Chairperson Matt Crowell called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M. He recognized the members who were present. Crowell swore in all present who intended to speak.

I. APPROVE MINUTES:

Crowell approved the minutes from the October 13, 2022 Board of Adjustment meeting as printed and distributed.

II. OLD BUSINESS:

1. ZV2021-04: Variance to Section 42-244.4 (h) to allow a reduction in the front yard setback for a sign in the C-1, Neighborhood Commercial district.

Tom Coots presents the staff report.

Steven Moorkamp, located at 817 Cambridge Drive in Rolla, and Charles Arthur, located at 489 Crescent Ridge in Rolla, are the applicants. They confirmed they were sworn in.

Pictures were presented to the Board showing two signs near the subject property that were close to the street. Moorkamp states one sign is 4 feet 11 inches from the sidewalk, and the other is 3 feet 10 inches. It was mentioned at the last meeting that there were no similar signs in the area, but the pictures show the neighbors do have signs closer to the road than the one proposed. Arthur states there was concern at the last meeting about this sign being the first permanent sign and the precedent it would set. The pictures presented show there are other existing signs in the neighborhood and have been there for years.

Moorkamp states this is a safety issue, especially heading from the south to the north. Due to the unique layout of the lot and the location of the sewer, the building could not be placed anywhere else. He states the north side of the property line is at an angle, which determined where the sewer, building and parking lot had to be placed. The trees on the south side of the lot cannot be removed to increase visibility because that land is not owned by the applicants. He
mentions there are other signs in the neighborhood that have been there for two years. Crowell asks if those signs are in concrete. Moorkamp states he is unsure.

Arthur states the proposed sign will be 15 feet from the road and 7 feet from the sidewalk. It will match the character of the neighborhood and the new building, and be similar to City park signs. Rohter asks about potential safety issues pulling out of the driveway with the sign being close to the sidewalk. Arthur mentions the sign will be 15 feet from the sidewalk and mock ups have been made of the proposed sign with no concerns.

Crowell asks if there were any similar existing signs that had any issues. Coots mentions the Board has approved other similar sign variances with no known issues. Crowell asks if there is any cause for concern where the applicant is wanting to place the sign. Coots no.

Crowell moves into Board deliberation.

1st Criterion: Crowell due to the layout of the land, the road, and the trees, in order to make their sign visible in a safe manner, the applicants would have to make major changes. Hines mentions the building placement was dictated by the terrain and sewer. All Board members agreed the 1st criterion was met.

2nd Criterion: Crowell mentions the applicant didn’t lay out this land. All Board members agreed the 2nd criterion was met.

3rd Criterion: Crowell states the placement of the sign has no relevance to increasing the income of the property. All Board members agreed the 3rd criterion was met.

4th Criterion: Crowell mentions there are other similarly placed signs in the neighborhood. Hines states the sign will be seven feet from the sidewalk and he cannot see any safety issues. All Board members agreed the 4th criterion was met.

5th Criterion: Crowell based upon visibility issues the variance is necessary so people have time to turn safely. Hines mentions people need plenty of time to process the sign and turn. Crowell asks the applicant if there have been complaints from customers about not being able to see the sign. Arthur yes. Moorkamp mentions some people miss the turn.

6th Criterion: Crowell agrees there is an unnecessary hardship. He states even if the applicants clear the trees on one side, it still does not solve the problem. Hines mentions the applicants cannot fix the south approach anyway because they do not own those trees. Meusch comments increased visibility makes it safer so drivers can control their speed. All Board members agreed the 6th criterion was met.
A motion was made by Jonathan Hines, seconded by John Meusch, to approve the variance to allow a reduction in the front yard setback for the subject sign. A roll call vote on the motion showed the following: Ayes: Crowell, Hines, Rohter, and Meusch. Nays: None. The motion passes unanimously.

III. PUBLIC HEARING: NONE

IV. OTHER BUSINESS/REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRPERSON, BOARD, OR STAFF: NONE

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:58 P.M.
Minutes prepared by Sarah West

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, December 1, 2022