



**MINUTES**  
**JOINT STUDY SESSION**  
**CITY COUNCIL / PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2011, 6:00 P. M.**  
**STANLEY PLUMMER COMMUNITY BUILDING**  
**245 E. BONITA AVE.**

---

**PRESENT:**

**CITY COUNCIL:**

Mayor Curtis W. Morris  
Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Templeman  
Councilmember Emmett Badar  
Councilmember Denis Bertone  
Councilmember John Ebiner (arrived at 6:03 p.m.)

**PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Chairman Jim Schoonover  
Commissioner David Bratt  
Commissioner John Davis  
Commissioner Stephen Ensberg  
Commissioner M. Yunus Rahi

**STAFF:**

City Manager Blaine Michaelis  
City Attorney J. Kenneth Brown  
City Clerk Ina Rios  
Assistant City Manager for Community Development Larry Stevens  
Assistant City Manager Ken Duran  
Director of Development Services Dan Coleman  
Director of Public Works Krishna Patel  
Captain Don Slawson, San Dimas Sheriff's Station

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE**

Mayor Morris called the special joint City Council/Planning Commission study session to order at 6:02 p.m. and led the flag salute. He said staff spent a lot of time and effort to make this item as comprehensive as possible.

- 2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS** (Members of the audience are invited to address the City Council on item not on the agenda. Under the provisions of the Brown Act, the legislative body is prohibited from taking or engaging in discussion on any item not appearing on the posted agenda. However, your concerns may be referred to staff or set for discussion at a later date. If you desire to address the City Council on an item on this agenda, other than a scheduled public hearing item you may do so at this time or asked to be heard when that agenda item is considered. Comments on public hearing items will be considered when that item is scheduled for discussion. The Public Comment period is limited to 30 minutes. Each speaker shall be limited to three (3) minutes.)

- a. Members of the Audience

Stacy Westlein, Property Manager, The Mat West Company, said she and Nancy manage three industrial business parks in San Dimas and she expressed concern that the sign ordinance and the limitation in signage is negatively affecting their properties on Arrow Highway and West Allen Avenue, that are experiencing a high vacancy rate. She said banners are seen hung in various businesses and she made it clear it is not her intention to ask for those signs to be removed. Rather, she urged the City Council to consider the use of banners and other signage to help property owners survive in this sluggish economy.

Mayor Morris explained the procedure for the meeting and said that in addition to comments from the Mat West Company, communications were received from Maurice Kane and Carl Williams which will be included in the official record. He introduced Assistant City Manager for Community Development Larry Stevens.

### 3. STUDY SESSION

- a. Consideration and discussion of survey results associated with sign related concerns previously identified in Community Forum and other meetings. Identification of other concerns which may be addressed in the Sign Code Update and future public hearings to amend the Sign Code.

Assistant City Manager for Community Development Stevens stated that at their fall retreat, the City Council suggested that the Planning Commission conduct a community forum to solicit comments and concerns regarding the sign ordinance to help determine an appropriate scope of update. Mr. Stevens presented a Powerpoint presentation to summarize areas of concern associated with the existing sign Code that were identified in the community sign forum conducted by the Planning Commission on March 16, 2011. He stated that on May 4, 2011, staff presented a report on the Sign Forum to the Planning Commission and 15 issue areas were targeted to consider for possible amendments. At their meeting on May 10<sup>th</sup>, the City Council confirmed the Planning Commission's determination of primary issue areas and directed staff to initiate an analysis of the Municipal Code Text Amendment relating to the Sign Code.

Manager Stevens stated that in the interim period, some significant concerns arose as it pertains to enforcement of window regulations and as a result, the City Council directed staff to prepare interim standards on window regulations, which were adopted on August 9, 2011 as an Urgency Ordinance, and extended on September 13, 2011 for an additional 10 months, 15 days. He said there will be discussion on those interim regulations to determine whether they should be further modified or whether they are appropriate as they stand. He said the purpose of the joint meeting is to primarily review survey results and discuss each issue area previously identified, and to determine if it is appropriate to add other regulations before proceeding to the public hearings before the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Manager Stevens said for each issue area, a comparability survey of surrounding cities was conducted and is included in the report as exhibits A-1 through O-1. Mr. Stevens said of the 15 issues, seven primary categories were identified as having the most direct impact to business owners and the community. He added that subsequent to the determination of issues, additional sign issues have arisen in the interim and he would like direction from the City Council whether or not further consideration should be given to these issues. He stated that most of the issues that related to legibility and readability have been addressed in subsequent amendments, rather than incorporating standards into the ordinance. Additionally, staff will determine if it is appropriate to make adjustments for unique circumstances; define appropriate content for murals and signs painted on vehicles; and address temporary paper signs. He will be suggesting that the beneficiary of the paper sign be made responsible for any damages and the cost of removal.

Mr. Stevens added a disclaimer that photographs of various signs are being presented to illustrate the type of sign to visualize the issue that is of concern, and will not be used for the purpose of initiating code enforcement.

#### Window Signs

Manager Stevens summarized interim regulations adopted and said the previous standards allowed two window signs, two permits per year, for a total of 60 days, and no restriction on the area covered. He said this became an issue and staff felt the best approach was to create multiple categories of window signs. He said permanent window signs are applied, stenciled, or etched to the glass surface of the window and are limited to 5% of the total window area of a store or building, for a maximum of 40 square feet. He said there are no time limits and the permit required is available over the counter. He said that small neon signs 4 square feet or less would be included in the permanent window signs, and be subject to the 5% limit.

### Temporary Window Signs

Manager Stevens said temporary window signs are intended to change every 30 days on a regular basis and the signs could be painted, cloth, a banner, or any form of temporary material. He said temporary signs are commonly used to advertise seasonal sales or other temporary message and are permitted under the existing regulations to cover up to 20% of the total window area. He stated that in order to ensure compliance, the business owner is being asked to create proof of installation date to avoid enforcement issues.

### Accessory Window Signs

Manager Stevens stated that accessory window signs are limited to 12 square feet per business, with no individual signs exceeding 4 square feet, do not require a permit, and do not count against the 5% or 20% restriction for temporary or permanent window signs.

In response to Councilmember Bertone, Mr. Stevens provided examples of accessory window signs and said most businesses are in compliance.

### Recommendation:

Manager Stevens recommended that the standards adopted in the interim ordinance are appropriate and should be retained, with the exception as directed by the City Council to come up with a method to overturn the use permit restrictions against alcohol advertising. Mr. Stevens added that attention attracting lighting is currently prohibited and further discussion is warranted.

### Comments:

Mayor Morris invited comments on window signs.

1) Nate, San Dimas Liquor, said he depends on window advertising to draw customers to his store and he would appreciate any adjustments to the Code. He said alcohol advertising was never an issue in the past, however, since the city went to proactive enforcement, he has had to cut down on window advertising. He said he is still receiving notices to comply.

2) Rick, Ranch Town Market, said he has taken down all but one neon sign and two signs facing San Dimas Avenue but he is getting notices to remove even those signs. He also has shelves against the window to protect the wine from the sun.

In response to Mayor Morris, Manager Stevens replied that a shading mechanism that is not a sign is not subject to sign code regulations. He stated that knowing the liquor prohibition would be amended, code enforcement was instructed to be lax in enforcing the liquor prohibition. Mr. Stevens will assign a planner to work with the two business owners as it relates to their needs of shading and how to get to 20% window coverage in a cooperative way.

3) Rick, Ranch Town Market, said he also has an A-frame sign that he sets in front of the store at 8:00 a.m. and goes back into the store at 6:00 p.m.

Manager Stevens said an A-Frame sign is not allowed under the present rules and is the next item of discussion. He added that code enforcement practices was less proactive 15 years ago, however, staff will process a complaint that is received. He mentioned that staff is looking to make some adjustments to recognize how things have changed and try to come to rational standards that work for everybody.

In response to Councilmember Badar, Mr. Stevens replied that of the surveyed cities most of the results were 5% or 10% for permanent window signs and between 15%-25% for temporary window signs. He said 20% seemed like a good mid-point number for temporary window signs. He indicated that most cities do not address accessory signs. He said it is at the City Council's discretion whether or not the recommended numbers of 5% and 20% should be considered for change when the formal code is brought for consideration.

Planning Commissioner John Davis said there is no reason to have a different percentage between permanent and temporary signs. He did not oppose 40% window coverage.

Manager Stevens said permanent signs are intended to accommodate decals and thought it was important to create a separate category for permanent window signs and try to get away from processing permits for temporary window signs. He said the Planning Commission can consider increasing those numbers, however, Mr. Stevens still recommends a total cap of window sign coverage.

In response to Councilmember Ebner, Mr. Stevens replied that the background of the graphic in the sign area is included in the calculation. He added that a reduced graphic and a separate shade can be considered.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman would like staff to consider some type of balance on attention attracting lighting. He said the typical twinkle lighting or chaser lighting do not pose an issue.

Councilmember Bertone said San Dimas is unique and he does not want to duplicate the standards of other cities. He is not opposed to the recommended 5% and 20% for temporary and permanent window coverage.

Planning Commissioner David Bratt concurred with Commissioner Davis that staff needs to arrive at a total window coverage number. He concurred that 20%-25% was a low number and suggested between 30%-35%.

4) Marlene, Pizza Place, said the lights in the patio area are not very bright and the neon lights exceed 5%. Pursuant to code enforcement, the rope lighting was taken down. She expressed concern with the dark and unsafe patio area and said there is a huge tree in front that also obscures their building.

Manager Stevens replied that 5% would not be a problem if all available window space is counted. He said the neon lights can be squared off to calculate the percentage.

5) Alline Kranzer said several downtown merchants asked for a poster advertising the Wildlife Show to display in their windows to attract people to town, however, the liquor stores declined because they were afraid a complaint would be issued against them. She added that Marlene from the Pizza Place informed her that business was down and the merchants need help advertising.

Manager Stevens said nonprofit advertising in windows is exempt from any category and is permitted.

6) Stacy Westlein, The Mat West Company, pleaded with the Planning Commission and City Council to relax the advertising restrictions on businesses that are struggling in this sluggish economy, rather than citing them on small issues such as lighting.

Mayor Morris said the purpose of this meeting is to review the sign ordinance to come up with practical, enforceable sign standards.

Councilmember Bertone said Councilmembers want to make the standards fairer for everybody, not stricter.

7) In response to Ron Kranzer, Mr. Stevens replied that if a merchant goes to the expense of enlarging their windows, whatever the ultimate window configuration is the basis for applying the standard. He said a framed glass entry door counts as window space for the purpose of calculating permissible window signs.

### Portable Signs

Manager Stevens said that under the existing code, A-frame signs are not permitted in San Dimas and similar prohibitions were found in other cities. He summarized the various standards of the surveyed cities that permit A-frame signs. He said Claremont only permits small signs 12 square feet, for 60 days per year, subject to a permit. He said an exception is made for chalk boards and restaurant menus in Claremont Village area that are not subject to the 60 day limit. The City of Covina permits signs on a limited basis in their town core, shoppers' lane district, on the building premises or adjacent public sidewalk. The signs are limited to 6 square feet and may not have balloons or attachments, and must be of professional quality. The City of Diamond Bar allows portable signs to be addressed in their Comprehensive Sign Programs. He said the City of Monrovia permits temporary sidewalk signs in the historical district only for businesses with perishable goods. The Design Review Committee may approve for other business districts subject to an encroachment permit and insurance to protect the City against trip hazards in the public right-of-way. He said in addition to regular signs, temporary sidewalk signs are also permitted for special sales or openings, 4 times per year, for a maximum of 15 days. The City of Upland only permits portable signs during business hours in the Town Center in the public right-of-way or on the premises. If it's a multi-tenant building, only one 6 square foot sidewalk sign is permitted. West Covina limits signage to 30 days per year for only special promotion events.

Mr. Stevens illustrated examples of portable signs in the public right-of-way, that may be in violation of ADA standards, including the popular wire signs that are placed in medians, planters, and other places. He said if it is determined that portable signs should be permitted, the City Council and Planning Commission need to clearly define what types of portable signs are appropriate. Mr. Stevens stated that the State Attorney General ruled that cities cannot regulate Lotto signs.

Mr. Stevens said staff does not believe there is a beneficial reason to permit A-frame signs, however, if it is determined appropriate, staff recommends the portable signs be limited to the Frontier Village area, with standards similar to those consistent with the Cities of Claremont, Monrovia, Covina and Upland.

### Comments

Mayor Morris invited comments from members of the audience.

1) Cyndia Williams, 125 W. Bonita Avenue, owner of Old Town Antiques for the past 19 years, said she recently had to remove a single pole sign that was previously permitted to let people know her store was open. She now puts out a table, however, she is prohibited from using the word "Antique". She noted that the merchants are suffering in this economy and she would like to be able to put out a temporary sign that says "antique" to attract business. She would be willing to store the sign inside at closing time.

In response to Councilmember Ebner, Ms. Williams replied that the single pole sign is gone, but it was a 4 square foot, black pole sign that said "Antiques" surrounded by painted flowers. Her concern is to let people know she is open. She strongly urged the City Council to reconsider allowing these types of portable signs.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman said A-frame signs have been an issue for a long time. He said there are stores in the downtown that are located within a courtyard and he thought it seemed reasonable to allow

them to have some A-frame signs in front, which would help with the quaintness we have tried to promote at that site.

Mayor Morris suggested the problem for those businesses can be solved by installing an outside monument sign. He does not oppose the type of pole sign at the Antique Store or A-frame signs, however, he said there is a limited amount of sidewalk, and staff needs to review this issue and come up with guidelines that work. He said these issues will be discussed in a public hearing before the Planning Commission and then come before the City Council for approval.

In response to Councilmember Bertone, Mr. Stevens replied that outside display is regulated differently. He said outdoor displays are permitted in the downtown public right-of-way, subject to Design Review Board guidelines and an encroachment permit. He said while outside display is not within the purview of the ordinance, it may require some review in areas other than the downtown where it is currently permitted.

Planning Commissioner Davis mentioned that the Planning Commission approved three mannequins at a Boutique Shop.

Mr. Stevens said a conditional use permit was required for that approval. He added that Lowes had an approved plan for outside display as part of a development project. He said if it is the desire to add outside display, a simpler process may be a better strategy.

Councilmember Bertone said the main issue is that it not be a safety hazard.

In response to Commissioner Davis, Mr. Stevens replied that a menu sign is considered an A-frame sign. He said an A-frame menu sign might be permitted with limited text where outside displays are permitted or in places that have outdoor eating. He said it sounds like there is the inclination to find a way to permit A-frame signs at least in the downtown and staff will work in that direction. He said if it is permitted in venues outside the downtown, we may want to require them to be back on the private sidewalk in front of the store to avoid multiple signs along a public street.

Commissioner Davis suggested that A-frame signs should not be restricted to the downtown.

Manager Stevens said staff will present at the public hearings quality standards to include a reasonable mix of standards that address normal concerns.

In response to Mayor Morris, Mr. Stevens stated that staff encourages downtown businesses to have outside displays and space was created for that purpose, subject to complying with an encroachment permit and insurance requirements. He said when displays are in the public right-of-way, ADA access must be ensured to protect the city against trip hazards.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman said multiple A-frame signs on the curblin at San Dimas Station could be problematic. However, staff needs to address businesses tucked back in with some type of signage.

2) Alline Kranzer suggested allowing a banner across the porch bannisters or railings at the Walker House to advertise the restaurant and menu.

Mayor Morris was not in favor of a banner at the historic Walker House and suggested an A-frame sign or some portable signage might be a better choice.

3) Dr David Swearingen, Spectrum Eyecare Optometry, Inc., said they are located in a multi-tenant two story building and he would encourage the use of professional portable A-frame signs for directional purposes in front of the business.

In response to Mayor Morris, Mr. Stevens said directory signs are currently permitted, which could be utilized onsite depending upon the design and layout of the building and how parking relates. He said under the current regulations, the sign has to be fixed, not portable.

In response to Mayor Morris, Dr. Swearingen said the landlord has a small sign attached to the side of the building, however, his eyecare practice is tucked away from the street and he currently puts out a portable directional sign in the morning and returns it indoors in the evening. He urged the City Council to consider adjusting the regulations to allow portable directional signage.

### Digital Electronic Message Boards

Manager Stevens said this issue emanates from a specific request from San Dimas Community Hospital for a digital monument sign. He said most cities in the survey do not address electronic message centers and the one city that does have standards allows the digital message boards for large development complexes and/or automobile dealerships. He said the cost is out of range for small businesses or shopping centers.

Mr. Stevens said that at the minimum, digital signs must be defined to distinguish them from time and temperature signs, changeable copy boards, and other types of similar signs. He said if the City Council and Commission think this type of sign is appropriate, staff has to determine under what circumstance they should be permitted and create appropriate standards through the Design Review Board or Planning Commission to ensure the messages are relative to the site.

Councilmember Bertone supported the use of a digital message board at San Dimas Community Hospital, however, he would not support the use at a liquor store.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman thought it was appropriate to regulate the digital signs with proper oversight. He stated that these types of signs are seen in front of various city halls that believe they have merit to advertise public information via technology.

Mayor Morris said technology is moving quickly and there is value in replacing existing freeway signs or other signs with a quality digital message board devoted 40% of the time to advertise nonprofit and city events in exchange for permitting the board to advertise 60% of the time.

Commissioner Davis agreed that technology is changing and something has to be done to permit these signs to let the public know businesses are open in the shopping centers. However, this is not something he would consider without a permit and appropriate standards.

### Comments

Mayor Morris invited comments from the audience.

1) Gregory Brentano, Chief CEO for San Dimas Community Hospital, said the hospital will leave the decision to the City Council's discretion. He said the sign is intended for public service to inform patients what health benefits they can achieve at the hospital and he would like to accomplish it within the framework of the existing sign.

Manager Stevens affirmed that the City Council and Planning Commission want staff to look at digital message board signs for other types of circumstances including retail centers. He said most cities do not currently have standards in place for retail digital message boards, however, he will conduct further research.

For Lease or Sale Signs – Commercial and Industrial Zones

Manager Stevens stated that 10 square foot of signage for each 100 lineal feet of property is currently permitted to advertise For Sale or For Lease signs on a specific property, and no permits are required for these types of signs as long as they meet standards specified in the Code. However, there have been a significant number of complaints about the condition and long standing duration of these signs. He said other cities' sign standards are similar and only the Cities of Claremont and Upland require a one-year permit when space is available for rent, lease, or sale. He added that other cities permit either a free standing sign or banner type signs and some permit two on a corner building. He said in San Dimas, 350 linear feet is required for a second sign, however, in a shopping center there are multiple properties that may qualify separately. He displayed multiple examples and said most of the signs are excessive, and virtually permanent. Mr. Stevens said in discussions, people have suggested that these types of signs should be addressed differently than in the existing code as follows: the business should be permitted one free standing sign or banner; there should be some size reduction of the sign; impose permit requirements to ensure time limits; periodic review; and enhanced maintenance standards.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Templeman, Mr. Stevens replied that one thought might be to require some kind of coordinated real estate sign for multiple parcels. He suggested allowing bonus square footage to the brokers for the second sign to facilitate the coordination. He further replied that existing standards require that when the vacancy is filled, the sign should be removed, however, that standard has been difficult to enforce. He suggested imposing time limits and continuing maintenance standards on the permit as conditions that can be monitored through enforcement.

Mayor Morris stated that restrictions are definitely appropriate for vacant parcels and thought there should be some balance to allow signage for active businesses.

Commissioner Davis could see no benefit in advertising the brokers instead of the vacancies and thought this type of signage should not be permitted.

Councilmember Ebner said standards are needed to permit this type of sign and said he would add a maximum timeframe of approximately six months and a hiatus period.

Mr. Stevens summarized that the Council and Commission would like stringent regulations on free standing signs.

Comments

Mayor Morris invited comments from the audience.

1) Stacey Westlein, The Mat West Company, agreed that some signs are excessive and will comply with any regulations decided by the City. She advised that she and Nancy own and manage their own properties and said 50% of their business comes from drive-by traffic, the rest from Craigslist and potential referrals. They would not get calls if their clients did not see their real estate signs or banners. She has 186 potential businesses in their property, with 30% vacancy. She added that they take pride in their properties and do not allow graffiti on their signs to remain for more than one day or over the weekend. She said the signs are up because the economy is bad and will get worse if they do not get help with signage.

Councilmember Ebner suggested that in addition to square footage, there could be a height limitation that would not obscure the streetscape or other business signs in the shopping center.

Mr. Stevens said staff was suggesting a six-foot limit, but he would take another look at this issue.

### For Rent Signs – Multi-family Zones

Manager Stevens said not including tracts, for sale, for lease, and for hire signs are permitted in single family and multi-family residences. The signs are limited to a height of 6 feet, for a total of 12 square feet, and do not require a permit. He said this issue came up in response to someone who was cited for excessive size, balloons, flags and related materials. They wanted more time than available. The Temporary Sign Permit regulations allow six banner permits, up to 60 days per year; balloons, streamers, and pennants are allowed in the banner permits. Staff looked at other cities, and found their standards are similar to San Dimas, and no one has provisions for multi-family rental signs. He provided examples of an inappropriate banner type sign and an A-frame sign with balloons similar to the complaint received. Staff recommended no change to the existing regulations.

In response to Councilmember Bertone, Mr. Stevens replied that regulations are enforced.

### Comments

Mayor Morris invited comments from the audience. There were no audience comments.

### Temporary Banners

Manager Stevens said the current temporary banner regulations are addressed for the purpose of announcing: 1) special events, 2) sales, and 3) other activities. He said an over-the-counter temporary use permit is required and applicants are allowed six permits per year per business; cannot exceed 60 days, and the maximum period for individual banners is 30 days. He said no more than one banner per business is allowed at any time. Streamers, pennants, and balloons could be permitted subject to restrictions.

### Special Event Banners

Manager Stevens said in conjunction with the use, special event banners require a temporary use permit for seasonal activities and other types of permissible sidewalk sales. The display is restricted to no more than two weeks and must be removed within seven days upon conclusion, subject to one banner per property.

### Opening/Coming Soon Sign

Mr. Stevens provided multiple examples of temporary business signs and free standing banners and said all are allowed subject to obtaining the appropriate over-the-counter permit for a specified time limit of no more than 90 days prior to the planned opening.

Manager Stevens provided a summary of the survey of thirteen cities and said all impose a limited number of permits per year (between 4-8 banner permits), and in most cases have a cap on the number of days. He said most cities have a square footage criteria; San Dimas does not currently have a maximum size standard, but he thought it would be prudent to consider imposing that standard. He indicated that most cities have a limit on the number of banners posted at one time, either one or one per street frontage for a corner parcel; some require a bond to guarantee removal; some have professional quality standards; and some with minor exceptions for grand openings, not dissimilar to San Dimas' code.

In response to Councilmember Ebner, Mr. Stevens replied that La Verne's code is restrictive with a maximum of seven days for one sign, four permits per year, and the banner flies for 28 days per year, limited to no more than 18 square feet.

### Recommendation

Staff recommended retaining the existing standards regarding the number of permits to six and the duration of 60 days per year, with a limit of one banner per business at one time. He said it seems reasonable to consider a maximum square footage of 40-50 square feet and suggested adding criteria about the quality and condition; where the banner is located so it can be properly installed; and a height limit for free standing banners in addition to the number limitation to avoid multiple banners. He said the standards can be flexible for new businesses to allow the first 60 days without counting against the 60 days per year, if they do not have a permanent sign.

Commissioner David Bratt felt it would be appropriate to allow two banners if the business has frontage on two different streets.

In response to Commissioner Davis, Mr. Stevens replied that under the existing regulations, depending on how the first part of the code is interpreted, temporary signs, banners, and other signs erected for the purpose of announcing special events, sales, or other activities may be permitted. He said the code can be interpreted to permit a leasing banner, subject to 60 days. He said in the case of Mat West, he would have issued two 30-day permits. He further replied that human directional signs are prohibited in the code.

### Comments

Mayor Morris asked if anyone had questions or suggestions on this item.

Councilmembers Bertone and Ebiner supported staff's recommendation.

### Monument Sign Identification Standards

Manager Stevens said he focused on the ability to have multiple tenants or business names on the monument sign versus a more general review of the number of monument signs or size and related standards. He said the code allows only the name of the complex in a multiple-tenant complex, and may not list the individual tenants on the side. He said in the late 1990's an exception was created in the code that monument signs for certain sized commercial shopping centers that are 40,000 square feet, and in certain circumstances may have a multi-tenant sign. Mr. Stevens presented four examples and said at Target, the multiple tenant sign is larger than other signs because in the specific plan, unique standards were created for the free standing monument sign, which allows it to be that size to accommodate a higher number of tenants. He said in another example, two signs, one for office and one for retail existed for more than 20 years because they were constructed under a different set of regulations and if the tenants were to modify the sign, they would have to go back to current standards. Mr. Stevens said he surveyed other cities and virtually nobody had a standard that said the tenant could only have the center's name on the monument sign; some cities did require the center's name; some cities limited to only major tenants; and some cities allowed a limited number of tenants' names to be determined by the property owner.

In response to Councilmember Bertone, Mr. Stevens replied that unless the City Council directed him to look at size standards, there are no plans to change the current size of the monument size.

Councilmember Ebiner thought it might be helpful to list addresses on the monument signs.

In response to Councilmember Ebiner, Mr. Stevens replied that some cities have a standard that in a multiple-tenant complex requires the address or range of addresses to be on the monument sign. He can take a look at that and the design components in a multiple-tenant sign would be addressed in a Master Sign Program.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem, Mr. Stevens said it is reasonable to impose a rational standard on legibility. He said a number of cities impose standards for lettering, generally 8-inches is a minimum letter size. He said he could also include design standards that encourage a more uniform approach, rather than have signs with different font type and color.

Mayor Morris said the city can adopt standards that the Federal Government requires for street signs. He suggested grandfathering the Stater Bros. sign, and allowing them to put as many names as they want if they replace the sign.

Mr. Stevens replied that as long as the square footage remains the same, the sign can be redesigned.

Commissioner Davis asked if staff would consider incorporating leasing information into the monument sign. Mr. Stevens replied that it would not be prohibited and the tenant could choose to use a portion of the sign to include "for lease" and the telephone number.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Templeman, Mr. Stevens said the recommendation is to eliminate the standard to allow merchants the opportunity to list the businesses.

In response to Councilmember Bertone, Mr. Stevens said the address can be included as a requirement.

In response to Mayor Morris, Mr. Stevens said he will conduct preliminary research on electronic digital signs that could be used as monument signs.

#### Comments

Mayor Morris invited comments from audience members.

1) Stacey Westlein, The Mat West Company, noted that national tenants will not come to the city if they do not get proper signage.

Mr. Stevens said that in the past the sign program had restrictions on font and colors that were permissible within a limited range, and vigorous objections by national tenants forced modification to the Master Sign Program to eliminate almost all those restrictions.

2) In response to Representative, Holiday Express, Mr. Stevens replied that the Planning Department will explain the regulations and determine the size and where the monument sign can be placed on the property.

3) Ron Kranzer felt it was important for the Holiday Inn Express to have a monument sign. He also thought the regional/national logos were extremely important and easily identified a business.

Manager Stevens said he would briefly address the next eight issues previously identified.

#### Façade Upgrade Limitations in Frontier Village

Manager Stevens said there is a restriction that prohibits monuments in the public right-of-way in the downtown area, unless the façade is upgraded. He thought that eliminating the façade restriction was appropriate, however, the entire issue of monument signs in the public right-of-way could be affected. He added that when the sidewalks are enlarged in the downtown, there may not be space to appropriately put monument signs and he will look at different ways to provide signage.

### Purpose and Intent Statement

Manager Stevens said this issue was raised by staff. He stated that because of many recent litigation cases, it is important to have a clear Purpose and Intent Statement that provides sufficient Federal protection on first amendment issues dealing with content neutrality. He said it is difficult for staff to limit text of signs and will revise the Purpose and Intent Statement by adding a substitution clause.

### Historic Signs

Manager Stevens said there are several historic signs in the downtown and staff encourages the preservation with minor cleanup warranted.

### Costs to Remove Signs in the Public Right-of-Way

Manager Stevens mentioned earlier about the cost to remove a sign in the public right-of-way and said the Municipal Code will be amended to make the benefiting party of illegal signs responsible for the cost of removal and damage created by said sign.

### Bulbs, Lighting, and Other Attention Attracting Techniques

Manager Stevens said he will work on this issue, based upon earlier discussion.

### Minor Accessory Signs

Manager Stevens said minor accessory signs are scattered throughout the code, as well as other cities' codes. He will work to address certain mandatory signs, extra directional signs, menu boards, etc. that need to be addressed in a clear way.

### Calculation of Sign Area

Manager Stevens said some concern was expressed that it was not clear how to measure a sign facing or area of limitation. He said in the comparability study information, some cities provided graphic illustrations on how to compute the area. Staff will expand the definition and add graphic illustrations to provide visual aids for different shapes, forms, and height.

Manager Stevens invited Council and Commission to evaluate his comments so he can prepare the format for the public hearings before the Planning Commission. He would like to know if anyone has additional issue areas to add.

1) Mayor Pro Tem Templeman suggested that Mr. Stevens be involved in designing and identifying the sites for monument signs or other type of signage that might be near the curb before concrete is poured for the sidewalk improvements in the downtown area.

Mr. Stevens replied that is his intention to look at this project as part of the downtown sidewalk project. He stated that he will probably not preserve all or most of the existing signs. He may have to change the form, shape, number, and location as part of the evaluation, or go in a different direction to provide signage information than a freestanding sign in front of the business.

2) In response to Councilmember Ebner, Mr. Stevens replied that the code revision to make the benefiting party responsible for paying for damages could include yard sale signs in the public right-of-way, however, staff will waive any charge if there is no damage.

3) Councilmember Ebner noticed that the City of Claremont enables a little more signage without calculating window space.

Mr. Stevens replied that staff will apply a common sense approach and as long as signs are reasonably well done, there should be no need for enforcement.

4) In response to Planning Commissioner Yunus Rahi, Mr. Stevens replied that it is his goal to present a completed package to the Planning Commission at their first meeting in December or the first meeting in January, and to go before the City Council in February.

Mayor Morris stated this has been a long process and thanked the Planning Commission and staff for their hard work in giving this process all due consideration, and thanked the audience for their input. He said this will result in a reasonable, enforceable sign ordinance that can be in effect for many years.

#### **4. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Morris adjourned the joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission at 9:33 p.m.. The next meeting is on Tuesday, October 25, 2011, 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Ina Rios, CMC, City Clerk