

**Town of Eatonville  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MONDAY 7:00 PM, OCTOBER 30, 2006  
COMMUNITY CENTER  
305 CENTER STREET WEST**

**MSC- Motion, Second and Carried.**

**Chairman Beach** called the meeting to order at 7:00PM .

**Commissioners Present:** Beach, Lind, Valentine, Schaub, Frink and Pruitt.

**Town Staff Present:** Mayor Smallwood, Nick Bond and Karen Bennett.

**Approval of agenda:** MSC

**Approval of minutes:** No Minutes.

**Communications and Announcements:**

**From Commissioners, Town Officials, other government bodies:**

**Beach** spoke on upcoming subdivision at the airport.

**From the Public:** There was none.

**Public Hearings:**

**Lind** read Incentive Based Sign Option, dated October 30, 2006 by Stephen Lind. Entered into the record. Made a motion to move the document date October 30, 2006 labeled "Incentive Based Sign Option" to put a new section with in the code. Schaub seconded the motion.

**Bond** purposed of the signs is to promote business and protect the character and health, safety and well fair of the neighbor hood. Does not see how this proposal protects the health, safety and well fair of the Town of Eatonville, Believe this proposal is one sided and does not protect the community interest. The purpose of the sign ordinance is to regulate signage to stop signs that will have a negative impact on a community.

**Cliff Murphy**, 133 Washington Avenue North, Eatonville, WA

Probably nothing wrong with a Incentive Based Sign Option, however, would not the normal variance relief be available t those that object to the ordinance if the council passes it? Why clutter the ordinance.

**Bond** there are two issues here which there is an opportunity for an application to ask for something different. One of them is design review and the other is the existing variance provision in our municipal code which is in Chapter 18.08.

**Terry VanEaton**, 41918 Lynch Creek Road West, Eatonville, WA

Believes that the sign ordinance was written is super restrictive. Believes that it is restricting the free speech of the people when they want to put a sign up to let the public know what they sell and where to find it. If the town wants such a thing I suggest that the town partner with the business and accept the responsibility for directing the people to the businesses with a sign program of their own where you have signs around the town that direct people to those business. If you don't want to do that then you don't want taxes and if you don't have taxes then you can't run the town.

**Mayor Smallwood** read from memo for the record.

**Bond** discussed designed review. Reviewed memo covering sign lighting, electronic reader boards, variances, expanded data spreadsheet, non-conforming signs, voluntary compliance incentive, comparison by sign type and freestanding height limit.

**Terry VanEaton**, 41918 Lynch Creek Road West, Eatonville, WA

Feels that this should be tabled for six months and have a committee of business people get together with town staff and go over the sign ordinance and try it once more.

**Rich Williams**, 3144 Hollywood Drive NE, Eatonville, WA

Read from memo for the record. Noted that he represents the Downtown Revitalization Committee.

**Pruitt** thanked Mr. Williams for taking the time to go through this.

**Mayor Smallwood** the issues are still here, the grandfathering, antique eligibility, fair exception process and the implementation process that are the four issues that we should look at along with the height and style of signs, the size of the signs, the brightness of the signs, newer technology signs for the future and a community sign. Basically, this is a hearing to get input and I think we have done a good job at getting input tonight. Not asking the planning commission to take this code as is written and approve it, what I am really looking for is the planning commissions option on it and where do we need to change it so that it works for everybody.

**Nancy James**, Holly Hut

Went to eighteen small towns and deliberately looked at all the signs and checked out the information centers. If signs are not tall enough the parked cars blocked your vision.

**Charlie Butler**, former owner of Ohop Bakery.

Got a sign permit for their sign and tried to follow the criteria. The sign blended into the landscape to well. Something he wished he could have done but it was not within the criteria to do was to somehow place that sign out a little bit where it could be seen by the public that was just driving by on Washington. The street lights, the parallel parking blocks the signs that are off the street.

**Charles McTee**, 408 Ridge Road, Eatonville, WA

Think it is a mistake to pass a restrictive sign ordinance and then have a design committee made up from away from there to give people a variance. Variances should be given by the planning commission.

**Pruitt** is in favor of a sub-committee.

**Lind and Schaub** withdraw their motion and second for the “Incentive Based Sign Option” to put a new section within the code.

**Bond** majority of the planning commission are of the opinion to have a sub-committee. Would the commission agree to allowing the mayor and I to structure such a sub-committee, it would have representation from the planning commission, the businesses and whomever else the mayor would like to put on it.

The commission was in favor of putting together a sub-committee.

**New Business:** None

**Old Business:** None

**Public Comments:** No comments.

**Commissioner Comments:** No comments.

**Next Meeting:** November 6, 2006

**MSC to Adjourn at 09:44 PM**

---

PC Chairman, Philip Beach

---

PC Recorder, Karen T. Bennett

---

PC Secretary, Bob Schaub