



# SIGN DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

JANUARY 23, 2020



# OVERVIEW

- Clarifications & Minor Changes
- Signs in Historic Districts and HLS
- O-I Zone and Shelter Care
- SDRC Composition
- Possible 7A.7 Revisions
- Next Steps



## CLARIFICATION – 7A.7.I.G.I.e

- **SDRC Suggestion:** In 7A.7.I.G.I.e change “vehicle” to “driver”.
- **Staff Comment:** Review of current industry standards does not preclude this change. It is appropriate to remove “vehicle” and replace with “driver”.
- **Redline:** e. Enhances driver~~vehicle~~ reaction time to the signs,

## MINOR CHANGE – 7A.10.2.C.1.a(1) & (2) / 7A.11.3.E.4 & 6.

- **Staff Suggestion:** Allow minimum setback at 10 ft. for an access point sign that is outside of the SVT; Allow for a larger access point sign, up to 4 ft. tall and max 12 sq. ft., if a premise is one acre or greater
- **SDRC Comment:** Instead of basing increased size of access point signs on the size of the premise consider basing the size of the sign on the linear street frontage of the property
- **Staff Comment:** No issue with including linear street frontage of property as a consideration for size of access point sign. Also need to codify the current policy regarding access point signs for all properties – up to 3 ft. tall and max 6 sq. ft. in area. Need to remove access point sign references in scenic corridor zone district.

## MINOR CHANGE – 7A.10.2.C.1.a(1) & (2) / 7A.11.3.E.4 & 6.

- **Redline: a. Access Point Sign** An on-site sign located at or near the access point or other wayfinding location. This sign is permitted in the residential category for non-residential uses, in a multi-family residential or non-residential category for non-residential uses and multi-family uses and is not permitted in the historic district.
  - (1) – Size and height allowed**  
Up to 3 ft. tall and up to 6 sq. ft. in area, unless section (3) below is met.
  - (2) – Site Visibility Triangle (SVT)**  
If an Access Point Sign is outside of the SVT the required minimum setback is 10 ft.
  - (3) – Additional allowance**  
If the Access Point Sign is located on a premise that has a street frontage of 125 feet or greater, or that has an area of one acre or greater the Access Point Sign may be up to 4 ft. tall and 12 sq. ft.
- **Redline:** Remove Sections 7A.11.3.E.4 & 6 in their entirety

## SIGNS IN HISTORIC DISTRICTS – UPDATE

- **Staff Suggestion:** Remove language from Section 7A.11.1 and reference for signs in Section 5.8.9.M Historic Districts.
- **Historic Preservation Officer Comment:** Language in 7A.11.1 should be removed and instead placed in Article 5. Ensure that reference to exemption of non-commercial murals from regulation under 7A.8.1 stipulates that murals in historic districts are subject to review and murals on properties listed on the National Registry are discouraged.
- **Redline:** See supporting materials, Proposed Amendments to the Tucson Unified Development Code, pages 5, 13-14 and 18-19

## HISTORIC LANDMARK SIGNS (HLS)– UPDATE

- **Staff Suggestion:** Remove language requiring HLS to be within current City limits
- **SDRC Comment:** Agreement with staff suggestion
- **Historic Preservation Officer Comment:** If Historic Landmark Signs are renamed, something like Heritage signs then no issue with removing requirement that “heritage” sign be within current City limits. Additionally, there is no need for Tucson Pima County Historic Commission (TPCHC) to review these heritage signs. Instead SDRC can be reviewing body. TPCHC should continue to be reviewing body for signs in HPZ, Historic Landmark properties, and historically designated signs.
- **Staff Comment:** Is Mayor and Council appropriate reviewing body for HLS that TPCHC does not recommend?

## O-I ZONE AND SHELTER CARE – UPDATE

- **SDRC Suggestion:** Concern that Shelter Care facilities, eg. Women’s Shelter, will need lighted signs to indicate location to those in need at night
- **Shelter Care** – A Residential Care Service providing lodging on a temporary basis, meals, and counseling to homeless persons, pregnant teenagers, victims of domestic violence, and children who need full-time supervisions, including those who are neglected, runaways, or status offenders
- **Staff Comment:** After review of the UDC it appears that Shelter Care is NOT a permitted use in the O-I Zone. Additional review was completed to ensure that there are no existing nonconforming Shelter Care facilities permitted in current O-I Zones throughout the City. There are none. Suggestion to include allowance for lighted signs for Shelter Care within O-I Zone is moot as this situation does not and will not apply within the City.



# SDRC – COMPOSITION

- The SDRC was created under UDC Section 2.2.12, *Sign Design Review Committee*, and shall be comprised of the following 9 members:
  1. Architect (George Holguin)
  2. Outdoor Lighting Committee representative (None)
  3. Sign industry representative (Michael Addis)
  4. Local business representative (Michael Marks)
  5. Planner (architect, land use planner or landscape architect) (Ryan Repucci)
  6. Portable sign expert (e.g. commercial real estate broker) ( Jason Wong) (Chris Leighton - alt)
  7. At-large appointment by the City Manager (Robert East)
  8. General neighborhood association representative (Brent Davis)
  9. Ad hoc representative appointed by a neighborhood association within 300 feet of the location of the subject property submitting the application. (Will vary depending on location of project)

\*The City Manager may appoint a professional or stakeholder with a similar background and/or experience as any of the above listed committee members.

# SDRC – COMPOSITION

- Issues
  - Large committee, difficult to find members – Outdoor Lighting
  - *To date*, an ad-hoc representative appointed by a neighborhood association within 300 feet of the location of the subject property has not been appointed for a 7A.7 review before the committee
  - Although only 8 members are currently serving, 5 members are needed to establish a quorum per current UDC requirements. This is also be the case if less members were serving.
- Suggested Solutions
  - Reduce members/members needed to establish a quorum
  - Distinguish between Minor and Major Sign Design Option Review – to ensure that the in depth projects are heard by the SDRC, while more straight forward projects are sent to a design professional for recommendation to the PDSD Director

## DISCUSSION – SDRC COMPOSITION

- **Staff Suggestion:** Reduce amount of committee members
- 5(6) member committee; allow for a quorum with 3 members present
  1. Land Use Professional (architect, planner, landscape architect)
  2. Outdoor Lighting Committee rep
  3. Sign industry rep
  4. Local business rep (commercial real estate broker)
  5. General neighborhood association representative
  6. Ad hoc representative appointed by a neighborhood association within 300 feet of the location of the subject property submitting the application.



## 7A.7 REVISIONS – MAJOR V MINOR REVIEW

- **What type of cases should the SDRC review?**
  - Sign Design Option – MSP Permanent Signs
    - Generally more involved, more signs on a single premise
    - Includes all exterior permanent signs at a premise
  - Sign Design Option – MSP Portable Signs
  - Singular Sign Design Option

## 7A.7 REVISIONS – DESIGN PROFESSIONAL’S ROLE IN 7A.7 REVIEW

- **Current Role** – Pursuant to 2.2.12, “if...a quorum is not obtained for a particular application, the director may request that the Design Professional make a recommendation directly to the PDSD Director.”
- **Best Practice Option** – A variation from the design standards must show a best practice used as an alternative. A best practice may be based on one of the following sources:

\*\*\*

- **7A.7.1.F.4** – “A design guideline based in technical standards including ... United States Sign Council Model On-Premise Sign Code...or a similar document recommended by the Design Professional and approved by the PDSD Director; and,
- **7A.7.1.F.5.** – “A master sign program, sign design, or document recommended by the Design Professional as being appropriate for the surrounding context of the affected City streetscape.

## 7A.7 REVISIONS – LANDSCAPING

- **Current Code:** Landscaping is required for “ground-mounted signs [and] shall be located within a landscaping area that is proportional to the affected sign area. The materials shall consist of non-obstructing live and/or inert landscaping materials.”
- **Staff suggestion:** Current requirement should only be for new development. If the site is existing it does not make sense to require irrigation lines to be run to the new landscape area. There is also a need to revise landscaping requirements as it seems that irrigating near a sign can disrupt the integrity of the sign and causes maintenance issues.

## NEXT STEPS

- PUBLIC MEETINGS: JANUARY 28, 12:00pm, 201 N. Stone, basement  
and JANUARY 29, 5:30pm, Murphy-Wilmot Public Library, large meeting room
- NEXT MEETING: FEBRUARY 6 AT 12:00PM/1:00PM  
(201 N. STONE, 3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR)