

Benefits and Challenges for Maintenance of Entrance Signs/Features on Private Property

Option 1	Benefits	Challenges
<p>Private lot owners (or homeowner association if applicable) continue to maintain entrance signs/features that are located on private property.</p>	<p>The City operational budget does not need to be reallocated or adjusted.</p> <p>No new resources needed to manage a program.</p> <p>No overall process changes as this is current practice.</p>	<p>Private lot owners may not have funding to complete maintenance or repairs.</p> <p>Owners may not realize this responsibility and assume it is City infrastructure.</p> <p>Repairs may not meet best practices and industry safety standards and could create future safety issues without qualified repair staff and a disparity in the quality of work across the city.</p>
Option 2	Benefits	Challenges
<p>City assumes responsibility for all or a portion of private sign/entrance features or establishes a grant program to offset costs of property owners.</p>	<p>Entrance signs/features would be repaired in a timely fashion.</p> <p>Repairs would follow standards, have uniform quality and have qualified personnel or contractors tendered to complete the work.</p>	<p>Agreements with individual lot owners would be needed prior to doing repair work.</p> <p>The City would need permission to enter private property each time to inspect or repair as needed.</p> <p>Risk of damaging adjacent private infrastructure during maintenance work could make the City liable for damages.</p>

		<p>Increase to the operational budget required to take over responsibility for all private entrance signs/features or to establish a grant program.</p> <p>City repairing private infrastructure may not be seen as a core service by the public.</p> <p>Could create precedence for other private placed infrastructure by developers (e.g. noise walls and fences, masonry fence pillars, private roads).</p>
Option 3	Benefits	Challenges
<p>A developer contributed 'maintenance' fund is created. This option could only be applicable to new signs/features and would require all features to be placed entirely on City lands.</p>	<p>Removes financial burden on private owners as signs/features are now on City land.</p> <p>Maintenance fund reduces the financial burden of the City for repairs during the lifecycle of the asset.</p>	<p>Signs/features would now be City assets and the City would be responsible for all operation and maintenance.</p> <p>New design standards would be created which could take away the individuality of the signs and move more towards a more standard approach for all signs/features.</p> <p>New process would have to be created which would include additional engagement with industry.</p>

Attachment 1

		<p>Resources needed to manage the fund and disperse funds.</p> <p>This option is only applicable to future signs/features (not existing signs/features), and as such would create a disadvantage to existing features on private property.</p> <p>Maintenance fund per sign/feature would only be one time and would not necessarily cover cost or entire lifecycle.</p> <p>Additional land would be required from the development industry to ensure safe designs for sightlines are maintained.</p> <p>Additional cost for maintenance funds could discourage developers from proposing entrance features.</p>
--	--	--