

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Work Session
Signage
Tuesday, March 13, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Comm. Pateidl, Comm. Roberson, Comm. Jackson, Chair Rohlf, Comm. Williams, Comm. Elkins, Comm. Strauss, Comm. Ramsey, Mr. Klein, Mr. Rexwinkle and Mr. Coleman.

Mr. Klein: The signs we would like to talk about are illuminated open signs placed in windows, which are not currently allowed in the LDO. We would also like to go over signage with drive-thrus and identity monument signs, which we have over at Park Place. We would also like to cover directional signs and directory signs.

Neon Signs

Mr. Klein: We would like to start with "Open" signs placed in windows. We have currently not allowed this in the City of Leawood. Currently, the LDO prohibits neon window signs and signs whose source of illumination is visible from offsite. We have a number of store owners who want to get these approved and have something in their window.

Comm. Ramsey: Can you give an example?

Mr. Klein: The two shown on the right are more of the traditional neon that you would see. The one on the left is an LED sign.

Comm. Ramsey: I don't know why they want to do that. They leave the thing on all the time, and it really doesn't say if they're open or not.

Mr. Coleman: We've had issues with businesses that want them and our code enforcement officers sending notices to these businesses for an "Open" sign. It has become controversial.

Comm. Ramsey: My short answer would be no.

Chair Rohlf: Have the requests been the signs that just say "Open" and no others?

Mr. Coleman: Yes, this is all about having an illuminated "Open" sign.

Comm. Ramsey: It means some sign company has hit on this and said, "Hey, look what I have for you."

Mr. Coleman: One of them is Fritz's Meats on 103rd. There are stores in Camelot Court and other retail areas that have requested it. In our current ordinance, they can go through the Planning Commission and City Council to get a neon sign. It has to do with total signage. You can put some signage in your window without going through the process.

Comm. Ramsey: If it weren't neon, could they have an "Open" sign?

Mr. Coleman: Yes, they could have regular paper signs. They are requesting an LED "Open" sign in the window.

Comm. Pateidl: Is there any industry standardization on the size?

Mr. Coleman: You can determine that as part of the regulation. You could say it is 2 square feet.

Comm. Pateidl: I didn't know if there was an industry standard so we don't have to go through all that.

Mr. Coleman: I don't know if there is an industry standard. There is some scientific information about how big the letters have to be in order to be visible from a certain distance.

Mr. Klein: We think 2 square feet would fit fairly well. Most of what we have seen seem like 1 ½ feet by 1 ½ feet or somewhere in that range. I tried to find standardization, but it was hard to tell because many don't give dimensions. Then I just started trying to look around the area.

Comm. Ramsey: The bigger issue is if we really want Leawood to be a mini Las Vegas with "Open" signs.

Mr. Klein: This has been an issue before, and we have cracked down on it before because a number of businesses did want it. Then code enforcers required them to take them down. We would like your input.

Comm. Pateidl: It looks like your sign with the LED is less likely to be as gaudy as that sign in the center. I'm assuming that backing is something like a cabinet. To me, if we are going to allow an "Open" sign, which I see no real reason not to allow it, we should do it with LED and not neon.

Chair Rohlf: It would be nice if they could be somewhat consistent. I'm not sure I'm sold on them yet.

Comm. Strauss: My concern is that we allow them in the window, and then the request comes for a sign out front. We have to decide if we like the LED or not. It seems like we have not historically.

Comm. Ramsey: It is a slippery slope, and that is why I would be inclined to say no.

Comm. Pateidl: If you stipulate that it is an interior sign, do you really think it is an issue?

Comm. Ramsey: I'm going along that same line. I think it will let the camel put his nose under the tent with the interior sign. The next thing you know, you've got people wanting it outside. For example, I'm not going to go to Fritz's at 10:00 to buy meat. Fritz's is going to have standard operating hours, and I don't think it's necessary to have a neon sign in the window to tell people they're open. It is redundant and is more along the lines of trying to be an attractive nuisance.

Comm. Jackson: With Fritz's, it would show if they're open on a Sunday or wanting to know if they close at 5:00 or 6:00.

Comm. Ramsey: You get out and go look.

Comm. Roberson: Or you look it up on the website.

Comm. Strauss: They can put a window sign that says that, and they may be worried that people can't see it from the street, but could it be illuminated with an indirect light?

Mr. Klein: Typically, they are against the window, so if they had a canopy with can lights, those may illuminate it. Fritz's is more of a flat façade, so in that instance, there are really no lights on the other side.

Comm. Jackson: Is there a difference in the LEDs and the neon?

Mr. Klein: The neon has been around for a long time and can get bright. Some of them can look subdued, but they have the ability to use several different colors. What I've noticed with the LEDs is that the line seems a bit smaller. I've seen patterns that are much thinner than neon.

Comm. Ramsey: On the traffic signals, the LED gives a brighter, more intense look. You have to be in line with it for it to really show up. If you want to come at it from a green standpoint, LED uses a lot less electricity and lasts a lot longer. If you're inclined to do it, I think the LED would be the preferred way to go.

Mr. Klein: Is there consensus as to whether to allow them or not?

Comm. Williams: I think if you control the size and placement (inside) and limit to LED, it is the business's choice on how they operate.

Comm. Roberson: How many do we allow?

Comm. Williams: One per store.

Comm. Roberson: What if I have two entrances?

Comm. Williams: I still say one.

Comm. Roberson: If I have an entrance here and one here with traffic coming in both sides, how are these people going to know?

Comm. Williams: Then I would say one per façade.

Comm. Roberson: So now we could have four.

Comm. Williams: Macy's only has two entrances, and that's a big store.

Comm. Strauss: Would every store have an LED light, then?

Comm. Williams: Theoretically, they could have one.

Chair Rohlf: How do they look during the day?

Mr. Klein: I don't know that they're really visible during the day, but they are definitely visible at night, which is why they want them.

Comm. Williams: In the winter when it's dark at 5:00 and Town Center is open until 9:00 at night.

Comm. Roberson: And all the stores are lit up.

Comm. Williams: Even now in Town Center, they don't put up "Open" and "Closed" signs on their doors, so I think we're talking about a rarity of businesses with these signs.

Comm. Roberson: So I don't see a need for them.

Comm. Pateid: I don't see a need to restrict them.

Comm. Williams: I agree; I don't see a need to restrict them.

Comm. Strauss: I'm thinking back to what the Planning Commission has thought historically, and the fact that neon has not been allowed is telling me something. I'm relying on that a little bit, and I am a little worried that every store in Town Center could do it, but it would surprise me a little bit.

Comm. Williams: That's not going to happen.

Comm. Pateidl: The center is open those hours, and you know when you drive by that they are.

Comm. Ramsey: With all due respect, you don't know, once they get authorization to do it, whether they would do it or not. Once you open the door, you don't know how many will rush through.

Mr. Coleman: We haven't had many people apply for the neon signs, and they can.

Mr. Klein: And it's a much bigger deal.

Comm. Ramsey: Those aren't inexpensive.

Mr. Coleman: No, but the application is a couple hundred dollars for the application. I'm saying a neon "Open" sign can be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Comm. Strauss: There are no neon examples in Leawood. Can you think of examples in other communities?

Mr. Klein: Sullivan's has a neon sign; Ted's Montana had one as well.

Comm. Ramsey: I know how we can resolve this really easily. We put it under the guidelines of a Special Use Permit, and then we'll deal with it as it needs to.

Mr. Klein: That's where it is right now. I definitely understand it is mixed as far as what you want.

Chair Rohlf: Let's take a vote. I'm a no.

Comm. Jackson: I wouldn't mind the LED but not the neon.

Comm. Ramsey: No.

Comm. Pateidl: LED.

Comm. Elkins: LED.

Comm. Roberson: No.

Comm. Williams: LED.

Drive-Thru Signage

Mr. Klein: Then we'd like to go back to signage associated with drive-thrus, and we've talked about this quite a bit. It is currently not addressed in the Leawood Development Ordinance. We understood from our other work session that it is important to limit clutter by prohibiting other types of signage in the drive-thru, including pre-order and promotional signage. We would like to talk tonight about whether or not confirmation

displays should be permitted, separate from the menu board. The last time we talked to you, we had a requirement that the confirmation display be located within the menu board itself. Some examples you have seen have the entire face of the sign illuminated. These particular ones have panels that flip with products on both sides. The Leawood McDonald's has one panel that flips.

Chair Rohlf: What is the order confirmation?

Mr. Klein: This is the sign that digitally reads out your order with the price. It typically looks like an LCD screen.

Chair Rohlf: Is it in the menu board?

Mr. Klein: Some of them have it incorporated into the menu board. Currently, the Leawood McDonald's has it incorporated. Many of them have a separate, freestanding box that is similar to this. The three located within Leawood are displayed here. Parkway Plaza has a Starbucks with one that would not meet what we are proposing because of the promotional items and the pre-order board. It does show a freestanding order display.

Comm. Williams: Is that also where you place your order?

Mr. Klein: Yes, it is.

Mr. Coleman: What is the one on the left?

Mr. Rexwinkle: It is the equivalent of a presale board.

Comm. Ramsey: Is there any menu information on it?

Mr. Rexwinkle: Yes, it is what they are promoting at that time.

Mr. Klein: The bottom one is Winstead's, and they have a speaker box with no confirmation screen. We talked about potential regulations previously. They can have a monument sign or pole sign, provided that the pole is a maximum of 12 inches in height. We allow one per drive-thru lane, not to exceed two, total, per establishment for the menu boards. The maximum area is 52 square feet. The maximum height is 7 feet with a maximum letter height of 6 inches. The lighting is indirect or internally illuminated only with no motion. Location shall be adjacent to or oriented to the drive-thru lane and shall be oriented away from adjacent areas that are used, zoned or master-planned residential. The back of the menu boards shall be screened with either a masonry structure or evergreen landscaping. I know that issue came up previously. The picture shows landscaping screening a board at Starbucks with a masonry wall.

Comm. Jackson: Mark, what is the pole sign that's limited to 12 inches in height?

Mr. Klein: A pole sign is a sign that you can see underneath the sign itself. It is prohibited currently in the LDO. Going back to order confirmation display, it is a sign that displays the customer's order for confirmation purposes only. These signs are typically electronic or digital readout signs and are usually located within the menu board, within a freestanding structure specifically made for the order confirmation display or within another structure within the drive-thru, such as a canopy used for weather protection.

Comm. Ramsey: Would this meet the requirement?

Mr. Klein: The way I have it, the proposed ordinance incorporates this possibility. Previously, there was a limitation of no more than 8 square feet, and I bumped it to 10 and no more than 5 feet in height. This display shows a McDonald's within the menu board itself.

Comm. Ramsey: Would these all meet what you are currently proposing?

Mr. Klein: Yes; the maximum is one per drive-thru lane, not to exceed two, total. The maximum display area is 3 square feet. The maximum size of a freestanding structure is 10 square feet and 5 feet in height, however, it may be incorporated into a secondary structure as approved by the Governing Body after recommendation by the Planning Commission. That would cover if a canopy was approved as part of the drive-thru.

Mr. Coleman: This is a change that incorporates the freestanding order board; whereas, previously, it was just the order menu board incorporating it all into one.

Comm. Roberson: Do we want a canopy?

Comm. Jackson: It adds a lot to the whole system.

Mr. Coleman: We saw it as more of an architectural issue.

Mr. Klein: It does protect the drivers from rain.

Chair Rohlf: Do the three that are currently in Leawood comply with what we are proposing?

Mr. Klein: The Starbucks one would not be because of the pre-order board. With regard to the other two, I don't have the measurements. Assuming they fit within the measurements, they probably would comply.

Comm. Jackson: That McDonald's has signs up front.

Mr. Klein: Those would not be allowed.

Mr. Rexwinkle: A lot of places have the presale menu boards now.

Comm. Jackson: It's more of a promotional sign.

Comm. Pateidl: Those are temporary signs, and they can have all of those that they want.

Comm. Elkins: I was wondering why they would be prohibited.

Chair Rohlf: Mark, what is McDonald's coming back for?

Mr. Klein: They are coming back in for a second drive-thru and associated signage.

Comm. Pateidl: You said that the maximum size of the sign is 7 feet. Is that 7 feet on top of the pole?

Mr. Klein: It would be from the top all the way down to the ground.

Comm. Ramsey: What is the thinking behind not allowing the promotional signs?

Mr. Klein: We were concerned, and in speaking with the Planning Commission before, we felt that the number of structures would become overwhelming.

Mr. Coleman: It is already a signage package that is not allowed for other retail sale practices.

Comm. Elkins: I would like to get your thoughts on why those signs that Ken objected to wouldn't qualify under the temporary sign ordinance.

Mr. Klein: It would depend on the material they are made of.

Mr. Coleman: We would probably have to write something specific for those.

Mr. Klein: They are allowed a total of 48 square feet for the entire lot with no individual sign more than 16 square feet. If they were not constructed out of temporary materials, they would not be allowed.

Comm. Roberson: What about all the window signs that McDonald's sticks in?

Mr. Klein: The window signs are allowed at 5%.

Mr. Coleman: They become problematic to enforce because they go up and come down quickly.

Mr. Klein: On the order confirmation boards, we talked about three examples: freestanding structure, within the structure or within the canopy. The regulations we currently have proposed for that would allow for all three of those instances. I also wanted to make sure that everyone realized that in addition to what we talked about before, there are certain things the menu boards don't meet with regard to the ordinance. As you see this coming before you, you'll notice other changes in the sign ordinance as well. For instance, the LDO does not currently prohibit pole signs. They could actually change it into a monument sign by adding a skirt to hide the pole. Currently, we are proposing that the pole could be no more than 12 inches. Some of them actually are taller, but we didn't want the pole to become a dominant feature. We would need to have an exception to allow the pole sign if we allow the 12 inch regulation.

Mr. Coleman: Or we could just require them to put a skirt around it.

Mr. Klein: Box signs are signs with the entire surface illuminated, which is most menu boards. We would need an exception with regard to menu boards. Electronic graphic signs would be any sign in which the copy changes automatically with a crystal display, television screen or other mechanical, digital or electronic means. That addresses the order confirmation screen itself, so we would need an exception with regard to the order confirmation displays. We list digital readout screens as prohibited, but I didn't find a definition in the ordinance. To me, it sounded a lot like the order confirmation screens. Changeable copy signs are designed so the characters, letters or illustrations can be changed or rearranged without altering the face or surface of the sign. I just want to make sure you know the menu board has products that change, and it would have to be another exception. Permanent signs that identify phone numbers, product or any other specific situation about the tenant beyond the name of the tenant are not allowed. Again, the whole point of the menu board is to advertise products and services. If this comes before you, it would need these exceptions to allow menu boards and order confirmation screens as well.

Comm. Strauss: What about the electronic graphic sign if motion is not allowed? Does the electronic graphic sign have motion in it, or does it just change?

Mr. Klein: I look at it as just changing and not an actual animation. What we would like to get feedback on is the order display screen itself being allowed in the three different ways. Would you be supportive?

Comm. Pateidl: Yes.

Comm. Roberson: The freestanding?

Comm. Pateidl: If it's no more than 5 feet tall, 2 feet wide or 10 square feet total.

Comm. Jackson: If you're talking about a canopy, it will be taller than that.

Mr. Klein: The canopy wouldn't have to fit in that section. That could be placed into a canopy if it is freestanding for the display itself. I might need to work on the wording so we know it is dedicated strictly for that.

Comm. Jackson: What about those gaudy lights coming out of it? Would that be in our lighting regulations?

Mr. Klein: The lighting regulations allow for .5 foot candles at the property line.

Mr. Coleman: The ones on the bottom would not be allowed because the canopy is illuminated, so it would be considered a sign.

Comm. Jackson: Can we bring everything forward about five years when you can put your SmartPhone up there on a tiny sign, download the menu and order from that app?

Mr. Klein: It could be coming. Commissioner Pateidl indicated he would be supportive. Is there a consensus?

Comm. Williams: Yes.

Chair Rohlf: I think so.

Comm. Roberson: I don't see why you can't incorporate that screen into the order board. Most places do that now.

Mr. Coleman: The indication is they're moving away from that because, as a car pulls up, it is really close to the menu board, which makes it difficult to read everything. If the display is separate, it is easier to see.

Comm. Roberson: If I have a freestanding order system with a speaker and a TV screen, it will be beyond or in front of the order board?

Mr. Coleman: It will be in front of the menu board.

Comm. Jackson: Those mainly occur when there are two signs: the preorder and the menu board.

Mr. Klein: In this case, they would locate it here because there is not a lot of room to put the menu board here.

Comm. Roberson: it is incorporated in the other one.

Mr. Klein: In this one, there is a little more room for the car to come around here. My understanding is it is a visibility issue.

Mr. Coleman: The way we originally wrote it was with it all as one deal.

Comm. Pateidl: Did you get what you need?

Mr. Klein: I think so. It sounds like the majority is supportive, but there are still some concerns.

Mr. Coleman: We might put a maximum distance it could be so it's not too far apart.

Comm. Strauss: If it is incorporated, there is less clutter. I prefer that, but I can see where there could be an instance where it would be out.

Chair Rohlf: Is this because we are anticipating more drive-thrus or because we don't know what is going to happen on 135th?

Mr. Klein: We have had some approach us. The Village of Seville at 133rd and State Line originally had a Chick-Fil-A and Hardee's approach the city. This is intended to address any kind of situation we may have.

Mr. Coleman: We also have the dry cleaners and banks.

Chair Rohlf: Most of time with these chains, wouldn't they have one type of system they would want to put up that may or may not comply?

Mr. Klein: They seem to change.

Chair Rohlf: Will they modify to meet our ordinance?

Mr. Coleman: They would have to. McDonald's is telling us it is the way they have found works best for their drive-thrus. We agreed to bring this forward to you to see what you thought.

Chair Rohlf: This is kind of a unique situation?

Mr. Coleman: Starbucks is pretty similar.

Mr. Klein: Most of them have an order confirmation screen.

Chair Rohlf: Aren't most of those the same?

Mr. Coleman: They have a speaker thing that tells you what you're ordering and then a menu board you can look at.

Chair Rohlf: This gives them enough options, depending on what system they want to use.

Mr. Klein: Yes, this basically allows them three: incorporated into the menu board with the least clutter, placed in one other structure or freestanding. In any case, a maximum of two structures per drive-thru would be allowed.

Chair Rohlf: You would see these before anyone could put one up.

Mr. Klein: It would have to come before the Planning Commission and City Council. It seems like more and more are going to a menu board with panels that flip.

Chair Rohlf: Do you think they would make the effort to look at the ordinance before they started coming forth so we won't get a situation with them putting it up without knowing.

Mr. Coleman: McDonald's is waiting to see what we do.

Mr. Klein: It requires a Special Use Permit for the drive-thrus in the SD-CR District. They have to notify people, and it has to come through the Planning Commission and City Council.

Comm. Jackson: How long are those SUPs for?

Mr. Klein: By ordinance, they expire in 20 years unless a limitation is placed on them.

Comm. Ramsey: Is the purpose of providing this guidance because we want it standardized, we're concerned about over-cluttering or to provide protection to the public?

Mr. Klein: Right now, it is not listed in the LDO at all. If somebody asked for it, we would deny it. For instance, if McDonald's came forward with a second drive-thru, we could approve it but not a second menu board. This is trying to address the issue.

Mr. Coleman: There are no criteria in the LDO for us to make a judgment on what can or can't be approved.

Comm. Ramsey: I think most people are immune to the differences because you drive through Overland Park and all these other places and see this, and whether it's 10 square feet or 12 square feet, it doesn't really matter to the average person.

Mr. Coleman: We just want to set up some criteria.

Development Identity Monument Signs

Mr. Klein: These are currently not addressed in the LDO. They are structures identifying mixed-use developments which exceed the regulations regarding monument signs, which are allowed to be a maximum of 50 square feet, 10 feet in length and 5 feet in height. An example is on the AMC side of 117th street and one located on the Park Place side. Currently, they have the logo of the Park Place Development and then "City of Leawood." I would just like to go through what I think we heard from the Planning Commission.

This would be permitted in the MX-D District only. One Nineteen and Cornerstone would not be able to get one at this point. The overall development must have a sign plan approved by the Governing Body and recommended by the Planning Commission prior to approval of individual identity monuments. The maximum number we talked about was one per 200,000 square feet of the floor area; however, in no case shall the total number of such signs exceed four. The maximum height is different than what we talked about before. We talked about 30 feet because the ones in Park Place are 30 feet. We talked about linking it to the height of the development itself. This tries to take a stab for discussion purposes. It would be 15 feet if 50% or more of the buildings are more than one story, 20 feet if they are three stories or more and 30 feet if they are four stories or more. I tried to compare this to Park Place and see if they fit within the 30 feet since they already have two, and I didn't want to make those non-conforming. That is just a starting point for discussion. Maximum monument area has a height to width ratio of 4.5 feet to 1 foot. We took that as the ratio that we have over at Park Place. The number of signs per monument would be four. This would cover a sign on each of the bases. The maximum sign area or the sum of all signs on a given monument surface shall not exceed 5% of the surface area upon which they are placed. No temporary signage shall be permitted to be placed on the development identity monuments. The monument may only be illuminated

indirectly. Individual signs on monuments may only be illuminated indirectly with internally illuminated channel or halo illuminated letters. No motion would be allowed.

Comm. Roberson: They couldn't have an external light shining on it?

Mr. Klein: That would be indirect illumination.

Mr. Coleman: They could not have a regular cutout sign with an illuminated face.

Mr. Klein: Right now, we do have internally illuminated channel letters.

Mr. Coleman: We might want to think about that. I don't think we want that.

Mr. Klein: Having them halo illuminated as well?

Mr. Coleman: I don't think you really want reverse channel letters with illuminated faces on there; it's too commercial.

Comm. Roberson: What could the four signs say?

Mr. Klein: We talked about limiting it to the name of the development or the name of the city. These would be used the same as a monument sign; they just don't fit in that criteria.

Mr. Coleman: They really would be entry markers or boundary markers for the project.

Comm. Roberson: That is the reason I ask the question because the intent would be to identify the development they are marking as opposed to having a store name or something like that.

Mr. Coleman: That was brought up previously because Park Place wanted to use those openings in the middle of it for putting banners and advertising.

Comm. Roberson: Personally, I don't think that's appropriate.

Mr. Klein: Additionally, Mission Farms wanted a tower element located more in the middle of their development. I would imagine that would also fall under that type of development identity monument.

Chair Rohlf: How tall are the ones at Park Place?

Mr. Rexwinkle: Almost 30 feet.

Chair Rohlf: So we have more than 50% that are four stories or more?

Mr. Klein: Yes, a lot of the future residential buildings in there were five stories. I was trying to think of other mixed-use developments. For instance, Parkway Plaza might be one of those. You have one building that is three stories, but the rest of it is one story. Would you be comfortable with having the 30 feet for that development as well? I was just trying to spark the discussion.

Comm. Strauss: It would still come before the Planning Commission to look at scale. I think it's better to give them flexibility because they could put the taller buildings up front where a taller monument makes sense but the averages don't work out right.

Comm. Roberson: I could see a clock tower in Mission Farms. It would be nice.

Chair Rohlf: Does this include the lantern on top?

Mr. Klein: Yes.

Comm. Pateidl: This might be academic more than anything else, but it bothers me that we're having these monuments as being markers for development property and limiting what they can put on there as either the name of the development or the city, and we're calling those signs. There is so much interpretation as to what a sign is. I wonder if we use the wording "limit of inscriptions" that can be on any given monument. Then when you say there are no temporary signs, you're talking about signs. What we're doing here is identifying more than advertising. To me, a sign is an advertisement of some sort.

Comm. Strauss: Those were some of my comments I wrote down when I was looking at this earlier today. We're not talking about signs, so let's not use that term.

Comm. Roberson: I totally concur with that. You want to identify the project or the city, but you certainly wouldn't want a store name.

Comm. Jackson: Maybe a place identification sign?

Mr. Coleman: Maybe it needs to be in a different category.

Mr. Klein: Monument signs do the same thing as these do, and they are classified as signs.

Mr. Coleman: It's a different type of sign, but it's a form of communication that is communicating the identity of the place literally with the name of the development. If they took off their name, I would agree, but once they put their name on there, it's a type of sign.

Comm. Strauss: When you're driving down Nall, you don't see Park Place. To me, they're not so much signs. I kind of think of them as art pieces. They are like bookends to a development. The signage part is secondary. I almost don't see it.

Comm. Ramsey: Would you classify them as an architectural accent?

Comm. Strauss: Yeah, that's how I think of them more.

Mr. Coleman: I don't know that it matters how we classify them; it matters more how we regulate them. I agree with Mark that we have the short ones that are like a bookend. We have Pinnacle Corporate Center, and it's an architectural wall with a name on it. It's not as fancy as this, but it serves the exact same purpose.

Mr. Klein: The other question we really haven't addressed so far is the number of monuments. That has become an issue before. When I first got here, we basically used to tell everyone they could be the major entrances into the development, but if the development has three entrances off 135th street, the primary could have one but the secondary could not. We don't have anything in the ordinance that states that. We wanted to talk to you about it. We have gotten requests to have them at each of the entrances. We've had those in the past.

Chair Rohlf: Are you talking about the true monument signs?

Mr. Klein: Yes, and in a way, I was thinking if these are on the perimeter, they would almost be taking the place of a monument sign. For instance, you probably would not want a monument sign that was located adjacent to these because they would both identify the development. However, with something like Mission Farms, if it was interior to the development, it might make sense not to take place of one of the monuments. Maybe there should be a way to differentiate that and not penalize them. I have been hearing to go with more height because it allows them flexibility. I have heard concerns about the number of signs on the monument itself. Would you want to limit it to two or make it dependent upon how adjacent it was to a public street?

Comm. Williams: With what you said earlier with four sides, the sign could be on each side. There may or may not be an occasion in which it would be appropriate. In what we looked at, it didn't make sense to do that, but we allowed "Park Place" and "City of Leawood" on those structures?

Mr. Klein: We were just thinking that it would either have the name of the city or the development as identification. Originally, the applicant wanted to talk about the purpose as identification; however, they also wanted temporary signage for events.

Comm. Williams: Four signs would be reasonable, but then add some definition of what that signage could be and what it could include.

Comm. Pateidl: What is the square footage in Park Place?

Mr. Klein: 1.2 million square feet.

Comm. Pateidl: So if we just limit it to the 200,000 square feet of development, they could have six signs.

Mr. Klein: That is correct.

Comm. Pateidl: With the different entrance points and the size of that development, I don't know that we need to limit it to four. Using 200,000 square feet as a requirement places a pretty restrictive number on what could be put up. For example, Park Place has two and wants to put one on the corner of the new AMC building and one down here. If they want to put another at another entrance, I don't see a reason to restrict it to four.

Comm. Ramsey: I would think, since you've got the requirement that they have to have a sign plan that includes it, have them propose, and we'll dispose. If it's too many and they're just throwing up ten because they're going to put them on alleys or whatever, it might be a bit much, but let them propose it.

Comm. Roberson: I could see them putting one of those low monument signs at some of the lesser entrances to Park Place and then a few more of those big ones at some of the major entrances coming into it, especially the residential area. I would agree to something like that.

Comm. Ramsey: I think the key is to get them to focus on the plan and think through what it is they're trying to do and put the effort into the plan instead of fighting us on just the number.

Comm. Roberson: Again, I think we need to address the word "sign." I don't want to see a sign for Saks Fifth Avenue; I want to see a Park Place sign.

Mr. Coleman: Call it a monument marker?

Comm. Roberson: We're not advertising a specific store, nor could the store buy the advertising rights.

Comm. Strauss: You could see the anchor store wanting that.

Mr. Klein: Joe brought up the fact that we originally called these development identity monuments.

Chair Rohlf: Are “City of Leawood” and the Park Place logo etched or engraved?

Mr. Klein: I think those are metal panels, so they’re attached.

Chair Rohlf: Do we have concerns about the lettering sizes?

Mr. Klein: The way we have it written now is 5% of the façade that it’s on. I would interpret that to be 5% of the entire façade.

Chair Rohlf: Theirs happened to be tastefully done, but I could see where we could get into a situation that was not.

Mr. Coleman: That was one of our concerns, too.

Chair Rohlf: If they have to bring it forward, I guess we would see all that.

Directional Signs

Mr. Klein: We would also like to introduce you to possible applications coming. One is directional signs. This is an on-premise sign providing directional information for the safe and efficient flow of pedestrian or vehicular traffic. Directional signs should mark entrances, exits, parking and other operational features but should not include logos, names or other commercial information. This is taken strictly out of the LDO. As stated per the LDO, pole signs are prohibited; however, we have seen many directional signs that use the poles. In the SD-CR, SD-NCR and MX-D Districts, there is a maximum of two directional signs with a maximum area of six feet with no lighting and no motion. This is not a lot. Typically, we require them to be 3 feet in height. If they are in the BP district, the maximum number is as approved with a maximum area of 6 square feet with no lighting and no motion.

Chair Rohlf: Could you give me some examples of these types of signs?

Mr. Klein: These would be like this one for Starbucks, although we typically would not allow the logo. Winstead’s and Church of the Resurrection have one.

Comm. Pateidl: Three out of five are pole signs?

Mr. Klein: Yes, and that is currently prohibited.

Comm. Pateidl: Where are the enforcement people?

Mr. Coleman: These were approved by the previous Planning Commission and City Council.

Comm. Elkins: Was that before the current ordinance? If the ordinance doesn’t allow it, there is no room for a variance.

Mr. Coleman: It didn’t always matter.

Mr. Klein: The Winstead's was before; the M&I Bank definitely would not have been. The Starbucks is a monument sign.

Chair Rohlf: When the Church of the Resurrection came through, they wanted something on the signs that we told them they couldn't have.

Mr. Klein: There are at least 20 directory signs there. We are talking about it today because we have been approached again with regard to directional signs for a large campus site that wants more than two directory signs.

Mr. Coleman: A campus that has four entrances and covers 20 acres with four or five buildings.

Comm. Elkins: I don't really understand or see a reason for the restriction on logos. I have noticed in Leawood that these signs that don't have any sort of connector to the development or facility are kind of stark; they're almost like a stop sign. I actually kind of like the one in the middle with the logos. For instance, if Park Place had that starburst as a background to their directional signs, it helps tie the whole thing together. From my perspective, I would like to see us loosen up on that restriction. Secondly, I tend to agree and it startles me that we are limiting MX-D to two directional signs.

Comm. Pateidl: If we apply your definition, perhaps changing the square footage that you have for BP to MX-D where it is as approved, it would give more discretion.

Mr. Rexwinkle: We would need to open to other zoning districts for the church.

Comm. Elkins: I think you have to apply a rule of reason to whatever the campus or complex size is.

Mr. Klein: The developments vary so much. Some have the drive-thrus that almost need a sense of direction to get in and out. Other ones don't have it at all and would not need much.

Mr. Coleman: Leawood is not really big. You might have one or two of some kind of development that another city might have a dozen.

Comm. Elkins: We could potentially see more of that because there is a whole lot of 135th Street that is not developed yet.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, especially in MX-D.

Directory Signs

Mr. Klein: Directory signs are any sign structure summarizing businesses within a complex and identifying business locations. The current LDO states that directory signs that are scaled to pedestrian traffic can be approved as a deviation provided they are approved by the Governing Body after recommendation to the Planning Commission. This would be more of a directory sign. Another thing we have heard is they would also like to identify buildings within the development similar to Johnson County Community College, which has three letters to identify which building is which. I would imagine they would want that on a directory sign. We would like you to think about that.

Comm. Elkins: It seems to me that one of the challenges there is, if you are in a commercial development, that directory sign could look like the signs off the interstate for McDonald's, Starbucks and different eating establishments. I don't know what everyone else thinks, but my guess is they would not be very supportive of that. The naming of buildings is a different situation.

Mr. Coleman: There is a directional sign and a directory sign. We still would be prohibiting the directory sign.

Mr. Klein: Directory signs are allowed in the LDO under that deviation. It is defined in the LDO.

Comm. Pateidl: So directory signs are a non-event for this evening?

Mr. Klein: These are just things we wanted to introduce you to.

Comm. Pateidl: Going back to your directory signs, what caught me is that they are scaled to pedestrian traffic as a deviation. We're talking about these being on sidewalks?

Mr. Klein: That was the intent. These are not intended to be for vehicles to see what stores are within the development.

Mr. Coleman: It is like a kiosk directory sign.

Comm. Pateidl: Are we proposing anything tonight that would change that?

Mr. Klein: We are not; we just want your impressions right now. For instance, the increase in directional signs is helpful for when we go back and look at it. For both the directory signs and the directional signs, do you want to allow them to be pole signs, or do you want to keep them as monument signs?

Comm. Pateidl: Nothing besides what we described on the monuments.

Comm. Roberson: Zona Rosa has directory signs. They're very tastefully done. It is a little kiosk on the corner where you can see where you are and where the stores are located around you.

Mr. Coleman: That is what ours' intention is.

Comm. Roberson: I don't have a problem with that at all. I think they've done that very tastefully. What I wouldn't want to see is something like the pole sign stuck out on a sidewalk somewhere.

Mr. Klein: So keeping them to a certain scale as far as the directory signs?

Comm. Pateidl: I think you use the definition of pedestrian scale and recognize that you are doing something interior for walking traffic. Those are useful.

Comm. Jackson: You would have to allow them for cars on a large campus so you can see where they would park.

Mr. Coleman: Would that be a directional sign?

Comm. Jackson: I'm thinking of something like the Church of the Resurrection. I would prefer to see them as monument signs versus the pole signs. You can do too much with the pole signs that doesn't look so good.

Comm. Elkins: The point is that the current ordinance is limited to the pedestrian signs. What I hear is a consensus that there ought to be provision for vehicular signs under certain circumstances.

Mr. Klein: So have the directory signs as a deviation for the vehicular ones?

Comm. Elkins: I just hear a consensus for both types of signs. I don't know that we got deeper into it. If you have a campus with multiple buildings, you need a way to identify those buildings.

Mr. Klein: One of the ways they were intending to direct you is with regard to banners on light posts. We do have banners in the City of Leawood in Town Center Plaza. They change them out for various things. Church of the Resurrection has them, and they are trying to identify what parking lot you are in. They have also indicated they would like to do that with "Parking Lot D" and then a directory sign taking you from there to a specific building.

Comm. Jackson: I think it's big enough over there that you need some of that.

Comm. Strauss: I like the signs on the street lighting.

Comm. Roberson: Me, too.

Comm. Strauss: There is a necessity at the church because it's huge. People get lost with the parking.

Comm. Roberson: And with the handicapped parking.

MEETING ADJOURNED