## City of Huron Planning Commission/DRB November 8, 2023, 5:30 P.M. WORK SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 5:30pm. in the Council Chambers at Huron City Hall, 417 Main Street by Chairman Gary Boyle. Members in attendance: Bob Howell, Mark Claus, Mark Cencer, and Jim Hartley. Staff in attendance: Planning Director Erik Engle, Zoning Inspector Jeff Fantozzi, and Administrative Assistant Christine Gibboney.

Proposed Amendments to Chapter 1129- Sign Code attached and made part of the minutes.

Mr. Engle and members reviewed the proposed amendments and made the following comments/suggestions:

## Chapter 1129- Sign Code: Key Considerations/Discussion

- 1. Remove all content-based restrictions (specific sign types where the content needs to be read and interpreted) pursuant to recent legislation based on the *Reed v. Town of Gilbert and the City of Austin v. Reagan National Advertising of Austin* 
  - a. Latter found that off-premises signs are content neutral; the precedent of cities regulating billboards is upheld, but content neutrality is crucial in these updates.
- 2. Simplify the sign code categories into Temporary and Permanent Signage with appropriate subcategories defined and allowances/performance standards reformatted in a clearer manner; staff find overall max area allowances to be appropriate.
- **3.** Reconsider industrial signage maximums, no more than 10-15% of the overall facade? Other key factors to simplify review.
- **4.** Temporary signs are not being regulated. Is this something we want to pursue? Difficulty in tracking timeframe/performance standards approved?
- 5. Clearly define calculation of signage-needs included, proposed language needs simplified; again, just a simple percentage of the façade or maximum overall, whichever is greater; need to include diagrams.
- 6. Refer to downtown design guidelines for overlay district added; size can remain for the B-2. Staff finds this appropriate.
- 7. Fate of Route 2 Corridor overlay? Keep or delete?
- 8. Simplify illumination requirements.
- 9. Added more succinct list of prohibited signs (content neutral)
- 10. Overall, a lot of redundant/conflicting language needs to be removed and performance standards streamlined.

## **Items of Note/Comments**

Page 2: Members recommended a hybrid of the existing and proposed "Purpose" language. Pages 3-6: "Definitions" – grammar edits suggested. Expand definition of Electronic Message Boards/LED/Backlit

Page 4: Define Freestanding, ground, monument

Page 5: (23) Projecting Sign- Members recommending leaving this language as is. (28) Street Clock Signs- members agreed with deleting. Add Three-Dimensional Signage. (30) Temporary Signs- discussion ensued regarding current code and the fact that the city does not regulate, difficulty in being able to regulate these. Staff advised there are no issues with temporary signs relative to compliance/complaints. Lengthy discussion over stores in town placing flyers/ads on windows and if regulation is needed, how would staff regulate, does the city want to regulate.

Page 6: 1129.02 (b) Change language to "Unless otherwise provided, this chapter shall apply to any sign, in any zoning district, this visible from a public ROW, from an adjacent property or from open sky above".

Pages 7-10: (Currently Computation) change to Measurements and Calculations- members agreed with striking current language as proposed and simplify as presented on Page 9. Mr. Engle to add a diagram/visual aid to the legislation. B. Sign Height – clarify what type of signs. Members want to have the following added for Max sf of Temporary Signs: 6sf in residential 32sf in industrial/business 12sf in MU

## **Staff Report**

Mr. Engle noted that discussion of this Code can continue at the next meeting.

Mr. Hartley and Mr. Howell mentioned some developers that the city may wish to reach out to regarding the ConAgra property. Mr. Hartley noted he had an informal conversation with one developer and they expressed interest. Mr. Engle suggested that they send contact information to the City. Mr. Claus noted that the updated RFQ is ready to go out. Members advised that it would make sense for the city to reach out. Members referenced the possibilities of the surrounding properties owned by the railroad which these developers would find attractive. Discussion ensued on railroad property, current valuation, and ongoing discussions between the city and the railroad.

With no further business, the work session was adjourned at 6:38pm.

Christine M. Gibboney

Administrative Assistant-Planning & Zoning

Adopted: <u>Sec. 13, 202</u>