



Unified Government Clerk's Office

Monica L. Sparks, CMC
Unified Government Clerk

701 North 7th Street, Suite 323
Kansas City, Kansas 66101-3070

Phone: 913-573-5260
Fax: 913-573-5299
<http://www.wycokck.org>

NOTICE OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE MEETING

A meeting of the Business Development Task Force of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, will be conducted in person only on Monday, August 11, 2025, at 3:00 pm. in the Fifth-floor conference room of the Municipal Office Building, 701 N. 7th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

We invite you to view the meeting in person in the 5th-floor conference room, Suite 515, 701 N. 7th Street, Kansas City, Kansas,

Business Development Taskforce

July 28, 2025

3:00 pm- 4:00 pm

City Hall

5th Floor Conference Room

701 N 7th Street

Kansas City, Kansas 66101

AGENDA

Commissioner Tom	Burroughs	Chair
Commissioner		Co-
Chuck	Stites	Chair

Nate	Brungardt
Edgar	Galicia
Renee	Hadley
Lynn	Holcomb
Greg	Kindle
Gabe	Munoz
Richard	Napper
Mindy	Rocha
Jim	Schraeder

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call of members**
- 2. Review of July 14, 2025, Meeting Minutes**
- 3. Review of Tabled Recommendations from July 14th meeting - Alyssa Marcy, Long Range Community Planner, and Legal Department and Taskforce Members**
- 4. Taskforce final recommendations to move forward with next steps**
- 5. Public Comment**
- 6. Adjourn**

Mayor's Business Development Taskforce

Monday, July 14, 2025

City Hall

701 N 7th Street KCK

5th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

Introduction: Chairs: Commissioner Tom Burroughs and Commissioner Chuck Stites opened the meeting at 3:02 pm **Members Present,** Edgar Galicia, Renee Hadley, Mindy Rocha and Jim Schraeder **Members Excused:** Nate Brungardt, Lynn Holcomb, Greg Kindle, Gabe Munoz, Richard Napper, and Dawn Rattan. **UG staff and advisors present:** Alan Howze, Chelsee Chism, Wendy Green, Alyssa Marcy, Rodney Lucas, Michael Sutton and Michael Farley.

- **Commissioner Burroughs** called the meeting to order and roll call taken.
- **Commissioner Burroughs** explained he would like us to run through the minutes before we act or get started on today's meeting. There were a few questions that he would like a brief pause to make sure everyone looks through the minutes if members haven't already seen them. There were a couple of questions that the Commissioners Sites and he had in reference to a task that we wanted staff to have done. We talked about some additional staff signage recommendations, from Alyssa Marcy, UG Long range Community planner and the legal department. There were some questions and concerns that came up with a very robust discussion last time, and I think we're really narrowing in on recommendations. He had a meeting with the leadership of Overland Park when it was brought up that we were working on signage ordinances, they just smiled and said, good luck with that. He also told them that we were fortunate to deal with parking, and they were somewhat impressed we were able to get that done. Today we will continue. If there's no questions about last meeting, let's just go ahead and run through the presentation.
- **Sign Code Recommended Changes July 14, 2025: PowerPoint presentation (attached):** Alyssa Marcy will go through the recommendations from last meeting with the incorporation of some of the taskforce comments and concerns, and she also has a couple outstanding changes for the code that we did not have time to get to.

1. **Sandwich/ A Frame Signs: Alyssa Marcy, Long Range Planner, Planning + Urban design** The first recommended change, sandwich/A frame signs. The change that you're seeing is that we would allow them by right with the exception, of course, they must adhere to ADA requirements. Any questions on the first page? **Jim Schraeder** asked what would be the examples of things that might override this? The table addresses where they are allowed, these are not allowed in front of someone's house, but it would be all commercial, and obviously you can't have it in the middle of the sidewalk, you can't block the sidewalk. **Commissioner Burroughs** mentioned that was a great question and asked, is there a size mandate on these that if it's a very broad sidewalk, I can see 4x8s, being put up end to end versus maybe a small sandwich sign. **Edgar Galicia** mentions as they produce events on Central Avenue all the time, we have always declared the sidewalks free for passage so that even if we use the street level and all that, there is way for people to walk across and around. What we have understood before is there has to be a four foot or five feet passageway. **Michael Farley**, Legal explained as of right now, the sign base maximum for sandwich signs is 12 square feet total, with the maximum height of five feet. Unless there is a recommendation from the taskforce, we could just continue that across the board for all new districts that's allowed. **Edgar Galicia** mentioned he has not seen many larger than Four feet squared, or anything bigger than 2.5 feet wide. That's the commercial standard.

Recommendation: Allow by right in all zones but enforce ADA compliance.
(Consensus list)

This change would be reflected in Table VIII-11-10.

(4) Sandwich / "A" Frame Signs

- a. **Definitions.** A "Sandwich Board" means a portable sign that is ordinarily in the shape of an "A" with back to back sign faces, an easel, or a similar configuration.

- b. **Standards.**

1. Sandwich / "A" frame signs are allowed in the right-of-way or on private property, subject to the standards in *Table VIII-11-10 Sandwich / "A" Frame Signs* below.

2. Sandwich / "A" frame signs are allowed by right at only where a building is within a build-to-line established in the TND district, or where a front façade that

~~includes~~ an entryway open to the general public during normal business hours ~~is~~ within 10 feet of the edge of a public sidewalk, subject to *Table VIII-11-10* below.

3.2. Sandwich boards / "A" Frame Signs shall leave a minimum, unobstructed sidewalk clearance of ~~48~~36 inches or as otherwise required by the ADA.



- **Alyssa Marcy** recommended an additional change to the sandwich sign is that we would not have to review any copy changes, so current we would have to. This means if you are changing the content of your sandwich time we wouldn't need to review. **Mindy Rocha** asked do we review chalkboard sandwich signs? **Alyssa Marcy** answered yes, technically, but that will now be removed.

Recommendation: Allow changeable copy. (Consensus List)

Design Characteristics								
11. Digital	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
12. Illumination, Internal	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
13. Illumination, External	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
14. Illumination, Halo-Lit	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
15. Channel Letters	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
16. Changeable copy	No-Yes	No-Yes	No-Yes	Yes	Yes	No-Yes	No-Yes	

- **Consent List Discussion:** **Alan Howze** requested as we go through these, for example the two requested changes to the sandwich/A frame sign if there is consensus among the task force like those two, to advance, we can go through these and then go back through second time with what you want to do? **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated he will take recommendations as they come. He is good with that recommendation, we had much discussion in reference to the sandwich sign and if the changeability of the sign is allowed without having to come forward to ask. That's a business decision. He is here to do the committee's bidding. If you want to make that motion to approve the first two items, I'm good with that. **Alan Howze** indicated we can put them on a list as consensus items and at the end vote on them all. **Edgar Galica** indicated he truly did not want to waste anyone's time approving text on signs. **Mindy Rocha** asked, does it happen? Does somebody go around and check sandwich signs? **Edgar Galica** mentioned he had never questioned anything other than the location of a sign. He has never seen them affixed to the floor or other than copy enticing them to come into business. **Mindy Rocha** mentioned there may be some signs that have some stuff we are not happy with putting but there are first amendment rights. **Jim Schraeder**

liked Alan's suggestion, let's put it on a consent list and then we can approve it. **These will be the first two on the consent list for the committee to approve.**

2. **Projecting signs: Alyssa Marcy** reported the change that we've discussed regarding Projecting Signs is to allow by right, so long as it is installed by a bonded and insured individual/company. That change is the red text on slide 4. We also added a little bit of clarification on item B1. This is to take into account the fact that sometimes after a sidewalk, there might be a patch of grass before you actually hit the road where the cars are, so that would be something that you are allowed to have a projecting sign over as long as it's not going into the street where the actual cars are going back and forth. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked for clarification as he reads it must be at least 10 feet above any sidewalk. If the facade, the roof line or whatever is at 10 feet and the sign goes underneath that, that's not 10 feet above the sidewalk. If a sign is put in front of a canopy and comes out from it, and it's 10 or 11 feet up. The sign is 24 inches. It's not going to be 10 feet above the sidewalk. Is 10 feet a standard that we use? I just want to ensure that we're not limiting ourselves. Has 10 feet always been the requirement? **Alyssa Marcy** indicated it has been written as 10 feet since 2016. She said for projecting signs specifically, she could not think of a case in which we have something lower than 10 feet off the top of her head. She also does not want to confuse this with things like awnings or other things that also hang across because those have different requirements. **Commissioner Burroughs** is using the example of the bottom picture located on fourth slide of the PowerPoint. He indicated if that roof line came out and that roof line was 11 feet, and that sign is attached to the building, there's no way that sign's going to be 10 feet off the ground. It's going to be closer to nine feet off the ground, probably 8 and half feet.
- **Edgar Galicia** asked if there should be language saying the lowest part of the sign should be 10 feet. **Mr. Schraeder** indicated that is what it reads. **Ms. Marcy** asked if he is suggesting the sign must be at least the height of the building, if it is less than 10 feet. **Commissioner Burroughs** is not suggesting anything but as he reviews the second picture it gave him pause, because even if that eve was 11 feet off the sidewalk, they put a sign, as seen in the picture, that sign is more than a foot wide. And so that would be 10 feet at the minimum, but at the maximum, it would probably be more like 9 feet. **Mr. Galicia** says #2 reads the lower edge of the projecting sign shall be at least 10 feet above any sidewalk. The lower edge of the projecting sign. Using your example and the image you're looking at, that corner under the 66, that edge must be 10 feet. **Ms. Marcy** indicated that was correct. **Mr. Galicia** indicates if that edge of the roof is at 10 feet exactly, any projecting sign should be above that line. It should be a separate structure with engineering so that it's held out above that edge. **Ms. Rocha** indicated she understands what is being said and there must be creative in a way to get over and on. She indicates that might be a lot more work to get this done. **Ms. Marcy** wonders if a 10-foot standard comes from a public works requirement, because if you look at the 14 feet for alleyway, she is sure that this must deal with utility vehicles coming in and out of an alleyway. **Mr. Schraeder** does not think this is an issue as either the sign is going to be farther out. He does not think this is an issue we should deal with. **Mr. Rocha** indicated, if necessary, there is a variance process that those types of issues can be addressed. **Commissioner Burroughs asked the taskforce if this is recommended for the consensus list. All indicated yes.**

Recommendation: Allow by right as long as sign is installed by a bonded and insured individual/company. (Consensus List)

These changes would then be reflected in Table VIII-11-5.

(6) Projecting Signs

- a. → **Definition.** A "projecting sign" is a sign supported by and extending at least 18 inches from a building wall.
- b. → **Standards**
 1. No projecting sign shall extend more than 5 feet or beyond the outer edge of a sidewalk, whichever is greater. A projecting sign may not extend into any portion of the paved surface of the street right-of-way, other than a sidewalk.
 2. The lower edge of the projecting sign shall be at least 10 feet above any sidewalk and 14 feet above any alley surface where vehicles may pass below.
 3. The upper edge of a projecting sign shall not extend vertically above the eave line of a structure.
 - ~~3.4. No permit shall be required for projecting signs installed by a bonded and insured individual or company as designated in Sec. 27-723.~~
 - 4.5. All projecting signs shall be attached at right angles to the supporting structure and may be anchored no more than six inches from the structure.
(Code 1988, § 27-1385; Ord. No. 64690, § 1 (27-71.6(I)), 8-30-1984; Ord. No. O-9-15, § 1, 1-29-2015)



3. **Wall Signs:** Alyssa Marcy mentioned we discussed wall signs maximums for a single entry. She pointed to the chart on slide 5 of the PowerPoint presentation, indicating we've changed it in all zones from only one wall sign to three as your maximum number, that you're allowed. And again, this does not deal with a strip mall with multiple doors and multiple stores. **Commissioner Burroughs** reminded us that there was much discussion on this one. **Mr. Galicia** felt the determining factor is the single point entry. **Commissioner Burroughs** asks are we good with this one? All indicted yes.

Recommendation: Maximum number of walls signs allowed in a single entry structure changed from 1 to 3. (Consensus list)

4. **Feather Signs;** Alyssa Marcy mentioned Feather signs are currently temporary signs. **Mr. Farley** confirmed that is correct, feathered signs are considered temporary signs. If we were to remove the maximum three days in a 60-day period, that doesn't mean that a feather sign could be out continuously, it would still have to be out for no more than 90 days as every temporary sign is allowed. **Ms. Marcy** mentioned, theoretically, you can put it out for 90 days, take it in, then put it back out for 90 days. Currently, no one is monitoring this, but this was a suggestion that we had. **Mr. Galicia** recommended that there should be a provision for cloth or textile signage to be there for a specific length of time, because these materials get destroyed rather quickly and sometimes, business owners are business owners and they want to do the least amount of investment as possible, but some of these flags and some of these sky dancers, they get really destroyed, worn out and dirty. It really doesn't help them a lot. He thinks on the Central Avenue we need to continue educating our businesses because at some point, that doesn't look good and it's not even inviting anymore. He would recommend that they should be removed every day and installed every day instead of being left out, or only use on special occasions, something that helps them be more effective. This may not have to be written in the ordinance, but it might be education that may have to be done, which is not a problem, but some of them look bad. **Commissioner Burroughs** thinks with the feather sign, he thinks of the sign that is in front of the new city lofts when they want to rent, and they had the issue out of 267, when they had the feathers out there. It was just trying to be uniform in what we do. They lose their oomph after a period. He would think that somebody would recognize that especially if they are not getting any clientele. Is 90 days the

standard time that we've used before? **Ms. Marcy** answered yes for a temporary sign. They're considered 90 days and under. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked, is that a time frame we're accustomed to? **Ms. Marcy** indicated yes. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated If it's 90 days, then any of any other issues with this one? 2B on the recommendation was struck which read, feather signs may only be installed for a maximum of three continuous days. So, 90 days is what will be implemented. You can take it out for 24 hours, put it back in for 90 days. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked who is going to monitor this? We cannot monitor now.

- **Mr. Galica** thinks it's one of those situations where education for the purpose of signage and marketing must be there and that should help as much as possible unless we have a police officer or an inspector at every corner, and monitoring times and as if they were parking spaces. It's impossible. But education will take a great deal of time, however, should yield results on their own benefits. **Mr. Schraeder** indicated his is in favor of this change. For a business facing the sidewalk on Central Avenue, having one of those, I agree with you, you would be better if they could bring it in every night. He also sees them up and down State Avenue, along the curves, and they stay up, quite a while, and hopefully they take them down when they get tattered. What the staff is suggesting is allowed by right and this is something that we can review, again, at another time. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked if we should state it has to stay in once tattered, faded, or worn out. **Mr. Schraeder** mentioned how do you monitor that. It may be where Central Avenue Betterment Association could have an educational campaign for their area. **Mr. Galicia** indicated the nature of these is to bring attention, outstanding attention, to the location, at a given moment. Sometimes they use these feathers or Sky dancers as we are open signs, and that is the wrong use, because they have it up all the time. When they have it up all the time, it ceases to call attention. It is one more thing to visually avoid while you're driving by. It's not in their best interest to hold it there forever or for a long time. It means more if they did it on the weekends or having a sale, or specials or the hour, then this needs to be called attention to. That's the nature of these signs, feathers and skyers dancers. Education is a great deal in what we do, but we don't have the power to monitor every single day. Stopping by and talking to them and explaining is part of the work. We're interested in and willing to do it. He does not know how that could be reflected in the writing of these regulations. **Mindy Rocha** mentioned she does not want to punish somebody because their sign is discolored and it's on back order or UPS or postal service hasn't delivered yet or somebody hasn't taken down because the replacement has yet to come or short staff or someone is sick. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated we're not trying to create a major issue here. We're just trying to ensure that we're going to allow a feather sign or allow these to be out for a period. We are a windy city. We do have severe weather, and if that's the case, these things get ripped, tattered, torn and bleached. To what extent are they really serving the purpose? Who has the authority to go in and say, hey, it's day 67, and your sign is tattered, and it doesn't look like a sign. It might encourage you to either pull it out or seek a new way to put it up. He does not want to see Mr. Schrader walking down the street knocking on a business door, mentioning your sign's a little tattered, can you clean it up? That's what he is trying to avoid us having to do. **Commissioner Stites** indicated, we're not going to have anybody that says it's day 67, because we don't know when day one was and if it's an entrance to their business and it's not attractive business there because it's been out there too long that's on them. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked, are we good with the way it is?
- **Michael Faley** added that looking at the existing code for feather signs there is something we have not addressed yet. The setback from the property lines, is 5 feet. Technically, anything along Central Avenue that goes right up to the right of way, couldn't be putting that sign unless it was treated like an sandwich/A frame sign. There might be some more changes to the code or to the table, specifically for feathers that we need to make. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked if he could give us an example. **Mr. Farley** mentioned as we were discussing before, for example, a new apartment opening. They have a sign in a side yard, off Parallel Parkway, in nice green space. It looks like maybe it's in the right of way, but it's really their yard. They're

five feet off wherever their property starts. Its indistinguishable, but it's assuming they're following the rules. That's what the code reads right now that they could have it out but if we make the change, they could have it out there for 90 days to advertise their rentals. If you're on Central Avenue, chances are you're building goes right up to the property line, right where the sidewalk starts. It is just the way that they were built. You can't follow a five-foot setback because five feet beyond the property line is five feet inside the store. So technically under the code right now, knowing that's not how it operates, but any feather sign that's on Central Ave or Minnesota, or on any of these traditional avenues, can't have a feather sign out on the right of way, unless we treat them like sandwich/A frame signs that can be on a sidewalk as long as they allow for at least a four foot walkway. He did not intend to throw a wrench into our discussion, but we should consider this. **Mr. Galica** mentioned a feather sign uses way less space than an A frame, nonetheless the sky dancer signs use just about the same space as an A frame, if there is four feet to walk through, it should be okay. **Mr. Farley's** suggestion from legal counsel would be, we do two things 1) add in another line in the table that the feather signs use and 2) we would take away the property line setback minimum, and then we would put in language similar to the A frame, saying that they can go in the right of way, they just need to give that four foot clearance that complies with the ADA. **Commissioner Burroughs requested a recommendation brought back next time and all agreed**, so this is the first one we're pulling out or set aside.

(d) Feather Signs

- (1) **Definition.** A "feather sign" means a banner in the shape of a feather, quill, sail, blade or teardrop, and mounted on a solid or flexible pole or cord. These are sometimes referred to as "quill signs" or "sail banners."
- (2) **Standards.** Feather signs shall comply with *Table VIII-11-14 Feather Signs* and the following:
 - a. Feather signs are not allowed in the public right-of-way. Where feather signs are installed in the right-of-way in violation of this ordinance, the unified government may require the applicant to pay the costs of removing the feather signs to the extent allowed by law.
 - b. ~~Feather signs may only be installed for a maximum of 3 continuous days during any 60-day period.~~

5. **Window Signs:** **Alyssa Marcy** explained the recommendation is to increase the sign area that is allowed from 25% to 50% as discussed, the last time. However, we need guidance from you on is do we also add some language in the area that reads, you must keep three to six feet from the ground clear so that people can see in from their site range. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated that was the part of the minutes that he wanted us to discuss. **Ms. Galicia** mentioned he did his homework. He spoke to four of the businesses on Central Avenue that hold these signs, and they all have their windows covered. One of them, the dental office, has literally 60% of the facade covered by glass, covered by signage. The other business is very close to that business, on 18th Street and Central, a corner building that used to be a furniture store and has very big windows and all of them are covered. They all are folding 50% mesh, which is the material that their signs are printed on, and it has holes in it. It's like a meshing and it's 50%. They use these because they provide shade, and they provide promotion for their business. Their visibility concerns are literally nonexistence. None of the four businesses he spoke to were worried about visibility from inside

out or outside in, however, from the inside out during the night, you can see through because the light is inside, not outside. That makes a difference. They all mentioned that they have cameras for safety rather than the windows. We are working on a three canopy rebuild on Central, so we're planting trees, and one of our arguments is that all this shade is part of lowering the temperature in their buildings and helping with their air conditioning bill. One of the businesses mentioned, you're planting trees, and I am putting mesh on a window so that the heat isn't as high.

Commissioner Burroughs also indicated Commissioner Stites was to reach out to our police chief.

Commissioner Stites reported, he made an attempt to reach out to the Chief and was unsuccessful so far, but he has been thinking about this a little bit more after Edgar spoke about it, and I understand that if a building didn't have any windows in it at all, it's 100% blocked. Considering that, let's work the change to 50%, and see what happens. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates we also have the recommendation to keep the three to six foot vision field, do we want to strike that?

- **Jim Schraeder** asked Mr. Farley, what is in the code? What is the definition of, "window sign?" A concern he has had before is it something applied to the outside of the glass? Is something applied to the inside of the glass or is it something loose inside the glass? What is the definition in the code of a window sign? **Mr. Farley** replied, Window signs are signs posted, painted, placed, affixed to a window, and inside of a building, but clearly visible from outside the building. Signs that are replaced on the exterior of the window are not permitted. This is all this is always going to be a sign affixed to the inner side of a window. **Mr. Schraeder** mentioned the keyword there, to him is affixed. The 50% mesh that Mr. Galicia was referencing is affixed, paintings would be affixed. Theoretically, somebody could put a poster board, leaned against a window and that wouldn't be a window sign. It's not affixed, nor a blind, it is not a window sign. Even though you could put advertising on it when you pulled it down. **Mr. Farley** responded saying possibly your cardboard sign, as an example, would qualify, because it's placed to a window, but the shades might be different. **Mr. Schraeder** explained he does not know the right answer to any of this. On one hand, he wants to just let everything be the way it wants to be, because that's the way it is but there are safety issues. **Ms. Rocha** indicated the first time someone gets robbed and police cannot see in, it's going to be our fault, it is a double-edged sword. **Mr. Schraeder** mentioned he would be in favor from 25 to 50 and leaving it at that. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked the members if we're all good with the 25 and 50%, increasing this sign size on a window and would like to confirm that we're not happy with the 6-foot vision field measured from the ground. Should we strike it altogether. Mr. Galicia agrees to strike that because there's no way to control it. **Commissioner Stites** mentioned then are we saying that the places that are 95% now need to be enforced and go back down to 50% because that's what we're about to approve. **Mr. Schraeder** mentioned they're already, not in compliance today. **Commissioner Stites** asked about the examples Mr. Galicia gave that are fully covered up, now do we go to them and say, you're in violation? **Mr. Schraeder** mentioned that if it is, yes, but the mesh with holes meets this as they are often 50% covered. **Commissioner Stites** indicates but it should be 50% when you're on the outside looking in. **Mr. Schraeder** mentioned it doesn't say that, maybe we need to clarify that. A lot of people put those films on the inside of their windows. **Commissioner Stites** indicates he likes them, and they look good, but you can only see what is going on outside. Mr. Schraeder responded, saying as **Mr. Galicia** mentioned at night if the lights are on inside the building, you can see into the building.
- **Commissioner Stites** replied if that's the case, then why not we just go to 100%? They can do whatever they want in their building. **Mr. Galicia** mentioned there is not a way to stop someone from covering all their windows, because of too much light and board them up, even if they are nicely painted. They have the right to board them up and close the windows or shades or blinds. That's 100%. Again, window signs by nature are very open, for example the open sign if it is attached to the inside, hanging there, if it is there, it's there. That's a window sign. **Mr. Schraeder** indicated one reason why he would support the

change of 25% to 50% and not closing your windows up completely is, particularly in commercial areas. One of the things you want is to enliven the street and the sidewalks to the people, you know, it's a business and you want to come in. Otherwise, you're just walking by a bunch of sideboards. It ends up that way anyway, but he does not want to allow 100% coverage. **Commissioner Stites** replies then do we want the police department to go enforce the ones that are 100% covered or the ones that are over 50%. That means someone's out there measuring square footage because that's what they then will have to go and do. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated if he heard correctly, we already have businesses that are doing that, and understood what was stated, the mesh has perforations in it that allows light to transfer. He is not a scientist that can tell you how many perforated holes are in a 10 by 10 sign that allows light to transfer that if those holes weren't in there, what size would the sign truly be. We do the same thing with tint on vehicles. They have tools that can measure the darkness of tints. How do we move forward with this one, if it's not for more discussion. We can come back. It's recommendation was 25 to 50 where does that number come from, Allysa. Is it just something that we tried to float out here? **Ms. Marcy** indicates this is a recommendation from CitiesWorks.

- **Commissioner Stites** asked why change it at all? We're not enforcing it, we're not doing anything, don't do anything. **Commissioner Burroughs** mentioned that's an option. **Alan Howze** indicated that if somebody who was trying to be complainant +opening a new business will say, I want to put a window sign asking what the rules are, and they're trying to be a good citizen, then these are the rules, this is what they will do. Then there's the other category of people actively trying to skirt the rules, and that may be a different question with enforcement and code officers and that kind of thing, but for somebody who comes in the planning and says, I want to do this, I want to open this building up. What can I do? What am I allowed to do? This gives them the rules. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked if we have a new developer that comes in and the front part of that building has a history of being a flamboyant building, or a moniker, that's their moniker. They have bright colors that start on the brick, go across the window and continue around the facade of the building. That's on the outside, not on the inside, so is that a different criterion. **Michael Farley** explained by the definition of the window signs, that it would not be allowed, because it cannot be applied to the outside. **Commissioner Stites** believes it would be interesting to find out from the people that are issuing the permits now to find out what is the most common thing that gets asked? Or what are they trying to do? Right? Before we make changes. It is like padlocks, they are only there for an honest person, because everybody's got a pair of bolt cutters and can cut them off and do where they want, right? Like the 25 to 50%, they're going to start out at 50, and they're going to see that their neighbor's doing, and if they are at 100, then they're going to be a 100. He would like to know what the folks are out there asking of our department. Do we know that? Or the last 10 if this is an option for a variance. **Ms. Marcy** mentioned they could always get a variance and indicated that in reviewing the last 10 years of the variances, this was not one that was particularly common. **Commissioner Stites** mentioned we may be spending a whole lot of time trying to figure out something that's not really a problem.
- Michael Farley pointed out, the UG would not have those statistics for window signs because window signs don't require a signed permit because that is the way it's arranged. If you don't have a signed permit, the only way it can be enforced is on is on the back end. Unfortunately, we wouldn't have those stats. Commissioner Stites thinks what we could do is our community policing department that goes out and does that and they are all involved with the CEPTED, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, for safety, you might want to tone those window things back So we could see in, you could see out and then it would be their decision. **Mr. Galicia** mentions the 25% to 50% range would be applicable to safety and to them working. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked, are we going to strike this one all together? All agreed with no changes to this. **Mr. Galicia** indicates he has not seen a viable business who has boarded up windows. **Commissioner Burroughs** replied We will keep as is, so there's no changes to this section. We're staying at 25%. **Mr. Galicia** believed we were staying at 25 to 50. What we said, no change to this section, that would mean that there would be no change from 25 to 50. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked If we want

to keep the 25 to 50. **Mr. Galicia** indicated Every business he visited has a 50 percent window signage. Mesh or not, but 50% visibility. Commissioner Burroughs ask for a group to give them a range. Up to 50% He wants to make sure he is on the same page with everyone. If the only change we're going to have in this section at section 27-728-9, is we're going to accept the 25% to 50%, and we're going to strike the three-to-six-foot field measured from the ground and everything else stays the same? Committee in favor

Recommendation: Sign area (maximum percent of window area) changed from 25% to 50%. (Consensus list)

Potential addition: Must keep the 3-6 foot vision field, measured from the ground, clear of signage. (Strike)

Table VII-11-8 Window Sign Standards

Requirements	Zoning Districts / TND-T-Zone	A-G, R-1, R-1(B), R-2, R-2(B), TND-T-1, T-2, T-3, CS	R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6, R-M, TND-T-4	C-O	C-1, TND-T-5	C-D, TND-T-6	C-2, C-3, M-1, B-P, TND-D	M-2, M-3
1. → Permitted?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. → Permit required?		No	No	No	No	No	No	No
3. → Number per street frontage (max.)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. → Number total (max.)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dimensions								
5. → Sign area (maximum percent of window area)		2550%	2550%	2550%	2550%	2550%	2550%	2550%
6. → Height (maximum feet)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location								

6. **Murals Recommendation: Alyssa Marcy** There are two changes being recommended for murals: one is a change to the exception part of the code, which would be adding letter D, which states that no sign permit is required for the creation of new murals kept in good condition. That does not exempt them from all the requirements, however, in actual murals section, which will be on the next slide. We had the discussion about murals in residence or facing residential districts last time, so we could just leave in what was originally number two, any mural would be allowed, however, if they were facing a residential district or in one, they would have to seek a variance for that, and that would be the only instance in which they would have to pursue some type of permit. **Ms. Rocha** asked if that would cover Argentines Mural. **Ms. Marcy** responded, yes, this would be city wide. This would be one change in the standards for murals here, we could leave in item two to address the residences. Item three, there was a change to and includes, instead of trying to regulate the amounts of copy on a mural, that we would just say no more than five items of information, which is defined in a different part of the code and that really must deal with commercial versus advertising versus that kind of thing. We can go into more detail on that. The next item removes the approval by a director of components of it. It still leaves in requirements to be in adherence with having good conditions, which is defined in the code and has not been changed. We also added number 5, which clarifies that if there is a mural that's in a historic district, they must follow the historic review process as defined in the other part of the code. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated this one's going to take a little bit of time to go through. He would like us to come back to this one and hold it over. We could just move on to a couple of the other items and come back to this one.

This section covers exceptions to the sign code.

Recommended change is to add in language: d. Murals: No sign permit is required for the

b. → Standards¶

1. ~~Murals are not permitted on the primary façade. A primary façade is defined, for purposes of this section, as a building elevation that faces the adjacent street right-of-way and is the primary customer entrance. Buildings located on a block corner with the primary customer entrance located diagonally at the building corner to both intersecting streets has 2 primary façades.~~¶



2. ~~On lots that share a property line with a residential zoning district, murals are not allowed on building walls that face a residential zoning district.~~¶

3. ~~2. Up to 20 percent of a mural may include text or commercial copy. No more than 5 items of information (as defined in Sec. 27-724(d)) may be included in the area used for text or commercial copy.~~¶

4. ~~3. The mural shall be kept in good condition for the life of the mural, according to the maintenance schedule and responsibilities approved by the Director and incorporated into the Sign Permit. A mural is in a state of disrepair when 25% or more of the display surface area contains peeling, faded or flaking paint, or is otherwise not preserved in the manner in which it was originally created.~~¶

4. ~~The display surface shall be kept clean, neatly painted, and free from corrosion.~~¶

5. ~~For murals in a designated historic district, murals must follow the Historic Preservation historic Commission review process for a Certificate of Appropriateness as defined in Article IV, Division 4 of this chapter.~~¶

This section covers specific requirements for murals. These changes would be reflected in Table VIII-11-4.

Recommendation to leave existing language on item 2:

“On lots that share a property line with a residential zoning district, murals are not allowed...”

And add language that says an exception can be granted by BOZA (this would eliminate the state variance requirements).

7. **Illumination Recommendation: Alyssa Marcy** Many slides for illumination with a very similar change, two changes to illumination, the first in this section we removed items 2 through four, and again, we're not going to try to regulate the specific dynamics or content of illumination. It's only that it cannot imitate, mimic or steer traffic signs or signals. That is that only shall not that would exist with this change. The other change for elimination here is that specifically with internal elimination to just give a little context internal is coming from within the sign, and external is when maybe you have a sign there's a light from a separate office, something being shown onto a sign. We will only be looking at internal illumination, so that's number 12 on the design characteristics slide, we would allow, we would change the no's in the second and third column. So, for those zoning districts, it would be allowed, and we would change that for all the following sign types. So, this is just for awnings, but the following slides include projecting signs through signs, wall signs, window signs, and monument signs. So that's just allowing internal elimination in the second and third columns of zoning districts for all those sign types. All the R3, R4, R5, R6 TND, T4, these are the larger residential and then CO, so we just change those no's to yes's, and we would do that for all the following sign types in this presentation. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked about the first column, we're going to keep three four no's and the two yeses'. Ms. Marcy indicated that is correct. For the second column, we would only be changing the yes for number 12, internal illumination. For the CO or the third column, commercial, that would also be a yes for internal illumination on line 12. Line 12, internal illumination will be allowed, and that would be for all the sign types that were mentioned. We didn't really want to do astro because it gets a little more complicated when we have a light that's shining onto something, and it involves wiring or maybe there is a residence near it because it becomes messy. Commissioner Burroughs asked for an example, for instance a ribbon light that is on the building, is that is an internal or speed signs the police put on the side of the road that monitor your speed, that is an internal light. **Ms. Marcy** indicated some projecting restaurant signs, for example if it is a bar, they may have something

dimly lit, something like that. Neon, yes, if it's a lit. **Commissioner Burroughs** would like to make sure if they ask us what the examples are, they can answer the question. **This was agreed to be on consent list by members. That was V111-11-3 will we be talking about V111-11-5 here? Ms. Marcy mentions this will be all the way through V111-11-9. (Please refer to slide 11-16 of the PowerPoint). We would do the same change for each of those types of signs for internal illumination in the same districts.**

This section outlines requirements associated with illumination. **Recommended changes include removing the following language: (consensus list)**

~~(c) Illumination: An illuminated sign shall not:~~

~~(1) Imitate, mimic, or obscure traffic signs or signals; be illuminated by flashing, intermittent, or moving lights;~~

~~(2) contain or display animated, moving video, or scrolling advertising;~~

~~(3) consist of a static image projected upon a stationary object; or~~

~~(4) be a mobile sign located on a truck or trailer.~~

8. **Grabbing devices:** Commissioner Burroughs indicated this topic may need additional discussion and time. **This item was tabled for further discussion.**
9. **Master Sign Plans:** Allysa Marcy mentioned One of the concerns that we've heard from developers, especially with large developments, was the issue of having to get their sign permits later on in the development and the additional timing and cost that adds. So, in our code, we currently have language for masters sign plan, which supersedes a lot of the requirements. However, as it's written, the developer must submit it with their preliminary development planner or their initial stages when they're applying for permits. We wanted to add in a language to clarify some of that as well as say they could submit a master's sign plan with their final signage plan, which would give them more time so if they don't have everything figured out in the beginning, they could still have everything approved together in a master sign plan and submit it with the final development plan. That would save them again from having to go through all of those individuals sign permits, grouping it together and then they're doing it as part of the final development plan. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated for the sake of time; he would like us to come back to this one at the next meeting. This is one that has been a bottleneck. He does not want to rush through this one. We've got two items that we tabled. This would be a third for our next meeting. Thank you for preparing this. **Ms. Marcy** asked for those we have on consensus list and if we want to be able to get this on, basically now, we would be able to get on the September 9th Planning commission agenda, we must get everything submitted to the echo by August 7th. She wanted to give us a heads up, that would be the timeline. **Commissioner Burroughs** is willing to advance it but would like to do it all at once if we could, so we don't piece meal it. At the same time, some of these items are causing problems, we can go ahead and move them forward. He asked if legal can weigh in on how we handle it? **Alan Howze** indicated July 28th is the next scheduled task force meeting. If we were able to work through those last ones on July 28, we still have a window of time in which to publish in the echo and get to the September 9 planning meeting. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated he is willing to do that and hopefully we can get information that we've asked for, and you'll be able to come back and make the changes that we' recorded day. **Michael Farley** indicated yes, that is correct. **Commissioner Burroughs** thanked the members and staff. He appreciates the attentiveness of the committee to address this, the comments that were made. He wants to ensure as we advanced this that he has as much knowledge as he can so when it appears before the

committee, we have a compromise. **Alan Howze** mentioned of those we are ready to move forward, are there any other sign topics that we need to look at? **Ms. Rocha** indicated that it is a Mr. Napper question as he does a lot more with signage or Mr. Kindle. They deal with this more regularly. **Ms. Hadley** indicated that it's in line with Mr. Kindle and the Chamber has heard some of the effects of the struggles that they found, but she agrees. She also indicated to Mr. Kindle that she would take notes and meet with him. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked anyone that has an issue, we will have another meeting, and we can always come back and review, and we may run through those at the end of the meeting if we have enough time of what we've approved just so everybody understands what has been approved.

Recap:

1. Sandwich/A Frame (Consensus list)
 - Allow by right in all zones but enforce ADA compliance.
 - Allow changeable copy.
 2. Projecting signs (Consensus list)
 - Allow by right as long as sign is installed by a bonded and insured individual/company.
 3. Wall Signs (Consensus list)
 - Maximum number of walls signs allowed in a single entry structure changed from 1 to 3
 4. Feather Signs (Tabled)
 - Remove time requirement
 5. Window Signs
 - Sign area (maximum percent of window area) changed from 25% to 50%. (Consensus List)
 - Must keep the 3-6 foot vision field, measured from the ground, clear of signage. (Strike)
 6. Murals (Tabled)
 - No sign permit is required for the creation of new murals kept in good condition.
 7. Illumination (Consensus List)
 - Recommended changes include removing the language:
 - Recommendation: allow internal illumination in R3, R4, R5, R6, RM, TND, C-O
 8. Grabbing Devices (Tabled)
 9. Master Sign plans (Tabled)
 - During pre-application meetings with developers, encourage them to take advantage of this part of the code. Allow for a master sign plan to be submitted with the final development plan - would add this language to (b)(2). Would also require language changes to 27-212(d)(16) and 27-212(g)(7) regarding preliminary development plans and final development plans.
- Commissioner Burroughs mentioned at the next meeting we will concentrate on the three items we table. **Commissioner Stites** asked about the pop-up canopies, the 10 by 10 canopies, that you see, those seem to be more prevalent around. Is that signage? They're set up in front of their business, on a sidewalk. **Michael Farley** indicates those aren't in the code but treated as temporary structure for outdoor sales. He does not think those are regulation right now, except is it blocking the sidewalk? **Commissioner Stites** indicate you must walk under it. **Mr. Farley** responded that the way the code reads needs to be unstructured, four feet wide and without anything hanging over it, but he will check into this. **Commissioner Stites** mentioned it then may go under the 10-foot minimum clearance type thing if you've got an awning set up. **Michael Farley** will review and bring it back. **Commissioner Burroughs** thanked Ms. Caudillo for the minutes. He requested a motion to approve the minutes if all have had a chance to review them. **Mr. Galicia** motioned to approve the minutes as written. **Mr. Schraeder** seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:03 pm. **Next meeting is July 28, 2025, at 3:00-4:00 pm.**