5. Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

5.1 Aesthetics

This section describes the existing aesthetics setting and the potential effects from the proposed Project implementation on the Project site and its surrounding area. Aesthetics refers to visual considerations, including scenic resources, scenic vistas, changes in visual character, and lighting or glare. Aesthetics analysis is a process to assess logically visible changes and any anticipated viewer response to that change. The analysis herein is based on visual simulations, a Photometric Assessment prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, dated February 15, 2017 (Appendix C), and a Visual Impact Analysis prepared by KTUA, dated September 2017 (Appendix G).

The Visual Impact Analysis divided the area surrounding the Project into visual assessment units to evaluate the aesthetic impacts that the proposed Project would have on different viewer groups. Each viewer group is expected to have a common perception or sensitivity based on the visual quality and character of their associated visual assessment unit since visual impacts are relative to the visual environment in which they are found. The visual quality and visual character of each visual assessment unit were evaluated to determine the proposed Project’s visual impact on the visual experience and common perception.

The Visual Impact Analysis categorized the Project site and surrounding areas according to 18 visual assessment units. The visual quality (vividness, memorability, intactness) and visual character (harmony, visual interest, consistency of materials, textures, colors and scale) of each assessment unit were evaluated to determine the proposed Project’s impact based on contrast to setting. Each of the 18 visual assessment units are analyzed using a scale of 0 through 4, where 0 represents “none” and 4 represents “high,” to determine the magnitude of impact the proposed Project would have on each viewer group with respect to visibility of Project signage and number of viewers. The distance of views from the assessment unit to the Project are also presented, and are found on Table 5-1.

The described visual assessment units are typically defined by the limits of a particular viewshed with perceivable boundaries. These boundaries are generally created by landforms, with edges defined by vegetation, buildings, and fencing. The visual assessment units are used to represent the context of where viewer groups may be found, while also assessing visual quality and character from the visually prominent elements of the proposed Project, as shown on Exhibit 5-1 – Visual Assessment Units.

Photos A through Q are included to provide a visual representation of identifying characteristics for each of the referenced visual assessment units, as shown on Exhibit 5-2 through Exhibit 5-4. The identifying characteristics include uses such as public facility, commercial, urban corridor, light industrial, residential, open space, school, hotel, and the outlet center.
5.1.1 Existing Conditions

The City of San Clemente is bisected by the I-5 Freeway and is generally characterized by tall hills and ridgelines to the east, with bluffs and mesas to the west. Ocean views are prominent from near and distant locations within the City. The I-5 Freeway corridor is generally characterized by residential uses east of the freeway and commercial and industrial development concentrated west of the freeway near Avenida Pico. Existing signage is visible in close proximity to the Project site denoting said commercial developments.

The Project site is developed with a portion of a 641,000-square-foot regional commercial center, including an approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center and an approved, unbuilt hotel. The outlet buildings on the Project site have a Spanish style architecture. Also visible on and near the Project site are graded slopes, parking lots, and I-5 Freeway northbound and southbound travel lanes. The regional commercial center is located within the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan, which encompasses a large area within the western portion of the City and includes single-family and multi-family housing and open space. Existing sources of light and glare include the outlet parking lot lighting, building lighting, landscape lighting, freeway lighting, lighting from car headlights and park lighting.

5.1.2 Regulatory Setting

City of San Clemente

The City of San Clemente has several regulatory documents which provide guidance related to aesthetics. First, the City’s General Plan identifies scenic corridors and scenic vistas, which are detailed in the Initial Study (Appendix A). Next, the City’s Zoning Ordinance Section 17.04.020(e) identifies that the purpose and intent of the zoning code is to “Preserve the traditional scale and seaside orientation of the City and provide for reasonable preservation of public views.” Neither the General Plan nor the Zoning Ordinance provide protection of private views, as further detailed herein.

1. Sign Ordinance

The City’s Sign Ordinance stated purpose is to protect the City’s historical and residential essence, while ensuring individual expression and attractive community character. The City established specific objectives to ensure economic viability and its overall attractiveness, which include:

- To promote a high quality business environment by assuring that signs are complementary to the City’s goals for historic preservation and quality urban design;
- To ensure that signs are carefully designed, aesthetically pleasing, appropriately maintained, and professional in appearance;
- To reduce possible traffic and safety hazards through reduced sign clutter, the elimination of unauthorized signs in the public right-of-way, and minimizing visual competition among signs;
- To minimize the visual and lighting impacts of business signs on adjacent residential neighborhoods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-1</th>
<th>Visual Assessment Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Assessment Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outlets at San Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open / Under Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Open Space / Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Freeway Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Major Urban Corridor (Avenida Vista Hermosa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Major Urban Corridor (Avenida Pico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Multi-family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Open / Undeveloped Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Multi-family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Church / Place of Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I-5 Freeway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Foreground: Less than 1/8 mile; Middleground: 1/8 to 1/2 mile; Background: Greater than 1/2 mile
² Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.1, Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Signage, September 2017
Exhibit 5-1 – Visual Assessment Units

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Signage and Project Identification Tower
Exhibit 5-2  – Visual Assessment Unit Photos

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Signage and Project Identification Tower
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Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Signage and Project Identification Tower

Exhibit 5-3 – Visual Assessment Unit Photos
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Exhibit 5-4 – Visual Assessment Unit Photos

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Signage and Project Identification Tower
Related to the general design standards, Section 17.84 of the Municipal Code establishes that signs must be constructed of permanent materials such as metal or other compatible, durable, and waterproof material. Sign scale and colors must be compatible with the style of buildings and must be oriented to minimize light or glare upon adjacent residential properties and public rights of way.

In addition to the City's Sign Ordinance, the City has a set of design guidelines intended to “preserve and strengthen San Clemente's unique atmosphere and historic identity.” These guidelines are used by the City to evaluate proposed development Projects subject to discretionary design review.

2. **Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan**

The purpose of the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan Development Standards and Guidelines is to ensure that development within the Marblehead Coastal Plan area will be consistent with the City's General Plan goals, Urban Design Program, and Master Landscape Plan for Scenic Corridors. This Specific Plan provides the following design objectives:

- Preserve and strengthen San Clemente’s unique character as the "Spanish Village by the Sea."
- Define a consistent approach to site planning, architecture, streetscape, lighting, landscaping, and other design elements to achieve visual harmony within Marblehead Coastal.
- Recognize the unique character, constraints, and opportunities of the Marblehead Coastal area.

3. **Marblehead Coastal Development Standards and Guidelines**

The proposed signage is subject to the following guidelines and standards:

**Site Design Guidelines** (only those that apply have been listed below)

E. Project Identification Signs - Projects should be identified by low monument signage to provide neighborhood identification. Such signs should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with residential buildings, walls, and other structures, and shall conform to the City's Sign Ordinance.

**Commercial Development**

D. Signs - Commercial centers should be identified by a sign program with monument signage and wall signs for individual tenants. Such signs may include logos, and should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with project buildings, walls, and other structures. Due to the size and proportions of the buildings, appropriate scaled signage may require maximum sign area allowances greater than currently specified in the City's Sign Ordinance. A specific Sign Plan accounting for all such allowances shall be provided for consideration at the time of site plan review.

Freestanding signage shall be integrated with the overall architectural and landscape design for the commercial center. Multiple locations for the freestanding signage shall be permitted and appropriately located with respect to multiple frontages and entries into the center.
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Architectural Guidelines

Section 305 II-D-5 - Signs should be integrated into the architectural design of the building in a manner consistent with the intent of the City's Sign Ordinance, as well as the architectural elements, scale, and massing of the project.

5.1.3 Thresholds of Significance

The City thresholds of significance for the evaluation of Project impacts in the area of Aesthetics are based upon suggested criteria from the CEQA Environmental Checklist in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA protection of views generally pertains to public views and not private views. In this instance, the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance identify a “reasonable preservation of public views” but do not provide any specific protection of private views. The Project would result in a significant impact if it would:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

5.1.4 Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation

1. Short-Term Impacts

Short-term impacts to aesthetics are those associated with the Project during Project construction phases. The installation of signs on the existing buildings of Phase 1, the future buildings of Phase 2 and the hotel, and the Icon Tower will have dominant views from the residences and the church located across the I-5 Freeway, as well as traffic traveling both directions on the I-5 Freeway. Installation timing will be staggered, as it is anticipated that the signs for Phase 1 and the Icon Tower would be completed upon Project approval, while the signs for Phase 2 and the hotel would be completed independently of one another in the future once those buildings have been constructed.

The proposed signs would be installed on the outer walls of the outlet center, on an archway connecting Building 17A and 17B and the hotel, or on a Project sign monument, referred to as the Icon Tower. The activities for installation of signs to the outlet center and the hotel buildings include drilling anchor holes into the walls, fastening power feeds, mounting a watertight sign backing, and mounting the sign face. Installation activities require minimal construction equipment such as a snorkel or scissor lift. The duration for wall installation activities of Phase 1 is anticipated to occur over the span of a few days, as each sign takes a two-technician team 4 to 8 hours to install, and multiple technician teams will work simultaneously to ensure the signs are installed quickly. The duration of Phase 2 installation is anticipated to be similar to Phase 1; however, due to the small quantity of hotel signs, the duration of the hotel sign installation is anticipated to be much shorter than installation on the outlet center.
The Icon Tower is proposed to be located at the southeast corner of the subject property immediately beyond the existing parking lot. Construction activities for the Icon Tower would include minor site preparation work and construction of the Icon Tower. The equipment used and construction duration would be similar to that of the wall signs.

2. Long-Term Impacts

Long-term impacts to aesthetics are those associated with the Project upon completion of all Project construction phases and are generally related to operational impacts. The outlet center is described herein as typically operating from 10:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. However, individual tenant hours may vary, with stores closing as early as 8:00 p.m. or later during seasonal special hours of operation. Signs will automatically shut off 1 hour after the close of individual tenants, and the Icon Tower will be shut off at 10:00 p.m. However, the movie theatre and a select number of restaurants will remain open after 10:00 p.m., as will their signage. The hotel and hotel signage will operate 24-hours a day.

The visual impacts of a Project include both the objective visual resource change created by the Project and the subjective viewer response to that change. Distance from the Project, frequency of view, length of view, viewer activity, viewer perception, and viewing conditions contribute to the assessment of a visual impact. The physical limits and changes of the views and the quantity of the viewers are objective. Viewer perception is subjective.

The perception of different viewer groups to the visual environment and its elements varies based on viewer activity and awareness. Activities such as commuting in heavy traffic can distract an observer from many aspects of the visual environment. Conversely, pleasure driving or relaxing in a scenic environment can encourage an observer to look at the view more closely and at greater length, thereby increasing the observer’s attention to detail. Sensitivity is also determined by how much the viewer has at stake in the viewshed. Typically, people who own property in an area are more sensitive to change than those just passing through an area. As such, views from residential neighborhoods are included in the visual impact assessment for disclosure purposes. However, views from private areas – including views from residences, backyards, or other private areas such as private streets – are not considered within the impact assessment, because the City’s regulatory documents do not provide protection of private views and because CEQA does not consider private views in determining an aesthetic impact.

Viewshed Analysis

The Visual Impact Analysis provided a theoretical viewshed showing that the proposed signs are potentially visible mostly from both the northbound and southbound lanes of I-5, as well as areas to the north, south, and east of the Project site. The approximate distances from the Project site to the selected 51 area viewpoint locations are shown on Exhibit 5-5 – Signage Viewshed – Regional.

To quantify impacts experienced by neighboring communities, the proposed Project was assigned a point system by the Visual Impact Analysis. In the point system, each sign represents three points and there are 36 signs proposed for a total of 108 possible points. The area viewshed and assigned visual points are depicted on Exhibit 5-6 – Signage Viewshed – Local.
Exhibit 5-5 – Signage Viewshed – Regional

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage, September 2017
Exhibit 5-6  – Signage Viewshed – Local

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage, September 2017
From most points within the highlighted viewshed area, vegetation, structures, and topography between the viewer and the Project site block views of the site. Points with the greatest potential to view the site have been selected as Candidate Key Views, and are discussed and analyzed for potential changes due to Project development, in the Visual Character section below.

The roads and viewpoints shown on the viewshed map include private roads, as well as property inaccessible by the general public, which are considered as private views. It is possible for a local city to implement its own thresholds of significance for determining significant visual impacts. However, San Clemente has not developed these local standards. While this analysis is only required to consider public views based on the CEQA guidelines and the City’s General Plan, private views have been included in the analysis to provide a more thorough depiction of potential aesthetics impacts and changes to the visual setting.

The proposed Project will be viewed by several types of viewer groups. An individual might belong to more than one viewer group in the course of a day. However, the sensitivity and exposure of each group varies due to the amount of time a view is available to a viewer (duration of view) and the viewer’s awareness at the time the view is available. A viewer’s exposure can be estimated by the size of the viewer group, the proximity of the viewer in relation to the proposed location, and the duration of views available of the Project site. Viewer sensitivity to changes in the visual environment can be estimated through a combination of their level of activity (allowing them to focus on the views), their awareness (which can limit their focus), their engagement in local interests, and the value they place on local views.

The viewer groups present in the Project area are defined as the following:

1. Freeway Drivers: Those drivers traveling on I-5.
2. Local Area Drivers: Drivers on Avenida Vista Hermosa, Avenida Pico, and Calle de Los Molinos.
3. Local Area Workers/Customers: Those working/visiting at nearby commercial establishments and light industrial employment centers.
4. Adjacent Residents: Those living to the north and west of the Project site.
5. Distant Residents: Those living to the east of the Project site, across I-5.

Lighting can also have a significant effect on views. Clouds and fog can change viewing conditions by increasing or decreasing contrast. Atmospheric conditions in Orange County tend to be hazy a large percentage of the time. A combination of fog, mist, haze, and smog combine to decrease visibility to less than 2 to 3 miles. Often, details of visual features are not discernible when more than 3 miles away. A 2-mile buffer has been marked on the Project viewshed map. Based on typical viewing conditions in this area, objects more than 2 miles away generally will not be considered visually prominent.

Viewing duration for northbound I-5 would be less than 1 minute, considering average speeds of the freeway. Due to limited visibility from the southbound I-5 direction, the
duration is expected to be less than 30 seconds. Workers and customers of local businesses, are likely to see the Project while traveling anywhere from a few seconds to a few minutes. Residential views of the Project site could be as long as the sunlight hours in a day. Nighttime views of lighting/signage for churchgoers, depending on if there is an outside event, are likely to be visible for 1 to 15 minutes in duration, given other activities and directions of view are available.

The analysis provided considers view impacts to several types of viewers. The greatest visual impacts of the proposed Project will be observed by the residences and the church located across the I-5 Freeway, which have direct views of the Project site. However, the City has not adopted thresholds of significance for protecting private views, and CEQA guidelines only consider public views.

Following is a summary of potential aesthetics resources impacts associated with development of the proposed Project.

Visual Character

The Visual Impact Analysis provided candidate key views as a representation of locations that have been identified to represent the best location for typical views for each viewer group. Key views were selected based on locations that most clearly display the visual contrasts of the Project and are representative of primary viewer groups that would potentially be affected by the Project.

The primary factors that were taken into account for the selection of Candidate Key Views include Project elements visible at the location, the dominant viewer group, number of viewers, sensitivity of viewer to change, visibility rating, distance from viewer to Project site, and signage. A tabular inventory and summary of the primary factors used for selecting candidate key views for simulation, including an impact scale of 0 through 4, where 0 represents “none” and 4 represents “high,” is shown below on Table 5-2 below.

Candidate Key Views

For the purpose of this analysis, all views listed on Table 5-2 are considered key views. A key view that is classified as a candidate key view is one that may display visual changes and has the potential to show or not show a significant impact. Those candidate key views were narrowed to the final recommendations for visual simulations.
### Table 5-2  Candidate Key View Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and tower</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 3</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Built Outlets</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be moderately visible</td>
<td>No, Key View 2 is closer to development and signage can be seen in more detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and tower</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 4</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Built Outlets</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be highly visible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-5 SB / Avenida Vista Hermosa Off-ramp</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and tower</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 4</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Phase 2 Outlets</td>
<td>Berm obscures some of the proposed signage. So only partially visible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calle de Industrias</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and tower</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Middleground to Background</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Calle Frontera</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Local Driver / Residents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets and Phase 2 Outlets</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be partially visible</td>
<td>No, Key View 10 is better because it shows planned hotel and signage from Visual Assessment Unit 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>St. Andrews by the Sea</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Church attendees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be partially visible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Outlets and Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-5 SB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 5</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Hotel and Phase 2</td>
<td>Outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Calle Frontera</td>
<td>Proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 5</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Avenida Vista Hermosa</td>
<td>Proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employee / Resident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 5</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Avenida Vista Hermosa</td>
<td>Proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 5</td>
<td>Foreground</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Avenida Vista Hermosa</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 4</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
### Key View #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pacific Coast Church</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Church attendees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 4</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Proposed hotel signage would be visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marblehead Inland</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and planned outlets</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Calle Miguel</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Resident</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and proposed hotel</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets, Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Freeway SB 1/2 mile from hotel</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Avenida Presidio more than 1 mile</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2815 Corte Esmeralda</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2410 Calle Aquamarina</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2246 Calle Opalo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2402 Via Mero</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>703 Corte Topacio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2333 Via Aguilla to the NW</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2312 Calle Almirante</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2304 Calle Almirante</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2401 Camino Bucanero</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
### 5.1 – Aesthetics

#### Key View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2318 Avenida Manejada</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2340 Avenida Manejada</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2148 Via Teca</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2211 Via Galvan</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2233 Avenida Platanar</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207 Avenida Platanar</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2129 Avenida Oliva slightly less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2129 Avenida Oliva 1/4 mile</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
## 5.1 – Aesthetics

### Table 5.1: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2011 Via Aguilla</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2003 Via Mango</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2005 Paseo Laro</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2178 Calle Ola Verde 3/8 mile to hotel</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2141 Calle Ola Verde slightly more than 1/8 mile</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41a</td>
<td>2165 Avenida Espada more than 1/2 mile to hotel</td>
<td>Portions of the proposed buildings and hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 3</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41b</td>
<td>2165 Avenida Espada 1/4 mile to outlet</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The proposed signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage, September 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2035 Via Mandaraya 3/8 mile</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The proposed signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Via Teca and Ave Faceta</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2111 Avenida Oliva</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2179 Via Aguila</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2182 Via Teca</td>
<td>Proposed Hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2245 Avenida Oliva 3/8 mile from outlet</td>
<td>Portions of existing and proposed buildings</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>651 Via Faisan</td>
<td>Proposed Hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>MarbleHead Entrance on Aven Faceta</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
### Table 3.4: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>Avenida Faceta and Via Teca</td>
<td>Portions of existing buildings and hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50b</td>
<td>Avenida Faceta and Via Teca</td>
<td>Portions of existing and proposed buildings and hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets, Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Avenida Faceta and Via Agulla</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Exhibit 5-7 – Candidate Key View Locations Aerial shows 51 Key Views that were reviewed for visual analysis, the 9 views that are included in the 3D Model Overlay, and the 10 views that are included in the visual simulations. The exhibit is color coded by views that are Key Views (green), have a 3D Model Overlay (orange), and Simulated Key View (red). In addition, the exhibit provides a color-coded depiction of sign visibility, depicting the surrounding locations from which the signs will be visible; the darker the color, the greater number of visible signs. Locations with the highest number of visible signs will be from the back yards of residences located easterly across the I-5 Freeway. In addition, a high concentration of signs will be visible from the neighborhood located southeast of the Project site, east of the I-5 Freeway and south of San Clemente High School, primarily along Avenida La Cuesta. There is substantial fluctuation between the quantity of visible signage from both residential neighborhoods. The fluctuation is due to existing topography and the presence of residential dwelling units that block views.

Following Exhibit 5-7 is a series of key view photographs. The key view photographs are provided on Exhibit 5-8 through Exhibit 5-51. Each exhibit contains a photograph from the locations identified on Exhibit 5-7. Many of the key views are provided with a corresponding 3D Model Overlay under the photo. The 3D model overlay was used in assessing the rough approximation of the proposed project to identify appropriate view locations for the more detailed View Simulations. As such, the 3D model overlays are not intended as photo realistic simulations of a specific view, and readers may notice minor project components that do not appear in precise locations. The 10 View Simulations that are included as Exhibit 5-52 through Exhibit 5-61 do provide a precise simulation of the proposed project.

Each key view – or key view with 3D model overlay – includes a notation indicating which visual features may be visible from that location. Each visual feature visible from a key view location is represented with an orange box. When the outlets site is not visible, the “none” box is selected. Even when the “none” box is selected, Project elements may appear within the 3D simulation model overlay to help orient the reader. For example, in certain instances, signs are physically blocked by topographic features such as a berm, or are located behind a bridge or a road. In those cases, signs or buildings may be superimposed onto the 3D simulation to illustrate that the sign(s) are accounted for, but not visible from that vantage point. See key views 3-5 and 18.
Exhibit 5-7 – Candidate Key View Locations Aerial

Source: Figure 3.5; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-8 – Candidate Key View 1 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 2: View on Interstate 5 northbound looking west

For this keyview, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-9 – Candidate Key View 2 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 3: View on Interstate 5 southbound looking southwest

Exhibit 5-10  – Candidate Key View 3 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-11  – Candidate Key View 4 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-12 – Candidate Key View 5 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-13  – Candidate Key View 6 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 7: View on Interstate 5 northbound looking west toward the hotel site

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- [ ] Signs
- [ ] Tower
- [ ] Existing stores
- [ ] Future stores
- [ ] Future hotel
- [ ] None

Candidate Key View Photograph 7: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-14 – Candidate Key View 7 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-15 – Candidate Key View 8 Photographs
5.1 – Aesthetics

Candidate Key View Photograph 9: View on Interstate 5 southbound looking southeast

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- [ ] signs
- [ ] tower
- [ ] existing stores
- [ ] future stores
- [ ] future hotel
- [ ] none

Candidate Key View Photograph 9: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-16 – Candidate Key View 9 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 10: View from Calle Frontera looking southwest toward the hotel site

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- [ ] Signs
- [ ] Tower
- [ ] Existing stores
- [ ] Future stores
- [ ] Future hotel
- [ ] None

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-17 — Candidate Key View 10 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 11: View from Avenida Vista Hermosa looking north toward the hotel site

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 11: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-18  – Candidate Key View 11 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 12: View from Avenida Vista Hermosa looking south toward the hotel site

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 12: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-19 – Candidate Key View 12 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 13: View from Avenida Vista Hermosa looking south toward the hotel site

Candidate Key View Photograph 13: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-20 – Candidate Key View 13 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 14: View from Pacific Coast Church looking south

For this keyview, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- Signs
- Tower
- Existing stores
- Future stores
- Future hotel
- None

Candidate Key View Photograph 14: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-21 – Candidate Key View 14 Photographs
5.1 – Aesthetics

Candidate Key View Photograph 15: View from Marblehead Inland looking south

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- new signs
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 15: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-22 – Candidate Key View 15 Photographs
Exhibit 5-23 – Candidate Key View 16 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 17: View on Interstate 5 northbound

For this keyview, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- [ ] signs
- [ ] tower
- [ ] existing stores
- [ ] future stores
- [ ] future hotel
- [ ] none

Candidate Key View Photograph 17: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-24 – Candidate Key View 17 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-25 – Candidate Key View 18 Photographs
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- Signs
- Tower
- Existing stores
- Future stores
- Future hotel

Candidate Key View Photograph 19: View from Avenida Presidio looking west

Candidate Key View Photograph 20: 2815 Corte Esmerelda

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-26 – Candidate Key View 19 Photographs
Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-27 – Candidate Key Views 21 and 22 Photographs
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 23: 2402 Via Mero

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 24: 703 Corte Topacio

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-28 – Candidate Key Views 23 and 24 Photographs
Exhibit 5-29  – Candidate Key Views 25 and 26 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-30 – Candidate Key Views 27 and 28 Photographs
Exhibit 5-31  – Candidate Key Views 29a and 29b Photographs
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Exhibit 5-32 – Candidate Key Views 30 and 31 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-33 – Candidate Key Views 32 and 33 Photographs
5.1 – Aesthetics

For this keyview, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 34: 2207 Avenida Platano

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Candidate Key View Photograph 35a: 2129 Avenida Oliva

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-34 – Candidate Key Views 34 and as Photographs
For this keyview, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- signs
- tower
- existing trees
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 35b: 2129 Avenida Oliva

Candidate Key View Photograph 36: 2011 Via Aquilla

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-35  – Candidate Key Views be and 36 Photographs
For this keyview, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 37: 2003 Via Mango

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

For this keyview, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 38: 2005 Paseo Lars

Exhibit 5-36 – Candidate Key Views 37 and 38 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-37 – Candidate Key View 39 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-38 – Candidate Key View 40 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 41a: 2141 Avenida Espada looking west towards hotel

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- [ ] signs
- [ ] tower
- [ ] existing stores
- [ ] future stores
- [ ] future hotel
- [ ] score

Candidate Key View Photograph 41a: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-39  – Candidate Key View 41a Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 41b: 2165 Avenida Espada looking southwest towards outlet

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-40 – Candidate Key View 41b Photographs
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- [ ] signs
- [ ] tower
- [ ] existing trees
- [ ] future trees
- [ ] future hotel
- [ ] none

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-41 — Candidate Key View 42 Photographs
Exhibit 5-42 – Candidate Key View 43 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-43  – Candidate Key View 44 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-44 – Candidate Key View 45 Photographs
Exhibit 5-45  – Candidate Key View 46 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-46 – Candidate Key View 47 Photographs
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November 2017 The Outlets at San Clemente

Candidate Key View Photograph 48: View on Calle Frante looking southwest toward the hotel site

For this keyview, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-47 – Candidate Key View 48 Photographs
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Exhibit 5-48 – Candidate Key View 49 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 50a: Avenida Foothills & Via Teca

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- Signs
- Tower
- Existing stores
- Future stores
- Future hotel
- none

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Candidate Key View Photograph 50a: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-49 – Candidate Key View 50a Photographs
5.1 – Aesthetics

Exhibit 5-50 – Candidate Key View 50b Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

 Candidate Key View Photograph 51: Avenida De La Costa & Via Agulla

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-51  – Candidate Key View 51 Photograph
This page intentionally blank
Visual Simulations

Of the 54 candidate key views presented in the Visual Impact Analysis, Project signage is not visible from 35 of the locations. As detailed in Table 5-1 (page 61), 10 candidate views were chosen for simulation (Views 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, and 41a) because these represent vantage points with the greatest visibility. More specifically, the views were chosen for additional analysis and simulation based on 1) Medium to large number of viewers; 2) Proximity of the viewer to the Project; 3) Public views having a higher priority than private views; and 4) Visibility of the Project elements. Key Views 2 and 3 were chosen because of their proximity to the Project, while Key Views 8, 9 and 13 were chosen because of their large number of public viewers. Key Views 6 and 10 were selected because the signage can be seen in more detail. Key Views 16, 41a, and 41b were added based on key views that were more distant or where in the Marblehead housing development areas that were evaluated in the past. Key View 17 was added to evaluate the first point to the south on I-5 that northbound viewers can see the Project. The following are descriptions of the locations of Exhibit 5-52 through Exhibit 5-61.

Visual Assessment View 2

View 2 (Exhibit 5-52) shows the existing view and simulated view of the proposed Project as seen from the northbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway just north of Avenida Pico looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 400 feet from the Project site. As depicted in the simulated view, northbound traffic at this location on the I-5 Freeway will have a direct view of the proposed Icon Tower located on top of the berm and an obscured view of the proposed hotel. The outlet center buildings are viewed in the background, set back from the berm and Icon Tower by the parking lot. In addition to the slight increase in elevation, the buildings are set back from the freeway by approximately 180 feet. The building tenant ID signage would be somewhat recognizable, and the building Project ID signs would provide adequate recognition to vehicle passengers on the freeway. The Icon Tower signage would be fully recognizable from this vantage. The hotel Project ID signs would be unrecognizable from this vantage.
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Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

**Exhibit 5-52 – Candidate Key View 2 Visual Simulation**
Visual Assessment View 3

View 3 (Exhibit 5-53) shows the existing view and simulated view of the proposed Project as seen from the southbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway lateral to the northern corner of Phase 1 of the outlet center looking southwesterly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 120 feet from the Project site. As depicted in the simulated view, southbound traffic at this location on the I-5 Freeway have direct view of the berm and a slightly obscured view of the outlet center buildings sitting on top of the berm with the Icon Tower viewable in the background. In addition to the berm resulting in a slight increase in elevation, the buildings are set back from the freeway by approximately 75 feet due to the parking lot located between the berm and outlet buildings. The building tenant ID and Project ID signs would be fully recognizable from this vantage. The Icon Tower tenant ID and Project ID signs would be recognizable in the background. The hotel location is not in view from this vantage, as it is past the hotel site.
Exhibit 5-53  – Candidate Key View 3 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 6

**View 6** (Exhibit 5-54) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from Saint Andrews Church located along Calle Frontera near Avenida Pico looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 1,000 feet from the Project site and at a slightly higher elevation looking down toward the Project site. As depicted in the simulated view, this location has a partly obscured view of the outlet center buildings and Icon Tower, and very minimal to no view of the hotel. The tenant ID and Project ID signs on the buildings and the Icon Tower would be noticeable at this location; however, the existing outlet center is part of the current viewshed and recognition of individual lettering on building signs will vary from observer to observer due to the distance. The hotel Project ID signs would not be recognizable from this location.
Exhibit 5-54  – Candidate Key View 6 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 8

View 8 (Exhibit 5-55) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the northbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway midway between Avenida Pico and Avenida Vista Hermosa looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 500 feet from the Project site, which is approximately 300 feet closer to the hotel than view 7. As depicted on the simulated view, northbound traffic at this location on the I-5 Freeway has a direct view of the future hotel. There is very little grade differential at this location and the buildings are set back from the edge of the property by approximately 80 feet due to the parking lot located between the berm and hotel buildings. The tenant ID and Project ID signs on the buildings and Icon Tower are not visible from this vantage. Hotel ID signs would be recognizable from this vantage.
Exhibit 5-55 – Candidate Key View 8 Visual Simulation

Note: Detailed site grading or architectural plans or 3D models do not exist for the hotel. This simulation accuracy is as best as can be expected given the available materials.

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 9

View 9 (Exhibit 5-56) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the southbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway just past Avenida Vista Hermosa looking southwesterly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 400 feet from the Project site. As depicted on the simulated view, southbound traffic at this location on the I-5 Freeway has a direct view of the future hotel. The outlet center and the Icon Tower are mostly obscured by the grade differential produced by the berm and the angle of this vantage. Hotel ID signs would be recognizable from this vantage.
Exhibit 5-56 – Candidate Key View 9 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 10

**View 10** (Exhibit 5-57) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the vacant lot located across the I-5 Freeway on Calle Frontera looking southwesterly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 600 feet from the Project site. As depicted on the simulated view, pedestrians and vehicles traveling along Calle Frontera have a direct view of the future hotel, including clearly recognizable hotel signage. The outlet center and the Icon Tower are not shown in this simulation but would also be visible from this vantage point. Tenant ID and Project ID signs would be visible and recognizable.
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Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-57 – Candidate Key View 10 Visual Simulation

Note: Detailed site grading or architectural plans or 3D models do not exist for the hotel. This simulation accuracy is as best as can be expected given the available materials.
Visual Assessment View 13

View 13 (Exhibit 5-58) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from westbound Avenida Vista Hermosa looking southerly, across the I-5 Freeway, toward the Project site. This location is approximately 400 feet from the Project site and approximately 650 feet to the future hotel building. This vantage is relatively direct with a few bushes or trees potentially obscuring views. The outlet center and Icon Tower cannot be seen at this angle. Hotel ID signs would be slightly recognizable from this vantage.
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Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-58 – Candidate Key View 13 Visual Simulation

Note: Envisioned site grading or architectural plans or 3D models do not exist for the hotel. This simulation accuracy is as best as can be expected given the available materials.
Visual Assessment View 16

View 16 (Exhibit 5-59) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from Calle Miguel looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately a mile away from the Project site. This vantage is from a relatively high elevation that provides immediate views of houses and landscaping with the I-5 Freeway and the outlet center in the distance and the Marblehead development area in the far distance. Depending on weather conditions, the outlet center tenant ID and Project ID signs and the hotel Project ID signs would be only slightly discernable and would not be recognizable from this vantage.
Exhibit 5-59  – Candidate Key View 16 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 17

View 17 (Exhibit 5-60) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the northbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway just north of Avenida Pico off-ramp looking northwesterly toward the Project site. This location is approximately a half mile from the Project site. The immediate views from this vantage are of the northbound and southbound traffic of the I-5 Freeway with the outlet center located at a slightly higher elevation in the northwest distance. The Icon Tower signs would be discernable from this vantage; however, the outlet center tenant ID and Project ID and hotel Project ID signs would not be recognizable.
Exhibit 5-60  – Candidate Key View 17 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 41a

View 41a (Exhibit 5-61) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the inland Marblehead housing community area looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately a half mile from the Project site. The immediate view from this vantage include landscape and houses with the future phase 2 of the outlet center, future hotel and Marblehead coastal community in the distance and the Pacific Ocean in the far distance. The outlet center tenant ID and Project ID signs would not be discernable from this vantage and the hotel ID signs would be only slightly discernable.
Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-61 — Candidate Key View 41a Visual Simulation
**View Simulations Conclusion**

As detailed in the Visual Impact Analysis, while the signage is proposed to be placed in visible locations, the signage is consistent with a commercial development in terms of overall size, form, and lighting, and is not dominant in the viewing scene. Visibility of signage is generally from the I-5 Freeway and from farther east along Calle Frontera (east of the Faire Harbour Condominiums). The proposed signage is generally limited to 100 square feet, where 5 of the 27 tenant signs would exceed 100 square feet ranging from 100.5 to 127.5 square feet. In addition, two of the four of the Project ID signs would exceed 100 square feet. According to the Visual Impact Assessment, legibility of 100-square-foot signs is limited to approximately one-quarter mile. In total, 7 of the 36 proposed signs would exceed 100 square feet. The five tenant signs that exceed 100 square feet may be marginally more visible, with two of the Project ID signs, which are 200 square feet, also visible.

The proposed Project Icon Tower is scaled to the surrounding buildings and relates to the forms of the adjacent outlet buildings. The signage materials proposed for the Icon Tower will be consistent with rest of the Project signage and will not contrast with its setting.

The wall signs are proposed to be placed in a consistent manner with locations between wall towers, rooflines, and protruding wall spaces. While there would be a variation in fonts and colors, the overall company names and logos are balanced with each other and with the scale of the walls on which they are placed. The proposed signs are balanced and scaled for the size of the building, and are placed in consistent locations. If the signage were of varying scales, styles, materials, and lighting sources, and were randomly placed in different locations on the buildings, a potential visual quality impact could occur. However, the balance in scale, design, and number of signs are compatible and consistent, resulting in a uniform visual perspective.

**Light and Glare**

**Light and Glare from Sign Materials**

The proposed sign materials are matte-finished with no mirrored glass panes, highly polished metal materials or other highly reflective surfaces. As such, signs are not anticipated to produce daytime glare. Exhibit 4-6 (page 42) depicts the colors and materials to be used for the signs.

**Photometric Assessment**

A Photometric Assessment was prepared for the Project for the purpose of investigating on-site and surrounding off-site impacts produced by the installation signage on the subject site. The Photometric Assessment is included as Appendix C. A computer model was used to compare lighting levels using a measurement in foot-candles at 5-feet above the ground between the existing condition and the Project buildout condition at 376 distinct plot locations on the Project site.
The Photometric study analyzed the potential increase in lighting levels that would result from the implementation of the proposed Project. Based on computer model output, the photometric report concluded that the Project would generate an increase of on-site levels immediately adjacent to the proposed outlet and hotel signage ranging from one to three foot-candles. Lighting of the Icon Tower will result in an increase in illumination levels in the immediate vicinity of the tower by approximately 10 foot-candles. However, off-site lighting levels due to the proposed Icon Tower will only increase by one foot-candle along a small part of the I-5 Freeway and to the proposed hotel and outlet signage are predicted to have zero off-site lighting impacts, as shown on Exhibit 5-62 below.

The adjacent properties would have no discernable incremental increases in lighting due to the proposed signage. The proposed Project will not result in off-site spillage (glare) to adjoining properties or public rights-of-way.

**Sign Lighting**

The sign lighting will be done by backlighting, with the metal box letters and logos held away from the wall. An internal lighting system will cast light back onto the wall where the raised letters or logo will block this portion of the light from shining off-site. The void created by this technique is enough to provide recognition of the lettering and logo forms. This approach is subtle and will control light spillover because lighting is beamed directly at the building behind the sign. There will be no light pollution that will negatively affect sensitive receptors because the amount of light produced is minimal. As discussed above, the proposed Project will not generate a discernable increase in the amount of off-site lighting. The proposed reverse channel halo lighting is detailed on Exhibit 5-63 below.

**Tower Lighting**

The tower will be lighted with down-lighting and up-lighting. Spillover for up-lighting and down-lighting is controlled by light cut-off functions included as an integral part of the light fixture. This reduces spillover lighting and helps to keep the light from negatively affecting a driver passing by on the freeway and to avoid unnecessary light spillover.
FIGURE 5b: Predicted Project (36 Project Signs) Illumination Levels, 100-Ft Increments (ISE 1/17)

Exhibit 5-62 – Photometric Plan
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Exhibit 5-63 – Sign Lighting Example
General Night Lighting

The outlets center is developed with surface parking lots which include light standards for parking lot safety, landscape lighting and building lighting. A comparison of outlet center daytime views with and without signage is included as Exhibit 5-64 – Daytime View Comparison. The pictures on the left-hand side of the exhibit represent original views as they currently exist. The pictures on the right-hand side of the exhibit represent the existing views with added sign simulations.

A comparison of outlet center nighttime views with and without signage is included as Exhibit 5-65 – Nighttime View Comparison. The comparison between the existing nighttime views and Project nighttime views depict proposed signage as having a minimal amount of backlighting for the purpose of creating a visual depth that will allow the signs to be legible to people on-site, in the vicinity, and traveling on the I-5 Freeway.

The proposed signs will be most visible from the Faire Harbour Condominiums located to the east across the I-5 Freeway because of the close proximity to the outlet site. While the sign lighting will be visible during the nighttime hours, the sign lighting will not result in a new source of light and glare because the outlet site is already extensively lit. The photometric plan demonstrates that there will be no spill generated from the sign lighting onto off-site locations, especially those across the I-5 Freeway. The prominence of lit signs will diminish with the attenuation provided by distance.

In addition to the nighttime view comparisons provided above, visual simulations were prepared from Key View locations 8, 9, 10 and 13 because those vantage points present the most direct views of the proposed signage. Night lighting as viewed from these four nearby locations including the I-5 Freeway northbound immediately adjacent to the Project site looking east toward the hotel site, I-5 Freeway southbound immediately adjacent to the Project site looking east toward the Project site, the empty lot along Calle Frontera located across the I-5 Freeway looking east toward the hotel site, and from a location along Avenida Vista Hermosa and Calle Frontera looking east toward the Project site are shown on Exhibit 5-66 through Exhibit 5-69.

As shown on the nighttime lighting visual simulation exhibits, the proposed signs will not substantially contribute to nighttime light or glare beyond the existing conditions because the proposed Project would not discernably increase the amount of existing night lighting from adjacent sources such as the I-5 Freeway and other public view locations.
Exhibit 5-64  – Daytime View Comparison
Exhibit 5-65  – Nighttime View Comparison
Exhibit 5-66 – Nighttime Views – Candidate Key View 8

Note: Detailed site grading or architectural plans or 3D models do not exist for the hotel. This simulation accuracy is as best as can be expected given the available materials.
Exhibit 5-67 – Nighttime Views – Candidate Key View 9

Note: Detailed site grading or architectural plans or 3D models do not exist for the hotel. This simulation accuracy is as best as can be reported from the available materials.
Exhibit 5-68 — Nighttime Views — Candidate Key View 10
Exhibit 5-69  – Nighttime Views – Candidate Key View 13

Note: Detailed site grading or architectural plans or 3D models do not exist for the hotel. The simulation accuracy is as best as can be expected given the available materials.
3. City of San Clemente Sign Ordinance

The City of San Clemente Sign Regulations Ordinance (Title 17, Chapter 17.84 – Sign Regulations) has established specific objectives in its sign regulation ordinance to enhance the City’s economic base and promote an aesthetically pleasing environment. Project compliance with these objectives are described in the table below.

Table 5-3  Sign Ordinance Objectives Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.84.010.A.4 – To promote a high-quality business environment by assuring that signs are complementary to the City’s goals for historic preservation and quality urban design</td>
<td>The proposed metal channel lettered signs are complementary in quality and design to the Spanish Village theme. The sizes of the signs are proportional to the building sizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.84.010.A.5 – To ensure that signs are carefully designed, aesthetically pleasing, appropriately maintained, and professional in appearance</td>
<td>The proposed signs are designed to have metal channel lettering with a matte finish to provide an appearance that is aesthetically pleasing and professional. Signage does not include mirrored glass panes or polished metal materials, and would be placed in locations appropriate for signage such as between wall towers, rooflines, and protruding wall spaces. The proposed Project is considered consistent with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.84.010.A.7 – To reduce possible traffic and safety hazards through reduced sign clutter, the elimination of unauthorized signs in the public right of way, and minimizing visual competition among signs</td>
<td>The proposed signs include variations in font and color consistent with the individual tenants that they are representing. They are not arranged in a cluttered manner, and they comply with the City’s requirement for signage to not exceed more than 75% of the building façade width. The proposed tenant ID signs will represent nationally branded companies that will be readily recognizable for the viewer. The proposed signs are designed to minimize distractions to the overall visual environment and attention of the drivers in the vicinity, especially on the northbound or southbound I-5 Freeway. Potential traffic impacts are analyzed in Section 5.4, Transportation and Traffic of this report. The proposed Project is considered consistent with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.84.010.A.8 – To minimize the visual and lighting impacts of business signs on adjacent residential neighborhoods</td>
<td>The proposed signs will be seen from adjacent residential neighborhoods; however, the signs have been designed to complement the existing and future buildings. The materials used for the proposed signage would not include mirrored glass panes, polished metals or other reflective surfaces capable of producing daytime glare. At night, the signs will be back lit to emphasize the shape of the raised lettering or logos by creating a lighting contrast between letters or logo and the background wall where the letters or logo also act to block direct light from view. This type of lighting controls light spillover and is a subtle way to illuminate signs. The proposed Project is considered consistent with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 17.84 of the zoning code establishes that signs must be constructed of permanent materials such as metal or other compatible, durable, and waterproof material. The proposed Project is consistent with this requirement, as signage proposed by the Project would be made of metal.

Sign scale and colors have to be compatible with the style of buildings and must be oriented to minimize light or glare upon adjacent residential properties and public rights of way. Due to building location and orientation, a majority of the proposed signs will directly face adjacent residences. The signs have been designed to be compatible in size and style with the buildings where they will be located. The maximum size of each
sign varies based on location and architectural compatibility. The proposed Project is considered consistent with this requirement.

Based on the City's zoning code, the maximum sign area permitted is 1 square foot of sign area for every 1 lineal foot of building, not exceeding 75% of the business façade width, and the maximum size is 64 square feet. Though some of the proposed signs are larger than specified by the applicable sign ordinance, they occupy substantially less than 75% of the business façade width and are otherwise harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with Project buildings, walls, and other structures.

While the proposed Project is seeking signage larger than allowed by the City’s Sign Code, larger scale signage has been contemplated for the Regional Commercial Center as far back as the adoption of the 1998 Specific Plan for Marblehead Coastal Development, as noted in Section 3-4 II of the Specific Plan, “Due to the size and proportions of the buildings, appropriate scaled signage may require maximum sign area greater than specific in the City’s Sign Ordinance.” Based on this analysis, oversized signage could be found consistent with the intent of contemplated signage for the Outlet Center.

The Sign Regulation Ordinance objectives were established to enhance the City’s economic base and promote an aesthetically pleasing environment. The proposed Project upholds these objectives by providing signage for the Outlets at San Clemente, a regional commercial center that relies on promotional identification for patronage. The metal channel lettering, pinned off the wall with halo illumination, is consistent with the high-quality architectural standards.

The Visual Impact Analysis includes photos and simulations of the Project area taken from various vantage points, including private residential areas and public areas. An analysis of views is provided in Section 5.1.4 of this report. The primary viewers of the proposed signage would be northbound and southbound traffic traveling on the I-5 Freeway. More residences are located east and northeast of the I-5 Freeway. The photometric studies and maps, included as Appendices C and D, depict lighting levels associated with the proposed Project as having minimal impacts on the surrounding residential community (as further detailed in Section 5.2, Biological Resources). This is due, in part, to the type of lighting proposed for the signs which is minimal, but in larger part to existing building, landscape, and parking lot lighting.

Although, the Project will not create a substantial new lighting source or potentially degrade public views, the Project proposes to keep lighting on for 1 hour after the close of individual tenants. While nighttime sign lighting is allowed, there is no demonstrable need to retain night lighting for 1 hour past the close of individual tenants, and related to the Project identification signs, for 1 hour past the close of the outlet center. Lighting of signs beyond the hours of individual tenant and center closure will result in a significant impact.
### 4. Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan

The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan provides the following design objectives with responses as to how the proposed Project will affect or conform to these standards included in Table 5-4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 301 11.A – Preserve and strengthen San Clemente’s unique character as the “Spanish Village by The Sea.”</td>
<td>The Project Icon Tower is designed with a Spanish Village theme consistent with outlet center building architecture. The proposed signage materials would be of a metallic matte finish, consistent with the building’s architecture. In addition to the allowable bronze and metallic finishes, the Project includes up to four color exemptions that would be independently decided in the future by the owner and approved by City staff. The colors would be associated with nationally trademarked brands and logos for the purpose of tenant identification, as depicted on Exhibit 4-6 – Materials Board (page 42). Project signs, as shown in the photo simulations, become a dominant visual feature, minimizing the Spanish Village architectural theme. While it is acknowledged that other areas of the City contain large, colored signs, this Project has been evaluated on the basis that the City’s adopted Village by The Sea character which promotes a robust Spanish architecture and building detail, including non-obtrusive, wrought-iron bracket signs with hand crafted appearances. The proposed color exceptions are considered inconsistent with the City’s Village by the Sea theme. The resultant conflict with this architectural standard is considered a significant impact requiring a Statement of Overriding Considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 301 11.C – Define a consistent approach to site planning, architecture, streetscape, lighting, landscaping and other design elements to achieve visual harmony within Marblehead Coastal.</td>
<td>The proposed signage has been designed with the intent to provide outlet center and hotel identification. The locations of the proposed signs are compatible with the building architecture. For example, signage will utilize spaces within the articulated façade and between the roofline and other building features. The metal channel lettering and logos will be backlit by a halo lighting method creating a subtle contrast between the signs and walls for nighttime recognition of tenants and project identification. The lighting, however subtle, is proposed to be illuminated beyond the hours of the outlet center’s operation. The function of lighted signage is to provide wayfinding and identification, and lighting beyond hours of operation does not serve the objectives of the lighted signage. Hotel signage will not be illuminated beyond hours of operation, as the hotel maintains 24-hour operations, requiring visible daytime, as well as nighttime, signage. The proposed hours of operation for the outlet center to keep signage lighting on for one hour past the closing of each individual tenant contradicts the Specific Plan’s objective for lighting in harmony with Marblehead Coastal. Sign lighting gives the impression that the lighted tenants are open. Therefore, keeping lights on past the closure of each individual tenant would be a source of confusion and would not result in visual harmony with the rest of Marblehead Coastal. This is considered a significant impact and requires mitigation as detailed below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 301 11.E – Recognize the unique character, constraints, and opportunities of the Marblehead Coastal area.</td>
<td>The unique character of the site is its canyons, landforms, and Spanish Village architectural theme. The proposed signage does not affect any of the unique characteristics of the Marblehead Coastal area. The Icon Tower is considered consistent with the primary architectural theme. The Project is considered to be consistent with this guideline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan objectives were established to preserve and strengthen San Clemente’s unique character as the “Spanish Village by The Sea,” define a consistent approach to planning in visual harmony with the Marblehead Coastal development, and recognize uniqueness of the coastal area. The proposed Project upholds these objectives by proposing high-quality metal signage that will be pinned off the walls with subtle backlighting in visual harmony with the existing buildings. However, the four color exceptions provide unlimited flexibility in selecting colored signage and may result in the selection of colors which are inconsistent with the Spanish Village by the Sea architectural style required by the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. The Materials Board specifies metallic and neutral colors. The allowance of four color exceptions will draw unnecessary attention to the four signs and will clash with the rest of the color palette, potentially degrading the visual character of the site and the otherwise high-quality requirements for sign design and construction. The proposed sign color exceptions are considered to be a significant impact requiring a Statement of Overriding Considerations because unknown colors will clash with the Spanish Village by the Sea architectural style.

Based on analysis of the Visual Impact Analysis and photometric study, the lighting proposed will not create a substantial new lighting source or potentially degrade public views. The Project proposes to keep lighting on for 1 hour after the outlet center closes. The necessity for signage, and signage to be lighted at night, is consistent with the Specific Plan on the basis that it is providing wayfinding and identification. However, maintaining lit signage after the close of business is not essential for the objectives of signage, as the merchants, restaurants, and retailers would not be open for business at the time. Therefore, the Project component, including lighting signs for 1 hour past closing of the outlet center, is not consistent with the Specific Plan and is considered to be a significant impact.

5. Marblehead Coastal Design Guidelines and Standards

The proposed signage is also subject to the following guidelines and standards as identified in the Site Design Guidelines section of the Specific Plan, as described in Table 5-5 - Marblehead Coastal Design Guidelines and Standards Consistency Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline/Standard</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chapter 3. Section 303 1.E – Project Identification **Signs**: Projects should be identified by low monument signage to provide neighborhood identification. Such signs should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with residential buildings, walls, and other structures. | The Project Icon Tower is considered to be in scale with the outlet center’s primary architecture and includes elements that tie into the architecture of the primary buildings. The tower contains materials and color consistent with the primary buildings. The signs proposed on the walls, although larger than some business signs found on the customer-viewed side of the center, are in keeping with the larger scale of the existing buildings, which range in height from 28 to 40 feet with architectural features ranging from 35 to 50 feet in height. The primary Freeway viewpoints of the outlet center and hotel buildings are set at a minimum distance of 150 feet with a grade differential contributing to muted building size. The primary residential views are setback a minimum distance of 450 feet. Both views are part of a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3. Section 303 11.D – Commercial Development Signs: Commercial centers should be identified by a sign program with monument signage and wall signs for individual tenants. Such signs may include logos, and should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with Project buildings, walls and other structures. Due to the size and proportions of the buildings, appropriately scaled signage may require maximum sign area allowances greater than currently specified in the City’s Sign Ordinance. A specific Sign Plan accounting for all such allowances shall be provided for consideration at the time of site plan review.</th>
<th>The proposed metallic matte finish for the signs is consistent with the building’s architecture, which incorporates the white walls, red roof, and wrought iron theme of a Spanish Village by The Sea. In addition to the allowable bronze and metallic finishes for signage, the Project includes up to four color exemptions that would be independently decided in the future by the owner and approved by City staff. The colors would be associated with nationally trademarked brands and logos for the purpose of tenant identification. The potential color schemes would not be in harmony with the City’s Village by The Sea theme. The Village by The Sea character promotes a robust Spanish architecture and building detail, including non-obtrusive, wrought-iron bracket signs with hand crafted appearances. The proposed color exceptions would contradict the Project identification sign guideline.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 303 11.O – Freestanding Signage: Freestanding signs shall be integrated with the overall architectural and landscape design for the commercial center.</td>
<td>As described in the Specific Plan for the Project site, the Marblehead Coastal area is intended to, among other purposes, provide for “regional and recreational uses,” including a “destination resort hotel.” The proposed Project includes a sign program for the outlets center wall signs, the proposed signage for the hotel, and the freestanding Project location tower and associated signage consistent with this guideline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 303 1.D.5 – Architectural Guidelines: According to the architectural guidelines found under Section 305 II-D-5 of the Specific Plan, signs should be integrated into the architectural design of the building in a manner consistent with the intent of the City’s Sign Ordinance, as well as the architectural elements, scale, and massing of the Project.</td>
<td>Project signs, as shown in the photo simulations, become a dominant visual feature, minimizing the Spanish Village architectural theme. The signs proposed on the walls, although larger than some business signs found on the customer-viewed side of the center, are in keeping with the larger scale of the existing buildings, which range in height from 28 to 40 feet with architectural features ranging from 35 to 50 feet in height. The primary Freeway viewpoints of the outlet center and hotel buildings are set at a minimum distance of 150 feet with a grade differential contributing to muted building size. The primary residential views are setback a minimum distance of 450 feet. Both views are part of a wide-open spatial context giving the viewer the perception of reduced building sizes in comparison to the greater environment. The proposed signs would be constructed of high quality metal signage that will be pinned off the walls with subtle backlighting in visual harmony with the existing buildings in context with other design elements found in the immediately adjacent areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Marblehead Coastal Development Standards and Guidelines are included as a part of the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. Standards and Guidelines for Project identification signs, commercial development signs, freestanding signs, and architecture should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with Project
buildings, walls and other structures. Although the size and scale of the signs are larger than most commercial signs in the area, the signs are consistent with the larger scale of the regional commercial center and hotel buildings, which is a large development with architectural features up to 50 feet in height. The size and scale of the proposed signs are appropriate.

The metal channel lettering, pinned off the wall with halo illumination is consistent with the building's architecture, which incorporates the white walls, red roof, and wrought iron theme of a Spanish Village by The Sea. However, the color exceptions reserved for owner's discretion would not be limited to particular tenants and would thereby allow for colors inconsistent with the Marblehead Coastal Development Standards and Guidelines. The Project component including color exceptions for colors that are beyond those compatible with the City's adopted Spanish Village by The Sea theme is inconsistent with the Marblehead Coastal Development Standards and Guidelines. This is considered a significant impact requiring a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

5.1.5 Mitigation Measures
The Project proposes outlet tenant sign lighting will be turned off 1 hour past the closure of individual tenants, and Project identification sign lighting will be turned off 1 hour after the closure of the last tenant, which will give the impression that businesses are open after they are closed. Sign illumination beyond the hours of individual tenant and overall outlet operation is unnecessary and considered a significant impact, because it is inconsistent with the objectives of the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. Because the function of sign lighting is to provide wayfinding and identification after dark, lighting beyond the hours of operation will not serve to fulfill either of those functions. The following mitigation measure is proposed:

| MM AE-1 | Prior to the issuance of building permits for proposed outlet center tenant and Project identification signage, the Project Applicant shall submit plans to the Planning Division demonstrating that all proposed sign lighting is set to a timer. Sign lighting shall be turned off at the time of closure of each individual tenant consistent with the Project use permit. |

5.1.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation
The potentially significant impact resulting from the signs remaining lit for one hour after the close of individual tenants and the overall outlet center can be mitigated to a level of less than significant with the implementation of MM AE-1.

The proposed color exceptions cannot be mitigated and remain a significant impact as further detailed below.

As analyzed herein, and per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines:
1. The proposed Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
Scenic Vistas

The closest scenic vista to the Project is located at the Knob Hill viewing point on the Rancho San Clemente Hiking Trail approximately 1 mile northeast of the Project site along the ridgeline near Calle Del Cerro and Avenida Pico. The dominant south and west views from Knob Hill are of coastal bluffs and the Pacific Ocean, with the possibility of viewing Catalina and San Clemente Islands on clear days. The dominant north and east views are of local and regional mountains. View of the Project site from Knob Hill is blocked by a hillside. Even if the view were not blocked by a hillside, the distance from the scenic vista to the Project site would make viewing the proposed signs unlikely.

Visual Corridor

The Project site has direct views from the northbound and southbound lanes of I-5 Freeway; however, the I-5 Freeway is not a designated scenic highway, and views in this area are largely of existing commercial and industrial buildings and residences. There are limited views to the Pacific Ocean in the background. The closest visual corridor is located southbound along Avenida Vista Hermosa at the I-5 Interchange, approximately one-half mile northwest of the Project site. The existing outlet center can be seen very minimally on the far left-hand side from a vehicle traveling southbound on Avenida Vista Hermosa. The northbound side of the highway includes a sidewalk for pedestrian travel. Beyond that, there is very little pedestrian access in this area of Avenida Vista Hermosa. Visual impacts due to the placement of signs on the existing outlet center buildings, on the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center, or on the approved but unbuilt hotel would not create a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista. Project-related aesthetics impacts to vehicles or pedestrians traveling along Avenida Vista Hermosa would be less than significant because the dominant view of the coastal bluffs and the Pacific Ocean would not be altered.

There are two major visual corridors within the Project vicinity, which include Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico. The visual corridor from Vista Hermosa is directed southwesterly toward the ocean, whereas the outlet center is located to the south of Vista Hermosa. To the extent that existing and approved but unbuilt structures are located within the periphery of the view corridor from Vista Hermosa, and signage will not block any views. Sign lighting that will occur at night may be visible from the Vista Hermosa. However, the center is currently lit with a variety of parking lot and building lights, and additional lighting from signage will not impact nighttime views from the visual corridor, because that view is not oriented at the Project site.

The visual corridor along Avenida Pico is also oriented toward the ocean and is located westerly of the outlet center, near El Camino Real. There will be no view impacts from the Avenida Pico view corridor, because the view is to the ocean, which is in the opposite direction of the outlet center and the proposed signage will not be oriented in that direction. The proposed signage would be placed on an existing outlet center, the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center, or
the approved but unbuilt hotel and signage would not block or interfere with views from visual corridors. The Project site is not visible from the view corridor located on Avenida Pico northeasterly of the I-5 Freeway, because a large hillside landform blocks the view.

2. The Project site is developed with a retail outlet center and accessory uses, including such things as a parking structure and surface parking lots, light standards, and trash enclosures, and will not result in substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway because there are no scenic resources within the approved development area and the I-5 Freeway, located easterly of the Project site, is not classified as a state scenic highway. All proposed signs will be located on previously approved buildings within the Project area.

3. The addition of Project signage will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as the site is approved for retail/commercial use. The outlet center and hotel were analyzed in the Marblehead Coastal DEIR, which considered the addition of typical retail/commercial center development. The signs proposed by the Project were analyzed in a Visual Impact Analysis and the View Simulations did not present evidence of significant impact with respect to the design, balance, scale, and number of signs primarily because the visual prominence of the signs is reduced with distance and there are no public views within one-quarter mile of the Project site which would be negatively impacted by the placement of signage on existing and previously approved, unbuilt structures.

However, the Project proposes four color exceptions to the metal and dark color palette depicted on Exhibit 4-6 – Materials Board (page 42). The color exceptions, while limited to “nationally recognized brand logos” would provide a sharp contrast to the metallic and dark which currently exist on the monument signage, and those proposed for the majority of the tenant, Project identification and hotel signs. Spanish style architecture is characterized by curves and arches, smooth stucco exterior walls, terracotta roof tiles, towers, ornamental iron work and courtyards. While Spanish style architecture may include colorful decorative elements such as painted tile signs are not considered an architectural element per se.

As such, the color exceptions proposed as part of the sign program are inconsistent with the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan, which requires Spanish style architecture. This impact cannot be feasibly mitigated and is considered a significant impact requiring a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

4. The proposed sign lighting will be reverse channel halo fabrication, which will result in minimal lighting compared to other types of lighting available for wall mounted signs because the light source reflects off the wall upon which the sign is mounted. The result is that the sign appears to be surrounded by a halo of light rather than having an entire face of a sign or even individual letters directly illuminated.
While the Project signs will be visible at night when illuminated, the photometric analysis demonstrates that the sign lighting will not result in a substantial increase in ambient lighting levels. When combined with night lighting for the existing and approved but unbuilt Project components, the sign lighting will result in a nominal increase in night lighting.

The Project component including lighting signs for 1-hour past closing of individual tenants and 1 hour past the close of the outlet center is inconsistent with the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan and the Sign Ordinance, because the additional night lighting is not required for wayfinding, will create confusion as to whether businesses are open, and will result in lighting visible from nearby residences when said lighting is unnecessary. With the implementation of MM AE-1, this impact will be mitigated to less than significant.

5.1.7 Cumulative Impacts

CEQA Guidelines §15355 defines **cumulative impacts** as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Cumulative impacts are the direct and indirect effects of a proposed Project that, when considered alone, would not be deemed a substantial impact, but when considered in addition to the impacts of related projects in the area, would be considered potentially significant. “Related projects” refers to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, which would have similar impacts to the Proposed Project.

Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan contemplated development for the Marblehead coastal area, including the Project site. The proposed signs primarily face east and northeast toward the I-5 Freeway and residences located to the east and northeast of the I-5 Freeway. The regional commercial center is unique to the area, and no other freeway-oriented signs currently exist or are proposed in the Project vicinity, located along the I-5 Freeway between Avenida Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico. As analyzed in this report and depicted in the photometric study, the lighting that the proposed signs will contribute will be negligible as compared to the existing landscape and parking lot lighting. The Project will not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

5.1.8 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

1. **Short-Term**

   No short-term impacts are anticipated to occur.

2. **Long-Term**

   The long-term unavoidable adverse Project impacts are associated with the operation of lighted signage and color exceptions retained for use at the discretion of the owner. The purpose of illuminated signs is to extend the signs’ primary function of wayfinding and Project identity into the evening and night. However, once the tenants have closed, the lighted signs no longer serve their primary function and contribute to light pollution as an
unnecessary light source, albeit at a minimum. The operation of illuminated signage past the outlet center’s hours of operation is not consistent with various components of the City’s General Plan, the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan, and Design Standards and Guidelines, as detailed in Section 5.1.4 of this report, and will be mitigated to a less than significant level with the implementation of MM AE-1.

The four-color exceptions reserved for use at owner’s discretion would not be limited and allows for the use of colors that would be considered inconsistent with the established Spanish Colonial Revival architecture. The Sign Design Guidelines specify the appropriate design of signage pin mounted letters with metal finish consistent with the architectural character of the building. The Project color exception component of the Project is not compatible with the City’s adopted Spanish Village by The Sea theme. This impact cannot be feasibly mitigated and is considered a long-term unavoidable adverse impact.