

APPROVED

**CITY OF EDMONDS
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEETING
*Summary Minutes***

April 21, 2010

Board Member Kendall called the April 21, 2010 meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:00 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5th Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Board Members Present

Valerie Kendall, Chair
Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair
Lois Broadway
Steve Bullock
Bryan Gootee
Michael Mestres
Bruce O'Neill

Board Members Absent

Staff Present

Kiernan Lien, Associate Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2009 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS

File Number PLN20100017: Application by Island Dog Sign Company for Aegis Living of Edmonds regarding a monument and pole sign proposal located at 21500 – 72nd Avenue West. The site is zoned Multiple Residential (RM-1.5)

APPROVED

Mr. Lien advised that the subject proposal, submitted by Steve Hintzke of Island Dog Sign Company on behalf of Aegis Living of Edmonds, is for design review and approval of two new signs on property located at 21500 – 72nd Avenue West. The property is located near the hospital and just a half block from Highway 99. The site is zoned Multi-Family Residential (RM-1.5), but the use on site is an assisted living facility, which is more commercial in nature. He reminded the Board that commercial uses in the RM zones are allowed to use some of the sign standards from the Neighborhood Business (BN) zone, particularly those related to size and height.

Mr. Lien reviewed that the applicant is requesting a modification from the sign code in the following three areas:

- **Sign Type** – The applicant has requested two separate freestanding signs. The sign proposed for the corner of 76th Avenue West and 216th Street Southwest would be a monument sign. Pursuant to ECDC 20.609.020.L, monument signs are conditionally permitted for business uses in RM zones. However, monument signs over six feet in height must be reviewed to ensure that materials, colors, design and proportions proposed are consistent with those used throughout the site. The proposed primary monument sign would not exceed six feet in height.

The pole sign would be placed at the driveway entrance, which is shared with an adjacent development (Aldcrest Health and Rehabilitation Center). Although the sign would be supported by two poles, it would not have the appearance of a typical pole sign. The design would be similar to Aldcrest’s existing sign. The intent is to make the two signs compatible. Pole signs are not an allowed sign type for businesses in RM zones. However, it is important to note that the subject property is located within the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center as defined in the Comprehensive Plan, and pole signs are a permitted sign type within the activity center pursuant to ECDC 20.60.020.L. Generally, when there are conflicting codes, the most restrictive code applies. However, given the setting of the site, which is surrounded mostly by commercial property and medical uses, and its location just off of Highway 99, it may be appropriate to apply the sign types allowed within the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center in this location.

- **Number of Signs** – The applicant is requesting two permanent freestanding signs. Pursuant to ECDC 20.60.025.B.5, the maximum number of permitted permanent signs in RM zones is one, except sites with more than one vehicular entrance may have one permanent sign per entrance. The subject property is developed as an assisted living facility and is being treated as a commercial enterprise for purposes of the application. While multi-family uses are permitted outright in the RM zones, convalescent homes require a conditional use permit in RM zones and are considered more of a business.

ECDC 20.60.045.A states that permanent freestanding signs are discouraged and should only be approved where the applicant demonstrates by substantial evidence that there is no reasonable and feasible alternate signage method to provide adequate identification. The applicant has argued that given the location of the building on the site, a sign mounted on the building would be difficult to see from the road. A site visit confirmed that it would be difficult to see a wall-mounted sign approaching from the east off Highway 99 or from the north along 72nd Avenue West.

ECDC 20.60.045.F states that no more than one freestanding sign shall be permitted on each lot, except in the business and commercial zones where a lot has frontage on two arterial streets, in which case one sign per street frontage would be permitted subject to the restrictions on sign area. The subject property is not located in a business or commercial zone and neither 216th Street Southwest nor 72nd Avenue West have been identified as arterial streets in the 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

There are currently a number of unpermitted signs on site. In addition to the two unpermitted signs that are being replaced, there are also three temporary signs: a large banner attached to the side of the building, a sandwich board sign on the corner, and a real-estate type sign about mid property. The banner exceeds the allowable sign area for temporary signs and the sandwich board sign is not an allowed sign type in the RM zone.

APPROVED

- **Sign Area** – According to ECDC 20.60.025.B.4, commercial uses in residential zones can use the maximum area and height limitations established for signs in the BN zone. The maximum total permanent sign area in the BN zone is one square foot of sign area for each lineal foot of wall containing the main public entrance to the primary structure. For the subject site, this would equate to 151 square feet of total sign area, and the two proposed signs would total 54.92 square feet of sign area.

The maximum area of each freestanding sign for the BN zone is 24 square feet, and the area of the proposed parking entrance pole sign would be 19.67 square feet. The area of the primary monument sign would be 35.25 feet, which exceeds the maximum allowed and is part of the request under consideration. ECDC 20.60.005 defines monument signs as “freestanding signs that have integrated the structural component of the sign into the design of the sign and sign base.” Sign area is defined as the “maximum actual area of a sign that is visible from any single point of observation from any public vantage point. Supporting structures which are part of a sign display shall be included in the calculation of the sign area.” By definition, monument signs include supporting structures as part of the total sign area. The applicant is requesting that the 24 square foot maximum allowable sign area be applied only to the sign face of the primary monument sign. The sign face of the proposed monument sign would be 24.4 square feet, which is close the total sign area allowed in the BN zone.

Mr. Lien advised that the landscape standards (ECDC 20.50.045.G) would require that each freestanding sign provide a landscaped area twice the size of the sign area at the base of the sign. To meet the landscape requirement, the applicant is proposing 75 square feet of landscaping for the 35.25 square foot monument sign and 40 square feet of landscaping for the 19.67 square foot pole sign.

Mr. Lien said the applicant is proposing external illumination for both signs, which is allowed in RM zones. However, ECDC 20.60.020.G states that no light source that exceeds 20 watts can be directly exposed to any public street or adjacent property. The proposed external lighting would consist of landscape floodlights (see Sheet 6 of Exhibit 4), with 40 watt bulbs. The bulbs would be shielded and would point at the signs to be compliant with the code.

Mr. Lien pointed out that because both signs would be taller than 3 feet, they would have to meet the setback requirements for the RM-1.5 zone. Both of the proposed sign locations would meet the 15-foot setback requirement set forth in ECDC 16.30.030.A. As part of their technical review during the building permit phase, the Engineering Department would ensure the location of the signs meet the site distance requirements.

Mr. Lien referred the Commission to ECDC 20.60.015.B.1, which sets forth the criteria the ADB must use when reviewing modification requests. He reviewed the criteria as follows:

1. The request is for signage on a site that has a unique configuration, such as frontage on more than two streets, or has an unusual geometric shape.
2. The subject property, building, or business has site conditions that do not afford it the opportunity to provide signage consistent with or similar to other properties in the vicinity.
3. The design of the proposed signage must be compatible in its use of materials, colors, design and proportions with development throughout the site.
4. In no event shall the modification result in signage which exceeds the maximum normally allowed by more than 50 percent.

Mr. Lien shared the following staff findings related to the application:

- **Sign Type** – The sign code is conflicting on whether a pole sign would be allowed at the subject property. Pole signs are not allowed for businesses in RM zones, but are allowed in the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center, all of which apply to the subject property. The pole sign is proposed in order to be consistent with the design of the sign for the Aldercrest Health and Rehabilitation Center, which sits on the opposite side of the shared driveway from the

APPROVED

subject property. Given the location of the subject property (close to the hospital and surrounded by business and medical uses), staff believes it would be appropriate to apply the Comprehensive Plan overlay requirements in this situation.

- **Number of Signs** – Only one freestanding sign is allowed and the code also discourages freestanding signs altogether in the RM zones. However, it is important to note that the subject property has a unique configuration in that the building is set back from the street and is surrounded by trees. This makes it difficult to see a sign placed on the building. Also, the entrance to the facility is not near where the majority of visitors would be coming from off Highway 99. A sign at the corner of 216th Street Southwest and 72nd Avenue West and another sign at the entrance off 72nd Avenue West would make it easier for visitors and residents to navigate to the site. The subject site is largely surrounded by General Commercial 2 and Mixed-Use zoning, which is permitted to have three signs per site, so the applicant's request would be consistent with surrounding properties.
- **Sign Area** – The total maximum allowable sign area for the site is 151 square feet, and the two proposed signs would total 54.92 square feet. The maximum allowable sign area for any given freestanding sign within the BN zone is 24 feet, and the primary monument sign area, including the base of the sign, would be 35.25 square feet. The area of the sign face of the monument sign would be 24.4 square feet, which itself exceeds the maximum allowable sign area. The Board can approve an increase in sign area of no more than 50 percent of the maximum normally allowed. There are several unpermitted signs on site that currently exceed the allowable sign area for temporary signs, and these signs should be removed from the site. Staff believes the request for increased sign area appears unnecessary if the other two modifications are granted.

Mr. Lien said that based on the analysis and attachments in the Staff Report, staff recommends approval of the request for modification to the sign type and number of signs and denial of the request for modification to the sign area.

Board Member Mestres asked if the pole sign proposed at the entrance off 72nd Avenue West would be similar in design and size to the existing Aldercrest Health and Rehabilitation Center sign. Mr. Lien answered affirmatively. He referred to Sheets 6 and 7 of Exhibit 4, which illustrate the existing and proposed signs. Vice Chair Schaefer asked if research was done as to the conditions under which the Aldercrest Health and Rehabilitation Center sign was approved. Mr. Lien responded that he did not research the history of this particular sign.

Board Member Bullock said that while ECDC 20.60.005 states that supporting structures that are part of the sign display should be included in the calculation of the sign area, in this case, the small stone base does not appear to be part of the display. Interpreting the sign base to be part of the total sign area would be a deterrent against having monument signs. Mr. Lien pointed out that even if the base is not considered part of the total sign area, the proposed monument sign would slightly exceed the total area allowed. Staff interprets ECDC 20.60.005 to mean that the base should be calculated as part of the total sign area. Board Member Bullock suggested the Board start their discussion by clarifying what constitutes sign area in this case.

Vice Chair Schaefer asked where the signs would be positioned with regard to the setback requirement. Mr. Lien answered that the proposed sign locations would be consistent with the setback requirements of the RM zone. They would be located more than 15 feet from the property line.

Chair Kendall suggested it would be distracting for the Board to discuss the temporary signs that currently exist on the site. These signs should be dealt by the City's code enforcement staff. The Board's charge is to review the proposed new signs, and the existing temporary signs should not be a factor in their final decision.

Steve Hintzke, Island Dog Sign Company, Seattle, said that, for the most part, Mr. Lien did a good job of explaining the reasons why the applicant is asking for a modification to the sign code requirements. However, he disagreed with staff's method of measuring the total area of the proposed freestanding sign. He said he installs signs throughout the

APPROVED

Puget Sound area and Edmonds is the first jurisdiction that counts the stone portion of a monument sign as part of the sign area. He said he finds the City's method of measuring sign area unusual.

Mr. Hintzke explained that site distance is a key consideration when determining the appropriate sign size. The typical standard is to have 1/8-inch of letter height for every foot away from the sign, which means the letters on the proposed sign should be at least three inches in height in order to be fully visible to cars that pass by the intersection 25 feet away. The address line on the proposed sign contains letters that are 3 inches high, but the telephone number and website address would only be 2 inches high. The remaining letters would be 2.5 inches high. However, the smaller letters should be adequate given the contrast between the color of the letters and the background. If the City requires the applicant to shrink the size of the sign further, they will likely decide to reduce the base and place the sign closer to the ground. He expressed concern that reducing the size of the lettering would result in the sign being less visible from the street for the average person's eye site.

Mr. Hintzke asked that the Board reconsider the staff's recommendation related to the sign area and allow the actual face of the monument sign to have a total area of 24 square feet, not including the supporting structure. This would allow the sign to provide maximum readability from the street.

Board Member Mestres asked if the monument sign would be the site's primary sign. Mr. Hintzke answered affirmatively and noted that no sign is proposed for the building. He explained that the building cannot be seen from most areas along the street because the property is lined with large fir trees. Mr. Lien agreed that the building is not visible coming from Highway 99 towards the hospital on 216th Street Southwest. There is a break in the trees past 72nd Avenue West, but it is past the entrance to the site. Mr. Hintzke referred to Sheet 6 of Exhibit 4, which illustrates how well the building is hidden by the trees.

Board Member Broadway asked if any thought was given to incorporating the lighting into the monument sign as opposed to using free standing spotlights. Mr. Hintzke said the applicant has requested the freestanding lights. He explained that customers most often request the freestanding lights as opposed to internal lighting because it is easier to maintain. Mr. Lien reminded the Board that internal illumination is not allowed within the zone.

Board Member Bullock asked the applicant to explain the rationale for using a white cabinet with blue letters. Mr. Hintzke responded that this is the standard design for Aegis Living signage. The contrast is intended to maximize visibility. He reminded the Board that the applicant's clientele tends to have sight problems, so it is important to choose colors that will maximize the contrast to make the signs easy for people to see.

Board Member Gootee pointed out that local fire departments typically require addresses on all buildings, and this would be separate from the sign code. If the applicant is trying to make the lettering on the sign larger so it is more readable, he suggested they eliminate the address from the sign and place it on the building, instead. The address that is placed on the building would not be counted as part of the total sign area because it is a fire department requirement. Mr. Hintzke said he believes the address is already on the building, but it is not visible from the street because of the trees that line the property. He suggested that emergency vehicles would have trouble identifying the site from the address on the building. Placing the address on the sign would improve emergency access, as well. Vice Chair Schaefer observed that the monument sign would face towards traffic on 216th Street Southwest and the actual address of the building is 72nd Avenue West. He agreed it would make sense to include the address on the signs.

Vice Chair Schaefer asked if the applicant would consider replacing the proposed pole sign with another monument sign. Mr. Hintzke answered that the applicant has indicated a willingness to consider this option. However, from an aesthetic standpoint, the applicant felt it would be appropriate to match the style of the adjacent sign placed for the Aldercrest Health and Rehabilitation Center. Chair Kendall agreed that a monument sign would be more attractive than the proposed pole sign. She noted that the existing Aldercrest Health and Rehabilitation Center sign is old, and it would not necessarily be appropriate for the applicant to make the new sign compatible. Board Member O'Neill asked if there

APPROVED

would be a significant cost difference associated with changing the proposed pole sign to a monument sign. Mr. Hintzke answered that there would be a significant cost difference, and Board Member Gootee agreed.

Board Member Gootee asked if the applicant would be willing to compromise some of the script (phone number and website address), which is not typically found on monument signs for retail businesses. Mr. Hintzke answered that he could approach the applicant with this request. However, he pointed out that the information on the proposed sign is consistent with signs placed at other Aegis Living facilities throughout the region.

Board Member Bullock asked if the total sign area of the pole sign included the poles. Mr. Hintzke said it was calculated based on the sign face and the poles.

THERE WAS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC HEARING, AND THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Kendall suggested the Board first make a determination about whether the total area for the monument sign should include the supporting structure. Board Member Gootee said that in jurisdictions he has worked with, it is typical to consider the monument base as part of the total sign area. Chair Kendall said that is her experience, as well. Mr. Hintzke pointed out that neither Bellevue nor Kirkland calculate the supporting structure as part of the total sign area. Board Member Gootee noted that Bellevue has a lower height limit than Edmonds, so they can be more forgiving on the sign area size.

Board Member Bullock said he knows of monument signs in Edmonds where the sign area was calculated using the actual sign face and not the base. He said his interpretation of the code is that the stone base should not be included in the total sign area. If the supporting structure is included, then he suggested that the poles on the pole sign should be included as part of the total sign area, as well.

Board Member Mestres expressed his belief that the fine brick work proposed for the base of the monument sign could be interpreted as landscaping more than signage. He suggested the Board should also keep in mind that the total sign area allowed on the site is 151 square feet, and the applicant is only proposing 54.92 square feet. They should also keep in mind that the site is located in a congested area of Edmonds. Board Member Bullock said a building sign does not make sense, so there should be some way for the applicant to apply this area to signage that is oriented towards the street.

Board Member Mestres observed that three modifications for one property seems like a lot, but the Board should keep in mind that the proposed pole sign would mirror an existing sign on the adjacent property, and the monument sign would be the only other signage on the site. In this case, he felt there are extenuating circumstances to support the modifications proposed by the applicant.

Board Member O'Neil agreed the Board could make a case for defining the structure as being the portion of the sign above the foundation. The stone part of the proposed monument sign could be considered the foundation for the structure of the sign. Board Member Mestres agreed that the proposed monument sign appears to have two separate elements. Vice Chair Schaefer agreed. However, if the actual sign area extends over the face of the supporting structure, that portion of the supporting structure should be included as part of the total sign area. He said he would support a decision that the stone base not be counted as part of the total sign area. However, he recommended the proposed pole sign be replaced with a monument sign that is similar in design to the proposed monument sign. He felt this would be more compatible with the architecture of the building.

Chair Kendall said she works for a company that owns an assisted living facility, and they just replaced their signage. She said she can relate to the need to include a lot of information on the sign because of the population served by the facility and the types of services offered. In addition, the building is tucked behind the landscaping, so the proposed signage appears reasonable.

APPROVED

With the exception of Board Member Gootee, the remainder of the Board agreed that the stone base on the monument sign depicted on Sheet 5 of Exhibit 4 of the Staff Report is not part of the sign display area and should not be counted as part of the total sign area.

Chair Kendall said she would support the proposal to allow two freestanding signs on the site, but she would prefer that both signs be monument signs rather than one monument sign and one pole sign. Board Member Broadway agreed. She said she would like the applicant to do more than just mimic the pole sign that exists on the adjacent property.

Board Member O'Neill suggested the monument sign be limited to 24 square feet rather than the proposed 24.4 square feet. Board Member Bullock reminded the Board that the purpose of the modification clause in the code is to give the applicant the right to come before the Board with a request for more signage. This type of request should not be considered a variance. If a request for modification meets the criteria in Section 20.60.015.B.1, the Board has the ability to approve the modification. He reminded the Commission that the applicant would be allowed a building sign of up to 151 square feet. Therefore, he did not feel it would be inappropriate for the Board to grant a modification to allow a small amount of additional square footage for the monument sign.

Board Member Bullock reminded the Board that ECDC 20.60.025 allows the Board to use the BN zoning standards for signage on commercial uses in the RN zones. However, it is important to note that the BN standards are intended to apply to small neighborhood business uses, and the current application involves a large facility with adequate screening from surrounding properties. The BN standards would not apply in this situation because a building sign would not be visible. He expressed his belief that the applicant has clearly met the criteria to support the request to modify the sign area and number of signs. However, he agreed with Chair Kendall's recommendation that rather than a monument sign and a pole sign, the applicant should be allowed two monument signs that are similar in size and character.

Board Member Bullock said that while he understands that signs with white cabinets and dark lettering are generally more visible, he felt the letters stick out too much. He said he would prefer the applicant reverse the color arrangement. Chair Kendall asked if the applicant would be willing to reverse the colors as recommended by Board Member Bullock. Mr. Hintzke said he would take this request back to his client. He noted that his client recently replaced a sign at their Kirkland facility that had white letters and a dark background. The new sign reversed the colors.

Board Member Gootee pointed out that the City does not have a specific code requirement related to sign color. Mr. Lien agreed there is no specific code language to regulate color. However, there is some reference to color in the zoning standards. For example, if the Planning Manager determines a proposed sign is too garish or out of character with the site, he can require design review by the ADB. In addition, monument signs over six feet in height require design review to ensure that materials, colors, design and proportions are consistent with those used throughout the site.

Board Member Gootee explained that it is important for companies to use their branding when they place new signs. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for the Board to require the applicant to reverse the colors on the proposed signs, particularly since there is no code language that specifically prohibits white backgrounds with dark lettering. He said he respects the branding colors of the applicant, and he would support the sign colors as proposed.

Board Member Broadway pointed out that, as proposed, the back of the sign cabinets would be white. She suggested the Board require the applicant use a dark color for the back and side of the proposed signs. She agreed with Board Member Bullock's conclusions regarding the application, except she cautioned against requiring the applicant to replace the pole sign with a monument sign, since monument signs are costly. However, she felt it would be appropriate to require the applicant to investigate other options that are more substantial or permanent than a pole sign at the entrance. Board Member Bullock agreed that the entrance sign would not necessarily have to be a monument sign, but he would prefer something other than a pole sign.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Schaefer asked Mr. Lien if staff would have enough information to act without bringing the application back to the Board if the Board's final decision included the requirement that the second sign be something of a more permanent design than the temporary look of a pole sign. Mr. Lien answered affirmatively. Mr. Hintzke pointed out that a stone-based monument sign would be significantly more costly than the proposed pole sign. However, he agreed to approach his client with other options.

BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE FILE NUMBER PLN20100017 AS SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT THE FREESTANDING SIGN LOCATED AT THE SHARED ENTRY DRIVE WITH ALDERCREST HEALTH AND REHABILITATION CENTER NOT BE ALLOWED TO BE A POLE SIGN. HE FURTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD FIND THAT THE BASE OF THE MONUMENT SIGN LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF 216TH STREET SOUTHWEST AND 72ND AVENUE WEST IS NOT PART OF THE SIGN DISPLAY AREA AND SHOULD NOT BE COUNTED AS PART OF THE TOTAL SIGN AREA. THE PROPOSED SIGN PACKAGE COMPLIES WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES AND PLANS AND THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN ECDC 20.60.015.B.1 FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- **THE BUILDING IS LOCATED BEHIND SUBSTANTIAL VEGETATION SO A BUILDING-MOUNTED SIGN WOULD NOT BE VISIBLE FROM THE STREET.**
- **THE STRUCTURE IS LOCATED ON A LARGE LOT AND THE PROPOSED SIGN DESIGN WOULD BE COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING DEVELOPMENT.**
- **THE MODIFICATION WOULD NOT EXCEED THE MAXIMUM SIGN AREA ALLOWED BY MORE THAN 50 PERCENT.**

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO REQUIRE THAT THE BACK SIDE OF EACH OF THE SIGNS BE PAINTED A DARKER COLOR, PREFERRABLY A COLOR ALREADY ESTABLISHED ON THE SIGN. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION TO AMEND.

THE MOTION, AS AMENDED, WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS

No public hearings were scheduled on the agenda.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

No consolidated permit applications were scheduled on the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

There were no administrative reports by staff.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBERS COMMENTS

Board Member Bullock explained that it is important to provide clear direction to staff about the type of sign design the Board likes. This will enable staff to provide enough information to applicants to influence the design early on when it is easier to make changes. He suggested the Board reach a consensus about whether or not they would prefer signs that use white letters and dark backgrounds. Board Member Mestres expressed his belief that readability and function of the sign

APPROVED

are just as important as aesthetics, and signs with white backgrounds and dark letters are typically more readable. Board Member O'Neill suggested that each proposal must be considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on the location of the sign. Board Member Broadway observed that signs with dark backs and sides are less likely to be "tagged." Chair Kendall agreed with Board Member Bullock that signs with white boxes can be garish and too bright.

Board Member Kendall welcomed new Board Member Broadway.

The Board requested staff provide clarification at their next meeting about how the City calculates the total area of monument signs. They specifically asked for clarification as to whether the base of the sign should be included in the total sign area or not. Board Member Gootee pointed out that in some cities, businesses tend to provide large bases to accentuate the area of the sign. Board Member O'Neill suggested staff's analysis include a review of monument signs that were previously approved by the ADB.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

APPROVED