



## **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Phil Kern

FROM: Alan Brixius

DATE: December 9, 2009

RE: Delano – Sign Ordinance: Dynamic Signs

FILE NO: 432.08 – 09.08

## **BACKGROUND**

Due to the growing popularity of dynamic signs or computerized message boards, the Delano Planning Commission has studied information relevant to the use, operation and regulation of dynamic signs. In October, the Planning Commission held an open house to discuss this topic. At that meeting, they reviewed the League of Minnesota Cities information on dynamic sign regulation, and an SRF study relating to the impact of dynamic signs on traffic safety. The Planning Commission also received public testimony and written information from Daktronics supporting the use of dynamic signs.

In November, the Planning Commission reviewed ordinances from other cities and decided that the City should continue to permit dynamic signs but establish regulations that allow for uniform and reasonable use of this technology.

## **DISTRICTS**

In discussing the appropriate zoning districts where dynamic signs may be allowed, the following findings were made:

The B-2, General Business District and B-3, Highway Business District along Highway 12 were viewed as acceptable locations for these types of signs.

Within the B-4, Central Business District and B-W, Business Warehouse District located in Delano's historic downtown area, the Planning Commission requested comments from Delano's Historical Preservation Committee. On December 7, 2009, the Delano Historical Preservation Committee met and discussed dynamic signs and offered the following comments:

1. They would suggest prohibiting dynamic signs in the B-4 and B-W Districts finding that they have no historical relationship with the Central Business District architecture and community goals.
2. The committee would allow these types of signs along Highway 12, but they would prohibit flashing signs and would require dynamic signs to be more muted, not as brilliant.
3. The Historical Preservation Committee finds the scrolling message centers to be more distracting than the larger dynamic signs. The scrolling signs hold motorist's attention until end of message.

Within residential districts and the B-1, Neighborhood Business District, dynamic signs may be acceptable for schools, churches, public locations, and B-1 businesses provided protections are established mitigating nuisance glare to adjoining residential properties.

## **NUMBER**

Staff recommend limiting dynamic signs to one sign per property. The electronic message board would be allowed as part of the permitted freestanding sign allotment. The Planning Commission generally agreed with this standard.

## **SIZE**

In discussions of size of dynamic signs, the Planning Commission determined that a property owner may use up to 100 percent of the allowed freestanding sign area as a dynamic sign.

## **LOCATION / SETBACKS**

The Planning Commission recommended that the dynamic signs be held to the same setbacks as current freestanding signs.

## **MOTION / ANIMATION / VIDEO**

The Planning Commission requested additional information in the definition and difference between motion, animation and video signs. Adam Skare of Daktronics will be present at the next Planning Commission meeting to conduct an informational presentation on dynamic signs and demonstrate the following elements of dynamic signs: animation, flashing, change of message intervals, and brightness. Through this demonstration, the Planning Commission may be able to define the types of regulations that may be appropriate.

Attachment: Daktronics Presentation

cc: Marlene Kittock  
Wendy Biel  
Scott Dornfeld