

Mikayla Schmidt, City Planner

From: Alice Thomas, Commission Member

Re: Revisions made in wall sign check list reviewed in 3-11-21 HPC meeting

In the revision, I tried to reflect the changes suggested by commission members in the March meeting; any additional changes I am suggesting are noted as such.

1. Added sentences in “Note” to convey that they may not be all of the factors. *“These factors are an important part of the approval decision of the HPC. If unsure or unclear how any of the following regulations apply in your case, please consult early with the City Planner.”* The latter sentence had previously appeared as a footnote for the “unsure” column.
2. Removed columns on right, “Perhaps”, “No”, & “Not applicable” and corresponding numbers.
3. Replaced column numbers under “yes” with checkboxes.
4. Revised question from
~~“Does the sign plan include the following?”~~
 to *“Does your sign plan meet the following specifications?”*
5. In #2. Removed “(no appearance of plastic)”. Although our regulations speak to the appearance of plastic, it does not seem useful & is confusing in this checklist.
6. In #7. Eliminated multiple “(if included)” notes and inserted in the stem, *“applicable only if”*
7. In #7 a, added item iv. *“Fixtures complement historical character of district”*.
 I added this item because the question arose in an example at our meeting and, in fact, we have no specific regulation addressing the lighting fixture. It seemed to me a general regulation for signs in the historic district would apply which reads “Signage shall be designed to enhance and complement the historic character of buildings within the downtown district”.
8. In #7 b. Changed language of stem from “Internal illuminated signs:” to “Internal signs”. That was my error in previous draft. 7b. related to both internally illuminated and exposed lighted signs.
9. Added material to the reverse side of page.
 - (a) I thought it would be helpful to indicate 1) that there were some general regulations that apply to all signs including a couple that could be informative, and 2) that the other types of signs also had their own regulations.
 Thus, I added the following quoting LDC language in the two bullets:
General regulations that apply to all types include the following:
 - *Signage shall be designed to enhance and complement the historic character of buildings within the downtown district.*
 - *All sign permits for the property within the H-O District [Historical District] shall comply with both the C1 [downtown commercial area] and H-O District requirements of this section.**The different types of signs are listed below; each have their own regulations.*
 - followed by the different types (see checklist)
 - (b) There is a problem of accuracy with the Figure 6-3 caption. To be consistent with the language in the regulations, the caption should read:
Figure 6-3: Illustration of where signs ~~are~~ were historically attached to buildings in the downtown historic district.
 A related problem is that the LDC listed on the City website in the Municode Library does not contain the additions to this figure we made in our last revision two years ago, i.e., “Storefront Cornice” and “Horizontal Lintel”.