

**Minutes of the
Planning & Zoning Commission Special Workshop
City of Parkville, Missouri
Tuesday September 13, 2016 @ 5:30
p.m.
City Hall Boardroom**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Katerndahl called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners present

Dean Katerndahl, Chairman
Keith Cary, Vice Chairman
John Delich
Walt Lane
Barbara Wassmer
Doug Krtek
Shane Smeed

Staff Present

Stephen Lachky/ Community Development Director
Shakedra Knight/ Community Development Department Assistant

Brian Bode – Park University

- Community Development Director Stephen Lachky announced Chris Brewster with Gould Evans would not make the meeting.
- Chairman Katerndahl opened discussion for Park University's proposed entrance monument sign replacement and review of the City's current Zoning Code regulations of Electronic Message Center (EMC) signs.
- Lachky Introduced Brian Bode with Park University.

Note: This workshop was made open to the public and all interested parties were welcome to attend. All items were for discussion only. The Planning & Zoning Commission did not take any action on any workshop agenda item.

2. WORKING SESSION

A. Park University proposed (replacement) entrance monument sign and review of the City's current Zoning Code regulations of Electronic Message Center (EMC) signs

Brian Bode – Interim Chief Financial Officer with Park University stated the University's old reader board sign stopped working, the current sign has a temporary sign over the reader board, and that the school is asking for approval to have the sign changed to an Electronic Message Center (EMC).

Lachky gave the background of the current Ordinance regarding Electronic Message Center use. He referenced Ordinance 2530 which permits EMC signage but restricts the location to gas or fuel stations that are within 1,000 feet of interstate highway right-of-way. He provided a definition of EMC, a sign that is capable of displaying words, symbols, figures, or images that change electronically by remote or automatic means, and visual examples.

Lachky first addressed the common concern of traffic with EMC use. He referenced the Texas A&M Traffic Safety study which was a statistical analysis of the relationship between on-site premise digital signage and traffic safety. Monitored two years before and two years after sign installation, findings revealed no statistically-significant relationship. Another study by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) measured possible effects of digital billboards on driver attention, distraction, and safety. The study found that drivers devoted 75-85% of visual attention to roadway and the average fixation of duration to digital billboards was less than one second.

Next, Lachky addressed Regulatory Issues. Message hold time is the time interval a frame must be displayed. The current hold time is a 10 minute minimum in Parkville. Lachky explained that at the time the Ordinance was created this made sense since it was primarily gas prices. He provided time interval regulations of other municipalities to show the broad range from six (6) seconds to 24 hours.

Brightness in EMC use was the next issue Lachky presented. He gave an overview and provided terminology definitions. Luminance is the amount of light emitted from a lit object and is measured in nits. Parkville's current EMC brightness regulations are 5,000 maximum nits. The International Sign Association reported there is no scientific basis for the 5,000 nit restriction and does not recommend it. Lachky illustrated examples via PowerPoint images. He stated Parkville copied Gladstone's 2010 brightness standard of 5,000 nits and that one community is up to 7,000. Daytime illumination was also addressed with an example of why standards are not needed.

Lachky explained transition methods and stated Parkville had Level One (1), static message with instantaneous change. He also explained sign face footage limitation regulations and that some communities have none. He pointed out that typically EMC sq. footage is restricted to 50-75% of sign face for residential neighborhoods and less intense districts.

Chairman Katerndahl asked what our current regulation was. Lachky stated footage limitations were not addressed in current regulation.

Director Lachky referenced U.S. Supreme Court Case Reed v. Town of Gilbert to show the importance of content neutrality with sign regulations. Zoning considerations to adopt reasonable offsets and avoid borrowing EMC regulations (because they could be outdated) were concerns pointed out. Economic considerations were highlighted to show the positive impact on the community, primarily in commercial districts. Lachky added that Park University would announce events in addition to promoting the University and then opened up discussion.

Chairman Katerndahl asked how the health department sign was approved. Lachky stated the health department functioned as a reader board. The monument sign at the

entrance to the Parkville Athletic Complex (PAC) was the closest example to an EMC sign, but he stated he needed to research how it was approved. He also stated that a text amendment had to be done prior to any area in the City having an EMC.

Chairman Katerndahl stated his biggest concern was animated signs looking junkie on 45 Hwy. Director Lachky stated animated signs were prohibited.

Commissioner Delich asked was a permit required for an EMC. Lachky stated it was with the ability to add conditions. Also, standards not followed would be issued a violation.

Commissioner Delich then asked what the maximum size was. Lachky explained it would be comparable to a monument sign, 100 sq. ft. or so, comparable to the current Park University sign.

Vice Chairman Cary asked what the current size was. Brian Bode stated 10x6 ft.

Chairman Katerndahl asked if the sign on the other side of the University was affected. Lachky stated it was not.

Brian Bode stated the new sign would be used to promote enrollment periods, school games and international concerts and it would not look like a billboard.

Commissioner Lane commented that he researched other Universities, University of Kansas and University of Missouri, and they are using the stately look more of a monument. He added he did not want the new Park University sign to get cheapened.

Commissioner Delich commented the other entrance sign looked stately and he hoped to maintain that look. He also commented the neon sign is gone and the new technology is LED. Brian Bode commented in response that the University is trying to use new technology and added the West entrance sign is not a favorite of University staff.

Vice Chairman Cary asked how soon the sign would be replaced. Bode responded that staff would like it done as soon as possible. Cary then asked what steps were needed. Lachky responded a public hearing would be held with the Commission and then it would go to the Board of Aldermen for adoption. Vice Chairman Cary asked Mr. Bode if they could have the required proposal by October. Mr. Bode replied they could.

Director Lachky stated current Code required administrative approval according to the Master Plan and a new sign required a new Public Hearing.

Chairman Katerndahl asked Lachky if he needed input from the Commission. Lachky stated he did.

Commissioner Delich commented that the original University entrance sign looked fine and he had no problem with LED copy within the framing. He added he was bothered by the example but had no objection to copy in the frame. Bode asked if Delich thought the sign should be taller with stone around the edge. Bode added the University could compromise with masonry around the top and the sign would definitely be taller than the current sign.

Commissioner Smeed asked Lachky to pull up the Centennial, Colorado monument sign image. Lachky showed the picture and then played a video of the Centennial, Colorado case study.

Chairman Katerndahl asked about current size and time requirements. Bode responded he could not speak for the school but he believed 10 minutes was long.

Commissioner Delich stated his concern for information versus advertising. He added that time would make a difference. Commissioner Wassmer commented she liked to know what was going on and that fast timing was not good.

Bode stated the EMC would post City events and provided the Fourth of July as an example. He stated the sign could inform the community of parking for events and added the sign would be informational for students and the community.

Commissioner Lane commented the sign did not need to be flashy and its purpose is to provide information not marketing.

Commissioner Delich commented that weekly events could be on one panel with the digital format.

Commissioner Lane stated that aesthetics mattered.

Commissioner Delich stated the sign could not diminish entrance to Parkville. He questioned signage ordinance. Lachky stated he could have Chris Brewster address that. Chairman Katerndahl asked if he could have information from Brewster to review and provide feedback to Lachky within the week.

Vice Chair Cary asked if Park University could establish a sign that did not open the door for advertising for the entire community. Delich asked if it could be controlled by ordinance.

Chairman Katerndahl stated daytime standards did not matter. He asked Lachky if he had any questions. Lachky asked if the Commission would consider lower time duration than 10 minutes. Katerndahl stated time duration needed to be considered because it could affect later EMCs.

Commissioner Delich asked about the current ordinance. Lachky referred him to the copy provided in the packet.

Lachky stated he would do more research on brightness.

Commissioner Delich asked what the proposed ordinance terminology was. Lachky stated he would draft it after he received feedback from the Commission. Delich asked what Kansas City's was. Lachky stated the Cities he researched either covered commercial districts only or they had no restrictions. He added EMCs were permitted for church and school in North Kansas City.

Chairman Katerndahl commented he believed the Commons would want an EMC if Park University is approved. He added he was okay with the decreased duration.

Commissioner Lane asked about distance.

Chairman Katerndahl commented to allow the text amendment for the Park University EMC.

Lachky stated the Commission should keep in mind costs associated with public hearing regarding changes with signs.

Commissioner Delich asked the cost for electronic componentry. Bode stated the cost was \$48,000.

Lachky stated he could present three options to the Commission with different levels of restriction: Loose, medium, and very restrictive.

Commissioner Delich stated the maximum size needed addressing, vertical versus horizontal.

Vice Chairman Cary stated the sign should be addressed in two aspects, the physical sign and the display.


Chairman Katerndahl stated in the long run EMCs could be restricted to districts. He added the Commission needed to get comments to Lachky. Lachky stated communication online with the Commission was not a good idea.

Chairman Katerndahl asked if there were any other questions. Seeing none, he stated the intent was to adopt the amendment next month, and adjourned the meeting.

3. ADJOURN

The Special Workshop was adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

Submitted by:



Stephen Lachky, AICP
Community Development Director

9-13-16
Date



Shakedra Knight
Community Development Department Assistant

9-13-16
Date