Jen Daugherty

From: Bill Taylor [wthomsontaylor@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 06, 2011 7:16 AM
To: Jen Daugherty; Sandra Moberly; Jay Deinken; Tony Barrett; Smith, Jim; Bruce Woodward; Mary Handel; Harvey, David
Cc: Mark Wardlaw
Subject: ZCUG - Signs
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Staff and ZCUG members,

Since our meeting, I have been thinking more about amortization and looked again at the signs on Main Street. I see two issues with amortizing signs. The first is the time and money that it would take to conduct the baseline inventory and the second is the political will of the community. That being said, there are a few signs that are so intrusive they strongly detract from the community's image (or define the community's image). I think that those signs really need to go. I can think of three ways to get rid of them. The first is amortization, the second is buying them outright, and the third is attrition. To date, the Town has used the third avenue. As properties applied for improvements or redeveloped the Town was able to require removal of nonconforming signs. The old B of A pole sign and the Kentucky Fried Chicken bucket on a pole are two examples. When those businesses did face lifts, the signs were required to be removed. With the Mammoth Vista project, the Royal Pines sign will go, but we could wait another 30 years or more for some of the others. That leaves amortization or direct purchase as the ways to remove the remaining problems. The only question is which is cheaper and more effective. Adoption of amortization has the secondary benefit of decreasing the amount that the Town would have to pay to remove a sign as the amortization period elapses should it choose to seek removal ahead of the amortization deadline.

Perhaps an inventory could be focused on the commercial zones as the top priority. This would limit the number of signs and the geographic scope, making the inventory more manageable. I also think that if the community actually cares about the signage, you could get volunteers to conduct the inventory. Given the Town's budget that would keep the cost minimal. Given the strength that amortization gives to the Town in furthering its vision, I would like to see it re-inserted in the code.

I would like to see the really bad signs removed, so that leads me to some questions for the Commission/Council and the Town Attorney.

For the Commission/Council:

1. Are you concerned enough about the impact of the few remaining pole signs (or others) on the Town's image to act to have them removed?
2. Are you willing to adopt and enforce an amortization provision?
3. Are you willing to pay to have them removed?
4. Is attrition sufficient?

For the Town Attorney:

1. Is an inventory focuses on specific zones such as the commercial zones or on certain classes of

signs such as freestanding signs enforceable?
2. Would a photo inventory suffice for establishing the baseline?

Any other thoughts?

Bill

--
Taylor Consulting Services
William T. Taylor, AICP
P.O. Box 7363
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
760.709.6964
wthomsontaylor@gmail.com