Click links to view:

- **Preliminary proposal for a new sign submitted for congregational comment in January 2019**
- **List of committee activities 2018- January 28, 2019**
- **List of congregational comments from January 2019**

Committee response to comments:(Note the numerical references at the end of each section refer to the total list of all comments provided in the link above.)

1. **Need for a Sign**: The Committee was given the task of proposing a new sign based on informal congregational comments over time as well as recent discussions during the 60th anniversary and Vision 20/20. We believe that the many supportive and effusive comments regarding the preliminary proposal indicate that those commenting agree there is a need for such a sign. Those comments follow: 1) I love both; 2) Looks good; 3) Looks great!; 4) Sign is great!; 5) I LOVE it!; 6) Looks good to me; 7) Very Nice!; 8) I Love it!! Wonderful; 9) Beautiful!; 10) It's Awesome!! Wonderful Job; 11) Great—go for it; 12) Love it!; 13) Good!; 14) I love it; 15) Nice looking; 16) Lovely; 17) Very Nice; 18) I like It!! Good job committee!; 19) Fabulous—will invite curiosity; 20) We do need one! (see comments 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 29, 34, 35, 38, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 59, 70). One comment questioned the cost of such an endeavor (see comment 5).
2. **Location and Positioning**. The Committee sought the most effective location and considered several venues along our property line facing US 15/501 as well as the corner of Willow Drive and Fordham Blvd. The corner location was eliminated because traffic on Willow Drive often blocks viewing the sign and it is not visible to northbound traffic on Fordham Blvd. Meetings with Town officials and Duke Power were held to understand the limitations for erecting a sign. Town ordinance requires the sign be set back 10 feet within the property line which places the sign within the tree line. The most optimal site was determined to be in front of the church at an open area in the landscape and near the walkway close to the area where pumpkins were sold. The Committee erected a temporary Styrofoam model (see comment 14) to gauge visibility from the highway before making the preliminary proposal to the congregation regarding this location. From this model we were able to determine there would be visibility from Fordham Blvd. Comments were received suggesting a two-sided sign perpendicular to US15/501 as more practical for reading by passer-bys (see comments 32, 70). Because the current town ordinance requires a sign to be 10 feet inside a property line, the Committee believes placing a sign perpendicular to US15/501 10 feet inside our property line would result in a sightline through the surrounding wooded area (in both directions) that would be so occluded as to render our intended message ineffective. Safety was an issue also mentioned. While safety can never be guaranteed, the Committee was not aware of significant safety issues related to the Church's banner sign that had similar or more prominent placement (see comment 23).

3. **Design**. After becoming cognizant of many signs in the community, understanding the Town ordinance, and having discussions with a local professional sign maker and a local sculptor, several sign designs were considered before arriving at the preliminary design presented to the congregation. Governing the Committee's choice on design were also the requirements to not exceed 80 square feet in total display and to make all lettering a minimum of 9 inches in height. We wanted a design that was eye catching, modern and in keeping with the building architecture. While design per se was not often mentioned in comments received (see comments 19, 57), the Committee infers that the design was acceptable given the broader comments about the overall impression of the signs submitted as preliminary proposal (see comments 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 21, 22, 29, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 59).
4. **Base Material**. The Committee had not reached a decision regarding base material but provided photos of two masonry options (brick and stone) to consider for the sign base. Some comments reflected a preference for brick with some mention of matching the existing building (see comments 4, 15, 43, 53). More comments favored the stone façade (see comments 3, 6, 28, 30, 34, 36, 46, 49, 54, 57, 61, 68). Stucco was also suggested as an alternative (see comment 39). The Committee believes that the multiple mortar joints of brick veneer conflict with the readability of the lettering on the sign. While the final facade has not been determined by the Committee, the result will have to allow maximum readability of the sign from the highway (see also comments 8, 20, 30, 36, 62, 71). The Committee will continue to consider the best solution and will prioritize sustainability, aesthetics, and readability for the sign.
5. **Wording**. Both preliminary proposals for the sign submitted for comment by the Committee used lettering that read "BINKLEY CHURCH All Are Welcome". This wording was put forward for comment because of considerations for the size of the sign given the Town requirements for letter size. The Committee discussed this issue at length on several occasions. We received multiple insightful comments expressing a desire to include the word "BAPTIST" on the sign (see comments 1, 2, 5, 25, 31, 32, 46, 47, 48, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70,71. Contrarily, there were multiple comments preferring not to use the word "BAPTIST" on the sign (see comments 3, 4, 26, 27, 30, 43, 44, 45, 61, 62, 63, 64, 69). It is the belief of the Committee that this issue requires further church discussion before we proceed. Therefore we have sought direction from the Church Council to establish a process to resolve this important question. The leadership team will be setting up an opportunity for congregational conversation soon.
6. **Sculpture**. The Committee met with a local artist (Mike Roig) known for his modern and inspirational work. He was given general concepts of Binkley beliefs (see proposal for more details), and asked to create an appropriate sculpture to draw attention to our sign. The sculptural model presented in the Committee's preliminary proposal display is a prototype of an approximate 6-7-foot sculpture to be positioned on and to the right of the proposed sign. Many comments favored the sculpture as is (see comments 3, 23, 26, 30, 33, 36, 40), and probably many more who favored the design in general were referring to the sculpture too (see comments 18, 19, 29, 34, 35, 38, 39, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 59) . Some indicated the sculpture did not speak to them (see comments 17, 31, 32). Others suggest changing the sculpture in size or color (see comments 16, 40, 55, 58).

Please note that the color is more vibrant in sunlight. Vandalism was also a concern (see comment 52). The Committee believes there is general consensus favoring the sculpture, but will continue to take your comments into consideration.