

1. Agenda

Documents:

[11-27-18\\_PC\\_AGENDA.PDF](#)

2. Meeting Materials

Documents:

[501\\_BAYVIEW\\_TERR.PDF](#)  
[BLDG\\_PERMITS\\_AS\\_OF\\_11-13-18.PDF](#)  
[BERDIE\\_COMP\\_PLAN\\_QUESTIONS.PDF](#)  
[ATTORNEY\\_COMMENTS\\_SIGNS.PDF](#)  
[CLEAR\\_VISION\\_STANARDS\\_11-27-18.PDF](#)  
[DRAFT\\_10-16-18\\_PLANNING\\_WORK\\_SESSION\\_MINUTES.PDF](#)  
[DRAFT\\_10-16-18\\_PLANNING\\_MINUTES.PDF](#)

3. Work Session Minutes

Documents:

[2018-11-27 PLANNING WS MINUTES.PDF](#)



CITY OF YACHATS

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

441 Hwy 101 N., Yachats Commons, Room 1

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2018: 2 PM WORK SESSION;  
3 PM REGULAR MEETING**

### WORK SESSION AGENDA

- A. Comprehensive Plan Amendments
- B. Sign Amendments – Feedback on Draft Amendment

### REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

- I. Announcements and Correspondence
- II. Minutes
  - A. Work Session and Regular Meeting – October 16, 2018
- III. Planning Commissioner Interview
- IV. Citizen's Concerns
- V. Public Hearing (continued)
  - A. Title 9 Zoning & Land Use Code Amendment – Chapters 9.52.030 and 9.64  
Clear Vision Standards & Fences, Hedges and Walls
- VI. Planner's Report
- VII. Other Business
  - A. From the Commission
  - B. From Staff

Commission meets the third Tuesday of each month.

**Next scheduled meeting: December 18, 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](http://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: November 14, 2018



## Larry Lewis

---

**From:** haverstocks@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 30, 2018 2:21 PM  
**To:** Larry Lewis  
**Subject:** Haverstocks at 501 Bayview Terrace

Larry,

We are glad that you are addressing the accident potentials created by poor visibility around corners in Yachats and HWY 101 (HWY). We are familiar with this issue, intimately.

As neighbors, we have had particular concerns at Bayview Terrace, as one enters the HWY. We do understand that Bayview Terrace is not really a road, but a private driveway. Yet, that should not preclude accommodations for safe exit and entry from 101.

Because of many speeders from the north, all driving fast around the curve toward Bayview Terrace, we have often experienced difficulty crossing onto the HWY. Several years ago, we elected to be proactive regarding this issue. We removed several large trees and bushes that might inhibit our (and our neighbors') views of the HWY curve, immediately, and in the future. We have recently spent in excess of several thousand dollars to remove overhanging tree limbs and shrubbery growing along the HWY. Frankly, we did not expect to be spending quite as much money to accomplish the "pre-potential-problems clean-up" as we did. Some of the trees were on our property. Some were growing into and on the HWY "right-of-way." One large spruce tree remains beside the HWY. This tree is definitely a problem.

The purpose of my letter to you is to state that, in my opinion, it is important to recognize that trees and shrubbery in "rights-of-way" are creating visual line-of-sight problems on HWY 101. I am specifically referring to the HWY at Lori Lane and Bayview Terrace. But, I am sure there are others in town. For example, we have personally paid to professionally trim-up the large spruce tree, off our property, in the "right of way" several times. Otherwise, its branches would partially block the line-of-sight from Bayview up to the curve. That tree should be removed to affect better line-of-sight—primarily to accomplish a view of the speeding cars coming south around the curve.

In other words, ODT should be a party to any notice or legislation that affects adverse traffic issues involving visibility, also, just in case they have not been.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Yours, Dave

Dave & Nancy Haverstock  
1133 Rio Glen Drive  
Eugene, OR 97401  
and  
501 Bayview Terrace  
Yachats, OR 97498 (no mail)  
541-342-1210 or 541-521-0211 cell  
[DaveHaverstock@Comcast.net](mailto:DaveHaverstock@Comcast.net)

## Larry Lewis

---

**From:** maggie marshall <marshallmag@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 30, 2018 3:19 PM  
**To:** Larry Lewis  
**Subject:** Planning Commission proposed amendments

This is regarding the discussion of proposed changes to clear vision standards and fence/hedge/wall regulations in Chapter 9.64. We would like to know if the proposed amendment goes through, would it apply only to future development or would it apply retroactively to existing properties in Yachats?

Thanks,  
Paul and Maggie Marshall  
500 Lemwick Lane  
Yachats

## Larry Lewis

---

**From:** Barbee Bird <barbee.bird@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 02, 2018 11:01 AM  
**To:** Larry Lewis  
**Subject:** Fence hedge wall regulations

Greetings Larry,

At the entrance to Windy Way from 101, there is a row of very large, very tall Pampas Grass. I have no idea if it violates any regulations, but I do know that it's a safety hazard when pulling out of Windy way onto 101. It's very difficult to see cars to the North until you have already put yourself in harms way. I feel like if even just the last one closest to Windy Way was removed, it would be a great improvement.

Regards,

Barbee Bird

**City of Yachats**  
**2018 LAND USE / BUILDING PERMIT ACTIVITY**

**For the Period August 18, 2018 through November 13, 2018**

| <b>Date</b> | <b>Application/<br/>Activity</b>         | <b>Owner/Applicant</b>      | <b>Tax Map/Lot<br/>Location</b>                    | <b>Zoning</b> | <b>Description</b>                                                | <b>Status</b>                         |
|-------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 8/22/18     | Building Permit                          | Doug Rawson                 | 14-12-34AD/2200<br>112 Greenhill Dr                | R-1           | Repair foundation                                                 | Approved 8/22/18                      |
| 9/11/18     | Property Line<br>Adjustment              | Marilyn Kennelly            | 14-12-27AA/1310 & 1311<br>231 & 245 Aqua Vista Lp  | C-1           | Property line adjustment<br>to resolve building<br>encroachment   | Tentative approval<br>granted 9/25/18 |
| 10/18/18    | Building Permit                          | Eric Breon                  | 14-12-26CB/5900<br>180 Prospect Ave                | C-1           | Replace decking and<br>railing                                    | Approved 10/23/18                     |
| 11/6/18     | Building Permit                          | Koho Oregon                 | 14-12-34AA/Ph.3 Lot #28<br>16 Basalt Lp<br>Koho PD | R-4           | New single family<br>dwelling                                     | Approved 11/6/18                      |
| 11/8/18     | Manufactured<br>Home Placement<br>Permit | Gordon & Virginia<br>Horton | 14-12-27AD/2801<br>25 E. 8 <sup>th</sup> Street    | R-3           | New single family<br>dwelling                                     | Approved 11/10/18                     |
| 11/9/18     | Building Permit                          | Rik Arndt                   | 14-12-27AC/2500<br>880 Ocean View Dr               | R-1           | Install roof mounted<br>solar system on single<br>family dwelling | Approved 11/13/18                     |
| 11/13/18    | Building Permit                          | Michael Ruane               | 14-12-27AB/100<br>591 Aqua Vista Lp                | R-2           | Accessory structure and<br>patio cover                            | Approved 11/13/18                     |

Please accept the following as honest questions and suggestions. They are not meant to be accusatory. I apologize if they seem overly harsh, but I compiled them to simply help myself understand the complex document.

Again, thanks so much to the Planning Commission for doing such an excellent job with a challenging topic.

#### **Questions/Comments Re. Comp Plan**

Goal A, 8: What does "direct its growth so as not to encroach upon public or commercial forestlands" mean? Does it in anyway preclude us from acquiring Riggs/Grabow property or other forestlands?

Goal A, 12 and Proposed Action e: Neither mentions Ridgeline. Why? Why treat View Shed and Ridgeline differently? Why rank and identify versus establish an ordinance (ala tree protection)

Goal C, Proposed Action a: This is incomplete compared to other Proposed Actions. Specifically: Policy 3, 4, and 5 should be explicitly noted as Proposed Actions so as not to lose the required actions

Goal E, 8: Why only forest concerns to ODF? Why not also NFS (National Forest)

Goal E, Proposed Action a: a bit vague compared to other proposed actions but can live with it

Goal E, Proposed Action d and e: Are these not redundant (but highly important). Why not require ordinance? (Especially since struck performance bond?)

Goal F, Proposed Actions: Would like additional actions: c) Encourage development of new trails d) develop 804 trail with full accessibility access and improved aesthetics e) encourage business development that encourages people to make use of natural resources.

Goal G, Proposed Action C: again, can we consolidate view shed and ridgeline?

Goal H: Policies: Include 1) develop an inventory of vacant commercial properties 2) develop an inventory of vacant residential property

Goal H, Proposed Action: 1) Establish processes to identify developers of vacant properties. 2) Explore incentives to attract developers for vacant commercial property. 3) Establish incentives to convert abandoned housing to full use including low-income housing

Goal I: 4: add "including holding ponds" and 5: and ensure street system is well maintained.

Goal I, Proposed Actions: Add; f) Provide access and keys to emergency supplies. Keep such supplies fresh and current. g) Provide means for individuals to acquire and refresh emergency supplies.

Goal J, Proposed Actions: Add; c) Explore multiple forms of housing appropriate for part-time and seasonal workers.

Goal L: Consider adding "Develop restrooms in high utilization areas including the south beach of the Yachats river

**CITY OF YACHATS  
ORDINANCE NO. 354**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE YACHATS MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 9.44 SIGNS**

**WHEREAS**, the City shall, through development regulations, ensure that new development shall be of an appropriate scale to retain and enhance the small-town, ocean side character of the Yachats community (Yachats Comprehensive Plan Goal G Policy 6).

**WHEREAS**, the Yachats Comprehensive Plan stipulates the City shall review the sign ordinance.

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission held a public meeting on February 6, 2018 to obtain public input on sign regulations.

**WHEREAS**, on August 21, 2018, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and continued said hearing to August 28, 2018.

**WHEREAS**, on August 28, 2018, the Planning Commission met, continued the public hearing, and passed a motion to forward the following recommended code amendments to Chapter 9.44 Signs.

**WHEREAS**, and in consideration of the conditions and issues above, the City enacts the following regulations on signs.

**NOW THEREFORE**, the City of Yachats ordains as follows:

**SECTION 1.** Chapter 9.44 Signs, of the Municipal code is replaced with the following Chapter 9.44:

**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.

*Seasonal*

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 11:58 AM

**Comment [1]:** Probably better to say "seasonal" decorations rather than "holiday." Still could be a problem, but at least we don't have to check to see if the decorations are related to a particular holiday or not (which is pretty clearly content-based restrictions). You can also get away from this by simply agreeing that holiday decorations (like lights and garland) are not "signs". To the extent there are holiday decorations that fit the definition of a sign, they would be regulated.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 11:57 AM

**Comment [2]:** Regulating the state or national flag differently from other flags is unconstitutional content-based regulation (e.g., you have to look at the flag to determine whether it is lawful or not). For example, someone should be able to fly a jolly roger flag in any location where the City allows the 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" 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.

"Linear Street Frontage" means the contiguous tax lots under single ownership on which the business is located.

"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.

"Open sign" means a sign referencing if the business is open or closed.

"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.

"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.

"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.

"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, Banner signs, and one Open sign, as defined above, are exempt from sign permits.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:33 PM

**Comment [3]:** I'm not sure I understand this definition. What do contiguous tax lots have to do with "street frontage"? Shouldn't the definition make reference to streets or right-of-way?

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:02 PM

**Comment [4]:** This is black letter unconstitutional under Oregon Supreme Court case law. In order to determine whether a sign is on-premises or off-premises, you need to read the content of the sign.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:25 PM

**Comment [5]:** This is content-based.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:01 PM

**Comment [6]:** This definition needs some work. The model code has a better definition. The use of the phrase "which directs attention" implies a content-based standard.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:03 PM

**Comment [7]:** This needs work, as it arguably is content-based due to being tied to an "event" - you can only know that a sign is "accessory to an event" if you read the sign.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:34 PM

**Comment [8]:** Why use the term "business owner"? Do you mean "sign owner"?

- 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.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:38 PM

Comment [9]: Do you mean "this Chapter?"

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:37 PM

Comment [10]: I think you have to define what "current code" means

#### 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.).

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:38 PM

Comment [11]: This is content-based

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:40 PM

Comment [12]: I don't see these terms defined and I'm not sure what these terms mean. Do you mean "illuminated?"

##### B. In the R-4, C-I, 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.
  - e. The maximum amount of internally lit signs shall be limited to a total of 24 square feet. One open/closed sign with a maximum size of two (2) square feet is allowed.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:26 PM

Comment [13]: This seems like a very difficult standard to measure and judge. I'm also concerned that this could backfire on the City because an issued permit could be the City's pronouncement that the sign does not distract. When someone gets in an accident they could look to the City for liability because the City okayed the sign.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:04 PM

Comment [14]: A "directional sign" is content-based and likely unconstitutional - you need to read the sign to determine if it is providing directions or not.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:24 PM

Comment [15]: This is content-based

##### 2. Sign types:

a. Building Signs.

- 1) Wall signs. A maximum 10% of a building façade is allowed to have signs. The maximum size of any one sign shall be limited to 10% of the façade (all of the allowable sign footage on the façade). ~~The maximum size of any internally lit sign shall be 24 feet.~~ A building façade is an exterior side of a building excluding the roof.
- 2) Window signs. Windows are part of a building façade. Therefore, window signs are included in the maximum 10% of a building façade described above.
- 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) Roof signs.
  - a) No signs shall be painted directly on a roof.
  - b) Roof signs shall not exceed 16 feet in height above the adjacent street grade nor exceed the peak of the roof.
  - c) A roof sign on a flat roof shall be limited to a maximum of 16 feet above the street grade but not more than 3 feet above the roofline.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:05 PM

**Comment [16]:** Strike-out text should be removed from an ordinance

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) Free-standing signs shall have a maximum of:
  - a. 8 feet in height as measured from the elevation of the centerline of the adjacent street.
  - b. 5 feet in width and 32 square feet of area on lots having up to 300 linear feet of street frontage
  - c. 8 feet in width and 50 square feet of area on lots with more than 300 linear feet of street frontage.
  - d. The Planning Commission may grant a waiver of Section 9.44.070 for pre-existing nonconforming signs as of (the date the sign ordinance is adopted).
  - e. One ~~vacancy/no vacancy sign~~ is permitted in addition to 'b' and 'c' above.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:11 PM

**Comment [17]:** This is content-based and unconstitutional distinction between signs

c. Banner signs.

- 1) One freestanding 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 15 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.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:06 PM

**Comment [18]:** This is unconstitutional content-based regulation of banners

- d. Digital signs. Digital signs are prohibited.

#### 9.44.050 Temporary signs.

In addition to the allowances for signs provided by this section, temporary signs are allowed on private property without a permit with the following standards:

- A. No more than one temporary sign is permitted per issue 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 an election or event.
- D. Temporary real estate signs for property for sale or lease shall be removed within fifteen (15) days of the sale or lease.
- E. Temporary signs shall be secured so as not to be movable (pushed, pulled, blown, etc.).
- F. No objects shall be attached to temporary signs, e.g. balloons, banners, etc.
- G. Temporary A-Frame signs.
  - 1) Temporary A-frame signs are allowed for a maximum of three days in conjunction with a special occasion or unique event not related to an ongoing 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 six (6) square feet with maximum dimensions of two (2) feet wide by three (3) 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 event hours and should be removed during periods of high winds.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:13 PM

**Comment [19]:** What does "per issue" mean? Is this a reference to the content of the sign? If so, this would be unconstitutional

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:05 PM

**Comment [20]:** Regulations based upon the date of an "event" are likely unconstitutional because you are forced to read the sign to find out the date of the "event." Using election dates is less problematic because election dates are set by statute

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:08 PM

**Comment [21]:** This needs work, as the sign regulations must be associated with a property that is for sale, without regard for what the sign itself may say. Here, the regulation refers to real estate signs, which requires us to read the sign to determine if it meets the regulation. Plus, real estate sign is an undefined term, so I am left to guess we mean a sign that refers to the sale or rental of real estate – which is content based regulation

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:10 PM

**Comment [22]:** This could be constitutionally problematic, but I also question how you can regulate this. What is a special occasion or unique event?

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:11 PM

**Comment [23]:** This distinction is content based and unconstitutional

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 12:10 PM

**Comment [24]:** Should remove strike-out text.

#### 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.

Ross M. Williamson 9/18/2018 1:21 PM  
**Comment [25]:** I like the model code's adjustment process, since it applies specifically to signs and reduces discretion, which can cause constitutional problems.

**SECTION 2. SEVERABILITY.** Any provision of this Ordinance which proves to be invalid, void, or illegal shall in no way affect, impair, or invalidate any other provision of this Ordinance, and the remaining provisions of this Ordinance shall remain in full force and effect.

**SECTION 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.** This ordinance shall take effect on the 30<sup>th</sup> day after its adoption.

ADOPTED by unanimous vote on September 12, 2018 and October 3, 2018  
DATED this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of October, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald F. Stanley, Mayor

ATTESTED TO:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shannon Beaucaire, City Manager

October 30, 2018

**To: Yachats Planning Commission**

**From: Larry Lewis, City Planner**

**Re: Clear Vision Standards & Fences, Hedges and Wall Regulations**

---

This memorandum provides proposed amendments to clear vision standards and fence/hedge/wall regulations as drafted by the Planning Commission.

The draft clear vision standards primarily focus on the need to have clear vision standards at the intersection of a street and a driveway. Currently, the clear vision standards only apply to the intersection of two streets.

Regarding fence/hedge/wall regulations, the City Attorney recommended these regulations be taken out of the 'accessory use' section. This draft amendment removes fence/hedge/wall regulations from Section 9.52.030 General Provisions Regarding Accessory Uses and inserts the regulations into Section 9.64.010 Design Standards (under Street Construction and Design).

This October 30, 2018 memorandum updates the September 18, 2018 memorandum by adding item 'K' at the end of the document (as discussed at the Oct. 16, 2018 Planning Commission meeting).

---

#### **Section 9.52.030 General provisions regarding accessory uses.**

An accessory use shall comply with all requirements for a principal use, except as this title specifically allows to the contrary, and shall comply with the following limitations:

- A. An accessory structure not used for human habitation and separated from the main building may be located in the required rear and side yard, except in the required street side yard of a corner lot, provided it is not closer than five (5) feet to a property line.
  - 1. The maximum height shall be one story or fifteen (15) feet, whichever is the lesser.
  - 2. Accessory buildings are not permitted in the front yard.
- ~~B. Fences, hedges and walls may be located within required yards, but shall not exceed three (3) feet in height in any required yard which abuts a street other than an alley. Higher screen may be allowed with proper setbacks for clear vision in accordance with Section 9.64.010. (Ord. 319, 2013; Ord. 267, 2007; Ord. 73E § 3.050, 1992).~~ (First sentence proposed to be moved to Chapter 9.64 – see below.)

#### **Chapter 9.64 - Street Construction and Design**

##### **Section 9.64.010 Design standards.**

Any street constructed within and dedicated to the City as a city street, or dedicated to the public for use as a street and constructed after the date of the ordinance codified in this title shall comply with Chapter 7.04. In addition, the following standards shall apply **to all streets, i.e. public streets and private streets:**

- A. Clear-Vision Areas. A clear-vision area shall be maintained on the corners of all property at the intersection of two (2) streets **and at the intersection of a street and a driveway.**
1. A clear-vision area shall consist of a triangular area, two (2) sides of which are lot lines measured from the corner intersection of the street lot lines for a distance specified in this regulation, or, where the lot lines have rounded corners, the lot lines extended in a straight line to a point of intersection and so measured, and the third side of which is a line across the corner of the lot joining the non-intersecting ends of the other sides.
  2. A clear-vision area shall contain no planting, fence, wall, structure, temporary or permanent obstruction exceeding 2.5 feet in height, measured from the top of the curb or, where no curb exists, from the established street center line grade, except that trees exceeding this height may be located in this area provided all branches and foliage are removed to a height eight feet above grade.
  3. For clear-vision areas, the minimum distance shall be fifteen (15) feet or, at intersections including an alley, ten (10) feet, except that when the angle of intersection between streets, other than an alley, is less than thirty (30) degrees, the distance shall be twenty-five (25) feet.
- B. Fences, hedges and walls may be located within required yards, but shall not exceed three (3) feet in height in any required yard which abuts a street other than an alley.**
- C. Street Intersections. Streets shall intersect one another at an angle as near to a right angle as is practical considering the topography of the area and previous adjacent layout. Intersections shall be designed so that no danger to the travelling public is created as a result of staggered intersections; and in no case shall intersections be offset less than one hundred (100) feet.
- D. Cul-De-Sacs and Turn-Arounds. In general, dead end (cul-de-sac) streets in urban subdivisions (average lot size under one acre) shall not exceed four hundred (400) feet in length and shall terminate in a turn-around with a minimum property line radius of forty-five (45) feet or other type of turn-around approved by the Planning Commission. Turn-arounds approved by the Planning Commission shall be provided on all dead-end streets.
- E. Easements.
1. Where alleys are not provided, easements of not less than five (5) feet in width shall be provided on each side of the rear line or side line for necessary utility lines, wires, conduits, storm and sanitary sewers, gas and water. Easements of the same or greater widths may be required along boundary lines or across lots or parcels where necessary for the extension of utility lines, waterways, and walkways, and to provide necessary drainage ways or channels.
  2. A private easement established without full compliance with these regulations may be approved by the Planning Commission provided it is the only reasonable method by which the rear portion of an unusually deep lot or parcel may be provided vehicular access.

- F. Blocks. No block shall be longer than one thousand two hundred (1,200) feet between street lines.
- G. Public Access Ways. When necessary for public convenience and safety, the Planning Commission may require the land divider to dedicate to the public access ways ten (10) to twenty (20) feet in width to connect to cul-de-sacs, to pass through oddly shaped or unusually long blocks, to provide access to schools, parks, beaches or other public areas, of such design and location as reasonably required to facilitate public use.
- H. Public Streets. If topography or other physical conditions make a street of the minimum required width impractical, the Planning Commission may modify this street regulation requirement provided the public and future owner's interests are adequately protected.
- I. The layout of streets shall give suitable recognition to surrounding topographical conditions in accordance with the purpose of this title.
- J. Variance. The standards for street construction may be varied by the ~~City Council~~ **Planning Commission** where topography, soil characteristics, or other factors indicate such variance would be in the best interest of the City. Any request for variance in the above standards must be made in writing and filed with the City Recorder when the application for construction is submitted. (Ord. 175, 1995; Ord. 73E § 8.010, 1992)
- K. Amortization Period. Existing non-compliant clear vision areas, fences, hedges, and walls shall come into compliance with these regulations within xxx years from adoption of this ordinance.**

# YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

October 16, 2018

## Work Session Draft Minutes

Vice-Chair Ron Urban called the October 16, 2018 meeting 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, Ginny Hafner, James Kerti, Shelly Shrock, and Lance Bloch. Absent: Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey. Staff present: City Planner Larry Lewis. Audience: 4.

### **I. Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

City County Craig Berdie presented his ideas for the Comp Plan review and content. He suggested the Council could give the Commission priorities for their work. Commissioner Anderson reported from her conversation with Mayor Stanley, that there were two separate tasks: the ordinary Planning Commission review of the Comp Plan and the Council's direction to the Commission to address specific issues in the Comp Plan. Berdie believed the Council should give the Commission areas requiring statutes and areas to be of priority.

Commissioner Hafner expressed concern over having one Councilor direct the Commission. Anderson suggested Berdie was present for clarification. Commissioner Urban indicated the Commission would need more time to review Berdie's page of questions. Berdie asserted the Commission did not go far enough in their review of the Comp Plan. Anderson asked Berdie if Council had seen the list Berdie handed out. Berdie indicated Council had reviewed his document. Berdie added that there were inconsistencies in which components of the Comp Plan had identified actions, policies, and ordinances. Hafner noted part of the Comp Plan was to present vision rather than specific actions.

Anderson thanked Berdie for his interest in the Commission's work and indicated the Commission would welcome input from the Council on priorities. Planner Lewis noted Commissions in the past have identified where ordinances were needed when they went through the updating process. Urban raised concern about the Commission proceeding without the Council having approved the changes to date. Commissioner Kerti noted the 2008 survey and apparent community input for the priorities in the Comp Plan. Commissioners discussed the possible need for another community survey.

Anderson indicate the Commission would review Berdie's question at the November work session

### **II. Sign Ordinance – Attorney Feedback**

Anderson explained to Manager Beaucaire that the Commission needed help in figuring out how to work with the attorney. Manager Beaucaire suggested the model ordinances created by the League of Oregon Cities factor in recent court cases on planning. Anderson reported the Commission had been working from code from other cities and adopting that to Yachats. Anderson indicated she was hearing Manager Beaucaire say that the Commission should clearly identify what the problem was to be addressed, then ask the attorney if he has any recommendations for code.

Hafner recalled that the Commission had a public meeting and send the draft ordinance to ODLCD for review. Lewis noted ODLCD often does not comment on drafts unless there is a problem with respect to a state goal. He noted Waldport had worked from the DLCD model ordinance to write theirs, and Yachats worked from Waldport's plan. Manager Beaucaire explained other city

1 ordinances might not reflect legal changes or might not have yet been challenged on issues.  
2 Manager Beaucaire also reported the regulation of signs was an extremely complicated and  
3 difficult issue to legislate.  
4

5 Manager Beaucaire noted the attorney provided recommendations and the Commission was not  
6 bound to those recommendations. She added that the Commission could have a legitimate reason  
7 to not agree with the attorney, but that they should seriously consider his recommendations.  
8 Anderson asked about the feasibility of having the attorney draft the initial document.

9 Commissioner Shrock commented on the cost of using the attorney to draft documents. Anderson  
10 recalled previous Commissions were asked not to ask questions of the attorney. Anderson  
11 suggested that the Commission was now working in a context of worrying about avoiding lawsuits.  
12

13 Commissioner Bloch noted the majority of the code was not about content, and the attorney's  
14 major concern appeared to be about the content issue. He suggested the area that would be of  
15 concern around content would be temporary signs. Anderson noted the comments about  
16 open/closed signs, address signs, and directional signs.  
17

18 Urban expressed frustration with the attorney's comments about flags where he asserted that a  
19 Jolly Roger flag was equally as important as the American Flag. Manager Beaucaire suggested  
20 the Commission could state what their intent was and ask for clarification with the attorney or  
21 decide to not follow that advice of the attorney. Anderson asked if the Commission could disagree  
22 with the attorney. Manager Beaucaire suggested the Commission, when presented to Council,  
23 clearly state what the attorney's position was and why the Commission disagreed with that position  
24 so Council would be fully informed to make policy.  
25

26 Anderson clarified that Manager Beaucaire would be open to having a workshop with the attorney  
27 after the new year. Commissioners expressed frustration over how extreme some of the attorney's  
28 positions appeared to be. Urban clarified that the City's present sign ordinance would not meet the  
29 attorney's criteria. Kerti noted the attorney had comments about portions that were taken from the  
30 model ordinance.  
31

32 Kerti stressed the importance of involving the attorney earlier in the process of developing new  
33 code. He added that he learned Lincoln City had difficulty in revising their sign ordinance over the  
34 same issues the City's attorney was raising.  
35

36 Urban adjourned the work session at 3:03 pm.  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 \_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Urban, Vice-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

42  
43 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on November 17, 2018.  
44

# YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

October 16, 2018

## Draft Minutes

Chair Helen Anderson called the October 16, 2018 meeting of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 3:06 pm in the Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Ron Urban, Helen Anderson, Ginny Hafner, Lance Bloch, Shelly Shrock, and James Kerti. Absent: Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey. Staff present: City Planner Larry Lewis. Audience: 14.

### **I. Announcements and Correspondence - none**

### **II. Minutes**

#### **A. September 18, 2018 Work Session Meeting**

Dates at top of document indicate July 17, not August 21

Page 1, Line 24: remove period

Page 2, Line 19: change to "Kerti asked for a follow up on the Planning Commission..."

Page 2, Line 43: "generating list" should read, "generating a list"

Page 1, Line 41: Block should be Bloch

Commissioner Urban moved to approve the September 18, 2018 work session minutes as amended: Aye – 6; No – 0.

#### **B. August 21, 2018 Regular Meeting**

Page 1, Line 9: add Rick McClung to Staff present

Page 2, Line 8: add McClung after Plant Lead

Page 2, Line 15: delete "other water needs"

Page 2, Line 19: "draught" should be "drought"

Page 3, Line 19: "Uban's" should be "Urban's"

Page 3, Line 32: "City need" should be "City needs"

Page 3, Line 33: edit sentence to read, "Anderson explained the reason was so the City would have control over only issuing licenses to businesses in permitted buildings."

Page 3, Line 35: insert "(205 Radar Road) after "Leslie Vaaler"

Page 3, Line 40: "they license" should be "the license"

Urban moved to approve the August 21, 2018 Planning Commission meeting minutes as amended: Aye - 6; No – 0.

### **III. Citizen's Concerns**

Craig Berdie (319 E 3<sup>rd</sup> Street) asked why the Landmark did not have a demolition permit or a barrier protecting the estuarine area. He reported his concern over future building and protecting the natural resources. Planner Lewis reported the County does not require demolition permits. Lewis indicated the property owner was aware that they would need a geotech report before pursuing any building. Lewis was not certain how the owners could have erected a barrier without digging into the protected area. Anderson reported there were three off-street parking spaces and the highway would no longer be grandfathered. She added that the 25-foot bluff setback would also apply to any new building. She noted the owners were aware that they have lost the grandfather status.

1           **IV. Public Hearing on Title 9 Zoning and Land Use – Section 9.52.030 and Chapter**  
2           **9.64 Clear Vision Standards**

3       Lewis summarized that the draft ordinance moved language on clear vision standards from Section  
4       9.52.030 on accessory uses to Chapter 9.64 on street construction and design. He noted the City  
5       Attorney suggested making this change and the placement under accessory uses limits its  
6       applicability. Lewis explained the clear vision zone at an intersection was the triangle established  
7       by the area measured a distance back from the corner in each direction connected by the  
8       hypotenuse. Lewis also noted that the application of a clear vision zone was added to intersections  
9       of a street and a driveway.

10  
11       Lewis reported three emails in favor of the changes were received from Barbie Bird, Dave and  
12       Nancy Haverstock, and Paul and Maggie Marshall.

13  
14       Lewis reported her sent Commissioners feedback from the City Attorney on grandfathering the  
15       existing walls, fences, and hedges.

16  
17       Public Input

18           1. Doug Conner (490 Lemwick Lane) noted the proposed ordinance dealt with the first  
19           twenty for the lot. He wanted to see the Planning Commission take action to limit walls,  
20           fences, and hedges along the rest of the lot. He noted County code required building  
21           permits for walls and fences above six feet, but no requirement exists for a hedge. He read  
22           a definition for “fence” from the Yachats Code, which included an unroofed barrier made of  
23           “any other material,” which could include a hedge.

24  
25           2. Fran Morse (636 Marine Drive) expressed support for the inclusion of driveways.

26  
27       Anderson clarified with Lewis that the City Code does not require permitting on hedges.

28  
29       Anderson reported the Attorney had indicated three ways the Commission could address existing  
30       conditions: 1. Not apply the ordinance to existing conditions, 2. Establish an amount of time for  
31       people to come into compliance, or 3. Put the change into a section of Code other than Title 9 so  
32       that it would go into effect immediately as a public health and safety issue.

33  
34       Commissioners discussed whether the portion of this regulation on vegetation could go into Title 5  
35       on Health and Safety so that it would take effect immediately. Kerti suggested that residents  
36       should have adequate time to come into compliance.

37  
38       Urban noted 9.64.010.A.2 stated the height limit to be 2.5 feet and the current ordinance stated 3  
39       feet. Lewis reported he has consistently seen differences on clear vision standards versus  
40       setbacks for fences, hedges, and walls.

41  
42       Commissioners agreed that the language should remain in Chapter 9.64 and they should ask the  
43       attorney for a recommendation on the appropriate length of time to come into compliance. Urban  
44       suggested adding an item K to 9.64.010 that specifies the amortization schedule for compliance.

45  
46       Kerti noted a section of Code that addressed bushes impacting sidewalks and streets.

47  
48       Urban moved to recommend to Council the adoption of an ordinance on Clear Vision Standards  
49       and Fences, Hedges and Wall regulations with a section K to included the schedule for coming into  
50       compliance and to direct the City Planner to prepare the documents: Aye – 6; No – 0.

1 Anderson continued the public hearing to the November 27, 2018 at 3:00 pm.

2  
3 **V. Planner's Report**

4 Lewis reported there was only one permit for a remodel.

5  
6 **VI. Other Business**

7 **A. From the Commission**

8 Commissioners agreed to meet on November 27, 2018 instead of November 20, 2018 during  
9 Thanksgiving week.

10  
11 Hafner indicated she would be resigning at the end of 2018.

12  
13 Kerti asked if the Drift Inn had been notified of the additional and revised parking requirements.  
14 Lewis indicated he just sent Linda Hetzler a notice.

15  
16 Commissioners agreed to discuss signs and the comp plan at the November work session.

17  
18 **B. From Staff - none**

19  
20 **C. From the Floor**

21  
22 Anderson adjourned the meeting at 4:13 pm.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
Helen Anderson, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

28  
29 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on November 17, 2018.  
30

# YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

November 27, 2018

## Work Session Approved Minutes

Vice-Chair Ron Urban called the November 27, 2018 meeting 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, Ginny Hafner, James Kerti, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, Shelly Shrock, and Lance Bloch. Absent: none. Staff Not Present: City Planner Larry Lewis. Audience: 4.

### **I. Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Commissioner Urban reported he looked up "ridgeline," and several other Commissioners indicated they looked up the word as well. Commissioner Anderson added that her research indicated that ridgelines were commonly addressed in other jurisdictions under the more general category of view sheds.

Urban suggested, while Councilor Berdie's suggestions were appropriate and useful, Berdie's recommendations should be treated separately from the Comp Plan review, and Council should inform the Commission of its priorities based on their goals. Anderson asserted many of Berdie's suggestions were more Council policy decisions rather than decisions for the Planning Commission. Anderson recalled Commissioner Hafner had previously expressed concern that Councilor Berdie was not representing the entire Council position, only his perspective. Commissioner Bloch had the opinion that the Council had directed Councilor Berdie to speak for them at the Planning Commission. Commissioners had different opinions on this topic, and speculated that several Councilors had not read the Comp Plan. Bloch had concern that this issue was going to go back and forth between Council and the Commission without any action being taken. Anderson suggested the new Council might be more able to give clearer directives to the Commission.

Anderson suggested she could draft a memo to Council stating they should accept or deny the previously proposed Comp Plan update, then direct the Commission on what the points they want the Commission to address. Urban indicated he was not comfortable acting on any of Councilor Berdie's comments, and other Commissioners agreed.

Anderson noted under Goal E, Proposed Actions d and e do contain a redundancy and wondered if Action e was supposed to be removed when "building permits" were added to Action d. Bloch suggested a distinction between subdivisions and building permits. Commissioner Shrock agreed the original intent might have been to merge Action e into Action d. Hafner wanted to proceed with the memo to Council. Shrock suggested attaching Councilor Berdie's handout to the memo.

### **II. Sign Ordinance**

Urban expressed frustration with the attorney's position on content-based regulations. Bloch did not agree with the argument that simply reading a sign meant the sign was being content-based regulated. Anderson suggested if they took the attorney's comments in full, signs could only be regulated based on placement, such as on a building or a roof. Kerti added that the attorney's definition would allow regulation based on materials. Urban added that one must read a sign in order to determine whether it was a sign. Urban suggested that the Commission would be guessing at what would be acceptable to the attorney without getting greater direction from the attorney.

The Commission agreed that seasonal could replace holiday per the attorney's suggestion. Urban added that the Commission could eliminate the remainder of that sentence.

1  
2 Anderson noted Manager Beaucaire had indicated the Commission could disagree with the  
3 attorney if they had justification. Anderson suggested the Commission go ahead and include  
4 regulations that might not meet all of the opinions of the attorney. Commissioner O'Shaughnessey  
5 noted the decision was one of risk assessment, as anyone could sue over anything. She asserted  
6 when the attorney stated something was a violation of Supreme Court law, the Commission  
7 definitely needed to pay attention. Urban noted the attorney's comment for off-premises signs was  
8 that the regulation was "black letter unconstitutional over Oregon Supreme Court law." Urban  
9 suggested the attorney should suggest a means to accomplish the goal in a legal manner.

10  
11 Hafner recalled that the attorney had suggested the Commission use the Model Sign Ordinance to  
12 draft its sign code language. Bloch noted how lawyers constantly disagree with each other and  
13 their positions are opinions. Bloch asserted the attorney's definition of content-based regulations  
14 was too restrictive.

15  
16 9.44.010: change "holiday" to "seasonal" and delete, "temporary interior window signs, or  
17 the display of the national or state flag."

18 9.44.020 Definitions: Linear Street Frontage: add "with adjoining street frontage: to read,  
19 "Linear Street Frontage' means the contiguous tax lots, with adjoining street frontage,  
20 under single ownership on which the business is located."

21  
22 Kerti asserted other cities have been dealing with this same issue, and he believed Yachats should  
23 stick as closely as possible to what the attorney recommends. Kerti suggested the content-based  
24 regulations the attorney has cited were not critical or essential to the City's sign code. Urban  
25 suggested the attorney or someone else should help the Commission with ways to approach the  
26 regulations.

27  
28 Kerti referred to the Reed case where a directional sign was deemed unconstitutional.  
29 Commissioners discussed the potential difference between the sign in the Reed case and those  
30 that have a blanket application like an Open-Closed sign.

31  
32 Commissioners discussed how to proceed revising the sign code and agreed to study the Model  
33 Sign Ordinance before the next work session.

34  
35 Urban adjourned the work session at 3:01 pm.

36  
37  
38  
39  
40 \_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Urban, Vice-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

41  
42 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on December 15, 2018.  
43