



RE: Sign Ord question

Lori Parlin <loriparlin@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, May 26, 2015 at 6:24 PM

To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>, Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>

Cc: Anne Novotny <anne.novotny@edcgov.us>, rich.stewart@edcgov.us, gary.miller@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us, Russell Langley <rlangley40@gmail.com>

Hi Shawna,

The problem is that there is going to be information presented to the Planning Commissioners, and that information is not being made public PRIOR to the meeting. How is someone that has to work during the day supposed to view the information and send in their comments to the Planning Commissioners PRIOR to the meeting? It states on the Sign Ordinance webpage:

"Staff will present additional information for the Commission's review and will ask the Commission for their recommendations to take to the Board."

What is that additional information? I would like to make comment on it, but it is not attached to the agenda item. If it is not a proposed errata sheet, then what is it?

That is all we're asking. We would like to make meaningful comments, but that is impossible if we're not provided with the information that will be presented to the Planning Commissioners.

And it was a best guess that an updated errata sheet would be provided, based on all of the comments from the March 26 meeting.

So I would ask that the Planning Commissioners continue this meeting so that the public can review that new information before the Planning Commissioners make a recommendation to the Board.

I hope you can see why we asked for this new information and are frustrated that it is not available PRIOR to the meeting.

Lori

From: Shawna Purvines [mailto:shawna.purvines@edcgov.us]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 5:10 PM
To: Ellen Van Dyke
Cc: Anne Novotny; Lori Parlin
Subject: Re: Sign Ord question

Hello Ellen,

The Errata Sheet from the March 26, 2015 meeting is posted on the project website at: http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/LandUse/Sign_Ordinance_Update.aspx

As you are aware, the Planning Commission continued the item to May 28, 2015, as they are still deliberating on the project. Therefore, the Errata Sheet posted for the March 26, 2015 meeting has not been revised. Once the Planning Commission has concluded their discussions and prepared their recommendation for Board consideration, staff will revise the March 26, 2015 Errata Sheet as needed. This revised Errata Sheet will accompany the Planning Commission's recommendation to the Board.

Shawna

On Fri, May 22, 2015 at 3:11 PM, Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

I'm not sure who to ask this of, but, wasn't there supposed to be an errata sheet from the March 26th meeting on the Sign Ordinance?

Can you please direct me to it? I do not see it posted for the hearing on the 28th (Planning Commission)

Thank you – Ellen

--

Shawna L. Purvines

Principal Planner

County of El Dorado

Community Development Agency

Long Range Planning

5/27/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - RE: Sign Ord question

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

Phone:(530) 621-5362/Fax: (530) 642-0508

shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

www.edcgov.us



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

3 pages

Public Comment, PC meeting 5/28/15, Sign Ord. file no. 13-0086

Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, May 26, 2015 at 9:00 PM

To: Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>, Brian Shinault <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, Gary Miller <gary.miller@edcgov.us>, Tom Heflin <tom.heflin@edcgov.us>, Dave Pratt <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, Rich Stewart <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>

Cc: Anne Novotny <anne.novotny@edcgov.us>, Lori Parlin <loriparlin@sbcglobal.net>, Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Public Comment, Planning Commission 5/28/15, Sign Ord. file no. 13-0036

Dear Commissioners:

Please do not take action on this item until the public has had the opportunity to review the not-yet-provided errata sheet. To do otherwise would prohibit public involvement (not to mention it would be a pretty basic Brown Act violation).

There was a decision made at the last hearing in March that Planning would be coming back with an errata sheet of the recommended changes. That decision is shown in an excerpt of the meeting minutes below. We need to see that sheet and be able to comment, and there are most definitely members of the public who cannot be there Thursday to do so in person.

I would respectfully request that you receive the latest errata sheet per the Ms. Purvines email below, take comments from those present at the Thursday hearing, then re-agendize this item to allow public feedback from those not in attendance.

thank you for any consideration on this - Ellen Van Dyke

(excerpt from the 3/26 Planning Commission minutes for the, Sign Ord item that was continued to 5/28 (this Thursday))

- Restoration of damaged signs; and
- Feather/quail banners.

Commissioner Heflin made the following comments:

- Inquired what was the largest electronic sign size allowed in a community region; and
- Feather/quail banners are not addressed in the ordinance, but they are a visual blight.

Commissioner Miller made the following comments:

- This may destroy a scenic corridor before it is even designated; and
- Code enforcement is a big issue.

Ms. Purvines notified the Commission that instead of re-writing the Sign Ordinance Update, they would be providing an errata sheet showing the Commission's recommended changes.

Chair Stewart requested that staff try to avoid placing any other agenda items on the meeting date that this item will be continued to.

Dave Defanti, Long Range Planning, stated that he would be willing to meet with anyone at any time to discuss this project and that offer was open to the public.

There was no further discussion.

Motion: Commissioner Heflin moved, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried (4-0), to continue the item to the May 28, 2015 meeting.

AYES: Pratt, Miller, Heflin, Stewart
NOES: None
ABSENT: Shinault

From: Shawna Purvines
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 5:10 PM
To: Ellen Van Dyke
Cc: Anne Novotny ; Lori Parlin
Subject: Re: Sign Ord question

Hello Ellen,

The Errata Sheet from the March 26, 2015 meeting is posted on the project website at: http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/LandUse/Sign_Ordinance_Update.aspx

As you are aware, the Planning Commission continued the item to May 28, 2015, as they are still deliberating on the project. Therefore, the Errata Sheet posted for the March 26, 2015 meeting has not been revised. Once the Planning Commission has concluded their discussions and prepared their recommendation for Board consideration, staff will revise the March 26, 2015 Errata Sheet as needed. This revised Errata Sheet will accompany the Planning Commission's recommendation to the Board.

Shawna

5/27/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Public Comment, PC meeting 5/28/15, Sign Ord. file no. 13-0086

On Fri, May 22, 2015 at 3:11 PM, Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

I'm not sure who to ask this of, but, wasn't there supposed to be an errata sheet from the March 26th meeting on the Sign Ordinance?

Can you please direct me to it? I do not see it posted for the hearing on the 28th (Planning Commission)

Thank you – Ellen

Shawna L. Purvines

Principal Planner

County of El Dorado

Community Development Agency

Long Range Planning

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

Phone: (530) 621-5362/Fax: (530) 642-0508

shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

www.edcgov.us



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

13 pages

Fwd: Comments Submitted to PC re Sign Ordinance and Related EIR

Planning Unknown <planning@edcgov.us>
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Wed, May 27, 2015 at 8:10 AM

Char,

Please see Public Comment for Planning Commission below.

Thank you,

Julie Saylor
Office Assistant II

County of El Dorado
Community Development Agency
Development Services, Planning
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5324 / FAX (530) 642-0508
julie.saylor@edcgov.us

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Eva Robertson** <evagrobertson@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, May 26, 2015 at 10:24 PM
Subject: Comments Submitted to PC re Sign Ordinance and Related EIR
To: planning@edcgov.us
Cc: Eric Driever <cameronparkdrc@yahoo.com>, Jane Layton <jane@janelayton.com>





Dear Planning Commissioners:

On behalf of the Cameron Park Design Review Committee, I submit the attached letter with enclosures for the May 28th hearing. Among the enclosures are comments we submitted October 29, 2014. We noticed at our meeting tonight that these were not included in the online posting of the May 28th agenda.

Please confirm receipt of this email at your earliest convenience.

Eva Robertson
Cameron Park Design Review Committee Member

5 attachments

-  **Letter to Plan Comn 5.26.15.docx**
222K
-  **EIR on EDC Sign Ord- Issues.docx**
20K
-  **Sign Ordinance - POINTS TO BE STRESSED TO PLANNING COMMISSION.docx**
20K
-  **Confirmation of Receipt of Comments Submitted October 29, 2014.pdf**
186K

5/27/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Comments Submitted to PC re Sign Ordinance and Related EIR

 **Gmail - Comments Submitted October 29, 2014.pdf**
166K



Cameron Park Design Review Committee & Vision Subcommittee
cameronparkdrc@yahoo.com

May 26, 2015

El Dorado County Planning Commission

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Hearing May 28, 2015, Sign Ordinance

Dear Planning Commissioners:

At our regularly scheduled meeting this evening, we observed that our comments submitted October 29, 2014 regarding the Sign Ordinance EIR are not posted on the agenda for Thursday's hearing on the matter. Accordingly, we enclose copies of those comments previously submitted along with the transmittal and confirmation emails. In addition, we enclose summaries of the points that several of our committee members intend to address at the hearing. One summary addresses the EIR while the other, the sign ordinance.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to answering any questions that you might have at the hearing.

Sincerely,

Eva Robertson

Eva Robertson

CAMERON PARK DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

ISSUES LIST FOR COUNTY SIGN ORDINANCE EIR

- Does not mention that sign applicants must also adhere to officially adopted (BOS) local guidelines.
- No visual representations of tall signs. What does this do for the County visually?
- What does “scenic highway” mean for Cameron Park? Develop our own “scenic overlay” or some other identifier.
- The section of the Sign Ordinance regarding highway-oriented signs has greatest impact on Cameron Park.
- No cap on number of flags allowed on commercial property.
- Sign area allowed based on floor area rather than building facade, which could result in signs that are out of scale as viewed from street.
- Doesn't allow signs above the roof line in many instances but does not define roof line.
- Should limit the number of directional signs on commercial property.
- Should limit height of monument signs to no more than 10'; 20' too high otherwise will interfere with trees and is not auto-oriented.
- No penalty for failure to remove non-permitted or illegal signs.
- How to measure the height of signs. Should not be situated on a mound and measures from surrounding increased grade. Measure from street or sidewalk.
- Highway signs at 80' are ridiculous.
- Ordinance does not say how far from existing signs these Highway 50 signs must be.
- Ordinance limits Planning Commission review of highway-oriented signs to considering that they meet standards, i.e., setbacks and height, and cites CEQA, which must mean that CEQA finds no impact with these signs. NOT TRUE. There should be a use permit required for these signs to determine compatibility with surroundings and visual impacts. CEQA does not negate the need for environmental review in this instance.
- Sign Variance procedure onerous and expensive, time consuming, and unnecessary in most cases. Call them “exceptions” or some other identifier than a variance.
- Definition of temporary sign does not state how many times a year a temporary sign may be posted.
- EIR fails to come up with an alternative that eliminates the 80-foot-high signs, which are the most imposing of all the proposed signs. The EIR fails to visually represent impact of these signs.
- EIR concludes that light and glare will be significant and unavoidable, BUT NOT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF SIGNS visually. How do you know: no visual representations? Could have close-up impacts as well as from a distance.
- Picture on 2.0-9 displays only best case scenario.
- Page 3.0-4 states that signs are GENERALLY more restrictive, but that does not mean that revisions in themselves are not visually offensive. Even says the intent is to not detract from physical surroundings.

- Under Aesthetics, re pictures: Such an analysis is beyond the scope of this document. What does this mean, beyond what they are getting paid for? Said for all sign types and location? Not really.
- Under Land Use Planning: Keeps referring to consistence with the General Plan so everything should be okay. The General Plan is currently being revised and will be subject to CEQA. Wrong conclusion on part of the author.

CAMERON PARK DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE POINTS TO BE STRESSED TO PLANNING COMMISSION

EIR Should Consider Aesthetic Impacts Significant

The EIR concludes that additional 60-foot-high signs along the Highway 50 corridor would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. The Design Review Committee takes exception to this conclusion. As such, the EIR should be modified and re-circulated.

No Review of Highway 50 Signs

As written, the proposed sign ordinance would allow any highway-oriented sign that meets size and setback requirements to be allowed with no other consideration. Also, this matter would be considered by the Planning Commission, but why should that be when all that they could consider is if the size and setback requirements are met. A Use Permit should be required which is reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Excessive Height of Highway 50-Oriented Signs

Lettering so small on a 200 square foot sign that it cannot be read until almost upon it, making the excessive height unnecessary.

East-bound vehicles on Highway 50 cannot see highway signs on south side of highway until close to the Cameron Park Drive off-ramp, making excessively tall signs unnecessary.

The sign industry has created methods of determining height of signs and size of lettering when considering roadway conditions and speed. This type of system should be employed in determining the height of signs necessary. There should be a reasonable relationship between the need to be viewed and the height of the sign. When a sign ordinance refers to a "maximum height," no sign will be less than that height!

Sign Heights on Local Roads

Freestanding signs are directed primarily to those traveling on roads. Therefore, the height of the sign should be measured from the grade of the road rather than the grade upon which the sign is installed. For example, there is no point in installing a 6-foot-high monument sign atop a slope that is 15 feet higher than the travel way.

As drafted the proposed sign ordinance would allow 20-foot-high freestanding business identification signs along the roadways. Local roads consist of two lanes where typically visibility is not a problem. Drivers' eyes are focused on the road and those items within the windshield. They should not be directed 20 feet into the air to view a sign. Furthermore, when trees are mature, their canopies are often within this 20-foot-high area; and when trees obscure sign faces, it is often the trees that are the victims of vandalism or illegal removal. Finally, our communities are small and local residents are aware of what businesses are in town.

Signs on Vehicles

DMV requires signs on vehicles to be securely fastened to the extent that vehicles can be driven with them fastened on the vehicle. The ordinance should say that signs on vehicles must meet DMV standards. This does away with sandwich boards sitting atop a vehicle.

Variations for Signs are Anti-Business

Businesses often do not seek sign permits until ready to occupy. As the ordinance is proposed, if a sign is being proposed at a location or at a size that is not permitted by the sign ordinance, the business owner must apply for a variance, which costs approximately \$3000 up front and which may take 3 to 4 months to process. There should be an alternative system for signs, such as "administrative sign exceptions," with specific criteria for approval. Get creative!

When the costs of obtaining a sign variance are significant and when the time within which to gain approval or denial of a sign is considerable, installation of illegal signs is encouraged.

Enforcement

The current system is not effective, yet nothing new is being proposed. Furthermore, a court order is being called for as necessary before a sign which is creating a hazard is removed. This procedure is nothing less than outrageous.

Local Community Sign Guidelines

There should be some mention in the Sign Ordinance that signs must be in substantial conformance with officially adopted community sign guidelines.

Flags Too Numerous

The proposed sign ordinance does not limit the *number* of flags which may be placed on a parcel. One flag is enough to show patriotism or some other message; however, numerous flags are perceived as simply advertising to draw attention in an unattractive way to a business.

Calculation of Sign Area Bears on Relationship to Building Frontage Facing Street

The area of a sign should be such that the sign is in scale with the area of the face of the building where the sign is located. As written, a long and narrow building with a relatively large amount of square footage could have a sign on the front of the building that is out of scale with that face of the building. The square footage of the face of the building upon which the sign is to be located should determine the size of the sign.

5/26/2015

Gmail - FW: CPDRC/Anderly Comments re County Sign Ordinance (Draft EIR)



Eva Robertson <evagobertson@gmail.com>

FW: CPDRC/Anderly Comments re County Sign Ordinance (Draft EIR)

1 message

Jane Layton <jane@janelayton.com>
To: Eva Robertson <evagobertson@gmail.com>

Tue, May 26, 2015 at 8:01 PM

From: Anne Novotny [mailto:anne.novotny@edcgov.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 7:49 AM
To: Dyana Anderly
Cc: Driever, Eric; Harris, Mark; Layton, Jane; Neibauer, Vicky
Subject: Re: CPDRC/Anderly Comments re County Sign Ordinance (Draft EIR)

Thanks Dyana / CPDRC for your comments which will be included in the public record for comments received during the NOP for the draft EIR 30-day review period. The comment period closes this Friday, October 31st. Comments received will be posted to the Sign Ordinance Update web page next week.

Regards,

Anne Novotny

Senior Planner

County of El Dorado

Community Development Agency

Long Range Planning Division

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 621-5931 / (530) 642-0508

anne.novotny@edcgov.us

On Wed, Oct 29, 2014 at 2:17 AM, <danderly@comcast.net> wrote:

Hi Anne,

5/26/2015

Gmail - FW: CPDRC/Anderly Comments re County Sign Ordinance (Draft EIR)

I've attached my older comments, which is fine to attached to whatever you wish. You can just please destroy my other email comments. Thank you for asking.

Regarding the DRC's comments re what should be included in the EIR for the draft Sign Ordinance, we request the following:

Since the major issue associated with signs is the visual impact, there should be plenty of pictures representative of signs allowed under the current sign ordinance (no project), the proposed sign ordinance, and the alternatives.

When deciding on the range of reasonable alternatives to the sign ordinance, we are suggesting, with the exception of two shopping center signs (one on either side of 50), eliminating any additional large freeway-oriented signs and showing the blue State-authorized square freeway signs instead, using individual letters rather than any can signs on building walls, showing the use of natural materials such as wood and rock in the signs, and showing shorter signs, such as a maximum of 6-foot-high monument signs as measured from the street grade, all of which are potentially feasible alternatives.

We appreciate your willingness to consider our suggestions.

Regards,

Dyana Anderly

From: "Anne Novotny" <anne.novotny@edcgov.us>
To: "Driever, Eric" <driever.eric@yahoo.com>, "Anderly, Dyana" <danderly@comcast.net>
Cc: "Shawna Purvines" <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
Sent: Friday, October 3, 2014 10:32:42 AM
Subject: County Sign Ordinance Update - Notice of Preparation for draft EIR and Public Scoping Meeting

Eric & Dyana,

On October 1, 2014, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released for the Sign Ordinance Update draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A public scoping meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, October 23rd at 6:00 PM** in the Planning Commission Hearing Room.

The NOP is posted on the Long Range Planning Website, along with the Public Review Draft of the proposed Sign Ordinance Update:

http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/LandUse/Sign_Ordinance_Update.aspx

Please forward this email to the other members of the Cameron Park Design Review Committee and anyone

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/?ui=2&ik=18c380ff3f&view=pt&q=driever.eric%40yahoo.com&qs=true&search=query&th=14d935188ea18267&siml=14d9351...> 2/3

13-0086 Public Comment
PC Rcvd 05-27-15

else who may be interested.

Thank you for your valuable input on this comprehensive update to the Sign Ordinance. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Regards,

Anne Novotny

Senior Planner

County of El Dorado

Community Development Agency

Long Range Planning Division

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 621-5931 / (530) 642-0508

anne.novotny@edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Eva Robertson <evagrobertson@gmail.com>

FW: My Comments and DRC Comments re EIR

1 message

Jane Layton <jane@janelayton.com>
To: Eva Robertson <evagrobertson@gmail.com>

Tue, May 26, 2015 at 8:01 PM

This contains the attachment.

From: danderly@comcast.net [mailto:danderly@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 2:18 AM
To: anne novotny
Cc: Anderly, Dyana; Driever, Eric; Harris, Mark; Layton, Jane; Neibauer, Vicky
Subject: My Comments and DRC Comments re EIR

Hi Anne,

I've attached my older comments, which is fine to attached to whatever you wish. You can just please destroy my other email comments. Thank you for asking.

Regarding the DRC's comments re what should be included in the EIR for the draft Sign Ordinance, we request the following:

Since the major issue associated with signs is the visual impact, there should be plenty of pictures representative of signs allowed under the current sign ordinance (no project), the proposed sign ordinance, and the alternatives.

When deciding on the range of reasonable alternatives to the sign ordinance, we are suggesting, with the exception of two shopping center signs (one on either side of 50), eliminating any additional large freeway-oriented signs and showing the blue State-authorized square freeway signs instead, using individual letters rather than any can signs on building walls, showing the use of natural materials such as wood and rock in the signs, and showing shorter signs, such as a maximum of 6-foot-high monument signs as measured from the street grade, all of which are potentially feasible alternatives.

We appreciate your willingness to consider our suggestions.

Regards,

5/26/2015

Gmail - FW: My Comments and DRC Comments re EIR

Dyana Anderly

From: "Anne Novotny" <anne.novotny@edcgov.us>
To: "Driever, Eric" <driever.eric@yahoo.com>, "Anderly, Dyana" <danderly@comcast.net>
Cc: "Shawna Purvines" <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
Sent: Friday, October 3, 2014 10:32:42 AM
Subject: County Sign Ordinance Update - Notice of Preparation for draft EIR and Public Scoping Meeting

Eric & Dyana,

On October 1, 2014, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released for the Sign Ordinance Update draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A public scoping meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, October 23rd at 6:00 PM** in the Planning Commission Hearing Room.

The NOP is posted on the Long Range Planning Website, along with the Public Review Draft of the proposed Sign Ordinance Update:

http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/LandUse/Sign_Ordinance_Update.aspx

Please forward this email to the other members of the Cameron Park Design Review Committee and anyone else who may be interested.

Thank you for your valuable input on this comprehensive update to the Sign Ordinance. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Regards,

Anne Novotny

Senior Planner

County of El Dorado

Community Development Agency

Long Range Planning Division

2850 Fairlane Court

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/?ui=2&ik=18c380ff3f&view=pt&q=driever.eric%40yahoo.com&q&s=true&search=query&th=14d93517c9c6f5e4&siml=14d93517...> 2/3

13-0086 Public Comment
PC Rcvd 05-27-15

5/26/2015

Gmail - FW: My Comments and DRC Comments re EIR

Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 621-5931 / (530) 642-0508

anne.novotny@edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited. If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system. Thank you.



Comments re EDC sign ord..docx

15K

5/27/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Further to email sent last night

PC 5-28-15

#2

Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

4 pages



Fwd: Further to email sent last night

Planning Unknown <planning@edcgov.us>
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Wed, May 27, 2015 at 8:11 AM

Char,

Please see Public Comment for Planning Commission below.

Thank you,

Julie Saylor
Office Assistant II

County of El Dorado
Community Development Agency
Development Services, Planning
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5324 / FAX (530) 642-0508
julie.saylor@edcgov.us

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **Eva Robertson** <evagrobertson@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, May 27, 2015 at 7:46 AM
Subject: Further to email sent last night
To: planning@edcgov.us

I forgot to attach the following to my email sent last night. Please confirm receipt, thanks.

 **Comments re EDC sign ord 10.29.14.docx**
16K

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
COMMENTS ON COUNTY SIGN ORDINANCE

The environmental document should focus on visual examples of what the County would look like if signs were to be installed in accordance with the proposed County sign ordinance.

There should be a "Purpose" section. The "Content" section should be renamed "Purpose."

1. The "Content" section would to the extent allowable by law eliminate billboards along "identified scenic and historic routes." This paragraph refers to "objective 2.7.1, but it does not indicate that this is an objective of the County General Plan.

Cameron Park is not located in an identified scenic and historic route, but the goal of the sign ordinance should be to eliminate the billboards in Cameron Park or actually the entire County. They mostly advertise goods and locations that are not helpful to the local economy (beer, Thunder Valley Casino, etc.) Objective 2.7.1 (***OBJECTIVE 2.7.1: SIGNS REGULATION, Regulation of the location, number and size of highway signs and elimination of billboards along identified scenic and historic routes. Policy 2.7.1.1 The Sign Ordinance shall include design review for signs within the foreground and background of the designated scenic corridors commensurate with the goal of scenic corridor viewshed protection.***)

2. Under the "Applicability" Section, subsection E. states "Protect viewsheds in designated scenic corridors." Because billboards are inherently unattractive and constitute a visual blight and contribute nothing positive to the character of El Dorado County, they should not be allowed anywhere and more specifically in Cameron Park.

3. Under "General Sign Requirements" subsection A, refers to complying with "other private agreements that provide more restrictive sign regulations than are required by this chapter. Reference should be made to complying with community-based, officially adopted sign guidelines.

Under subsection G. there is an indication that exceptions from sign standards require a variance. However, those businesses pursuing signs are typically just starting out and the costs and time associated with the variance process are too restrictive and not practical. Come up with another process, such as "Sign Exceptions" (or other wording) which can be approved by the Planning Director when certain criteria are met.

4. Under "Exemptions," subsection 6, there should be a maximum area for street addresses and oversized addresses can be used as an advertisement in themselves. Under subsection 10, vehicles with signs on them should also be registered, operable, should not be stationary (not parked in a field and serve as a huge sign.)

5. Under "Exempt Signs With Limitations," subsection 3 relating to flags, there should be a limitation on the number of flags. There should be an indication that when a flag is used as a sign to identify a business, the flag must count toward the number and area of allowable signage.

Under subsection 8, real estate signs cannot be placed in the public right-of-way, but this is not very practical given the rural character of the area.

Subsection 12, sub-subsection a. refers to temporary signs and indicates that temporary signs should not project above the roof line. They should be prohibited from being on the roof at all.

Under "Permanent Signs, subsection 4, indicates where permanent signs are permitted. Sub-subsection 4 would indicate that permanent signs are allowed only outside designated scenic corridors. The reader would incorrectly conclude that permanent signs are not allowed in the scenic corridor at all if within 100 feet of Highway 50.

Under "Sign Development and Design Standards," subsection C, "Sign Height Measurement," the height should be measured from the sidewalk or street grade given the topography of the area. One sign might sit on the high side of the street and another on the down-hill side of the street where visibility is equally important. Signs should not be placed on landscaped mounds to achieve greater height. Signs are viewed by motorists and pedestrians, so measuring the height from the sidewalk or road grade is ideal.

Under "Sign Development and Design Standards," subsection C, sub-subsection 4.b. relates to minimum spacing distance between permanent freestanding signs. Highway 50 signs are to be separated by 1000 feet. Did County staff determine how that might look in Cameron Park or how that could result in many signs already existing being rendered nonconforming? If nonconforming, which sign should be removed first? The environmental analysis should include visual depictions of what this might look like. This section goes further to say that approving authority may allow a reduction in spacing to ensure that a qualified (whatever that is) business can have at least one freestanding sign. If this is the case, then the separation requirement does not hold any water and most signs in Cameron Park and along Highway 50 would be much less than 1000 feet apart. Would a variance be required?

Under "Sign Development and Design Standards," subsection F relates to maintenance and indicates that violations could be considered a nuisance and a zoning violation and would be enforced as such. There should be different enforcement procedures for signs. For example, temporary signs in the public right of way that cause a nuisance should not be allowed to wait until a court date or given a couple of weeks to comply. There should be a provision for County staff removing dangerously placed signs.

Under "Sign Development and Design Standards," subsection H, "Design Standards for Specific Sign Types," raceway signs should not be allowed as individual letters (push pin signs) are much more attractive. Also, canned signs should not be permitted.

Under "Sign Development and Design Standards," subsection J, "Standards for U.S. Highway 50-Oriented Signs, design review by the Planning Commission is required. However, these signs should not be taken for granted and a use permit should be required. Further, under subsection J, sub-subsection 4 relates to height. Although maximums are indicated, there should be proof that the maximum height is necessary for adequate visibility and not just be taken for granted. A much lesser height may be

adequate and more readily and safely seen by motorists. The sign should be within a motorist's line of sight and no higher.

TABLES

The tables make reference to "public" streets, yet many of the County's streets are private.

Monument signs should not exceed 6 feet high. This height is within the line of sight of motorists. County communities are small and speed-limits are relatively low so that large, tall signs are unnecessary and unnecessarily intrusive.

It should be clear that when there are multi-tenant buildings or campus-type developments each tenant should not be allowed a free-standing sign. One sign for most developments, with space on the sign for each tenant is adequate. This is especially true in an industrial area where the general public is generally not looking for a specific location. Once a truck driver finds an industrial business, they need to find it only the first time.

Within the AE-PA zone the maximum height is 6 feet above the roofline. There is no such thing as an attractive roof line and all roof signs should be prohibited in every zoning district.

Under "Permit requirements and Review Procedures," it should be made clear that sign design and location should be a part of any proposed development, especially commercial development. It should be shown how the sign will relate to the architecture of the building, where on the building a sign may be situated, where within the proposed landscaping a sign would be located, and how a sign will not interfere with proposed landscaping, such as trees and shrubs, and with proposed light standards. Landscaping should be designed to ground a sign by providing an attractive and colorful base around the sign. Attractive signs are not afterthoughts. Signs should not overlap architectural features, including windows or other decorative elements, or hang off an eave.

Under "Prohibited Signs," subsection b, sub-subsection 3, provides for roof signs in rural areas. All roof signs should be prohibited. (What defines a "rural" area?)

Under "Prohibited Signs," subsection b, sub-subsection 12, and subsection C. "nonconforming signs," refer to a "person installing the sign." This language is likely non-enforceable in that the "person" may no longer be available or his/her whereabouts may not be known, and a sign company rather than an individual may be responsible for the sign. Re-write this section.