

Lauren Whetstone

From: S Holden <holdten@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 3, 2021 7:22 AM
To: DSD Planning
Subject: Church Sign Variance

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

In regard to the request by the Catalina Foothills Church to increase the size and placement of their signage, I see no need or a variance. There is no hardship to consider. There are rules in place, why not just adhere to them?

Sue Holden
Shadow Hills

Lauren Whetstone

From: Bill and Mary Read <maread05@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, December 3, 2021 8:34 AM
To: DSD Planning
Subject: District 1 Board of Adjustment meeting Dec 6 2021

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Bill Read wishes to speak at the District 1 Board of Adjustment meeting on Nov 1 regarding Item #5 - P21VA00010 CATALINA FOOTHILLS CHURCH.

Lauren Whetstone

From: Bill and Mary Read <maread05@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, December 3, 2021 8:32 AM
To: DSD Planning
Cc: Thomas Drzazgowski; District1; Kate Hiller; Durand Law; Fred Fiastro; Frank Bangs; Larry
Subject: P21VA00010 - Catalina Foothills Church
Attachments: Objectioni to P21V00010-Catalina Foothills Church.pdf

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Members of Board of Adjustment,

As a member of the neighborhood group working to find a compromise on the signs for the Catalina Foothills Church, and President of Catalina Foothills Estates No 8, I was troubled by the latest revised application submitted for the CFC variance request.

In our meetings with CFC, we had a verbal commitment for 19 in letters for the wall sign, but the letter height in the revised application is 24 inches. We had also discussed using the Dark Sky option of the sign code as a means to have larger signs without the need for a variance. That would have satisfied a huge concern of the entire foothills community - wall sign illumination off by 9 PM and the monument signs off by 10 PM. The revised application makes no mention of any adherence to the Dark Sky requirements. The drawings still state compliance with the Outdoor Lighting Code – not the same!

Because of that breach of trust, and the discovery of a 2001 agreement between CFC and Cat 8 in which CFC agreed to restrict traffic from turning into our neighborhood, I am opposing the monument sign on Skyline as well as the illumination of any signs that do not comply with the requirements of the Dark Sky option of the sign code.

I want to address the concerns of a majority of residents of Catalina Foothills Estates No 8 regarding the proposed signs for Catalina Foothills Church (CFC).

The top two concerns are the illumination of the signs and the monument sign on Skyline.

1. A monument sign on Skyline should be not be approved because:
 - a. Section 18.79.080(D)2 allows **1 sign per site** – exception: 1 sign per vehicular access point for a development complex having a street frontage of at least 500 feet.
 - i. **There is no property entrance (vehicular access point) on Skyline.**
 - b. In 2001, CFC and Catalina Foothills Estates 8 signed an agreement as part of a variance (Case No Co19(1)01-06). Item A.12 of that agreement states that the church will install signs at the

parking lot exits on Camino Miraval in order to restrict traffic from turning into the neighborhood.

- i. Encouraging drivers to turn onto Camino Miraval would violate the spirit of that agreement.
 - c. Drivers turning onto Camino Miraval will create a safety hazard for our residents. Camino Miraval is a narrow residential street used by local residents for walking exercise, many with small children in tow. With no sidewalks, and vegetation growing over the pavement, it is impossible for pedestrians to step off the pavement when traffic approaches.
 - d. A sign on Skyline would be a duplication of the proposed wall sign located nearby facing the intersection of Skyline and Orange Grove, creating a cluster of signs along that scenic road.
 - e. There is no stated hardship that would warrant a monument sign on Skyline.
 - i. The hardship created by the elevation of Skyline in 2004 will be remedied by the wall sign proposed in this variance.
2. Illumination: No signs larger or higher than those allowed by code for Residential zoning should be allowed unless the requirements of the Dark Sky option are fully implemented.
 - a. Allowing an increase in sign area without a decrease in luminous intensity only adds to the excessive lumens on the site.
 - i. The current lighting on the church property (1,092,872 lumens) exceeds the maximum allowed lumens (234,000 lumens) by 4½ times since new parking lot lights were installed in Feb 2021. A Zoning complaint P21CI01373 was filed on July 19 2021 for this apparent violation.
 - b. If an applicant can get a variance for larger signs without complying with the Dark Sky incentive, then why would anyone ever choose the Dark Sky incentive?
 - c. Granting a size or height increase without meeting the conditions of the Dark Sky incentive undermines the efforts of the light experts and business people who worked hard to develop that portion of the sign code.
 - d. Variances for signs that would otherwise be in compliance by using the Dark Sky option should never be granted.

If this rural area is not a textbook example of where the Dark Sky initiative should be used, then what is! There are no competing signs in the area to detract driver's attention. There are no streetlights. The only background light is from the church's own parking lot lights.

According to the narrative on page 3 of the variance application, the purpose of the two monument signs is to indicate the entrances to the property and help drivers navigate and prepare to turn into the church.

That **is** a valid reason for the Orange Grove sign. But, the Skyline monument sign should be rejected **because** of that very reason. **There is no entrance on Skyline.**

Even though no hardships have been provided for any of the required standards necessary for a variance, I support a variance for the Orange Grove sign to be located in the ROW. With a 60 foot distance from the pavement edge to the property line, a sign on the property line is not reasonable. A height of 8 feet is not necessary on Orange Grove. A two-lane road does not restrict the visibility of the sign for drivers.

A wall sign to identify the church is also reasonable given that Skyline was elevated in 2004 reducing the visibility of the existing freestanding sign in the drainage basin.

I respectfully urge you to:

1. Grant a variance for a 6 foot high sign in the ROW on Orange Grove.
2. Reject the Skyline monument sign outright, and
3. Require strict compliance with the Dark Sky incentives of the sign code for all signs.

Thank you,

Bill Read – President Catalina Foothills Estates No 8

Please see the attached document for more information.

Lauren Whetstone

From: J Peppard <jvpeppard@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 3, 2021 8:12 AM
To: DSD Planning
Subject: P21VA00010 sign variance application for Catalina Foothills Church, Dec. 6

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

As residents of the nearby Shadow Hills development, we'd like to register disapproval of this application. The signs proposed are very large and intrusive, not to mention lighted which is a whole new concept for that corner. It is clear from the application that this is an advertising push by the church for new parishioners, thinly veiled as a concern for traffic safety. Because of this it also sets a precedent - we would ask you to consider how this would all play out if this was a gas station. Or indeed, La Encantada mall. Our Dark Skies policy is of high concern to all residents of this area and we need to push for it one variance application at a time. This is such a time.

There is just no discernable justification for so much permanent signage other than advertising. This church already seems to be in violation of several regulations and trying to push for more, and we hereby request that this application be denied completely. A new application from the church for 2 small signs at road level to direct cars into the parking lot entrances should suffice if they are genuinely concerned about traffic safety, rather than their coffers.

Sincerely,
Jane & Terence Peppard
1190 E. Calle de la Cabra Tucson, AZ 85718

Lauren Whetstone

From: Larry Ivy <laruivy@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, December 3, 2021 8:54 AM
To: Bill and Mary Read
Cc: DSD Planning; Thomas Drzazgowski; District1; Kate Hiller; Durand Law; Fred Fiastro; Frank Bangs
Subject: Re: P21VA00010 - Catalina Foothills Church
Attachments: Objectioni to P21V00010-Catalina Foothills Church.pdf

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Very explicit and hopefully garners support from majority of board. Thanks Bill.

On Dec 3, 2021, at 8:31 AM, Bill and Mary Read <maread05@msn.com> wrote:

Members of Board of Adjustment,

As a member of the neighborhood group working to find a compromise on the signs for the Catalina Foothills Church, and President of Catalina Foothills Estates No 8, I was troubled by the latest revised application submitted for the CFC variance request.

In our meetings with CFC, we had a verbal commitment for 19 in letters for the wall sign, but the letter height in the revised application is 24 inches. We had also discussed using the Dark Sky option of the sign code as a means to have larger signs without the need for a variance. That would have satisfied a huge concern of the entire foothills community - wall sign illumination off by 9 PM and the monument signs off by 10 PM. The revised application makes no mention of any adherence to the Dark Sky requirements. The drawings still state compliance with the Outdoor Lighting Code – not the same!

Because of that breach of trust, and the discovery of a 2001 agreement between CFC and Cat 8 in which CFC agreed to restrict traffic from turning into our neighborhood, I am opposing the monument sign on Skyline as well as the illumination of any signs that do not comply with the requirements of the Dark Sky option of the sign code.

I want to address the concerns of a majority of residents of Catalina Foothills Estates No 8 regarding the proposed signs for Catalina Foothills Church (CFC).

The top two concerns are the illumination of the signs and the monument sign on Skyline.

1. A monument sign on Skyline should be not be approved because:
 - a. Section 18.79.080(D)2 allows **1 sign per site** – exception: 1 sign per vehicular access point for a development complex having a street frontage of at least 500 feet.

- i. **There is no property entrance (vehicular access point) on Skyline.**
 - b. In 2001, CFC and Catalina Foothills Estates 8 signed an agreement as part of a variance (Case No Co19(1)01-06). Item A.12 of that agreement states that the church will install signs at the parking lot exits on Camino Miraval in order to restrict traffic from turning into the neighborhood.
 - i. Encouraging drivers to turn onto Camino Miraval would violate the spirit of that agreement.
 - c. Drivers turning onto Camino Miraval will create a safety hazard for our residents. Camino Miraval is a narrow residential street used by local residents for walking exercise, many with small children in tow. With no sidewalks, and vegetation growing over the pavement, it is impossible for pedestrians to step off the pavement when traffic approaches.
 - d. A sign on Skyline would be a duplication of the proposed wall sign located nearby facing the intersection of Skyline and Orange Grove, creating a cluster of signs along that scenic road.
 - e. There is no stated hardship that would warrant a monument sign on Skyline.
 - i. The hardship created by the elevation of Skyline in 2004 will be remedied by the wall sign proposed in this variance.
- 2. Illumination: No signs larger or higher than those allowed by code for Residential zoning should be allowed unless the requirements of the Dark Sky option are fully implemented.
 - a. Allowing an increase in sign area without a decrease in luminous intensity only adds to the excessive lumens on the site.
 - i. The current lighting on the church property (1,092,872 lumens) exceeds the maximum allowed lumens (234,000 lumens) by 4½ times since new parking lot lights were installed in Feb 2021. A Zoning complaint P21CI01373 was filed on July 19 2021 for this apparent violation.
 - b. If an applicant can get a variance for larger signs without complying with the Dark Sky incentive, then why would anyone ever choose the Dark Sky incentive?
 - c. Granting a size or height increase without meeting the conditions of the Dark Sky incentive undermines the efforts of the light experts and business people who worked hard to develop that portion of the sign code.
 - d. Variances for signs that would otherwise be in compliance by using the Dark Sky option should never be granted.

If this rural area is not a textbook example of where the Dark Sky initiative should be used, then what is! There are no competing signs in the area to detract driver's attention. There are no streetlights. The only background light is from the church's own parking lot lights.

According to the narrative on page 3 of the variance application, the purpose of the two monument signs is to indicate the entrances to the property and help drivers navigate and prepare to turn into the church.

That **is** a valid reason for the Orange Grove sign. But, the Skyline monument sign should be rejected **because** of that very reason. **There is no entrance on Skyline.**

Even though no hardships have been provided for any of the required standards necessary for a variance, I support a variance for the Orange Grove sign to be located in the ROW. With a 60 foot distance from the pavement edge to the property line, a sign on the property line is not reasonable. A height of 8 feet is not necessary on Orange Grove. A two-lane road does not restrict the visibility of the sign for drivers.

A wall sign to identify the church is also reasonable given that Skyline was elevated in 2004 reducing the visibility of the existing freestanding sign in the drainage basin.

I respectfully urge you to:

1. Grant a variance for a 6 foot high sign in the ROW on Orange Grove.
2. Reject the Skyline monument sign outright, and
3. Require strict compliance with the Dark Sky incentives of the sign code for all signs.

Thank you,

Bill Read – President Catalina Foothills Estates No 8

Please see the attached document for more information.

Lauren Whetstone

From: Ann Wells <annyn@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, December 3, 2021 8:23 AM
To: DSD Planning
Cc: catalinafoothills8@stratfordmanagement.org
Subject: Sign Variance request for Catalina Foothills Church (CFC)

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Dear Board of Adjustment Members,

My husband and I purchased a home in the Catalina Foothills Estates #8 this past July. It is our dream home. We are profoundly disturbed by the sign variances the Catalina Foothills Church is requesting. These variances would negatively impact the residential neighborhood. We feel that the type of signage requests they are making are more suitable for within a commercial area rather than within a residential area.

The signs do not follow the Dark Sky Incentive. I own a telescope and love being able to view the night sky without hindrance of lights due to this provision. The Dark Sky Incentive is in place for a reason. There is no reason for the church to violate it.

The signs being proposed go well beyond the size limits and maximum allowance. The church erects banners and is seeking to advertise itself in a commercial way, which is highly inappropriate in this neighborhood.

We feel that the Catalina Foothills Church is requesting signage without regard to the aesthetic blend with the natural desert surroundings and natural beauty of the area, which is one of the reasons we bought our home and love living here. The church is requesting signage which lacks harmony with the neighborhood and surrounding area. Personally, I do not understand why the Catalina Foothills Church feels it needs to advertise itself like a retail business while located within this residential area.

We are requesting that the Board reject all variance requests in this matter in order to maintain the balance with nature which this neighborhood features. The church should have to adhere to all sign standards and should also be in compliance with all current sign standards and agreements.

We will be out of town on the date of the meeting, so please accept this letter as our voice of opposition to this variance request.

Sincerely,
Douglas F and Ann L. Wells
2234 E. Miraval Tercero
Tucson, AZ 85718

annyn@aol.com
928-853-7460