



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 7/28/15 BOS 7/28/15

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Sign Ordinance Update Comments for 7-28-15 BOS Agenda Item

1 message

Nikki or Tim Costello <ntcostello@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Jul 28, 2015 at 12:09 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, Anne Novotny <anne.novotny@edcgov.us>

To the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to provide comments to the Sign Ordinance Update. I cannot attend the meeting on Tuesday. My name is Tim Costello and I am a 20+ year resident of Shingle Springs. My comments focus on billboards, large tall signs, and digital signs, as I fear that allowing such signs will degrade our County's rural character and charm.

I ask that you vote to NOT ADOPT the Sign Ordinance Update as currently drafted.

I appreciate the effort to develop a County-wide ordinance regulating signage, especially in the stated spirit of protecting our viewsheds, removing/relocating billboards, reducing sign clutter, protecting the County's visual appearance and scenic landscapes, and maintaining the visual integrity of hillsides and ridge lines. However, somewhere along the 2 1/2 years of this process the focus of the original intent to remove the large billboards along Highway 50 has been lost, replaced by allowances for 60-foot tall signs and even digital billboards, completely opposite of the wishes of community members who have commented in meetings and submitted written comments. The amortization schedule for removing the large highway billboards has been eliminated. Sustained input and threats by industry lobbying groups and signage companies (as evidenced by their comment letters during the comment periods) has apparently been effective in changing the spirit of the update from one of protecting our rural character and iconic views to one of industry-favorable signage that will further degrade the night sky, degrade our countryside views, and cause visual blight. Contrary to what the industry representatives state, multiple large signs indeed is blight within our rural environment. The signage and billboards along highway 50 near the Ponderosa Road interchange, and near the Cameron Park Drive interchange, is proof of that. The large billboard at the top of the hill along Highway 50 at the Ponderosa Road interchange area, which was approved by the BOS over the objections of community members in response to the project proponents' hollow threats of a lawsuit, has ruined the natural view of the crystal range from that perspective as one ascends the grade eastbound toward Ponderosa Drive. That billboard, which is located in an area I consider to be the gateway to Ponderosa High School, over the years has advertised beer and gambling at the local casino. Not the type of messages we should be giving our local high school students. The signage companies and lobbyists apparently don't care about shoving those messages down the throat of our high school kids coming and going from school each day.

In the end, as stated in Exhibit A-1 to the Update, the "significant and unavoidable environmental effects" of digital signage - light and glare - which will cause a "visual intrusion" is disregarded and ultimately allowed. Even though it is in direct conflict with the stated objective of the ordinance. That should not be allowed.

With that preamble additional comments are presented below:

1. Please DO NOT ADOPT the sign ordinance update because it will cause significant and severe environmental impacts, as stated on Page 12 of Exhibit A-1.
2. Digital signage (animated, flashing, scrolling, digital, video) should be outlawed in this County - please disallow those signs. They are very bright, further adding to the degradation of our night sky that has been eroding in the Shingle Spings Highway 50 area over the past 20 years. They are distracting to drivers, annoying and completely out of character within our rural environment.
 - a. Digital signs are obnoxious and have no place in or near rural communities.
 - b. The industry arguments that digital signs will reduce sign clutter is utter nonsense. Along Highway 50 in Sacramento County near Sacramento State there are two large digital signs within a couple of hundred feet of one another. In Rancho Cordova along Highway 50 east of Sunrise Blvd. there are several digital signs in close

proximity to perhaps 15 to 20 other billboards and large signs. The presence of a digital sign has NOT resulted in fewer billboards in those areas; that highway corridor is cluttered with large signs. Purported facts and figures put forth by industry-sponsored studies (such as the 2012 "Watchfire Signs" paper cited on Page 11 of Exhibit A-1) to support their interests should not be considered legitimate unbiased evaluations and cited in this Update as supporting evidence to allow digital signs. The notion that a digital sign would result in fewer other signs, and reduce sign clutter as stated in the Update, is preposterous and not borne out by observation along the Highway 50 corridor in Sacramento County. Digital billboards and signage is blight within a rural County.

c. I live near the new fire station on Ponderosa Blvd. before the high school, north of Highway 50. When that building design was evaluated a few years ago by the planning department plans called for a small digital sign to replace the old wooden sign that was used to post various general public messages out in front of the building. The planning dept. disallowed the digital sign because it was not in character with the surrounding rural community. I agree with that determination. What has changed since that time that we now are considering allowing such signs, including much larger digital signs?

3. Earlier draft versions of the Update allowed for signs as tall as 30 feet. The final Update language allows for signs up to 60 feet tall. That is much too tall for our rural communities. Tall billboards and other signs, such as for shopping centers, are ugly and significantly degrade our views. The cookie cutter signage along Highway 50 in Folsom for the shopping centers are "anywhere, USA" generic signs that do not reflect the local community at all. Please do not allow signs that tall. Please discourage the cookie cutter generic sign designs - signs, especially large signs, should be in the character of the local community.

4. I ask that the existing billboards along Highway 50, including those in Shingle Springs, be removed in accordance with an amortization schedule as originally intended and included in earlier versions of the Update.

5. Reference to areas of scenic vistas and viewsheds in the Update should not be restricted to only those officially designated scenic corridors. Common sense should be used to include other scenic areas in the County where signs should not be erected, especially tall signs or lit signs. For example, the Highway 50 corridor at Ponderosa Road at the top of the hill reveals the crystal range, and that view is truly an iconic one, the first revealing vista of the mountains for east-bound travelers. That specific location is not within a designated scenic corridor, but certainly should be, and that area should be off limits to any large signs or billboards.

6. The Update provides an allowance for potentially large signs to be erected on County property. The County should not allow large signs to be erected on County-owned property. County-owned property should be used in the best interest of the community, not used for ugly signs that cause blight.

I hope you consider these comments when it comes times to vote on the sign Update. Please do not adopt the Sign Ordinance Update as currently written.

Thank you,

Tim Costello



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Public comment 7/28/15, Sign Ordinance 13-0086

1 message

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

Tue, Jul 28, 2015 at 7:24 AM

To: Brian Veerkamp <bostthree@edcgov.us>, Ron Mikulaco <bosone@edcgov.us>, Shiva Frentzen <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Sue Novasel <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Michael Ranalli <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Jim Mitrising <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

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

Dear Supervisors-

I just learned yesterday that the proposed ordinance involving freeway signs was changed AFTER the EIR analysis was completed.

Draft ordinance section 17.16.070J has been revised to increase the sign area by over 100% up to 500sf. And the spacing limitation has been struck out altogether.

You cannot adopt the draft as currently proposed without recirculating the Draft EIR for appropriate analysis. Please consult with County Counsel if you have any doubt on this. I am already advocating for the No Project alternative in my previous comments submitted 7/28, but this type of thing demonstrates a serious lack of transparency, and makes the public wonder *'what else has been slipped in there that we are not aware of'*.

From the proposed ordinances posted for today's meeting, showing the change, Attachment G Exhibit E:

J. Standards for U.S. Highway 50-Oriented Signs. Proposed on-site signs within 100 feet of the edge of the right-of-way of U.S. Highway 50, outside of the officially designated scenic corridor, are subject to a Design Review Permit. U.S. Highway 50-Oriented signs shall be consistent with the standards provided below, and as required in other provisions of this Chapter. U.S. Highway 50-Oriented ~~S~~ signs shall not be used as general advertising for hire.

1. Location

- a. ~~Spacing between signs~~ Distance from Right-of-Way. U.S. Highway 50-Oriented sign shall be a minimum of 100 feet from the edge of the highway right-of-way ~~separated by at least 1,000 feet.~~

and

3. **Area.**

- a. **Maximum allowed area.** For single-tenant signs, the maximum sign area shall be 60 square feet. For multi-tenant signs, the maximum sign area allowed shall may be up to 2500 square feet with a Special Use Permit as required by the Uniform Sign Program (see Section 17.16.080(B) Permit Requirements and Review Procedures.)

From the Draft EIR project description, showing what WAS evaluated, page 2.0-12:

C. Standards for U.S. Highway 50-Oriented Signs

Section 17.16.070(J) establishes that proposed on-site signs within 100 feet of U.S. Highway 50, outside of the officially designated scenic corridor, are subject to a Design Review Permit. U.S. Highway 50-oriented signs must be consistent with the standards in this section and as required in other provisions of Chapter 17.16. U.S. Highway 50-oriented signs may not be used as general advertising for hire.

Under the proposed regulations, U.S. Highway 50-oriented signs must be separated by at least 1,000 feet. All signs must be set back a minimum of 10 feet from the highway right-of-way or other distance as determined by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). All U.S. Highway 50-oriented signs must be a minimum of 200 feet from any residential district. All signs must be designed as pylon signs and made of materials and design-compatible with the building materials and design of the applicable establishment. If illuminated, the signs must be internally lit, with no blinking, flashing, or intermittent lights or other illuminating devices that have a changing light, brightness, or color. Electronic (digital) changeable copy LED lights are allowed to be incorporated into the structure consistent with the restrictions listed in Section 17.16.070(H)(3).

Section 17.16.070(J) reserves a section entitled Special Development and Design Standards for Designated State Scenic Highway Corridors (future Scenic Corridor Ordinance).

and pgs 235 and 236 of 261 of the DEIR pdf, again, showing what WAS evaluated:

- J. Standards for U.S. Highway 50-Oriented Signs.** Proposed on-site signs within 100 feet of U.S. Highway 50, outside of the officially designated scenic corridor, are subject to a Design Review Permit. U.S. Highway 50-Oriented signs shall be consistent with the standards provided below, and as required in other provisions of this Chapter. U.S. Highway 50-Oriented Signs shall not be used as general advertising for hire.

1. **Location**

- a. **Spacing between signs.** U.S. Highway 50-Oriented sign shall be separated by at least 1,000 feet.

3. **Area.**

- a. **Maximum allowed area.** For single-tenant signs, the maximum sign area shall be 60 square feet. For multi-tenant signs, the maximum sign area shall be 200 square feet.

Please include this in the public record for the TGPA/ZOU as well (file no.11-0356)
Ellen Van Dyke



#28

Updating the Signage Ordinance July 28th meeting

1 message

charlet burcin <charlet331@gmail.com>

Tue, Jul 28, 2015 at 8:48 AM

To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Cc: anne.novotny@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisors,

I am against updating of the sign ordinance for the following reason:

It is being stated that this policy will ensure that the signs will be consistent with the aesthetic and visual goals of the general plan. How is the ordinance inconsistent with the current plan? Not true.

If adopted, this will cause more signs, larger signs, signs to remain for a much longer time, and I do believe, is a traffic safety distraction! The location of the signs look as though they will be located along HWY 50 near EDH, Shingle Springs, and Cameron Park where there is and will be more traffic.

I urge you not to change our existing sign ordinance!

Respectfully,

Charlet Burcin
EDH



#28

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Sign Ordinance

1 message

Jim Pridemore <jimpridemore@gmail.com>

Tue, Jul 28, 2015 at 9:37 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, anne.novotny@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisors,

I am against updating of the sign ordinance.

If adopted, this will cause more signs, larger signs, signs to remain for a much longer time. Aesthetically it will take away from the rural feel of the area.

I urge you not to change our existing sign ordinance!

Respectfully,

Jim Pridemore
EDH

D. Anderly #28 BOS 7/28/15

TOO TALL SIGNS UNNECESSARILY DETRACT FROM THE BEAUTIFUL SKY.



WHAT IS A GOOD HEIGHT FOR ADEQUATE IDENTIFICATION WITHOUT INTERFERING WITH VIEWS?

NO ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIRED WITH PROPOSED ORDINANCE.



TOO MANY SIGNS TOO LARGE AND CLOSE TOGETHER
CREATE BLIGHT. DOES NOT INDUCE SHOPPERS TO STOP.



NOTICE HEIGHT OF TYPICAL TREE CANOPY. 20' HIGH SIGNS WOULD BE OBSCURED BY THE TREE CANOPY, PUTTING THE TREE IN JEOPARDY.



IN ADDITION TO ADVERTISING, DIGITAL SIGNS CREATE A DISTRACTION FROM THE MORE BEAUTIFUL ASPECTS OF THEIR SURROUNDINGS.





IN THE SPRING AND SUMMER, THE TREES WILL HAVE LEAVES THAT BLOCK THE SIGN.

