

**Development Advisory
Commission
Meeting**

**Friday
January 10, 2020**

9:00 a.m.

**Development Conf. Room 128
903 W Main Street
Blue Springs, Missouri**



City of Blue Springs, Missouri



City Hall – Room 128 (Development Conf. Room)
903 W. Main St.

DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING AGENDA

Friday, January 10, 2020 - 9:00 a.m.

Board Members please call 228-0207 if unable to attend

1 CALL TO ORDER

A. Approval of October 4, 2019 meeting minutes

2 REVIEW OF PROJECT APPLICATIONS

A. Sign Code Update

Nathan Jurey, Senior Planner, will provide the Commission with an update of the Sign Code changes that will be proposed for approval.

3 OTHER BUSINESS

4 ADJOURN

If special accommodations are required for citizen participation in this meeting,
PLEASE CALL 228-0207 (VOICE) OR 228-0250 (TDD)

Agenda posted at the following locations:

City Hall, 903 W. Main Street

City's website

<http://www.bluespringsgov.com/AgendaCenter>

January 7, 2020

A quorum of the City Council may be in attendance however no City Council votes will be taken.
Community Development



**City of Blue Springs
903 Main Street
Blue Springs, Missouri 64015**

**Development Advisory Commission
MINUTES
Friday, October 4, 2019**

A meeting of the Development Advisory Commission of the City of Blue Springs was held in City Hall Development Room 128 located at 903 W. Main Street on Friday, October 4, 2019 with the following members and guests in attendance.

**MEMBERS
PRESENT**

Bob Frost
Mitchell Peil, Chairman

Bruce Reynolds

STAFF / OTHERS

Thomas Cole, Director, Community & Economic Development
Mike Mallon, Assistant Director, Community & Economic Development
Nathan Jurey, Senior Planner
Matt Wright, Senior Planner
Galen Ericson, Councilmember Liaison Dist. 1

ABSENT

Board Member Chris White
Board Member Orion Berridge
Jackie Sommer, City Attorney
Karen Findora, Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER /

Chairperson Mitchell Peil called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES**

Chairperson Peil requested action on the Consent Agenda and the approval of the August 19, 2019 meeting minutes. Board Member Bob Frost moved to approve the August 19, 2019 meeting minutes. Seconded by Board Member Bruce Reynolds.

**AGENDA ITEM 2A /
UDCT-09-19-7081 /
“An Ordinance
amending various
Sections and
Subsections of Title
IV, Chapter 401-411,
Unified Development
Code, of the Code of**

Mike Mallon, Assistant Director, Community Development, informed the Commission that staff will be presenting a number of proposed UDC changes. There are three main amendments that need to be made.

- Amend and adopt regulations related to development procedures, regulations, and standards.
- Amend and adopt regulations related to short term loan establishments and tobaccoists.
- Amend and adopt regulations related to building inspections.

Ordinances of the City of Blue Springs to amend and adopt regulations related to development procedures, regulations, and standards.

The first update would allow an applicant that is going through a Site Plan/Design Review, Preliminary Plat, or a Conditional Use Permit the right to request a Variance as part as that process. This would allow an applicant that is already going through the development process to request a Variance in conjunction with their development applications, so that they can both be heard by the Planning Commission rather than having the applicant go through a separate Variance process with the Board of Adjustment. An example is the Dental Depot project. The setback didn't meet the current UDC requirements and the applicant had to go through the Variance process with the Board of Adjustment then go through the Site Plan with the Planning Commission. With combining the two processes into one, it will save the applicant valuable time.

Matt Wright, Senior Planner stated that the next couple amendments are related to the Downtown Development Code. The first amendment would be adding rooftop decks, patios, and associated enclosures in combination with mixed-use building and small commercial buildings in the T5 zoning district, which is predominately the Main Street frontage.

The second amendment would be to the building heights within the T4 and T5 zoning districts related to mixed use, live work, and small commercial buildings. Currently, in the T4 district there is a floor to ceiling height of 15ft. Mr. Wright stated that in looking at other cities this is a strict code in terms of height. Staff is proposing to decrease that from 15ft. to 12ft. and change from floor to ceiling, to floor to floor, or floor to roof in case of a single story small commercial building. The upper floors currently have a floor to ceiling requirement of 10ft. Staff is proposing to remove any reference to ceiling and change it to floor to floor or floor to roof at 9ft., and making it clear that the parapet wall is in addition to that.

The next amendment is an addition to the building types. The 2015 UDC is based on building types and not exclusively on zoning. There are some unique instances where a land use or development type does not have a building type. Instead of the applicant having to go through a special process to get permitted the amendment would allow the Director of Community Development to determine which building type would best fit, based on the land use and location.

The next amendment would pertain to the Rowhouse building type. It hasn't been utilized and staff feels that it's likely because it's not been clear on how it is to be applied. Staff has added some additional items to it to help clarify how this could be developed. The Rowhouse is intended to be basically a townhouse development where the owner owns the unit and the front and back yard and in some cases the side yard. Mr. Wright went through all the amendments to clarify the section.

Mr. Mallon stated that the Condominium Plat has been removed since this can be approved by the County. A Conveyance Plat has been created for the sole purpose of defining the legal description and to be able to use that for the sale or the conveyance of the property. This would allow the parcel to be subdivided into tracts of land, not buildable lots. It would not allow for any development to occur on the site. Staff has approved a handful of these plats that have been titled, "For Sale Only."

Nathan Jurey, Senior Planner discussed the parking and loading requirement amendments. Mr. Jurey informed the Commission that staff reduced the aisle width on

90 degree parking from 28ft. wide to 26ft. for an 8ft. stall and 25ft. wide for a 9ft. stall among other amendments.

Mr. Wright stated that the driveway access width has become an issue. The current requirement allows coverage up to 50% of your front yard or street facing side yard with a driveway provided you don't exceed 30ft. maximum at the right-of-way. The issue is that the 30ft. driveway width doesn't specify how many driveways. Staff would like to clarify that the 30ft. is the total of the driveways on your lot.

MOTION
AGENDA ITEM
2A1. / UDCT-09-19-7081 / "An Ordinance amending various Sections and Subsections of Title IV, Chapter 401-411, Unified Development Code, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Blue Springs to amend and adopt regulations related to development procedures, regulations, and standards.

Commissioner Bob Frost made a recommendation to approve UDC Text Amendment / UDCT-09-19-7081.

SECOND

Commissioner Bruce Reynolds.

VOTE

Bob Frost – Aye
Bruce Reynolds – Aye
Mitchell Peil, Chairperson – Aye
(APPROVED 3-Aye, 0-No)

Orion Berridge – Absent
Chris White – Absent

AMEND MOTION
AGENDA ITEM
AGENDA ITEM
2A1. / UDCT-09-19-7081 / "An Ordinance amending various Sections and Subsections of Title IV, Chapter 401-411, Unified Development Code, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Blue Springs to amend and adopt regulations related to

Commissioner Bruce Reynolds moved to amend the motion. Commissioner Bob Frost requested that staff clarify that the driveway widths were for corner lots only.

development
procedures,
regulations, and
standards.

SECOND Commissioner Bob Frost.

VOTE Bob Frost – Aye Orion Berridge – Absent
Bruce Reynolds – Aye Chris White – Absent
Mitchell Peil, Chairperson – Aye
(APPROVED 3-Aye, 0-No)

MOTION Commissioner Bruce Reynolds made a motion to recommend the approval of
AGENDA ITEM amendments to the short-term loan establishments.

2A2. / UDCT-09-19-7088 / An Ordinance
amending various
Sections and
Subsections of Title
IV, Chapter 401-411,
Unified Development
Code, of the Code of
Ordinances of the City
of Blue Springs to
amend and adopt
regulations related to
short term loan
establishments and
tobacconists.

SECOND Commissioner Bob Frost.

VOTE Bob Frost – No Orion Berridge – Absent
Bruce Reynolds – Aye Chris White – Absent
Mitchell Peil, Chairperson – No
(DENIED 1-Aye, 2-No)

MOTION Commissioner Bruce Reynolds made a motion to recommend approval the amendments
AGENDA ITEM to tobacconists.

2A2. / UDCT-09-19-7088 / An Ordinance
amending various
Sections and
Subsections of Title
IV, Chapter 401-411,
Unified Development
Code, of the Code of
Ordinances of the City
of Blue Springs to
amend and adopt

regulations related to short term loan establishments and tobacconists.

SECOND

Commissioner Bob Frost.

VOTE

Bob Frost – No
Bruce Reynolds – Aye
Mitchell Peil, Chairperson – Aye
(APPROVED 2-Aye, 1-No)

Orion Berridge – Absent
Chris White – Absent

AGENDA ITEM

2A3. / UDCT-09-19-7089 / An Ordinance amending Title IV, Chapter 403 Development Review Procedures, Section 403.120 Occupancy Certificates, Unified Development Code, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Blue Springs to amend and adopt regulations related to building inspections.

Mr. Mallon stated that this amendment would be related to certificate of occupancy and the ability to allow Third Party building inspections. This is a direct result of state law changes that went into effect on August 28, 2019. This would affect new construction of one or two single family dwellings, giving the developer the opportunity to submit a third-party inspection to the City.

MOTION

AGENDA ITEM

2A3. / UDCT-09-19-7089 / An Ordinance amending Title IV, Chapter 403 Development Review Procedures, Section 403.120 Occupancy Certificates, Unified Development Code, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Blue Springs to amend and adopt regulations related to building inspections.

Commissioner Bruce Reynolds made a motion to recommend the approval of the UDCT-09-19-7089 amendments.

SECOND

Commissioner Bob Frost.

VOTE Bob Frost – Aye Orion Berridge – Absent
Bruce Reynolds – Aye Chris White – Absent
Mitchell Peil, Chairperson – Aye
(APPROVED 3-Aye, 0-No)

OTHER BUSINESS The Sign Code Task Force is currently reviewing a sign code update which is anticipated to come before the DAC in December.

ADJOURN With no other business, Commissioner Bob Frost made a motion to adjourn, seconded Commissioner Bruce Reynolds. The DAC meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted by,
Karen Findora, Recording Secretary

Mitchell Peil, Chairperson

Date

MEMORANDUM

DATE: Friday, January 10, 2020

TO: Development Advisory Commission

FROM: Nathan Jurey | Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Sign Code Update

When the Mayor and City Council established the Sign Code Task Force (SCTF) in February, the SCTF was tasked with updating the Sign Code to balance the current interests of businesses and residents of Blue Springs and to align the Sign Code with recent U.S. Supreme Court and other Appellate decisions.

Over the last 10 months, the SCTF has studied and revised the Sign Code to provide its recommendations to City Council. From April and June, the SCTF reviewed the existing Sign Code to build a common foundation and frame ideas for the Sign Code Update. In August, the SCTF commissioned City staff to survey citizens, businesses, & sign companies. Staff distributed 3 surveys through a variety of methods (Media Press Release, City's website, Mayor's Newsletter, Development Newsletter, Economic Development Council, Downtown Alive, Chamber of Commerce, the Blue Springs School District, and an email sent to Community Development's list of sign companies, Homeowners Associations and churches). Altogether, we received 224 responses (124 citizens, 100 businesses/organizations, & 10 sign companies). From October and November, the SCTF reviewed these results and recommended changes to the existing Sign Code.

Overall, the SCTF and staff are proposing a Sign Code that:

- Is much less content-based, especially for exempt signs. However, staff still needs to finish their review and recommends outside legal review of the Sign Code prior to adoption;
- Is more aligned with current public sentiment towards signs, using the results from the surveys taken by Citizens, Businesses, and Sign Companies in September 2019;
- Exempts more and larger temporary signage than before;
- Allows more types of Temporary Signs to be permitted by Sign Permit (e.g. feather flags and ground-mounted banners); and
- Has more specific criteria for certain Permanent Signs (e.g. Pole, Pylon, Historic, 3D signs, and Murals).

The following is a more detailed summary of the proposed changes that are either a major change to the current Sign Code or a change that will have a noticeable visual impact in Blue Springs.

OVERALL:

1. **Reorganization of the Code.** To improve the readability of the Sign Code, staff has rearranged the outline and format of the Sign Code. Staff believes this reorganization will help staff administer and sign companies understand the Code.
2. **Regulation of Free Speech.** In 2015, the Supreme Court has ruled in Reed vs. Gilbert that it is illegal to regulate signs differently based on their content. Staff has rewritten the entire Sign Code to remove content-based regulation to the best of their knowledge. However, we are unsure how much content-based regulation remains in the proposed Sign Code because legal counsel has not had a chance to fully review the draft.
 - a. **Permanent Signage.** Currently, the Sign Code regulates the total amount of permanent signage allowed per property based on the ‘use.’ For example, we allow retail establishments twice as much signage as churches, even if located in the exact same location. Staff believes that this is content-based regulation. Thus, staff felt it necessary to rewrite the entire Permanent Sign section since ‘regulation by use’ was the foundation of the current Code. While it is a major change, it is not as significant as one would think. As policy, staff has applied the greater sign allowance when multiple uses are on the same property. For example, staff would allow a church in a shopping center the same amount of signage as any other business in that shopping center. Thus, this is a significant change, but not as significant when compared to staff policy.
 - b. **Temporary Signage.** Currently, the Sign Code regulates temporary signage based on the ‘message’ of the sign. For example, Real Estate signs may be 7 sq. ft. but Political signs can only be 6 sq. ft. on residential property. The Town of Gilbert (Reed vs. Gilbert) lost its case in the Supreme Court because of this same issue. Staff rewrote the Exempt Sign and the Temporary Sign sections to address many of these content-based issues.
 - c. **Artwork.** Currently, the Sign Code is unclear whether ‘art’ is a sign. The proposed Sign Code classifies all ‘art’ as a sign. Staff believes that art should be regulated as a sign due to its potential to impact neighbors and the city. For example, some art (e.g. graffiti) may negatively impact a neighbor’s ability to sell their property. Thus, if some art should be regulated, then all art must be regulated equally.

EXEMPT SIGNS:

3. **Signs Not Visible from Off-Site.** Currently, Sign Code requires a Sign Permit for any sign located outside of a building (unless specifically exempt), even when the sign is not visible from off-site. The proposed Code exempts all signage that is not visible from any abutting property or public right-of-way.
4. **Residential Exempt Signage.** The table below outlines the current and proposed changes to exempt residential signage. While the table shows the ‘previous’ sign type as identified by content (e.g. political signs are signs that have political content), the proposed signs are not identified by content (e.g. the proposed signs may be political or commercial like a real estate sign, but must always be relevant to the premise):

	CURRENT	PROPOSED None are Identified by Content
Political Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: No time limit • Place: No setback • Sign: 1 sign per candidate & issue / lot, up to 6 sf & 3’ tall max. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: Temporary ‘mounting’ • Place: Min. 10’ spacing btwn signs if within 10’ of street • Size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any # of temporarily mounted signs, up to 6 sf & 3’ tall,
Philosophical Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: No time limit 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place: No setback • Sign: 1 sign per street per lot, no size limit 	<p>provided they do not exceed 60 sf cumulatively; AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 sign, up to 8 sf & 5' tall.
Garage Sale Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: 3 days per sale • Place: No setback • Size: 6 sf max. • Number: 1 sign per lot 	
Real Estate Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: No time limit • Place: No setback • Size: Sign: 1 per street / lot, up to 7 sf & 5' tall max. 	

5. **Non-Residential Exempt Signage.** The table below outlines the current and proposed changes to exempt non-residential signage. Like above, the proposed signs are never identified by content. For example, a 'construction' sign may convey any message relevant to that property (commercial or non-commercial), but is limited in time to 'during construction':

	CURRENT	PROPOSED None are Identified by Content
Political Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: No time limit • Place: No setback • Sign: 1 sign per candidate & issue / lot, up to 16 sf & 6' tall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: Temporary 'mounting' • Place: Min. 25' spacing btwn signs if within 25' of street • Sign: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any # of temporarily mounted signs up to 6 sf & 3' tall each, provided they do not exceed 60 sf cumulatively; AND ○ 1 sign, up to 32 sf & 8' tall
Philosophical Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: No time limit • Place: No setback • Sign: 1 sign per street per lot, no size limit 	
Garage Sale Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: 3 days per sale • Place: No setback • Sign: 1 sign per lot, up to 6 sf 	
Real Estate Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: No time limit • Place: No setback • Sign: 1 per street / lot, up to 16 sf & 8' tall. 	
Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Required • Time: Anytime 90-days prior to or during 'construction' • Place: 20' setback • Sign: 1 sign, up to 32 sf & 8' tall 	
Grand Opening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Required • Time: 30-day max. per permit anytime within 180 days after 'opening' • Place: No setback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: 90-days max. after 'opening' or obtaining occupancy by Building Permit • Place: No setback

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign: 1 sign/permit, up to 40 sf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign: 1 sign/lot, up to 32 sf
Information Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Required • Time: Permanent • Place: No setback • Sign: Limited to 1 per driveway & 'as needed', up to 3 sf & 3' tall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Exempt • Time: Permanent • Place: Min. 25' setback • Sign: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any # of permanently mounted signs up to 6 sf & 3' tall each, provided they do not exceed 60 sf cumulatively

6. **Vehicle Signs.** Currently, vehicle signs of any size are exempt from the Sign Code if they are parked for less than 24 consecutive hours in a lawful parking space. The proposed Sign Code extends this regulation to 48 consecutive hours to account for weekends and exempts parking of vehicle signs for greater than 48 consecutive hours, when they meet either of the following restrictions:
 - a. The sign is 6 sf or smaller and parked in any lawful parking space; or
 - b. The sign is 100 sf or smaller and parked in a lawful parking space that is at least 30' away from the street. For sizing comparisons, the broad side of a 15' box-truck is roughly 120 sf in size (15' x 8').
7. **Person Signs.** Currently, people dressed in costume or displaying signs for a commercial purpose are prohibited. The proposed Sign Code keeps this prohibition, but clarifies that people dressed in costume or displaying signs for a non-commercial purpose are exempt from the Sign Code, provided they are not obstructing the safe flow of traffic or pedestrians.

ADMINISTRATIVE:

8. **Sign Permit Inspections.** Currently, the City is responsible for requesting a final inspection of a sign after permit approval. Thus, the City staff may inspect a sign multiple times if it is not installed for multiple months. The proposed Sign Code puts the burden on the applicant to request the final inspection, like the building inspection process. This will reduce the amount of resources the City needs to expend on the inspection process.
9. **Admin. Sign Plan.** The current Sign Code requires Master Sign Plan approval by Planning Commission for any new development with 3 or more tenant spaces, even if all the signage meets Code. This is intended to require a common design across a shopping center. The proposed Code will keep the same requirement for common design but allow Staff to approve such a Sign Plan when all proposed signage meets Code.
10. **Admin. Appeal for Minor Sign Adjustment.** Currently, any sign that does not meet the Sign Code in any way must be approved by Planning Commission. In order to reduce the burden on the Planning Commission, the proposed Code allows Administrative approval of signs that do not meet Sign Code when there are unusual physical site conditions. Staff may approve no more than one (1) of the following:
 - a. Increase in height up to 2 feet
 - b. Increase in sign area up to 10%
 - c. Reduction in setback up to 20%
 - d. Reduction in sign spacing up to 20%

DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION:

11. **Maximum Illumination.** Currently, the maximum illumination allowed for any sign is restricted by the amount of light measured at the nearest line. However, this restriction only measures the light that touches the ground at the property line (horizontal light

output). To reduce potential glare from a sign, the proposed Sign Code restricts vertical light output as well to 0.3-foot-candles above ambient light conditions.

12. **Exposed Light Signs.** Currently, signs with exposed bulbs are prohibited, even though light fixtures (not a part of a sign) may have an exposed bulb if they do not exceed the maximum illumination allowed by the General Development standards of the UDC. The proposed Sign Code allows exposed bulbs if they do not exceed the maximum illumination (stated above) and are not displayed/mounted within 200 feet of any residentially zoned property. The Citizen Survey results showed that 51 percent of citizens believed that 'exposed bulb' signs are appropriate in Blue Springs (compared to 88 percent for internally illuminated signs).
13. **Digital Signs.** Currently, Sign Code requires that Electronic Reader Boards only display a single color on a different color background (e.g. gas price signs or the typical time/temperature sign). However, staff has approved "full-color" signs with a condition that the sign displays no more than 2 colors simultaneously. As one can imagine, this is difficult to enforce. The Citizen Survey results showed that 72 percent of citizens believed that 'full-color' Display Signs are appropriate in Blue Springs (compared to 82 percent approve '2-color' Display Signs). The proposed Sign Code allows Digital Signs to be full color.

PERMANENT SIGNS:

14. **Encouraged Signs.** Currently, wall signs and monument signs are the preferred type of sign, but the Code does not require either of these. The proposed Sign Code encourages Individually-Mounted Letter wall signs and Monument signs constructed with stone, brick, or similar by providing a 'bump' in size and height allowances.
15. **Minimum Ground-Mounted Sign Spacing.** Under the current Code, Monument signs are limited to 1 per frontage (e.g. corner lots can have 2). Under the proposed Code, a property with enough frontage may have multiple Monument, Pylon, & Pole signs, but only if they are allowed that many signs and can meet following spacing requirements:

- a. When located on the same property & street, signs must be spaced as follows:

	Monument	Pylon	Pole
Monument	250 ft.	500 ft.	750 ft.
Pylon	500 ft.	1,000 ft.	1,500 ft.
Pole	750 ft.	1,500 ft.	Not Allowed

- b. When located on the same property, signs must be spaced as follows:

	Monument	Pylon	Pole
Monument	125 ft.	250 ft.	375 ft.
Pylon	250 ft.	500 ft.	750 ft.
Pole	375 ft.	750 ft.	Not Allowed

16. **Pylon Signs.** Currently, Pylon signs are not allowed except by Master Sign Plan approval by Planning Commission. However, the current Code has no standards on which Planning Commission could base their decision. The proposed Sign Code allows Pylon Signs without Planning Commission approval, but only when they meet certain standards:
 - c. Only allowed on properties up to 4 acres in size; 1 per property or 1 per 1,000 linear feet of frontage (e.g. a property w/ ½ mile of frontage could have 2 pylons)
 - d. 12' tall max, except may increase up to 24' tall, based on lot size (1 extra foot per ½ acre over 4 acres).
 - e. 95 sf max, except may increase up to 155 sf in size, based on lot size (10 extra sf per acre over 4 acres)
17. **Pole Signs.** Currently, Pole signs are not allowed except in the I-70 Corridor and by Master Sign Plan approval by Planning Commission. Again, the current Code has no standards on which Planning Commission could base their decision. The proposed Sign

Code still only allows Pole Signs by Planning Commission approval, but also provides standards on which Planning Commission can base their decision:

- f. 1 per property in between frontage roads of I-70 or within 400 feet of the edge of the I-70 pavement
 - g. 35' tall max. (This is the current max. & the proposed max.)
 - h. When abutting I-70: 100 sf max, except may increase up to 350 sf in size, based on linear feet of frontage on I-70 (1 extra sf per 5 linear feet along I-70)
 - i. When not abutting I-70: 100 sf max, except may increase up to 200 sf in size, based on acreage (10 extra sf per acre)
18. **Skyline Sign.** Currently, there is no maximum number of Wall Signs a business may request. The proposed Code limits the number of Wall signs to one (1) 'skyline' sign, which is a Wall sign located above the 2nd story. Wall signs on the 1st & 2nd stories still have no maximum number, only a maximum coverage of the wall area. This will only impact true "3-story" buildings (such as hotels), not 2-story buildings with a parapet wall above.
19. **Historic Signs.** Currently, there is no mechanism for Historic signs to be saved. The proposed Code allows a property owner to request to keep their Historic signs. This may be approved by Planning Commission when the sign meets certain standards, such as age (30 years min.), importance to the community's history, uniqueness, etc. Additionally, the Historic Preservation Commission must provide a recommendation to Planning Commission.
20. **3D Signs.** Currently, 3D signs must be approved by Planning Commission, but there are no standards on which they can base their decision. The proposed Sign Code still requires Planning Commission approval of 3D signs but creates criteria on which to base a decision. The proposal requires 3D signs to meet all the requirements of the closest applicable sign type. For example, if a property is only allowed a Monument Sign, only a 3D sign of similar size should be approved. Additionally, the two (2) largest sides of a 3D sign is calculated towards the max. sign area. In contrast, only 1 side of a 2-sided Monument Sign is calculated. Thus, 3D signs will be limited in size accordingly.
21. **Murals.** Currently, murals are only allowed downtown when approved by Planning Commission. The proposed Sign Code allows murals anywhere in the City and still only approved by Planning Commission. The proposed Code also adds a few more criteria to the approval of murals, such as they can only convey a non-commercial message, they must 'add to the existing collection of public art,' and they cannot be painted directly on a building in a way that damages the building when removed. Additionally, the proposed Code requires the Public Art Commission to provide a recommendation to Planning Commission.
22. **Billboards and Digital Billboards:** In December 2012, City Council passed an Ordinance that removed the requirement to take down all non-conforming Billboards by December 2009. Thus, all existing Billboards, whether on I-70, 7 or 40 Highway, or elsewhere in the City, may remain in perpetuity unless they are damaged by at least 50% or when they cease to be used. The proposed Sign Code allows a Digital Billboard to replace any Billboard regardless of its location (e.g. 7 or 40 Hwy), provided that two (2) Billboards not along I-70 are removed and the Digital Billboard is the exact same in dimension and location as the Billboard it replaces. In other words, one (1) Digital Billboard may replace three (3) Billboards.

TEMPORARY SIGNS:

23. **Maximum Allowed Temporary Signs.** Currently, Code allows each business up to 4 temporary sign permits per year but no more than 2 permits simultaneously. One sign per permit can be displayed up to 30 days when attached to a permanent structure, such as building or a light pole. In the case of multi-tenant buildings, a property may have year-

round temporary signage attached to a light-pole or other structure, since each tenant is allowed 4 temporary sign permits per year. The proposed Code allows 4 ground-mounted temporary sign permits per property and 4 building-mounted temporary sign permits per premise (i.e. tenant space). Thus, a shopping center may have year-round building-mounted signage, but ground-mounted or non-building-mounted signage is limited to 4 permits per year. The following table outlines these changes:

	CURRENT	PROPOSED
Building-Mounted Temporary Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: 4 permits per year per business • Time: 30-days per permit, up to 2 permits simultaneously • Place: Must be Building- or Structure-Mounted (e.g. mounted to any permanent structure, but cannot be staked to the ground) • Sign: 1 sign per permit, up to 48 sf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: 4 permits per year per premise (i.e. tenant space) • Time: Time depends on Sign Type, up to 2 permits simultaneously • Place: Must be Building-Mounted • Sign Type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Semi-Permanent Sign: 10% of wall area or 100 sf; Up to 1 year after opening or occupancy ○ Temporary Signs: 48 sf, up to 30 days per permit
Structure-Mounted Temporary Signs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: 4 permits per year per property (regardless of tenants) • Time: Time depends on Sign Type, up to 2 permits simultaneously • Place: Anywhere on the property except Building-mounted (e.g. may be staked into the ground or strung between 2 light poles)
Ground-Mounted Temporary Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit: Prohibited • Time: N/A • Place: N/A • Sign: N/A 	Sign Type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Temporary Signs: 48 sf, up to 30 days per permit ○ Feather Flags: 10 flags or 65' of cumulative height per permit; 13' max. height per flag; up to 30 days per permit

24. **New Temporary Sign Types:** The current Sign Code does not allow feather flags or temporary banners that are staked to the ground. The Citizen & Business Surveys showed the following results when asked if the associated sign should be allowed in Blue Springs:

	Citizens Survey	Business Survey
Allow Feather Flags	52%	73%
Allow Ground-Mounted Banners	65%	82%

The proposed Sign Code allows both feather flags and ground-mounted banners with the restrictions stated in the table from the previous issue above (Issue #23).