

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
March 19, 2019
Approved: kmd



6:33:02 PM

Chair Kathryn Beck called the meeting to order. Commissioners in attendance: Christine Lavra, Greg Tisdel, Adam Yanasak, Carly McGinn, Alex Lark, and Michael Finch.

Commissioner Absent: Chris Holland and Michael Zelinski

Voting Alternates: Alex Lark and Michael Finch

Staff Present: Allan Giffen, David Stalheim, Karen Stewart, Dave Tyler, Steve Ingalsbe, and Kathy Davis

Meeting Minutes

Chair Beck asked if there were revisions to the February 26, 2019 meeting minutes. Commissioner Lavra would like to amend her question about settlement on page 4 to read, "Commissioner Lavra asked Mr. Evans about settlement in the areas around the buildings that are not pile supported."

Motion: Commissioner Lark made a motion to approve the February 26, 2019 meeting minutes with the revision. Commissioner Tisdel seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Tisdel, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

Motion Carried.

Motion: Commissioner Yanasak made a motion to approve the March 5, 2019 meeting minutes. Commissioner McGinn seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Finch, abstain; Commissioner Lark, abstain; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Tisdel, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

Motion Carried.

Commissioner Reports

Commissioner Tisdel reported on his attendance at a group tour to Seattle's SoDo and Yesler areas regarding Business Improvement Districts.

Staff Comments

Allan Giffen, Planning Director, reminded Commissioners of the special Planning Commission meeting on March 26 to consider amendments to the Riverfront Redevelopment Landfill Site.

General Citizen Comments

None

Item 5: Sign Regulations-Briefing

David Tyler, Planning staff, distributed pictures of storefront signage. He reviewed changes made from the previous draft sign regulations and next steps.

Commissioner McGinn asked about another category for brand signage for mixed-use developments that function similar to Hopeworks. Mr. Tyler responded that the upper story signage standard only applies in the UM zone, and would not be applied citywide. Commissioner Lark stated that type of signage helps create a sense of space and place, and the City should consider that type of signage in other areas of the City.

Commissioner Lark asked about the consolidated sign table. Mr. Tyler responded that sign design and size is in the sign standards in terms of wall signs, projecting signs, and canopy type signage.

Commissioner Lark referred to page six, section E of 19.36.020, and asked about the Planning Director's discretion. Mr. Giffen responded the intent of the signage guidelines would be an illustrative guide and not a regulatory document. The guide would not be promulgating regulations but would provide guidance for people who want to understand the sign code better.

Commissioner Finch appreciated the administrative sign guide and the new language regarding the enforcement penalty. He asked about the size limitations and flags in commercial zones as well as the interior oriented signs. Mr. Tyler responded 32 square feet for interior oriented signs. The flags in commercial zones addressed a distinction between commercial and residential. Commissioner Finch responded that his only concern was when he read the definition of a flag and a definition of a feather or banner sign, depending on the shape of the staff, one could say that was a flag and if there are no controls on a flag then we have a problem. Mr. Tyler responded that staff would clarify that language.

Commissioner Tisdell asked about signage dimensions. Mr. Tyler responded that the 32 square foot interior oriented signage was a current standard for directional type signs. Commissioner Tisdell asked if the current draft sign regulations addressed the sign company concerns. Mr. Tyler responded that the City received feedback and some of those concerns are in the current draft. Commissioner Tisdell asked about the limitation of wall signs to 18-inches on top of a building. Mr. Tyler stated that the letters could extend above the eaves or parapet.

Commissioner McGinn asked if there was any conversation about keeping the sign size in proportion with building type or size. She added that the 12 square feet seem appropriate especially for the building example provided; however, a larger sign might be more appropriate for a larger building. Mr. Tyler stated that the examples provided were both cabinet signs, which are a type of wall sign. The overall wall sign standards in Category A is 15% of the façade area or 300 square feet whichever is

greater. The percentage standard is intended to keep sign an appropriate size in relation to the building face.

Commissioner Tisdell asked if a nonconforming sign could be replaced. Mr. Tyler responded if there is an existing nonconforming sign, one nonconforming sign would have to come down for any new sign that is installed which is a current sign regulation and no changes are proposed.

Chair Beck asked if there was some flexibility in the review process for creative signage. Mr. Tyler responded that there is a process for an administrative modification.

Commissioner Yanasak asked if the amended language could allow some additional flexibility for unique projects as long as the signage is tastefully done and fits in with the surrounding area.

Citizen Comments

Don Gerould, 7400 Hardeson Road, Owner of Berry Signs, stated that his staff has been working with the City on the draft sign regulations. He stated that the challenge with 12 square foot limitation on cabinet signs shown in one of the examples is the size of lettering that probably could not be seen from the street. Temporary signs can only be in place for seven days; however, it takes him a lot longer to build the signs. He suggested 90 days. He would like to include consideration of LED signs along with neon. There are not a lot of neon suppliers. He was concerned about specifying the darker background color when a lot of brand signage is lighter in color than the letters. Message center signage are very expensive and could be encouraged in multi-use shopping centers. He was also concerned about the direction projecting signs for Hopeworks along the alley.

Chair Beck asked if the City would be responding to Mr. Gerould's comments. Mr. Tyler responded that he would provide a list of the issues and how the City is responding to those concerns.

Commissioner Yanasak asked Mr. Gerould what was the cabinet sign size most requested by businesses. Mr. Gerould responded that a typical common cabinet size is 4 x 8.

Earl Hall, 3425 Colby, was concerned about monument signs that are constructed to a property line bordering a sidewalk. He suggested that monument signs be further setback from sidewalks to help protect pedestrians from someone possibly hiding behind a monument sign.

Item 1: Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Shorelines-Public Hearing

Karen Stewart, Environmental Planner, reviewed the revisions and resolution exhibit with Commission.

Commissioner Yanasak asked if there was any feedback. Ms. Stewart responded no.

Motion: Commissioner McGinn made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Yanasak seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Tisdell, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

Motion Carried.

Item 2: Shoreline Master Program – Proposed Action

Ms. Stewart read the resolution and discussed the exhibits to the resolution.

Motion: Commissioner Lark made a motion to approve Planning Commission Resolution 19-03 regarding the amended Shoreline Master Program and amendments to Chapters 1 and 3 of the city's Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Lavra seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Tisdell, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

Motion Carried.

Item 3: Zoning/Local Project Review Amendments-Public Hearing

David Tyler, Planner, reviewed the critical areas amendments to Title 15 and Title 19 of the Everett Municipal Code.

Citizen Comments

None

Motion: Commissioner Lark made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner McGinn seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Tisdell, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

Motion Carried.

Item 4: Critical Areas & Shoreline Related Amendments-Proposed Action

Motion: Commissioner Finch made a motion to approve Planning Commission Resolution 19-04 regarding amendments to Chapter 19.37, Critical Areas. Commissioner Yanasak seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Tisdell, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

Motion Carried.

Motion: Commissioner Yanasak made a motion to approve Planning Commission Resolution 19-05 regarding amendments to the Zoning Code related to shorelines, critical areas and home occupations. Commissioner McGinn seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Tisdell, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

Motion Carried.

Motion: Commissioner Yanasak made a motion to approve Planning Commission Resolution 19-06 regarding amendments to Title 15 regarding Local Project Review procedures. Commissioner McGinn seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Tisdell, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

Motion Carried.

ADJOURNED 7:35:06 PM



Planning Commission Secretary

4-2-19

Date



Administrative Assistant

4-2-19

Date