

MEETING AGENDA

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016 AT 9:00 A.M.
SUN VALLEY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TO BE HELD IN SUN VALLEY COUNCIL CHAMBER AT CITY HALL

1. **Call To Order**

The Idaho Code requires that, "...A member or employee of a [Planning and Zoning] Commission shall not participate in any proceeding or action when the member or employee or his employer, business partner, business associate, or any person related to him by affinity or consanguinity within the second degree has an economic interest in the procedure or action." Any actual or potential interest in any proceeding shall be disclosed at or before any meeting at which the action is being heard or considered. A knowing violation of this section shall be a misdemeanor.

2. **Public Comment**

Opportunity for the public to talk with the Planning and Zoning Commissioners about general issues and ideas not otherwise agendized below (3 minutes max. each).

3. **Consent Agenda**

A. Draft Minutes from the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting of January 14, 2016.

4. **New Business**

A. Design Review #2016-01: Application for a proposed main level remodel and a 654 square foot, second story addition to an existing residence in the Single-Family Residential (RS-1) Zoning District. Applicant: Jolyon H. Sawrey for Maud Alison Long Trust. Location: 700 Fairway Rd; Lot 20 Upper Fairway Subdivision No. 2.

5. **Continued Business**

A. Discussion and possible action on revisions to the City's Sign Regulations (SVMC 9-3F), changing content-based standards to form-based standards.

6. **Discussion Items**

7. **Adjourn**

Meeting Schedule:

Regular Meeting at 9:00 am on Thursday, March 10, 2016

DRAFT
Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission
January 14, 2016

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Sun Valley, Blaine County, State of Idaho, met in regular session in the Council Chambers of Sun Valley City Hall on January 14, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.

1. [Call To Order](#)

Jake Provonsha called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Present: Vice Chair Jake Provonsha, Commissioners John O'Connor, Bill Boeger, and Sherri Newland.

Also Present: Community Development Director Jae Hill; Associate Planner Abby Rivin; City Attorney Adam King; City Clerk Alissa Weber; Mayor Peter Hendricks; and Michael Bulls.

3. [Consent Agenda](#)

A. [Draft Minutes from the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting of November 12, 2015;](#)

Jake Provonsha noted the spelling of Doug Clemens' name was incorrect in portions of the minutes and requested it be changed.

MOTION

Commissioner John O'Connor moved to approve the minutes from the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting of November 12, 2015 with the requested changes, seconded by Commissioner Bill Boeger. All in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

2. [Public Comment](#)

No comments.

4. [New Business](#)

A. [Discussion and possible action on revisions to the City's Sign Regulations \(SVMC 9-3F\), changing content-based standards to form-based standards.](#)

Community Development Director Jae Hill gave an update on a fence reviewed at the prior Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. He stated the wire had been removed and the applicant was developing a vegetation plan. He stated they plan to place wire half of the way up the interior of the fence.

Commissioner Boeger asked for an update on the wireless data structures that were placed on the top of the Sun Valley Lodge. Jae Hill stated he looked at the building applications during the remodel and the antennae were not a part of that application. The Commission discussed what could be done to mitigate their appearance, and Jae Hill stated he would place the issue on a future Planning and Zoning Commission meeting agenda.

Chairman Herich arrived at meeting.

Jae Hill gave an overview of the recent Supreme Court case, *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, regarding sign ordinances. He stated the decision requires ordinances to be content neutral when regulating signs. He noted the current City Code is not compliant and suggested the Commission consider changes. The Commission held a discussion about the different ways in which the Supreme Court decision could affect the City Code.

Jae Hill presented a table showing the existing code juxtaposed with suggested changes to bring it into compliance. He also discussed Idaho Senate Bill 1138, passed in 2013, that requires Commission approvals and denials to be based on express standards. He noted the City Code needed to be updated to come into compliance with that as well.

In response to a question by Commissioner O'Connor, Jae Hill explained that many homeowners associations in the City have covenants that restrict certain signs. He noted they can do this because they are private entities. However, there are areas not controlled by HOAs and the City must plan for the entire community. The Commission and staff held a conversation about various types of signs and how they could be regulated under the new rules. Jae Hill emphasized the City could regulate signs by category by limiting certain aspects such as size and materials. However, the City could not differentiate between different types of "temporary" signs, such as real estate or political signs.

The Commission held a conversation about how to regulate temporary sign size, and whether a total sign square footage per property was reasonable or if there were other ways to establish limits.

The Commission discussed Ketchum's sign ordinance. Jae Hill pointed out that ordinance included pictures of various sign types, which could be helpful to include in Sun Valley's new ordinance.

Commissioner Provonsha asked about the definition of lighting temperature. Jae Hill explained the scale. Commissioner Provonsha asked that the word "pleasing" be removed from the definition, as that indicated subjectivity. Chairman Herich stated his discomfort with including elements such as lighting temperature, as regulating that much would place severe limits on designs. The Commission and staff discussed inclusion of this proposed requirement. Jae Hill stated he would request a sign manufacturer come to present more information about the topic.

Commissioner O'Connor asked about limitations on how high certain signs can be placed. Jae Hill noted the current code does have a minimum clearance and maximum height requirements by sign type. He stated that real estate signs currently have less regulation, but that will change as they are categorized with other signs to meet the content-neutral requirement.

The Commission discussed the intersection of the sign ordinance with the City's dark sky ordinance. Chairman Herich requested they cross-reference each other and be consistent.

Commissioner Newland asked why a definition for banners was omitted from the proposal. She suggested adding one. Commissioner O'Connor noted how some areas, such as Festival Meadows, have different needs for displaying certain signs, such as banners. City Attorney Adam King responded that the regulations can be zone oriented, so the Commissioners could decide to allow larger banners or signs in certain areas and not others.

Commissioner Provonsha asked if the City allows inflatable or moving signs, and Jae Hill responded it does not. Chairman Herich asked about time restrictions on banners. Jae Hill stated there was not one. Chairman Herich stated his opinion that there should be. He also stated there could be more flexibility in the commercial or recreation zones as it relates to various types of signs, such as blade signs.

Jae Hill requested more direction from the Commission on banners. The Commission discussed display time limits for banners.

The Commission discussed the nuances of temporary signs and the needs of various types of signs currently regulated, such as political and real estate signs. Jae Hill noted there can no longer be distinctions between those types of signs. He noted that instead of regulating content, they were considering definitions based on construction type, such as depth, how it is built, etc.

Commissioner Newland asked about how aesthetics will be regulated. Jae Hill discussed the proposed requirement that designs fall within a certain Munsell color scheme as an alternative to the current standard of conformity with the surrounding neighborhood. He noted the color scheme is common in mountain communities and is a better way to meet the state requirement of an expressly-written standard. He noted this could be applied to the construction of homes, the sign code, or both.

The Commission debated the merits of using the Munsell color system. Jae Hill emphasized the need for an objective standard by which to review designs. Commissioner Provonsha agreed the City needs to protect the integrity of homeowners' investments and the Munsell guide may help facilitate that.

The Commissioners discussed the missing pieces of the current code as it applies to various sign types, such as governmental and utility signs. The Commission also discussed banners and whether their height and face area should be regulated. Jae Hill discussed various options, such as allowing a certain square footage of signage per property. Commissioner Newland asked that Jae Hill provide additional information about the standard size of banners to help the Commission make a decision.

Chairman Herich stated his belief that the code language needs to be clear as to what constitutes a sign, and whether that includes the supporting structure or not. The Commission held a discussion about various signs and whether their accompanying structures should be included in what is considered part of the sign. Jae Hill offered his interpretation that the current definition in the code does not include supporting structures, just the sign face itself. The Commission discussed whether that definition is still appropriate as well as height requirements for signs, such as banners, that go over roads.

The Commission discussed whether to include a materials requirement for signs and whether a list of example materials would meet the express-standard requirement of Idaho law.

Jae Hill outlined the next steps, noting he would incorporate the Commission's feedback into a draft ordinance. Chairman Herich asked that staff make suggestions on certain aspects where there were holes and the Commission for the Commission to deliberate on at the next meeting.

The Commission discussed the next meeting agenda, at which a discussion of the sign ordinance would continue. Jae Hill also stated there was one application for design review and asked the Commission if it needed a site visit. The Commission agreed it did not.

Chairman Herich asked the Commissioners to read through the code book as it pertains to signs to gain familiarity with what would potentially change with the new ordinance.

The Commission discussed whether it needed to appoint officers. City Attorney Adam King suggested they review the bylaws and determine if they needed to do so at the next meeting.

7. [Adjourn](#)

MOTION

Commissioner John O'Connor moved to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Sherri Newland. All in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:26 a.m.

Ken Herich, Chairman

Alissa Weber, City Clerk

**CITY OF SUN VALLEY
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
AGENDA REPORT**

From: Abby Rivin, CFM, Associate Planner
Meeting Date: 11 February 2016

DESIGN REVIEW (DR 2016-01)

APPLICANT: Jolyon H. Sawrey for Maud Alison Long Trust

LOCATION: 700 Fairway Rd, Lot 20 Upper Fairway Subdivision No. 2

ZONING DISTRICTS: Single-Family Residential (RS-1) Zoning District

REQUEST: 654 sq ft second story addition to an existing detached single-family dwelling.

ANALYSIS: The applicant submitted an application for design review approval for a second story, 654 sq ft addition to an existing detached single-family dwelling. The upstairs addition includes two bedrooms, a bathroom, and a study area. Also as part of the construction, a remodel of the main level reconfigures the mud/laundry room to accommodate a new stairway to access the new addition; the remodel does not require approval as a part of this design review application. The exterior of the addition utilizes materials and styling consistent with the exterior of the existing residence. While an existing eave encroaches into the required 15 foot rear setback of the lot, the encroachment conforms to City Code Section 9-2A-3E-2 allowing eaves, roofs, awnings, or canopies to encroach into a required setback a maximum of 4 ft.

The subject home is a nonconforming structure as the existing building footprint exceeds the maximum allowable, as calculated per City Code Section 9-2A-3I, by 121 sq ft. While the home is a nonconforming structure, the project design does not intensify the existing nonconformity as the addition does not add new footprint. Increases to nonconforming structures are permitted through design review, provided they meet the intent and standards of SVMC § 9-1B-2. The project drawings stamped received by the City of Sun Valley on December 23, 2015 detail all proposed changes and alterations to the existing structure.

Single-Family Residence Floor Area:

	Proposed Floor Area (sq ft)
Existing Living Space	4,392
Existing Garage	558
New Addition	7654
Total Gross Area	5,604

Lot Area: 33,192.72 sq ft
 Total New Building Footprint: 0 sq ft
 Building Footprint Allowed: 4,859 sq ft max. (calculated as per Section 9-2A-3I)
 Building Footprint Proposed: 4,980 sq ft [EXCEEDS MAX ALLOWABLE BY 121 SF.]

Applications for design review are subject to standards in SVMC § 9-3A-3. Many of the standards are not applicable as the second-story addition and remodel solely upgrades an existing structure without adding building footprint or modifying the site layout or access.

A. Design and Siting:

*1. The design of proposed improvements is appropriate and compatible to the lot and the surrounding neighborhood. Attention has been given to the location and design of streets, view corridors, privacy of adjacent properties, outdoor spaces, shadows, solar access, view access, lighting, vehicular access, building massing, privacy of other noise generating equipment, openings and doors as these elements impact adjacent properties. **The proposed design is similar in styling, color, and materials to other existing residences in the subdivision. The addition is situated directly adjacent to the rear setback and may impact the privacy of the neighboring lot.***

*2. The location and design of the proposed improvements has given consideration to special sites of historical, natural, ecological, architectural, archaeological, and scenic value or significance, including, but not limited to, those identified in the city's comprehensive plan. The essential character of special sites should be preserved and protected with any proposed site or structure improvements. **Not applicable.***

*3. The siting of the proposed improvements complies with the adopted uniform fire code and any other applicable regulations regarding emergency vehicle access and circulation as set forth in title 7 of this code. **Vehicle access and circulation will not be altered with this project.***

*4. The proposed improvements are sited to meet the ingress, egress, and driveway standards and requirements set forth in title 7 of this code, and the siting standard in subsection A1 of this section. **No changes are proposed to ingress, egress, or the driveway.***

*5. The proposed improvements are sited to take into consideration and to mitigate natural hazards such as floodplains and avalanches as set forth in this chapter. Mitigation measures shall not adversely impact other properties. **Not applicable.***

*6. The siting of the proposed improvements minimizes interference with natural drainage patterns and is designed to minimize adverse impact on other properties. All drainage shall comply with the standards set forth in title 7 of this code; be contained on site, or be connected to drainage easements or rights of way. No drainage shall be diverted off site onto private property. **All drainage is contained on site through soil percolation and drywells. Sheet 1.0 of the design review submittal illustrates the location of a new drywell that will be installed if it is found necessary.***

*7. The site design provides for adequate space or means to maintain snow storage. Snow storage areas are in accordance with the requirements set forth in article G of this chapter. **The applicant has proposed 1,913 sq ft of snow storage area, which is 162 sq ft more than required by code.***

*8. Appropriate address numbers and monuments are shown in accordance with the requirements as set forth in article G of this chapter. **Not applicable.***

9. *The siting of the proposed improvements, including streets and driveways, where applicable, minimizes hillside visibility and, where applicable, skylining by using a combination of stepped building forms, natural colors and materials, sloped roofs, and landscaping. **No ridges or prominent terrain features exist on or directly adjacent to the site.***

10. *Every lot shall be designed to be connected to public water and sewer systems, unless the property is over five hundred feet (500') from a public system as measured from the closest property line and an alternative utility system is approved by the city engineer. **All utilities are connected to the existing residence.***

B. Grading:

1. *Essential grading is shaped to blend with natural landforms and to minimize the necessity of padding and/or terracing of building sites. Cut and fill are shaped, rounded, minimized and nonuniform to simulate natural existing contours. **No grading will be changed and the site is predominantly flat.***

2. *Areas which are not well suited for development because of existing soil conditions, ridges, ridgelines, ridge tops, knolls, saddles, summits, wildlife habitat, natural features or hydrology are allocated for open site area or recreational uses. **Not applicable.***

3. *The development is in accordance with the design criteria, as applicable, as set forth in article H of this chapter and title 7 of this code. **No ridges or prominent terrain features exist on or directly adjacent to the site.***

C. Architectural Quality:

1. *The proposed project maintains the quality of materials and design that is appropriate to the location, the lot and the neighborhood. **The addition over the existing garage expands the enclosed floor area of the single-family dwelling by 654 sq ft, which is less than 15% of the fully developed 5,604 sq ft site. While the addition extends higher than the existing structure, the maximum height above record grade is 28'5", which is 5'5" less than the maximum permitted.***

2. *The proposed improvements conform to natural landscape features by minimizing the degree of cuts and fills. **The project does not alter the site's grade.***

3. *The plan includes the location of all exterior lighting. All lighting shall be directed onto the subject lot and shall not be directed towards other properties. **No new exterior lighting fixtures are proposed.***

4. *Building design includes weather protection that prevents water from dripping or snow from sliding onto pedestrian or vehicle areas or onto adjacent properties. **The new roof includes a snow fence and gutters.***

5. *Any exterior addition or alteration to an existing building is compatible with the design character of the original building. Any new detached structure is compatible with the design character of the existing buildings and/or structure(s). **The new addition will use similar materials and colors to the existing structure.***

6. All improvements are designed to minimize light and sound emanating to other properties as set forth in article B of this chapter. **The existing lighting conforms to the City's Exterior Lighting Regulations.**

7. Rooftop chimneys and utilities are enclosed and design is consistent with the primary structure. **All existing utilizes are enclosed. No new rooftop chimney or utilities will be installed.**

D. *Pedestrian and Vehicle Circulation Design:* **These standards are not applicable as the project does not propose any changes to the existing site.**

E. *Landscaping Quality:* **These standards are not applicable as the project does not propose any changes to the existing landscaping.**

F. *Irrigation Limits:* **Not applicable.**

G. *Fences, Walls, Retaining Walls, Screens, and Dog Runs:* **None proposed.**

H. *Sign Design:* **Not applicable.**

I. *Exterior Lighting:* **All existing lighting complies with the City's Exterior Lighting Regulations. No new exterior lighting is proposed. See sheet 6.0 of the design review submittal.**

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of DR2016-01.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: "I move to approve DR2016-01 to allow for construction of a 654 sq ft, second story addition, pursuant to the Findings of Fact."

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS: Move denial of the application and draft findings supporting denial.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Findings of Fact
2. Application Materials

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
CITY OF SUN VALLEY
DESIGN REVIEW**

Project Name: Design Review Application DR2016-01
Applicant: Jolyon H. Sawrey, AIA for Maud Alison Long Trust
Location: 700 Fairway Rd, Lot 20 Upper Fairway Subdivision No. 2
Zoning District: Single-Family Residential (RS-1) Zoning District

Project Description: The applicant submitted an application for design review approval for a second story, 654 sq ft addition and main level remodel to an existing detached single-family dwelling. The addition includes two bedrooms, a bathroom, and a study area. The exterior of the addition utilizes materials and styling consistent with the exterior of the existing residence. While an existing eave encroaches into the required 15 foot rear setback of the lot, the encroachment conforms to City Code Section 9-2A-3E-2 allowing eaves, roofs, awnings, or canopies to encroach into a required setback a maximum of 4 ft.

The subject home is a nonconforming structure as the existing building footprint exceeds the maximum allowable, as calculated per City Code Section 9-2A-3I, by 121 sq ft. While the home is a nonconforming structure, the project design does not intensify the existing nonconformity as the addition and remodel project does not add new footprint. The project drawings stamped received by the City of Sun Valley on December 23, 2015 detail all proposed changes and alterations to the existing structure.

Required Findings: In order to approve a design review application and based on the standards set forth in **Sun Valley Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 3A (DESIGN REVIEW REGULATIONS)**, the Community Development Director shall make the following findings pursuant to **Development Code Section 9-5B-3 (DESIGN REVIEW)**.

1. The proposed design is in conformance with the purpose of the zoning district and all dimensional regulations of that district. **The subject addition and remodel will not cause the property to further exceed the height, setback, nor any other dimensional regulation of the Single-Family Residential (RS-1) Zoning District set forth in Title 9, Chapter 2A. The existing development consists of a single-story, detached single-family dwelling with associate landscaping, vehicular access, and other site improvements. The design of the addition and remodel comply with all applicable standards appropriate for single-family structures within the RS-1 Zone.**
2. The proposed design is in conformance with the standards for design review as set forth in Chapter 3A (DESIGN REVIEW REGULATIONS) of this Title. **The proposed addition retains the overall design while providing extra living space for the structure. All new materials and colors will match the existing structure. The addition over the existing garage expands the enclosed floor area of the single-family dwelling by**

654 sq ft, which is less than 15% of the fully developed 5,604 sq ft site.

3. The proposed design does not significantly impact the natural, scenic character and aesthetic value of hillsides, ridges, ridgelines, ridge tops, knolls, saddles, and summits in the City. **No ridges or prominent terrain features exist on or directly adjacent to the site.**
4. The proposed design is in context and complimentary to adjacent properties. **The proposed design is complementary to adjacent properties because of similarity in design, bulk, and mass. While the addition extends higher than the existing structure, the maximum proposed height above record grade is 28'5", which is 5'5" less than the maximum permitted.**
5. The proposed design is compatible with the community character and scale of the neighborhood. **The addition's styling is consistent with the original design of the dwelling, and will be similar in use and styling of other properties in the vicinity. The site is sufficiently set back to maintain privacy.**
6. The proposed design adheres to standards for the protection of health, safety, and general welfare. **The project proposal has adequate snow protection, snow storage areas, fire and rescue access, connection to public utilities, and other characteristics which protect the health and safety of the neighborhood. 4,040 sq ft of the existing shake shingle roof will be replaced with a metal roof to match the existing.**
7. The proposed design is of quality architectural character and materials. **The design seamlessly integrates the second story addition with the existing structure using high quality materials that match the residence.**
8. The use is not in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan or other adopted plans, policies, or ordinances of the City. **The project will upgrade an existing single-family residential structure with quality architectural character and materials while remaining consistent with the original dwelling's design, use, and impact on adjacent properties. No land use change is involved with this addition and remodel project. The existing single-family residential land use is consistent with the Low Density Residential Land Use Designation of the City's Future Land Use Map.**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1. Applicant and their representatives shall comply with all applicable City codes and ordinances, including those related to noise (Section 4-4D-2 and 3) and water pollution control (Section 4-4C-2).**
- 2. Design Review approval is good for one year from the date of approval, unless extended pursuant to Sun Valley Municipal Code Section 9-5A-8.**
- 3. Any requirements and/or approvals of private associations or other entities are the sole responsibility of the property owner.**
- 4. Any permits issued during the 10-day appeal period provided for under section 9-5A-9 may be subject to a stop work order in the event of an appeal. Any work commenced during the appeal period shall be at the applicant's own risk.**
- 5. Approval is specific to the project drawings and the construction management plan dated received by the City of Sun Valley on December 23, 2015.**
- 6. Fairway Road shall be kept free and clear for emergency vehicle access at all times. Any significant access issues shall be brought to the attention of the City and project neighbors in advance.**
- 7. No modifications to the approved plans shall be made without written permission of the Building Official and/or Fire Chief.**

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Therefore, this project does meet the standards for approval under Title 9, Chapter 3A, City of Sun Valley Municipal Code provided the conditions of approval are met. Design Review approval shall expire 365 days from the date of approval, unless extended as per Municipal Code Section 9-5A-8.

DECISION

Therefore, the Sun Valley Planning and Zoning Commission approves this Design Review Application No. DR2016-01.

Dated this 11th day of February, 2016.

Ken Herich, Chairman
Sun Valley Planning and Zoning Commission

Date Findings of Fact signed _____

DRAFT

31 ~~Sign, Off Site: A sign which directs attention to a business, commodity, service or entertainment conducted,~~
32 ~~sold or offered at a location other than the premises on which the sign is located.~~

33
34 ~~Sign, Political: A temporary sign denoting a political campaign headquarters, party affiliation, cause or~~
35 ~~candidate.~~

36
37 ~~Sign, Portable: A sign that is not affixed to a building, structure or the ground, including, but not limited to,~~
38 ~~sandwich boards and real estate "for sale" and "open house" signs.~~

39
40 ~~Sign, Private Sale Or Event: A temporary sign advertising private sales of personal property such as yard,~~
41 ~~garage, or rummage sales or events, such as, but not limited to, picnics, carnivals, bazaars, games night,~~
42 ~~arts and crafts shows and Christmas tree sales.~~

43
44 ~~Sign, Temporary Sales And Site Development: A nonpermanent sign that identifies an approved project~~
45 ~~currently under construction as evidenced by a city building permit. Sales signs identify a parcel of improved~~
46 ~~or unimproved property that is for sale.~~

47
48 SECTION 3. The following sections and clauses of Title 9, Chapter 3, Article F [Sign Regulations] of the
49 Municipal Code of the City of Sun Valley shall be amended:

50
51 9-3F-1.B. Appropriate to the type of activity use and zoning district to which they pertain.

52
53 9-3F-5.C. Governmental and/or utility warning signs.

54
55 9-3F-5.E. Flags, ~~either official or historic, of any state or nation.~~

56
57 SECTION 4. The following definitions will be added to Title 9, Chapter 1, Article C, Section 1:

58
59 LIGHTING TEMPERATURE: Light-emitting diode (LED) or liquid crystal diode (LCD) lighting should measure
60 between 4500 and 7500 Kelvins, as certified by the manufacturer, for a natural white or semi-yellow hued

61 appearance.

62

63 SIGN, A-FRAME: A sign with two faces attached to each other by a hinge at the top. Commonly called
64 “sandwich boards.”

65

66 SIGN, BASE LEGS: A sign typically constructed of a plywood or sheet metal display face affixed to two 4”x4”
67 posts with some sort of “feet” constructed for support at the base of the “legs.” Typically used for
68 construction information, subdivision sales information, and other temporary informational signage of a
69 commercial or semi-commercial nature.

70

71 SIGN, BLADE: A fabric sign that is supported by a single curved metal support pole.

72

73 SIGN, EXTERNALLY-LIT LIGHT-SHIELDED: Indirectly lit signage wherein a light is projected at the sign face,
74 which reflects a certain amount of luminosity.

75

76 SIGN, H-FRAME: A sign characterized by corrugated plastic or cardboard sign faces with wire or metal
77 prongs or supports. Commonly used for real estate sales, yard sales, political signs, and other temporary
78 events or announcements.

79

80 SIGN, INFLATABLE: Signs of fabric construction which are inflated by a fan and intended to move in such a
81 manner to attract attention. A type of moving sign.

82

83 SIGN, INTERNALLY-LIT SEALED-CASE: An internally illuminated sign which achieves the look of channel
84 lettering without relief by shielding the majority of the sign face with a metal (or other opaque) material.

85

86 SIGN, L-STAKE: A sign with an L-shaped post from which the sign face is suspended. Commonly used for real
87 estate sales and occasionally for property identification.

88

89 SIGN, MONUMENT: A large freestanding sign, erected on a pedestal or foundation, typically used for
90 identifying subdivisions, commercial areas, public facilities, and entrances to the city.

91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120

SIGN, TEMPORARY: Signs which are designed to be non-permanent in nature. Such sign styles which include H-frame, A-frame, base legs, blade signs, and other signs without a permanent foundation and with a support depth of no more than six inches into the soil.

SIGN, WAYFINDING: Signs which help direct pedestrian and/or vehicular traffic through the use of uniform appearance and logos or markings, informational contents, and arrows or directional markers.

SECTION 5. Table 9-3F-2 shall be removed in its entirety and replaced with the new Table 9-3F-2 below.

[INSERT 9-3F-2]

SECTION 6. SAVINGS AND SEVERABILITY. If any section, subsection, paragraph, subparagraph, item, provision, regulation, sentence, clause or phrase is declared by a court to be invalid, such actions shall not affect the validity of this Ordinance as a whole or any part thereof other than the part declared invalid.

SECTION 7. CODIFICATION. The City Clerk is instructed pursuant to Section 1-1-3 of the City of Sun Valley Municipal Code to immediately forward this ordinance to the codifier of the official municipal code for proper revision of the code.

SECTION 8. REPEALER CLAUSE. All City of Sun Valley Ordinances or parts thereof which are in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

SECTION 9. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its approval, passage and publication as provided by law.

APPROVED BY THE SUN VALLEY CITY COUNCIL THIS 3rd day of MARCH, 2016.

APPROVED:

121 ATTEST:

Peter Hendricks, Mayor

122

City of Sun Valley

123

124 _____

125 Alissa Weber, City Clerk

126 City of Sun Valley

DRAFT

Zoning District	Sign Type	Sign Face Area	Maximum Height	Minimum Clearance	Number Allowed	Lighting
CC, SC	Monument	70	10	-	1 per major vehicular access to a subdivision or commercial district	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Freestanding	25	8	-	1 sign per public-facing façade of the building	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Building Mounted	25	15	8	1 square foot of sign per 5 linear feet of frontage, to the maximum allowable area. 1 sign per public-facing façade of the building	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Temporary	3	4	-	???	None
	Hanging/Projecting	15	15	8	1 sign per commercial tenant	Indirect
	Banner	???	???	8	???	Indirect
	Display Boxes	5	-	-	n/a	Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally illuminated
	Murals	-	-	-	n/a	Indirect
	Window Signs	-	-	-	15% of the window, 10sf max	Indirect
RS-2, RM-1, RM-2	Monument	70	10	-	1 per major vehicular access to a subdivision or commercial district	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Freestanding	25	8	-	1 per building or facility	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Building Mounted	25	15	8	1 square foot of sign per 5 linear feet of frontage, to the maximum allowable area. 1 sign per public-facing façade of the building	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Temporary	3	4	-	1 sign per dwelling unit, totalling no more than 3 square feet per sign face	None
	Banner	???	25	15	???	Indirect
OS, PI, REC	Monument	70	10	-	1 per major vehicular access to a subdivision or commercial district	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Freestanding	25	8	-	1 sign per public-facing façade of the building	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Building Mounted	25	15	8	1 square foot of sign per 5 linear feet of frontage, to the maximum allowable area. 1 sign per public-facing façade of the building	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Temporary	3	4	-	2 signs, totalling no more than 3 square feet per sign face	None
	Banner	???	25	15	???	Indirect

RA, RS-1	Monument	16	10	-	1 per major vehicular access to a subdivision	Pan Channel, Indirect, Backlit, Shielded Internally Illuminated
	Temporary	3	4	-	2 signs, totalling no more than 3 square feet per sign face	None
	Banner	???	25	15	???	Indirect
Right-of-Way*	Monument	70	10	-	1 per major vehicular access to a subdivision or commercial district	None
	Temporary	3	4	-	2 signs, totalling no more than 3 square feet per sign face	None
	Banner	???	25	15	???	Indirect
					*(City Encroachment Permit Required)	