Draft

MINUTES

SIGN CODE BOARD OF APPEALS February 21, 2007

The Sign Code Board of Appeals met on Wednesday, February 21, 2007, with the following members present: Peter Neumann, Chairman; Lesley Rutter; Jim Jackson, and Kyle Mattison. Staff present: Brenda Vespested and Brad Solon, Development Service Center; and Joel Landeen, City Attorney's Office.

Neumann called the meeting to order.

Appeal No. 2007-1

VIP Properties, 909 Saint Joseph Street #3, Rapid City, SD 57701, appeals the decision of the Historic Sign Review Committee that the proposed electronic sign to be located at 909 Saint Joseph Street, legally described as Unit 3 & 4.987% Common Area, Turnac Tower Condominium, Sec 2, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; does not meet the criteria set forth in the Historic Sign Review guidelines for materials and illumination.

Solon gave the video presentation. Tony Marshall turned in the green cards. Tony Marshall was present to speak on the appeal. Marshall said that the only thing he had different for this meeting was a bill of sale of Daktronics. Marshall said that Bryan Gonzales told him that the original sign that was at this intersection is at Rosenbaums's sign graveyard. Jackson said that it was an incandescent lighted sign. Marshall said that it was a lighted electronic sign. Jackson said that incandescent and LED are totally different types of signs. Jackson told Marshall he is in favor having an electronic sign this corner that meets the criteria of the time. Jackson also said that he has done extensive research about the signs from the time and could not come up with a sign of the type proposed. Jackson motioned for discussion, with a second by Mattison. Jackson said that the proposed location of the sign is in the environs and just halfway down the parking lot is out of the environs and would be a very good area for the sign. Jackson said that there are areas on the site that are not in the historic environs that would be a good visible spot for the sign. Mattison and Neumann agreed that this location would not be correct for this sign. Marshall said that moving the sign 50' further would overshadow the West Boulevard Historic Sign. Landeen said that the Historic Sign Review Committee is looking at changing the criteria so they can look at the façade of the building and not just when the building was built. But for now, they have to review the criteria that is currently in the code, according to Landeen. Mattison asked about the size of the sign. Marshall said that it would be 8'x10' and smaller than the one the Radisson has. Jackson moved to deny the request, upholding the decision of the Historic Sign Review Committee; with a second by Mattison. Appeal No. 2007-1 was denied, upholding the decision of the Historic Sign Review Committee; by a vote of 4-0.

Appeal No. 2007-2

Pride Neon Inc., 3010 W 10th Street, Sioux Falls, SD 57104, applies for a variance on the maximum height requirement for an on premise sign located at 620 Howard Street, legally described as Lot 1 & Vacated Street & Lots 2-3 of Block 4 & Lots 1-12 Less Right-of-Way, Block 4, Pine View Subdivision, Sec 25, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota.

Solon gave the video presentation. Donna Gratzfeld turned in the green cards. Gratzfeld, general manager of Americas Best Value Inn. Gratzfeld said that they want to put up an electronic message board just below the existing sign. Solon said that the existing sign has a

Sign Code Board of Appeals February 21, 2007 Page 2



variance; but the sign ordinance says that in order to alter a sign, it must come into compliance. Jackson moved to approve the 54 foot sign height with the addition of an electronic reader board under the existing sign cabinet, with a second by Mattison. Appeal No. 2007-2 was approved for the 54 foot sign height with the addition of an electronic reader board (19'3" X 5') under the existing sign cabinet by a vote of 4-0.

Jackson moved to approve the minutes of July 19, 2006, with a second by Mattison. Motion carried 4-0.

There being no further appeals to come before the board at this time, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 a.m.