

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session**  
**Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ**  
**Thursday, February 16, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.**

**1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

Vice Chair Levin called the work session to order at 3:34 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

**Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present:** Vice Chair Kathy Levin and Commissioners Randy Barcus, Eric Brandt, Avrum Cohen, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer. Chair Losoff was excused.

**Staff Present:** Warren Campbell, Audree Juhlin, Cari Meyer, Robert Pickels and Donna Puckett

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS**

Vice Chair Levin noted that there is one agenda item today and there are public present, so with the Commission's consent she would open that item to the public for comment after the Commission's discussion; the Commission concurred.

Audree Juhlin announced that Cynthia Lovely presented the Schnebly Hill CFA to Council, and they are ready to move forward for action at a future meeting date to be determined.

**3. Discussion/Possible Direction regarding the Draft Revised Sign Code (DRSC), an update of Sedona Land Development Code Article 11, Sign Regulations.**

Cari Meyer indicated that this is continuing the discussion on the draft Sign Code that was started on February 7<sup>th</sup>, when we got a lot of direction on the staff recommendations, and this discussion will be centered around the worksheet in addition to new items. Tuesday's meeting has been canceled, because of absences, so we want your feedback and hope to finish the discussion today.

Cari then indicated that the first couple of questions from the worksheet were discussed last time. She then referenced Question #3 regarding sign legibility, symbols and logos, and explained that most of these questions were items that staff didn't have a strong opinion about; there was no legal issue, etc., so we are looking for direction from the Commission and community. The first one is encouraging the use of logos and images rather than words, like a barber pole or like the McDonald's building that doesn't say McDonald's; it just has the logo. It wouldn't be required, but the question is should it be encouraged.

Vice Chair Levin asked if logos weren't discussed at the last meeting; she thought there was concurrence from the Commission that it was appropriate. Audree Juhlin explained that staff was looking for more specifics regarding logos not necessarily related to corporate. If there is a business that could be identified by something like an internationally-recognized symbol, should that be encouraged? Commissioner Barcus asked what "encourage" means, and Cari Meyer explained that it would not be a "shall" statement; it would be a "should" statement. The Commissioner then asked if by "encouragement", you are suggesting that the size of the signage could deviate from the footage standards, and Cari Meyer stated that if the Commission felt strongly, that is something we could consider.

Audree Juhlin indicated that one reason we wanted to have this discussion, and going back to how we ended the last meeting, we have signs to help provide information. The first primary purpose is not about the aesthetics or how many words we can put on it; it is about relaying a message, so if there is an easier way with symbols, is that something you would like to explore in the Sign Code?

A barber's pole is universally known, so you don't need a bunch of words, which can be confusing for traffic.

Cari indicated that if the Commissioner is asking if by using a symbol, they would get a larger sign area. . . Commissioner Barcus interjected that was a hypothetical. His sense is that we are in the weeds, so "encouraging" is something that . . . he is not interested in making additional allowances, but if somebody wants to use a symbol, his sense would be that would be fine or if they want to use words, because they feel that communicates more accurately. It is not our responsibility to help businesses develop effective signage for their businesses; that's not our business.

Commissioner Cohen agreed with all but the last part of what Commissioner Barcus stated; we should be flexible on words and symbols, but we need to understand that the signs are also there for the business to attract customers, so he is okay with either one. He then asked if staff had gotten feedback from some business folks, and Cari Meyer indicated that there would be meetings in the next few weeks. The Commissioner indicated that would be helpful to the Commission on this particular subject, and Cari stated that this item will be added to the list of items from the last meeting.

Commissioner Mayer stated that some logos are well known and others aren't; it could be a combination of logos and wording. Businesses rely on that exposure to the public, and we have many visitors every year. We can't overload everything with so much bureaucracy, and how many more businesses do we have room for? There is not that much space left for more commercial buildings. He agrees that we can put a little restriction on certain things, which we discussed at the last meeting, but he is not in favor of overregulating things – it is mindboggling to him.

Vice Chair Levin noted that it isn't a "shall" clause; it is an "encouragement". She then asked if the Commission is leaning toward recommending that this language remain as a way of expressing it. Commissioner Cohen indicated that just encouraging logos isn't a good idea; it should be left up to the individual business as to whether they use logos, words or a combination. Everybody knows what McDonald's looks like, but a dentist might want the name.

Cari Meyer indicated that the next item was signs painted directly on facades and if that is appropriate for Sedona. Vice Chair Levin noted that staff's comments on both opinions seemed to be expressed based on whether or not it was appropriate. Cari explained that sometimes it depended on the materials of the wall; for example, we wouldn't want a sign painted on a red rock wall based on comments we heard. The Vice Chair then commented that historic signs are in a class of their own.

Commissioner Mayer also referred to historic signs and referenced Jerome's historic signs, but he hasn't seen any historic signs from the 1800s here, so he would not encourage painted signs on any background. Commissioner Klein agreed, and Commissioner Brandt asked if Commissioner Mayer preferred no signs painted on walls, even though you like historic signs. Commissioner Mayer asked if we have any historic signs, and Cari indicated no.

Commissioner Cohen asked if it includes murals, and Cari stated no. Commissioner Brandt indicated that it would be appropriate only if they have a 3-dimensional appearance, because it can simplify things by not having signs in addition to the buildings; it reduces clutter.

Audree Juhlin asked if there is consensus that we don't want wall signs. Vice Chair Levin stated that we do; she picked up at least two noes. Commissioner Barcus indicated that he thought we were arguing pro, and Commissioner Cohen stated that he liked what Commissioner Brandt stated. The Vice Chair then stated that she thinks we have a consensus. Cari asked if with Commissioner Brandt's statement and the Vice Chair indicated yes. Commissioner Barcus then added "in lieu of"; however, the Vice Chair pointed out it is all dictated by square footage, and the Commissioner agreed.

Cari then referred to sign materials and indicated it was discussed last time and rusted metal was permitted, plus you wanted staff to look at allowing plastic for sign lettering, even if it is prohibited as a background.

Cari then indicated that sign illumination also was discussed, but she wanted some clarification regarding the number of different colors, so we found some different pictures and wanted to get your feedback. Vice Chair Levin recalled that the multi-colored sign was not acceptable, and Commissioner Cohen indicated that we liked Option 2 in coordination with the dark sky, and that should be added to the slide before showing it to anybody.

Cari agreed that the discussion was about updating the sign illumination standards to further the dark sky goals of the City, and there was definitely consensus on that, but she was asking about the color of the lighting. Commissioner Brandt thought there were a maximum number of colors, like two or three, but not five or six, because it would start to get gaudy; however, on a case-by-case basis he supposes – why limit, and Commissioner Mayer agreed. Vice Chair Levin asked if staff wanted flexibility or more precision as to the number of colors, and Audree Juhlin expressed preference for more specificity; the more you give us, the easier it is for staff and the people reading the Code.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that one color would be boring and limiting it to three colors eliminates the problem in the bottom right picture, but makes Red Rock Pizza much more interesting than Crate & Barrel. Commissioner Barcus then asked how many colors Commissioner Cohen sees on Red Rock Pizza and the Commissioner stated three or four; however, Commissioner Brandt stated there are two colors -- white and red, and Commissioner Barcus stated that he sees five. Commissioner Mayer then expressed that the aesthetics of a sign can be expressed negatively or positively by colors as well, so he has objections to limits. He can see a sign that looks great with multiple colors and a sign with one or two colors that looks like. . .

Vice Chair Levin indicated that staff really doesn't want to judge each sign for color; we need to do it against a set of standards. Commissioner Brandt asked if this was just for internal lighting or any lighting, and Cari Meyer indicated that she couldn't find any pictures of external lighting with multiple colors; it was usually the backlit signs. Commissioner Brandt stated that we are not talking about the colors of the sign, just the lighting, so it could be a little more restrictive with two or three colors. Obviously, they blend and look different, but different hues.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that the topic is sign illumination and if the sign has five colors and is illuminated by white light and that is dark sky compliant, he is okay with that, but he wants to be sure everyone else is okay with that. Cari stated that we have different standards for sign color; this is just the color of the lighting. Commissioner Mayer then indicated that is fine with him too. Vice Chair Levin then confirmed up to three and Cari added, dark sky compliant.

Cari Meyer then indicated that the next question was about wayfinding signs and we currently have directional signs that are allowed at driveways, but we don't have any standards for what happens once you get into a shopping center, so we are proposing to add some. Currently, the draft code has a limit for height and size, and they have to be out of the setbacks. The first question is if this is something you want to allow and, if so, with what limits. Vice Chair Levin asked if there are industry standards for like a Marriott project for directional signs to wing one or two or to a pool, etc., and Cari Meyer indicated yes, those usually have standard signs up to 3 ft. in height, and they can work within whatever standards we give them. Cari explained that staff is thinking like if you went into the Safeway Center and wanted a sign to say Safeway is this way, etc., to help direct traffic. Audree Juhlin offered the example of Hillside; you wouldn't know how to get to the Hudson Restaurant unless you were local, so that would be a good place for a directional sign.

Vice Chair Levin asked if the Commission supported wayfinding signs, and Commissioner Cohen stated yes; no Commissioner said no. Commissioner Barcus asked if guidance for wayfinding signs would be applied in a Master Sign Plan for a new or existing development, because it doesn't

seem that it would be applied to existing businesses that have no changes. Cari Meyer explained that if the Hillside wanted to do one, we have nothing that says they could. They wouldn't need a Master Sign Plan, but it would give them the ability to install directional signs.

Commissioner Mayer stated that they would have to apply for a Master Sign Plan first; however, Cari stated no. If it was a new center, that would be part of their sign package. For Hillside, there is no language now that allows it. The Commissioner then stated that he would allow it then.

Commissioner Cohen referenced two kinds of signs – one on the street, and the other inside the shopping center. Being in favor of businesses being in control of their lives, he would favor signs that could be idiosyncratic to the individual business. On the street is a different matter; we need to regulate that.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that it seems that it is going to be tough to differentiate the shopping center wayfinding sign, because we have to articulate what “wayfinding” means, as opposed to a supplemental sign for a business that has a sign on its premise. Vice Chair Levin indicated that it said the definitions and illustrations would come later, but maybe for this discussion we could all agree that “wayfinding” means directional. Cari Meyer agreed and indicated that wayfinding would be considered separately; they have different standards. The wall sign has to be on the wall of the business.

Commissioner Barcus expressed concern as to if a sign saying “Hudson's Restaurant” is a wayfinding sign or a business sign, or would we want it to say just restaurant with an arrow? Who is going to know what to do with clarity for staff and the businesses? Audree Juhlin indicated that the preference would be to say more shops this way or restaurant this way, etc. You are not talking about content, etc. Commissioner Barcus added that even “generic” could be open to interpretation, but it should be defined specifically, because it is just messy.

Commissioner Klein asked if the Sign Code would say how many of these are allowed and in what size, and Vice Chair Levin pointed out that the Commission is being asked to do that. The Commissioner then asked if that is something to be done in advance, because it may depend more on what is in the shopping center. Would we decide the maximum number for every shopping center now? Audree Juhlin stated that if you establish a low number like one that would be allowed outright that might be the easiest, then for additional, they would have to go through a Master Sign Plan that would consider how much property they had, how many buildings, etc. Commissioner Klein then asked if they went through a Master Sign Plan, would they have to comply with it, and Audree Juhlin explained that if it is an existing complex, they would tell us what they want it to look like. When existing signs are changed, they would be required to meet the new Master Sign Plan.

Vice Chair Levin then commented that existing developments could add wayfinding signs, but new developments with a Master Sign Plan would include wayfinding signs in their plan. Commissioner Barcus pointed out that wayfinding signs would not be required. Audree Juhlin added that businesses with street frontage don't need wayfinding signs, but there could be language indicating that under these conditions, you would be eligible.

Commissioner Brandt asked if there is consensus that we want these and some Commissioners indicated yes. Commissioner Brandt then noted that they currently are not allowed and asked if there is any requests for them, and Cari Meyer stated yes. The Commissioner then commented that with GPS and the fact that Sedona is a small town with small properties, etc., and with large properties like Safeway, the wayfinding sign should come out of their overall sign allowance; there shouldn't be more clutter to allow these signs. Commissioner Barcus asked if Commissioner Brandt would be okay if it comes out of their allowance, and Commissioner Brandt explained that it then is not a special provision; it is just coming out of their allowance for signs. Commissioner Mayer stated there would still be clutter, and Commissioner Brandt said okay, but we are not saying it is another provision for doing more signs. If the Commission does want to do that, then there

should be no logos, special type, etc., they all should have to be the same type that just says the restaurant is over there. Vice Chair Levin indicated that sounded good.

Commissioner Barcus referenced some wayfinding signs in the community, even though they aren't permitted, and Vice Chair Levin indicated that is an enforcement issue or they are grandfathered or maybe we will catch up to them in our new Sign Code. The Commissioner then commented that part of the reason for revising the Sign Code is to get more specificity and less interpretative stuff.

Cari Meyer asked if there is any consensus on a number to be allowed, and as Audree suggested, a low number might encourage them to complete a Master Sign Plan. Commissioner Mayer asked what a low number is, and Audree Juhlin indicated one. Commissioner Barcus stated if it is on the premise, and not the frontage. . . Cari interjected that the draft Code says it would not be allowed in a setback area. Commissioner Barcus then commented that might help address Commissioner Brandt's concern about clutter.

Warren Campbell indicated some of the sample codes talked about one at turns, so it could be one or one per or maybe it could be based on site size, etc.; there are various methods to trigger more. Vice Chair Levin indicated there is a vast spectrum of number of businesses within a shopping center, so it is hard to come up with a formula and one might be too limiting; it really has to do with topography, accessibility and encouraging good circulation. Commissioner Mayer referenced the Hudson and indicated that it would need more than one; it should be specific to the location of the business. Audree Juhlin indicated that staff would draft some language to say that under these conditions, this would be the regulation.

Commissioner Klein asked how many centers we have where it is difficult to find the businesses. Commissioner Mayer pointed out that visitors might not know, and Vice Chair Levin agreed that Safeway doesn't need additional wayfinding signage, but she could see some large resorts needing that. Commissioner Cohen indicated that the Basha's center does; however Vice Chair Levin noted that they have significant signage at the top of their businesses. Commissioner Cohen then asked at what point does it becomes flexible enough for businesses to decide what they want on the inside private areas. Vice Chair Levin stated that would come from the Master Sign Plan. Audree Juhlin added that when staff drafts some language, we could look at interior courtyards that have no public right-of-way visibility having a lot of flexibility to let the businesses determine what that should look like. Commissioner Cohen commented there is a lot of investment put in businesses and signs are important.

Cari Meyer then indicated that the next one is a question staff has received from various businesses, and it is regarding outline lighting, which we currently allow between Thanksgiving and January 15<sup>th</sup>. Several businesses have requested an allowance for something year-around that is more like café lighting around landscape areas, etc., to try to comply with dark sky requirements, but it is a question we are asked a lot, so are we interested in some standards for it? Commissioner Mayer asked how they could be made compliant with dark skies, and Vice Chair Levin asked if this illumination per se is dark sky compliant. Cari Meyer explained that by itself it is not; they would have to put it under vegetation or in a trellis, etc. Audree Juhlin added that we could say it has to be low LED lumens. Vice Chair Levin commented that she is not sure of what is out there in the market and this is very popular in courtyards and dining areas, but she would guess that kind of lighting isn't necessarily compliant. She then asked if we want to write a Code that is inherently not compliant.

Commissioner Mayer stated that we might exempt the period of Thanksgiving to Christmas, and Cari stated that it currently is exempt, and Vice Chair Levin explained that the Commission is being asked if this kind of illumination could be year-around. Cari also pointed out that if you allow it year-around, there would be no need for it to be exempt, but if we put restrictions on it, maybe those restrictions wouldn't apply from Thanksgiving through January 15<sup>th</sup>. Audree noted that the standards could be dark sky compliant, so it would be allowed under a canopy, etc.

Commissioner Cohen stated that in addition to dark sky compliant, if a lot of business start doing that kind of lighting, then we would have a circus. Commissioner Brandt commented that he noticed Mariposa, and then there was another one, so what if they all were like that. If they all do that, it would look like a carnival. Commissioner Cohen stated that we would have to limit that.

Commissioner Mayer referenced a big heart on the roof of Chocolatree, and Commissioner Brandt stated that it would be good to have restrictions, but it should just stay the way it is; however, if someone puts lights under a canopy and no one can see it, is that really sign lighting – no, that is just illumination. Cari Meyer stated that this could be a conversation with the Land Development Code update as well, and Audree Juhlin explained that it is in the Sign Code now, because the definition of “sign” says anything that is used to attract attention.

Vice Chair Levin asked how the Land Development Code addresses that, and Cari referenced the outdoor lighting section, which might be a more appropriate place to address the standards. The Vice Chair asked the Commission about removing it from the Sign Code and just leaving the language that addresses the holiday period, although it might come back in the Land Development Code review. Audree commented that would be on March 2<sup>nd</sup>. The Vice Chair then stated it might be helpful to say to staff that the Commission would anticipate having that conversation under the rubric of dark sky and lumens.

Commissioner Barcus said he has heard discussion about the first paragraph, but the 2<sup>nd</sup> question is what color should be allowed. Cari Meyer clarified if it was allowed year-around, what color should it be, and Commissioner Cohen then asked if we are recommending not year-around, there should be no recommendation on the color. Vice Chair Levin explained that what she heard from Commissioner Barcus was if we retain the existing language for seasonal lighting, what color should that be, but if the entire discussion is being punted to the Land Development Code . . . what is staff’s preference? Audree Juhlin indicated her preference would be to leave the language as is and address it specifically in the lighting element of the Land Development Code. This is holiday lighting, so do you really want to restrict that? The consensus of the Commission was agreement.

Cari Meyer referenced signs on vehicles in Question #9 and read the existing language. She then indicated that Warren has had experience in trying to come up with different standards regarding parking a car to act as a 2<sup>nd</sup> sign, so we wanted to ask if the Commission thinks we need stricter standards.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she hasn’t seen any perpetual violators, and Commissioner Mayer indicated that he has seen two trucks with signage, like consignment shops, but it isn’t really a problem. Vice Chair Levin agreed and noted that there is a truck parked by Hozho. Commissioner Cohen referenced political signs placed on vehicles and asked what the Code says about that. Secondly, the best part of traffic problems in Sedona is reading bumper stickers.

Cari Meyer said that bumper stickers are listed as exempt signs; they are protected. Political signs are regulated by the state. Commissioner Cohen asked if they could have a big sign in the back window of their vehicle, and Audree Juhlin indicated it would be in accordance with the state statute, and there are allowances for larger signs for residential and commercial properties; we would not have anything in our Code. The Commissioner then asked what the state statute says, and Robert Pickels stated it is pretty detailed and the safest approach is to defer to the state statute, which is what all City Attorneys are recommending to their governing bodies; we don’t address that. Warren Campbell added that he highlighted this for discussion, because while we have a few around town, in some communities, many businesses have their vehicles always parked in the front row. Commissioner Cohen recalled a couple of businesses that did that in the past.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she is sure that staff responded to any complaints as a violation, so is this a problem? Audree indicated that we do get complaints and it is difficult to enforce. The Vice Chair then asked if staff cites the business and asks them to move the vehicle, and Audree indicated yes, but in some locations that is the only place they can park, so we are constantly

talking with them. Commissioner Mayer wanted to know the fine, and Audree explained that there is a whole code enforcement process. Vice Chair Levin asked if they are exempt now and noted that staff is asking if we need regulations against them. Cari Meyer explained that they are exempt under these conditions, and the Vice Chair added that they are not on the frontage. Cari clarified that they are in an assigned parking space that is not immediately adjacent to the street frontage.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that the vehicles need to be operable and licensed, and Audree Juhlin pointed out that the City Code doesn't allow junk or abandoned vehicles, but more and more businesses are advertising on their vehicles.

Commissioner Brandt referenced page 13 in 8.17 and asked if that is new language. Cari Meyer stated that is current language, and Commissioner Brandt asked if staff is saying it shouldn't be allowed at all, and Cari said no, does it need to be more strict like saying it must be parked in a loading zone or be more specific like behind screening walls, etc. Warren Campbell stated that some codes said they must be moved regularly, so they had to chalk tires. The Vice Chair then asked if staff is looking for more restrictive language, and Audree Juhlin explained that staff is asking the question, and we are also asking if there is a problem or if it is okay. If not, we will remove this entirely, but if appropriate, how and under what circumstances. Commissioner Brandt and Commissioner Mayer indicated that the existing language was fine and the consensus of the Commission was in agreement.

Cari Meyer indicated that for window signs, we have no language to say how far back from a window it counts as a window sign. Window displays don't count, just actual signs. Vice Chair Levin asked if there had been requests for that, and Cari stated yes. Commissioner Mayer asked about "Open" signs, and Cari stated that they are permitted. Commissioner Cohen asked how many are allowed, and Cari Meyer explained up to 25% of the window can be used for window signs; more would be a code violation. Commissioner Mayer asked if he could put 25% in each of five windows, and Cari stated yes. He then asked if the signs could be consolidated to fill one window, and Cari explained if there are less than 12 inches between windows, they are one window and he could consolidate, but if they are separated by more than 12 inches, they would be considered two windows, so it would be 25% of each window. The Commissioner restated his question, and Warren Campbell restated the answer, then Cari provided an example. Vice Chair Levin asked if staff has an example of this in the community, and Warren stated that bars have a lot of neon signs, and codes he has worked with before said anything 3 or 4 ft. back from a window isn't a sign.

Audree Juhlin referenced Tlaquepaque North with a display, but that is not signage since it is several inches back. She then asked if the Vice Chair sees that as a window sign, and Vice Chair Levin stated that what she sees as displays are dressed mannequins. Cari then indicated that the Main Street Design Guidelines suggests that anything within 12 inches counts as a window sign. Vice Chair Levin noted that is probably the best example, because Tlaquepaque has high standards for its businesses. Audree Juhlin stated that some people say they become a distraction, because the monitors are changing, so should they be further back than 13 inches? Commissioner Mayer indicated that 24 inches might not make sense to the store owner. Audree Juhlin then indicated that they maybe shouldn't be electronic monitor simulations. Robert Pickels noted that there is more flexibility when it potentially distracts drivers.

Commissioner Barcus referenced temporary painted signs on windows during the holidays, and indicated those are window signs he would prefer to prohibit. Commissioner Brandt noted that is the next item. Vice Chair Levin pointed out that we are on #10, and Cari repeated the recommendation in the Main Street Design Guidelines, and stated that there is nothing in the Sign Code. Commissioner Mayer indicated he would agree with that recommendation and about moving signs being a distraction that could lead to an accident, especially with people crossing the street.

Commissioner Brandt asked if these are not part of the sign allowance, but in addition to what can be put on the outside. Cari Meyer explained that you can cover 10% of the window without it

counting toward the outside of the building, and you can go up to 25%, but the 15% does count toward the total square footage. Commissioner Brandt asked about a huge sign on the back wall of a business that you could read from the street, and Cari Meyer stated it wouldn't count toward the total signage if it is beyond the required distance back from the window. Commissioner Brandt indicated that he was going to suggest something proportional, but that is extra complexity. He then suggested 4 ft. or make it proportional. Commissioner Cohen asked if Commissioner Brandt is talking about the last clause, and the Commissioner said yes, and the size of the sign. He doesn't think it would be appropriate for a driver to see a large sign on the back wall of a building. Commissioner Mayer disagreed and said he doesn't see a sign 4 ft. back from a window creating a traffic problem. You would have to maneuver around it inside the store.

Vice Chair Levin asked if any Commissioner felt these window signs should be prohibited, and Commissioner Mayer stated the moving signage. Commissioner Barcus indicated that he would be for 10%. The Vice Chair then said there is no consensus on prohibiting them, so maybe staff should come back with some proposal on where they should be and how much. Commissioner Mayer then suggested asking the business owners, and Robert Pickels then suggested looking at what would stand scrutiny for public safety purposes and bringing that back.

Cari Meyer indicated that the next one is lifestyle graphics that cover the window, more like decorative artwork. Commissioner Barcus explained he was thinking of 25% of everything in the store being painted on the window. Cari explained it is not really advertising a business, but it still covers the window. Vice Chair Levin asked if it gives a sense of what the business is within and if we have any now. Cari Meyer indicated that there are a couple in Uptown in side alleys. Commissioner Mayer referenced murals and said he considers those murals too. It is an artistic thing and there should be no restrictions. If you don't restrict murals, why restrict those? He doesn't like either one, but. . . Audree Juhlin pointed out that the Police Department needs to weigh-in as well, because Police Officers need to be able to see inside a building, so staff will check with them. The Vice Chair then suggested deferring the item to Public Safety.

Vice Chair Levin noted that the Commission already discussed drive-thru menu boards; however, Cari indicated that was menu display boards. Vice Chair Levin then commented that the code doesn't provide for drive-thru menu boards, but we have them, so we don't have regulations against which to permit them. Cari Meyer agreed and showed examples that would be allowed with regulations on the height and size, but noted that they tend to add specials on them.

Commissioner Mayer asked if they have to go for a permit and Cari stated that they would, because we are proposing a limit on the overall height and size, and they would have to screen it from the right-of-way, etc. Commissioner Mayer then asked if the existing would be grandfathered, and Cari stated, if they were permitted. Vice Chair Levin asked if there is concern about the seasonal additions, and Cari Meyer stated that there is more concern that we don't have location, number. We don't have regulations for them now, so currently we have to work with the business owner and we don't have any standards to measure them against. Commissioner Mayer then asked how many more fast-food businesses we expect, and Cari pointed out that even the existing ones change.

Commissioner Cohen asked about the logic in how they are designed. Some people get confused if there is too much stuff, so we should ask the business community if there should be limits. Vice Chair Levin stated that those with menu boards are major corporations, and their corporate has some pro forma design and if we had those standards, we might know what we would want to encourage. Otherwise, we are all over the board on this and not having a really focused discussion. Commissioner Mayer asked about encouraging them to go with a certain design or regulating them to have them comply. Vice Chair Levin indicated that the Commission may be able to do that after having the foundational material. Audree Juhlin pointed out that we don't want to get into the content of the signs; we just want to talk about the size and location. Businesses will want as much as they can get. Vice Chair Levin then asked staff to bring back the size of the existing signs.



Commissioner Mayer asked if they would be part of the overall square footage allowed for signage, and Cari stated they would be their own category; the business would not have to reduce the business identification signage. The premises will have different categories of signs with so much for wall signs, free-standing signs, etc. and this would be a separate category.

Commissioner Brandt noted that the examples were internally-lit plastic signs and asked if they would be an exemption or would they be prohibited. Cari stated that it indicates they can be internally lit; she hasn't found anything different. The Commissioner indicated it is just a conundrum; we aren't going to allow them, but we are going to allow them. Cari stated that we would allow them for any business with a drive-through; however, Commissioner Brandt asked if a pedestrian-friendly city should allow a drive-thru. Commissioner Barcus then asked if we agreed that these should not be a distraction to people driving down the street, and Cari indicated that we do have some location criteria. The Commissioner then added that they also would be dark sky compliant.

Cari Meyer indicated that a number of the following items have been discussed; we did Main Street and temporary business signs. Vice Chair Levin noted that staff has a goal for us to finish this today, so the Commission then agreed that they would like to hear from the public at this time, and then then continue their discussion.

*Vice Chair Levin opened the public comment period.*

**Erin Estes, a realtor with Sedona Verde Valley Realtors Association, Cornville, AZ:** She lived in Sedona for many years and worked for the City for about a decade, so she appreciates this process. Ms. Estes indicated that she is a member of the Government Affairs Committee for the Association, and they put out A-Frame signs for open house. She doesn't know if there has been a problem, so she wanted to find out if there has been a problem. We are probably dealing with the federal regulations on signage, but she wanted to find out if there has been a problem.

Robert Pickels pointed out that this is not a time for discussion, unless the Commission feels there is information needed to make a well-informed decision. Ms. Estes then indicated that open house signs are professionally designed, not like the cardboard boxes, and the size is typically 36 x 2 and put on the ground, so they are really not a hindrance. She knows if you allow one, you have to allow all, but please keep in mind that this has been an accepted practice in Sedona since pre-incorporation, and it is an accepted practice in many communities. It is important for realtors to have them available, and it is a dynamic aspect of their business plan. There are a lot of independent realtors who thrive in Sedona and would like to be included in the voice heard by you. This signage is very low-key although not standardized, but they are the same kind of A-Frame sign. She also would request that, because this is so important to so many people, the Commissioners research how other communities have handled this with this law to allow it, or be open to them providing you with research they have done. We don't need to reinvent the wheel; we do need to figure out a way for this to continue.

**Ron Volkman, Government Affairs Director for the Sedona Verde Valley Association of Realtors:** Mr. Volkman stated that those open house signs are a big deal and a big economic driver in their business, and he has been in and around Sedona for 42 years and they have been used for that entire time. You already have some other exceptions like open studio signs, special event signs, etc., so maybe you should have a chapter just for exceptions, because those are for such a short window of time. Typically, open house signs are up 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and it is the same for garage sale signs. Even the Community Plan talks about small town atmosphere and these signs are not blight or a cause of danger or an impediment, so he thinks you let it go. You can sanitize this town to death, but there really is no harm here. There are more benefits than harm, and sometimes garage sale signs are fun.

*[Note: The audio recording malfunctioned at this point and the remainder of the meeting is summarized from staff's notes.]*

**Marc Jacobson, Sedona:** He has been making signs as long as the Sign Code has been around and probably pulled at least half of the permits. He would like to set with staff and go over the draft Code, and particularly, there is language related to the car wash. Wayfinding signs aren't necessarily just for businesses, but also for parking, elevators, open spaces, etc. You will need one sign to the Hudson and one to the Cantina; they are more site specific and depend on the location. At Safeway, a small one sends you to the Subway and laundromat, so there are other uses.

Christmas lights aren't a sign, and regarding window signs, you addressed the video in the Tlaquepaque store, and a video is not a sign; it's a video. Typically, window signs are vinyl lettering on the exterior of the door; if it is on the interior, they don't regulate it. Regarding the distance from the window, if it is inside, the City shouldn't regulate it. They may have a display that blocks the window or put up 50% off or sale sign on the inside of the window. Drive-thru signs aren't all corporate; they are for any drive-thru. A couple of them have different uses; one is the cleaners that used to be the liquor store, and another is at the "Y".

*Vice Chair Levin encouraged him to meet with staff, since his time was up.*

**Thomas Palmer, Sedona, AZ:** Mr. Palmer indicated that he submitted a survey and was disappointed there have been no responses discussed. Regarding garage sale signs, they are horrific. Elsewhere, they were registered with the City and all the signs went in the same location, not up and down 89A. Regarding vans with signs, the new Courtyard has a van and you see it driving down the street. How many previous regulations will be grandfathered if a new ordinance is adopted, do people have to change current signs? On outside lighting, like the Golden Goose, it is yellow and green to attract customers, but doesn't fit with Sedona, and if businesses aren't open, their signs shouldn't be illuminated. There are too many signs; he agrees with Commissioner Brandt that 90% of the population has GPS and Sedona doesn't have big developments to worry about. He will send another email to you.

Vice Chair Levin asked him to send it to staff. Mr. Palmer then indicated that he dealt with Cari on a lighting complaint a couple of years ago; nothing happens unless someone complains.

*Vice Chair Levin closed the public comment period.*

**Commission's Discussion, continued:**

Cari Meyer indicated that comments would be updated next time. She then referenced #14, other types of signs like special event signs, etc., and the question is if there are some we are missing. Vice Chair Levin stated that is a long discussion, but you want to codify that so should we start with the laundry list.

Audree Juhlin stated that when you discuss them, it is all or nothing and open to everyone, but we have the capacity to have signs for governmental allowances. Vice Chair Levin stated that banners could be for anything and that would carry through to the other means of providing advertising, like electronic, etc.; however, Robert Pickels explained that it can be limited to civic messages or "government speak", but beyond that you can't limit it.

Commissioner Brandt asked if you either allow banners up or no one can put one up, and Robert Pickels stated yes, unless it falls within a civic purpose. Commissioner Brandt then asked if you could put up something about the City but not St. Patty's Day or a school, and Robert Pickels stated yes, if it is for a school purpose, and Audree Juhlin added that it would be contained to their premise. Vice Chair Levin asked about Parks & Rec, and Robert Pickels indicated yes, but regarding non-profits, no decision has been made.

Vice Chair Levin asked about the Film Festival and Commissioner Cohen stated that Parks & Rec is doing it this year, so they would be allowed; however, Robert Pickels added if it is a city event, and we could go through a lot of samples, but the response is the same.

Commissioner Klein referenced Section 1114.01.B.5, and read through the temporary sign permit language. Cari Meyer pointed out that is the next question, and they are permitted for a set number of days per year. The Commissioner then referred to B.5.h, Open House Signs – A-Frame signs, and Cari Meyer indicated that is three questions ahead. Vice Chair Levin explained that we are talking about methods that may not be permissible.

Commissioner Barcus stated that it is complicated by doing all or nothing. Special event signs don't bother him, but electronic kiosks for every business might be. . . How do you do all or nothing on electronic kiosks; could every business have an electronic kiosk? Cari stated yes and the Commissioner then added it could be churches, etc. Vice Chair Levin added, unless it is limited to civic information.

Commissioner Mayer asked if they are restricted to the premise only, and Cari Meyer stated yes. Commissioner Brandt indicated that this is too broad. Regarding the school's sign, similar to the plastic back-lit signs, the electronic signs should be inappropriate. Should we look at these signs further to be sure?

Commissioner Cohen talked about people flipping signs, and asked if that counts. Cari stated yes, and Audree Juhlin explained that the state has some statues for sign walkers and says we have to allow them, but through a permit.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that electronic kiosks that are pedestrian-friendly might be okay, but one that is for vehicles might not. Direction counts; he wants to be pedestrian-friendly, and they might be able to question in a queue, but how do we differentiate? Audree Juhlin indicated you can gear for that by location.

Cari then referenced directional signs for events and explained that currently they are only allowed for events with a Temporary Use Permit; otherwise, we don't have a way to regulate them although they might benefit from directional signage, so the recommendation is to leave existing language, but expand the types of events that would require Temporary Use Permits for these, but the question is where do you draw the line.

Commissioner Mayer asked if a permit is required if the event is outdoors, and Cari Meyer stated that they have to get a Temporary Use Permit and apply for directional signage. The Commissioner then asked about indoors at the school for parking, and Vice Chair Levin noted that you would eliminate the Film Festival. Commissioner Cohen asked about Tlaquepaque and Cari Meyer stated that they get a Temporary Use Permit. No further objections or question were raised.

Cari Meyer said the next question is the distinction between temporary signs, but language was added for the types of signs. Commissioner Klein noted that we discussed staff's recommendation that off-premise signs should not be allowed, so this is in conflict; however, Cari Meyer explained that this would mean all signs have to be on premise; these are things allowed on premise. Commissioner Klein then referenced across 89A, and Cari Meyer explained that was discussing whether or not we should have these types of signs. The Commissioner indicated that he thought we had already discussed this, and Cari Meyer agreed, but noted that the Commissioner was talking about the types of signs.

Cari referenced the prohibited sign section and noted that we added the pole signs and cabinet signs illumination updates, but we didn't really touch this section. She then asked if there is anything that should be added or taken away.

Commissioner Klein asked who defines obscene, and Vice Chair Levin stated the Supreme Court; you know it when you see it. Commissioner Cohen asked if a real estate agent can't put a sign on your property without your permission, and Cari explained that it would be off-premise without the owner's approval. Commissioner Klein then asked about with the owner's approval, and Cari stated no. Audree Juhlin suggested removing it entirely, and Cari proceeded to say that we get

approval. Audree stated that we can include that in the approval process. Commissioner Cohen then asked about easements that are on their property, and Cari said they would have to comply.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that he disagrees with Section 1115. Internally-lit cabinet signs should be prohibited and electronic message signs should be prohibited signs, including time and temperature. The Vice Chair noted that is a substantive change. Commissioner Barcus then suggested striking them, except for time and temperature signs. Electronic message signs are prohibited.

Commissioner Klein asked if that would be regulating content and Audree Juhlin stated that is a good catch. Cari Meyer asked if there is consensus, and Audree Juhlin stated yes. Commissioner Barcus suggested striking B., and Cari Meyer stated that we discussed striking that illumination. Commissioner Barcus added this was in the original document, and Audree Juhlin explained that it doesn't necessarily comply with dark sky lighting. Warren Campbell gave a few examples of cabinet-type signs with a fully-illuminated sign. Audree Juhlin stated that when the whole sign is lit, it is in conflict with dark skies, and those things related to public safety would be an exemption.

Cari Meyer stated that since we are done with prohibited signs, we just have any open questions remaining, but we would be happy to receive your written comments. Audree Juhlin referenced upcoming meetings with the business communities, and indicated that if we have something come up, we will have another meeting, but if not, we will have a public hearing.

Commissioner Mayer suggested waiting for the feedback, so his recommendation would be Option 2. Commissioner Brandt asked if Commissioner Barcus is a minority on internally-lit signs. Commissioner Cohen stated that he is with Commissioner Barcus to allow them. Audree Juhlin explained that the sign face itself is the light, and Commissioner Brandt stated that they are not rustic and they glow like crazy and are meant to glow, so he was excited that they were going to be prohibited.

Vice Chair Levin asked how many support internally-lit signs and Commissioner Barcus said if they can't be dark sky compliant no, but if they can why limit it? Audree Juhlin indicated that the next meeting will be a public hearing, but Commissioner Mayer indicated that he wanted to wait for the feedback before the public hearing, and Cari stated that the meetings with the community will start in two weeks, so provide any comments as quickly as possible.

Vice Chair Levin complimented staff and the Commission for their preparation.

#### **4. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS**

- a. Tuesday, February 21, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- b. Thursday, March 2, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- c. Tuesday, March 7, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- d. Thursday, March 16, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**

Cari Meyer indicated that the meeting on February 21<sup>st</sup> is canceled. On March 2<sup>nd</sup>, we will have a work session with the Land Development Code consultants. Vice Chair Levin referenced an email from Mike Raber, and Cari stated that March 7<sup>th</sup> will be a public hearing on the Sign Code, but if we need to continue it we can; we had to notice it. Commissioner Cohen indicated that he wouldn't be available on March 2<sup>nd</sup> and Commissioner Barcus stated that he wouldn't be available on March 2<sup>nd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>. Audree Juhlin indicated that if the Sign Code has to be continued, it would be on March 16<sup>th</sup>.

#### **5. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Planning and Zoning Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:**

- a. To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).
- b. Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.

*No Executive Session was held.*

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Levin called for adjournment at 5:55 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on February 16, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date