

Sign Regulation Amendment Tracking Sheet

November Resolution Proposals	Current Code/Impact	Recommendations	Council Action Compared to November Resolution Proposals
<p>1. Define elevated travel ways and except major interchanges and intersections from that definition</p>	<p>No such definitions exist in the current code.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Not applicable due to non-support for increased height.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Did not accept definitions.</p>
<p>2. Prohibit truck-mounted and car-mounted ads within the full-purpose City limits, on vehicles driven solely for the purpose of advertising businesses that are unrelated to the vehicle's primary business, excluding vehicles that are not motor-operated (such as pedi-cabs), vehicles which display only an advertisement or business identification of its owner so long as such vehicle is engaged in the usual business or regular work of its owner and is not used merely, mainly, or primarily to display "third-party" advertisements, and buses used primarily for the purpose of transporting multiple passengers.</p>	<p>City Code does not currently regulate "mobile" billboards.</p> <p>Amendment bans <i>motor</i>-operated vehicles that operate for the main/sole purpose of advertising a business' unrelated to the purpose or business of the vehicle. For example, vehicles with advertisements displaying the business of the owner of the vehicle would be allowed. But, vehicles advertising an unrelated business would not be authorized. Buses, including those operated by Capital Metro, are exempt from this regulation if they are used primarily for the purpose of transporting multiple passengers. Pedi-cabs and horse-drawn carriages would be exempt as well.</p>	<p>Design Commission. Recommended. Applauds well designed graphics, etc on business vehicles that identify goods transported by the vehicles. Regards mobile billboards as off-premise signage banned since '83.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended <u>with clarifications.</u> <u>Immediately ban new mobile billboard businesses. For existing mobile billboard companies operating in Austin (City is aware of two companies), give 2 years after adoption to comply.</u></p>	<p>1st Reading – Accepted with PC recommendation to give 2 years for existing companies to comply.</p>
<p>3. Clarify, and establish penalties, for Section 25-10-152(B)(6)(b) that removes the right to replace a billboard sign once it is removed</p>	<p>Signs that are part of a relocation application must be removed from their original site and may not be replaced.</p> <p>Amendment clarifies once the sign is physically removed/relocated, it cannot be replaced, regardless if a replacement application is submitted/approved.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation. Design Commission opposes the concept of relocation and recommends eliminating the concept entirely.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full) Recommended.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Intended to be accepted; needs clarification.</p>

November Resolution Proposals	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation	Council Action Compared to November Resolution Proposals
<p>4. Allow signs to be relocated to commercial corridor sign districts without regard to the size of the sign</p>	<p>Currently, only signs that are 300 square feet or less can be located in commercial sign districts.</p> <p>Amendment allows nonconforming signs that are 300 square feet or more to be located in a commercial sign district. TXDOT limit to billboards is 672 square feet</p>	<p>Design Commission. Not recommended. Design Commission opposes the concept of relocation and recommends eliminating the concept entirely.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full) Not recommended.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Did not accept relocation to commercial corridors regardless of size.</p>
<p>5. Allow signs on limited commercial corridors within the scenic roadway sign districts to be designated by stakeholders by the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission subcommittee on Codes and Ordinances</p>	<p>Currently, nonconforming signs may not be moved to scenic roadways, and are actually encouraged to be moved out of scenic roadways.</p> <p>Amendment allows nonconforming signs to be placed along certain portions of scenic roadways</p>	<p>Design Commission. Not recommended. Design Commission opposes the concept of relocation and recommends eliminating the concept entirely.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Not recommended.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Did not accept relocation into scenic roadways.</p>
<p>6. Change the way the sign height is measured to permit signs to be 42.5 feet above the elevation of the highest adjacent main travel lane (measured to the top of the sign face) for signs not on elevated travel ways, and 25 feet above the elevated travel way (measured from the highest elevated point of the travel way within 500 feet of the sign to the top of the sign face) for signs on elevated travel ways, but not within one-half mile of an interchange</p>	<p>Current measurement (42 feet) is taken from ground level street pavement. In situations where an elevated highway is involved, measurement is taken from the nearest road, which is often times an access road, rather than from the elevated highway.</p> <p>Amendment allows a nonconforming sign to increase in height by not more than 25 feet above an elevated highway. For signs located adjacent to a non-elevated roadway, the 42.5 ft measurement would begin from the grade of the main traveled way.</p> <p>The 25 ft increase above the elevated travel lanes would not be authorized within ½ mile or 2640 ft of an interchange or intersection with elevated travel lanes.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full) Not Recommended</p>	<p>1st Reading – Did not accept change to the way height of billboard is measured.</p>

November Resolution Proposals	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation	Council Action Compared to November Resolution Proposals
<p>7. Clarify that a sign is deemed to be “adjacent” to an elevated travel way only if the sign face is oriented toward the travel way and the foundation of the sign is located no more than 500 feet away from the travel way at the closest point</p>	<p>No such clarification exists in the current code.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full) Not necessary w/o support of height measurement.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Did not accept clarification of the term adjacent.</p>
<p>8. Allow the face size of newly-relocated signs to be as large as the total aggregate square footage of face size of all signs removed as a part of the relocation application up to a maximum of 672 square feet, and make signs where the aggregate does not reach a maximum of 672 square feet subject to a required overall 10% reduction in the total aggregate amount of square footage of the sign face size</p>	<p>Currently, billboard companies cannot use more than one nonconforming sign to replace a nonconforming sign.</p> <p>Amendment allows the use of more than one nonconforming sign to be replaced by one nonconforming sign as long as the aggregate of the sign face is no more than 672 square feet. In cases when the aggregate does not reach the max 672 square feet, the relocated nonconforming sign face shall be 10% less than the aggregate sign face square footage of all the signs removed.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation. Design Commission opposes the concept of relocation and recommends eliminating the concept entirely.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended with the following addition: when aggregating, the maximum size for the newly relocated sign is 300 square feet as opposed to 672 square feet.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Did not accept aggregation option in its entirety.</p>
<p>9. Require energy-efficient, pollution reduction lighting of non-conforming off-premises signs for all relocation signs immediately and for all other signs within 36 months after the first month the sign is registered following the date of adoption of the requirement</p>	<p>The current code does not address energy efficient lighting for signs.</p>	<p>Design Commission. Recommended. Design Commission supports the “greening” of signs by requiring low wattage lamps for illuminating the signs at night.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended with the additions: Energy efficient dark sky lighting is required within six months after the adoption of this amendment.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Accepted requirement to install energy efficient/dark sky lighting per Planning Commission’s recommendation.</p>

November Resolution Proposals	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation	Council Action Compared to November Resolution Proposals
<p>10. Amend the code to require off-premise sign owners to register signs and pay fees for all signs within the City's planning jurisdiction, and establish penalties for non-compliance</p>	<p>Property owners currently register signs. A nonconforming sign may not be relocated without being registered.</p> <p>Amendment shifts the responsibility to register signs to the sign owner rather than the property owner</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full) Not recommended.</p> <p><u>Re Penalties portion:</u> Design Commission. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Accepted all portions. Sign owners will be responsible for registering signs and paying related fees. Penalties for non-compliance will apply to the sign owner.</p>
<p>11. Prohibit any sign owner from relocating a sign if that sign owner is in violation of the registration requirements for any other sign owned by that sign owner within the City's jurisdiction</p>	<p>There is no prohibition from relocating a sign if the sign owner does not register a sign.</p> <p>Amendment prohibits a sign owner from relocating a sign if the sign is not registered.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation. Design Commission opposes the concept of relocation and recommends eliminating the concept entirely.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Not recommended.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Accepted prohibiting sign owners from relocating a sign if in violation of registration, but needs to be clarified during 2nd/3rd reading.</p>
<p>12. Require annual registration of all non-conforming off-premises signs</p>	<p>Nonconforming signs were registered every two years previously.</p> <p>Amendment requires an annual registration.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended annual registration only. Do not change current requirement for property owner to register sign.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Accepted requirement to make sign owners register annually.</p>

November Resolution Proposals	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation	Council Action Compared to November Resolution Proposals
<p>13. Establish a notice requirement to notify sign owners of the upcoming expiration of the registration of a sign no earlier than 90 days and no later than 30 days prior to the expiration and establishing that failure by the City to send such notice voids the prohibition against relocating signs if any signs owned by the sign owner within the City's jurisdiction are in violation of the registration requirements</p>	<p>The building official is not currently required to notify a sign owner that their sign is not registered.</p> <p>Amendment would place the responsibility upon the City to notify when a sign is not registered properly.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended with addition that sign owner or manager must provide an annual inventory of all owned and managed signs with their location, property owner, and description of the sign.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Accepted notice requirement with Planning Commission recommendation that the sign owner provide an annual inventory of all owned and managed signs with information requested by the Director. Additional requirement from Council to create an accessible online database of information on billboards.</p>
<p>14. Impose registration requirements (including the requirement to pay a registration fee) upon taxis that advertise unrelated businesses</p>	<p>There are currently no registration fees for taxi cabs to display advertisements.</p> <p>Amends Chapter 13, Transportation Code for Ground Transportation Passenger Services and requires an annual fee to display third party advertisements. The fees would be set by the Public Works Department and would be dependent upon the cost to administer the program.</p>	<p>Urban Transportation Commission. Recommended (4-3 in favor)</p> <p>Design Commission. Recommended, if such signage is allowed to continue and if the amount of the fee can be enough to actually pay for the cost of implementing and enforcing the program and still have funds left to defray the cost of enforcing the sign ordinance. But Prefers not to have advertising on Taxicabs.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended</p>	<p>1st reading – Did not accept Taxi Cab registration fee.</p>

November Resolution Proposals	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation	Council Action Compared to November Resolution Proposals
<p>14a. Remove 25-10-152(B)(5) which allows for the replacement of existing non-conforming off-premise signs. (per 5/8/08 Council Direction)</p>	<p>Currently, non-conforming off-premise signs may be replaced, if the replacement sign does not direct illumination onto a property zoned or used for residential use; does not exceed the height of the sign it replaces; and is constructed in the same location with the same type of materials and construction design as the sign it replaces at a approximately 25% smaller in size than the original sign it replaces.</p> <p>Amendment would eliminate the ability to replace an existing non-conforming off-premise signs.</p>	<p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended.</p>	<p>Action to be determined.</p>

Additional Planning Commission Recommendations	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation	Council Action on Additional Planning Commission Recommendations
<p>15. No sign may be relocated to within 1,000 ft of a residential zoning or use or within 800 feet of a school property.</p>	<p>Currently, signs may not be relocated within 500 ft of a residential structure in a residential base zoning district.</p> <p>Amendment would expand the limitation to 1,000 ft of a residential base zoning district or a residential use AND a 800 ft of a school property</p>	<p>Design Commission. Did not consider relocating signs within 1,000 ft of residential zoning or use. Recommends prohibiting the installation of a sign within 800 ft of a boundary of school property.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended</p>	<p>1st Reading – Not accepted.</p>
<p>16. Require identifying markers and additional info to be placed on signs (as determined by the Director of WPDRD)</p>	<p>Code does not currently require the sign to identified with any special markings for compliance.</p> <p>Amendment would require identifying markers such as registration number and markers to identify height of the structure as well as any other requirements as determined by the Director.</p>	<p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended</p>	<p>1st Reading – Accepted.</p>

Additional Planning Commission Recommendations	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation	Council Action on Additional Planning Commission Recommendations
<p>17. Relocated signs are limited to a face-for-a-face” but a double face sign may not be relocated to two separate locations and thereby become 2 single-face signs</p>	<p>Currently, staff practice is to require that a sign replace on a like for like basis. A two face sign must be relocated with a two face sign and a one face sign for a one face.</p> <p>Amendment would clarify the staff’s current practice as well as clarify that a two face sign could not be replaced with 2 single face signs.</p>	<p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Not accepted.</p>
<p>18. All relocated signs must be removed before the new sign may be built; “relocated” signs are permitted to remain in place for a term of 10 yrs; the permitted term may be extended in six year increments if another sign of equal or larger size is removed for each 6 year period; each removed sign must have a sign face equal to or greater than the relocated sign face area</p>	<p>The Code does not specifically state that the sign must be removed prior to relocating the new sign. Additionally, relocated signs are limited to a 25 year life span and then must be removed from their new location unless another billboard is removed. The code is also silent on whether or not the 2nd billboard to be removed must be of similar size in sign face or not.</p> <p>Amendment would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify that the original sign must be removed before erecting a new relocated sign. ▪ Change the code to limit life span of the new sign from 25 years to 10 years ▪ Change the code to limit additional years granted for removal of additional billboard removed to 6 years per billboard removed ▪ Clarify that any additional sign remove be of equal or larger size in sign face area. 	<p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended.</p>	<p>1st Reading – Not Accepted.</p>