PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
CITY OF TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES, NEW MEXICO

WORKSHOP
Tuesday, March 19, 2013

TIME & PLACE: The Planning & Zoning Commission of the City of Truth or Consequences, New Mexico, met in Workshop in full conformity with the law and ordinances of said Commission, at the Commission Chambers of said City on Tuesday, the 19th day of March, A.D., 2013.

PRESIDING OFFICER: The meeting was called to order by January Roberts, Chairman, and Angela A. Torres acted as Secretary.

ATTENDANCE: Upon calling the roll the following members were reported present:

January Roberts, Chairman
Joey Perry, Vice Chairman
James Jacobs, 2nd Vice Chairman
John Saridan, Member

Absent:

Jimmy Butler, Member

Also Present:

Bill Slettom, Community Development Director
Robbie Travis, Building Inspector
Jeff Lawlis, M & J Sign Co.
Don Gustin, SW Sign Company
Rubin Olivas, CMC Construction
Angela A. Torres, Deputy City Clerk

QUORUM: There being a quorum present the Commission proceeded with the business at hand.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: January Roberts, Chairman called for approval of the Agenda.

"John Saridan moved approval of the Agenda as submitted."

Seconded by James Jacobs
Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION REGARDING SIGN CODE: January Roberts, Chairman, noted that tonight's Workshop is to review which changes they would like to make to the Truth or Consequences Sign Code. The first item they will be reviewing is off premise signs.

Jeff Lawlis, owner of M & J Sign Co., stated, in order to fix the issues with off premise signs in the City of Truth or Consequences, they would have to bring the T or C Sign Ordinance in compliance with the State Sign Ordinance. The main reason for this is that most of the businesses in Truth or Consequences are located on the business loop, which is controlled by the State, and the Beautification Act (which is Federal as of 1965).
Every off premise sign that is on the business loop (which is the majority 80% of all businesses in T or C and Williamsburg) is affected by the sign code. One of the problems that may occur with the off premise sign ordinance; is that currently the code allows off premise signs on buildings. Under the State Ordinance, it does permit you to have a sign on a building, but there are very few owners that do that, because the distance of an off premise sign from an on premise sign has to be a minimum of 100 ft., therefore allowing an off premise sign on buildings here in Truth or Consequences, will put about 95% of business owners in violation of State and Federal Ordinance on the business loop. An off premise sign is only allowed in commercial areas and if a sign is in a Commercial Zoned Property then they would have to get a State Permit.

Mr. Lawlis stated that an off premise sign is considered a sign that advertises a Business, or an Entity, that is not located on the premise property itself. Everyone who is allowed an off premise sign under the State Code (or who meet the requirements for a State Permit) would not be allowed to do so, but anyone within a mile would be able to. If a sign meets the requirements of the State on distances, and it is commercial zoned, then an off premise sign is allowed. A City Permit is required in order for the State to issue a permit. Most of the businesses that have an off premise sign along the business loop do not have A State Permit because they do not meet State’s requirements. The Truth or Consequences Sign Ordinances on the freeway are completely different than what the State requires on the freeways. There are very few signs on the freeway that do not have a State Permit, and the State requires the permit to be removed every year at a cost of about $25.00 per side, so if you have a sign in the City, you’re required to pay $50.00 a year to the State if it is on the business loop, and if it’s considered an off premise sign.

Joey Perry asked if the City of Truth or Consequences has an annual renewal fee for signs.

Bill Sletton, Community Development Director stated no, we do not.

January Roberts, Chairman, asked if other communities adopted any ordinances.

Jeff Lawlis replied, not in Sierra County, but possibly in Las Cruces and/or Socorro.

Rubin Olivas asked if there will be additional meetings regarding the sign ordinance.

January Roberts, Chairman, stated that they will have several more Workshops regarding the sign code, and they will start looking into State Statutes to make their sign ordinances.

Bill Sletton, Community Development Director, stated that the City of Aztec also has what’s called a CSP (Comprehensive Sign Plan) which reads:

*The Comprehensive Sign Plan may be submitted that permits consideration of unique conditions, flexibility, and creativity. Such CSP is subject to approval by the City Commission. The application of such plan cannot be viewed as imposing more restrictive requirements than permitted by the basic standards, but rather, may permit additional signs, and/or sign area based on the applicant’s demonstration of unique characteristics of the design, building, and/or site and appropriate landscaping associated with the signs.*

January Roberts, Chairman, stated at the next Workshop they will make a decision on what kind of changes they would like to make regarding the sign ordinance.
Don Gustin, owner of SW Sign Co., suggested that they adopt a partial State Ordinance, and personalize it with the City Sign Ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT: “John Saridan moved to adjourn the meeting.”

Seconded by James Jacobs
Motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, January Roberts, Chairman, called the meeting adjourned.

APPROVAL: PASSED AND APPROVED this __th day of ____________ 2013, on motion duly made by ________ and seconded by ________ and carried.

January Roberts, Chairman