

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS

Note: This item was continued from the Planning Commission's January 29, 2015, meeting.

1. **ZOTA 2014-4: RECREATION AND TOURISM LAND USES** – petition for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to address recreation and tourism land uses in all zones, in order to implement the recommendations of the Recreation ZOTA Work Group.

INITIATED BY: Urban County Planning Commission

PROPOSED TEXT: *(Available upon request, and for viewing at:
<http://www.lexingtonky.gov/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=28457>)*

The Zoning Committee made no recommendation on this request.

The Staff Recommends: Approval for the following reasons:

1. The 2013 Comprehensive Plan recommends "strengthening regulations and policies that propel the agricultural economy; including, but not limited to, local food production and distribution, agritourism, and the equine industry that showcase Lexington-Fayette County as the Horse Capital of the World" (Theme C, Goal #1, Obj. B); "encouraging the development of appropriate attractions and supporting uses that promote and enhance tourism" (Theme C, Goal #1, Obj. E); and "providing entertainment and other quality of life opportunities that attract young professionals and a workforce of all ages and talents to Lexington" (Theme C, Goal #2, Obj. D). The proposed text amendment improves the opportunities for recreation and tourism-related land uses throughout Fayette County, to the benefit of all residents.
2. The *Rural Land Management Plan* (1999) acknowledged that "the best preservation tools for the rural service area are those that keep the agricultural economy viable and strong" (page I-4), and called for greenways, staging areas and trails, as well as public access to the community's unique resources. This all suggests some level of access for recreational enjoyment and possibly tourism.
3. The proposed changes and additions to the definitions in Article 1 of the Zoning Ordinance will provide guidance and clarification to the Board of Adjustment and the Planning Commission in reviewing development applications. This text amendment adds or modifies 38 definitions related to recreation and tourism-related uses.
4. The proposed changes and additions to land use regulations in Articles 8, 11, and 23 will implement the recommendations of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan related to tourism and improving the community's overall quality of life.

Chairman Comments: Mr. Owens commended the Commission and the staff for their hard work on this text amendment, noting that Ms. Wade, Mr. King, and Mr. Sallee, in particular, had done a great deal of work to get the draft to this point in the process.

Staff Presentation: Ms. Wade stated that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on this Zoning Ordinance text amendment request in October of 2014. At that time, the staff did a presentation about the proposal, and the Commission heard public comments. Since that time, the Commission held three work sessions to discuss the comments that were presented at the public hearing, and those that were submitted in writing. The Planning Commission's next step will be to take action on the proposed text, after which the staff would forward the Commission's recommendation to the Urban County Council for their consideration.

Ms. Wade displayed a timeline of the Commission's consideration, noting that the staff had made changes to the draft text that was presented to the Commission in October based on their discussion at their recent work sessions. She said that the Commission members had received copies of the revised text. The new draft includes additions, deletions, and modifications to the definition section, and additions and modifications to the land use regulations.

With regard to the definition changes, Ms. Wade explained that the Commission added definitions for "cultural tourism" and "farm gift shop;" and deleted the definitions for "gift shop" and "homegrown restaurant." Modifications were made to the definitions of "recreation vehicle and trailer campground;" "primitive campground;" "children's rides;" "country inn;" "ecotourism;" "commercial farm market;" "festival;" "nature preserve;" "recreational outfitter;" "seasonal activities;" "sportsmen's farm;" "tree canopy tour;" and "value-added product sales."

Ms. Wade stated, with regard to changes to the land use portion of the Ordinance, that farm gift shop would become a new conditional use that would be accessory to a permitted agricultural use, and limited to 500 square feet in size. Zoological gardens were removed from all the residential zones. Hiking and biking were allowed as accessory with other non-commercial recreation, but added as commercial if they were conditional or prohibited; this change was intended to separate non-commercial and commercial hiking and biking activities. Homegrown restaurants were removed from any zone where they appeared. Commercial farm market, such as the downtown Farmers Market, were removed from the A-

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

R zone, and allowed in the business zones. Kayaking and canoeing were modified to reflect "launch sites" rather than "operators." Ms. Wade added that, where value-added products appear also as an accessory use in the agricultural zones, they were moved from general agricultural accessory uses to be grouped with roadside stands. Botanical gardens were incorporated into the land use regulations, similar to nature preserves. The B-1 zone was modified to include the sale of sporting goods and recreational equipment. In any instance in which automobile racetracks appeared, the text was modified to reflect all types of racetracks, such as motocross and ATV tracks. Some language was added to the Light Industrial zone to clarify recreational uses, and equine trails were moved from a conditional use to a prohibited use in that zone to avoid conflicts. The word "agritourism" was removed from all the non-agricultural zones, and bird-watching was removed from all the zones, because the Commission felt that use should not be regulated.

Ms. Wade stated that the staff is recommending approval of this text amendment, for the reasons as listed in the staff report and on the agenda.

Staff Alternative Text Presentation: Mr. King stated that the staff would like to thank and commend everyone who has been involved in this process, opining that it has been a thoughtful, in-depth clarification of some provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in the A-R and A-N zones. He reiterated that the staff is recommending approval of this request, because they believe that it is much-improved legislation that will provide guidance to the Board of Adjustment and the community in the future.

Mr. King said that, prior to the October 2014 hearing on this request, the staff submitted an alternative text for the Commission's consideration; however, after some discussion with the Commission, the staff withdrew that text in favor of having the public hearing. Following the Commission's last work session, there are now very few changes between the text as currently proposed by the Commission, and the things the staff would like for them to consider.

Mr. King stated that the staff believes that a very small number of limited and heavily restricted conditional uses should be considered by the Planning Commission for inclusion in the allowable group for the A-R zone. Those uses would not be principal; and, as conditional uses, would be subject to Board of Adjustment approval and special review. Because of the nature of the A-R zone, the staff is recommending that, before any of the new A-R uses are permitted, the Board of Adjustment should consider several items as pre-conditions. Those pre-conditions include an assurance that the proposed activity would not harm agricultural; would not cause a loss of prime soil; would meet a local need; would provide access to a natural landscape feature; and would be consistent with the major, adopted plans that guide such uses. Also required would be an operational plan; traffic management plan; environmental assessment, if necessary; and other certifications, if required by outside organizations. Mr. King noted that the Board of Adjustment has the right to consider those types of conditions, and the staff felt that it would be good to identify them specifically in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. King said that there are currently a few uses in the A-R zone that the BOA has the authority to review, that the Planning Commission has opted to direct to the A-N zone. He explained that most of the agricultural area in Lexington-Fayette County is zoned A-R, while the area recommended by the Rural Land Management Plan (RLMP) for A-N zoning is mostly in the southeastern portion of the county. The staff believes that a few additional uses could be added to the A-R zone, including: primitive camping; rock climbing; launch sites for canoeing and kayaking, since those sites are functionally dependent on locations of streams and waterways; tree canopy tours; bicycle and hiking trails; and recreational outfitting. Rock climbing, in particular, is not currently included in the A-R or A-N zones, and the staff believes that it could be appropriate in either of those zones, with proper regulation by the BOA. With regard to recreational outfitters, Mr. King said that the staff sees that use in conjunction with other types of recreational uses, similar to the manner in which the Planning Commission's draft proposes to address gift shops as accessory to agricultural uses. He noted that this list of uses comprises the only differences between the Planning Commission's draft proposal, and the text proposed for inclusion by the staff. He said that that the staff believes that the proposed text will result in "a better piece of legislation than that under which we are currently operating."

Discussion: Mr. Owens stated that the public comment portion of this hearing was held in October, and the hearing will not be reopened for public comments at this time. He opened the floor for questions or comments from Commission members.

Mr. Brewer asked, with regard to commercial equine activities, how a use is determined to be commercial, as opposed to non-commercial. Mr. King responded that, if a business license is obtained and a fee charged, then the use is commercial. He said that, as Zoning Administrator, he had to make the determination on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Brewer asked why commercial use is referred to specifically in this instance, but not in others. Mr. King answered that it is referenced specifically in this instance to clarify that these uses are not something that property owners have an inherent right to do on their property as a business operation. Ms. Wade added that the commercial aspect would apply to all of the uses. She said that, earlier in their consideration of this text amendment, the Commission decided that non-commercial hiking and biking could be accessory uses, but commercial would be prohibited.

Mr. Brewer asked what would determine "local need" for a particular use. Mr. King answered that the staff thought it would be good to establish that there is a need for a facility locally, rather than having to travel somewhere else to find a similar

facility. Mr. Brewer asked how that local need would be determined. Mr. King responded that that determination would fall to the BOA. Mr. Brewer asked if there are guidelines in place to assist with that determination, to which Mr. King responded that there are no guidelines at this time. He added that, currently, no guidelines of this type are in place, and the BOA functions without them. The staff believes that the proposed text will provide additional guidance and direction to the BOA.

Mr. Penn stated that he was concerned about letting the BOA decide where commercial uses can be located in the A-R zone. He said that the Commission is "trying to drive our commercial uses to the B-1 sites" in the agricultural area, because that is where they believe commercial uses should be located.

Mr. Owens said that the primary issue of this text amendment is commercial vs. non-commercial activities in the agricultural area. He said that, during the public hearing, the Commission received only one letter from a member of the bicycling community, and the writer was not concerned about commercial cycling in the rural area, since she could cycle freely on the roadways. That letter writer also recommended not including commercial activities in the agricultural area.

Mr. Owens opined that "commercial agricultural activities are incompatible with the agricultural activities that the Commission has been charged with promoting and preserving." He said that approximately 40% of the Comprehensive Plan's mission statement speaks to the preservation of rural character and agricultural land. Each page of the City of Lexington's Visitors' Guide contains either an equine-related article, or an image of the blue horse that LFUCG adopted as part of its branding.

Mr. Owens stated that "equine is agriculture, and it is not compatible with bicycles and pedestrians." He said that the proposed staff text refers to uses that "do not result in significant loss of prime agricultural land." He said all agricultural land is prime, and he believes that that determination would be subjective. Mr. Owens said that, during this ZOTA process, the workgroup and the Commission "tried to think of everything," but new uses like canopy tours and rock climbing keep coming forward. He opined that the Commission "has a good plan," with this text amendment, and "we need to push it forward."

Mr. Drake stated that he believes it is essential to preserve and nurture the thoroughbred industry, and that public policy and regulation have a significant role to play in that effort. He opined that it is important to strike a balance between the needs of the equine industry and the economic and social interests of other segments of society; the Planning Commission must determine if the proposed text amendment strikes that balance.

During the public hearing, Mr. Drake stated, some of the speakers indicated that they were opposed to this text amendment simply because it adds regulations; others were opposed for other reasons, while some speakers supported it. He said that he views the text amendment in its totality, rather than in portions, and he is concerned that it is too narrow and restrictive, and does not strike the necessary balance.

Mr. Drake stated that it is incumbent upon those who are entrusted with the power of governance to use it judiciously. Many citizens see government as an intrusive force, and he believes that the Commission must be careful in their role so that they do not exacerbate those feelings. Mr. Drake opined that, at times during this process, he has felt like the Commission's proposed text showed a "lack of trust in our successors." He said that decision makers must have the flexibility and latitude to assess issues and apply judgment to obtain an optimum outcome. For those reasons, Mr. Drake stated that he could not vote in favor of this proposed text amendment, although he honors opposing viewpoints and will accept the collective decision of the body.

Ms. Richardson stated that she agreed with many of Mr. Drake's comments, noting that she, too, has concerns about the restrictiveness of the proposed text. She said that she loves animals and supports the agricultural industry; but she believes it is important for the Commission to be careful about the balance of those industries, noting that she "does not want to be part of the Commission that squashed entrepreneurship." There are many differing viewpoints in society, and people who have different interests and activities. Ms. Richardson stated that Commerce Lexington spends a great deal of time and effort to promote the community and draw in new businesses and activities. When new companies are considering locating in Lexington-Fayette County, they want to know that there are good schools available, along with a variety of activities for their employees.

Ms. Richardson said that, because it is already difficult and expensive to start a new business, she is concerned that severely limiting the allowable uses in the rural area (such as in the Commission's proposed text) could result in a loss of entrepreneurship in the community. She believes that there should be regulations in place to protect the equine industry, but she believes that "this one has gone a step or two too far." She said that she could not support the proposed text amendment at this time, because she feels that it is too restrictive.

Mr. Penn stated that the proposed text amendment would allow 50 new uses in the A-R zone that are not currently permitted. He said that the objective of this text amendment was to define uses, not change the intent of the zoning

categories. Mr. Penn said that "commercial uses in the A-R zone work "only if they are well thought out." He said that there are 23 B-1 sites in the agricultural area, and commercial uses should be limited to those locations.

Mr. Penn said that, "agriculture is a commercial use; it is a factory, we produce a product that lives and breathes." He opined that thoroughbreds are just a small part of the equine industry, which includes the Kentucky Horse Park, show horses, and non-race industry breeds. Mr. Penn said that those industries support the economy of Lexington-Fayette County, and people move here from other counties to take advantage of the rural protection offered here. He added that the community would have to make a decision about whether "to be a convention town or a tourism town," and to protect the agricultural industry, which brings tourists here; the proposed text amendment is intended to be part of that protection.

Mr. Cravens asked if the Commission needed to take action on the staff alternative text. Mr. Owens said that, if the Commission is ready, they could vote for their draft, or for the staff alternative.

Mr. Cravens stated that he had made several suggestions for modifications to the draft text, but none of the changes were made until the work session one week prior to this hearing. He said he believes that many of the suggested changes are "absurd," such as defining a "recreational vehicle" and determining if children's rides can include music. He believes that the proposed text amendment goes too far, and he does not believe that it is appropriate to make so many activities conditional uses, which will require more applicants to go to the BOA. Mr. Cravens said that part of his objection to this text amendment is based on his belief in personal property rights.

Mr. Cravens explained that, for some time, he has wanted to modify the draft text to include some principal uses in the A-N zone, including: youth camps; agritourism; equitourism; and commercial and non-commercial outdoor recreational facilities. He said that a residence is the only principal use currently listed in the A-N zone, and he believes that it is too onerous to require every other use in that zone to be a conditional use. He asked if the Chair would prefer to discuss his A-N proposal, or if he should make a motion to include it at this time. Mr. Owens responded that he would prefer to discuss the proposal in a work session. Mr. Cravens stated that, if a vote on this text amendment takes place today, there will be no more work sessions. Mr. Owens said that, if the Commission is ready to vote, they can; if not, this item could be continued to another meeting.

Motion: A motion was made by Mr. Cravens and seconded by Mr. Drake to include the following as principal uses in the A-N zone: youth camps; agritourism; ecotourism; and commercial and non-commercial outdoor recreational facilities.

Discussion of Motion: Mr. Owens stated that the staff would need to draft language for Mr. Cravens' proposed addition, and he did not believe that the staff preferred to "draft text on the fly."

Mr. King said that the staff would be opposed to that addition to the text, since they believe that it is "entirely against" the intent of the proposed text amendment. He stated that the environmental sensitivity of the A-N area warrants BOA approval of any of those types of uses. With regard to drafting the text, he noted on the staff exhibit the list of uses that would move from conditional to principal under Mr. Cravens' proposal. Mr. Owens asked if the staff could draft that text at this point. Mr. King answered that, with the knowledge that there was a motion on the table, the staff would do what they could to assist. He noted that the staff was still opposed to Mr. Cravens' proposed text.

Mr. Berkley asked if it was necessary to make uses in the A-N zone conditional, since no land is currently zoned A-N and any new uses would require a zone change. Mr. King answered that, if a parcel is proposed for rezoning and the owner wants a conditional use, they could apply to have the Planning Commission hear the conditional use request along with the zone change. Mr. Berkley stated that he did not see the point of making those uses conditional, since zone changes will be required. Mr. King responded that circumstances can change; a property could be rezoned for one use, but financing or other issues might result in that use not being operated on the property. Mr. Berkley said that those types of issues can be addressed via conditional zoning, and added that he did not see "why we would need this extra layer of a conditional use" when there is currently no land zoned A-N in Lexington-Fayette County. Mr. King stated that the Planning Commission's control would be at the time of a re-zoning, but the use could continue on past that date. Mr. Berkley said that he believed that "these are big enough issues" that the Planning Commission needs to be dealing with it, not the BOA. Mr. King noted that the BOA has the authority to regulate specific conditions of operation and other criteria, that the Planning Commission cannot. He said that conditional zoning restrictions are very limited under statute, compared to what can be regulated by a conditional use permit through the BOA. Mr. King said that the staff believed that the Commission would need and want that level of flexibility in dealing with new uses in the A-N zone.

Ms. Plumlee stated that she believed that the proposed text amendment is much too liberal; and, as written, does not fulfill the intent of the A-N zone. She said that the area of the county recommended for A-N zoning is environmentally sensitive and has steep slopes. An ad hoc committee was specifically appointed to study the potential for the use of surety bonds for environmentally sensitive areas, and that group has not yet released its results. Ms. Plumlee said that, if the group determines that it is too expensive to participate in a surety process, that should serve as an indication that the land is so valuable that it should not be developed at all. In addition, there are currently no mitigation requirements or measures for returning the land to its original state, should a use no longer be active. Ms. Plumlee stated that that portion

of Lexington-Fayette County is a "prized area, and we need to offer the most protection there." She opined that the proposed text amendment should not be any more liberal than the current regulations in that area.

Mr. Brewer asked if the motion on the table referred to the staff's proposed text, or the Planning Commission draft. Mr. Cravens answered that he wanted to add those items as conditional uses. Mr. King stated that the motion would take the Planning Commission's version, and make the changes that he outlined, as requested by Mr. Cravens. Mr. Brewer said that he was concerned about this motion, because it includes new information as well as the entire text amendment. Mr. Cravens explained that his intent was just to add his proposed changes, not to vote on the entire text. He said that the result of the motion would be to either add his proposed changes, or carry the text amendment forward as is.

Action: Mr. Cravens' motion carried, 6-5 (Brewer, Owens, Penn, Plumlee and Wilson opposed).

Discussion: Mr. Berkley stated that he would like to make a motion to modify the proposed text amendment, to apply to all agricultural zones. He proposed: an amendment to Article 1-11 to redefine "farm gift shop" to "accessory gift shop;" an amendment to Article 8-19(d), adding #32 as accessory gift shops, limited to 500 square feet; and to add "accessory gift shop," limited to 500 square feet, to Article 8-2(d), Article 8-3(d), and Article 8-4(d). His motion was seconded by Mr. Cravens.

Mr. Owens stated that he believed that Mr. Berkley's modification to the proposed text would allow a gift shop anywhere in the agricultural area. Mr. Berkley responded that his intent would not be to allow a freestanding gift shop anywhere in the agricultural zones; rather, it would allow an accessory gift shop to one of the otherwise allowable uses. Mr. Owens asked if it would allow gift shops as accessory to agricultural, agritourism, or ecotourism uses. Mr. Berkley answered that gift shops would be allowed as accessory uses to any permitted use in the four agricultural zones, whether they are a principal or conditional use.

Mr. Penn asked if Mr. Berkley would be agreeable to requiring BOA approval for such gift shops. Mr. Berkley responded that, if the use required BOA approval because it would be conditional, that would be acceptable. He said that, based on Mr. Cravens' modification that was just approved, he believed that new uses in the A-N zone might be principal, which would not require BOA approval. Mr. Penn said that, under the current Ordinance, farm gift shops are conditional uses. Mr. Berkley clarified that, if the primary use was allowable without BOA approval, he would not want BOA approval to be required for an accessory gift shop.

Mr. Owens suggested continuing this hearing, so that the Commission and the staff could discuss these issues further at a work session, rather than attempting to draft text on the fly. He asked if Mr. Berkley would be agreeable. Mr. Berkley answered that, if the Commission chose to continue the hearing, he would be agreeable; but he did not want to take his motion off the table. He said that, whenever the Commission votes on this item, he wants that modification to be considered. Mr. Owens asked if Mr. Berkley would be willing to withdraw his motion at this point, in order to allow the Commission and the staff to work on it further. Mr. Berkley answered that he would rather vote on his motion today, then discuss the rest of the text amendment.

Mr. Cravens asked if Mr. Owens was suggesting continuing the hearing. Mr. Owens answered affirmatively.

Mr. Brewer stated that he thought the Commission was much closer to being ready to vote on the proposed text amendment. He proposed that they continue the hearing at this point to allow for further discussion, since several substantive issues had been brought forward.

Mr. Berkley stated that he would withdraw his motion, provided that action would not be taken on the whole Ordinance today.

Mr. Owens stated that ZOTA 2014-4 would be continued to a later date. Mr. King suggested that, if any Commission member intended to make another motion, they let the staff know as soon as possible so that the language could be presented and discussed at an upcoming work session.

Mr. Wilson asked if the text amendment would be tabled or continued. Mr. King answered that the Commission should continue their hearing. Mr. Brewer asked if it could be continued to a work session. Mr. King responded that formal Commission consideration of the text amendment needs to be at a full public hearing, but the Commission could have a work session to talk about it in the interim.

Mr. Penn asked if the report would be available from the environmental surety bond work group, so the Commission could use that information in their consideration. Mr. King answered that the report is very close to being completed, and it could possibly be available at the next work session. Mr. Penn noted that he did not believe the Commission should vote on the proposed text amendment without knowing the results of that report. Mr. King stated that it was staff's understanding that environmental surety bonds would be treated as a separate issue, although the report would somewhat inform their work on this text amendment.

Mr. Brewer asked if a motion was needed to continue this item. Ms. Jones stated that, if the Commission has questions to pose to the staff, they should ask them as soon as possible, so that the staff is not "working on the fly" at the work session. She added that, if the Commission intends to continue the hearing, a motion would be needed; and it must be continued to a specific date. Mr. Sallee noted that the Commission's next scheduled work session is April 30th. Mr. King stated that the Commission would be asked to set April 30th as a hearing date for two small area plans, so that would not be a good day to discuss this text amendment. He said that the Commission could potentially schedule a work session on the 16th, but they would need to continue this hearing, not to a work session, but to a regularly scheduled meeting. He suggested that they continue to their April 23rd meeting.

Mr. Drake stated that he had a previous commitment out of state on April 23rd. Ms. Plumlee stated that, since consideration of this item had dragged on for so long, she believed it should be heard in April. Mr. Cravens said that he disagreed, since Mr. Drake could not attend on April 23rd. He opined that this item should be continued until May.

Mr. King stated that May 21st was available for a work session, with the hearing on May 28th.

Motion: A motion was made by Mr. Brewer, seconded by Mr. Cravens, and carried 10-1 (Plumlee opposed) to continue ZOTA 2014-4 to the May 28, 2015, Planning Commission meeting.

2. **ZOTA 2015-3: AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 17-7(k) TO ALLOW MULTI-TENANT LISTINGS ON FREE-STANDING SIGNS IN THE PLANNED SHOPPING CENTER (B-6P) ZONE** (6/4/15)* – petition for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to allow a maximum of eight multi-tenant panels on free-standing signs in the Planned Shopping Center (B-6P) zone.

REQUESTED BY: Ruggles Sign

PROPOSED TEXT: (Text underlined) indicates an addition to the existing Zoning Ordinance.)

ARTICLE 17: SIGNAGE REGULATIONS

17-3(b) (2) ATTRACTION BOARD - A sign which contains no permanent copy, either letters or emblems, on which copy is changed manually with changeable letters and which announces special activities on the property.

17-3(b) (4) BUSINESS SIGN - A sign which directs attention to a business, profession, product, activity, or entertainment, sold or offered upon the premises where such sign is located, and may include information as for an identification sign.

17-3(c) (5) FREE-STANDING SIGN - A sign, not attached to any building, and attached to the ground by poles, braces, or other means.

17-7(k) PLANNED SHOPPING CENTER ZONE (B-6P) - Signs within the B-6P zone shall be permitted and regulated as for B-1 [Section 17-7(f)], except as follows:

- (1) In place of the free-standing signs permitted under Section 17-7(f)(1)(b), the only permitted free-standing signs shall be shopping center identification signs. One sign shall be permitted per street frontage, with a maximum of two (2) signs. The maximum square footage of each sign shall be 150 square feet, with a maximum height of twenty-five (25) feet for a regional shopping center; and seventy-five (75) square feet, with a maximum height of twenty (20) feet in a community or neighborhood shopping center. An attraction board may be attached to the free-standing sign, provided it does not exceed the area of the identification sign and provided that no permanent copy identifying any specific business or product sold within the center is included on the attraction board. The area of the attraction board shall be included in the computation of the area of the free-standing sign. The copy on such an attraction board shall be limited to sales or other events on the premises and civic meetings, rallies or other noncommercial events on or off the premises.

In lieu of an attraction board, multi-tenant panels may be used. A maximum of eight (8) tenants may be listed. The area of the tenant panels shall be included in the computation of the area of the free-standing sign.

- (2) The wall-mounted signs shall show only the name and/or logo of the business or profession, and shall contain no product trade name identifications. A listing of any products sold or offered on the premises may be an integral part of, and incorporated into, each permitted wall sign, provided the listing occupies no more than fifty percent (50%) of the area of the sign.
- (3) Window signs shall be permitted, limited to no more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the total window area.