



Planning & Zoning Board Work Session Minutes

January 28, 2025 at 12:00 PM

Chapman Room
401 S. Park Avenue

Present

David Bornstein, Warren Lindsey, Jason Johnson

Absent

Alex Stringfellow, Jim Fitch, Michael Spencer, Bill Segal

Staff Present

Director of Planning & Zoning Allison McGillis. Senior Planner/Zoning Official John Harbilas, Planner II Nicholas Lewis, Planner I Corinna Lundgren, Administrative Coordinator Mary Bush

1. Meeting Called to Order

Chairman Bornstein called the meeting order at 12:03 p.m.

2. Discussion Item (s)

- a.
 - Sign code challenges/potential changes
 - Upcoming work session topics

Mr. Harbilas began a discussion on sign code challenges and potential changes. He noted that the code has not been significantly updated in the past several decades, so staff receives a lot of notices, inconsistencies, questions, and clarification requests on certain topics in the code. He indicated that there is a lot of extra verbiage, conflicting verbiage, and things that are not clear in the code. He then continued discussion on the appropriateness of all the main sign types allowed in the city while providing pictures and examples of them. He started off with awning signs, which he indicated are the most common signs in the downtown, Orange Avenue, and Hannibal Square areas of the city. A brief discussion ensued regarding whether allowing for both an awning and wall sign is appropriate, if the city has an official font used for city signage, having uniformity in terms of size and font of signs, if staff had reviewed the sign codes of other cities and towns, and if there is a surrounding municipality with a more restrictive sign code than Winter Park.

Mr. Harbilas then discussed banners, noting that they are a prohibited sign type. He explained that the banners are supposed to be temporary, but some businesses do not take them down. He also explained that the prohibition of banners has hindered businesses from being able to post banners for temporary activities such as grand

openings. A brief discussion ensued on the Board's preference for allowing temporary banner signs. Mr. Harbilas then discussed canopy signs, noting that they are very popular in more urban areas and that the city's code allows them above and below eaves and canopies for various purposes. He noted that the most common ones are placed on the underside of canopies and that the code allows a business to have both a wall sign and a canopy sign. A brief discussion ensued about limiting the amount of space a canopy sign can take up on the facade of a business and the process for signage when opening a business in the city. Mr. Harbilas then began discussion about ground signs, noting that they are the most prevalent along the city's main corridor of U.S. 17-92, Lee Road, and Fairbanks Avenue. He explained that the main issue with them is that, although the sign code indicates that when a property is redeveloped, any non-conforming signs must be removed, if there is no redevelopment and just a change in tenancy, these signs can end up remaining. He further explained that there needs to be a change to when a ground sign must be removed rather than it being tied to redevelopment of a property. A brief discussion ensued regarding making the removal requirement based on a minimal percentage of renovation, whether the sign code distinguishes between pole and monument signs, prohibiting pole signs, examples of sign requests that have been denied, if pole and monument signs are restricted in height, requiring all ground signs to be monument signs, and how to enforce the requirement on existing non-monument ground signs.

Mr. Harbilas then discussed murals, noting that the sign code indicates they cannot be commercial in nature and must go before the City Commission for approval. He indicated that a clear and easy process for approving murals was needed. A brief discussion ensued about the difference between murals on commercial buildings and those on residences, what is considered a commercial mural, and the type of restrictions that should be applied to murals. Mr. Harbilas then continued the discussion and spoke about projective signs. He noted that these signs sit perpendicular to the front of a building and a wall sign is allowed in addition to them. A brief discussion ensued regarding whether both projective and wall signs should be allowed together, reducing the size allowed for projective signs, and where projective signs should be allowed. Mr. Harbilas then briefly discussed wall signs, and the Board suggested that, due to their complexity, it might be ideal for the city to consider obtaining a consultant to assist with creating a provision for wall signs.

Mrs. McGillis then began discussion about temporary signs, noting that they tend to create a difficult battle for code enforcement and many of them exceed the allowed 12 square foot size and end up being posted more than temporarily. She indicated that requiring a permit for the signs could help with keeping them in compliance and no more than temporarily posted. A brief discussion ensued regarding the process of code enforcement addressing non-compliant temporary signs and how often the fines for non-compliance are collected. Discussion then ensued about the Board obtaining a list of pocket parks owned by the city, regulations regarding for-sale signs,

and topics for future work sessions. The Board requested to receive an update on the South of Fairbanks Avenue (SOFA) district for a future work session.

3. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:59 p.m.

ATTEST:

/s/ Mary Bush, Recording Secretary