

1. Agenda

Documents:

[2-27-18_PC_AGENDA.PDF](#)

2. Meeting Materials

Documents:

[01-16-18_PC_DRAFT_WS_MINUTES.PDF](#)
[01-23-18_PC_SPECIAL_DRAFT_MINUTES.PDF](#)
[BLDG_PERMITS_02-13-18.PDF](#)
[02-06-18_PC_DRAFT_SPM_MINUTES.PDF](#)
[02-13-18_SIGN_ORD_AMEND_INFO.PDF](#)
[01-16-18_PC_DRAFT_MINUTES.PDF](#)
[01-23-18_PC_DRAFT__SM_MINUTES.PDF](#)

3. Work Session Minutes

Documents:

[2018-02-27 PLANNING WS MINUTES.PDF](#)



CITY OF YACHATS

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

441 Hwy 101 N., Yachats Commons, Room 1

Tuesday, February 27, 2018: 2 pm Work Session; 3 pm Regular Meeting

WORK SESSION AGENDA

- A. Sign Ordinance

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

- I. Announcements and Correspondence
- II. Minutes
 - A. Regular Meeting and Work Session – January 16, 2018
 - B. Special Meeting and Work Session – January 23, 2018
 - C. Special Public Meeting – February 6, 2018
- III. Citizen's Concerns
- IV. Planner's Report
- V. Other Business
 - A. From the Commission
 - B. From Staff

Commission meets the third Tuesday of each month.

Next scheduled meeting: March 20, 2018 at 2:00pm and 3:00pm.

This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are invited to attend. This meeting will be audio taped. All items to be considered by the Commission must be submitted to City Hall no later than one week prior to the meeting. Minutes of all public meetings are available for review at City Hall, or on the City website at www.yachatsoregon.org.

In accordance with ORS 192.630, City of Yachats will make a good faith effort to provide accommodations for any person desiring to attend a public meeting, if the request is made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting time. The meeting room is physically accessible to persons with mobility devices; a sign language or foreign language interpreter may be available, with advance notice. Call City Hall at 541-547-3565 or Oregon Relay 1-800-735-2900 (TDD).

Posted: February 21, 2018



YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

January 16, 2018

Work Session Draft Minutes

Vice-Chair Ron Urban called the January 16, 2018 work session of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 2:00 pm in Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Ron Urban, Helen Anderson, Shelly Shrock, Ginny Hafner, James Kerti, and Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey. Absent: Christine Orchard. Audience: 11.

Commissioner Anderson explained to the audience that a work session is for discussion among Commissioners and they will have an opportunity to speak during regular meeting.

Commissioners noted documents were not currently accessible through the document library as there was some server problem.

I. Light Industrial

Urban referred Commissioners to his draft in their meeting packet.

- A. Section 9.04.030 adds a definition for Light Industrial
- B. Section 9.28.020(T) adds a conditional use in zone C-1 for Light Industrial
- C. Section 9.48.010 adds parking requirements (with edit of first "600" to be "six")
- D. Section 9.72.050 addresses standards for Light Industrial in section 9.72.050(F)

Draft item 1: as is

Draft items 2 and 3: Commissioners discussed the portion of a building that would be dedicated to retail sales and agreed to 20%, with Anderson agreeing to research other jurisdictions for support for this level. These two items were combined to state: *Goods manufactured, fabricated, or assembled shall be offered for retail sale on the premises in a dedicated space occupying a minimum of twenty percent (20%) of the building.*

Draft item 4: Commissioners debated the type of screening fence that should be used, noting that the form of screening would be addressed at a Condition Use Hearing with the Planning Commission, and agreed to: *Outdoor storage shall be on the side or back of the building and shall be screened with a sight-obscuring fence, hedge, or wall.*

Draft item 5: Commissioners discussed the possible location of retail parking in the front of the building. For a building of maximum size of 6,000 square feet with 20% or 1,200 square feet of that as dedicated retail, 16 parking spaces would be required.

Commissions agreed to: *Employee parking and loading area shall be located on the side or rear of the building.*

Urban stated the next step would be to prepare for a Public Hearing.

II. Signs

Commissioners Kerti presented his research on digital signs. He reported Panama City had developed code to address some of the same issues that were being raised in Yachats. Given recent feedback from residents, Anderson suggested there is a need to get more technical in developing code. Kerti noted light meters are relatively inexpensive. Kerti also noted that requiring adjustments for light intensity during daytime versus nighttime is advisable, as the recommended difference in nits was 7,000 versus 500. Kerti noted the Commission had previously crossed out an item requiring the inclusion of an adjustable light sensor on digital signs, and this new information suggests that the inclusion of a sensor remain.

1 Commissioner Hafner asked about current code regulations on digital signs. Kerti and Anderson
2 noted "digital" is not in current code as the code was written in the 1990s. Anderson suggested the
3 Commission consult with the community regarding the extent of regulations on digital signs.
4 Commissioners discussed variable around Dark Sky lighting that could be incorporated now into
5 the code, such as a requirement that all lights have downward shielding.

6
7 Kerti noted requirements from other cities on requirements for electrical permits. While this issue is
8 addressed in County codes, Commissioners agreed that some statement of electrical standards be
9 included.

10
11 Lewis noted the current sign permit application has a box asking about flashing or moving signs
12 and suggested eliminating this box as flashing and moving are prohibited in the existing code.
13 Commissioners began a discussion of how existing signs might be addressed in light of code
14 changes.

15
16 Anderson urged Commissioners to agree to have a community input meeting as soon as possible
17 so that their positions get incorporated early in the drafting process. Commissioners wanted more
18 time to go through a draft before setting a meeting date.

19
20 Urban adjourned the work session at 2:58 pm to be continued after the regular meeting.

21
22 Urban reopened the work session at 3:24 pm.

23
24 Urban asserted the Commission needed to stick with their plan to go through the comparison table
25 provided by Lewis. Hafner emphasized that the Commission needed to have definitions for all
26 terms set before getting into the detail of the requirements. Urban clarified the definition provided
27 by Kerti is the working definition going forward in discussions.

28
29 Table Item A: Urban recommended the Waldport version. A home business sign would be a
30 maximum of two (2) square feet (increase from 1.5 sq ft); a B&B would not exceed six (6)
31 square feet (increase from 3 sq ft); and no freestanding signs would be allowed.
32 Commissioners clarified that signs displaying a home name could only attach that sign to
33 the wall of the home. Kerti noted there are homes that are set back further from the
34 highway that have shared driveway which need signage to indicate their address. Current
35 code does allow for signage for street addresses and requires that they be visible from the
36 road.

37 Table Item B: Urban recommended the Waldport version. O'Shaughnessey reported she has
38 heard complains about the Sea Note being too close to the crosswalk. Anderson
39 expressed concern over banners on poles blocking views in ingress/egress areas, noting
40 this section only addresses setbacks from other government-installed signs.
41 Commissioners agreed a buffer zone for egresses is warranted.

42 Table Items C&D: Urban noted items C and D are dependent. Hafner recommended the
43 Waldport versions. Kerti clarified that the approach is to eliminate a general restriction on
44 sign size and to address limitations for each sign type individually.

45 Table Item E: Urban recommended the Yachats version. Commissioners agreed.

46 Table Item F: Urban recommended the Waldport version. Commissioners agreed.

47 Table Item G: Urban recommended the Yachats version. Commissioners agreed and
48 indicated digital signs would be addressed elsewhere.

49 Table Item H: Urban recommended the Waldport version. Commissioners agreed.

50 Table Item I: Hafner reported the issues around A-frames were more complicated.

51 Commissioners discussed whether a three-day event would be managed differently than a
52 one-day event. Urban recommended beginning with the Waldport version. Hafner

suggested, regardless of when A-frames might be allowed, they should conform to all of the factors in Item I.

Table Item J: Hafner preferred to limit banner signs to one per business. Shrock was less concerned about the number if they were setback from the street. O'Shaughnessy noted that drivers expect signs before a turn, so it made sense to have a banner on either side of an entrance. Urban recommended the Waldport version.

Table Item K: Urban recommended the Waldport version. Anderson suggested this area is one where they need to set numerical limits based on some measure of light intensity.

Table Item L: Urban recommended the Waldport version. Urban noted the Waldport version is much simpler and clearer. Anderson noted the ninety-day limit on real estate sign.

Table Item M: Urban recommended the Waldport version. Hafner noted Waldport does not have an enforcement section. Lewis indicated enforcement was addressed elsewhere in the code.

Anderson asked if Commissioners were ready to set a date for a public meeting. Lewis explained how a power point presentation was used for the Waldport public meetings. Anderson suggested January 23, 2018 for a work session. Anderson noted the second week of February has an evening meeting for the Council. Commissioners agreed that an evening meeting during the first week of February would be best. Commissioners tentative set February 6, 2018 at 6 pm for a community meeting.

Commissioners agreed to meet at 2 pm on Tuesday, January 23, 2018 for a work session.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 pm.

Ron Urban, Vice-Chair

Date

Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on January 28, 2018.

YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

January 23, 2018

Special Meeting Draft Minutes

Vice-Chair Ron Urban called the January 23, 2018 work session of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 2:03 pm in Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Ron Urban, Helen Anderson, Shelly Shrock, Ginny Hafner, Christine Orchard, and Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey. Absent: James Kerti. Audience: 0.

I. Sign Ordinance

Orchard clarified the Commission covered the comparison table at the last work session.

1. Digital Sign Definition

Orchard suggested a clarification to the digital sign definition to read:

"Digital sign", also referred to as "LED sign" means a sign or portion thereof that uses light emitting diode technology or similar semiconductor technology to produce an illuminated image, picture, or message of any kind, regardless of whether the image, picture, or message is moving or stationary. This type of sign includes any sign that uses LED technology of any kind whether conventional (using discrete LEDs), surface mounted (otherwise known as individually mounted LEDs), transmissive, organic light emitting diodes (OLED), light emitting polymer (LEP), organic electro luminescence (OEL), or any similar technology.

2. Temporary Sign Definition

Orchard and Anderson discussed what "limited, fixed duration" actually applied to. Lewis and Hafner noted 9.44.050 included the limits on duration. Commissioners agreed to:

"Temporary sign" means any sign which that is not permanently installed to or affixed to any sign structure or building, and is accessory to an event, election, government or institutional sponsored activity, lease, rental, or sale of limited, fixed duration. A temporary sign does not include an A-Frame sign as identified above.

Lewis stated in the past, a restaurant owner believed a sign reading "Fish" was an event sign. Commissioners did not want to get into defining an event. Urban suggested someone in authority use common sense. Anderson noted the code enforcer has the right to make some interpretations.

Shrock clarified that having a definition does not imply the sign is allowed (e.g., digital and A-frames). Shrock, Urban and Hafner were adamant about explaining to people at the public meeting that this document is a draft.

Anderson indicated she would ask the City Manager to post this draft document on the home page (link). Commissioners found it amusing that the website could accomplish

3. Permits Required - 9.44.030.E

Item E was modified to read:

E. A building permit shall be required of all signs for all free-standing signs as provided for in the Oregon Structural Specialty Code, which shall be issued prior to sign placement, construction, or alteration.

4. Permits Required - 9.44.030.D

1 Anderson believed the sentence beginning with, "The owner of..." seemed out of place with this
2 section. Lewis suggested removing the sentence so that 9.44.030.D reads:

3 D. Signs conforming to the current code that are damaged by acts of nature, vandalism or
4 accident shall not be assessed a new sign permit fee when repaired to the pre-damaged
5 condition. ~~The owner of free-standing signs shall be required to obtain a building permit~~
6 ~~prior to construction.~~
7

8 **5. Zones R-1, R-2, and R-3 – 9.44.040.A**

9 Anderson questioned whether a 24 square foot sign would be allowed for a home business (item
10 A.3). Lewis noted some multifamily complexes have larger signs, such as the rock sign at Fistera
11 Gardens (R-3 zone). Shrock noted the Aqua Vista condos have a large sale/lease sign. Hafner
12 noted Quiet Water has a large sign on Lori Lane. Anderson noted that Item 2 prohibited larger
13 signs in zones R-1 for home occupations and B&Bs.
14

15 Urban clarified only wall signs are allowed in R-1, with a free-standing sign for an address
16 identifier. Commissioners concluded that a free-standing sign for neighborhood or PUD names
17 could be allowed through the variance process. Orchard noted the variance process has very
18 specific criteria that might not allow for exceptions.
19

20 Anderson suggested the Commission revisit this issue with the intent of finding a way to allow for
21 community signs.
22

23 **6. Zones R-4 and C-1 – 9.44.040.B(1)b**

24 Commissioners discussed the phrase, "light illuminating from a sign shall be directed away
25 from..." noting "directed away" is not very specific. Anderson suggested the Commission find
26 some technical method to address glare onto neighboring properties. Anderson handed out
27 information on the types of light emanating from a light source. She noted "trespass" light is the
28 term for how much a light illuminates a distant area, such as the light from parking lights making a
29 nearby living room seem light. O'Shaughnessey noted "residential use" is also vague and should
30 be clarified.
31

32 **7. Zones R-4 and C-1 – 9.44.040.B(2) Sign Types**

33 Anderson suggested putting a limit on the size of an internally lit sign on a building façade.
34 Anderson asked if the number of internally lit signs should be limited. Anderson believed limiting
35 the lit sign is more of an aesthetic issue than a problem of glare.
36

37 Commissioners agreed to adding internally lit wall signs as a type of sign in 9.44.040.B(2)a, Sign
38 types, so that there are five categories of signs types:

- 39 1) Wall signs, not internally illuminated
40 2) Wall signs, internally illuminated, shall be limited to one sign per façade limited to ____
41 square feet.
42 23) Projecting signs
43 34) Window Signs
44 45) Roof signs
45

46 **8. A-frame signs -9.44.040.B(2)c**

47 Anderson asked if it mattered how an a-frame sign is weighted. Orchard suggested the following
48 language:

- 49 5) A-Frame signs shall be weighted and secured by means of attaching an interior weight
50 so as not to be movable (pushed, pulled, blown, etc.)
51

52 **9. Banner Signs - 9.44.040.B(2)d**

1 Anderson summarized the Commission's discussion from the last work session that ground-
2 mounted pole signs could be useful on either side of an entry to a business such as the Village
3 Bean. She suggested banners on poles in the ground be set back from areas where cars need
4 clear vision to turn onto a road. Anderson noted ground-mounted signs cannot be attached to a
5 building.

6
7 3) Ground-mounted banner signs may be placed on private property. Such signs may and
8 not be mounted in or extend into public right-of-way. Such signs must be setback ten (10)
9 feet from an ingress/egress.

10 4) Banners that are attached to a building may and that extend over a sidewalk within the
11 public right-of-way with must have a minimum clearance of 7.5 feet from the ground so as
12 to not impede pedestrian access.

13 45) as written for Item 4

14 15 **10. Digital Signs - 9.44.040.B(2)e**

16 Urban suggested added back in Item 3 about adjusting digital sign according to ambient lighting
17 conditions. Commissioners noted Item 2 prohibits varying intensity. Commissioners agreed to:

18 2) Digital signs may not be externally or internally illuminated by a flashing light or a light
19 that varies in intensity.

20 3) Digital signs must be equipped with a light sensor that automatically adjusts the intensity
21 of the sign according to the amount of ambient light.

22 23 **11. Nonconforming Signs - 9.44.070**

24 Orchard had questions about the clause about proving the original sign was permitted.

25 Commissioners agreed that the record of a permit could come from City records.

26 ~~Limitation.~~ Any sign deemed to be nonconforming at the time these sign regulations
27 become effective shall be deemed to be in compliance if the sign's owner can prove that
28 the sign was erected with an approved sign permit at the time. In the event that a
29 nonconforming sign is damaged or destroyed by any means to the extent of fifty (50)
30 percent or more of its replaced value, the sign may not be rebuilt or used thereafter unless
31 it conforms to all of the provisions of this title.

32
33 Commissioners discussed the best way to address how the value of a replacement or repair is
34 calculated. Orchard and O'Shaughnessey suggested simplifying the requirement to requiring
35 compliance only if the sign has to be replaced. Hafner suggested the Commission get public input
36 before deciding on this matter.

37 38 **12. Abandoned Signs - 9.44.080**

39 Commissioners discussed why sections A and B are both required. Lewis clarified that all
40 businesses must remove their identity, but the sign structure can remain if the structure is
41 conforming. O'Shaughnessey was concerned that abandoned signs could remain in the event that
42 a business moved out. Lewis provided an example of Caldwell Banker moving out of the facility
43 that Sweet Homes Rentals now occupies. Caldwell Banker had to remove their identity from the
44 sign, but the sign structure could remain, as it was a conforming sign at the time of property
45 transfer. On the other hand, if Sweet Homes were to leave after this code were enacted, they
46 would have to remove the entire structure as it is now nonconforming.

47
48 Urban noted that if a sign were abandoned and began to degrade because a new business had not
49 taken occupancy, it would be up to the City to ensure that the deteriorating structure be removed.

50 51 **13. Public Meeting Plans**

1 Urban asked about the process to be followed at the public meeting. Anderson stated the meeting
2 would be in the multipurpose room. She planned to use a power point from Lewis and to proceed
3 through the ordinance by sign type. She indicated she would summarize the issues the
4 Commission considered about each sign type and then ask for input on that sign only. Anderson
5 suggested they ask people to indicate where they reside so as to identify if they are City residents.
6 They could then indicate if they operated a business within the City limits. Hafner clarified that
7 input from everyone is desired.

8
9 Hafner noted she heard a complaint from the last work session that the Commissioners did not
10 have nameplates and there was no agenda available to the audience.

11
12 Commissioners agreed they could ask for a show of hands for support for or against a specific sign
13 or regulation.

14
15 O'Shaughnessey emphasized that the discussion should not focus on current businesses that
16 have signs that people do not like. She suggested reminding people that this ordinance will apply
17 to the future.

18
19 Shrock offered to make nameplates for the meeting.

20
21 Hafner asked how the meeting would be publicized. Anderson stated the meeting will be posted at
22 the Post Office and in the Commons, will be put on Facebook. A draft would be emailed to people
23 with a business license, attached to the Facebook posting, and left on the counter at City Hall. If
24 possible, a link to the draft would be put on the website home page.

25
26 Urban adjourned the work session at 4:12 pm.

27
28
29
30
31
32 _____
33 Ron Urban, Vice-Chair

Date

34 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on February 11, 2018.

City of Yachats 2018 LAND USE / BUILDING PERMIT ACTIVITY

For the Period January 1, 2018 through February 13, 2018

Date	Application/ Activity	Owner/Applicant	Tax Map/Lot Location	Zoning	Description	Status
1/9/18	Building Permit	Anthony Shepherd	14-12-27AD/3400 969 N Hwy 101 Village Bean	C-1	Amended building permit for addition to existing building	Approved 1/9/18
1/16/18	Building Permit	Jerry McCall	14-12-27DA/11907 270 W 1 st St	R-1	Replace single family dwelling with new dwelling	Approved 1/23/18 per #1-VAR-PC-17 conditions
1/18/18	Building Permit	Ingrid Olson	14-12-27AD/14700 103 10 th St	R-1	Addition to single family dwelling	Approved 1/23/18
1/19/18	Building Permit	Douglas Cochran	14-12-27AC/4500 789 Ocean View Dr	R-1	Addition to single family dwelling	Approved 1/23/18
2/12/18	Building Permit	Fisterra Gardens Townhomes LP	14-12-23CC/5100- 5600; 100-430 Diversity Dr	R-3 (PD)	New 6-unit townhouse	Approved 2/13/18 per #1-PD-PC-07 Mod #3 Conditions
2/12/18	Building Permit	Fisterra Gardens Townhomes LP	14-12-23CC/5700- 6000; 100-430 Diversity Dr	R-3 (PD)	New 4-unit townhouse	Approved 2/13/18 per #1-PD-PC-07 Mod #3 Conditions
2/12/18	Building Permit	Fisterra Gardens Townhomes LP	14-12-23CC/6200- 6400; 100-430 Diversity Dr	R-3 (PD)	New 3-unit townhouse	Approved 2/13/18 per #1-PD-PC-07 Mod #3 Conditions
2/12/18	Building Permit	Fisterra Gardens Townhomes LP	14-12-23CC/6600- 6700; 100-430 Diversity Dr	R-3 (PD)	New 2-unit townhouse	Approved 2/13/18 per #1-PD-PC-07 Mod #3 Conditions
2/12/18	Building Permit	Fisterra Gardens Townhomes LP	14-12-23CC/6900 100-430 Diversity Dr	R-3 (PD)	New 6-unit townhouse	Approved 2/13/18 per #1-PD-PC-07 Mod #3 Conditions

YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

February 6, 2018

Special Public Meeting Draft Minutes

Chair Helen Anderson called the February 6, 2018 special public meeting of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 6:00 pm in the multipurpose room of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Ron Urban, Helen Anderson, Shelly Shrock, Ginny Hafner, Christine Orchard, James Kerti, and Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey. Audience: 30.

Anderson welcomed and thanked audience members for coming. She explained this meeting was to get input from citizens on an early draft of proposed changes to Yachats code on signs. Anderson provided a brief overview of the duties of the Planning Commission, specifically on the process for revising code. She noted the approval steps with the city attorney, the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, a Planning Commission public hearing, and public hearings with the City Council.

Anderson asked citizens to state their name, where they live, whether they are inside or outside of the City limits, and whether they operate a business within the City limits.

Anderson explained the reason for using the code from Waldport as a means of organizing the Yachats code.

A. Residential Zones

Anderson stated the regulations that apply to all signs, then moved to code around residential zones. Anderson stressed the Commission believes strongly in maintaining the standards of the residential zones.

No public input.

B. Zones R-4, C-1, SF, PF

Anderson explained the Commission's work on the sign code was not started because of the installment of the digital sign at the Sea Note. She noted the Lion's Club had asked about being able to put A-frame signs out for events.

1. A-Frame Signs

Anderson noted that there must be a four feet (4') clearance for A-frames, should they be allowed. Hafner clarified there is an option to not allow A-frames. Anderson stated the options are to (1) not allow A-frames at all, (2) allow A-frames for use at events only, or (3) to allow A-frames with the conditions indicated in the draft.

Bill Cowen (3501 Hwy 101 N) asked if there were four feet wide sidewalks in Yachats. Lewis indicated sidewalks were larger than four feet.

Ann Stott (915 Driftwood Ln) asked if there was a possibility of eliminating A-frames. She believed A-frames make it difficult for pedestrians to get around, especially when walking with walkers. She believed A-frames would make Yachats seem more commercial.

Darlene Huckins (2636 Hwy 101 N, on behalf of the Ladies Club) stated the Ladies Club has been putting A-frames in front of their building, at the corner of 101 and 3rd St, and at the State Park. She wanted to be able to continue placing these signs as they are very helpful to their events.

1 Lawrence Calkins (230 1st St), speaking for the Lion's Club, noted they do not have sidewalks. He
2 would like to see guidelines around where to place the signs. He believed the signs are very
3 helpful to their events.
4

5 Maggie Paul (268 Yachats Ocean Rd) supported A-frames for events but not to be out on a regular
6 or ongoing basis. She believed the signs would hinder navigation.
7

8 Leslie Vaaler (205 Radar Rd) agreed A-frames can hinder foot traffic and people who want to walk
9 fast. She was not in favor of on-going use of A-frames and was agreeable to temporary use in
10 conjunction with events if certain standards were met.
11

12 Anderson posited there was support for temporary use of A-frames in conjunction with events but
13 not for permanent or on-going use
14

15 **2. Permanent Free-Standing Signs**

16 Anderson noted there are many existing free-standing signs, and this code change would not affect
17 existing signs. However, if existing signs needed to be replaced, they would need to come into
18 compliance. Anderson explained the draft proposes to eliminate pole signs and to allow
19 monument signs.
20

21 Creight Horton (105 Reeves Cir) favored of eliminating pole signs. He referred to Chester,
22 VT as a community that has enacted code similar to what would be good for Yachats.
23

24 Ann Stott wanted clarification on the cost to repair and who determines what fifty percent
25 (50%) of a repair is.
26

27 Anderson noted this issue is squishy. Lewis indicated panels blowing out would not come near
28 50% of the repair value.
29

30 Bob Langley (25 Spindrift St) wanted to make the size limits smaller, as a 5x10 sign
31 seemed very large. Anderson asked Langley if he had a size in mind. Langley indicated 32
32 square feet.
33

34 Leslie Vaaler wanted regulations on how bright a sign could be.
35 Shrock indicated this topic would be addressed later in the meeting. Anderson noted the City
36 would be buying light meters to address lighting.
37

38 Lewis asked if people had opinions about the 8 foot height limitations. There was confusion as to
39 whether all pole signs or just single pole signs were being eliminated.
40

41 Julie Bailey (Eugene, possible business owner) suggested the size limit of a sign be tied to
42 the frontage of the property. She believed if all the small businesses put out signs, it would
43 look very congested.
44

45 Johnni Prince (3501 Hwy 101 N) concurred with Langley about decreasing the allowable
46 size.
47

48 **3. Banner Signs**

49 Anderson explained the variety of banner signs. She noted that banner signs would not be allowed
50 in the clear vision area by an ingress/egress. Anderson reported the Commission had considered
51 a positive of having signs on either side of an entrance, for example at the Village Bean.
52

Leslie Vaaler expressed concern about banner signs in windy conditions.

1
2 Ann Stott agreed with Vaaler's concern about wind. She believed one banner would be
3 appropriate for businesses that are away from the center of town.
4

5 Lawrence Calkins believed the 10 feet setback is not large enough.
6 Hafner noted that banner signs often help people to know when the businesses are open.
7 Shrock wanted to know people's feelings about temporary banner signs associated with events.
8

9 Bob Langley suggested a requirement that banners be taken down at night.
10

11 Maggie Paul asked if there was a unifying aesthetic for the appearance of the town. She
12 believed temporary banners could be useful to events for drawing attention. She also
13 agreed that wind is a problem for long-term banners.
14 Anderson explained the desire for architectural design standards but the difficulty of defining the
15 "character of Yachats." She noted the Commission was proceeding with this sign work now as it
16 would take at least a year into the future to get into place a comprehensive standards policy.
17

18 Ann Stott believed the character of Yachats was mixed between 20th and 21st century
19 technology.
20 O'Shaughnessey noted banner signs help businesses on side streets, such as Toad Hall. She
21 also noted new businesses might want to attract attention. Hafner asked if the Commission could
22 grant variances for signs.
23

24 **4. Building Signs**

25 Anderson described the 20% of a façade and the limitation of one internally lit building sign.
26

27 Bette Perman (410 E 2nd St) asked if a building could have a monument sign and a building
28 sign.
29

30 Leslie Vaaler suggested 20% of a small building seemed reasonable but 20% of a larger
31 building would be too much. She also thought 30 feet was too high for a roof sign.
32

33 Julie Bailey emphasized the need for control for the light intensity.
34

35 Bob Langley asked what the façade area included.
36 Kerti clarified that roof signs are treated separately from building facades.
37

38 **5. Internally Lit Signs**

39 Anderson explained internally lit refers light emanating from the guts of a sign, which is different
40 than a light shining onto a sign. She noted internally lit signs produce more glare. Anderson
41 explained the Commission wants to measure light coming from internal lighting. She noted nits are
42 the unit of measure for intensity of light coming from a screen. Anderson added digital signs would
43 be required to have a sensor to adjust the intensity based on ambient lighting conditions.
44

45 Anderson explained the definition of trespass light, the light that illuminates an area a given
46 distance away from the source light.
47

48 Ann Stott recommended putting up a fence behind the Dollar General to block the light
49 going to Driftwood Lane.
50

51 Julie Bailey wanted to see a requirement to turn off lights or reduce light intensity at night.
52 She noted the lights coming off the hotels are problematic to dark sky compliance.

1
2 Creight Horton wanted to prohibit digital signs. He noted Sedona, AZ has a good sign
3 ordinance with a purpose that sounds similar to Yachats. Horton noted how one flashy sign
4 can change the nature of an area. He believed part of the attraction of Yachats is that it is
5 not showy, and businesses would benefit more from retaining the less obtrusive signage.
6

7 Anderson asked people to raise their hand if they were opposed to digital signs. Anderson
8 observed all but one person raised their hand.
9

10 Julie Bailey applauded Horton's comments about digital signs changing the character of the
11 town.
12

13 Bob Langley asked about the brightness of external lights (spotlights). He noted the lights
14 can be a problem if they are not properly installed and directed. He asked why the Drift
15 Inn's digital sign did not bother people as much as the Sea Note sign.
16

17 Ann Stott noted the position of the Sea Note sign makes it more visible. She commented
18 that the lights around downtown are so much brighter than south of the bridge.
19

20 **6. Temporary Signs**

21 Anderson noted the 90-day limit on temporary signs for real estate sales/leasing/rentals did not
22 make sense. She indicated the Commission would address this matter. An audience member
23 noted a person might have several political signs.
24

25 Bette Perman asked how the ordinance would be enforced and how the 50% of value for
26 repair/replacement would be assessed.
27

28 Anderson thanked the audience for their input.
29

30 Anderson adjourned the regular meeting at 7:13 pm
31
32
33

34 _____
Helen Anderson, Chair

Date

35
36 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on February 12, 2018.
37

February 13, 2018

To: Yachats Planning Commission

From: Larry Lewis, City Planner

Re: Sign Ordinance Amendments

The Planning Commission will continue review of the draft sign ordinance amendment at the February 20, 2018 Planning Commission Work Session. The latest draft ordinance dated February 6, 2018 is attached. Please note that no changes have been made to the draft sign ordinance since before the public meeting. The public meeting minutes are included in the Planning Commission packet.

Additionally, the City has received the following written testimony (also attached):

2/6/18 Nancy Bolton-Rawles

2/6/18 Quinton Smith

2/6/18 Ron Vil, Yachats Farmers Market Manager

2/8/18 Bob Langley

Chapter 9.44 - Signs

Sections:

9.44.010	Scope.
9.44.020	Definitions.
9.44.030	Permits required.
9.44.040	Zone requirements.
9.44.050	Temporary signs.
9.44.060	Nonconforming signs.
9.44.070	Maintenance and appearance of signs.
9.44.080	Abandoned signs.
9.44.090	Variances.

9.44.010 Scope.

Every sign erected, altered or relocated within the City of Yachats shall conform to the provisions of this Chapter. It does not regulate traffic and street signs erected and maintained by a road authority as defined in ORS 801.445, trespass signs posted in accordance with ORS 164.245 to 164.270, holiday decorations, temporary interior window signs, or the display of the national or state flag.

9.44.020 Definitions.

"A-Frame sign" means a freestanding sign which is ordinarily in the shape of an "A" or some variation thereof, which is readily moveable, and is not permanently attached to the ground or any structure.

"Banner sign" means a ground-mounted or building-mounted banner, pennant, flag or similar type of sign on fabric or similar material.

"Building sign" means a wall, projecting/hanging, window or roof sign.

"Digital sign", also referred to as "LED sign" means a sign or portion thereof that uses light emitting diode technology or similar semiconductor technology to produce an illuminated image, picture, or message of any kind, regardless of whether the image, picture, or message is moving or stationary. This type of sign includes conventional (using discrete LEDs), surface mounted (otherwise known as individually mounted LEDs), transmissive, organic light emitting diodes (OLED), light emitting polymer (LEP), organic electro luminescence (OEL), or any similar technology.

"Free standing sign" means a sign which is supported by a separate independent structure and is not attached to or supported by any other building or structure.

"Monument sign" means a ground-mounted sign supported from grade with a solid base that is at least 75% of the width of the sign. A monument sign can also be supported with multiple architectural-designed posts. Single posts are prohibited.

"Nonconforming sign" means a sign which was erected legally but which does not comply with currently applicable sign restrictions and regulations.

"Off-premises sign" means any sign used for the purpose of displaying, advertising, identifying or directing attention to a business, service, activity or place, including products offered for sale or sold on premises other than on the premises where such sign is displayed.

"Projecting sign" means a sign which is attached to the wall, overhang or awning of a building and which projects more than twelve (12) inches beyond the wall, overhang or awning of the building.

"Sign" means an identification, description, illustration, or device which is affixed to or represented, directly or indirectly, upon a building, structure or land, and which directs attention to a product, place,

activity, person, institution or business.

"Temporary sign" means any sign that is not permanently installed or affixed to any sign structure or building, and is accessory to an event, election, government or institutional sponsored activity, lease, rental, or sale. A temporary sign does not include an A-Frame sign as identified above.

"Size" means the aggregate area of all sign display surfaces located on a single structure, but excluding posts and base that are without attached identification, description or illustration. Two surfaces parallel and back to back on the same structure, e.g. a projecting sign or 2-sided monument sign, shall be considered a single display surface.

"Wall sign" means a sign attached to or painted on a wall of a building with a display surface which projects no more than twelve (12) inches from the surface of the wall and not higher than the lowest roof edge above the building wall to which it is attached.

9.44.030 Permits required.

A. Except as herein provided, no sign shall be erected, replaced, altered or relocated without the business owner first obtaining a sign permit and the property owner (if different) granting permission for a sign permit, demonstrating that the sign is or will be in compliance with all provisions of this Chapter. A-Frame signs and Banner signs, as defined above, are exempt from sign permits.

B. Permits are issued for specific property only. Permits may transfer with ownership provided the signage is not altered or moved except to bring it into compliance with this section.

C. Fees for sign permits shall be established by resolution of the city council, and shall be paid prior to the sign being placed or altered.

D. Signs conforming to the current code that are damaged by acts of nature, vandalism or accident shall not be assessed a new sign permit fee when repaired to the pre-damaged condition.

E. A building permit shall be required for all free-standing signs as specified in the Oregon Structural Specialty Code, which shall be issued prior to sign placement, construction, or alteration.

9.44.040 Zone requirements.

A. In the R-1, R-2, and R-3 zones: one (1) accessory sign shall be allowed and shall be limited to the following sizes and restrictions:

1. Only wall signs are allowed in the R-1, R-2 and R-3 zones. The one exception is that free-standing address (house number) signs are permitted with a maximum size of four (4) square feet.

2. A sign not exceeding two (2) square feet in size accessory to a single-family dwelling or a home occupation, or six (6) square feet for a bed and breakfast inn.

3. A sign not exceeding twenty-four (24) square feet in size accessory to any other permitted or conditional use in the zone.

4. No moving or flashing signs, lit signs, roof signs, A-Frame signs, or banner signs shall be allowed in the R-1, R-2 and R-3 zones.

5. No sign shall be placed within ten (10) feet of any government-installed sign within a street right-of-way (stop signs, traffic control sign, etc.)

B. In the R-4, C-1, P-F, and S-P zones:

1. General sign requirements:

a. No sign shall be placed within ten (10) feet of any government-installed sign within a street right-of-way (stop signs, traffic control signs, etc.)

b. External light illuminating from a sign shall be directed away from a residential use or zone and shall not be located so as to distract motorists.

c. No sign shall be of such intensity or brilliance as to impair the vision of a motor vehicle driver or interfere with the effectiveness of an official traffic sign, device, or signal.

d. Where it can be demonstrated that directional signs are needed for directing or controlling vehicular access, or where such signs are required as a condition of approval for public safety, such signs may be permitted in addition to any other signs permitted by this section. Such signs shall be placed at each motor vehicle entrance or exit, shall not exceed nine (9) square feet in size and six (6) feet in height, and shall not restrict required sight distances or pedestrian and vehicular flow.

2. Sign types:

a. Building Signs. A maximum 20% of a building façade is allowed to have signs. A building façade is an exterior side of a building excluding the roof.

1) Wall signs – not internally illuminated.

2) Wall signs – internally illuminated. Wall signs internally illuminated shall be limited to one sign per façade with a maximum size of ____ square feet.

3) Projecting signs. Projecting signs may extend a maximum five (5) feet from a building. Projecting signs may extend over a sidewalk within the public right-of-way with a minimum clearance of 7.5 feet from the ground so as to not affect pedestrian traffic. Placement of projecting signs on Hwy 101 sidewalks are subject to agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation.

4) Window signs.

5) Roof signs. Roof signs shall not exceed 16 feet in height above the adjacent street grade or up to the peak of the roof, whichever is less restrictive. Roof signs painted directly on the roof surface, or on a surface attached flush to the roof surface, are prohibited.

b. Permanent free-standing signs.

1) No more than one free-standing sign is permitted per street frontage per property.

2) Single pole signs are prohibited.

3) Monument signs shall have a maximum 8 foot height, maximum 10 foot width, and maximum 50 square feet.

4) Electrical service to free-standing signs shall be underground.

c. A-Frame signs.

1) No more than one A-Frame sign is permitted per business.

2) A-Frame signs may be placed on private property.

3) A-Frame signs may be placed within the right-of-way on a sidewalk, however a minimum four (4) feet of lateral clearance shall be maintained on a sidewalk. A-Frame signs may not impede pedestrian access or opening of vehicle doors. Placement of A-Frame signs on Hwy 101 sidewalks are subject to agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation.

4) A-Frame signs shall be a maximum of eight (8) square feet with maximum dimensions of two (2) feet wide by four (4) feet tall.

5) A-Frame signs shall be weighted and secured so as not to be movable (pushed, pulled, blown, etc.)

6) No objects shall be attached to A-Frame signs, e.g. balloons, banners, etc.

7) A-Frame signs are only permitted during business hours and should be removed during periods of high winds.

d. Banner signs.

1) One banner sign is allowed per business.

2) Banner signs shall not exceed 20 square feet.

3) Ground-mounted banner signs may be placed on private property. Such signs shall not be mounted in or extend into public right-of-way. Ground mounted banner signs shall be setback 10 feet from the street at ingress/egress locations.

4) Banners that are attached to a building and that extend over a public right-of-way shall have a minimum clearance of 7.5 feet from the ground.

5) No banner, other than the American flag, shall be placed in flagpole holes along Hwy

101, and no banners shall be placed in the planters.

e. Digital signs.

1) One digital sign is allowed per business or institution. In addition, one digital 'open' sign is allowed per business.

2) Digital signs may not be externally or internally illuminated by a flashing light.

3) Digital signs must be equipped with a light sensor that automatically adjusts the intensity of the sign according to the amount of ambient light.

4) Digital signs may only display one static message daily.

5) If attached to a building or displayed inside a building so as to be visible from outside, the digital sign shall be considered to be a building sign and included in the maximum 20% of a building façade that is allowed to have signs.

9.44.050 Temporary signs.

In addition to the allowances for signs provided by this section, temporary signs are allowed on private property with the following standards:

A. No more than one temporary sign is permitted per property. Temporary signs are not permitted in the public right-of-way.

B. Temporary signs shall be a maximum of eight (8) square feet.

C. Temporary signs are allowed for not more than ninety (90) consecutive days or for any period of time during which the property is for sale, lease or rent, or for an election or event.

D. Temporary signs shall be secured so as not to be movable (pushed, pulled, blown, etc.)

E. No objects shall be attached to temporary signs, e.g. balloons, banners, etc.

9.44.060 Maintenance and appearance of signs.

All signs, together with all of their supports, braces, guys and anchors, shall be kept in good repair and maintained in a safe condition. All signs shall be maintained in a neat, clean and attractive condition.

9.44.070 Nonconforming signs.

Any sign deemed to be nonconforming at the time these sign regulations become effective shall be deemed to be in compliance if the sign was erected with an approved sign permit. In the event that a nonconforming sign is damaged or destroyed by any means to the extent of fifty (50) percent or more of its replaced value, the sign may not be rebuilt or used thereafter unless it conforms to all of the provisions of this title.

9.44.080 Abandoned signs.

A. Any sign shall be removed when the associated business or event has been discontinued or completed, or when the sign is no longer properly repaired or maintained as required by this Chapter.

B. Abandoned non-conforming signs shall be removed in their entirety.

9.44.090 Variances.

To provide for reasonable interpretation of this Chapter, and in certain instances where this Chapter will produce hardship, a business owner (with permission from the property owner, if different) may apply for a variance pursuant to Chapter 9.80 of this Code.

Larry Lewis

From: Nancy Bolton-Rawles <nbr@nancybolton.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 9:19 AM
To: Larry Lewis
Subject: Re: current sign code

In a small town as lovely as ours it would be wonderful if digital signs were not allowed. Instead of digital, how about a nicely painted wood sign (not too large) with a light shining on it for the dark evening hours? This would be more in line with the look of coziness and history our town conveys. A small lit sign near an entrance door seems enough to convey open or closed at night.

I really would like to see our town keep with it's small town cozy feel and in-your-face digital lights just do not fit in.

Thank you,

Nancy Bolton-Rawles
470 Overlook Drive
Yachats
~~~~~

INTENT DESIGN STUDIO, LLC

WordPress Web Design & Site Maintenance Services

Nancy Bolton-Rawles & Bruce Rawles  
PO Box 1113 Yachats, OR 97498  
Nancy mobile: 541-992-0456

NANCY BOLTON, Art Studio  
Acrylic, Mixed Media, Photography

2/6/18

To: Yachats Planning Commission  
c/o Larry Lewis, via email  
Yachats City Hall

From: Quinton Smith  
501 Lemwick Lane  
Yachats  
Phone: 541-547-8050  
Email: [QandKSmith@gmail.com](mailto:QandKSmith@gmail.com)

I am unable to attend the Planning Commission's hearing Tuesday night on proposed changes to the city's sign code, so (as suggested by Chair Helen Anderson) am sending my comments to the commission via city planner Larry Lewis.

First of all, thanks for taking a look at the city's sign ordinances. I appreciate any and all work from any of the city's volunteer commissions.

For a couple of reasons that I will explain below, I do not have specific feedback on details of the draft ordinance but have general comments on what I would hope the proposed ordinance would address and suggestions on more clearly relaying this to the public and businesses.

My comments:

- 1) In seeking public comment on the proposed ordinances, there was no context or background narrative to give residents and businesses an idea of what the commission is trying to do. Is this in reaction to the appearance of Sea Note's LED sign; of Dollar General's big lighted signs, other less visible issues, or is this a routine once-in-awhile update? I have been following - in person and via meeting minutes - the Planning Commission's work and I have not heard or cannot find in the minutes what prompted the review. Context is everything; don't be shy about explaining why this has come up and giving general background to people. Most folks are not up to speed on this and will struggle to understand and put in context four pages of highly detailed sign code language.

- 2) It is not clear to me what you are trying to accomplish with these changes. It was not clear to me during the commission's last workshop and formal meeting, nor is it clear now. Help me (and possibly others) understand better. It might even help the commission to formally write out its goals for the sign ordinance. I have not seen those in writing or in meeting discussions
- 3) I can't decipher from the proposed ordinance – and the previously used charts comparing sign ordinances in Yachats and Waldport – what the big changes and/or impact might be. A narrative with any proposal might help residents digest the necessary technical aspects of the proposed ordinance.
- 4) Speaking of comparisons, it is not clear to me why Yachats would use Waldport's sign ordinance as a model to copy. It may be the best in Oregon, but that hasn't been pointed out in meetings or minutes that I attended or could find. Are there better "templates" available through the League of Oregon cities for tourist-oriented cities or from cities like Cannon Beach, Sisters, Gearhart, Seaside, etc. Why Waldport as a model? Can Yachats do better? No one has ever said, that I could find.
- 5) I endorse your efforts to get out in front of new technology on LED signs.

The above comments have been about the Planning Commission's process, discussions and getting the word out to residents in a more easily understandable way. There are two points of emphasis outside the wording of the proposed ordinance that I would most hope the Planning Commission would consider.

- 1) In your last meeting, Chair Anderson raised a couple of eyebrows when she suggested that the commission might want to discuss encouraging the City Council to help may for replacing or changing signs that may not meet a new sign ordinance, or signs erected before any new regulations took effect. I would heartily encourage this discussion. I would endorse the idea of using money from the from Visitor Amenity Fund to help business owners improve and replace old, ugly outdated signs and to bring signs up to code if they would be

out of compliance with a new ordinance. (This could be a years-long process, spelled out with specifics, etc.) I would make a specific outreach to owners of old or new LED signs to see if, with the city's help, they would take them down and replace them with less garish signs. Upgrading and beautifying signs in the city, I believe, is an appropriate use of visitor funds and would go a long way to improving the attractiveness of the Highway 101 corridor.

- 2) My next point of emphasis has more nuance to it. It is likely outside the Planning Commission and City Council's direct control, but I believe and hope it is something that both will put their political will toward. This is the absolute clutter of repetitive traffic control signs along Highway 101 through downtown. In my opinion, the most obnoxious signs in Yachats are not necessarily any business signs (except for the new, bright LED sign) but the new and old signs that line Highway 101 every few feet throughout downtown. The sheer number of repetitive signs is an eyesore. Can the city contact ODOT and ask to discuss this issue? Certainly some can come down and others possibly consolidated.

Please feel free to contact me if you have comments, questions or want to discuss this further.

## Larry Lewis

---

**From:** Yachats Farmers Market . <YachatsFarmersMarket@live.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2018 5:09 PM  
**To:** Larry Lewis  
**Subject:** Yachats Farmers Market signs, Market Manager  
**Attachments:** Img\_6141.jpg; Img\_6147.jpg

Mr. Lewis,

I have reviewed the proposed Yachats signage draft and compared them with the signs & banners that we have been using for years at the Yachats Farmers Market on Sundays, Mothers Day through Mushroom Festival. All of the following temporary event signs go up at 7:00 AM and are taken down by 3 PM.

The A-Frame signs we use to close off 4th street adjacent the Commons seem to conform in size but not in number. We use four of this type to close off the road and one to designate a handicapped parking spot. We also use four of the "Farmers Market Parking" signs that measure 24 inches by 18 inches that stick into the ground at the base of the new lamp posts along the 101. Our 3 banners measure almost 30 sq. ft, which seems to be the standard size for this type of banner. I have attached pics of all three of these types of signs. I coordinated with the project manager of the 101 sidewalk project (the work destroyed the old banner ground mount holes) to install 3 new mounting holes on the west side of the 101. We used these mounts during the 2017 season with no issues. I need to speak with you as some, but not all of the Farmer's Market signs conform to the new, proposed rules.

Please reply and/or give me a call at the number below. Thank you.

Ron Vil  
Market Manager  
(682) 300-3389 cell

<http://YachatsFarmersmarket.webs.com>

The sign for the Adobe is approx  $100 \text{ ft}^2$  and seems quite a bit less obtrusive than many of the smaller lighted signs in town. Conclusion = the design and color of signs may be of greater importance than their size in terms of their minimizing impact.

Dollar General sign is approx  $3.5 \times 6' = 21 \text{ ft}^2$ ; based on  $50 \text{ ft}^2$  in proposed ordinance, it could be twice its current size. Conclusion = maximum sign area should be  $24 \text{ ft}^2$ . Or, perhaps, some measurement of existing signs should be undertaken to establish a reasonable maximum size.

The 7 commercial lots N of Village Bean are approx. 192 paces in total road frontage, Village Bean is approx 23 paces, Dollar General is approx 70 paces. This means that each of those lots has highway frontage about the same as that of the Village Bean.

Based on the current version of the ordinance, there could, conceivably, be *7 back lit signs approx twice the size of the Dollar General sign just in the stretch of highway between the Village Bean and Marine Drive*. I don't want to even contemplate how that would look. Conclusion = consider some way of relating the maximum permitted size of a sign to the length of highway frontage or not even allowing lighted signs on lots that do not exceed a minimum road frontage.

People don't like the digital sign at the Sea Note Café; keep in mind that, based on the current version of the ordinance, *it could be replaced with a 10' wide x 5' back lit sign that is 8' off the ground at the top*. Again, I don't want to even contemplate how that would look. Conclusion = there needs to be something in place that would prevent that; perhaps, no backlit signs in the "downtown" area N of the river and S of the Commons. Or, perhaps, signs must be removed from the road by some prescribed distance

The Dubliner Inn is largely built at a grade considerably lower than the street which means that a sign limited to 8' off the ground there would hardly be visible from the road. Unless they are filled to road grade, the same applies to the lots to the N of the Village Bean. Conclusion = consider determining sign height using road level as the reference point.

I would even consider prohibiting any future lighted signs that are not attached to a building facade. I don't know how many other commercial lots there are but I, certainly, wouldn't want to see any more signs on the 101 corridor.

Bob Langley  
2/8/18

# YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

January 16, 2018

## Draft Minutes

Chair Helen Anderson called the January 16, 2018 meeting of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 3:00 pm in Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Ron Urban, Helen Anderson, James Kerti, Shelly Shrock, Ginny Hafner, JD Deriberprey, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey. Absent: Christine Orchard. Audience: 11.

### **I. Announcements and Correspondence**

Anderson welcomed new Commissioner Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey and presented her with documents about being a Commissioner. Anderson indicated she would get these materials into the online document library.

### **II. Minutes Approval**

#### **A. December 19, 2017 regular meeting**

Commissioner Hafner noted on Page 1, Line 45: Hafner was present and voted to approve minutes.

Commissioner O'Shaughnessey moved to approve the December 19, 2017 minutes as amended: Aye - 6; No - 0. Minutes approved

#### **B. December 19, 2017 work session**

Hafner and O'Shaughnessey noted:

Page 1, Line 7: Room 3 should state Room 1

Page 1, Line 43: "allow" should be "allowed"

Page 1, Line 44: insert "not" to read, "...does not cause direct glare..."

Commissioner Shrock moved to adopt the December 19, 2017 work session minutes as amended: Aye 6; No - 0. Minutes approved.

### **III. Public Input**

1. Ann Stott (915 Driftwood Lane) noted letter K in the table comparing sign codes addresses light shining into another property. She indicated lighting from the Dollar General store shines into her house at night.

2. David Johnson (71 E 9<sup>th</sup> Street) reported he found information in 2004 documentation stating that exterior lighting shall not shine directly onto a residential property. He also referred to a recent letter from Code Enforcer Davies indicating exterior lighting shall not be directed onto other property. He indicated LED parking lights at the Dollar General shine into his house.

Anderson noted the lack of specificity in code language about "directed," noting while light pointed at something is clearly directed, whether "directed" refers light that results from a glare or glow effect is unclear. She indicated the Commission is working toward code that would involve an actual measurement of light intensity.

3. Creight Horton (105 Reeves Circle) note he can see both the Dollar General and Sea Note signs from his property south of the bridge. He referred to his letter where he noted the actions taken in Chester, VT.

1 4. Jacqueline Danos (116 Spring Hill) was concerned about the extent of parking the Commission  
2 was discussing in the light industrial code. She wanted to see an emphasis on bicycle parking.  
3

4 **IV. Planner's Report**

5 Lewis reviewed permit applications. Lewis informed Commissioners about terminology that arose  
6 with the County on the recent Hetzler Conditional Use application. He indicated a "hotel" requires  
7 a minimum number of rooms, so the County cannot call the old laurdromat and house on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
8 a hotel. There are other classifications that can be used for the fewer rooms. The County has  
9 classifications including rooming house, lodging house, and boarding house that could apply.  
10 Lewis noted rooming house and boarding house are defined in the Yachats code, but there are no  
11 regulations around those entities.  
12

13 **VI. Other Business**

14 **A. From Staff** - none

15 **B. From the Commission** - none  
16  
17

18 Anderson adjourned the meeting at 3:21 pm.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 Helen Anderson, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

26  
27 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on January 28, 2018.

**YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION**  
January 23, 2018

**Special Meeting Draft Minutes**

Chair Helen Anderson called the January 23, 2018 special meeting of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 2:00 pm in Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Ron Urban, Helen Anderson, Shelly Shrock, Ginny Hafner, and Christine Orchard. Absent: James Kerti and Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey. Audience: 0.

**I. Election of Officers**

Commissioner Orchard nominated Helen Anderson for Chair: Aye – 5; No – 0.

Orchard nominated Ron Urban for Vice-Chair: Aye – 5; No – 0.

Anderson adjourned the regular meeting at 2:03 pm

\_\_\_\_\_  
Helen Anderson, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on February 11, 2018.  
H Anderson on February 11, 2018.

# YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

February 27, 2018

## Work Session Approved Minutes

Vice-Chair Ron Urban called the February 27, 2018 work session of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 2:00 pm in the Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Ron Urban, Helen Anderson, Shelly Shrock, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, James Kerti, and Ginny Hafner. Absent: James Kerti and Christine Orchard. Audience: 0.

### **I. Sign Ordinance**

Planner Larry Lewis noted the February 6, 2018 public meeting was very cordial and productive. Commissioners appreciated the ideas they received.

Commissioner Shrock suggested there was consensus with the public input that digital signs not be allowed. Urban asked if it was within the power of the Planning Commission to make this decision. Commissioner Anderson asserted since the standard would apply to everyone, the Planning Commission could make this recommendation. Lewis noted there would be a public hearing and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development 35 days prior to the hearing. Anderson added that the City Attorney would review the proposal as well. Commissioners agreed to recommend to not allow digital signs.

Commissioner Hafner suggested that A-Frame signs not be allowed for businesses on an ongoing basis. Anderson recalled comments about public input about having to navigate around signs. Commissioner Kerti asked for clarification as to why not to allow A-Frames. Anderson suggested sign clutter and sidewalk crowdedness are valid reasons. Anderson suggested allowing A-Frames for temporary events but not for ongoing business use. Commissioners discussed what would constitute a "temporary event," noting some restaurants could have nightly specials. Kerti suggested special occasion could be differentiated from regularly occurring events. Hafner suggested the distinction might be made over whether the use is for a regular business. Anderson suggested language of, "events not related to ongoing business." Commissioners agreed this language would allow the Farmer's Market, the Ladies Club, and the Lions Club to use A-Frames.

Hafner asked if "non-profit" would be a better way to distinguish events from businesses. Anderson noted there are arts and crafts fairs that are not nonprofit events. Kerti asked if a business wanted to use an A-Frame four times each year, would that be allowed? Urban suggested the property type could distinguish usage. Anderson summarized that Ron Vil, manager of the Farmer's Market, wrote that they use four A-Frame signs to indicate parking for the Market.

Hafner noted the current code prohibits A-Frames except for temporary use. Anderson suggested the current code language is unclear about what constituted temporary use. Urban noted the Farmer's Market uses an A-Frame to block off 4<sup>th</sup> Street from 101. Shrock suggested having A-Frames that direct traffic only on Highway 101. Hafner recalled there was a suggestion to have different regulations for areas outside of the downtown area.

Commissioners discussed differences between A-Frame signs and banners on poles

Commissioners discussed rewording "events not related to ongoing business." Anderson believed the restriction should be more over frequency of occurrence than the type of organization.

1 Urban pointed out even for temporary use, A-Frames are heavily regulated. Anderson suggested  
2 moving the entire section of 9.44.040(B)2c to 9.44.050 Temporary Signs.  
3

4 Commissioners agreed to:

5 Adjust 9.44.040(B)2c to: A-Frame Signs are allowed for events lasting no more than three (3)  
6 days.

7 Delete 9.44.040(B)2c.1

8 Adjust 9.44.040(B)2c.4 to: maximum of six (6) square feet with maximum dimensions of two (2)  
9 feet wide by three (3) feet tall.

10 Adjust 9.44.040(B)2c.7 to: permitted during the event  
11

12 9.44.050(C): Commissioners agreed real estate signs should be allowed to remain up until a  
13 property is sold or rented. Commissioners agreed to require real estate signs be removed within  
14 fifteen days after closing.  
15

16 9.44.050(A): Commissioners noted that people often have multiple political signs. Commissioners  
17 agreed to proceed with one temporary sign per issue, and to revisit the language of "issue" later.  
18

19 Anderson asked about the regulations on flags. Urban noted 9.44.010 exempted national and  
20 state flags. Kerti noted people display flags for their sports teams. A final decision was not  
21 reached.  
22

23 Urban adjourned the work session at 2:59 pm.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
29 Ron Urban, Vice-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

30 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on February 12, 2018.  
31