

Attachment B - Changes in 6-2-17 Draft

This is intended to be a companion document to the 6-2-17 Draft Sign Standards. For each change made since the 3-30-17 draft, there will be information related to that below. In many cases it will only be a staff clean-up item, in others it may have a more extensive explanation with options. In general, the edits made fall into the following categories:

1. Recommendation of the Citizen Sign Code Committee,
2. Responses to Commissioner Martin's Recommendations,
3. Historic items that have been presented to the Tucson-Pima County Historic Commission – Plans Review Subcommittee,
4. Items needing clean-up that staff has found through their review of the draft.

1. Page 1 - Section 7A.1.1 - Removed highlighting from purpose statement. **(Staff Clean-up)**

2. Page 2 - Section 7A.2.2 - Added text referencing special district maps. **(Commissioner Martin Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Commissioner Martin asked *these* vs *the* 'sign standards' – Should all references throughout the Sign standards use the same word?
- **Comment:** We don't believe there is any conflict using two words. We can change all reference by doing a document search to the phrase, "the sign standards"
- **Additional Options:** None

3. Page 9 - Section 7A.6.2.A - Clarification language added related to historic districts. **(Staff Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** In reviewing the 3-30-17 draft, staff noticed a clarification was needed stating that the maximum sign area calculation ratio does not apply to historic districts.
- **Comment:** Staff believes this is an important clarification.
- **Additional Options:** None

4. Page 10 - Section 7A.6.4 - Removed highlighting and changed rate-of-change to five-minutes **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Citizen Sign Code Committee voted to recommend a five-minute change rate (5-3 approval – three votes for one minute) and the Joint Subcommittee (JSC) voted to recommend a five-minute change rate (4-1 approval – one vote for one minute).
- **Comment:** Staff has changed text to reflect the recommendation of the Citizen Sign Code Committee.

- **Additional Options:**

C. A digital sign is permitted to have a rate of change of sign copy, graphic, or information not more than once an hour. The digital sign copy shall not have any transitions or animations.

-or-

C. A digital sign is permitted to have a rate of change of sign copy, graphic, or information not more than once every five minutes. The digital sign copy shall not have any transitions or animations.

-or-

C. A digital sign is permitted to have a rate of change of sign copy, graphic, or information not more than once every one minute. The digital sign copy shall not have any transitions or animations.

5. Page 12 - Section 7A.6.10.I - Added language clarifying A-Frame signs and permanent signs.
(Chuck Martin Recommendation)

- **Background Info:** Commissioner Martin asked *does the section 'Signs in or over Public Right of Way' apply to permanent signs?*
- **Comment:** Section 7A.6.10 was intended to regulate temporary (now called portable) signs over the right of way. In reorganizing sections to respond to the Reed case, this section included signs in the right of way which are also portable.

In other sections of 7A, the temporary revocable easement (TRE) is required. These include A-frame signs that have their own time limits and permanent projecting signs that regularly receive TREs from the Department of Transportation. Section 7A.6.10 is limited to only the type of signs not regulated elsewhere in Article 7A.

Section 6.10.A states the City may allow for 60 days or allow a sign to be in the right of way for an alternative time frame. This provision may take care of A-frames and Permanent Signs when using a TRE. The alternative time frame can be stated in the TRE document. Another option is to add a section stating in an additional Section I (i.e., 7A.6.10.I) stating, "the time frame for a permanent sign and an A-frame sign are regulated separately as part of the temporary revocable easement process."

- **Additional Options:** None

6. Page 13 - Section 7A.7.1.B - Removed language related to prohibited signs in Master Sign Program (CSCC Recommendation)

- **Background Info:** Citizens Sign Code Committee voted to recommend not including mentioning prohibited signs as part of a master sign program (7-1 approval), and the Joint Subcommittee voted to recommend to not allow Prohibited Signs as part of a Master Sign Program but exempted commercial flags (4-1 approval).
- **Comment:** The original vote of the JSC focused on master portable sign programs being allowed to use commercial flags as part of their design. They felt other prohibited signs should not be allowed.

In the CSCC discussion, it was mentioned that a historical building with a historic roof sign would be prohibited to replace it for a new business to keep the historic designation and historical credibility in its setting. The CSCC decided that there may be other situations where a prohibited signs may be acceptable in that situation and that the Sign Design Review Committee (SDRC) considering its composition of design professionals as well as neighborhood and business stakeholders would be able to discern where a prohibited sign has a case to be considered appropriate and where a proposal is not appropriate.

Ultimately, the Planning and Development Services Department (PDSD) Director will decide and can also consult with the City’s Design Professional on any SDRC recommendation.

- **Options:**
 - B. Applicability. The master sign program includes all exterior permanent signs at a premise and provides a process where the provisions of Article 7A may be varied subject to the standards and findings listed below. Prohibited signs are not allowed to be used in a master sign program.**

-or-

B. Applicability. The master sign program includes all exterior permanent signs at a premise and provides a process where the provisions of Article 7A may be varied subject to the standards and findings listed below.

7. Page 13 - Section 7A.7.1.B - added language clarifying that Billboard signs are not to be used in a master sign program. **(Staff Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** There has been considerable concern throughout the Sign Code Revision process about loosening up regulations on billboards.
- **Comment:** Clarification was added to ensure that Billboard Signs may not be used in a master sign program.
- **Additional Options:** None

8. Page 14 - Section 7A.7.1.E.2.c - Removed requiring caps from design option **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Citizens Sign Code Committee voted to recommend no caps be applied in reviewing design option applications (6-2 approval), and the joint Subcommittee voted to recommend the draft standard that required freestanding signs to have caps of 20 feet sign structure height and 100 square feet sign area (3-2 approval).
- **Comment:** Staff stated to the CSCC that in reviewing this issue it became clearer that, if there are caps, someone who cannot meet the caps for various reasons is forced to go to the Board of Adjustment to resolve the matter with a variance.

The proposed design review process is modeled after existing successful design review committees of the Infill Incentive District and the Main Gate Urban Overlay District.

The SDRC, staff stated, is the most appropriate group to review sign design issues and not the Board of Adjustment. A given situation may require a larger sign that fits within its context and setting and is apparent to a design reviewer looking at the facts of the application. To send such an applicant to the Board of Adjustment causes the applicant and staff to switch review criteria from design considerations to the standards of a variance where having a unique hardship becomes the key standard. During the 18-month period prior to the ordinance sunseting or being readopted, the caps issue can be monitored.

As noted above with the composition of the SDRC, the ability of the PDSO Director to consult with the City's Design Professional, having a set of design standards connected to the Purpose Statement, and having an appeal to the Board of Adjustment and Mayor and Council, it becomes difficult for a sign representing an intrusive or inappropriate design to be approved.

Some JSC members voting in the minority favored a more cap-oriented process with some type of incentives. Those preferring caps pointed to Flagstaff and Phoenix's use of caps in their review processes. In the case of Flagstaff, greater areas could be obtained for greater amounts of compliance with specific incentivized design criteria.

- **Additional Options:** None

(3) The sign height shall not be greater than 20 feet tall and 100 square feet in area.

9. Page 14-16 - Section 7A.7.1.E, .F, & .G - Reformatted and rearranged these sections to improve clarity of regulations and make text more concise. **(Staff Clean-up)**

- **Background Info:** During the process there has been some concern raised that the Sign Design Option not concise and is difficult to understand.
- **Comment:** Through the reorganization and minor text changes to these sections, staff believes they have tightened up the regulations and in turn made them more clear for the future users of the code.

- **Additional Options:** None

10. Page 17 - Section 7A.7.2.B.1 – Removed highlighting and to remove language related to prohibited signs for portable master sign programs as voted upon by the CSCC. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Citizens Sign Code Committee voted to recommend not including mentioning prohibited signs as part of a master sign program (7-1 approval), and the Joint Subcommittee voted to recommend to not allow Prohibited Signs as part of a Master Sign Program but exempted commercial flags (4-1 approval).
- **Comment:** The original vote of the JSC focused on master portable sign programs being allowed to use commercial flags as part of their design. They felt other prohibited signs should not be allowed.

In the CSCC discussion, it was mentioned that a historical building with a historic roof sign would be prohibited to replace it for a new business to keep the historic designation and historical credibility in its setting. The CSCC decided that there may be other situations where a prohibited signs may be acceptable in that situation and that the Sign Design Review Committee (SDRC) considering its composition of design professionals as well as neighborhood and business stakeholders would be able to discern where a prohibited sign has a case to be considered appropriate and where a proposal is not appropriate.

Ultimately, the Planning and Development Services Department (PDS) Director will decide and can also consult with the City’s Design Professional on any SDRC recommendation.

- **Options:**

1. The master sign program for portable signs allows a design option for all portable signs and applies to all portable signs intended to be viewed from the right of way. The program provides a process where the provisions of Article 7A may be varied subject to the standards and findings listed below. It applies to on-site signs that are intended to be viewed from the right of way. If off-site signs are used they must be approved and coordinated with the Department of Transportation.

-Or-

1. The master sign program for portable signs allows a design option for all portable signs and applies to all portable signs intended to be viewed from the right of way. The program provides a process where the provisions of Article 7A may be varied subject to the standards and findings listed below. It applies to on-site signs that are intended to be viewed from the right of way. If off-site signs are used they must be

approved and coordinated with the Department of Transportation.
Prohibited signs may not be used in a master sign program for portable signs except for commercial flags.

11. Page 18 - Section 7A.7.4 - Removed highlighting and revised to keep language voted upon by CSCC. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Citizens Sign Code Committee voted to recommend the current draft standard using the PDSB Notice Policy (6 approval - 2 abstentions), and the Joint Subcommittee voted to recommend the draft standard using PDSB notice policy focusing on email to neighborhood associations and a PDSB email lists (3 -2 approval). The minority preferred the sending of first class mail to property owners within either 50 or 300 feet of the subject property depending on the size of the project.
- **Comment:** The current draft language follows a policy already in place for other similar City design review committees. It attempts to balance the need to be open and transparent while avoiding special time constraints that may be interpreted as an undue burden on the timing of the review of an application and inhibiting the applicant from exercising his/her First Amendment rights (the legal term is prior restraint). In addition, the SDRC will have a local neighborhood representative who can act as a liaison with the applicant and the neighborhood if there is an issue. There is also an at-large neighborhood representative involved in the application review.

The Tucson Residents for Responsible Government (TRRG) has recommended that the Sign Design Option include notification similar to rezonings and special exceptions (notification to property owners within 300' for Master Sign Program or to property owners within 50' for Singular Sign Program).

- **Options:**

Notification for Sign Design Option shall be in accordance with PDSB Departmental policy.

-or-

Notification for the Master Sign Program – Permanent Signs shall be in accordance with Section 3.3.5 300' notice procedure.

Notification for the Singular Sign Program shall be in accordance with Section 3.3.4 50' notice procedure.

12. Page 18 - Section 7A.8.1.A.4 - Removed highlighting related to murals in commercial districts and cleaned up text. **(Staff Clean-up)**

13. Page 19 – Sections 7A.8.2.A, & .D.1 – Added clarifying text related to prohibited signs. **(Staff Clean-up)**

14. Page 19 - Section 7A.8.2.F - Removed highlighting on text related to Roof Signs. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** The Citizens Sign Code Committee voted unanimously to recommend revising the definitions of roof sign and wall sign so that architectural features of the building would not be interpreted to be roof signs and the Joint Subcommittee voted 4-1 approval on two extended parapet options dealing with the size of the sign and parapet. The JSC ultimately asked Commissioner Cook to recommend an alternative.
- **Comment:** There was consensus among the CSCC members on Commissioner Cook's recommendation. Over the years, there have been several staff interpretations on what is a roof or wall sign. The extended parapet option was the first attempt to resolve the interpretation issue in the draft.

The JSC asked Commissioner Jude Cook to recommend an alternative so that signs on the actual building features that represent the architecture of the building would not be considered roof signs. A roof sign has to be a separate structure from the building and is attached to the building in a way to be above the roof line. A wall sign is a sign placed against a wall or various incorporated integrated feature of the building's architecture. The sign must be in the same plane as the wall or building feature.

Additional Options: None

15. Page 19 - Section 7A.8.2.F - Added text related to roof signs on historic buildings. **(Staff & Historic Commission Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Staff has presented this option to the Tucson-Pima County Historic Commission – Plans Review Subcommittee and they have voted to recommend this revision be a part of the Sign Code Revision Project.
- **Comment:** Currently, on some of the older commercial corridors, preservation efforts towards buildings listed, or eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places are being compromised. Examples of this are the old Table Talk building, which is now the Bisbee Breakfast Club in Broadway Village, and the old Tucson Podiatry building on Broadway Boulevard. Because there were no obvious locations for signs (all glass walls, art walls, and shallow or no parapets), the parapet heights were significantly increased to accommodate new signs. These changes have compromised the historic integrities, designs and National Register eligibilities of the buildings. This regulation attempts to address this issue.
- **Additional Options:** None

16. Page 19 - Section 7A.8.2.H - Removed highlighting and text related to prohibition of Feather Banners. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** The Citizens Sign Code Committee had a tie vote on whether to recommend allowing four feather banners (two color limit) and one portable sign in a

residential/commercial area in lieu of the limit of four signs and sign area allotment for portable signs (4-4 no recommendation), and the Joint Subcommittee - Voted to recommend prohibiting feather banners (3-2 approval).

- **Comment:** During the review by the JSC and CSCC, there was discussion to consider allowing four feather banners (limited to two colors) and a portable sign as a substitute for the standards on a sign area allotment plus a number limit of four portable signs. The other consideration was to place feather banners in the Sec.7A.8 - Prohibited Sign Section.

The supporters of prohibiting them said that they can be unsightly and are a common feature of sign clutter along City streets. The supporters for allowing feather banners said they are likely to occur whether they are allowed or prohibited and having a standard would help to control their display.

Staff said that non-commercial flags like national flags are exempt in the current Sign Code and the draft. There are national flags, however, that are composed of two simple bands of color that someone could use for commercial wayfinding reasons and be in compliance (e.g. Poland's flag has one red and one white stripe). It is worth considering having a regulation that focuses sign users on a controlled amount of display. On the point of someone using a non-commercial flag in a commercial setting, it is likely to be unpopular having a regulation that limits the display of a non-commercial flag like the American flag.

It was mentioned that apartment complexes are common users of these banners and that they are similar to commercial flags that are already prohibited by the current Sign Code. There have been staff interpretations stating feather banners are commercial flags thus prohibited and, on the other hand, that the current Sign Code inadvertently allows them through the wording of the definition for banner.

The outcome of the Sign Code Project is to clarify the status of feather banners to be either regulated with standards or prohibit them and control them through enforcement.

- **Options:**

H. Feather Banners Prohibited

-or-

2. Feather Banners. In lieu of Portable Sign allotment, applicant may use four (4) feather banners using two colors. One (1) additional portable sign permitted in commercial/industrial zones.

17. Page 21 - Section 7A.10.1.C - Removed options and highlighting related to menu boards. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** The Citizens Sign Code Committee voted unanimously to recommend allowing menu boards with a voice-activated feature to be set back either 30 feet from residential property or have a sound mitigation wall in place, and the Joint Subcommittee voted unanimously to recommend the same as noted above.
- **Comment:** A menu board is a type of interior sign located at a drive through restaurant. The two committees considered a setback distance and mitigation options for two-way communication devices on menu boards. Both agreed to send it forward with the 30-foot setback or the use of an option for a sound mitigation wall.
- **Additional Options:** None

18. Page 21 - Section 7A.10.1.C – Added clarifying sentence related to Interior Signs that are readable from the right of way. **(Staff Clean-up)**

19. Page 23 - 25 – Section 7A.10.2 – Revised tables to use “P” for permitted signs in place of an “*” and removed text “See Below”. **(Chuck Martin Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Commissioner Martin asked what does the note ‘See Below’ refer to in Table 2?
- **Comment:** This note is intended to direct attention to the sign area standards immediately below the note. This has been removed to reduce confusion.
- **Additional Options:** None

20. Page 25 – Section 7A.10.2.B – Revised amount of area allowed for freestanding sign’s in the multi-family zone category for non-residential uses on arterial or collector streets from 40 to 50 so that it matches current regulation in the Sign Code. **(Staff Clean-up)**

21. Page 26 – Section 7A.10.2.C – Conflicting regulations between 7A.10.2 table and 7A.10.2.C additional sign standards. Changed to allow Access Point Signs as is the case in the current Sign Code. **(Staff Clean-up)**

22. Page 27 - Section 7A.10.2.C.1 - Removed highlighting and text related to Canopy Signs. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** The Citizens Sign Code Committee voted unanimously to recommend keeping the draft language that simplifies the current Sign Code provision, and the Joint Subcommittee did not make a specific recommendation. They suggested the issue continue to be reviewed.

- **Comment:** The CSCC voted to simplify the canopy sign standards to prohibit the sign type to be above a roof line. Additionally, it is to be part of the sign area allotment for wall signs.

The current standard is very complicated for both staff and applicants to use and has often created the need for variances and interpretations. Earlier discussion considered size limits on the sign copy lettering and whether the letters could exceed the sides of the background panel or the beam upon which it was attached. The CSCC recommendation does not address the attachment issues but rather looks at the sign as a subtype of a wall sign.

- **Options:**

(1) Canopy signs are not allowed to extend above the roofline.

(2) Canopy signs are counted as a part of the wall sign allotment for these sign standards.

-or-

(1) Canopy signs are not allowed to extend above the roofline.

(2) Canopy signs may be no greater than 100 square feet in area and are counted as a part of the wall sign allotment for these sign standards.

-or-

(1) Canopy signs are not allowed to extend above the roofline.

(2) Canopy signs are counted as a part of the wall sign allotment for these sign standards.

(3) Maximum size: The vertical measure of the sign face shall not exceed twenty-four (24) inches except for individual letters with descenders that are proportionate to the remaining text but in no case larger than eight (8) inches. Logos may be thirty (30) inches in height.

(4) Maximum height: The top of the canopy sign shall be no more than two (2) feet above the top surface of the canopy directly below the canopy sign, and no more than fifteen (15) in height above the finished grade immediately below the canopy sign.

(5) Location: Within twenty (20) feet of the building wall that backs the canopy sign.

23. Page 28 - Section 7A.10.2.C.2 - Removed highlighting and text related to setback from curb. **(Staff Clean-up)**
24. Page 29 & 30 - Section 7A.10.2.C.2.a.3 - Reorganized and removed duplicate text related to general business zone category. **(Chuck Martin Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Commissioner Martin asked, should the term ‘general business zone category’ be removed from the standards in the Industrial Zone Category related to Freestanding pole signs?
- **Comment:** The sections involved in what zones various freestanding signs are permitted. In c.4, it states in the general business zone category that all types of freestanding signs are permitted.

In c.5 it states which freestanding signs are permitted in the industrial zone category. In one statement it mentions both general business zone and industrial zone categories allow freestanding pole signs. Note this is Chapter Three Sign Code original language. It is repetitious in that the general business zone category already allows freestanding pole signs. The general business zone category reference will be removed from section c.5.

- **Additional Options:** None

25. Page 31 - Section 7A.10.2.C.3 - Removed text related to Extended Parapet Option. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** The Citizens Sign Code Committee voted unanimously to recommend revising the definitions of roof sign and wall sign so that architectural features of the building would not be interpreted to be roof signs, and the Joint Subcommittee voted 4-1 approval on two extended parapet options dealing with the size of the sign and parapet. The JSC ultimately asked Commissioner Cook to recommend an alternative.
- **Comment:** There was consensus among the CSCC members on Commissioner Cook’s recommendation. Over the years, there have been several staff interpretations on what is a roof or wall sign. The extended parapet option was the first attempt to resolve the interpretation issue in the draft.

The JSC asked Commissioner Jude Cook to recommend an alternative so that signs on the actual building features that represent the architecture of the building would not be considered roof signs. A roof sign has to be a separate structure from the building and is attached to the building in a way to be above the roof line. A wall sign is a sign placed against a wall or various incorporated integrated feature of the building’s architecture. The sign must be in the same plane as the wall or building feature.

- **Additional Options:** None

26. Page 32 – Section 7A.10.3.B.3 – Added clarifying text to Ground-mounted General Standards and removed text related to Feather Banners. **(Staff Clean-up)**

27. Page 35 - Section 7A.10.3.C.2 - Removed highlighting and text related to prohibition of Feather Banners - **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** The Citizens Sign Code Committee had a tie vote on whether to recommend allowing four feather banners (two color limit) and one portable sign in a residential/commercial area in lieu of the limit of four signs and sign area allotment for portable signs (4-4 no recommendation), and the Joint Subcommittee - Voted to recommend prohibiting feather banners (3-2 approval).
- **Comment:** During the review by the JSC and CSCC, there was discussion to consider allowing four feather banners (limited to two colors) and a portable sign as a substitute for the standards on a sign area allotment plus a number limit of four portable signs. The other consideration was to place feather banners in the Sec.7A.8 - Prohibited Sign Section.

The supporters of prohibiting them said that they can be unsightly and are a common feature of sign clutter along City streets. The supporters for allowing feather banners said they are likely to occur whether they are allowed or prohibited and having a standard would help to control their display.

Staff said that non-commercial flags like national flags are exempt in the current Sign Code and the draft. There are national flags, however, that are composed of two simple bands of color that someone could use for commercial wayfinding reasons and be in compliance (e.g. Poland's flag has one red and one white stripe). It is worth considering having a regulation that focuses sign users on a controlled amount of display. On the point of someone using a non-commercial flag in a commercial setting, it is likely to be unpopular having a regulation that limits the display of a non-commercial flag like the American flag.

It was mentioned that apartment complexes are common users of these banners and that they are similar to commercial flags that are already prohibited by the current Sign Code. There have been staff interpretations stating feather banners are commercial flags thus prohibited and, on the other hand, that the current Sign Code inadvertently allows them through the wording of the definition for banner.

The outcome of the Sign Code Project is to clarify the status of feather banners to be either regulated with standards or prohibit them and control them through enforcement.

- **Options:**

H. Feather Banners Prohibited

2. Feather Banners. In lieu of Portable Sign allotment, applicant may use four (4) feather banners using two colors. One (1) additional portable sign permitted in commercial/industrial zones.

28. Page 37 - Section 7A.10.4.D.d – Added clarifying text related to permitting wall signs as a Historic Landmark Sign type. **(Staff & Historic Commission Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Staff has presented this option to the Tucson-Pima County Historic Commission – Plans Review Subcommittee and they have voted to recommend this revision be a part of the Sign Code Revision Project.
- **Comment:** In the current Sign code, the only sign types that fall under the Historic Landmarks Signs ordinance are detached, projecting, or roof sign. This is to allow for Wall Signs to be a permitted type of Historic Landmark Sign.
- **Additional Options:** None

29. Page 37 & 38 - Section 7A.10.4.D - Reorganized and renumbered to reflect intension of current code. **(Staff Clean-up)**

30. Page 41 - Section 7A.11.1.C - revised text to allow for 40 square feet in historic district when appropriate. **(Staff & Historic Commission Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Staff has presented this option to the Tucson-Pima County Historic Commission – Plans Review Subcommittee and they have voted to recommend this revision be a part of the Sign Code Revision Project.
- **Comment:** The current sign area allotment for all zones in a historic district (HPZ or HL) is 8 square feet per street front and per sign. In order to allow for commercial properties that are either within an HPZ or seeking an HL designation to remain economically viable, we should consider increasing the maximum sign area allotment for buildings in commercial zones.
- **Additional Options:** None

31. Page 41 - Section 7A.11.1.E - Protrusion limitation removed from text. **(Chuck Martin Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Commissioner Martin asked, should a reference to a ‘Protrusion Limitation’ be removed as the title of a section referring to a height increase?
- **Comment:** The use of one version of the verb to protrude has been used in the Sign Standards to mean something that is projecting horizontally. However, in this case it means to extend above. Protrude means ‘to extend beyond or above a surface.’ Project means ‘to extend outward beyond something else or to protrude.’ It appears to be more of an issue of preference in wording choices versus a substantial difference in meaning. Staff does not see a substantive issue here and defers to the Planning Commission if they want to change the wording. We recommend the removal of the

title of the Section, 'Protrusion Limitation' and leave the standard which is original Chapter Three Sign Code language as is.

- **Additional Options:** None
32. Page 42 - Section 7A.11.1.H - added Historic Landmark Signs are a permitted sign type in Historic Districts. **(Staff & Historic Commission Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** Staff has presented this option to the Tucson-Pima County Historic Commission – Plans Review Subcommittee and they have voted to recommend this revision be a part of the Sign Code Revision Project.
- **Comment:** Over the years, as new regulations have been written for the Sign Code, and interpretations made, unintended consequences have arisen. One such case is that through interpretation, Historic Landmark Signs are not allowed in historic zones such as Historic Preservation Zones (HPZ) or Historic Landmark Zones (HL). A clarification would be made in the Sign Code, making it clear that Historic Landmark Signs are allowed in these historic zones.
- **Additional Options:** None

33. Page 45 – Section 7A.11.2 – Revised boundary of Mercado per Planning Commission recommendation and updated map. **(PC & CSCC Recommendation)**

34. Page 48 – Section 7A.13 – Revised text related to Sign Design Review Committee (SDRC) to reflect change from CSCC to SDRC. **(Staff Clean-up)**

35. Page 50 & 51 - Section 2.2.12 - Removed highlighting and text related to M&C appointed Sign Design Review Committee. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

- **Background Info:** The Citizens Sign Code Committee voted unanimously to recommend keeping the current composition in the draft, and the Joint Subcommittee voted unanimously to recommend keeping the current composition in the draft.
- **Comment:** This issue was mostly a consensus item. There may be future discussion on making the commercial real estate representative a real estate representative for commercial or residential property.

The SDRC is composed of nine members. They are an architect, an Outdoor Lighting Committee member, a sign industry representative, a local business representative, a planner, who could be one of the following, (architect, land use planner or landscape architect), a real estate representative, who could have a commercial or residential background, one at-large appointment by the City Manager, a general neighborhood association representative, and an ad hoc neighborhood representative from a neighborhood association within 300 feet of the application property.

- **Additional Options:** None

36. Page 51 & 52 – Section 2.2.12.G – Separated Section 2.2.12.G.2 into four sections for added clarity. **(Staff Clean-up)**
37. Page 60 – Section 11.4.5 – Removed definition of Directory Sign as it is now listed as an interior sign. **(Staff Clean-up)**
38. Page 68 - Section 11.4.24 - Removed highlighting related to the wall sign definition and highlighting and text from Window Sign definition. See number 14 for more information. **(CSCC Recommendation)**

General Changes

1. Throughout the document only refer to "the sign standards." **(Chuck Martin Recommendation)**