



232 Matthews Station Street
Matthews, NC 28105
704.847.4411

**ZONING APPLICATION FOR UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TEXT CHANGE
AS PROVIDED IN THE UDO AT 155.401.3**

APPLICATION NUMBER _____ DATE FILED MONDAY OCT 2ND 2017
APPLICANT'S NAME MARK MOORE BRAKEMANS COFFEE
APPLICANT'S MAILING ADDRESS 225 N TRADE ST MATTHEWS
APPLICANT'S PHONE NUMBER/EMAIL ADDRESS 202 329-3291 MARK@MANANUTRITION.ORG

I request consideration of the following change in text of the Matthews Unified Development Ordinance:

Requested text change is:

- a change in wording to existing Section(s)
- an addition to Section(s)
- a deletion of wording at existing Section(s)

Below is the text requested to be changed, added or deleted:

Existing Section 155.213 / 155.608 Proposed Section _____

Current:
Rooftop signs prohibited....

Proposed:
In historic Matthews flat, painted, vinyl or other printed signs affixed to the roof structure are prohibited, but raised lettered or crafted stand alone letters and or images ~~may be permitted upon permission~~ is permitted in keeping with the architectural style of the building and in keeping with signage of that era.

Or more simply:
In historic Matthews rooftop signs are prohibited, but ~~in some instances may be permitted if applicants can prove they are~~ is in keeping with the architectural style of the particular building and signage that would have been specific to that era.

THIS IS SPECIFIC & FACTUAL AND EASY TO ASSESS BY HISTORIC RECORD?
www.matthewsnc.gov



232 Matthews Station Street
Matthews, NC 28105
704.847.4411

ZONING APPLICATION FOR ORDINANCE TEXT CHANGE
Page 3

FILING INSTRUCTIONS

An application for text amendment of the Matthews Unified Development Ordinance must be completed on the application form provided for such purpose and submitted with the appropriate fee to the Town Hall. The application shall be reviewed by the Town Planning and Development Department for completeness and then submitted to the Town Board of Commissioners for acceptance. The Town Board of Commissioners shall set a public hearing date according to their policy. The application shall be considered at a public hearing held jointly by the Town Commissioners and the Planning Board.

After the public hearing the application shall be reviewed by the Planning Board at their next regular meeting. At that meeting, the Planning Board may recommend approval, denial, or approval with conditions. This recommendation is then passed on to the Board of Commissioners at their next regular meeting in which zoning issues are discussed, according to Town Board policy. The Town Board of Commissioners may then approve, amend and approve, deny, or table action on the application. Any decision of the Town Board is final and subsequent revisions shall be handled in this same process as a new application.

The application for text amendment may be withdrawn by the Applicant at any time up to and including fifteen (15) days prior to the hearing date. Any subsequent withdrawal shall only be allowed by action of the Town Board of Commissioners.

ZONING APPLICATION FOR ORDINANCE TEXT CHANGE FEE:

Add a permitted use:	\$100
Any other reason, fewer than three (3) paragraphs affected:	\$250
Any other reason, three (3) or more paragraphs affected:	\$400



Oct 2, 2017

Town of Matthews
Planning Office
Town Hall
Matthews, NC 28105

RE: Application for Text Change

Dear Zoning Office,

Thanks for all you do to keep Matthews' codes enforced and thanks for your patience with us as we endeavor to present our business in a way that enhances the town. We feel our current sign does just that, and accordingly would like to respectfully apply for a slight text change to the existing law.

While we now realize (as of your notice) that our current sign violates *sections 155.213 and 155.608*, we would like to respectfully propose that blanket code banning roof signs is ineffective at achieving its goal of preventing tasteless or unsightly signs that deter the classic theme of downtown Matthews.

In our research into best practice and existing laws in towns we felt have a similar classic feel as desired by Matthews, we found several instances of simple language that would be useful. While we found plenty of towns that used boiler plate language banning roof signs we also found several that had more nuanced approaches like this one here at the city of Alexandria VA. Their language acknowledges a very similar situation to Matthews when they say:

The old and historic Alexandria District is the third historic district established in the United States. It has a remarkable ensemble of late 18th and early 19th century buildings and includes virtually every architectural style that has been popular on the east coast over the last 200 years.

While our history in Matthews covers just 150 years rather than 200+ we also can say we have a wide variety of architectural styles that came in and out of popularity over that time. A large part of our architectural history in Matthews came during a time when rooftop signs were in vogue: As the NPS historians say here:

Rooftop signs appeared with greater frequency in the second half of the nineteenth century than previously. Earlier rooftop signs tended to be relatively simple—often merely larger versions of the horizontal signs typically found on lower levels. Late in the century the signs became more ornate as well as more numerous. These later rooftop signs were typically found on hotels, theaters, banks and other large buildings.

Also noted in the National Park Service observations about the history of signs in the USA was this section we found relevant to Matthews:

Most historic districts contain buildings constructed over a long period of time, by different owners for different purposes; the buildings reflect different architectural styles and personal tastes. By requiring a standard sign "image" in such matters as size, material, typeface and other qualities, sign controls can mute the diversity of historic districts. Such controls can also sacrifice signs of some age and distinction that have not yet come back into fashion.⁷

As I reviewed the [ordinance for Alexandria VA](#) it is interesting how they craft sign rules for the buildings in their historic district that are left more open to interpretation (knowing that a one-sized-fits-all rule might not enhance their historic feel) but require that signs erected on these designated buildings that may be in question be erected upon permission from authorities. This would encompass hundreds of structures for them, but be limited to no more than a dozen or so in Matthews. It seems this would not present some sort of unwieldy process for the downtown area if we adopted a similar approach to Alexandria. Surely if we achieved their level of compliance we would be thrilled with our look and feel.

Finally in this application we have the support of our building owner Garry Smith as well as our neighbor Jim Johnson both of whom have volunteered to provide letters of support or appear in person in favor of our current sign and in favor of our text variance request.

Thanks again for all you do and for your kind consideration on this matter.


Mark Moore

THANKS FOR YOUR TIME
AND KIND CONSIDERATION,

| mark@mananutrition.org | office 855-438-6262 | mobile 202-329-3291