

**Flynn, Maria**

---

**From:** Jacob Patterson <jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 7, 2025 1:38 PM  
**To:** CDD User  
**Subject:** Public Comment -- 2/12/25 PC Mtg., Item No. 7A, Gulf Oil Sign

Planning Commission & Staff,

First, thanks to Sarah for the thorough staff report. Second, I recommend approving all of Sarah's recommendations, including adding the optional special conditions, except, perhaps, Optional Special Condition 3. I think Option Special Conditions 2 and 4 are essential, particularly 4 to remove the garish orange from the canopy.

Optional Special Condition 3 is another matter because I think its language isn't specific enough to actually require the elimination of the price information. If you want to do that, you would need to be more specific, IMO. However, if you want to require a reduced width monument sign, which is fine, you could use the suggested language just not tie it specifically to eliminating the price information as is implied by the staff report analysis.

Most customers expect gas station signs to display current prices and it doesn't make sense to have them remove it from the monument sign. This is partially true because doing so would open up the possibility of having a sign that is technically taller than the existing non-conforming sign because they could move the price information to above the logo portion of the monument sign for the same state law reason we don't include that area in our calculations because price info is exempt from local sign requirements. If they took this route, it would potentially add four feet to the physical height of the sign for a total height of 14 feet rather than the existing 12. Basically, they have a right to put pricing information on a sign at their discretion and if you reduce the width of the monument sign to address the Public Works concerns, then you would likely just increase the physical height of the "sign" to accommodate relocated price info even though the top four feet wouldn't be counted as part of the sign despite being part of the same structure. Of course, you may find that preferable to a wider sign as proposed. In any case, I don't have a preference but thought I would highlight the potential ramifications of your choice.

Regards,

--Jacob