PLANNING COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER'S HEARING ROOM, COUPEVILLE, WA
TUESDAY, JULY 24, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Members Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Enell</td>
<td>Val Hillers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Joselyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Mitchell Howard – Chair</td>
<td>Anna-Marie Sibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leal Dickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Wayne Havens – Vice Chair</td>
<td>James Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Yonkman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Chair Howard

ROLL CALL
Wayne Havens, Mike Joselyn, Scott Yonkman, Mitchell Howard, Dean Enell, Jim Hall

Planning staff present: Robert Pederson – Director, Troy Davis – Long Range Planner

Public Works staff present: Bill Oakes – Director, Donna Keeler, Phil Cohen, Melissa Gehrmann

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
May 22, 2012
Commissioner Mike Joselyn moved to approve the minutes as presented, Commissioner Scott Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC
No Comments

DIRECTOR'S REPORT
Mr. Pederson introduced James Hall, new Planning Commissioner.

NEW BUSINESS:

Public Works – Hearing and Deliberation:

Adoption of the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program 2013-2018 and the Capital Improvement Program 2013 – 2018
Bill Oakes began with the 2013 – 2018 six year plan Transportation Improvement Plan, stating there were no new projects for the Transportation Plan due to a shortage of funds.

- Revenues are down.
- Costs are increasing.

**North Whidbey**

- Troxell Road and Highway 20 - working with State on improvements at intersections.
- Monkey Hill Road / Henni Road intersection - safety improvements.
- Imperial Road- safety project, sight distance issue.
- Frostand Road Intersection - wetland mitigation completion is projected for this year.
- Clover Valley Road - heavily traveled road, potential roundabout.
- Crescent Harbor / Regatta Ave. - working with Navy on project.
- Reservation Road - vertical curb improvements, Federally funded project.
- Boon Road Phase 1 and 2 - State funded for safety issues.
- Hastie Lake Road / Zylstra Road - Federally funded program to improve sight distance.
- Kettles Trail Connector - formalize the parking area and improve the connection trail to the Kettles.
- Rhododendron Trail Phase 2 - complete the trail and connect to Rhododendron Park.
- WSDOT Race Road to Jacobs Road - first phase left turn movement lane installation to the solid waste facility and Island Transit.
- Race Road to Houston Road connector - Federally funded, secondary route highway.
- Shoreview Dr. Culvert - replacement of failing culvert.
- Freeland Trail - trail from Bush Point Road / SR 525 intersection to Fish Road along the Highway.
- Myrtle Ave. Trail - working with the Friends of Freeland for potential construction in 2013.
- Harbor Ave. - Complete Street Project, speculative on Federal funding becoming available.
- Honeymoon Bay Road - turn lane concurrency project and working with State on intersection improvements.
- Scurlock Road - safety project, sight distance.
- Harbor Ave. and Highway 525 signalization - working with State.
- Pine St. Pump Station - longstanding project.
• Wildes Road and Quade Creek - replacing a failing culvert.
• Swede Hill Road / Burley Road - non standard intersection with limited sight distance.
• Orr Road / Heggenes Road - Capital Project, due to realignment of the road.
• Anderson Road / Deer Lake Road Culvert - failing culvert replacement.
• Heggenes Road / Hoist Road - intersection improvements.
• Winter Green Dr. and Campbell Road – intersection improvements.

Camano Island
• Outfalls in the north end of Island, Scenic Ave., Maple Grove, and North Camano.
• Terry’s Corner Phase 4 - improve the road from the highway to the intersection.
• Simonson Place - retaining wall and outfall replacement.
• East Camano/ Elger Bay Road / Monticello Dr. - multi year project, working on turn lanes due to high accident rates.

Capital Improvement Plan
• Clean Water Utility – will have funding in 2013 to start the Capital Projects.
  o Areas with historic flooding.
  o Threatened septic systems.
• Fairgrounds - several projects.
  o Coffinan Kitchen.
  o Pole Building Kitchen.
  o RV Facility Support.
• GMA Infrastructure – place holder to conduct planning for utility infrastructure to support growth management planning.
• Jail HVAC system was built in the 80’s, looking at grant money to replace system due to the fact it is failing.
• Libbey Road/Kettles Trailhead.
• Swan Lake Feasibility Study ongoing to look at the feasibility of restoring the saltwater habitat to Swan Lake area.

The nature of the document is that all plans are summarized in the Capital Plan.

Commissioner Haven asked what is causing the rise of costs.
Bill Oakes responded that the Seattle price index is used to project the 6 year plan costs. Statewide distribution and local distribution is down, but there is a 4% deficit between revenue and cost.

Further discussion regarding costs continued.

Commissioner Havens wanted to know what changes are going to be made to Terry Road.

Bill Oakes answered that shoulders would be added and the road is being shifted away from Diking District 5. There is a new playground and it would allow people to use the playground facility.

Commissioner Yonkman asked how the projects are weighted.

Mr. Oakes responded they use a priority array scoring system based on different criteria significant to the safe operation and maintenance of the road system. An example of some of the criteria is safety, number of users, environment impacts, and neighborhood acceptance. The staff then recommends what projects are included. Ultimately the Board of County Commissioners decides the final projects.

Commissioner Yonkman asked if safety is the higher priority.

Mr. Oakes said safety is a high priority, but mobility is also a priority, as is protecting the environment. Madrona is an example of a road that was not maintained and it is now costing 1.4 million dollars to repair the road due to the inability to maintain it in the past.

Discussion of maintenance and safety discussed further.

Commissioner Enell would like to see some sort of a schedule to see how often the roads are resurfaced and maintained. He would like to see some quantative data on how often the roads are redone. He would like to examine that since there is a lot of money going into it.

Bill Oakes responded that both engineering judgment and maintenance judgment go into determining when the roads are resurfaced. There is computer program input and human input from the road shop supervisors. They make a preliminary list and then do some onsite investigation to determine the final list. Pavement typically has a 7 to 15 years lifespan for typical pavement and use. All neighboring counties, except for Jefferson, spend more per mile.

Additional discussion regarding maintenance and data continued.

Commissioner Howard discussed the dependency of partners and whether the software being used is sophisticated enough. Feels that in the next 6 years there will be a lot of adjusting that will need to be done. He also feels that Public Works is doing a great job.
Public Comment

Ron Nelson, Economic Development Council, 180 W. Coveland St., Coupeville
Discussed:
  • Living Wage jobs.
  • Increase of jobs.
  • Public Works has received comments regarding interest of having access to the South Whidbey Air Park.
  • Aerospace manufacturing.

Bill Oakes responded that he welcomes partners in exploring that possibility but cannot add any new projects without new partners.

Commissioner Enell stated there is a piece missing for access to light manufacturing.

Commissioner Joselyn asked if Honeymoon Bay and SR 525 is still scheduled to be a roundabout.

Bill Oakes answered that the state is looking at other alternatives to the turn lane.

Commissioner Joselyn also asked about Swede Hill and Burley Road intersection cost being higher than Honeymoon Bay Road.

Bill Oakes stated that it was due to the high accident rate on that road.

Commissioner Joselyn commented on the capital expenditures, the biggest project is the Swan Lake study.

Bill Oakes responded the Jail HVAC is the higher expenditure project on the list.

Commissioner Enell asked if there is a signal being put on Harbor Ave.

Bill Oakes stated that was just a place holder.

Commissioner Enell wanted to know if Island Transit is putting in a park and ride at Bush Point and a trail to Freeland.

Bill Oakes - Island Transit purchased property at the corner of Bush Point Road and SR525 to build a park and ride that will access the new Freeland Trail to Main Street.

Further conversation was carried on regarding the park and ride by Island Transit.

Commissioner Joselyn asked if some of these projects are sent out to bid to see the cost if a private enterprise does them.
Bill Oakes responded that most projects go out to bid and not constructed by them. There are very strict rules on how they bid.

_Commissioner Yonkman moved to recommend approval of the Adoption of the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program 2013-2018 and the Capital Improvement Program 2013-2018, Commissioner Joselyn seconded, the motion carried 5 to 1, with Commissioner Enell opposed._

Recess

**Sign Code Update Work Session**

Mr. Pederson presented the reasons for amending the sign code ordinance. Due to all the complaints and questions it was necessary that a process be set forth to assist in clarifying questions. The Public Hearing for this matter will be August 28, 2012 for approval to move forward to the Board of Commissioners. This is a Land Development amendment so it is not part of the Annual Docket.

Troy Davis presented the issues for the proposed amendments to Sections 17.03.040 and 17.03.180.R of the Island County Code relating to development regulations for signs.

**Why Update the Sign Code?**

- Experience has shown that current rules:
  - Lack clear definitions.
  - Resulted in confusion on how signs are measured.
  - No standards for institutional or subdivision signs.
  - Unclear what standards apply to many types of signs.

**Policy Framework**

- Signs are important element of any Non-Residential land use or activity.
- Signs are a necessary element for business visibility and viability.
- Signs should be visible to motorists but non-obtrusive.
- Signs should reflect the rural environment of Island County.
- Encourage the effective use of signs, while simultaneously preventing over concentration, improper placement, or excessive size.
- Maintain and enhance the aesthetic environment while promoting creativity and the County's ability to attract sources of economic development and growth.
- Minimize the possible adverse effects of signs on nearby public or private property.
• Preserve, protect, and promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.

**Issues to be Evaluated**

• Establish clear definitions.
• Clearly define how signs are measured.
• Include standards for institutional and subdivision signs.
• Evaluating the size limit for signs (UGAs, RAIDS, rural areas).
• Consider larger signs for multi-tenant premises.
• Establish standards for temporary or special event signs.
• Should new pole signs be allowed?
• Allowable types of lighting for signs.
• Include provisions for way-finding and directional signs.
• Measurement of sign height does not account for differences in topography.
• Signs for agricultural uses (farm stands, wineries, and agro-tourism).
• Retaining provisions that reflect the rural nature of Island County.

**Examples of Exempt Signs**

• Real Estate Signs.
• Political Signs.
• Construction Signs.
• Agricultural Signs.
• Government Signs – Wayfinding.

**Signs and Height**

• Current code limits height to 18’ or height of building.
• Current code does not account for topography in measuring height.
• Signs need not be overly tall in rural Island County.

**Signs and Size Issues**

• Billboards not appropriate in rural Island County.
• Scale is obtrusive.
Signs and proliferation

- Too many signs can confuse and message can be lost.
- Inappropriate signs for Island County.
- Blinking, neon, scrolling signs are not allowed in the current code. Time and temperature is allowed.

Examples of Inappropriate Signs for Rural Island County were provided

Subdivision Entry Signs

- Current code is not clear on whether allowed.
- Most exceed current size limit for signs in rural areas.
- Most seem appropriate for ISLAND COUNTY.

Examples of Wayfinding Signs were provided

What is in the Draft Ordinance

- New definitions for all types of signs
- Clear and balanced policy direction.
- Clear provisions for exempt signs.
- Clear provisions for prohibited signs.
- Larger signs allowed in commercial areas.
- Larger signs allowed for multi-tenant sites (in commercial zoning).
- Provisions for institutional signs.
- Provisions for subdivision signs.
- Retains current requirements for rural areas (preserving rural character).
- Revise lighting standards – but no flashing, neon, or scrolling text signs.

Public Feedback/Concerns

- Subjectivity.
- Size limitations.
• Sign Measurement - description in the code was too difficult to understand.
• Permits required for all Signs.
• Number and type of Signs permitted - wineries have concerns.

Next Steps and Schedule
• Continue to meet with interested groups, individuals, etc.
• Revise draft code changes for PC.
• Planning Commission public hearing(s).
• BOCC work session.
• BOCC public hearing(s).

Schedule
Completed
• May 12 - Initial Outreach
• May 14 - 1st Draft code
• May 15 to July 23 - Meetings & outreach
• June 18 - 2nd Draft
• July 11 - 3rd Draft
• July 24 - PC work session

Upcoming
• August 28 - PC public hearing
• Sept/Oct - BOCC public hearing

Mr. Pederson discussed the use of pole signs since it still maintains the rural look of the area as long as it is not taller than the height of the building. This still preserves the 18’ height restriction unless there is a need to do monument signs.

Commissioner Hall asked about the Elger Bay Road Market, he is concerned that all signs need to be permitted. The owner has small sandwich boards and small banners, is the intention to encourage him to use something more decorative or be able to have a sign he can change daily.

Mr. Pederson stated that signs have always needed a permit. The sandwich boards are allowable as long as they are part of his permitted sign amount.

Further discussion regarding sign limits continued.
Public Comments

Ron Nelson, Economic Development Council, 180 W. Coveland St., Coupeville
- Discussed the comments that the EDC has on signage.
  - Rural character is economic asset to the Island County.
  - Defining rural character is the responsibility of the citizens. The council contacted a number of businesses in helping define rural character and signage application.
  - Wineries showed concern in their ability of having people directed to their place of business.

Public concern was discussed in further detail.

Commissioner Havens assumed that it is the person putting the sign up who has the responsibility of whether they are on private property or public right of way.

Robert Pederson stated a survey is not required for a sign unless there is a dispute.

Commissioner Enell encouraged placing signs closer to the road and recommended the size limit be smaller than the proposed 100 sq. ft.

Signage size and location was further discussed.

Commissioner Yonkman commented about the State being good about enforcing signage. Is it possible to set a partnership with the State for certain events?

Mr. Pederson said the State has a set of rules specific to scenic highways. The Department of Transportation will pull signs that do not comply. County Public Works will also pull signs that are in the Public Right of Way.

Discussion of sign location persisted regarding removal of signs and State enforcement on signs.

Public Input on the Sign Code Update

The following is a list of specific concerns regarding the first and second drafts of the proposed sign code revisions that staff received from the public. These concerns were considered by staff as staff wrote the third draft. The following represents the original comments:

It is important to note that the third draft includes structural changes to improve the logical flow of code requirements. References to code sections below are in reference to the proposed sign code as written in the second draft.

1. Code Section: 17.03.040


**Sign, Abandoned:** Any Sign or Sign structure which bears no Sign or copy for a period of six (6) consecutive months, or for on site Signs that display for a period of six (6) consecutive months, information which incorrectly identifies the business, owner, lessor [sic], or principal activity conducted on the site. Abandoned Sign shall also mean any Sign on which proper maintenance is not being done; any on site Sign on a parcel that has been vacant or unoccupied for six (6) months or more; or any Sign which pertains to a time, event, or purpose which no longer applies, regardless of the message or lack of message.

**Origination:** New language added.

**Feedback:** Six consecutive months is too short of a time period given the current state of the economy. Also, the way the language is written, real estate signs could be considered abandoned signs in certain situations.

**Discussion:**

1. Is 6 months a reasonable expectation?
2. Should language be added to clarify that real estate signs don’t apply here?

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends no change (other than grammatical) and has included this language in the third draft. Six months is believed to be reasonable as there are always fluctuations in the economy.

---

2. **Code Section:** 17.03.040

Signs, Electronic Message Centers (EMC)

**Feedback:** Why are there no provisions in the code for allowing Electronic Messaging Centers?

**Origination:** Not in code and not currently allowed.

**Discussion:**

1. Are EMCs appropriate in unincorporated Island County?
2. If so, what would be an appropriate size? Situation?

**Recommendation:** Staff believes that these types of signs are inconsistent with the Rural Character of Island County and should; therefore, not be allowed. In the third draft, staff listed electronic messaging signs under “Prohibited Signs”.

---

3. **Code Section:** 17.03.180.R.1

*Signs - Purpose and Intent. Signs are recognized as a very important element of any Non-Residential land use or activity. Signs are a necessary element for business*
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visibility and viability. Signs should be visible to motorists but should be non-obtrusive and reflective of the rural environment of Island County. The Sign regulations established in this section are designed and intended to promote the following principles:

a) Encourage the effective use of Signs as a means of communication for the convenience of the public, while simultaneously preventing their over concentration, improper placement, or excessive size.

b) Maintain and enhance the aesthetic environment while promoting creativity and the County's ability to attract sources of economic development and growth.

c) Minimize the possible adverse effects of Signs on nearby public or private property.

d) Protect and enhance the rural character of the County by requiring new and replacement Signs to be:

(i) Creative and distinctive;

(ii) Compatible with their surroundings;

(iii) An integral component of the style and character of the building to which each Sign relates;

(iv) Appropriate to the type of activity to which they pertain;

(v) Protect the view of the night sky;

(vi) Expressive of the identity of individual proprietors or of the community as a whole, and;

(vii) Appropriately sized for its context.

Origination: New language added.

Feedback: Use of subjective language in the code like “reflective of the rural environment” and “creativity” can lead to unfair application of the code.

Discussion:

1. Should sign code language be more precise and less flexible, or less precise and more flexible?
2. Should the code be amended to reflect specific colors and materials that are prohibited?

Recommendation: Staff recommends leaving most of the language as is. Staff has removed item (i) “Creative and distinctive” from the third draft because of its subjective nature. Reference to “Rural Character” has been added since “Rural Character” is a defined term in Title 17 of the Island County Code as well as in the Washington State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.030(14)).
4. **Code Section:** 17.03.180.R.2.c  

*Political signs in accordance with State Law.*

**Origination:** New language added

**Feedback:** Political signs are considered free speech and regulating them could cause legal issues.

**Discussion:** In the first draft of the sign ordinance, language was added regarding political signs and the window of time they were allowed to be displayed. This language was stricken from the second draft as political signs are considered free speech.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends leaving the language as corrected in the second draft and has included it in the third draft under “exemptions”.

5. **Code Section:** 17.180.R.2.f  

*Real Estate Signs not exceeding 9 square feet in Sign Area, provided such Signs are posted on the property advertised for sale, rent, or lease. Such Signs are not permitted in the adjoining right-of-way.*

**Origination:** New language added.

**Feedback:** Nine square feet might not be adequate in some instances.

**Discussion:**

1. Are there instances where 9 square feet may not be sufficient area?
2. Have you seen real estate signs larger than this? If so, did they seem appropriate given the context?
3. What about off-premise real-estate signs? Are the necessary? Are they appropriate? If so, should real estate signs be allowed off-premise?

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends no change and has included this language in the third draft under “exemptions”. Nine square feet in sign area is believed to be reasonable.

6. **Code Section:** 17.03.180.R.2.j  

*One temporary Construction Sign, no larger than four feet by eight feet in size, on sites for which a valid permit is active, for a period not to exceed 12 consecutive months, after which it must be removed. Any such Sign shall be removed immediately upon issuance of a certificate of occupancy or certificate of completion.*

**Origination:** New language added.
Feedback: If a permit is active, the 12 consecutive month requirement isn’t really necessary.

Discussion:

1. If the sign can only be up until a certificate of occupancy is issued, is a 12 consecutive month limitation necessary?

Recommendation: Staff concurs that the 12 month limitation is not necessary so long as the permit is valid and active. The 12 consecutive month limitation was not included in the third draft.

7. Code Section: 17.03.180.R.2.m

Small Signs for farm stands and indicating farm products for sale, such as “eggs for sale,” hay for sale,” or Signs identifying the type of crops being grown. Such Signs shall not exceed nine (9) square feet in size, shall not be illuminated, and must meet all General Standards for Signs.

Origination: New language added.

Feedback: Size limitation may not be practical.

Discussion:

1. Is 9 square feet in size reasonable for farm signs? (nine square feet is consistent with other signs allowed in rural areas, such as a home business sign).
2. Is there something unique about farms that would make it reasonable to have a larger sign?

Recommendation: Staff recommends no change to the square footage requirement and has included this language in the third draft under “exemptions”. The square footage requirement of 9 square feet is reasonable and consistent with sign limitations for other signs in the rural areas. In the third draft, these signs are called “Agricultural Signs”, as opposed to “small Signs”.


Any Sign, when mounted on a building, shall not extend above or beyond the eave, rake, or parapet of the wall on which it is mounted.

Origination: New language added

Feedback: Roof signs should be allowed on some buildings, particularly on small buildings because trees have the potential to block visibility.
Discussion:
1. Are roof signs appropriate in some instances?
2. Does the presence of vegetation justify the necessity of roof-top signs?
3. Are roof-top signs consistent with the rural character of Island County?

Recommendation: Staff recommends no change to this language and it has been included in the third draft under general standards for all signs under the subsection “Placement”. Staff does not believe that roof-top signs are consistent with Island County’s definition of Rural Character.


a) Color.

(i) Sign colors shall be architecturally compatible. Sign colors shall provide sufficient contrast to be legible, yet be subdued enough to blend with the natural landscape or surrounding structures.

(ii) The majority of the background area of a Sign, exclusive of any letters, words, or symbols, shall be of earth tones, a dark color, or made of materials such as rock, natural wood, old wood, tile, brick, etc.

(iii) Bright or fluorescent colors and reflective surfaces in the background area of the Sign are prohibited.

Origination: Language is a carryover from existing sign code.

Feedback: The language in this section is seen as both confusing and too restrictive. The language appears to impede on a businesses’ ability to use any name brand logo that would conflict with coloring restrictions. The language is also very subjective.

Discussion:

1. Is the code language easy for an applicant to understand what is required of them?
2. Is the code language too subjective? If so, how can it be improved?
3. Should the code language even regulate color? And if so, to what extent?
4. Should it be made clear that logos are exempt from color requirements?
5. Do “bright” colors need to be better explained?
6. This code section addresses more than color. It also addresses construction materials and architectural compatibility. Are these regulations appropriate in this subsection?
7. Is it appropriate to regulate sign material? If so, what type of material is appropriate?

Recommendation: Staff has revised this language in the third draft under “Design” to make it clearer and less subjective.
10. **Code Section:** 17.03.180.R.4.h

*Measurement of Sign Height.* The height of a Sign shall mean the vertical distance from the average line of the highest point and the lowest point of finished grade adjacent to the base to the top of the highest attached component of the Sign, exclusive of any on-site fill, berms, mounding, landscaping, or excavating solely for the purpose of locating the Sign. When the land slopes downward in elevation from an adjoining roadway, the maximum Sign height should be measured from the center line of the adjoining roadway. Any Sign support structure below the elevation of the adjoining roadway will not be counted toward the measurement of Sign height.

**Origination:** Existing language was expanded upon.

**Feedback:** Code language is very difficult to understand.

**Discussion:**

1. Can the average person easily understand how sign height is measured? If not, how should sign height be measured in a way that can be understood?

**Recommendation:** Staff has revised this language in the third draft under “Measurement of Sign Height” to make it more easily understood.

11. **Code Section:** 17.03.180.R.4.i.ii

*No more than one (1) freestanding identification Sign may be located on the property, except for multi-tenant premises, where no more than [sic] two (2) freestanding Signs are allowable.*

**Origination:** Original language expounded upon.

**Feedback:** This is too restrictive.

**Discussion:**

1. Is the 1 freestanding sign allowance too restrictive?
2. Are the instances where more than one freestanding sign might be reasonable?

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends no change to the limitation on freestanding Signs as they don’t apply to Sandwich Signs.

12. **Code Section:** 17.03.180.R.4.j

*Conditions of Sign Approval.* The County may impose such reasonable conditions and standards as may be found necessary to ensure that Signs and lighting are compatible with the character of surrounding permitted uses.
**Orignation:** New language added.

**Feedback:** This language could allow for inconsistent and unfair decision making with regards to sign permitting.

**Discussion:**
1. Is this provision in the code reasonable?
2. Could the language lead to inconsistency and unfairness?

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends no change and has included this language in the third draft under “Permit Required – County.”

---

**13. Code Section:** 17.03.180.R.4.k.1

The County shall reserve the right to remove or require the removal of Abandoned or Existing (i.e., nonconforming) Signs when their useful life has ended.

**Orignation:** New language added.

**Feedback:** Language here seems subjective and unclear with regards to the process for removal.

**Discussion:**
1. Should the code specify a process for notifying an owner when the County is contemplating removing an Abandoned or nonconforming sign?
2. How is “useful life” determined?

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends no change and has included this language in the third draft under “Abandoned Signs”.

---

**14. Code Section:** 17.03.180.R.5

Sign Permits Required. All Signs require a Sign permit from Island County. Fees for Sign Permits are established on the Planning and Community Development Department fee schedule for Building Permits.

**Orignation:** New language added.

**Feedback:** Some signs, like banners and sandwich signs shouldn’t require a permit.
Discussion:

1. Should some business signs be exempt from needing permits?
2. Should we create a temporary sign permit for banners, etc.?

Recommendation: Staff recommends no change to the fact that signs that are not exempt require a permit. Sentence structure has been changed in the third draft.


In the event that a business ceases operation, all Signs shall be removed within ninety (90) days of closing its doors to the public.

Origination: Language is a carryover from existing sign code.

Feedback: Code language doesn’t specify if this is just referring to the sign message or the entire sign. The ninety day time period is too short.

Discussion:

1. Is 90 days unreasonable?
2. Should the code language be clarified as to whether this is just referring to the sign message or the entire structure of the sign?

Recommendation: Staff recommends no change and has included this language in the third draft. This section of code originally only applied to the Camano Gateway Zone. Staff has added it to the general standards for signs under the “Abandoned Signs” subsection.


Lighting fixtures sixty (60) watts or less.

Origination: Language is a carryover from existing sign code.

Feedback: Light output is measured in lumens, not wattage.

Discussion: Language was changed in the second draft to reflect the use of lumens as the measure of light output.

Recommendation: Staff recommends no additional change and has included changed language in the third draft under “Outdoor Lighting”.

Mr. Pederson reminded the Commissioners that they may contact him or Troy Davis if they have any questions.
Commissioner Enell requested that he be included in literature that is sent out on the public outreaches and PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Pederson wanted to remind the Commission that the Shoreline Management Plan Update is coming up and to make sure to prepare for intensive meetings.

*Commissioner Yonkman moved to adjourn, Commissioner Enell seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Virginia Shaddy