

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**MAY 5, 2016**

**VI) PUBLIC HEARING**

**Case No. 16-103**

**A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of their client, 1103, LLC (owner) for a major revision of the Lake Broadway Condominiums PUD to accommodate on-site signage. The proposed amendment would permit a 32-square-foot on-site identification sign to be installed on the existing fence near the property's Broadway entrance. The subject site contains 5.17 acres, is developed with 58 residential units, and addressed as 1103-1121 W. Broadway Street.**

MR. REICHLIN: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the PUD amendment as requested.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of staff? Mr. Harder [sic]?

MR. TOOHEY: What's their reason for doing this now? They didn't do it when they --

MR. PALMER: Well, just to increase advertisement, I guess. It might be something we can ask Kevin, who is here from the --

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Toohey, if your question is why are we amending the plan, it is -- if you do not state signage within a planned zone per our sign code, you are -- you have to comply with the underlying zoning district's requirements. So the underlying zoning district requirement for an R-2 subdivision would specify that you could have a 32-square-foot sign no greater than six feet in height. However, you have to meet the ten feet behind the road right-of-way standard. So had it been ten feet behind the road right-of-way, you would not be seeing this. We would have required it as a minor amendment. But since it is encroaching and asking for a reduction in the underlying zoning requirements for signage, you are having to, in essence, approve the setback variance which is really more driving the process, not the sign. They would have been permitted to have the sign had they met the setback. And, yes, it was not addressed on the original plan. It may not have been contemplated as necessary; however, signage is somewhat of a given for residential subdivisions if you want it, and they would like it at this point. They consider themselves, I imagine, a subdivision.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions of staff? At this time, I'll open up the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, again, Commissioners. Kevin Murphy, A Civil Group, at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. To answer Mr. Toohey's question, this -- this project is an R-2 PUD which predates -- I don't know -- it predates me. It was probably zoned in the '80s when they had a just -- again, different types of zonings. It was a very nominal plan that was done at that time. I'm not even sure that the sign regulations were that clear or even if we had them at that time, but -- and anyway, its

previous owners had not done anything with this. A previous client of ours, for him, we had to -- we revised that plan because we did a bit of a layout. Again we had to create a whole new plan and -- and basically did that as a -- as a minor revision because the -- the old plan again was so nominal, just really just elevations of buildings and what they would look like and some raw placement of them. So that is the plan then from 2007 that we're amending, and the property has since been sold to the client that we're doing this for now and -- and he is desiring to have some -- some signage up there. We had originally thought of having it downlighted, but we discussed it and -- and the location that it's at. We have the fence there. There's a -- probably a four- or five-foot berm behind that fence, and -- and several pine trees on that, and that would be -- you really couldn't see the sign behind the fence. There's an island in the shared driveway that it is set back behind that fence, as well, so you really wouldn't be able to see any -- be seen until you get right on it to turn there. But, basically, it's for deliveries, for, you know, a little bit of advertisement, I guess, but to let folks realize where this is at. The driveway just gets overlooked sometimes and that's what he's wishing to do. Again -- oh, as far as the lighting, we've decided to do kind of a backlighting or glow-type lighting. There would be a -- a backboard and then the lights will actually reflect off of the back of the letters onto the board, so it'll kind of more glow versus shining out or shining down onto the sign, and we just thought that would look a little bit nicer. But that's all I had to say. If have any more questions?

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker? Seeing no one, thank you, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else in the audience wishing to comment on this matter. Seeing no one, I'll close the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. REICHLIN: Open this matter up to my fellow Commissioners. Anybody wishing to comment, frame a motion? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: The signage appears to meet current regulations with the exception of the setback through no fault of the current owner. Therefore, I'd propose to move to approve, unless someone else would care to comment. So in the Case of 16-103, request by Civil Group, move to approve the major revision to the Lake Broadway Condominium PUD to accommodate on-site signage with a variance to the requirement for the ten-foot setback.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: Ms. Rushing. May we have a roll call, please.

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. LOE: We have eight votes for. The motion carries. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you, Ms. Loe. Yes?

MS. LOE: I have a point of clarification. I have a vote sheet in here for Case 16-110, which was the request of City of Columbia to adopt the uniform --

MR. ZENNER: That is -- you can disregard that one.

MS. LOE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: Unless you're really adventuresome and you'd like to approve it.

MS. LOE: Disregard.

MR. REICHLIN: No. Let's not -- let's not go there tonight. Okay.

MR. ZENNER: But we could avoid five more meetings if you'd like. I have no problem.