

# City of MISSION

City Hall - 6090 Woodson Street - Mission, Kansas 66202  
Community development Department  
(913) 676-8360 - Fax (913) 722-6318

## **CITY OF MISSION BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

### **AGENDA August 24, 2015 6:30 PM**

1. Approval of the Minutes of the July 27, 2015 meeting
2. Application #15-04 Variance-Public Hearing  
5399 Martway Street-Roof Sign  
Application  
Staff Report  
Exhibits

Please contact Nakeisha at 676-8362 if you will be unable to attend.

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING**  
**JULY 27TH, 2015**

The regular meeting of the City of Mission Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order by Chair Jim Brown at 6:30 PM Monday, July 27th, 2015. Members also present: Mike Lee, Robin Dukelow, Stuart Braden and Carla Mills. Also in attendance: City Planner Danielle Murray and Board of Zoning Appeals Secretary Nakeisha Cooper.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 22, 2015**

**Mrs. Dukelow moved and Mr. Braden seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the June 22nd 2015 meeting. The vote was taken (5-0-0). The motion carried.**

Jim Brown read the BZA rules of procedures into the record.

**CASE#15-02 VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING**  
**5605 W. 49TH STREET- FRONT YARD SETBACK**

Ms. Murray presented the staff report.

The existing building was constructed in 1956 as a residential home. The application indicates that the home has been in the current owner's family since that time. Over the years, the homeowner has made interior alterations to adapt the space for his use. Following a recent hospitalization, the homeowner is requesting that exterior alterations be allowed to continue the same. Information submitted by the homeowner's doctor and brother is included in the packet. The proposed alteration includes a front deck and handicap accessible ramp which extends into the required front yard area.

The subject property is zoned Single-Family Residential "R1" district. The Comprehensive Plan indicates this area is appropriate for residential low density development. The adjacent properties are all developed. To the north is a sewage treatment facility, to the east/west/south are detached residential homes similar to the subject property.

The "R1" District requires that front yard a minimum of 20'30' in depth be maintained. This request is to allow the construction of a deck and ramp on the subject property with a reduction to the setback . The applicant is requesting the the setback from the property line be reduced from 30' feet to 16' to accommodate the deck and ramp. Approval of this variance does not constitute approval of the specific structure shown, only the change in the zoning code requirements which would allow the applicant to submit a building permit application that meets the new standards.

Due to the nature of this request, the City's attorney has advised that the following three criteria be used to make a determination on this case instead as there appears to be adequate evidence to demonstrate a medical/physical need for the alteration. The City's attorney has indicated that Federal Disability and Fair Housing laws require public entities to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures when the modifications are necessary to avoid discrimination on the basis of disability.

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING**  
**JULY 27TH, 2015**

1. Is the applicant or person to be accommodated disabled?

The City's attorney has reviewed the materials submitted and agrees that adequate evidence has been presented to establish a medical or physical need for a ramp entrance.

2. Is the variance reasonably necessary to accommodate the disability?

In order to construct any addition to the existing building a variance would be required as the current home is already located at the limit of the front setback. The variance requested is no more than the minimum needed to add a front deck and ramp. A variance is the appropriate zoning relief to be requested.

3. Would the variance fundamentally and unreasonably alter the nature or purposes of the zoning ordinance?

In land use , a front setback is the distance which a building or other structure is set back from a street or road. The purpose of establishing a zoning setback standard is both to provide a uniform open area or front yard and to control the density of development in a neighborhood by establishing a maximum buildable area. The requested variance to add a front entry feature would not increase the density (number of housing units per acre) of the lot nor significantly alter the open area of the front yard.

Paul Lillig, agent for the property owner came forth and explained that the homeowner contracted them to construct a new handicapped ramp that will allow easy access to the entrance of the residence. Mr. Lilling submitted photos to show an example of what the scope of work would look like.

Ms. Dukelow asked Mr. Lillig if he would keep the existing stoop and the walls around the stoop.

Mr. Lilling stated that here will be an extension on the deck and the walls will be removed. Mr. Dukelow asked the applicant how the excavation will be maintained.

Mr. Lilling explained that they will be installing landscaping timbers.

Mr. Dukelow asked the applicant if the handrails would be constructed with wood and if the applicant would consider using a visual lighter material or iron.

Mr. Brian Sunday with Accessibility remodeling came forth and explained that the material has not been chosen and explained that rails over time will become hard to maintain. They will use a material that will be long lasting.

Ms. Dukelow reiterated her question about the walls along the ramp.

Mr. Brown opened that Public Hearing, with no public comments Mr. Brown closed the Public Hearing.

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING**  
**JULY 27TH, 2015**

Mr. Braden moved and Mrs. Dukelow seconded a motion to accept findings of fact presented in the staff report and approve the proposed variance as requested reducing the front setback for property located at 5605 W. 49th Street from 30" to 16' for the construction of a front deck and ramp. **The vote was taken** (5-0-0). The **motion carried**.

Mr. Brown asked what steps would be necessary if agreed and approved by the BZA panel, to allow staff to approve or disapprove an applicant by allowing them to put the ramp portion of an access ramp in an area beyond the front setback; as long as it is for accessibility purposes and is offered with the condition that the accessibility is no longer required.

Ms. Murray explained that is an approach that can be made by the Planning Commission there could be an amendment to the Zoning Code that allows for that type of structure.

**CASE#15-03 VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING**  
**5820 LAMAR AVENUE- MONUMENT SIGN**

Due to conflict of interest, Mr. Lee recused himself from this Public Hearing case.

Ms. Murray presented the staff report.

The subject property is currently zoned Pedestrian Oriented Business District "C2A" and is located mid block north of Johnson Drive between Lamar Avenue and Russell Street on Lot 3 of the Holly Grove subdivision. The property was developed as an office building in 2002. In 2003 sign permit applications were received and approved for wall signs. Signs are not approved at the time of site plan review but by the sign permit application process. At this time the applicant is requesting a variance in order to allow for the addition of a monument sign to the site consistent with the monument sign dimensional requirements of the current sign code 430.090(B)(2). This zoning district does not allow for monument signs by right.

Mr. Brown asked staffed if the applicant is requesting an additional sign for the property and not a sign in exchange of another sign. The MS2 language discusses signs in exchange for other signs.

Mr. Murray replied yes, that is her interpretation, in the sign code typically a monument sign is allowed in lieu of another kind of sign, however she suggests that Mr. Brown receive clarity from the applicant.

Mr. Brown also asked if the applicant is currently employing all of the signs that they would be allowed to on the building facades.

Ms. Murray stated that she doesn't believe so. Maybe one of the tenants, but she can't say for sure.

Laura McConwell agent for Dr. Raymond Brill came forth and explained that the subject property was built in 2002 and predates the city's current zoning, Form Based Code and the West Gateway. When the building was built the Brill investors were required to set the

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING**  
**JULY 27TH, 2015**

building back significantly far on the property, they were also required to make a number of accommodations because it butts against a neighborhood, such as fencing and landscaping.

The ordinance did not preclude a monument sign back then it just didn't allow for it. In other areas of the ordinance it allows to substitute a wall sign for a monument sign. In the zoning code this building is allowed to have 3 different wall signs and it currently has two signs, one on the east face and one on the south face. The applicant is not asking for something separate he is asking for something consistent with what's happened on other buildings throughout the City of Mission, such as Mission West, the Pawn Shop, Fire Department and the previous Back Yard Burger sign. The applicant is asking to substitute a monument sign for that third phase sign. The property has plenty of room to comply with the setbacks, the mounting requirements and additionally to perform the landscaping that is required by the City. There is also additional room on the property if the city requires the sign to be set back further.

Ms. McConwell also addressed the 5 conditions listed in the attached staff report.

Mr. Braden asked how many tenants are leasing space in the building.

Ms. McConwell replied 3 total, and they have 1 additional vacant office.

Ms. Mills asked why the applicant waited until now to request the monument sign.

Ms. McConwell explained that the applicant believed that he was already approved for the sign. The electricity has been in place to provide service for the sign. Mr. Brill was not clear on the process to be granted a monument sign. The sign has always been in discussion and it was just presented to the city with a sign application. There were also some land parcel discussions in process and the applicant decided to wait until that particular business was handled.

Mr. Brown opened the Public Hearing and with no public comment Mr. Brown closed the Public Hearing.

**Mr. Braden moved and Mrs. Dukelow seconded** a motion to accept the applicant's findings and fact and approve the proposed variance as requested allowing for a monument sign for property located at 5820 Lamar Avenue. **The vote was taken (4-0-0).** The **motion carried**

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no other agenda items, **Mrs Mills moved and the Commission seconded a motion to adjourn.** The vote was unanimous. The **motion carried.** The meeting adjourned at 7:18 P.M.

**ATTEST:**

---

Jim Brown, Chair

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING**  
**JULY 27TH, 2015**

Nakeisha Cooper  
Board of Zoning Appeals Secretary



Community Development Department  
6090 Woodson Street  
Mission, KS 66202  
Phone: (913) 676-8360  
Fax: (913) 722-1415

Permit # 15-04

**Application to the Board of Zoning Appeals**

Applicant Name: Beverly ODonnell		Company: Mission Recreation, Inc. DBA Mission Bowl	
Address: 9211 Beverly Drive			
City/State/Zip: Overland Park, KS 66207			
Telephone: 913-432-7000			
Email: missionbowl@yahoo.com			
Property Owner Name: c/o Commercial Ventures		Company: Mission Mart Shopping Center, LLC	
Address: 5426 Martway			
City/State/Zip: Mission, KS 66205		K. Andrew Gilmore	
Telephone: 913-262-7799		TK Architects	
Email:		agilmore@tkarch.com	
Address of Property: 5399 Martway			
City/State/Zip: Mission, KS 66205			
Zoning: Commercial			
Variance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Application Type	
		Appeal <input type="checkbox"/>	
Description of Request			
Please provide a brief description of the request including specific Code Section and quantity of variance or decision for appeals:			
We are requesting a variance to section 430.090.E.1.A prohibiting signs from extending above the walls they are mounted to. The "wall" in question is strictly a RTU Screen. No parapet walls existing on the building currently. The sign in its current location is completely above the wall and we are proposing to reuse the existing iconic sign in the same fashion as it is currently constructed. The relocation of the sign was to put the sign in a more optimal location aesthetically. Raising the RTU screen would create a significant increase in cost by requiring additional steel both inside and outside the building to support it.			

**Consideration of Variances**

The Board of Zoning Appeals has the authority to grant variances upon a finding that all of the following conditions have been met. Please explain how your application satisfies the conditions. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

- 1) The Variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question, is not ordinarily found in the same zone or district and is not created by an action of the property owner of applicant.
- 2) The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.
- 3) The strict application of the provisions of this Title would constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.
- 4) The variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare.
- 5) Granting the variance will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of the Title.

**Agreement to Pay Expenses**

Applicant intends to file an application with the Community Development Department of the City of Mission, Kansas (City). As a result of the filing of said application, City may incur certain expenses, such as but not limited to publication costs, consulting fee, attorney fee, and court reporter fees. Applicant hereby agrees to be responsible for and to reimburse City for all cost incurred by City as a result of said application. Said costs shall be paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of any bill submitted by City to Applicant. It is understood that no requests granted by City or any of its commissions will be effective until all costs have been paid. Costs will be owed whether or not Applicant obtains the relief requested in the application.

x Beverly R. O'Connell Date 7-27-15  
 Signature (Owner)

X \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature (Owner's Agent)

\*\*\*\*\*FOR OFFICE USE ONLY\*\*\*\*\*

<p><b>File Fee:</b> \$ <u>\$75 - app</u></p> <p><u>\$77.88 notes</u></p> <p>Total: <u>152.88 - paid</u></p> <p><b>Receipt #</b></p> <p>Notes:</p>	<p><b>Meeting Date</b></p> <p><u>8/24/15</u></p> <p>PC <u>OC</u></p> <p><b>Date Notices Sent</b></p> <p>_____</p> <p><b>Date Published</b></p> <p>_____</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>_____</p>
---	---

August 11, 2015

Danielle Murray, AICP, Interim Community Development Director  
City of Mission  
6090 Woodson Street  
Mission, KS 66202  
913-676-8363

Re: Mission Bowl  
TKA – 15051/113

Dear Ms. Murray:

a. The variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question, is not ordinarily found in the same zone or district and is not created by an action or actions of the property owner or the applicant.

**Mission Bowl has been open since 1958. Before the fire, there were four signs on the building's façade: a small "Mission Bowl" over the canopy; two back lit "Bowl/Golf" signs on the east side of the building and the large "Mission Bowl" Sign on the west end of the façade. The smaller Mission Bowl sign has been recognized as a unique and antique ceramic sign that will be moved inside the building to be preserved and showcased. The two back lit "Bowl/Golf" signs have been taken down and will not be replaced.**

**The large Mission Bowl Sign is to be relocated, centered on the façade above the canopy at a slightly lower height as in the original location. The wall to which the relocated sign will be attached is new and being constructed as an RTU screen wall. The fire destroyed all of the existing mechanical equipment and the new design is relocating the mechanical equipment to the roof necessitating the screen wall per City ordinances. The large sign, in its original location, was completely above the exterior wall and supported by exterior building columns in the exterior wall. The relocated sign will be mounted to the screen wall as a matter of convenience.**

b. The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

**Mission Bowl is isolated from other property owners and residents. The sign will remain at similar height as before and will result in the sign being less visible to the adjacent properties to the south and west of the Mission Bowl.**

c. The strict application of the provisions of this Title would constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.

**The owner of Mission Bowl is actively renovating the building after the fire. Under a tight budget, the owner is eager to open a revitalized Mission Bowl to the community. However, raising the RTU screen wall would create a significant cost increase due to additional required steel structure both inside and outside the building. As an alternative to attaching the sign to the screen wall, the building columns may be extended up to support the relocated sign, but this will also add cost to the renovation.**

Danielle Murray, AICP, Interim Community Development Director  
City of Mission  
Mission Bowl  
TKA – 15051.00  
August 11, 2015  
Page 2

**As a small business, Mission Bowl will rely on this one sign to advertise their services and location to potential customers. According to International Sign Association, “businesses have a better chance to succeed if they are allowed to have well-placed ... signage”. Therefore, Mission Bowl believes relocating the existing sign will help their business recover and function to its full potential.**

d. The variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare.

**Relocating the sign to be centered on the façade will not adversely affect public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare. Enhanced readability of the proposed sign location will benefit passing cars from both directions to safely react and stop at the Mission Bowl.**

e. Granting the variance will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this Title.

**According to Sign Ordinance 430.010, the intent of having sign regulations is to “facilitate an easy and pleasant communication between people and their environment and to avoid the visual clutter that is potentially harmful to traffic and pedestrian safety, property values, business opportunities, and community appearance”. By relocating the sign to be centered on the façade above the canopy, the sign is more aesthetically pleasing relating better to the bowling alley and surrounding environment. The centered location is also easier for passing cars to read reducing the risk of harmful traffic incidents.**

Sincerely,

TK ARCHITECTS



BEFORE



AFTER



MISSION BOWL

Google earth

feet  
meters



**STAFF REPORT**  
**Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting August 24, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.:** 2

**PROJECT # / TITLE:** Variance Application # 15-04, Sign ordinance

**REQUEST:** Application for variance to Section 430.060 and 430.090.E.1.a. to allow for the re-installation of a roof sign as part of reconstruction of a building damaged by fire.

**LOCATION:** 5399 Martway Street  
Mission, Kansas 66202

**OWNER:** Mission Mart Shopping Center.  
5426 Martway Street  
Mission, KS 66202

**APPLICANT:** Beverly ODonnell, Mission Bowl Business Owner

**ADVERTISEMENT:** 8/4/2015 - The Legal Record Newspaper

**PUBLIC HEARING:** 8/24/2015-BZA

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The subject property is currently zoned Main Street District 2 “MS-2” and is located on the south side of Martway Street and is bounded by the Mission Mart Shopping center to the north and Rock Creek to the south. The property was damaged in April of this year by a fire and subsequent heavy rains. As part of the recovery the business owners are planning a renovation which includes changes to the exterior of the building. Those changes were deemed to be minor or insignificant in nature and were reviewed administratively by staff in July. A copy of the review memo is attached.

As part of that review it was noted that a portion of a sign was to extend above the height of the wall on which was to be mounted. Roof signs are a prohibited sign type anywhere in the City.

While signs are not approved at the time of site plan review but by the sign permit application process, the applicant was notified of this issue. The applicant explained that their



intention was to reuse the old sign that had been mounted on the north face of the building to the west of the main entrance. The sign was to be moved and integrated into a new entry storefront design. Staff suggested that the sign could be made compliant by raising the height of the metal panel parapet behind it. After exploring this option with their architect, the applicant chose to pursue a sign variance instead. At this time the applicant is requesting a variance in order to allow for continued use of a roof sign in a new location on the building.



North Facade of the building prior to fire-subject sign located on right



New Entryway design

## CODE REVIEW

From 2000-2015 the Board of Zoning Appeals has heard no other variance requests regarding roof signs.

### Applicable Ordinances

#### SECTION 430.090: SIGNS PERMITTED IN COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS

E. Districts "C-2A", "MS1" And "MS2".

1. Each business or commercial establishment shall be permitted signage as follows:
  - a. Three (3) wall signs, not more than one (1) on a facade, provided that the area of each sign shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the total area of the facade upon which it is placed. **Such signs shall not extend above the height of the wall upon which they are mounted.**
  - b. In lieu of one (1) of the wall signs, one (1) projecting sign shall be permitted for each establishment, provided that the area of such projecting sign does not exceed ten percent (10%) of the total area of the facade upon which it is attached or ten (10) square feet, whichever is more, and does not extend above the roof level of the building where the sign is located. The lowest point of such sign must be a minimum of seven (7) feet above the ground or sidewalk.
  - c. A combination of a wall sign and projecting sign shall also be allowed, in which case the total area of both signs shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the total area of the facade upon which the signs are attached. The projecting sign shall not be more than ten (10) square feet.
2. In addition to the permitted wall signs, one (1) pedestrian oriented sign per business entry shall be permitted to be placed beneath a non-retractable awning and/or canopy that extends from the building. Such sign shall be limited to three (3) square feet in area and may be internally illuminated. The lowest point of such sign must be a minimum of seven (7) feet above the ground or sidewalk. In lieu of said pedestrian oriented sign, one (1) non-illuminated identification sign, not more than three (3) square feet in area, may be placed on the wall at each major entrance to the building. The highest point of the sign may be no higher than seven (7) feet above the sidewalk.
3. Project identification signs for a residential project may be permitted at each entrance to the project. All project identification signs shall be monument signs and, except as hereinafter provided, shall be located on the premises. Such signs shall not exceed six (6) feet in height above the average grade and the sign face shall not exceed fifty (50) square feet in area per face. If not sitting within the landscaped setback, the sign base shall be located within a curbed landscaped area extending a minimum of three (3) feet on all sides of the sign base. Where a project is situated on both sides of a public or private street, one (1) project identification sign may be located on each side of the street or, alternatively, one (1) project identification sign may be located in a landscaped median with the approval of the Planning Commission. Where a project identification sign is to be located in the public right-of-way, plans shall be submitted to the Planning Commission indicating the location, size and design of the project identification sign as well as a copy of the bylaws or other documentation of the association which will have permanent responsibility for maintenance of the sign and required landscaping.

4. On property zoned "MS2", monument signs are permitted subject to the following restrictions:
  - a. One (1) detached monument sign shall be permitted for each building in lieu of one (1) wall sign or projecting sign; provided however, that in the case of a shopping center designed as one (1) unified entity and consisting of one (1) or several buildings, either attached or freestanding, one (1) detached monument sign shall be permitted for the entire center.
  - b. The minimum setback from the right-of-way line to the closest building or buildings on the lot must be equal to or greater than fifteen (15) feet.
  - c. Such sign shall not exceed six (6) feet in height above average grade and the sign face shall not exceed fifty (50) square feet in area per face. If not sitting within the landscaped setback, the sign base shall be located within a curbed landscaped area which is equal to or greater than two hundred (200) square feet.
  - d. The minimum setback for the monument sign is ten (10) feet.
5. Monument signs are not permitted in the "C-2A" and "MS1" Districts unless a sufficient ten (10) foot setback exists for such a sign.
6. In the area defined in Section 410.330 as the Downtown District, the following requirements shall apply:
  - a. Window signs are geared towards pedestrians and therefore should be no larger than ten percent (10%) of the storefront glazing. Signs should be of a permanent nature applied directly on the glass. No placards or poster board panels leaning in windows are allowed, except for open/closed signs that shall be no larger than one (1) square foot.
  - b. No canopies, panels or awnings which span through two (2) or more storefronts shall be allowed. Backlit awnings are permitted only if the awning is opaque. If a portion of a backlit awning is not opaque, then that portion shall be considered a "sign".

#### 430.060 Prohibited Signs

A. The following signs are prohibited except as stated below or as otherwise specifically provided hereinafter:

7. Roof signs.

#### 430.020 Sign Definitions:

##### ROOF SIGN

Any sign erected, constructed and maintained wholly upon or over the roof line.

##### WALL SIGN

Any sign attached to and erected parallel to and within one (1) foot of the face or wall of a building, including signs painted on the walls of buildings. Awnings which are backlighted shall be considered wall signs.

#### **ANALYSIS**

The Board of Zoning Appeals has the authority to grant variances to Section Title IV. Land Use of the Municipal including the sign code. Granting of the requested variance would allow staff to approve a sign permit for the placement of a roof sign on the subject property. Staff suggests that the roof sign be in lieu of one wall sign as normally permitted by the sign code and be limited to the north facade/roof edge of the building. When considering applications for a variance the BZA may only grant a variance upon a finding that **all of the following conditions** have been met:

- a. The variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question, is not ordinarily found in the same zone or district and is not created by an action or actions of the property owner or the applicant.
- b. The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.
- c. The strict application of the provisions of this Title would constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.
- d. The variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare.
- e. Granting the variance will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this Title.

**POSSIBLE MOTION**

I move to accept the applicant's findings of fact and approve the proposed variance for property located at 5399 Martway Street allowing for one (1) roof sign in lieu of one (1) wall sign as normally permitted by the sign code and to be limited to the north facade/roof edge of the building.



---

To: Joy Ding, TK Architects  
File

From: Danielle Murray, Interim Community Development Director

Date: July 13, 2015 **Update 7/24/2015**

Re: Case #15-07A 5399 Martway St-Staff Review Comments

---

This letter is provide staff review comments for the project.

### **Review**

The proposed project consists of the restoration and interior remodel of an existing bowling alley within the current footprint of the building. The subject building was damaged by fire and water earlier in the year. The bowling lanes, seating concourse, office areas, bathrooms, and concessions areas will be remodeled. Changes other than for basic layout/tenant finish include redesign of the front entry storefront and canopy and new rooftop units. Exterior materials will match the existing and rooftop equipment will be screened by a prefinished metal panel screen wall (A1.50 & S1.40)

**Revised drawings were provided showing a reduction in the height of the east and west rooftop screen walls. Perspective views were provided to confirm that all roof-mounted mechanical equipment would continue to be screened on all sides to the extent that such equipment will not be seen from adjacent property or street at normal eye level according to Section 415.030.**

Per City Code 440.160 existing structures being altered, replaced, or repaired may be approved administratively by the Community Development Department if the proposed changes are determined not to be significant. Upon review, the proposed changes are determined to meet the intent of the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines and do not change the compatibility of the development with the surrounding uses.

This letter is to confirm that your application for final site plan review of 5399 Martway Street is eligible for administrative review and to provide you staff review comments for the project. Please respond to the comments below and provide revised drawings as necessary.

### **Comments**

1. Note, exterior signs are reviewed and approved at the time of sign permit application not



as part of this application. However, the sign shown on the elevation drawings appears to extend above the roof. The sign code for the MS2 district prohibits signs from extending above the height of the wall upon which is mounted. The metal panel screen wall might need to be extended. (430.090.E.1.a)