



Rochester Hills Master Report

1000 Rochester Hills
Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
(248) 656-4660
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

File Number: 2004-0907

File Number: 2004-0907 **File Type:** Ordinance **Status:** For Introduction
Version: 2 **Reference:** **Controlling Body:** City Council Work Session
Requester: **Cost:** **Introduced:** 10/20/2004
File Name: Sign Ordinance **Final Action:**

Title: Acceptance for First Reading - An Ordinance to amend Chapter 134, Signs, of the code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan to Modify Sign Regulations, Repeal Conflicting Ordinances and Prescribe a Penalty for Violations.

Notes: 4/28/05 CDV recommend Council Workshop

Code Sections:

Indexes: Ordinance Change, Signs

Sponsors:

Attachments: Agenda Summary.pdf, Ordinance Amendment Chapter 134 Signs.pdf, Sign Ordinance Table - Revisions 11-2-05.pdf, Sign Ordinance Comparison Chart.pdf, 100704 Anzek Ltr Sign Ord.pdf, Master Report.pdf, Supplemental Information.pdf, Sign Ordinance Summary.pdf

Agenda Date:

Agenda Number:

Enactment Date:

Enactment Number:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	City Council Work Session	10/27/2004	Discussed				
<p>Notes: <i>Mr. Scott Cope, Director of Building/Ordinance Enforcement; Mr. Bob White, Supervisor of Ordinance Services; and Mr. John Sage, Ordinance Inspector, distributed a spreadsheet that compared Rochester Hill's existing Sign Ordinance to those in other municipalities.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Hill asked that, rather than re-examining the entire ordinance, the Sign Board of Appeals (SBA) identify the specific portions of the ordinance that are of concern.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Colling noted the following issues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Height of pole signs. * Height of monument signs. * Set backs. * Number of tenants on a sign. <p><i>He stressed that sign visibility seems to be of greatest concern. He noted that the ordinance's height restriction is "on the minimum end" compared to other communities. He</i></p>							

questioned whether Rochester Hills is being too restrictive.

Mr. Rosen concurred that the issue of sign height is the primary complaint of businesses that appear before the SBA.

Mr. Staran discussed the issue of tenant sign limitations, noting that the City is currently involved in litigation regarding the limit of four (4) tenants per panel sign.

Mayor Somerville questioned why the City would permit the construction of a multiple storefront complex and then not permit signage for all tenants.

Mr. Colling requested that there be some flexibility written into the ordinance when there is an "exceptional case." He asked that the ordinance allow the SBA "the necessary latitude it needs to come to a reasonable, sane solution."

Ms. Raschke noted that Crittenton Hospital needs better signage, as it is often mistaken for an office building.

Some of the suggestions made by SBA members for leeway in applying the ordinance are as follows:

- * A range of heights instead of one set limit.
- * More flexibility when allowing increased sign size in conjunction with setbacks.
- * A "percentage manipulation" (perhaps of 25%) allowing leeway when determining an appropriate sign height.

Ms. Hill concurred that the City sign ordinance needs to maintain standards but should include language that permits exceptions or waivers that "further the intent and purpose of the ordinance."

The consensus of City Council was that Mr. Staran would be tasked to incorporate the suggestions presented during the joint Work Session into a new draft of the Sign Ordinance to be brought back before City Council for further consideration.

1 Community Development 01/27/2005 Discussed
& Viability Committee

Notes: Scott Cope, Building Director, made the following presentation:

- * Sign Ordinance review is a "stand alone" apart from the Ordinance.
- * Building Department regulates Sign Ordinance.
- * Meeting between City Council and Sign Board of Appeals generated direction for Administration and City Attorney.
- * City Attorney is currently drafting language to allow the Sign Board of Appeals flexibility regarding decisions over Sign issues.
- * Additional Sign issues that have developed:
 - * Crittenton Hospital requested additional Emergency signage off Livernois and University
 - * Crittenton Hospital requested additional Directional "H" signage off major highways.
 - * Medical Office buildings along M59 corridor requested directional signage.

- * *Enough different sign issues warranted a closer inspection of Ordinance Language.*
 - * *Planning Department and Building Department Ordinance Inspectors will review Ordinance Language to:*
 - * *Identify and Clarify Sign Language sections of Ordinance.*
 - * *Clarify definition of a Business Center.*
 - * *Clarify how many tenants can be on one Sign.*
 - * *Determine duration Temporary Signs can remain displayed.*
 - * *City does see a need to address sign challenges and work with community businesses without discarding the Ordinance.*
 - * *City needs to consider the following when Sign Ordinance is amended:*
 - * *Maintain an attractive look for the City.*
 - * *Help the business community succeed.*
 - * *Make businesses easier for residents to locate.*
 - * *Sign Ordinance currently reflects legal language that is disputed and misinterpreted.*
 - * *Amendments should reflect straight forward language that is simple to understand without dispute or misinterpretation.*
- Mr. Cope concluded stating that Sign Issue will then be brought back before Community Development & Viability Committee for recommendations and to move forward to City Council.*

1 Community Development 04/28/2005 Recommended for City Council Work
& Viability Committee Approval Session

Notes: *Robert White and Jack Sage, Building Department, made a presentation explaining how staff reviewed, updated and clarified the entire Sign Ordinance Language without changing the intent of the original ordinance.*

Committee was presented with a spreadsheet that reflected the following:

- * *What was changed*
- * *The reason for the change*
- * *Impact on Ordinance*

It was recommended by the Committee that this item be referred to a Council Workshop.

Text of Legislative File 2004-0907

..Title

Acceptance for First Reading - An Ordinance to amend Chapter 134, Signs, of the code of Ordinances of

the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan to Modify Sign Regulations, Repeal Conflicting Ordinances and Prescribe a Penalty for Violations

..Body

RESOLVED: That an Ordinance to amend Chapter 134, Signs, of the code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan to Modify Sign Regulations, Repeal Conflicting Ordinances and Prescribe a Penalty for Violations is hereby accepted for First Reading.