

Ad Hoc Group on A-Frame & Digital Signage  
Monday, January 11, 2016  
Meeting # 7 7:00-9:30 PM  
Official Meeting Minutes

**Present:**

**Committee:** Mr. Nate Macek (Chair), Mr. Steve Milone, Mr. Peter Smeallie, Mr. Michael Porterfield, Ms. Carol Supplee, Ms. Pat Miller, Ms. Barbara Belmont, Mr. Jay Nestlerode and Mr. Pete Benavage

**City Staff:** Joanna Anderson, Alex Dambach, Brian Hine, Nancy Williams, Stephanie Sample

General Meeting Overview: The meeting was deemed in session by chairman shortly after 7 PM and continued as follows:

- Introductions of committee members and city staff
- Review of December 7<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes and overview of recent planning commission hearing and corresponding decisions
- Opening signage discussion
- Signage PowerPoint describing adopted Phase I components and proposed Phase II components( Presentation was presented by Alex Dambach with Joanna Anderson providing clarification as necessary)
- Committee reactions to PowerPoint Presentation
- Public comment period
- Group census and recommendations
- Adjournment just before 10:10 PM.

Details of Meeting:

Introductions: All committee members and city staff introduced themselves

Mr. Macek called the meeting to order and asked for a review of the December 7<sup>th</sup> meeting notes. He emphasized that the essence of what the group (committee) had recommended to the Planning

Commission was best captured in the recent docket items then advised committee members to discuss any needed corrections with City staff.

Alex Dambach:

City is in a transition period right now regarding signage.

- Planning Commission voted 7-0 in favor of Signage Phase I adoption regarding signs in the right of way. The Commission did not adopt the alternative language that would have permitted signage during election times. Questions were raised about the effect of some signs in the right of way versus others, particularly regarding public art and public announcements.
- Phase II will cover overall signage regulations.
- Today's meeting and ensuing PowerPoint presentation will serve as a broad overview of proposed regulations on signage.
- City staff is still trying to finalize new language.

Joanna Anderson: Comments from today's meeting will help shape the new language and guidelines.

### **Phase I Discussion**

Mr. Macek (Speaking about the Planning Commission Decision)

- Discussed the reluctance of the other members of the Planning Commission to adopt the signage ban.
- In the end, the commissioners felt that the permission of signage in the public right of way at any time would be difficult to enforce.
- Planning Commissioner Dunn raised questions regarding the application of the first amendment.
- The Commission discussed the issue of political signs in the public right of way versus political signs in general and corresponding regulations and concluded that an outright ban on right of way signage was preferred.
- Everyone acknowledged the difficulty of controlling this issue. After a healthy debate on this issue by the Planning Commissioners, Phase I was sent forth as a recommendation to the City Council.
- Due to the political nature of the issue, the City Council has the final say.

Alex Dambach: Discussed the scope of public rights of way and how public spaces are perceived by the public. They are integral part of the way that people enjoy the city. The adopted view is that they are places left better controlled with no signage.

Question was raised regarding who can enforce fines for the signs in the right of way. Anyone can enforce the sign rules by removing a sign.

Alex Dambach: Fines increase from \$50 per incident to \$100. There is a recovery cost provision for signs that are taken from the public right of way.

Joanna Anderson: Signs in the right of way will be redefined as a Class 4 civil violation which should strengthen the ability for enforcement. Repeat offenders can be sent to the police.

Mr. Macek: Despite the 7-0 vote by the Planning Commission, there were 3 different opinions. Overall the best approach was deemed to be a general prohibition of all signs in the right of way.

Alex Dambach: There was concern about selective prohibition versus overall prohibition.

Joanna Anderson: Phase II will start as a text amendment with a march target date for implementation.

Alex Dambach: Proposed roll out would involve a 6 month period of letters and notifications to citizens/business owners regarding new signage ordinance. After 3 months, in collaboration with the AEDP, guidelines for appropriate signage would be unveiled.

Mr Macek: Why wait on advice guidelines? Better to do advice before the letters and notifications. A grace period would also be appropriate.

Mr. Benavage: Must stress why this is happening. It is a result of the recent Supreme Court decision.

Alex Dambach: Important to reiterate this is the law and it is not new. The question of 3 months versus 6 months is pertinent because of financial investment owners have in the signs.

Ms. Supplee: 3 months seems adequate versus 6 months. Collection of the signs should begin after 3 months.

Topic changed back to signage for election time periods:

Joanna Anderson: The Planning Commission considered alternative language to include restrictions on the number of signs, but it ultimately decided it was difficult to find a balance that addresses all signs and situations. There were aesthetic concerns about too much clutter in the right of way.

Mr. Nestlerode: Civic associations currently advertise using signs in the right of way, but it is illegal. What goes to City Council?

Joanna Anderson: Alex will review private property uses. Currently, only wayfinding A-frame and political signs are allowed in right of way. However, prohibition of all signs will go forth to City Council.

Alex Dambach: The City Council will see what both this committee and the Planning Commission discussed. The Planning Commission decision was 7-0, but that vote includes some reluctance by members who voted in favor because there is no better alternative.

Mr. Macek: The staff memo is very clear on how the decision was derived.

Topic changed back to implementation and outreach to businesses:

Mr. Milone: Perhaps 60 days is better especially along King Street where there is heavy clutter

Mr. Macek: April, and not the summer months, is actually the busiest time of year in the city. Make sure to set a realistic time frame.

Ms. Supplee: There should be no fines during grace period.

Mr. Benavage: Question regarding parallel actions that have to occur.

Alex Dambach: City Staff is working with AEDP to help produce a guidebook.

Mr. Benavage: Easier to let go of A-frame signs if you know there is an alternate solution.

Alex Dambach: Information about alternative to A-frame approvals is included in the Planning Commission information.

Mr. Macek: The information is not fully specific about monument signs, more through a parallel recommendation, policy is not codified as to what we hope signs will look like

Joanna Anderson: Existing wayfinding A frame signs will continue to be used until the new monument signs start.

Ms. Miller : Concern regarding businesses spending money on A-frame signs

Alex Dambach: Delray does have private property in front of businesses. In the proposed code, use of A-frames on private property will be included.

Mr. Milone: A-frame replacements and monument signs, AEDP working with city more on enforcement push. Is design for those in the staff report?

Alex Dambach: Way finding program is being supervised by Matt Melkerson

Mr. Smeallie: Do monument signs have to go before BAR? (Mr. Dambach answered, "Yes").

### **Phase II: New Regulations for Properties (Slide 3 in PowerPoint Presentation)**

Alex Dambach: Proposing complete removal of language in the zoning ordinance regarding sign content but with mechanisms for situations involving properties that are for rent, under construction, or for sale, as well as, billboards. This ordinance is also the correct opportunity to address lingering problem areas such as poll signs and light box signs (which are both currently allowed). BAR can regulate signs in historic district. In other areas, there is not much in zoning ordinance regarding signage light box or pole signs now.

Joanna Anderson: Focus should be about wording the ordinance a different way. For instance, it is no longer a "real estate sign", it's a sign on property while the house is on sale. It is really a content issue.

Mr. Milone: Raised a question about the definition of billboards.

**Signs that would remain Prohibited (Slide 4)**

Alex Dambach: Added language for digital text and graphic signs. Mainly focused on governmental signs. An optional Special Use Permit provision was added in case an applicant wants to use digital signage for a special need or theme (eg. Las Vegas of the East). There is now a provision for a coordinated signage style program for smaller businesses.

Mr. Macek: Raised a question regarding wind blown signs, are they considered tear drop or feather signs?

Alex Dambach: Yes, they would be, and they are currently prohibited.

Mr. Milone: Need to start enforcing prohibition of the feather signs immediately.

Mr. Benavage: In regards to the special or unique need for a digital sign, how is it not content exclusive?

Joanna Anderson: The content of the signs would not determine whether restaurants are approved for the coordinated signage program.

Mr. Benavage: Shouldn't it be more wedded to certain areas that are zoned for different things? There would be a caveat, for areas exempted like old town and historic.

Alex Dambach: There is a proposed new SUP process to accommodate signs that would not be permitted by right by the Ordinance. It could accommodate unique signage installation situations. Haven't been able to plan out scenarios where this would be allowed. The goal was to create a vehicle if the situation arises through the fairly extensive SUP process. This would provide an opportunity for people to request special signage. As an example, there is the flower shop at the end of King Street using unique digital signage. This process could accommodate the owner.

Mr. Milone: The committee's recommendation was no digital signs for any private businesses. The SUP provision was intended for schools and parking lots, not commercial uses.

Mr. Benavage: Until we get a chance to review the digital signage issue in depth we will let the main provisions stand: They are only for governmental use. No further action was described for the future.

Alex Dambach: As proposed, any signs would seek an SUP.

Mr. Smeallie: I worry about creativity versus manifestations of advertisements that we don't want in this city. I am against anything other than just digital signs getting SUP provision possible.

Mr. Macek: It is a matter of figuring out which signs are excluded all the time, which signs are permitted with discretion, which signs are allowed by right.

Joanna Anderson: Certain types of signs in certain areas.

Mr. Smeallie: Change in the city is gradual, but does happen. Overtime an appropriate use for a windblown sign may arise.

Mr. Milone: Leave as a variance.

Mr. Benavage: Whirly gigs from Navy, appropriate use for windblown signs, perfect for in front of a naval recruiter. Point is there are possible examples of appropriate use, a variance is more complicated. Beauregard small area plan, some of that is possibly a part of it may look like the Mosaic District. It is fundamentally private property, not affecting old town. A DSUP would be a good vehicle to regulate this.

Mr. Milone: Beauregard has very few signs.

Alex Dambach: We could set a 3 part threshold or provision for signs. Forbidden, SUP with discretion, Allowed by right

Mr. Benavage: Good idea to support flexibility in Zoning Code. This accommodates different parts of the city. It is hard to forecast how this will play out. Provided it is reasonable.

Question raised about Hilton sign being above roof level

Joanna Anderson: As far as the discussion of digital signs allowing to continue for schools, allowing for governmental signs, we can't actually say it is for schools now, that is content based.

Mr. Macek: Can schools use signs as an institutional use?

Joanna Anderson: Way finder signs in right of way out in public property, city hall, rec centers

Joanna Anderson: I am comfortable with the idea that in certain zones you can have certain signs. As long as we are leaving the definition broad.

Mr. Macek: A restaurant that has a certain SUP can have certain signage. Define how certain entities use certain signage and interact with the government

#### **Signs That Would No Longer Be Prohibited (Slide 5)**

Alex Dambach: Reviewed the signs that are content based and no longer prohibited.

#### **New Sign Types That Would Become Prohibited (Slide 6)**

Alex Dambach: Highlighted prohibited types of signs to include: signs emitting any substance or sound, pole signs, signs that use a spotlight to project message in a way that is visible to the operator of a motor vehicle, rectangular light box signs, and all non-governmental signs in the right of way. The distinction between rectangular light box signs and channel lettering was explained to the group.

Mr. Macek: made a joke about hailing Batman with a spotlight.

#### **Residential Districts - 1 or 2 Family Dwelling (Slide 7)**

Alex Dambach: Explained there will be new provisions for flags. There will no longer be restrictions on what a flag says. There are currently no regulations on flags or the number of flags outside of the old town area. The zoning definition is only applicable to flags of a nation or governmental jurisdiction. Monument signs primarily apply in commercial districts, but a provision would be made for

neighborhood entrance signs (formerly called subdivision signs). Neighborhood entrance signs will be permitted by being renamed.

Mr. Milone: How do wayfinding signs fit in?

Alex Dambach: Responded that these signs are already allowed but would be renamed.

Mr. Macek: Inquired about the number of temporary signs allowed... Some discussion ensued regarding the definition and types of temporary and minor signs

### **Residential Districts - Townhouse ( Slide 8)**

Alex Dambach covered the proposal for residential districts with townhouses.

### **Residential Districts – Apartments in the RB Zone (Slide 9)**

Alex Dambach stated that the regulations would remain the same, but instead of being allowed a “40 ft apartment sign” they would instead be allowed a “40 ft sign.”

### **Residential District – Non Residential (Slide 10)**

Mr. Macek: Asked if house numbers are considered signage? Answer: Yes, they are.

Alex Dambach: Mentioned 6 inch curb sign and minor sign. Pointed out that a citizen would have to own curb to put 6 inch sign on it.

Joanna Anderson: Caveat on political signs, there is a proposal that that 4 sqf, or that it has to be as large as the largest temporary sign on the property. May have to allow additional sign to be 24 sqf (ideally for political speech or whatever). Has to be allowed to be as large as the largest available temporary sign.

### **Residential Districts - RA, RC, RCX, RD Zones**

Alex Dambach: These are the zones for complexes like Southern Towers and other big apartment complexes. 40 sqf + 4 sqf. Property managers would figure out how to divide it up.

A was question raised about how certain buildings having oversized “leasing” signs and the concern of owners willing to just pay fines. Mr. Dambach explained that 1 sqf of signage per linear footage would be allowed at a portion of the building put to commercial use. The leasing signs would remain subject to the size limits proposed

### **Commercial, Mixed Use, Special, and Overlay Zones**

Alex Dambach: described how the current code allows for 1 sign lower than 20 ft above grade and a second sign higher than 20 feet above grade. Cited the Hilton Hotel as an example of the upper sign (near the roof). He presented that the standard for both signs is 1 square foot of signage per linear foot of building wall. In cases of temporary signs (for instance contractor or real estate signs) they will be allowed to be as large as regular business signs, but they will be credited against the total allowed signage amount. Window signs are allowed to be 20% of each window area. Window signs also count toward wall sign regulation and will be subtracted out of the total signage amount that will be allowed by the ordinance. An extra temporary sign for 30 days will be allowed. It will be allowed to be half of the

size of regular business marque sign. A question was raised about the possibility of extending these signs to 60 days.

### **Commercial, Mixed Use, Special, and Overlay Zones (100' Wide Lot)**

Alex Dambach: The new ordinance will move away from allowing pole signs of up to 30 feet in height. We are proposing to drop the height to 6 ft, but still keep the same rules in regards to total sign area. For 2 or more businesses, the total sign area will be 50 ft. For 3 or more businesses, the total sign area will be 100 ft.

Mr. Porterfield : Raised a question regarding a line of sight issue with lowering signs to 6 ft and cars driving and park lots.

Alex Dambach Pointed out that there are already provisions in the current zoning code to protect against the line of sight issue.

### **Historic district**

Alex Dambach stated that signs for the historic district will still go through BAR Review. The zoning ordinance has been revised to change the way signs have been defined.

### **Roundtable of Committee Member Comments**

Mr. Benavage: Real estate have to verified or it has to be listed, what about for sale by owner? Real estate pending or sold? How will this affect agents? Will there be a time limit on under contract or pending signs?

Mr. Milone: Once property is sold, sign must removed. While it is for sale the sign can be up.

Mr. Benavage: Stated there is usually a long lead time with developers and signs, while they try to get a DSUP

Mr. Benavage: Asked about flags on poles.

Alex Dambach: Both will be covered in new code.

Mr. Benavage: What about a scenario with a new town center with main avenue, whole series of flags, advertising that they are international with many government flags or any situation with a circular avenue?

Mr. Benavage: house numbers, lump of anthracite of coal and put house number.

Joanna Anderson: Responded that minor signs are permitted and permanent

Alex Dambach: Explained that when defining non rectangular signs with no clear border, you create a rectangle around the letters.

Mr. Benavage: Reference collective signage. if we use an apartment complex such as Southern Towers, a vacant digital sign might be a practical use.

Alex Dambach: We put in a provision where driveways or sidewalks or walkways intersect, and a 6 sqf sign would be permitted.

Mr. Macek: Is this the difference between a sign that directs you to a drive thru versus a parking lot?

Alex Dambach: Pavement markings are being reviewed right now for cases like McDonalds,

Mr. Milone: Parking in rear sign of less than 1 ft should not count against them.

Mr. Benavage: Why are pole signs limited to 6ft versus a standard door way size of 8 ft?

Alex Dambach: 6 ft is common in zoning.

Mr. Benavage: There is an allowance for a provision in circumstances in SUP for pole signs where median comes into play or certain similar situations.

Mr. Benavage: What about a scenario where a precinct captain for a political party has 7 candidates running and he wants to put 7 signs on private property out of the right of way?

Joanna Anderson: The current ordinance defines them as political signs. The problem is they are now considered additional temporary signs.

Mr. Macek: What about incorporation of certain language for use of right of way and different language for the use of more temporary signs during political times on private property?

Joanna Anderson: We will review private property political signs, especially in cases with multiple positions or candidates running for office.

Mr. Macek: On commercial properties, people may just put up Joe's BBQ during political season.

Mr. Milone: We probably will not see signs with "we buy junk cars" often at all.

Mr. Benavage: Commented that an individual with neighbors on both sides who are politically active will not be happy with the number of signs.

Mr. Macek: Pointed out that on private property people can do that now.

Mr. Benavage: Does not want neighbors to do that.

Alex Dambach: We cannot limit to one sign per candidate because of the content issue.

Joanna Anderson: Options are being explored. However, other jurisdictions have not found a great solution to the political sign issue.

Mr. Benavage: Can people put signs on brick or in the window?

Alex Dambach: Yes, you can wall mount according to zoning.

Mr. Benavage: The rules really only provide for 3 signs in residential areas.

Mr. Nestlerode: Parking plan, with off site parking in Delray, should not count against total signage.

Alex Dambach: We will make sure a directional sign provision does not count against other allowances.

Mr. Nestlerode: Should there be a distinction between entry feature signs for a neighborhood sign and a private entrance. Neighborhood sign would go through the city for approval. It should be 24 sqf.

Alex Dambach: 24 sqf should only apply to private property. If it is in the right of way, we are back to way finding signs.

Mr. Nestlerode: What about the Delray citizens sign?

Mr. Macek: Directions to neighborhoods are part of the government way finding program and would remain allowed.

Joanna Anderson: Subdivision ones are the private neighborhood signs not the way finding neighborhood signs.

Ms. Miller : Posed a question. If there is a piece of art and there is a designation in it, how does that affect size, such as a welcome to Delray public art piece in the right of way.

Joanna Anderson: Art is defined as an item expressing creative skill in form. If it says welcome to Delray it is a sign.

Alex Dambach: If it is on private property, it is a 24 sqf sign max.

Ms. Miller : What about just Delray, no sign language?

Mr. Macek: This is an issue of city use on city property and is assessed on a case by case basis. It is not an issue where the ordinance language needs to be changed.

Ms. Miller : Murals are okay.

Ms. Supplee: One additional exempt 4 sqf 2x2 sign un lit, that's the menu board I am not allowed to have?

Stephanie Sample: Generally, menu boards only allowed to be at restaurants, and their size is regulated.

Alex Dambach: Cannot regulate their content. 4 sqf unlit sign which is intended to cover political sign if they wish.

Ms. Supplee: Thought the 4 sqf sign was an alternative to A-frame sign.

Group consensus: We do not want to outlaw menu signs.

Stephanie Sample: Only certain sign types are allowed in the historic district ( currently 3 types).

Alex Dambach: 53 feet of signage are already permitted and will still be permitted.

Joanna Anderson: Menu signage is still under review especially in the historic district. There are clearly some Issues to work out.

Ms. Supplee: Currently 20% of windows can have signage.

Stephanie Sample: 1 sqf is currently allowed.

Alex Dambach/Joanna Anderson: There are currently 2 types of review (staff and full hearing BAR review) for the historic district.

Joanna Anderson: 3<sup>rd</sup> phase is to look at old and historic district regulations in addition to other regulations already made.

Ms. Supplee: 20% of window sign should be exempt from overall sign allowance.

Alex Dambach: Asked for clarification if the intention of this request was to exempt window signs that do not exceed 20% from BAR review adding that some buildings have huge windows. In these situations large signs would be exempt.

Joanna Anderson: We are currently rewording existing exemptions. If we are going to add different kinds of signs to exemptions, then it happens in phase 3. Right now we are rewording to keep exemptions.

Mr. Nestlerode: The 20% window sign is not currently exempt.

Alex Dambach: Only 1 sqf signs are exempt.

Mr. Smeallie: The 1 sqf decal in addition to sign are now subject to BAR review?

Joanna Anderson: No exemptions are currently changing.

Ms. Supplee: I am concerned about putting the name on a business.

Alex Dambach: Our goal now is to focus on the content question from the Supreme Court

Joanna Anderson: Our goal is to protect public right of way in the zoning ordinance versus public property.

Mr. Porterfield : What about the bullying mindset of some larger tenants who are content to keep paying fines. How do we stop this situation without hurting the little guy.

Mr. Porterfield : Flags can be used for advertising and additional signage.

Alex Dambach/Joanna Anderson: Reemphasized that we cannot restrict signage on content.

Mr. Porterfield : Thus cannot limit on flags as part of signage.

Alex Dambach: The proposal allows for flags and sqf footage of flags ,just not the overall flag total.

Mr. Nestlerode: What about mural rules to regulate flags?

Joanna Anderson: It is not a mural if it is advertising anything in the building.

Questions raised by group regarding redefining flags to governmental so that someone could have USA, Alexandria, university they attended. Idea proposed to have a sliding scale for number of flags

Mr. Smeallie: Flag issue is my main issue, 5 flags constitutes 5 flag pole ads. What if we restrict to 1 flag pole and live with court ruling?

Mr. Smeallie: Temporary signs should be downsized to 4 sqf in residential (size of temporary signs).

Mr. Smeallie: Questions about historic district, additional 4 ft sign seems like A frame solution, not just for commercial though, any citizen can put up a 4 ft unlit sign in historic district.

Mr. Milone: Exemptions in historic need to be reviewed, ie 32 sqf contractor sign, signs for for-sale or being marketed.

Alex Dambach: While we are at it we might as well revisit entire historic district exemptions.

Mr. Macek: There is a lot of support for any business to do a menu board sign like “Danielles Knitting Class”

Mr. Milone: Menu boards used generically in replacement of A-frames.

Mr. Macek: What if we give people an additional avenue for other businesses not just restaurants (would still go through BAR or admin staff review)?

Mr. Milone: Too much signage in residential townhouse side. One flag seems like enough. How are flags not windblown signs if they have advertising?

Alex Dambach: Definition of a flag is it has no adverting and so it is not a sign.

Mr. Benavage: I worry about classifying flags as part of signage.

Mr. Macek: it's a flag on private property.

Mr. Benavage: If you include flags as a part of the signage it puts the City Council in a tough place.

Joanna Anderson: City Council has to rule on private property. Another problem that you encounter is governmental flag is not a sign. The Hilton flag is a sign. If no flags are signs, then Hilton can put up as many flags as they want.

Group consensus: Need to work on advertising vs. actual flag distinction.

Mr. Milone: If you burn a US flag, you get arrested, if you burn a McDonalds flag, you won't get arrested. Perhaps a legal distinction can be found to leave governmental flags out of signage.

Mr. Benavage: Asked a question about raising and suspending a flag such as a wall sign.

Mr. Macek: voter sign issue is very important. We should definitely allow more than one. Existing regulations for voter sign issue and flag issue are adequate. Truth is someone could go crazy with political signs and flags, and the city would be powerless against it. Let's make as few changes as possible. Lets

focus on getting rid of content neutrality in school zones and focus on key changes. I do support restrictions on pole signage and requirement to switch them over to monument signage. As far as moving signs versus motor vehicle signs? Do not be too creative to find exceptions. Good taste tends to prevail.

Alex Dambach: Moving and windblown signs are defined together. Parts of a sign actually moving versus a sign on an actual motor vehicle.

Mr. Macek: Most egregious issues can be addressed later (eg., signs over large apartments/ complexes and people violating repeatedly violating ordinances without some meaningful penalties or enforcement).

Mr. Macek: There seems to be a consensus to limit flags on commercial property from 5 to 3.

Public comment period:

Mr. Macek: Staff, what are you looking for in terms of recommendations?

Joanna Anderson: Was hoping to keep moving forward on schedule. Lots of good suggestions and points. Probably going to move it to the March docket or Planning Commission hearing.

Mr. Milone: Rename the group to the Ad Hoc Committee on Signage. Do not want to mislead people into thinking we are only discussing A-frame signs.

Jay Nestleroad: It is clear in the Alexandria E news what we are discussing.

Public Comments:

Eleanor Coleman, Vintage Mirage Consignment Store: It would be helpful to have more information about these meetings. State she was representing businesses off King Street, so the issue with A-frame signs is a big deal. She worked with city to get wayfinding A frames allowed so that they could compete with restaurants. Businesses all need that opportunity to have an equal playing field. Restaurants will still put out signs on Saturday and Sunday nights. City inspectors do not go around after hours to regulate the restaurants, so A-frames are critical to businesses off the King Street corridor. A-frames on corners are critical and Robert Lusk (Old Town Signs) has drawn up some informational proposals. He has worked with signs for 30 years. On issue of flags, businesses will not do that. Need to find an easy way that businesses can invest in. Please formally type something up that includes what has changed, will change, etc. Itemized list with changes proposed. Please improve the clarity and frequency of communication with business owners. Given BAR restrictions, cannot increase the size of window signs. This rises concerns about the fairness of windows off King Street versus window construction on King Street.

Josh Verpent, Northern Virginia Association of realtors: Expressed concerns regarding the limitation on the size of real estate signs because of the new regulations by the state and about directional signs guiding people to open houses. Larger residential areas need large signs. Concerns with limiting size of signs on

private property. Not worried about prohibiting signs in public right of way, since real estate agents would comply.

Mr. Benavage: Asked if he had a minimum requirement on for sale signs or real estate signs.

Josh Verpent: Not sure about specific rider regarding signs.

Mr. Benavage: Riders would still count toward real estate signs

Alex Dambach: May have to adjust size of signs.

Mr. Macek: Do you have information on an industry group as what size signs are being used?

Michael Hobbs, resident on Cameron street: Spoke at Planning Commission on signage. 50-50 split to preserve right to political signs versus the side that felt it was too tough a hill to climb. The 7-0 Planning Commission vote is an oversimplification, since the majority expressed varying degrees of reluctance to reach that conclusion. He said he is not very eager about the idea of prohibiting signs in the right of way all together. His view coincided with commissioner Brown's as stated in a letter did not feel like as a private citizen or his role as a member of the Planning Commission that their view should preempt the Planning Commission's decision. Banning political signs all together is a draconian approach and there has to be a way to keep them a possible. Rules distinguishing between public and private property and rules distinguishing between residential and commercial. May be beating a dead horse. Encourage committee clearly define what you may or may not do with commercial signage, public signage, residential signage, etc. Supreme Court ruling meant to leave some room to adopt reasonable government regulation in terms of signage.

Group Consensus and Recommendations: Given the complexity of the issue there are a lot of angles and differences of opinions to sort through.

Mr. Macek: Let's have a slate of issues to address to next time. Where there are distinctions that were brought out so that we can debate them next time. Get the issues to us with adequate time to review them before next meeting.

Alex Dambach: Try to get to get them to committee by the end of January so we can keep on track with the March docket.

Mr. Benavage: No matter what happens changes will be made.

Ms. Miller : Provide an excel sheet to help compare current to proposed signage guidelines. Also show pictorial comparisons on slides and display the situations for each district.

Mr. Macek: Establish baseline of comparison with one sheet instead of 15 slides.