

From: [Cecilia Brown](#)
To: [Peter Imhof](#); [Anne Wells](#)
Cc: [Mary Chang](#); brownknight1@cox.net; paulaperotte@cox.net
Subject: ZO SIGN Ordinance
Date: Friday, February 08, 2019 8:46:38 AM

Hi Peter and Anne! As a follow on to my Monday meeting with you and initial inquiry about LED signs in the revised ZO, I was so very happy when I read in the sign ordinance that the use of electronic changeable copy signs was much limited as compared to the last iteration of the ZO. This was an important and necessary change. Hurrah! Thank you!

And, the limitation of these signs to quasi public uses (the text of the ordinance uses the word semi-public use, see p. iv-117 and should be changed for consistency) was fortunately tempered by the requirement for at least 400ft street frontage of the particular use and in non residential districts. Well thought out.

However, I think there needs to be some review of the following: Besides gas stations and indoor theater marquee signs, there are currently time and temp changeable copy signs in the city which need to be considered. And they change copy more frequently than 2x per day, an ordinance standard. (Maybe they are listed elsewhere and I missed it, there is much to review.)

There is no mention of what colors can be used on the electronic changeable copy sign. One color, multiple colors in the changeable copy? Copy need not change but color many times over the day could. I think your intent is for one color for the sign, like the gas station pricing signs, but this needs to be clear and specified. I am against the color changes because it goes against

The standard for allowing the copy to change on my twice a day.

There are existing gas station pricing signs and marquee signs which are currently higher than the 10ft height limit of the ordinance. Believe that the 10ft height standard for a sign for a quasi public use that meets the ordinance standards might mean a pole sign, which isn't allowed, or a 10 FT freestanding sign, which in most instances is not appropriate and most likely not be approved by the DRB.

Pls review the 10ft height limitations for each kind of sign.

The sign ordinance is much improved and greatly detailed. While this is good it means it will require much careful review to understand the changes from the antiquated county ordinance the city adopted because they are considerable.

I am concerned that the city hasn't allowed enough time for the public to review the sign ordinance. The decision makers who understand signs and are responsible for reviewing and approving them in the city, The DRB, meet Tues Feb 12th to do their review. And this meeting occurs just barely a week after the ZO rollout. Having just gotten my copy of the revised ZO and barely time to read it much less consider the changes, there isn't sufficient time to thoroughly review and understand the 20 pages of sign ordinance standards to prepare for this meeting or even comment on them thru written or verbal testimony.

So, I request the city allow another opportunity for public to share their comments to DRB on this ordinance at later dates. There should be multiple reviews planned not just one. The review of this section of the ZO is being rushed and deserves unhurried and careful attention.

Very very important we get this ordinance right. Dont want any unintended consequences!
Thank you!
Cecilia Brown

Sent from my Galaxy Tab® A