

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|--|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 1. | 7A.1.1 (Page 1) | <p><i>October 17, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> "promote equity between businesses and other sign users " - in the revised version, 1st line. Comment: Don't think this belongs in the purpose statement.</p> <p><i>October 24, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> The Code purposely restricts certain types of signs and not everybody should be treated equitably.</p> <p>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting: No consensus was reached regarding the use of the word "business." There are commissioners who believe it should remain and others who don't think it belongs.</p> | <p>Accommodate the rights of individuals to freedom of speech, promote equity between businesses and other typical <u>among all</u> sign users and, enable the fair and consistent enforcement of these sign standards;</p> | <p>Ultimately Reed v. Town of Gilbert mandates that we regulate all signs without regard to content. This addresses this issue and provides a basis for the code that follows.</p> <p>It is important to note that the court will apply strict scrutiny analysis to non-commercial speech regulations, but commercial speech is protected and regulations relating to commercial speech will be analyzed using intermediate scrutiny, an only slightly lower standard. Further, any one commercial message must be treated the same as any other commercial message.</p> <p>Staff recommends adding "business," or similar wording back into suggested edit #2. In order to provide a more complete and accurate portrayal of sign use and regulation, it should acknowledge the role businesses have. Staff suggests the Subcommittee explore ways to bring this language back that would be acceptable to the group as a whole. This would help to strengthen the Sign Code's purpose statement, and be beneficial should the City receive a Reed-based legal challenge to the Sign Code.</p> | X | | | M |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 2. | 7A.1.1 (Page 1) | <i>October 17, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting</i> In the 3rd line suggest removing the word "prominent" from "protect prominent scenic views..." Strike hazard from - fear legibility. | Provide an improved visual environment for the citizens and visitors to the City and protect prominent natural scenic views by exercising reasonable control over the character and design of signs; | Staff has no objection if this is included or excluded. | X | | | A |
| 3. | 7A.1.1 (Page 1) | <i>October 17, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting</i> Add something about protecting dark skies and something more about tourism | This comment has been combined with edit #4. Please see below: | This is something neither covered in the purpose statement of the current sign code nor is it a <i>Reed</i> issue. Dark skies are currently addressed and covered in the Outdoor Lighting Code. All permitted signs must currently comply with this and must do so under the draft. If anything related to the Outdoor Lighting Code is included, it should only be a reference to that governing Code. | | | | N/A |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|---|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 4. | 7A.1.1 (Page 1) | <p><i>October 17, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Feel original wording about beauty and protecting our desert environment, etc. should be in the language. The language about makes Tucson special.</p> <p><i>October 24, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> It is suggested more needs to be stated about dark skies. It is suggested that Staff look at combining statement #3 of Commissioner McLaughlin's proposed purpose statement with suggested edit #4. It is also suggested to remove "enhance" and replace with "protect", in relation to the fragile desert.</p> <p>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting: Additional language from Commissioner McLaughlin added related to commercial and non-commercial speech.</p> | <p>Add "<u>Foster a good visual environment for Tucson, protect the fragile desert and its environmental assets, preserve the natural resource of dark night skies, and create an aesthetic and enjoyable appearance for visitors and residents, while allowing avenues of speech for both non-commercial and commercial messages.</u>"</p> | <p>While currently covered in purpose statement under aesthetics, staff has no objection to adding in the following section from the original purpose statement. Additional suggested language from Commissioner McLaughlin has been combined with the previous suggested edit #4.</p> | X | | | M |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|---|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 5. | 7A.1.1 (Page 1) | <p><i>October 17, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Third item in the list -- delete "businesses" and just leave "individual". The safety concerns should be for the general community vs. individual.</p> <p><i>October 24, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Commissioner Ench suggested removing "Balance" in proposed edit 5, and substituting "Observe." He also suggested removing "against" and substituting "exercise reasonable control."</p> <p>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting: No consensus was reached regarding the use of the word "business." There are commissioners who believe it should remain and others who don't think it belongs. It was suggested possibly using "entities" in its place.</p> | <p>Balance <u>Observe</u> the rights of businesses and individuals to convey messages through signs, against and exercise reasonable control to <u>mitigate</u> the aesthetic and safety hazards that come from the proliferation of confusing and objectionable sign clutter;</p> | <p>Staff has no objection to removing "businesses" from this text and adding a comma after signs. Staff has added suggested edits from the October 24, 2016 Subcommittee meeting.</p> <p>Staff recommends adding "business," or similar wording back into suggested edit #2. In order to provide a more complete and accurate portrayal of sign use and regulation, it should acknowledge the role businesses have. Staff suggests the Subcommittee explore ways to bring this language back that would be acceptable to the group. This would help to strengthen the Sign Code's purpose statement, and be beneficial should the City receive a <i>Reed</i>-based legal challenge to the Sign Code.</p> | X | | | M |
| 6. | 7A.1.1 (Page 1) | <p><u>February 6, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</u> <u>Committee suggested reviewing Ruth Beeker's suggested revisions to the purpose statement and discussing at future meeting.</u></p> | <p><u>No changes at this time.</u></p> | <p><u>Staff has no objection to adopting suggested purpose statement from Ruth Beeker.</u></p> | | | | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|--------------------|--|---|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 7. | 7A.1.2 (Page 2) | <p><i>October 24, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was in agreement with Staff suggestion to say "City shall be in compliance with City Administrative Directives."</p> <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was concerned with the effect this may have on the ability for the city to not follow the Sign Code.</p> <p><i>November 14, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee still has concerns and would like to have wording, "City shall follow its own sign standards" remain in the code.</p> <p><i>November 21, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was in general agreement with the changes.</p> | <p>The regulations in this article are applicable to all signs in the City, except as noted in Section XXX (Exemptions) unless otherwise stated. The City of Tucson shall follow its own sign standards, except where a deviation from the standards are is necessary to protect or promote public health, welfare or safety, and be in compliance with Section XXX of City Administrative Directives.</p> | <p>Staff has no objection to the edits suggested by the subcommittee.</p> <p>Staff does not believe this will have any effect on how the Sign Code is enforced. This is simply a more clear way of stating existing policies.</p> <p>Additionally, Staff has added back in the language related to the City of Tucson following its own sign standards.</p> | X | | X | M |
| 8. | 7A3.2 (Page 4) | <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> It was suggested that the definition for Billboard be change off-site to off-premise.</p> | <p>No changes at this time.</p> | <p>Staff recommends this is not changed from "off-site" to "off-premise," as there are examples where a billboard may be off-site per its definition, but may not have an actual premise.</p> | | | | N/A |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|-------------------|---|--|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 9. | 7A3.5 (Page 5) | <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee had concern with the use of the term Electronic Sign Copy in place of Electronic Message Center. They also expressed the need to include digital signs (e.g. computer screens), in the definition.</p> <p><i>November 14, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee preferred the word "Digital" to Variable, and suggested staff use that.</p> <p><i>November 21, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was in general agreement with the changes. Additionally, they express concern about use of the word "scroll" or "scrolling" later in the document.</p> | <p>Electronic Sign Copy <u>Digital Sign</u>. A sign component whose informational content <u>such as symbols, logos, graphics, and words</u> can be changed or altered by electric, electro-mechanical or electronic means.</p> | <p>Staff proposes the name be changed to "Variable Message Sign," which is a common term used for this type of sign. Staff also recommends the clarifying words, "such as symbols, logos, graphics, and words" be used.</p> <p>Staff has no objection to committee's recommendation to use the word "Digital Sign" in place of either Electronic Sign Copy or Variable Message Sign.</p> | X | X | X | M |
| 10. | 7A3.5 (Page 5) | <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested that this is currently regulated by other public service agencies, and may not be within the purview of the Sign Code.</p> | <p>Emergency site locator. Consists of signs and markers required for direction of emergency vehicles in multiple tenant and multiple building complexes.</p> | <p>Staff recommends the removal of Emergency Sign Locator definition as it is regulated by Tucson Fire and under the staff suggested revisions, would be considered an interior sign.</p> | | | X | A |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|--------------------|--|--|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 11. | 7A3.7 (Page 6) | <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee stated concern about whether an "interior sign" can be seen from adjacent property.</p> <p><i>November 21, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was in general agreement with addressing in a later Section instead of the definitions.</p> | <p>Interior sign. An on-site sign, emblem, or decal that is ground or wall-mounted providing information to the public such as wayfinding, facilities, services or prohibitions relating to the premises and which is inside a building, in a courtyard or hallway, or is within a premise's boundaries but is either not facing or is not readable from the right of way or is not designed nor intended to be readable from the right of way, does not require zoning review but may require building code review.</p> | <p>Staff recommends there be no changes to the interior sign definition, but the additional clarifying language be added to wall signs section to ensure there are no unintended consequences of this regulation. For discussion, staff suggests the addition to the wall signs regulation would be to require a setback of 100 feet for illumination of interior wall signs facing adjacent single-family residential uses that are not viewable from a right of way.</p> | X | X | | M |
| 12. | 7A3.10 (Page 7) | <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested the words non-permanent be added to the end of the definition of portable sign.</p> | <p>Portable sign. A sign that is capable of being moved and not designed to be permanently attached to a building or permanently anchored to the ground that is constructed of paper, cloth, canvas, light fabric, cardboard, plywood, light plastic or other similar <u>non-permanent</u> materials.</p> | <p>Staff has no objection to the edits suggested by the subcommittee.</p> | X | | | A |
| 13. | 7A3.11 (Page 8) | <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested the words "existing" be removed from the definition of repair.</p> <p><i>November 14, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested adding the words "as it applies to historic sign definition."</p> <p><i>November 21, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was in general agreement with addressing at a later date.</p> | <p>No changes at this time.</p> | <p>The word "existing" refers to language used in the Historic Landmark Signs section of the Sign Code and is important for clarification of the definition.</p> <p>Staff has concerns about larger implications related to adding this language and will conduct further research and return to this issue.</p> | | X | | M |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|--|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 14. | 7A3.12 (Page 8) | <i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested the former definition of "sign" be used with the exception of the last sentence related to malls. | Sign. <u>Every advertising message, announcement, declaration, display, illustration, insignia, surface or space erected or maintained in a location outside any building and visible to the public for identification, advertising or promotion of the interest of any person, entity, product or service.</u> A ground or wall mounted structure or painted surface that has a visual display from a right of way or street and is designed to identify, announce, direct, or inform. | Staff has no objection to the edits suggested by the subcommittee. | X | | | A |
| 15. | 7A3.13 (Page 9) | <i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested the definition of tenant add the following language: "of a site or portion of a site." | Tenant. The occupant of a <u>site or a</u> portion of a site or structure with exclusive control over that portion, regardless of whether it is by individual ownership or lease. | Staff has no objection to the edits suggested by the subcommittee. | | | | A |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|---|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 16. | 7A.3.14 (Page 10) | <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee has concern over the removal of the word "interior" from the definition of wall and window sign.</p> <p><i>November 14, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee has concern over the removal of the word "interior" from the definition of wall and window sign.</p> <p><i>November 21, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested moving comma after "including" to after "vertical. Committee members also expressed a concern about not regulating a sign on the interior of the window, but not affixed – anything intended to attract attention on the exterior of the building should be included. There was no consensus at this time among the Committee if these non-affixed interior window signs should be regulated or what the distance behind the window should be, if it were to be regulated.</p> | <p>Wall. An exterior building surface thirty (30) degrees or less from vertical, including -, affixed <u>to</u> interior and the exterior <u>of</u> window and door surfaces.</p> <p>Window sign. Any sign affixed to interior or exterior <u>of</u> window surface.</p> | <p>This is simply a reflection and clarification of how this windows sign regulation is currently enforced. As a process improvement, PDSD staff has noted it is very complicated to regulate the interior of a window or a sign that can be seen through a window, but is not attached to the window.</p> <p>Staff suggests changing the definition of window sign reference signs to "affixed to interior or exterior" of a window. Additionally, we recommend adding a regulation to section 7A.10.1.F in relation to window signs that will limit window signs to 30% of the surface area of a window. Those windows would be regulated, but would not require a permit.</p> | X | X | X | |
| 17. | 7A.3.14 (Page 10) | <p><i>December 12, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested adding definition of wayfinding, as it can be both broad and/or narrow.</p> | <p><u>No changes at this time.</u></p> | <p>PDSD staff believes the addition of this definition is not necessary for the effectiveness of the sign code.</p> | | | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---|--|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 18. | 7A.6.4 (Page 14) | <p><i>January 9, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting Committee suggested changing the word "scroll" to something else that more accurately portrays the regulation.</i></p> <p><i>January 23, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting Committee suggested adding in graphic to make sure it covers all changes. Committee also suggested we look at solutions to reduce from a one hour rate of change.</i></p> <p><u>February 6, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested changing the rate of change from one hour to five minutes and adding language that it may not have transitions or animations.</u></p> | <p>A digital sign is permitted to <u>have a rate of change of sign copy, graphic, or information scroll</u>—not more than once <u>an hour every five minutes.</u> <u>The digital sign copy shall not have any transitions or animations.</u></p> | <p>Rate of change replaces scroll and refers to the timing of copy or information change on a digital sign. The hour rate of change has been changed from one hour to five minutes.</p> | | | | |
| 19. | 7A.6.5 (Page 21) | <p><i>January 9, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested staff clarify the interpretation of how the top of sign is measured.</i></p> <p><i>January 23, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting Committee suggested staff clarify the word "crown."</i></p> <p><u>February 6, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested there be a graphic to better clarify.</u></p> | <p><u>The sign height is measured as the vertical distance from the average finished grade beneath the sign to the topmost sign copy of the sign; except that if the sign location has an average finished grade lower than the adjoining grade of the road, the sign height is measured from the top of the curb (or highest point of the road nearest the property if no curb exists) to the highest point of the topmost sign copy on the sign.</u> <u>Average finished grade refers to the mean average elevation of ground after site preparation at the bottom of a sign structure, measured five feet from the bottom of the sign structure at five-foot intervals.</u></p> | <p>PDSD staff have interpreted the current Sign Code based on the definition of a sign to mean that the top of the sign is measured from the highest point of the sign copy. Thus any top constructed feature above the sign copy is not counted.</p> <p>Staff has replaced the word "crown" with "highest point".</p> <p>Staff agrees and will be adding graphics into the new sign code revisions.</p> | | X | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strike through~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 20. | 7A.6.6 | <u>February 6, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested we reference clearance in definitions.</u> | <u>Clearance (7A): See definition in Section 7A.6.6.</u> | <u>Staff is amenable to changes.</u> | | | | |
| 21. | 7A.6.10 (Page 23) | <i>January 9, 2017 subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested staff add the word "concludes" to the end of the first paragraph of 7A.6.10.</i> | The licensee may require the removal of the sign within forty-eight (48) hours after the advertised event or other temporary occurrence <u>concludes</u> . | Staff has no objection to the changes. | | | X | |
| 22. | 7A.6.11 (Page 24) | <i>January 9, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting Committee asked about 7A.6.11 and if Premise belongs in definitions.</i> | <u>Premise (7A): See definition in Section 7A.6.11.</u> | Staff believes a reference in the definitions directing to Section 7A.6.11 will adequately address the concern. | | | | |
| 23. | 7A.7.1.E. 1 (Page 25) | <i>December 12, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee expressed concern related to the term, "Illuminated colors shall be predominantly those colors that reduce light trespass and offer protections to dark skies in compliance with the City's outdoor lighting standards." The committee's concern was that it may be too vague. Committee members suggested use of the term opaque for the background of a sign panel may be more appropriate.</i> | <u>No changes proposed at this time.</u> | PDSD staff has reviewed this and believes the current language is necessary to provide the flexibility needed for quality design. The regulation is intended to decrease the amount of light emitted from signs as opposed to the general standards. For example, if the amount of light was depicted on a continuum with general standards on one end and no light on the other, the goal would be a sign at the midpoint or below. | | | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 24. | 7A.7.1.E.2.b (Page 26) | <p><i>December 12, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee expressed concern with no cap on either the height or area within the Master Sign Program.</p> <p><i>January 23, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> It was agreed upon by the committee to add a cap to the height of 20 feet and 100 square feet for the Master Sign Program and Singular Sign Option.</p> | <p>The sign height shall be compatible with the surrounding building height profile of the buildings and structures on the property and in the surrounding area. The sign structure shall not obstruct significant scenic views from the right of way .</p> <p><u>The sign height shall not be greater than 20 feet tall and 100 square feet in area.</u></p> <p>The height of the sign copy shall not be set so as not to be obstructed by landscaping or a parked vehicle;</p> | <p>PDSD staff has reviewed this and believes the current language is necessary to provide the flexibility needed for quality design. The provision is not intended to automatically increase the size or height of a sign but includes the visibility of the sign as a consideration. General standards set the acceptable height baseline. It is also worded with the advisory 'should' as a design consideration but not a standard per se.</p> | | | X | |
| 25. | 7A.7.1.E.5 (Page 26) | <p><i>December 12, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee expressed concern that the provision, "An already approved permanent sign, master sign program within the City" is too vague and has a potential to set poor precedent for signage that is not site specific.</p> | <p><u>No changes at this time.</u></p> | <p>There has been discussion with removing this provision and that previous approval decisions may set a precedent. If some previous approval is considered an outlier that can be reviewed as part of the entire design process.</p> <p>It should be noted that this is only one criteria being used by the Sign Design Committee and they still need to meet all other criteria.</p> | | | X | |
| 26. | 7A.7.2.E.6 (Page 26) | <p><i>December 12, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested adding in a finding related to dark skies.</p> | <p><u>Represents a best practice of the design of dark sky sign illumination.</u></p> | <p>This finding would further clarify the purpose statement on preserving dark sky by reducing sign illumination.</p> | | | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 27. | 7A.7.2.C. 5 (Page 26) | <i>December 12, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee expressed concern in the provision that states, "In no case may a sign exceed in sign area or sign height a sign that has historically been used within the city." The Committee commented on if this may need to have a specific date put on it. | In no case may a sign exceed in sign area or sign height a sign that has historically been used <u>in previous standards</u> within the City-. | This provision attempts to recognize that certain sign sizes have historically been used in the City but can only be used within the confines of total design plan for identification and wayfinding and only if warranted under the findings. The word 'historically' was changed to 'used in previous standards' to address the Committee's concern. | X | X | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---|--|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 28. | 7A.7.3 (Page 29) | <p><i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested moving this to the Master Sign Program section. They also stated they believe that the requirement of using option should be to bring other signs up to code. Committee also suggested replacing word "individual" with "singular."</p> <p><u><i>January 23, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested requiring a list of non-conforming signs on-site with submittal.</u></p> <p><u><i>February 6, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested a clarification of the word status.</u></p> | <p>7A.7.3 INDIVIDUAL-SINGULAR SIGN DESIGN OPTION</p> <p><u>F. Applicant shall include list of non-conforming signs currently on-site with submittal materials.</u></p> | <p>There is a suggestion to require all signs at a premise with a single sign option to be brought into compliance as a condition for approval of a single sign.</p> <p>In that a premise can include multiple lots with multiple owners this type of condition could be impractical. It also requires an evaluation of all signs on the site to find what is applicable. The intent of this single sign provision was 1) to replace the integrated architecture option in the current sign code and 2) to separate minor design cases from major ones.</p> <p><u>After further review of this edit, staff is concerned with the implications of this regulation. Many times shopping centers will have a large amount of tenants with only one single owner. An example of this is The Crossroads Shopping Center at Swan and Grant. Forcing a tenant who may want to use the singular sign design option to document all the signs and statuses on-site would be a logistical nightmare and nearly impossible. A similar situation could also be true of a large shopping center with many different owners, like many of the ones on Broadway.</u></p> <p><u>Staff suggests this be addressed as a case-by-case basis during the application process.</u></p> | | | | X |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|--|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 29. | 7A.10.2 (Page 36) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested to add footnote to Billboards entry on table to clarify it only applies to C-2, C-3, I-1 and I-2 zones. | <u>4. Restricted to C-2, C-3, I-1, I-2 zones</u> | The following footnote should be added to clarify where billboards are allowed. | | | X | |
| 30. | 7A.10.2 (Page 36) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested removing Roof as type of sign in table. | Roof | Staff agrees that roof should be removed from the table. | | | X | |
| 31. | 7A.10.2 (Page 36) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested finding a way to simplify the headers on the table so that they read better. | | Staff agrees, the formatting of the table will be adjusted | | | X | |
| 32. | 7A.10.3 (Page 38) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested adding a legend to the table for clarification. | | Staff agrees, a legend will be added for clarification. | | | X | |
| 33. | 7A.10.3 (Page 38) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested a larger non-residential maximum sign area on collectors and arterials to account for churches. | 20 Sq. Ft. (2) 100 Sq. Ft. (3) <u>2. Maximum sign area - Residential uses and non-residential uses located on local streets.</u> <u>3. Maximum sign area - Non-residential uses on arterial or collector streets. Permanent freestanding sign's sign area may not exceed 32 square feet</u> | This number reflects discussion at the Subcommittee on allowing non-residential uses like churches some flexibility when on arterials and collectors streets. | | | X | |
| 34. | 7A.10.3 (Page 38) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was in general agreement related to including Historic Landmark Signs in the R-3 Zone. | <u>6. Historic landmark signs (HLS), all types. The first HLS on a premise does not count toward the maximum total sign area.</u> | Staff agrees with these changes. | | | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDSD) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|----------------------|---|---|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 35. | 7A.10.4 (Page 41) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested staff look into if we need to have a provision related to the relocation of billboards. | <u>No changes at this time.</u> | Staff does not believe a provision related to relocation of billboards is necessary. | | X | X | |
| 36. | 7A.10.4 (Page 42) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> <i>There was considerable discussion related to the general standards for the Canopy Signs. While the Committee acknowledged this section is confusing and needs work, it was suggested it be put in a parking lot of issues to be addressed at a later date.</i> <i>January 23, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested we fix this and make it a wall sign. <u>February 6, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting:</u> <u>Committee suggested looking into adding back in size, height, and distance from the building.</u> | <u>a. Canopy signs are not allowed to extend beyond the roofline.</u> <u>b. Canopy signs are counted as part of the wall sign allotment for these sign standards.</u> <u>c. Maximum size: The vertical measure of the sign face shall not exceed eighteen (18) inches except for individual letters with descenders that are proportionate to the remaining text but in no case larger than six (6) inches.</u> <u>d. 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) feet in height above finished grade immediately below the canopy sign.</u> <u>e. Location: Within twenty (20) feet of the building wall that backs the canopy sign.</u> | Staff believes the current regulations are onerous to enforce and create the need for variances. We could keep existing language and deal with it at a later date or remove and make a wall sign for the time being. | | | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 37. | 7A.10.4 (Page 45) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee concluded that the spacing requirement shall remain what it is in the current sign code. The committee was in general agreement that issues brought up earlier in the process have been addressed through revisions to the definition of premise. | <u>No changes at this time.</u> | Staff agrees to leave the language as is. | | X | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|--|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|--|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M | |
| 38. | 7A.10.4 (Page 45) | <p><i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was in general agreement to remove "roof sign" and replace with "extended parapet option."</p> <p><i>January 23, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested adding clarification to the dimensional restrictions.</p> <p><u>February 6, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</u> Committee suggested staff review regulation and address concerns related to size of parapet, disguising structural bracing of parapet, and size of sign.</p> | <p>3. Roof Sign: A sign may be allowed on a parapet that is no greater than ten feet higher than an adjoining parapet.</p> <p>Any other roof sign must be approved through the Individual Sign Design Option.</p> <p><u>Extended Parapet Option. A sign may be allowed on a parapet that is no less than ten feet wide and no greater than ten feet higher than an adjoining parapet. The sign may be perpendicular to the front of the building. Any other type of extended wall sign must be approved through the Section 7A.7 Sign Design Options. If braces are used to support the parapet, they shall not be visible.</u></p> <p>-or-</p> <p><u>Extended Parapet Option. A sign that is no greater than ten feet high may be allowed on a parapet. The sign may be perpendicular to the front of the building. Any other type of extended wall sign must be approved through the Section 7A.7 Sign Design Options. If braces are used to support the parapet, they shall not be visible.</u></p> | <p>Staff agrees to these changes.</p> <p><u>Staff has clarified related to the extended parapet option and has added language related to mitigation of braces used.</u></p> | | | X | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 39. | 7A.10.6 (Page 48) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested staff add in section related to annual fee for portable signs.</i> | <u>No changes at this time.</u> | This provision will be part of a greater change to the overall PDS fee schedule and when the applications for the new portable signs are created. | | | X | |
| 40. | 7A.10.6 (Page 48) | <i>December 19, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested staff include language such as taut fabric related to feather banners. There was not a consensus among the committee on whether this should be a permitted sign type or not.</i> | A ground-mounted portable sign shall be made of similar materials such as all non-pliable <u>or taut</u> materials. | Staff agrees to the proposed changes. | | X | X | |
| 41. | 7A.10.7.A (Page 49) | <i>January 9, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested remove requirement for a shape to be square in A-Frame Signs</i> | 1. An A-frame or portable sign is an on-site <u>square in shape</u> non-illuminated sign temporarily authorized for one (1) year used to advertise the location, goods or services offered on the premises. The portable or A-frame sign must be made of a durable, rigid material such as, but not limited to, wood, plastic or metal. | Staff agrees to the proposed changes. | | | X | |
| 42. | 7A.10.7.A (Page 51) | <i>January 9, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested adding a reference to ADA and sight triangles.</i> | <u>No changes at this time.</u> | Staff doesn't believe this is necessary as there are already references to them in the code and they are addressed on the existing application for A-Frame Signs. | | | X | |
| 43. | 7A.10.7.B .1 (Page 52) | <i>January 9, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested rearranging list so that "Maximum number" is listed first.</i> | <u>This change has been made.</u> | The language in Section 7A.10.7.B.1 has been rearranged per Committee recommendation. | | | X | |
| 44. | 7A.10.8.D .1 (Page 57) | <i>January 9, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested adding wall sign to list of qualifying signs for Historic Landmark Signs.</i> | The sign shall be a detached, <u>wall</u> , projecting, or roof sign. | It was agreed by the committee that wall signs can have historic significance and due to the outdoor lighting code may become non-conforming and need to be mentioned in the HLS section as potential candidates. | | | X | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 45. | 7A.10.8.F.4 (Page 58) | <i>January 9, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested deleting HLS Treatment Plan reference to GPS coordinates.</i> | -4. GPS coordinates for the final location of the proposed HLS. | The language in Section 7A.10.8.F.4 has been edited per Committee recommendation. | | | X | |
| 46. | 7A.13 (Page 75) | <i>December 12, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee has not reached a consensus related to the structure of the new Citizen Sign Code Committee. A few committee members were in favor of term limits, some were not. A few committee members were fine with a shift to an all-City Manager appointed committee; others would like to see a mix, as it is currently.</i> | | | | | X | |
| 47. | 11.4.2 | <u><i>February 6, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested we check to make sure the definition of Abandoned is in agreement with the enforcement section.</i></u> | <u><i>No changes at this time.</i></u> | <u><i>Staff has reviewed the document and this is clarified through the enforcement section.</i></u> | | | | |
| 48. | 11.4.7 | <u><i>February 6, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting: Committee suggested indenting the different kinds of freestanding signs, and look into removing the dimension from the low-profile sign.</i></u> | Freestanding - Low profile freestanding Sign (7A) A sign that has been provided with a minimum continuous prepared base or support, at least two (2) feet in height, that extends in a continuous base to the outside dimension of the sign. To encourage design flexibility, the maximum height of the sign may be lowered in order to decrease the required setback from the street. | | | | | |

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS (OR EDITS) TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SIGN CODE REVISIONS

Basis: Member discussion at meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of the Planning Commission / Citizen Sign Code Committee

Prepared by: City of Tucson Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department. Contact Daniel Bursuck (Daniel.bursuck@tucsonaz.gov)

Note 1: Under the Redline Edits, within a "quote", black plain text is from the September 20, 2016 draft, and red underline & ~~strikethrough~~ text is the proposed edits for a recommendation to the larger Planning Commission and Citizen Sign Code Committee.

Note 2: A/R/M used for responses to comments A = Comment accepted A/M = Comment accepted with modifications R = Comment rejected M = Comment modified

| Suggestion | Section | Subcommittee Suggestions | Redline Edits | City Staff Comments | Edits related to: | | | |
|------------|---------|--|---|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Reed | Fairness | Process Improvement | A/R/M |
| 49. | 11.4.19 | <p><i>November 7, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested the words "existing" be removed from the definition of repair.</p> <p><i>November 14, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested adding the words "as it applies to historic sign definition."</p> <p><i>November 21, 2016, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee was in general agreement with addressing at a later date.</p> <p><u><i>February 6, 2017, Subcommittee Meeting:</i> Committee suggested the words "existing" be removed from the definition of repair.</u></p> | <p>Repair (7A) To mend, renovate or restore a sign structure to its original condition.</p> | <p>The word "existing" refers to language used in the Historic Landmark Signs section of the Sign Code and is important for clarification of the definition.</p> <p>Staff has concerns about larger implications related to adding this language and will conduct further research and return to this issue.</p> | | | | |