

Plan Alternatives Comparison Chart Section 10.7 Scenic Resources - PC Final Markup 7-21-11

| Plan Alternative | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|---------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 10.7.4 Goals | | | | |
| A | B | <p>SR-G1. Scenic Resource Protection. Protected high-value forest, agriculture, river, and coastal scenic areas that contribute to the enjoyment of Humboldt County’s beauty and abundant natural resources.</p> | | R Straw Vote 5-1 |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 5-26-11</p> <p>C. Nelson – what does “high value” mean? Isn’t this covered in other parts of the Plan?</p> <p>K. Girard – we heard a lot of testimony about protecting Humboldt County’s quality of life and scenic resources (in particular, the removal of billboards).</p> <p>TH – Scenic resources is part of an Open Space Element and is required to be addressed by state law. There are other parts of the plan that protect scenic areas and we cite those (land use designations, timber and agricultural policies, etc). These are additional policies, most are from the coastal plans. We have been asked why Alternative C is so short. It is not mandated to address to this detail; therefore we don’t have to include all these policies in the Plan. If you want less scenic resource policies, that is what C would look like.</p> <p>C. Nelson – my general concern is what is considered scenic to someone else may not be scenic to me – will this prohibit me from cutting my trees or managing my lands?</p> <p>C. Kreb – I recommend that we retain policy 3541.3 from the Framework Plan – it addressed this issue.</p> <p>C. Disiere – what is scenic? Is it mapped already? Development in general affects someone’s scenic area? Why are we putting it in here?</p> <p>TH - the scenic quality is one of the most important qualities of Humboldt County– and that is what we heard from the public. They wanted this protected.</p> <p>K. Girard – in Coastal Plans – there are areas that are identified on the maps as scenic – which would require design review.</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>C. Edmonds – does the protection of these resources constitute a taking? Carolyn Ruth – no. C. Masten – these are the tough decision that we have to make to protect the resources we value and enjoy. We are just going to have to struggle with that here to figure out what that means. C. Disiere – I am concerned with property rights. How are we going to do this? It is hard for me to support something that is not defined or mapped. I don't know if we will all agree on what is scenic. How much of the old goals of the Framework Plan were met (Alternative D)? TH – Scenic Route study for Hwy 101 and Avenues of the Giant was done by Caltrans but it was never adopted by the County. It required land use controls that the County was not willing to adopt. This is a very difficult thing to do to the state standards. There is a scenic route for Trinidad and Humboldt Bay (coastal plans). C. Faust – the way that Humboldt County looks is fundamentally different than other counties in California. We still have open space values that are lost in other counties (especially in Southern California). People are concerned about their entitlements. Billboards on the bay – incredible natural resources there – we destroy the public view that we all share. Hillside development. Affecting the view. You don't have to stop development to protect your scenic resources. You just need to be sensitive on how you develop. These policies are incredibly important. Straw Votes: Disiere – I can support with the elimination of the word "high value". Masten, Kreb, Faust, Nelson and Edmonds can support with keeping in "high value" with a definition later.</p> | | |
| A | B | | | <p>SR-G2. Community Separators. Visible and aesthetic open space areas between urban development areas that separate and preserve unique identities of the county's cities and communities.</p> | | <p>R Straw Vote 5-1</p> |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 5-26-11 C. Nelson – I don't see the need for Community Separators. When would we use this? C. Masten – I don't want to see Willow Creek move into Hoopa. I like this. C. Nelson – I don't know where they are and what their purpose is? I don't support this.</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| | <p>K. Girard – look at the north part of Sacramento – twenty years ago every community had a unique identity and now they are merged together. The cultural definition of these towns now is blurred into Sacramento. If there is open space, agriculture or forests that separate these communities now we can strive to keep them separated. Europe has separated all their towns with open space.</p> <p>C. Edmonds – I see this in big cities the identification of neighborhoods.</p> <p>C. Disiere – implementation of an overlay zone. Isn't that what zoning is? Ag zone, coastal NR? Why do you need an overlay?</p> <p>TH – akin to a combining zone, like flood zone, that provides extra protection and review by the jurisdiction. Flags the area for heightened review. It states that there is a value here – and this is what we expect to do to maintain that value.</p> <p>C. Krebs – I support this concept. Very common in Europe and has been very effective in the last 600 years. Would like to see these cities around the bay merge in 100 year.</p> <p>C. Disiere – I'm concerned with property rights – hazard overlay – good notification. If you put an overlay on, how do you notify the property owner? I don't see the need to have the overlay; however, I support the concept.</p> <p>C. Masten – I support the language that is here. The areas that were planned for in tribal planning, these areas have remained distinct. I like going to Ferndale, Arcata – unique feeling. If we don't plan for it, it won't happen. Right now we have a separation between Arcata and Eureka – and I like that. We can change zoning to allow development, but if we have a higher principal, we can't just change the base zoning.</p> <p>C. Nelson – Most of the land in Ferndale is in the WA – can't develop anyway. I like the idea that we have zoning to keep the lands in open space, so I don't see the need for an additional layer of regulation without compensation.</p> <p>Faust – I like the way G2 is written and will support. (Please specify in the charts the Implementation Measure that would enact this).</p> <p>Straw Vote: Krebs, Disiere, Faust, Masten, Edmonds all support as written. Nelson opposed.</p> | | |
| D | <p>3540-1 SR-Gx. Scenic Routes.Roadways. Establish a A system of scenic routes roadways that will increase the enjoyment of, and opportunities for, recreational and cultural pursuits and tourism in the County.</p> | | M Straw Vote |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | | | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | 5-0 |
| | | | <p>COMMENTS: 5-26-11 C. Disiere – requests that a goal be added to address this. C. Kreb agreed. TH – may want to consider 3540.4. C. Faust – please return with us to see how they should be integrated into a goal.</p> | | |
| | | | <p>Comments: 6-16-11 (Commissioners Kreb and Masten excused) At the May 26th meeting, the Commission requested staff to return with Framework Plan policy 3540.1 re-stated as a goal. Staff recommended the following language: SR-Gx. Scenic Routes.Roadways. Establish a A system of scenic routes roadways that will increase the enjoyment of, and opportunities for, recreational and cultural pursuits and tourism in the County. <u>Straw vote</u> Unanimous support of staff’s recommendation</p> | | |
| | | D | <p>3540.2. Conserve, enhance, and protect scenic resources observable from scenic routes.</p> | | D |
| | | D | <p>3540.3. Provide multiple recreational uses, trails, roadside rests, picnicking and observation points when appropriate on present or future publicly owned lands adjacent to scenic routes.</p> | | D |
| | | D | <p>3540.4. SR-PX Working Landscapes. Recognize the dual scenic value and economic value of resource production lands. lands planned or zoned for the growing and harvesting of timber and other agricultural products by maintaining continued resource harvesting and production along scenic routes</p> | | M Straw Vote 4-2 |
| | | | <p>Comments: 6-16-11 The Commission requested the retention of Alternative D Policy 3540.4. to be renamed “SR –PX Working Landscapes.” It was recommended to be added between P2 and P3. C. Faust requested that staff should re-write to address the opposing duel nature of the scenic and harvesting.</p> | | |
| | | | <p>Comments: 6-23-11</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>Staff recommended the policy to be reworded as follows:</p> <p>SR-PX Working Landscapes. Recognize the dual scenic value and economic value of resource production lands by supporting their continued integrity and viability as working landscapes lands planned or zoned for the growing and harvesting of timber and other agricultural products by maintaining continued resource harvesting and production along scenic routes.</p> <p>PC Discussion:</p> <p>C. Faust – I’m not sure if this revised language addresses my concerns. These are conflicting interests. It attempts to integrate these two concepts in favor of the economic values. These are opposing values. They ought to be separate goals. They reflect separate interests.</p> <p>C. Gearheart – do you have suggested wording?</p> <p>C. Faust – I would just drop this all together. It is covered in other sections of the Plan.</p> <p>C. Gearheart – what about ending the policy after “resource production lands”?</p> <p>SR-PX Working Landscapes. Recognize the dual scenic value and economic value of resource production lands. by supporting their continued integrity and viability as working landscapes.</p> <p>K. Girard – this still doesn’t address the purpose of this policy.</p> <p>C. Nelson – we need public input and agreement on what the scenic resources are. Everybody has a different vision of what is scenic (clearcut? Barn?). If there is a majority opinion, than you can move forward. I support the staff revisions.</p> <p>C. Gearheart – I’m not sure about this language, but everyone does consider ag land their open space.</p> <p>C. Masten – The viewshed is very ugly for a clearcut from the road – we may want to address this. I’m not sure how.... A working farm is scenic – but it may not be so pretty if it was all torn up.</p> <p>C. Kreb – I operate a farm along a scenic highway (Avenue of the Giants). I support the staff language but could also support Mary’s language to put a period after the word</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------------|----------|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | "land". Straw Vote – Commissioners Nelson Edmonds, supports staff’s wording. Commissioners Masten, Faust, Kreb – Mary’s revisions. | | |
| 10.7.4 Policies | | | | | | |
| A | B | | | SR-P1. Development in Identified <u>Mapped</u> Scenic Areas Viewsheds. In <u>mapped</u> identified scenic areas, new <u>discretionary and ministerial</u> development shall be consistent with and subordinate to natural contours, including slopes, visible hilltops, and tree lines, and bluffs and rock outcroppings. Visible disturbance <u>and interruption of natural features</u> shall be minimized to the extent feasible. | Staff recommended changes for clarity. Prog, QJ, Min, S1, IM  | R Straw Vote 4-1 |
| | | | | COMMENTS: 6-16-11 Chair Gearheart - Scenic Highways (state billboard law) the only avenue to regulate billboards? C. Ruth - not the only way. You have a lot of authority to regulate billboards through zoning. C. Nelson – in the last general plan – weren’t we supposed to map scenic routes and we never did? TH – yes. Scenic routes at the state level by CALTRANS are difficult to do. Where does this fall on the priority list. Chair Gearheart – I don’t like the phrase “extent feasible” at the end of the sentence. C. Edmonds – what do you do with vegetation that blocks scenic views? TH – this policy addresses scenic views that are the public’s views, not from private property. C. Faust – hillside development on Jacoby Creek Road, Myrtle Avenue, are these areas that have not been protected but would be under this policy? What about cutting trees that affect individual’s views but affects the publics view of the landscape. TH – we could map this if the Commission wanted to have these identified. KG – the system we have right now is a patchwork (design review committees) – these duties often fall to staff in CZ where there is not a standing committee. I think we would | | |

| Plan Alternative | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|----------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>need a countywide design review if we wanted to identify and map scenic areas – new Implementation Measure.</p> <p>C. Faust wants to delete the word “mapped”. If we wait for staff to map, we may lose our scenic resources.</p> <p>C. Disiere – I think that is too vague. What is scenic to me may not be the same as the next person. I can’t support without the word “mapped”.</p> <p>TH – we would highly prefer to map. More straightforward.</p> <p>C. Disiere – IM1 – mapping scenic areas with a public process.</p> <p>Straw Vote: ALL support as written except C. Faust who would like the word “mapped” removed.</p> | | |
| | B | <p>SR-P2. <u>Development in Mapped Heritage Landscapes.</u> Protect the scenic quality of mapped heritage landscape areas with appropriate land use designations and design review standards to ensure that new development preserves or enhances the heritage landscape values of the site.</p> | <p>Prog, QJ, Min, S2, IM1 </p> | <p>R Straw Vote 5-0</p> |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-16-11</p> <p>C. Faust – what is a heritage landscape?</p> <p>TH – usually ranchlands, cultural overlay that takes you beyond scenic.</p> <p>Straw votes: C. Disiere – I support Alt B because it will be mapped and we will be able to review it. All support B.</p> | | |
| A | | <p>SR-P2. <u>Heritage Landscapes.</u> Protect the scenic quality of mapped heritage landscape areas with appropriate land use designations and design review standards to ensure that new development preserves or enhances the heritage landscape values of the site. <u>Require new development within mapped heritage landscape areas to undergo review by historic resources specialists to ensure that such development preserves or enhances the heritage landscape values of the site.</u></p> | <p>See <u>underline</u> and strikethrough text for differences with Alternative B.</p> | <p>D</p> |
| | | <p>COMMENTS:</p> | | |
| A | B | <p>SR-P3. <u>Scenic Roadway Protection.</u> Protect the scenic quality of designated scenic roadways for the enjoyment of natural and scenic resources, <u>coastal views</u>, landmarks, or points of historic and cultural interest.</p> | <p>Prog, QJ, Min, S3, IM3 </p> | <p>M Straw Vote</p> |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | | | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | 5-0 |
| | <p>COMMENTS: 6-16-11 C. Gearheart – wants to add “coastal views”. All support as revised by Commissioner Gearheart.</p> | | | | D |
| | <p>D 3541.1 The Scenic Routes System shall be developed and implemented through the adoption of specific Scenic Route Plans. The impetus for preparing Scenic Routes Plans should come from the Board of Supervisors, landowners or interested citizens. Except for Scenic Route Plans initiated by the Board of Supervisors, a petition of support signed by 25% or more of the property owners within the proposed scenic route shall be required to undertake any Route Study.</p> | | | | D |
| | <p>D 3541.2 The Scenic Route System shall be consistent with adopted County and City General Plans, and shall be coordinated with local, state and federal agencies.</p> | | | | D |
| | <p>D 3541.3 When considering Scenic Routes where regulations may have to be applied to productive or potentially productive natural resources, primary consideration shall be given to sound resource harvesting and management.</p> | | | | D |
| | <p>D 3541.4 In both urban and rural areas, uses normally permitted by the General Plan and by zoning shall be allowed in Scenic Routes, except that scenic resources within officially designated Scenic Routes may be preserved and enhanced by supplementing normal zoning regulations with special height, area and setback regulations; by providing architectural and site design review; by regulating billboards, signs not relevant to the main use of the property, obtrusive signs, and automobile wrecking yards and junkyards. Design and location of signs may be regulated to prevent proliferation of unsightly signs along roadsides.</p> | | | | D |
| | <p>D 3541.5 Specific development controls for any proposed Scenic Route shall be identified and adopted in the specific Scenic Route Plan for such route. The nature and type of controls may vary from route to route, and specific controls adopted for any one route or route segment do not necessarily apply to other routes within the scenic route system.</p> | | | | D |
| | <p>D 3541.6 In regard to proposed development projects, the intent of the specific Scenic Route Plan shall be to render projects as aesthetically pleasing or as compatible with surroundings as possible, but not generally to determine whether or not the project itself</p> | | | | D |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | should occur. | | |
| | <p>D 3542.2 The control and regulation of timber harvesting operations where permitted within an officially adopted Scenic Route shall remain solely under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Forestry. The County shall not require additional permits, nor be otherwise involved in the timber harvest permit process.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.3 Lands planned and/or zoned by the County for the growing and harvesting of timber and agricultural products shall not be limited in their principal permitted uses by the adoption or designation of a Scenic Route. Should such action result in the application of regulations which exceed existing land use regulations, by any governmental body or agency, then the scenic highway or scenic highway route designation shall be withdrawn or terminated.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.4. Buildings and landscaping shall be designed and located on the site to create a harmonious visual relationship with surrounding development and the natural terrain and vegetation.</p> <p>A. Existing topography, vegetation and scenic features of the site shall be retained to the maximum extent possible and incorporated into the proposed development.</p> <p>B. Structures and signs shall be limited in height, bulk, and siting to prevent visual competition with or dominance of existing land forms, vegetation, water bodies, or adjoining structures.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.5. Structures, signs, and plant materials shall be constructed, installed and planted to complement, enhance, and retain scenic views. Vegetative screening shall be used where needed to prevent significant intrusion or degradation of public views.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.6. New off-premise signs (billboards) should be limited to selective locations within Scenic Routes and specific dimensional limitations and limits on the number of on-premise and off-premise signs should be formulated as an element of each Scenic Route Plan.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.7. Potentially unsightly features such as parking lots, etc. shall be located in areas not visible from the Scenic Route. Where it is not possible to locate such features out of view, they shall be effectively and expediently screened from view by planting and/or fences, walls, or berms. Screening shall utilize primarily natural materials rather than solid fencing, preferably vegetation in conjunction with low earth berms.</p> | | D |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>D 3542.8 Any grading or earth-moving operation in conjunction with a proposed development shall be planned and executed in such a manner that final contours appear to be consistent with the existing terrain both on, and adjacent to, the site</p> <p>A. Vegetative cover shall be provided within a reasonable time after grading is completed to prevent visible scars remaining on the land from such operations.</p> <p>B. Contours altered by grading should be restored by means of land sculpturing and a cover of top soil in such a manner as to minimize runoff and erosion and prevent ponding of water.</p> <p>C. Finished contours shall be planted with plant materials native to the area, so as to require minimum care and to be visually compatible with the existing ground cover.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.9. The location and design of access roads should not detract from the scenic quality of the route and should be consistent with the adopted Scenic Route Plan, where practicable.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.10 New, relocated or existing utility distribution lines should be placed underground whenever feasible. When it is not feasible to place lines underground, they should be located so as to be inconspicuous from the scenic route. Combined or adjacent rights of way and common poles should be used wherever feasible.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.11 No Scenic Route Plan shall regulate or interfere with the maintenance or operation of the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Company or the Arcata and Mad River Railroad. The maintenance and operation of North Western Pacific does not include bill boards</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.12. No Scenic Route Plan shall regulate or prohibit commercial traffic.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.13 The Humboldt County Board of Supervisors may initiate the preparation of specific Scenic Route Plans. Specific Scenic Route Plans may also be initiated through a formal request to the Board of Supervisors by landowners or interested citizens pursuant to Policy 1 of this element. All such requests should include a completed Scenic Route application and be submitted initially to the Planning Department.</p> | | D |
| | <p>D 3542.14 The Planning Department will incorporate any requests for preparation of Scenic Route Studies into its annual Plan Implementation Program for Board consideration. Once the program has been approved by the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Department, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation,</p> | | D |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|----------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | shall prepare each Scenic Route Study. | | |
| | | | D | 3542.16 The Board of Supervisors shall hold a noticed public hearing to consider each Scenic Route Study. At this point, the Board can: A. Accept the study and abandon the proposal; or B. Accept the study, order the preparation of a Scenic Route Plan, and may appoint a citizen's advisory committee to make recommendations on the plan. | | D |
| | | | D | 3542. The Planning Commission shall review each proposed Scenic Route Plan at a noticed public hearing and transmit their recommendations to the Board of supervisors. Recommendations by the Planning Commission on a proposed Scenic Route Plan shall be accompanied by a report stating whether or not the proposal has the support of 50% of the property owners and the owners of 60% of the property within the proposed Scenic Route segment. | | D |
| | | | D | 3542.18 The Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of the Planning Commission report and recommendations, may, by a majority vote, elect to: A. Not hold a public hearing and deny the proposed plan, or B. Hold a public hearing and take whatever action is deemed proper. | | D |
| | | | | End here 6-16-11 | | |
| A | B | | | SR-P4. Community Separators. Protect the scenic quality of "community separators" from degradation by maintaining adequate open space between communities and cities. | Prog, QJ, Min, S4-5, IM2   | R Straw Vote 5-1 |
| | | | | COMMENTS: 6-23-11 (Commissioner Disiere was excused) C. Nelson – I would like to delete this policy. I don't believe it will ever be mapped or regulated. Sonoma County had more detailed regulations. Our proposed regulation is vague. People in these areas will not know how they can develop their land. C. Masten – I didn't see any revisions proposed by either the realtors or Healthy Humboldt. I will support staff language. I want to support the unique character of each of the community. There are separators now and that makes us unique. C. Gearheart – I support also. I just visited the Dallas area and you cannot tell where one community start sand stops and that is unique to our area. Straw Vote: | | |

| Plan Alternative | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|----------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>Commissioners. Krebs, Masten, Edmonds, Faust and Gearheart support staff's original language. C. Nelson – no, I can't support this policy.</p> | | |
| A | B | <p>SP-P5. Development within Community Separators. Retain a rural character and promote low intensities of development in community separators. Avoid annexation or inclusion in spheres of influence for sewer and water services. Provide opportunities for consideration of additional development in community separators in exchange for permanent open space preservation.</p> | <p>Prog, QJ, Min, S4,  </p> | <p>D See alt A</p> |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11 C. Gearheart – can staff explain the prohibition of annexation in Alternative A? K. Girard – this is stronger language. If there are services, there will be development there. We can't prohibit – LAFCo is the approving agency – we can only discourage. C. Faust – I prefer the use of "avoid" in B version and keep the second sentence in the A version because of the UDA. County Counsel – I recommend using "avoid" if you choose the A version. C. Masten – I was hoping staff could weigh in on the Healthy Humboldt comments for this section. K Girard – their recommended sentence is redundant regarding rezoning – low intensity covers it. They are saying that you can develop in a community separator if you provide public benefits (trails, parks). C. Faust – this would be in UDA's (urban development areas) not community separators. K. Girard – the A version says before you develop within UDA, you need to retire rights in community separators. TDR type of program. Straw Vote – Commissioners Krebs, Faust, Gearheart, Masten, Edmonds support the A version with the substitution of the word "prohibit" with the word "avoid". C. Nelson – no – I don't support the community separators at all.</p> | | |
| A | | <p>SP-P5 Development within Community Separators. Retain a rural character and promote low intensities of development in community separators. Prohibit <u>Avoid</u> annexation or inclusion in spheres of influence for sewer and water services. Provide opportunities for additional development in urban development areas in exchange for permanent open space preservation within community separators.</p> | | <p>M Straw Vote 5-1</p> |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|--|--|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | COMMENTS: | | |
| | B | | | <p>SR-P6. Limit the Term of Off-Premise Billboards. Limit the term of new off-premise billboards with use agreements to provide for removal.</p> | Staff recommended title change for consistency with other policy titles. Prog, QJ, Min, S6, IM4 | D See alt A |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11</p> <p>C. Kreb – I support the A version of SR-P6. I have seen a proliferation of billboards in the Sohum area and am not sure why. If you don't have an ordinance in place, you can't do anything about the billboards.</p> <p>C. Edmonds – isn't there limits on the flashing/animated billboards under state law?</p> <p>K. Girard – I think those are allowable under state law but you can regulate them under local law.</p> <p>C. Gearheart – I want to change the word "roadways" to routes (didn't we do this already? – yes) and I want to add "coastal views" with that I support the A version.</p> <p>C. Kreb – I can support those changes to A.</p> <p>C. Faust – I can support those changes to the A version.</p> <p>C. Nelson – I don't know why we have so many billboards on our scenic roads.</p> <p>D. Girard – that was why we produced a suite of billboard policies – scenic corridors, RR, sensitive areas, etc. We don't have control over the majority of the billboards along the HWY 101 corridor between Arcata and Eureka. RR, or city of Eureka.</p> <p>C. Nelson – how can we get rid of these billboards? I want a "super A" to remove all billboards along scenic routes.</p> <p>C. Edmonds – are there any billboards that offer public service billboards? (I don't know if you need to put in a request to CALTRANS) – I am reluctant to remove all billboards- there could be a public value (hazard conditions). They are an eyesore, but I'm balking</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| | | <p>at prohibiting all billboards. County Counsel – “advertising displays” as billboards – “amber alerts” would not be included in that. C. Edmonds – I can support the A version with Mary’s revisions. C. Masten – I’m like Denver – I don’t support any billboards in the coastal view areas. However, I support A with Mary’s revisions. D. Girard – the coastal views would need to be mapped. IM-3 C. Faust – you don’t need to map it. If you can see the ocean, you don’t get a billboard. Discussion on how this would be implemented – what side of the road? Bay part of the ocean. Straw Vote: All support the A version with Mary’s revisions. Kept the word “roadways” in because routes is specific to outdoor advertising act as administered by caltrans. This is consistent with the changes to GX.</p> | | |
| A | | <p>SR-P6. Limit the Term of Off-Premise Billboards and Prohibition. Limit the term of new <u>and existing</u> off-premise billboards <u>by ordinance with use agreements</u> to provide for removal. <u>Prohibit the construction of new off-premise billboards along mapped Scenic Roadways and coastal views.</u></p> | See <u>underline</u> and strike through text for differences with Alternative B. | M Straw Vote 6-0 |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: see discussion for the B version of this policy.</p> | | |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 7-21-11 During the meeting of 6-23-11, the Commission reviewed SR-P8 and P9 and requested that staff re-write SR-P8 and P9 to advocate the removal of billboards from the public right-of-way and provide policies and standards that would limit the use of billboards countywide and advocate for the removal of illegal billboards. Staff included P6 in this re-write so that the Plan would maintain internal consistency. The revised language as recommended by staff reads as follows: <u>SR-P6 Limit the Term of Off-Premise Billboards and Prohibition</u> Limit the term of new and existing off-premise billboards shall be limited by ordinance with use agreements to a maximum of 15-years. The term of existing</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>off-premise billboards shall be limited to a maximum of 15-years from the date of the adoption of the ordinance. Provide for removal. Prohibit the construction of new off-premise billboards along mapped Scenic Roadways and coastal views.</p> <p>The Commission determined that this language be moved from SR-P6 to SR-S1 and SR-S3.</p> | | |
| A | B | | | <p>SR-P7. Reduce Scenic Impacts of Billboards in Sensitive Habitat Areas. Prohibit construction Limit the location of billboards in industrial zones within mapped sensitive, habitat areas.</p> | <p>Staff recommended policy and editorial changes to improve clarity and enforceability. Prog, QJ, Min, S6, IM4  </p> | <p>R Straw Vote 6-0</p> |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11 All support as written.</p> | | |
| A | B | | | <p>SR-P8. Removal or Relocation of Billboards <u>on Public Lands and Right-of-Ways</u> in the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Right-of-Way. Support efforts of <u>public agencies, such as</u> the North Coast Railroad Authority <u>and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</u> to remove or relocate billboards from their right-of-way between Fields Landing and Arcata <u>on lands under their control.</u></p> | <p>Prog, QJ, Min, IM5  </p> | <p>M Straw Vote 3-2</p> |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11 C. Gearheart – why are we only supporting the removal in the RR public ROW. And why just Fields landing and Arcata? Girard – you certainly could include other public RoW – but it would dilute this policy. C. Masten – you could add the word “public” C. Gearheart – I can’t think of a place where I would want a billboard in a public ROW. C. Faust – NCRA is in theory already trying to get rid of billboards, where in P9 Caltrans is not (petition them to do something). We should also think about the city of eureka. We should petition them also – may need to re-write. Girard – I think the general approach is to use the mapping to extinguish billboards where you want them out and then call these out specifically. You could adopt a policy</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>that just says – we don’t want billboards here.</p> <p>C. Masten – this is our general plan and these are very specific and short term policies. Is this where they belong?</p> <p>Girard – when the county has to work with another jurisdiction, it is good to have it in your GP – more weight.</p> <p>Don’t we want guidance only? This is “do things” – we want broader language.</p> <p>Gearheart – I would like staff to take another look at it.</p> <p>CC- why don’t we add another policy that is general – we don’t want billboards in public ROW.</p> <p>Edmonds – how dependent are some of the companies on these billboards?</p> <p>Girard – outdoor advertisement groups say they are very necessary. About 50% is visitor serving. Visitor bureaus say they are important. But the Caltrans service signs can also serve this purpose.</p> <p>C. Kreb – technology is changing – google on smart phone. May need less billboards in the future. Especially young people. Becoming an obsolete item.</p> <p>K Girard – so I hear a request to rework P8 and P9 and alternative that is in public ROW, public lands, countywide limitation for billboards. Add a general policy, should move P8 to an IM. We will bring back a menu.</p> <p>C. Nelson – why are we limiting to public lands?</p> <p>Girard – jurisdictions that map and write ordinances that are very specific, you set yourself up well for retiring billboards. Difficult time defending lawsuits. First map scenic areas, develop standards, extinguish them by ordinance through a amortization program. No new ones. Right now you can do it in industrial and commercial only. If it was on a public ROW.</p> <p>c. Gearheart – would that be solved by a good sign ordinance? Yes. Off premise signs are only allowed in commercial and industrial zoned lands.</p> <p>C. Masten – we need to be more specific as to what an illegal/legal billboard is, and how we can influence the cities of eureka, Arcata, Caltrans and RR. We want to be able to petition those jurisdictions. Add to P6 and get rid of P8 and P9. Then address in an implementation.</p> <p>Key word is removal of illegal billboards.</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>COMMENTS: 7-21-11 <u>SR -P6, 8 and 9 (Billboard Policies)</u> During the meeting of 6-23-11, the Commission reviewed SR-P8 and P9 and requested that staff re-write SR-P8 and P9 to advocate the removal of billboards from the public right-of-way and provide policies and standards that would limit the use of billboards countywide and advocate for the removal of illegal billboards. The revised language as recommended by staff reads as follows:</p> <p><u>SR-P8 Removal or Relocation of Billboards on Public Lands and Right-of-Ways in theNorthwestern Pacific Railroad Right-of-Way</u> Support efforts of public agencies; such as the North Coast Railroad Authority and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to remove or relocate billboards from their right-of-way between Fields Landing and Arcata lands under their control.</p> <p><u>SR-P9 Removal of Illegal Billboards</u> Illegal billboards on property within County jurisdiction shall be removed through code enforcement. The County shall advocate for removal of illegal billboards in areas outside of County jurisdiction, including petitioning Caltrans’ Outdoor Advertising Office to remove illegal billboards along highways.</p> <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> C. Nelson-had issues with the addition of free standing billboards being constructed along the 101 corridor. C.Faust- Prohibit all off premise billboards and thought it was inexcusable that there were any billboards existing at all. C. Disiere was in support of the changes but could not support a blanket ban without public input. C. Kreb was in support of the comments made by C. Faust. In support of SR-P6 C. Ruth explained that SR-P6 was actually a time frame for new billboards not existing billboards C. Faust clarified he was not in support of any new billboards and new billboards should be removed as expeditiously as possible within the law. C. Edmonds – supported signs that provided information to travelers C. Faust-clarified had no problem with traditional Caltrans signs C. Nelson-agreed with the comments made by C. Faust</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | | | <p><u>Straw vote</u> Commissioners Faust, Krebs, and Nelson supported the prohibition of all new off premise billboards and thought it existing billboards should be removed as expeditiously as possible consistent with law. Commissioner Disiere was in support of the changes but could not support a blanket ban of off premise signs without public input. Commissioner Edmonds was not in support of prohibition of new billboards 3/2</p> | | |
| A | B | C | | <p>SR-P9. Removal of Illegal Billboards. <u>Illegal billboards on property within County jurisdiction shall be removed through code enforcement. The County shall advocate for removal of illegal billboards in areas outside of County jurisdiction, including petitioning</u> Petition Caltrans' Outdoor Advertising Office to remove illegal billboards along highways.</p> | Prog | M Straw Vote 3-2 |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 7-21-11 See discussion under P8</p> | | |
| A | B | C | | <p>SR-P10. Wayfarers Signage. Establish a local scenic byways network designed to direct travelers to areas of scenic, cultural, and historic interest.</p> | Staff recommended policy deletion. As written, P-10 is an implementation measure not a policy. Prog | D |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS:</p> | | |
| 10.7.5 Standards | | | | | | |
| A | B | | | <p>SR-S1. <u>Development in Mapped Scenic Areas.</u> Discretionary and ministerial development shall avoid visual disturbance of natural contours, hilltops, tree lines, forest landscapes, bluffs and rock outcroppings, to the maximum extent feasible. Roads and</p> | Staff recommended policy re-write. As originally written the | M Straw Vote |

| Plan Alternative | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|---|---|----------------|
| | | <p>public utility corridors shall be narrow as possible and follow natural contours. Natural features disturbed for construction purposes shall be restored to as close to natural condition as feasible. <u>The construction of new off-premise billboards is prohibited.</u></p> <p>SR-S1. Natural Landform Protection Natural contours, including slopes, visible hilltops and treelines, and bluffs and rock outcroppings, shall not suffer beyond the minimum feasible disturbance compatible with development of any permitted use, and the following standards shall, at a minimum, secure these objectives:</p> <p>A. Under any permitted alteration of natural landforms during construction, mineral extraction, or other approved development, the topography shall be restored to as close to natural contours as possible, and the area planted with attractive vegetation common to the area.</p> <p>B. In permitted development, land form alteration for access roads and public utilities shall be minimized by running hillside roads and utility corridors along natural contours where feasible, and the optional waiving of minimum street width requirements, where proposed development densities or use of one-way circulation patterns make this consistent with public safety, in order that necessary hillside roads may be as narrow as possible.</p> | <p>policy would apply to all development through-out the County. The revised wording applies these standards to mapped Scenic Areas only consistent with SR-P1.</p>  | 6-0 |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11 All support as written.</p> | | |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 7-21-11 See discussion under P6, P8 and P9.</p> | | |
| A | B | <p>SR-S2. Development in Mapped Heritage Landscapes. <u>Protect the scenic and historical qualities of mapped heritage landscapes as a resource of public importance. Discretionary and ministerial development shall be sited and designed to protect views, minimize the alteration of natural land forms, be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and preserve significant historical features. Discretionary development should restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.</u></p> <p>SR-S2. Scenic and Visual Quality Protection. Consider and protect the scenic and</p> | <p>Staff recommended policy re-write. As originally written the policy would apply to Scenic Areas. The revised wording applies standards to</p> | R |

| Plan Alternative | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------|
| | | visual qualities of scenic areas as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along scenic areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. | Mapped Heritage Landscapes only consistent with SR-P2.   | |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11</p> <p>c. Nelson – we don’t have any mapped heritage landscapes?</p> <p>C. Gearheart – they will be mapped as a part of the plan (IM1)</p> <p>CC – you adopted SR-P2 regarding this.</p> <p>All support as written.</p> <p>Faust – have we defined this yet?</p> <p>K. Girard – the mapping would define that.</p> | | |
| | | | | |
| A | B | <p>SR-S3. Scenic Roadway Plan Standards. The following standards apply to mapped scenic roadways: Plan for scenic roadway protection includes the following standards:</p> <p>A. Visual Buffer Width. <u>The width of the visual buffer along the road shall not exceed 200 feet from the edge of the traveled roadway.</u></p> <p>B. Permitted Uses. Permitted uses shall be allowed except <u>the construction of new off-premise billboards is prohibited. Permitted uses</u> that within the visual buffer area measures may be required to protect scenic qualities of the site.</p> <p>C. Site Development. Buildings and landscaping within the visual buffer shall be designed and located on the site to create a harmonious visual relationship with surrounding development and the natural terrain and vegetation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Existing topography, vegetation, and scenic features of the site shall be retained to the maximum extent possible and incorporated into the proposed development. Structures and signs shall be limited in height, bulk, and siting to be visually compatible with, and subordinate to, the character of surrounding areas. | Staff recommended editorial change.   | M Straw Vote 6-0 |

| Plan Alternative | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>D. Consideration of Views. Structures, signs, and plant materials within the visual buffer shall be constructed, installed, and planted to complement, enhance, and retain scenic views. Vegetative screening shall be used where needed to prevent significant intrusion or degradation of public views.</p> <p>E. Location and Screening of Unsightly Features. Potentially unsightly features within the visual buffer area, such as parking lots etc., shall be located in areas not visible from the scenic highway. Where it is not possible to locate such features out of view, features shall be screened from view by planting and/or fences, walls, or berms. Screening shall utilize primarily natural materials rather than solid fencing, preferably vegetation, in conjunction with low-earth berms.</p> <p>F. Site Grading. Grading or earth-moving operations within the visual buffer area shall be planned and executed in such a manner that final contours appear to be consistent with the existing terrain both on, and adjacent to, the site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Vegetative cover shall be provided within a reasonable time after grading is completed to prevent visible scars remaining on the land from such operations. 2) Contours altered by grading shall be restored by means of land sculpturing and a cover of topsoil in such a manner as to minimize runoff and erosion and prevent ponding of water. 3) Finished contours shall be planted with native vegetation, so as to require minimum care and to be visually compatible with the existing ground cover landscaping. <p>G. Access Roads. The location and design of access roads within the visual buffer area shall not detract from the scenic quality of the road.</p> <p>H. Utilities. New, relocated, or existing utility distribution lines within the visual buffer area shall be placed underground whenever feasible. When it is not feasible to place lines underground, they shall be located so as to be inconspicuous from the scenic route wherever feasible. Combined or adjacent rights-of-way and common poles shall be used wherever feasible.</p> <p>I. Railroads and Public Facilities. Visual buffers shall exclude railroad rights-of-way and public facilities.</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11 Gearheart – why 200 feet? Why not more? Edmonds – that is more than adequate. Girard – you could add language – Gearheart – how about “to the extent feasible” C. Nelson – is F covered under the grading ordinance? Girard – this is more than what is required in the Grading Ordinance. Gearheart – say “existing landscaping” instead of “cover” in #3 under F. and what about cell towers under utilities? Some wording that would allow them if they blend into the landscaping. Girard – we will add that cell towers can’t be permitted or they are “stealthed”. We will use language out of telecommunications. Masten – I support C. Gearheart’s requested changes. C. Nelson – 200 feet doesn’t cut it if it is at the bottom of a canyon. (it will be mapped) All support as revised by C. Gearheart.</p> | | |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 7-21-11 See discussion under P6, P8 and P9.</p> | | |
| A | B | <p>SR-S4. Development in <u>Mapped Community Separators</u>. Unless there are existing design standards adopted for community separators, New structures development within <u>mapped community separators</u> shall: A. Site and design structures to take maximum advantage of existing topography and vegetation in order to substantially screen structures from view along scenic corridors. B. Minimize cuts and fills on hills and ridges. C. Minimize the removal of trees and other mature vegetation. D. Install landscaping consisting of native vegetation in natural groupings that fits with the character of the area in order to screen structures from view where existing topography and vegetation would not screen structures from view from scenic corridors. E. Design structures to use building materials and color schemes that blend with the natural landscape.</p> | <p>Staff recommended re-write. There are no existing design standards within possible community separator areas in the inland areas of the County.</p>  | <p>M Straw Vote 6-0</p> |

| Plan Alternative | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>F. Cluster structures on each parcel within existing built areas and near existing natural features, to the <u>maximum</u> extent feasible.</p> <p>G. <u>Locate building sites and roadways to preserve natural features, native vegetation and existing trees.</u></p> | | |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11</p> <p>C. Faust – Healthy Humboldt suggested some language from the Sonoma county plan –</p> <p>C. Masten – I would support that language by HH</p> <p>C. Kreb – I would support that language by HH</p> <p>C. Gearheart – I would support that but was wondering about the way it is worded under C in S5</p> <p>C. Faust – S5 pertains to subdivision and this is to all development.</p> <p>C. Nelson - yes</p> <p>All support as revised by HH.</p> | | |
| A | B | <p>SR-S5. Subdivisions in Community Separators. Subdivisions in community separators shall:</p> <p>A. Ensure developments are subordinate to the viewscape, from the point of view of public roadways <u>and trails.</u></p> <p>B. Reduce visual impact where consistent with the Land Use Element by clustering.</p> <p>C. Preserve natural features and native vegetation by locating building sites and roadways.</p> <p>D. Require dedication of permanent open space easement at the time of subdivision to the extent <u>possible allowable by law.</u></p> <p>E. <u>Be accompanied by a visual analysis that demonstrates that the development is not detrimental to or enhances the visual quality of the Community Separators as a whole.</u></p> <p>F. <u>Adequate additional public services and infrastructure are available to serve the development.</u></p> <p>G. <u>The development is compatible with surrounding properties especially those used for agricultural pursuits.</u></p> <p><u>In addition to the mandatory criteria set forth above, special consideration will be given to projects that incorporate one or more of the following:</u></p> <p>1) <u>Aggregation of parcels within the Community Separator to achieve a project</u></p> |  | <p>M Straw Vote 6-0</p> |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|----------|--|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p><u>design that enhances the separators as a whole.</u></p> <p>2) <u>Creative financing mechanisms to maintain and preserve open space or parkland that may be dedicated in fee as part of the proposed development.</u></p> <p>3) <u>Project design features that provide for pedestrian or bicycle links between the communities on either side of the Community Separator and to any parkland that may be dedicated in fee as part of the proposed development.</u></p> | | |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11</p> <p>C. Faust – I prefer the HH version to the staff version (Masten, Krebs and Gearheart also)</p> <p>C. Nelson – I thought we did not allow subdivisions in community separators?</p> <p>Girard – not necessarily prohibited if you have a large lot. TDR program would require a purchase of entitlement from a urban development owner.</p> <p>C. Nelson - I can support this also – though I don't like Community Separators.</p> <p>Unanimous support of Healthy Humboldt version.</p> | | |
| | B | | | <p>SR-S6. New Off-Premise Billboards. New off-premise billboards shall be restricted to a maximum term of 15 years and limited to areas designated as Commercial Services or Industrial General, as described in the Land Use Element.</p> | Staff recommended re-write to omit unnecessary words. | D see Alt A |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11</p> <p>C. Krebs – I support the A version of S6 (changed to support Healthy Humboldt version)</p> <p>C. Faust – I also support A but support HH version of the change to 10 years.</p> <p>C. Masten – also support HH version of A.</p> <p>C. Nelson – wants a one year limit.</p> <p>All support the HH version of A.</p> | | |
| A | | | | <p>SR-S6. New Off-Premise Billboards. New off-premise billboards shall be restricted to a maximum term of 15 <u>10</u> 5 years and limited to areas designated as Commercial Services or Industrial General. Off-premise billboards shall not include animation or electronic messaging unless for public service purposes and be restricted to a size of 300 square feet.</p> | See <u>underline</u> and strike through text for differences with Alternative B. | M Straw Vote 6-0 |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS:</p> | | |

| Plan Alternative | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| A | | <p>SR-SX. Light and Glare. New outdoor lighting shall be compatible with the existing setting. Exterior lighting fixtures and street standards (both for residential and commercial areas) shall be fully shielded, and designed and installed to minimize off-site lighting and direct light within the property boundaries.</p> | | R |
| | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11 C. Kreb – I support the A version. Everyone should see the milky way at their home. All support as written.</p> | | |
| | | <p><u>SR-SXX. Permits for Billboards. Require Conditional Use Permits and conformance to building, zoning and other local codes for construction of new billboards as well as expansion, repair, or re-construction of existing billboards.</u></p> | | New All support |
| | | <p>6-23-11 Has staff had a chance to look at the HH version? K. Girard – what is new is the expansion, repair, reconstruction of a billboard. You could repair one. Right now you need to get a CUP for a new billboard. Carolyn Ruth – the city of Arcata case sued over a billboard that fell down and they reconstructed w/o a permit, and lost. You are allowed to require a building permit even if they are a non conforming use. K. Girard – I think you would need a CUP for not only new construction, but reconstruction of billboards. All support as revised by staff.</p> | | |
| 10.7.6 Implementation Measures | | | | |
| A | B | <p>SR-IM1. Mapping of Scenic Areas, Heritage Landscapes and Scenic Roadways. Initiate a public process to identify, map, and designate Scenic Areas, Heritage Landscapes and Scenic Roadways, including specific ordinance standards for scenic protections and design review.</p> <p>SR-IM1. Identification and Protection of Scenic Landscapes. Map heritage landscape areas in the Ferndale and Arcata Bottoms and the forested hillslopes between Eureka and Arcata and develop protection measures that protect the scenic quality of these areas with</p> | Staff recommended changes to remove policy content and improve consistency with SR-P1, P2 and P3. | R |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|--|--|---|--|---------------------------|
| | | | | appropriate land use designations and design review standards. | | |
| | | | | COMMENTS: 6-23-11 All are fine with the revision proposed by staff. | | |
| A | B | | | SR-IM2. Community Separators. Identify, map, and designate an overlay zone, for community separators with specific standard for open space protections and design review. | | R Straw Vote 5-1 |
| | | | | COMMENTS: 6-23-11 C. Nelson - There should be some incentive or reward (tax incentive) to compensate for having your land designated as a community separator. All are fine with IM as written except C. Nelson who does not like community separators. | | |
| A | B | | | SR-IM3. Scenic Road Protection Program. Community Development Services and Department of Public Works staff shall develop a program for coordinated protection of mapped Scenic Roads in concert with the involved public and private agencies. | Staff recommended addition to improve clarity. | R |
| | | | | COMMENTS: 6-23-11 All are fine with IM as written. | | |
| A | B | | | SR-IM4. Off-Premise Billboards Sign Ordinance Revision. Amend the sign ordinance to implement adopted policies for off-premise billboards and to consider other revisions to ensure community compatibility. limit the term of new billboards to 15 years, and to disallow new billboards in the Resource Dependant land use designation within the industrial land use category. | Staff recommended changes to remove policy content and improve consistency with SR-P6. | R |
| | | | | COMMENTS: 6-23-11 All are fine with IM as written. | | |
| A | B | | | SR-IM5. Removal of Illegal Billboards. Identify billboards that may have been placed without permits <u>or have expired permits</u> —and with the help of Caltrans' Outdoor Advertising Office—pursue removal of billboards found to be illegally placed <u>as defined by the California Outdoor Advertising Act.</u> | | M Straw Vote 6-0 |

| Plan Alternative | | | | Section 10.7 Scenic Resources | Staff Remarks/ Implementation | Position R,M,D |
|------------------|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11 C. Faust – recommends Healthy Humboldt language. All support the HH language.</p> | | |
| A | B | | | <p>SR-IM6. Wayfarers Signage. Establish a local scenic byways network designed to direct travelers to areas of scenic, cultural, and historic interest.</p> | | R |
| | | | | <p>COMMENTS: 6-23-11 All are fine with IM as written.</p> | | |
| | | | D | <p>5-3540.1 Adopt the Scenic Route Plan Process (Standards 3542 13-18) as the exclusive means for implementing the Scenic Highways Element.</p> | | D |
| | | | D | <p>5-3540.2. Develop a Scenic Route Application form for the public to use when requesting preparation of a Scenic Route Plan.</p> | | D |
| | | | D | <p>5-3540.3. Refrain from initiating any additional scenic route studies until completion of the Framework General Plan and Community Plans.</p> | | D |
| | | | D | <p>5-3540.4. Proceed with the Scenic Route Study authorized by the Board of Supervisors on October 23, 1979 for that portion of U.S. Highway 101 from Bald Hills Road to the existing scenic highway.</p> | | D |