

City of Winsted
Planning Commission
City Council Chambers
February 13, 2013
6:00 p.m.

Present: JoLynn Cafferty
Marvin Ebensperger
Mike Guggemos
Allison Moses
Mike Thonvold
Tom Ollig (Council Liaison)

Staff Present: Raquel Kirchoff, Administrative Assistant

1) Call the Meeting to Order

Mr. Ebensperger called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2) Approval of Minutes

Ms. Cafferty motioned to approve the minutes from the Planning Commission Meeting on January 16, 2013. Mr. Guggemos seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

3) No Public Hearings

4) Old Business

a) Sign Ordinance

Mr. Ebensperger stated that John Anderson, from Municipal Development Group, provided an electronic mail (e-mail) response to the items that the Planning Commission had questions on regarding the draft Sign Ordinance from the Planning Commission meeting on January 16, 2013. Mr. Ebensperger stated that the Planning Commission would review each response that Mr. Anderson provided for each section of the Sign Ordinance.

- **In Section E.** "Except as otherwise provided in this section, no sign or structure shall be erected, constructed, altered, rebuilt, relocated or existing sign structure expanded a permit has been issued by the Zoning Administrator or designee.", a word is missing in the first sentence "...existing sign structure expanded _____ a permit has..."

The Planning Commission members stated that they agreed with the word "until" that Mr. Anderson inserted.

- **In Section E.1.** "The content of the message or speech displayed on the sign shall not be reviewed or considered in determining whether to approve or deny a sign permit.", the Planning Commission is confused on this statement because it is in direct conflict with language later limiting profanity and off premises advertising. Does the ordinance need this statement?

Mr. Anderson's e-mail response to this question was as follows: "'Off premise advertising is not the content of a sign since advertising can take many forms. Profanity is regulated by State Statutes so I am not exactly sure the background to that but I do think that should be referenced.'" The Planning Commission members were satisfied with Mr. Anderson's recommendation to leave the wording as he originally drafted it.

- **In Section F.9.** "Temporary signs pertaining only to a property upon which it is displayed. Such signs shall not exceed ten (10) square feet for residential property or forty (40) square feet for other properties. One (1) sign shall be permitted for each lot and must be removed within thirty (30) days", it was brought up that in the last sentence the word "lot" should be replaced with "street frontage" as that is what is referred to throughout the document. Another question on the wording is, does it mean a thirty (30) day period per year or can you have a sign up for thirty (30) days, take it down for a day and put it back up?

Mr. Anderson changed the wording to clarify this section to “Temporary signs pertaining only to a property upon which it is displayed as regulated in section 1501.23, letter H, number 11 of this chapter.” The Planning Commission members were satisfied with this language.

- **In Section G.4.** that speaks about prohibited signs on municipal property, language needs to be drafted to allow for more signs on City property. Examples of when signs need to be on City property are the Women’s Expo signs (that is a Chamber of Commerce sponsored event) and also banners placed at ball fields by the Little League to show sponsors.

Mr. Anderson changed the wording for this section to “Sign placed on municipal property, other than official signs for City or Chamber of Commerce use and signs located in the A Airport District as regulated by section 1501.023, letter J, number 3b of this chapter.” The Planning Commission members were satisfied with this language.

- **In Section G.6.,** change “Signs placed on vehicles or trailers which are parked or placed for the primary purpose of displaying said sign.” to “Signs greater than forty (40) square feet placed on vehicles...” This would allow for some of this type of sign throughout the city, but not large trailers.

Mr. Anderson’s e-mail response to this was that he left the language as is for now and that this item will need discussion since the City’s current Sign Ordinance prohibits this type of sign.

The Planning Commission members discussed this type of sign again and still agreed that they would like to see some of these signs allowed on a temporary basis, so they would like the wording changed to “Signs greater than forty (40) square feet placed on vehicles or trailers which are parked or placed for the primary purpose of displaying said sign.”

- **In Section G.9.,** the Planning Commission would like to allow flashing signs in areas other than R-1 Single Family Residential Districts, R-2 Multiple Family Residential Districts, and R-M Manufactured Home Districts.

Mr. Anderson changed the wording to “Flashing signs and signs with zooming, twinkling, sparkling or flashing illumination in the R-1, R-2, and R-M zoning districts.” The Planning Commission members were satisfied with this language.

- **Section G.14.** can be deleted because the Planning Commission wants to allow off premises signs.

Mr. Anderson’s e-mail response to this was that he left the language as is for now and that this item will need discussion since the City’s current Sign Ordinance prohibits this type of sign.

The Planning Commission discussed this type of sign again and would like to allow it on a temporary basis for occasions like grand openings and special events. The Planning Commission members were satisfied with the present draft language of “All off premises commercial content signs except temporary portable signs, banners, pennants and similar devices placed on non-residential private property for grand openings and special events as regulated by section 1501.023, letter H, number 11.e. of this chapter.”

- **Section G.15. Multivision Signs** - The Planning Commission wants to know why it is recommended to prohibit these signs.

Mr. Anderson’s e-mail response to this question was “This type of sign can be considered distracting to drivers which can cause accidents due to the movement taking place with the sign.” The Planning Commission members were satisfied to leave the language as is which prohibits this type of sign. If a business would want to install this type of sign, it could request a variance and then the Planning Commission could handle this type of sign on a case by case basis.

- **Section G.16. Shimmering Signs** - The Planning Commission wants to know why it is recommended to prohibit these signs.

Mr. Anderson’s e-mail response to this question was “This type of sign can be considered distracting to drivers which can cause accidents due to the movement taking place with the sign.” The Planning Commission members were satisfied to leave the language as is which prohibits this

type of sign. If a business would want to install this type of sign, it could request a variance and then the Planning Commission could handle this type of sign on a case by case basis.

- **Section G.17. Video Display Signs** – The Planning Commission wants to know why it is recommended to prohibit these signs.

Mr. Anderson's e-mail response to this question was "This type of sign can be considered distracting to drivers which can cause accidents due to the movement taking place with the sign." The Planning Commission members were satisfied to leave the language as is which prohibits this type of sign. If a business would want to install this type of sign, it could request a variance and then the Planning Commission could handle this type of sign on a case by case basis.

- **In Section H.11.b.**, in the second sentence, should "residential properties" be changed to R-1 Single Family Residential Districts, R-2 Multiple Family Residential Districts, and R-M Manufactured Home Districts?

Mr. Anderson's e-mail response to this question was "The intent is to limit to residential properties. You can have a residential property in other zoning districts than R-1, R-2, and R-M. They would be grandfathered in and be legal non-conforming residential uses. I would recommend keeping "residential properties". The Planning Commission members were satisfied with Mr. Anderson's recommendation to keep the language as is.

- **Section H.11.c.**, this section can be deleted.

Mr. Anderson's e-mail response to this was that he left the language as is for now and that this item will need discussion since the City's current Sign Ordinance prohibits this type of sign.

The Planning Commission members discussed this type of sign again. The current trailer signs in Winsted would be grandfathered in when the new ordinance is adopted. With these signs that will be grandfathered in, anyone wanting to advertise on this sign could pursue the owner of the sign to advertise for their organization.

Mr. Ollig stated that in previous discussions, the Planning Commission members liked the idea of the Winsted Area Chamber of Commerce installing signage on County Road 1 directing traffic to the different downtown businesses in Winsted.

These options would provide some opportunity for businesses to advertise off premise, so the Planning Commission members were satisfied with keeping the language as Mr. Anderson had it in the draft ordinance.

- **In Section H.11.e.**, Delete "Off-premises" and begin with Portable.

Mr. Anderson's email response to this was that he left the language as is for now and that this item will need discussion since the City's current Sign Ordinance prohibits this type of sign.

The Planning Commission members discussed this section and were satisfied with keeping the language that Mr. Anderson had in the draft ordinance.

- **In Section H.12.** "Wall Sign: Wall signs may not extend more than eighteen inches (18") from the wall they are attached to. Wall signs may not exceed more than twenty percent (20%) of the wall area that they are affixed to." Does this need to be further defined so the allowing signs to extend 18" means only out from the wall and not above the wall?

Mr. Anderson's e-mail response stated that he added language to this section to address this concern and the Planning Commission was satisfied with Mr. Anderson's amendment.

- **In Section H.15.** "Awning Sign: There is a minimum of eight feet (8') of clearance under the base of the awning sign to the ground below." Should this paragraph start with "Allowed provided" there is a minimum...

Mr. Anderson changed the language to start with "Allowed provided..." per the Planning Commission's request.

- **Section H.19.** can be deleted. The Planning Commission would rather have this limited by regular guidelines for space.

Mr. Anderson deleted this language per the Planning Commission's request.

- **In Section H.20.** "Address Signs. Except for farm buildings, at least one address sign identifying the correct property number shall be required on each principal building in all districts. The number shall be at least three inches (3") in height." Extend this paragraph to be "...in height and of a contrasting nature to be visible from the property line."

Mr. Anderson changed the language per the Planning Commission's request.

- **In Section 24.c.** "Electronic graphic display or dynamic display signs may be used for all or part of an on-premises sign that displays a commercial or noncommercial message. Electronic graphic display or dynamic display signs may not display off-premises commercial advertising." Delete ... "signs may not display off-premises commercial advertising."

Mr. Anderson's e-mail response to this was that he left the language as is for now and that this item will need discussion since the City's current Sign Ordinance prohibits this type of sign.

The Planning Commission members discussed this type of sign and want Mr. Anderson to remove the last sentence from this section - "Electronic graphic display or dynamic display signs may not display off-premises commercial advertising."

- **In Section 24.f.** "As measured at the property line, the maximum light emanation from an electronic graphic display or dynamic display sign shall be no greater than zero point two (.2) foot candles." Where did the 0.2 foot candles number come from? Why is the number 0.2?

Mr. Anderson's e-mail response to this question was that he was uncertain where the 0.2 foot candles came from and believes it relates to engineering. He stated that he will look for the answer. Mr. Ebensperger stated that he also tried to research the answer for this question online and could not find any information regarding this number.

Mr. Ebensperger stated that this concluded the questions and changes that the Planning Commission had asked Mr. Anderson to respond to the Commission on. He asked if there were any other comments or questions.

Mr. Ollig stated that since Mr. Thonvold is a new member of the Planning Commission, he would review the process for the ordinance. It was the intention of the Planning Commission to have the Winsted Area Chamber of Commerce review the ordinance and discuss it at a meeting, once the Planning Commission agreed on draft language. If the Winsted Area Chamber of Commerce had any concerns regarding the ordinance, they would let the Planning Commission know and the language could be addressed again.

Mr. Thonvold asked who approves the ordinance? Mr. Ollig stated that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the ordinance to the City Council, who has the final approval of the ordinance.

Mr. Ebensperger stated that the changes discussed will be incorporated into the draft ordinance and the ordinance will be reviewed by the Winsted Area Chamber of Commerce.

b) Winsted Pride Awards

Mr. Ebensperger stated that residents have requested that the time of year that the judging of the Pride Award be changed to take full advantage of landscaping flowers and plants that residents have planted. The Planning Commission members discussed the time of year for the judging and stated that they would like to have the judging event in June.

The Planning Commission members reviewed the new judging form and agreed on the new format, stating that it was more clear than the old form. They agreed that the new form was sufficient for judging.

5) No New Business

6) Other Business

a) New Planning Commission Member - Mike Thonvold

Mr. Ollig welcomed new Planning Commission Member Mike Thonvold.

b) March 2013 Planning Commission Meeting

The Planning Commission members stated that the Planning Commission meetings can go back to the second Monday of the month at 6:00 p.m.

7) Adjournment

Ms. Cafferty motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Thonvold seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Raquel Kirchoff

Raquel Kirchoff,
Administrative Assistant
City of Winsted