



City of Yachats

YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION

February 26, 2019

Work Session Approved Minutes

I. Call to Order

Vice Chair Lance Bloch called the February 26, 2019 special work session of the Yachats Planning Commission to order at 2:00 pm in the Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Jacqueline Danos, Doug Conner, Helen Anderson, Lance Bloch, and Christine Orchard. Absent: Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey and Doug Conner. Staff Present: City Planner Dave Mattison
Audience: 1.

II. Sign Ordinance

Bloch recalled they Commission stopped with the section on page 7 on Banners. He recalled they agreed to remove reference to the American Flag and they had questions about the flagpole holes in the sidewalk.

For item v under c. Banner Signs, Commissioners agreed to stipulate:

v. **Only city-provided banners** ~~No banner, other than the American flag,~~ shall be placed in flagpole holes along Highway 101 **in front of the Commons**, and no banners shall be placed in the **city-owned** planters.

For 9.44.090 Maintenance and appearance of signs, Commissioners like the language in the model code and agreed to use all of the language from section 120(D) on page 47. Dickinson noted the entire section 120 covered maintenance as well. This section should be changed as follows:

9.44.090 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.~~ All signs, together with all of their supports, braces, guys, and anchors shall be kept in good repair and be maintained in a safe condition. All signs and the site upon which they are located shall be maintained in a neat, clean, and attractive condition. Signs shall be kept free from excessive rust, corrosion, peeling paint or other surface deterioration. The display surfaces of all signs shall be kept neatly painted or posted. Signs which are faded, torn, damaged or otherwise unsightly or in a state of disrepair shall be immediately repaired or removed.

Under the section on 9.44.100 Variances and Adjustments, Commissioners noted that references to other sections of this Title needed to be updated.

1 For section B on variance adjustments, Mattison explained adjustments allow for the Planner and/or
2 City Manager to allow for slight variations without the person having to apply for a variance. He
3 provided an example of a situation where a sign being in a congested area where the height might
4 work better with a 6-inch adjustment, the Planner could allow this change to happen.

5
6 Commissioners discussed whether they needed to stipulate the circumstance under which the
7 Planner could move forward with making an adjustment without consulting with the Commission.
8 Some Commissioners had concern about the Planner making an adjustment that would later present
9 a problem for the City or Commission. Noting that sometimes the adjustments are best used in a
10 timely way and that the City assumes the Planner is skilled in these decisions, the Commission
11 agreed that the Planner could decide when the Commission would need to be involved prior to
12 allowing the adjustment. In all cases, the Planner should report any adjustments to the Commission
13 at the next Commission meeting.

14
15 Anderson noted much of the language in section 135 of the model code was essentially the criteria
16 the Planning Commission uses to determine granting a variance. Anderson read the five variance
17 criteria the Commission uses. Commissioners agreed to the following:

18 B. Adjustments.

19 1. Up to a five (5) percent adjustment to the numeric standards of this section shall be allowed
20 only in compliance with this subsection. Adjustments allowing the use of prohibited signs, or
21 allowing signage other than that specifically allowed by this code, are not permitted. ~~Adjustments~~
22 ~~may be requested to allow for the relocation of a sign, on the subject property, reducing the height~~
23 ~~of a sign, or enlarging the area of a sign. Adjustments allowing for the use of prohibited signs, or~~
24 ~~allowing signage other than that specifically allowed by this code, are not permitted.~~

25 2. Requests for adjustments shall be submitted to the City on a form provided by the City, and
26 accompanied by a fee as approved by the City Council. An adjustment request may be handled
27 administratively. ~~The request shall include the specific standards from which the adjustment is~~
28 ~~requested, the numeric amount of the adjustment and a written response to the following approval~~
29 ~~criteria:~~

30 ~~a. Strict application of the code requirements would deny the applicant a reasonable opportunity to~~
31 ~~communicate by sign in a manner similar to like persons or uses because of an unusual or unique~~
32 ~~circumstance relating to the property or some other circumstances;~~

33 ~~b. The adjustment made to a sign will not affect the surrounding neighborhood or other property~~
34 ~~affected by the request the manner materially inconsistent with the purpose of the sign codes as~~
35 ~~stated in 9.44.010.—~~

36 ~~c. The degree of the adjustment is limited to that reasonable necessary to alleviate the problem~~
37 ~~created by the unique or unusual circumstance identified above.~~

38
39 Dickinson noted the chapter numbers referenced needing updating.

40
41 For projecting signs, commissioners agreed to add item D on page 45 of the model code to become
42 item 3 for projecting signs to read: 3. The sign does not project above the roofline or parapet wall,
43 whichever is higher.

44
45 Commissioners decided to use the language from the model ordinance to address illuminated signs.
46 They noted item D in the model code referring to temporary signs could be eliminated.

47 Commissioners discussed the numbers on the illumination as stated in watts and milliamperes
48 should remain in this section. The Commission agreed to reword item E1 on page 48 of the model

code into two statements and to condense E3 to eliminate reference to industrial zones as described below. Commissioners agreed that there should be a statement about LED lights as well.

G. Illuminated Signs

1. No sign, light, lamp, bulb, tube, or device shall be used or displayed in violation of this section.

2. Regardless of the maximum wattages or milliamperere rating capacities allowable under Section XX.XX.125(E) of this chapter, no light source shall create an unduly distracting or hazardous condition to a motorist, pedestrian or the general public. Lighted signs shall be placed, shielded or deflected so as not to shine into residential dwelling units or structures, or impair the road vision of the driver of any vehicle.

3. External light sources for a sign shall be directed and shielded to limit direct illumination of any object other than the sign.

4. The illumination of signs shall comply with the following standards:

a. No bulb or lamp light source exceeding twenty-five (25) watts shall be exposed to direct view from a public street or highway.

b. No LED light source exceeding the equivalent of a twenty-five (25) watt incandescent bulb shall be exposed to direct view from a public street or highway.

c. When neon tubing is employed on the exterior or interior of a sign, the capacity of such tubing shall not exceed three-hundred [300] milliamperes rating for white tubing nor one-hundred [100] milliamperes rating for any colored tubing.

d. When fluorescent tubes are used for interior illumination of a sign, such illumination shall not exceed an illumination equivalent to eight-hundred [800] milliamperere rating tubing behind a sign face spaced at least nine (9) inches, center to center.

In 9.44.130 Sign Permit Application section C, Commissioners agreed the fee reference should not contain a fixed number but should refer to the approved City fee schedule: C. Application Fee. A filing fee as set by Resolution ~~of \$25.00~~ shall be paid at the time of filing each sign permit application.

Commissioners discussed whether stipulations should be made about the shape of a sign and agreed that was not of great concern. They agreed they would review potential diagrams to include at the next work session.

Mattison indicated he would provide some diagrams for the next meeting, and Danos indicated she would find out if there was a standard for addressing light output such as lumens.

Mattison reported that he was talking with the Drift Inn about the parking situation with the recent changes. Anderson clarified this would not require a hearing.

Bloch adjourned the work session at 3:33 pm.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

_____	_____
Lance Bloch, Vice Chair	Date
Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on March 10, 2019.	