

The  
**AREA PLAN COMMISSION**  
of Tippecanoe County

**Ordinance Committee**  
**Notice of Public Hearing**

Date: August 5, 2020

Time: 4:40 PM

Location: Tippecanoe County Office Building

Tippecanoe Room

20 North Third Street

Lafayette, IN

**AGENDA**

**I. PLEASE NOTE:**

Due to the public health emergency, public comment on agenda items may be submitted prior to the meeting at [apc@tippecanoe.in.gov](mailto:apc@tippecanoe.in.gov). Comments must include name and address to be heard. Comments may also be made live on the streaming platforms. Members of the public may watch the livestream of the meeting on Facebook or YouTube. Links can be found on the county website at [www.tippecanoe.in.gov/apc](http://www.tippecanoe.in.gov/apc).

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Documents:

[ORD 07.01.2020.PDF](#)

**III. BUSINESS PARK SIGNAGE:**

An amendment creating a new type of sign called a "Gateway Directory Sign" and developments defined as "Business Parks" as well as minor changes to the sign section of the UZO. Continued from the July APC meeting.

Documents:

[SIGN SECTION CHANGES AMEND 97.PDF](#)

**IV. INTRODUCTION TO THE DISCOVER PARK DISTRICT FORM-BASED OVERLAY:**

A brief introduction to the Discover Park District Form-Based Overlay amendment to the Unified Zoning Ordinance - Ryan O'Gara

**V. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**



**AREA PLAN COMMISSION OF TIPPECANOE COUNTY  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING**

DATE.....July 1, 2020  
TIME.....4:40 P.M.  
PLACE..... COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING  
20 N. 3RD STREET  
LAFAYETTE, IN 47901

*Due to the public health emergency, the meeting was held virtually. Members of the public may watch the livestream of the meeting at <https://www.facebook.com/TippecanoeCountyIndiana> or <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCJleeA9ZQo9E11GdZTdjurQ/featured>*

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Jackson Bogan  
Greg Jones  
Carl Griffin  
Jerry Reynolds  
Gary Schroeder  
Larry Leverenz  
Vicki Pearl

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Tom Murtaugh

**STAFF PRESENT**

Ryan O’Gara  
Kathy Lind  
Chyna Lynch  
Larry Aukerman  
Zach Williams, Atty.

**ALSO PRESENT**

Bill Hutzal  
Liz Solberg

Chair Larry Leverenz called the meeting to order.

Attorney, Zach Williams, called roll to establish members present.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Gary Schroeder moved to approve the minutes from the June 6, 2020 joint meeting of the Ordinance and Bylaw Committees. Carl Griffin seconded and the minutes, as submitted, were approved by unanimous voice vote.

**II. ALLOWING SMALL WIND ENERGY CONVERSION SYSTEMS (WECS) FOR INSTITUTIONAL USES:**

A discussion (continued from the June meeting) requested by the Tippecanoe School Corporation which is interested in the possibility of installing small WECS on its residentially zoned school properties which the ordinance currently prohibits.

Kathy Lind said Tippecanoe School Corporation is interested in installing small WECS on their properties in the county like James Cole Elementary. Bill Hutzal from Purdue contacted TSC regarding the possibility of using WECS and he is here this evening to answer any questions the Committee may have.

Bill Hutzal said he is a faculty member of the Mechanical Engineering Technology school at Purdue and designs net zero energy buildings. He said he looks at next generation buildings and how they interact with the power grid. He led a team of students to make recommendations for an existing building to make it net zero energy. A net zero energy building is a property that on an annual basis provides as much energy as it takes from the grid. In the early stages of looking at James Cole, with the amount of land available, the possibility of solar and wind made the most sense. The cost of solar has dropped to the point where it is more cost competitive than wind systems like the one seen at CityBus. The much larger wind systems, in the megawatt range, are more cost effective but much larger than what would be needed at a school. The

net metering regulations in Indiana which deals with how people are compensated for what they put on the grid can also impact this conversation about net zero energy.

Gary Schroeder asked what the pay back would be on the solar panels.

Bill Hutzel said the payback in Indiana is about 12 years. The capacity of the system at James Cole would be in the range of 300 kilowatts and would cost around \$600,000 based on the rate electricity is used at the school. The pay back would be seen in a range of 12 to 15 years. There will be more schools looking at this option because solar panels are guaranteed to perform for about 25 years. At the midpoint of the life of the panel, the electricity is free which is attractive to school districts. For example, Frontier School Corp is installing solar panels and there are about 20 other projects throughout the state to install solar panels to offset energy prices. TSC will see an electric rate increase of 16% next year. This is what is driving school districts to find better options. They are not looking at megawatt wind turbines or 50 to 100-kilowatt wind turbines. They are looking at solar fields because the prices are significantly lower.

Carl Griffin asked if he would point the school corporation towards solar fields rather than small WECS.

Bill Hutzel said that is correct. Based on the amount of energy the school uses, to get the best pay back, they will be looking at solar instead of wind. Indiana has a unique net metering structure. Net metering is the rate that utilities compensate people for the energy they put on the grid. In Indiana, when a person puts energy on the grid, they are compensated at the rate of generation which is substantially less than the retail rate. There is very little incentive for a school or business to put in an oversized solar field or wind turbine to sell energy back to the grid.

Carl Griffin asked staff if this new information takes pressure off the Committee needing to revisit the WECS ordinance.

Kathy Lind said that is correct. Solar panels are currently permitted by right. She asked if this amendment is needed.

Bill Hutzel said he is not sure about policy. When he counsels school districts to find cost-effective ways to manage their schools, he first suggests renewable energy initiatives. For example, installing motion detectors, LED lights or updating cooling systems. Next, they look at renewable energy sources which would have to be solar as opposed to wind at this point.

Carl Griffin asked if it will be relatively easy for a typical school to size their solar needs. He asked how much space will be needed for the solar panels or if they will go on the building.

Bill Hutzel said James Cole is a unique building that already has energy efficient features. It is built into the ground, so the heating and cooling loads are less. It is also heated with a geothermal heat pump which means the energy demand is relatively low. The rural schools that sit on significant amounts of land, like James Cole, only need about 2 acres of solar panels to get to the break even point. The rule of thumb is for every megawatt of solar electricity, about 6 acres of land is needed. Solar panels need to be oriented facing south and James Cole has a perfect south facing roof which presents the opportunity to put panels on the roof. However, it is cheaper to install and maintain solar panels that are on the ground.

Larry Leverenz asked if there are places in the county that are not applicable for wind energy that are applicable for solar energy and vice versa. He asked if wind is considered at all as far as small systems are concerned.

Bill Hutzel said he has not looked at wind in detail. However, in 2010 TSC sponsored a wind survey to specifically look at James Cole. The survey looked at maps and sensors to study wind speeds. James Cole had an above average wind source to put in a wind turbine but since 2010 the price of solar has decreased significantly. He has not looked at wind in the whole county. On US 231 by the Purdue Airport, there is a 1.6-megawatt solar farm. If TSC installed a wind farm, they would assume the risk of owning the wind farm. However, Duke and other utility companies will assume the risk and the cost of installing a solar farm. Utility

companies typically create a leasing arrangement based on the solar farm sites on the land. In 2013, Southwest Middle School put in a 50-kilowatt wind tower before it was hit by a tornado. The wind turbine was damaged enough that the physical structure was standing, but the generator was damaged. The school never found anyone to recommission it properly and the school ultimately decommissioned the wind turbine. There are risks when a school pays \$600,000 to put either solar or wind on their property.

Jerry Reynolds said the City of Lafayette would be more inclined to investigate solar than wind.

Larry Leverenz said West Lafayette Council members and the mayor are in favor of the amendment as it stands. As far as renewable energy, West Lafayette is open to the idea of solar as well.

Jerry Reynolds said Lafayette is open to solar. He thought solar would benefit the city's institutional uses because more people would take advantage of solar than wind.

Carl Griffin said nothing needed to be done to allow institutional solar farms.

Kathy Lind said that is correct.

Carl Griffin asked if this ordinance amendment should be tabled.

Jackson Bogan said we should press pause on this amendment to see if there is a need or a want for WECS in institutional settings.

Jerry Reynolds said he agreed with Jackson and thought the Committee should investigate the WECS more.

Vicki Pearl said this request was brought up for a reason. She asked who brought this request to APC and TSC.

Bill Hutzel said he contacted Larry Aukerman when he first started to look at James Cole Elementary.

Jackson Bogan asked if Bill would be comfortable with the Committee pausing work on this ordinance amendment. This can always be brought up again if the need arises.

Bill Hutzel said that is fine. When he is working for a client, he looks for the most cost-effective option. If something like wind becomes cost-effective, this would be worth revisiting. But at this time, solar is the best option.

Carl Griffin said this committee has the responsibility to facilitate energy effective methods and allow them to happen in our community. He said he looks back at his approval vote to the bus company's request for a wind turbine and thinks the community learned that they do not want to have wind turbines. It is good to investigate alternatives. He said he is comfortable with leaving this amendment alone based on the cost and risk benefit that solar offers. We would encourage our communities towards solar rather than wind.

Carl Griffin moved to discontinue the reassessment of WECS in Tippecanoe County. Gary Schroeder seconded.

Larry Leverenz asked staff if this is the right step to take in the chance there is another request to look at wind energy later.

Kathy Lind said that is fine; staff will be ready to go in the future.

Liz Solberg, League of Women Voters of Greater Lafayette, 4030 Sylvan Trail, West Lafayette, IN 47906, said it may be a good idea to be in touch with the staff member from TSC that made the request. She said she was interested in what was presented. This would not be the reason to go ahead with the big wind ordinance but there is an educational benefit. The jurisdictions have the option to not pass the ordinance if

they do not want to. She thanked the Committee for their work on this and added that our state senator is trying to change the net metering.

Zach Williams conducted a vote by roll call. The motion was approved 7 yes to 0 no.

**Yes-Votes**

Jackson Bogan  
 Carl Griffin  
 Greg Jones  
 Larry Leverenz  
 Gary Schroeder  
 Jerry Reynolds  
 Vicki Pearl

**No-Votes**

**III. BUSINESS PARK SIGNAGE**

An amendment creating a new type of sign called a "Gateway Directory Sign" and developments defined as "Business Parks" as well as minor changes to the sign section of the UZO. Continued from the June meeting.

Kathy Lind said the Committee requested the changes discussed last month be put into ordinance format. The definition of Business Park changed how big a monument sign can be. Previously, the monument sign was limited to equal 25% of the total allotment of signage. Staff thought this was too strict and changed it, so they may have no more than one monument sign equal to up to 50% of the total signage allotment. This allows more flexibility if businesses want to use more of their signage for a monument sign. She presented the proposed ordinance. She said a brand-new definition of business park has been added as well as a definition for a gateway directory sign. This amendment would also change the way signage is calculated for a business. Currently, if a business has three or four street frontages, they can calculate each of the frontages in their sign allotment to get a larger number of signs. Staff now wants to limit that to two street frontages. Section 3 calculates the number of freestanding signs per sign-lot. Currently, a business gets one freestanding sign per road frontage which can be too much sometimes. Staff is proposing to change this to one freestanding sign per 2,000 linear feet of frontage. The amended ordinance includes two new charts for gateway directory signs. A gateway directory sign is like an integrated center sign except it is for a business park. These charts give guidance on how big and tall the directory sign can be. Section 5 has been updated with the proposed changes to how signage is calculated.

Carl Griffin asked if a business is allowed use 50% of their signage for a gateway directory sign.

Kathy Lind said up to 50% of the total signage could be used as a monument sign. The signage on the gateway directory sign is not included in their sign allotment.

Larry Leverenz asked if this is on the agenda for the APC meeting.

Kathy Lind said that is correct.

Larry asked if a motion needed to be made.

Zach Williams said staff likely wants to know if the Committee is in favor or against the amendment. It is already on the agenda and it is likely the full APC will want to hear what the Committee thinks about this.

Carl Griffin moved to send the amendment to the full APC. Jackson Bogan seconded.

Gary Schroeder said the Speedway on SR 38 and Creasy Lane was discussed at the previous meeting. SR 38 is a four-lane road that runs east to west and Creasy Lane is a four-lane road that runs north to south. They have two signs that are perpendicular to each other. One sign faces SR 38 traffic and the other faces Creasy Lane traffic. The signs are not very large with only one visible depending on what road a person is on. The proposed changes would not allow signs like this, but these signs are appropriate for this

particular corner. He said he is rethinking section 3 where it now requires 2,000 total linear feet and leaving it as it was. There is some risk of leaving this in place like the example Kathy gave of the CVS that has 4 road frontages. They only use 2 signs but would be allowed to have 4 per the ordinance. He said he is in favor of leaving section 3 the way it is. The risk is not substantial, and signs are expensive to put up and maintain. Businesses have to calculate where they want to put their signage.

Carl Griffin asked if the same thing can be accomplished by a diagonal sign placed close to the intersection so that both directions of traffic can see the site.

Gary Schroeder said there are instances where signs that are on the corner of the lot cannot be seen until a person is in the intersection. A busy intersection is not the ideal place to be looking around for signs. It is more convenient to see the signs from 300 or 400 feet away.

Jackson Bogan asked if Speedway would have had to file for a variance.

Gary Schroeder said he believes those signs are allowed by right. If section 3 were changed, they would not be allowed by right and they would have to file for a variance.

Larry Leverenz asked if a business could still have these signs if they filed for a variance if section 3 were changed.

Kathy Lind said that is correct. They could apply for a variance.

Jackson Bogan said this would take away the right to a certain number of signs. He asked if they could have 2 smaller signs and 1 large sign.

Kathy Lind said this change would take away the ability to have 1 sign per road frontage unless a variance was granted.

Carl Griffin said if this is left to allow one freestanding sign per 2,000 linear feet of road frontage, a business would spend more time and money to go through the variance process to get two signs. He said looking back at similar arguments that have been presented to the BZA, would the members of the BZA allow this variance? He asked Zach Williams if this would be considered a variance.

Zach Williams said yes, that would have to be a variance. There are policy provisions in the ordinance about sign changes. This would likely come with a recommendation that the sign ordinance be adhered to.

Carl Griffin asked Gary Schroeder if he thinks these sign variances would receive an affirmative vote at the BZA.

Gary Schroeder said it would depend on the members of the BZA. He said we write sign ordinances that we think are reasonable. It may be a conflict that the ordinance is written but businesses must get a variance each time. On the other hand, when businesses apply for a variance, staff will not recommend approval.

Carl Griffin said staff will not recommend approval. There may be a tendency for the BZA to approve this. If it is going to be approved anyway then why make people apply for a variance?

Gary Schroeder said he agreed. The BZA is reasonable and does not approve all signs that come to them for a variance.

Jackson Bogan asked if there are examples of the current ordinance being misused.

Kathy Lind said she disagreed with Gary about the Speedway at SR 38 and Creasy Lane. She believes both signs can be clearly seen at the same time and they are not necessary. The CVS on Union and 18<sup>th</sup> has four frontages with two freestanding signs that are not necessary. There are times staff recommends approval of sign variances but there must be a compelling reason that the ordinance is creating a hardship.

Jackson Bogan said he agrees with Gary. When someone buys a piece of real estate that is highly valued because it is near a busy intersection, they want to highlight it with signs.

Vicki Pearl said it is easy for us to say that these signs are unnecessary but, when traveling somewhere unfamiliar, people use the signs to navigate.

Jackson Bogan moved to amend the motion on the floor to change section 3 back to the original wording. Gary Schroeder seconded.

Zach Williams clarified that the first vote will be to amend the ordinance. The packets have not been sent to APC. This can still be changed and get out to APC with the hold item on the agenda.

Kathy Lind said this has already been sent to the newspapers, but it was a general legal ad that stated signage would be amended.

Zach Williams said the first vote will be for the motion on the floor then a second vote for the second motion.

Kathy Lind said one of the reasons we wanted to change this because the Culvers coming to Sagamore Commons will have 3 frontages which means they will be allowed 3 freestanding signs.

Jackson Bogan asked if the freestanding signs will have to be within the allotted sign square footage. If they want to use their signage for freestanding signs instead of on their building, they can.

Kathy Lind said if the gateway directory sign gets put up first, Culvers would just get one monument sign.

Jackson Bogan said regardless of the gateway directory, they would still have to abide by the square footage allotment.

Zach Williams said the vote is to modify the motion on the floor. The modification is going to change section 3 to how it was originally written.

Zach Williams conducted a vote by roll call. The motion was approved 6 yes to 0 no.

**Yes-Votes**

Jackson Bogan  
Greg Jones  
Larry Leverenz  
Gary Schroeder  
Jerry Reynolds  
Vicki Pearl

**No-Votes**

Zach Williams said the motion on the floor has been amended. The next vote will be for passing the ordinance amendment to the full Area Plan Commission at the July meeting with a recommendation.

Gary Schroeder asked if the changes that were made are cohesive with the rest of the changes. Section 5 says not to exceed 2 frontages.

Kathy Lind said section 5 has to do with the sign area that is permitted. Because section 3 has been changed, section 5 should be too.

Gary Schroeder asked if there needs to be a motion on this change.

Kathy Lind said one section has to do with a number of freestanding signs and the other has to do with the amount of signage permitted on the sign lot. This would also include section 2.

Gary Schroeder said this section is for the gateway directory sign. He asked what part of section 2 would

be removed.

Kathy Lind said section 2 is changing the number of street frontages used to calculate sign area. Section 2 and section 5 are tied together. They both do the same thing. She said in section 2 the highlighted "up to two" would need to be changed.

Gary Schroeder moved to send the amended ordinance to the full Area Plan Commission and to amend the motion to remove "up to two" in the two highlighted places in section 2 and the changes made to section 5. Jackson Bogan seconded.

Zach Williams conducted a vote by roll call. The motion was approved 7 yes to 0 no.

**Yes-Votes**

Jackson Bogan  
Greg Jones  
Larry Leverenz  
Gary Schroeder  
Jerry Reynolds  
Vicki Pearl  
Carl Griffin

**No-Votes**

**IV. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Larry Leverenz said there will be a 30-second pause for citizen comment.

Ryan O'Gara said there were no citizen comments.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

Gary Schroeder moved to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chyna R. Lynch  
Recording Secretary

Reviewed By,



Sallie Fahey  
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: APC Ordinance Committee  
FROM: Kathy Lind, Senior Planner  
DATE: July 30, 2020  
SUBJECT: Revisions to the sign section of the UZO

---

*Here is what staff originally proposed:*

**Section 1.** Add two new definitions to **UZO Section 1-10-2 WORDS AND TERMS DEFINED** as follows:

**BUSINESS PARK.** A commercial subdivision with internal public streets, containing more than two lots, the limits of which are created by the approved preliminary plat, with a **gateway directory sign** located near the main entrance from the perimeter arterial street, that advertises the businesses located on the lots within the subdivision. In addition to advertising on the **gateway directory sign**, businesses within a business park may have no more than one **monument sign** equal to up to 50% of the business's total allotment of signage located on its **sign-lot**. All other signage for businesses within the business park shall be fascia signage. A business park is not an **integrated center**.

**GATEWAY DIRECTORY SIGN.** A sign located at the main entrance of a **business park** that advertises the businesses located within a commercial subdivision. A minimum of 25% of the sign's supporting structure shall be composed of brick, masonry, or stone. The name of the **business park** shall comprise at least 20% of the total sign area of the gateway directory sign. The size and height of a gateway directory sign is as described in Section 4-8 below. A gateway directory sign may only be erected within a sign easement.

**Section 2.** Change **UZO 4-8-5 Maximum Sign Area Per Sign-lot, By Zone** to read as follows:

The maximum total **sign** area for a **sign-lot** (except for **building marker signs, gateway signs, gateway directory signs, incidental signs, flags** and **event oriented signs** which are exempt from this section), is calculated using the following table. It is determined for **up to two street frontages** along a private or public **road** by multiplying the appropriate **zonal base rate** by the **road** speed limit factor, the **building setback** factor, and the percent of permitted **freestanding sign** area used. A **sign-lot's** maximum total **sign** area is then the calculated sum of the **sign** areas for **all up to two street frontages**, unless that sum falls below the **sign area assurance** or above the **sign area cap** noted on the following page. Except as indicated in 4-8-6 below regarding **freestanding signs**, the total **sign** area may be applied at any location on a **sign-lot**. See 4-8-7 below for maximum **sign** area for **primary uses** within **integrated centers** and for **integrated center signs**. Notes follow on the next page. A worksheet can be found in Appendix D.

**Section 3.** Change **UZO 4-8-6 Number of Freestanding Signs per Sign-Lot** as follows:

	Institutional Use: Res/Rural zone	MRU NBU NB OR MR GB HB CB	I1, I2, I3
MAX. NUMBER OF FREESTANDING SIGNS	1 per <del>each road frontage</del> 2,000 total linear feet of all frontages		

**Section 4.** Add two new charts as **UZO 4-8-8 (b) and (c)** to calculate the area and height of gateway directory signs as follows:

**Gateway Directory Sign Area equals:**

Zonal Base Rate	x	Property area factor	x	Road speed limit factor
40 sq.ft.		10 acres or smaller = 1.5		40mph or less = 1.5
		Over 10 acres = 2.5		45mph or more = 2.5

**Gateway Directory Sign height maximum:**

Sign Area	Sign Height
100 square feet or less	20'
101 to 200 square feet	25'
Over 200 square feet	30'

Minimum sign setback is no less than the sign height.

**Section 5.** Change the sign worksheet in **UZO Appendix D-2** as follows:

Step 1: Calculate A x B x C x D (for every frontage **not to exceed two**) = E

Here is what the Ordinance Committee approved on July 1<sup>st</sup>:

**Section 1.** Add two new definitions to **UZO Section 1-10-2 WORDS AND TERMS DEFINED** as follows:

**BUSINESS PARK.** A commercial subdivision with internal public streets, containing more than two lots, the limits of which are created by the approved preliminary plat, with a **gateway directory sign** located near the main entrance from the perimeter arterial street, that advertises the businesses located on the lots within the subdivision. In addition to advertising on the **gateway directory sign**, businesses within a business park may have no more than one **monument sign** equal to up to 50% of the business's total allotment of signage located on its **sign-lot**. All other signage for businesses within the business park shall be fascia signage. A business park is not an **integrated center**.

**GATEWAY DIRECTORY SIGN.** A sign located at the main entrance of a **business park** that advertises the businesses located within a commercial subdivision. A minimum of 25% of the sign's supporting structure shall be composed of brick, masonry, or stone. The name of the **business park** shall comprise at least 20% of the total sign area of the gateway directory sign. The size and height of a gateway directory sign is as described in Section 4-8 below. A gateway directory sign may only be erected within a sign easement.

**Section 2.** Change **UZO 4-8-5 Maximum Sign Area Per Sign-lot, By Zone** to read as follows:

The maximum total **sign** area for a **sign-lot** (except for **building marker signs, gateway signs, gateway directory signs, incidental signs, flags** and **event oriented signs** which are exempt from this section), is calculated using the following table. It is determined for **street frontages** along a private or public **road** by multiplying the appropriate **zonal base rate** by the **road** speed limit factor, the **building setback** factor, and the percent of permitted **freestanding sign** area used. A **sign-lot's** maximum total **sign** area is then the calculated sum of the **sign** areas for all **street frontages**, unless that sum falls below the **sign area assurance** or above the **sign area cap** noted on the following page. Except as indicated in 4-8-6 below regarding **freestanding signs**, the total **sign** area may be applied at any location on a **sign-lot**. See 4-8-7 below for maximum **sign** area for **primary uses** within **integrated centers** and for **integrated center signs**. Notes follow on the next page. A worksheet can be found in Appendix D.

**Section 3.** Add two new charts as **UZO 4-8-8 (b) and (c)** to calculate the area and height of gateway directory signs as follows:

**Gateway Directory Sign Area equals:**

Zonal Base Rate	x	Property area factor	x	Road speed limit factor
40 sq.ft.		10 acres or smaller = 1.5		40mph or less = 1.5
		Over 10 acres = 2.5		45mph or more = 2.5

**Gateway Directory Sign height maximum:**

Sign Area	Sign Height
100 square feet or less	20'
101 to 200 square feet	25'
Over 200 square feet	30'

Minimum sign setback is no less than the sign height.

Proposal for August Ordinance Committee:

At the July 15<sup>th</sup> APC meeting, both of these proposed amendments were included in the packet. These changes to the sign section of the ordinance were tabled and sent back to the Ordinance Committee for further discussion. The definitions of “business park” and “gateway directory sign” (Section 1) are the same in both proposals. Also, the charts regarding gateway directory sign area and height (Section 4 in the original, Section 3 in the Ordinance Committee version) remain the same. The only differences between staff’s proposal and what was approved by Ordinance Committee in July is how to determine the total amount of signage any non-business park property would be permitted to have and how many free-standing signs any non-business park property may have.

In an effort to reach a compromise that everyone can agree on, staff is proposing the following changes to staff’s original proposal to sections 2, 3, and 5. (Again, the two other sections have always remained unchanged.) Staff’s original proposed changes to the UZO are shown in **red**; staff’s latest compromise positions are shown in **green** below:

**Section 1.** Add two new definitions to **UZO Section 1-10-2 WORDS AND TERMS DEFINED** as follows:

**BUSINESS PARK.** A commercial subdivision with internal public streets, containing more than two lots, the limits of which are created by the approved preliminary plat, with a **gateway directory sign** located near the main entrance from the perimeter arterial street, that advertises the businesses located on the lots within the subdivision. In addition to advertising on the **gateway directory sign**, businesses within a business park may have no more than one **monument sign** equal to up to 50% of the business’s total allotment of signage located on its **sign-lot**. All other signage for businesses within the business park shall be fascia signage. A business park is not an **integrated center**.

**GATEWAY DIRECTORY SIGN.** A sign located at the main entrance of a **business park** that advertises the businesses located within a commercial subdivision. A minimum of 25% of the sign’s supporting structure shall be composed of brick, masonry, or stone. The name of the **business park** shall comprise at least 20% of the total sign area of the gateway directory sign. The size and height of a gateway directory sign is as described in Section 4-8 below. A gateway directory sign may only be erected within a sign easement.

**Section 2.** Change **UZO 4-8-5 Maximum Sign Area Per Sign-lot, By Zone** to read as follows:

The maximum total **sign** area for a **sign-lot** (except for **building marker signs, gateway signs, gateway directory signs, incidental signs, flags** and **event oriented signs** which are exempt from this section), is calculated using the following table. It is determined for **up to ~~two~~ three street frontages** along a private or public **road** by multiplying the appropriate **zonal base rate** by the **road**

speed limit factor, the **building setback** factor, and the percent of permitted **freestanding sign** area used. A **sign-lot's** maximum total **sign** area is then the calculated sum of the **sign** areas for all ~~up to two~~ **three street frontages**, unless that sum falls below the **sign area assurance** or above the **sign area cap** noted on the following page. Except as indicated in 4-8-6 below regarding **freestanding signs**, the total **sign** area may be applied at any location on a **sign-lot**. See 4-8-7 below for maximum **sign** area for **primary uses** within **integrated centers** and for **integrated center signs**. Notes follow on the next page. A worksheet can be found in Appendix D.

**Section 3.** Change **UZO 4-8-6 Number of Freestanding Signs per Sign-Lot** as follows:

	Institutional Use: Res/Rural zone	MRU NBU NB OR MR GB HB CB	I1, I2, I3
MAX. NUMBER OF FREE-STANDING SIGNS	<del>1 per each road frontage 1 per 2,000 total linear feet of all frontages</del> <b>1 per street frontage, up to a maximum of 2 signs which shall be separated by 500' of total street frontage</b>		

**Section 4.** Add two new charts as **UZO 4-8-8 (b) and (c)** to calculate the area and height of gateway directory signs as follows:

**Gateway Directory Sign Area** equals:

Zonal Base Rate	x	Property area factor	x	Road speed limit factor
40 sq.ft.		10 acres or smaller = 1.5		40mph or less = 1.5
		Over 10 acres = 2.5		45mph or more = 2.5

**Gateway Directory Sign height** maximum:

Sign Area	Sign Height
100 square feet or less	20'
101 to 200 square feet	25'
Over 200 square feet	30'

Minimum sign setback is no less than the sign height.

**Section 5.** Change the sign worksheet in **UZO Appendix D-2** as follows:

Step 1: Calculate A x B x C x D (for every frontage ~~not to exceed two~~ **three**) = E

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval