

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes– August 10, 2020 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Chair Daniel McKay called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

II. Chair’s Remarks

The Conduct of Hearing and Statement of Public Notice were read into the record.

III. Roll Call

Present for roll call were: Daniel McKay, Angela Niggli, Jean Svadlenka, Ken Pitta, and Katie Hamm

Staff present: Kimberly Rybold, Barbara Jacobson, Miranda Bateschell, Philip Bradford, Cindy Luxhoj, Khoi Le, and Shelley White. Daniel Pauly attended via Zoom.

IV. Citizens’ Input This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

V. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of May 11, 2020 DRB Panel A meeting

Jean Svadlenka moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Katie Hamm seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VI. Public Hearings

A. **Resolution No. 380. Frog Pond Ridge Subdivision: Li Alligood, AICP, Otak – Representative for West Hills Land Development, LLC – Applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of an Annexation and Zone Map Amendment from Rural Residential Farm Forest 5-Acre (RRFF-5) to Residential Neighborhood (RN) for approximately 15.93 acres of property located on the west side of Stafford Road south of SW Frog Pond Lane, and adopting findings and conditions approving a Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review of parks and open space, Tentative Subdivision Plat, Type C Tree Plan, Waiver to Minimum Front Setback, and Abbreviated SRIR Review on 16.25 acres for a 71-lot single-family subdivision. The subject site is located on Tax Lots 1500 and 1700, a portion of 1800, and a portion of Stafford Road right-of-way, Section 12D, and a portion of Tax Lot 400, Section 12DD, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Cindy Luxhoj

Case Files: DB20-0007 Annexation

- DB20-0008 Zone Map Amendment
- DB20-0009 Stage I Preliminary Plan
- DB20-0010 Stage II Final Plan
- DB20-0011 Site Design Review of Parks and Open Space
- DB20-0012 Tentative Subdivision Plat
- DB20-0013 Type C Tree Plan
- DB20-0014 Waiver – Front Setback
- SI20-0001 Abbreviated SRIR Review

The DRB action on the Annexation and Zone Map Amendment is a recommendation to the City Council.

Chair McKay called the public hearing to order at 6:46 p.m.

Cindy Luxhoj, Associate Planner, explained the key reasons for continuing the hearing were as follows:

- The initial mailing list for the public hearing notice omitted six property owners to the north and east of the Frog Pond Ridge properties. On August 10, 2020, a revised public hearing notice was mailed to all property owners, including those who received tonight’s hearing notice, in order to meet the 21-day Development Review Board (DRB) noticing requirement for parts of the application under DRB jurisdiction.
- Clarification was needed on the jurisdiction of the right-of-way of Southwest Frog Pond Ln from Clackamas County to Wilsonville. The Applicant had elected to include a portion of the right-of-way in the annexation request. City Engineering Staff would coordinate with Clackamas County to initiate the jurisdictional transfer and annexing the right-of-way with the current application more clearly delineated the transfer. Continuing this hearing allowed this correction to be made to the record.
- Upon review of the DRB conditions of approval, the Applicant had numerous questions about the language and timing of the conditions. The Applicant also sought clarification about the tree protection easement on Lots 63, 64, 67, and 68 and wanted the opportunity to propose revisions to the Staff report and public record. Continuing the hearing provided the necessary time to accomplish those tasks.
- She noted continuing the hearing to a special meeting on August 31, 2020 would still allow the City Council hearing on the Annexation and Zone Map Amendment to be held as scheduled on September 10, 2020.

Chair McKay confirmed no one on Zoom or in Council Chambers was present to provide public testimony on the resolution.

Angela Niggli moved to continue Resolution No. 380 to August 31, 2020 date certain. The motion was seconded by Ken Pitta and passed unanimously.

B. Resolution No. 381. I & E Construction: David Hardister, Woodblock Architecture – Representative for I & E Construction – Owner/ Applicant. The

applicant is requesting approval of a Site Design Review for exterior changes and a Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver for I & E Construction. The site is located at 27375 SW Parkway Avenue on Tax Lot 303 of Section 11, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Philip Bradford

Case Files: DB20-0033 Site Design Review
 DB20-0034 Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver

Chair McKay called the public hearing to order at 6:38 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair McKay, Angela Niggli, Katie Hamm, and Jean Svadlenka declared for the record that they had visited the site. No Board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No Board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Philip Bradford, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 1 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Mr. Bradford presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's location and surrounding features, with these key comments:

- Background. The building originally housed Print-Right Copy Center and then Lazerquick in the 1990s. In the 2000s, Pioneer Pacific utilized the structure as a laboratory and classroom space. I & E Construction obtained DRB approval for the renovation and expansion of the building at the January 10, 2020 DRB Panel A hearing. In April 2020, while monitoring the site during construction, Staff noticed the design did not match the DRB approval from January 2020. Both the Applicant and their representative were notified.
 - Since April 2020, Staff had been working with the project team to find a solution that could bring the project into substantial compliance with the DRB approval. However, the Applicant felt strongly about the changes to the final building design and wanted to reincorporate the building sign originally included with the 2019 application and replaced with a plain, perforated screen wall when reviewed by the DRB in January 2020. The Applicant wanted to reincorporate the logo design into the screen wall and move forward with the predominately black design.
 - Given the scope of the project and the type of changes made, Staff determined the best course of action would be to return to the DRB to address the design changes and sign waiver.
- Standard noticing procedures were followed for the application, which included mailing notice to all property owners within 250 ft of the subject property. Notice was also published in the newspaper and posted both on-site and on the City's website.
- Site Design Review. The Applicant's original site design proposed at the January 2020 DRB Panel A hearing included fiber cement panels in gray and metal panels painted silver with Russian oak siding on the second-floor terrace and an aluminum screen wall. (Top photo, Slide 7) The mix of gray, silver, and natural tones created breaks in the façade and provided

a cohesive look on all sides of the building. The Staff report had also referenced compatibility with the Grace Chapel project to the south as part of the rationale for the design to meet site design criteria.

- The current proposal used the differences between the black metal panels and black fiber cement panel to provide changes in texture. However, the contrast did not create the same variety or break up the façade in the same way as the original proposal.
 - To provide articulation, vertical trellis structures with greenery were proposed to unify the building's appearance and break up the facade. (Bottom photo, Slide 7)
 - The dynamic window pattern with the white interior of the building created additional interest and variety along the Parkway Ave façade.
 - On the I-5 side of the building, the perforated aluminum screen was proposed to incorporate the company's logo.
 - A revised landscaping plan was submitted shortly after the DRB approval Class I application approval. The new landscaping plan enhanced planting along Parkway Ave and changed various proposed tree types. The plan also provided additional verticality on the I-5 portion of the site that broke up the façade more than the original landscaping plan.
- Photos of Grace Chapel were displayed along with the Applicant's proposed design. (Slide 8) Cohesion was still maintained with the Grace Chapel property through the use of wood, angular design elements with the roof, as well as black color and use of aluminum, which read as a silver gray tone that was also used on the Grace Chapel project.
- Staff had been working with the Applicant to explore various design alternatives that could either meet substantial compliance, be processed as a Class II application, or other alternatives that would need to return to the DRB.
 - He highlighted some of Design Alternatives (Slide 10) considered, noting the two images on the left would have brought the project into substantial compliance. The two images on the right would leave the project as-is, requiring DRB approval. The top right image showed a previous iteration of the project with a different type of trellis structure, which was currently proposed.
- He explained that the site design review standards encouraged harmonious development and originality and avoiding excessive uniformity and monotonous development.
- Class III Sign Permit and Waiver. The Applicant proposed a 134 sq ft building sign on the western façade facing I-5 that would be incorporated into the aluminum screen wall. This change would be accomplished by changing the size of the perforations in the panel to create the appearance of the I & E logo within the perforated panel.
 - The default allowed by Code for a sign on the western side would be 64 sq ft, which would be from transferring the sign area allowed from the freestanding sign onto the building.
 - The sign would also function to further breakup the façade and add visual interest to the building on the western elevation.
 - Staff did not believe the sign would draw attention from passing drivers on I-5 or pose a safety hazard.

- The Applicant also revised the monument sign. The current sign was smaller than the previously approved sign. The limit for a freestanding sign along the Parkway Ave frontage was also 64 sq ft with an 8 ft height limit. The revised sign contained a different base than originally proposed and more accurately reflected the architecture of the building. Staff included a condition of approval to ensure the sign would have the address of the building incorporated.

Angela Niggli inquired about the materials used on the front façade.

Mr. Bradford replied that the sides and a majority of the front of the building were built with fiber cement panel that had been painted black. The central portion with the window pattern was black aluminum panel. Natural cedar was used above and around the windows and on the second-floor outdoor terrace area.

Chair McKay asked if the aluminum structure in the back pictured as part of the original DRB proposal approved in January 2020 on Slide 7 was part of the previously approved proposal.

Mr. Bradford stated the structure, which was an overrun of a stairwell, was not part of the approval and was not included in the original building plans included with the application. The structure was only included on the rendering. He confirmed the shrubbery shown along the building were already in place.

Katie Hamm asked about the trellis' materials and the plants that would be used against the black wall to maintain a nice visual appeal over time.

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner suggested asking the Applicant for more information about the materials and planting types.

Jean Svadlenka asked if the only change was the color of the façade or if the windows were also changed.

Mr. Bradford confirmed the only change was the color of the façade, adding the original rendering did not reflect the actual windows proposed.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, clarified minor revisions had been made to the windows, but they were considered to be in substantial compliance with the DRB approval.

Mr. Bradford confirmed the screen wall was approved with the original application and had appeared in the original design. (Slide 13) The logo was the only new change to the screen wall, which had not yet been installed due to the pending decision on whether the logo could be incorporated. He clarified the screen wall was a matter of building code. Without the sign on the screen wall, it would not have been part of any sign review for planning purposes.

Ms. Svadlenka asked about the size of sign for Al's Garden along I-5.

Ms. Rybold said she did not know the size of the sign, but noted the Al's Garden sign was a newer sign and she did not believe it had required any waiver. It could be assumed the sign was less than the 64 sq ft maximum.

Ms. Svadlenka asked if Grace Chapel would be putting a sign on the I-5 facing wall of its building.

Mr. Bradford replied he recently approved signs for the Grace Chapel building that were less than the 64 sq ft limit allowed by Code that would face I-5. Those signs were visible on Slide 8; however, changes had been made so that the words "Grace Chapel" were now on one façade and no longer split between the two sides on the corner. He confirmed the new sign was still less than 64 sq ft.

Ms. Svadlenka stated the I & E logo would be at 134 sq ft and the largest sign in the vicinity.

Ken Pitta noted 137 sq ft would be more than double the allowed limit.

Chair McKay asked if the logo or the entire sign would be 134 sq ft.

Mr. Bradford clarified the dimensions of the sign were calculated as prescribed in the Code standards by drawing a rectangle around the actual I & E logo, not around the entire mesh screen panel. He confirmed the sign's dimensions were calculated based on the black dotted line shown in the diagram on Slide 13.

Mr. Pitta noted the documentation stated the I & E logo would be 137 sq ft and did not say anything about the mesh panel. This needed to be clarified to avoid giving leeway to use the entire panel, which he believed was much bigger than 137 sq ft.

Ms. Rybold explained the panel was an existing approved architectural feature. Any sign permit and waiver granted by the DRB would limit the use of the panel to the maximum 134 sq ft requested sign. If a sign greater than 134 sq ft were to be installed, the Applicant would be in violation of the approval.

Mr. Pitta asked why it is stated as a 137 sq ft sign and logo in Finding B23.

Ms. Rybold confirmed 137 sq ft was a typo and would be corrected to read 134 sq ft as part of the resolution.

Mr. Pitta continued that it was currently not clear if the Applicant wanted the entire panel or the I & E logo to be 134 sq ft. He believed the language needed to be clarified.

Chair McKay asked if Staff had received any renderings of the screen wall with the I & E logo that show whether drivers on I-5 might be distracted by the sign potentially changing when seen at varying angles.

Ms. Rybold reminded that a materials board would have been included in the approval of the actual panel itself. She reminded that with regard to the sign and sign waiver was that the sign was content neutral and the appearance would be based more on the material itself. She suggested the DRB approve or disapprove the sign based on the sign area and not on the content of the sign.

Chair McKay clarified his concerns were less about the content and more about the aesthetic standard being set and any safety issues ~~and~~.

Mr. Pauly noted the Sign Code prohibited both movement and the appearance of movement. A specific condition of approval could address any concern about the appearance of movement with the graphic.

Mr. Pitta stated there was no rendering showing what the logo would look like on its finished surface on the side of the building, and it would actually be a sign.

Mr. Bradford displayed the materials board from the approved application, noting the mesh screen material proposed for the sign. He understood the sign would be made solely from the mesh and that the perforations in the metal would vary in size to create the appearance of the logo from a distance with no moving parts or illumination on the actual panel.

Ms. Svadlenka asked if the aluminum material was brushed or reflective.

Mr. Bradford replied the aluminum was not very reflective. He had taken the materials board to the site on a sunny day to assess the reflectiveness. While the aluminum did brighten up in the sun, it was not as severely reflective as glass, for example. The material was comparable to other common sign and building materials.

Ms. Svadlenka asked if there would be any issues with driver visibility due to the reflection of direct sunlight.

Mr. Bradford replied he was not certain, but there did not appear to be any issue while he was on site with the material.

Ms. Niggli requested clarification about sign's actual placement. The drawing showed the sign centered under the shed roof, while rendering showed the sign more to the left under what looked like a gable. (Slide 13)

Mr. Bradford stated the sign would be centered, adding the roof pictured in the right image created an incorrect optical illusion of the logo's alignment.

Mr. Pitta voiced concern about approving a sign double the size of an allowable sign. He believed this would cause other businesses along I-5 would also seek approval for larger signs.

Ms. Niggli responded that anything smaller than the proposed sign size would appear out of proportion on the giant metal screen

Chair McKay called for the Applicant's presentation.

Ryan McTague, Woodblock Architecture, 7945 North Chautauqua Blvd, Portland, OR, representing David Hardister stated the objective for redesigning the building was to show off the scale of the company and have something that fit into the context, but remained distinctive. Changing the color allowed the building to remain unique and more contemporary, particularly compared to the prior design. More contrast was provided with the interior lobby and exterior of the building to bring people into the building.

- He noted the sign was not as explicit as a typical sign. It would only contain the logo, which would be created by varying the size of the perforations in the metal. It was not an advertisement and would not include contact information. The sign was not contrasting and would not stand out as much on the façade of the building. It was a modern way to show off the company's skill.

Ms. Niggli confirmed with Mr. McTague that the black aluminum panels could be painted.

Chair McKay noted the revised application stated there was an issue with acquiring the proper materials needed for the gray cement fiber panel. He asked what issues prevented using the original materials.

Mr. McTague stated the original gray metal panels were out of stock and were not available for installation within the short construction timeframe, so the Applicant decided to go with black panels.

Chair McKay inquired why the Applicant was requesting such a large logo compared to those in the surrounding area.

Mr. McTague said studies had been done on the logo size and a smaller size made it difficult to achieve enough contrast to make the logo visible.

With the custom fabrication, shrinking the size made it difficult to achieve the contrast and maintain the definition needed to make the complex I & E logo visible. The larger size was also more appropriate for the size of the overall screen wall.

Chair McKay asked if any renderings of the proposed sign were available.

Mr. McTague stated 2D drawings of the sign had been created, but he did not have them available this evening. He added 3D renderings could be produced as well.

Ms. Svadlenka asked why the City had not been notified of the unavailable building materials and material changes.

Mr. McTague replied he did not believe the Applicant thought the change would be that significant. He was not completely familiar with the Development Code, however, working with the City helped both him and his company understand its nuances. At the time, he believed the site plan was the issue, not the elevation.

Ms. Svadlenka inquired about the size of the perforations to make the logo on the screen wall.

Mr. McTague clarified the sizes would vary. Three different sizes, 1-in, 2-in, and 3-in perforations would be used that changed depending on the design. The blank main screen wall would have 3-inch perforations. He clarified the logo was not included in the original application because the manufacturer developing the logo in the screen wall was not ready. His company was still working on the final design. They were planning to submit the application at a later date.

Ms. Hamm confirmed the design did not use colors but rather achieved the appearance of the logo by the varying the sizes of perforation.

Chair McKay asked if the Applicant was familiar with this type of perforated metal design and if it had been used elsewhere in the community.

Mr. McTague replied the process was new, even to the manufacturer. The Applicant wanted to use what the manufacturer had available to create this new sign design concept that did not currently exist in Oregon.

Chair McKay asked if the logo was static or might appear to move or change either in color or location depending upon the angle from which the sign was seen. He was concerned about distracting drivers on I-5.

Mr. McTague confirmed there were no visual changes in size or color, regardless of angle. The size of the perforations would not change, the logo would appear flat. He did not believe the sign would appear to move. The Applicant had done studies at off angles with the perforated metal, but not the logo. The logo's design did not have any components that would give it any depth.

Chair McKay confirmed that no one was present on Zoom or in City Council Chambers to provide public testimony on the application. He called for discussion from the Board.

Chair McKay said he had doubts about the use of new technology for the logo. He did not understand what the sign would look like and if it would create some nuisance. Additional renderings would have helped allay his concerns and inform his decision.

Mr. Pitta asked why the studies regarding similar signs and how the signs did or did not reflect had not been included in the packet.

Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, explained DRB approval had already been given, and the Applicant was asking for a different approval. She advised the Board to continue if they had additional questions.

Mr. Pauly noted there had been precedence where the Board had continued with part of an application and made a decision on a different portion, so the building changes and sign could be addressed separately.

Ms. Niggli expressed concern about the building being entirely black. She did not believe it had enough contrast or tied into the current surroundings enough. With the vertical windows in the front, driving by all the windows reflected black, so the building looked like a solid black surface. The white outlines of the windows shown in the renderings did not appear that way in person. She suggested painting the black aluminum entry area back to silver aluminum to break up the façade.

Ms. Pitta reiterated his concern about approving the 134 sq ft sign size resulting in other businesses along I-5 requesting larger signs.

Ms. Svadlenka agreed the sign size could set a precedent and be an issue in the future. She also agreed with the comments about the color, noting no other buildings were that dark anywhere in the city limits or along the I-5 corridor.

Ms. Niggli believed the screen wall helped break up the black façade along the I-5 side of the building, but adding some cedar elements on the I-5 elevation might create a more cohesive look all around the building.

Ms. Hamm said she was concerned about reducing the size of the sign because the logo would lose definition. She believed the new technology was an innovative way to present a logo, and while the Board might be setting a precedent, the sign seemed pretty cool looking.

Ms. Niggli agreed, adding it was a perforated logo so the Board was not setting a precedent for a three dimensional, illuminated or flashy sign.

Chair McKay believed both concerns were valid and reiterated that renderings or photographs of similar sign designs would have been helpful. He agreed the design could be innovative and might promote Wilsonville for it was so different. However, he did not feel comfortable approving until he could determine if the design was different in a positive or negative way.

Ms. Svadlenka suggested the Applicant provide renderings of the logo at 134 sq ft and 64 sq ft.

Ms. Hamm added the logo's orientation should also be more accurately depicted on the building as it did not appear to be centered in the existing renderings.

Mr. Pitta stated he was concerned about upsetting other business owners who had followed the 64 sq ft requirement. The I-5 corridor was a prime location for advertising and he believed other business owners would start asking for the same variance.

Chair McKay asked if Mr. Pitta was worried about there being billboards, essentially, along I-5 in Wilsonville.

Mr. Pitta replied it was a prime location and the logo would be very visible. Nothing was stopping I & E from illuminating the logo. The building was beautiful with great architecture, and the Applicant did a great job with the black and gray colors, which were daring. The perforated metal was a nice architectural touch, but it was free advertising for the company. The variance would have consequences later on as all the businesses on that side of the freeway would be requesting variances as well.

Ms. Niggli noted that currently, there were no buildings past I & E on I-5 before the exit, and no room for another building except for the other side of Parkway Ave. She asked if businesses on the other side of I-5 had signs larger than 64 sq ft.

Mr. Pitta stated the body shop, World of Speed, Chevrolet, the motel, and other businesses had complied with the signage rules.

Mr. Pauly noted the Sign Code was revised in 2012 and there had been no other sign area waivers along I-5 since the revision. Signs approved prior to the revision might be larger than 64 sq ft, but under the current Code, this would be the first waiver of this magnitude.

Mr. Pitta reiterated his concern about other businesses asking for variances which could result in large signs cluttering the I-5 corridor. Once the door was opened, the requests could not be denied.

Ms. Niggli believed it would be helpful to continue the sign request until the Applicant could provide more information.

Chair McKay confirmed there were no further questions of the Applicant and closed the public hearing at 7:53 pm.

Mr. Pitta said for the Board's discussion, he proposed modifying the sign to the allowable Code, denying the waiver to the sign's size from 64 sq ft to 134 sq ft.

Angela Niggli moved to continue Resolution No. 380 and request additional details from the Applicant about the sign's size and better renderings of the proposed sign, as well as

renderings showing the aluminum panels painted silver. Jean Svadlenka seconded the motion.

Chair McKay clarified the motion did not separate the site design review and sign permit requests, so the entire Resolution would be continued for discussion at the next meeting.

Mr. Pauly noted the record would need to remain open if the meeting was continued.

Mr. Pitta stated he would like to see more accurate, detailed renderings of the sign at 134 sq ft and also at 64 sq ft. The existing renderings did not show the scale of the sign to the size of the building or the sign's placement. He also requested clarifications about the perforation sizes to better understand the difference between a casual embossed sign and a really distinct sign.

Ms. Jacobson understood the Board wanted more information about the sign's details before they felt comfortable voting. She noted Miranda Bateschell had worked on the project and suggested she share her comments about the project.

Ms. Niggli agreed the Board would like to hear Ms. Bateschell's thoughts regarding the sign.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, Wilsonville, stated Staff had been in discussions with the Applicant over the last four months about what concepts were not coming through in the submitted materials. She believed the Board had asked great questions. When approving a waiver, it was always good to be very specific about the waiver's parameters to avoid setting a broad, unclear precedence. The Board's questions were good and helped refine materials the Applicant could submit to would help the Board make a very clear and informed decision. As far as setting any precedent, it was important to be specific about the items requested and clear about what was unique about the project as well as the limits of the waiver. Both Staff and the Applicant were tracking the Board's questions, so she suggested the Board be clear about what was needed to make a decision.

Chair McKay confirmed with the transcriptionist that different renderings of the different sign sizes had been requested in the motion.

Ms. Rybold added the renderings were to provide a better understanding of the scale of the sign and a more exact representation of its placement on the building.

Chair McKay requested to modify the motion to also request a rendering to better understand the scale and the sign's representation on the building.

Angela Niggli and Jean Svadlenka agreed to the addition to the motion.

Mr. Pauly suggested the motion also clarify the meeting date for the continuance.

Ms. Niggli said she did not have a date preference.

Ms. Svadlenka suggested the continuance be scheduled for the next regular DRB A meeting in September because the special meeting scheduled on August 31st would be [pretty substantial](#).

Chair McKay asked that given the change to the design the Board previously approved if there were any violations or potential repercussions for moving the hearing into September.

Ms. Rybold stated both Staff and the Applicant had been working together in good faith. She believed they would be open and willing to continue the conversation so the Board could have all the information it needed to make a decision. Staff would not seek to create any additional issues for the Applicant as they worked to rectify the issues.

Chair McKay asked if the Board wanted to see anything else related to the building design, noting that the Applicant's requests were being addressed together.

Ms. Niggli clarified that her motion did request additional renderings of the façade with silver.

Ms. Hamm suggested offering the Applicant some leeway regarding the color on the panels; rather than specifying silver, request that a lighter, contrasting color be used in the requested renderings.

Ms. Niggli agreed to add the request for a rendering showing a contrasting color on the black aluminum panels at the front entrance to her motion.

Chair McKay restated the final modified motion as follows:

The motion was to continue the public hearing for Resolution No. 381 to September 14, 2020 date certain, requesting that the Applicant provide additional renderings of the 64 sq ft and 134 sq ft sign sizes, the perforated metal, and the front façade showing lighter, contrasting colors on the black aluminum panels at the front entrance, as well as renderings to better show the scale and location of the proposed sign on the building.

Ms. Niggli agreed to the modified motion.

The modified motion was seconded by Jean Svadlenka and passed unanimously.

Ms. Jacobson clarified that due to the continuance, the public hearing would still be open for input and public testimony.

VII. Board Member Communications

- A. Results of the July 27, 2020 DRB Panel B meeting
- B. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, highlighted the results from the DRB Panel B and City Council Action Minutes.

VIII. Staff Communications

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, stated Staff had been working on sending out communications regarding the upcoming special meeting. The Board would be receiving information about what the meeting would look like and who would be participating.

- She updated that Staff had been busy with a number of applications that would be coming before the DRB Panels in the coming months. A survey regarding the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge and Gateway was available on the City's website until August 24, 2020, and three online open houses would take place on Thursday at three different times. Each open house would have the same information. She invited the Board members to attend, provide feedback and ask questions.

Chair McKay noted that this had been the most lively discussion he had had since joining the Board. Board members had asked good questions and he appreciated their thoughtfulness, adding he was proud to be serving on the Board.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant