

**Planning Board Meeting –
November 17th, 2014
Minutes**

Members Present: Harold Broadwell, Charles Kramer, Ruth Van der Grinten, Errol Briggerman, Judy Silver, Billy Bryant, Ashley Anderson, Larry Vaughan

Members Absent: Joseph Sparacia

Others Present: Lucius Jones Jr., Commissioner Sam Laughery, Commissioner Virginia Gray, Renae Farrah, Randy Broach, Paul White, Tommy Edwards

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. He told the guests that they would have an informal meeting. He asked that guests be recognized by the Chair before they speak.

3. Chairman and Board Members' Comments

There were no comments from the Board. Mr. Broadwell said that the Town Board had met and did not accept the Planning Board's recommendation relating to residential design standards. He said they instead accepted the staff's recommendation, and that would be on for a second reading November 24.

4. Adjustment and Approval of Agenda.

Mr. Kramer made a motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Silver seconded the motion. It was passed unanimously.

5. Public Comments

Mr. Broadwell asked for public comments, with the understanding that he wouldn't disallow anyone to speak later in the proceedings.

Renae Farrah from Broach custom signs spoke about item 7B from the agenda as it relates to signs. She said she was present to answer any questions the Board may have when the topic came up. She said she became involved while talking to staff about the Food Lion monument sign, and had been talking to Mr. Bergmark about changes to the UDO as they pertain to signs. She said she would be happy to answer any questions when that item came up on the agenda.

6. Approval of 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 5 of the Unified Development Ordinance derived from community input and staff logs.

Mr. Bergmark asked the Planning Board to review and make a recommendation related to possible text amendments to Chapter 5 of the UDO. He 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. The first group of UDO amendments brought before the Planning Board (shown below) dealt with residential design standards, as this category received the most public comments.

Mr. Bergmark said at their October 20, 2014 meeting, the Planning Board discussed garage width requirements, but requested that staff return with additional information prior to them making a recommendation.

Potential Text Amendments (Group 1 – Residential Design Standards)

1. Garage width requirement
2. Rear alley-access requirement for townhomes
3. Front porch width requirement
4. Front porch depth requirement
5. Raised entrance requirement

Item # 1: Garage width requirement

- **Current Language of the UDO (5.9E):**
 - “The width of an attached garage shall not exceed 40 percent of the total building facade.”
 - The Town received two comments stating that the current standard should change. No alternative standard was suggested.
- For reference, as part of Wendell Fall’s text amendment, the following standard was applied to master planned communities in excess of 1000 acres:
 - **Garage Width.** Notwithstanding Section 5.9.E.5.f., garage doors will not exceed:
 - 65% of the length of the façade on lots less than 65 feet in width; and
 - 40% of the length of the façade on lots 65 feet in width or greater.

Mr. Bergmark noted the porch width requirement was also changed to 30% for master planned communities. Otherwise, the 65% rule above would conflict with the porch width requirement (40%) for narrow lots. He cautioned the planning board from applying the 65% rule to all development. Mr. Bergmark said master planned communities generally have larger investments than typical subdivisions in the form of amenity sites, landscaping, trails, and commercial development which help ensure a higher level of housing quality. He said as a result, staff was

more comfortable with allowing more flexibility in the garage requirement for this type of development.

Mr. Bergmark said staff had created two tables related to garage size. Table 1 showed the percentage of the front façade the garage comprised in 5 recent dwellings constructed in the Woodlands of Timberlake subdivision. Pictures of each home were also included in Attachment B. Table 2 showed the maximum percentage of the front façade that a 24-foot wide garage could comprise in various zoning districts.

Table 1. Woodlands of Timberlake Ex.- Garage Width

Address	House Width	Garage Width	Garage % of Façade	Lot Width
400 Raymond Dr.	52'	21'	40%	Corner (> 60)
35 Deer Lake Tr.	34' 4"	20' 4"	60%	60.32'
34 Wood Green Dr.	39' 4"	22' 8"	58%	61.99'
40 Wood Green Dr.	51'	23'	45%	Cul-de-sac (> 60)
58 Wood Green Dr.	40'6"	22'	54%	62.03'

Table 2. Garage Width by Zoning District using Max. Buildout of Lot

Zoning District	Min Lot Width	Min. Side Setback	Max House Width	Garage Width	Garage % of Façade
RA/RR	100 ft	10 ft	80 ft	24 ft	30%
R2	70 ft	10 ft	50 ft	24 ft	48%
R3	60 ft	6 ft	48 ft	24 ft	50%
R4	50 ft	5 ft	40 ft	24 ft	60%
R7/NC	24 ft	3 ft	18 ft	N/A	N/A

Note: Front load garages are not allowed on lots less than 50 feet wide

Mr. Bergmark said staff’s recommendation was to raise the percentage of the house which the garage may comprise from 40% to 50%. He said if the Planning Board wished to use a higher figure, the data contained in Table 1 and 2 suggest that 60% would accommodate a 24 foot garage in any zoning district in which front loaded garages are permitted.

Mr. Bergmark said this item was brought up as an issue during the UDO public comment, but no alternatives were suggested. He said Wendell Falls had asked for this to be changed for their development, but that was under certain circumstances and they had additional design and development standards that offset the negative impact.

Ms. Van der Grinten said that after doing her own research, and in looking at the tables provided, she was of the opinion that allowing 60% for garage width would be more than fair. Mr.

Vaughan said he was also comfortable with 55 or 60% percent. Mr. Vaughan said he didn't know where the Planning Board stood on double garage doors vs. single garage doors. Mr. Broadwell said the garage door issue had already been addressed. Mr. Bergmark said that there was currently no requirement towards single or double garage doors. He said the amendment currently before the Board of Commissioners stated that the only time two garage doors for a double garage would be required was when the front-loading garage protruded from the front façade of the house.

Mr. Broadwell said if there was no more discussion in this item, then he would ask for a motion. Mr. Briggerman made a motion to accept the staff's recommendations, with the amendment to increase the percentage allowed to 60%. Ms. Silver seconded it. 7 voted in favor, Mr. Bryant voted against. The motion carried.

Item # 2: 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 was 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 the presence of this requirement varied from one municipality to another. For example, the Towns of Knightdale and Wake Forest have a similar requirement, while the City of Raleigh and Town of Zebulon do not.

Mr. Bergmark said the purpose of these design standards was to encourage community interaction, to pull the homes closer to the sidewalk, and to ensure that cars and garages were not blocking people from their neighbors. Mr. Bergmark pointed out that all attached homes, such as townhomes and apartments, require approval through special use, so the developer can always request a variance from this standard as part of that process.

Mr. Bergmark showed the Planning Board examples of townhomes at different price points, with rear garages, no garages, and front garages, to show the differences in streetscapes. He said it might cost a little more money for the developer to meet the current standard, although there were homes with rear-loaded garages at all price points. He also said that it might take a little more space to have rear alleys, but not all that much more.

Ms. Van der Grinten said she made a point of driving around to look at townhomes in the area. She said the homes with the rear garages were certainly more attractive, they promote a sense of community, and give it a neighborhood feel. She said if the Planning Board does allow front-loading garages, she does support having width restrictions, such as 50%, and saying that the garages must be flush with the façade. She said she saw some townhomes in Clayton where the garages were 70% of the house and protruding from the front, and they were very unattractive.

She said only allowing rear-loaded garages seems a little restrictive. She said she likes the idea of allowing a mixture, maybe 70% and 30%.

Mr. Broadwell asked for a motion from the Board. Mr. Vaughan said he didn't have enough information yet. He wanted to know how these measures would affect density. He said he knew that if the Town had a mix of options, that would increase the density, but he wanted to know by how much. He did say that he liked the variety a mix of options would introduce.

Mr. Bryant also said he would like more information from the staff. He said if the Board were to consider a mixed situation, he said he wanted to know what the parameters would be. Mr. Bergmark said he would come back with some written guidelines. He said, regarding density, he would look into it, but that information may be difficult to find. Mr. Bryant said he was more interested in the most effective guidelines regarding allowing a mix of garage styles.

Item # 3 & 4: Front Porch Width and Depth Requirements (single family dwellings)

- Current Language of the UDO(5.9E):
 - **“Front Porches:** On lots 49 feet or less in width, ground level front porches shall be at least 8 feet deep and extend more than 40 percent of the façade”

Mr. Bergmark said the Town received one comment suggesting that the current standard should change. He said no alternative standard had been suggested. Mr. Bergmark said for reference, as part of the Wendell Fall's text amendment, the porch width percentage was changed to 30 percent of the façade and the porch depth requirement was reduced to 7 feet. For this item, the text amendment passed by Wendell Falls was not a major change of dimensional standards. He said staff did not have objections to the 30 % rule for front porches and the 7 foot depth requirement to be applied to all developments.

Mr. Bergmark said the purpose of having a depth requirement for the porch was to ensure that the front porch was usable, rather than merely decorative. As an example, staff would seek to maintain a standard which would allow enough space for a rocking chair to be used with room to navigate past it. He showed in Attachment A that those municipalities which did have a porch depth requirement used a 6 foot minimum.

Mr. Bergmark said that he wanted to make everyone aware that this requirement currently only applied to lots 49 feet in length or less. All other lots would not be subject to this restriction. Mr. Bergmark showed the Board some examples of porches that staff considers too narrow. He said the porch width should be wide enough to be functional to the resident, and said he believed this width requirement should be extended to all porches, regardless of lot size.

Mr. Bryant said the 8 foot minimum porch depth was excessive. He said 6 feet seemed adequate, based on personal experience, but that any porch should have that requirement. Ms. Van der Grinten said 6 feet seemed narrow, and asked if Mr. Bryant would be opposed to compromising at 7 feet.

Mr. Bergmark said that has the ordinance currently stood, the 40% requirement did not conflict with their 60% garage width requirement.

Mr. Vaughan made a motion to recommend that on lots 49 feet or less in width, ground level front porches shall be at least 6 feet deep and extend more than 30 percent of the façade. Mr. Bryant seconded it. 7 voted in favor, Ms. Van der Grinton opposed.

Mr. Bergmark asked if the Board wanted to extend the 6 foot porch depth requirement to all lot sizes. He said he would like to ensure that anyone's porch is usable, regardless of lot width. Mr. Broadwell asked what the UDO currently states regarding porches on larger lots. Mr. Bergmark said there were no guidelines at all regarding porch width or depth on larger lots. Ms. Silver said she was fine with that. Mr. Broadwell said they would move on to item number 5.

Item # 5: Raised Entrance Requirement

- Current Language of the UDO (Section 5.9E & 5.10D)
 - **“Raised Entrances** (single family dwellings): “All front entrances shall be raised above the finished grade a minimum of 1 ½ feet.”
 - **“Raised Entrances** (Townhomes): “All front entrances shall be raised from the finished grade (at the building line) a minimum of 1 ½ feet, except live-work units, which may have entrances at grade.

Mr. Bergmark said the purpose of the existing standards were to create a more visually appealing front façade and to allow homes to be pulled closer to the road to encourage social interaction while still creating a sense of vertical separation. He said in staff's opinion, maintaining a raised entrance helped support the value of the home.

Mr. Bergmark said a raised entrance could be obtained using a raised stem wall, rather than a crawlspace. He said builders in Woodlands of Timberlake were currently using this approach (without being required to) in order to obtain a more desired look without making the full investment that a crawlspace requires.

Mr. Bergmark said they had this standard to create a more visually appealing front façade. He said when homes were pulled closer to the road, front porch height gives a sense of separation without blocking the resident from the rest of the community, even if they're the same distance apart. He said this requirement supports a neighborhood and community-based value. He said there was a bit more cost involved, but that according to builders, that cost would be minimal, around \$2000, compared to a slab on grade. Mr. Bergmark showed the Planning Board pictures of homes with and without raised stem walls.

Mr. Broadwell said he understood the aesthetics, but asked whether there was any evidence that these types of foundations increased the property value of homes. Mr. Bergmark said he didn't know. Mr. Broadwell asked if it was staff's opinion that it did increase property value. Mr. Bergmark said if the question was whether a property owner would pay more for that amenity than it cost the builder to supply it, he said he believed they would.

Mr. Bryant asked where the consideration was coming from to change this standard. Mr. Bergmark said it came from Lucius Jones. Mr. Bryant asked if there were any alternatives suggested, or if there were only two choices. Mr. Bergmark said nothing else was suggested. He said the only alternative possible was if there was a mixture allowed within one development.

Lucius Jones asked to speak to the Planning Board. He said he was a builder and he knew the value of homes. He said it was an obstacle when you were trying to sell homes to people who did not want steps. He said there are people who did not want steps, particularly seniors. He said he didn't understand why a municipality would dictate the number of steps in a house. He said as far as cost, Mr. Bergmark was probably correct in that it would cost about \$2000 more for a raised foundation. However, Mr. Jones did not believe it would affect the resale value of the house.

Mr. Bergmark said that if a retirement community or age restricted community was being developed, that would be a valid reason to apply for a variance as part of the special use approval. He said, however, that it would not be addressed in the case of a person looking to build a single home without a raised stem wall.

Mr. Vaughan said he had a problem dictating to people how they should build their houses. He said that was not allowing the market to work appropriately. Mr. Kramer and Ms. Silver agreed. Mr. Vaughan added that raised stem walls should be offered as an option. Mr. Bryant said he had empathy for people who did not want to go up steps to their house. He made a motion that the requirement be removed from Sections 5.9E and 5.10D of the UDO. Mr. Bergmark said Section 5.10D applied to townhomes, and asked if they wanted to apply this to both townhomes and single family homes. Mr. Broadwell said he didn't know why there would be a difference. Mr. Bryant said that in order to be consistent, the change should apply to both. Mr. Vaughan seconded the motion. 7 members voted in favor of the motion, Ms. Anderson voted against.

Mr. Bergmark asked for a statement of consistency. The Planning Board approved of the two suggested by Mr. Bergmark.

Item 7 B – Discussion and Action on Potential Text Amendments to Chapter 12 of the Unified Development Ordinance pertaining to signs.

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 the second grouping of UDO comments and potential changes being brought before the Planning Department was in regards to signage regulations. He said this item was seen as more time sensitive than others, as the Food Lion Shopping Center was trying to create a new monument sign. He said the shopping center had problems for years with their existing monument sign, which sits in the middle of the drive aisle. The existing sign is hard to see from the road, and has caused multiple accidents and property damage to the sign and motorists'

vehicles. The shopping center was under new management and the new owner wished to develop a larger monument sign to be located outside of the drive aisle.

Mr. Bergmark said based on research conducted on other town's regulations and the Town's recent experience designing and purchasing its own welcome sign, it was believed that a new, larger monument sign category was needed for shopping centers. He said the proposed text amendments included within this report addressed this need, as well as other perceived deficiencies in the town's current sign regulations based on community input. Those UDO comments which addressed the town's sign regulations were included in Table 1.

Potential Text Amendments (Group 1 – Residential Design Standards)

1. Monument Signs (time sensitive)
2. Development/Subdivision Advertising Signs
3. Suspended Single Post Signs
4. Wall Signs
5. Temporary Signs
6. Flashing Signs

Item # 1: Monument Signs

- Current Standards of the UDO (12.6 & 12.7):

Mr. Bergmark said currently, monument signs (also referred to as free-standing signs) had to include a stone, brick, or masonry base (1 foot minimum), have a height limit of 7 feet, and were limited to 36 square feet of signage per side. He said it was staff's belief that these standards were appropriate for some commercial uses, but did not provide sufficient height or area for larger commercial centers. The proposed text amendments (below) aimed to address these perceived deficiencies by creating two categories of monument signs.

Mr. Bergmark said the first category (Low Monument Sign) was similar to our existing category. However, the overall height was increased by one foot and the maximum area of the sign face was increased from 36 to 50 sq. feet.

Mr. Bergmark said the second category (Tall Monument Sign) was created for commercial uses with at least 50,000 square feet of retail space. For reference, the Food Lion shopping center had just over 55,000 sq. feet of space. He said this sign could be up to 13 feet tall and had a maximum area of 120 sq. ft. per sign face. Mr. Bergmark said Renae Broach with Broach Custom signs recommended the '120 sq. ft. per sign face' standard based on what other municipalities use. He said the UDO already had a provision to allow developments with over 200,000 square feet of retail space to submit a master sign plan for approval which could exceed the normal standards outlined in Chapter 12 of the UDO.

- Proposed Amendments to Monument Signs:
 - Amend the table under 12.7B to allow subdivisions in the NC district to have 2 monument signs per neighborhood entrance. Currently only one is allowed. Two signs is the standard for other residential zones.

- Amend Section 12.7B to change the height of neighborhood monument signs from 7 ft. to 8 ft. (to be consistent with ‘low monument signs’). Add language stating that the sign copy may not exceed 7 feet in height. This would allow a decorative border or top to be placed up to 8 feet, while keeping the actual commercial signage at 7 feet tall.
- Amend section 12.6E5 to say “Monument signs shall include a support or base (min. **2 feet** in height) constructed of stone, brick, or other masonry material. (rather than min. 1 foot in height).
 - A one foot base does little to make the sign more prominent and is typically covered if landscaping is installed.
- Amend the monument sign section (Section 12.6E) to include the following language under # 7.
 - 7. Monument signs shall be broken into two categories: Low Monument sign and Tall Monument sign. Tall monument signs may only be used for single or multi-tenant developments where the total square footage equals or exceeds 50,000 square feet of retail commercial space and is adjacent to a limited-access highway.
- Amend Section 12.6E to include #8, with the following language.
 - 8. The maximum height of sign copy for all monument signs shall be one foot less than the maximum sign height. The purpose of this provision is to allow decorate borders or sign toppers to extend an additional foot beyond the height of the sign face. See Attachment B for examples of how this approach can improve the appearance of a sign.
- Amend Section 12.6E to include #9, with the following language:
 - 9. All monument signs shall be fully encased or skirted at a minimum width that is one-half of the width of the sign face so as to present an appearance of pillars or other substantial supports.
 - Staff comment: This language ensures that you don’t end up with a monument sign that has a 2 foot base, but that otherwise has the appearance of a pole sign (see picture above).
- Amend Section 12.7C to list 2 categories of monument signs:
 - 1. Low Monument Sign
 - Max Area: 50 sq. ft per sign face
 - Maximum Height: 8 feet
 - Maximum number: 1 per street frontage
 - 2. Tall Monument Sign
 - Max Area: 120 sq. ft per sign face
 - Max Height: 13 feet
 - For reference, the ‘Welcome to Wendell’ sign on Wendell Boulevard is approximately 12 feet tall.
 - Maximum Number: 1 per street frontage

Mr. Vaughan asked if this ordinance complied with NCDOT’s zone of recovery standards, which related to the placement of the sign in relationship to the road in case of accidents. Renae Farrah said the Town of Wendell already addresses this in other parts of the UDO and the NC DOT

guidelines superseded the Town of Wendell's. She said the placement of the sign does not relate to this ordinance.

Ms. Van der Grinten made a motion to accept the proposed changes to Sections 12.6E, 12.7B, and 12.7C of the UDO pertaining to monument signs. Mr. Briggerman seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

Item # 2: Development/Subdivision Advertising Signs

- Current Language of the UDO (Section 12.8F):
 - Development Advertising Signs. Subdivision signs advertising the sale of lots, buildings within new subdivisions, or nonresidential development were permitted on site provided:
 - They do not exceed 20 square feet;
 - They are non illuminated or indirectly illuminated;
 - Not more than one such sign may be erected at each major entrance to the development;
 - They meet all requirements applicable to principal structures with respect to yard, setback, and height requirements;
 - Display of such signs shall be reviewed every two years. Once development is complete signs of a temporary nature must be removed or replaced with a sign of a permanent nature. Signs of a permanent nature shall be constructed in accordance with sections 12.1-12.7 of this chapter.
- Potential Changes
 - Amend section 12.8F (Development Advertising Signs) to increase the square footage of signs advertising the sale of lots or buildings within new subdivision or non-residential development on which they are located from 20 square feet to 32 square feet.

Mr. Bergmark said discussions with multiple signage companies had indicated that 32 square feet is the industry standard.

Mr. Briggerman made a motion to approve the proposed changes to Section 12.8F of the UDO. Ms. Silver seconded it. It passed unanimously.

Item # 3: Suspended Single Post Signs

Mr. Bergmark said currently section 12.6 A (Suspended Shingle Post Signs) did not have clear standards for how these types of signs could be designed and used. He said the UDO stated that you may substitute a monument sign with one of these signs, but did not provide standards for such things as the size, height, etc. when a monument sign was substituted for this type of sign. He said staff recommended that the following amendments to section 12.6A be made to provide clear regulations and allow larger lots to have a slightly larger sign face.

- Change title to ‘Suspended Single Post Signs’ instead of ‘Suspended Shingle Post Signs’
- Add “4. Suspended single post signs may not exceed 5 feet in height, as measured from the top of the sign face (not the top of the post).”
- Add “5. For Non-residential lots between 50 and 99 feet wide, the sign face shall not exceed 6 square feet. For lots 100 feet wide or greater, suspended single post signs substituted for a monument sign may have 12 sq. feet of signage per sign face.
- Amend Section 12.7B to replace the term “Suspended Shingle Post Sign” with “Suspended Single Post Sign”.
- Amend Section 12.7C to add a row for ‘Suspended Single Post Sign’.
 - List ‘See 12.6A’ in the first two columns.
 - For maximum height, list 5 feet.
 - For Maximum number, list ‘1 per street frontage’.

Mr. Kramer asked if these regulations apply to residential lots. Mr. Bergmark said there was already an ordinance that addressed which signs were permitted in residential lots. Mr. Vaughan asked if there was already a setback requirement for these signs. Mr. Bergmark said the same setbacks would be used as monument signs. Mr. Bryant made a motion to accept the proposed changed to Sections 12.6A, 12.7B, and 12.7C of the UDO. Mr. Kramer seconded it. It passed unanimously.

Item # 4: Wall Signs

Mr. Bergmark said one of the UDO comments requested that the Town change the amount of wall signage allowed for businesses from ‘1 sq. foot of signage per 1 linear foot of store frontage’ to ‘1.5 sq. feet of signage per 1 linear foot of storage frontage’. He said using the current standard, if a business’s store front is 80 feet wide, they would be allowed 80 square feet of signage for their entire building. He said certain types of informational signage (such as ‘enter’, ‘exit’, store hours, etc.) are excluded from this amount. Mr. Bergmark said corner lots may receive additional wall signage (to a maximum of 100 sq. feet of signage).

Mr. Bergmark said staff had not received any complaints or received any comments from commercial developers regarding the town’s current wall signage regulations. As a result, staff did not recommend changing this standard at that time.

Mr. Kramer made a motion to approve the staff’s recommendation not to make a change to this section of the UDO. Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Mr. Broach from Broach Custom Signs asked to make comments to the Planning Board, which Mr. Broadwell allowed. Mr. Broach said when stores were built right along the street, 1 sq. foot of signage per 1 linear foot was fine. He said with stores built pushed further back from the road, smaller signs weren’t visible from the road. He said the 1 sq. foot of signage per 1 linear foot regulation wasn’t reasonable and it was a matter of safety. He said many towns allowed for 2 square feet, and that Cary allowed 1.5 square feet.

Mr. Vaughan said that Mr. Broach made a good point. He said the distance of the business from the street might need to be factored into the size allowed for the sign. Mr. Vaughan suggested they not make a change now but come back later with more information. Mr. Broadwell said Wendell's downtown was a special place and was a National Historic District. He said different standards should apply to Historic Districts. Ms. Van der Grinten asked if the sign regulations could be separated from Historic Districts to the rest of Wendell. Mr. Bergmark said that an overlay district could be created, which would have specific design standards associated with it. He said that would be a larger project to tackle.

Mr. Bergmark said if the issue was wall signs attached to businesses that were pushed further back from the street, that was the purpose of monument signs. He said, from a safety perspective, they didn't want drivers looking far to their left or right to read wall signs, they should look straight ahead at the road.

Mr. Briggerman said he agreed with Mr. Broach that buildings that were pushed further back behind parking lots needed larger signs. Mr. Bergmark said that was one reason why the Town needed to encourage businesses to be built closer to the road with parking on the sides.

Mr. Broadwell said there was a motion on the floor to make no changes at that time, which would allow staff to come back with more information at a later date. The Board voted unanimously to pass the motion. Mr. Broadwell asked Mr. Bergmark to bring more information about this topic to a future meeting.

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. Staff had received complaints that the time limit for general temporary sign permits (not banners) was too short. He said that currently businesses could obtain:

- 4 temporary sign permits annually, each valid for 10 business 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 amended the temporary sign regulations to make a single category which included mobile signs, civic event signs, and banners. As proposed by staff, this temporary sign category would be valid for 30 calendar days, up to 4 times per year. Mr. Bergmark said this approach would simplify the temporary sign section and would allow those signs not placed on the buildings to be erected for a much longer period than currently allowed. However, any banners erected would be included as one of the 4 temporary signs permitted annually. He said if adopted, this change would allow a business to have temporary signage up for a maximum of one third of the entire year.

Ms. Van der Grinten said that combining the two types of sign did simplify the ordinance and made it easier for people to understand. Ms. Silver asked if there were any temporary signs in Wendell at that time. Mr. Bergmark said there were some temporary banners that had been out for a while.

Mr. Broadwell said he didn't want to make things more difficult for businesses who were using temporary banners to advertise their business as their permanent sign was being built. Mr. Bergmark said staff would be pretty understanding towards those situations. Mr. Broach said some lighted signs took 6 weeks to build. Mr. Broadwell said he would like to give temporary business signs a little more time. Mr. Briggerman said Food Lion's temporary sign had been out for a very long time.

Ms. Farrow said this proposed amendment looked great, but she would like to see the Town adopt different sign criteria for the Downtown. She said she was concerned the Downtown would start to look junky if these temporary sign standards were allowed there. Mr. Broach agreed, saying the standards for Downtown Wendell were way too lenient. He said aluminum signs stuck on to the side of a building wouldn't attract people to Wendell. He said the Wendell General Store's dimensional sign was a look that improved the downtown feel.

Mr. Broadwell said the Board had an option of not taking action on this item, and to ask staff to come back with more information. Mr. Bergmark said it would not be inappropriate to adopt the current suggestions and to ask staff to return with regulations specific to Downtown Wendell. Mr. Bergmark said language could be added that allowed new businesses to use a temporary sign so long as a permit has been pulled for their permanent sign if that was a concern.

Mr. Bryant asked if there was any language in the ordinance that prevented people from putting up a temporary sign for 30 days and immediately follow it with another temporary sign. Mr. Bergmark said the sign would have to have a minimally different message, but otherwise no. He said that was the case in the current UDO as well.

Mr. Broadwell asked if the Board would not like to take action on this measure that night. The Board agreed.

Mr. Bergmark said he would come back to the Board with language saying no more than one or two banners would be appropriate at one time, as well as language to address new businesses. Mr. Bryant said he would like to see a height restriction on feather signs. Mr. Briggerman said he would also like to see a restriction on the number of feather signs on a property. Mr. Bergmark said he would include language that dictated the minimum distance allowed between feather signs, which would resolve that concern.

Item #6: Electronic Message Board Signs

Mr. Bergmark said currently the UDO did not directly address Electronic Message Board (EMB) signs. In order to clarify that EMB signs were generally permitted, staff recommended amending the text of 'Flashing Signs' and 'Animated, rotating or moving signs' to state that EMB signs were not considered one of these types of prohibited signs.

- Potential Change:
 - Amend 12.9B (Flashing Signs) to read as follows:
 - **Flashing signs:** No flashing or intermittent illumination shall be permitted on any advertising sign or structures.
 1. Electronic message board signs shall not be considered flashing or intermittent provided the graphic message does not change faster than every 8 seconds.
 - Amend 12.9C (Animated, rotating or moving signs.) to read as follows:
 - **Animated, rotating or moving signs:** No animated, rotating, or moving signs shall be permitted.
 1. Electronic message board signs shall not be considered an animated sign simply due to the changing nature of its graphic message.

Mr. Bergmark said Ms. Farrow had suggested the 8 second restriction because any change longer than 8 seconds was not considered flashing. Ms. Farrow said that she got the 8 seconds from the a Federal agency, who found that there was no evidence of an increase in car accidents when signs were flashing at that rate.

Ms. Van der Grinten made a motion to accept the proposed changes. Mr. Bryant seconded it. It passed unanimously.

Mr. Bergmark asked for a statement of reasonableness. The Board agreed to submit the proposed statement.

8. Adjourn to Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting

Mr. Briggerman made a motion that they adjourn. Ms. Silver seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.