



MEMORANDUM

To: Trinidad Planning Commission
FROM: Trever Parker, City Planner
DATE: January 25, 2017
RE: Community Design Element

I have provided you with a current draft of a community design element. I have not done much updating to it since the Planning Commission last reviewed it in June 2014. Though the Planning Commission did spend some time on this element, it is still pretty rough. I started putting together this element by reviewing community design policies from other jurisdictions and adding anything that seemed to apply to Trinidad into the mix; existing policies of Trinidad were also included. We then started grouping the policies into different topics and narrowing them down. But that is where we left off. And I think that there are still too many policies remaining. There appears to be some redundancy and overlap and some possible conflicting policies. Therefore, the Planning Commission should focus on policies that are the most important and relevant and try to eliminate some of the others.

Note that the highlights are generally things that need more discussion or definition. Also, the italicized City names at the end of most of the policies are where that particular policy came from for reference. I don't know if that is still useful, but I decided to leave them in for now.

Community design is actually a difficult topic as evidenced by a number of controversial Design Review hearings over the years. And it is an issue that past Planning Commissions have expressed a desire to address through amended design review / view protection guidelines and criteria. Two of the primary issues that become controversial are view impacts and the size/scale/bulk of structures. The existing design review and view protection guidelines are somewhat subjective, and therefore I am not able to offer definitive guidance as to a project's compatibility with the community and whether or not some of the findings can be made. It also makes the Planning Commission's decisions more difficult, because there is no clear guidance on how to weigh and value the various viewpoints. On the other hand, having general guidelines rather than set standards allows more flexibility and creativity in design and for the merits of projects to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Taking the approach of evaluating things this way has been the preferred method in Trinidad over the years

with things like the Views and Vegetation Ordinance and the OWTS Management Program Ordinance being good examples.

I have attached the Planning Commission minutes from April 8, 2002 in which community design was the topic of a special meeting. Although the discussion is almost 15 years old at this point, it still provides a good overview of the type and breadth of issues to consider. And these same issues continue to come up at design review hearings to this day. The list of issues developed by the Planning Commission during the discussions in 2002 (including those after the April 8 discussion) included: a) size/scale/bulk of structures in Trinidad; b) floor-to-area ratios; c) setbacks; d) view protection; e) landscaping; f) design review/coastal development permit exemptions; and g) nuisance abatement.

However, the result of these 2002 discussions was eventually the Views and Vegetation Ordinance rather than an amendment to the Design Review criteria. (A new nuisance abatement ordinance was also developed.) The City Council authorized the Planning Commission to work on a zoning ordinance amendment to address design review issues, including landscaping. The Planning Commission started that discussion in July, and over the next couple of months, it became apparent that the public's priority at that time was view blocking vegetation. Therefore, the Design Review criteria and other issues were not further addressed, but do continue to come up. However, the Views and Vegetation Ordinance did start to address how view blockage should be considered in determining significance (e.g. where the view is from and what percentage is blocked). These details though, are better left to ordinances rather than General Plan policies.

**MINUTES OF THE 8 APRIL 2002
TRINIDAD PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING**

I. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 pm. Commissioners in attendance were Blue, Odom, Cuthbertson, Snell and Golledge-Rotwein. Commissioners absent were none. Staff in attendance were Brown and Parker.

II. AGENDA ITEMS

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

A. Community Design: Blue explained that this meeting had been scheduled in response to recent community criticism of the design review/development approval process and Commission decision making. The Commission is concerned because people show up to speak against projects and also later complain to the Commission about approvals and denials, but no one shows up to General Plan updates to discuss these issues. The Commission would like to discuss various options and receive community input on the following five Community Design Considerations. The Commission would like to develop some rules or guidelines that everyone understands. The following points were made and issues discussed for each topic. Observations made about what the community seems concerned about was inferred from public comments made during and after past project reviews. The outcome was that the Commission would like to have this item on the April agenda as a recommendation to the City Council to allow/direct the Commission to pursue a Zoning Ordinance amendment.

1. Size/Scale/Bulk of Structures in Trinidad:

- There are lots of small lots in Trinidad with small existing homes and there will be a lot of proposals to remodel and add on to these structures in the future – what direction does the City want to go with these properties?
- The only actual standards in the Zoning Ordinance are the 2000 s.f. max (unless “unobtrusive”), a 25’ height limit and a 1500 s.f. 15’ tall minimum residence allowed on vacant parcels – all recent proposals tend to be around 2000 s.f. and just under 25’ tall.
- Possible height limitations based on proximity to bluff (lower in front) – but is that fair to the people in front who pay more for the property? Is it too late to do this because the bluffs are already almost fully developed?
- How should garages be considered – should there be different standards for sloped lots where the garage is under the house and not seen from above verses flat lots where the garage is separate?
- “Mansionization” means a huge box that fills the lot setback to setback and to the max height, not just a large house.

2. Floor-to-area ratios:
 - Should percentage be based on total lot square footage or the percentage of the buildable portion of the lot (excluding setbacks, leachfield, steep slopes, easements, open space, etc.), or look at both numbers to consider projects from different angles (currently, numbers are based on total lot size)? Several numbers may be more confusing, but also allow different comparisons and analysis in different situations to help assess the real impacts of a project.
 - Floor area is based on the definition in the Zoning Ordinance and includes the wall to wall area of the residence but excluding garage space – staff reports include statistics with and without garage for comparison purposes.
 - Lot coverage percentage could also be a number to consider.

3. Setbacks:
 - A major concern of the community seems to be crowding and the closeness of structures.
 - Leachfield requirements are effective open space that reduces crowding without the need to increase setbacks.
 - Trinidad setback requirements are fairly standard in a City setting
 - Zoning Ordinance language (view protection) allows the Commission to alter the configuration and placement of structures on a lot (i.e. reducing setbacks) without a variance in order to protect views. Is this legal?
 - Arcata has a “2:1” standard for remodels where setbacks vary with height, and setback requirements can be reduced with an O.K. from the neighbor.

4. View Protection:
 - There is a conflict in the design review/view protection criteria between minimizing the alteration of natural landforms and digging into a site to lower the house and minimize view blockage.
 - Community members are mostly concerned about the impacts to their own personal views.
 - Coastal Act requires protection of public viewsheds, but not private views; Trinidad is the only coastal City in CA that protects private views.
 - Views get taken out of perspective (views get more consideration and debate than other issues) – there should be some kind of weighting on private views to determine “significant blockage” – which is worse, impacting a larger percentage of a miniscule view or a smaller percentage of an open view – primary verses secondary views?
 - Impacts to the site from keeping a structure low but spreading out to keep same size and protect views.
 - Interior lot views verses bluff lot views – should they be distinguished and how?
 - Blockage of potential views (adding on to or developing a structure in front of a house that could potentially add a second story and have a view in the future).

- To what extent should private views be protected?
- Contractors can spend a lot of time and money to develop a plan that meets all known parameters, but then private view considerations halt the project at the public hearing, this should be minimized.
- “Good neighbor” design approach verses strict standards.

5. Landscaping:

- Heyenga has stated that he has been working on developing a hedge ordinance with enforcement measures; the Commission would like to pursue this.
- There are many mixed feelings about trees; residents speak about the same tree as both blocking views and enhancing views.
- Species and size standards (regardless of setbacks) and maintenance requirements.

Other general issues/options discussed:

- General Plan language is purposely left vague to allow the Zoning Ordinance to further define standards and to allow the Commission to consider individual projects on a case-by-case basis.
- Should the Commissioners narrow down specifics that would allow them to make more objective/quantitative decisions but leave less flexibility for individual circumstances?
- The Commission and staff should just better define the existing standards.
- It would be helpful to have some kind of overlays that illustrate existing development verses potential development under various zoning/ design standards.
- The price of property in Trinidad verses strict development limitations.
- Possible design review and view protection ‘areas’ or zones; areas east of the freeway and in the southeast portion of the City along scenic drive – both have different issues and considerations for development than the main part of town and each other.
- Exemptions from coastal development permits/design review – minor projects like enclosing an existing porch require review while 500 s.f. accessory structures are exempt in most areas.
- Guidelines should be just that, guidelines and not law.
- Brown was directed to develop a worksheet with all the various calculations, which differentiates between sloping lots and flat lots.
- How will nonconforming structures on alleys be dealt with – there is lots of potential in this category?
- Removal of off-street parking requirements in PD zone for residences converted to a commercial use and parking-in-lieu fee.
- Illegal signage and update sign ordinance.
- Public noticing and encouraging public participation.
- Nuisance abatement / enforcement of conditions of approval and regulations.

Various ways of approaching these issues was also discussed. The Commission could adopt specific language in the General Plan or amend the Zoning Ordinance to implement policies. An alternative would be to adopt informal policies, such as Design Review Guidelines that are used by all Commissioners and staff to assess individual projects. Individual Commissioners could also come up with their own standards to use in reviewing individual applications. These policies, formal or informal, can utilize actual minimums and maximums and ratios that are quantifiable, objective and easy to apply, or they can be more like vision statements that are more subjective, but that allows flexibility in different situations. The Commission would like to leave some flexibility for considering individual circumstances for each project.

Some guidelines and standards that are currently used were discussed so that everyone understands what they mean and how they are applied. No specific language/policy changes were finalized. However, it was generally decided that the General Plan language should remain general to allow the Zoning Ordinance and the Commission to narrow down specific policies. It was also determined that several sections of the Zoning Ordinance should be amended at this time. For example, specifically the exemption from a coastal development permit (and therefore design review) for 500 s.f. accessory structures where enclosing an existing porch is not exempt. Other revisions will include clarifying some of the ambiguous and confusing language and possible modifications the design review and view protection guidelines. Some administrative approvals for certain projects such as the enclosing of an existing porch may also be added. Certain areas of the City may also be separated out to have different requirements. For example, areas east of the freeway may be made exempt from design review and/or view protection criteria. Other modifications that may be considered will be off-street parking, landscaping, lighting, signs, nonconforming structures and public noticing.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

Trever Parker
Assistant City Planner/
Secretary to the Planning Commission
City of Trinidad

COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

- A. Purpose and Background**
- B. Community Design and the Coastal Act**
- C. Design Review**
- D. Community Design Goals and Policies**
 - 1. Scenic Views**
 - 2. Compatibility with Natural Surroundings**
 - 3. Compatibility with Man-made Surroundings / Size, Scale and Bulk of Structures.**
 - 4. Signs**
 - 5. Lighting**
 - 6. Green Building**
 - 7. Landscaping**
 - 8. Public Art and Open Space**
 - 9. Other Community Design Issues**

A. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The Community Design Element is primarily concerned with the aesthetic quality of the City, and what residents and visitors see. The City's appearance is essential to the quality of life in Trinidad. Visual quality and amenities go hand-in-hand with long-term economic development strategies and strengthen the stability and desirability of the community. To be attractive to residents, visitors, and businesses, and to fit in with its scenic setting, the City must be concerned about its appearance, physical character, and livability. Existing residential real estate values and the desirability of businesses that depend on tourism are closely tied to the visual character of the community.

The Community Design Element establishes goals, policies, and programs to preserve and enhance Trinidad's authentic, small town, coastal character. The community is defined in part by its isolated location on the magnificent coastline of Humboldt County. Its sense of place derives from its heritage as the site of the Yurok village of Tsurai, and later, as a regional center for the mining, timber and fishing industries. As the economy evolves to a more tourism and service-based economy, the community has acknowledged the importance of maintaining the cultural and scenic identity of the town and the integrity of the residential neighborhoods, while enhancing views and access to the coastline and planning for managed growth and development.

Trinidad has traditionally been very protective of its views and small-town character. An architectural design review process is required for new development and remodels that alter the external profile of a structure. The City has also adopted a 'views and vegetation' ordinance that establishes a permit process to restore views that have been unreasonably blocked by growing vegetation.

One area where Trinidad's view protection has differed from the Coastal Act is in its regulatory protections of private views from residences. These protections have been in place since at least the adoption of the 1976 General Plan that was updated in 1978

and certified by the Coastal Commission in 1980. Since this time, the City has also restricted the size of homes and commercial structures as well as limited the use of 'franchise' development. These restrictions will continue to be an important component of this General Plan. However, the Design Review process in Trinidad can be difficult and controversial; better guidelines are needed as to what projects require Design Review and more objective decision-making criteria.

This element contains sections addressing design review, view protection, lighting, signs and other aspects that contribute to the aesthetic setting of the community.

B. COMMUNITY DESIGN AND THE COASTAL ACT

Protection of visual resources is called for by the Coastal Act. Section 30251 of the Coastal Act states that the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Because of the emphasis on public resources, the Coastal Act only protects public views. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize 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.

Trinidad has many valuable visual resources in the Coastal Zone, including high bluffs, the jutting headland of Trinidad Head, rugged offshore rocks, coastal streams and riparian areas, beaches, dunes and a quiet harbor. The southern and western viewsheds along the coastline, particularly from Edwards Street, provide an important visual resource. Scenic resources attract many visitors to these areas and provide the basis for the City's tourist industry. Visual resources can be readily degraded through poorly-located, designed and maintained structures, roads, signs, landscaping and utility lines that block coastal views, alter natural landforms, and detract from the small town character of the community.

C. DESIGN REVIEW

Most new development in the City is subject to a design review process which is intended to ensure that it preserves and enhances the aesthetic character of its setting. The Planning Commission is tasked with design review approvals along with Coastal Development Permits and other required land use approvals for new development. Compliance with the Design and View Protection Criteria are the basis for current Design Review approval. While the criteria are flexible in order to encourage innovative and creative designs, they do include many requirements that are qualitative statements rather than quantitative standards. There are many acceptable ways to meet each of the criteria.

Over the last few years of Design Review hearings, a couple of issues with the existing criteria have been identified that should be addressed in this update. One is the subjectivity of them. The Planning Commission and community members have expressed an interest in developing more objective design review and view protection guidelines. The second issue is the breadth of projects that require Design Review,

including any project that alters the external profile of a structure with few exceptions. The Planning Commission and community members have also expressed an interest in limiting the number and type of projects that require Design Review or to have an administrative approval process for small projects that are unlikely to have impacts to views and aesthetics.

D. COMMUNITY DESIGN

1. Scenic Views

Goal CD-1 Preserve, enhance and restore scenic views for the benefit of the public and residents.

Scenic View Policies

CD-1.1 Site and design permitted development to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural landforms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and to restore and enhance scenic views in visually degraded areas where feasible (*Fort Bragg*).

Program CD-1.1.1 Adopt additional Citywide Design Guidelines for scenic views and resources identified in **Figure 19**. Consider including, at a minimum, the following guidelines (*Fort Bragg*):

- a) Discourage continuous buildings that block scenic views and require view corridors between structures that provide unobstructed views of the shoreline and/or the sea from public rights-of-way.
- b) Limit the size and bulk of structures to maintain Trinidad's small-town character, adequate room for septic and open spaces between structures.
- c) Require bluff setbacks for development adjacent to or near public areas along the shoreline.
- d) Minimize the size of advertising, business identification, and directional signs to ensure scenic views are not obstructed.
- e) Design night lighting to be indirect with no source of light directly visible, and lighting should not intrude on adjacent property or cause glare.
- f) Prohibit or require screening of the following uses in **scenic view corridors**: signs and fencing which block the scenic views, mechanical equipment, refuse containers such as dumpsters, and the outdoor storage of materials.
- g) Require open view fencing where appropriate.
- h) Ensure that new development in locations which are highly visible from beaches, trails and open space areas maintains a high quality of design and construction.
- i) Require screening of propane tanks visible from public roadways or trails.
- j) Prohibit parking of large recreational vehicles, including boats, within view corridors unless other alternatives are infeasible.

CD-1.2 Prohibit structures, including fences, walls signs, and landscaping from significantly blocking views of the harbor, Little Trinidad Head, Trinidad Head, the Pacific ocean, rocky coastline or islands from public roads, trails, key public viewing

points (e.g. vista points and benches; see Figure 10) or from inside an occupied residential or commercial structure (*Trinidad*).

Program CD-1.2.1 Review Trinidad's View Protection Criteria and revise them as necessary to provide clearer guidance and reduce community conflicts while still protecting important public and private coastal views (LU-2.2).

CD-1.3 Require Design Review for all development that has the potential to affect visual resources, unless otherwise exempt from Design Review pursuant to the City's Zoning Ordinance. Design Review approval requirements do not replace, supersede or otherwise modify the independent requirement for a coastal development permit approved pursuant to the applicable policies and standards of the certified LCP. Ensure that development is constructed in a manner consistent with the **Citywide Design Guidelines**. (*Fort Bragg*)

Program CD-1.3.1 Develop and adopt design guidelines that provide objective criteria while allowing flexibility and creativity in design.

CD-1.4 Retain unobstructed coastal views from Edwards Street to the extent feasible (*Fort Bragg*). The lands designated as open space lying seaward of Edwards and Van Wycke Streets shall remain entirely undeveloped and preserved in their present data. It is from these lands that the unparalleled view to the south is obtained.

CD-1.5 Ensure trees are planted in locations that frame but do not block important coastal view corridors. Require that trees be shown on landscaping plans and for new developments subject to City review and approval. In **view corridors** and within the Views and Vegetation Overlay Zone (as mapped in the City's Views and Vegetation Ordinance), tree species should be limited to slow-growing canopies that will not impair views from nearby properties and that can be viably pruned and maintained without compromising their health. (*Pismo Beach*) Trees shall be maintained such that they do not cause unreasonable view blockage in accordance with the policies and regulations of the City.

CD-1.6 Develop a vegetation management plan or program for bluffside vegetation maintenance consistent with protections for EHSAs.

2. Compatibility with Natural Surroundings

Goal CD-2: Ensure that new development demonstrates sensitivity to the environment and scenic beauty of Trinidad.

Environmental Compatibility Policies

CD-2.1 Maintain and incorporate the City's natural amenities, including its hillsides, indigenous vegetation, and rock outcroppings, within proposed projects. (*Menifee*)

CD-2.3 Minimize the alterations of natural land forms caused by cutting, filling and grading. Design structures to fit the site rather than altering the land form to accommodate the structure (*Trinidad*) by: (*Fort Bragg*)

1. Conforming to the natural topography.
2. Preventing substantial grading or reconfiguration of the project site.
3. Minimizing flat building pads on slopes. Building pads on sloping sites shall utilize split level or stepped-pad designs.
4. Requiring that man-made contours mimic the natural contours.
5. Ensuring that graded slopes blend with the existing terrain of the site and surrounding area.
6. Minimizing grading permitted outside of the building footprint.
7. Clustering structures to minimize site disturbance and to minimize development area.
8. Minimizing height and length of cut and fill slopes.
9. Minimizing the height and length of retaining walls.
10. Cut and fill operations may be balanced on-site, where the grading does not substantially alter the existing topography and blends with the surrounding area. Export of cut material may be required to preserve the natural topography.
11. Integrate site design with infrastructure systems of the surrounding area, including street patterns, trails, open space, water courses, drainage and utility systems. (*Palmdale*)

CD-2.4 Incorporate a setback from the edge of the bluff and design features that avoid and minimize visual impacts from the beach and ocean below from blufftop development. (*Fort Bragg*)

CD-2.5 The beaches and sea cliffs which border the southern and western sides of the city (identified by Open Space) shall be preserved from further structural development and allowed to remain in or restored to, their natural state. (*Trinidad*)

CD-2.7 Require that structures in, or adjacent to open space areas to be made as visually unobtrusive as possible and constructed of materials that reproduce natural colors and textures as closely as possible. (*Trinidad*)

CD-2.8 Provide buffering and screening between natural and built environments, where appropriate in the design of new development. (*Palmdale*)

CD-2.9 Integrate the manmade and natural environments by using plant materials to screen or soften the visual impact of new development, and to provide diversity in developed areas. (*Trinidad*) Preferably, use **native**, drought tolerant vegetation that will not grow to block scenic views.

CD-2.10 Minimize removal of natural vegetation in new development. Preserve existing native plants on the site to the maximum extent feasible to maintain aesthetics, minimize soil disturbance and maximize soil stability. (*Fort Bragg*)

CD-2.11 Preserve and enhance view corridors by undergrounding and/or screening new or relocated electric or communication distribution lines. Require underground utility service connections for new development. (*Meniffee*)

3. Compatibility With Man-made Surroundings / Size, Scale and Bulk of Structures

Goal CD-3: Ensure that new development demonstrates excellence of design and sensitivity to the character of the surrounding neighborhood and built environment and that buildings are designed to maintain the small-scale character of the community.

Community Compatibility Policies

CD-3.1 Promote quality and diversity of design compatible with community context. Harmonize site and building design with the community context, including existing structures. (*Arcata*)

CD-3.2 Ensure that commercial and mixed use development, fits harmoniously with the scale and design of existing buildings and streetscape of the City. (*Fort Bragg*) Prohibit preset architectural styles (e.g. standard fast food restaurant designs). (*Trinidad*)

CD-3.3 Ensure that second dwelling units, manufactured units, and single-family residences are sited and constructed in a manner harmonious with surrounding development. Discourage sameness and repetitive residential designs. (*Fort Bragg*)

CD-3.4 Integrate each project with the character and design of the surrounding area, with respect to such design elements as size, shape, massing, setbacks, orientation, architecture, colors and landscaping. (*Palmdale*)

Program CD-3.4.1 Revise the Zoning Ordinance to provide more refined Design Review Guidelines that objectively address the design, size, bulk, and scale of new development and ensure that new and remodeled buildings are compatible with and enhance the character of the neighborhoods in which they are located. (LU-1b.5)

Program CD-3.4.2 When reviewing the design of commercial or residential buildings, ensure that that the scale, bulk, orientation, architectural character of the structure and related improvements are compatible with the rural, coastal, uncrowded, rustic, , small, casual, open character of the community (*Trinidad*)

CD-3.5 Support the development and preservation of unique communities and neighborhoods in which each neighborhood exhibits a special sense of place and quality of design. (*Meniffee*)

Program CD-3.5.1 Ensure that future development and redevelopment improve the environment for the public and support the distinctiveness of each

neighborhood as well as the special characteristics of the existing fabric of its local context. Adopt design guidelines for each identified neighborhood in Trinidad that recognizes, maintains, and enhances the character and identity of each district; integrate existing specific plans' policies and design guidelines as applicable. (*Costa Mesa*)

CD-3.6 Except for necessary public safety facilities, ensure that structures blend with the natural visual form of the area and do not unnecessarily extend above the natural silhouette or the silhouette of existing structures in the area.

CD-3.7 Design parking lots and associated facilities to be functionally and visually integrated and connected; off-street parking lots should not dominate the streetscene. (*Menifee*)

CD-3.8 Provide variations in color, texture, materials, articulation, and architectural treatments. Avoid long expanses of blank, monotonous walls or fences. (*Menifee*)

CD-3.9 Ensure rooflines are compatible with other roofs along the street; larger buildings should have more varied roof massing and / or variation in heights. (*Palmdale*)

CD-3.10 Design new development to ensure that garages do not dominate the residential streetscape through the use of design, location and setbacks. (*Palmdale*)

CD-9.7 Fences and walls within residential areas should contribute to the neighborhood identity and enhance community design and minimize view blockages. (*Palmdale*)

4. Signs

Goal CD-4: Minimize the proliferation of signage in Trinidad, and ensure that signs are designed to compliment their surroundings with sensitivity to viewsheds.

Sign Policies

CD-4.1 Limit the overall proliferation of signage and minimize the size of advertising, business identification, and directional signs to ensure scenic views are not obstructed. (*Fort Bragg*)

CD-4.2 Design on-premises signs as an integral part of the structure and should complement or enhance the appearance of the surrounding area. (*Trinidad*)

CD-4.3 Limit off-premise signs to only those needed to direct visitors to commercial establishments. Ensure they are well designed, limited in size, don't block coastal views and clustered at appropriate locations with a single design theme.)

Program CD-4.3.1 Prohibit off-premise signs within a public right-of-way that advertise individual businesses.

CD-4.4 Orient permanent signs to pedestrians rather than automobile traffic
(*Arcata*)

CD-4.5 Prohibit pole signs, except for public traffic, directional and safety signs.

CD-4.6 Integrate project signage into the architectural design and character of new buildings. (*Menifee*)

CD-4.7 Prohibit the use of flashing, moving, or audible signs. (*Menifee*)

CD-4.8 The following criteria shall apply to all signs: (*Arcata*)

1. Place signs so that they do not obscure other building elements such as windows, cornices, or decorative details.
2. Ensure that sign size, materials, style and color complement the building facade and are compatible with the surrounding area.
3. Limit copy shall to icons, logos, services identification, and hours of operation (rather than advertising copy) except as required by law or ordinance.
4. Flush-mounted signs and monument signs are the preferred types; no more than one freestanding sign may be allowed per business street frontage (including alleys), and freestanding signs shall not exceed **fifteen** feet in height.
5. Ensure that signs are not of a height or design which is intended to be read from the State Route 101.
6. Ensure that lighted signs are designed to minimize glare and with the minimum amount of illumination necessary to make the sign legible; neon signs with **distinctive designs** are acceptable. Plastic-faced internally lit signs are discouraged.
7. At the time of any future alterations of a lawfully permitted existing sign, except for a change in copy, the entire sign shall be modified as necessary to conform to these policies.

Murals

5. Lighting

Goal CD-5: Minimize light pollution consistent with public safety.

Lighting Policies

CD-5.1 Ensure that exterior lighting (except traffic lights, navigational lights, and other similar safety lighting) be minimized, restricted to low intensity fixtures, and shielded so that no light or glare shines beyond the boundary of the property or into Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. (*Fort Bragg*)

CD-5.2 Encourage street and parking lot lighting that creates a sense of security, complements building design, is energy-efficient, avoids glare, and conforms with standards designed to reduce light pollution. (*San Juan Batista*)

CD-5.4 Require that lighting and fixtures be integrated with the design and layout of a project and that they provide a desirable level of security and illumination. (*Meniffee*)

6. Green Building

Goal CD-6: Encourage energy efficiency, use reduction and conservation in new and existing development.

Green Building Policies

CD-6.1 Ensure that site and building design emphasize energy efficiency and solar orientation. (*Arcata*)

CD-6.2 Incorporate green building concepts into site and building design, including maximizing use of recycled materials and recycling, energy efficiency, solar access, insulation, energy efficiency, use of toxic-free materials, natural lighting, native landscaping, permeable surfaces around structures, and minimizing construction waste generation. (*Arcata*)

CD-6.3 Encourage renewable energy such as wind, solar, micro-hydro and waves in new and existing development and set an example by utilizing renewable energy in City facilities where feasible. (CIRC-5.2)

CD-6.4 Investigate and adopt appropriate policies encouraging “green building technologies” that reduce negative impacts on the environment from both existing and new development. (LU-1c.1)

CD-6.5 Encourage LEED certification in new development.

7. Landscaping

Goal CD-7: Promote native landscaping appropriate to the Trinidad environment that will enhance rather than interfere with coastal viewsheds.

Landscaping Policies

CD-7.1 Require native and drought tolerant landscaping with drip irrigation, or other water conserving irrigation system, in all new and rehabilitated development. (*Pismo Beach*)

CD-7.2 Ensure that all public landscaping is adequately maintained (*Meniffee*)

CD-7.3 Require property owners to maintain the landscaping on developed sites such that it does not present any unreasonable view obstructions consistent with the City's Views and Vegetation Ordinance.

CD-7.4 Ensure commercial property owners maintain required landscaping and replace unhealthy or dead landscaping in existing development. (*Menifee*)

CD-7.5 Promote viewshed-friendly, LID based landscape designs that improve the environment within and adjacent to new developments by reducing heat, glare and noise, and by promoting ground-water recharge, retardation of storm water runoff, and improvement of air quality. (*Palmdale*)

CD-7.6 Ensure new landscaping is consistent with the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

8. Public Art and Open Space

Goal CD-8 Support Public Art and Open Space.

Public Art and Open Space Policies

CD-8.1 Encourage the provision of murals, fountains, sculptures, and other forms of public art in public spaces and parks, including gateways, major projects and other public gathering places.

Program CD-8.1.1: Consider implementing an ongoing outdoor sculpture exhibit adjacent to City Hall and/or in other locations, with an emphasis on supporting and showcasing local artists and reflecting the cultural life of the community.

CD-8.2 Provide special landscaping and decorative monument signage in order to highlight arrival and departure from the City. (*Menifee*)

CD-8.3 Encourage the development of public open spaces for gatherings and fairs in commercial areas of the City and the inclusion of such facilities in new commercial development that is sufficiently large to accommodate such uses.

9. Other Community Design Issues

Other Community Design Policies

Goal CD-9: Maintain Trinidad's beauty and character.

CD-9.1 Support local beautification efforts by neighborhoods and merchant groups. (*San Juan Batista*)

CD-9.2 Ensure that properties are well maintained and nuisances are abated.

Program CD-9.2.1: Continue to implement and enforce the City's nuisance abatement ordinance, and update it, as necessary, to ensure that property values are maintained throughout the City.

Program CD-9.2.2: Consider adopting regulations in the Municipal Code requiring that alleyways in residential areas be kept free of obstructions to ensure unimpeded access at all times.

CD-9.3 Provide for and develop pedestrian and bicycle facilities to serve the transportation and recreational needs of the residents. Where feasible, these can include benches and attractive, secure and accessible bike parking, etc. (CIRC-4.1)

CD-9.4 The Tsurai Village site, the Trinidad Cemetery, the Holy Trinity Church and the Memorial Lighthouse are important historic resources. Any landform alterations or structural construction within one hundred feet of the Tsurai Study Area, as defined in the Trinidad general plan, or within one hundred feet of the lots on which identified historical resources are located shall be reviewed to ensure that public views are not obstructed and that development does not crowd them and thereby reduce their distinctiveness or subject them to abuse or hazards. (*Trinidad*)