

Section / topic	Prior wording or position	Updated change	Rationale / feedback from
26.01.006 — Abandoned sign	Definition cross-referenced the wrong section in the earlier draft.	Change the definition so “Abandoned sign” points to Section 26.04.006 [Abandoned or discontinued signs].	Drafting correction requested by Chadwick Fox; the final rewrite already moved this in the right direction.
26.01.006 — Responsible party	Earlier draft included anyone who “benefits from” a sign.	Keep the narrowed formulation limiting “Responsible party” to ownership, control, authorization, installation, maintenance, or legal duty.	Chadwick Fox objected that “benefits from” was too broad; the final rewrite corrected this and it should be preserved.
26.01.006 — Right-of-way	Earlier definition swept in drainage areas and utility easements too broadly.	Keep the narrower formulation tying right-of-way regulation to areas the government has the legal right to regulate.	Chadwick Fox raised this as an overbreadth issue; the final rewrite corrected it and that change should be retained.
26.01.012(d) — Design preferences not an independent denial basis	Preference/discouragement language could blur into mandatory regulation.	Keep the sentence clarifying that preferred/discouraged design guidance does not independently justify approval or denial unless tied to a mandatory standard.	Requested by Chadwick Fox and reinforced by Becky Atkins’ concern about muted-color language becoming an implicit denial standard.
26.02.004(b) — Commercial wall-sign formula	Mixed linear width and area and did not explain per-sign/per-elevation treatment.	Use the clarified formula: 64 sq. ft. total wall-sign area per business on any one building elevation, with a 75% linear tenant-frontage limit on that elevation, applied separately where two wall signs are allowed.	Requested by Chadwick Fox and echoed by Council Member Husted as part of the line-by-line consistency / usability review.
26.02.007 — Banner duration	Earlier draft allowed a business banner and a lot banner without a clear display duration.	Keep the 90-day continuous display cap unless otherwise approved by master sign plan, variance, or other specific provision.	Requested by Council Member Husted and also identified by Chadwick Fox as a drafting inconsistency.
26.02.004(n) — Daily display / A-frame sign	Earlier draft lacked a square-foot cap and only said the sign could not impede pedestrians.	Keep the objective rule: 6 sq. ft. max, 3 ft. max height, and minimum 5-ft. clear pedestrian / accessible route.	Requested by Council Member Husted; Becky Atkins also wanted A-frame terminology made explicit in applicant-facing materials.
26.02.009(c) — Individual unit lease signs	Prior draft required the signs to be not legible from the public right-of-way.	Keep the revised text allowing visibility from the public right-of-way, but limiting the sign to identifying the individual unit and not functioning as unrelated off-premises advertising.	Requested by Chadwick Fox as a practical fix.

Section / topic	Prior wording or position	Updated change	Rationale / feedback from
26.02.010(a) — Overlay adoption and official maps	Earlier draft allowed overlays to be designated by ordinance, zoning map, master plan, preservation plan, corridor plan, or development agreement.	Keep the revision requiring overlays / transition zones to be adopted only by ordinance with an official parcel-level map, with planning documents advisory unless formally adopted by ordinance.	Requested by Chadwick Fox.
26.02.010(d) — Highway-corridor visibility relief	Earlier draft reserved additional corridor height relief to Council.	Keep the change allowing administrative approval up to 10 feet with a sightline/visibility study, with Council approval above 10 feet up to 15 feet.	Requested by Chadwick Fox and consistent with Becky Atkins' corridor-visibility comments.
26.03.002 — Proportional application requirements	Permit application requirements were broad and potentially burdensome for simple signs.	Keep the simple vs. complex application concept and the ability to waive or defer items not reasonably necessary for a simple non-illuminated sign.	Requested by Council Member Husted.
26.03.003 — Completeness review and missed-deadline remedy	Earlier draft waived the fee if the City missed the deadline, but generally required waiting until day 45 to appeal.	Keep the new framework: completeness determination within five business days; missed deadline becomes a deemed denial for immediate appeal; Council hearing within 30 calendar days.	Requested by Chadwick Fox and reinforced by Council Member Husted's appeal-timing concerns.
26.03.006 and 26.03.007 — Objective criteria and written findings	Earlier draft used terms like "modest," "compatible," and "minimum needed" without much numerical or record support.	Keep the 20% definition of "modest" and the requirement that both the sign administrator and Council state the factual basis for findings.	Requested by Council Member Husted and consistent with Chadwick Fox's concern about excessive discretion.
26.03.006(h)-(i) — Referral limits for administrative variances	Earlier draft allowed referral of any administrative variance to Council.	Keep the narrowed referral criteria and the statement that referral does not restart or extend the review period.	Requested by Chadwick Fox.
26.03.008(d) and 26.03.010(a) — Appeal period	Prior draft used a 10-day appeal period.	Keep the 15-day appeal period for both administrative-variance appeals and permit/interpretation appeals.	Requested by Council Member Husted.
26.03.011 — Master sign plan deadline and findings	Earlier draft had no hard 30-day deadline for complete master sign plan applications and less precise findings language.	Keep the 30-day review deadline and the written-findings formulation for site-specific alternative standards.	Requested by Chadwick Fox and consistent with AG Husted's objective-criteria concerns.

Section / topic	Prior wording or position	Updated change	Rationale / feedback from
26.04.001(c) and 26.05.002(a) — Defined cure periods	Earlier draft used “reasonable time” language.	Keep the shift to a stated cure period and not less than 15 calendar days for maintenance violations unless immediate action is needed for safety.	Requested by Council Member Husted.
26.04.002 and 26.04.008 — Chapter 216 / lawful existing signs	Earlier draft did not state as clearly that a previously lawful sign does not become unlawful solely because the chapter is amended or replaced; redevelopment exemptions were narrower.	Keep the express grandfathering sentence, the direct Chapter 216 / compensation / vested-rights cross-reference, and the expanded list of redevelopment-trigger exemptions.	Requested by Council Member Husted and Chadwick Fox; also responsive to Becky Atkins’ grandfathering questions.
26.07.001(e)-(h), 26.07.002(a)-(b), 26.07.003, 26.07.004(1)-(12) — Website/public materials, noncommercial examples, ETJ guidance, political-sign note, and mural/public-art applicant guidance	Earlier applicant guidance was thinner and did not expressly include noncommercial examples, ETJ guidance, the political-sign caution, or direction on how murals, public art, or decorated rainwater tanks/cisterns would be treated.	Keep the stronger website/public-materials commitments, the noncommercial-message examples, the ETJ guidance, and the political-sign/state-law warning; add applicant guidance directing users to confirm whether a mural, public art feature, or decorated rainwater tank/cistern will be treated as signage or as non-sign art/decorative treatment; and conform the internal subsection references to the added 26.07.001(e), 26.07.002(b), and 26.07.004(6).	Requested by Pam King, Council Member Husted, and Becky Atkins as usability clarifications; mural/public-art additions further reduce ambiguity before fabrication or installation.
26.07.005(a)(7) — Permit application checklist for murals/public art	Permit checklist did not ask applicants to identify whether a mural, painted surface, public art feature, or decorated rainwater tank/cistern with text or logos was proposed as signage or as non-sign art/decorative treatment.	Add a new checklist item requiring the applicant to identify whether a mural, painted surface, public art feature, or decorated rainwater tank/cistern that includes text, logos, symbols, or other messaging is proposed as signage or as non-sign art/decorative treatment, and to provide supporting description needed for the City to make that determination.	Added to help staff document and apply the art-versus-sign distinction consistently at intake.

Section / topic	Prior wording or position	Updated change	Rationale / feedback from
26.08.001 — Relief-type explanation	Earlier Appendix C duplicated the administrative-approval sentence and omitted a separate administrative-variance description.	Keep the clarified four-part explanation: administrative approval; administrative variance; City Council variance; ordinance/master-sign-plan amendment.	Raised first by Chadwick Fox as a drafting error/inconsistency and consistent with AG Husted’s determinability concern.
26.01.006 / 26.01.009 / 26.01.010(24) — person-carried sign package	The rewrite removed the old express allowance for noncommercial signs carried by a person, while also retaining a ban on body-worn commercial advertising.	Add a new person-carried sign definition; revise portable signs so person-carried signs are not automatically prohibited portable signs; add a narrow permit-exempt allowance for person-carried signs; and replace the commercial-message ban with a content-neutral location/obstruction rule.	Council Member Husted requested legal-review point on commercial speech and whether the City’s objectives could be achieved through physical/location regulation instead.
26.01.006 / 26.01.010(25) / 26.02.001(d) / 26.02.004(m) / Appendix A flag rows — anti-circumvention flag package	The draft allows certain flags but separately bans “flags with commercial messages,” which invites the argument that flags can be used as an end-run around ordinary sign rules.	Delete the commercial-message flag ban; revise the flag definition to distinguish true flags from feather banners, pennants, inflatables, and similar attention-getting devices; revise the residential and commercial flag provisions to regulate flags by fixed number/size/height rules; and add anti-circumvention language stating that flags may not be used to avoid another sign type’s standards.	Council Member Husted requested legal-review changes over commercial speech, while implementing stated policy concern that flags not become an end-run around the sign regulations.
26.01.005(e)-(f), 26.01.006, 26.01.009(16) — Murals, public art, and decorative treatment	Draft did not expressly distinguish murals, public art, or decorative treatment of structures from regulated signage.	Add a functional test clarifying that murals, public art, and decorative treatment of structures, including rainwater tanks, cisterns, water-storage features, screening elements, and similar features, are not signs unless they function primarily as advertising or site identification; add definitions for Mural and Public art; and add permit-exempt item 26.01.009(16) for murals/public art/decorative treatment that are not signs.	Added to clarify treatment of non-sign art and decorative features while preserving regulation of commercialized displays and reducing ambiguity in administration.

Section / topic	Prior wording or position	Updated change	Rationale / feedback from
Appendix A — overall structure	The draft used a flatter quick-reference table structure without the later expanded “How to use this Appendix” and more segmented organization.	Appendix A was reorganized into a more user-friendly structure with a “How to use this Appendix” section, contents, and separate sections by property type and sign context.	Improves usability and responds to concerns that residents and businesses need a clearer path to determining whether a sign is allowed, prohibited, or requires a permit or variance.
Appendix A — political-sign/state-law note	The draft did not clearly call out that state law may provide broader protections for certain political signs on private property.	Added a note stating that state law may provide broader protections for certain political signs on private property than the general residential size or placement standards summarized in the appendix.	Requested by Council Member Husted so residents do not incorrectly assume the ordinary residential limits always control.
Appendix A — A-frame terminology / daily display row	The draft did not make A-frame / sandwich-board terminology as explicit in the quick-reference table.	Updated the Appendix A row to expressly identify daily display signs as A-frame/sandwich-board/easel signs, and aligned the row with the revised objective standards.	Responds to business feedback that owners should be able to recognize this common sign type easily in the table.
Appendix A — flag rows revised to anti-circumvention format	Earlier flag rows used message-based wording, including “noncommercial messages; setbacks apply” and did not address use of flags as a workaround to avoid other sign standards.	The residential, commercial, and industrial/institutional flag rows were revised to remove the older message-based shorthand and instead state that flags may not be used to avoid the standards applicable to another sign type or prohibited display.	This reflects the later legal-review-driven change prompted by Council Member Husted and the policy direction that flags should not become an end-run around ordinary sign regulation.
Appendix A — Commercial wall sign row	Appendix A summarized the commercial wall-sign rule as 64 sq. ft. total per business on any one building elevation and 1; 2 for qualifying corner/two-entrance sites.	The body text was revised to a more flexible frontage-based rule, but Appendix A still needs to be conformed so the row reflects: lesser of 64 sq. ft. or 1 sq. ft. per linear foot of tenant frontage on each building elevation, and 1 per public-facing building elevation with a customer entrance or other legitimate public-facing facade.	Council Member Husted’s concern that the wall-sign rule be objective and workable for multiple legitimate public-facing facades.

Section / topic	Prior wording or position	Updated change	Rationale / feedback from
Appendix A — Commercial monument sign row	Earlier draft summarized the commercial monument-sign rule as a flat 32 sq. ft., 6 ft., 1 allowance.	The body text was revised to a proportional frontage-based monument-sign rule, so Appendix A still updated so the row reflects: 32 sq. ft. if lot frontage is less than 150 ft.; 48 sq. ft. if lot frontage is 150 ft. or more, and 6 ft.; up to 8 ft. if lot frontage is 150 ft. or more.	Council Member Husted's concern that the base monument-sign standard be more proportional for larger or higher-speed-roadway commercial sites.
Appendix A — Accessory digital display row	Didn't exist	Added an Appendix A commercial-property row for Accessory digital display reflecting new Section 26.02.004(h): incidental and subordinate to an on-site business or use; used for on-site ordering, sales, dispensing, pricing, customer service, or similar operational purposes; not primarily intended to attract roadway traffic; lighting-compliant; no flashing, scrolling, full-motion video, or simulated movement when visible from the public right-of-way unless otherwise specifically approved.	Council Member Husted asked that ordinary on-site business-operation screens not be unintentionally swept into the general electronic-sign prohibition.
Appendix A — Person-carried sign row	Appendix A did not include a general quick-reference row for person-carried signs, even though the old ordinance did expressly allow a noncommercial sign carried by a person without a permit.	Added a row in the general-signs table for Person-carried sign reflecting the new permit-exempt allowance and location-based limits: not installed on public property, not displayed in or over the public right-of-way without authorization, not displayed in a median/ driveway throat/traffic sight triangle, does not obstruct a sidewalk, accessible route, fire lane, required exit, or emergency access route, and no flashing, moving, or animated lights.	Council Member Husted requested legal-review-driven commercial-speech cleanup

Section / topic	Prior wording or position	Updated change	Rationale / feedback from
Appendix A — mural/public-art/decorative-treatment rows	Appendix A did not tell applicants how non-sign murals, public art, or decorated site features were treated in the quick-reference tables.	Add a general row in Section 26.06.003 for murals/public art/decorative treatment that are not signs under Section 26.01.005(e); add a commercial-property row for a wall mural or painted wall display that functions as a sign; and add a historic-district mural/public-art row in Section 26.06.009.	Makes the clarification visible in the quick-reference tables applicants and staff are most likely to use.
26.10.001 note, 26.10.002(c), 26.10.004(f) — murals/public art in corridor and historic areas	Design guide did not explain how murals, public art, and decorated functional site features fit into corridor and historic-area review.	Add a note that murals, public art, and decorative treatment may be appropriate in corridor, gateway, transition, and historic areas when integrated with the architecture or site and not functioning primarily as advertising or site identification; add materials guidance for decorated walls, screening elements, rainwater tanks, and cisterns; and add a rule that murals/public art should not be used as a substitute for oversized wall signage or off-premises advertising.	Aligns the design guide with the new substantive clarification and preserves the distinction between art and regulated signage.
Appendix A — Administrative equivalency note	Earlier draft did not point applicants to any mechanism for an unlisted but substantially similar sign type.	Added a note in Section 26.06.001 [How to use this Appendix]: “If a proposed sign type is not listed in this Appendix, the applicant should confirm whether the sign may qualify for administrative equivalency under Section 26.01.010 [Administrative equivalency for unlisted sign types].”	This later change reflects Council Member Husted’s concern that the “prohibited unless expressly allowed” framework not make the ordinance obsolete or too rigid for harmless new sign types or technologies.

Feedback or suggestion	From	Response
Interactive website questionnaire / decision tree	Ana Grace Husted	Aniz will attempt to design something upon adoption of the ordinance. For now, Appendix B has been updated to
Reduce the standard monument-sign setback from 8 feet to 5 feet citywide	Becky Atkins / Small Business Alliance	The draft instead keeps the baseline setback structure and relies on administrative/case-specific relief where conditions justify it. The defined setback is intended to facilitate case-
Expand historic-district-style post/hanging sign types broadly outside the historic district	Becky Atkins / Small Business Alliance	This is a broader policy expansion, not a surgical clarification, and the draft remains focused on the historic-district pathway. If the City wants to study broader use later, it should do so as a separate policy choice with context-specific standards. Is there a
Create a specific Master Sign Plan for the Heritage as part of the general ordinance	Pam King	That is still a site-specific planning/policy issue, not a citywide
Keep a standalone commercial-message ban for body-worn signs	Legal-review topic raised by Ana Grace Husted	The City's objective is better served by a content-neutral location/obstruction rule for person-carried signs rather than a message-triggered prohibition.
Keep a standalone commercial-message ban for flags	Legal-review topic raised by Ana Grace Husted	The anti-circumvention objective is better handled through the flag definition and flag standards than by
Add a more detailed material-specific list for temporary signs	Pam King	The broader temporary-sign definition remains adequate; more detail belongs in guidance materials rather than in the
Adopt deemed approval for sign permits where legally appropriate	Chadwick Fox suggested it; Ana Grace Husted raised deadline concerns	The draft instead uses immediate appealability and a defined appeal schedule, which is a more conservative procedural fix. Deemed approvals are more likely to result in unintended

Feedback or suggestion	From	Response
Line-by-line consistency review among ordinance, tables, applications, and presentation materials	Ana Grace Husted	This has been attempted but it's possible some discrepancies remain especially where content is repeated between ordinance text and appendix
How do franchises/restaurants fit into the code? Do they get variances?	Pam King	The draft already contains restaurant-specific sign provisions and the general variance/master-sign-plan framework, so no additional category was needed
Can someone use solar lights to illuminate a sign?	Pam King	The draft regulates sign lighting by performance standards rather than by power source.
Should nonprofit groups selling tickets be allowed to use a noncommercial sign?	Michelle Fischer	Best handled through interpretation and the noncommercial-message framework rather than a nonprofit-specific carveout that could create speaker/content problems.
Scenic Texas newsletter about billboards / dark sky / scenic preservation	Michelle Fischer forwarding Scenic Texas	Informational context only.
General supportive comments on the rewrite and appendices	Russell Collins	Supportive feedback only; no requested text changes.