



Nice Matters!

**Emerald Isle  
Planning and Inspections**

7500 Emerald Drive  
Emerald Isle, NC 28594

252-354-8548 voice  
252-354-5068 fax

[www.emeraldisle-nc.org](http://www.emeraldisle-nc.org)

**Town Planner**

Josh Edmondson

[jedmondson@emeraldisle-nc.org](mailto:jedmondson@emeraldisle-nc.org)



**DATE:** September 2, 2016  
**TO:** Frank A. Rush, Jr, Town Manager  
**FROM:** Josh Edmondson, CZO, Town Planner  
**SUBJECT:** Consider a request from C4 Emerald Isle LLC, for an Amendment to Chapter 6 Section 6.6.6 Signs in Commercial, Government and Mixed Use Districts

A request has been submitted by C4 Emerald Isle LLC, for an ordinance amendment for alternate sign area allowance. The ordinance amendment has been attached for your review. Please note that the ordinance would only apply to individual businesses that have at least 150 linear feet of street frontage either public or private. The business could be located in its own building or could be located within a strip commercial center, but in either case the individual business would need to have at least 150 linear feet of street frontage. The ordinance enables the use of this alternative formula by qualifying businesses, with administrative approval by staff. This amendment would apply to both new and existing businesses.

The ordinance establishes a formula whereby the maximum sign area is equal to the amount of linear feet of street frontage times 0.50 (one-half). For example, an individual business with 160 ft. of street frontage could have a maximum sign area of 80 square feet. The ordinance does allow a business that fronts on more than one street to have a maximum of two signs, with no more than one sign per frontage and calculated according to this same formula for each side of the business. Using the same above example, a business with 160 ft. of street frontage could have a maximum sign area of 80 square feet. If it has frontage along another street using the example of 60 linear feet of frontage the total square feet of the other could be no more the 30 square feet.

Staff feels the typical storefront in Emerald Isle has about 50 linear feet of frontage and with the current allowance of 32 square feet of signage, the ratio is about 0.64. Thus the attached amendment would actually allow less sign area than would otherwise be allowed if a large building was divided into small storefronts. An example would be, under current ordinance a 150 linear ft. building with 3 businesses that each have 50 linear ft. of frontage are allowed a total of 96 sq. ft. of sign (3 times 32 sq. ft.), whereas the formula in the sign ordinance amendment would only allow the one business to have 75 sq. ft. of sign.

By staff analysis using GIS, we believe the attached amendment would potentially be available to any new or existing business with 150 linear feet or more of street frontage. The existing businesses that are believed to be eligible for this alternative are:

- Pacific, with 150 linear feet on NC 58 and Reed Drive, and 75 linear feet on Loon (ordinance would allow signs on only 2 of the 3 street frontages)
- CVS, with 150 linear feet on NC 58 and 80 linear feet on Mangrove
- Wings, with 160 linear feet on Bogue Inlet Drive and 50 linear feet on NC 58
- Bogue Inlet Motel, with 260 linear feet on Bogue Inlet Drive
- Oceanview Inn, with 260 linear feet on Fairview Drive and 35 feet on Bogue Inlet Drive
- Islander Suites, with 160 linear feet on Islander Drive
- Bert's Surf Shop, with 160 linear feet on NC 58 and Crew Drive, and 60 linear feet on Islander Drive (would allow sign on only 2 of the 3 street frontages)
- Food Lion, with 190 linear feet on NC 58

If this ordinance is applied to the proposed new grocery store, which has 230 linear feet of frontage along NC 58 and 170 linear feet of frontage on Emerald Landing Drive, it would be allowed on sign up to 115 sq. ft. on the NC 58 frontage and on sign up to 85 sq. ft. on the Emerald Landing frontage. The applicant has proposed signs with 75 sq. ft. on each street frontage.

The Planning Board recommend approval of the text amendment to the Commissioners as presented. I look forward to discussing this with the Commissioners at their September 13, 2016 meeting.