

**Development Review Board – Panel A  
Minutes– October 12, 2020 6:30 PM**

---

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Daniel McKay called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

**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, and Ken Pitta. Katie Hamm was absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, Kimberly Rybold, Philip Bradford, Cindy Luxhoj, and Shelley White

**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 August 10, 2020 DRB Panel A meeting

**Chair McKay moved to approve the August 10, 2020 DRB Panel A meeting minutes with the following corrections:**

- Page 7, third paragraph, delete "and" at the end of the second line.
- Page 9, second paragraph, correct the first line as follows, "...did not believe the Applicant thought the change..."

**Jean Svadlenka seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

B. Approval of minutes of August 31, 2020 DRB Panel A meeting

**Angela Niggli moved to approve the August 31, 2020 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ken Pitta and passed unanimously.**

**VI. Public Hearing**

**A. 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

*This item was continued to a date and time certain of September 14, 2020 at the August 10, 2020 DRB Panel A meeting. Due to poor air quality in City Hall Facilities, the September 14, 2020 DRB hearing was cancelled and postponed to October 14, 2020.*

**Chair McKay** reconvened the public hearing to order at 6:38 pm and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members 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**, presented the Staff report, reviewing the I&E Construction Exterior Changes and Sign Waiver via PowerPoint, briefly noting the project's location and surrounding features with these key additional comments:

- At the August 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, the DRB requested additional renderings for the Site Design Review that incorporated additional articulation and a color change on the metal panels on the center of the building, as well as the types of trellis plantings and their seasonal characteristics.
  - For the Sign Waiver, the Applicant was requested to provide additional renderings to show the Code compliance size for the sign, as well as renderings of the entire building with the sign in order to demonstrate the scale and proportion of the sign in relation to the rest of the building. An updated material sample of the sign was also requested to clarify the size of the perforations and the material type being used.
- Since the prior meeting, the Applicant had provided additional materials to address the DRB's concerns. The Applicant proposed painting the fiber cement panels underneath the second-floor terrace white with the trellis structures at the front of the building remaining the same. This additional exterior paint option was entered into the record. (Slide 5)
  - The Applicant had noted that the metal panels, which were factory finished, were not good candidates for repainting due to maintenance issues. Therefore, the Applicant was no longer proposing a change to the center metal panel as requested in the previous hearing.
- Additional proposed renderings were included in the packet as Exhibit A2 with several of those additional design alternatives presented in Slide 6.
- Additional renderings were provided for the sign and Slide 7 showed the logo at the 134 sq ft size that was part of the waiver request in relation to the rest of the building. The left and right corners of the rear of the building facing I-5 were also painted metal panels. The portion of the building where the sign was going, along with the area where there were windows, was the other material. In previous renderings, the full back of the building was not shown.

- As requested, renderings of the difference in the logos were provided showing the requested 134 sq ft size, which required the waiver, as well as the 64 sq ft size allowed by Code. (Slide 8) The legibility of the sign decreased from the angled view from I-5. (Slide 9)
  - The most up-to-date information about the sign material was shinier than what was on the original Materials Board on August 10th. A condition of approval now required the sign to be finished with a matte finish upon installation, so it would not produce glare to passing-by traffic on I-5.
- As part of the revised materials, the Applicant also provided information from the landscape architect. Either two or three common jasmine or star jasmine plants would be planted per trellis that would grow to an ultimate height of 12 ft. These jasmine varieties were low-maintenance and evergreen, providing greenery year round.
- Another topic discussed at the previous hearing was precedent with regard to the sign. An architecturally integrated sign was more different from the common types of signs like cabinet signs and channel letters on a raceway. The architecturally integrated sign proposed as part of the waiver request had a different nature compared to more traditional sign types with a more of a subtle look than a cabinet or traditional wall sign. He briefly highlighted the sign types on Slide 12.
- Staff recommended that the project be approved with the revised conditions in the Staff report.

**Chair McKay** noted the grey and white designs on Slide 6, showing the Other Design Alternatives, only showed the east side of the building. He asked if the cement fiber panels on the south side would be painted as well.

**Mr. Bradford** responded he understood that only the eastern elevation would be changed to the colors shown. The design alternatives were provided to Staff as something that was seeking substantial compliance with the original approval. The other walls might be left as is, but he would let the Applicant speak to that.

**Chair McKay** agreed to ask the Applicant about the south side of the building. He asked if the trim along the front façade windows was also a design change.

**Mr. Bradford** replied the most recent rendering did not show the trim, and that trim was not actually on the building currently, so the trim did not likely reflect what was built or proposed. This rendering was a more accurate reflection of the window trim as built.

**Chair McKay** believed the original rendering on Page 5 of 29 of Staff report, Exhibit A1, showed light brown colored doors on the south side that were now shown as black in the most recent rendering (Slide 5) and asked if that had been a design change. The brown elements had broken up the uniformity and now the building just looked completely black. Were there any suggested enhancements to the south side that would break up that uniform black on the south side? He noted a large grey door was there.

**Mr. Bradford** confirmed there was a grey door there, and that no changes were recommended from Staff. He believed the garage door near the blue truck was glass (Slide 5), but he deferred to the Applicant to speak to the garage door material.

**Chair McKay** asked if the Applicant was using that light wood coloring for the window coverings to help break up the south side.

**Mr. Bradford** replied that in the previous hearing, Ryan McTague had mentioned that window shades would be installed in that tone. He did not know if they had installed the window shades yet or if the Applicant still planned on that color palette for the blinds.

**Ken Pitta** understood the UTS sign was on a 10-story building, compared to the other signs shown, which were single-level, strip mall signs. (Slide 12)

**Mr. Bradford** responded the UTS sign was on at least, an 8-story building and the other sign examples were on single-story buildings. He explained the UTS sign example was to illustrate the type of sign rather than the context. The UTS sign was a good representation of a similar laser-cut sign design into a panel.

- He confirmed that the original rendering of the exterior showed the same color scheme as presented on the Materials Board and had been approved. The center metal panel was proposed to be more silver, though it appeared more white on a screen.

**Chair McKay** said he appreciated the sign renderings that showed the back of the building, which were helpful. He asked if the railing shown behind and underneath the sign was a design element that would be incorporated. (Slide 9)

**Mr. Bradford** noted that what appeared to be a concrete bar in the renderings was not on the actual building. To his knowledge, that would not change when the sign was installed.

**Chair McKay** said that he would ask the Applicant, noting the concrete bar made the building look nice and did a great job of breaking up the back of the building that faced I-5. He called for the Applicant's presentation.

**David Hardister, Architect of Record, Woodblock Architecture, 3754 SE Market St, Portland, OR 97214**, noted Mr. Bradford had covered most of his presentation, but he did have some new photographs to show of the building, some comparisons, and perhaps, one additional color scheme. He presented the Applicant's proposal via PowerPoint with these comments:

- In its current condition, the building was a spectacular design that had garnered a lot of recognition from the design and construction industry. (Slide 1) Mr. Ivanov's idea was to make the building a showcase for I&E Construction and to reflect I&E Construction's branding, which was all black with some white accents. The current design was achieved by

turning the building all black and using natural wood colors as accent colors. There was a lot of transparency into the two-story lobby.

- Previously, the building had been rather nondescript, neglected, 1970s with T1-11 siding; but now it had been transformed into something architecturally special. (Slide 2 & 3)
- The proposed changes would make the lower, one-story volume/mass white and add in the trellis elements. Another schematic was all black with the trellis elements and a vertical wood accent at the northeast corner. (Slide 4)
- The sign renderings included illustrations showing how the perforations work by changing sizes to create the I&E logo (Slide 6) and the sign's size at 134 sq ft and 64 sq ft. (Slide 8)
- He believed the renderer included the concrete band to represent a foundation line that did not exist for the actual building.

**Karl Ivanov, Owner, I&E Construction, 27375 SW Parkway Ave, Wilsonville, OR 97070,**

clarified that when I&E first began the remodel, the foundation line was leaking very heavily. After a heavy rain, the entire floor was wet, which required the foundation line to be repaired. The soil was graded to slope the water from the building to stop the leaking and to repair the foundation, which was now black because it was covered by tar waterproofing.

**Mr. Hardister** concluded the PowerPoint presentation with these comments:

- The proposed 134 sq ft logo was shown as seen from both directions on I-5. In response to a question at the last meeting, he clarified the sign logo would be centered over the central atrium element. (Slide 11)
- A rendering of a standard lit sign that would meet the 64 sq ft requirement was shown, which he noted was not as subtle as the perforated panel logo. (Slide 12)
- The last slides featured renderings of the proposed white mass at different angles.

**Mr. Ivanov** asked that the Board consider the way the building currently sat. (Slide 1) The all black was part of I&E Construction's branding and they would love to keep it that way. One reason I&E had come to Wilsonville was for the I-5 exposure. All of I&E Construction's trucks, equipment, and branding were blacked out. I&E had received many compliments on the building and some construction magazines had featured it last year. Other magazines were hoping to feature it this year as well. When I&E first submitted its application, it was a fast process and its other facility was being sold, and the designers had not gotten together with the architects and the architects included colors that were never going to work. The last option would be to add the white on the corner, though he would not be happy about it. He urged the DRB to consider I&E's branding and leaving the building as it currently existed.

**Jean Svadlenka** noted in the alternative color schemes presented by Staff (Exhibit A2, Slide 6), the areas to the left and right of the front door were painted different colors than black.

However, the Applicant's proposal showed only the area left of the front door as being white. She asked if the material to the right of the front door was unpaintable

**Cory Riedel, I&E Construction, 27375 SW Parkway Ave, Wilsonville, OR 97070,** confirmed the material to the right of the main entry was the prefinished metal, which was unpaintable because the manufacturer's warranty would be loss and the paint would just peel off, creating an eyesore in a short time period. Further north on the building, not quite halfway down, the material changed to Hardiplank, which could be painted. Painting that area would be an option to break up the black if need be. The City had been phenomenal to work with through the entire process and the Applicant had worked through many different options.

- He assured that I&E Construction was not trying to disrespect the City or the Board, or pull a bait and switch. I&E's team did not get a chance to review the design review package as this was all something that had moved very quickly. Within four months, I&E had to make the deal, get it permitted, and get in. The color issue had been an oversight and was not I&E's intention.

**Chair McKay** appreciated knowing the Applicant's preference for the building, adding the updating I&E Construction had done to the building was nice. He asked if the vertical accent on the northeast side of the building, which appeared to be a trellis support, would serve to break up the black rather than painting the panels on the left side of the door.

**Mr. Hardister** answered that was correct, adding the intent was if the Applicant reached an agreement to keep the building black, then they was also on board with the vertical trellis and plantings.

**Chair McKay** noted the Applicant had proposed another design not presented by Staff and asked if I&E preferred that design.

**Mr. Ivanov** emphasized I&E was trying to do everything possible to keep the building black, which was why the design was added. He hoped adding more wood in that corner would enable I&E to keep the branding by keeping the building black.

**Chair McKay** said he did not believe the City or the Panel had an issue with I&E's all black branding, rather, the desire was to break up any excessive uniformity for the structure. He appreciated hearing the Applicant's perspective.

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager,** clarified that in all the renderings, I&E had been exploring what could be done to achieve substantial compliance without returning to the DRB, but now that the Applicant was before the Board, it really opened the options. The earlier renderings explored what could be done without having to go through a full design review process.

**Mr. Hardister** added the Applicant went through a lot of back and forth before deciding to return to the Board. He clarified the roll up door on the building's south side would be glass.

**Mr. Ivanov** stated that he would like to eliminate the options from the original proposal since the DRB was willing to consider the options on Slide 4. (Exhibit B7) The Applicant's order of preference was as follows: Option 1, keeping the existing, all black building; with the addition of the trellises and greenery; Option 2 would be to add the vertical wood accent; and Option 3 would be to add the white to the left corner of the building.

**Chair McKay** wanted to ensure that is something the Board could do, and that Staff was okay with modifying their design proposals.

**Mr. Ivanov** added I&E Construction would do whatever possible to work with the City to make this a successful process. He reiterated that leaving the building as is was preferred.

**Mr. Pauly** added if the Board believed any of the current designs met the standards, then there was no reason to not go against the precedent in the DRB's previous decision. This was a new hearing, and the Board could do what it thought best in this context.

**Chair McKay** confirmed no one was present in Council Chambers or via Zoom for public testimony regarding the application.

**Mr. Pitta** asked how often sign waivers had been issued since the 64 sq ft requirement was introduced into City Code.

**Mr. Pauly** noted several size waivers had been approved for size, not for sign's like the one proposed, but to allow electronic changing message boards. He noted the sign needed to stand on its own merits, and because of the sign's uniqueness, it was understood that approving the waiver would not create a precedent for another type of sign. The idea of a waiver was to improve design and allow a unique approach that made sense in the context. If it did, the sign could be larger without creating a precedent due to the unique context.

**Chair McKay** recalled comments from Miranda Bateschell at last month's meeting, stating, "When approving a waiver, it is always good to be very specific about the waiver's parameters to avoid setting a broad or unclear precedent." He asked if the Board could state for the record the reason the waiver was being granted to ensure that a precedent was not being set for other types of signs.

**Mr. Pauly** explained there were a couple points the Board could use to form a relationship as to why approving the waiver made sense. First, the metal panel was already approved without a sign, and the relationship to that existing panel and what made sense proportionally to the architectural feature that the sign was being integrated into, and the fact that the sign was integrated in this unique form. Additionally, the material was essentially constant, which was often a big deal. While the image could be seen, visually, no difference in material could be seen, which could make a major aesthetic difference.

**Chair McKay** asked how the Board could best state the reasons for granting the sign waiver in the approval.

**Mr. Pauly** said if the Board could not identify any findings to the matter, Staff could be directed to add specific findings to explain the findings used for the final decision. If the Board did not believe the Applicant made a strong point or that the sign made sense under the sign waiver criteria, then the smaller sign was another option. He clarified the Board could add findings if it wanted, but anything stated in the public meeting was legally part of the public record.

**Chair McKay** noted the Board had a lengthy discussion at the prior meeting about the building design and requested sign waiver. He asked if any Board member wanted to add or modify any conditions of approval.

**Ms. Svadlenka** stated she preferred Option 3 of the Applicant's design alternatives. (Exhibit B7, Slide 4) Compared to the other buildings in the area, the black needed to be broken up because it was too much of the same mono color for what was trying to be achieved in Wilsonville. When viewed from Parkway Ave, the building looked very dramatic at night, but during the day, it was just a black façade. A combination of Options 2 and 3 would be nice. Option 2 had the vertical oak trim on the corner, and Option 3 had the area to the left of the front doors painted white, and both options had trellises with jasmine out front.

**Chair McKay** stated he preferred Option 2, which was in keeping with the Applicant's design wishes. The vertical accent broke up the front as well as the side viewed when heading south on I-5, rather than only the front with the white paint to the left of the front door. The original design presented to the Board in January had a sort of silver or gray color that covered the front of the building except for the middle piece. The suggested design with the white to the left of the front door seemed awkward and did not seem to solve the need to break up the black. He asked if the Board wanted to add any modifications to the conditions on Page 9 of the Staff report.

**Mr. Pitta** said he would like to see if the sign [inaudible].

**Chair McKay** understood the sign permit for the panel was already approved, but a condition was being added requiring the panel to be a matte, brushed, or otherwise non-reflective material. He confirmed with Staff that condition would apply to both the sign and the entire panel. He also confirmed that if the Board proceeded with Mr. Pitta's suggestion of reducing the sign to 64 sq ft, the Board would just deny the waiver and approve the Class 3 Sign Permit, which was required for a sign of any size. He noted that none of the conditions related at all to the size of the sign and could be discussed during deliberation.



**Chair McKay** confirmed there was no additional discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:39 pm.

**Mr. Pauly** suggested making a motion on each application separately in order to more easily discuss each item separately.

**Angela Niggli moved to approve DB20-0033 Site Design Review with Staff's recommendation and changing the façade to represent the Applicant's preferred Option 2 with the wood corner accent, as well as the trellises and jasmine plantings proposed for the front of the building. Chair McKay seconded the motion.**

**Chair McKay** called for discussion, noting it did not seem like the design option with the wood corner accent was the favorite of the Board.

**Ms. Niggli** stated she appreciated the design of the building and the intention of the Applicant to express their brand in the building's design. At night, the building was stunning visually, but during the day, it was a blank, black façade because the windows reflected black and there was nothing to break it up. She had been a huge proponent of having some contrast and breaking up the façade. Last time, she had suggested painting the middle section in a lighter color, not only to break up the façade, but to also make the vertical window designs pop during the day; so, it was unfortunate the Applicant could not paint that middle portion of the building. Hearing the Applicant's explanation about why it was so important to keep the building black, she believed Option 2 with the wood corner accent and trellises would satisfy the desire to break up the black façade and tie the wood across the front. She also believed the bottom white part seemed almost too contrasting from the black as it already had wood on top of it, making it stick out. Knowing the Applicant wanted to keep the façade all black, she believed the Applicant had provided some nice options.

**Ms. Svadlenka** agreed Option 3 was unbalanced and a bit awkward without the white being able to be on both the left and right sides of the front door. Combining both options would likely be awkward as well. She still had some concerns about the building being only black when driving north on Parkway Ave. She did not know what else the Applicant could propose or modify, but having the accent on the opposite corner would tie in with the trellis, and it did break it up coming south on Parkway Ave.

**Ms. Niggli** believed the trellises and the plantings, which were not currently present, would do a nice job of breaking up the black and connect the top wood feature across to the other side.

**Ms. Svadlenka** noted no trellis was planned for the south side of the building.

**Chair McKay** believed one design had showed a trellis on the south side, but the Board could include that in the motion. He noted the beautiful windows on the east side provided some breakup of the black, but the south side had one glass door and the other doors were painted black, so he supported having at least one trellis, and another if space was available.

**Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney**, advised how the Board could include the additional trellis in the motion making process.

**Chair McKay** stated adding another trellis was his preference, noting it looked like there was space between the glass door and the other windows. He did not believe the Board needed to be that prescriptive, but adding it would be good.

**Angela Niggli amended her motion to add a fourth trellis with jasmine plantings along the south side to break up the black façade.** [No second, though implied as the amendment was from Chair McKay, who seconded the original motion.]

**Ms. Svadlenka** questioned jasmine would work on that side given its light requirements.

**Chair McKay** suggested the Board vote against the motion, and then rephrase the motion to not specify jasmine.

**Mr. Pauly** suggested looking at the Landscape Plan to ensure there was space for the trellis. If the sidewalk was tight to the building, adding the trellis might not be possible. He added the hearing could also be reopened, if necessary.

**Ms. Svadlenka** suggested adding the language, "if possible".

**Chair McKay** asked if the Board included that language and it was not possible, would the Applicant have to return to the Board to request an amendment.

**Mr. Pauly** suggested clarifying what would not make it possible to place the trellis, like having no landscaping area available, making it either/or, so it would not have to return to the Board.

**Ms. Jacobson** noted if the Board wanted a trellis, "if possible" language would not be a good option. The Board could just make the trellis a requirement if it was deemed necessary.

**Mr. Pauly** confirmed that according to the approved Landscape Plan, the sidewalk was tight to the building on the south side. There was a planting area between the sidewalk and parking lot, so a trellis could not be close to the building like the others. Another treatment would be needed or the trellises would not match. He was not sure how feasible building a new planter area with a new sidewalk would be without understanding the impacts of the elevations, ADA requirements, etc.

**Chair McKay** asked how strongly the Board felt about adding the trellis or something else to break up the south side façade.

**Ms. Svadlenka** noted some low shrubs were pictured in Exhibit A, Page 7, the Applicant's rendering for the design change with the white to the left of the front door. She believed a taller landscaping element could help break up the south side of the building when passing by.

**Chair McKay** noticed several trees in the renderings and asked if additional trees been added in the rendering or if those trees were already present. The tree pictured behind the truck on Page 7, would also break up the façade, but he could not remember if the tree was actually there.

**Ms. Svadlenka** said she could not recall if the trees were there either, but when visiting the site, they did not strike her as significantly breaking up the flat black façade at this point. If the tree on Page 6 was bigger, it could be helpful for the view from Parkway Ave.

**Mr. Pauly** confirmed the tree was on site and was a village green zelkova, which would mature to a medium to large tree with a canopy.

**Ms. Svadlenka** said she did not believe it was necessary to remove concrete to put in a trellis.

**Chair McKay** agreed and confirmed Ms. Niggli also agreed with not requiring a trellis on the south side of the building. He restated the original motion and proposed amendment to add a single trellis on the south side of the building and called for the vote.

**The motion failed 0 to 4.**

**Chair McKay moved to approve DB20-0033 Site Design Review with Staff's recommendations with the addition of the Option 2 design with the vertical wood accent on the northeast side of building and wood contrasting trellises on the east side of the building. Angela Niggli seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Pitta** said that the building's design and architecture looked great and he appreciated I&E Construction moving into Wilsonville and having the respect to ask the community about the design. His only concern was that approving a larger sign would lead the neighbors requesting larger signs. He believed the panel would be taken as a sign and not a design element.

**Ms. Svadlenka** believed putting the 134 sq ft logo on the panel made the entire panel look like one big sign. However, the design was nice and different enough that specific findings could be added to deter the sign from becoming a precedent in the future, because if the very specific material and the fact that the screen panel was approved prior to the sign being added.

**Ms. Niggli** believed it was a neat, architecturally integrated sign and was different from signs used by other businesses. She did not think the smaller scale made sense on the building, so she supported the waiver.

**Chair McKay** said he was also concerned about setting a precedent, noting the potential risk that the sign could appear to be a 400 sq ft sign. He suggested that language be added in the waiver stating that the design was approved because the sign was incorporated into the design of the building itself and was also aesthetically pleasing. The proposed sign did not incorporate any 3D, flashy, high contrast elements, it was not lit or distracting, and was not a traditional cabinet or channel letter sign. This would help prevent having billboards in Wilsonville.

**Mr. Pitta** noted the building was 65 ft from the I-5, making it the closest structure to the road in the Wilsonville area with a sign that would probably be viewed as being larger than expected. He was not as concerned about the sign's size as he was about possible legal ramifications in the future from a different applicant being denied a larger sign. He identified numerous other businesses located along I-5, including Toyota, Artistic Auto Body, Subaru, Fred Meyer, and Bullwinkle's.

**Chair McKay** said one caveat with the subject sign verses other businesses wanting similar integrated panels, was that the panel was already an approved design element of the building. Even if the 64 sq ft sign was added, it would still not be seen as just a sign. He wondered how this would differ and whether some kind of permit would be needed if some other design element were incorporated on the building; if the window was used as a logo or something like that. But, he believed the panel piece being part of the building should be considered.

**Mr. Pitta** confirmed the monument sign the Applicant was proposing on the front side of the building was the legal size. If the rest of the Board was okay with it, then so was he. Being a coach and a father and knowing what the schools needed in Wilsonville, he got nervous thinking about having to pay for a decision the Board made. He was on the Wilsonville Youth Sports Board, which was always looking for money, and if the City was paying for legal fees in the future, he would be upset.

**Chair McKay** understood Mr. Pitta's concern, which made it even more important to include findings to clarify the narrow parameters for why the waiver was being approved.

**Mr. Pauly** entered the following exhibits into the record:

- **Exhibit B6:** Three-page handout received October 12, 2020 from the Applicant showing key slides from the Applicant's PowerPoint presentation.
- **Exhibit B7:** The Applicant's PowerPoint presentation.

**Chair McKay** inquired about wording the motion to direct Staff to include the findings or if the conversation already on the record was sufficient.

**Mr. Pauly** suggested that the motion could include condition, such as, "The sign of [this size] shall be of the specific material indicated." That way, no one in the future could buy the building and put in any other type of sign. The condition would make it clear that the waiver was just for this material and just in this case. A motion might be, "I move to adopt Resolution No. 381 as it regards to the Class 3 Sign requested waiver, DB20-0034, and approve with an

added condition that the sign is only approved to be made of the perforated metal material indicated." He confirmed the sign was not lit.

**Chair McKay** asked if the condition should include language reiterating that the sign was not lit, high contrast, did not distract the public eye, etc.

**Mr. Pauly** agreed that was entirely appropriate, adding the motion language would indicate that the sign portion was the same color as the rest of the material, that there was no change in color between the sign portion and the rest of the material, and include Exhibits B6 and B7 as well as the Staff report.

**Ms. Niggli** noted an existing condition of approval already stated, "a matte, brushed, or other non-reflective material that prevents glare impacting vehicles on I-5."

**Mr. Pauly** noted the language was broad regarding material if the Board wanted to be very specific to the sign.

The Board briefly discussed the language needed for the motion.

**Chair McKay moved to adopt Resolution No. 381 and approve DB-0034 Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver with Staff's recommendation and the addition of Exhibits B6 and B7 and adding a condition of approval stating, "The sign is only approved using the perforated metal material indicated; it will not be high contrast; it will not be illuminated; there is no change in color, and it is not distracting to drivers on adjacent roadways." Ken Pitta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Pauly** suggested making another motion to adopt the Staff report to make the record clear.

**Chair McKay moved to adopt the Staff report for Resolution No. 381. Angela Niggli seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**Chair McKay** read the rules of appeal into the record.

## **VII. Board Member Communications**

- A. Results of the August 24, 2020 DRB Panel B meeting
- B. Results of the September 28, 2020 DRB Panel B meeting

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager**, noted the results of Panel B's meetings were available, adding that City Council held a special meeting today to discuss the Board's recent decision regarding Resolution No. 382, the Magnolia Townhome Development.

**Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney**, explained that several neighbors were not happy with the decision and City Council agreed to review the decision on the record as a courtesy. The matter

would be considered at the November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting at which time Council would affirm, reverse, or send back the DRB's decision.

**Mr. Pauly** added that Council had great appreciation and deference for the hard work done by the DRB Panels.

C. Recent City Council Action Minutes

There were no comments.

**VIII. Staff Communications**

There were no comments.

**IX. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:23 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

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