

**MINUTES OF THE 20 JULY 2007
SPECIALLY SCHEDULED
TRINIDAD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
(CONTINUED FROM 18 JULY 2007)**

I. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Johnson, Rowe, and Lake were present. Kenny was absent. Chairman Morgan arrived after Lake called the meeting to order at 3:25 PM. Council Liaison Bhardwaj was in attendance. Parker and Martin represented staff in attendance.

II. AGENDA ITEMS

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION / ACTION / PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. Chevron 2007-01: Design Review and Coastal Development Permit to repaint building, install new sign faces, new canopy fascias, one with backlighting, install new pump valences, remove existing 'flag' price sign and install a new 'monument' price sign in a different location. In addition, review of several existing signs placed without approval will occur. Trinidad Chevron station (at the corner of Patrick's Point Dr. and Main St.); APN: 042-051-30. **Continued from the March, April, May, June, and July 18 meetings.**

The Commissioners discussed their options for proceeding with a decision at this point: either deny the whole project without prejudice, allowing the applicant to return with an alternative proposal, or make individual motions on each of the project elements. The Commissioners reviewed a memorandum that Parker had drafted, presenting language that might be included in the motions. Morgan said he would prefer to make a motion stating the Commission's desired changes to the project, since denying the whole thing and letting the applicant re-apply would start the long process over again.

Morgan suggested wording the motion so that the applicant would be required to comply with all the Commission's recommendations and complete all aspects of the project. Lake asked what would happen if the applicant decided to complete only some aspects of the proposed work. Parker said that the Commission could require all work to be completed within a certain time frame. Lake wondered why it was necessary to require "all or nothing." Morgan said the applicant had stated earlier that he would leave up the "flag" price sign if the Commission would not allow the "monument" sign in his preferred location. To avoid such a situation, the Commission could either condition each motion upon completion of the others, or make a separate motion stating that project approval is contingent upon all conditions being met. Morgan suggested that making individual motions would make things clearer for the applicant.

Parker led the Commission through a point-by-point review of the issues discussed in her memo. This portion of the meeting was kept semi-informal, as discussion shifted between the public and the Commission. First, she stated that the Commission had not yet resolved the question of what constitutes a “sign” according to the Zoning Ordinance. Morgan said that a sign should be “visible and legible” from off-premises. Parker said that she used 2 sq. ft. as a guideline because that is the area of signage allowed per parcel in every zone.

The second issue was replacing the sign faces on the tall freeway sign and the price sign. Parker said that this portion of the project should be denied, since the legality of the freeway sign is still being investigated and the flag price sign is going to be replaced. The Commission agreed.

The third issue was the pump valences. Parker was under the impression that the Commission was ready to approve the valences on condition that they are unlit. A question arose as to whether the valences would be counted as signs, since they include the Chevron logo. Morgan suggested that the valences should be considered signage, and said that the applicant should put the minimum size logo available on the valences. Others pointed out that if the whole valence were counted as a sign, then the applicant could increase the size of the logos to take up the entire surface area of the valences. Morgan stated at this point, and several times later during the meeting, that discussion should focus on what the applicant has specifically proposed, rather than on what he “might” do in the future.

The fourth issue was the canopy fascia. Parker said that according to her notes from previous meetings, the applicant is willing to remove signage from two of the fascia panels. The Commissioners were unable to provide clarification on what this meant. The Commissioners discussed the possible paint colors, signs, and logos that could be allowed on the fascia panels.

The fifth issue was the monument price sign. Parker told the Commission that the sign would not meet state visibility requirements if placed on the corner of Main St. and Patrick’s Point Dr., in the orientation proposed. She noted that the Commission can decide whether or not the sign is two-sided. Morgan stated that the Commission will require the sign to be located on Patrick’s Point Dr. but should allow the applicant some flexibility. He suggested approving the larger (C-45) model for the monument sign, which would still allow the applicant to use a smaller sign. It is possible that the smallest sign available would not be adequately visible from Main St. at the corner location. Johnson agreed that the applicant should be given different options for meeting the 300 sq. ft. maximum signage allowance.

The sixth issue was the existing unpermitted signs and total signage area. Parker stated that if the tall freeway sign is removed, then the applicant will have less than 300 sq. ft. A citizen pointed out that Parker had not included the Propane sign in the total square footage, and Parker made the correction. The Commissioners were in agreement that the unpermitted signs should be denied based on the

current square footage exceedance, and the applicant should re-apply to get them approved. The Planning Commission did not want to decide for the applicant which signs to keep. Johnson asked for clarification on the size of the monument price sign that would be approved. Morgan suggested allowing the C-45 model, which is the applicant's preference, as the maximum. As a concession to the applicant, he also suggested not counting the pump valences as signs. A question arose as to how much time the applicant would have to remove or get permits for the existing signs. The Commission responded that it would depend on how long it takes to resolve the legal issues surrounding the freeway sign. A citizen expressed concern that the Commission, by approving the larger monument price sign, was not adequately considering aesthetic values.

The final item for discussion was the lighting. Johnson said that the intensity of lighting at the station could not be determined without data, but suggested that the Commission could require lights to be recessed or shielded. Morgan stated that the canopy lights need to be on 24 hours a day, for safety, but that the applicant should look into ways to reduce or shield the lights.

The Commission began the process of making a multi-part motion to conditionally approve portions of the project and deny others. Johnson wrote up a possible motion based on the draft provided in Parker's memo, including the conditions that the Commissioners had agreed upon.

Lake left the meeting at 5:00 PM due to another commitment.

Draft motion 2007-01A (replacing sign faces): Accepted as written in the memo.

Draft motion 2007-01B (pump valences): Parker suggested adding a condition stating that approval of this portion is contingent upon completion of the other project elements. The Commissioners added language to this part of the motion, and to each subsequent part of the motion, stating that all project elements must be completed concurrently. It was not necessary to give a time frame, as the entire permit approval is valid for one year. Further conditions were added to this part of the motion stating that the applicant must 1) remove all the light poles on the property except the one next to the air/water station, 2) remove the unused flag pole, and 3) design the canopy lighting to be recessed or shielded.

Draft motion 2007-01C (canopy fascia): Rowe modified the given language to clarify the location of the canopy fascia panel on which new logo signs would be allowed. Parker asked the Commission to clarify how many logos, and what paint colors, would be permitted on the fascia. A condition was added to allow two 5 sq. ft. logos, one on the Main St. side. The Commissioners agreed that the remaining fascia panels should be painted either white or a color matching the building, and that the existing blue stripe on the building should be removed.

Draft motion 2007-01D (monument sign): Parker and the Commissioners discussed the different design options available for the sign. The language in the draft motion was modified to permit a “New Build” style monument sign, maximum size C-45, not to exceed 94 inches in height (thereby restricting the height of the rock base to 2 ft.), to be placed in the planter on Patrick’s Point Dr. and finished with rock from Trinidad Quarry. Another condition was added to state that it must be located the legally required distance from the driveway, to provide vision clearance for oncoming drivers. Parker also suggested adding language to Design Review finding ‘C’ stating that the signs need to “complement and enhance the appearance of the surrounding area.”

Draft motion 2007-01E (existing unpermitted signs/total square footage): Parker recommended adding language from certain Design Review findings to justify the Commission’s denial of this project element. The Commissioners decided not to include those findings because it would make it more difficult to approve the signs when the applicant re-applies for them in the future. The Commissioners agreed to deny without prejudice the unpermitted signs, not including the pump valences, based on the fact that they exceed the 300 sq. ft. limit prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance. They added a recommendation that the applicant return to the Commission with a new proposal for complying with the square footage requirement. The applicant would not be required to pay a fine for placing the signs without approval, as stated in the original draft motion.

The floor was opened to the public for questions and comments on the proposed motion. The Commission was asked whether the canopy fascia panel facing Patrick’s Point Dr. would be made of plastic if approved without the LED lighting. The Commissioners suggested adding a condition that the panel must not be plastic, or that it must be flat instead of bubble-shaped. Some citizens asked for language to be added to certain parts of the motion stating the Commission’s preference for certain design elements. They wanted to make it clear to the applicant that the smaller C-30 monument price sign is preferable, and that the rock base used for the sign should be as low as possible. They also wanted to recommend that the applicant consider alternative designs for the canopy, using the design employed at a Napa Chevron station as a model. The Commissioners agreed to incorporate these recommendations into the motion. A citizen asked if the motion should include an explanation of the fact that the main portion of the price sign will not be counted toward the total square footage, due to an exemption for legally required notices. Parker said that she would include this in a post-meeting memo to the applicant.

After Johnson made the following motion, Rowe moved to amend it by 1) placing a condition at the beginning, stating that approval of each project element is contingent upon commencement of work on all other project elements within one year; 2) adding the Propane sign to the list of existing unpermitted signs; and 3) modifying the language regarding the canopy fascia to clarify the Commission’s requirements for signage and paint colors.

Motion: Johnson made the following multi-part motion, as amended:

Overall

All of the following motions and conditions are made as one project approval, are not severable and are contingent on completion of all permit elements to be commenced within one year of permit approval.

Replace Sign Faces

Based on the information submitted in the application, included in the staff report and public testimony, I find that Design Review finding 'C' and View Protection finding 'B' can not be made because the signs consist of preset architectural styles and they block public coastal views and the signs do not meet current Zoning Ordinance standards and I move to deny (without prejudice) the proposed replacement of the sign faces on the two freestanding signs.

Pump Valances

Based on the information submitted in the application, included in the staff report and public testimony, I move to adopt the information and findings in the staff report and approve the proposed pump valances with the condition that they are not internally lit, in order to make the project compatible with its surroundings according to Design Review finding 'C' and as conditioned in the staff report with the added conditions that (1) the applicant shall remove all light poles except the one adjacent to the air / water station and (2) the applicant shall remove the unused flag pole and (3) that the canopy lighting shall be recessed and / or shielded to minimize light spillage.

Canopy Fascia

Based on the information submitted in the application, included in the staff report and public testimony, I move to adopt the information and findings in the staff report and approve an unlit blue canopy fascia facing Patrick's Point Drive with Chevron lettering not to exceed thirty six (36.0) sq. ft. and three new canopy fascia panels on the other three sides of the canopy to be either white, or colored in the same tan or olive color as the building (either PPG Stone Grey / Tropical Tan chip or PPG Southern Breeze / Frost color chip), with not more than two (2) Chevron logos on the entire canopy, each logo shall not exceed five (5.0) sq. ft., and with not more than one (1) logo on any one canopy face in order to make the project compatible with its surroundings according to Design Review finding 'C', and as conditioned in the staff report and with the added conditions that (1) the blue striping be removed from the building face and painted tan as originally proposed (PPG Southern Breeze / color chip Frost) and (2) that any new fascia shall not be made of plastic and shall not exceed the dimensions of the existing fascia. The Commission encourages the applicant to investigate the possibility of modifying the canopy

as shown at the Napa Chevron Station located at 800 W. Imola Ave.; Napa, CA 94559.

Monument Sign

Based on the information submitted in the application, included in the staff report and public testimony, I move to adopt the information and findings in the staff report and approve a maximum 'New Build' C-45 (preferred C-30 or C-32) Hallmark and Price sign with 2 corresponding APCs, not to exceed a total of forty eight and six tenths (48.6) sq. ft. with a maximum height, including the optional base, of ninety four (94) in. (lower preferred), with the optional base to be finished with Trinidad Quarry rock if constructed, and with the sign to be located within the Patrick's Point Drive planter outside of the vision safety setback (15 ft. radius from driveway / street intersection) in order comply with State price signage laws and to make the project compatible with its surroundings in accordance with Design Review finding 'C', and to make the on-premise signs complement and enhance the appearance of the surrounding area as required by Design Review finding 'E' and as conditioned in the staff report.

Existing Unpermitted Signs

Based on information submitted in the application, included in the staff report and public testimony, and in order to comply with the maximum 300 sq. ft. of total signage allowed on this property by the Trinidad Zoning Ordinance (§17.56.160.B.1) I move to deny without prejudice the following unpermitted signs:

- 'Aztec Grill'
- '24 Hours' lettering
- 2 plastic squares on the building
- 2 plastic squares by the gas pumps
- Portable diesel price sign
- 'Redwood Market' (replaced approved 'Food Mart')
- Propane sign

The applicant is encouraged to reapply for a permit with a proposal to comply with the 300 sq. ft. limit.

Morgan seconded. Motion carried 3-0.

III. **ADJOURNMENT**

Rowe made a motion to continue the remaining agenda items to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Johnson seconded. Motion carried 3-0. The meeting was adjourned at 6:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted by: Kristen Martin, Assistant City Planner
Secretary to the Planning Commission
City of Trinidad