

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Work Session
Signs
Tuesday, June 12, 2012**

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Mark Klein, planning department; Kip Strauss, commissioner; Debbie Brenner; Lisa Rohlf, commissioner; Jane Neff-Brain, commissioner; Joe Rexwinkle, planning department; Franki Shearer, legal; Justin Peterson, planning department; Stephanie Kissler, intern; Katherine Rush, intern; Jim Pateidl, commissioner; Len Williams, commissioner; Richard Coleman, planning department.

Mr. Klein: We would like to review identity monument signs. We still want to get clarification as far as what you think. Development identity monument signs are located at Park Place, and we will look at those first. Directional signs identify entrances, exits, lanes of travel, etc. as opposed to a directory sign, which summarizes a business with a list of buildings and directional arrows. We would also like to talk about signage on light posts. At Town Center, they have banners that identify the development within their parking lot. We have had requests for these to identify specific parking lots for specific buildings. Building identity signs are basically wall signs with not so much the name of the business itself but rather the name of the building. They could be as simple as a letter or a description of the activity that building has in it.

Development Monument Signs

Mr. Klein: Development monument signs are located in Town Center Plaza and Park Place. They are 30 feet high. These are not listed in the Leawood Development Ordinance as a sign type and would not be permitted. If we make an amendment and add them to the LDO, we need some criteria to regulate them. They are asking to put signage with the name of the development. We have talked about this with regard to opposition to temporary signage on the monument sign. The other issue is who would be allowed to have them and where they would be allowed to be.

(Shows Park Place) We want to regulate within the zoning districts. In this particular case, we are looking to limit it to the Mixed-Use Development. We want to ensure the development brings forth an overall sign package that includes the identity monument signs so that the Planning Commission could see the design and location. We are proposing one sign per 400,000 square feet of floor area. Park Place is approximately 1.2 million square feet. Town Center is a little over 500,000 square feet and is SD-CR, so these signs would not be allowed here, as is the same for One Nineteen or Cornerstone. However, Parkway Plaza and Park Place are in the Mixed-Use Zoning. The height-width ratio is 4.5 feet to 1 foot to maintain proportionality. The maximum number of signs is four. Right now, no one in the City of Leawood would meet those criteria at 400,000 square feet. Temporary signage would not be permitted on the identity monuments. The maximum sign area would be 2% of the face of the identity monument. The monument would only be allowed to be indirectly illuminated with ground light or some sort of internal light. Motion would not be allowed.

Some of the places they could be limited to would be the boundaries of Leawood. We could also have them located at the primary entrances into the development. We could also have a limitation as far as number along any one street. That becomes a little harder to deal with if they are on a corner because of having to decide which street they are officially on. Park Place is the only one eligible. Parkway Plaza is another MX-D District. This is a little over 600,000 square feet and would therefore be allowed one. It could be centrally located on something like the clock tower. We would like to get input as to what you see these being used as and what types of developments you would like them in. Would you like them in more than the MX-D, or do you feel this is a good limitation?

Comm. Williams: Initially, we wanted to keep them to the MX-D; what is that rationale?

Mr. Klein: We had monument signs for our commercial districts, such as Town Center and One Nineteen. We saw these as one step above those as an architectural feature. In MX-D, with a residential component, it tends to be more of a campus or village feel. Part of the reasoning was to be able to have that type of feature in that style of development. If we allow it in the other developments, it would have to be limited to the size of the development. Then those that are just under the minimum requirement might ask for the signs.

Comm. Williams: I can see the benefit of allowing the development markers in other developments to be used to give a definition of an entryway instead of just the monument signs. I could see an additional consideration for the size of the marker, and maybe that is related, in part, to the size of the development, both in terms of square footage of the development and also height of the structures within the development. Take the current markers in Park Place and put those out here, and they stand up like giant trees or monopole pines. I think that could be detrimental to the overall appeal and goal of using them as entrance markers. Park Place has a hotel to balance it out.

Mr. Klein: We suggested that last time and had categories. If the development contained more than 50% of the buildings that were more than three stories in height, it would be in one category. At that time, we sensed reluctance to leave it open to the design when they came through.

Comm. Williams: I would agree to keep it open so we can see how it fits in the scheme of things. In this development, we are requiring them to have a corner feature at the intersection of Roe and 135th. Locating one of these markers on the corner conflicts with that goal. That is the primary entrance into the development from a major street, and it could be a bonus.

Mr. Coleman: Part of it has to do with the fact that those markers were eventually seen as entry markers and were put in with only "City of Leawood" on them. The developer has now come back and asked for identification of their development, which changes it in the sense that it has commercial signage. If they weren't asking for that, maybe these markers would be accepted as part of the overall development plan of MX-D developments and that it would be part of the Preliminary and Final Plan as an architectural element, not unlike a building. It wouldn't count toward any of their F.A.R. When they start putting signage on it, the parameters change. This is why we are doing this.

Comm. Williams: In terms of current signage, putting "City of Leawood" is a bit of a misnomer because it is not an entrance into a city center.

Mr. Coleman: It is actually because this is supposed to be the city center of Leawood.

Comm. Williams: We could argue all night about that.

Comm. Strauss: I think it is fine to have a sign that says "Park Place" because it is showcasing the area.

Comm. Williams: I agree with that.

Chair Rohlf: I think it is the number; that is what I am more concerned about. Park Place is our only point of reference, and the signs there happen to be nice. I want to make sure that they don't overdo it, either. We don't know exactly how many they would like to have.

Mr. Coleman: Three on their property and one on Town Center's property.

Chair Rohlf: Then I think it is starting to get to be too much. I think maybe two more. I don't know if that's a square footage requirement.

Mr. Klein: I think a lot of it is how you see them being used. For instance, if they are used at the entrances into the development, it will be for the primary entrance; or, they could be used at the boundaries at each of the corners. If we do that on Parkway Plaza, two could be on 133rd at either corner and two on 135th Street. It would have a much different look if they were on either side of Briar, which bisects the development. Mission Farms is the other MX-D development, and they talked about doing something like a clock tower. They indicated they plan on having horseshoe buildings with a clock tower. They have a monument sign there, but if they didn't, they could have one to identify the entrance into the development.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Another thing we have to think of is the sight distance. Where these large ones are at Park Place, they have a right-in, right-out at one location; at the other is a light. As tall and large as they are, they will create sight distance problems. I think there should be fewer rather than more. It is nice to have a really nice entry marker, but in a lot of places, they would not be fine.

Comm. Williams: Are you saying four is fine or it should be fewer than four because the maximum would be four?

Comm. Neff-Brain: I think they have plenty right now, and I don't think we need to be proliferating them throughout the city because unless it is a controlled intersection of some kind, you will have sight distance problems.

Mr. Coleman: They want to put one at Nall and Town Center Drive and one at 117th and Town Center Drive.

Comm. Strauss: A light is planned there.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Until then, we will have problems. It is too big and too much to have four or five of them.

Comm. Elkins: I agree on the sight distance issue; although, this shouldn't trump the sight triangle.

Mr. Coleman: No.

Comm. Elkins: The other thing I'm struggling with just a little bit is how you count one sign. For instance, to me, it would be exceedingly odd at the place by AMC where they have one on either side of the entryway. We all seem to agree to call those two. To me, those two towers together really constitute a single unit, and I don't know how you would address that. I tend to agree about the issue of proliferation, but I'm also concerned about balance. I call the monuments on either side of a street a single element.

Mr. Coleman: They make an element.

Comm. Elkins: That would be my concern.

Comm. Pateidl: How did the two monuments for Park Place get approved in the first place if they were not allowed by the LDO?

Mr. Klein: They were seen as architectural features because they weren't really proposing signage on them.

Comm. Pateidl: Richard just made the comment that these, perhaps, would be better handled as an architectural element rather than dealing with this issue you're talking about and the signs that can and can't be put on it. This allows the planning department or Planning Commission the options of dealing with magnitude and size.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Would you allow more than “City of Leawood”?

Comm. Pateidl: I might allow something like “Park Place,” but that’s it. Rather than calling it a sign, we could deal with it as an architectural element. To try to get a blanket setup that will fit everything that could potentially come through is more than we can chew in a sign ordinance.

Comm. Neff-Brain: They really are more architectural than signs.

Comm. Williams: That plays into the comment you made a moment ago about Mission Farms’ clock tower. That becomes an identity marker, and it is clearly an architectural element. They could still have monument signs, but the development marker is an architectural element.

Comm. Strauss: Who is responsible for viewing architectural elements?

Comm. Williams: In essence, we do.

Mr. Coleman: It would be part of a Final Plan.

Chair Rohlf: Would a clock tower come under this category?

Mr. Klein: That is what we were thinking. Mission Farms also wanted “Mission Farms” at the top of the clock tower. The name is up high, and it still creates a nice feature for the development. When we review an application with regard to signs, do we count that as signage? If it is an architectural element, do we have a provision in the sign code that allows an architectural element with signs as a certain percentage of the façade? Then the architectural element itself is something that is approved through the Final Plan of the development itself.

Comm. Elkins: I think you regulate the content in the architectural element.

Mr. Klein: It would be the sign area allowed on that particular architectural element.

Comm. Elkins: Yes; what Jim said makes a lot of sense.

Comm. Neff-Brain: You couldn’t list all the shops in the development. You could maybe list the development and not in neon at the top, either.

Comm. Williams: Let’s look at the clock tower as an example. Do we have height limitations for the structures that go in? It has three-story buildings there now, so for a clock tower to stand out, could it exceed the height of the tallest buildings?

Mr. Klein: MX-D has a height of 90 feet. I think these are probably around 50-60 feet.

Comm. Strauss: That would exceed our monument height of 30 feet.

Mr. Klein: That is true.

Comm. Williams: Given the design, would there be any leeway on where the height is taken? I could see a clock tower with a peak cap, and maybe they want to extend a spire of some sort.

Mr. Klein: It would be the actual roof; spires are listed as an exception to height. That actually might help. It does simplify it a lot as far as getting out of trying to do the architectural element and addressing the signage. We can go back and look at that.

Comm. Pateidl: The specific question on this tower out here is if it is clear that one is in Park Place and one is in Town Center.

Mr. Klein: Currently, yes.

Comm. Pateidl: They are only going to want to put that mark on the one that is in Park Place and not the one in Town Center.

Mr. Coleman: They want to put two more towers up.

Mr. Klein: This would require them to come back for a Revised Final Plan showing the architectural elements that they want. We would have to amend the LDO regarding signage on architectural elements. If that is the direction, it would be a two-step process. If Mission Farms or Parkway Plaza wanted to come in and do something similar, they would propose an architectural element for their particular development.

Comm. Elkins: Would there be a limit on the size of the development that would qualify for an architectural element?

Mr. Klein: At this point, we don't have anything like that. This would open it up for the types of buildings, the location of the buildings and the amenities proposed for the features.

Comm. Williams: You had some requirements as far as the sign.

Comm. Pateidl: I think you need to write those into an architectural element in the same way you were going to write it into a sign.

Mr. Coleman: An architectural element for MX-D that exceeds "X" number of square feet.

Comm. Williams: Yes, was it a minimum of 400 square feet?

Comm. Elkins: Yes because you don't want a clock tower for a two-building strip mall.

Mr. Coleman: Right; that would look odd.

Mr. Klein: This will probably have to be a new section because I don't think we have anything like that in the ordinance that addresses this.

Mr. Coleman: We could put it in the architectural section or performance standards. We'll figure it out.

Comm. Williams: Something you didn't have in your proposal when we were looking at this as signage but is still an issue of whether it is an architectural element is the actual size of the element. If they are individual, standalone pieces like the ones at Park Place, do we want to limit the size of those or to be objective?

Comm. Strauss: That is why I asked who is responsible for reviewing it. I would rather leave it open to let them propose something, and then we decide whether it is to scale. Rather than get detailed with each component, it limits their creativity, I guess.

Comm. Williams: I don't want to limit their creativity, but on the same token, if we don't have something we can hang our hats on, it just gets to be arbitrary.

Comm. Strauss: I still think we should have our maximum total height and ratios. I thought you were talking about individual pieces like the light on top.

Comm. Williams: No, in the case of Park Place, total size of that element is from ground to top without the size of the light post or how they design it, but if it's a standalone element, it has a maximum footprint of X by Y and a maximum height of 30 feet or something like that.

Comm. Strauss: I misunderstood. I agree with that.

Comm. Williams: An architectural element can be defined in many ways. A clock tower itself could end up being a very sizable structure, but properly done, it's not bad.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I just worry about the mass in proportion to the development.

Comm. Williams: We don't have the latitude of an architectural review commission here, but we often offer our thoughts and opinions.

Comm. Elkins: Mass regulation has been difficult for us in the past.

Comm. Williams: So maybe we don't address it.

Comm. Strauss: Could we talk about the zoning regulations?

Mr. Coleman: 90 feet.

Comm. Neff-Brain: But we could end up with cell towers and monopines all over the city.

Comm. Strauss: They might try to hide them in there.

Mr. Coleman: That's true.

Comm. Williams: In the case of Mission Farms, if they do want to do a clock tower, they're not making any money off the clock tower, so they're not going to spend a lot; they're going to spend what they need and what they can afford to get that recognition. It could be attached to a new building going in, 20-30 feet on the top of the building. It probably is not going to be a terribly big investment for them, and they will probably feel they will get it back in advertising.

Mr. Klein: I think we have the direction for addressing architectural elements: don't get too into the design or massing because it would be approved through the Final Development Plan and add a Leawood Development Ordinance amendment that would allow signage on these types of features.

Comm. Pateidl: I have one last observation on it, and maybe we'll kill two birds with one stone. The situation with the sight line and public safety is something that should be kept in mind, and the number of signs in any particular development could be another. If you limit it to these types of developments on controlled intersections only, you would then minimize the number and take care of the safety aspect of it.

Comm. Strauss: Would that limit the clock tower?

Comm. Pateidl: The clock tower is separate as far as entry points. If you have something internally in a subdivision that is an element of that nature, I don't think you have an issue. You could establish it as a sight line issue. If it is going to be anywhere close to a parameter, it would not be allowed unless it is a controlled intersection.

Comm. Neff-Brain: If we are going to allow a sign on it, I would say we should limit it to the name of the development and not all the things in it.

Comm. Williams: In the case of Park Place with one of these existing currently outside the actual property line, if it is part and parcel of the development in question of Park Place, I think it counts.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Didn't they put it in?

Mr. Klein: They put it in. AMC signed the application on the other one because they were the property owner. I could almost see Town Center Plaza wanting their name on that one. I think Park Place would have a real problem with that, considering that they paid to put it there.

Comm. Neff-Brain: You could say that each gets a name or neither does. I think it's going to be misleading if you have "City of Leawood" on one and "Park Place" on the other. People are going to think they're both Park Place.

Mr. Klein: AMC has a good relationship with Park Place, especially with the headquarters moving in, too. I don't know what Town Center Plaza is going to do. I see your point. At this point, Park Place is the only one that has mentioned it.

Directional Signs

Mr. Klein: We talked a little about directional signs. These are for safe and efficient flow of pedestrian traffic to certain areas. We indicated a willingness to change the LDO to allow for post and panel signs. The pole sign would still not be allowed.

Comm. Elkins: Didn't we have some issues with the size of the directional signs.

Mr. Klein: We did. The current regulations for the directional signs limit to two signs at 6 square feet, which isn't very much. Church of the Resurrection had much larger directional signs they wanted to do. Does it need to be separated? Do we need to call for vehicular directional signs, or since these are more or less to identify entrances and the directory signs have the list of businesses, do we address that under directory signs, which might be more appropriate?

Comm. Williams: A lot of the signs we were talking about with Church of the Resurrection are within their property and not at the street level. Are we getting a little too controlling to dictate to them how they address their signage within the depths of their own property? I can see that we don't want great big billboards, but in terms of the numbers of signs, they could have a little more flexibility. They could end up with a modest-sized sign for vehicular and pedestrian information. One sign does it all, and we could reduce the number of signs in that respect.

Comm. Neff-Brain: You can't just do it for Church of the Resurrection. You would have to allow everyone else to do it.

Comm. Williams: Within the depths of the development, let them have it. Our primary concern should be at the public right-of-way, getting on the property.

Mr. Coleman: What would stop them from putting a big sign up farther back from the right-of-way anywhere on their property?

Comm. Williams: I'm not saying we don't have any; I'm just saying we give more latitude in terms of the number and maybe increase the size of the signage.

Mr. Coleman: That's what we're here for. They've submitted a package that has 50 signs.

Comm. Williams: With a sign package, you can see where they would be in place and understand why a sign is going to a certain location. It may have very valid reasons to be there.

Mr. Coleman: Sure.

Comm. Neff-Brain: We don't want aesthetic pollution, either. They're a little bit different as a church with not much that close to them. Put it at Town Center, and it's different.

Comm. Williams: Why would Town Center be different?

Mr. Coleman: It's commercial and not a church complex.

Comm. Williams: I understand that, but you still have a need for directing more traffic probably on a day-to-day basis going through a large retail center than a church parking lot.

Comm. Neff-Brain: They want 50 signs.

Comm. Williams: That is excessive.

Mr. Klein: We can run through the different sign types, and then we'll go through the possibilities with these signs. We have directional signs that direct traffic flow. Directory signs list individual businesses or buildings and then show a directional arrow.

Comm. Strauss: It is a campus.

Mr. Klein: Yes; in fact, Church of the Resurrection has a lot of these now.

Comm. Neff-Brain: The pole sign is not something they can currently have?

Mr. Klein: Yes, and those are all coming down, and they are proposing new ones. We are going to have post and panel as well as monuments. Other signage that comes into these large developments is signage on light poles and the building identity signs. (*Shows examples*)

Comm. Elkins: Do the first two examples qualify as temporary signs since they are banners?

Mr. Klein: These are advertising the development. We want to talk about the number of these as well. They are on all the light poles. Church of the Resurrection has them, also.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Do those change seasonally?

Mr. Klein: I believe so for many of them. Church of the Resurrection is using them to identify the particular parking lot; whereas, others advertise special events. We are getting into large development/campus signs. We are looking for direction on a few items. Should we require minimum lot size of the development to allow certain types of signs? Town Center Plaza is about 70 acres; One Nineteen is closer to 17 acres; Parkway Plaza is about 60 acres; Church of the Resurrection is about 69 acres. We could limit it to very few developments or open it up quite a bit.

Comm. Neff-Brain: We probably don't have any content on the regulation, do we? I know that's a fine line, but you could get into some fairly negative content if we allow everything.

Mr. Klein: The purpose right now is to identify the development or to give direction within the development.

Comm. Williams: Smaller lot developments have much less need for directional signage. One Nineteen has three ways in off three different streets; it doesn't need way-finding.

Chair Rohlf: The buildings that make up a church complex have so many things going on at the church versus a mall or Town Center. I think it would depend on what the development is than necessarily the lot size or the number of buildings.

Mr. Coleman: Some other jurisdictions break it down by the zoning categories.

Comm. Williams: I think that would be a good idea.

Comm. Strauss: I think the Sprint campus would be an example.

Mr. Klein: Overland Park has a limitation on some of the developments.

Mr. Coleman: Johnson County Community Colleges, schools or churches.

Mr. Rexwinkle: If we are going to regulate it by zoning, we need to keep the AG district in mind because Church of the Resurrection is on AG with a Special Use Permit.

Chair Rohlf: The only time I remember directional signs is with banks. I don't remember seeing them for other developments.

Mr. Klein: We also need to establish minimum number of buildings in the development. The problem with that is Church of the Resurrection really only has two buildings. A Sign Plan for the overall development would require the following information: type, number, design, size and location of each sign type. This seems like a good rule in general. Should we allow deviations for some current sign types? For instance, on directional signs right now, we limit the number to two, and we have a limitation of 6 square feet. For these larger developments or campus signage, should it be changed to allow two directional signs per building? It makes it a little more flexible since they are larger developments and it gets them more directory signs.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Is the Church of the Resurrection the only campus facility we have in the city?

Mr. Coleman: We could split it off to schools and churches, but we are also trying to address the request from Park Place for the post and panel signs for that. They would have directory signs and directional signs. They are in MX-D, and if we limit it to MX-D, it would apply to only two other developments right now. But we also have Town Center, which already has some post and panel signs.

Comm. Elkins: Who knows what we might end up with on 135th Street?

Mr. Coleman: It is shown as MX-D for the most part.

Comm. Pateidl: Under the current LDO, do we have the capacity to allow a deviation?

Mr. Klein: The only way the directory signs themselves are allowed is with a deviation. It only states that they have to be pedestrian scaled. The directional signs are listed in a couple zoning districts, and they are limited to two. Currently, we don't have a deviation available to those.

Comm. Pateidl: When you look at something like the Church of the Resurrection, which is so unique in its character versus the balance of property in the city, wouldn't it be reasonable to create the ability to have a deviation and then allow the planning department to control common sense as to what's allowed by its recommendations for the deviation?

Mr. Klein: Typically we can't have a deviation unless we have some parameters to it, but we could allow up to a certain number.

Mr. Coleman: Then have a deviation for anything additional.

Mr. Klein: We have the standard requirement now, but the deviation could be for an increase in size or number.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It would have to be based on something, or you're going to get everybody wanting a deviation and no reason to turn them down. We need set parameters or we will be in legal trouble.

Mr. Klein: It seems like it would be good to have deviations. We talked about it before. The LDO actually provides deviations to some very major things, but it doesn't really provide a lot of deviations to minor things such as landscaping, signage, architectural elements and that kind of thing.

We also want to know if you are supportive to adding sign types, such as banners on light posts. We have them already, but it is in an older development. We do have other ones who would like to use them for parking lots and that kind of thing. I could definitely see where One Nineteen would want them as well. Are you supportive of that or not?

Comm. Elkins: I am just trying to track the LDO. The way I read it, it currently permits banner signs conditionally via sign permit. What does that mean?

Mr. Klein: We used to have temporary banner signs that were up for a certain number of days, and they required a permit.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I'm fine with something like "Spring in Leawood," but to have "Joe's Barbecue" is something I don't want to see.

Mr. Coleman: Something that advertises the city or the development.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Yes, and not commercial advertising.

Comm. Williams: You don't want to see "\$10 Haircuts This Week"?

Comm. Neff-Brain: Or that peach.

Comm. Elkins: I still think these banner signs need to be treated as temporary signs, and I think we need to have some enforcement provisions that limit the length of time that a temporary sign can stay in place if we can do so legally. As an example, we have banner signs that are semi-permanent, and they end up getting faded or ripped up; we, as a city, should have enforcement authority to remove them.

Mr. Klein: We currently do on the temporary signs. We require that they are maintained and in good condition.

Comm. Elkins: That is why I believe the banner signs should be treated as temporary signs.

Mr. Coleman: We will probably have to address that with a temporary sign ordinance issue and set it aside for now to deal with the campus package we're talking about here.

Ms. Shearer: We know we will have some issues; we can deal with that later.

Comm. Williams: Can you pull the banner signs out of this?

Mr. Klein: The banners are considered permanent signs.

Mr. Coleman: We might say, "One parking area identification sign on a light pole per 200 parking spaces" or something like that because that is what the signs at Church of the Resurrection are for.

Mr. Klein: Currently, they have them on every pole.

Comm. Williams: They don't even have that at KCI.

Mr. Klein: The other type of sign that really isn't addressed by the LDO is building identification signs for the building itself and not for the individual business. I have examples from the JCCC campus where they want the ability to say that a particular building is one direction and be able to confirm the identification on the building.

Mr. Rexwinkle: That is something Church of the Resurrection wants to do, also.

Mr. Klein: Right now, we limit the wall signs to two per building. Church of the Resurrection already has their maximum. Now, they want to place these building identification signs on different parts of the building to indicate the area you go for a particular reason.

Comm. Neff-Brain: If the people go to church there all the time, wouldn't they know that?

Mr. Coleman: In one building, the west end might be the daycare, and then the east end of it is the gym.

Comm. Neff-Brain: That's ridiculous. These aren't different people that come in and out all the time; it is not like a community center or a hospital. These are parishioners who can go inside and find out where they're supposed to be.

Mr. Coleman: They're telling us they all get lost.

Comm. Williams: In the case of Church of the Resurrection with a directory sign with the function and the arrows for whatever direction, you don't really have a need to put the name on the building. You could have something down closer to the entrance.

Mr. Klein: Like an entry sign or something like that.

Comm. Williams: At most, you could have a letter designation. If they are going to use up all their wall signage with the church name, the letter designation could tie to the directory sign. If you're out of your car and are walking to the childcare center and you see the directory sign that tells you to go to Building A, you look for a building with "A" on the building.

Mr. Rexwinkle: That is exactly what they want to do.

Comm. Strauss: I've been one of those "lost souls," and they invite outside people to use their facility. They let us have our HOA meetings there. I had no idea where I was going. I think they open it up to all kinds of organizations.

Comm. Williams: I have been there as a guest for various functions, and I didn't know where I was going.

Mr. Coleman: It boils down to the number of signs.

Comm. Strauss: I am fine with having the signage on the building, but it really is how many; I agree.

Chair Rohlf: Are we trying to tailor this to everything, or are we trying to think about it in terms of the church?

Mr. Klein: We need to look at it overall because somebody else could ask for it down the road.

Comm. Williams: Maybe that's where you have the grey language in the LDO that allows for a deviation or overview.

Comm. Elkins: In some respects, it strikes me as a little bit analogous to all the trouble that we dealt with for AMC. Where is the entrance for the IMAX? Again, one of the guiding principles for us in signs is to avoid the proliferation of sign pollution. I don't think we can treat COR (Church of the Resurrection) as a specific example. I don't know that we can even treat campuses a whole lot differently than we treat developments.

Mr. Coleman: Right now, they can have two directional signs for the campus and two wall signs for each building or a monument sign in lieu of one of the wall signs.

Chair Rohlf: That doesn't seem like enough for that.

Comm. Elkins: Is there anything for directory signs?

Mr. Klein: That is the deviation that requires it to be pedestrian scale, but a lot of their signs are over 6 feet in height and fairly large.

Mr. Coleman: The way we were trying to look at it is a campus sign package. If it's an 80-acre campus, it is different than an 80-acre development with a couple office buildings.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It is because they are farther back from the street, and it is not as polluting.

Mr. Coleman: They kind of have their own street back there, too. I guess it's a private street that goes from Nall to Roe. They have a spiritual walk they are doing for the campus that has signage in and of itself.

Comm. Williams: You are saying to break out the LDO so that you have a section for campuses, and you can begin to define examples such as churches, office complexes, school and medical.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Of a certain size.

Comm. Williams: You can qualify the number of signs for each campus size. Then for commercial developments, it is the same situation with different requirements for different sizes. Because they're commercial versus campus, maybe we approach them differently.

Mr. Klein: You are right because we wouldn't want an identity sign on Town Center Plaza, but at a campus like Church of the Resurrection, it might make sense.

Comm. Pateid: I would be careful about using acreage as a criterion. I drove by Church of the Resurrection the other day and saw a sign up for 29 or 49 acres for sale.

Mr. Klein: That's a good point. If they sell some, they don't meet the acreage requirement, and they are out of conformance.

Comm. Williams: Then they have to take their signage down.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It would have to be grandfathered.

Comm. Williams: Put it in the LDO that if the size of the development should reduce, the number of signs allowed would reduce accordingly. It seems only logical that if they sell it to another person, the signs would potentially change.

Mr. Coleman: Some have it all under one ownership.

Comm. Williams: Perfect.

Comm. Strauss: You could break your back with a matrix.

Comm. Neff-Brain: We don't have that much more developable land to have that many more huge campuses.

Mr. Klein: What we noticed on JCCC was they have identification to locate the parking lots, but they don't have signs on every pole. We talked about limiting the banners on light poles to a certain number of parking spaces.

Comm. Pateid: That's a good idea.

Comm. Williams: Along that line, we have limitations on the size of the light poles within the developments, and with this type of signage, maybe we limit the height of where it goes.

Mr. Klein: Currently, our maximum is 18 feet in height, which isn't terribly large.

Mr. Coleman: The ones we're showing are 35 feet high.

Comm. Neff-Brain: No car is going to need it that high.

Comm. Williams: Town Center does have larger light poles. We would have to address that.

Mr. Klein: (Shows example of Oak Park directory signs) They tried to create a design element that matches the parts of the center. Corporate Woods has monument signs. They are fairly pedestrian. The Corporate Woods sign is large.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It is huge.

Chair Rohlf: I like the monument directional sign; I think that's nice.

Mr. Klein: Corporate Woods actually allows individual monument signs for the building on each façade.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Although, to even see those, you have to be in the center. It doesn't cause pollution outside of the development.

Mr. Klein: The Sprint campus has a post and panel directory sign. They vary in size, but most were huge. They have building identity signs on the garages with a single letter indicating which garage is it. They are mainly on the posts.

Comm. Elkins: To the extent that they use those directory signs to identify parking buildings and whatnot, in my opinion, it is an accident waiting to happen because the print on the sign is so small that I almost have to come to a complete stop to read it. I'm not sure how you deal with that, but those post and panel signs look good in the macro; in terms of fulfilling their function, they're not very helpful.

Comm. Pateidl: I think they're great for pedestrians.

Comm. Elkins: I agree with that.

Mr. Klein: We would like to show the developments that could take advantage of this. We have talked about Church of the Resurrection, and it really comes down to what limitations we would place. It would definitely be more of a campus feel. We talked about Mission Farms in the MX-D. Some of those sign types would probably not be appropriate for that type of development. What about banners on the light posts here?

Comm. Neff-Brain: As long as it just says "Mission Farms" or "Happy Spring" or something.

Comm. Williams: I don't recall that we've talked about the size limitations on banner signs on poles. Do we have restrictions on how large those can be?

Mr. Klein: That is true. I saw one that was 77 inches tall by 18 inches wide. It didn't equal out that much at 9 square feet. It probably should be fairly small to fit on the scale of the light posts that are 18 feet in height.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I still think we need to have a driving trip someday with all of us in the van, actually seeing these things before we vote on it. We've talked about it for several years.

Mr. Coleman: During the day or evening?

Comm. Neff-Brain: Saturday morning.

Mr. Coleman: So we just meet here at 6:00 and take off? We can get a van.

Comm. Elkins: That was so helpful in the height and massing to understand the problem when we did that years and years ago.

Chair Rohlf: Are they actually going to submit something for this?

Mr. Coleman: They have already; we just don't have anything in the LDO to deal with it.

Mr. Klein: Schools might also have campus signs; however, the lot size of these is much smaller. That is pretty much all we had.

Mr. Coleman: Before we adjourn, I want to remind everyone that, if you are emailing about a question, you can email me directly if it is concerning an application or a project. Don't email everybody because it becomes a violation of the Kansas Open Meeting Session.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Even when I reply to things, I don't spread it out because you can be in violation even if you don't realize it.

Ms. Shearer: I know sometimes you think I'm being a stickler, but what Patty and I are paid to do is to try to keep everybody out of trouble.

Chair Rohlf: What happens if they allege that? What is the penalty and method of proof?

Comm. Neff-Brain: They can ask for all of our emails.

Chair Rohlf: Who would do that?

Ms. Shearer: In that particular case, we have some very interested citizens who would do something like that.

MEETING ADJOURNED