

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

June 09, 2016

Members Present

Justin Ferrell
George Davis
Sheri Chaney
John Ranson
R.J. Lackey
Peyton Keesee

Members Absent

Courtney Nicholas

Staff

Ken Gillie
Anna Levi
Tracie Lancaster
Clarke Whitfield

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 202 Boatwright Ave. to install 31.92 sq. ft. aluminum and acrylic signs reading "Biomat USA. Grifols" on the Northern and Western elevations. The request also includes a 15 sq. ft. ground sign with 20.8 square feet of architectural elements.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Tom Powers, the applicant. This is part of the expansion I'm sure you all had to approve the expansion right? So the old sign was taken down so this is just to replace the sign. These are going flat against the wall. With LED backing and it's going to stick out about 4 inches. I'm just doing the install.

Mr. Ranson stated the yard sign is that going to be made out of aluminum?

Mr. Powers stated yes sir.

Mr. Lackey stated Ken; I have a question for you. I thought there was something with backlit signs that was an issue.

Ms. Levi stated those are not recommended.

Mr. Lackey stated I knew there was some restriction about that type of sign.

Mr. Davis stated didn't we discuss this with the YMCA sign?

Mr. Powers stated what is the situation with the previous sign that was backlit? Would that be grandfathered even though it had to be relocated since the building has to be modified?

Mr. Keesee stated you are saying the one before was backlit?

Mr. Powers stated it was just a box.

Mr. Gillie stated so you are not building a new box you are just moving the sign?

Mr. Powers stated if this were turned down then the sign that was there could be put back up or could it? That is nothing anybody wants because it was just an old box. A sheet metal sign that was probably 12 inches thick and total square footage for the one sign was 5x10. So it was 62 counting the 2 sides.

Ms. Levi stated well the Zoning Regulations doesn't say anything about the backlit part of the sign. Since one is coming down and a new one is going up I think that would be your determination whether you think it's appropriate or not.

Mr. Keesee stated I think it would be grandfathered.

Mr. Gillie stated not if it is moved. If it is taken down and the new sign is then put up that counts. But if they take the old sign down then they are supposed to when they move the location, the location has to be approved by this Board. At that point they can't say whether they think that sign is appropriate. Illumination for signs should be from shielded incandescent or LED lights. Halo-lit pin letters are allowed. Ground mounted spotlights are allowed for illuminating monument or freestanding signs. Not recommended are plastic signs, backlit awnings, backlit plastic panel signs and digital signs are also not recommended under section 7.2 subsection 4.

Mr. Powers stated so the definition of this is an internal illuminated channel light.

Mr. Gillie stated existing signs are grandfathered, but any changes to the existing signs must meet the guidelines. So if they move the sign that is a replacement and it is not grandfathered. It loses its right it is fine where it is but if they take it off and move it.

Mr. Keesee stated so the stationary one is going to be backlit?

Mr. Powers stated no it's not showing its lite only the two on the wall.

Mr. Keesee stated let's talk about that one then.

Mr. Ranson stated it seems to me that this sign this location is perfectly appropriate. On Main Street it doesn't seem like that sign would be appropriate. So I don't know if within

the district you can say a sign is appropriate here and not appropriate there. That is like a slippery slope.

Mr. Gillie stated subsection 4 says not recommended. It is not prohibited. We specifically used the word not recommended as opposed to prohibited. It is up to this Board to determine whether or not it is appropriate. We don't recommend it in general but if you feel that this is appropriate for this location then this Board has the authority to grant that.

Mr. Ranson stated in my opinion it is appropriate in that location but it may not be appropriate somewhere else.

Mr. Gillie stated then my only suggestion to alleviate that is when you make your motion or whoever makes the motion spell out the reason why you think it is appropriate in that location. We gave you the flexibility by saying not recommended not specifically prohibited. There are very few things we prohibit out right.

Mr. Lackey stated Mr. Powers as an expert at signs would you say that the same sign that you are going to put up is different than what you already have?

Mr. Powers stated no. You did mention internally illuminated channel letters was that part of the descriptions?

Mr. Gillie stated not recommended plastic signs components (e.g. backlit sign panels, plastic letters or prefabricated sandwich boards) are not recommended. Backlit awning and plywood are not recommended. Backlit plastic panel signs and digital signs are not recommended. No signs or parts may flash or move with the exception of restored historic signs that had these characteristics or new marquees with review and approval. Highly reflective metallic signs are also not recommended. Again that is section 7.2 subsection 4.

Mr. Powers stated so I didn't hear that that wasn't recommended.

Mr. Lackey stated he is describing it as a different sign.

Mr. Powers stated now the one that was there that is coming down would be not recommended because it's a plastic panel faced sign. But I didn't hear you say anything about individual channel letters.

Mr. Gillis stated just where it says plastic letters.

Mr. Powers stated well the face of the plastic would be in our definition just a plastic letter. This has a metal can with a plastic face. It is a combination of the two with LED on the inside. Now to be honest I don't know why they want it lit up, down in that neighborhood. But then again they are spending a lot of money and they are supposed

to do some more. No you wouldn't want to put a set of lighted channel letters in front of Georges building. That would be out of place. But on a building built in the seventy's that has been expanded and it basically a brick single story building other than the apartments across the street I don't think there is any detriment to doing this kind of stuff.

Mr. Keesee stated well I personally think the sign looks nice.

Mr. Davis stated for the size of the sign I think it works.

Mr. Keesee stated the size of it is a very professional sign. Where it sits I think it looks a whole lot better than the other signs in that area.

Mr. Ranson stated I guess another thing to consider is that if we don't approve it they will put another sign up that is worse back up.

Mr. Powers stated well what you were saying they couldn't put it back up?

Mr. Gillie stated not without approval from this Board.

Mrs. Chaney stated if they put it in the exact same spot?

Mr. Gillie stated if they put in the exact same spot no, but they can't put it in the same because of the addition.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson stated is it more appropriate to bring up questions like I was asking during this time rather than Public Hearing?

Mr. Gillie stated that's the Chairman's call but my opinion is that since we have an expert on signage here I don't mind you asking and allowing him to answer but that's up to the Chairman.

Mr. Keesee made a motion to approve as submitted. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-2 vote.

- 2. A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 318 Craghead St. to install window decal signage for "A La Carte." The applicant has proposed to install a 12.5 sq. ft. sign reading "A La Carte. Home Décor" on the window above the entrance that will be white and gold lettering on a black background. The applicant has also proposed 20 sq. ft. signs on each window beside the entrance.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Cooleen Richardson with A La Carte Home Décor. I have a correction to make. The 20 square feet is the space on both sides of the door the signage on the right is only 7.17 and on the left 7.09. So it's not twenty square feet of signage on both sides of the door. The sign above that says A La Carte Home Décor is 14.77. So the total square footage of all of that are 30.83.

Mrs. Chaney stated what the cover sheet says and what is on her application is different. The sheet that you just read has different dimensions than her actual application.

Ms. Levi stated I got the email from her with the exact dimensions on it after I had written the agenda and I changed the information in the packet. I just didn't get the agenda changed so what's in the definition in the packet is what's correct.

Mrs. Chaney stated if I'm reading this correctly the sign that we approved last time to go above the door you are not going to use that?

Mrs. Richardson stated I'm not going to do that. When I had the sign company take a look at it and try to configure it, it looked like Japanese when we wrote those words out because it is such a long narrow space. So aesthetically I just didn't think it was right for the building. So I had him redesign the signage to go on the windows. It will be applied to the exterior of the building because we had to put a tint on the interior. The sun and glare is so bad in that building in the morning. So we had to have a really light tint put on the inside of the windows so you could actually use the inside of the building in the morning. They would have had to cut holes in that tinting to apply the lettering on the inside instead of the exterior.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0-1 vote. (Mr. Lackey abstained from the voting due to a conflict of interest)

- 3. A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 310 Main St. to replace the existing side doors with black wooden doors with clear glass panels. New door handles and lucks will also be installed.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Ms. Corrie Teague with the Economic Development Division. At the prior meeting I forgot to include this in my request. We request that to change the front door to a wooden black door with a clear glass front panel. This is a request to do matching doors on the side that faces Memorial.

Mr. Davis stated so that's the new one?

Ms. Teague stated it would be black instead of brown. It is very similar to what is there now except taking the decorative glass out and putting clear glass in.

Mr. Ranson stated why are you doing it?

Ms. Teague stated the doors haven't been replaced in a number of years and the tenants are having issues with opening and shutting them. It's time for them to be replaced.

Mr. Lackey stated why aren't you replacing them with the same type?

Ms. Teague stated this is the one that the tenants preferred the clear glass versus the decorative glass.

Mr. Keesee stated what is this building near Corrie?

Mr. Lackey stated it's the Atrium building.

Ms. Teague stated these are the doors under the Old 97 mural.

Mr. Keesee stated the City owns that building.

Ms. Teague stated the IDA does.

Mr. Keesee stated close enough.

Mr. Davis stated but you said the doors are basically the same you are just replacing the type of glass that is in there.

Ms. Teague stated they will be new doors but they will still be wooden and they will be black. The glass won't be decorative it will be clear glass.

Mr. Gillie stated the inside glass will be different but the outside of the door is basically identical.

Mr. Keesee stated what's in the building now?

Ms. Teague stated the Lizzie Lou Boutique.

Mr. Keesee stated so the City is paying for this?

Ms. Teague stated yes sir exterior renovations or the IDA I should say.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve the request. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-1 vote.

- 4. A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 549 High St. To redevelop the building in to 23 loft-style apartments with 25 parking spaces. The redevelopment will require replacement windows, replacement roofing, handrails, and exterior stairs with corrugated metal awnings to be installed on the East elevation. An aluminum gate is also proposed to go in the entrance to the parking lot.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Ms. Corrie Teague with Economic Development. Ms. Teague stated I was asked to speak on behalf of the developers they were not able to attend today. They're will be a number of exterior renovations to this building. If you are familiar with the building it's on the Corner of Floyd and High Street. It in pretty rough condition. They will be replacing the roof with fiber glass and asphalt shingles. They will be replacing all the windows with aluminum windows which will be brown. All of the railings will be metal and will be painted black. The gate will be metal and installed to enter the parking lot. The doors will be replaced with either black or grey doors.

Mr. Davis stated is everyone familiar with this building which one it is?

Mr. Ranson stated it used to be Schewels or something.

Ms. Levi stated yeah and it's the same one that we told you about last month that had the variance case which was passed. It was approved by City Council to operate as an apartment building as a primary use that was on Tuesday.

Mr. Keesee stated this is the one with the parking space issue correct?

Ms. Levi stated yes and that was approved as well.

Mr. Lackey stated can you explain the aluminum gate?

Ms. Teague stated so if you were on High Street looking at the building they were two connecting buildings and one collapsed and the other is still remaining. They are able to reuse a portion of the wall that remains from the collapsed building and they are going to create an interior space for parking and a courtyard. So the gate as shown in the drawings will be the entrance off of High Street into that parking lot for tenants.

Mr. Lackey stated so it's not a chain linked fence?

Ms. Teague stated no, it's a very nice decorative gate. My understanding is that it will be automatic so if you are a tenant it will open up for you.

Ms. Levi stated its right here in your packet.

Mr. Ranson stated did you say this is going to be a tax credit project?

Ms. Teague stated it is yes sir.

Mr. Ranson stated so the window replacement would be entire replacement?

Ms. Teague stated in the drawings and what they submitted to the Parks Service and to DHR for the aluminum clad windows. They are still wanting on approval from DHR but the Park Service has already approved it.

Mr. Ranson stated I always liked those.

Mr. Davis stated but they are going to leave that piece of brick wall that is standing back there?

Ms. Teague stated yes.

Mr. Davis stated it looks like if you blew on it hard it would blow down.

Ms. Teague stated DHR is requiring them to maintain that wall.

Mr. Gillie stated Department of Historic Resources.

Mr. Keesee stated they are making them keep that wall?

Ms. Teague stated yes or they lose tax credits. It will be stabilized. If that makes you feel better.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Keesee made a motion to approve the request. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

5. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 506 Floyd St. to install a 6 ft. chain link security fence with barbed wire on top. The fence is proposed to have two 12 ft. swinging gates at the entrances on Upper St. and Poplar St.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was John Ranson for DCC. Mr. Ranson stated I brought this project to you last meeting because we were making some slight exterior

changes adding some ramps. We are moving into this building temporarily while the work is being done to our building. The owner is renovating the building to accommodate the precision machine program. The faculty expressed some concerns about the security of the area. As response to that the owner called me and wants to put up a fence around the property. A chain linked fence with barbed wire. So I called Renee and asked her about it. Actually, I think I submitted an application to her. She said chain linked fence and barbed wire specifically prohibited. I said well I guess that means we can't do it. Well you can try. Having said that I took a few pictures of the area. My job is to defend my position. So this an aerial photograph of the building. This is the building and you can see from the plan where the fence is going to be. So I took pictures of the building directly behind our building on Poplar. They have a fence which is a chain linked fence. The building at the corner of Memorial and Poplar which is the AAMCO Transmission Store has this fence which is a chain linked fence with barbwire. Now those of course were not seen by this Commission because this fence has been there for a long time.

Mr. Keesee stated is this fence going to be just around the parking lot where people are parking? Is that what they are concerned about security?

Mr. Ranson stated DCC is going to provide security guards when they have night classes. So I think the gates will be closed after the school is closed. They will also provide additional security for the premises when they are not there. It's going to be some high dollar machinery and stuff in the building. This is the district right here and here is our building. So we are sort of in the tail end of the district. But we are in the district.

Mr. Keesee stated do you have a barbwire fence around somewhere for people to park at DCC now? I don't think so.

Mr. Ranson stated I believe we do.

Mr. Ferrell stated at DCC.

Mr. Keesee stated you do at DCC?

Mr. Ranson stated I believe so at the maintenance building. I'm not sure if there is barbwire on top. It is a fairly tall chain link fence.

Mr. Keesee stated I guess my point is at DCC that doesn't back up to a great neighborhood either as far as safety goes.

Mr. Ranson stated well we do have a parking lot at our maintenance shop where we park our state vehicles and other things it's a chain linked fence around it.

Mr. Keesee stated but that's for the vehicles.

Mr. Ferrell stated that's for state vehicles.

Mr. Ranson stated it's a little bit of a remote part of campus as well.

Mr. Ferrell stated I'm in agreement with Peyton here. Is this for securing the parking lot or the building? You said parking lot but they were going to have someone in the parking lot.

Mr. Ranson stated I guess it's really to secure the building. I will just tell you that we didn't ask them to put the fence up. We are paying a fixed amount of rent and the owner is making the improvements. So he just called me up one day and said we would like to put a fence up. I said okay we didn't ask for that. But we felt like in that situation it might be a good idea.

Mr. Ferrell stated being someone that works in those communities I think DCC and the owner, if this was really a concern of theirs, they should have questioned before they decided to go through with the program.

Mrs. Chaney stated but you are saying that the program is only going to be there temporarily?

Mr. Ranson stated it should be there no more than a year and half to two years. You know I think the owner was looking forward to the time that we would occupy the building.

Mr. Davis stated so basically they are using you as an excuse to try and get a fence put up.

Mr. Ranson stated well I can't say that. They are addressing a concern that we had. So I can't say that.

Mr. Ferrell stated is this prohibited?

Mrs. Chaney stated this is not recommended at all.

Mr. Ferrell stated right here it is not recommended. It just takes away from the integrity of the Downtown.

Mr. Keesee stated that example you showed us John with the transmission place. Obviously, if you took your car down there they are going to work on it inside and then it's sitting out there and anything could happen. I think it's probably there responsibility where as your situation kids come over there at night or whatever don't the windows have bars on it as well?

Mr. Ranson stated they do yeah.

Mr. Keesee stated you understand what I'm saying.

Mr. Ranson stated Mr. Ferrell about your comment. Trying to find a place with 3500 square feet in Danville where you can put something like this is not too easy. We didn't have a whole lot of choices. Particularly, with an owner that would develop the property to suit our needs.

Mr. Ferrell stated I mean I get heart burn every time I ride by that transmission place also.

Mr. Ranson stated I completely understand if you don't want us to do that.

Mr. Davis stated John if it wouldn't put you on the spot I would almost ask you how you would feel about this if you were sitting there not presenting it to us.

Mr. Whitfield stated but he can't answer that question.

Mr. Davis stated but that's why I phased it that way because I knew Mr. Whitfield would not look lightly upon it.

Mr. Ranson stated I have no idea. It is a tough situation.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Chaney made a motion to deny the request. Mr. Ferrell seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0-2 vote. (Mr. Ranson and Mr. Lackey abstained from the voting)

6. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install an outdoor charging station at Main St Plaza. The charging station will allow people to charge their electronic devices outdoors and are ADA compliant.*

The vote to add this item to the agenda was approved.

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Brian Dunevant, Public Works Engineering. We were approached by Womack Electric. They want to donate these charging stations. It would be black about 46 inches tall. They would like it placed in the plaza area so most likely it would be placed between two of the benches down there. They're hope is that other businesses in the River District will step up and donate their own charging station and we will continue to add these to the plaza area. They also want to get there name placed on this somehow. We have had an internal discuss on how we should allow that.

We basically said we would put something like dedicated by Womack Electric or something to that affect not a logo.

Mr. Keesee stated the little sign that you are talking about the dedicated to would that be very small?

Mr. Dunevant stated I really don't know the answer it could be very small. It would be whatever we told them it could be.

Mr. Keesee stated it is nice of them to do that. But I don't think we would want something that looks out of place down there.

Mr. Lackey stated could it be a sign that has a big roof???

Mr. Gillie stated if you grant them something today and say it can't be bigger than so many inches by so many inches. Than no they wouldn't have to come back.

Mr. Lackey stated we are not being asked to do that we are being asked to approve the charging station.

Mr. Gillie stated correct internally we haven't decided about the plaque they want a label on it and we thought donated by so and so. We hadn't decided how small or how large the plague should be. If you guys say no bigger than this then we can go back and tell them.

Mr. Dunevant stated actually it wouldn't be a plague it would be screen printed on it.

Mr. Gillie stated we can tell them don't make it bigger than this. You can do that.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ferrell stated so can we make a recommendation on where you place it and the size of the sign? I'm thinking about Downtown and how we have signs all over the place. Would it be best to have it at the bottom maybe covering the two lines.

Mr. Gillie stated you can make any recommendation that you feel is appropriate as a Commission.

Mr. Davis stated would it be seen at the bottom?

Mr. Lackey I think that's the point.

Mr. Ferrell stated I guess if you look down. I look at charging stations.

Mr. Gillie stated there are multiple benches down on the Main Street plaza. You have the fountain. Then you have a set of benches we would probably split the difference on

one or the other. You know if you have a preference otherwise we were going to decide where the easiest is for us to get power. It's probably going to be the bench on the far south eastern corner.

Mr. Keesee stated it will be beside a bench?

Mr. Gillie stated correct. So if you are sitting on the bench you would have access to the charging station.

Mr. Keesee stated the new public restrooms do they not have a plug in there outside that someone could use?

Mr. Gillie stated there are some outside plugs. There are also some outside plugs on the area bench.

Mrs. Chaney stated but they are just standard electrical outlets. This will have USB ports in it as well.

Mr. Gillie stated so if you have got your phone cord with you then you can just plug the phone cord part into it.

Mr. Lackey stated they are all over the airports now.

Mr. Keesee stated if they wouldn't put it somewhere where it would look gaudy.

Mr. Ferrell stated I think it will look nice.

Mr. Keesee stated it's got to be somewhere where it will look nice.

Mr. Ferrell stated down at the fountain what is happening is it's more of a millennial trend you plug in and work.

Mr. Lackey stated and we are going to enable that awful trend.

Mr. Gillie stated I presented this idea to my 17 year old son and he went ballistic. He thought it was a great idea and I was like oh okay.

Mr. Ferrell stated with downtown becoming a place for young professionals it really looks good.

Mr. Gillie stated if this Board approves this and we install it we expect that there may be additional ones placed in other areas. We will be bringing those back. We may even have to bring a plan of we want them here and here. This was kind of the first test case to see how it worked.

Mr. Ranson stated I'm a little surprised that the benches are that close. I thought they were several feet apart.

Mrs. Chaney stated if I understand correctly this is going to have a light on it as well.

Mr. Gillie stated yes.

Mrs. Chaney stated this is going to encourage people to come down at nighttime as well.

Mr. Lackey stated do they have an emergency box like they do in colleges.

Mr. Gillie no this one will not have it, that is an option to do. But we are not installing that at this time on this one. Correct?

Mr. Dunevant stated correct.

Mr. Lackey stated this is getting out of our responsibility but doesn't it make sense to install the emergency call box that you see on all college campuses for safety purposes.

Mr. Gillie stated in order to do that you have to have a safety plan. You need multiple locations for those boxes to have a single and that is part of the internal discussion as he said to maybe be branching out into some additional things. But at this point we are not ready for that and we don't think that one should be installed.

Mr. Lackey stated could it be retrofitted?

Mr. Gillie stated yes.

Mr. Lackey stated would staff consider its placement based on that potential retrofit because those boxes are not the most attractive.

Mr. Keesee stated so are yall going to make a recommendation on where to put them?

Mr. Gillie stated yes if you approve them we are looking at between the benches along the plaza. We just are not sure exactly which bench yet.

Mr. Keesee stated so will you all come back to us and tell us where you are going to out them or how does that work.

Mr. Gillie stated if you all give us the ability to place it along the plaza. The internally staff can handle it themselves. If you want to know the exactly location between which bench; then right now I would say it would be the southeastern bench adjacent to the fountain. We are looking at possibly moving it to the other end if you just give us that flexibility we would like that.

Mr. Lackey made a motion to approve the Certificate of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the charging station which will be placed by staff with the size being no larger than 3 in by 8 inches placed on the bottom half. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The May 12, 2016 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Davis there is one other order of business concerning this Coca-Cola sign.

Ms. Levi stated I passed out a photo for you. We have been approached by someone that wants to repaint this historical Coca-Cola sign. They have got grant funding through Coca-Cola to repaint this sign. It is hard to see. But right here is the Coca-Cola script.

Mrs. Chaney stated and the woman drinking.

Ms. Levi stated yes and the woman drinking. She is over here on this side.

Mrs. Chaney stated is this on Floyd Street?

Ms. Levi stated yes right by the Five Forks area. It appears to me to be the red background that the Coca-Cola signs usually are with the white script on top. I would leave it to their experts to figure out exactly what they want the repaint to look like. That's what we have got.

Mr. Gillie stated they believe it matches a 1930's Coke Cola logo based on their findings.

Mr. Ranson stated it seems like a few years ago there was a controversy about this.

Mr. Gillie stated we changed the zoning regulations to allow it as long as they met certain guidelines. It had to be a sign over 50 years and some other things. This sign meets all of those requirements and that is why we have been working with Coca-Cola and the property owner to make sure he ticked off all the boxes as he went through. As you know me being color blind I can't see the sign that's why she is doing all the talking. I don't know that it is there.

Mr. Ranson stated thank you for speaking up. I think it is rather cool to do stuff like this. I couldn't remember what the resolution of the conversation was.

Mr. Whitfield stated we have the authority to do it.

Mr. Davis stated do I still need to take a vote that we add this to the agenda.

Mr. Gillie stated actually it doesn't require their action because it is a reface of an existing sign. We brought it more for your attention in case you see them working on this sign in the area. It falls within the River District this was more of just and information that this is going to happen. It does meet all of the Zoning requirements for replace of an existing sign.

Mr. Ferrell stated are they working with the River District Association and the murals that they have to replace within the district?

Mr. Gillie stated no because this was found a historic sign and the way the Zoning Code reads as long as they meet certain criteria they are allowed to replace it.

Mr. Davis stated it looks like a chained linked fence is around it?

Ms. Levi stated that is correct.

Mr. Gillie stated this is more for an FYI we wanted to let you know in case they started working on this. So that you weren't surprised by all of sudden there is this sign that wasn't in the district why didn't we approve it. One, is to let you know it's there its historic we have went with Coke and everybody else to do all of the stuff that they are supposed to. Two, it's there and yeah it's going to happen and Coca-Cola is really sponsoring the replacement of the sign.

Mr. Keesee stated who owns that lot there?

Mr. Gillie stated I don't know who owns it. It's not the guy who owns the building that's a separate lot.

Mr. Keesee stated I believe in the City of Danville you can't let your grass get so high or they will come out.

Mr. Gillie stated 18 inches and we can go out and measure it and see.

Mr. Lackey stated it's this sign not this sign right?

Mr. Gillie stated correct.

Mr. Davis stated we thank you for informing us.

Mr. Ranson stated yeah I appreciate it too. Like I said I knew there was some controversy I'm glad to know that has been resolved.

Mr. Gillie stated the red one on Main Street that I couldn't see.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

Approved By: