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

ROLL CALL

Mike Joselyn, Wayne Havens, Jim Hall, Dean Enell, Mitchell Howard, Scott Yonkman, Anna-Marie Sibon, Val Hillers

Planning staff present: Troy Davis – Long Range Planner, Brad Johnson – Long Range Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 24, 2012
Commissioner Joselyn moved to approve the minutes as presented, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.

August 14, 2012
Commissioner Hillers moved to approve the minutes as presented, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments

NEW BUSINESS:

New Business – Public Hearing
Long Range Planner, Troy Davis presented DRA 107/12, an amendment to Sections 17.03.040 and 17.03.180.R of the Island County Code to clarify the standards and requirements of sign and outdoor lighting regulations.
Outreach Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Language</th>
<th>1st Draft</th>
<th>May 14, 2012 – Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign Color</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Signs</td>
<td>2nd Draft</td>
<td>June 18, 2012 – Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of Height</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Signs</td>
<td>3rd Draft</td>
<td>July 11, 2012 – Public / PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage Area</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Review Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Signs</td>
<td>4th Draft</td>
<td>August, 2012 – Public / PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Signs*</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balancing Act

We have to meet business needs and rural character.

Sign Code Revision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGULATION TOPIC</th>
<th>CURRENT CODE</th>
<th>PROPOSED CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>Defines 3 different types of signs</td>
<td>Defines 28 different types of signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Description</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Includes a description of the section at the beginning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose &amp; Intent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes. Does not include the phrase “creative &amp; distinctive”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Yes. Subsection identifies zone to which sign regulations apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULATION TOPIC</td>
<td>CURRENT CODE</td>
<td>PROPOSED CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Signs</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Yes. Identifies what signs are exempt from regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited Signs</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Yes. Identifies what types of signs are prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Required</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Yes. States when a permit is required by both the County and State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Standards for Signs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes. Adds additional standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Signs</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Adds definition and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Requires signs to be architecturally compatible with associated building. Regulates color and background area of signs.</td>
<td>Requires sign structures (not the actual “sign”) to be architecturally compatible. Only prohibits florescent colors and reflective surfaces in the background area of signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>Requires that lighting for signs is stationary, shielded, of minimal intensity, externally illuminated, limited to certain hours.</td>
<td>Modifies existing language and removes requirement limiting the hours of illumination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Requires signs to be maintained.</td>
<td>Modifies existing language and includes who makes the determination for sign repair and how many days the owner has to comply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of Area</td>
<td>Area is computed by measuring the sign copy by the smallest polygon. Specifies that sign structure does not count toward sign area.</td>
<td>Modifies language. Adds language regarding signs painted on buildings and prohibits measuring individual letters/numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of Height</td>
<td>Height is measured from average line of highest and lowest point of sign, exclusive of topographical modifications.</td>
<td>Height is measured from finished grade to the top of the highest component of the sign, exclusive of any topographical changes. Adds provisions for when topography naturally slopes downward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Prohibits off-premise signs.</td>
<td>Identifies additional areas where signs cannot be placed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size &amp; Height</td>
<td>Prohibits any signage per business from exceeding 100 sq. ft. and 40 sq. ft. per sign and limits height to 18 ft.</td>
<td>Includes a matrix that specifies allowed sign area and height by sign type and zoning classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULATION TOPIC</td>
<td>CURRENT CODE</td>
<td>PROPOSED CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations for Superior Design</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Allows the department director to waive sign requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Signs</td>
<td>Specifies when signs must come into compliance with code requirements.</td>
<td>Modifies language and adds additional language for clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Direction Signs</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Includes definition and requirements for sign type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific Use or Zoning District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>CURRENT CODE</th>
<th>PROPOSED CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeland NMUGA</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Adds language addressing the Freeland NMUGA with regards to signage standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebey’s Landing</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Adds language addressing specific signage standards for Ebey’s Landing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planned Resorts</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Adds language addressing specific signage standards for these resorts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Review Districts</td>
<td>Does not address</td>
<td>Adds language addressing specific standards for these districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camano Gateway Village</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Does not modify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Lighting Standards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Simplifies language-There are a number of exemptions and specific standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revisions to 3rd Draft**

- Corrections to grammatical errors.
- Modified the definitions of Agricultural Signs, Agriculture Directional Signs, and Free Standing Signs.
  - Difference between Agricultural signs and Agricultural Directional Signs.
  - Sandwich Signs are not included under Free Standing Signs.
- Added Sandwich Signs to the list of exempt Signs under 17.03.180.R.3.m
- Added language regarding Sandwich Signs in 17.03.180.R.7.g.v.1
- Modified the square footage allowance of Agricultural Directional Signs (see 17.03.180.R.7.h).
- Modified requirements regarding Agriculture Directional Signs (see 17.03.180.R.8).
- Modified and expanded the language regarding Outdoor Lighting standards (see 17.03.180.R.11).
Agricultural Directional Signs

PURPOSE: To provide agricultural businesses with a means of directing potential customers to their respective locations while protecting the aesthetics of the rural environment.

Off Premise Signage

Undesirable

A Proliferation of individual Off-Premise Signs at intersections
Desirable

Simple, conglomerated Off-Premise signage at intersections.

Code allows up to 8 different plate signs and has to at least be utilized by four different businesses. The purpose is to avoid too many directional signs being installed.

The dimensional requirements are one and a half square feet per blade, which equates to 6 inches by 36 inches. This is a standard blade size.

**How Agricultural Directional Signs Work**

Only one sign may be used on the highway road. This would allow businesses to establish a route to their location. This is a fair and equitable way for businesses to direct potential customers to their locations.
Next Steps

• Continue to meet with interested groups and individuals.
• Continue to receive / incorporate feedback from public and Planning Commission.
• 2nd Planning Commission public hearing in September.
• Board of Island County Commissioners work session will be held.
• Board of Island County Commissioners public hearing will be held.
• Adoption.

Schedule

• Recommend Planning Commission continue hearing to September.
• Board of Island County Commissioners hearing late September/October.

Public Comments:

Ron Nelson, 180 NW Coveland Street, Coupeville
• Stated he is pleased with the outreach made to businesses and the importance of the Sign Code. Feels they have accomplished the goals of the Economic Development Council.

Commissioner Val Hillers commented that she was concerned that the rules of the Special Review District make the small businesses, like Greenbank Farm invisible.
• Is there a way to allow these businesses to be more visible from the highway?
• Another example of a business that would be affected by the sign limitations would be the Crocket Barn Rural Event Center.

Further discussion regarding Rural Event Centers continued.

Commissioner Yonkman supports Commissioner Hiller’s comments.
• Asked Mr. Nelson if there are any comments being made by the businesses.
Ron Nelson stated the size and color of the signs were the concerns most businesses had.
• Agricultural signs - is there a time limit seasonal signs can stay up?
Mr. Davis stated there is no time limit, but the sign size is 9 square feet.

Additional discussion continued regarding agricultural signs.

Commissioner Hillers asked if vehicles with signs are allowed under the sign ordinance.

Troy Davis stated portable signs are not allowed. He continued to read the code regarding portable signs, which is listed under subsection 4, as prohibited as a temporary sign.

Commissioner Enell commented on:
• Sign classifications; Freeland would like to use the Camano Village Gateway Code in the interim while the County finalizes the sign ordinance.
• Stated the footnote conflicted with the code.
Freeland NMUGA did an inventory of signs.
  - Perhaps the sign size being allowed in Island County may be larger than needed.
  - Other locations were looked at, such as Langley, Carmel, & Woodinville during their review. Discussed sign size limitations.
  - Hwy 525 and SR 20 are considered Scenic Highways, which also complicates the ordinance more.

Does the State regulate the signs or does the County?
Mr. Davis stated the State would be involved in the approval process of a sign on the highway.

Commissioner Hall asked if conglomerate agricultural signs are put up by County or the business.

Mr. Davis replied the signs are privately installed. In order to utilize the blades there has to be a total of four businesses to utilize the post. The County would not regulate the contracts or costs.

Commissioner Sibon stated this can cause problems.

Commissioner Howard stated this can cause a form of discrimination towards various businesses.

Troy Davis stated this was more of a legal question and would have to look into it.

Commissioner Hall asked if signs like this can also hold a special events section.

Commissioner Yonkman wanted to know if there was a regulation on text, color, size.

Further discussion regarding how many businesses can use each post and usage of blades continued.

Commissioner Yonkman asked if there is a potential for a variance to allow more blades on the sign.

Troy Davis stated that the problem with a variance decision for superior design is that there are no historical standard criteria to veer from.

The purpose of the agricultural signs was discussed in further detail.

Commissioner Yonkman wanted clarification of one directional sign per business. There are a few side roads that can get you to a location.
  - Asked if there could be language limiting seasonal signs such as hay signs?

Troy stated that that they can only have one blade placed along the highway, but they are allowed to have way finding signs on the rural roads.
Commissioner Howard stated he is surprised that there is not a large amount of public present today. Due to such a large document submitted by the realtors he would like to know the impact this may have on real estate signs.

Troy Davis stated that traditionally real estate signs have used right of way locations in the past. Our Code currently limits to 9 square feet and this has not been an issue in the past. Technology now allows for various ways of locating real estate for sale. People that are in the market for real estate do research and is not an impulse buy. With that in mind some off-site signage can be looked at. Open house sandwich boards are fine, since they are not long-term. Perhaps more can be explored to balance the issue.

Additional discussion in regards to real estate sign ensued.

Commissioner Howard brought up electronic signs. He is not advocating these signs but it is something to think about for the future.

Brad Johnson stated there is a specific rural character definition that is used in Island County. Item C in the definition for rural character is to provide visual landscapes found in traditional rural areas.

Additional discussion continued in regards to the definition of rural character and electronic signs.

Commissioner Joselyn asked whether or not fluorescent color on signs could be prohibited.

Troy stated it can be regulated as part of the design.

Limitations on color were further discussed.

Commissioner Enell discussed the overuse of real estate signs in Snohomish, wanted to know if that situation can occur in Island County.

Troy stated it is already visible in Island County and that is the purpose for the regulation.

Commissioner Yonkman would like a proposal for real estate signs to be able to promote business instead of cutting these businesses off.

*Commissioner Hillers moved to continue the Public Hearing to a later date in September, seconded by Commissioner Enell, motion carried unanimously.*

Commissioner Anna-Marie Sibon wanted to discuss her concern that about notifications of the Planning Commission meetings. The public does not always look at the legal notices. She suggested that there is a calendar section in the newspapers that could be utilized to notify the public. She thought that maybe if the Commission would make a motion to print the workshops in the Calendar.
Commissioner Sibon also wanted to know if the Planning Commission could meet at 10 a.m. rather than 9:00 a.m.

Commissioners discussed the meeting start times and decided to continue meeting at 9 a.m.

Commissioner Hillers moved to adjourn, Commissioner Hall seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Shaddy