

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
PHONE: (831) 427-4863
FAX: (831) 427-4877
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



Click here to go to
original staff report

Th11a

Prepared December 9, 2014 for December 11, 2014 Hearing

To: Commissioners and Interested Persons
From: Susan Craig, District Manager
Kevin Kahn, District Supervisor, LCP Planning
Subject: **STAFF REPORT ADDENDUM for Th11a**
County of Santa Cruz LCP Amendment Number LCP-3-SCO-14-0817-1 Part B
(Sign Exceptions)

The purpose of this addendum is to clarify a minor discrepancy in the staff report for the above-referenced agenda item. The correction does not change staff's recommendation, which is still approval with suggested modifications. In the time since the staff report was distributed, staff received correspondence from Santa Cruz County staff dated December 1, 2014 (see letter attached as Exhibit A) indicating a minor discrepancy in the report's description of the proposed amendment. Specifically, the letter points out that while the staff report states that the proposed amendment requires a public hearing for any exception proposing more than three signs, section 13.10.587(C)(1)(a) of the proposed amendment requires a public hearing for more than three business/identification signs, or more than three pedestrian-oriented business/identification signs, or any combination of general and pedestrian-oriented business/identification signs exceeding four.

Commission staff agrees that the staff report's description of the proposed amendment should be modified to correct this discrepancy and accurately describe the proposed amendment's sign exception language. Thus, the staff report dated prepared November 21, 2014 is modified as shown below.

1. Amend the following text on Page 1 of the Staff Report as follows:

As proposed, any sign exception is required to meet specific criteria and findings, including that the proposed exception shall vary from sign standards only to the extent necessary to address site-specific circumstances, shall not adversely impact coastal visual resources, and must be consistent with the Local Coastal Program, among others. Additionally, a public hearing is still required for any exception proposing more than three business/identification signs, more than three pedestrian-oriented business/identification signs, a combination of both types of signs exceeding four, or for an exception that would increase sign area by 50 square feet or more. A public hearing is also required ~~or~~ for any sign exception that also requires a coastal development

permit. These requirements will help set an important limit on the size, number, and location of signs that may be considered for a sign exception without a public hearing, and ensure consistency with Land Use Plan policies that protect coastal resources, including visual resources and community character.

2. Amend the following text on Page 8 of the Staff Report as follows:

Additionally, a public hearing is still required for any exception proposing more than three business/identification signs, more than three pedestrian-oriented business/identification signs, a combination of both types of signs exceeding four, or for an exception that would increase sign area by 50 square feet or more. A public hearing is also required for any sign exception that requires coastal development permit (CDP) approval, consistent with IP Section 13.20.100.

Exhibit

Exhibit A – County’s Letter

From: [Paia Levine](#)
To: [Kahn, Kevin@Coastal](#)
Cc: [Craig, Susan@Coastal](#); [Jerry Busch](#)
Subject: Staff report, Signs ordinance amendment
Date: Monday, December 01, 2014 9:15:15 AM

Hello Kevin,

Thanks so much for your hustle getting this on the agenda. The staff report contains one error regarding the number of signs that triggers a public hearing for a sign exception. Seems like the kind of thing that can be pointed out at the meeting and thereby corrected in the record, or whatever your procedure is for last minute corrections.

The staff report states that more than three signs requires a public hearing, when in fact it the trigger is more than three business/identification signs, or more than three pedestrian oriented signs, or more than four of any type combined. Please see 13.10.587.(C) (1) (a).

Sincerely,
Paia

Paia Levine
Principal Planner
County of Santa Cruz
Phone (831) 454 5317

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
PHONE: (831) 427-4863
FAX: (831) 427-4877
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



Th11a

Prepared November 21, 2014 for December 11, 2014 Hearing

To: Commissioners and Interested Persons

From: Susan Craig, District Manager
Kevin Kahn, District Supervisor, LCP Planning

**Subject: County of Santa Cruz LCP Amendment Number LCP-3-SCO-14-0817-1 Part B
(Sign Exceptions)**

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The County of Santa Cruz proposes to amend its Local Coastal Program (LCP)'s Implementation Plan (IP) by inserting new provisions that address signage. Specifically, the proposed amendment establishes a new administrative review process for approving exceptions to established sign standards, replacing the existing IP's requirement to obtain a variance for any sign standard deviations. The existing certified IP includes numerous standards for the siting and design of signs, including limits on the number, location, and materials to be used. Any exception from the required sign standards is allowed only through a variance process, which requires detailed findings as well as a public hearing. The proposed amendment replaces the variance requirement with a new "sign exception" process, which still requires specific findings to be made, but does not require a public hearing, which the County hopes will help streamline development review and permitting.

As proposed, any sign exception is required to meet specific criteria and findings, including that the proposed exception shall vary from sign standards only to the extent necessary to address site-specific circumstances, shall not adversely impact coastal visual resources, and must be consistent with the Local Coastal Program, among others. Additionally, a public hearing is still required for any exception proposing more than three signs, or would increase sign area by 50 square feet or more, or for any sign exception that also requires a coastal development permit. These requirements will help set an important limit on the size, number, and location of signs that may be considered for a sign exception without a public hearing, and ensure consistency with Land Use Plan policies that protect coastal resources, including visual resources and community character.

However, one modification to the proposed amendment is necessary to ensure LUP consistency. The proposed amendment allows illumination for a sign visible from a scenic corridor as long as the sign is within a commercial or visitor-serving area or within the Highway 1 corridor. This

illumination exception is inconsistent with specific LUP policies that limit signs in scenic roads (of which Highway 1 is designated), and that limit illumination of signs visible from a scenic road to only state and county directional and information signs or those within a commercial or visitor serving area. Therefore, staff is recommending **Suggested Modification 1**, which clarifies that if the exception proposes illumination of a sign visible from a scenic road, the sign shall be only for state and county directional and information signs or must be situated only within a commercial or visitor serving area.

In addition, the County has requested two additional modifications. **Suggested Modification 2** provides a clarification on the maximum sign area for particular lots, while **Suggested Modification 3** provides clarification regarding the processing of sign exceptions. Both of these suggested modifications are minor in nature and simply offer clarification of proposed IP language.

As modified, the proposed amendment is consistent with and adequate to carry out the Land Use Plan, and the County has indicated its agreement with the staff recommendation. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission approve the amendment with suggested modifications. The required motions and resolutions are found on page 4 below.

Staff Note: LCP Amendment Action Deadline

This proposed LCP amendment was filed as complete on November 7, 2014. The proposed amendment affects the Implementation Plan (IP) only, and the 60-day action deadline is January 6, 2015. Thus, unless the Commission votes to extend the action deadline (it may be extended by up to one year), the Commission has until January 6, 2015 to take a final action on this LCP amendment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS4

II. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS5

III.FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.....5

 A. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED LCP AMENDMENT 5

 B. CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS 7

 C. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)..... 9

EXHIBIT

Exhibit 1: Proposed IP Amendment in Strikethrough and Underline

I. MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Staff recommends that the Commission, after public hearing, approve the proposed LCP amendment with suggested modifications. The Commission needs to make two motions in order to act on this recommendation.

A. Deny the IP Amendment as submitted

Staff recommends a **YES** vote on the motion below. Passage of this motion will result in rejection of the IP amendment as submitted and adoption of the following resolution. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Motion: *I move that the Commission reject Implementation Plan Amendment Number LCP-3-SCO-14-0817-1 (Part B) as submitted by the County of Santa Cruz.*

Resolution: *The Commission hereby denies certification of Implementation Plan Major Amendment Number LCP-3-SCO-14-0817-1 (Part B) as submitted by the County of Santa Cruz and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the Implementation Plan amendment as submitted does not conform with, and is inadequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified Land Use Plan. Certification of the Implementation Plan amendment would not meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, as there are feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen the significant adverse impacts on the environment that will result from certification of the Implementation Plan amendment as submitted.*

B. Certify the IP Amendment with Suggested Modifications

Staff recommends a **YES** vote on the motion below. Passage of this motion will result in certification of the amendment with suggested modifications and the adoption of the following resolution and the findings in this staff report. The motion to certify with suggested modifications passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Motion: *I move that the Commission certify Implementation Plan Major Amendment Number LCP-3-SCO-17-0817-1 (Part B) if it is modified as suggested in this staff report.*

Resolution: *The Commission hereby certifies Implementation Plan Major Amendment Number LCP-3-SCO-17-0817 (Part B) to the County of Santa Cruz Local Coastal Program if modified as suggested and adopts the findings set forth in this staff report on the grounds that the Implementation Plan amendment with the suggested modifications conforms with, and is adequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified Land Use Plan. Certification of the Implementation Plan amendment if modified as suggested complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the Implementation Plan on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts on the environment that will result from certification of the Implementation Plan amendment if modified.*

II. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS

The Commission hereby suggests the following modifications to the proposed LCP amendment, which are necessary to make the requisite Coastal Act consistency findings. If the County of Santa Cruz accepts each of the suggested modifications within six months of Commission action (i.e., by June 11, 2015), by formal resolution of the Board of Supervisors, the modified amendment will become effective upon Commission concurrence with the Executive Director's finding that this acceptance has been properly accomplished. Where applicable, text in ~~cross-out~~ format and text in underline format denotes text to be added/deleted by the County. Text in ~~double cross-out~~ and double underline denotes text to be added/deleted by the Commission.

1. Modify IP Section 13.10.587 (B)(3) as follows:

(B)(3) If the exception proposes illumination of a sign visible from a scenic road, the sign shall be only for state and county directional and information signs or for a sign situated within a commercial or visitor serving area or the urban Highway 1 corridor.

2. Modify the Table in IP Section 13.10.581(A)(2) as follows:

TOTAL SIGN AREA ALLOWED (Include All Signs Displayed)	
***	***
Maximum allowable area <u>on other lots</u>	50 square feet

3. Modify IP Section 13.10.587(C)(1) as follows:

(C)(1) A sign exception shall be processed as an Administrative Permit with public notice, in accordance with noticing and appeal procedures set forth in Chapter 18, except that the following proposals shall ~~be subject to review by the Zoning Administrator following~~ require a public hearing by the Zoning Administrator, ~~as per Chapter 18:~~... *[remainder of section unmodified as shown in Exhibit I]*

III. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED LCP AMENDMENT

The proposed amendment establishes an administrative process for approving exceptions to the IP's existing sign standards. Under the existing IP, standards for signage are listed in Sections 13.10.580 through 13.10.586. These sections include standards specific to particular zoning districts. For residential and agricultural districts,¹ no signs are allowed except for one non-illuminated sign for a home occupation and for the sale, lease, rental, or display of a structure or land; one identification sign for a discretionary use; and one or two non-illuminated signs for the sale of subdivided lots; all subject to sizing limits. For commercial, industrial, and public

¹ Defined as the Single-Family Residential district (R-1), Single-Family Ocean Beach Residential district (RB), Rural Residential district (RR), Residential Agricultural district (RA), Multifamily Residential district (RM), Agriculture district (A), Agricultural Preserve district (AP), and Commercial Agriculture district (CA).

facilities districts,² no sign is permitted except for one business or identification sign and one pedestrian-oriented sign, along with signs pertaining to a use conducted on the site. For signs in the parks, recreation and open space district,³ no sign is permitted except for one identification sign and directional signs, also subject to size and design standards. All allowed signs are subject to sizing, siting, and performance standards, including requirements that signs visible within a scenic corridor use appropriate materials and be located in an area so as to minimize visibility, as well as a prohibition on illuminated signs. Moving signs, flags, and flashing signs are also prohibited in all commercial, industrial, and public facility zoning districts. However, the IP also specifies that exceptions to the aforementioned sign standards may be allowed under the IP's variance approval provisions, specified in Section 13.10.230. Under the existing IP, a variance is allowed to grant exceptions to LCP standards, subject to specific findings listed in Section 13.10.230(C):

- (1) That because of special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the zoning ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification.
- (2) That the granting of such variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of zoning objectives and will not be materially detrimental to public health, safety or welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity.
- (3) That the granting of such variance shall not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such is situated.

Additionally, any variance approval is categorized as a Level V approval, which the LCP defines as a type of permit that requires a public hearing before the Zoning Administrator.

The amendment proposes to replace the existing variance process with a new "sign exception" process. As proposed, new IP Section 13.10.587 is added that states that, in any zoning district, exceptions to any sign ordinance standard may be considered where warranted by site-specific circumstances such as restricted visibility, distance from thoroughfare, location on a corner, unusually large structure, or historic preservation concerns. Additionally, the exception may vary from the sign standards only to the extent necessary and appropriate to address the circumstance; the resultant signage must be architecturally and aesthetically compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and must not adversely impact coastal visual resources, and must otherwise be consistent with the LCP, among other requirements (see proposed IP Section 13.10.587(B) in Exhibit 1). Proposed Section 13.10.587(C) states that a sign exception is to be processed as an Administrative Permit with public notice. This type of permit category, as described in IP

² Defined as the Commercial district (C), Tourist Commercial district (CT), Visitor Accommodations district (VA), Professional-Administrative Office district (PA), Industrial districts (M), and Public and Community Facilities district (PF).

³ Defined as the Parks, Recreation and Open Space District (PR).

Section 18.10.112, is designated as a Level IV permit, which requires similar noticing as a Level V permit;⁴ however, a Level IV permit does not require a public hearing and can therefore be acted upon by the Planning Director or his or her authorized designee.

Please see Exhibit 1 for the proposed IP amendment text.

B. CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

Standard of Review

The proposed amendment affects the IP components of the Santa Cruz County LCP. The standard of review for IP amendments is that they must be consistent with and adequate to carry out the certified Land Use Plan (LUP).

Applicable LUP Policies

The proposed amendment affects the coastal zone's visual/aesthetic resources, as well as the protection of neighborhood and community character. Relevant LUP policies include:

Visual Resources

5.10.2 Development Within Visual Resource Areas

Recognize that visual resources of Santa Cruz County possess diverse characteristics and that the resources worthy of protection may include, but are not limited to, ocean views, agricultural fields, wooded forests, open meadows, and mountain hillside views. Require projects to be evaluated against the context of their unique environment and regulate structure height, setbacks and design to protect these resources consistent with the objectives and policies of this section. Require discretionary review for all development within the visual resource area of Highway One, outside of the Urban/Rural boundary, as designated on the GP/LCP Visual Resources Map and apply the design criteria of Section 13.20.130 of the County's zoning ordinance to such development.

5.10.3 Protection of Public Vistas

Protect significant public vistas as described in policy 5.10.2 from all publicly used roads and vista points by minimizing disruption of landform and aesthetic character caused by grading operations, timber harvests, utility wires and poles, signs, inappropriate landscaping and structure design. Provide necessary landscaping to screen development which is unavoidably sited within these vistas. (See policy 5.10.11.)

5.10.10 Designation of Scenic Roads

The following roads and highways are valued for their vistas. The public vistas from these roads shall be afforded the highest level of protection.

State Highways

Route 1 - from San Mateo County to Monterey County

⁴ Both Level IV and Level V permits require notices to be posted on the property, to be sent to each member of the Board of Supervisors, and sent to the owners and occupants of the subject and surrounding properties.

5.10.18 Signs Visible from Scenic Roads

Actively discourage the placement of signs which will be visible from scenic roads; where allowed, require strict compliance with the County Sign ordinance to minimize disruption of the natural scenic qualities of the viewshed. Give priority to sign abatement programs for scenic roads.

5.10.19 Highway One Signage in Rural Areas

In the rural Highway 1 corridor, allow only Caltrans standard directional, access, and business identification signs except for the commercial area at Davenport.

5.10.20 Highway One Signage in Urban Areas

In the urban Highway 1 corridor, allow signage where consistent with the Sign ordinance and any applicable village, town, community, or specific plan.

5.10.21 Illuminated Signs Visible from Scenic Roads

In accordance with the County Sign ordinance, allow illuminated signs to be visible from scenic roads only for state and county directional and information signs and in designated commercial and visitor-serving areas. Seek to eliminate all other non-conforming illuminated signs which are visible from scenic roads.

Thus, the Land Use Plan requires development to be located within existing developed areas where it will not have any adverse impact on coastal resources, including scenic visual resources. For otherwise allowable development, the LUP includes policies meant to protect visual resources, including policies specific to signs and their location away from designated scenic roads, and prohibitions on illuminated signs visible from scenic roads except for State and County directional signs and for signs in designated commercial and visitor-serving areas.

Consistency Analysis

The proposed amendment is largely consistent with LUP policies, including policies that limit impacts on important scenic resources and public viewsheds. For example, the amendment includes required findings that limit any exception from IP sign standards only to the extent necessary to address a site-specific circumstance, that any proposed sign exception shall not adversely impact coastal visual resources, and must be consistent with the Local Coastal Program (including, for example, not allowing signage to be located within LCP-protected areas, such as wetlands, streams, and other sensitive habitats). Additionally, a public hearing is still required for any exception proposing more than three signs, or that would increase sign area by 50 square feet or more. A public hearing is also required for any sign exception that requires coastal development permit (CDP) approval, consistent with IP Section 13.20.100. These requirements will help set an important limit on the size, number, and location of signs that may be considered for a sign exception without a public hearing, and ensure consistency with Land Use Plan policies that protect coastal resources, including visual resources and community character.

However, one modification to the proposed amendment is necessary to ensure LUP consistency. The LUP contains very specific policies regarding illuminated signs visible from scenic roads. LUP Visual Resources Policy 5.10.21 allows illuminated signs to be visible from scenic roads

only for State and County directional and information signs and in designated commercial and visitor-serving areas. In addition, Policy 5.10.10 defines all of Highway 1 throughout the County to be a designated scenic road, and Policy 5.10.18 discourages signage in designated scenic roads in order to minimize disruption of the natural scenic qualities of the viewshed. The proposed amendment, however, does not limit the types of illuminated signs to only State and County directional and informational signs. Moreover, the proposed amendment would allow illuminated signs in the urban Highway 1 corridor, inconsistent with LUP policies that discourage signage within scenic roads such as Highway 1. Therefore, the proposed amendment is inconsistent with the LUP and cannot be approved as submitted. **Suggested Modification 1** ensures consistency with the above mentioned LUP policies by stating that if the exception proposes illumination of a sign visible from a scenic road, the sign shall be only for State and County directional and information signs and for signs situated within a commercial or visitor serving area.

The County has also requested additional clarifying modifications. First, the “Total Sign Area Allowed” table set forth in IP Section 13.10.581(A)(2) establishes the basis for determining total sign area allowed for interior and corner lots (determined by building width, lot width, or a combination of the two) and provides the maximum allowable sign area for other lots at 50 square feet. **Suggested Modification 2** simply clarifies that this 50-foot maximum applies to “all other lots” (i.e. those other than interior or corner lots). Second, Section 13.10.587(C)(1) establishes the procedure for processing sign exceptions. As proposed, this section provides that a sign exception shall be processed as an Administrative Permit with public notice in accordance with procedures set forth in IP Chapter 18 of the County Code. However, the section does not specify which procedures. The County has therefore requested that this section specify the “noticing and appeal” procedures listed in Chapter 18. This modification provides an important clarification regarding notice and appeal rights. Furthermore, the amendment as proposed also provides that certain types of sign exceptions “shall be subject to review by the Zoning Administrator following a public hearing.” **Suggested Modification 3** clarifies that the required public hearing will be by the Zoning Administrator. These two modifications thus add clarity to the proposed sign exceptions process.

Finally, it bears mention that the County is in the process of updating its sign ordinance, including addressing the number, size, design, and review process. Thus, this proposed sign exception process is in many ways an “interim” fix to enable minor deviations from the existing IP provisions until the County develops a more holistic sign ordinance amendment update. Therefore, it is the Commission’s understanding that the County’s upcoming sign ordinance update will include necessary and appropriate signage standards that are adequate to stand on their own without the need for an administrative “exception” process.

As modified, the IP amendment is adequate to carry out the policies of the LCP’s Land Use Plan.

C. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

As part of its local action on the subject LCP amendment, on January 28, 2014, the County of Santa Cruz found, per Title 14, Section 15061(b)(3) of the California Code of Regulations (“CEQA Guidelines,”) that the proposed IP amendments are exempt from CEQA based on the fact that the sign exception ordinance will not result in a significant effect on the environment. The County further found that the proposed IP amendments are exempt from CEQA based on the

Class 5 Categorical Exemption (Minor Alteration in Land Use Limitation; CEQA Guidelines Section 15305), Class 11 Categorical Exemption (Accessory Structures; CEQA Guidelines Section 15311), and the Statutory Exemption as a Local Coastal Program Amendment pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15265(a).

Section 21080.9 of the California Public Resources Code – within the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) – exempts local government from the requirement of preparing an environmental impact report (EIR) in connection with its activities and approvals necessary for the preparation and adoption of a local coastal program. Therefore, local governments are not required to prepare an EIR in support of their proposed LCP amendments, although the Commission can and does use any environmental information that the local government submits in support of its proposed LCPA. The Commission's LCP review and approval program has been found by the Resources Agency to be the functional equivalent of the environmental review required by CEQA, pursuant to CEQA Section 21080.5. Therefore the Commission is relieved of the responsibility to prepare an EIR for each LCP.

Nevertheless, the Commission is required, in approving an LCP amendment submittal, to find that the approval of the proposed LCP, as amended, does conform with certain CEQA provisions, including the requirement in CEQA section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) that the amended LCP will not be approved or adopted as proposed if there are feasible alternative or feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact which the activity may have on the environment. CEQA Guidelines Sections 13542(a), 13540(f), and 13555(b).

The County's LCP amendment consists of an Implementation Plan (IP) amendment. The Commission incorporates its findings on Land Use Plan conformity into this CEQA finding as it is set forth in full. As discussed herein, the Implementation Plan amendment as originally submitted does not conform with and is not adequate to carry out the policies of the certified LUP. The Commission, therefore, has suggested modifications to bring the Implementation Plan amendment into full conformance with the certified Land Use Plan. As modified, the Commission finds that approval of the LCP amendment will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts within the meaning of CEQA. Absent the incorporation of these suggested modifications to effectively mitigate potential resource impacts, such a finding could not be made.

**Strikethrough / Underline Ordinance Amending Chapter 13.10
of the Santa Cruz County Code, relating to sign exceptions**

0526

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz ordains as follows:

SECTION I

Subsection (4) of Subdivision (H) of Section 13.10.324 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read:

(4) Signing. To be consistent with SCCC sections 13.10.580 through 13.10.587.

SECTION II

Section 13.10.581 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read:

13.10.581 Signs in C, CT, VA, PA, PF and M Districts.

(A) No sign, outdoor advertising structure or display of any kind shall be permitted except the following:

(1) One business or identification sign and one small pedestrian-oriented sign per site as provided below. ~~A variance to allow more than one business sign may be considered under the provisions of SCCC 13.10.230 if justified by special circumstances such as limited visibility or unusually large size of a structure, location on a corner, historic preservation concerns, or consistency with a village design plan.~~

(2) Signs pertaining to a use conducted on the site, with aggregate areas according to the following table. ~~The following formulas for calculating sign area shall be used unless a variance is obtained under the provisions of SCCC 13.10.230.~~

TOTAL SIGN AREA ALLOWED (Includes All Signs Displayed)	
Basis for Calculation	Total Sign Area* Allowed
Front width of building on an interior lot; or Front width plus street side width of building on a corner lot	1/2 square feet (72 square inches) of sign area per foot of building width
Width of site along the street (interior or corner lot)	1/4 square feet (36 square inches) of sign area per foot of site width
Maximum allowable area on an interior lot less than 40 feet wide at the street	20 square feet
Maximum allowable area	50 square feet
* "Sign area" is defined as: The area within a well-defined border; or, the area of	

<div style="text-align: right;">0527</div> TOTAL SIGN AREA ALLOWED (Includes All Signs Displayed)	
Basis for Calculation	Total Sign Area* Allowed
one side of a double-sided sign, or on a sign with no defined border, the area within the perimeter which encloses the letters, symbols or logo.	

- (3) Direction signs for off-street parking and loading facilities not exceeding four square feet.
- (4) One sign pertaining to the sale, lease, rental or display of a structure or land, not exceeding six square feet.
- (5) Up to two gas station price displays, limited to numerals, business logo and discount information required by California Business and Professions Code Sections 13530-13540.

(B) Permanent and temporary window signs are each limited to a maximum of 20 percent of the window area of the building. Temporary window signs not displayed for more than two weeks are not included in the total sign size limitation.

(C) Signs directly across the street from a residential zone district shall be limited to 30 square feet in area and shall not be directly illuminated or flashing.

(D) A freestanding sign detached from a building shall be of a design consistent with the architectural character of the building and shall be designed as an integral part of the landscaped area. Freestanding signs shall not exceed seven feet in height, measured from the existing grade at the edge of the road. Where on-street parking limits the visibility of freestanding signs, such signs may be erected to a maximum height of 12 feet, measured from the existing grade at the edge of the road.

(E) Signs located on a wall or on a roof fascia shall be designed as an integral part of the building design. Building signs shall be located on or below the upper line of the roof fascia.

(F) Signs and supports shall be set back a minimum of five feet from the edge of the right-of-way or roadway, whichever is greater, and shall not obstruct vehicular sight distance or pedestrian/bicycle circulation.

(G) No sign other than a directional sign shall project more than 12 inches into a required rear yard or required interior side yard.

(H) Visibility of signs within a scenic corridors shall be minimized by the use of appropriate material, size, location, and orientation. No illuminated signs shall be permitted within a scenic corridor.

(I) Where sign lighting is permitted, only indirect illumination or low-intensity interior illumination shall be used. It is preferred that lighted signs be designed with light-colored translucent letters and logos, on

a semi-opaque dark background. Any permitted sign lighting shall be unobtrusive to adjacent properties and any glare shall be directed onto the site.

0528

(J) Moving signs, flags, banners, sandwich board signs or flashing signs shall not be permitted.

(K) Shopping Centers.

(1) A sign program shall be developed for any shopping center or any group of business uses with shared sign facilities. The program shall include a name sign containing the name of the center, a directory sign either separate or combined with the name sign, and one small pedestrian-oriented sign for each shop. The sign program shall specify sign designs, dimensions, materials, colors, lighting, if any, and placement.

~~(2) A variance to allow more than one name sign for the center may be considered under the provisions of SCCC 13.10.230 if justified by special circumstances such as limited visibility or unusually large size of structure, location on a corner, historic preservation concerns, or consistency with a village design plan.~~

(32) The total area of the center's name sign(s) and directory sign shall not exceed 50 square feet. The area of each individual shop sign shall not exceed one-half square foot per foot of building width measured across the front of the building, and shall not exceed a maximum of 18 square feet, whichever is smaller. [Ord. 4346 § 33, 1994; Ord. 3432 § 1, 1983].

SECTION III

The Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by adding Section 13.10.587 to be entitled "Sign Exceptions," to read as follows:

13.10.587 Sign Exceptions.

(A) In any district, exceptions to any applicable ordinance standards for a sign, sign program, temporary sign or directional sign may be considered for approval where warranted by site-specific circumstances such as restricted visibility, distance from thoroughfare, location on a corner, unusually large structure, or historic preservation concerns.

(B) Sign exceptions shall meet the following criteria:

(1) The exception shall vary from sign standards in the Santa Cruz County Code only to the extent necessary and appropriate to address site-specific circumstances.

(2) The signage is architecturally and aesthetically compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, environmental setting and associated buildings; does not create or contribute to visual clutter, does not adversely impact coastal visual resources, is consistent with the Local Coastal Program, and, if lighted, avoids undue incidental illumination away from the signage.

- (3) If the exception proposes illumination of a sign visible from a scenic road, the sign shall be situated within a commercial or visitor serving area or the urban Highway 1 corridor.

0529

(C) Processing of sign exceptions

- (1) A sign exception shall be processed as an Administrative Permit with public notice, in accordance with procedures set forth in Chapter 18, except that the following proposals shall be subject to review by the Zoning Administrator following a public hearing, as per Chapter 18:
- (a) Any proposed exception to establish more than three business / identification signs, or more than three pedestrian-oriented business / identification signs, or any combination of general and pedestrian-oriented business / identification signs exceeding four.
- (b) Any proposed exception that would exceed by more than 50 square feet either the maximum aggregate sign area established by 13.10.581(A) or the maximum area for directory signs established by 13.10.581(K)(2).

SECTION IV

Subsection (a) of Subsection (1) of Subdivision (F) of Section 13.11.072 is hereby amended to read as follows:

- (a) All sign regulations shall be met according to SCCC 13.10.580 through 13.10.586, inclusive. All requirements relating to signs set forth in SCCC Sections 13.10.580 through 13.10.587 shall be met.

SECTION V

This Ordinance shall take effect on the 31st day after the date of final passage or upon certification by the California Coastal Commission, whichever date occurs last.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2013, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS
NOES: SUPERVISORS
ABSENT: SUPERVISORS
ABSTAIN: SUPERVISORS

Chairperson, Board of Supervisors