



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, March 24, 2014

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:00 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 Laura Terway

2. Work Session

2a. [PC 14-029](#)

Presentation: Review Proposed Sign Code (OCMC Chapter 15.28)

Sponsors: Planner Laura Terway

Laura Terway, Planner, said the purpose of the Work Session was to go through the details of the proposed Sign Code. She discussed the project goal, purpose of the sign regulations, definitions, scope, permit process, and signage standards. She showed examples of sign size. She then explained the proposed code and changes from the existing code for single and two family residential zones, multi-family residential zones, and conditional uses in residential zones.

There was discussion regarding adding regulations for signs on cars, clarifying how the sign regulations supported economic development, how to deal with signs with lasers, smoke, or sound and painted windows, enforcement and compliance, regulations for abandoned signs, criteria for maintaining signs, and highway frontages. For residential zones, there was discussion regarding the materials signs were made from, adding restrictions for flag and flag pole size, the number of political signs allowed on a property, off premise signs, and not allowing banners in these zones.

Ms. Terway then explained the proposed code for office, commercial, mixed use, and industrial zone signs.

There was discussion regarding clarifying the language for ground floor tenants who were entitled to a minimum of a 20 square foot wall sign.

Jonathan Stone, Main Street Manager, asked about entrances for second and third floor tenants and if they were allowed a 20 square foot sign. He was concerned the Code would preclude the entrance to a lobby for tenants upstairs.

Ms. Terway stated it would apply to a lobby on the ground floor. The tenants upstairs would have to share one 20 square foot sign. They would also get one foot of signage per every foot of tenant space. She would bring back examples to better

clarify what was proposed.

There was discussion regarding properties with large frontages being allowed to have a second free standing sign and the possibility of having different standards for different areas of the City instead of having it based on frontage. The Commission wanted the emphasis to be on enforcement.

Commissioner Mahoney suggested creating a Design Review Board for signs.

Chair Kidwell thought there should be emphasis on the quality of the sign rather than the quantity of the signs.

Commissioner Mabee thought enforcement would be more effective than a Design Review Board.

Commissioner McGriff did not think a Design Review Board was practical at this time. Enforcement was key.

There was consensus that a Design Review Board could be created in the future when there was better compliance.

Chair Kidwell suggested adding the criteria that if a sign deteriorated from its original condition that it either needed to be repaired or replaced. Commissioner Mahoney suggested saying signs had to be maintained to the standard of their original application.

There was discussion regarding the need to add funding for enforcement through the budget process and making a shorter deadline of four years or less to remove any non-complying signs.

Mr. Stone said a lot of downtown signs were incentivized through grants. Peer pressure was also a way to encourage people to come into compliance.

Staff would bring back more clarity on enforcement and bringing signs into conformity, creating a design maintenance requirement, and limiting the size of flags and height of flag free-standing poles.

There was discussion regarding having special sign corridors or a one size fits all approach. There was consensus to wait for special sign corridors until there was baseline compliance. The Commission agreed that for non-conforming signs that were constructed legally, they could be grandfathered in, but if they were not constructed legally, they would need to be removed. The enforcement piece of the Sign Code would come back to the Commission on April 14. Ms. Terway would continue going through the proposed code at another Work Session.

3. Communications

Ms. Terway discussed what would be on the next meeting's agenda.

4. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 10:15 PM.