



3 First Amendment Overview Contraction of Local Generations A Division of the New York Department of State



Types of Speech

Commercial speech relates to the economic interests of a speaker and audience



A Division of the New York Department of State





Carpent Briston of Local Service





 INTERMEDIATE
 Regulations are constitutional if they

 INTERMEDIATE
 Impose valid time, place, and manner restrictions without reference to content

 SCRUTINY
 Are narrowly tailored to serve a significant governmental interest

 Provide ample alternative channels for communication of information







Covernment Services

11

Temporary signs

14

Whitton v. City of Gladstone:

The local law restricted "political signs within zones"

It also imposed time limits when signs can be posted before & after election

These provisions were deemed content-based and unconstitutional

A Division of the Name York Department of State



- Ovision of Local

12

Too restrictive of free speech

Temporary sign & other content neutral regulations must be narrowly tailored

Allowing only two temporary signs on private residential property would <u>not</u> be narrowly tailored, because it would infringe on political speech & the rights of homeowners.

- Arlington County Republican Committee v. Arlington County, VA A Division of the New York Department of State

Contractional Conversional Conversion

Ample alternative channels

Regulation of signs posted at private homes determined to be unconstitutional because there were no adequate alternative channel for speech:

- Residential signage not allowed
 - City of Ladue v. Gilleo

A Division of the New York Department of State

- · Complete ban on posting any lawn signs - Cleveland Area Board of Realtors v. City of Euclid
- . Posting of "for sale" or "sold" signs prohibited
- Linmark Associates v. Township of Willingboro

Coversion Division of Local Coversion

13



- Prevent posting of sign too close to street
- Limit duration of signs sion of the New York Deparament of State



Z= General Beenslow of Local General Server

Content neutrality

Local governments may forbid the posting of signs on public property, as long as it's in an evenhanded, content-neutral manner

People v. On Sight Mobile Opticians: upheld a ban against posting signs on public property. nion of the New York Department of State A Div



E Generated British Block







Off-premises advertising

The Court of Appeals has upheld local laws that prohibit all offpremises commercial billboards.

A Deletion of the New York Department of State

The Town of Southampton's prohibition on erecting all non-accessory billboards

 The local law did not regulate the content of the commercial speech

 It regulated the place & manner of billboards

· Suffolk Outdoor Advertising v. Hulse

A second Consignational

15

20

Non-traditional Commercial Signs

- LED/Animated signs
- · Flags, streamers & balloons
- Moving billboards
 - Signs on vehicles whose sole purpose is advertising

Time, place & manner

- Medium of expression
- People v. Target Advertising
- A Division of the New York Department of State



Contraction of Local Generation of Local Generation (Service)



Regulation by NYS DOT

Restricts advertising devices within 660 feet of Interstate, National Highway Systern & primary highways.

Signs beyond 660 feet outside urban areas intended to be read from interstate or primary highways are prohibited

Regional DOT offices have sign permit applications

A Division of the New York Department of State

DOT sign program includes registration, limitation on size, placement & lighling.

More restrictive local regulations often apply

Anno const Divisions of Local Government Service es

23

22

Commercial vs. Non-Commercial Signs

Municipalities may permit non-commercial signs in some districts while restricting commercial signs

A Division of Its New York Department of State

 Municipalities cannot permit commercial signs while ignoring or restricting similar noncommercial signage in the same district

Devision of Land

24

Implications of Reed v. Town of Gilbert

A Division of the New York Department of State

2 Company District and Local Generation

Reed v. Town of Gilbert, AZ

Town of Gilbert Sign Regulations:

A Division of the New York Department of State

- Several categories based on information signs convey, subject to different restrictions.
- · Display of outdoor signs prohibited without a permit.
- · 23 categories of signs were exempted from permit.

Careford Distance of Local Government Barrelies





Justice Thomas:

"If a sign informs its reader of the time and place a book club will discuss John Locke's Two Treatises of Government, that sign will be treated differently from a sign expressing the view that one should vote for one of Locke's followers in an upcoming election, and both signs will be treated differently from a sign expressing an ideological view rooted in Locke's theory of government. More to the point, the Church's signs inviting people to attend its worship services are treated differently from signs conveying other types of ideas."

A Division of the New York Department of Store

Covernment Local

29

DEL DO HANT D

28

Content based discrimination Court determined the law was content based on its face because restrictions applied depend on sign's communicative content.



It signals out specific subject matter even if it does not target viewpoints within that subject matter

A Division of the New York Department of State





Concurring Opinion: Munis may adopt

Rules distinguishing between lighted and unlighted signs.

Rules distinguishing between signs with fixed messages and electronic signs with messages that change.



31

& Distance of the blace buck Department of State



Concurring Opinion: Munis may adopt

Rules that distinguish between the placement of signs on private and public property.

Rules distinguishing between the placement of signs on commercial and residential

A Division of the New York Department of State

property.



And American Division of Local Coversmant Ser







- Do existing regulations regulate content?
- Study the issue - Sign inventory
- - · Establish a record of legally existing signs · Are existing sign regulations being enforced?
 - · Which signs are consistent with community character?
 - · Which one are not working?
 - Take pholographs
 - · Public input

size

 Relate findings to the Comprehensive Plan a of the New York De



 Advertising Readability

Cost

35

colors 36 **Regulatory options** HOGANS Without zoning through MOTEL Site Plan Review an Sign Permit Consis en munic Restrict by signage structure and Restrict location by property type (i.e., public rights-of-ways) A Division of the New York Department of State E Carponia Division of Local Government Service

tures

win

Regulatory options

With zoning

Prohibit certain signs by structure, location

Allow some as-of-right

Allow others special use permit or site plan review

A Division of the New York Department of State

A sign matrix for each district & use indicates Number, size & type of signs allowed

Approvals necessary



Land Givenhinted Sarvices

38

37

Typical provisions

Purpose Statement Definitions Schedule of Allowed Locations Construction & Design Standards Sign Permit Procedures Specific provisions Review & Appeals Enforcement & Remedies Enforcement Officer, appeals & penalties Severability Specific provisions Standards Sign Permit Procedures State Sign Permit Reference Existing/Nonconforming Signs Prohibited Signs Substitution Clauses Illumination Sign Maintenance

Purpose Statements

Examples of purposes:

Promote & protect public health, welfare & safety Protect property values Create a more attractive business climate Reinforce & strengthen community identity Preserve scenic beauty Regulating for aesthetic purposes is permissible.

Aesthetics may be addressed in detail by local design guidelines Suffolk Outdoor

Advertising v. Hulse

Convenient Service

40 **Definitions & Standards** Definitions PORTABLE SIGN Sign Types of signs A sign, whether on its own trailer, wheels, motor vehicle or otherwise, designed to be Portable signs Permanent or temporary Standards movable & not structurally Construction attached to the ground, a Mounting Materials building, a structure or another Village of Pittsford, New York Zoning Chapter 168. SIGNS Design Lighting/illumination Materials Size on of the New York Department of State English Christen of Local Government Services

41
Design
Considerations

Types of signs Wall signs Banners, streamers & flags Projecting signs Marquee Freestanding signs Billboards Roof Off-Premises Canopy & awning Portable /mobile Window & door Window & door

Design considerations	Bureau
Mounted	Reco
Size, area & height	L
Location	 Stand
Lighting/illumination	− 1 i • 25 to 3
Landscaping	- 3 i
Materials	• 55+ m
Architectural design	— 6 i
Color	
	Mounted Size, area & height Location Lighting/illumination Landscaping Materials Architectural design

A Devicing of the New York Department of State

⁴³
Bureau of Land Management Recommended Size of Letters on Signs
Standing still

1 inch
25 to 35 mph
3 inches

55+ mph

6 inches.

E Government Services

























Base should be larger 3ìA h

















Nonconforming Signs and Enforcement

Enforcement

Who is authorized to enforce the sign law?

How violations are handled?

What are the criminal penalties? Is the municipality authorized to institute civil proceedings?

What is the process for appeal?

A Division of the New York Department of State



68

Division of Local Generation

59

Enforcement

Notice to owner(s) specifying the violation

Require sign be brought into compliance or removed

State period of time in which to conform or remove sign

Authorize enforcement officer to revoke the sign permit & remove the sign for noncompliance

Within timeframes as specified in the sign regulations

Authorized to assess all costs & expenses incurred for such service against the owner(s)

rialism of the New York Department of State

Distaion of Lecal Generation Services

60

Sign maintenance

Local regulations should include provisions for the proper maintenance of all signs

Example:

"...Sign must be kept clean, neatly painted & free from all hazards, such as, but not limited to, faulty wiring & loose fastenings, & the sign must be maintained at all times in such safe condition so as not to be detrimental to the public health or safely."

- Village of South Glens Falls Code: Chapter 115-9

A Division of the New York Department of State

Contraction of Local

Billboards & off-premises signs

Temporary moratorium while considering law

Prohibit new billboards

Restrict billboards

By district, special use permit or setbacks

Removal of nonconforming billboards

Billboard

A sign for a business, profession, activity commodity, or service not on the premises where the sign is located

Can be commercial or non-commercial

> Continue Devision of Local Continues of Local

61

Pre-existing nonconforming signs

Protected status

- Sign legally existed prior to the effective date of the current regulations
- Does not need to comply with specifications of current regulations
 - Municipal regulations should include provisions for the termination of this protected status
 - Upon termination, such signs must either be brought into compliance or removed

A Division of the New York Department of State

2. Generation of Local Generation Services

83

2. January Distance of Local Gavernment Gavernment Gavernment

62

Nonconforming signs

If specified in local regulations, nonconforming status may be terminated for the following reasons:

- Alterations
 - Change in size
 - Moved from original location on site
 - Improved, repaired or reconstructed beyond the sign's original condition
- Replaced by another nonconforming sign
- Change in use on the premises
 - Not a change in ownership
- Abandonment of use for a specified period

Elimination of nonconforming signs

Amortization

- Allows the sign owner to recuperate their investment
- A specified period of time based on the fair market value
 - Depreciation
 - No compensation

A Division of the New York Department of State

Local Law Example:

In the event a sign lawfully erected prior to the effective date of the local law does not conform to the provisions & standards of the local law, then such signs should be modified to conform or be removed according to the following regulations are

Empire Distance of Local Constantion of Local Constantion of Local

65

64

Elimination of nonconforming signs

Zoned industrial or manufacturing

Municipality must compensate owner pursuant to Eminent Domain Procedure Law

A Division of the Next York Department of Since

NOT zoned industrial or manufacturing: Municipality may

allow amortization period pursuant to General Municipal Law §74-c

Geverament Service



Summary

Significant governmental interest

Time, place, manner Content neutrality

Compelling governmental interest Can't permit commercial

signage and restrict similar non-commercial signage

A Division of the New York Department of State



Concernation Division of Local Concernation Service

88

Case Citations

Clark v. Community for Creative Nonviolence, 468 U.S. 288, 293, 82 L.Ed.2d 221, 227, 104 S.Ct. 3065 (1984)

Hobbs v. County of Westchester, 397 F.3d 133 (2d Cir. 2005)

Whitton v. City of Gladstone, Missouri, 54 F. 3d 1400 (8th. Cir. 1995)

Arlington County Republican Committee v. Arlington County, VA, 983 F.2d 587 (4th Cir.1993)

A Division of the New York Department of Elete

Contemport Service

69

Case Citations

City of Ladue v. Gilleo, 512 U.S. 43, 129 L.Ed.2d 36, 114 S.Ct. 2038 (1994)

Cleveland Area Bd, Of Realtors v. City of Euclid, 88 F.3d 382 (6th Cir. 1996)

Linmark Associates v. Township of Willingboro, 431 U.S. 85 (1977)

Central Hudson Gas v. Public Service Commission, 447 U.S. 557, 65 L.Ed.2d 341, 100 S.Ct. 2343 (1980)

A Question of the New York Copertment of State

A Geveninent Service

Case Citations

A Division of the New York Department of State

Party City of Nanuet, Inc. v. Board of Appeals of the Town of Clarkstown, 212 A.D.2d 618, 622 N.Y.S.2d 331 (2d Depl. 1995)

Suffolk Outdoor Advertising v. Hulse, 43 N.Y.2d 483 (1977)

People v. Target Advertising, 184 Misc.2d 903 (NY City Crim.Ct. 2000)

Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, 135 S.Ct. 2218 (2015)

E

71

70

Resources

New York State Department of State James A, Coon Local Government Technical Series Publication

Municipal Control of Signs

A Division of the New York Department of State

r

Constant Devision of Lacal Generations

1				72
	New Yo			
	(518) 473-3	3355	Division of Local Goverr	ament
	(518) 474-6	6740	Counsel's Office	
	(800) 367-8	3488	Toll Free	
	Email: Website:	www www	l <u>gov@dos.ny.gov</u> /.dos.ny.gov /.dos.ny.gov/lg/index.html	, Canana Milan el Local
	A Division of the New York	k Department of S	inte	Greenment Sarvices

General Municipal Law §74-c.

Taking of billboards.

1. If any local law, ordinance or resolution adopted by a municipal corporation in the exercise of its police power shall require the removal of any legally erected and maintained billboard or like outdoor advertising device, which is leased or rented for profit in areas zoned industrial or manufacturing, just compensation for said taking shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of article five of the eminent domain procedure law; provided, however, section five hundred two of such law shall not be applicable in any such proceeding.

2. Unless compensation therefore is provided pursuant to section eighty-eight of the highway law, if any local law, ordinance or resolution adopted by a municipal corporation in the exercise of its police power shall require the removal of any legally erected and maintained billboard or like outdoor advertising device, which is leased or rented for profit, and which is located in an area or zone, other than an industrial or manufacturing zone, the display shall be allowed to remain in existence for the period of time set forth below after giving notice of the removal requirement:

fair market value on date of	minimum years
notice of removal requirement	allowed
under \$1,999	3
\$2,000 to \$3,999	4
\$4,000 to \$5,999	6
\$6,000 to \$7,999	7
\$8,000 to \$9,999	9
\$10,000 and over	10

If the removal is required sooner than the amortization periods specified herein, such removal by any local law, ordinance or resolution adopted by the municipal corporation shall be with just compensation being paid for such taking and removal determined in accordance with the provisions of article five of the eminent domain procedure law or in accordance with any table of values established by the state department of transportation; provided however section five hundred two of the eminent domain procedure law shall not be applicable to any such proceeding.

Notwithstanding any other law, rule or regulation, all amortization periods under such laws, ordinances or resolutions shall commence not earlier than January first, nineteen hundred ninety.

3. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any city having a population of one million or more.

NOTE: Where it is feasible, a syllabus (headnote) will be released, as is being done in connection with this case, at the time the opinion is issued. The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by the Reporter of Decisions for the convenience of the reader. See United States v. Detroit Timber & Lumber Co., 200 U. S. 321, 337.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Syllabus

REED ET AL. V. TOWN OF GILBERT, ARIZONA, ET AL.

CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-502. Argued January 12, 2015-Decided June 18, 2015

Gilbert, Arizona (Town), has a comprehensive code (Sign Code or Code) that prohibits the display of outdoor signs without a permit, but exempts 23 categories of signs, including three relevant here. "Ideological Signs," defined as signs "communicating a message or ideas" that do not fit in any other Sign Code category, may be up to 20 square feet and have no placement or time restrictions. "Political Signs," defined as signs "designed to influence the outcome of an election," may be up to 32 square feet and may only be displayed during an election season. "Temporary Directional Signs," defined as signs directing the public to a church or other "qualifying event," have even greater restrictions: No more than four of the signs, limited to six square feet, may be on a single property at any time, and signs may be displayed no more than 12 hours before the "qualifying event" and 1 hour after.

Petitioners, Good News Community Church (Church) and its pastor, Clyde Reed, whose Sunday church services are held at various temporary locations in and near the Town, posted signs early each Saturday bearing the Church name and the time and location of the next service and did not remove the signs until around midday Sunday. The Church was cited for exceeding the time limits for displaying temporary directional signs and for failing to include an event date on the signs. Unable to reach an accommodation with the Town, petitioners filed suit, claiming that the Code abridged their freedom of speech. The District Court denied their motion for a preliminary injunction, and the Ninth Circuit affirmed, ultimately concluding that the Code's sign categories were content neutral, and that the Code satisfied the intermediate scrutiny accorded to content-neutral regulations of speech.

Held: The Sign Code's provisions are content-based regulations of

speech that do not survive strict scrutiny. Pp. 6-17.

(a) Because content-based laws target speech based on its communicative content, they are presumptively unconstitutional and may be justified only if the government proves that they are narrowly tailored to serve compelling state interests. E.g., R. A. V. v. St. Paul, 505 U.S. 377, 395. Speech regulation is content based if a law applies to particular speech because of the topic discussed or the idea or message expressed. E.g., Sorrell v. IMS Health, Inc., 564 U.S. ____, _____. And courts are required to consider whether a regulation of speech "on its face" draws distinctions based on the message a speaker conveys. Id., at ____. Whether laws define regulated speech by particular subject matter or by its function or purpose, they are subject to strict scrutiny. The same is true for laws that, though facially content neutral, cannot be " 'justified without reference to the content of the regulated speech,'" or were adopted by the government "because of disagreement with the message" conveyed. Ward v. Rock Against Racism, 491 U.S. 781, 791. Pp. 6-7.

(b) The Sign Code is content based on its face. It defines the categories of temporary, political, and ideological signs on the basis of their messages and then subjects each category to different restrictions. The restrictions applied thus depend entirely on the sign's communicative content. Because the Code, on its face, is a contentbased regulation of speech, there is no need to consider the government's justifications or purposes for enacting the Code to determine whether it is subject to strict scrutiny. Pp. 7.

(c) None of the Ninth Circuit's theories for its contrary holding is persuasive. Its conclusion that the Town's regulation was not based on a disagreement with the message conveyed skips the crucial first step in the content-neutrality analysis: determining whether the law is content neutral on its face. A law that is content based on its face is subject to strict scrutiny regardless of the government's benign motive, content-neutral justification, or lack of "animus toward the ideas contained" in the regulated speech. *Cincinnati* v. *Discovery Network*, *Inc.*, 507 U. S. 410, 429. Thus, an innocuous justification cannot transform a facially content-based law into one that is content neutral. A court must evaluate each question—whether a law is content based on its face and whether the purpose and justification for the law are content based—before concluding that a law is content neutral. *Ward* does not require otherwise, for its framework applies only to a content-neutral statute.

The Ninth Circuit's conclusion that the Sign Code does not single out any idea or viewpoint for discrimination conflates two distinct but related limitations that the First Amendment places on government regulation of speech. Government discrimination among viewpoints

is a "more blatant" and "egregious form of content discrimination," Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of Univ. of Va., 515 U. S. 819, 829, but "[t]he First Amendment's hostility to content-based regulation [also] extends . . . to prohibition of public discussion of an entire topic," Consolidated Edison Co. of N. Y. v. Public Serv. Comm'n of N. Y., 447 U. S. 530, 537. The Sign Code, a paradigmatic example of content-based discrimination, singles out specific subject matter for differential treatment, even if it does not target viewpoints within that subject matter.

The Ninth Circuit also erred in concluding that the Sign Code was not content based because it made only speaker-based and eventbased distinctions. The Code's categories are not speaker-based—the restrictions for political, ideological, and temporary event signs apply equally no matter who sponsors them. And even if the sign categories were speaker based, that would not automatically render the law content neutral. Rather, "laws favoring some speakers over others demand strict scrutiny when the legislature's speaker preference reflects a content preference." Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC, 512 U. S. 622, 658. This same analysis applies to event-based distinctions. Pp. 8–14.

(d) The Sign Code's content-based restrictions do not survive strict scrutiny because the Town has not demonstrated that the Code's differentiation between temporary directional signs and other types of signs furthers a compelling governmental interest and is narrowly tailored to that end. See Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club PAC v. Bennett, 564 U.S. _____. Assuming that the Town has a compelling interest in preserving its aesthetic appeal and traffic safety, the Code's distinctions are highly underinclusive. The Town cannot claim that placing strict limits on temporary directional signs is necessary to beautify the Town when other types of signs create the same problem. See Discovery Network, supra, at 425. Nor has it shown that temporary directional signs. Pp. 14–15.

(e) This decision will not prevent governments from enacting effective sign laws. The Town has ample content-neutral options available to resolve problems with safety and aesthetics, including regulating size, building materials, lighting, moving parts, and portability. And the Town may be able to forbid postings on public property, so long as it does so in an evenhanded, content-neutral manner. See *Members of City Council of Los Angeles v. Taxpayers for Vincent*, 466 U. S. 789, 817. An ordinance narrowly tailored to the challenges of protecting the safety of pedestrians, drivers, and passengers—*e.g.*, warning signs marking hazards on private property or signs directing traffic—might also survive strict scrutiny. Pp. 16–17.

707 F. 3d 1057, reversed and remanded.

THOMAS, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which ROBERTS, C. J., and SCALIA, KENNEDY, ALITO, and SOTOMAYOR, JJ., joined. ALITO, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which KENNEDY and SOTOMAYOR, JJ., joined. BREYER, J., filed an opinion concurring in the judgment. KA-GAN, J., filed an opinion concurring in the judgment, in which GINSBURG and BREYER, JJ., joined

т Т