I.  Call to Order and Roll:

Present:
Jeremy Biggs, Secretary
Ronald Colin
Josh Holtgrewe, Chairman
Jeanne Myers
Tommy Reyes
Deadrick Turner

Others Present:
Angela Reeder, Town Planner
Janet Lucci, Planning Admin Assistant

Absent
Daniel Davidson - excused

II. Approval of Minutes from November 13, 2018 Meeting:

Chairman Holtgrewe called for a motion to approve the November 13, 2018 meeting minutes as submitted.

Motion: Jeremy Biggs made the motion. Ron Colin seconded it.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

III. Old Business:

A. Other as Properly Presented

There was no old business to come before the Committee.

IV. New Business:

A. Arlington Trails Commercial Planned Development – Master Sign Plan – Airline and Brooks Branch Rd.
Chairman Holtgrewe noted the Planning Commission had tasked the DRC to make their recommendation regarding the Arlington Trails PD Master Sign Plan.
Ron Colin disclosed to the committee he is an employee of the design firm Renaissance Group, but he is not associated with this particular project or with Mr. Grant.

Chairman Holtgrewre recognized Angela Reeder, Town Planner, who presented the staff report (on file.) The applicant received approval for the Arlington Trails Commercial PD from the BMA on October 1, 2018. This is a 17-acre, undeveloped commercial site on the southwest corner of Airline Road and I-40.

Ms. Reeder noted the PD includes seven commercial lots; two intended for hotels, one for a storage facility, and the remaining four for future tenants. One condition of the PD was to prepare a Master Sign Policy.

Ms. Reeder reported the Planning Commission had considered the Master Sign Policy in November and noted some concerns. They asked for DRC input prior to making their recommendation.

Ms. Reeder explained the intent of a sign policy is to guide future signage within the PD for consistency and quality. The majority of the Master Sign Policy repeats or is consistent with the Town’s existing Sign Guidelines. However, Ms. Reeder noted there are some variations from existing code.

Ms. Reeder reviewed the 10 primary variations from the Town’s Code detailed in the staff report. Additionally, Ms. Reeder displayed renderings for the Grouping Sign, Wall Sign for the Storage facility, Ground Sign for the Storage facility, Wall Signs for Fairfield Inn & Suites and Ground Sign for Fairfield Inn & Suites.

Ms. Reeder noted the PC asked for input from the DRC and the DRC could recommend the policy as currently written, recommend the policy with changes or conditions, or recommend against the policy as written.

The guidelines set for the Master Sign Plan will guide staff when reviewing signs for the PD. Individual signs will be submitted and reviewed based on the policy set forth in the Master Sign Plan.

**Discussion:** Mr. Holtgrewre stressed the DRC’s role was to work towards a recommendation for the PC. Mr. Holtgrewre believes it is important to maintain the standards set forth in already established sign guidelines yet still be able to consider extenuating circumstances for this unique project.

Ms. Reeder reminded members they were considering grouping, ground mounted and wall signs on the buildings.

Mr. Turner expressed concern with the white background as is currently shown for the Sentry Self-Storage ground sign. There was general agreement among the members that a ground sign with a white background was not desirable. A dark background for the ground mount signs was agreed upon.

Ms. Myers asked for continuity between the grouping sign and the ground signs. She asked these signs complement each other and be consistent. For example, ensure the signs have a continuous color scheme and similar backgrounds. There was agreement among the committee that a coordinated, cohesive design for the ground mount signs would be recommended.
Ms. Reeder declared the goal of the Master Sign Plan was to make sure the ground mount signs compliment the buildings.

Mr. Grant agreed all ground mount signs will have a similar design. They will be internally illuminated, including the logo, and have white lettering with a dark background.

Jeremy Biggs stressed the signs on the hotel are a unique request for Arlington and will set a precedence for future signs. Mr. Biggs noted the Town set guidelines to encourage halo and reverse channel signs. He does not want to make an exception for internally illuminated signs on the hotels. Mr. Reyes agreed.

Mr. Holtgrewe explained intensifying the lighting on reverse channel or halo lit signs makes the light between the letters bleed and the sign fuzzy and difficult to read. Placing effective reverse channel or halo lit signs on the 4-story hotel will be challenging.

Mr. Holtgrewe asked if stipulations could be added that would ensure allowance for internally illuminated signs only for this specific location, in this specific PD, and these two specific hotels.

Ms. Reeder assured the committee this request would only apply to two lots in this PD. Stipulations and conditions could be added to the Master Sign agreement to reiterate this. Ms. Reeder noted the hotels are in the “special sign corridor” off I-40 which already allows for some exceptions to the typical sign guidelines.

Ms. Myers inquired if there are studies that have analyzed the relationship between speed and sign readability. For instance, the current signs in Arlington that are halo/reverse channel, are designed to be read as cars pass at 40 mph. Ms. Myers questioned what affect 70 mph has when attempting to read a sign. Mr. Holtgrewe explained in greater detail the principles of lighting engineering and the inverse relationship of increased light/lumens and the clarity of the sign. Mr. Biggs stated he was starting to see Mr. Holtgrewe’s point.

Mr. Biggs proposed a trade-off to have the ground signs as back lit or reverse channel if the hotels signs on the buildings were internally illuminated.

Mr. Grant agreed the ground signs could be reverse channel or halo.

Ms. Myers and Mr. Turner asked for confirmation that the grouping sign and the ground signs will match. Mr. Grant confirmed yes.

Ms. Myers requested the unlit letters on the grouping sign be metallic and not acrylic. The committee agreed. Ms. Myers also confirmed the development name (Arlington Trails) and the logo on the grouping sign would be non-illuminated.

Mr. Holtgrewe summarized the discussion; the grouping sign will be backlit for tenants, it will be complimentary to the other ground signs with an opaque background, the development name and logo will have raised metal letters.

Mr. Grant agreed. Ms. Reeder noted the ground signs will all be consistent and have a dark background.

Ms. Myers maintained the two hotels ground signs be backlit (lots 1&2) and the other five (Lots 3-7) be as proposed but with a dark background and complimentary to the grouping sign.
Mr. Grant asked the logos on the ground signs be internally illuminated. It was agreed yes; the text and logos could be internally illuminated on the ground signs. Mr. Grant noted the bases of the ground signs would be uniform to maintain consistency.

Mr. Holtgrewe summarized the changes.

Mr. Holtgrewe advised internally illuminated signs, due to their design, are sharper and easier to read than backlit. A backlit or halo sign on a 4-story building off I-40, he continued, will have intense lighting but fuzzy and unreadable letters. Furthermore, the letters on the sign will have to be spaced further apart increasing the size of the sign.

Mr. Holtgrewe recommends an internally illuminated sign for the two hotels but with specific language making it applicable to this development only. Mr. Turner agreed an internally illuminated sign would look better in this specific instance.

Ms. Myers said internally illuminated could be allowed in this case because of the height and size of the buildings and the distance from I-40. Ms. Reeder assured the committee this consideration was for these two hotels only. Specific conditions would be written to explain why it would be applied in this case only; for example, the distance from I-40, the height of the building, the special sign corridor.

Mr. Holtgrewe requested the vision of the Town be preserved even with this exception.

Mr. Holtgrewe and Biggs suggested a compromise; to allow internally illuminated wall signs on the two hotels but limit the number of wall signs on each hotel to two as opposed to the requested three.

Mr. Turner asked for clarification of where the second sign would go, facing Airline or the cul-de-sac. The Committee discussed it would make sense to have it on the opposite side of the cul-de-sac, to avoid two signs facing one another from the hotels, and all agreed that made sense.

Mr. Grant said he would be amenable to that request if he is allowed to change to location of the side wall signs on each hotel. The committee agreed that would be acceptable.

Mr. Holtgrewe asked Ms. Reeder to review the committee’s recommendations through discussion, so a clear recommendation could be given to the PC. She noted the conditions proposed were:

a. The Grouping sign may include internal illumination for the tenant portion, the shopping center name and logo shall be non-illuminated, the nonilluminated portions shall have added depth and be metal.

b. Ground signs on lots 3-7 shall use a consistent dark background color that matches the grouping sign, shall have a masonry base that matches materials on the associated building, and may have internally illuminated text and logos.

c. Lots 1 and 2 (hotels) may have internally illuminated wall signs with white letters along the top floor of the building, due to the unique height being over 40 feet, the location along a freeway in our special sign corridor, the vehicles along I-40 traveling at such high speeds, and the hotel use. Reasons for the allowance shall be clearly stated in the Policy.

d. Ground signs for Lots 1 and 2 shall have reverse channel lettering.
e. Wall signage permitted along Fair Springs Cove for Lots 1 and 2 may be shifted to opposite side of the building, still resulting in wall signage on two sides only.

Chairman Holtgrew called for a motion to approve the recommendations and forward them to the Planning Commission.

**Main Motion:** Jeanne Myers made a motion to approve the recommendations. Jeremy Biggs seconded it.

**Vote on Motion:** The motion carried unanimously.

**B. Discussion of Design Guidelines – update DRC design guidelines.**

Chairman Holtgrew recognized Angela Reeder, Town Planner, who summarized the inputs and comments to update the Design Guidelines, staff report on file. Ms. Reeder identified several of the changes were corrections/administrative changes.

**Discussion:**

The Design Review Committee members agreed to update the DRC guidelines to reflect current standards and practices and to provide guidance for the Town Planner when reviewing DRC site plans from applicants. The goal being to provide the Town Planner with stronger guidelines and firmer implementation policies.

Mr. Colin requested stucco be removed from the primary list of building materials. Mr. Biggs agreed that stucco should be a secondary material.

Members discussed raising the percentage of acceptable secondary materials. It currently stands as 10% of the building which all agree is too low and not representative of what is currently being approved.

After discussion members agreed secondary materials should be no more than 30% and perhaps one quarter to one third of the building. Ms. Reeder will look for some language to best reflect this change.

Ms. Myers mentioned working towards the goal of adding “human scale” into our design guidelines. Ms. Myers requested the removal of CMU block from the list of secondary materials. Ms. Reeder confirmed it would be removed.

Mr. Colin commented on the aluminum composite metal paneling that is occasionally used. He allowed if used properly it can add character to the building.

It was agreed by the committee that clear anodized or silver aluminum storefront window systems were acceptable but should be avoided unless it complements the overall color scheme of the building.

Also approved by the committee was the inclusion of color renderings and a complete materials board of proposed exterior materials as a requirement by applicants. Ms. Myers recommended a minimum size be included. It was concluded that 3 by 3 materials board and a panel of brick would be sufficient.

Ms. Myers noted the base of a building should include the requirement for a masonry base roughly one third of the height of the building.
The committee made several changes to the landscape guidelines based on prior input from Mr. Davidson who was absent tonight. The addition to include a moisture sensor on commercial sites was discussed.

Mr. Turner identified a correction to Ch. III, C, paragraph 5 to change “back” of the curb to front of the curb.

Mr. Holtgrewe briefed the members on necessary lighting changes. He identified several areas to update including: changing wording to Lumens instead of watts, removing the requirement of 250 watts lighting at gas stations, updating standards to include guidance on vertical illumination, striking mercury from guidelines, adding verbiage to include a preference to LED and including information about auto diming. Mr. Holtgrewe will provide his detailed assessment to Ms. Reeder.

Mr. Reyes inquired if the guidelines could be updated to require developers to include external lighting to the entrance signs on residential developments.

Ms. Reeder explained these changes will be added to DRC Guidelines and brought back to DRC members in February or March for review. Once the DRC has approved the changes, the new DRC Guidelines will be sent to the BMA. They will receive two public readings in front of the BMA.

C. Other as Properly Presented.

There was no business to present.

V. Adjournment:
Chairman Holtgrewe called for a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Tommy Reyes made the motion. Ron Colin seconded it.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

\[Signature\] 1/15/19
Josh Holtgrewe, Chairman

\[Signature\] 1/15/19
Jeremy Biggs, Secretary

Submitted By: Janet Lucci, Planning Administrative Assistant