

## City of Milwaukee

## Meeting Minutes ZONING CODE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Teodros Medhin, Chair

Stuart Mukamal, Ed Richardson, Ronald Roberts Staff Assistant, Linda Elmer, 286-2232, lelmer@milwaukee.gov; File Specialist Charlotte Rodriguez, 286-8797, crodri@milwaukee.gov

Wednesday, October 1, 2008		2:00 PM		Room 301-A, City Ha
	Ρ	Meeting convened: 2:03 P.M. Also present: Kari Egerstrom - Board of Zon Reference Bureau, Chris Rute of Neighborhood Services esent 4 - Medhin, Mukamal,	- Dept. of City Development a	
1.	080676	A substitute ordinance relating	to floodplain zoning regulatio	ons.
		<u>Sponsors:</u> THE CHAIR		
		Mr. Osterman noted that this of floodplain regulations requeste and the Southeastern Wiscons moved, seconded by Mr. Muka	ed by the Wisconsin Departme sin Regional Planning Commi	ent of Natural Resources ssion. Mr. Richardson
2.	080751	An ordinance relating to the de	efinition of a sign.	
		<u>Sponsors:</u> Ald. Zielinski		
		File 080751 was introduced by Committee, as a response to t of their buildings. If passed, th also include murals. Mr. Richa murals and enforcement might therefore grandfathered in und amendment issues with the cit long as no restrictions are place that the city currently has a mu appeals needing to be heard b that the current ordinances red also found problematic. Both to Department of City Developme enforced. Mr. Rute recommended adding and murals and to allow larger definition of "mural" while Mr. If the painting is on a building wi noted that 70% of the calls rela- rather than the building owner.	the problem of businesses allo nis ordinance would mandate a ardson's concern is that there to be difficult in proving that a m for the proposed ordinance. If y regulating murals as it curre ced on the contents of the mu- ural tour and she fears a back by the Board of Zoning Appear quire that a sign be free of gra- the Department of Neighborh ent are concerned with how the g caveats to the proposed ord r-size murals. Ms. Egerstrom Roberts stated that the curren th the owner's permission the ated to grafifit on a property co	owing graffiti on the sides that the definition of "sign" are many socially useful mural is pre-existing and Mr. Mukamal sees no first ently regulates signs as rals. Ms. Egerstrom noted lash from local artists with Is (BOZA). Ms. Turk noted offiti, which Mr. Roberts bood Services and the his legislation would be linance to separate signs recommended adding a t ordinance notes that if n it is not graffiti. He also oome from the neighbors,

creating a line of demarcation between "good" murals and "bad" murals. Ms. Blando presented the committee with pictures of existing, problem murals (Exhibit 1) and discussed free walls or permission walls which often result in increased violence in the surrounding neighborhood. These walls are created to allow individuals to express themselves with no fear of police prosecution. Graffiti vandalism may also result in traffic safety issues when traffic signs and public buildings are targeted (Exhibit 2). Ms. Blando also provided a picture of a graffiti tag (Exhibit 3). Ms. Turk stated that there are few cities that have definitions of murals and those cities tend to be smaller ones. Ms. Egerstrom did read two definitions of "murals" that she had found.

*Mr.* Rute suggested that legitimate murals could be defined as being pre-designed, have a completion date, cover a certain maximum percentage of the facade, not encroach on the fenestration, provide the name of the artist and meet other criteria that the city could devise.

*Mr.* Richardson moved, seconded by *Mr.* Roberts, to recommend that this proposed ordinance does not meet administrative efficiency and that a new ordinance be drafted to contain the suggestion that "murals" be legislated separately from signs with the above-listed criteria recommended by *Mr.* Rute and any other criteria that may seem relevant.

Meeting adjourned: 2:54 P.M. Linda M. Elmer Staff Assistant