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Background

• SMC 17C.240 – Signs
• Last comprehensive update 2009
• Need to update
  – to respond to City Council Moratorium
  – to incorporate changes recommended by Current Planning staff
  – to comply with recent Supreme Court decision
Emergency Ordinance

• Emergency Ordinance 35490
  – Passed April 10, 2017
  – SMC 17C.240.250 (B)(2) Public Works Exception
  – Moratorium on the relocation of off-premise signs into areas having a Center and Corridor zoning designation
Current Planning Recommendations

• Maintained a list of needed revisions as they encounter challenges implementing the code

• Eight recommended changes
  – SMC 17C.240.250 B. – Off-Premise Signage, Public Works Exception
    • Clarify definition of *roadway* and add relocation requirements
Reed v. Town of Gilbert

• Supreme Court case decided in 2015.
  – Provided new guidance on sign code regulations
• A church was cited for violating the Town of Gilbert’s sign code
• In 2008 the church filed suit in Federal District Court
• The Supreme Court unanimously agreed that the sign code violated the First Amendment
• First Amendment
  – Prohibits laws abridging freedom of speech
    • Courts have not take a literal approach
    • Restrictions on content trigger the highest level of scrutiny
    • Restrictions that are content neutral are afforded a lower level of scrutiny
Background

• Content Neutral Tests
  – Need to read vs. government purpose

• Content Neutral Regulations
  – Time, place and manner
  – Intermediate scrutiny

• Regulations that differ based on the content of the message
  – Strict scrutiny
Background

- **Strict vs. Intermediate Scrutiny**
  - **Strict Scrutiny**
    - Must be justified by a *compelling* government interest
    - Must use the least restrictive means to achieve that interest
    - Government bears the burden of proof
  - **Intermediate Scrutiny**
    - Must be justified by a *substantial* government interest
    - Must be narrowly tailored to achieve that interest
    - Must leave open ample alternative avenues of communication
SMC 17C. 240 - Signs

• Our code is set up similar to Gilbert’s
• There are currently 10 categories of temporary signs, 8 of which do not require a permit
• Our Purpose Statement Cites
  – Health, Safety, and General Welfare
  – Avoiding Nuisances
  – Zoning
  – Aesthetics
  – Communication
  – Free Speech
  – Visual Clutter (traffic safety)
Project Scope

• Amend the code to be sign-content neutral
• Respond to the City Council’s moratorium
• Clarify code requirements and improve overall efficiency and effectiveness in code administration.
• Public engagement process to ensure viable outcome
Project Scope

What the scope does *NOT* include:

- Changes to size, number, placement of signs*

- Changes to regulations regarding different sign types*
Recommended Revisions

- Strengthen purpose statement
- Reevaluate exemptions and prohibitions
- Address temporary signs and content neutrality
- Eight changes recommended by Current Planning
- Reexamine definitions for completeness and organization
- Reorganize for readability and cleanup for clarity
Timeline

April - May  Internal staff audit and baseline draft development

June 14  Plan Commission workshop and appointment of Work Group members

June-August  Work Group review and recommendations

September 13  Plan Commission workshop

September 14  Submittal to Washington State Department of Commerce for 60 day review (prior to Council Action)

September 27  Plan Commission Hearing

October 2  Council Briefing at PED

November 6  Council Advance Briefing

November 13  Council First Reading

November 20  Council Hearing and adoption
Work Group Participants

• City staff
  – Planning
  – Legal
  – Streets
• Community Assembly
• Sign Code Industry (1-2)
• Plan Commission Members (1-2)
Action Items

• Feedback and approval of project charter

• 1-2 Volunteers for work group