

To: The Planning Board

July 20, 2017

Re: Proposed revisions to the County Sign Control Ordinance

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the proposed revisions to the County Sign Control Ordinance.

And let me start by saying that I love the relatively new street signs coming into Brevard, directing visitors to our county's venues. Delightful style, coloring, and purpose, which so contribute to the county's character. Nothing would please me more than to have all commercial signs take a page out of the book of Brevard's city signage.

And I am delighted that there can't be any off-premise sign visible from any portion of a Scenic Corridor – that is so appropriate for a county whose nature, environment and beauty attract residents and tourists alike.

My questions and suggestions are regarding:

1. TC Scenic Corridor:

- The definition at 1.19 focuses on mountain views. I invite the Board to consider not just views, but the experience of being in the mountains, as one has when driving up 276 toward the Parkway. An enhanced definition might read here, and in the Scenic Corridor Designation Ordinance: Transylvania County Scenic Corridor - Roadways designated by the Transylvania County Scenic Corridor Ordinance that are particularly beautiful and offer the most outstanding *views and experience* of the natural grandeur of our *environment, which may include mountains, waterfalls, streams, creeks, and forest*, as seen by the public while traveling on the roads and highways in Transylvania County.
- The restrictions for signage on TC Scenic Corridors apply to off-premise signs [4.5, 4.1]. Given those surveyed for the comprehensive plan like most our small town rural atmosphere and scenic beauty, would the Board consider applying further size, material, and height restrictions to on-premises signs on Scenic Corridors?

2. Safety. I am glad to see restrictions on **Signs creating unsafe distractions to motorists** in 4.2.

I wonder if the Board would be willing to list flashing or blinking lights and moving parts which simulate movement as examples of, and not the definition of, what is unsafe. I would love to see as additional examples, such as upside down lettering, *or politically challenging*.

3. County character. I share with you a photo study of delightful signage along 276 S. Given the appreciation for our small town rural atmosphere and scenic beauty, and desire to preserve safety, please consider

- **Off-premise signs (Sec 5)**
 - Reducing maximum height to 15 feet tall and size from 150sf to 100 sf per sign
 - Or restricting cumulative signage per establishment per road to 150 sf, or 20 feet wide
 - And setting distance between signs per establishment to 2000 feet from any other off-premise sign.
- **ON-premise sign regulation (attached and freestanding) (Sec 6)**
 - Reducing maximum height from 25 feet tall to 12-15 feet tall
 - Retain proximity of sign to edge of traveled way at 20 feet for roads < 4 lane roads (6.4)
 - Restricting signs/establishment to only 1 freestanding and 1 attached (6.5):
 - per road; visible by a scenic corridor

4. Materials: I don't see any limitation of, or specification of, materials, and wonder if the Board would be willing to consider requiring natural or natural-looking materials, for off-premises,

5. Lighting. It's a shame when our natural night skies are polluted by light traveling upward. Please consider limiting sign illumination to downward pointing light or muted ground-lighting. And please consider environmentally sensitive LED or solar lighting.

6. Implementation. For those establishments that already have signs that won't conform to revisions in the ordinance, consider establishing a remaining life for those signs, rather than grandfathering the establishment throughout the organization's life.

Thank you for considering these suggestions. I have listed minor ones on page 2.

Respectively,

Jan Nickerson and John Graham

884-3514 | JanNickerson@citcom.net | JMGraham@comporium.net

Relatively minor questions/suggestions

7. A **Sight Distance Triangle is defined as** 35 feet visibility in each direction. I am not an expert in this by any means, but find myself wondering if that distance is sufficient at all speeds? Or should the number of feet ramp up beyond a base speed limit? 1.14
 - Is **Sight Distance Triangle** this the same thing as **Sight Visibility Triangle**? Page 6 5.4 and 6.4 and 7.4
8. **Temporary Portable sign:**
 - Definition at 1.18 is limited to specified materials which don't list wood or metal. I would think that wood or metal could provide a structure for a temporary sign. Please consider including wood and metal as materials which might be used in temporary signs.
 - Why increase the max from 14 to 45 days? Sec 7.
9. **Flags:** Should there be any **restrictions on flags** or insignia or signs on motor vehicles [Sec 3 page 4]. If there are certain flags which would be inappropriate to hang publicly, can the county limit their being flown outside the establishment?
10. **Sign Maintenance** Article VII reads: *No sign or sign structure shall be allowed to stand if a business no longer exists.* As a business could exist and have moved and the sign should come down, suggest inserting: **or the property has been vacated for more than 15 days**, resulting in: *No sign or sign structure shall be allowed to stand if a business no longer exists or the property has been vacated for more than 15 days*
11. **Permit revocation:** consider adding: *or failure to conform to this ordinance*
12. **Non-conforming signs:** consider removing: damaged/destroyed signs can be re-established without meeting distance between signs or size limitations. 16.3

Source: <http://planning.transylvaniacounty.org/new-page-5/>

Source: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56674090a128e67d423d2ee9/t/595fda02a5790ab79e3d3871/1499453954598/170626+Draft+Sign+Control+Ordinance.pdf>