

## A. Aesthetics

### Environmental Setting

#### Visual Resources in the Vicinity of Project Site

The project site is a vacant 43-acre brownfield located in the northwest corner of the city. Humboldt Bay borders the city to the north and the west, and thus the subject property is close to Humboldt Bay. There are views of the bay and the Samoa Peninsula from the property, and because the property is vacant, the bay and peninsula can also be viewed off-site through the property.

The relatively flat project site ranges in elevation between 8 and 12 feet North American Vertical Datum (NAVD). The site has been intensively used, principally by railroad operations, since the latter part of the 19th century. Formerly tidal marsh, the western and northern rim were filled and a railroad line was established before the 1890s. Inner portions of the marsh were filled over the first half of the 20th century and, by 1947, most of the site had been diked off and filled. During this period, the site was used as a railroad switching, maintenance, and freight yard, in addition to use of some portions of the site for petroleum operations. Active use of the project site decreased markedly in the mid- to late-1980s.

The project site is generally bounded by the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and Waterfront Drive to the north and west, Washington Street to the south, and Broadway (Highway 101) to the east. General land uses in the vicinity include coastal-dependent industrial to the north and northwest; vacant or underutilized lands to the west; coastal-dependent industrial to the southwest; a mixture of industrial and office uses to the south; the Clark District, one of the city's oldest residential neighborhoods, to the southeast; and a broad mixture of light industrial and commercial uses including Downtown and Old Town Eureka, to the east.

The industrial buildings are generally stand-alone buildings that are boxy in appearance, one-and-one-half to three stories in height, and often clad in metal siding. They have minimal signage and little consideration or need for aesthetic appeal, and have little or no on-site landscaping. The commercial buildings are usually smaller, can be attached or in close proximity to other commercial buildings, and generally one story or two stories. There is usually some consideration for aesthetic appeal in architecture and color, signage is more prominent, and there is likely more landscaping particularly in newer construction. Office buildings are generally rectangular one-story buildings and often have fairly large parking lots. The Clark District is known for late 19th century and early 20th century homes, interspersed with newer apartment buildings.

U.S. Highway 101 is east of and borders a portion of the project site; thus vehicular traffic along the U.S. 101 corridor is a dominant visual characteristic in the area. Near the project site, U.S. 101 turns 90 degrees from Broadway to the east through downtown Eureka as a one-way couplet on Fourth and Fifth Streets, which travel in the westbound and eastbound directions, respectively. Development along the U.S. 101 corridor generally includes one- to two-story

buildings containing restaurant, retail, service, and motel uses on the ground floor, and offices or residential uses on upper floors. Sidewalks are provided, and buildings are typically built out to the property line. Surface parking lots constructed to serve adjacent businesses, and driveways interrupt the building frontages that line the Highway 101 roadway corridor.

Although Broadway continues north of Fourth Street to Second Street there are no marked vehicle travel lanes and the roadway condition is deteriorated; the sidewalks are intermittent. Broadway ends and has been formally vacated north of Third Street.

Existing views to the north and west from the project site are of the developments along Waterfront Drive, with Humboldt Bay beyond. Waterfront development to the north of the project site supports privately owned industrial uses, including warehouses, and commercial fish processing operations in one- to two-story structures with outdoor storage of fishing equipment. The waterfront property to the northwest of the project site is the City's Small Boat Basin which is comprised of marine-oriented recreation and municipal uses, including the City-owned three-story marina building, known as the Wharfinger Building, and its adjacent public marina comprised of 140 boat slips, boat launching ramps, and surface parking. To the west of the project site are a number of vacant waterfront parcels currently owned by the City of Eureka and the City of Eureka Redevelopment Agency. Westward long-range views, where not blocked by existing waterfront development, encompass Humboldt Bay and industrial structures, including a pulp mill, power plant and their related smokestacks and chip piles located on the Samoa Peninsula.

Views to the south from the project site include the back walls of the industrial warehouse buildings located on the north side of Washington Street and their related storage and equipment yards. The Schmidbauer Lumber Co. lumber mill is also visually prominent because of the large mill processing plant and the large log decks. The lumber mill is located south of Washington Street between Koster Street and Waterfront Drive. Sidewalks line the southern side of Washington Street and are intermittent along the northern side of the street.

Long-range views to the east from the project site are framed by existing development adjacent to the project site and are focused up roadway corridors through downtown Eureka. The upward-sloping topography towards Downtown affords views of the downtown skyline, which is more densely developed than the immediate project vicinity, with some buildings extending up to five stories.

The existing buildings located between the project site and Broadway, and between Fourth and Sixth Streets, are not included in the proposed project. These one- and two-story structures include the businesses of Bob's Fine Cars, Nilsen Feed & Grain Company, and an auto glass business. These buildings are not a part of the project and would remain if the project were developed.

## Visual Resources on the Project Site

The project site is the former location of the Union Pacific Railroad switching and maintenance yard and the visual character of the site is that of a classic brownfield. The terrain of the project site is relatively level but uneven, consisting of a variety of landforms, including mounds of debris, a channelized muted tidal drainage (Clark Slough), upland drainage ditches and various depressions created by former industrial cleanup activities. The property has a number of compacted gravel roadways that provide access throughout the site. The 43-acre site is surrounded by a temporary 8-foot-tall chain link fence.

Vegetation is present throughout most of the project site, but there is no formal landscaping. Although most of the 43-acre project site is dominated by non-native weedy vegetation, there exists on-site a total of about 8.67 acres of low quality wetlands. Please see Section IV.D, *Biological Resources*, for more detailed discussion of existing vegetation communities.

The site is basically vacant having only the remains of dilapidated structures and the foundations of former structures associated with past railroad use. The only railroad track still present on the site is the North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA) line that passes along the western and northern boundary of the site. There also exists on the property several old locomotives and rail cars owned by the NCRA.

## Light and Glare

For purposes of this EIR, light is defined as illumination from a direct source, such as a street light or vehicle headlights; glare is defined as indirect illumination such as light reflected off of a building's windows.

The surrounding industrial and commercial uses described above are sources of existing nighttime light in the vicinity and include exterior night-time security lighting and parking lot lighting. In addition, vehicular traffic along the U.S. 101 corridor and surrounding city streets is the source of a notable amount of nighttime light. Other sources of light in the project vicinity include street lights, neon and illuminated signs, traffic signals, landscape lighting, and other accent lighting.

The most significant source of glare in the vicinity comes from vehicular headlights reflecting off of buildings and structures. Other sources of glare include the reflection of the light sources described above off of nearby buildings and structures and the reflection of light onto the vehicles passing along U.S. 101. A source of daytime glare is the sun's reflection on Humboldt Bay.

From a broader perspective, light and glare result from industrial and residential development on the Samoa Peninsula that is visible from the project site. Light and glare can also be attributed to nautical traffic on Humboldt Bay.

The project site is vacant and does not have existing sources of light, and glare is minimal because of the lack of surfaces to reflect light.

## Environmental Analysis

### Significance Criteria

For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant effect on aesthetics if, based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, it would:

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

### Regulatory Framework

The following standards and regulations govern aesthetics and are used to measure impacts.

#### ***California Scenic Highways Program and Scenic Corridor Protection Program***

The California Department of Transportation administers California's Scenic Highways Program, intended to preserve and protect scenic highway corridors from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of lands adjacent to highways. Within the City of Eureka, there are no officially designated California Scenic Highway segments.

#### ***General Plan and Local Coastal Program***

The City of Eureka's adopted General Plan and adopted Local Coastal Program together formalize a long-term vision for the physical evolution of Eureka and they outline the policies, standards, and programs that guide day-to-day decisions concerning Eureka's development in the coastal zone. The Policy Consistency Analysis, found in Section IV.I, *Land Use and Planning*, provides an evaluation of the Marina Center project's conformity with the policies of the adopted General Plan and Land Use Plan portion of the adopted Local Coastal Program.

#### ***Coastal Zoning Regulations***

The Coastal Zoning regulations which implement the policies of the Land Use Plan portion of the adopted Local Coastal Program are codified in Chapter 156 of the Eureka Municipal Code (EMC), and are also referenced as Article 29, Part 1, Section 10-5.29 et. seq. of the zoning regulations of the City for the coastal zone.

## **Zoning Regulations**

The Zoning Regulations of the City of Eureka are found in Chapter 155 of the EMC and are adopted pursuant to the City Charter to protect the public health, safety, peace, comfort, convenience, prosperity and general welfare.

## **Project Impacts**

### **Impact A-1: Would the Marina Center project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

In relation to the project site, the closest bay view scenic vista points are the Wharfinger Building and the City's Boardwalk. The Marina Center project is landward of these vista points and, therefore, would have no impact on the scenic views available from these vista points.

Humboldt Bay and the Samoa Peninsula are visible from the project site, and because the project site is vacant, Humboldt Bay and the Samoa Peninsula can also be seen from Highway 101 and other locations east of the project site. Development of the Marina Center project would reduce views of Humboldt Bay and the Samoa Peninsula from Highway 101 and from other lands east of the project site. While protecting coastal views is an important consideration, pursuant to EMC § 156.054, Visual Resource Standards, neither Humboldt Bay nor the Samoa Peninsula are identified as "Scenic Coastal Resources" for which special protection measures are required. Nonetheless, the extension of Fourth Street through the project site would maintain and enhance, through landscaping and other amenities, views to Humboldt Bay and the Samoa Peninsula from the east. In addition, the creation of the approximately 11.89-acre restoration area would include trails and seating areas that would augment opportunities for public views of Humboldt Bay and the Samoa Peninsula.

Although some views of the bay and peninsula would be lost as a result of the project, the Marina Center project would, overall, augment public coastal viewing opportunities by providing improvements and amenities.

### **Mitigation**

None recommended.

### **Finding of Significance**

The potential impact of the Marina Center project on a scenic vista would be *less-than-significant*.

**Impact A-2: Would the Marina Center project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?**

There are no officially designated California Scenic Highway segments in Humboldt County; therefore, the project would not substantially damage any scenic resources within a State scenic highway.

The Eureka Municipal Code (Section 156.054 (D)), states that local scenic routes in the coastal zone shall be as depicted on the map “Eureka Scenic Routes” contained in the Scenic Route Element of the Eureka General Plan (City of Eureka, 1966). The scenic routes map of the 1977 Eureka General Plan shows a scenic route along the then-planned downtown freeway bypass that was subsequently rejected (City of Eureka, 1977). Highway 101, in its present location, is not identified as a scenic route. It appears that Waterfront Drive from about Marina Way eastward is designated as a scenic route. Thus a portion of Waterfront Drive bordering the project site is a local scenic route. EMC § 156.054(D) provides that along scenic routes the City shall:

1. Ensure that the scenic route rights-of-way are maintained in an attractive manner.
2. Incorporate bicycle lanes and pedestrian walkways along scenic routes, whenever possible.
3. Establish a public information system which would guide and direct visitors to various scenic areas in the community.
4. Provide street furniture and other accessory amenities which serve to enhance the use of scenic routes.

The project’s proposed landscaping, wetland restoration, pedestrian/bike path, interpretive trail, informational kiosks, and benches would implement the Visual Resource Standards for scenic routes as prescribed in § 156.054(D) above.

**Mitigation**

None recommended.

**Finding of Significance**

The potential impact of the Marina Center project on scenic resources within a State scenic highway would be *less-than-significant*.

---

**Impact A-3: Would the Marina Center project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

The Marina Center project is subject to design review approval from the City of Eureka’s Design Review Committee. The Design Review Committee will review the exterior design, materials, textures, and colors, and under EMC § 155.180 et. seq., “the ugly, the inharmonious, the

monotonous, and the hazardous will be barred,” but originality in architecture, site planning, and landscape and graphic design will not be suppressed. Generally, the Marina Center project would improve the visual character of the site, as it would transform a vacant brownfield with low visual quality to a planned development containing a mix of land uses and building types that draw from the site’s maritime and industrial heritage, as well as from the contemporary influences of the Eureka waterfront, Old Town, and downtown areas.

To evaluate changes in views from public vantage points at project build-out, computer-generated visual simulations illustrating “before” and “after” visual conditions from five representative public vantage points near the project site are included as part of this analysis. The “before” pictures establish the ‘baseline’ and were taken at the time of the Notice of Preparation. Subsequent to the pictures being taken, an 8 foot temporary chain link fence has been erected around the full perimeter of the project site; see Figure IV.A-7 for current photographs of the site. The locations of the visual simulation vantage points are shown on Figure IV.A-1. The renderings of the proposed project are intended to provide representations of proposed building height, bulk, and architectural style.

Figure IV.A-2a depicts an existing view of the project site from Broadway just south of Seventh Street, looking north toward the site (vantage point 1). As illustrated in the photo, the project site is currently undeveloped, including little vegetation with slight variations in on-site elevations. Some vegetation encroaches on to the sidewalk fronting the project site, and the sidewalk is interrupted by utility poles. Concrete blocks separate the project site from the adjacent sidewalk. This view also includes a portion of U.S. 101 traffic traveling southbound, as well as existing structures that are not part of the project site and would not be disturbed by the project. With the project, views from this vantage point would change as depicted in Figure IV.A-2b. The most prominent change from this perspective is the addition of the southernmost project driveway along Broadway, which would include sidewalk, curb and gutter. A new surface parking lot, landscaping, and the proposed 6,000-square-foot retail building would also be visible. Glimpses of additional proposed retail/service buildings would be available toward the northwestern portion of the view. Views of the U.S. 101 corridor would remain unchanged, and the upper portions of the existing buildings fronting Broadway that are not part of the project site would continue to be visible in the background.

Figure IV.A-3a shows an existing view of the project site from Sixth Street on the east side of Broadway, looking west (vantage point 2). In this photo, U.S. 101 is shown in the foreground. Existing buildings that abut the project site’s southern border, and buildings located opposite the project site along Washington Street are visible in the distance, beyond the project site. These buildings have little articulation and no visually distinctive characteristics. Also partially visible from this perspective is Bob’s Fine Cars, a used automobile dealership, with surface parking for vehicle display and customers and a single-story building, which is not part of the project site. As shown in Figure IV.A-3b, the project would substantially alter the view from this vantage point with the construction of a new driveway that would serve the southern portions of the project site. From vantage point 2, new pedestrian sidewalks, extensive landscaping and new surface parking areas located to the south of the intersection would be visible. The Anchor 1 building would be



SOURCE: Baysinger Partners Architecture PC, 2008

Marina Center Mixed-Use Project EIR . 205513

**Figure IV.A-1**  
Viewpoint Location Map



A. Existing view from Broadway just south of Seventh Street, looking north. (VP1)



B. Visual simulation of proposed project.

SOURCE: Baysinger Partners Architecture PC, 2008

Marina Center Mixed-Use Project EIR . 205513  
**Figures IV.A-2A and B**  
Site Photo and Simulation – Viewpoint 1



A. Existing view from Sixth Street on the east side of Broadway, looking west. (VP2)



B. Visual simulation of proposed project.

SOURCE: Baysinger Partners Architecture PC, 2008

Marina Center Mixed-Use Project EIR . 205513  
**Figures IV.A-3A and B**  
Site Photo and Simulation – Viewpoint 2

visible in the background and would block the view of the rear portions of the existing buildings located on Washington Street to the south of the project site. An existing dilapidated concrete block wall on north side of the new driveway between Bob's Fine Cars and the project site would be removed and replaced with landscaping and new fencing.

Figure IV.A-4a depicts an existing view of the project site from Fourth Street, on the east side of Broadway, looking west toward the site (vantage point 3). As illustrated in the photo, the project site currently contains a single-story, vacated structure surrounded by some low-lying vegetation. An existing single-story building with little articulation, not included as part of the project site, is situated just to the left of the existing billboard in the photo. Fourth Street in this area carries the westbound portion of U.S. 101, connecting to the southbound U.S. 101 access along Broadway. With development of the project, views from this vantage point would change as depicted in Figure IV.A-4b. Prominent changes would include the Fourth Street extension through the site and new buildings constructed along the roadway extension. The proposed four-story residential building would be constructed at the northwest corner of Fourth Street and Broadway, and new buildings along the Fourth Street extension would include ground floor retail to establish an active street frontage. The existing structure in this viewpoint would not change with the project, although new sidewalks and landscaping would be introduced around the site, so that it would more readily blend in with the proposed project. Proposed buildings along the south side of the Fourth Street extension would be comparable in height to this existing structure and would not substantially degrade the existing character of the area. Visible in the center of the photo simulation in the interior of the site are the upper roof lines of the proposed five-story office building.

Figure IV.A-5a illustrates an existing view of the project site from Second Street and Broadway, looking southwest toward the site (vantage point 4). Currently, a warehouse and an associated surface parking lot located on the project site are visible from this vantage point, with Broadway located in the foreground. Also visible are the NCRA railway cars located on the project site. Long-range views from this perspective are of industrial activities, specifically the pulp mill located on the Samoa Peninsula, opposite Humboldt Bay. The proposed project would substantially alter the view from this vantage point, removing the on-site structure, associated surface parking, and railway cars (see Figure IV.A-5b). The project would extend Second Street through the project site and construct new buildings to line the roadway extension. New buildings would vary in height; those located on the southwest side of Second Street would be between one and three stories, and those located on the northwest side of Second Street (between Second Street and Waterfront Drive) would be between one and two stories. New buildings would include a mix of land uses, including retail/service, restaurants, and museum space, constructed to the sidewalk with landscaping to encourage an active street frontage.

Figure IV.A-6a shows an existing view of the project site from Waterfront Drive at the proposed intersection with the Second Street extension (vantage point 5). The project site comprises the foreground of this view, including low-lying vegetation with slight variations in elevations on the site. Views beyond the project site show existing buildings that are generally warehouse/ light industrial structures with little articulation and few windows. Long-range views include the ridgeline located east of the City of Eureka. As shown in Figure IV.A-6b, the project would



A. Existing view from Fourth Street, on the east side of Broadway, looking west. (VP3)



B. Visual simulation of proposed project.

SOURCE: Baysinger Partners Architecture PC, 2006

Marina Center Mixed-Use Project EIR . 205513  
**Figures IV.A-4A and B**  
Site Photo and Simulation – Viewpoint 3



A. Existing view from Second Street and Broadway, looking southwest. (VP4)



B. Visual simulation of proposed project.

SOURCE: Baysinger Partners Architecture PC, 2006

Marina Center Mixed-Use Project EIR . 205513  
**Figures IV.A-5A and B**  
Site Photo and Simulation – Viewpoint 4



A. Existing view from Waterfront Drive at the proposed intersection with the Second Street extension, looking southeast. (VP5)



B. Visual simulation of proposed project.

SOURCE: Baysinger Partners Architecture PC, 2006

Marina Center Mixed-Use Project EIR . 205513  
**Figures IV.A-6A and B**  
Site Photo and Simulation – Viewpoint 5



SOURCE: City of Eureka

Marina Center Mixed-Use Project EIR . 205513  
**Figure IV.A-7**  
Current Photograph of the Project Site

substantially alter the view from this vantage point. Visible in the foreground would be the Second Street extension and proposed buildings that would range in height from one to five stories. With construction of the project, views of existing buildings would be blocked and views of the ridgeline, although still available, would be interrupted by the new buildings.

The southwest portion of the project site would be restored as an 11.89-acre wetland area. Currently this area, like much of the rest of the project site, includes dilapidated warehouse structures and uneven terrain, consisting of a variety of land forms including mounds of debris, a channelized muted tidal drainage (Clark Slough), and graveled and paved areas that are used occasionally as storage or log deck for the adjacent lumber mill. The proposed project would provide trails along the edges of the restored Clark Slough and outside the buffer areas surrounding Clark Slough to provide opportunities for viewing of the bay. Additional amenities in this portion of the project site would include an interpretive trail, informational kiosks, benches, and other street furniture. The proposed improvements to this portion of the project site would enhance the visual character and allow for some pedestrian activity on the site.

The project site includes the property fronting Washington Street west of Clark Slough. None of the property along the north side of Washington Street east of Clark Slough is included in the project site. Thus, the existing land uses and visual characteristics in this area would remain unchanged with the proposed project.

Although visual quality is subjective, it can reasonably be concluded that the proposed project would not result in a significant negative aesthetic effect. The project would result in substantial changes in visual character due to the construction of new buildings and parking facilities, the extensions of Second and Fourth Streets, and an overall intensification of on-site development. The project would, however, improve the visual quality of the area by redeveloping the mostly vacant brownfield site, introducing public amenities such as a new pedestrian and bicycle path along Waterfront Drive, restoring a wetland area, and implementing a streetscape program (paving, landscaping, lighting, etc.) for the new streets throughout the project site.

### **Mitigation**

None recommended.

### **Finding of Significance**

The potential impact of the Marina Center project on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings would be *less-than-significant*.

---

### **Impact A-4: Would the Marina Center project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

The Marina Center project would introduce a considerable amount of light and glare to a project site that does not contain existing sources of light or glare. However, the amount of new light and

glare would not be inconsistent with the existing light and glare in the vicinity of the project site. As described in the Environmental Setting section above, existing sources of light and glare in the area are typical of an urban environment. The light and glare created by the project would be of a similar nature.

New sources of light would include interior building lights, street lights, security lighting, parking lot lighting, neon/illuminated signs, traffic signals, landscape lighting, and other accent lighting. In addition, the extension of Second and Fourth Streets through the project site would extend vehicular headlights into the area.

New sources of glare would come from vehicular headlights reflecting off of buildings and structures, and the reflection of the light sources described above off of buildings and cars.

To reduce potential adverse impacts resulting from the introduction of new light and glare, the project would be permitted a reasonable use of outdoor lighting for nighttime safety, utility, security, and enjoyment while preserving the ambiance of the night. This would be accomplished by mitigation that would minimize glare and obtrusive light by limiting outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary.

### Mitigation

**Mitigation Measure A-4a:** All lighting installations shall be designed and installed to be fully shielded (full cutoff) and to minimize glare and obtrusive light by limiting outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary, except as in the exceptions below, and shall have a maximum lamp wattage of 250 watts for commercial lighting, 100 watts incandescent, and 26 watts compact fluorescent for residential lighting. The location and design of all exterior lighting shall be shown on the site plan submitted to and approved by the City of Eureka Design Review Committee.

Lighting that is exempt includes:

1. Lighting in swimming pools and other water features.
2. Exit signs and other illumination required by building codes.
3. Lighting for stairs and ramps, as required by the building code.
4. Signs that are regulated by the sign code.
5. Holiday and temporary lighting (less than thirty days use in any 1 year).
6. Low-voltage landscape lighting, but such lighting should be shielded in such a way as to eliminate glare and light trespass.

See also Mitigation Measure D-3e.

### Finding of Significance

The recommended mitigation measures would avoid or minimize potential adverse impact of the Marina Center project due to light or glare, reducing the impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

## Cumulative Impacts

### **Impact A.5: Would the Marina Center project, in conjunction with cumulative development, adversely alter the visual character in vicinity?**

The project site is located within an urban area, with adjacent development including a mix of retail and commercial uses oriented along the U.S. 101 transportation corridor, visitor-serving uses comprising motels and restaurants, industrial uses, marine-based recreation, waterfront commercial activities, and some office uses. The project site vicinity is largely built-out, although infill development would likely occur in the immediate vicinity of the site.

The proposed project, in combination with planned or approved projects, would increase built development in the project site vicinity. Since the project site vicinity is already built-out with numerous commercial and industrial properties and the City of Eureka supports systematic infill development, the visual effects of the project in combination with other planned or approved projects will not have any adverse impacts on the environment. The proposed project beneficially impacts the project site's aesthetics by cleaning up the site from its current condition, providing a maintained wetlands preserve, and utilizing architectural motifs that will complement Eureka's architectural heritage.

The proposed project would benefit aesthetics in the vicinity by redeveloping the site from its current brownfield condition, providing a maintained nature reserve, and using architectural motifs that would complement Eureka's architectural heritage.

The project site is located in the Redevelopment Area where new development is subject to Design Review. Design Review examines the exterior design, materials, textures, and colors, and bars the ugly, the inharmonious, the monotonous, and the hazardous. All new development, redevelopment and infill development in the Redevelopment Area is subject to the same level of review and analysis. Thus, the project's incremental contribution to cumulative aesthetic effects would be less-than-significant.

### **Mitigation**

None recommended.

### **Finding of Significance**

The project would have a *less-than-significant* impact on the visual character in the vicinity and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative visual impacts.

## References – Aesthetics

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) The California Scenic Highway System. *Eligible and Officially Designated Routes*, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>, accessed September 2, 2008.

City of Eureka, 1977, *City of Eureka General Plan*, adopted 1977.

City of Eureka, 1997, *City of Eureka General Plan*, adopted February 1997, amended through April 2008.

City of Eureka, 2005, *Eureka Redevelopment Final Program EIR*, prepared by Environmental Science Associates (ESA), January 10, 2005.

City of Eureka, *Eureka Municipal Code*, adopted May 1966, amended through April 2008.