REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

- MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: January 9, 1998

TO: Building Services Division Staff Land Use Services Division Staff

Lynn Baugh	Mark Carey
Chris Ricketts	Lisa Pringle
Pam Dhanapal	Marilyn Cox
Terry Brunner	Lanny Henoch
Ken Dinsmore	Gordon Thomson
Priscilla Kaufmann	

Greg Kipp, Deputy Director
Michael Sinsky, Prosecuting Attorney's Office

FM: Sophia Byrd, Code Development Coordinator

Present: Sophia Byrd, Pam Dhanapal, Priscilla Kaufmann, Andrew McDonald,
Betty Salvati, Gordon Thomson, Harold Vandergriff (Susan Marlin, recorder)

Issue:

1. How does one calculate allowable signage with regards to service station canopies? (Andrew McDonald)

Discussion:
K.C.C. 21A.20.100A states... " Wall signs are permitted, provided they do not total an area more than 15 percent of the buiding facade on which they are located..."

The question is how one may determine calculations based on the definition of " building facade" (K.C.C. 21A.06.140)... " that portion of any exterior elevation of a building extending from the grade of the building to the top of the parapet wall or eaves, for the entire width of the building elevation."

The group discussed how the definition of " building facade" does not address open spaces on buildings, such as canopies and non-traditional buildings that are tiered or cantilevered. Thus calculating 15 percent of the building facade is determined differently among staff. There was some disagreement within the group on how one would measure the facade. One approach is to figure the entire wall surface from the grade to the top of the eaves as the overall face of the building whether it is a tiered building or not; the other is to consider each portion of a tiered building as a separate exterior elevation, thus allowing a sign located on more than one facade. It was decided that an Administrative Interpretation addressing measuring levels would satisfy the need for consistency among staff.

It was agreed that signs may project down and out but not up. It was noted that a discussion of " projecting signs" took place at a June 9, 1995 RRC meeting. It was then suggested that a code amendment was needed to change wording in K.C.C. 21A.06.1155 and 21A.06.1165 from " ...projects vertically... to " projects horizontally." Currently there is an amendment before the Council (Proposed Ordinance 96-937) clarifying the definitions and height limits for wall, awning and projecting signs which deletes the word " vertically" and clarifies that projections can be no more than one foot from the wall of a building or structure.

Conclusion:
An Administrative Interpretation will be written to address what constitutes a facade. Pam Dhanapal and Andrew McDonald will provide examples of drawings depicting different structures such as buildings that are tiered or with canopies. They will meet with Sophia Byrd to draft an interpretation for review and discussion at a future RRC meeting.

2. Legislative Update

Full Council will meet Monday, January 12. The item of major interest to DDES is Proposed Substitute Ordinance 97-607 relating to allowing structures in setbacks. Councilmember Derdowski is preparing an amendment to address his concerns about neighbor disputes over structures in side-yard setbacks.

On the agenda for adoption is Proposed Ordinance 97-727, adopting sensitive lake protection standards for Lake Sammamish drainage basin. Also on the agenda for reintroduction in '98 is Proposed Ordinance 93-682, Title 23

rewrite. A council appointed committee is continuing to work on this measure.

SB:sm