

## ZOC Comments – Chapter 6: Signs 12/15/21-1/3/22

ID	Section
#6839	Chapter 6: Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:1/3/2022	ENCODE COMMENTS FROM STAFF FOR: When will the Staff comments on the SIGNS packet be distributed?
#6897	Chapter 6: Signs
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:ryan.reed@loudoun.gov">ryan.reed@loudoun.gov</a> Date:1/3/2022	Comment report is currently being compiled.
#6514	Chapter 6: Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	This section badly needs a Definitions section, perhaps with illustrations.
#6732	Chapter 6: Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Definitions are provided in Chapter 11. We'll add illustrations later. It probably makes sense to have those in the tables located in sections 6.04 - 6.06. In some sign codes, I embed the definitions in the tables, with a cross-reference in the definitions. This tends to keep most of the applicable regulations and definitions together. With enCode's hyperlinking capabilities, however, it probably makes sense to keep the definitions in Chapter 11.

#6517	Chapter 6: Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Mark's paper suggested some good ideas, such as not allowing political signs more than 60 days before an election. I'd like to see ZOC brainstorm that part of the report. For example, is ANY flag permitted, or only those of a government? Can HOAs ban signs, and if so, what kinds of signs.  Like many things brought to ZOC, this section would benefit from general discussion.
#6731	Chapter 6: Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Noted. Political signs are folded into an overall temporary sign category because we cannot call signs out based on their message. However, we can establish content-neutral time limits for temporary signs in general. The same applies to flags - we have to treat flags the same way regardless of their message or user. HOA rules are not affected by the ZO - those are a matter of private contract.
#6497	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Findings, 2nd sentence. It should be "Protect" plural.
#6836	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:ryan.reed@loudoun.gov">ryan.reed@loudoun.gov</a> Date:1/3/2022	Changed to "protects."
#6455	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"CONSULTANT'S REPORT, p. 4 states for the, ""first category (residential/agriculture), it is not clear whether the category refers to districts (i.e., residential districts) or residential/agricultural uses (such as farms, regardless of a farm's zoning district)."" However, 1993 ZO Section 5-1200 clearly shows for -- Residential/agricultural: HOA activity signs, Farm signs, and wayside stand (incl. Christmas Tree, Vineyard/wineries) in this category are a combination of residential and commercial uses. -- Business signs: Bed & Breakfast Inn and Homestay, Country Inn, Guest Farm or Ranch, Rural Retreat, Rural Resort, and Rural Agricultural Corporate Retreat, with no reference to many other business types.  1. The current ZO 1993 acknowledges business/commercial signs in the rural area; why does the ZOR draft not include the same categorization? 2. The current ZO 1993 identified vineyard/winery sign requirements by example for residential/agricultural. Why does ZOR draft for those and other specific uses that are clearly non-residential business operations required to be on a ""farm"" not make an equivalent/consistent categorization?"
#6749	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations

<p>By: Mark White                  Tags: public,staff  <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a>                  Date:12/23/2021</p>	<p>The draft avoids user-based categories or preferences. User preferences can have the same legal effect as content preferences, particularly when the use distinctions are so narrowly defined that they appear to preference some messages over others. That is why this draft draws distinctions between sign regulations based on districts or very broad categories (e.g., residential v. non-residential), rather than narrowly targeted uses.</p>
<p>#6456</p>	<p>6.01 Application of Sign Regulations</p>
<p>By: Maura Walsh-Copeland                  Tags: public  <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a>                  Date:12/12/2021</p>	<p>"CONSULTANT'S REPORT, p. 5, footnote 1 states, ""Sign regulations do not define what constitutes an ""R"" DISTRICT. It is assumed for purposes of this discussion that this refers to "residential" districts other than those enumerated for the A-3 through CR category (R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-8, R-16, R-24, PD-H, and PD-AAAR).""                  How does this ""discussion definition"" adequately address all the residential ""uses"" and locations in other districts, specifically ARN, ARS, A-10, JLMA? "</p>
<p>#6748</p>	<p>6.01 Application of Sign Regulations</p>
<p>By: Mark White                  Tags: public,staff  <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a>                  Date:12/23/2021</p>	<p>The ARN, ARS, and A-10 districts are not described as residential districts, however, in the Categories (6.01.E) we include JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3, JLMA-20 and JLMA-LN in the "Neighborhood" category.</p>
<p>#6457</p>	<p>6.01 Application of Sign Regulations</p>
<p>By: Maura Walsh-Copeland                  Tags: public  <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a>                  Date:12/12/2021</p>	<p>"CONSULTANT'S REPORT, p. 7 Farm Signs --                  The report defines ""Farm signs"" as "" Sign erected or maintained on any farm by the owner or tenant of such farm and relating solely to farm or horticultural produce, livestock, silviculture, or services sold, produced, manufactured or furnished on such farm.""                  We are back again to the question, ""What is the definition of a FARM?""                   IF any type of business operation is required by Code of Virginia (e.g., Sec. 4.1-206.1) to                  -- be located on a farm in the Commonwealth on land zoned agricultural and owned or leased, and                  -- agricultural products, including barley, other grains, hops, or fruit, used by such brewery in the manufacture of its beer are grown on the farm""                  But does NOT produce the requirements outlined in Code of VA, then                  -- does it qualify as a ""farm""? and                  -- if not, should the business operation be reclassified as a commercial business instead of a ""farm"" for the purposes of sign regulations?"</p>
<p>#6747</p>	<p>6.01 Application of Sign Regulations</p>
<p>By: Mark White                  Tags: public,staff  <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a>                  Date:12/23/2021</p>	<p>While staff is working on an updated definition of "farm," the sign report simply recognizes the existing definition of a "farm sign." The revised draft distinguishes between districts (recognized by the concurrence in Reed v. Town of Gilbert as a legitimate way to distinguish sign regulations) but not between users.</p>

#6458	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"CONSULTANT'S REPORT, pp. 10 and 23. DARK SKY ORDINANCES. The report references to the night sky and other ""Dark Sky Ordinance"" impacts are important. Where and when will we see the regulations for ZOR/ZOC review and comment?"
#6746	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Exterior lighting standards are in section 5.12 of the draft. These do not include detailed foot-candle or related provisions found in more detailed "dark sky" ordinances. Section 6.08 has brightness standards, and lighting types are addressed for each sign type/district in 6.04 through 6.06.
#6459	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"CONSULTANT'S REPORT, p. 15. Consultants confirm that, ""the County can set different sign type, dimensional and design standards by zoning district. This should reflect the district character, which in turn relates to the policy area and place types established by the Comprehensive Plan."" The ZOR draft does provide different sign regulation categories at a lower level than zoning district for TPA, SPA and UPA (i.e., the categories of commercial vs. employment/industrial vs. urban/mixed use. Therefore, why were similar sub-categorizations not applied to Rural?"
#6745	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	The rural districts tend to include a different range of uses than most residential districts to accommodate the County's agricultural economy. However, some are more residential in character, and I'll work on splitting those as well.
#6460	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"CONSULTANT'S REPORT, p. 20 Just to see if you're reading comments, my favorite sentence for this topic -- Pedestrian and Transit Users: "" . . . pedestrians tend to move at much slower speeds than motorists . . . "" I sure hope so, unless you've been watching too many superhero movies?!?"
#6744	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	In addition to superheroes, some pro athletes can approach about 18 mph. Mortals like me move at much smaller speeds, especially when walking!

#6461	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
<p>By: Maura Walsh-Copeland          Tags: public  <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a>          Date:12/12/2021</p>	<p>"6.01 APPLICATION OF SIGN REGULATIONS          As indicated in the comments to the Consultant's report, there may be a significant inconsistency/conflict or fatal flaw in the proposed ZOR Sign Ordinance. The ""Purpose"" section includes          -- ""Ensure the compatibility of signs with land uses,""          -- ""Protect property values by facilitating the harmony between residential and commercial uses""          -- ""Complement the character of the comprehensive plan policy areas"" and          -- ""Preserve the residential character of residential neighborhoods.""          However, it has applied only one sign category to over 200,000 acres covering ARN, ARS, and A-10, all lumped as ""rural.""</p> <p>This lump ""rural"" categorization is conflicting and inconsistent with other policy areas/districts that identify sign regulations in the matrices differently for ""residential"" versus ""commercial.""          This is where ""residential"" as a ""use"" creates a major problem, because applying only one set of regulations for all ""rural"" completely ignores/negates the fact that there are both residential and rural economy/business/commercial uses outside of the Suburban Commercial (SC), Rural Commercial (RC), and Village Commercial (VC) districts.</p> <p>Can Rural as a category be further broken down with two columns for all matrices?          RURAL          Rural Res          Rural Econ/Comm/Bus"</p>
#6743	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
<p>By: Mark White          Tags: public,staff  <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a>          Date:12/23/2021</p>	<p>Yes - the sign regulations can distinguish rural residential from rural commercial districts. We will work on revising the tables to do that.</p>
#6486	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
<p>By: Gem Bingol          Tags: public  <a href="mailto:gbingol@pecva.org">gbingol@pecva.org</a>          Date:12/13/2021</p>	<p>6.01 E. Categories--I don't see CR districts. Will signage be regulated through VCOD?</p>
#6742	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
<p>By: Mark White          Tags: public,staff  <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a>          Date:12/23/2021</p>	<p>The current CR districts correspond to Village Residential (VR) in the draft ZO.</p>

#6495	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Purpose statement: I strongly caution you NOT to use purpose language, or to use it only if there is a disclaimer early in the ZO that says it's for guidance only and that text controls.  If you do not do this, I guarantee that there will be litigation when an applicant wants to find a loophole. Worse, a court may say that Purpose equals intent, an that intent supersedes text.
#6741	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	I think it's a good idea to include a rule of interpretation about the role of purpose statements in Chapter 11. Purpose statements are commonly used to explain the intent of regulations, and with regulations that have First Amendment implications this is important to clarify the underlying public purposes.
#6496	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	I compliment Mark for his excellent work on this.
#6740	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Thank you, Charlie!
#6498	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Delete A. Content Neutral. In fact, a number of signs have limitations specifically because of their content, such as real estate signs and political signs. As I suggest, the easiest solution is just to delete this paragraph. It's not necessary anyway.
#6739	6.01 Application of Sign Regulations
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	This draft deliberately does not make content distinctions, as those are generally prohibited by First Amendment caselaw.

#6487	6.02 General Sign Requirements
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public <a href="mailto:gbingol@pecva.org">gbingol@pecva.org</a> Date:12/13/2021	6.02 C If a community wants to add interpretive signs (as an example) then would they need to amend their original master plan and go through the sign-permitting process?
#6753	6.02 General Sign Requirements
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	6.02 C If a project wants to add a sign, it would need to amend the existing master plan unless that sign is already permitted by the terms of the master plan.
#6499	6.02 General Sign Requirements
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	6.02 - General.  I would like to regulate entry features to projects, which makes sense in that they are signifiers just like signs. There should be size limits, lighting specs, etc.
#6752	6.02 General Sign Requirements
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Most project entry features would qualify as ground signs (example: these images popped up in a Google search of "project entry features", and would all qualify as ground signs - <a href="https://www.secplanning.com/project/entry-feature-design/">https://www.secplanning.com/project/entry-feature-design/</a> ). It does make sense to regulate subdivision entry signs separately, as they are typically ground signs are not permitted or customary on a residential lot.
#6502	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Attention-getting devices. Prohibit feather signs. They are intrusive and tacky.
#6837	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:ryan.reed@loudoun.gov">ryan.reed@loudoun.gov</a> Date:1/3/2022	Feather signs added to 6.03.F

#6427	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	I think we should rethink the neon light prohibition in transit and mixed use centers. Such lighting van add to the dynamic of the community.
#6760	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Noted.
#6428	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	Will or does the ordinance distinguish between signs and artistic murals? Would like to see murals permitted as public art.
#6759	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	"Art" is considered a form of speech, and murals are legally considered signs/speech. I am drafting language for those based on the 12/15/21 discussion with ZOC and comments.
#6462	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	6.03 PROHIBITED SIGNS, F. Attention-Getting Devices. How is a "feather flag" classified? Should Feather flags be included in the list of prohibited signs as they have been increasing used all over the County and are a distraction to drivers and cause clutter?
#6758	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Feather signs are added to the list of prohibited signs (see Charlie's comment).



#6500	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Include LEDs along with neon.
#6757	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	LEDs are digital signs. These are regulated by the draft, rather than outright prohibited or left to the SIDP process. If the committee prefers a different approach, let's discuss.
#6501	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	6.03 The prohibition against signs on trees and fences may not be fair. For example, land trusts usually place signs on the fences of properties on which they hold conservation easements.
#6756	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	We could count signs placed on fences toward a project's incidental sign allocation.
#6701	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public <a href="mailto:kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com">kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com</a> Date:12/19/2021	If the definition of a sign is: "Any visual display that comprises letters, words, numerals, figures, logos, trademarks, symbols, emblems, devices, or illustrations, or any combination thereof, which identifies a property, business, product, service, person, or entertainment, but not including, when standing alone, a flag, emblem, badge, or insignia of any governmental unit.", which is found in the '93 ordinance, then a Mural is not necessarily a sign and could be allowed without a sign permit--just as any other work of public art. Do we have a mechanism for controlling what is displayed as public art? Where would that be in the ordinance? What is the impact upon public health, safety or welfare?
#6755	6.03 Prohibited Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Murals include illustrations, and often include text, so they would qualify as a wall sign as currently defined. Per the ZOC discussion, I'll work on regulations that involve design review for these.

#6463	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	6.04 FREESTANDING SIGNS. Can and will matrices for Ground Signs, Pole Signs and Sidewalk Signs differentiate the lump category of "Rural" and "Rural Res" and Rural Econ/comm/biz"?
#6844	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:ryan.reed@loudoun.gov">ryan.reed@loudoun.gov</a> Date:1/3/2022	Staff and the consultant are contemplating further division of "Rural."
#6464	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	<p>"6.04-1 FREESTANDING SIGNS. Ground Signs, Rural Rural sign allowances are a huge increase over what is allowed now. For example, home occupations are allowed 2 sf and B&amp;Bs, 4 sf in the current ordinance and would be allowed up to 45 sf in this proposal. Signs of 4 sf are easily seen on rural roads; there is no other human clutter to interfere with the view. One might think that signs of almost 7 ft by 7 ft would be appropriate for farms of 100 acres or more. However, these proposals would allow these large signs anywhere in the Rural areas.</p> <p>Categorizing all of ARN, ARS and A-10 as ""rural"" in the Rural areas is a misnomer. Although many areas are still generally rural, there are more and more smaller lots (many grandfathered A-3 and newer cluster lots) and many more coming. These are ""suburban-like"" type developments within the Rural districts.</p> <p>Would 45 sf signs be appropriate in these development areas? Would housing developments in the other Neighborhood/Residential/Suburban areas (UPA/SPA/TPA) want signs this big in neighbors yards? (No, they would not.) Many of these suburban incursions in the rural areas look like developments in Suburban districts, houses all along the roads and acreage out back. In addition, lighting of these signs would be allowed just as it will be in heavy use areas such as Commercial.</p> <p>If a residence on 25 acres, with neighbors on 3-5 acre lots closer to the road put up a 45 sf sign, would it impinge on the ""rural"" nature? Yes.</p> <p>In a similar manner, would such a sign for a rural business on 25 acres with neighbors on 3-5 acre lots also impinge on the rural character as described in the Purpose section? Also, yes.</p> <p>Are large signs needed or should they be allowed with the increased use of GPS and internet ""tour maps"" to locate Loudoun's great farm markets, wineries, breweries and such rather than the possibility of large signs? This points to the need for additional sign regulation review and categorization for ""rural."" Large signs in rural ""residential"" areas would add to the woes of many narrow dirt roads.</p> <p>Constituent comment: ""Let's not throw out the baby with the bath water and clutter our rural areas so much that they become unattractive. That will hurt businesses as well as homeowners.""</p>

#6776	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	According to staff, the County recently processed a Board Member Initiative (BMI) to allow greater flexibility in signage for rural businesses to address concerns that rural businesses are located on such large properties that limited sign allowances are inadequate. Signs on lots < 5 acres are reduced to 20 sf, but are kept at 45 sf on larger lots pending further discussion.
#6465	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"6.04-1 FREESTANDING SIGNS. Ground Signs, Commercial Commercial signs total more square footage than currently allowed especially for some commercial entities. Constituent Comment: ""It seems that because we now need everyone in one ""pot"" so to speak, we are changing the ordinance to allow for the biggest sign allowed now to be allowed for everyone. The entire character of the County would change from one where without knowing why, we feel more comfortable in Loudoun than in nearby Fairfax where signs assault the eye in Commercial areas. We breath a sign of relief when we get to Loudoun. Don't change that.""
#6775	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Noted. This draft avoids user preferences for sign allowances, and we are in the process of benchmarking allowances in similar communities. The current ranges in commercial districts range widely between uses, so maybe we can divide the range at a finer level of detail based on lot or building size?
#6466	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"6.04-1 FREESTANDING SIGNS. Pole Signs, Rural The section permits 45 sf (almost 7 sq feet) for all uses (with over 5 acres); the same as allowed in Commercial areas of the County. This drives up the rural clutter and interferes with the rural nature for the many, and rising, number of homeowners. Our rural areas would be greatly changed by these large signs. Lighting of these signs would be allowed just as it will be in heavy use areas such as Commercial."
#6774	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	According to staff, the County recently processed a Board Member Initiative (BMI) to allow greater flexibility in signage for rural businesses to address concerns that rural businesses are located on such large properties that limited sign allowances are inadequate. The draft provides a smaller allowance for smaller lots and is revised to eliminate backlighting per other comments.

#6467	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"6.04- FREESTANDING SIGNS. Commercial, Employment/Industrial and Urban/Mixed Use By lumping all in one category, this draft allows for the large signs now allowed in our biggest heavy use district to be used in all of them. Constituent comment: ""We hope these will be restricted to viewing within the complex and not viewable from any road. Digital signs are very distracting for drivers, especially those with changing messages. We note the fact that our eyes are torn from the road unwillingly to the ever-changing digital signs at schools. Such signs are frequently followed by stoplights, or, school children walking where they should not be.""
#6773	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	Noted. Digital signs are currently allowed by SIDP, and this draft provides standards for them in 6.08 with standards such as hold time provisions to minimize distractions.
#6488	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public <a href="mailto:gbingol@pecva.org">gbingol@pecva.org</a> Date:12/13/2021	Table 6.04-2 Are interpretive signs considered pole signs? If a neighborhood wants to provide permanent environmental or historic information on an interpretive sign, does this mean that only two such signs would be possible in a community that may not be a PD neighborhood with a master plan?
#6772	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	"Interpretive signs" are not defined in the current regulations, but I assume from the comment (#6488) that this means signs that provide environmental or historic information. Those messages could occur on any kind of sign - ground, pole, sidewalk, or any attached or incidental signs. This draft does not define signs by their message, as generally required by law.
#6489	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public <a href="mailto:gbingol@pecva.org">gbingol@pecva.org</a> Date:12/13/2021	6.04-2 Pole signs Same question as in the residential category--how would free-standing interpretive signs that provide environmental or historic information for the public be handled? These might occur after the original plan that maxxed out the number of permitted signs.
#6771	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	I suggest adding a subdivision entry sign category (based on location and not message). To accommodate other types of signs, we could include a freestanding sign allocation for subdivisions or larger properties (maybe > 5 acres as in the rural category). That could accommodate a range of functions on a larger sign that is general out of scale with a residential lot.

#6503	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	These are Ground signs, and their height limit should be 4 feet or less; 5 feet is too massive.
#6770	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	Change made (Rural ground signs from 5' to 4').
#6505	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Suggest only external illumination for ground-mounted signs in RPA. Then define this as a ground-mounted floodlight with no light spread beyond the sign it illuminates.
#6769	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	Change made, and limits on external illumination are added to 6.08 (not to the definitions).
#6504	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Individual signs in RPA: 30/45 sf are much to big. Suggest 20 sf on small lots, 30 sf on larger.
#6768	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	According to staff, the County recently processed a Board Member Initiative (BMI) to allow greater flexibility in signage for rural businesses to address concerns that rural businesses are located on such large properties that limited sign allowances are inadequate. Signs on lots < 5 acres are reduced to 20 sf, but are kept at 45 sf on larger lots pending further discussion.

#6506	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Pole Signs in RPA. The permitted sizes are way too big. A 45 sf sign could be 5' x 9'. That's enormous.
#6767	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	According to staff, the County recently processed a Board Member Initiative (BMI) to allow greater flexibility in signage for rural businesses to address concerns that rural businesses are located on such large properties that limited sign allowances are inadequate. Signs on lots < 5 acres are reduced to 20 sf, but are kept at 45 sf on larger lots pending further discussion.
#6515	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Ground signs in Urban areas should be held to 86 or 8 feet high, not 15 feet.
#6766	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	Change made
#6516	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Why is halo lighting not permitted for ground signs in Urban areas? (Perhaps I don't know what halo lighting is, which reinforces my previous comment that definitions and examples are sorely needed.)
#6765	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	"Halo lit" is defined in Chapter 11 ("Halo Lit: Illumination created by concealing the light source behind three-dimensional opaque letters, numbers, or other characters of a sign, resulting in the nighttime perception of a halo around the silhouette of each character. This is also referred to as "reverse channel" or "reverse lit" illumination. A halo lit sign is not considered an internally illuminated sign.") We will add graphics in later drafts. Meanwhile, here's an article that has some examples of halo lit signs: <a href="https://www.davessigns.com/5-benefits-of-halo-lit-channel-letters/">https://www.davessigns.com/5-benefits-of-halo-lit-channel-letters/</a> These are common for wall signs, but are added here ground signs at your suggestion.

#6702	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public <a href="mailto:kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com">kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com</a> Date:12/19/2021	The Zoning District Categories in the Tables should exactly parallel those identified in 6.01.E Categories. They do not. Is it correct to presume that "Residential" shown on the Table is the same as "Neighborhood" in 6.01.E? If so, please adjust.
#6764	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	Good catch - "Residential" is changed to "Neighborhood" throughout.
#6703	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public <a href="mailto:kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com">kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com</a> Date:12/19/2021	I agree with Maura that in essence, the allowed sign sizes in the Rural area are too large. They are not consistent with the rural environs and detract.
#6763	6.04 Freestanding Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/26/2021	According to staff, the County recently processed a Board Member Initiative (BMI) to allow greater flexibility in signage for rural businesses to address concerns that rural businesses are located on such large properties that limited sign allowances are inadequate. Suggestion: provide a smaller allowance for residential property or property that is < 5 acres, and a larger allowance for non-residential property with > 5 acres (including farms)?
#6430	6.05 Attached Signs
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	The County has permitted digital signs in several commercial areas. If the goal is to not create nonconforming signs, should we permit digital signs in commercial, employment and mixed use areas?
#6790	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	This draft does allow digital signs in commercial, employment and mixed use areas (see Table 6.05-1, line 7).

#6433	6.05 Attached Signs
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	Wall signs in rural area - are these commercial signs or home address signs? I don't see the relationship between lot acreage and number or size of signs. Wouldn't the number of signs be based on number of entrances or buildings; and shouldn't the size be based on setbacks from the road or some function or visibility-related measure?
#6789	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Wall signs are not tied to message (such as a "commercial" message or an address), as constitutionally required. Tying the signs to lot acreage allows the signs to scale to lot size (allowing for wider spacing between signs, for example). Some codes to allow larger signs if they are set back further from the road. Does the ZOC or staff support that approach in the RPA? To what maximum sign area?
#6434	6.05 Attached Signs
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	Cumulative and Individual sign area (lines 4 and 5 - is there a need for a limit on individual sign area if we have a cumulative maximum? Some of our larger individual user buildings could use a single logo that is 20% of the wall area. I do think 20% is a high number. Are these based on actual sign plan applications?
#6788	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	The cumulative and individual sign area categories are based on the current standards (Table 5-1204(D)).
#6435	6.05 Attached Signs
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	Window sign - number allowed - am I correct the standard is 4 per facade or 4 per tenant space? Is there a need to restrict the number if the area limit is 25% of the window area? Is 25% based on local applications? I suggest removing the 10 sf maximum. It seems arbitrary and small. Just go with a % of window area.
#6787	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Window signs are 4 per tenant space per the current standards, but if there are no "tenants" it's 4 per facade. The suggestion to eliminate the number and 10 SF max is noted for discussion. These limits are consistent with the current standards in Table 5-1204(D).



#6468	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	6.05 ATTACHED SIGNS. Can and will matrices for Wall and Window signs differentiate the lump category of "Rural" and "Rural Res" and Rural Econ/comm/biz"?
#6786	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Yes - we can create separate categories for residential and non-residential in rural. This already has separate allowances based on lot size.
#6469	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"6.05 ATTACHED SIGNS, Wall Signs. Greatly appreciate having no animated signs which really distract drivers attention from the road. Larger signs are allowed in rural areas than in other residential areas. Residential areas in the rural areas are not protected. Will this inconsistency be reviewed and rectified by before the 90-day referral?"
#6785	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Noted for discussion.
#6490	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public <a href="mailto:gbingol@pecva.org">gbingol@pecva.org</a> Date:12/13/2021	Table 6.05-1 Wall Signs When rural signs enforcement was triggered in a complaint, I think that a barn mural was also cited.  The suggestion of a artwork/mural category seems like it would be helpful to be a separate category as suggested.
#6784	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Noted - thanks!

#6507	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Wall signs in RPA. The word "Building" is problematic. Logically it would include barns. Here's an example using our farm: 4 barns + 1 house = 5 buildings, so we could have 15 signs! That's nuts. Just change Building to Lot.  The sizes areas seem fine.
#6783	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Change made. According to staff, the County recently processed a Board Member Initiative (BMI) to allow greater flexibility in signage for rural businesses to address concerns that rural businesses are located on such large properties that limited sign allowances are inadequate. However, the definition of "farm sign" currently only includes freestanding signs, so restricting wall signs by lot still provides flexibility for sign displays.
#6508	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Why allow ANY window signs? And if you do, why on earth would a property in the RPA need three?  Under Design, show LED and show LED as not being allowed in the RPA.
#6782	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Window sign are common forms of expression, even in residential areas. Banning them would be unusual. They are very restrict (1.5 sf) in rural areas. LED is already prohibited in the rural districts because it's a form of digital sign.
#6518	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Wall signs in Urban area: The number of facades per building is good. Thanks.
#6781	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Thanks!

#6519	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	I would not allow digital wall signs anywhere.
#6780	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Noted for discussion.
#6520	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Item 6 Wall signs must not extend beyond the edges of the façade, including the building's parapet.  Question: If there's an enclosed mechanical room on the roof, can a wall sign be placed upon it? suggest not, but that should be stated.
#6779	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Clarified here that the facade does not include any rooftop structure (this is a term defined by the International Building Code, which is incorporated by reference as part of the state building code). Also added a definition of "facade" to Chapter 11 ("The exterior wall of a building exposed to public view or a wall viewed by persons not within the building").
#6521	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Allowing 4 window signs per facade in the Urban area, PLUS wall-mounted signs of up to 200 sf per facade is a nasty recipe!
#6778	6.05 Attached Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Do you have examples of buildings meeting these existing standards (some uses get up to 6 wall signs) that are unacceptable?
#6511	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	Temp. Signs - 8 feet high? Too much.

#6792	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Mark White Tags: staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Noted for discussion. This is consistent with the current standard (Table 5-1204(D)(5)).
#6509	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	6.06 A 2. It's "De Minimis."
#6893	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:ryan.reed@loudoun.gov">ryan.reed@loudoun.gov</a> Date:1/3/2022	corrected. thank you.
#6436	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	Do banners include the festival, seasonal banners attached to light poles? If not how are such banners permitted?., Temporary signs line 6 typo - should be 8 ft. Incidental signs Line 6 add the word height. Lines 3, 4, and 5 - if we are allowing one incidental sign per entrance and limiting the individual signs to 2 square feet than we would need 16 entrances to meet the maximum cumulative sign area. - just doesn't seem right. Maybe we could drop the cumulative total?
#6800	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Banners are addressed in Table 5-1204(D). Typos for temporary (line 6) and incidental signs (line 6) are fixed. The maximum cumulative area is for freestanding signs, and the individual area applies only to attached signs. So, if you have two building entries you can have one 32 sf freestanding sign, or two 16 SF signs.

#6470	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	6.06 INCIDENTAL SIGNS. Can and will matrices for Banner Incidental Signs, Generally (E.) differentiate the lump category of "Rural" and "Rural Res" and Rural Econ/comm/biz"?
#6799	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	All of the tables can differentiate residential and non-residential uses in the RPA, as discussed in the other sections.
#6471	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"6.06-INCIDENTAL SIGNS. Banners. The Consultant reports indicates that, ""Loudoun County does not generally allow balloons, banners, pennants, or inflated devices (Section 5-1202(A)(5)). An exception is ornamental/seasonal banners are allowed on lamp posts in PD-CC, PD-SA, PD-TC, PD-TREC, PD-TRC, and PD-MUB (Sign Matrix, Table 5-1204(D)(7)(h))."" Why then, are banners now being allowed without similar type and location restrictions?"
#6798	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Table 6.06-1, line 3 limits banners to lamp posts with the same restrictions provided in Table 5-1204(D)(7)(h).
#6472	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"6.06-2 INCIDENTAL SIGNS. De Minimis Signs. -- The cumulative area for sf is 2 sf, with individual sign area max is 1sf, but the number allowed is blank. Shouldn't the number allowed be 2 to help folks understand the limit? -- Although the cumulative area is listed under Dimensions is 2 sf (line 4) under Design (line 7), digital signs are allowed ""max percent of sign area or 30sf, whichever is greater"" Surely this is either in error and digital signs are /should not be allowed as De Minimis Signs, or this inconsistency needs to be clarified?"
#6797	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	The number is left blank because the sign area is the controlling factor. So, 4 0.5 sf de minimus signs are allowed, for example. The max percent for digital is an inconsistency and is eliminated - thanks for catching that!

#6473	6.06 Incidental Signs
<p>By: Maura Walsh-Copeland          Tags: public  <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a>          Date:12/12/2021</p>	<p>"6.06-3 INCIDENTAL SIGNS. Temporary Signs. How does this category make sense? The section allows for 32 sf signs anywhere in the County including town houses and other residential districts; these would be larger than some of those allowed in Commercial/Industrial areas. There is no limit to the number of signs and no cumulative area.          Although the description at the top describes a limit of 120 days a year, what would prevent a second sign to be put up for 120 days, and the third, etc., meaning that multiple signs could be up all year?          Temporary signs should not be allowed; signs should follow the other sections only. This is a remnant of the Board's problems with those who wanted to express their opinions in signs in an unlimited manner.            The Consultant's Report (p. 14) states, ""Courts have upheld reasonable restrictions on size, height, setback, spacing, and the color of signs as well as bans on temporary, overhanging, free-standing, rooftop, windblown, moving, flashing, and illuminated signs.""          Additional review, clarification and regulations should be applied to ""temporary"" signs. Will this be done before the 90-day ZOR public review?"</p>
#6796	6.06 Incidental Signs
<p>By: Mark White          Tags: public,staff  <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a>          Date:12/27/2021</p>	<p>The concerns are noted, and this is consistent with the current regulations (Table 5-1204(D)(5)). As to placing multiple temporary signs during successive 120-day periods, this seems to be allowed by the current regulations and the regulations could resolve this with a limit on their number. The incidental sign section below debits the temporary signs toward the maximum number of incidental signs, so putting too many temporary signs on a property would limit the ability to place other incidental signs.</p>
#6474	6.06 Incidental Signs
<p>By: Maura Walsh-Copeland          Tags: public  <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a>          Date:12/12/2021</p>	<p>"6.06-4 INCIDENTAL SIGNS. Residential (a.k.a. ""neighborhood"") areas are not allowed to use Incidental signs, while Rural areas, with many residences, are allowed up to 6. Although 6 are allowed at 2 sf each, the cumulative area is 32 sf which could be construed to mean 16 signs. Is this an error?          Line #6 has no title.          Constituent Comment: ""Yards with many signs could detract from their neighbor's property values. Who would buy a home next to a neighbor using multiple signs?""          How do Incidental signs differ from De Minimus signs? Can a homeowner or business use both? This would allow 6 Incidental signs plus 2 De Minimus signs plus unlimited temporary signs (for 120 days each). "</p>

#6795	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	There was an internal conflict for neighborhood signs, which said "N" but then had maximum area and height. This is corrected to "Y." For the RPA, only 2 incidental signs (at 2 sf, or 4 SF total) may be attached, and the cumulative area applies to freestanding signs. So, if there are 2 x 2 attached incidental signs, up to 4 incidental freestanding signs are allowed (which could be 8 SF apiece). The temporary sign regulation is in the current regulations and the concerns are noted. We have to allow a reasonable number of incidental/temporary signs for free speech purposes - for example, during elections, while a house is for sale, to express an opinion, etc. This sets a limit on those.
#6491	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public <a href="mailto:gbingol@pecva.org">gbingol@pecva.org</a> Date:12/13/2021	Table 6.06-1 Banners  Is it possible for a vinyl, fence-mounted banner to be considered as a substitute for a pole-mounted, freestanding sign?
#6794	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	It's possible, but that would not allow much sign area (unless you mean that they could have a ground sign, but not a pole sign). Is that the intent here?
#6510	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	An 8 sf banner on every lamppost? Sounds crazy.
#6793	6.06 Incidental Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Noted for discussion. This is consistent with the current standard (Table 5-1204(D)(7)(h)).
#6512	6.07 Historic Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	6.07 A. Is not written well. It should read more like this: "...have a sign to designate a Historic Landmark..."

#6802	6.07 Historic Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	This language reads that the sign designates the landmark? I don't follow. The draft allows a property owner to apply to designate a sign as a landmark.
#6513	6.07 Historic Signs
By: Charles Houston Tags: public <a href="mailto:CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com">CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com</a> Date:12/13/2021	6.07 B and C. I see now that you are considering a sign to be an Historic Landmark. Any example of one? Weird.
#6801	6.07 Historic Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Some communities protect signs in historic areas or on landmarks (such as painted "ghost" signs for businesses or institutions that were part of the building or area's history).
#6437	6.08 Illuminated and Digital Signs
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	I forget the correct term but should we or do we have a limit on the rate at which a display sign changes messages?
#6804	6.08 Illuminated and Digital Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	Yes - hold time (see C.2).
#6475	6.08 Illuminated and Digital Signs
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"6.08 ILLUMINATED AND DIGITAL SIGNS. Digital signs should not be allowed to change messages continuously; this is a dangerous type of sign because of their distractive nature. Many jurisdictions do prohibit them. Constituent Comment: ""I recently saw a truck at the intersection of King and Market Streets with the whole side of the truck (mid-sized) a digital screen. Try not looking at it!""
#6803	6.08 Illuminated and Digital Signs
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	This draft establishes a hold time consistent with VDOT standards. It's certainly common to have longer hold times - such as 8 seconds (instead of 4).



#6440	6.09 Sign Permits and Administration
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:12/9/2021	Legislative review of sign plan or minor revisions is a terrible waste of time and money in my opinion, particularly when it comes to number and size of signs. The Zoning Administrator should be given more discretion to grant revisions and allow an applicant to appeal to the BZA or PC.
#6736	6.09 Sign Permits and Administration
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Noted - thanks!
#6476	6.09 Sign Permits and Administration
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	"6.09 SIGN PERMITS AND ADMINISTRATION. C. Sign Development Plan (SIDP) What is an example for 4.c. ""The plan must demonstrate compatibility with, and be subordinate to, the structures and land uses referenced by the sign""?"
#6735	6.09 Sign Permits and Administration
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	As part of a sign plan application, the applicant must demonstrate that the size, location, and type of sign are compatible with and subordinate to the development they will advertise. Signs should use materials, size, and location that are harmonious or consistent with the development. For example, a plastic-cabinet pole sign with a face that extends 10' above the front brick building facade is not compatible or subordinate to the facade. However, a monument sign that is only 10' tall and 50' in area with a brick background structure and a small digital portion of the face in front of a 35' tall brick structure is subordinate to that structure, and likely compatible with it.
#6492	6.09 Sign Permits and Administration
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public <a href="mailto:gbingol@pecva.org">gbingol@pecva.org</a> Date:12/13/2021	I agree with John on when the zoning administrator should be able to use discretion in granting a minor modification.
#6734	6.09 Sign Permits and Administration
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/23/2021	Noted-thanks!



#6477	6.10 Sign Measurements
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public <a href="mailto:Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com">Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com</a> Date:12/12/2021	6.10 SIGN MEASUREMENTS. Currently the County allows additional material attached to the sign making it appear, sometimes, twice as big as that allowed. Because the County does not count it as part of the sign, we are seeing extra-large signs appear around the County. How will the regulations stop signs from adding additional material and "pretending" that it is not part of the sign?
#6805	6.10 Sign Measurements
By: Mark White Tags: public,staff <a href="mailto:mwhite@planningandlaw.com">mwhite@planningandlaw.com</a> Date:12/27/2021	This draft eliminates the "background structure" and measures the entire sign face and background as a whole.