on street parking and a concrete sidewalk along Shelter Cove Lane. Mr. Ray also reviewed the front corner of the project showing the location of Shelter Cove Lane, the new fuel center, the existing Belk parking, and existing Belk store. Ms. Ray reviewed the location of the new concrete sidewalks with brick banding, the existing sidewalk in front of Belk's, and the proposed asphalt bike path around the trees, with connection into the parking lot at strategic locations.

Ms. Ray also reviewed the continuation of Main Street, the four stand-alone buildings in front, and the new right in/right out curb cut on Highway 278. The new oyster shell asphalt continues down Main Street as well as the new street that runs in front of Kroger, Belk, and the new shops.

At the entrance to Belk II there are more decorative features including oyster shell concrete with brick banding and colored concrete as well as a wood deck for performance space, and a drop off. This edge is treated the same as Main Street with the on-street brick paver parking, a brick edge with alternating landscape planters and street lights, and oyster shell concrete sidewalk with brick banding.

Ms. Ray then reviewed the entrance into Kroger. It has the same type of brick pavers and oyster shell concrete between the drive and the front of the store. The crosswalks are a painted striped crosswalk. The applicant proposes a painted/striped cross-walk versus a brick paver crosswalk due to concerns with grocery carts on pavers. Ms. Ray reviewed details of the proposed pedestrian walks. Some of the proposed details are oyster shell with a single brick border, oyster shell with double brick border, and a couple of types of specialty brick pavement with either a single band or a double band. There are two different types of truncated domes at the end of their handicap ramps. There is a standard Town handrail at the boardwalk section, and a wood deck in front of the Belk side of the development. Also in this area they have some trellis swings, tabby base with a brick path, and then a wood trellis with a swing. There are some entry columns with a brick base, continuing the brick and tabby, with a cap. There is a curb bench with knee walls and a proposed screen fence.

Ms. Ray reviewed samples of the materials being used for permeable pavers in the parking areas and the Old Carolina brick. Samples of the colored concrete were also reviewed. The colors and materials coordinate with the proposed building materials.

The applicant proposes bollards in areas where the power lines go through the parking lot on the front side of the store between the front side of the mall and Highway 278 to keep people from driving in this area. Planter pots are sprinkled throughout the development including some existing pots from inside the mall supplemented with new ones. This completed the review of the Hardscape portion of the application.

Ms. Ray then reviewed the landscaping portion of the application. Ms. Ray reviewed the entrance to Newport with some additional landscaping that is being proposed on Shelter Cove Lane and the top of their lagoon. A good landscaping mix is proposed to help screen the fuel center. Landscape plants contain a mix of native materials and plants historically used on the island, along with pots and planters with accent color in special places, and a good evergreen framework. The streetscape along Shelter Cove Lane consists of a mix of Oak trees on the park side of the sidewalk, along with low shrubs and ground cover in the islands between on street parking. The landscaping along Main Street includes palms with liriopse and Confederate Jasmine and planters adjacent to the building.

Ms. Ray reviewed the back corner and the elevation of Kroger. A buffer is included to help screen the service area. The materials include live oak trees, pines, wax myrtles, eastern red cedar, and other dense evergreen materials that will help screen the area. Ms. Ray reviewed landscaping for the area between the fuel center and parking, and Shelter Cove Lane. This consists of existing pines and oak trees with additional oak trees, oleander, yaupon holly, saw palms and azaleas. The proposed material includes native materials as well as supplemental materials that are thick to help provide a good buffer in the area. Ms. Ray also reviewed the existing and proposed locations of the power lines and easements. In this area the applicant will use lower vegetative materials.

Ms. Ray stated that there is no new landscaping shown for the Belk stores. This could be a good opportunity for Belk to help tie in with the rest of the new work that is being done. Ms. Ray continued with her review of the plantings for Main Street including shade trees and lots of accent color.

Ms. Ray stated that the applicant submitted their lighting plan showing two different types of overhead fixtures (overhead shoebox style fixtures in brown and more decorative fixtures in black). Ms. Ray reviewed the site lighting plan including the cut sheets for the fixtures as well as some other site lighting including bollard lights and some accent up lights and down lights. Based on the Board's previous comments regarding the style of the proposed light fixtures, a more contemporary lighting plan is proposed for the buildings.

Ms. Ray reviewed the proposed dumpster areas. They are very similar to the buildings with brick and stucco base, some brick walls, some horizontal siding, all in colors that complement the brick building that they are adjacent to. The staff recommended that a standard color be selected for the dumpster enclosure for consistency and so as not to call attention to the dumpster areas.

Ms. Ray presented an update to one of the sample boards. Previously the Board requested samples of the awning fabric and samples are available today. The colors are consistent with the Design Guide.

Ms. Ray stated that the applicant has also provided perspectives of the north and west Kroger walls. Ms. Ray presented details regarding the location of the drive-through pharmacy at Kroger. Landscaping details were reviewed. Mature landscaping will screen this building. The wall and service area will receive a good deal of landscaping including evergreen materials to help screen the wall.

The applicant is proposing a white vinyl fence to be located at the back of Kroger's service area. This type of fencing is not in keeping with the Design Guide. A wood or masonry fence should be

used. The staff recommended approval of the application with a few conditions.

With regard to the buildings that are called “Place -holder” buildings (#105, 106, and 109), staff recommended that these items return to the Board for review when finalized. Additional detail and design characteristics are needed for these buildings. When plans are finalized for the kiosks, they should return to the Board for review. Staff recommended that only one color be used for the dumpster enclosures. Lastly, staff recommended that additional landscaping be required for the entrance to Belk’s. Following staff’s presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicants make their presentation.

Ms. Kristen Mansfield and Mr. Trey Griffin, with Wood + Partners, presented statements in support of the application. The Board discussed several issues with the applicants. Mr. Smith inquired about plans for the north side of the Kroger building. Ms. Kim Traylor, with the Kroger Company, responded with comments regarding the north side of the building. Mr. Smith stated that he is still concerned with the blank wall at Kroger. Mr. Smith and Mr. Griffin discussed landscape materials and plans to screen the back side of Kroger including the service yard.

Vice Chairman Welch inquired about signage plans along Highway 278. Ms. Mansfield stated that the signage package will be submitted at a later date. Accent landscaping details will also be included in the package. Vice Chairman Welch inquired about plans for the wood bike path including the potential need for handrails. The style of the swings should be somewhat similar to the swings at Coligny Beach. Landscaping and signage should relate to a tropical feeling rather than ornamental.

Vice Chairman Welch stated that she liked the character of the dumpster screening areas as proposed. The dumpster areas should relate to the buildings that they are associated with. Each dumpster screening area should be dealt with on an individual basis. Vice Chairman Welch recommended that the Board conduct an on-site inspection for final approval of landscaping. Vice Chairman Welch also inquired about a maintenance plan for the future.

Mr. Matt Mills, Blanchard & Calhoun, presented statements on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Mills stated his opposition to the suggestion of an inspection by the DRB following the final installation of landscaping. Mr. Mills stated that budgetary considerations and functionality should be considered. The applicant stated that they believe the landscaping plan is very generous. Vice Chairman Welch agreed with staff’s concerns regarding the white vinyl fence. Vice Chairman Welch agreed with Mr. Smith’s concerns with the view of the back of building. This area needs to be treated in a better way for public viewing by those enjoying the new park.

Mr. Gartner agreed that the fence behind Kroger needs to be wood, masonry or a combination of both materials. The white vinyl should not be allowed. Mr. Gartner agreed that the dumpster service yard should complement each of the buildings as proposed by the applicant. The pedestrian hardscape design was discussed with Ms. Mansfield. Mr. Gartner agreed that additional landscaping at the Belk’s entrance is needed to better tie the store into the new project.

Mr. Mark Senn, Blanchard & Calhoun, presented comments regarding the existing landscaping at the entrance to Belk’s. There is not much room for additional landscaping here. Mr. Gartner stated that additional landscaping at the Belk location should be part of the discussion for future review.

Chairman Sodemann stated his agreement with many of the points that have already been provided by the Board, especially with regard to the dumpster screen area. Chairman Sodemann and the applicant discussed the location of the up lights and accent lighting. Chairman Sodemann stated that when additional information for the kiosk is available, this item should return to the Board for review.

The applicant stated that a mock-up of colors, materials, and patterns will be reviewed by the applicant and owner for accuracy with the plans. Chairman Sodemann agreed that the screen fence

needs to be wood or masonry or a combination of both materials. The staff is authorized to approve the final fence details. “Place holder Buildings (# 105, 106 and 109) should return to the Board for review. Final details for the kiosks should also return to the Board for review. Following final comments by the Board, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Vice Chairman Welch made a **motion** to **approve** the Shelter Cove Towne Centre Phase 1-C Final Review application for Hardscape, Landscape and Architecture with the following conditions: (1) the service area fence located behind Kroger should be made of wood, masonry, or a combination of both materials to coordinate with the building design. The staff will approve the final fence design; (2) The style of each dumpster enclosure should be consistent with the buildings that they are adjacent to; (3) the kiosks and “Place-holder” Buildings (105, 106, and 109) will return to the Board for review; (4) At the completion installation of the landscaping, the applicant will consider any recommendations for additional landscaping that are made by the Town. Mr. Gartner **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** with a vote of 4-0-0.

B. Alteration/Addition

1) Vine - DR130003

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated its location, 1 N. Forest Beach in Coligny Plaza. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application including photos of the completed project. The applicant has installed a patio enclosure for this restaurant that consists of a permanent hinged door frame and panel, as well as fabric curtains that can be drawn up and down depending on the weather.

Ms. Ray presented details of the permanent door, the curtains, the fabric, and clear window. The fabric is a green and tan stripe awning fabric. This work was completed prior to receiving approval by the DRB. The Forest Beach ARB has reviewed drawings for the project and they have approved the project. Staff is concerned with the aesthetics of the project because the building is part of a large complex and is not a stand alone building. The staff does not believe that the project is not in keeping with the rest of Coligny Plaza. The staff recommended that the application be approved with conditions: the roll-up curtains should be constructed of clear vinyl and the permanent door should be removed. Following the staff’s presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Stephen Hamile, business owner, presented statements in support of the application. The applicant discussed the design of the door and the fabric curtains with the Board. The applicant stated that he believes that the project is consistent with surrounding businesses. The Board discussed the aesthetics of the project of the project with the applicant. Mr. Hamile stated that he has no objection to retracting the curtains during the day if that is what the Board desires with the exception of windy days.

Mr. Smith stated his concern that the work was completed without receiving approval by the Town. The applicant stated that he believed his vendor, Coastal Canvas, had received approval from the Town on his behalf. Mr. Smith stated concern that the project is not in keeping with the Design Guide or island character. Mr. Theodore stated that he has the same concerns as Mr. Smith. The stripes are too busy and carnival tent like. A more uniform color, perhaps a green, would be preferred. The canvas drop-down awning outside of the fence is a problem.

Vice Chairman Welch recommended that the applicant consider placing the canvas drop-down awning on the inside of the fence instead of the outside. This would probably make it less objectionable and less tent-like. The Board stated that this is a good recommendation and agreed with this suggestion. Vice Chairman Welch stated that Coligny Plaza is not necessarily impacted by the project due to Coligny’s eclectic style. Vice Chairman Welch agreed that the door should be

changed. Some wood elements are needed to break up the canvas.

Mr. Parker agreed with Vice Chairman Welch's statements regarding the project. Mr. Parker stated that he is opposed to the door. Keep the curtains rolled up during the day and down at night time. Mr. Parker stated he is not that opposed to the project due to Coligny's eclectic style.

Mr. Gartner stated that he agrees with the Board's statements presented so far. Mr. Gartner stated that the panels should be rolled up and the front door needs to be changed. The Board agreed that the panels should be rolled up regardless and they should be placed on the inside of the fence.

Chairman Sodemann stated his agreement with the statements presented by the Board. Chairman Sodemann also requested that the applicant rethink the functionality of space in front of the door when the door is eliminated. Lastly, Mr. Richard Spruce presented statements on behalf of staff with regard to the requirement for two exits. A second door will be required.

Following final discussion by the Board, Chairman Sodemann recommended that the applicant withdraw today's application for needed design revisions. The applicant agreed to **withdraw** the application and will resubmit the project at a later date.

2) Kangaroo Express 71 Mathews Drive - DR130004

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated its location, 71 Mathews Drive. The Pantry is proposing major investment in five Hilton Head Island stores. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application including an aerial view of the site, existing site photos, and renderings of the proposed new design.

The applicant is proposing to re-clad their stores with a vintage brick veneer, horizontal cement board siding, and trim that resembles classic island character. The design incorporates removing the mansard roof that has defined the stores since they were built in the 1970's to 1980's. The applicant states in their narrative that the proposed design builds up the fascia and breaks up with a regular pattern of trim and horizontal cement board siding. The main entrance to the stores are bumped out to provide depth to the façade and transitions to a stucco or EIFS system, the box frame for the company sign logo will be recessed to provide an additional depth to the fascia. Ms. Ray presented a sample of the proposed materials (cedar, brick) and proposed colors for the horizontal siding, the main fascia frame, and the crown trim color, and Colonial red as accent color. Ms. Ray reviewed the elevations; no detail has been provided for the sides of the stores. The staff stated that all of the colors are consistent with the Design Guide and are an improvement over the existing.

Ms. Ray reviewed the proposed lighting fixtures including cut sheets. Shoe box lighting is proposed for the parking lot, with additional fixtures proposed for the front of the building. Featured lighting is designed to complement island character.

Ms. Ray stated that the applicant proposes to replace the existing mansard roof with a flat parapet roof. Flat roofs are discouraged by the Design Guide. The flat parapet roof is proposed for the installation of signage. Roof signs are not permitted per the Sign Ordinance so this configuration should be restudied. Ms. Ray stated that the long, flat brick wall on the side of the building (viewed from Highway 278) should be restudied as well. Relief is needed in this area perhaps with a brick base or water table with trim and then painted stucco above in a complementary color. This may help break up the edge and also help give some definition to the front elevation. Any adjacent dumpster screen, any service area, any walls, or fencing should be painted in a complementary color.

The lighting package needs to be submitted to staff with more detail, including colors of fixtures, and photo-metrics that will be reviewed by staff to make sure that the lighting levels are appropriate. Additionally, the submittal does not show any changes to the fuel canopy. The

proposed changes to the building might be able to be incorporated into the fuel canopy and columns so there is a relationship with the existing building. The staff recommended that the application be approved with the conditions listed above. Following the staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Timothy Reed, representative of The Pantry, and Mr. Doug Kirby, architect, with LMHT Associates, presented statements in support of the application. The Board and the applicants discussed several issues regarding the proposed improvements.

Mr. Gartner complimented the colors and the materials. The proposed design, however, seems too plain and needs to be restudied. Mr. Gartner agreed with staff's comments regarding the fuel canopy. It needs to have more of a relationship to the new store.

Mr. Parker complimented the applicant on making improvements to the stores. The colors and the materials are a great improvement. However, the flat roof is a problem. The mansard roof is preferred to the flat roof design as it's a better solution to a box-type building. The proposed flat roof amplifies the boxy building. Reconditioning or reconfiguring the mansard roof would be a much better solution over the flat roof. Marquees, unfortunately, are also not allowed under the Design Guidelines. A façade sign would be okay; however, a sign inside the roof is not allowed. The canopy needs to have a better relationship to the building.

Mr. Theodore stated that he agrees with the comments presented so far; the building is too boxy and the flat roof is out of character for Hilton Head Island. Mr. Theodore recommended a bronze or black color for the lighting package. The landscaping needs to be freshened up.

Mr. Smith recommended that the applicant keep the existing mansard roof instead of replacing it with the parapet roof. The mansard roof is a much better solution and should be upgraded as needed (repainting or replacing). The proposed building design is too heavy and inappropriate for Hilton Head Island.

Vice Chairman Welch agreed with the comments previously made by the Board. The Board stated that details for the fuel canopy are still needed and working drawings are still needed.

Chairman Sodemann stated that he agrees with all of the comments presented so far. The Board agreed with the idea of keeping the existing mansard roof form and the roof material be replaced or re-painted. The proposed brick needs to be carefully detailed as it relates to the existing windows.

Mr. Richard Spruce presented statements on behalf of staff regarding approval of the vertical requirements. At completion of the Board's discussion, Chairman Sodemann recommended that the applicant withdraw the application for needed revisions.

The applicant agreed to **withdraw** the application for needed revisions. The application will be resubmitted at a later date.

3) **Kangaroo Express** 1 Gum Tree Road - DR130005

The applicant agreed to **withdraw** the application for needed revisions based on the discussion of DR130004. The application will be submitted at a later date.

C. Minor External Change

1) **Kangaroo Express** Repaint - DR130006

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated the three store locations: 151 Arrow Road, 6 Palmetto Bay Road, and 1-B Regency Parkway. The applicant proposes to paint these three existing stores. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application. The proposal includes a two-tone paint scheme very similar to the colors reviewed in the Pantry's earlier

submittal. The proposed colors are consistent with the Design Guide.

Ms. Ray reviewed samples of the paint scheme. The base of the stores will be painted a brown color up to the sill of the window or storefront of the store. The remaining body of the building will be painted a khaki color up to the roof/mansard condition. The mansard will be painted a grey color. There is a trim on some of the buildings that will be painted the Colonial red color. The fuel canopy will be painted a color complementary to the individual building. Ms. Ray presented photos showing the existing conditions at each of the locations.

The staff recommended approval of the application with some conditions. The separation between the colors needs to be addressed better. The Arrow Road store specifically does not have a base or trim piece that will break up the two colors. The Colonial Red trim color should be extended on the trim at the Palmetto Bay store (#0855). The fuel canopy frame at the Regency Parkway (#3377) store should be painted Grey Tweed to be consistent with the other canopy and roof colors. Any adjacent accessory structures should also be repainted to be consistent with the proposed color scheme (specifically, the dumpster enclosure at the Regency Parkway store). Following the staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Timothy Reed, representative of The Pantry, and Mr. Doug Kirby, architect, with LMHT Associates, presented statements in support of the application. The Board discussed the application with the applicants. The board complimented the improvements that are proposed for the stores.

Mr. Gartner complimented the color scheme and stated his agreement with the staff's recommendations regarding the fuel canopy. Mr. Parker stated that he agrees with the staff's comments and with the Board's comments presented so far. Mr. Theodore stated that he also agrees with the statements provided so far. Vice Chairman Welch, Mr. Theodore, and Mr. Smith also stated their agreement.

Chairman Sodemann also presented statements in agreement with those already presented. Chairman Sodemann stated that something needs to be done about the horizontal band issue. At the completion of staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Mr. Gartner made a **motion to approve** the Kangaroo Express repaint application with these stores with the following conditions: (1) the separation between the base color and the body color needs to be a stucco band at the Arrow Road store; (2) the Colonial red trim color should be extended on the Palmetto Bay store; (3) the canopy frame on the fuel station at the Regency Parkway store should be painted Grey Tweed to be consistent with the roof on that store; (4) adjacent accessory structures should also be repainted to be consistent with the proposed color scheme. Mr. Parker **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** with a vote of 6-0-0.

2) Sands Village Repaint - DR120033

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated its location, 21 Lagoon Road. The applicant is proposing to repaint their buildings and slightly change their primary color scheme. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application. Two different shades of existing brown trim and railings are to remain. The applicant originally proposed to change from taupe to light green. However, based on the Board's previous comments, the applicant has revised their application and proposes a color combination that is appropriate based on the Design Guide. The staff recommended that the application be approved as submitted. The applicant for this project was not available for comments or questions from the Board.

The Board discussed the application with staff and compared the proposed color scheme against the project's existing color scheme. Mr. Parker stated his concern with the proposed shade of paint for the mansard, as the new color is too light. A white roof is not in keeping with island character or the Design Guide. The other Board members agreed that the new mansard color should not be any

lighter than the existing color. At the completion of the Board's discussion, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Mr. Smith made a **motion to approve** the Sands Village Repaint application with the condition that the new color for the mansard roof is not to be any lighter than the existing roof color. The body color is approved as submitted. Mr. Parker **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** with a vote of 6-0-0.

D. Sign

1) Reilley's Plaza Directional Sign - DR130008

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated its location, 7 Greenwood Drive. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application. Ms. Ray identified the location of the applicant's proposed directory sign. The proposed sign includes a 12-foot post with multiple arrows attached to it indicating the names of various businesses within the plaza and the distances to those locations. The project was originally submitted as a free-standing directional sign.

The staff reviewed it based on the Design Guide and the sign ordinance and the following comments were provided to the applicant: the colors and materials should be complementary to the adjacent structures; the sign needed to be made of high quality materials that must reference the adjacent buildings and signs, materials, and colors and overall design; the colors should be limited to three; the colors should be found within the existing development, the siding, trim, roof, etc.; that the materials be durable (wood, stucco or brick, would be appropriate especially with the high traffic area that is proposed); the tenant panels should be on sign frames between the posts; and the maximum height of a free-standing sign of this size is eight feet.

The staff met with the applicant to discuss these conditions, and the applicant requested that the application be reviewed by the DRB. The applicant would like the project to be reviewed as art rather than as a sign. The application does not meet the requirements for a sign. The project includes a variety of colors and the lettering is vinyl in the fonts that each of the businesses has. Following the staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Tom Reilley, business owner, presented statements in support of the application. The Board and the applicant discussed the intent of the project. The Board agreed that the project should be considered a piece of art and not a sign. Mr. Smith stated that the project may have too many colors. Mr. Theodore stated that it should be considered as a piece of art considering its environment. The colors are a part of the fun experience of this environment. Vice Chairman Welch agreed with Mr. Theodore's comments. Mr. Parker and Mr. Gartner also agreed with Mr. Theodore's comments. Chairman Sodemann also agreed. Following final discussion by the Board, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Vice Chairman Welch made a **motion to approve** the Reilley's Plaza Directional Sign application as a piece of art and not as a sign. The application is approved as submitted. Mr. Theodore **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** by a vote of 6-0-0.

9. Appearance by Citizens

None

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20p.m.

Submitted By:

Approved By:

February 26, 2013

Kathleen Carlin
Secretary

Scott Sodemann
Chairman