



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Monday, June 23, 2014

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

Work Session (6:00 P.M.)

Chair Kidwell called the Work Session to order at 6:00 PM.

Present: 5 - Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Robert Mahoney

Absent: 2 - Paul Espe and Tom Geil

Staffers: 2 - Tony Konkol and John Lewis

Linn Avenue, Leland Road, Meyers Road Corridor Plan Presentation

John Lewis, Public Works Director, said this project would be added as an ancillary corridor plan to the Transportation System Plan. He introduced David Brokaw and Jane Bell from Wallace Engineering who would be giving the presentation.

Ms. Bell reviewed what had been done so far including looking at the existing conditions, doing a needs assessment, and creating alternative concept plans. An open house and public opinion poll had been offered and the comments were currently being compiled. The final plan and implementation was yet to be done.

Mr. Brokaw discussed the vicinity map, existing connectivity and access, concerns and safety issues, planning priorities, concept plans and alternatives for the four identified segments, potential routes for pedestrians and bicyclists off Linn Avenue, concept plan for a 5-leg roundabout, and next steps.

There was discussion regarding the pros and cons of the roundabout. The Commission gave comments and ideas to be researched further. There was further discussion regarding alternative a and b for Segment 1.

The corridor plan would be brought back to the Planning Commission in a public hearing.

Chair Kidwell adjourned the Work Session at 6:50 PM.

Regular Meeting (7:00 P.M.)

Chair Kidwell called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Present: 6 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Robert Mahoney

Absent: 1 - Tom Geil

Staffers: 2 - Tony Konkol and Pete Walter

1. Call to Order**2. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

There was no public comment on non-agenda items.

3. Public Hearing**3a. [PC 14-057](#)**

Proposed annexation of 5.5 acres located at 19588 S. McCord Road (Planning file: AN 14-01).

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing.

Pete Walter, Planner, stated this application was still under review by planning and engineering staff, so there was no staff report or recommendation. He explained the property was located at 19588 S McCord Road. The property had been within the Urban Growth Boundary since the 1980s. It was 5.5 acre parcel with a Comprehensive Plan designation of low density residential. The Planning Commission needed to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Commission, and if the City Commission approved, it be would referred to the voters on the November ballot. Staff recommended continuing the hearing to July 14, however that agenda was already quite full and it could be continued to July 28.

There was no public testimony.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Espe, to continue the public hearing for AN 14-01 to July 28, 2014. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Robert Mahoney

3b. [PC 14-056](#)

Proposed zone change from R-8 to R-6 and a 10-lot subdivision for properties located at 19751 and 19735 Meyers Road (Planning Files ZC 14-02 and TP 14-02)

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing.

Mr. Konkol said the Planning Commission denied this application on June 9. Staff was bringing back an additional finding justifying the denial. Staff identified Comprehensive Plan Policy 10.1.1 as the reason that the application did not comply with the zone change as proposed. The finding would be part of the notice of decision for this application.

There was no public testimony.

Chair Kidwell closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Commissioner Espe, seconded by Commissioner McGriff, to adopt the findings for ZC 14-02 and TP 14-02. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Robert Mahoney

3c. [PC 14-065](#)**Oregon City Sign Code Update (Planning file: L 14-01).**

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing.

Mr. Konkol said staff was requesting a continuance of the hearing to July 28, 2014 to allow the Planning Commission to hold their Work Session on the Sign Code that night.

Tom O'Brien, resident of Oregon City, mentioned punctuation and clean up errors that he found in the document. One example was in the definitions, it talked about incidental free standing signs but there was no definition for them.

The Commission asked that grammatical errors be turned into staff.

Mr. O'Brien thought consideration should be given for sources of light other than light bulbs. He thought the single property banners being in place for up to 30 days up to twice per year would be difficult to enforce. Regarding signs placed within the right of way adjacent to a sidewalk, the sign would be placed within six inches of the face of the curb, and there was a recommendation from the Community Advisory Team members that signs in the right of way not block the space near the curb where people entered and exited parked vehicles and placement should allow for the passage of pedestrians. Signs should be located adjacent to the building. One of the key issues was how the signs were being used. He thought it was to attract both pedestrian and vehicular traffic. If the parked vehicles blocked the signs, it did the merchants no good. If the sign was up against the building, there was a better chance it would be seen. The CAT team also thought the signs should only be allowed during business hours, not when the business was closed. Enforcement was still a critical issue as well.

Jonathan Stone, Director of Main Street Oregon City, said Main Street Oregon City received a grant to install banners on light poles throughout downtown. He was unclear how that was addressed in the Sign Code. With respect to A-frame signs as clutter, some would say A-frames were a sign of vitality. He thought there needed to be education for retailers on the best way to use A-frames. Some of the signs were currently being used for way-finding as well. In regard to the signs obstructing people getting out of cars and path of travel, there were also furniture and other obstructions that would have to be addressed. With respect to lit signs inside of buildings, were they now regulating "open" signs? He wanted to make sure whatever regulations there were that it not impact inappropriately those businesses that had TV's in their front windows. Murals were not allowed on residential buildings, but he wondered how that would work if there were mixed use buildings downtown in the future. He also thought murals could be a way to dress up 99E. There was concern that the tax lot measure for the quantity of A-frames was inconsistent with the number of businesses downtown. He suggested making it one per tax lot or not more than one per 100 feet.

There was discussion regarding what to do for the buildings that had businesses on the second floor, where the A-frames should be located, how many should be allowed per building, and the effectiveness of A-frame signs.

Mr. O'Brien said within the current revised Code, there was limitation of signs per frontage. He thought the effectiveness of A-frames depended what was written on the A-frames. He agreed it was an education process.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabey, seconded by Commissioner McGriff, to continue the public hearing for the Oregon City Sign Code Update (Planning file: L 14-01) to July 28, 2014. The motion carried by the following

vote:

Aye: 6 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Robert Mahoney

4. Communications

Mr. Konkol reviewed what would be on the July 14 and 28 agendas. On July 8 there would be a joint work session with the City Commission.

5. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 8:10 PM.

Work Session (Following Regular Meeting)

Chair Kidwell called the Work Session to order at 8:15 PM.

14-382

Planning Commission work session for the Oregon City Sign Code Update (Planning file L 14-01)

Mr. Konkol said at the last meeting the Commission wanted to revisit signage allowed in the residential zones. Currently one sign was allowed for each frontage not to exceed a maximum of three wall signs. Wall signs were prohibited if there was a free standing sign except in the R-2 zone. The concern was having a free standing sign in an R-10 associated with a home occupancy. He asked if the Commission wanted further regulations for residential zones.

Commissioner McGriff did not think a house should have a free standing sign. They should have to come under home occupation requirements for review.

Chair Kidwell thought they shouldn't be allowed outright, but it could be a conditional use.

There was discussion regarding making a distinction for political and real estate signs. These could be temporary signs and only temporary free standing signs could be allowed in residential zones. There was consensus to allow only temporary free standing signs in single family residential zones.

There was discussion regarding the size of the A-frame signs downtown. Mr. Stone said if every single primary business entrance had an A-frame, the average was an A-frame every 15 feet.

Mr. Konkol said the maximum width for an A-frame was 28 inches, maximum height was 3 feet, and maximum size was 6 square feet per sign face.

Commissioner Mabee thought the A-frames should only be out during normal business hours and for no longer than 12 hours per day.

Mr. Konkol said regulating times of use was difficult. He thought they could make it certain hours, from 8 a.m. to 12 p.m.

There was consensus to make the hours 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. for A-frame signs.

There was discussion regarding the placement of A-frames. Chair Kidwell thought

there should be a five foot travel zone for pedestrians that needed to be kept clear. He liked having the sign in close proximity to the entrance of the business.

There was consensus to change it to say A-frames could be within six inches of the curb or within six inches of the building.

Commissioner McGriff said for properties in a mixed use commercial zone and in a historic district, there needed to be a reference to the historic district requirements. There were a number of non-conforming internally illuminated signs in the McLoughlin Conservation District. She wanted to see them come into compliance.

There was discussion regarding putting a timeline in the Code for bringing the non-conforming signs into compliance as currently the Code would allow existing signs to remain.

Commissioner Mabee suggested saying the existing signs would be allowed to remain except in historic districts which had one year to be brought into compliance.

Commissioner Henkin thought the signs could be reviewed every year with the business license renewal and checked off if it was in compliance or not. No business license would be issued until the sign came into conformance.

Chair Kidwell agreed the non-conforming signs needed to be brought into compliance, and the maximum amount of time they should give people to come into compliance was two years. He thought it would be pointless to update the Sign Code without compliance. People could come for a variance for their non-conforming signs.

Commissioner Mabee suggested for A-frames, a single tax lot greater than 50 feet of frontage may have a second sign.

Mr. Konkol said Clackamas Community College asked about institutionally zoned properties being allowed to change the message on an LED lit sign three times a day. It would not be a moving or flashing sign, but a fixed electronic sign.

There was consensus to allow text changes three times a day and to allow it City-wide. There was consensus that all signs City-wide would be brought into conformance within two years.

Mr. Konkol was working with Mr. Stone and Public Works regarding banners on light poles.

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 9:05 PM.