



Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 4.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: JULY 1, 2008

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY
DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JEBBIC

Consent Discussion

SUBJECT:
Bill No. 2008-30 Updates provisions of the City's sign regulations relating to enforcement, remedies and penalties. Sponsored by Councilman Gary Reese

Fiscal Impact:

No Impact Augmentation Required
 Budget Funds Available

Amount:
Funding Source:
Dept./Division:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill will update provisions of the City's sign regulations relating to enforcement, remedies and penalties. In particular, the bill will 1) expand the availability of civil proceedings regarding sign violations, 2) include clarifications regarding proof of responsibility in such proceedings, 3) provide authority to require the removal of illegal signs upon shorter notice, and 4) increase minimum fines and penalties for violations.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2008-30

Motion made by RICKI Y. BARLOW to Approve as DO PASS

Passed For: 2; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0
RICKI Y. BARLOW, LOIS TARKANIAN; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-None)

Minutes:

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY DAN STILL explained that the proposed bill pertains to revisions to the City's sign code. With regard to the first revision, he stated that it eliminates the presumption that gave the sign industry a defense in the administrative hearing process. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STILL explained that if a business hires a sign company to erect a sign, a contract would be entered into. However, for off-site signs that are problematic, the business could use the defense that they had never requested those signs to be installed. With the adoption of Bill No. 2008-30, the civil administrative process would come before the City Council and that would no longer be a valid defense. He reiterated that whatever name,

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: July 01, 2008

promoter or event appearing on the signage would be held responsible.

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STILL stated that the the second amendment relates to increased fees.

COUNCILMAN BARLOW questioned how the City intends to enforce the law. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STILL stated that the City has the right to remove signs. He noted that despite attempts to identify the sign owner using information displayed on various signs, determining responsibility has been a challenge for the Department of Neighborhood Services and the Municipal Courts.

