PLANNING BOARD MEETING

REGULAR MEETING PUBLIC MEETING

April 14, 2021

City Hall & via GoTo Meeting

**Members Attending:** Sandy Conlee, Al Bloomer, Paulette Richter, Susan Foisy, Jeff DiBenedetto, David Westwood, Warene Wall

**Members Absent:**

**Staff:** James Caniglia, Courtney Long

**Public**: 3

**Meeting Called to Order at 5:31 PM.**

**Roll Call:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Foisy | Present | DiBenedetto | Present |
| Bloomer | Present | Richter | Present |
| Wall | Present | President | Present |
| Westwood | Present |  |  |

**Motion to Approve Minutes:**

Motion to approve minutes. -Bloomer, Foisy 2nds. Board asks that minutes include Staff Reports or Conditions of Approval for ease of reference.

Roll Call Vote:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Foisy | Yes | DiBenedetto | Yes |
| Bloomer | Yes | Richter | Yes |
| Wall | Yes | President | Yes |
| Westwood | Yes |  |  |

*Motion passes.*

**1.**

* 1. **New Business: Public Hearing for a Design Review 21-03 for a neon sign in the Central Business (C-4) Zoning District**

Caniglia: *presents overview of design*

Conlee- *qualifies the board*

-The item has been duly noticed.

-The item has been posted at City Hall, the Post Office, and email notice was sent to members of the City of Red Lodge Google Group.

-No member of the Planning Board has a conflict of interest.

-No ex parte communication.

Conlee- May we have the staff report on behalf of the City?

Caniglia- *presents staff report*

Conlee- May we have the report from the applicant?

Jeff Schmidt- *presents applicant report. Notes that Grizzly Peak does not own the building. They are in a 5-year lease with first right of refusal to buy.*

Conlee- Are there any questions from the Board? I did notice that awning seems to be at an angle.

Schmidt- It will be braced.

Conlee- And “Flash’s” sign can’t be lowered because of the guylines?

Schmidt- Correct.

*Board members comment on applicant’s permit and that it is a straightforward design.*

**Public Hearing Opens**

-No public comment

Written comments for Historical Society read by James (attached).

**Public Hearing Closes**

DiBenedetto- I’d like to ask what was the rationale for keeping “Flash’s” on the building?

Schmidt- We wanted to maintain the identity of the building as the Flash’s building.

DiBenedetto- And what is the reasoning for keeping it neon?

Schmidt- The sign is iconic and that’s why we are going this route.

DiBenedetto- In regards to the canopy, the signage covers about 75% of the architectural element. Can it be placed more on top than on the face?

Bloomer-Would that then cover the windows?

DiBenedetto- Yes, but the current sign is situated on top.

Schmidt- I think the higher up we go the less people will see them. They don’t know where we are now. I see what you mean, Jeff but I think you can still see enough of the brick.

DiBenedetto- Do we need the signs on the south and north end of the canopy?

Schmidt- From business operations we need those for people to see us.

*Discussion over endcap signage and visibility of the store. Schmidt notes that none of it is permanent and can be moved later. Their goal was to maintain the current square footage and identity of Flash’s.*

**Motion to Approve:**

Bloomer motions to adopt Staff Report DR 2021-03 as a finding of fact. Wall seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Foisy | Yes | DiBenedetto | No |
| Bloomer | Yes | Richter | Yes |
| Wall | Yes | President | Yes |
| Westwood | Yes |  |  |

DiBenedetto- I didn’t feel the staff report covered enough of the percentage of signage on the canopy.

*Motion Passes.*

**Motion to Approve:**

Bloomer: I move to approve the Design Review Permit RLDR 21-03 to allow for a Neon Sign

located at 21 Broadway Avenue South. Foisy seconds.

Westwood- For the two side signs, could there be consideration to do in old style?

Schmidt- We could but that would be more neon.

Caniglia- Neon signs need to have an interesting shape and those signs are oval shape.

*Discussion over clarification of neon signs and interesting shapes.*

Bloomer- (to James) Does the Design Review include all five signs?

Caniglia- Yes, is does.

Bloomer- I motion amend previous motion to include all five signs. Wall seconds.

DiBenedetto- Can we make the main sign transparent, then background will be visible.

Tony Thelen (Epcon Sign Group)- No background gets away from the antique look we are going for. This current design covers a lot of damage from previous sign. Ultimately, what do you want in your downtown? Antique looking signs.

Roll Call Vote:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Foisy | Yes | DiBenedetto | No |
| Bloomer | Yes | Richter | Yes |
| Wall | Yes | President | Yes |
| Westwood | Yes |  |  |

Motions passes 6-1.

*Board compliments applicants on the design of the new sign.*

* 1. **New Business: Zoning Regulation Updates- 4.3.170 Overlay Zoning Districts**
* Board and staff discuss 4.3.175 with Steve Schmidt from the Airport Board. Improvements to graphics are identified. Schmidt discusses the airport’s intention of a Master Plan and survey done by the FAA.
* DiBenedetto suggests changing Zoning in this area from C-3-N to C-3-W to highlight unique location and limitations. Board agrees with this idea.

2. No staff communications or written correspondence.

3. No other business.

**Meeting Adjourned at 7:56 pm**

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

James Caniglia Sandy Conlee, President

Deb Hronek

Carbon County Historic Preservation Officer

April 12, 2021

To: James Caniglia

 Red Lodge Planning Board members

RE: Design Review for neon sign in CBD (C-4) Zoning District

Grizzly Peak Outdoors

21 S. Broadway Ave.

Red Lodge, MT 59068

In my role as Historic Preservation Officer for Carbon County I have been asked to review and comment on the proposed signage change to 21 S. Broadway, Red Lodge, MT 59068.

The proposed signage is well placed. The raised “Flash’s” sign will obstruct a portion of the decorative façade, but will celebrate the history of the building. The neon ads to the historic feeling of the sign. This sign, although not historic, does embody a historic-style sign and will not detract from the streetscape.

The color palate for this proposed sign is historically appropriate. It is always preferable, when hardware to hang signage is re-used, to avoid drilling new holes and potentially damaging the façade of the historic building, as is shown in the rendering.

After review, it is my opinion that the proposed sign design is proper for signage in the Red Lodge Historic Business District.

Deb Hronek

**Staff Recommendation / Suggested form of motion:**

A. I move to adopt Staff Report DR 2021-03 as finding of fact.

B. I move to approve the Design Review Permit RLDR 21-03 to allow for a Neon Sign located at 21 Broadway Avenue South:

1. That the use, operation and development of the property be in accordance with the plans, specifications and documents submitted for review except as modified by these conditions.
2. The sign shall be 13’2” wide and 3’6” tall.
3. The letters and mountain outline shall be red neon, not the whole sign, and no other lighting or illumination will be used, as is specified in the application.
4. The design dimensions shall be as outlined in application.
5. That the developer shall obtain a building permit from the City of Red Lodge and comply with any/all requirements discussed in the application.