



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 32.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: NOVEMBER 18, 2010**

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR: M. MARGO WHEELER

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT: ABYANCE - TXT-38853 - TEXT AMENDMENT - PUBLIC HEARING -
APPLICANT/OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Discussion and possible action to amend Title
19.14 and Title 19.20 to define standards for building wrap signage. Staff has NO
RECOMMENDATION.

THIS ITEM WILL BE FORWARDED TO CITY COUNCIL IN ORDINANCE FORM

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

0

City Council Meeting

0

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has NO RECOMMENDATION.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Proposed Amendment and Staff Report
2. Submitted at Meeting PowerPoint Presentation by Staff and Letters from Clear Channel Outdoor and Kaempfer Crowell Renshaw Gronauer and Fiorentino

Motion made by GLENN TROWBRIDGE to Hold in abeyance to 1/25/2011

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0

GUS FLANGAS, VICKI QUINN, GLENN TROWBRIDGE, RICHARD TRUESDELL,
STEVEN EVANS, BYRON GOYNES, TODD L. MOODY; (Against-None); (Abstain-None);
(Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-None)

Minutes:

CHAIR TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

While showing a PowerPoint presentation submitted for the record, FLINN FAGG, Planning and Development, gave a brief description of the proposed new signage addition to the sign code. Known as building wrap signage, it is large format, printed on vinyl or mesh and with/without text. He spoke on the signage standards and minimum requirements and indicated where the signage is permitted and not permitted. In addition, language was included within the sign code to address concerns relating to impact on residential. Staff received a letter, which was submitted also for backup, from Clear Channel Outdoor, stating the industry would like to meet with staff to clarify some issues with the proposed text amendments prior to the item being heard at City Council.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: NOVEMBER 18, 2010

ATTORNEY TONY CELESTE, 8345 West Sunset Road, appeared on behalf of Lamar Outdoor Advertising (Lamar), and submitted a letter from Lamar, who echoed the same request as Clear Channel Outdoor. ATTORNEY RUSSELL ROWE, 10100 West Charleston Boulevard, appeared on behalf of Boyd Gaming and echoed ATTORNEY CELESTES comments.

COMMISSIONER EVANS asked if the design standards for Symphony Park preclude the use of a building wrap. MR. FAGG replied that Symphony Park has its own sign standards in the design standards manual and did not believe they would be permitted to have building wrap signage. Their manual would have to be amended to include this type of signage. MR. FAGG pointed out that buildings must meet the minimum threshold requirement of 10 stories and 200,000 square feet. COMMISSIONER EVANS referred to the photo shown on the overhead depicting signage on the Mirage Hotel and Casino. He was concerned with opening Pandora's Box leading to unintended consequences, as signage content cannot be regulated. MR. FAGG discussed with COMMISSIONER EVANS his concern and stated that the signage should be coordinated with the architectural aspect of the building itself. In addition, the Code prohibits signage beyond the roofline/walls of the building. The photos shown depict good examples of appropriate signage. MR. FAGG also pointed out that signage within the Downtown Signage District would have to be reviewed by the Downtown Architectural Review Committee.

COMMISSIONER FLEMINGAS believed a problem could arise with this signage on a 10-story building, whereby the signage could potentially be seen from residential. He believed staff should review this condition further.

COMMISSIONER TROWBRIDGE was concerned with Sections C-212 versus E-3, off-premise sign and off-premise message. MR. FAGG responded they are one in the same. If a property has building wrap signage, it cannot have an off-premise billboard and vice versa. Off-premise messages are allowed as part of the building wrap signage where there is not an existing billboard on the property. The commissioners strongly believed additional discussion was necessary and should include input from the industry.

CHAIR TROWBRIDGE asked if an off-premise advertisement becomes an eyesore, can a time line be enforced to remove it and if a special use permit allows for various messages or an advertisement for one specific event. MR. FAGG replied that currently the Code does not address a time limit, but there could be language added to the Code requiring maintenance and/or removal.

Regarding the Citys Atrium building, MR. FAGG informed COMMISSIONER EVANS that this is a nine-story building which does not qualify. The Commissioner was leery that buildings could potentially become billboards. COMMISSIONERS TROWBRIDGE and EVANS discussed with MR. FAGG possible timelines and safeguards that may be in place to prevent this from occurring.

CHAIR TRUESELLE declared the Public Hearing closed.