

Marshalian, Richard

From: Aquia Mail
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2024 9:17 AM
To: mcarrington81@gmail.com
Cc: TLMA Planning Hearings
Subject: Request to Speak Web Submission - Planning Commission

Thank you for submitting your request to speak. Planning staff has received your request and will be prepared to allow you to speak when your item is called. .Please sign in by 8:45 AM using the Zoom application or dialing in with the phone number you provided in the form so you can be identified during the meeting. You will be muted until your item is pulled and your name is called. Do not share this information, each person will need to register to speak on an item.

Join by phone: (669) 900-6833 Meeting ID: 819 5354 0884 Password: 09232022

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81953540884?pwd=RERqYmNwL1hCMmlqbEo4ZjYzV2hVUT09>

Join Meeting using browser, no install needed:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81953540884?pwd=SzJobU82Q2FDRWtNalhaSmE4MjJmZz09>

Meeting Type (Select the meeting you will be attending from the dropdown below)

Planning Commission

Agenda Date

Wed, 04/03/2024

Agenda Item

24452- electronic signs

Name

Mark Carrington

Mailing Address

26250 Parkview Drive #48. PMB 644
Desert Center, California. 92239

Email

mcarrington81@gmail.com

Phone

[5095372266](tel:5095372266)

State Your Position Below

Oppose

Will you be calling into the meeting?

Yes

Comments

Opposed for the Chuckwalla Valley due to light pollution of “Dark Skies”.

The Chuckwalla Valley is the nearest readily accessible area of “Dark Skies “ for stargazers from the Coastal cities.

They are a resource worthy of protection.

Thank you

Mark

Marshalian, Richard

From: Ruth Brissenden <ruthbrissenden@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 30, 2024 10:25 AM
To: Marshalian, Richard
Subject: Change of Zone No. 2000001

Categories: Public: Comment, Ordinance: Rancho Community Event Ordinance

CAUTION: This email originated externally from the **Riverside County** email system. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Marshalian,

I am submitting comments on Public Hearing Agenda Item #4 appearing on the April 3, 2024 Calendar for Change of Zone 200001 pertaining to Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for On-Site Advertising Structures and Signs.

1) On-Site Free-Standing Digital Signs. My main concern with the proposed changes has to do with permitting larger free-standing digital signs on larger project sites.

Proposed Section 19.4 Subsection C(1)(b) states that *"The maximum surface area of a sign shall not exceed 150 square feet except that for those project sites have an area in excess of 15 acres, the allowable area of a sign shall be 10 square feet per acre of the project site, up to no more than 400 square feet in surface area."*

All Digital Displays should be limited to the 150 sq. ft. maximum. The allowance of larger signs for larger project sites should NOT be a part of the new regulations. The rules should apply uniformly to all applicants regardless of size. It seems like the result of doing otherwise would not be content-neutral, as larger signs would allow more "speech" than smaller signs.

I can think of a few proposed projects bordering Interstate 15 in my own community, which, under the proposed rules, would be permitted to erect the oversized 400 sq. ft. Digital Displays as On-Site Free-Standing Signs. The beautiful views along I-15 are very important to those of us who live in Temescal Valley and I shudder to think of the freeway lit up with such garish signs blighting the landscape.

It should also be noted that, while not a designated Scenic Highway, the section of I-15 between Temecula and Corona is eligible to be included in the State Scenic Highway System. As such, everything possible should be done to protect the scenic vistas along that route.

2) Definition of "Project Site." The term "project site," if included in the final regulations, should be defined. For example, does "project site" refer to the size of the parcel on which the project sits or does it refer to the portion of the parcel where the project is in operation?

3) Definition of "Display Face." "Display Face" should include the surface area of On-Site Advertising Structures as well as Outdoor Advertising Displays.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ruth Brissenden, J.D.

Temescal Valley Resident

I

Marshalian, Richard

From: Elisa Niederecker <elnieder@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2024 12:39 PM
To: Marshalian, Richard
Subject: Re: On-Site Digital Sign Ordinance

CAUTION: This email originated externally from the **Riverside County** email system. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Richard.

To clarify I asked if digital signs would be allowed within any of the zones of the Temecula Wine County.

After reviewing the draft I read that digital signs would be allowed which is unacceptable.

The concerns I have are as listed correctly except for "potential" light pollution. There is no doubt in my mind digital signs will create light pollution which will as I said during our conversation affect the nocturnal birds of prey.

Thank you for following up.
Respectfully,
Elisa

On Monday, April 1, 2024, 11:14:46 AM PDT, Marshalian, Richard <rmarshalian@rivco.org> wrote:

Good Morning Elisa,

It was a pleasure speaking to you just now. I just wanted to e-mail you to confirm what we discussed and to make sure I understood the comments you had for the proposed on-site digital sign ordinance Project going to hearing on April 3, 2024. You asked if the proposed changes to digital signs would impact the wine country area due to the design guidelines that apply to the Wine County area at present.

In addition, you had shared some concerns about allowing digital signage in the wine country area, due to concerns about aesthetics, creating distractions for people who are driving, and potential light pollution. You also expressed a desire to keep the wine country area as rural as possible.

Does my summary above capture your comments succinctly?

Sincerely,

Richard

Confidentiality Disclaimer

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure.

If you are not the author's intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please delete all copies, both electronic and printed, and contact the author immediately.

[County of Riverside California](#)

Marshalian, Richard

From: Elisa Niederecker <elnieder@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 8:29 AM
To: District3; Supervisor Jeffries - 1st District; Office of 2nd District Supervisor; District 4 Supervisor V. Manuel Perez; District 5; Leach, Charissa; Hildebrand, John; Marshalian, Richard
Subject: Amendment to ordinance 348

CAUTION: This email originated externally from the **Riverside County** email system. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Supervisors and Riverside County Staff.

This letter is regarding the proposed amendment to Riverside County ordinance 348 for the allowance of digital signs throughout Riverside County specifically the Temecula wine Country.

I am a 30+ year resident residing within the Temecula wine Country. Years ago I was a participant on the WCCP AdHoc committee. The meetings were at times lively but the goal to have homeowners, wineries and tourist coexist with minimal conflict was our motivation. One thing I believe we all did agree on was to keep the rural feel within our beautiful wine growing area. Digital signs promoting businesses was not something I remember discussing. Let's face it digital signs do not nor will not ever add to the beauty of a rolling countryside.

I believe ANY digital sign will be a distraction to drivers, are aesthetically unpleasant, and will create light pollution to humans and also will affect the hunting ability of our treasured nocturnal birds of prey. Unfortunately this amendment has been in the works for some time now. I don't understand how nobody I know had any knowledge of it. Obviously the county needs to work on their outreach before pursuing such a wide ranging amendment. I personally feel digital signs of any kind to not belong in the Temecula wine Country.

Respectfully,
Elisa Niederecker

Sent from my iPad

Marshalian, Richard

From: Terilee <casacolibri@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2024 1:19 PM
To: Marshalian, Richard
Cc: Terilee; District3
Subject: PC Hearing 4/3/24, Item 4.1: On-Site Digital Signage - NO

CAUTION: This email originated externally from the **Riverside County** email system. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Marshalian,

I am writing in opposition to allowing such signage in Wine Country. Part of the allure of this area is the rural ambiance of open space. Digital signs will clash with this and have no place in this setting, along with the size of such signs. These are very large signs! Put them in urban areas, not in the open countryside. They also should not be allowed in any residential areas.

This type of signage will also clash with our wildlife, which is already undergoing a lot of stress due to steady building out here. Their habitat is constantly being minimized, and digital lighting will only add to their disrupted lives. **Keep digital signs out of rural, residential areas and allow in more industrial and urban settings.**

Thank you for your time,
Terilee Hammett
GlenOak Hills

Marshalian, Richard

From: Jerry Sincich <jsincich1@ca.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 10:23 PM
To: Marshalian, Richard
Subject: Change of Zone No. 2000001 amendment to Ordinance No. 348
Attachments: Letter to County on Digital Signs.docx

CAUTION: This email originated externally from the **Riverside County** email system. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Richard,

Please include the attached letter into the public hearing record regarding the Change of Zone No. 2000001 amendment to Ordinance No. 348 Ordinance of the County of Riverside Providing for Land Use Planning and Zoning Regulations and Related Functions, Article XIX Advertising Regulations, Sections 19.2 through 19.5 regarding On-Site Advertising Structures and Signs, technical changes, and language clarifications.

Regards,
Jerry Sincich

October 10, 2023

Rosana Franco, Principal Planner
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92501

RE: Change of Zone No. 2000001 is an amendment to Ordinance No. 348, Ordinance of the County of Riverside for Land Use Planning and Zoning Regulations and Related Functions, Article XIX Advertising Regulations, Sections 19.1, 19.2 and 19.4 regarding On-Site Advertising Structures and Signs.

As a resident of the Temescal Valley and the Unincorporated Riverside County, changes to the proposed revisions to Ordinance No. 348 Sections 19.1, 19.2 and 19.3 are needed to preserve the aesthetics, safety, and open space scenic areas as well as safe guarding the life, health, property and public welfare of the Temescal Valley residents. The following needed changes to the proposed revisions are also in line with the sign illumination level recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA).

- **Issuance/Denial.** The Planning Director shall, within forty-five (45) days ~~of the filing of~~ following a complete permit application, and following a project presentation to the community Municipal Advisory Council and review of community input **approve and issue the On-Site Advertising Structure or Sign permit if the standards and requirements of this ordinance have been met; otherwise, the permit shall be denied.**
- **b.** The maximum surface area of a sign shall not exceed 150 square feet **except that for those project sites having an area in excess of 15 acres, the allowable area of a sign shall be 10 square feet per acre of the project site, up to no more than ~~400~~ 300 square feet in surface area. The entire allowable area of a sign can be comprised of a digital display.**
- **10.** The luminance of any digital display shall transition smoothly at a consistent rate of speed from the Daytime Luminance Level to the Nighttime Luminance Level, beginning at sunset and concluding the transition to nighttime intensity level no less than 15 minutes after sunset. The brightness of the digital display shall not exceed the following:
 - a. During Standard Time (1st Sunday in November to 2nd Sunday in March)
 - 1) 7:00 a.m. to sunset: ~~7,500~~ 5,000 Candelas/meter sq.
 - 2) Sunset to 7:30 p.m.: ~~600~~ 450 Candelas/meter sq.
 - 3) 7:30 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.: ~~450~~ 150 Candelas/meter sq.
 - b. During Daylight Savings Time (2nd Sunday in March to 1st Sunday in November)
 - 1) 7:00 a.m. to sunset: ~~7,500~~ 5,000 Candelas/meter sq.
 - 2) Sunset to 10:00 p.m.: ~~600~~ 450 Candelas/meter sq.
 - 3) 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.: ~~450~~ 150 Candelas/meter sq.
- **c.** Refresh rate of a digital display shall not be more frequent than one refresh event every ~~six~~ ten seconds;

It is imperative that Digital Displays be limited to advertising the businesses name, business conducted, services rendered, or goods produced or sold upon the property on which the

display placed and exhibits static images through the use of grid lights, cathode ray projections, light emitting diode displays, plasma screens, liquid crystal displays, fiber optics, or other electronic media or technology, that may be changed remotely through electronic means. In addition, the ability to have a digital display shall only apply to on-site advertising structures or signs, which are defined in Section 19.2.M.

Please enter the above recommended changes into the record regarding the Change of Zone No. 2000001 which is an amendment to Ordinance No. 348, Ordinance of the County of Riverside for Land Use Planning and Zoning Regulations and Related Functions, Article XIX Advertising Regulations, Sections 19.1, 19.2 and 19.4 regarding On-Site Advertising Structures and Signs.

Sincerely,
Jerry Sincich
Temescal Valley Resident

Marshalian, Richard

From: Pam Nelson <pamela05n@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 10:57 AM
To: Marshalian, Richard
Subject: Planning Commission meeting Item 1 comment

CAUTION: This email originated externally from the **Riverside County** email system. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Richard Marshalian,

I was notified about Item 1 (24452) on the agenda for the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow by members of our Sierra Club Group, Santa Margarita. We are based in the Temecula Valley, but cover adjacent cities and parts of watersheds nearby, as well. Preservation of the unincorporated areas of SW Riverside are of great concern so this amendment and Ordinance about digital signage is a worry to many of our members.

As one said, "Light pollution also impacts astronomical observations and astronomers are among the leaders fighting light pollution. Dark Sky International was started back in 1988 by astronomers. The 100-inch telescope at Mount Wilson, once the best telescope in the world, and which Edwin Hubble used to determine that the universe is expanding, is no longer useful for such deep space research due to the light pollution from Pasadena and nearby cities"

Also, it's well-known that migrating birds and insects are being disoriented and suffering declines due to light pollution at night. Night-time pollinators such as bats and moths have the same problems. The quality of life for humans is degraded and people can't get away from local city "glow" to experience constellations or dark evenings.

The suggested signage is excessive in scale. Energy usage, the Palomar light ordinance 655 and wildlife/human health issues, alone, should trigger CEQA compliance. The cumulative effects of these signs along with existing light impacts must be considered.

Solutions to the above problems could be to reduce the allowed size of the signage and only use them in the daylight hours.

Thank you for your efforts,
Pam Nelson
chair
Santa Margarita Group/Sierra Club