



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Sign ordinance

1 message

Terry Caruthers <t_caruthers@hotmail.com>

Thu, Oct 9, 2014 at 8:07 AM

Reply-To: t_caruthers@hotmail.com

To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Dear Commissioners,

As a lifetime resident of Knoxville who serves on the boards or as a representative with the Colonial Village Neighborhood Association (CVNA), the South Knoxville Neighborhood and Business Coalition (SKNBC), and the Neighborhood Advisory Council (NAC), I would like to share my personal opinion regarding the proposed sign ordinance.

While I respectfully honor and appreciate the extensive research and outreach conducted by the Sign Ordinance Committee and their dedication, time and commitment, I think they failed to achieve an outcome that benefits our scenic highways and vistas. I do not believe their height proposals (essentially a 10 foot reduction) are significant enough to impact the clutter along our roadways.

I support the height proposals made by Scenic Knoxville. From what I've read, they are more in keeping our roadways and vistas attractive, as well as being similar to what has been adopted and what is being proposed in other metropolitan cities in Tennessee and in surrounding states.

For once, Knoxville needs to up its game and remain in-step with the time, particularly when we are drawing more and more tourists and visitors because of our Urban Wilderness. They come to see the beauty of nature, not unsightly signage.

Thank you for your time.

Terry Lee Caruthers
6102 Arcadia Drive
Knoxville, Tennessee 37920
865-5556-5702

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Sign Ordinance

1 message

Josh Buchanan <jbuchanan@knoxvillechamber.com>

Mon, Oct 27, 2014 at 8:12 AM

Reply-To: jbuchanan@knoxvillechamber.com

To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

 Home

City of Knoxville

Sign Ordinance and Task Force Update

Knoxville is nestled into one of the most beautiful regions in the world. The hills, mountains, lakes, rivers, and wide variety of plant life truly are our most valuable assets. According to [The Great Smoky Mountains National Park website](#), "In the half-million acres of Great Smoky Mountains National Park there are more tree species than in all of Europe..." Without being able to enjoy these natural resources, these splendors of nature, while driving around town no one would want to live here. Knoxville has taken great strides in preserving natural spaces such as the Urban Wilderness, scenic highways, and greenways for which we are grateful. However, it is vitally important that we consider our business community, the engine that provides goods and services which we all need, and jobs to keep our economy, our society, moving forward and improving our quality of life. Businesses need signs; they are a necessity for survival. Signs are a basic fundamental tool for public outreach and information sharing. **This is why we have agreed to the negotiated terms of a 40% reduction in sign height in Knoxville, as well as reductions in overall sign square footage.**

For many businesses their window is the only means for advertising. Take a look at Patricia Nash or the Fresh Market, Elliott's Boots or Ashe's Liquor Store and you'll see tasteful window signs in which the majority of the window is covered. It is imperative that we uphold a business' right to advertise in their window space. Limiting this private space is damaging to businesses, addresses a non-existent problem, is unenforceable or would cost too much to enforce, and outside the parameters of government reach. **We oppose any regulation of window signage.**

Businesses come and businesses go and when a property owner is left with a vacant building and an unused sign, we don't need to add unnecessary costs to the property owner or new business as long as the sign has been maintained in accordance with set standards. **We agree that the property owner should maintain signs at vacant buildings, leaving them blank or covering them with a for sale or rent sign. But, the recommendation that a sign be removed after a building has sat empty after 1.25**

years is overly burdensome to the property owner, adding insult to injury when they are already losing money from a vacant building. Many times a vacant building takes years to be filled with a new business, and businesses want a move in ready building with signage already available. In order for a prosperous economy, let's not burden property owners and businesses with senseless regulations.

Another regulation we are ok with is a 10 foot set-back, however there is no need for a sight triangle. We already have a city code which regulates visual obstructions at intersections. Again, there is no need to overcomplicate or burden Knoxville's businesses. According to the proposed sight triangle some businesses would not be able to have a sign at all.


Finally, what businesses do with their landscaping and pole bases are better left to their own budgeting and plans and out of the hands of government regulation. Businesses understand how the aesthetics of their properties adds to the value of their service and will inherently strive for the best appearance in accordance with their cash flow. They should not be forced to do expensive projects that could put too much strain on their budgets, especially small businesses. This would also be difficult to regulate and is more appropriate for a master planned development.

We appreciate the time and hard work that has gone into formulating a more congruent sign plan that reflects the Knoxville Community as a whole. Restructuring the current ordinance will lend to more consistent interpretation. **We hope the long hours spent on this topic are not in vain and that an agreement can be made to put together the most sensible plan that considers the interests of our businesses for Knoxville's ever improving quality of life.**

Josh Buchanan | Policy Analyst


17 Market Square, #201 | Knoxville, TN 37902

Cell: [865.210.3782](tel:865.210.3782) | Office: [865.246.2641](tel:865.246.2641)

 cid:D05A90C8-7A46-4D47-8599-28EE0AF40592

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org

 **Info sheet for MPC_Sign Ordinance.docx**
19K



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] proposed sign ordinance

1 message

Martin Daniel <martin@elevationoutdooradv.com>

Thu, Oct 30, 2014 at 1:02 PM

Reply-To: martin@elevationoutdooradv.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Dear Commissioners:

I have reviewed the proposed sign ordinance, Exhibit E to the MPC package, and I have numerous comments regarding its content. Please see them attached.

Thank you.

Martin Daniel

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Proposed MPC sign ordinance 2014 issues.docx

15K

Proposed MPC sign ordinance:

Issues/problems:

1. C., p.1, Definition of "Advertising" repetitive, circular, non-sensical.
2. C., p.2. "Sight Triangle", too much space taken for this, resulting in too much setback.
3. C., p.5, "Window Sign", "but may not obscure the view" seems out of place. Non-sensical. Enforcement difficult.
4. D. 3., p. 8. Delete "and signs which have red, green, yellow, amber, or blue lights".
5. D. 7., Delete, or modify. Prohibition of signs on vehicles difficult to enforce, will result in conflicts with business owners.
6. D., 11., p.8. Window sign regulation too restrictive. Modify to 50% coverage allowed, or more.
7. E. 1., p. 8. What is Article IV referenced here? Does it exist?
8. E. 9., p.9. Modify this provision to allow bus advertising.
9. E. 13, p. 9. Too broad. Remove "not visible" as existing language this makes the provision too broad.
10. E. 18, p.9. Remove last sentence which requires menu boards to be located at certain distance from where orders taken.
11. E. 20, p. 9. Add "organizational".
12. E. 19. Is regulation of menu size necessary? Delete.
13. F. 1. Modify, Size of real estate signs in residential districts should be allowed up to 12 s.f.
14. G. 1. c., Delete, as too restrictive. Difficult to understand. A sign viewed from 2 different directions is "considered as one sign"?
15. G.2.a., allowed height should be measured from the road from which the sign is intended to be read, not the closest access road.

16. G. 2. c., This is vague, difficult to understand, too restrictive. Expand distance from interstate ROW in which signs next to interstate are allowed to be higher, to 300'. See also L.6.d.
17. G.4. This entire provision concerning "Primary Building Elevation" is excessive, vague and confusing. What is its purpose? How does it work?
18. G.6. So how do we measure setback, from what point? This is confusing. Clarification necessary.
19. H.5. Delete requirement of landscaping around detached signs. This is burdensome, expensive to the business owner.
20. I.1. Description of zone near intersections of interstate highway is confusing, difficult to understand. What is the purpose of this provision?
21. I.4. What is a "Large Site"? Not defined.
22. I.6. EMCs(digital signs) should be allowed in all commercial districts, not just H-1 and D-1 overlay districts. It's time for Knoxville to come into the 21st century.
23. J.1.-8. Master sign plans should provide incentives to use monument signs. The provision for Development Directory Signs is too restrictive, square footage should be enlarged to 400 s.f.
24. L.6.a. Reference to "Article IV". Where is Article IV?
25. L.6.c. Higher signs should be allowed at ALL interstate interchanges within City limits.
26. L.6.e. Signs in C-1 should be allowed to be 195 s.f., 30'high.
27. O.1. Time triggering "abandonment" is too short-60 days. Lengthen to 18 months.
28. P.2.,3. These provisions appear to be cut and pasted from the existing ordinance and are no longer applicable.
29. Q. 1.b. Delete requirement that sign permittee have a City business license.



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Sign Ordinance

1 message

Danny Kirby <dkirby@5881000.com>

Tue, Nov 11, 2014 at 12:22 PM

Reply-To: dkirby@5881000.com

To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Commissioners,

I would like you to consider these general and specific comments to the proposed Sign Ordinance. I believe that MPC needs to take more time to thoroughly vet what has been placed before them by MPC staff, to ensure that what is recommended to City Council is 1) representative of what the Sign Task Force discussed and approved; and 2) is in best interest of the community as a whole, including the most important people that it effects, which are the business owners.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- There seems to be some confusion about what the Sign Task Force actually took action on, as it relates to sending a Draft Ordinance to MPC. It's my understanding that the only item ever receiving a majority approval vote was the sign heights of 30', and that no other section of the Ordinance, whether individually or as a whole, was ever voted on or approved by the Task Force.
- If the purpose of the Ordinance is to "avoid visual clutter" as stated, then perhaps the City should try enforcing the current regulations first, as a majority of the "clutter" is created by illegal signs, flags, and banners (See attached Picture 1).
- If the purpose of the Ordinance is to "avoid visual clutter", what is the City doing to improve the clutter created by KUB, TDOT, TVA and other public and quasi-public entities (see attached Picture 2)? In both of these pictures, the least offensive clutter in the pictures are the legal signs...the legal signs are not what's doing the "visual harm".
- If the goal is to beautify Knoxville, then we need a comprehensive plan to address all of the problems and not just business signs. Why are we only addressing signs? Because the City has no control over the other offenders...not KUB, not TDOT, not TVA. So with no recourse over those other violators, the City has chosen to punish the local business community...in the name of beautifying the City. This is an unfair means for trying to achieve the goals the City, on the backs of those providing jobs and a substantial amount of the tax base. It is a myth that reducing signage will beautify the City...signs are only a very small part of the problem.

- Has anyone studied what the economic impact will be on the business community? We are still in a struggling economic environment, and the timing of this increased regulation is suspect. Is now really the time to be adopting new regulations that could possibly harm businesses? How sure are we about this?

- A document from the January 2013 meeting of the Task Force identified “Three Big Policy Directions” (see attached document)...Shrink Signage, Creative Incentives to Use Master Sign Plans, and Create Incentives to Use Monument Signs. This Ordinance only addresses one of them...Shrink Signage! Why? The other two have been completely ignored, not by the Task Force, but by MPC Staff. There was incentive language discussed by the Task Force for Master Sign Plans and Monument Signs. But, if you will see the last page of the e-mail from Joyce Feld dated September 9, 2014, that was attached to the on-line Agenda Package, you will see that she gave the direction that “Items in pink should be removed, whether new or old!”...and so they were. So I ask you, who is driving this boat? In a separate e-mail sent by Mrs. Feld, she refers to an article titled “The Secrets of Successful Communities”, and in that article, the number 3 “secret” is to “Use Education and Incentives, Not Just Regulation”. Again, this Ordinance has NO incentives...why?

- As mentioned previously, the only item that received a majority vote by the Sign Task Force was the height of detached signs of 30'. MPC's version of the Sign Ordinance includes that language as approved. However, an Exhibit J attached to the Agenda Package shows an alternate table of sign heights and sizes, and Mark Donaldson admitted that Staff was recommending that the alternate language be used instead of what the Task Force approved. Why was it not put in the body of the MPC version and instead put as an attachment? And why is MPC taking it upon itself to recommend alternatives to the one thing the Task Force agreed on?

- It's pretty clear by the attached e-mails from Joyce Feld, Mellissa McAdams, and Carlene Malone, that this Ordinance has continued to be “worked on” outside of a public forum, and that the supposed Task Force version you have before you may or may not resemble what was discussed during the two years the Task Force met.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

C. DEFINITIONS

- Sight Triangles are not necessary, as that is regulated by other sections of the Zoning Ordinance
- Abandoned Signs – One year is not enough time. Some large stores take two to three years to negotiate with a tenant.

D. PROHIBITED SIGNS

- #6 & #7 will never be enforced, and if they were going to be, what would be the cost to the City to do so?
- #11 is too restrictive...not all businesses are in rough parts of town that require the public to be able to see into their store to feel safe.

E. SIGNS EXEMPT FROM THESE REGULATIONS

- #11 - Signs carried by a person. So we are going to reduce signs to improve the aesthetics of our City, but we're going to allow people to stand on every corner holding an advertising sign. I understand the City is concerned about violating free speech rights, but it's pretty clear they can regulate free speech on private property as evidenced by this Ordinance, so why can't they regulate free speech on public property...this makes no sense.

G. CRITERIA FOR MEASUREMENTS

- #1(c) is confusing...a two-sided sign "shall be considered as one (1) sign"...so does a two-sided sign only get the area of one sign, or does each side get the area of one sign...needs to be clarified.
- #4 Primary Building Elevation still rewards the lot with the most street frontage, so that two one-level 5,000 sf buildings would be allowed different amounts of signage because the one that has more street frontage can have its longest side along the road, while the other with may not have as much frontage and have its shortest side facing the road. Same size building, but different amounts of signage allowed... makes no sense.

H. GENERAL SIGN STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS

- #5 Landscaping requirements – While it may be a good idea in theory, these areas tend to look bad after a while, and we know the City is not going to enforce maintenance of the landscaping. The requirement for a "reserve" area is a bit much.
- #6 – Needs to be clarified to include paint as a sufficient "covering"...merely stating the "supporting structure (of) a part of a detached sign shall be covered with material complementary to the construction of the principal building or structure on the parcel or lot" can be interpreted to mean that poles or structures would have to have a brick covering around it. I believe that to be the intent of this language and that could be very expensive on a business owner.

I. STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF SIGNS

- #6(a)(3) Need to list zones where EMC's are allowed
- #6(g) There is no evidence that a hold time of 60 seconds is any safer than a hold time of 30 or even 15 seconds. The City is exempt from this requirement as its EMC at the Convention Center changes more frequently than every 60 seconds. If it's okay for the City, it should be okay for everyone.

J. MASTER SIGN PLANS (See above regarding incentives)

- Part of the requirement of the Master Sign Plan is to submit Covenants & Restrictions so that the City can see the intention by the Developer to regulate signage within the restrictions. In exchange for this voluntary restriction, the Developer gets no additional signage. On a 50 acre development cut into 50 outparcels, a Developer could potentially eliminate 10,000 sf of signage within the development and get nothing in return. This makes no sense.
- Under the proposed Ordinance the Development Directory Sign has to be the same size as any other sign for the zoning district it is in...i.e., 30' and 195 sf. Under the current rules, a Development Directory sign can be as large as 400 sf...this is over a 50% reduction in a sign that is supposed to be used to entice developers. This is just wrong. The height and size of a Development Directory Sign should be directly related to the amount of signage being reduced or eliminated...i.e, as a percentage of the total reduced or eliminated.

- #4(b) – The Development Directory sign should not count against the allowable signage on the lot, if it is on a lot with a business...there should maybe be some spacing requirement, or limit to a monument sign, but not completely count against the detached allotment for the business.

L. SIGNS PERMITTED BY SPECIFIC ZONE DISTRICT

- #6(e)(2) – Staff took the liberty to again over-ride the Task Force and lower signs along Scenic Highways to 10' tall and 100 square feet, despite the vote by the Task Force to lower it from 35' to 30'.

O. ABANDONED SIGNS

- New signs should receive a longer exemption from this rule, as they would be constructed under the new approved rules, and therefore would not be considered as unsightly as perhaps some of the “non-conforming” sign structures.
- One year is still not long enough to re-tenant a large building. Negotiations take several years and the sign removal just adds a burden on the property owner in those negotiations, as someone will be tasked financially to construct a new one. An empty building is enough of a burden for a property owner, but adding another \$10,000-\$15,000 burden is unreasonable.

Q. ADMINISTRATION

- #1(b) It should not be required for a General Contractor licensed by the State of Tennessee to have to obtain a City of Knoxville business license in order to pull a permit for a sign...that's just a money grab.

I'll be glad to discuss any of these items at your convenience. I will reiterate, that I believe MPC should postpone this agenda item for at least 60 days until the Commissioners are at least somewhat knowledgeable and comfortable with what's being presented.

Thank you,

Danny Kirby

Turley & Co.

P.O. Box 10226

Knoxville, TN 37939

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org

3 attachments



SAVE 3¢

45.39

BEST PRICE TOWNSHIP
WITH 50 MILY 2 CANS
PAINEUR
WINTERGREEN
WARNING: This
product can cause
mouth cancer

45.39

Marlboro
45.39

Pilot

325.9 37.9

Pilot



BREAKFAST
CLOSED SUNDAY



HALF PRICE
SHAKES ALL



Keep ← Rennoc →



Walmart
Public Storage

Virginia
Liquor

Pinnacle



January Discussion

Three Observations about the Current Regulations

- Maximum SIGN AREA is much greater than what is being used.
- Signs used with planned development districts don't come close to using the maximum SIGN AREA allowed; so that development represents an unconstrained view of the sign packages desired by owners. These developments can be the model for determining sign area regulations.
- When made aware of local concerns about SIGN HEIGHT, many developers are willing to not maximize the height and willing to use monument signs

Three Big Policy Directions

- SHRINK THE MAXIMUM SIGN HEIGHT AND AREA ALLOWED FOR DETACHED AND ATTACHED SIGNS
- CREATE INCENTIVE TO USE MASTER SIGN PLANS
- CREATE INCENTIVE TO USE MONUMENT SIGNS

Detached Signs

- Primary detached may be a ground or pole sign, but second sign must be a monument or column sign
- Height is determined by street classification
- Area is determined by street frontage, with a relatively small maximum size
 - Maximum sign area for monument or column signs is smaller than maximum sign area for ground or pole signs

Master Sign Plans

- CREATE INCENTIVE TO USE MASTER SIGN PLANS
 - Detached Directory Signs, as part of a master sign plan, allowed at a significantly larger size (area, not height)
 - Size of directory sign approved could be associated with other sign rights that are removed.
 - If a Directory Sign is used within a master sign plan, all other detached signs within the master sign plan area must be approved as part of the plan and/or must be monument signs
- Approval of Master Sign Plans allows the City to assist the Owner in enforcing the owners sign restrictions
 - Broaden powers of master sign plan to regulate all detached signs within the master sign plan area

Attached Signs

- Total sign area for an entire building is determined as a percentage of the primary elevation of the building (for example: 7.5 percent)
- CREATE INCENTIVE TO USE MONUMENT SIGNS
 - A bonus sign area for attached signs may be utilized if the property does not use a ground or pole sign (for example, 2.5 percent)

1/7/13



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Tall Signs Don't Equal Success

1 message

joyce feld <jlfeld@gmail.com>

Thu, Oct 9, 2014 at 9:24 AM

Reply-To: jlfeld@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

There is no research that shows that tall and big signs translate into business success. Attached is a photo of Chuy's restaurant on Kingston Pike. Chuy's has a 10-ft sign and a full parking lot. Attached is also a photo of Rafferty's restaurant located across the street from Chuy's which was taken 3 minutes later. Rafferty's has a 50-ft sign and an empty parking lot.

There is research which shows that communities with strict sign regulations have greater economic prosperity and higher property values.

Joyce Feld

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org

2 attachments**chufs.jpg**
1444K**Raffertys vs. Chufs Signs.jpg**
2046K



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Planning Commission Workshop-Oct 30 (sign regulations)

1 message

Greater Knoxville Hospitality Association <gkha.info@gmail.com>

Thu, Oct 30, 2014 at 4:10 PM

Reply-To: gkha.info@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Cc: Greater Knoxville Hospitality Association <gkha.info@gmail.com>

Metropolitan Planning Commission:

As you consider changes to the City of Knoxville Sign Ordinance, we request your consideration of the impact sign reduction will have on our business community, taxpayers and the hospitality/tourism industry in particular.

Tourists are considered "temporary tax papers"; paying taxes when they visit and spend money, thereby relieving residents of some tax obligations. According to the recently released "*The Economic Impact of Travel on Tennessee Counties*" prepared by the Tennessee Department of Tourist Development & U.S. Travel Association, October 2014, direct spending in Tennessee by both domestic and international travelers reached \$16.7 billion on transportation, lodging, food, entertainment and recreation and general retail trade. This showed an increase of 3.4 percent from 2012.

Knox County received \$930.74 million from domestic travelers, ranking as one of the top five counties in Tennessee that benefited from direct domestic travel expenditures – a 2.9 percent increase over 2012.

Travel/Food Services ranked as the combined #1 industry by nonfarm employment in Tennessee in 2013. Knox County alone generated 9,500 jobs and produced \$292.13 million in payroll.

As a result of taxes generated by tourist activity in Knox County; each household pays \$379.91 less in local and state taxes; each household pays \$122.07 less in local county taxes and each household pays \$257.84 less in state taxes.

In other words, if it were not for state and local taxes generated by tourism, each Knox County household would pay \$379.91 MORE in taxes.

Tourism is an economic driver for our community. Signs drive tourists to their destination. Businesses need signs.

Knoxville is fortunate to be located in the heart of two interstate systems. By being parallel to the interstate, we enjoy the benefits of the travelers need for gas, lodging and food. Signage and vibrant

lighting indicate a safe, secure and thriving exit where a family feels comfortable and secure when stopping along their travels.

Cities that are perpendicular to interstates realize the importance of pulling travelers off the road. Their interstate sign regulations allow for large signs. They welcome the business these travelers bring. These cities appreciate their patronage and the extra tax dollars that are invested in the community.

The 40% reduction in sign height, as well as the reductions in overall sign square footage that were negotiated in the Sign Task Force Committee are extreme. The reduction in visibility will greatly inhibit a business's ability to pull tourists into the city. The main city streets off the interstate exits lie below the interstate. Sign height is critical to the health of those hospitality/tourism businesses.

Many of the other changes in the sign ordinance are unnecessary and difficult, if not impossible, to enforce. We are in agreement with the "Sign Ordinance and Task Force Update" as prepared by the Knoxville Chamber.

We respect and appreciate the work and dedication to the development of a new sign plan. It is our hope that an agreement can be provided, respecting the interests of businesses and Knoxville citizens.

Regards,

Jill Thompson

Jill Thompson

Executive Director
Greater Knoxville Hospitality Association
P. O. Box 239, Knoxville, TN 37901
o 865-342-9133 f 865-947-9888 c 865-567-6325
gkha.info@gmail.com

Facebook: Greater Knoxville Hospitality Association-GKHA

GKHA is a not for profit membership organization for hotels/lodging, restaurants, venues, attractions, service and suppliers of the hospitality and tourism industry - dedicated to enhance the economic, legislative and social interest of its members throughout the Greater Knoxville area.



Attached: Knox County EI

KNOX COUNTY TRAVEL SNAPSHOT

Facts About a Leading Industry That's More Than Just Fun

BY THE NUMBERS

2013 Economic Impact of Tourism in Knox County

- Generated **\$930.74 MILLION** in direct tourism expenditures
- Generated **9,500** jobs
- Produced **\$292.13 MILLION** in payroll
- Created **\$22.11 MILLION** in local tax revenue
- Created **\$46.70 MILLION** in state tax revenue

PER HOUSEHOLD

As a result of taxes generated by tourist activity in the county:

- Each household pays **\$379.91** less in local and state taxes
- Each household pays **\$122.07** less in local county taxes
- Each household pays **\$257.84** less in state taxes

ON AN AVERAGE DAY

On An Average Day In 2013, Tourist Spending in Knox County

- Generated **\$ 2,549,972** in daily expenditures
- Generated **26** jobs daily
- Produced **\$800,356** in daily payroll
- Created **\$60,575** daily in local tax revenues
- Created **\$129,945** daily in state tax revenues

IN OTHER WORDS....

If it were not for state and local taxes generated by tourism...

- *Each Knox Co. household would pay \$379.91 more in taxes*

Sources: 2013 Economic Impact of Travel on Tennessee Counties Report
www.tnvacation.com/industry; U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts by County
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/>



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] NAC endorses Scenic Knoxville's proposal for Sign Regulations

1 message

Travetta <travetta@msn.com>

Wed, Oct 29, 2014 at 11:29 AM

Reply-To: travetta@msn.com

To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Dear members of the MPC,

My name is Travetta Johnson. I attended your last meeting prepared to read this statement on behalf of the Neighborhood Advisory Council (NAC). The NAC consists of neighborhood leaders from around the city, meets monthly, and serves in an advisory and partnership capacity to:

- 1) Give advice and feedback on the programs and policies of the Office of Neighborhoods,
- 2) Bring neighborhood issues and concerns to the attention of the city administration,
- 3) Propose responses and solutions to address these concerns; and
- 4) Serve as a sounding board for city initiatives and proposals affecting neighborhoods.

Since the ruling was postponed, I am following up with this statement in writing.

The NAC has studied the MPC amendments to the City of Knoxville Zoning Ordinance Definitions and Sign Regulations document, and has listened to members from the Sign Ordinance Task Force at two different meetings. We have viewed photographic evidence that taller, bigger signage does not directly correlate to increased business.

With all due respect for the extensive work the Sign Ordinance Task Force has done, we feel their recommendation, regarding sign height and area is not enough of a change to make a significant difference for the future aesthetics of our city.

While we respect the local business interests to have greater visibility, our primary concern is for the residents who live and drive in Knoxville. We would urge the MPC to consider what other progressive-minded cities in the region are doing in regard to sign ordinances, and to imagine what we want Knoxville to look like 10-20 years from now in terms of its beautification, lack of visual clutter, and overall aesthetics.

At our last meeting (Oct. 8), the NAC voted to endorse Scenic Knoxville's proposal for maximum sign height and area. The vote was 11 in favor, with 2 abstaining, due to insufficient knowledge on the subject.

For sake of the residents of Knoxville, and the overall beautification of our city, we would strongly urge the MPC to consider endorsing the Scenic Knoxville proposal for sign height and area. As for the business interests, we respectfully believe people are more likely to support a business that has demonstrated through tasteful signage, that they care as much or more about investing in the greater good of the community, as they do their own private business endeavors.

Thank you,

Travetta Johnson, on behalf of the Neighborhood Advisory Council (NAC)

Travetta Johnson
865-368-5778 cell

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org

November 13, 2014



609 Weisgarber Road
Knoxville, TN 37919
(865) 584-8647
www.kaarmls.com

*Received at
13 Nov 2014
MPC Meeting
[Signature]*

Mark Donaldson, Executive Director
MPC Commissioners
Metropolitan Planning Commission
Suite 403, City/County Building
400 Main Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

RE: City of Knoxville Proposed Sign Ordinance

Dear Mr. Donaldson & Commissioners,

The Knoxville Area Association of Realtors (KAAR) is the local trade association for the Realtor brand whose membership exceeds 3,400 Realtors, over 1,000 of those in Knoxville, and whose territory includes the City of Knoxville, Knox County, and eleven additional counties in East Tennessee. The mission of KAAR is to unite and serve its members and to enhance the ability and opportunity of its members to conduct their business ethically, professionally, and successfully and to promote the preservation of the right to own, transfer and use real property.

KAAR supports economic growth throughout its 12 county region, while continuing to preserve the aesthetic qualities of its communities and the natural beauty and resources of East Tennessee. Balancing these ideals is a complicated and arduous task. KAAR commends Knoxville's City Council, Sign Ordinance Task Force, and Metropolitan Planning Commission for their dedication to maintaining that balance through their work on the Proposed Sign Ordinance. To that end, through its Governmental Affairs Committee and Board of Directors, KAAR supports acceptance of the terms currently negotiated that reduce sign height by up to 40% and acceptance of current reductions in sign area square footage.

Regarding Abandoned Signs, KAAR strongly supports the addition of language to this section that allows business and commercial property owners and lessors to retain signs that are 1) maintained in compliance with applicable sections of the Proposed Sign Ordinance and 2) altered with the removal or covering of the advertising message with properly maintained painted cabinet faces, installation of blank cabinet faces, a "for sale or lease" message, or a fitted boot to cover the sign cabinet. KAAR's sentiment concurs with those expressed by many MPC Commissioners and guests at the October 30, 2014, MPC Proposed Sign Ordinance Workshop. In addition, KAAR believes that allowing such properly maintained signs to remain on the property (rather than being removed) encourages (rather than punishes) compliance with the Proposed Sign Ordinance and reduces strain on an already strained enforcement body by allowing focus to stay on noncompliant and ill-maintained signs.

Commercial Realtor members of KAAR are particularly concerned with the proposed Abandoned Sign section, as it is currently written, because of the significant financial burden such sign removal places on their commercial clients, the negative effect it will have on property values by removal of an expensive and critical commercial property feature, added uncertainty to the due diligence period and closing process, and added hindrance to the ease of commercial property transferability. Mandating removal of properly maintained commercial signs puts the growth of Knoxville's commercial sector at a disadvantage to other communities that allow properly maintained signs to remain on commercial property for the duration of the sale or leasing period (in accordance with their current sign ordinances and taking into account applicable state law as well).

The Knoxville Area Association of Realtors thanks you for your commitment to our City and your time and consideration in reviewing our concerns.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jennifer Roche", written over a faint, illegible printed name.

Jennifer Roche, Governmental Affairs Director

CC: Mayor Madeline Rogero & Knoxville City Council Members
L. Duane Grieve, Chair, George C. Wallace, Vice-Chair, Sign Ordinance Task Force & Sign Ordinance Task Force Members