

MILLWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
FEBRUARY 8, 2010
MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order. The Special Meeting of the Millwood Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson John Newman at 6:00 p.m. February 8, 2010 at the Millwood City Hall. Members present were: John Newman, Bobbie Beese, Tammy McQuaig and Kelly Stravens. Staff present: Tom Richardson, City Planner.

2. Approval of Minutes. Mr. Stravens moved to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2010 meeting. Motion seconded by Ms. McQuaig. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Public hearing (cont.) – Special Sign Permit 09-05 Arrow Construction.

Mr. Newman re-opened the hearing and asked if any commissioners had any conflict of interest statement to make; there was none. He asked if anyone had an objection to any member participating in the hearing; there was none.

Mr. Richardson repeated his staff report presented at the hearing of January 25. He explained that this area of town is different than Argonne and the west end along Trent because there is such a large area of public land between the sidewalk and the property line. He showed several photos that he had taken of the site since the first hearing. He said the two signs to the east (the espresso shop and Neff Rental) were permitted at the required 15-ft setback, but in fact were built closer to the property line than required.

Robert Dean, Sign Service and Manufacturing 10014 N Government Way in Hayden, ID. He distributed a new site plan which shows the property lines. He did a WashDOT assessment under its sign regulations. He said their request is to put the sign at about the same setback as for the espresso shop next door. He said the swale is a really good location for the sign, it looks good there and it does not cause any site obstruction. Placing the sign too far back from the road would cause a safety problem when drivers pass by the store and then either brake suddenly or have to turn around and come back. He said the hot spots from the parking lot lighting causes a problem with the sign and the cost of raising the lights is prohibitively expensive. He looked at the lights after dark to check the reflection points and determined that they would put too much light on the signs. Moving the signs up more than 2 feet would be the highest that would work.

Mr. Stravens asked why the sign couldn't be placed in the grassy swale on the east side of the property. Mr. Dean said the cost for getting power to the location would be a great expense, and the sign is not visible for east-bound traffic. It is not a very large sign and setting it that far back would make it hard to see. Also he does not like to place signs in stormwater swales because of water flows. Ideally the sign should be located in front of the building. He said the landscaped island is the best place for the sign, it really fits there, it is safe and it looks very good there. He also noted that most other cities do not require such a large setback for pole signs, most are 5 or 10 ft.

Dave Lawless, Arrow Construction, explained that the sign was not included in the original building plan because the building contractor was not assigned the job of the sign. ...

Ms. Beese said there are three issues that have to be decided: the height, reader board and the setback.

Greg Mott, 3301 N. Argonne Rd, said he is concerned about consistency with the other signs that have been approved within the town. He thought it would be acceptable if it was at least 15-ft from the sidewalk, so that it would appear to comply with the setback requirement. He questioned the height exception, saying that the sign should meet the same height limit as for other signs. He suggested that the commission add an additional condition that the nonconforming sign at the company's other location further east on Trent be removed.

Mr. Lawless said that the other location has been leased to another business. Mr. Dean said that the sign would be allowed to continue as a nonconforming use. This is a separate property and should not be tied to this permit.

Ms. McQuaig said the sign at the 6-ft setback would line up with the other signs on the street. Aesthetically it would look good and fit in with the other properties.

John Newman moved to approve the 6-ft setback for the sign because of the unique situation and it fits with the neighborhood. Seconded by Mr. Stravens. Motion carried.

Mr. Newman moved to set the minimum height of the bottom of the sign at 10'6" because of the conflict with the lighting. Seconded by Mr. Stravens. Motion carried.

Mr. Newman reviewed the decision criteria required in the zoning code which were included in the staff report. He moved to approve the special sign permit, with the following conditions:

- a. The sign is located at least six feet from the front property line,
- b. The height of the bottom of the sign is no lower than 10'6".

Motion seconded by Mr. Stravens. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Adjournment. Mr. Stravens moved to adjourn. Seconded by Ms. Beese. Motion carried. There being no further business Mr. Newman adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Chairperson

Secretary