

**APPROVED**

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEETING**

**May 5, 2010**

---

Board Member Kendall called the May 5, 2010 meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

**ROLL CALL**

**Board Members Present**

Valerie Kendall, Chair  
Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair  
Lois Broadway  
Steve Bullock  
Bryan Gootee  
Michael Mestres

**Board Members Absent**

Bruce O'Neill

**Staff Present**

Kernen Lien, Planner

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF APRIL 21, 2010 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Board added a discussion about sign area calculation to their agenda. The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

**REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

No members of 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:**

**Landscape Modifications for Point Edwards, Located at 85 Pine Street and Zoned Master Plan Hillside Mixed Use (MP-1).**

Mr. Lien explained that the application is for two separate landscape modification requests. The Board agreed it would be appropriate to consider each of the requests independently. Mr. Lien advised that the homeowners association (HOA) recently assumed maintenance of the site. He recalled that the ADB approved the landscape plan in 2002, and indicated that any major changes to the plan should come back to them for approval. Staff considered both of the changes significant enough to require additional ADB review and approval.

### **Homeowners Association's (HOA) Request to remove a species from the landscape without replacement.**

Mr. Lien advised that the HOA is proposing to remove all the English Laurel from the landscaping without providing a replacement species. He noted that the approved landscape plan called for Schipka Laurel, but English Laurel was planted. English Laurel is a more aggressive variety of Laurel that requires more maintenance. The landscaping has now matured, and the area is filling. Therefore, the applicant does not feel a replacement for the English Laurel is necessary.

Mr. Lien said it is staff's belief that removing the English Laurel from the site would not take away from the quality of the landscaping. He referred to photographs provided in the Staff Report (Exhibit 15). He summarized that the first two pictures show places where the English Laurels tuck within the landscaping that is underneath the trees and other bushes. The landscaping has filled in nicely. The next two pictures illustrate areas where the English Laurel is out in the open and would be missed more than in other locations. He referred to the site plan submitted by the HMO, which highlights some but not all of the English Laurel. He emphasized it is their intent to remove all of this species, and not just those that are highlighted. He summarized that, in general, staff is supportive of the HOA's request.

Board Member Mestres questioned why English Laurel was planted instead of the Schipka Laurel that was identified in the landscape plan. Mr. Lien said it may have had to do with availability.

Chair Kendall asked if staff is concerned that the current request is to remove all of the English Laurel, when only some of the species is identified for removal on the site plan. Mr. Lien said he contacted the applicant and confirmed that they are requesting to remove all the English Laurel except for around the utility boxes.

**Brian Collins, D.G Landcare Services, Bellevue**, explained that the English Laurel is the most vigorous plant on the property. In looking at how many were planted, the amount of maintenance hours required, and how filled out the landscape was, they determined it would be much easier to remove them rather than keep them at their current level. With the exception of the utility areas, they have been kept at about 4 to 5 feet. Considering these are the regular English Laurel and not the Schipka Laurel, they can grow up to 25 or 30 feet tall, or about 2 feet per year. They are recommending the species be removed to reduce the amount of maintenance hours required for the property.

Board Member Broadway asked if any areas would be inadequately landscaped if all the English Laurel were removed. Mr. Collins answered no. He explained that, currently, there are 10 to 15 different species of plants. He estimated the existing landscaping would fill in the areas where the Laurel is removed within 2 to 3 years.

Vice Chair Schaefer referred to Picture 3 in Exhibit 15 and observed that the existing ground cover would eventually fill the holes left if the Laurel were removed. However, a number of the Laurel shrubs provide screening from the street. Removing the Laurel would add a bit more mass to the appearance of the building. He asked if another species could be planted in these situations. Mr. Collins agreed that this bed is almost entirely ground cover at this time. He advised that in the fall, they plan to transplant a species of Yew in this location. This species grows rapidly, but the height would be about the same as the existing English Laurel. Also, in this particular area, the Dogwood trees are stressed out due to improper planting and perhaps fungal diseases. They will likely need to be removed and replaced with something else, as well. Vice Chair Schaefer asked if the health of the trees has anything to do with the slope in the location where they were planted. Mr. Collins observed that with many of the trees planted on the property, the crown had been buried, but the cage surrounding the roots had not been removed. He noted there are many sloped landscape areas at Point Edwards.

Chair Kendall clarified that the applicant is not proposing to add any additional landscaping, but they might redistribute some of the existing landscaping. Mr. Collins concurred.

**BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK MOVED THE BOARD APPROVE ITEM 1 OF FILE NUMBER PLN20100022 (ELIMINATION OF THE ENGLISH LAUREL). ALL ENGLISH LAUREL IN THE PLAN**

**MAY BE ELIMINATED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THOSE AROUND UTILITY FEATURES AND THOSE USED FOR SCREENING. IN AREAS WHERE THERE ARE NO LARGE SHRUBS, THE APPLICANT WILL RELOCATE OTHER SHRUBS TO THOSE SITES. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Point Edwards LLC request for Modification for Release of Maintenance Bond**

Mr. Lien explained that upon inspection of landscaping for Buildings 6 and 7 for the release of a landscape maintenance bond, City staff determined that large portions of the approved landscaping appeared to be missing. This is particularly the case on the view side of the buildings where Serviceberry and Staghorn Sumac trees were supposed to be planted according to the approved landscape plan. He advised that Bruce Moe of Point Edwards LLC indicated the trees on the view side were not planted in an effort to protect views, and revisions to the landscape plan were approved by the landscape architect and the City of Edmonds Planning Division. However, the approved landscape plans on file with the City of Edmonds (Exhibits 6, 8, 11, 16 and 17) show the trees are to be planted. The City has no other documentation of an approved plan that identifies these areas not being planted with trees. The location where the Serviceberry and Staghorn Sumac trees were to be planted according the approved landscape plans is located on the hillside below the lawn areas of Buildings 6 and 7.

According to the Western Garden Book, Serviceberry trees grow to about 20 feet high, and Staghorn Sumac Trees grow to approximately 15 feet. Given the location of the trees at maturity, it is staff's opinion that the trees would not likely impact views significantly. Point Edwards LLC has indicated they would replant along the southern boundary. However, they do not wish to plant trees along the view area. Given that this was a significant change, staff felt it would be appropriate for additional ADB review. With the proposed location and mature height of the trees, staff does not believe they will impact views. Therefore, staff recommends the applicant be required to plant the trees before the maintenance bond can be released.

Board Member Gootee asked if lawn associated with Building 7 goes straight out from the bottom floor. Mr. Lien said the topography of the lawn areas in front of Buildings 6 and 7 is nearly level. Board Member Gootee observed that the shelf is approximately 10 feet below the height of the lawn area.

Board Member Gootee referred to Exhibit 7 in which the applicant points out that the City's Planning Department staff inspected the site and signed off on the revision that eliminated the trees in front of Buildings 6 and 7. Mr. Lien said the applicant indicated in their cover letter that the decision was made on site with the landscape architect, the builder and City staff. However, the landscape architect has indicated that City staff was not part of that decision, and there are no plans on file with the City that showed revised landscaping for these areas. He said there is no documentation that a revision was approved as part of the Certificate of Occupancy.

Board Member Broadway asked if anything was planted on the site in lieu of the trees. Mr. Lien answered that ground cover has been planted in this area, but no shrubs. Some smaller shrubs were planted at the corner of Building 6, but they are also identified in the landscape plan.

Board Member Mestres asked if the trees identified in the original landscape plan were intended to replace trees that had been removed as part of previous site clearing. Mr. Lien referred to Item L1.0 of Exhibit 16, which identifies the trees that were removed to accommodate the development. Item L1.3 of Exhibit 16 is the landscape plan that was approved by the ADB. His understanding is that the trees were intended to be replacement trees to re-vegetate the site.

Vice Chair Schaefer referred to L1.0 of Exhibit 16 and said it appears the heavy dashed line was to be the prescribed clearing line. Mr. Lien said Exhibit 16 is the initial plan that was submitted as part of the application. Exhibit 11 contains the approved plans. Mr. Bullock recalled that the developer was required to replant trees on the bank. However, this was completely separate from the approved landscape plans for the individual buildings. This requirement addressed the trees that were removed as part of the initial clearing of the site. He suggested the tree

replacement requirement should not have a significant bearing on whatever the ADB decides to do with the required trees associated with the construction of individual buildings.

**Forrest Jammer, Thomas Rengstorf and Associates, Seattle**, advised that his company is the landscape architect for the project. He referred to Item L1.0 in Exhibit 16, which is the legend showing which trees could be removed. The limit line (dashed line) is an approximation. Items L1.2 and L1.3 of Exhibit 16 identify the landscaping that was proposed for the entire area up to the limit line. Most of the trees and shrubs on the plan are necessary for the area as part of the deal for allowing the trees to be cleared. The developer spent a substantial amount of money to revegetate the hillside. He said he walked the site today and found that most of the plants and trees in this area are doing well and will eventually grow larger.

Board Member Bullock said it is important to understand that a landscape plan is submitted when a project comes to the ADB for review early in the project design phase. After ADB approval, the applicant continues to develop construction documents, which are submitted and reviewed by City staff at the building permit stage. It is not uncommon for landscape plans to evolve to a certain degree after ADB approval. At the building permit stage, it is staff's responsibility to determine if the landscape plan submitted with the building permit is still roughly consistent with what the ADB originally approved. If staff determines it is not consistent, the applicant must either change the plan or present a new proposal to the ADB. The same thing happens at the construction stage. What gets built often evolves from the landscape plans approved with the building permit. This results in a project that is two plans removed from when the ADB initially reviewed the application. Once a project has been completed, the Planning Division staff inspects the site to determine if the finished product is the same as what was approved as part of the building permit.

Board Member Bullock said he conducted many inspections of the site as part of the City's Planning Division, but he left the employ of the City by the time they got to Buildings 6 and 7. He said he may have reviewed the building permits for the two buildings, but he did not conduct any inspections. Mr. Lien referred to Exhibit 11, which are the plans that were approved as part of the building permit. He noted that staff signed off on the plans on January 25, 2007, which was several years after the other buildings were constructed. Board Member Bullock summarized that Exhibit 11 is the plan that was approved by the Planning Division staff as being conceptually consistent with ADB approval. It shows both a lawn and some trees. In addition, someone from the Planning Division should have inspected the site and signed off on the performance bond before the Certificate of Occupancy could be issued. Mr. Lien explained that, apparently, it was policy at one time that a performance bond was not needed as long as the landscaping was installed. Buildings 6 and 7 were reviewed, but he cannot find any documentation of the review. Board Member Bullock said someone from the Planning Division should have signed off on a form that went back to the Building Division indicating they were okay with what was installed.

Board Member Mestres observed that it would be difficult for the Board to make a judgment based on the information provided in the staff report. He suggested it would be helpful to have some more recent images to illustrate the existing situation. If the existing landscaping has grown into a suitable replacement, the ADB could take that into consideration. Mr. Lien referred to Exhibit 11, which contains the landscape plans that were approved in 2007. The other tree situation related to the hillside took place in 2003 or 2004. The dashed line along the edge in Exhibit 11 identifies the location where the hillside drops dramatically. This is the area where trees were planted as mitigation for the trees that were removed. No trees have been planted within the bench area.

Vice Chair Schaefer said he visited the site and noted that the road sits above the landscape area. The proposed plantings can be seen from the edge of the property and looking between Buildings 5 and 6. As he looked down, from above, he could see the very top of one evergreen tree that was located on the slope. With the drop off, he does not anticipate a view issue with trees that grow 15 to 20 feet tall. Without having any documentation or history to support the proposed change, he said he does not see a reason to modify the landscape plan that was approved by the ADB in 2002. He felt it was legitimate to require the applicant to establish a healthy root structure at the top of the slope, which would be accomplished with plantings as identified in the landscaping plan that was previously approved by the ADB. Board Member Bullock concurred. Neither of the proposed trees (Serviceberry and Staghorn Sumac) would grow tall, but their

root structure would add stability to the slope. The proposed planting locations would still accommodate a significant view corridor, and the trees would be planted down slope from the units. He does not see any reason to alter the plan.

Board Member Gootee pointed out that it is staff's responsibility to see that projects are constructed as per approved plans. If a project is not built per the plan, the applicant must resubmit an application and go through the process again. Mr. Lien said staff inspected the site and determined that the landscape area must either be replanted or the applicant must approach the ADB with a request for a landscape modification. The applicant chose to approach the ADB with their proposed change. It was staff's interpretation that the proposed modification was significant enough to warrant ADB review and approval.

Board Member Bullock summarized that the applicant is asking the ADB to approve a change to their plan that would not require them to plant trees on the hillside as called out in the currently approved plan. The ADB has the ability to accept the proposal or not. Vice Chair Schaefer pointed out that the ADB's approval of the proposal included the condition that "all tree clearing and replanting shall comply with the submitted arborist report and final landscape plan." The applicant is asking that the plan be modified to be consistent with the current situation on site.

Board Member Gootee expressed concern that the trees identified in the landscape plan could potentially block the view of the condominium owners. He said he would be willing to consider a resubmittal for a different type of species that would protect the existing view. Mr. Jammer advised that Staghorn Sumac has the ability to grow up to 30 feet, and the site has proven to be a very enjoyable location for this species. Board Member Bullock said that is assuming no maintenance is done on the trees. \

**Brian Collins, D.G Landcare Services, Bellevue**, said that in the past, previous landscape companies have sheared the plants on the property, and the HMO and his company are using a more naturalistic approach of letting things grow to a mature height. In addition, he noted that pruning trees actually encourages growth. He pointed out that the Staghorn Sumac species can grow fairly tall. He noted that the slope starts at the same level as the lawn, and over the course of about 30 feet going west, it drops down 10 feet. The Serviceberry species are proposed to be planted at the same level as the lawn. While the Board may think the mature height of both of the proposed species would not impede views; according to the landscape plans, they would be planted at the same level as the lawns and then grow 15 to 25 feet tall. This would ultimately block the entire first floor of both of the buildings, and possibly the second story, as well. Vice Chair Schaefer pointed out there is a drop from the building, so the trees would not be planted at the same level as the first floor. Mr. Collins pointed out that the lawn was expanded further out than shown on the plan. The bench drops off at slope of 3 to 1, which is not a significant slope.

Again, Board Member Gootee suggested the applicant resubmit the proposal using alternative types of vegetation. He said he is taking into account the potential hardship the existing plan could have on the condominium owners. He felt that a different type of vegetation could protect the views and still maintain the character of the site.

Board Member Mestres questioned why the trees were included as part of the original landscape plan if they were not a good choice. It is likely that the trees were proposed by the landscape architect. Mr. Jammer explained that owners of Point Edwards at the time were concerned about being able to market the units, and they wanted to maintain a passive view into the future. As much as possible, they avoided landscaping that would limit the view of the water. However, the re-vegetation plan required them to address certain areas of the site. He said the proposed tree species have been used in other locations on the site, but there is concern that they could grow to block the views from the condominiums. He suggested that the trees be shifted to another portion of the site in the general area (south of Building 7) that is currently being irrigated. At this time, the slope area has not been properly irrigated. Adding more irrigation to the slopes would place an additional burden on the HMO.

Chair Kendall asked if the developer or the HMO would be responsible for planting the trees as per the approved landscape plan. Mr. Lien said it would be the developer's responsibility in order to receive their maintenance bond. The HMO would not be responsible for the plantings.

Vice Chair Schaefer pointed out that, as proposed, the trees would be planted at various locations, and the taller of the two species would be located further down the slope. He pointed out that an uninterrupted view was never implied by the landscape plan. While he recognizes the homeowners might not have known that trees were supposed to be planted on the hillside, that is not something the Board can consider. He said he does not see the proposed modification as being functionally equivalent to what was originally approved. He suggested the applicant submit an alternative plan that would result in an equal root structure at the edge of the sensitive area. He said he would consider a proposal for a different species that would perform equally well but impact the homeowners less. However, modifying the plan to eliminate all of the trees in this location would not be appropriate.

Board Member Mestres expressed concern about the Board getting too much into the concept of views. If they are going to accept a certain amount of responsibility for the views of the residents at Point Edwards, they must also consider the views for the people who are down hill. He suggested it is likely the original landscape plan was intended to address the views from below the subject property, as well. Perhaps the trees were originally proposed to satisfy everyone's view.

Board Member Bullock said that, as someone who used to inspect projects and sign off on building permits, performance bonds and certificates of occupancy, he allowed for some minor relocation of trees as long as tree counts were maintained and as long as the general landscape design was followed. He said he would be opposed to allowing the applicant to jam all of the trees onto the narrow strip to the south of Building 7. This would not be consistent with the design concept of the original landscape plan, and it is not something that should or would have been allowed. He expressed his belief that there are good reasons for having the trees in the locations identified in the plan. If the location of the lawn was changed, it should not be the ADB's responsibility to fix the situation.

Chair Kendall said it appears the Board concurs that trees of some sort should be planted in the original locations identified on the plan. She explained that the Board could take action on the current request or ask the applicant to come back with an alternative plan. Again, Board Member Gootee expressed his belief that there are other solutions, but this type of change would require an alternate proposal that would maintain the integrity of the hillside and protect the view of the property owners above. Chair Kendall said she is not concerned that there is currently no irrigation on the hillside. She observed that it was the developer's responsibility to plant trees in this location, so they must also provide irrigation.

Board Member Bullock asked if the applicant would have the ability to submit an alternate proposal to the City within the next two weeks so it could be scheduled on the ADB's June 2<sup>nd</sup> agenda. Mr. Jammer answered affirmatively. Board Member Bullock said it would be helpful to have some section drawings, particularly if the applicant is trying to make a case that the grades are different than what is shown on the landscape plan. Board Member Mestres said it would also be helpful to provide images to illustrate the existing conditions. For example, if there are already pine trees and other vegetation in the area to soften the impact, images could help support their case.

**VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE BOARD DENY THE REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION TO THE LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR BUILDINGS 6 AND 7 (ITEM 2 OF FILE NUMBER PLN20100022).**

Board Member Bullock suggested that rather than deny the application at this time, the Board could continue the item to the next meeting to allow the applicant an opportunity to submit an alternate proposal. Vice Chair Schaefer expressed his belief that it would be better to deny the proposal, anticipating the applicant would submit an alternate proposal. Mr. Lien pointed out that if the application is denied, the applicant would be required to pay a new application fee to submit an alternate proposal. If the current proposal is carried forward, no new application fee would be required.

**VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER WITHDREW HIS MOTION.**

**BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD CONTINUE THEIR REVIEW OF ITEM 2 OF FILE NUMBER PLN20100022 TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT TIME TO SUBMIT ADDITIONAL**

**MATERIALS SHOWING AN ALTERNATE PROPOSAL. BOARD MEMBER MESTRES SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Board Member Broadway said it is important to keep in mind that the intent of the current landscape plan that was approved in 2002 was to create a level of density in landscaping and to stabilize the slope. She said she would like the alternative proposal to address both of these intents. The type of tree seems irrelevant as long the slope is stabilized. She said she would be more comfortable accepting a different species as long as the density and environmental component are maintained. Board Member Gootee expressed his belief that there are alternative species that would meet the two objectives noted by Board Member Broadway while protecting views at the same time.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:**

No public hearings were scheduled on the agenda.

**CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):**

No consolidated hearings were scheduled on the agenda.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

**Review of City's Current Method for Calculating Sign Area**

Mr. Lien recalled that at their last meeting, the Board had a discussion about what part of a monument sign would be included in the total sign area calculation. He reviewed that because monument signs are freestanding signs that have integrated the structural components of the sign into the design of the sign and sign face, staff initially thought the whole monument sign should be included in the sign area. At the request of the Board, he reviewed the code language again, focusing on the monument sign definition, which differentiates between the sign base and supporting structures that are part of the sign display. He observed that the definition is easy to apply to a monument sign that is set on top of a base, and it is clear that only the sign should be counted as part of the sign area. However, not all monument signs are constructed in this fashion. To address the various types of monument signs, he focused on the differentiation called out in the monument sign definition between the sign design and the sign base. He also focused on the sign area definition, which talks about the display area. He concluded that the sign display area is just that portion of the sign that carries the message. He reviewed the various examples he provided to illustrate how this new interpretation would be applied.

Mr. Lien advised that if the ADB agrees, staff would prepare a formal interpretation for how sign area is calculated for monument signs. The sign code could then be amended to address specific situations. He pointed out that the structural part of a monument sign and the wall around it would still be subject to ADB review, but questions regarding the maximum sign area allowed would be clarified.

Board Member Broadway challenged staff to come up with definitions and limits for the following elements of a monument sign: sign base, display area and sign frame. Vice Chair Schaefer suggested that the anything below the lowest point on the display area should be defined as the sign base. Anything above should be considered part of the sign area. The frame portion of the sign could be considered part of the sign area, similar to a cabinet sign.

Mr. Lien referred to Example 35, which has no base, and the supporting structures are all located above. Board Member Broadway pointed out that having three definitions, as she recommended earlier, would address all situations. A sign would be allowed as long as it does not exceed the cumulative maximums identified for sign base, display area and sign frame. Chair Kendall summarized that this approach would allow a sign to have a smaller display area and a larger frame.

Board Member Gootee said he works for a company that applies for sign permits quite often, and in most jurisdictions, all portions of a sign above the finished ground elevation are counted as part of the total sign area. This simplifies the issue. He noted that most companies want to maximize their allowed signage. If the City maintains their current height limits, companies will want to maximize their square footage massing as much as possible. If the City only counts the display as part of the maximum sign area, a company would be allowed to have a small logo with a large brick structure in order to maximize the size of the overall sign. He suggested they keep the code language simple.

Board Member Bullock said he has dealt with a lot of different jurisdictions about signage, and many do not include the base as part of the overall sign area. He observed that, oftentimes, businesses are seeking a permit for a simple cabinet sign with a rock base, and the proposed interpretation would open opportunities for them to consider other options. He said he would support staff putting together an interpretation as explained by Mr. Lien. However, he expressed concern about moving to the next step of code amendments. He said his experience is that Edmonds is quite restrictive about the amount of sign area they allow. He observed that the more complex the sign code, the more difficult it will be for people to understand. Simple is better. While he sees some value to breaking it into three parts (base, sign area, frame), he also supports a simpler approach. He referred to the example of a large stone fence that is placed at the entrance to a neighborhood with a sign to identify the neighborhood. He asked if the entire fence would be considered part of the sign base or frame. Board Member Broadway suggested that if the City identifies a maximum aggregate area for monument signs, applicants could break the sign area up any way they want to.

Board Member Mestres noted that the Board has never reviewed a sign application that included a small display area and a large base. He said he does not believe that sign designers would propose this type of design because the display area needs to be the focal point of the sign. If an applicant does propose a design of this type, the Board would have the ability to deny the application because the massing is inappropriate. Board Member Gootee agreed but suggested the simpler the sign code, the harder it will be for applicants to get around the requirements.

Mr. Lien referred to Board Member Broadway's suggestion that the City establish a maximum sign area and require applicants to work within that sign area. He observed that is basically what is in the current code, and his interpretation two weeks ago was that the structural part is part of the sign and should be included in the sign area. If the Board wants to go that direction, the interpretation should state that the entire monument sign above finished grade is included in the sign area. Board Member Broadway said there needs to be an aggregate total area, but only the display area should be included as part of the actual sign area.

Board Member Bullock recalled that when an applicant submits an application for a wall sign that uses individual letters, the code allows staff to draw a box around the letters to calculate the total sign area. However, the applicant also has the ability to submit the area calculation for each letter. This provision is intended to encourage applicants to do better quality signage in exchange for little more sign area. This same concept could apply to monument signs, as well. As a staff person, he would want to have the ability to calculate total sign area by drawing the smallest rectangle around what is considered the sign area.

### **ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBERS COMMENTS:**

Board Member Mestres reminded the Board that it is not within their purview to consider cost and undue hardships associated with an application. Chair Kendall agreed and said that is why she brought up the fact that the Board's decision should not be based on whether there is irrigation on the hillside or not.

Board Mestres also reminded the Board that it is outside of their purview to make decisions based on view. Chair Kendall agreed that the issue of view is between the developer and the individual condominium owners. The purpose of her comment was to establish whether trees that should have been planted per the plan were intentionally not planted to give potential buyers the appearance of a view they may not have. She said Vice Chair Schaefer's point was very well taken that a view is still a view, even if there is some filtration through the trees. A view is also what you see when you

look up on the project from below. Again Board Member Mestres expressed his belief that view is outside of the Board's purview. Board Member Gootee slightly disagreed and suggested it is more an issue of balance. He cautioned the Board against pushing something so strong that it becomes an extreme financial hardship for someone even if they are right and within the law to do so. There is a balance that the Board must at least understand and be aware of, particularly if there are other cost effective alternatives. Board Member Mestres cautioned against the Board making decisions based on cost to an applicant.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.