



Minutes of October 3, 2011

Meeting Called to order at 7:01 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

P&Z Board Members

Attendance table with columns for MEMBERS and dates from 10/3/11 to 1/18/11. Rows list members like Marianne McCoy, Diane Sori, Helen Cohen, etc., with attendance status (P, A, **P, ***P).

* Reappointed ** Resigned *** New appointment

STAFF PRESENT: Matt Wood, Director
Jason Chockley, Planner
Ro Woodward, Administrative Coordinator

APPLICANTS: Michael Cabak, Sunshine Storage
David Howell, Sunshine Storage

2. P&Z BOARD - MINUTES - WAIVE/APPROVE - SEPTEMBER 19, 2011
MOTION TO WAIVE READING OF MINUTES OF 9/19/11: Motion to waive the reading of the minutes made by Mr. Valenti and seconded by Ms. Keirnan. All ayes on voice vote. APPROVE: Motion to approve made by Mr. Konhauzer and seconded by Mr. Valenti. There were all ayes on voice vote. Motion was approved.

3. CORRESPONDENCE:
None.

4. NEW BUSINESS:

A. SUNSHINE SELF STORAGE SIGN WAIVER PETITION # SW 8-1-11 - LOCATED AT 9881 SHERIDAN STREET

Mr. Wood explained that this item is a Sign Waiver for Sunshine Self Storage. The petitioner requests three waivers from Section 25-23 of the Code relative to permanent signage, summarized as follows:

- 1. Increasing the number of full size wall signs from one to two.
2. Increasing the allowable height of the letters from 18 to 42 inches.
3. Increasing the maximum length of the signs from 20 feet to 26 feet, 3 inches.

The applicant currently has a freestanding monument sign that will be removed in favor of the wall signs, if approved. For a freestanding building not within a shopping center like Sunshine Storage that does not choose to erect a ground sign, secondary signs are allowed on two side

walls, up to one-third the size of the allowed ground sign. Under this request the applicant desires the permitted secondary wall sign at the full area allowed for a single wall sign.

Code stipulates that waivers may be granted where at least one of the following is met:

- 1) Signs cannot be properly viewed due to physical site distinctions.
- 2) Architectural design of a structure and/or a site plan poses unique and extenuating characteristics whereby a waiver is in the city's best interests.
- 3) Literal enforcement would result in unreasonable and undue hardship upon the petitioner.

The applicant's justification for the two wall signs with larger specs is to address limited visibility from Sheridan Street to the south related to the large scale of the building relative to the allowable sign sizes.

Mr. Wood concluded that Staff finds that the petition meets the submittal requirements for this sign waiver to be considered. He advised that the Planning and Zoning Board is requested to discuss the petition and make a recommendation. Board input will be forwarded to the City Commission for action.

Mr. Mike Cabak with Sunshine Self Storage, showed several displays and pointed out where the monument sign is currently located and then displayed a photo as to where the new signage was to be located on the building. He mentioned that they would remove the monument sign and the new signage would be on the building. On the west side of the building there would also be a sign. He pointed out the view going east on Sheridan Street there is a billboard, which is owned by others that would block that sign as well. The sign on the west side of the building would make note as to what the building is for.

Mr. Konhauzer wanted to know if this was one of the larger buildings in Cooper City.

Mr. Cabak responded yes, that is correct.

Mr. Konhauzer then asked if there were any other buildings that might not be as large that have signs that are red and 42" in height versus the 18" that they have been given.

Mr. Wood responded that there is another self service storage facility behind Cooper City Commons and they did get some sign waivers a few years back so there has already been some consideration given by this City. It went to the P&Z Board and the City Commission and they ended up getting a couple of deviations from code requirements to offset the fact that they were sitting behind the back from Sheridan Street as well. Each petition has its own unique issues and thought this applicant was trying to use as one of their justifications the size and scale of that building relative to the size of the lettering, so in other words, a bigger building needs a bigger sign.

Mr. Konhauzer remarked that this would be a case by case and if they do approve this would that mean then that any building could come before them to request 42" lettering.

Mr. Wood responded no, each petition would have to be its own waiver and would have to be justified on its own merits. Again, there are unique situations that come up with each petition.

Ms. McCoy commented that she didn't have a problem with giving approval for this and when you look at unique and unusual conditions notwithstanding that it is a large building, but just the fact that they have been encumbered with a sign that they don't even own that is a billboard. It does affect the ability for people to know what their business is.

Mr. Nall asked what hours would the sign be illuminated and would it be set hours.

Mr. Cabak responded there will be a dusk to dawn sensor on it. It will turn on at dusk and turn off at dawn.

Mr. Nall expressed his concern that because it was going to be large lettering he wouldn't want it to be so bright.

Mr. Cabak remarked that it doesn't give off light, but internally illuminates the letters.

Mr. Nall commented that if it was 18" like it was he knew that would not cause a problem, but with 140% bigger you wouldn't want it to be a distraction of some type and that was his concern.

Mr. Konhauzer remarked that at 18" lettering on the scale of this building would be like sitting at the top row at a football stadium and looking at the Dolphins. He said that he was not against it, but wanted to make sure that anybody now, because they are allowing a 42" letter, would be allowed to do so. It would be on a case by case scenario.

Ms. McCoy commented that both of the signs are on raceways and they were not doing channel lettering.

Mr. Cabak responded yes that was correct.

Mr. Valenti wanted to know who owns the billboard in the front of the building.

Mr. Howell responded that it is owned by the people that own the towers and the land. The do not own the land or the towers or the billboard.

Mr. Valenti then asked if they would be coming back before the Board once the Charter School is built and would it interfere with the signs in any way.

Mr. Howell responded that the more activity in the neighborhood the better it would be for them. People visiting that school may or may not have seen his facility before. They don't perceive coming back for more signage.

MOTION: TO APPROVE SUNSHINE SELF STORAGE SIGN WAIVER PETITION # SW 8-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MR. VALENTI AND SECONDED BY MS. MCCOY FOR DISCUSSION.

Ms. Keirnan remarked that she doesn't have an issue with the sign on the side of the building because it is so long. She commented that she does have an issue with 42" on the front of the building and thought it was too big for that small of an area.

Mr. Aronson commented that the pictures they showed were to scale and it seemed to him when he looked at it he thought that it fit well with the size of the building and in terms of visibility, the smaller letters he didn't think you could see.

Mr. Cabak responded that there are two building in the front joined together and it is a total of 181 feet across the front and is 39 feet tall. Just the 3 story building alone is 121 feet wide.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that their sign would be 26 feet wide in the wide.

Mr. Cabak responded that was correct and is 26.3 feet on a 121 foot 3 story building. He then mentioned that the display map did not show the entire building.

Mr. Nall remarked that the illumination was going to be quite large off of Sheridan Street, the other side looks good, but the billboard is an eyesore and if you have something so big right there and being illuminated and with the billboard being illuminated he expressed his concern with that.

Mr. Konhauzer referred to the new CVS that is in the same area and look at the scale of that building and the size sign that they have. It almost makes sense to him the other building being so much larger than the CVS. When you show the side of the building as part of the motion he would want to know that they were not going to want to come back and say that because I have it here, I want it over here as well. He asks that be added as part of the motion.

Mr. Aronson responded that they can do that, but they can always come back and ask.

Mr. Nall asked to see the front view of the building and if they took what they had and moved it over one section and would get it away from the entrance to get it away from that billboard and it wouldn't look so cluttered.

Mr. Aronson commented that they put their sign there for a particular reason he presumed and asked the applicant to explain the reason why they chose to put it there rather than elsewhere on the front of the building.

Mr. Cabak responded that it did look most aesthetically pleasing right where it's at. He remarked that they could put it over to the other area, but it looked like it was offset.

Mr. Konhauzer asked if the signage was centered on the building now.

Mr. Howell responded that it is centered on the 3 story building.

Mr. Aronson thought it was framed nicely where it is.

Ms. McCoy remarked that they have had an issue with the setbacks too. They are located so far off the road and having the sign monument was doing nothing and does nothing for them.

Mr. Howell interjected that in these economic times they need all the help they can get. It was very difficult today to stand up on your own and he thinks this is a great balance to help them.

Mr. Nall agreed with Mr. Howell and thought that the monument sign entrance was hard to see when you are looking for it.

MOTION: TO APPROVE SUNSHINE SELF STORAGE SIGN WAIVER PETITION # SW 8-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MR. VALENTI AND SECONDED BY MS. MCCOY. On roll call there were four aye votes and two no votes made by Ms. Keirnan and Mr. Nall. Motion was approved.

B. DISCUSSION FOR POSSIBLE CHANGES TO AMEND CHAPTER 25, ARTICLE II OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE POLITICAL SIGN CODE

Mr. Wood commented that Ms. Lundgren was present tonight to walk them through what they have as backup material. At the request of the Board they did look at some other cities and Ms. Lundgren can explain the results of those surveys. By way of summary from the last meeting they discussed this; there were 3 issues that the Board brought up. 1). Concern for the allowable 60 square feet that a temporary window sign could take up. Under the current code window signs are allowed to be up to 25% of the window area up to a maximum of 60 square feet. A political sign being an allowable temporary sign the Board had an issue with a political sign being up to 60 square feet within a window area. 2). Concern for the maximum 32 square feet of a political sign within a non-residential area. 3). Concern with the removal of the bonding requirement.

Mr. Aronson commented that the changes that were made from the last draft are the lowering of the percentage...

Mr. Wood responded we have lowered the proposed allowable 60 square feet of a window sign down to 32 square feet and that was the only change that is proposed.

Mr. Aronson then commented that they did not include language about bonding and Mr. Wood will explain why.

Ms. Lundgren explained that she has provided the Board with what they had requested from the last meeting. She commented that the only change at this point proposed in the draft is related to the temporary window sign because the Board was concerned that a political sign under the proposed provision could be substituted for an allowable political sign of up to 60 sq ft. She has made that change that addresses that issue and referred to page 14 of the draft, Section 25-26 window signs that addressed the permissible window sign area for a single temporary window sign and shall not exceed 32 square feet in sign area. That way a 60 square foot window sign would not be possible for political signs and it would be consistent with the proposed limit for

political temporary signs in general which is 32 square feet. Additionally, per the Board's request was to provide examples of municipal codes in the area that has comparable size limits for political and temporary signs and is provided in the backup materials. There are several provisions that are provided that deal with municipalities for bond and removal of temporary signs. These examples provide a bond requirement for all political and all temporary signs, but they do have an exemption so that if someone comes in and is proposing to place a minimum of up to 4 temporary signs, or no sign larger than a certain square footage can be exempt from the bond requirement. Anyone who chooses to post more signs whether they are temporary or political they would be subject generally and uniformly to that bond requirement.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that most of the bond requirements from other municipalities were \$500.

Mr. Wood remarked that Dania Beach was \$100, Adventura was \$500 and Homestead is \$500.

Mr. Konhauzer thought that a \$100 he would walk away from that a lot sooner than he would \$500. He said that he would want to keep the bond at \$500.

Ms. McCoy remarked that we are talking about a \$500 bond for political signs.

Ms. Lundgren responded that it would be for all temporary signs because that is the best way to constitutionally deal with the issue of both political signs and temporary signs being treated

Ms. McCoy interjected that would include political signs or temporary signs. She thought that was onerous for a political candidate in town to have to pay \$500 out of a campaign account.

Mr. Aronson remarked that he disagreed and all you have to do is comply with the law and you get it back.

Ms. McCoy responded that you still have to shell out \$500 and thought that was a lot of money.

Mr. Konhauzer commented then let's say you do \$100 and the political thing happens and you lose and don't care then who is going to pay for the signs that person says for \$100 they would let them sit.

Ms. McCoy responded there are so many candidates that come through the City that are not local candidates and on the last night or 2 nights before there are snipe signs that are put all over town. She commented there was cleanup no matter what and still thought that \$500 was too much for a candidate, especially for local campaigns.

Mr. Nall agreed with Ms. McCoy and also thought that \$500 was too much and \$100 was too little. He suggested the Board consider \$250 and thought that was a more reasonable fee. The intent is to get candidates to remove their signs and if they don't what is it going to cost the City to have someone pick them up and discard them. It might cost them more than \$100 and probably around \$250. You would have to pay someone say, \$50 an hour it sure is not going to take them 5 hours to go through the whole City and pick up temporary signs. If it does then you

break even, but the intent is to get them to do it. He thought that \$250 was reasonable even for a candidate campaign. He also thought that \$500 was a little steep.

Ms. McCoy agreed with \$250 and thought that was reasonable

Ms. Keirnan agreed with \$250 also.

Mr. Valenti commented that he didn't think that \$500 was enough. He explained that you get Judges and State Representatives that come in and put their signs all over and somebody has to go and clean it up. Some of these signs are up there with 2X4s in the ground and they don't care and could care less. If a guy wants to run for office he collects all kinds of money to run for office and if he decides he wants to put up signs he should have to pay for it and clean it up. He remarked that he was worried about his City and not a dollar in his pocket he was worried about what Cooper City looks like and that is his biggest concern.

Mr. Konhauzer agreed with Mr. Valenti and thought that \$500 is what it should be. If these people are serious they are going to have that money in their account and they will get that money back and it's not like we are charging them. To him it is a way from stopping someone from polluting our City.

Ms. Keirnan mentioned that at the last meeting they discussed eliminating the bond completely.

Ms. Lundgren responded that is how is it proposed currently, but are talking about an alternative.

Ms. Keirnan commented that as a consensus the Board is saying don't eliminate the bond. Whatever the dollar amount is decided to be, please don't eliminate it.

Mr. Aronson responded that there is a consensus that the Board wants a bond, but what is before them is what would be the appropriate amount. There are a number of members that think that \$500 is fine. There is one person that thinks that is too high.

Mr. Nall asked Ms. Lundgren to differentiate political signs if you have a local candidate for a Cooper City election have a different bond for them than somebody who is outside the City.

Ms. Lundgren responded that was not recommended.

Mr. Konhauzer interjected that would be discrimination.

Mr. Aronson commented that he disagreed with Ms. McCoy's view because if you can't come up with \$500 that is refundable even if it's a local campaigns then you are probably not able to run your campaign.

Mr. Wood explained that currently the code only requires a \$150 bond only for those signs other than developed residential zoning districts. In other words a \$150 bond is currently required only for the non-residential areas. There is no bond currently for political signs in residential areas.

Mr. Aronson wanted to know if that was because if you wanted to put a sign in my yard I have to give you permission, which means I would take it down.

Mr. Konhauzer thought it was more on commercial property where you see these huge signs and doesn't see them coming down so quickly and thinks this would expedite that.

Mr. Wood stated that the proposed change would be to remove the \$150 bond and not require any bond. That is the way it is proposed right now.

Mr. Aronson remarked that there is a consensus that the Board wants a bond required, but need to come to a dollar amount.

Mr. Wood commented that before the Board decides that it is also important to understand that when you talk about bonding for political signs, they are talking about for any type of temporary signs and would include all temporary signs. He asked the Board to keep that in mind when they are making a recommendation.

Mr. Aronson referred to the Optimists who put up signage during certain times of the year for a limited period.

Mr. Valenti commented that they were told by Ken Richardson they can put their signs up 2 weeks before registration and take them down 2 weeks after registration. There is a period of time when you look at a sign and think that this sign has been up for 3 months, but they are different signs. They are 2X2 signs and every program uses the same size signs, but if you read them, then you would see they say baseball, basketball, soccer, etc. all the different programs.

Mr. Konhauzer wanted to know if this would mean that for each sign that you put you would have to put up a separate \$500 bond based on what Mr. Valenti explained for each of those different signs.

Mr. Aronson commented that if you were to put up signs for football, you would have put your money up for the bond and you would have gotten it back when you removed the signs. Then when soccer comes you would put your signs up, put your bond up....

Mr. Konhauzer interjected that it would be separate bonds.

Mr. Aronson explained that you would keep getting your money back.

Mr. Konhauzer asked what about a church and synagogue and they see all these signs and do they currently need to put up a bond to put those temporary signs up.

Ms. Lundgren under the proposed code they are looking at now they would need to apply the bond requirement uniformly to both temporary signs of non-political type and political signs.

Mr. Aronson commented that in the past they have not had it.

Ms. Lundgren responded that currently the ordinance provides for political signs to be subject to that bond.

Mr. Aronson remarked that what you could say is that we can continue with that until somebody wants to challenge it.

Ms. Lundgren responded that they are recommending that they make some changes to get the sign code into a better position legally.

Mr. Aronson then commented that they could take the position on this Board that the bond requirement remains only for political signs. The City Attorney is suggesting to the Board that may not be the best practice.

Mr. Konhauzer remarked that it has to be one for all and all for one so if they want to change that and say it is going to be \$500 or \$250 or \$300 it has to be for everyone; churches, synagogues, political etc. anything but on a private piece of property, because the owner of the residential property would be responsible.

Mr. Aronson thought that if we have a bond requirement for religious signs some of our religious signs are exempt.

Ms. Lundgren responded no they are not exempt.

Mr. Aronson remarked that he has no problem with that because that is another issue that the Board has to deal with.

Mr. Konhauzer commented why would you differentiate between political or any sign.

Ms. Lundgren responded that the reason is temporary signage regardless of the type it has the same issues with removal. If you have a sign for a special event and you put them in different places it is still a concern to the City whether those signs are removed or not. That is why in the examples from other cities codes that there is a requirement for the bond uniformly, but there is a uniform exemption for a certain number of signs, such as Dania Beach is for a few temporary signs none of which exceed a sign area of 6 square feet per sign or few fewer event banners.

Mr. Konhauzer remarked that the City of Cooper City who has a red digital sign that does what it needs to do. He said that he gets why because it's about public safety and information, but we are also advertising all of the events that go on in the City. He said that he could see this as a hardship.

Mr. Aronson commented that we are talking about signage that is not on private property. The issue they have with religious institutions are that signage on their property is not in compliance. He didn't think they had a lot of issues with churches putting multiple temporary signs throughout our City.

Ms. Lundgren responded that the concern with and the reason for the bond is that when someone comes into the City to place a number of temporary signs we don't know where they are going to go. They could go on someone's private property or they could go on the right-of-way or anywhere. The reason for the bond is to insure that those signs are removed. It is triggered by the number of signs and the sign size whether they are required to post the bond. In the other cities that have this type of procedure and it seems to be effective in those cities that have that procedure.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that churches, synagogues, and private property would not be affected by this unless it was on public property.

Ms. Lundgren responded no it is required that if they are going to post multiple temporary signs that exceed the minimal, so if they are going to post 4 temporary signs depending on how they structure it, coming in and posting more than 4 temporary signs of certain size then they are required to post the bond. If they have just one special event sign on their property they are not required to post the bond.

Mr. Aronson asked Mr. Valenti when they post the signs for the Optimistss how many signs on average do they post?

Mr. Valenti responded that it depends on the program. The Optimistss is not allowed to put signs on islands and there are only certain areas where they can put signs in the swales of the road. He mentioned that when you drive down Stirling Road on a Sunday morning there are all kinds of church signs in the island in the middle of the road. The Optimists can't do that.

Ms. Keirnan didn't think that churches could do that and it's a code violation and they just do it anyway. No one is enforcing the code.

Mr. Valenti commented that there are several churches that are at the high school. We need to be fair for everybody. He remarked they put up a lot of signage and they do 6,000 registrations a year. If you want the club to do a bond for every program, he suggested that he would go back to the club and recommend they do one bond a year. Give \$500 to the City and let them know where they are in violation.

Mr. Konhauzer remarked that he was backing up and making it a hardship for the community.

Mr. Valenti mentioned they were a non-profit organization.

Mr. Konhauzer responded that was his point.

Mr. Nall commented that going back to political signs; he wanted to know if there was still going to be a provision for political signs not to be placed before September 1st.

Mr. Wood responded that right now it is proposed to read one per candidate or issue not before the filing date of the election.

Mr. Nall remarked that the reason he was going in this direction is that he agreed with Ms. McCoy and thought \$500 was a little steep, but the more he thought about it you would not start your campaign in September, but you should have the \$500 by then. He said that he has changed his thought on the \$500 figure and agrees with that now especially to keep the political signs from being out for 6-8 months to keep it within 90 days of the actual election. You should have your campaign.

Ms. Lundgren responded that 90 days was acceptable in constitutionally speaking.

Mr. Nall commented that if you keep it to within 90 days of an election, and then he would have no problem with the \$500 bond. He said that if the Optimists wanted to put up a \$500 bond because it's a sign for the Optimists and just because it's a different program it's still a sign. He wouldn't differentiate between the Optimists sign for softball, baseball, soccer he was good with that.

Mr. Aronson remarked that since this is a temporary sign ordinance, which political signs only form a part, do we not have to have a uniform time lines.

Ms. Lundgren responded that actually it is not specifically uniform for every type of sign. Every type of temporary sign is different and each sign has its own relation and relevance depending on the nature of the events.

Mr. Aronson asked if Ms. Lundgren could give examples of generic categories. He understands political signs for an election.

Mr. Konhauzer suggested that when it is Easter or Passover when can the a church or synagogue put up their signs educating the public that there will be services at a certain time and when must they take them down.

Ms. Lundgren responded that a community service sign shall not be posted for a period of more than 30 days prior to the event or activity to which it relates.

Mr. Aronson wanted to know if community service would include religious signage.

Ms. Lundgren responded that was correct and Optimists too.

Ms. McCoy asked if the City Commissioners wanted to get rid of the bond and we are talking about keeping the bond.

Ms. Lundgren responded that there was some initial discussion at the Commission level on that issue of removing the bond. She has noted that the bond is not consistently applied for political and temporary signs in the current code. If the recommendation is that there is a bond required then the Board can recommend that to the Commission. She said that she recommends that it be political signs and temporary signs of all types and that it be applied uniformly.

Mr. Nall asked if real estate signs were exempt. It is not a type of sign that is subject

Mr. Konhauzer commented that the only people that the political signs would affect would be the Commission.

Mr. Aronson interjected that it would also effect non-citywide elections.

Mr. Konhauzer thought it would be hard for the Commission to be unbiased because of this. It would affect them personally.

Mr. Valenti commented that he didn't know why a real estate sign would be exempt because it's a business and are making money by putting signs out and has a problem with that.

Mr. Aronson thought those were governed by a different ordinance and most of these ordinances have an exemptions for four or less signs and they don't usually put many out at one time.

Ms. Lundgren responded that you are allowed open house signs.

Mr. Aronson explained that they are amending the temporary sign ordinance and it has been recommended to the Board that political signs are only one component of temporary signs and should be treated the same as all temporary signs, and there is a consensus that the Board wants temporary signs to have a bonding requirement. The Board then needs to decide how much is fair taking into consideration that it is not only political signs but also community signs as well and that some of these community activities may find it a hardship to pay for a bond. They need to come to a consensus as to what is the threshold for exemption, for instance some cities have 4 or less were exempt, and then size is already dealt with. In summary, he explained they need a bonding requirement for all temporary signs, and an acceptable bond amount and then acceptable exemption level below which you don't have to have a bond.

Ms. McCoy referred to her HOA in Rock Creek when they put their sign out once a month in every entranceway in Rock Creek do they now have to pull a bond to do that. It is a temporary sign.

Mr. Aronson asked if they put it on their property.

Ms. McCoy explained that it is on the City right-of-way swales at the main entrances.

Ms. Lundgren responded they would have to have a bond providing they are posting more than the minimum that the Board would recommend as a trigger. If there is going to be 5 signs posted around the property.

Mr. Nall commented that you get into another area where the HOA's are required to post so many signs, 24 hours before their meetings are held.

Mr. Aronson responded that they have to post meeting notices. With regard to homeowner association signs he was not so concerned whether this affects them or not if it does, because

they have reserves for painting and paving and all kinds of stuff. They can take a couple hundred bucks and post a bond. He didn't think that was a big issue.

Mr. Konhauzer remarked that the \$500 would affect so many other organizations negatively.

Mr. Aronson commented that setting the threshold for the number of signs a little higher in order to avoid some smaller organizations from having to post a bond. He would be willing to set it at 5 signs.

Mr. Wood explained that what the proposed code change is doing now is eliminating the bond requirement, but not the registration requirement. It is basically doing away with the bond in favor of a registration process. There will still be a requirement for any 4 temporary signs they will still be required to file with the Building Department a written statement guaranteeing the removal of the temporary signs within 7 days after the required removal date. If they don't then any violation or nuisance can be removed by the City. Right now the removal fee is \$5 for anything less than 6 square feet and \$25 for anything over 6 square feet. It would be changing that from \$5/25 to a \$20 flat fee per sign for removal.

Mr. Aronson commented that if someone has 20 signs and they don't remove them and the City removes them the City can assess them \$400 and how would they enforce that.

Ms. Lundgren responded they would have to be code enforced.

Mr. Aronson then asked if someone running for school board who is not a resident of Cooper City what is their incentive to pay.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that you have to take a piece of paper and put a line down the center and say how would it affect us adversely and how it would affect us positively. He thought it would affect us adversely more than positively.

Mr. Nall agreed with Mr. Konhauzer but also agreed with Mr. Aronson where they raise the limit 5 signs and have a \$500 bond. You would encompass a lot of these exceptions that the Board has been discussing.

Ms. Lundgren responded that there would be very few individuals that would be posting more than 5 temporary signs.

Mr. Aronson referred to the religious institutions could afford it in a sense that if they put their signs up, they put their bond up they would get their money back in a few weeks.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that most religious institutions right now are not doing so great and he felt this would give them a hardship.

Mr. Aronson responded that the alternative is to not have bonds at all.

Mr. Konhauzer then remarked that if it's a \$20 penalty per sign, yes it's harder to collect it, but legally we could go after them.

Mr. Aronson responded that in reality you would never collect it. If you are trying to collect \$400 and the City assesses a fine and they don't pay what are you going to do. Is the City going to hire the City Attorney to collect it? He asked what the charge to collect \$400 was.

Ms. Lundgren responded that it would be a collection for outside of the City, but for a business that is located in the City would be code enforced. The difficulty was true and that is why the bond is implemented in a number of cities to get the money up front and have that provide for the removal.

Mr. Konhauzer mentioned that he was leaning more toward the \$250 than \$500.

Several Board members asked Mr. Valenti what he thought.

Mr. Valenti commented that he would recommend that the Optimists put up a \$500 bond for the whole year. He didn't think that would put a hardship on the club. He then commented that he didn't know why religious institutions would be exempt.

Mr. Aronson asked if there were a significant amount of organizations or candidates that simply don't register or come to the City and just put their signs up and does the City simply remove them.

Mr. Wood responded yes the City has the right to remove them and they do remove them.

Mr. Aronson commented that if a candidate or religious institution just puts their signs up he would like to know that the City could remove them on our own.

Ms. Lundgren responded that the code would still provide for removal and ability to charge the fine and charge the per sign fee, but there would also be if the Board recommends a bond to have an upfront payment as well.

Mr. Aronson remarked that we would not run the risk of some argument by some religious institution that we are encroaching on their right to....

Ms. Lundgren injected that this would be enforced across the board for all types of temporary signs.

Mr. Nall thought that they should have a threshold of 5 signs and a \$500 bond.

Mr. Wood commented that for perspective the current only requires \$150 for only those non-residential posted signs and no bond at all for signs posted on residential property.

The Board concurred that they all agree to have no bond on residential property.

Ms. McCoy remarked that she thought \$500 was a lot.

Mr. Nall commented that he was good with a \$500 bond with the sign threshold up to 5 signs posted and possibly putting something with the political sign within 90 days of an election. He remarked that he did have an issue with \$250 if you were going to hit the campaign right at the beginning.

Mr. Valenti agreed with Mr. Nall.

Ms. Keirnan agreed with Mr. Aronson and thought that \$500 was fine, but if it were lowered to \$250 she would be okay with that too. She thought that \$150 was definitely too low.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that what the City is saying is that they want to get rid of it completely.

Ms. Keirnan interjected that none of the Board members agrees with that.

Mr. Aronson thought the primary problem is the political signs. He wants the bond to be an amount to give the politician incentive to remove the signs or give the City ample money to have them removed. He also didn't want to hamstring charitable or community organizations either.

Mr. Nall commented that how many of those organizations would put out more than 5 signs other than the Optimists Club.

Mr. Konhauzer remarked that the Optimists is a non-profit group and Mr. Valenti commented that \$500 isn't going to affect them he still thought he could spend \$500 better for something else rather

Mr. Valenti interjected that the bottom line is that it would take away from what they provide to the kids, but he explained that if you don't sink your teeth into something why have it. Why have a rule that you are not going to enforce that you can't get something out of. To say that we don't have a bond and charge a guy \$20 per sign and try and collect that money and it wasn't going to happen.

Mr. Aronson thought the Board should be clear and give the City Attorney direction on how they want the revisions drafted.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that it was clear that the Board didn't want to get rid of the bond completely.

Ms. Lundgren responded that she will present this to the Commission with the revised draft with the specifics that the Board has provided to her with regard to the amount of the bond and the exemption.

Mr. Nall thought that \$500 was more teeth than \$250 and if you have a threshold of 5 signs and any more than that would require the \$500 bond.

Mr. Konhauzer responded that we want to be a friendly city.

Ms. McCoy commented that she doesn't feel that way now and why should her HOA have to pay \$500 for their temporary signs that they put out every month and she just didn't agree with that and was a lot of money.

Mr. Aronson responded that this was where he disagreed with Ms. McCoy in that the \$500 has to be put up by her HOA for a very short period of time.

Ms. McCoy remarked not when they put out a sign every month.

Ms. Lundgren commented that she would ask the Board to set the recommended trigger for the exemption for the temporary signs that aren't subject to a bond so that it does not concern an association's signs. As an example if they only have 5 signs they would be exempt from the bond.

Ms. McCoy mentioned that they put them up at all the entrances and there is 5 entrances, but she doesn't know exactly how many.

Mr. Konhauzer recommended that the Board choose 5 or 6 to be the trigger number and then thought they would be protected.

Mr. Valenti commented that he didn't believe that with the Commission would pass the \$500 bond and thought that maybe \$250 and he reminded the Board that they want to get rid of the bond all together.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: TO ADD THE BONDING REQUIREMENT IF THERE ARE MORE THAN 5 SIGNS POSTED. MOTION MADE BY MR. KONHAUSER AND SECONDED BY MS. MCCOY FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Aronson explained to the Board that they were asking the City Attorney to redraft this proposed ordinance to add the bonding requirement at \$250 and if there are more than 5 signs. All the other things with regard to size of signs and placement stay the same.

Ms. Lundgren thought that she was precise and clear as to what the Board has recommended and will add the Board recommendations to the draft ordinance.

Mr. Nall mentioned that on Section 25-21 and where it is limited to Flag Day and July 4th to display a flag and thought that they should add other holidays such as Memorial Day and Veterans Day.

Ms. Lundgren responded that there was no problem with adding "all federal holidays" to the proposed ordinance.

The maker of the motion agreed to add that to the proposed ordinance and maker of the second also agreed.

AMENDED MOTION: TO APPROVE THE DRAFT OF THE ORDINANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: 1) THAT SECTION 25-21 BE MODIFIED TO PERMIT FLAGS ON ALL FEDERAL HOLIDAYS 2) THAT THE BONDING REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TEMPORARY SIGNS BE REINSERTED AT \$250 FOR ANYONE PLACING MORE THAN 5 SIGNS. MOTION MADE BY MR. KONHAUZER AND SECONDED BY MS. MCCOY. There were all ayes on roll call. Motion was approved.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

None.

6. GROWTH MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Wood next regularly scheduled meeting would be October 17th and we may or may not have a meeting. The next meeting could be the regularly scheduled meeting which would be November 7th and he would advise the Board of the schedule.

7. BOARD MEMBERS' CONCERNS:

Mr. Konhauzer commented that he enjoyed the discussion tonight and thought the Board was great and it was nice to discuss things and make it happen.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

The Meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.