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02/23/15
Urgent - Request by Cameron Park Design Review Committee to continue Sign Ordinance

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
Fwd: Sign Ordinance & ROI comments
1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>  
To: Anne Novotny <anne.novotny@edcgov.us>  
Mon, Aug 11, 2014 at 4:03 PM

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Valerie Zentner <valeriez@edcfb.com>
Date: Mon, Aug 11, 2014 at 3:49 PM
Subject: Sign Ordinance & ROI comments
To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
Cc: Charlene Carveth <charlene.carveth@edcgov.us>, Jim Mitrisin - El Dorado County <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

Shawna,

I saw the article in the Mountain Democrat & realized I may not have sent this to you as I had planned to following the hearing on July 22. Here are the Farm Bureau comments, reiterated from the testimony we presented at the hearing. Let me know if you have any questions or need anything further.

Valerie Zentner, Executive Director

El Dorado County Farm Bureau

--

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

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.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=4196ba1e18&view=pt&as_from=shawna.purvines%40edcgov.us&as_has=Zentner&as_sizeoperator=s_sl&as_sizeu...
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.
July 22, 2014

El Dorado County Community Development
Agency, Long Range Planning
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Attention: Shawna Purvines

Subject: Sign Ordinance Update and Resolution of Intention – Agenda Item 30

Dear Ms. Purvines,

The El Dorado County Farm Bureau has reviewed the Public Draft Sign Ordinance and we provide the following comments for your review and consideration.

1. The draft update has addressed many of our concerns expressed during the 2013 draft iterations. We appreciate the difference between the rural and suburban signage uses and criteria. The ordinance is internally consistent with splitting out the rural uses from the suburban/urban requirements.

2. Winery signage allowed. On Page 19, Table 17.16.070. 2a – RE-10 is shown as not allowing building attached signage. The table does not indicate that signage is currently allowed for wineries on RE-10 zone parcels located within an Agricultural District. This needs to be added.

3. Commercial signage. We appreciate the parity now shown within the Rural Centers for commercial operations as compared to signs allowed within the Community Regions.

4. Home Occupations. We appreciate the signage now allowed and that it is scaled to parcel sizes.

5. In Section 17.16.110.C.4, reference is made to Section F and it should be corrected to show Section E where the Off-Site Signage in Designated Rural Areas is addressed.

Protect, promote, and enhance the economic opportunities and long-term viability for El Dorado County farmers, ranchers, and foresters.
We look forward to the public review draft and Notice of Preparation that will kick off the environmental review process and, ultimately, adoption of the sign ordinance. We support the Resolution of Intention as included for this item.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this important process. The point of contact for our organization for all future correspondence is the undersigned. For telephone inquiries, please contact our Executive Director, Valerie Zentner, at (530) 622-7773.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Davies
President

cc: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
    El Dorado County Agricultural Commissioner, Charlene Carveth
Hi Ann,

I have attached some of the comments by the DRC on the sign ordinance. Plenty of visual exhibits are necessary in the environmental document since the issues mostly boil down to that. What I indicated was that we wanted the BOS to hold off on their decision until we had an opportunity to review the draft sign ordinance. That was not granted. I do not even believe that the BOS had adequate time to carefully review the ordinance. Shawna indicated we had extra time following the BOS hearing, so we are just now putting it together. I've attached my initial draft for your information.

It appears that Cameron Park got the short shrift as we did not even a chance to bring our issues before the BOS before it went out for environmental work. We are not in a scenic corridor and we may never be there. The 1000 feet separation for freeway-oriented signs is a joke when you qualify it by saying that the distance can be less to make sure that everyone gets a freeway sign. Anyway, sorry for griping, but all the ugly signs seem to end up here. Those billboards were about the last straw.

As planners I would think that the planning staff would do everything in their power to promote healthy, attractive communities, but the proposed sign ordinance does not reflect this approach. I think the department head should take a leadership approach and promote good development instead of sitting back and asking the BOS what they want.

As for providing adequate notice to Cameron Park, we were not provided the draft sign ordinance in time to meet because we are subject to the Brown Act and the report did not come out as was indicated to us. It was supposed to come out on Thursday, but it did not. SO -- the folks most impacted had the least amount of time and input on the matter. Good planning? Don't think so. Here we are again, got noticed today that the Planning Commission is hearing matters on Thursday that is important to Cameron Park, yet we were not notified in time to look at the material to be presented to the PC and meet the requirements of the Brown Act.

Anyway, I am feeling quite disturbed about not being provided with enough time to review the material as a group and the department's refusal to share information with us before being posted on the web page. Also, the County web page has not been accessible this evening. Less than two days to review the material and come up with comments re impacts on Cameron Park is inconsistent with planning code of ethics, which I cite in part below:
A: **Principles to Which We Aspire**

1. **Our Overall Responsibility to the Public**

Our primary obligation is to serve the public interest and we, therefore, owe our allegiance to a conscientiously attained concept of the public interest that is formulated through continuous and open debate. We shall achieve high standards of professional integrity, proficiency, and knowledge. To comply with our obligation to the public, we aspire to the following principles:

   d) We shall provide timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information on planning issues to all affected persons and to governmental decision makers.

   e) We shall give people the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on the development of plans and programs that may affect them. Participation should be broad enough to include those who lack formal organization or influence.

   g) We shall promote excellence of design and endeavor to conserve and preserve the integrity and heritage of the natural and built environment.

   h) We shall deal fairly with all participants in the planning process. Those of us who are public officials or employees shall also deal evenhandedly with all planning process participants.

B: **Our Rules of Conduct**

We adhere to the following Rules of Conduct, and we understand that our Institute will enforce compliance with them. If we fail to adhere to these Rules, we could receive sanctions, the ultimate being the loss of our certification:

1. We shall not deliberately or with reckless indifference fail to provide adequate, timely, clear and accurate information on planning issues.

   Well, Ann, enough venting from me this evening. Sorry you had to be the recipient.

Regards,

Dyana Anderly, MA, AICP  
(510) 913-0698
Hello Dyana,

County staff is preparing to release the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Sign Ordinance. A Public Review Draft of the Sign Ordinance Update will also be released with the NOP.

The email you sent to the Board on July 20th noted that the Cameron Park Design Review Committee (CPDRC) CPDRC would prepare a response to the draft Sign Ordinance Updated that was presented to the Board of Supervisors for review on July 22, 2014 within a week after the July 28th CPDRC meeting.

Please let me know when the County can expect to receive the CPDRC's comments.

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.

DESIGN REVIEW comments Sign Ord.docx
15K
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 safety 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.