



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-115-50 (PHO-1-19)

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	January 13, 2020
<b>Planning Hearing Officer Hearing Date</b>	January 15, 2020
<b>Request</b>	Comprehensive Sign Plan Review for more than two (2) signs on a building over fifty-six (56) feet in height.
<b>Location</b>	Northeast corner of 1st Avenue and Adams Street
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Denial
<b>VPC Vote</b>	13-0

### **VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:**

*Committee member Christopher Coyler declared a conflict of interest and left the meeting during this item bringing the quorum to 12 members present.*

*Committee member Michael Langley arrived during this item bringing the quorum to 13 members present.*

**Mr. Joél Carrasco, City of Phoenix Staff**, provided a background presentation of the request, location, context and ordinance criteria for the committee's consideration.

**Committee members** requested clarity on the following:

- The location of the existing two signs.
- The location of the proposed third sign.
- The height of the Orpheum lofts to the west.
- The dimensions of the proposed third sign.

**Staff** provided the following responses:

- Clarified the location of the two existing signs with an exhibit depicting the US Bank signage on the east and west elevations located at the very top of the existing high-rise building.
- Clarified the location of the proposed third sign with an exhibit provided by the applicant depicting the proposed third sign approximately 88 feet above grade located on the west elevation of the existing 95-foot-tall parking structure.
- Clarified that the Orpheum Lofts are 11 stories and approximately 165 feet tall.

- Suggested the applicant would be better suited to provide the details of the proposed sign dimensions.

**Mr. Chad Keller**, Christy Signs, representing the applicant, provided a brief verbal presentation regarding the request and showcased several lighting products to provide examples of the potential light illumination, covering, and general size and materials anticipated to be utilized.

**Committee member Mr. Panetta** asked if the building owner was present. **Mr. Keller** responded that the building owner was not present.

**Mr. Keller** continued his verbal presentation and provided several details regarding illumination, square footage, width, height, and brightness while illuminating the display examples for the committee. **Mr. Keller** also showcased a vinyl mesh covering to minimize the impacts from the illumination. **Mr. Keller** elaborated on the need for additional signage and touched on several of the criteria outlined in the ordinance language.

**Chairwoman R. Johnson** asked if any other locations on this building have been considered for this signage. **Mr. Keller** responded no.

**Committee member Mr. Panetta** continued to question why the building owner was not present, not “driving” this request, and commented that he felt uncomfortable without the building owner present. **Mr. Keller** commented that WeWork has paid for this request in which he is the applicant and representative of. **Mr. Keller** also commented that the building and property owner has signed an authorization form to allow this request.

**Committee member Mr. Panetta** asked staff if we have a building owner authorization form. Staff responded that an owner authorization form is required as part of the submittal for the Planning Hearing Officer (PHO) process.

**Committee member Ms. Martinez** requested additional clarity on the location.

**Vice Chairwoman Starks** raised concerns about other tenants wanting signage at this scale and height and about what happens if the tenant/business goes away.

**Committee member Ms. Lockhart** asked for clarity on the manufacturers specifications regarding the reduction of illumination that occurs with use of the vinyl coverings. **Mr. Keller** responded that the manufacture suggest the vinyl covering restricts 70% of the light or illumination.

**Committee member Martinez** requested additional clarity on the size and use of vinyl.

**Committee member Mr. Rainey** commented that the downtown area is growing more urban and having two signs isn't a lot.

**Committee member Mr. D. Johnson** commented that consideration should be taken to dim the brightness after a certain time of night.

**Committee members** discussed their scope of evaluation of this request and brought the conversation back to whether the number of signs at this height and for this purpose should be allowed to change from two to three.

**Committee member Mr. Rainey** commented that 88 feet away is quite a distance. Mr. Keller added that it is approximately 100 feet from other buildings as well.

**Chairwoman R. Johnson** raised concerns about resident impacts and asked the applicant what community outreach was done. **Mr. Keller** responded he had followed the notification requirement as part of the Planning Hearing Officer (PHO) packet.

**Chairwoman R. Johnson** asked again if the applicant has considered other locations for this signage. **Mr. Keller** responded that no other locations have been considered.

**Chairwoman R. Johnson** opened the floor to public comment.

**Mr. Lawrence Gaffon, area resident**, commented that he resides on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor of the Orpheum Lofts with east facing windows and is concerned about the location of this sign. **Mr. Gaffon** asked to consider placing the sign on the south elevation instead of the west elevation to minimize impacts to the residents to the west.

**Chairwoman R. Johnson** asked **Mr. Gaffon** if there are any street lights or other lights on at night. **Mr. Gaffon** replied that there is street light however they are oriented downward.

**Vice Chairwoman Starks** asked **Mr. Gaffon** if he owns or rents. **Mr. Gaffon** commented that he owns.

**Mr. Doug Newton, area resident**, representing the Phoenix Downtown Neighborhood Alliance whom have been working for several years on illumination, signage, and lighting issues. **Mr. Newton** provided his evaluation of the request considering the criteria outlined in the ordinance and urged the committee to deny the request.

**Mr. Steve Toedtemeier, area resident**, commented that he too is a resident of the Orpheum Lofts, resides on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor and has 6 windows that are facing east. **Mr. Toedtemeier** commented that half the units in the Orpheum lofts will be impacted by this light and urged the committee to consider those impacts to residents.

**Chairwoman R. Johnson** closed the floor to allow committee discussion.

**Committee member Mr. Rainey** commented that more information up front and clarity on the evaluation criteria would have been helpful, and felt there is a lack of information on this request.

**Committee member Mr. Panetta** commented to consider a sign with no light, suggested that staff could have brought more information regarding the existing approved comprehensive sign plan for the property, and doesn't think this request meets the criteria outlined in the ordinance, particularly that requests such as these should be for signage "identification of the building" not for individual or different tenants.

**Vice Chairwoman Starks** asked for clarity on the request for another sign for the building and the process to amend the comprehensive sign plan. Staff provided additional clarity.

**Committee member Mr. Panetta** commented that the building owner should be present, and if this was another "US Bank" sign for building identification, than he might feel more comfortable.

**Committee member Mr. Johnson** commented that this request would open up a "can of worms" and he would rather "hold back".

### **MOTION**

**Mr. Ray Cabrera III** motioned to deny the request. **Vice Chairwoman Janey Pearl Starks** seconded the motion.

Several Committee members emphasized the following reasons for denying the request:

- This is not a building sign it appears to be a tenant sign.
- Concerns regarding the impacts to residents to the west, specifically the Orpheum Lofts.
- Concerns with the location and placement of the sign.
- Unclear the intent of the building/property owner due to lack of their presence and would like the opportunity to hear from the owner.

### **Vote**

**13-0**, Motion to deny passed, with Committee Members R. Johnson, Starks, Burns, Langley, Dubasik, Panetta, Cabrera, D. Johnson, Sonoskey, Stark, Lockhart, Martinez and Rainey, in favor.

### **STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

None.