

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 10, 2012

7:00 P.M.

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Don Darby.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Carolyn Ghanous, David Okum, Richard Bauer, Tom Vanover, Robert Diehl, Marge Boice, and Don Darby

Others Present: Anne McBride, City Planner; Don Shvezda, City Engineer; William McErlane, Building Official

III. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 13, 2012

(Mrs. Boice moved to accept the minutes of the March 13, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting; Mr. Vanover seconded the motion and with 7 “aye” votes from the Planning Commission Members, the minutes were accepted and approved.)

IV. REPORT ON COUNCIL

(Mr. Vanover reported that a Public Hearing is scheduled April 18th for the extension of the special event signs / banners.)

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Darby: There is no correspondence this month.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Darby: We will now move directly into Old Business, Minor Revisions to the PUD Plan, replacement of pylon sign at Tri-County Towne Center, 11711 Princeton Pike. Before the applicants come forward I am going to ask a Council Member, Mr. Vanover to give us a report on a task force meeting that was held previous to this meeting involving the two Council Persons and also the Planning Commission Chair; unfortunately because of a previous commitment for a doctor's appointment I had to leave prior to the end of the meeting.

Mr. Vanover: We had the meeting and in attendance from the Towne Center were Clark, Rick and John Gilhart, also in attendance were Mr. Tulloch and Mr. McErlane, Ms. McBride, Chairman Darby, Mr. Diehl and myself. When the Towne Center plan was presented it was the previously presented sign at the Kemper Road entrance. We asked about future plans for the center and essentially they are going to take it as it comes and there really isn't a formal plan set and that was disappointing. The one future item that they presented to us was the desire to eventually replace the old changeable message board at the Princeton Pike entrance. They asked for a digital message center on the Kemper Road sign. It was stated that they would like to have enough signage that they could have a panel for every tenant.

Mr. Clark Gilhart: Before we get started I would like to read a brief article.
(Mr. Clark Gilhart read a statement from a publication concerning the value of signage.)

(At this time, Mr. Clark Gilhart and Mr. John Gilhart presented Power Point presentations demonstrating former signage, existing signage and proposed signage at the Tri-County Towne Center location.)

Mr. Clark Gilhart: In attendance this evening are representatives from future tenants.

(Mr. McErlane and Ms. McBride read their Staff comments.)

Ms. McBride: The only things that I would add is that the sign is located in a landscape bed and a landscape plan would be submitted to Staff for review and approval; and that the sign exhibit that the applicant submitted does not designate that bottom panel as an electronic sign, it is listed as square footage but we would want to make sure that was designated.

Mr. Diehl: You are proposing by the year 2014 to go from 10 signs down to 9 signs, ideally?

Mr. John Gilhart: If you are referring to the Kentucky Fried Chicken and Monroe, that could be one or two tenants there, but regardless we would like to see one sign.

Mr. Diehl: You also indicated that the Frisch's sign would be replaced with a smaller sign?

Mr. John Gilhart: It would be replaced, to be determined and Rick Gilhart could speak more on that because he is working with someone right now to modify that sign to fit the tenant's needs and to work on the site.

Mr. Diehl: Could you comment on the Princeton Bowl sign; both of them?

Mr. John Gilhart: The Princeton Bowl sign has a message board at the entrance, we looked at this after the last Planning Meeting and the work session and we thought it might be best just to leave the sign out at the corner with the electronic board on Princeton Pike and try to go ahead and do something similar with the message board on Kemper and then we are done. We thought we would eventually replace the bowl sign with a fixed panel sign with no LED. We would like to adjust the Frisch's Big Boy sign, whether it is Frisch's or a future tenant. We want to meet the needs of the tenants and make the shopping center successful and Springdale and at the same time we are putting the money into doing that.

Mr. Diehl: Do you have any concerns with Ms. McBride's comments on the landscaping and other issues; what she wanted done?

Mr. John Gilhart: The landscaping underneath the sign, we will provide details and it would be identical to the ones that we have done in the past.

Mr. Bauer: I do see a plan; I am a little confused why that wasn't explored in the work session but there is a plan for signage and that was my objection last time and before that because we are getting piecemealed these signs and we have no plan for your development as far as signage goes. Is that big sign I am seeing (referring to the presentation) is that the replacement for the Princeton Bowl sign?

Mr. John Gilhart: Yes. Two things came out of the work session; Mr. Vanover requested a detailed plan for all of the signs, an end game. That is what you are seeing now. Things change daily, but that is what we would like to see happen. The other thing that came from the work session was a westbound view on Kemper Road. That sign would get rid of four manual message boards forever and if you allow us we would have an electronic message board on Princeton and we would have one on Kemper and that is all you would ever see again with the exception of the Kemper Road Princeton Bowl sign.

Mr. Okum: The total reduction of signage on the site will be one sign?

Mr. John Gilhart: Yes.

Mr. Okum: And the increase in signage area will increase from 958 s.f. to 1324 s.f.?

Mr. John Gilhart: That I don't know, I can only assume that is correct, we haven't verified that ourselves.

Mr. Okum: In the comments from Clark in regards to the documents that were given to us, if I was in the sign business I think this is probably exactly what a sign manufacturer would say. At Cassinelli Square right across the street it is a self-imposed mall. They built it where they built it, in a hole and you can't see it from the road, except for Haverty's, I believe that is the only one you can really see that is in the mall. In this particular case we have an applicant here that constructed a building along 747 that does exactly the same thing, obstruct the view from the rest of the buildings from their development. In my opinion that is a totally self-imposed situation. If we were to consider approving this significant of a change we would basically give no reason to deny any other business in the City of Springdale from that percentage of an increase of their allowed signage on their site; there would be no reason for us to deny that. We have not been given any reason that this site is privileged or special or unique or out of the ordinary that would put this site in a position that any other business in the City of Springdale wouldn't be entitled to. Therefore, based upon that, I can't honestly see a reason except that this applicant is requesting more signage. Both digital information signs will be visible from multiple locations at the same time. You would be able to sit at 747, westbound on Kemper Road and you would be able to see totally both signs right there in your face. Is that something that we want to see happen to every retail business in the City of Springdale? Has anyone presented any reason why this business is different than any other business?

Mr. John Gilhart: We are a Planned Unit Development and as far as the signs, I think there has been conversation in the past that there really wasn't a negative objection to the two LED signs. We can certainly go with our original plan which is to move the one at Princeton Pike down to the intersection at Tri-County Mall. On Mr. McErlane's comments there was a list of the developments; Rick, Clark and I did a count today and Tri-County Mall has 36 vacant stores and 10 that are temporary fillers, Cassinelli Square has 6 vacant stores and 2 more leaving with a Cinema and Longhorn that has been torn down. Springdale Plaza has 3 vacant stores and Schottenstein, as you may know by now basically paid TJ Maxx to leave our center so that they could save Bed Bath and Beyond, DSW shoes and the remaining retailers over there. Tri-County Towne Center, we are here today; we have 9 vacant stores and that is even with 2 moving in. We have 2 more potential here and there is another 2 or 3 that we are working on. Tri-County Commons has 6 vacant stores, Kemper Square has 11 vacant stores, Value City looks like they have 50% to 60% of that complex vacant. Tri-County Market Place is 100% occupied and this could be coincidence but they have one large road sign for each of their four businesses. They have one pole sign on the road for U.S. Bank out lot. We lost Play It Again Sports to Tri-County Market Place because we couldn't offer them road signage. Certainly that article that was read was a promotion probably by a sign company; but I thought it was dead-on appropriate. I notice on the agenda we are the only one here; in the good old days there used to be five to ten people on the agenda beating the doors down to get into the community. We have been talking about a food market, Earth Fare who we have been talking to, has been basically silent from the last meeting. We are having a problem getting them to respond and I don't know why that is; I don't know if someone was sitting in the audience at the last meeting or what the deal is. We have two tenants coming in and we have two in the audience; one of them is waiting on a lease agreement and the other is waiting until tomorrow to sign. I don't want to bring out the negativity but this is the reality.

Mrs. Boice: The comparison of Cassinelli Square to Tri-County Towne Center; they are two different colored horses. Cassinelli Square has had problems from "day 1". Tri-County Towne Center was basically always full. A tenant would

leave and someone else would come in. I don't like all of this signage but I made a point of driving around our entire commercial area and we have a lot of empty store fronts out there. We have lost much to Mason and West Chester and all over the place. The decision of the 25' height has been in the book a long, long time. We have to look at the big picture; empty store fronts. Mr. Okum, with all due respect, I don't think Cassinelli Square is a good comparison. I can tell you the economy is tough when the Gilhart property has vacancies, because that was unheard of for years and years. We have got to revitalize Springdale, we have got to bring it back to the glorious community that it was and it is a glorious community.

Mr. Bauer: I believe our role is to take what you have given us and our regulations when we are dealing with PUD's and try to come up and strike some kind of balance between it all. You believe signage is going to create all kinds of business and I personally don't believe that myself. I have been asking for a sign plan and I believe you sort of proposed it here; I thought that was going to be proposed at the work session. I see all kinds of issues with that sign plan in that it is only increasing what we already have, and even though you are eliminating a sign, the signage is going to increase by the size of the sign. I am not in support of what we are here for today because we haven't worked through the issues of a sign plan to try to iron it out a little bit more. I believe the sign proposed here today is way too big.

Mr. Diehl: I agree with Mr. Okum that the Towne Center is not better than anybody else however everybody has got to stand on their own merit, and what we are doing here today dealing with the Towne Center and not anybody else, then when somebody else comes to us we will deal with that on their own merits. Tonight we are here to decide whether they can take one sign down and put one sign up; and that is it. Mrs. Boice's comments certainly have a lot of truth to that, so I am going to be voting in favor of this resolution.

Chairman Darby: This has been the most exhaustive processes we have been through recently. I think Mr. Diehl summarized it; you are here to get one sign down and one sign up. All of this discussion must focus on that. We have had all kinds of input throughout this process but we really face a dilemma, as you can see from the comments that have come from this Board. We certainly want to be retail friendly and we all have an understanding of what the local, state and national business climate is like and I guarantee you that nobody up here wants to thwart economic growth in Springdale. Your comments about this being a PUD and we all know that in essence we can do anything we want to, but we do have guidelines. I am ready to support your request for a new sign to replace the existing pole sign but when we deal with PUD it is about give and take. The proposed sign is a tremendous improvement but in my opinion it is just too big. You have that fabulous sign that you installed that seems to just fit; it has the message board on it and it just looks so good; why can't this sign be identical in scale to that one? If you want the second message board, I have no problem with that. I don't know that you have ever brought a sign package from a comparable center that has every occupant with curbside signage or roadside signage. We can't compare you guys to Tri-County or Cassinelli because they are different sites. You have a tremendous number of potential tenant spaces and to get all of them to have representation on a road sign, it calls for this huge signage that you are requesting.

Mr. John Gilhart: I have a brochure from Cassinelli Square; this isn't something that we have created. I think that is almost identical to what we have.

Chairman Darby: No sir, it is not. They do not have the number of tenants that you do.

Mr. John Gilhart: They have fewer tenants, I agree; but they have 9 signs.

Chairman Darby: And you have how many on this one board?

Mr. John Gilhart: It could be six or it could be seven.

Chairman Darby: The one I referenced, on Princeton, I would be so much in support of a replication of that sign; would not a replication of that sign work for you with a message board?

Mr. John Gilhart: Well, that would certainly be better than what we have. What we are trying to do here is get enough signage and I know it is impossible to get a sign for every single tenant but ideally that would be the case. We are trying to get enough signage for the tenants so that we can get them in. In the outbuilding we are trying to relocate Office Depot to the former Border's space. We are in negotiations with Earth Fare and we are hoping to put Earth Fare out there. When we do that, it is the opportunity to finance the façade change in the building and that will make a huge impact on Princeton Pike.

Chairman Darby: At the last meeting you stated that you may be back 22 times and that is great, because it shows growth. Could we focus on taking down one sign and putting up another sign? I am talking about the give and take of taking down one sign and putting up another sign. The code says one LCD and it is a PUD; if you want two, then get two.

Mr. Okum: I really don't have a problem with replacing this sign. It may seem crazy but it obviously is dated and to update it to something similar to the feature sign on the site makes good sense. I don't have a problem with this site having two digital display boards, as long as they can't be seen easily from one vantage point. I think if the digital board was moved down where Princeton Bowling Alley area is at Francis Lane then there would be separation between the two digital signs. We do not have that on the floor in front of us; we have a request from the applicant to increase from 95.7 s.f. to 461.78 s.f. Let's put aside that they have more pole signs and more signs than any other site in Springdale, let's put aside that would impact any other PUD in the City of Springdale, any other future PUD that comes into the City of Springdale or any other business that decides that they want to be a PUD in the City of Springdale. Moving Monroe together with KFC, honestly is no give. KFC sign, most people can't see it, it is out of the view. If they end up tied in with the Monroe sign as a common monument sign, there is a variance on that and that is why it is right next to the public right of way, it is not the set back as normal. The Monroe sign got a variance a number of years ago and that is the reason it is where it is at. My personal feeling is if they want the digital information board there then the other one needs to be moved to another location where it is not in proximity to the other one; so you are not sitting at 747 and Kemper Road and looking at both of the signs in plain view flashing at intermittent times with different information on the signs. I think it is a distraction, signs with individual businesses are a distraction and I think signs that you can't legibly read are a distraction and a danger to the motoring public. There is a lot of reasons why this sign, this request should be denied tonight. We are talking about 461 s.f. with a digital sign right down the street from another digital sign that you are going to be able to see at 747 and Kemper Road; both changing intermittently at different times, with no reduction in signs on the site. I will be voting in opposition to this one sign request.

Mr. Vanover: Mr. Okum, I echo that. In the work session I asked for compromise and that the Monroe sign and the KFC sign disappear at some time in the future. What we got was a combination of the two signs and if you look, the Monroe has street level frontage and is quite visible. I would agree with you on the message center; you are canceling the two. I have no problem with two on this center. My feeling was that if this sign went in with the message center then that one had to be relocated or go away. Once we make the concession and open the flood gate then we are going to have to deal with it. Once you let the cat out of the bag or the horse out of the barn, it is hard to get it back in there. If the code is wrong then I say we change the code. If it is not, then for a good reason or a hardship case; we put them out there for a reason. We will see it when power goes down in an intersection: In Fairfield at a three way intersection on Route 4 and it was just a mess, I called Fairfield PD to make sure they were aware of the situation because people didn't know how to react or didn't care to react; I didn't have a red light so I am proceeding on. We are a country, a nation of laws and regulations and we don't always like it but it is for the better good.

Mrs. Boice: If I am reading the Commission correctly and this comes to a vote tonight and it would appear to me that it would be voted down; I know we have been on this project quite some time and I am not sure I would want to see it going down tonight without one more shot to try to work something out. Would anyone be open to another work session?

Mr. John Gilhart: We have had fifty years to get to this point and we are trying to fix this in a few short years. If I had five million bucks we would be done tomorrow. I don't know where we go from here. Am I going to come back? I am not going to come back, we won't have tenants. You can have laws and all your fancy regulations but it will be a ghost town. I understand that there has to be some reasonable codes and ordinances but if you don't give us the tools to attract tenants I don't know what we are going to do. We are not going to be able to pay our insurance or real estate taxes and the center will deteriorate. We won't be able to pave the parking lot or change the light bulbs. I am open for suggestions.

Chairman Darby: I would like to focus our attention on replacing one sign for a sign that is going to be taken down. I feel good about the existing new sign, as far as size, this works.

Mr. John Gilhart: Then could I get a straw vote if that would be acceptable to enough Members to allow us to proceed?

Chairman Darby: I am totally in support of that.

Mr. Rick Gilhart: John and I are both out of town; John is in Florida and he came up for the work session. I missed the kid's talent show, to meet with the folks at the work session. Tonight I am here while my family is in South Carolina on spring break with the kids. We are making concessions and we thought we could come to the work session and come to some kind of agreement so that when we get here we don't start again, back to ground "0". There are all these concessions going on from you folks too, you are going out and driving the area and trying to figure out for yourself if it is going to work. We have a lot of time and energy into this, if we could create something that is close to that in that slot; that is why we are all here.

Mr. John Gilhart: We have potential tenants ready to go. We could turn this shopping center around; it can look like those concept drawings. We need the sign to bring in the tenants. I think that we have done a good job with the center; we have a long way to go. If we could come to some compromise and get this thing in this summer, it will be a big turning point. We are going to have 55,000 s.f. Hobby Lobby open and done, the whole landscape island across the center. We will get Salon Concepts in, on the Border's Corner. We will get Firehouse Subs taking that whole TCBY & President Tuxedo. Then possible we could do the outdoor area.

Mr. Rick Gilhart: You can tell we are excited about this and we want to do this, but we have to have your support. If we don't have your support we are done.

Mr. John Gilhart: What you are saying is that you will support us but only at a certain level.

Chairman Darby: One of our charges as the Planning Commission is to regulate the size of the signs; not the content. The sign you are requesting in my opinion is too big.

Mr. Rick Gilhart: And we are saying you should move past that. Is it possible to let us know where the rest of you stand?

Mr. Diehl: I think we have a shot of getting this through, but that is just in my opinion. I have no problem with the sign.

Mrs. Boice: If I understand you correctly, Mr. Darby, you are saying that you would be more agreeable to it being the same size as the one that is on Princeton Pike?

Mr. Darby: That is correct.

Mrs. Boice: Basically we are talking 100 s.f. difference, if I am reading it right. The one on Princeton is 359.4 s.f. and the one that you are proposing for Kemper is 461.78, which roughly comes to about 102 s.f. I think that the Chairman has made a very good suggestion there. I think that it would certainly reduce what we are looking at by 100 s.f. and I think it would be workable.

Mr. John Gilhart: To do that, you would be removing the top two long panels and shrinking it down from the top and that would be identical to that other sign, the existing sign.

Mrs. Boice: The sign on Princeton is a winner, we already know that and I really wish I would have thought of that. I think Mr. Darby's idea is a good one for continuity because they would both be pretty much the same. I think it is a really good workable idea and kind of a give and take.

Mr. Rick Gilhart: And again, we are talking about one sign tonight.

Mr. John Gilhart: So, what you are saying is that you would be receptive to the other sign; which is minus two panels?

Mrs. Boice: To be a twin to the other one; yes.

Mr. Okum: So, my understanding is that two digital signs that are in that close proximity to each other is o.k. with everyone that is sitting here?

Chairman Darby: You are claiming that the site lines for those two digital signs, if they are in the location that we have discussed, that they conflict with one another?

Mr. Okum: That is correct. They are both seen at the same time on Kemper Road going westbound.

Mr. John Gilhart: The sign changes every 8 seconds.

Mr. Okum: The purpose of the digital sign legislation that we passed, which I felt is truly model legislation and other communities have looked at it for adoption and inclusion in their communities, it was important to help your business and help future Cassinelli business and is important to help any major development in any community. I felt that this sign being on your site, one digital sign was adequate. This Board concurred that one digital sign is adequate and Council had a public hearing and they too agreed that one digital sign is adequate for any development. Now we are sitting with a situation where we are asking for two digital signs that are clearly in my opinion visible from the same location and if that sign were relocated I wouldn't have a problem with it.

Mr. John Gilhart: We can certainly try to do that.

Mr. Okum: The purpose of that relocation would be to absorb some of those other miscellaneous signs that you have down there on Francis, that is the cluster of signage on your site. If you look at your site signage the bulk of your signage level is not where this sign is going. That is sign blight when you have that many signs in a concentrated area.

Mr. John Gilhart: We have telephone pole blight.

Mr. Okum: And you have that too, I agree with you. I would have loved to see them moved many years ago. That is my position, so if you want to have two digital signs then put them at each corner of your site and get the maximum out of it. This Board may not agree with me. I think that you need to eliminate some signs and make some assurances to this Commission that in the future there would be a consolidation of signage on your site and that would be the Monroe, the KFC and the Princeton Bowl. We want Princeton Bowl to be successful and we don't

want them not to have visibility but does Princeton Bowl by itself warrant this massive sign that Princeton Bowl currently has. Eliminate some signage; and I am not saying now but upon vacancy, upon the use. Let's say Princeton Bowl doesn't succeed, God forbid because it is an icon to the community but to sell that property does it need that signage? Would another business really want to locate back there in the bottom where they have to put up barricades to let the water flow when the creek goes up? Probably not. We are talking about a center-focus post signage system, not everybody's name on the sign. Your feeling is to get as many businesses on the that sign as possible and my feeling is it is confusing and it really doesn't help.

Mr. John Gilhart: (Addressing an audience member representing Firehouse Subs) What is your opinion, would you want a sign out on the road?

Representative of Firehouse Subs: Visibility from the road is imperative.

Mr. Okum: If your business could be seen from the road would that make a difference?

Representative of Firehouse Subs: Absolutely, there are different levels of visibility; if we were right on the front line it is going to be a little different than the site I am looking at.

Mr. Bauer: If I focus on this one sign, I agree that it is too big. I agree with Mr. Darby that the existing sign that is up there would look better in that location.

Mrs. Ghantous: What is your best guess when you will be able to eliminate that Princeton Bowl sign?

Mr. John Gilhart: As soon as we get enough tenants in and enough money to do that.

Mrs. Ghantous: It is not based on any lease dates or anything like that?

Mr. John Gilhart: No. We figured roughly it would take us about five years. The more tenants we get the more money we have to put into the center.

Mrs. Ghantous: For the folks that might be concerned with the two LED signs being close together, having the thought of "X" date of being able to separate them to the two further ends of the property would probably bring them some comfort.

Mr. John Gilhart: When we were here last month our goal was to put this sign up without an LED because quite frankly we don't have the money to do this. We are going to go ahead and go for it now because we are trying to give an overall, what we would end up with. Initially we wanted to put the sign up there and when we had enough money we would put an LED and move that other one up to another sign.

Mrs. Ghantous: I thought that was a great idea.

Chairman Darby: Your proposal looks like replacing the sign minus the LED, minus two panels?

Mr. John Gilhart: That is inaccurate; you said minus the LED.

Chairman Darby: I thought I heard some agreement that the LED should be on the next sign. I thought there was an agreement on your part that the LED should not be on this sign but should be around the corner.

Mr. John Gilhart: The bottom line is that we would like to see the two LED signs, one at Kemper and one where the Princeton Bowl sign is by Frisch's with a fixed panel and the LED. We are open to taking the existing LED on Princeton Pike and

moving that to a sign but we don't have the money to do that now. We could synchronize the LED signs, by the way, to have the same thing at the same time.

Ms. McBride: That sign is actually 102.4 s.f., that is the difference. I would suggest that whatever kind of motion the Commission chooses to make, instead of referencing panels, Mr. Chair, we really do need to reference square footage because sign panels can be cut up four, six, or whatever.

Mr. Okum: Why not just make it 359 s.f., which is the same size as the one on Princeton Pike.

Ms. McBride: That is fine, too, as opposed to referencing panels Mr. Okum, 359.4 s.f. that is the sign that is currently at the corner at 43.9' in height.

Mr. Okum: For my understanding, there is no long-term plan to relocate the Princeton Pike sign as it currently exists but to leave it at the height it is and it was raised up to accommodate the digital sign.

Mr. John Gilhart: No, that is not true. Klusty sign installed it 2'-3" too low and they had to come back out. It was a mistake, it put the LED down below the view.

Mr. Okum: If you were to take the digital sign off the Princeton Pike location and relocate it then it would go into a new cabinet where Princeton Bowl's sign currently is?

Mr. John Gilhart: We hope that would be the case.

Mr. Okum: Then there would be no possibility of Princeton Bowl's business being identified as a business icon in the development.

Mr. John Gilhart: I would put them on a sign panel on the replacement sign.

Mr. Okum: The offer from the applicant is to relocate the digital sign into another pole sign down at Francis Lane.

Chairman Darby: I think that if the applicant comes to us with that proposal it will have to stand on its own.

Mr. Okum: I would like to make a motion to the floor for consideration that no digital sign shall be permitted in the new pylon sign unless the existing sign on Princeton Pike is relocated to the Francis Lane area and a consolidation of pole signage on the site occurs. So you can't have two unless it is moved. If we are going to have two digital signs then one needs to go down near Francis Lane or we don't have a digital sign on this sign.

Mr. John Gilhart: That is what we initially proposed. We proposed one to replace Princeton Bowl.

Mr. Okum: There was also a discussion about eliminating pole signs on your site, the volume of signs on your site.

Mr. John Gilhart: What we would like to see is the main pylon sign with a LED message board; what I am hearing is that there is some negative feedback regarding the distance, because the existing sign isn't further down and we can't address that now. We would be willing, if you will allow us to go with what is identical and to put a new one to replace the message board then that would eliminate two panels. We could do that. The sign would come down about 6'.

Mr. Bauer: Why do you have to have a LED at the new location?

Mr. John Gilhart: The goal from the beginning was to have one on Kemper Road and one on Princeton.

Mr. Bauer: Why can't you leave a blank space and when the other sign gets built then you can make a move and put a second one up there?

Mr. John Gilhart: That is exactly what we proposed one month ago.

Chairman Darby: This entire conversation has taken us so many different ways; what it is, is what it is at this time.

Mr. Vanover: Focusing was what the special meeting / work session was about. The goal was to get a future plan out of it. Part of that discussion where Mr. Galster proposed a lease percentage based trigger for phasing of plans; that was not acceptable and here we are.

Mr. John Gilhart: I don't know that it was unacceptable; I just don't know how you would implement that.

Chairman Darby: Are we ready for a motion?

Mr. Okum: I think the feel is that unless the existing digital sign on Princeton Pike is relocated to the Francis Lane / Princeton Pike area, then that moves it away from the intersection. The other part of that, I am thinking, is that Princeton Bowl would then be incorporated into an existing pylon sign.

Mr. John Gilhart: We stated that we would replace the Princeton Bowl sign with a pylon sign and incorporate Princeton Bowl into that sign.

Mr. Okum: Then we end up with three of these monster signs on your site. Does anyone on this Commission hear that?

Mrs. Boice: Yes; I hear it.

Mr. Okum: That is why you have a plan and not on the fly because we end up with digital signs on pole signs where they are not wanted to be in the future; ultimately we end up with a need situation where we are trying to accommodate the applicant. I don't have a problem if the sign is reduced down by 102.4 s.f. I do have a problem if the digital sign is mounted on that and the other one remains where it is at. I do not, in any way, intend to consider another pylon sign on that site to replace the Princeton Bowl sign. If that sign is relocated, Mr. Chairman, they are stating in this meeting that is the intended purpose. We have to take that into consideration.

Chairman Darby: We will take that into consideration but tonight our vote is a sign to replace a sign. The digital center won't go there; when you get to a point and you bring us a plan whereby you would move the existing digital to another sign to be designed, then you would be allowed to replace the bottom 102 s.f. with your digital sign.

Mr. John Gilhart: So, that might work out for all of us because I think what you are saying is that we can go ahead now on Kemper Road and put the six up and no LED board and then when we come back to talk to you about the other sign we would have the lower two panel area to fit that in.

Chairman Darby: And it would replicate the existing sign.

Mr. Rick Gilhart: That would be the same height and everything?

Mr. John Gilhart: The same square footage as the one that is existing?

Chairman Darby: Correct.

Mr. Okum: Can we call the Princeton Pike sign the marquee sign?

Mr. John Gilhart: Main pylon sign.

Mr. Okum: Based upon Ms. McBride's recommendations I think that item #1 & #2 are the amended changes.

Ms. McBride: Depending on how the Commission wants to treat the LED / electronic sign issue, #3, #4 and #5.

Mr. Okum: Well, they have pretty well said that they would understand that there would be two permitted on the site provided they were at extreme points apart. Everybody on the Commission understands that it is 97.8 s.f. approximately.
Mr. Chairman, I would like to move to approve, with conditions the Tri-County Towne Center at 11711 Princeton Pike PUD modification for the pole sign on Kemper Road with the following considerations; to include our City Planner's considerations all inclusive with the exception of item #1 & #2, with an adjustment in height and square footage as indicated; that the signage conditions shall include a modification to the sign to replicate the existing Princeton Pike main pylon sign. The modified sign shall be approximately 359 s.f. The height shall be reduced by 6'-6" and eliminating 102.4 s.f. of the proposed requested signage. No digital sign shall be permitted unless the existing digital sign on the Princeton Pike main pylon sign is relocated to the Princeton/Francis Lane entry area, to be reviewed and considered at another time. The Princeton Bowl sign shall be incorporated into that existing pylon sign at such time.
(Mr. Vanover seconded the motion and with a unanimous "aye" vote the amended request was approved.)

Mayor Doyle Webster: I would like to make one comment. After the last meeting I had the occasion to talk to one of the owners of Larosa's at the Plaza; in 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 their sales have dropped. They were close to closing that store. The digital sign went up out front in 2010 and their sales have increased almost overnight by about 50%, they are now at the point where they are going to put \$200,000 into remodeling the interior of that facility. You can say that signage doesn't matter but it turned that business around.

Mr. Okum: To support that, Mr. Mayor, this Commission drafted the legislation that allowed the digital signage to be there and I am happy that we did because of that reason.

Mayor Doyle Webster: The only other comment I would like to make, and I am glad that you were able to separate the issues here, but Mr. Okum I was surprised when you indicated that you were astounded that they are going to request a third sign out there like these other two. I have heard that from "day one" that the ultimate plan included three signs.

Mr. Okum: Maybe my memory fails me but I recall a monument sign at that entrance for Francis Lane.

Chairman Darby: Thank you for your comments, Mayor.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

(No New Business presented at this meeting.)

VIII. DISCUSSION

(No Discussion presented at this meeting.)

IX. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Darby: As you can see from the Chairman's Report two signs were approved.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

10 APRIL 2012

PAGE 12

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Vanover moved to adjourn; Mr. Okum seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Chairman Darby: The next meeting will be May 8, 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2012 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2012 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary