

**Planning Board Meeting –
December 15, 2014
Minutes**

Members Present: Harold Broadwell, Ruth Van der Grinten, Errol Briggerman, Billy Bryant, Larry Vaughan

Members Absent: Charles Kramer, Judy Silver, Joseph Sparacia, Ashley Anderson,

Others Present: Brad Rhinehalt, Laurie Ford, Matt Cunningham, TJ Daly, Regina Harmon

Staff Present: Planning Director David Bergmark, Planner Allison Rice

1. Meeting Called to Order

Mr. Broadwell called the meeting to order.

2. Welcome and Recognition of Guests

Mr. Broadwell welcomed all guests.

3. Chairman and Board Members' Comments

There were no comments from the Board.

4. Adjustment and Approval of Agenda.

Ms. Van der Grinten made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Bryant seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

6. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Van der Grinten made a correction to the minutes. Ms. Van der Grinten made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Briggerman seconded the motion. It was passed unanimously.

7. Discussion, Consideration, and Action on the Following Items:

Item 7A - Discussion and action on a zoning text amendment to Chapter 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance as it relates to Sign Standards for Master Planned Developments in excess of 500 acres.

Mr. Bergmark said the applicant, Matt Cunningham on behalf of Newland Communities, has submitted a text amendment to add additional sign standards and amend existing sign requirements in Chapter 12 of the UDO as they would apply to master planned developments in excess of 500 acres. He said this item was also connected to a Development Agreement which governs Wendell Falls. If passed, the proposed amendments would apply to all master planned developments in excess of 500 acres. Mr. Bergmark said originally the request applied to master planned developments in excess of 1000 acres (similar to the text amendment passed in May), but the project size was reduced to 500 acres at staff's request in order to more easily accommodate other large projects.

Mr. Bergmark said the purpose of these amendments was to provide standards for sign types that were not currently addressed in chapter 12 (such as auto and pedestrian oriented wayfinding signs, kiosks, gateway signs, and signs for model homes) as well as allow greater flexibility for dimensional and design requirements for signs in large developments. He said typically many of these types of signs would be paid for and installed by the Town. However, Newland Communities has developed their own master sign plan which they wish to implement (included as Attachment A). Mr. Bergmark said Newland Communities was provided a copy of the Town's Wayfinding Sign plan. However, Newland chose to develop its own sign standards to better reflect the image/brand that they wish to create for Wendell Falls. He said in order to permit the signs illustrated in Attachment A, the proposed text amendments shown on the following page would need to be approved.

Mr. Bergmark said during development of the text amendment proposal, staff reviewed the master sign plan included as Attachment A and made suggestions on specific language which could be included to allow their desired sign types, while still maintaining standards to limit the number, size, and height of signs. He said staff's suggestions were incorporated into the proposed text amendment. He said one key question will be whether the Town was comfortable allowing a developer to install wayfinding signs, which would generally be placed within the road right-of-way. Mr. Bergmark said any signs installed within the right-of-way of state maintained roads would need to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Transportation (DOT).

Proposed Text Amendment

To amend Chapter 12 of the UDO (Signs) to include a new Section entitled '**12.14 Alternative Standards for Master Planned Developments**'. The proposed language, accompanied by staff comments, is provided below.

Section 12.14. Alternative Standards for Master Planned Developments

A. The following additional standards and exceptions to the general provisions of Chapter 12 shall apply to signage within Master Planned developments in excess of 500 acres. In the event of a conflict between the provisions of this section and the standards otherwise contained in Chapter 12, the provisions of this section shall apply.

1. No sign types permitted under this section may incorporate flashing or animated sign elements.

Staff Comment: This standard is to clarify that any new sign type (such as kiosks or gateway entry signs) may not incorporate flashing or animated elements, similar to all other sign types.

2. Notwithstanding Section 12.6E5 of the UDO, neighborhood entrance signs are considered a type of monument sign and shall include a support or base (min 2 ft. in height) with at a minimum of 60% of said base constructed of rock, brick, or other masonry material.
 - a. Neighborhood entrance signs may be substituted with a pedestal entry sign. Pedestal entry signs shall be limited to 5' tall by 5' wide, with a maximum depth of 3 feet. Pedestal entry signs shall not require a rock, brick, or other masonry material base, but shall require rock, brick, or masonry accents.

Staff Comment: These standards were developed to allow the neighborhood entrance signs and Pedestal entry signs illustrated in Attachment A. The standards otherwise contained in Chapter 12 would require the entire base (rather than 60%) to be constructed of rock, brick, or other masonry material, which would prohibit their proposed design.

3. The developer shall be allowed 2 neighborhood entrance signs per entrance.

Staff Comment: This standard will not be required if the proposed amendments to the sign chapter recommended by the Planning Board at their November meeting are approved by the Town Board at their December 8th meeting. One of those proposed amendments changed the number of neighborhood entrance signs allowed in the NC zoning district from 1 to 2. Two entrance signs is the standard for all other residential zoning districts.

4. The developer shall be allowed 1 ‘Gateway Entry sign’ per 250 acres included in the development, to be located along primary entrances of the development. Gateway Entry signs shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. Unless otherwise approved by NCDOT along a state maintained road, all gateway entry signs shall be located a minimum of 5 feet behind the street right-of-way.
 - b. No gateway entry sign shall be located within 10 feet of a side property line or 20 feet from any right-of-way intersection.
 - c. Gateway entry signs shall include a support or base (min. 2 ft. in height) constructed of rock, brick, or other masonry material.
 - d. Gateway entry signs shall not exceed 20 feet in height, and sign text may not exceed 10 feet in height.
 - e. Sign copy may not exceed 175 sq. feet.

Staff Comment: Newland Communities desires to construct at least 2 large gateway signs along their primary entrances to help brand the neighborhood and signify that a pedestrian or motorist has entered the community. The UDO currently allows neighborhood entrance signs, but would not allow the height or size desired by Newland. The bottom portion of the sign could be considered a neighborhood entrance sign, but the more artistic column supporting the Wendell Falls symbol (symbolic of a windmill) far exceeds the height standard for neighborhood entrance signs. It is staff’s opinion that a development of this size warrants additional flexibility to accommodate large gateway signs. The proposed language would still limit the text of the sign to a more modest height (10 feet), but would allow other structural or non-text elements (such as a logo/branding symbol) to extend up to 20 feet in height. The number of signs allowed would be limited on the size of the development. In the case of Wendell Falls, Newland could incorporate a maximum of 4 gateway entry signs.

5. Auto-oriented wayfinding signs shall be permitted, but must adhere to the following standards:
 - a. These signs shall be placed along primary and secondary routes around the development, for the purpose of guiding visitors to specific areas of the development.
 - b. Specific business names may not be included on the sign.
 - c. Sign Height may not exceed 13 feet.
 - d. Sign width may not exceed 5 feet.
 - e. Signs located along the same side of the road must be distanced a minimum of 500 feet apart.
 - f. Vinyl is not permitted as a building material

Staff Comment: Chapter 12 currently contains no language addressing auto-oriented or pedestrian oriented wayfinding signs. Typically the Town would construct such signs and would not require a sign permit. The standards above are intended to allow developments in excess of 500 acres to develop their own wayfinding signs, within the parameters listed. Business names are prohibited in order to ensure the sign is for directional purposes, not advertising.

6. Pedestrian-oriented wayfinding signs shall be permitted, but must adhere to the following standards:
 - a. These signs are geared toward the pedestrian and meant to help guide him/her to specific destinations. These signs will be installed along sidewalks, trails, and at crosswalks.
 - b. Pedestrian oriented signs should be installed so they are easily read by a pedestrian, and in a way that does not encroach on movement or create a hazard to pedestrians or automobiles.
 - c. Specific business names may not be included on the sign.
 - d. Sign height may not exceed 11 feet.
 - e. Sign width may not exceed 3'6".
 - f. Vinyl is not permitted as a building material.

Staff Comment: See comment under 'auto-oriented wayfinding signs'

7. Pedestrian-oriented Kiosks shall be permitted, but must adhere to the following standards:
 - a. Pedestrian-oriented Kiosks should be installed in places where pedestrians are likely to congregate, but they should not impede movement along a sidewalk or the movement of automobiles into and out of parking spaces.
 - b. Pedestrian-oriented Kiosks may include maps, directional information, and promotional information for the development or community events occurring within the Town, but may not contain commercial advertisement.
 - c. Kiosk height may not exceed 8 feet.
 - d. Kiosk width may not exceed 6 feet

Staff Comment: Currently Chapter 12 includes no language specifically addressing pedestrian kiosks. Large communities may wish to incorporate kiosks to display neighborhood maps, post community events, or other similar material. Commercial advertisement is prohibited, per the proposed language.

8. Model homes shall each be permitted 1 suspended single post sign or a similarly designed sign, as determined by the administrator. The sign face shall not exceed 6 square feet. No portion of the sign shall be located closer than 5 feet from any property line.

Staff Comment: Chapter 12 of the UDO does not directly address signage for model homes. It permits development advertising signs, but they must be located at the entrance of the development. It also permits construction signs, which may list a builder but must be located on the lot under construction. Once the model home was completed, the construction sign would no longer be permitted. Section 12.7B contains language allowing a 2 sq ft suspended single post sign for home occupation uses, but model homes are not technically a home occupation.

Mr. Bergmark said since this issue was not specific to large development, staff recommends that a standard be created for model home signage which would apply to all development. He said the chart in section 12.7B could be modified to allow a suspended single post sign for model homes. In order to avoid a building permit being required, the maximum area of the sign should not exceed 6 square feet. He said the height of suspended single post signs was limited to 5 feet.

Mr. Bergmark said any recommended change, if deemed necessary, should be accompanied by a statement explaining how the change is consistent with the comprehensive plan, and is reasonable in

nature. He said Such statements could refer to the general principles of the Comprehensive Plan, including but not limited to:

- Principle Number 5: “Promote Wendell’s attractiveness to businesses and people of all walks of life...”

Item 7 B – Discussion and Action on an amendment to the Development Agreement governing Wendell Falls as it relates to sign requirements.

Mr. Bergmark said Newland Communities submitted an amendment to the Development Agreement governing the Wendell Falls development for the purpose of applying the UDO’s sign regulations to the entire development. He said the Development Agreement, first adopted in June of 2006 by the Wendell Board of Commissioners had subsequently been amended multiple times due to necessary modifications and changes in ownership. He said the last amendment was made in May of 2014, for the purpose of applying certain standards of the UDO to the property identified as SF-1, SF-2, and SF-3. Mr. Bergmark said at the time the May amendment was passed, it also applied the landscaping standards and development review process described in the UDO to the entire Wendell Falls development.

Mr. Bergmark said the prior amendments did not apply the UDO’s sign standards to Wendell Falls. As a result, the old zoning code’s standards for signs would still apply. He said as Newland has moved forward with their project, they began developing a master sign plan. He said the master sign plan created by Newland was included as an attachment to the text amendment report. Some elements of the master sign plan are either not covered or would not be permitted under the old zoning code. Since the PUD document and the old zoning code cannot be modified at this point, Newland must amend their development agreement to apply UDO sign standards to Wendell Falls in order to make any changes to sign regulations governing Wendell Falls.

Mr. Bergmark said the draft Development Agreement amendment was included as Attachment A. He said the town attorney had reviewed the proposed development agreement and found no problems with the language.

Matt Cunningham, representing Newland Communities, presented the Board with the sign plans for Wendell Falls. He introduced Laurie Ford and Brad Rhinehalt from Newland Communities, and TJ Daly, who developed the sign plan.

Mr. Broadwell asked if there were any questions for the board. Mr. Briggerman asked if Wendell Falls’ gateway sign would be in the median. Mr. Bergmark said it was not planned that the sign would be in the median at that point, although the wording of the new proposed amendment would allow for signs to be in the median if approved by DOT.

Mr. Bryant asked if this was originally supposed to be an amendment to Wendell Falls’ agreement with the Town of Wendell. Mr. Bergmark said they could have applied to change the PUD document but it was recommended by lawyers on both sides to amend the current UDO. He said the old code can’t be amended since it’s no longer applicable, and the PUD can’t be amended because it was approved as a special use under the old zoning code.

Mr. Bryant said he had some reservations about the 20 foot height allowed. He said he liked the designs presented, however he felt the gateway entry sign was too overpowering. He said he was even more concerned since this would change to UDO to allow other future developments to build 20 foot signs. He said he was also concerned about the provision allowing 10 foot font on the sign.

Mr. Bryant said he believed the auto and pedestrian oriented wayfinding signs could be scaled back. He said both were overwhelming and were more in line with office park designs. He said he had designed signs like this in the past for office parks.

Mr. Bergmarks said that one reason why the proposed signs were so large was because they wanted the Town of Wendell's wayfinding signs to comply with the UDO as much as possible, even if the Town didn't have to get sign permits. Mr. Bryant said Wendell Falls will be setting the standard for what will be coming in with other developments. He said the Board needed to consider the maximum dimensions allow, especially considering further developments might not use such nice materials.

Mr. Bergmark said this amendment would only apply to developments with 500 acres or more, so this would not apply to every development that came in.

TJ Daly and Brad Rhinehalt showed the Board drawings of the proposed signage, to scale, so that the Board would have a reference. Mr. Daly said they had the same concerns about the scale, so they drew the sign on GoogleEarth to scale, with trees and the road. He said that the scale was actually appropriate when placed in the correct environment, with a 100 foot wide roadway, with a median and 60 foot trees.

Mr. Bryant said he agreed with Mr. Daly, but that he was still concerned about future developers that would not have the same streetscape characteristics. Mr. Daly said he would agree with Mr. Bryant if it were a single lane road. Mr. Rhinehalt suggested that they tie the height of the allowed signage to the miles per hour of traffic along the road.

Mr. Vaughan said he didn't have a problem with the height, when he looked at it from the perspective provided, and considering how far off the road it would have to be to comply with DOT regulations. Mr. Bryant said they had to consider the perspective of pedestrians, for example. Mr. Vaughan said most pedestrians wouldn't be walking right up to the sign itself.

Mr. Bergmark said that if there were a concern about the height of the sign relative to the size of the road, they could include language that made the allowed height depend of the road right of way. Mr. Bryant said he could see where that could be a desirable option. Mr. Bergmark said the Board could tie the height to a set width, or to the number of lanes. He said they could include language that said if the road had 4 or more lanes the sign could be 20 feet, and if the road had less than 4 lanes the sign could be 15 feet.

Mr. Broadwell asked how the Board wanted to move forward. Mr. Bryant said he didn't want to shoot from the hip. He suggested that staff return with updated language for them to vote on. Mr. Rhinehalt said that they were trying to install the signs in January and asked that the Board vote on the language now so they could move forward. Mr. Broadwell suggested the Board table the topic and move on to Item 7C, while the Newland team wrote updated language to present to the Board. The Newland team were shown to the conference room to work on the proposal.

Item 7C – Discussion and Action on Potential Text Amendments to Chapter 5 of the UDO related to Design Standards for Townhomes.

Mr. Bergmark said at their September 8th meeting, the Town Board directed staff to take the complete list of UDO comments received from the public to the Planning Board and to have the Planning Board begin making recommendations based on the comments in batches. He said the first group of UDO amendments brought before the Planning Board dealt with residential design standards, as this category received the most public comments.

Mr. Bergmark said at their November 17, 2014 meeting, the Planning Board provided recommendations for amendments to the Town's standards on garage width, front porch width and depth, and raised entrance requirements, but delayed action on 'rear alley-access requirements for townhomes'. The Planning Board asked staff to assemble draft language for different requirements related to townhome garages and design. The Planning Board also asked staff to look into how front-load vs. rear-load townhome design options impacted the density of a site. He said density will largely be determined by the size, layout, and environmental and topographical conditions of a site. However, staff did find a journal article entitled 'Explaining Residential Density' that compares the density which can result from different residential building options (See Attachment A). He said in the article, townhomes are referred to as 'row houses'. He said as can be seen in the chart on pages 2 and 3 of the article, there was no substantial difference in density or construction cost between front-load and rear-load options. In fact, the author found rear-load options to potentially allow 5 more dwelling units per acre (25-30 dwelling units per acre vs. 20-25 dwelling units per acre).

Rear Alley Access requirements for Townhomes

Current Language of the UDO:

- **“Garage Doors:** Garage doors are not permitted on the front elevation of any townhouse building.”
 - Mr. Bergmark said the Town received two comments requesting that this standard be changed.
 - He said the purpose of the existing standard is to reduce the visual impact of garages on the front of narrow townhome lots, to increase the amount of grass and landscaping which may be present in front of the townhome by taking the driveways away from the front of the home, and to make the streetscape in front of the townhome more pedestrian friendly.
 - Mr. Bergmark said requirement varies from one municipality to another. He said Knightdale and Apex require all townhomes to have rear-loaded garages. Wake Forest requires either a rear loaded garage, or a detached garage in the rear yard. Zebulon and Raleigh allow front loaded townhomes, but Raleigh limits the width of the garage to 50 percent of the front façade.
- **Mr. Bergmark presented the following design alternatives:**
 - Option 1: Maintain the current language prohibiting garage doors on the front elevation of all townhouse buildings.
 - Option 2: Delete the current language prohibiting garage doors on the front elevation of townhouse buildings.
 - Staff Comment: If the existing language were simply deleted, there would be no standard regulating whether the garage could protrude from the front of townhome units. Option 3 below includes language addressing this concern.
 - Option 3: Amend the current standard to state, “Garages on the front elevation of any townhouse may constitute no more than 50% of the width of the individual townhouse unit. Garage doors must be recessed at least 1 foot behind the front wall plane of habitable space or a second-story element over the garage door must be provided that extends at least 1 foot beyond the front wall plane.”
 - Staff Comment: This standard would allow front-loaded townhomes, but would limit the visual impact of having the garage on the front. These standards were taken from the City of Raleigh's ordinance.
 - Option 4: Amend the current standard to state, “No more than 40 percent of townhouse units in any development may incorporate garage doors on the front elevation.”
 - Staff Comment: This standard would require that the majority of townhomes in a development use rear-alley access, but would provide flexibility to incorporate

some front-load townhomes where site constraints exist. None of the municipalities reviewed had this type of standard in their ordinance.

- Option 5: Combine options 3 & 4.

Mr. Bergmark said staff recommended keeping the current standard for Townhome garages (option 1). He said prohibiting garages on the front elevation of Townhomes allows for more design details to be incorporated into the front façade of the house for an improved appearance, eliminates driveways and curb-cuts along the streetscape providing a safer pedestrian environment, and allows a larger landscaped area in front of the home due to the relocation of driveways. He said the Town's current standard is consistent with the standard used by Knightdale, Wake Forest, and Apex.

Mr. Broadwell asked for questions or comments from the Board. Mr. Bryant asked if it was true that a suggestion was made to change this section of the UDO, but no alternative was suggested and no one was present at the Board meeting to speak. Mr. Bergmark said that was correct. Mr. Bryant made a motion to keep the standard as it was. Mr. Vaughan seconded the motion. Mr. Vaughan asked how the density is increased for rear-loaded townhouses. Mr. Bergmark said it probably came from space in the yard. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 7D – Discussion and Action on Potential Text Amendments to Chapter 12 of the UDO related to Temporary Sign Standards.

Mr. Bergmark said at their September 8th meeting, the Town Board directed staff to take the complete list of UDO comments received from the public to the Planning Board and to have the Planning Board begin making recommendations based on the comments in batches. He said those UDO comments which addressed the town's sign regulations are included in Table 1.

Mr. Bergmark said at their November 17th meeting, the Planning Board delayed action on the text amendments related to temporary signage and requested additional information from staff regarding the size and number of temporary signs allowed at one time, as well as the preferred method of addressing feather signs. He said the proposed text amendments included within this report are intended to address perceived deficiencies and omissions in the town's current temporary sign regulations. Feather signs are addressed by applying a maximum height to temporary signs and restricting the size of signs placed on the same lot. He said the Planning Board also asked staff to evaluate alternative sign standards which could apply to the downtown area. He said this item will require further review and will be brought back before the Planning Board at a later time.

Item # 5: Temporary Signs

Mr. Bergmark said the Town received two comments requesting that the town's temporary sign regulations be reviewed and made more flexible. He said staff had received complaints that the time limit for general temporary sign permits (not banners) is too short.

Mr. Bergmark said currently, businesses may obtain:

- 4 temporary sign permits annually, each valid for 10 calendar days
- Each sign permit allows for up to 6 signs per event
- Both Mobile Signs (i.e. signs mounted on a mobile framework, trailer or other movable apparatus) and 'Non-Profit Community and Civic Event Signs' are included in this category.
- 4 banner permits, each valid for 30 days
- Banners must be placed on the building and must relate to a specific promotion of limited duration (i.e. 'Grand Opening' or 'All Men's clothes now on sale', etc.).

Mr. Bergmark said staff recommended that the town amend the temporary sign regulations to clarify that a total of 4 sign permits may be issued for all sign categories combined (banners, ground-mounted, mobile signs, lighter-than air, etc.). He said in order to provide more flexibility to business owners, staff suggested that the duration of ground-mounted signs vary according to the size of the sign, to allow smaller signs to be erected for a longer period.

Mr. Bergmark said this approach would allow those signs not placed on the buildings, depending on their size, to be erected for a much longer period than currently allowed. However, any banners erected on a building would be included as one of the 4 temporary signs permitted annually. Banners erected on poles in the ground would be treated like any other ground-mounted sign.

Mr. Bergmark said if adopted, this change would allow a business to have temporary signage up for a maximum of four months of the entire year, if all signs used are no more than 3 square feet in size or all permits are used for banners placed on the building. Otherwise, the total duration would be closer to two months.

Mr. Bergmark said in order to address concerns over multiple feather signs being erected on the same property, staff included language that limited the size of ground-mounted signs placed on the same property to 3 square feet. He said staff included language that would allow a business to pull additional temporary sign permits in order to keep a banner placed on their building for longer than 30 calendar days when they have received an approved commercial building permit. This would provide new business owners with the ability to have a banner up for a total of four months while their permanent sign is being made and installed, so long as they submit and obtain a building permit by the end of the first 30 day period. Mr. Bergmark said staff also included language which would allow staff to remove temporary signage which has fallen down or is in disrepair.

Mr. Bergmark read the following Proposed Amendment to Section 12.7D (Temporary Signs Requiring a Permit)

D. Temporary Signs Requiring a Permit

A temporary sign permit, obtained from the Administrator, shall be required for the following sign types. No more than 4 total sign permits (combined, of the categories listed below) may be issued to any party within the same calendar year. Signs enumerated below shall be located either behind a sidewalk or ditch line, or where neither is present, signs must be located at least 5 feet from the edge of pavement. Ground mounted signs (excluding lighter-than-air and mobile signs) shall be limited to 7 feet in height. The applicant must obtain permission from the property owner to post the sign. All temporary signs shall be properly maintained and kept in an upright position, or may be subject to removal by the Town.

Lighter-Than-Air Signs: A lighter than air sign may be permitted on the premises of any given business up to two times per year for no longer than three consecutive calendar days per use. The sign shall be situated so that the height of the sign is directly proportional to the distances to the property lines, not to exceed 100 feet in height.

Seasonal Farm Product Signs: Off-premise signs advertising the seasonal sale of farm products may be permitted for a maximum period of 60 calendar days. Signs are not to exceed 3 square feet in size and are to be located on private property. No more than six signs will be allowed at any one time.

Mobile Signs: Signs mounted on a mobile framework, trailer, or other movable apparatus other than vehicles used for transporting are prohibited on a permanent basis. One mobile sign will be permitted on a temporary basis at grand openings, open houses or special events in any commercial or manufacturing district for a 14 day calendar period.

Mr. Briggerman asked if mobile signs referred to trucks with giant signs on the back that drove around town. Mr. Bergmark said it referred to trucks that had signs on the back that were sitting in the parking lot next to the road.

Banners and Pennants Displayed on a Commercial Building. Banners and pennants may be displayed on a commercial building under the following conditions:

- a. Only one banner may be displayed by each business at any time and each banner is limited to 32 square feet in area. Temporary signs permits for banners and/ or pennants shall be valid for 30 calendar days at a time.
- b. No banner and/or pennant may be displayed unless the commercial message contained in the banner relates to a specific, special promotion of limited duration.
- c. No banner and/or pennant may be displayed or used as a general or ongoing advertisement of the business or its customary activities.
- d. No banner and/or pennant may be displayed or used as a replacement for permanent signage.
- e. The administrator may exempt the applicant from the requirements listed in b - d of this section if they have obtained an approved commercial building permit for a permanent sign.
- f. The Administrator shall have the authority to order the removal of any banner and/or pennant that:
 - Is, or appears to be, out of date.
 - Is, or appears to be deteriorated, or in a state of disrepair, wear, or neglect.
 - Is, or appears to be, abandoned.

All other Temporary Signs: All other temporary signs not enumerated in section 12.7D shall be limited by the additional standards herein. Such signs shall not exceed six per event and the combined square footage of the signs shall not exceed 32 square feet. If more than one ground-mounted sign is placed on the same property, the sign area allowed per sign shall be reduced to 3 square feet each. The duration of each sign permit shall vary according to the size of the proposed signs, as follows:

- a. Where the maximum size of any sign does not exceed 3 square feet, the permit shall be valid for 30 calendar days.
- b. Where the maximum size of any sign exceeds 3 square feet, the permit shall be valid for 14 calendar days.

Mr. Bergmark said any recommended change, if deemed necessary, should be accompanied by a statement explaining how the change is consistent with the comprehensive plan, and is reasonable in nature. He said such statements could refer to the general principles of the Comprehensive Plan, including but not limited to:

- Principle Number 5: “Promote Wendell’s attractiveness to business and people of all walks of life.”
- Principle number 1: “Preserve the small town feel and historic character.”

Mr. Broadwell asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board. Ms. Van der Grinten said that Ms. Harmon was present and that she had made UDO comments about this topic. She asked if Ms. Harmon had anything to say. Ms. Harmon said as a business owner, temporary signs have been very important advertising. She said these proposed regulations were better, but that they were still strangling businesses in not allowing them to market themselves. She said 4 months out of 12 was not enough time to be allowed to post temporary signs. She said 6 months was fair.

Mr. Bergmark said staff had to consider what they would be able to regulate as well as the fact that these signs were meant to be up temporarily. Mr. Broadwell said he personally didn’t like all of the temporary

signs in town. Mr. Broadwell asked for a motion. Mr. Bryant made a motion to recommend staff's recommendations to the Town Board. Ms. Van der Grinten seconded it. Mr. Vaughan said he didn't have an issue with allowing temporary signs more liberally, since Wendell is still small. The vote passed 4 to 1, with Mr. Vaughan dissenting.

Mr. Broadwell reopened topics 7A and 7B. Mr. Cunningham presented the updating wording in D4 regarding the gateway signs "gateway sign will not exceed 20 feet in height if located adjacent to roadways of 4 lanes or more in width, or 15 feet in height if located adjacent to roadways of less than 4 lanes in width. Sign text may not exceed 10 feet in height."

Mr. Broadwell asked if there were further questions or comments related to that amendment. There were none. Mr. Broadwell asked for a motion. Mr. Bryant made a motion to approve the suggested language for topics A and B with the amendment. Mr. Vaughan seconded it. It passed unanimously.

8. Adjourn to Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting

Mr. Briggerman made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Van der Grinten seconded it. It passed unanimously.