



**AGENDA**  
CITY OF SEASIDE  
PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING  
440 HARCOURT AVE (COUNCIL CHAMBER)  
Wednesday, July 22, 2026  
6:00 PM

Virtual Participation Guide: <https://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/129/City-Council-Committee-Agendas>  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81555467580> | WEBINAR ID 815 5546 7580 | (669) 900-9128

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. ROLL CALL - PLANNING COMMISSION**

|                          |              |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| William Silva            | Chair        |
| Dave Evans               | Vice Chair   |
| Keith Dodson             | Commissioner |
| Arlington La Mica        | Commissioner |
| Gonzalo Quintero Alcaraz | Commissioner |
| Robert Ward              | Commissioner |

**3. REVIEW OF AGENDA**

*If there are any items that arose after the 72-hour posting deadline, this is the point in the meeting where a vote may be taken to add the item to the agenda. (A 2/3-majority vote is required).*

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on matters within the jurisdiction of the City of Seaside, but not on this agenda, may do so during the Public Comment period for up to three (3) minutes. Comments on specific agenda items are heard under that item. For the public record, please state your name.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A. APPROVE MINUTES FROM JULY 8, 2026 REGULAR MEETING**

**6. BUSINESS ITEMS**

- A. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT ZOA-2026-003. A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE TO ALLOW ELECTRONIC MESSAGE DISPLAY SIGNS FOR PLACES OF WORSHIP AND PUBLIC AND PRIVATE MEETING FACILITIES ON LOCAL STREETS. THIS ACTION CONSISTS OF A RECOMMENDATION ONLY AND IS THEREFORE NOT SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Adopt the attached Resolution.

**7. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

**8. REPORTS FROM STAFF**

This is a time specifically set aside for the Staff Liaison to provide updates on non-agendized requests from the Commission, and to provide brief information on topics under the purview of the Commission.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting:  
August 12, 2026  
6:00 PM

---

The City of Seaside is committed to providing accessible facilities and accommodating people with disabilities in all of its services programs and activities. If special considerations are needed by any person to fully participate in this meeting, contact the City Clerk at 899-6707 no fewer than two business days prior to the meeting to allow reasonable arrangements. Agendas are posted at:

<http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/129/City-Council-Committee-Agendas>

Agenda-related writings or documents provided during public meetings are available for public inspection during the meeting or from the office of the City Clerk. This agenda is posted in compliance with California Government Code Section 54954.2(a) or Section 54956.



## FINAL MINUTES

CITY OF SEASIDE  
PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBER  
Wednesday, July 8, 2026  
6:00 PM

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Silva called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL – PLANNING COMMISSION**

PRESENT: COMMISSIONER SILVA, EVANS, LA MICA, WARD  
ABSENT: ALCARAZ, DODSON

**3. REVIEW OF AGENDA**

None

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approve Minutes from June 24, 2026

*On motion by Commissioner Ward, and second by LaMica, and carried by the following vote, the Planning Commission moved to approve the Minutes from June 24, 2026.*

RESULTS: 4-0-2-0

AYES: Chair Silva, Commissioners Evans, La Mica, Ward

NOES: None

ABSENT: Alcaraz, Dodson

ABSTAIN: None

**ACTION: APPROVED & ADOPTED RESOLUTION**

**6. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW APPLICATION AR-2026-002 AND MINOR USE PERMIT MUP-2026-001. PETER MACIEL, PROPERTY OWNER, AND THOMAS RETTENWENDER, PROJECT APPLICANT, REQUEST ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW APPROVAL FOR A SECOND-STORY ADDITION INCLUDING A BALCONY AND DECK TO AN EXISTING ONE-STORY DWELLING AND MINOR USE PERMIT APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED FIRST AND SECOND STORIES TO ENCROACH INTO THE REQUIRED SIDE SETBACKS NO FURTHER THAN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING**

**SETBACKS AT 1828 YOSEMITE STREET (APN 012-621-034) IN THE SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (RS-8) ZONING DISTRICT. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW IS NOT AN ACTIVITY SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO 15061(B)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Commission approve Architectural Review Application No. AR-2026-002 and Minor Use Permit No. MUP-2026-001 subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Beth Rocha, Senior Planner gave a presentation on Architectural Review Application AR-2026-002 for the proposed second story edition and the associated rooftop deck and balcony and Minor Use Permit MUP-2026-001 which is to consider areas of addition that encroach into a required setback no further than an existing nonconforming portion of the structure.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Tiara, the architect's assistant, read a written public comment submitted by Architect Thomas Rettenwender.

Chair Silva asked Tiara whether she was familiar with the construction assembly and the common wall. Tiara responded that she was not.

Christopher Kogan, a resident living above 1828 Yosemite in the Del Monte Heights subdivision, spoke about the history of view protection in Seaside. He stated that, in the 1990s, development was not allowed to obstruct views, but that the City's zoning regulations have since changed and no longer provide view protection. He expressed concern that the lack of view protection has negatively affected neighborhood relations.

Erica Sabin, a resident at 1820 Yosemite and owner of the adjoining garage shared with 1828 Yosemite, expressed disappointment with the revised project plans. She stated that one discussion has been had regarding a garage separation agreement. She also noted that the proposed deck had increased in size from 271 square feet to 323 square feet and expressed concern that the larger deck could accommodate large gatherings, resulting in increased noise. Ms. Sabin further stated that the revised plans did not include a privacy screen, which she said had been discussed with neighboring property owners and has become a point of contention. She reiterated her opposition to the proposed deck and expressed frustration that progress had not been made on the garage separation agreement.

Kathy Matthews, a resident of 1817 Yosemite, suggested reducing the size of the proposed deck. She noted that the last four homes sold on Yosemite Street have added second stories and stated that existing traffic noise is already noticeable in the neighborhood.

Michelle Maciel, daughter of Peter Maciel of 1828 Yosemite, stated that she and her fiancé intend to move into the proposed multigenerational home. She said they do not intend to host loud parties on the deck and expressed her hope that the project

would be approved so construction could move forward.

### **Commissioner Discussion**

Commissioner Silva opened the discussion.

Commissioner Ward made three observations. First, he complimented the architect and City staff on the quality of the project graphics and the clear depiction of the property lines. Second, he acknowledged the challenges associated with balancing property owners' efforts to maximize the use and value of their property with the impacts such improvements may have on neighboring properties, including the loss of views. Third, he commended Architect Thomas Rettenwender for revising the project to provide the required five-foot setback from the attached garages and expressed hope that neighbors could come to an understanding as development and residential density continue to increase.

Commissioner LaMica asked why the proposed deck had been increased in size.

Commissioner Evans stated that although the City has historically attempted to accommodate views where possible, State law does not recognize a protected right to a view. He expressed concern that the proposed deck was too large and would have a significant impact on the neighboring property. He encouraged the applicant to reduce or remove the deck, stating that he could support the Minor Use Permit but not the Architectural Review as proposed because he believed the deck was visually incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Chair Silva stated that he did not agree with the tone or content of the written public comment submitted by Architect Thomas Rettenwender. He also expressed concern that additional issues continued to be raised by the neighboring property owner at 1820 Yosemite throughout the review process. Chair Silva noted that the project had been revised to separate the attached garages in order to meet the required setback and encouraged the applicant to install a privacy screen along the south side of the deck as a good-neighbor gesture. He further expressed hope that any issues regarding the separation of the garages could be resolved without litigation and indicated his support for the project as modified.

Andrew Myrick, Housing and Planning Manager, clarified that the City would not be involved in any private garage separation agreement or property line dispute. He explained that any issues related to property boundaries or construction would be addressed during the Building Permit review process.

Erica Sabin, owner of 1820 Yosemite, stated that the two garage walls are supported by a shared cinder block retaining wall.

Chair Silva suggested that an easement may be a possible solution for resolving the shared garage issue.

Peter Maciel, owner of 1828 Yosemite, stated that the project plans had been revised to show the separation of the garages in order to comply with the required five-foot

setback.

Commissioner Ward noted that there had been considerable speculation regarding the property line and garage separation. He stated that he was confident any necessary survey or property line verification would occur during the Building Permit process and that these matters were outside the scope of the Planning Commission's review.

*On motion by Commissioner Silva, and second by Ward, and carried by the following vote, the Planning Commission moved to approve Architectural Review Application No. AR-2026-002 for a second-story addition, including a balcony and deck, to an existing one-story dwelling, and Minor Use Permit No. MUP-2026-001 for the proposed first and second stories to encroach into the required side setbacks no further than the existing nonconforming setbacks at 1828 Yosemite Street (APN: 012-621-034) in the single-family residential (RS-8) zoning district.*

RESULTS: 3-1-2-0

AYES: Chair Silva, Commissioners, La Mica, Ward

NOES: Evans

ABSENT: Alcaraz, Dodson

ABSTAIN: None

**ACTION: APPROVED & ADOPTED RESOLUTION**

**7. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

None

**8. REPORTS FROM STAFF**

Andrew Myrick, Housing and Planning Manager, reported that the City Council referred the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment (ZOA) for Electronic Signs back to the Planning Commission for further review of the regulations related to hours of operation, colors, and sign size. The item is scheduled to be considered at the Planning Commission's regular meeting on July 22, 2026.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

*On motion by Chair Silva, and second by Commissioner Ward, the Planning Commission moved to adjourn*

**Respectfully submitted,**

---

**Andrew Myrick,  
Housing and Planning Manager**

---

**William Silva, Chair**



**CITY OF SEASIDE  
STAFF REPORT**

**Item No.: 6.A.**

**TO:** Planning Commission

**BY:** Andrew Myrick, Housing & Planning Manager

**DATE:** July 22, 2026

**SUBJECT:** **ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT ZOA-2026-003. A  
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF  
SEASIDE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE  
AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE TO  
ALLOW ELECTRONIC MESSAGE DISPLAY SIGNS FOR PLACES  
OF WORSHIP AND PUBLIC AND PRIVATE MEETING FACILITIES  
ON LOCAL STREETS. THIS ACTION CONSISTS OF A  
RECOMMENDATION ONLY AND IS THEREFORE NOT SUBJECT  
TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).**

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Adopt the attached Resolution.

**BACKGROUND**

Signs in the City of Seaside are regulated by Chapter 17.40 of the Municipal Code.

Among the provisions of this Chapter is Section 17.40.080.I pertaining to electronic message board display signs at public and private meeting facilities. Public and private meeting facilities most commonly include religious assembly but can also include secular uses such as civic auditoriums or other meeting spaces. This portion of the Zoning Ordinance was adopted by the City Council in 2017 through Ordinance 1045, and includes provisions to allow for such signage while including operating standards to mitigate potential impacts on nearby residences. This was adopted to provide a simpler option for churches in the City to update message boards that are commonly found in front of churches, enabling the churches to replace manual updating of the letters with

an electronic update.

The full text of the Ordinance is included as Attachment 2 to this Report, but in summary, existing law indicates that such signs must abide by the following operating standards:

- Signs must be located so that they do not interfere with visibility or functioning of traffic signals or signage;
- Signs must be at least 50 feet from the nearest residence;
- Animated messages shall be limited to fading and dissolving, with no other effect to give the appearance of movement;
- Signs shall not include any audio message;
- Message shall have a minimum hold time of 30 seconds;
- Signs shall not illuminate between 9:00 PM and 6:00 AM;
- Illumination shall direct light towards the ground and shall not include excessive illumination (as defined in detail in Section 17.40.080.I.7);
- Signs shall employ light detectors so that they automatically dim after dusk and before dawn.

This item is being brought forward due to language in Section 17.40.080.I.1 which provides that electronic signs must be located on an arterial or collector street.

Currently, electronic display message signs are prohibited on local streets, which include the majority of residential streets in the City. Staff has received inquiries from a church located on a local street regarding the possibility of replacing an existing internally illuminated message board with an electronic message board.

This Item was considered by the Planning Commission on May 13, 2026. The Planning Commission ultimately was supportive of allowing the placement of such signs on local streets. The Planning Commission voted to recommend that the City Council approve the Ordinance allowing such signs as they are allowed on other street types in the City, subject to the requirement that these signs would be subject to the Minor Use Permit process (which would include public notification) unless the sign was a replacement of an existing illuminated sign.

This Item was then considered by the City Council on June 4, 2026. Extensive public comment was received, both in favor of the Ordinance as well as opposed. Those in favor pointed to the challenges associated with changing sign copy by hand, especially in inclement weather, and also asserted that several churches had already placed signs with no apparent ill effects. Those opposed brought up a number of concerns relating to the quality of life for those in proximity to the signs. After hearing the public comment, the City Council referred the item back to the Planning Commission for comment regarding matters related to sign size, color, and hours of operation.

### Sign Size



Under the current Ordinance, electronic display message signs are allowed to be up to 8 feet in height; this may be increased up to 14 feet with a Minor Use Permit. Staff believes that this is unnecessary on local streets. Local streets generally have a speed limit of 25 miles per hour. While signs on roads where higher speeds are allowed may need to be larger in order to be readable (since traffic is moving faster, letters need to be larger so they can be read from farther away in order to provide sufficient time to communicate the message), on local streets smaller lettering would be sufficient.

The proposed Ordinance would match maximum sign heights on local residential streets to those for other signs in residential districts (6 feet for freestanding signs). Maximum sign area for the screen would be limited to 18 square feet, reduced from the 24 square feet allowed in other locations.

### Sign Color

Several members of the public brought up potential issues related to the color(s) shown on the sign screen. The concept has been presented as signs allowing text - however, this does not preclude the use of designs or even of installing screens capable of displaying graphics. Staff is seeking direction from the Commission regarding desirable standards for the displays (if any).

Some factors to consider regarding different colors:

- Reds, greens, and yellows generally are colors used by traffic lights. The existing Ordinance includes language which limits the use of electronic display message signs when the signs could interfere with the operation of traffic signals or signage. Thus far, existing signs have made use of red lettering with no obvious negative effects. Further, traffic signals are rare on local streets, reducing the potential for interference or confusion.
- Blues and whites are unlikely to be confused with traffic signals. However, they also are closer to the natural daylight spectrum, which arguably could be more disruptive to sleep than other colors.
- Staff used Artificial Intelligence (AI) to conduct a review of the Ordinances of other California jurisdictions to see if other jurisdictions have passed Ordinances limiting the colors to a specific palette. None were found, although it was discovered that at least one jurisdiction outside of the state (Tyler, TX) limits the displays to amber lighting only when an institutional use is facing a residence (Section 10-415.a.15(a)).
- Another possibility would be to limit signs to be monochromatic (only one color, although the color itself would be up to the applicant). Again, staff used AI to see if there are any other jurisdictions in California with such a requirement and, again, no Ordinances with such a requirement were found.
- Limiting the signs to a single color would effectively prohibit the use of color graphics on screens capable of displaying graphics (such as a PowerPoint slide), as most graphics make use of multiple colors.

Staff is providing this information for the Commission's consideration. The Ordinance as presented has not been modified to reflect any of these changes.

### Hours of Operation

Concerns were brought up that the allowable hours of operation (6:00 AM to 9:00 PM) might not be appropriate for residential neighborhoods. In particular, the concern was that the 9:00 PM end time might be too late and would be disruptive to residents' sleep.

Staff used AI to search for time restrictions in other jurisdictions. Four examples were found, in Alpine County and the Cities of Monrovia, Ceres, and National City. None of the examples were perfect parallels - for example, the hours may not apply to residential areas, or may only apply to certain uses. However, for the individual circumstances of each jurisdiction, the prohibited hours were 8:00 PM to 7:00 AM in Alpine County, 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM in Monrovia and Ceres, and 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM in National City.

Staff also explored the possibility of using a "dusk to dawn" requirement. Staff does not recommend this approach for two reasons. First, during the winter it is dark by 5:00 PM, which is a time when most people are still pursuing daily activities even though it is dark outside and would be a prime time to display the messages to capture the evening commute. Second, it is unclear when dusk or dawn actually begin, which makes enforcement challenging. Staff also considered a hybrid model (ie dusk to dawn in the summer with specified hours in the winter), but the resulting rules would be challenging to enforce due to their complexity.

Staff's recommendation is to adjust the prohibited operating time on local streets to 8:00 PM to 6:00 AM (ie one hour earlier in the evening). The proposed Ordinance reflects this recommendation.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this Item.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. ZOA 26-03 PC Resolution 2026-07-22
- 
-



**RESOLUTION NO. 26-\_\_ PC**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE  
RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN ORDINANCE TO  
AMEND THE SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE TO ALLOW ELECTRONIC MESSAGE  
DISPLAY SIGNS FOR PLACES OF WORSHIP AND PUBLIC AND PRIVATE MEETING  
FACILITIES ON LOCAL STREETS.**

**WHEREAS**, on November 17, 2017, the City Council passed and adopted Ordinance No. 1045 to set forth requirements for the installation of electronic message display signs at public and private meeting facilities in residential zones; and

**WHEREAS**, when initially adopted, the Ordinance prohibited the installation of electronic message display signs on local streets; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 13, 2026, the Planning Commission met and discussed the potential for a modification to the Zoning Ordinance to provide the criteria under which electronic message display signs could be installed on local streets in residential zones; and

**WHEREAS**, on June 4, 2026, the City Council considered the proposed Ordinance and referred the matter back to the Planning Commission to consider potential impacts related to sign size, color, and hours of operation; and

**WHEREAS**, on July 22, 2026, the Planning Commission again met and discussed the potential for a modification to the Zoning Ordinance; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment consists of a recommendation only and therefore is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, AND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

1. The Planning Commission finds that: a) the facts set forth in the recitals in this Resolution are true and correct and incorporated by reference; b) the recitals constitute findings in this matter and, together with the staff report, other written reports, public testimony and other information contained in the record, are an adequate and appropriate evidentiary basis for the action taken in this Resolution; c) the provisions in this Resolution and the proposed permanent Ordinance are consistent with the General Plan, Seaside Municipal Code and applicable federal and state law; and d) neither this Resolution nor the Ordinance will be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience or welfare.

2. The Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt an Ordinance amending the Zoning Ordinance as described in the attached Exhibit "A" and make the findings contained therein.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Seaside, State of California, on the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2026, by the following vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

APPROVED:

---

Will Silva, Chairperson

ATTEST:

---

Andrew Myrick, Secretary

Attach:

Exhibit "A" – Zoning Ordinance Amendment Text

## Exhibit "A"

### Zoning Ordinance Amendment Text

#### 17.40.070 Zoning District Sign Standards

Each sign shall comply with the sign area, height, number, type, and other restrictions provided by this section, except as otherwise expressly provided in Section [17.40.080](#) (Standards for Specific Sign Types).

**A. Residential zones.** Each sign in a residential zone shall comply with the following requirements:

**TABLE 3-15 – SIGN STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL ZONES**

| Allowed Sign Types                                                       | Maximum Sign Height                                                                                                                    | Maximum Number of Signs Allowed per Parcel                                   | Maximum Sign Area Allowed per Parcel                                                                                                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Nonresidential Use                                                       |                                                                                                                                        |                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Wall or freestanding                                                     | Wall signs: below edge of roof no higher than 12 ft above grade<br>Freestanding: 6 ft<br>(See Figure 3-17 for sign height measurement) | 1 of either allowed sign type                                                | 32 sf                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Electronic message display signs for private and public meeting facility | <u>Same as above, except freestanding signs Up to 8 ft permitted; (or minor use permit for signs up to 14 ft) on non-local streets</u> | 1 per parcel (may be double-sided with a maximum cabinet depth of 24 inches) | 40 sf per side with a maximum digital screen area of 24 sf (maximum of 2 sides), <u>except on local streets maximum display area shall not exceed 18 square feet per side</u> |

## 17.40.080 Standards for specific sign types

**I. Electronic message display signs.** The following standards apply to electronic message display signs where allowed by Section [17.40.070](#) (Zoning District Sign Standards) (see Tables 3-15 and 3-16):

**1. Location.**

a. Signs shall be located ~~on a either an arterial roadway or collector street~~ in a manner that the Zoning Administrator determines will not adversely interfere with the visibility or functioning of traffic signals or traffic signage, taking into consideration physical elements of the sign and surrounding area, such as information analyzing physical obstruction issues, line of sight issues, brightness issues, and visual obstruction or impairment issues. ~~No electronic changeable message sign shall be permitted on a local street.~~

b. Signs must be 50 feet or more from the nearest residence on the same street as the sign. For purposes of this Subsection I, distances shall be measured from the sign to the nearest residential building (excluding non-habitable accessory structures) using a line-of-sight analysis.

**2. Sign area measurement.** The area of an electronic message display sign does not count toward area limits for other signs in Section [17.40.070](#).

**3. Animation.** Animated messages shall be limited to fading and dissolving, with no other effect to give the appearance of movement.

**4. Audio.** No sign shall include any audio message.

**5. Duration.** Signs messages shall have a minimum hold time of 30 seconds.

**6. Timing.** The sign will not illuminate from the message display area between 9:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., except that this time period shall be from 8:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. if located on a local street (as designated by the then-current General Plan) and is within 100 feet of a residence.

**7. Illumination.** Electronic ~~changeable~~ message display signs may be illuminated with continuous internal LED lighting. No sign shall be illuminated so that the primary source of the light is visible beyond the property line or in any way will cause excessive glare or brightness in excess of 0.3 foot candles. The Zoning Administrator reserves the right to require and/or complete a post-installation inspection of the sign illumination. If, as a result of this inspection, it is determined that the illumination is so bright as to adversely impact adjacent properties and uses,

the Zoning Administrator may require shielding or a reduction and/or adjustment in the intensity of the sign illumination, so that it is in keeping with the general level of illumination of the surrounding properties. Such intensity restriction may vary by time of day and ambient light conditions. Illuminated signs located adjacent to any residential area shall be shielded to direct light downward and away from adjacent properties such that there is no spillover light and shall be controlled by a rheostat or functional equivalent to avoid excessive glare to residential properties.

**8. Light detector.** No permit for such sign shall be issued unless the sign is installed with an automatic or a scheduled dimming time by which the sign's light intensity will reduce when ambient light conditions darken. Such dimming feature shall reduce the light intensity from the sign from dusk to dawn to a level that does not impair the visibility on any adjacent roadway, or be directed onto a residential property.

**9. Permits Required.** In addition to any required Building Permits or other applicable permits, electronic display message signs shall be subject to the following permit processes:

a. An electronic message display sign located on a local street (as designated by the then-current General Plan) or alley may be considered subject to approval of a Sign Permit, provided that the electronic display message sign replaces an existing illuminated sign legally established prior to July 1, 2026, occupies the same location as the existing sign, and is no larger than the existing sign.

b. An electronic message display sign located on a street other than a local street or alley may be allowed with a Sign Permit.

c. All other electronic message display signs shall require approval of a Minor Use Permit.