

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

JULY 14, 2022

Members Present

George Davis
Andrew Hessler
John Ranson
Adam Jones

Members Absent

R. J. Lackey
Peyton Keesee
Courtney Nicholas

Staff

Lisa Jones
Shanika Williams
Ryan Dodson
Bart Nuckols

Mr. Davis called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *Certificate of Appropriateness request PZ22-144 at 535 Wilson St to install new lightbox sign and two 2' x 6' metal signs on existing canopies.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Ashlyn Tickle, owner of Bubble Aquatics and Exotics who stated the two metal signs would be on the front canopy and on the side of the canopy, if needed we can do just the side of the canopy and have the light box in the front. If that works with the code and then is what we are asking.

Mr. Davis stated for right now the only thing that you are coming before the commission today is just the signs that you would like to put up.

Ms. Tickle stated okay.

Mr. Davis stated the old Danville communication center, I know it well. Where exactly are you going to put the signs that you have up before the commission right now. Where exactly are you going to put those two signs?

Ms. Tickle stated the light box would be where the white Danville communication center sign is and then the second metal sign image would go on the side canopy. In our original planning it would be a metal sign on that front canopy as well as the side canopy, but again if we need to meet city code, we can just do the side canopy for the metal sign.

Mr. Davis stated okay.

Mr. Hessler stated was there a concern that at all three locations it would be too much square footage?

Mr. Davis stated you could come back later with other requests but for right now our concern is the two signs that she is bringing before us.

Mr. Hessler stated as far as the paint or anything like maintenance you could always go back with the same color as it currently is or was historically. If you need to do any other changes as far as you wanting to paint the awning black instead, then we would have you come back to go over that.

Ms. Tickle stated okay.

Mr. Hessler stated depending on the status of the brick and everything.

Ms. Tickle stated okay. Is there any of those that I could go ahead and get approved now?

Mr. Hessler stated if you are for sure that you just want to repair what is already there and not change a color then you are free to do that automatically. If you were like I am asking to paint it a color that has never been before, then you would have to come back for that or decide what color you would like to ask for it.

Ms. Tickle stated okay. What about the tinting of the windows?

Mr. Jones stated you can go ahead for tinting the windows.

Mr. Dodson stated there are not regulations on tinting the windows.

Mr. Hessler stated I am sure there is also thermal tint that would look almost as if it were not tinted, and I don't see why there would be any issue there.

Mr. Davis stated are there any other questions?

Mr. Jones stated with the tint, do you take advantage of the façade grants?

Ms. Tickle stated we have been approved.

Mr. Jones stated good, because you should definitely look into that as well not just for the tint but to all the improvements of the outside would help with that project.

Ms. Tickle stated to update the doors we would love to use that grant to add new doors to the establishment to get more modern, and easier access, and better the building itself.

Mr. Hessler stated with the façade grant issues, I am sure they are also going to go over a kind of diagram of what things they would do and then that is really easy to turn into us. We have seen their architectural designs and things in the past through that program, and that should really streamline it.

Mr. Jones stated do you happen to know the size of the sign that is up there now?

Ms. Tickle stated off hand no, but when I got the sizing for my sign, they said that it is 4' x 13' but that sign has been up there since the 80's.

Mr. Jones stated I was curious the size of the sign.

Mr. Hessler stated because that is an existing sign and it has already been there if you wanted to work in the framework of the existing sign, could she not do that also? I know there are limitations on how big the signage can be per the store frontage, but in this case if it is a sign that has already been there and an established footprint technically, she could also make it as big as what is already there.

Mr. Davis stated I think technically and correct me if I am wrong but according to the guidelines, we are looking at a thirty-two' square foot area but if we wanted to go outside the guidelines to work with an existing sign, I think we could and we are able to do that.

Mr. Jones stated you are not asking that, are you? You are just looking at a 5' by 5' or a 6 by 6' sign, correct?

Ms. Tickle stated yes, as long as the dimensions are the same on both ends because my logo is cubic. We would prefer a 6' by 6'; if it could go bigger that would be nice, but 6' x 6' is what we want.

Mr. Davis stated what do you think?

Mr. Bart Nuckols with the Planning Department stated guidelines being guidelines are thirty-two square feet and there probably is leeway that the board has to go above that. I can't recall what the CBC district itself allows that can't exceed, but I believe that it is well under thirty-six square feet, and I think it is well below. I believe within the parameters you can permit it up to 6' by 6' in size. Although the guidelines suggest thirty-two square feet not thirty-six feet.

Mr. Davis stated as far as the sign in the front is concerned, I think you are going to have to come back and request a specific size to go there. We will certainly work with you as far as the existing sign is concerned, but I just don't think we can leave it wide open.

Mr. Jones stated are you referring to the existing sign?

Mr. Davis stated yes.

Mr. Jones stated she said she would prefer to go 6' by 6', but she would except 5' by 5'?

Ms. Tickle stated we would like to take that sign down and replace it with a lightbox that would be there. I have the order that I sent in for the measurements and everything, if approved I could go ahead and order it. We are hoping to open sometime in September but 5' by 5' or 6' by 6' would be perfect.

Mr. Davis stated my only concern right now as if you take that sign down and you don't put one up similar to that there is going to be some kind of stain or something behind it.

Ms. Tickle stated we would be pressure washing the building.

Mr. Davis stated okay.

Mr. Hessler stated say it is 5' by 5' they are still within the thirty-two square foot and not to over complicate it, I would say yes. I think we could move forward with 5' by 5' or slightly above.

Mr. Davis stated it is fine with me as long as it looks good.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Jones stated I want to know it, says per the design guidelines to not exceed thirty-two square feet. How do you guys feel on the 6' by 6' and are you willing to go the extra 4' square feet?

Mr. Ranson stated in the past we have rejected the request and then voted to allow a larger sign, because we can allow by the zoning and so that is what we have done in the past. As long as thirty-six is less than what is being allowed on the awning.

Mr. Nuckols stated right.

Mr. Davis stated how many signs can you have on the one building?

Mr. Ranson stated we would have to vote to make an exception.

Mr. Jones stated, or you can vote for the 5' by 5'.

Mr. Davis stated is that one of the one's that she is bringing forward today?

Mr. Jones stated the secondary is the metal sign that they will hang on the awning, but they would prefer to have two, one on the side and one on the front, but she will accept one for the second sign. I like the idea of the 5' by 5' to fall within the guidelines of the thirty-two square feet, personally and then if she decided they get there and they do

measurements, pull tape measures, and want it larger then she would come back for a larger sign.

Mr. Ranson stated if we approve the 6' by 6' then she could make it that size if she wanted it or maximum or up to.

Ms. Shanika Williams with Planning and Zoning stated I am sorry, but the zoning ordinance only allows the thirty-two square feet, so it wouldn't really matter. The thirty-six is not allowed per the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Jones stated to fall within the guidelines she would have to go with the 5' by 5' verses the 6' by 6'. I think if I am clear if you took down the sign and according to the square footage of that one if you wanted it to be the size of that one, she would have to come back, am I right?

Mr. Ranson stated the problem is we don't know how big the sign is and we cannot approve anything that doesn't exceed the zoning allowance. We cannot approve something that big because we don't know what the size is. I guess we could approve something that size as long as it does not exceed zoning, but I don't know what zoning would allow.

Mr. Jones stated so if we move forward to the second set of signs, she would like to have two awning signs as opposed to the Planning Commission where typically only one awning sign is permitted. How do you feel about that?

Mr. Davis stated that's why I asked how many signs she can have on the one building.

Mr. Hessler stated one facing Wilson and one on whatever the cross street is.

Mr. Jones made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for PZ22-144 at 535 Wilson Street, for one 5' by 5' sign with lightbox design in front of the building and one metal awning sign on the side of the building. (Mr. Ranson seconded the motion). Mr. Hessler, amended that technically it can be slightly more than 5' by 5' as long as it falls within the thirty-two 5' by 5' or 5' by 6'. Mr. Hessler motion was approved by 4-0 vote.

Mr. Davis stated before we vote on this to do understand what we are saying as far as what is allowed and what is not allowed.

Ms. Tickle stated yes.

2. *Certificate of Appropriateness request PZ22-140 at 651 Loyal St for a 3.2' x 10' wall sign and wooden fence on southside of building.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Lenny Keesee, owner of River City Systems who stated I think the request for the signage is pretty self-explanatory, it would be painted on the front of the building. As far as the fencing goes, we didn't have any plans to do prefabricated fencing and it would be built from scratch and we would like the height to go up to 7 or 8 feet, if there are no issues with that. I do need doors on it so we can drive vehicles back there and that is why I included the example in there.

Mr. Ranson stated the height of the fence 7 or 8 feet is too tall.

Mr. Davis stated is that something that you checked with the city about as far as the height of the fence that you could use?

Mr. Keesee stated no, I did not.

Mr. Davis stated okay.

Mr. Keesee stated we will do whatever is in your guidelines.

Mr. Davis stated if we recommend a shorter fence, you would be okay with that?

Mr. Keesee stated absolutely.

Mr. Ranson stated while staff is looking where is the sign going to go?

Mr. Keesee stated I printed out copies for you that I will pass out.

Mr. Davis stated do you have any problem with the type of fencing that they want to use?

Mr. Jones stated have you looked at any other types of materials that would blend with the surroundings of where you are such as a powder coated, black fence, or anything like that sort of?

Mr. Keesee stated we have not. Based on our budget we have doubled from where we started. We wouldn't use prefabricated, I understand how that would look and I was looking at wood and if it needed to be painted as well, we would. We did paint the building white based on the last COA.

Mr. Hessler stated looking at the guidelines as approved fencing and screening materials.

Mr. Jones stated I have noticed in the past that we have had several that come before the committee over the years, and I've had to turn down pressure treated look or a more modern wood residential fence rather than a commercial application. Then we also get into the historic area the black rod irons and other types of material makes the landscape flow.

Mr. Ranson stated if he painted it to match the building?

Mr. Jones stated were you painting it white?

Mr. Keesee stated if that helps get it approved then I am fine with painting it white.

Mr. Jones stated once again, just like the young lady it needs to fall within the guidelines and that is why we are here. I know you have obviously priced this out. Have you looked at any other options from a quote standpoint as far as a fencing that we would have something to compare to?

Mr. Keesee stated I do not.

Mr. Davis stated let me ask you this if he went with a wood fence and then painted it white, would you be, okay?

Mr. Jones stated how do you feel about that?

Mr. Davis stated I am okay with it if it matches the building to which it is attached.

Mr. Ranson stated the problem is that the material is not allowed by the guidelines.

Mr. Keesee stated are you saying that wood is not allowed?

Mr. Hessler stated wood is, but not prefabricated.

Mr. Keesee stated I think the key word here is prefabricated which we would not be putting in a prefabricated fence.

Mr. Hessler stated we can approve wooden fences non-prefabricated for areas not abutting to the public right-of-way.

Mr. Nuckols stated if I can jump in, I think if the commission determines that it is indeed not a prefabricated type of fence, but wooden fences are one of the permitted materials. I think you could approve that within the parameters of the guidelines.

Mr. Davis stated we have in other places like right down the street here. We approved a wooden fence around an air conditioner.

Mr. Ranson stated okay he explained it, and this is not a prefabricated fence so we can approve it.

Mr. Nuckols stated the applicant indicated that it was not a prefabricated fence.

Mr. Hessler stated the only contention that we have as a commission is whether we would like it to be painted or stained.

Mr. Davis stated I think it would look nice if it was painted.

Mr. Ranson stated if it was painted the same color as the building.

Mr. Davis stated it would blend right in and you would never notice.

Mr. Keesee stated I am fine with that and the only other thing that needs to be clarified is what the maximum height can be.

Mr. Nuckols stated I think the code is flexible up to 8 feet height in the zoning code.

Mr. Davis stated do you have any idea what height you will be using?

Mr. Keesee stated if we can top out at 8 feet then I will probably go to 8 feet.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for PZ22-140 at 651 Loyal Street, that it meets the guidelines as submitted with exception the fence is not prefabricated and the height will not exceed 8 feet and it will be painted to match the building. Mr. Hessler seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 3-1 vote.

3. *Certificate of Appropriateness request PZ22-146 at 308 Craghead St to move door sign to main entrance of building.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Cathryn Gore, who stated I with United Way. We are asking if we can move some of the signage that is on the current door, two doors down. So, currently you see where the front door of United Way is currently located on Craghead Street because of some configurations of our office we will be entering our new front door which enters into a suite of offices and that is the sign that we want to put up. The black just designates that was glass and the door is going to be one door down. Our request is to just move this signage and we are going to make new signs and the dimensions are in the request and they are the same. We want to have this building and United Way is not moving. The building I will share with you was sold last week and Gentry owns that block and United Way is the tenant. We are taking the back of the building and another tenant will be taking the front. The United Way signage will come down from the current location and we will be using the entrance. It is a nice hallway into a suite of offices and our new entry into our offices will be from the interior suite hall. This is going on the front door under the Botox

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Hessler made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for PZ22-146 at 308 Craghead Street, that it meets the guidelines as submitted. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 4-0 vote.

4. *Certificate of Appropriateness request PZ22-137 at 406 Main St for 20" x 22" vinyl door sign.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Felicia Thompson, who stated this is our sign, it is 20' by 20 and it will be on our window and that is all that we want to go on there. That is one of the processes before we open the doors.

Mr. Jones stated I like the sign it looks nice.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Jones made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for PZ22-137 at 406 Main Street, that it meets the guidelines as submitted. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 4-0 vote.

5. *Certificate of Appropriateness request PZ22-141 at 706 Wilson St for painting the exterior of building.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Rachel Covington, with Hawthorne & Jade Design Co who stated we rent 706 Wilson Street from William Gentry and with his approval we would like to paint the front and side of the building in any color really it is a dirty yellow right now and anything would be an improvement. That building is connected to another building beside us, and I know that he is planning on painting his building but I'm not sure what he wants to paint it, but he just installed new doors that are a nice gray metal. So that is why we chose the Sherwin-Williams network gray so that they might blend together and the building look more cohesive.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for PZ22-141 at 706 Wilson Street, that it meets the guidelines as submitted. Mr. Hessler seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 4-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The June 9, 2022, minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Approved by:
