

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Urgent - Request by Cameron Park Design Review Committee to continue Sign Ordinance

1 message

danderly@comcast.net <danderly@comcast.net>

Sun, Jul 20, 2014 at 2:14 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us, jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, Kitty <bostwo@edcgov.us>, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, terri.daly@edcgov.us Cc: "

shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

The Cameron Park Design Review Committee respectfully requests that you continue your consideration of the El Dorado County Sign Ordinance until our committee is able to review the issues associated with the new draft. Cameron Park will be impacted by what is contained therein, so it is very important that we be given this opportunity **before** the onset of the environmental review process.

The Cameron Park Design Review Committee and those who live and work in our community have waited literally years to have our draft sign guidelines considered and adopted. We were directed by you to hold off until the County developed their guidelines. However, your staff declined to give us access to the draft Sign Ordinance until it was received by you, the Board of Supervisors. That did not give us enough time over the weekend to gather a quorum, advertise a meeting as required by the Brown Act, and adequately review the proposed Draft. It appears that additional information may be necessary in order to effectively prepare the environmental documents. We believe it is only fair to have the item continued to a date following the next regular meeting of the Cameron Park Design Review Committee plus a week to prepare our response. Our next meeting is July 28, 2014.

Regards,

Dyana Anderly, MA, AICP Chair, Cameron Park Design Review Committee



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Comments on the 7-22-14 BOS Agenda Item, File #13-0086 Sign Ordinance 1 message

Nikki or Tim Costello <ntcostello@sbcglobal.net> Sun, Jul 20, 2014 at 4:55 PM To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Tim Costello, I live in Shingle Springs (20+ years), and I'm writing to comment on the sign ordinace item up for approval for Tuesday's BOS meeting.

For background, I spoke out against the three large Highway 50 billboards in a BOS meeting last year, only to see them approved during the next BOS meeting, apparently on advise of County council. I live off of Ponderosa Road and have to see that beer billboard daily. It is terribly offensive to see a large billboard jutting up in front of the view of the crystal range (on eastbound 50), a view so iconic it is used on County letterhead. Please know that the billboard location is also a gateway to Ponderosa High School - that sign is encouraging high school kids to drink beer. That type of message should not be allowed so close to a school. During winter, when the kids go to school and often leave school when it is dark, that sign is really lit up and noticable. Did you see the letter to the editor this week in the MD regarding Ponderosa HS Sober Grad Night? How does that align with the County-approved lit billboard encouraging all who view it to drink beer? That billboard should be removed ASAP. It is offensive, marring our view, creating light pollution at night (it is very bright, and the lights are aligned up), and particularly inappropriate for a main thoroughfare to the high school, with impressionable young drivers. Drinking and driving is a problem with high school kids, and that billboard is encouraging the high school kids to drink beer, plain and simple.

Back to the sign ordinance item for Tuesday's BOS meeting - my comments are below:

1. The ordinance appears to have been completely re-written, not just edited. As such, I think it is inappropriate to approve it without adequate public review. I'm concerned there may be significant changes, given that it has been almost completely re-written. Please allow a longer period of time for public review and comment, and postpone the approval vote.

2. Please disallow all "Animated, flashing, scrolling, digital, or video screen signs" - not just those that change messages more than once every 12 seconds. Those signs are terribly offensive and distracting to drivers. They should be outlawed. Also, I do not recall allowing those types of signs in the July 8, 2014 draft ordinance - is this an attempt to allow those types of signs? That should be clearly communicated to the public, rather then hidden in the prohibited signs section on Page 47.

3. Please shorten the amortization schedule for billboards. 7 years is too long. It has already been more than one year since the initial draft ordinance was issued, and it appears to be a 13-0086 Public Comment

whole new document requiring yet more public review. By the time the ordinance finally takes effect, it will be 2 or 3 years since beginning the process. Please reduce the 7 year period for billboards by at least 2 or 3 years minimum.

4. The draft ordinance seeks to prohibit billboards along scenic corridors and viewsheds. I support that effort, thank you. I'm not sure where those areas are; please define them or at least provide links or references. I am concerned that the eastbound view along Highway 50 beginning at Ponderosa Road is not covered in that effort (not an identified viewshed or scenic corridor) - I hope it is and wish to emphasize that it certainly should be - the view eastbound toward the top of the Highway 50 grade at Ponderosa Road is iconic.

5. I trust nothing in the ordinance prohibits typcial non-lit business signs, or the ability of homeowners to post garage sale signs or temporary community meeting signs, etc.

Thank you for considering my comments and requests. Please postpone the approval vote to allow the public more time to review the document. I also would like to add I wish that the effort to ban billboards was not slowed down by incorporating that effort into an all inclusive comprehensive County-wide sign ordinance full of with legal terms, definiaitons and references; it has really slowed down the effort to get rid of the offensive billboards.

Sincerely,

Tim Costello



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Comment on 7-22-14 BOS Agenda Item, File #13-0086 Sign Ordinance

1 message

Monique Wilber <monique.w@comcast.net> Sun, Jul 20, 2014 at 10:29 PM To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of Shingle Springs, and a former Sr. Planner in Long Range Planning in El Dorado County. While I was working for the County in 2006 to 2009, a colleague was working on the Sign Ordinance, as well as an update to the Zoning Code, which was put aside (how many years of that worker's time was for naught?? At what cost??).

I am not able to attend Tuesday's meeting as I work full time in Sacramento; otherwise, I would be attending.

I request that you do not approve and authorize the Chair to sign Resolution of Intention 106-2014 to Amend the Sign Ordinance and authorize staff to proceed with environmental review. The new draft was posted on Friday, July 18, which only gave the public 4 days to review the ordinance. The Sign Ordinance is a critically important document to the county and was completely rewritten instead of slightly edited. The new draft of the ordinance should be processed like a brand new ordinance to give the public time for review. Please start the process of public hearings to receive input.

Thank you,

Monique Wilber Shingle Springs District 4



LATE DISTRIBUTION 7-21-14 EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Comment on 7-22-14 BOS Agenda Item, File #13-0086 Sign Ordinance

1 message

edc.cob@edcgov.us

steve clark <jsclark58@gmail.com>

Sun, Jul 20, 2014 at 11:36 PM To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I request that you do not approve and authorize the Chair to sign Resolution of Intention 106-2014 to Amend the Sign Ordinance and authorize staff to proceed with environmental review. The new draft was posted on Friday, July 18, which only gave the public 4 days to review the ordinance. The Sign Ordinance is a critically important document to the county and was completely rewritten instead of slightly edited. The new draft of the ordinance should be processed like a brand new ordinance to give the public time for review. Please start the process of public hearings to receive input.

o ...

Thank you,

Steve Clark

Shingle Springs Ca.



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Sign Ordinance--Please Allow More Time For Review

1 message

Langley, Cheryl@CDPR <Cheryl.Langley@cdpr.ca.gov> Mon, Jul 21, 2014 at 8:20 AM To: "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "Mikulaco, Ron@El Dorado" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "Veerkamp, Brian@El Dorado" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "Santiago, Norma@El Dorado" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors--

Please extend the public review period for the draft sign ordinance. While I believe the review period might have been adequate if there were only minor changes, this is not the case. This is a 37 page document with substantial changes (the track-changes version--the version most of us would like to review--is approximately double that size).

This document was released on a Friday; need I say most of us had a busy weekend that precluded dwelling over the document. This is an important document--it will shape the appearance of the County for years to come. I think it is only prudent to allow the public ample time for review.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Cheryl Langley

Shingle Springs Resident



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Comment on 7-22-14 BOS Agenda Item, File #13-0086 Sign Ordinance

1 message

 Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>
 Mon, Jul 21, 2014 at 9:41 AM

 To: Ron Mikulaco <bosone@edcgov.us>, Brian Veerkamp <bosthree@edcgov.us>, Ron Briggs

 <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Norma Santiago <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Jim Mitrisin <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors:

Staff is asking for approval of the draft sign ordinance. They would also like approval of an ROI to amend two General Plan policies and objectives. Previous hearings on this subject have had significant community input, and the changes you are being asked to approve have NOT been made clear to the public.

My comments for the 7/22/14 hearing of the draft sign ordinance are as follows:

1. Not all public comments have been forwarded from previous hearings for inclusion in this review, and issues raised in them have not been addressed by staff. [Only attachments 2B and 2C show public comment as of this morning; where are the rest? I personally sent comments in July 15 and Sept 9 of last year].

2. The staff report indicates the dwell time for electronic signs is being reduced (...that's a FASTER change time...) from 12 second to 8 seconds because of public comment. This public comment is not posted - *who made it and why did it receive precedence over all the other public comments?*

3. MULTIPLE comments were originally made requesting that fines be included for illegal signs, to motivate a bit of respect for, and adherence to, the ordinance. This is not mentioned anywhere.[see graphic at the end of this email]

4. Attachment 4C is supposed to be a strike-out version of the draft ordinance from the July 2013 version, but there do not appear to be any strike outs. Is this an oversight, or are there no changes?

5. The ROI indicates the current sign ordinance is such a mess that this draft HAS to be adopted ASAP...you are being misled on this. The ordinance has been amended multiple times annually with ample opportunity to have made the legally required changes, and while revisions may be necessary, rushing an approval to the detriment of both a quality end product and public participation, is NOT necessary.

6. Why is the ROI proposed to remove protection of historic routes from Objective 2.7.1? 13-0086 Public Comment BOS Rcvd 7-21-14 1 of 3 Edcgov.us Mail - Comment on 7-22-14 BOS Agenda Item, File #13-0086 Sign Ordinance

7. Why does the ROI revise Objective 2.7.1 to put all Hwy 50 regulation in the hands of state and federal law rather than simply aligning with those regulations? The amortization schedule referenced (and removed..) from policy 2.7.1.2 could be created that meets state and federal requirements, rather than removing it altogether.

8. It is not clear we need a new ROI so much as we need to address the goals/objectives we already have in place (2.7.1 and 2.7.1.2).

9. The Cam Park DRC is correct in their comments that there are many scenic areas of our county besides Hwy 50 that have not been addressed and will be vulnerable with the sign ordinance as it is drafted (Green Valley corridor, for one)

10. What exactly does item 1 from page 2 of the staff report mean: *"A Uniform Sign Program may allow deviations up to 20 percent of development standards."?* It says that it is based on Board direction and community input. I'm pretty sure residents did not ask for a 20% increase to allowable sign height or area simply by virtue of an applicant submitting a sign 'program' application.

It is not clear that public participation is actually welcomed in this process. Staff is recommending that you approve the draft ordinance before we have had a chance to review the changes (...the draft sign ordinance was just posted Friday, today is Monday, tomorrow is the hearing; and *where are all the previous public comments*?...).

<u>Please continue this item</u>. Provide a summary of what the proposed changes actually are, and actually welcome the public input rather than *pretend* to welcome it. There is mistrust of the process and staff, and approving the recommendations made on this item will only further that mistrust and yield an ordinance that does not reflect the communities' input.

Ellen Van Dyke

From public comment July '13:

Edcgov.us Mail - Comment on 7-22-14 BOS Agenda Item, File #13-0086 Sign Ordinance

$Sign\ Clutter_$ intersection of Cameron Park Dr & Green Valley Rd

Enforcement is the bigger problem rather than the ordinance

aulimail a anala annimail/u/1/2ui-20il-25d550a0a70.ia







EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Comment on 7-22-14 BOS Agenda Item, File #13-0086 Sign Ordinance

1 message

sue-taylor@comcast.net <sue-taylor@comcast.net>Mon, Jul 21, 2014 at 2:45 PMTo: BOSDistr1 <bosone@edcgov.us>, "Veerkamp, Brian" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "Briggs, Ron"<bosfour@edcgov.us>, NormaSantiagoBOSDistr5 <bosfive@edcgov.us>, edc cob <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Numerous members of the public asked the Board to deal with the issue of the billboards cropping up along Highway 50. Apparently the Board sent Staff off to write a book which should be titled "Signage for the future urbanization of El Dorado County".

Please DO NOT adopt this Resolution of Intention 106-2014 to Amend the Sign Ordinance and start another environmental review process! There has not been the time to read this new draft given that it was just posted on Friday, July 18.

Quickly reviewing the ordinance it appears that the County is attempting to align this ordinance with a generalized sign policy similar to the efforts being make with the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinace Updage (TGPA/ZOU).

Since the TGPA/ZOU has yet to be implemented or will not even be discussed by this Board of Supervisors until all the public meetings are over, I question as to how you can move forward with a generalized sign ordinance that probably conflicts with the existing zoning ordinance.

If it if too hard for the County to just focus on the ONE policy (OFF-SITE BILLBOARDS) that is not working within the existing code, then please set this activity aside until you have first decided whether or not you are going to adopt the overhauled 2004 General Plan or the NEW zoning ordinances!

Thank you,

Sue Taylor



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Comment on 7-22-14 BOS Agenda Item, File #13-0086 Sign Ordinance

1 message

francesca duchamp <francescaduchamp@att.net>

Mon, Jul 21, 2014 at 3:49 PM

Reply-To: francesca duchamp <francescaduchamp@att.net>

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>,

"bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I request that you do not approve and authorize the Chair to sign Resolution of Intention 106-2014 to Amend the Sign Ordinance and authorize staff to proceed with environmental review. The new draft was posted on Friday, July 18, which only gave the public 4 days to review the ordinance. <---come on guys and gals <---I just found out about it now. Four days --really. After all the times ive heard that people are notified way ahead of each public item...four days doesnt seem like a whole lot of time. am i missing something ?

Thank you,

Fran duchamp

Pollock Pines



LATE DISTRIBUTION 7-21-14 EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

FW: ACTION ALERT! Sign Ordinance on 7/22/14 BOS Agenda

1 message

J Goggins <jgoggins@directv.net>

Mon, Jul 21, 2014 at 3:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I request that you do not approve and authorize the Chair to sign Resolution of Intention 106-2014 to Amend the Sign Ordinance and authorize staff to proceed with environmental review. The new draft was posted on Friday, July 18, which only gave the public 4 days to review the ordinance. We need more time to review this possible change. The Sign Ordinance is a critically important document to the county and was completely rewritten instead of slightly edited. The new draft of the ordinance should be processed like a brand new ordinance to give the public time for review. Please start the process of public hearings to receive input.

Thank you,

Bob & Judy Goggins