



City of Yachats

YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

June 16 , 2020

Work Session Approved Minutes

Vice-Chair Lance Bloch called the June 16, 2020 work session of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 2:02 pm via Zoom. Members present: Helen Anderson, Lance Bloch, Jacqueline Danos Christine Orchard, Doug Conner, and Loren Dickinson. Absent: none. Staff Present: City Planner Dave Mattison and Deputy Clerk Kimmie Jackson. Also present: COG Planner Justin Peterson. Audience: 0.

I. Danos Questions

Commissioner Danos stated she had sent a list of questions about the status of the Planning Commission. Danos asked Commissioners how they felt the Driftwood Project was handled with respect to planning. Commissioner Dickinson noted the importance of having a to-scale site plan for evaluating a project. Commissioner noted that the Planning Commission never saw the site plan. Dickinson added there were some issues with parking overhang onto the sidewalks. Anderson stated the sidewalk width was not changed for the RFP that went out. Anderson suggested that the project was planned out of sequence, noting the project started as the Driftwood Water Line and remained so until a grant was obtained in December 2019. She reported Public Works had a hand-sketched drawing in their February meeting packet but it was not discussed at the meeting. The Public Works and Streets Commission discussed the project at the end of their March meeting, and Rick McClung was planning to take the plan to the Parks and Commons Commission for their March meeting, which was canceled due to COVID.

Danos wanted the Commission to discuss whether the project should have come before the Planning Commission. She suggested that the interconnection between streets and how people move through the city is part of planning. She would have liked to have the Planning Commission discuss how this roadway could be planned to benefit more than cars to make the community more livable and healthier. Bloch could see a possible role for Planning but was not certain whether the Council wanted Planning to do that as it could create a bottle-neck. Commissioner Conner believed a Citizens Involvement

1 Committee, if it were to exist, would be the appropriate group for this type of discussion.
2 Conner argued that it was likely very few citizens knew about this project. Danos added
3 that calling it a “paving project” caused people to assume it was just repaving a street.
4

5 Orchard stated the Planning Commission focused on variances, hearings and code.
6 She indicated that traditionally the Commission has not taken on this type of role. Bloch
7 stated this role would be new for the Commission. Planner Mattison summarized that a
8 Planning Commission was to make recommendation to Council on land use issues,
9 handle land use applications, and update the Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code.
10 Anderson suggested the role of the Planner can be broader than the Commission.
11

12 Danos noted that ORS 227.090 referred to in the Yachats Code allows for Planning to
13 do much more. She wanted to know if the Commission wanted to take on those roles.
14 She also believed the Commission should meet more frequently. Danos wanted to be
15 able to “make a difference.” She wanted the Commission to be more proactive. Danos
16 argued that things that were in previous Comprehensive Plans that were deleted should
17 still be in the Comprehensive Plan. Anderson indicated that what Danos was
18 suggesting was not traditionally what has been covered by the Planning Commission.
19 Danos thought the City and Commission were not adequately looking at zoning and
20 how it is used for issues such as workforce housing. Anderson suggested the
21 mechanics of what Danos was suggesting would require multiple meetings each month.
22 Conner suggested the Commission could meet once each month as the Planning
23 Commission and a second time as the Citizens Involvement Committee.
24

25 Conner raised the issue of vacation rentals not being discussed in Title 9. Anderson
26 recalled that the Commission has recommended to Council that vacation rentals be a
27 conditional use in residential zones, and the Council has decided not to do that.
28

29 Bloch suggested the Commission could have a special work session specifically discuss
30 the role of the Commission. Planner Peterson stated that the Commission can examine
31 what is allowed in zones, but direction from City Council was typically what guides what
32 the Commission examines. He saw the two biggest roles were making
33 recommendations to Council and hearing variances and conditional uses. Mattison
34 suggested that the Commission could draft bylaws. Danos noted that Title 2 of the
35 Code did lay out the powers and duties of the Commission.
36

37 Orchard noted some of the very useful contributions Danos has made to the
38 Commission.
39

1 Bloch asked Peterson to provide the Commission with some examples of what the
2 Commission can do per the bylaws and suggested the Commission could resume this
3 discussion at the next regular meeting. Peterson noted some possibilities such as joint
4 meetings and questions to Council asking for direction. Anderson recalled there have
5 been times when the Commission has been reprimanded for taking its own initiative and
6 sometimes the Council will ask a commission to tell them what they want to do.

7 8 **II. Lighting Ordinance Draft**

9 Bloch noted Danos, Dickinson and Mattison had drafted some changes and Anderson
10 has incorporated some of those in to the draft ordinance document.

11
12 Anderson summarized that most of the changes were under the multi-family and
13 commercial uses.

14 15 1. Change the standard for residential lighting to be under, not over, 3000 Kelvin 16 (9.42.050.A.3).

17 Conner noted the luminaire is the entire light assembly and what was needed in this
18 instance is "lamp." Commissioners discussed using "light sources" versus "lamps."
19 Conner noted that the color of an entire fixture cannot be measured.

20 21 2. Use "light source" instead of lamp or bulb in 9.42.050.A sections 1, 2 and 3.

22 Dickinson noted that there was not a firm comparable of watts to lumens. Bloch
23 suggested the 60 watt equivalence to 800 lumens was roughly average.

24 25 3. Limit multi-family lamps to 150 watts or 2400 lumens.

26 27 4. Add "security lighting" to definitions.

28 Dickinson reported how Florence defined security lighting and Commissioners agreed to
29 use that definition.

30 31 5. Adding language for area of illumination plan.

32 Danos provided four areas to address in an illumination plan, and Dickinson agreed
33 these statements are comprehensive. Dickinson suggested adding "superimposed over
34 a copy of the site plan" in the third item.

35 36 6. Mattison and Dickinson agreed a site plan should be required in the multi-family 37 section.

38 39 7. Remove reference to another section in 9.42.050.C.2. 40

1 8. Limit of 1,800 lumens

2 Commissioners agreed the 1,800 limit in 9.42.050.C.4 seemed low given the change in
3 the multi-family section, and agreed to set the limit at 2,400.

5 9. Lighting per lot/area

6 Commissioners discussed maximum light output per site or acreage. Anderson noted
7 the Model Lighting Ordinance uses the area of hardscape. Danos noted Flagstaff used
8 25,000 lumens per net acre. Anderson noted 25,000 lumens was equivalent to 10 150-
9 watt bulbs. Commissioners agreed this total lot limit should apply to both commercial
10 and multi-family lots.

12 10. High intensity lights

13 Danos explained what Flagstaff had done where they indicated a “preferred sources”
14 that are encouraged, but not required. She added they also banned mercury vapor
15 lamps. Commissioners agreed mercury vapor lamps should not be allowed and noted
16 the commercial section needs to be consistent with the definition for High Intensity
17 (definition H). Conner suggested that metal halide lamps should also be banned.

19 11. Parking Lot Lighting

20 Anderson asked if the 25,000 lot limit would be adequate to light a very large parking
21 lot. Conner estimated that the parking lot at the Adobe was approximately an acre.
22 Peterson measure the lot via GIS and noted the lot was just under two acres.
23 Commissioners agreed that an equivalent of 10 150-watt bulbs would be adequate for
24 that space. Dickinson noted the limit on multi-family might need to be adjusted to what
25 is done for commercial. Commissioners agreed to adjust the multi-family lot limit to
26 25,000 per net acre.

28 Danos read from the Cannon Beach lighting which had an abundance of the use of
29 lumens, “Total Site Lumen Limit. The total installed initial luminaire lumens of all outdoor
30 lighting shall not exceed the total site lumen limit. The total site lumen limit shall be
31 determined using Table A. For sites with existing lighting, existing lighting shall be
32 included in the calculation of total installed lumens. The total installed initial luminaire
33 lumens is calculated as the sum of the initial luminaire lumens for all luminaires.”

35 Commissioners discussed using the hardscape versus net acre approach to total lot
36 limits. Anderson noted the definition for hardscape from the model ordinance,
37 “permanent landscape improvements to the site including parking lots, drives,
38 entrances, curbs, ramps, stairs, steps, medians, walkways, and non-vegetative
39 landscaping that is 10 feet or less in width.” Dickinson and Orchard favored the lumens

1 per square foot of hardscape approach. The model code sets the limit at 2.5 lumens
2 per square foot of hardscape.

3
4 Commissioners agreed to use Flagstaff's recommendations for high intensity lighting:
5 Preferred Source – Low-Pressure Sodium (LPS) Lamps and Narrow-Spectrum Amber
6 LEDs. Due to their high energy efficiency, long life, and spectral characteristics, low-
7 pressure sodium (LPS) lamps are the preferred illumination source throughout the City.
8 Their use is encouraged, when not required, for outdoor illumination whenever their use
9 would not be detrimental to the use of the property. In all applications where LPS
10 lighting is required or preferred, an acceptable alternative is narrow-spectrum amber
11 LEDs.

12 13 12. Replacement value

14 Dickinson and Danos suggested adding "replacement" before "value" in 9.42.030.C.4
15 and Commissioners agreed.

16 17 13. Uplighting

18 Dickinson reported he saw many jurisdictions that prohibited uplighting. Danos strongly
19 favored adding this requirement.

20 21 14. Time to Become Compliant

22 Danos suggested using the breakdown from Pittsburgh that bases compliance on extent
23 of repair or change. Peterson clarified that these standards would replace 9.42.070.B.

24 25 15. Street Lighting

26 Commissioners discussed options for including a requirement for street lights.
27 Anderson reported she communicated with Central Lincoln PUD who indicated to her
28 that they can add shields to any street light, noting the shields for the light under current
29 complaint have been ordered. She added that Rick McClung had indicated Central
30 Lincoln PUD was willing to move lights as well. Mattison added that the City had a
31 contract with Central Lincoln that would specify who was responsible for what.
32 Anderson indicated she requested that information from the city.

33
34 Bloch suggested something could be added for requesting shielding for street lights that
35 are not along Highway 101. Anderson indicated she would find out from Central Lincoln
36 PUD if they could provide solar lights or lower the height of the lights.

37 38 16. Pole heights.

39 Dickinson suggested adding the light pole height limit to multi-family standards.

1 Dickinson reported he saw that some jurisdictions had different pole height limits for
2 pedestrian pathways. Commissioners agreed to add a different pole height limit for
3 pedestrian areas. Orchard asked if this limit should also apply to parks and open
4 spaces. Danos referred to a table she included in her notes.

6 17. Height limit on buildings

7 Dickinson noted that there was no limit on the lighting height on buildings. He indicated
8 some limit the height to under the eaves. Conner noted some marine lights were on the
9 building roof.

11 18. Marine Lighting and curfews

12 Conner noted some marine lights were on the building roof. Conner argued that
13 allowing a curfew meant old marine lights were allowed in 9.42.040.D. Conner noted
14 this regulation was in conflict with the nuisance language in Title 5 indicating that
15 lighting could not be directed onto adjacent properties or areas. He stated that the
16 nuisance code would need to be repealed. Commissioners discussed ways to handle
17 this conflict. Peterson noted that there could be legal issues in tying Title 5 with Title 9
18 and agreed there was a conflict with the curfew and what was in Title 5.

20 Commissioners agree to strike the curfew portion of 9.42.040.D and outright prohibit
21 marine lighting (i.e., strike "new").

23 19. Color photos

24 Peterson stated it was not common to use color photos in the code. He suggested if
25 they were used, they should contain a citation.

26 Danos asked Peterson if he wanted to see an old version of the Comprehensive Plan to
27 see what was taken out. Anderson stated that the last revisions of the Comprehensive
28 Plan were approved by the Planning Commission, and if someone wanted something
29 put back into the Plan, they should raise that as an addition.

31 Anderson suggested that the Planning Commission review the Comp Plan and Code
32 changes before having another joint meeting with the Council. She indicated she was
33 not comfortable with discussing matters with Council when the Commission has not
34 reached its own conclusions. Peterson stated the grant was extended and they have
35 met the requirement to have one joint meeting. Peterson indicated they were still
36 working on the drafts of both documents.

38 Bloch noted that the draft of the Comprehensive Plan changes had changes that were
39 not related to the hazard mitigation updates. Anderson had concern that half of the
40 Comprehensive Plan would be in one format and the other half in another format.

1 Mattison did not see that difference as problematic. Anderson indicated she would
2 resend the documents to everyone.

3
4 Conner asked if there was a Natural Resources Map to go with the Comprehensive
5 Plan. Mattison indicated that was under development.

6
7 Commissioners agreed to have a special work session to review the Comprehensive
8 Plan and Code changes for Hazard Mitigation updates on July 7, 2020 at 2:00 pm.

9
10 Bloch adjourned the work session at 4:45 pm.

11
12
13
14 _____
15 Lance Bloch, Vice-Chair

_____ Date _____

16
17 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on July 12, 2020.