

**YACHATS PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
August 28, 2018**

**Draft Minutes**

Chair Helen Anderson called the August 28, 2018 special 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, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, Shelly Shrock, Lance Bloch, and James Kerti. Absent: none. Staff present: City Planner Larry Lewis. Audience: 2.

**I. Announcements and Correspondence**

Anderson referred to a letter from Jacqueline Danos and suggested the Commission had already incorporated her requests to modify Goal J in the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Urban noted the Commission had not completely removed Section 6 as she requested. Anderson recalled the Commission agreed to remove the first three paragraphs under Section 6, but leave the last paragraph beginning with, "The City strongly encourages developers to make government assisted housing..." She added that the Commission also agreed to add, "in particular the housing needs of local workers" to the end of the first sentence of the Goal J statement. Urban added that Danos' point about how the statement might be used.

**II. Discussion of Sign Ordinance**

1. Sign size in higher speed zones: Anderson suggested the Commission consider the speed of traffic in front of the Overleaf, as Drew Roslund noted, and that impact on sign readability. Urban proposed for to add a stipulation in section 9.44.040.B.2.b as follows:

For properties over 300 linear feet of street frontage, the Planning Commission may grant a waiver of provision 9.44.070 of this Code for pre-existing nonconforming signs as of INSERT EFFECTIVE DATE.

This statement should be placed as condition d under 9.44.040.B.2.b.3 Monument signs. Commissioner Kerti noted the existing sign code allows for signs of 100 square feet on the larger properties. Commissioners discussed the pros and cons of reducing size, noting the proposed code limits sign heights. Kerti suggested the Adobe and Overleaf signs seem appropriate for those lots. Commissioners posed arguments for both approaches, noting there are seven lots north of the Village Bean that could fall into this 300 linear feet section. Commissioners agreed the approach to grant an exception to 9.44.070 would be better than changing the maximum sign size of 50 square feet.

2. Linear feet of street frontage: Commissioners agreed to add a definition for street frontage as referenced for sign requirements as follows:

"Linear feet of street frontage" is defined as the contiguous tax lots under single ownership on which the business is located.

3. Free standing signs: Commissioners discussed the differences between monument signs, pole signs, and free-standing signs. Commissioner Shrock noted there are different elements to the Adobe sign, and it was not clear as to what is counted as a sign. Lewis noted the base and sign are separate components per the definition of monument signs. Lewis noted that the definition of Monument sign indicates the sign have a solid base that is at least 75% of the sign width but also could be supported by multiple posts. Commissioners discussed whether a two pole sign could be a monument sign and how one should define what constitutes a base. Lewis suggested removing "monument" from the permanent free-standing section would correct the potential conflict.

1 To maximize applicability, Commissioners agreed to change “Monument signs” to “Free-standing  
2 signs” in section 9.44.040.B.2.b.3.

3  
4 Commissioners agreed to keep “monument sign” in the definitions.

5  
6 4. Vacancy signs and internally lit signs: Anderson recalled the Commission had discussed  
7 allowing businesses to have vacancy and/or open signs. Commissioner Bloch noted lodging  
8 places often use “no vacancy” as a way to indicate the office is closed. Anderson recalled the  
9 Commission had discussed allowing neon signs for open signs. Kerti and Hafner also recalled the  
10 discussion on this topic. Urban noted the limitation on internally lit signs is in 9.44.040.B.2.a.3,  
11 which means it only applies to building signs.

12  
13 Commissioners agreed to move the internally lit limitation from 2.b.3 to 1.e so that 9.44.040.B.1.e  
14 reads:

15 e. The maximum amount of internally lit signs shall be limited to a total of 24 square feet.

16  
17 Commissioners agreed to add a statement about open/closed signs to building signs in section  
18 9.44.040.B.2.a.3 to read:

19 3) Open sign. One open/closed sign is allowed up to two (2) square.

20  
21 Commissioners discussed how to allow vacancy signs on free-standing signs and agreed to add to  
22 9.44.040.B.2.b.3.e:

23 e. One internally lit vacancy/no vacancy sign per free-standing sign is allowed in addition to  
24 the size limits in 9.44.040.B.2.b.3.b and 9.44.040.B.2.b.3.c.

25  
26 5. Digital Sign definition: Urban recalled an electrician had suggested that the reference to “LED  
27 sign” in the definition of digital signs. Kerti stated his research indicated the term was appropriate  
28 to the definition based on the research he conducted. Commissioners agreed the language was  
29 not essential for the definition, so it could be eliminated.

30  
31 6. Permits for temporary signs: Urban recalled the question of whether permits are required for  
32 temporary signs. Kerti suggested that language be added to the temporary sign section to make  
33 the requirement clearer. Commissioners agreed to add “without a permit” as follows to 9.44.050:

34  
35 In addition to the allowances for signs provided by this section, temporary signs are allowed  
36 on private property without a permit with the following standards:

### 37 38 **III. Continuation of Public Hearing on 9.44 Signs**

39 Anderson reopened the Public Hearing on code amendments for Chapter 9.44 Signs.

40  
41 Kerti asked Anderson to read the changes that were discussed today. Anderson read the agreed  
42 upon changes.

43  
44 Anderson opened the public testimony portion of the hearing.

45  
46 Leslie Vaaler (205 Radar Road) noted the Roslund from the Overleaf had compelling reasons for  
47 allowing for larger signs in the higher speed zones. She suggested the Commission could  
48 consider incorporating the speed limit in relation to sign size in the code. She also suggested the  
49 allowable size of the open/closed signs might also be tied to property size. Vaaler was concerned  
50 about there being no limits on sign brightness.

1 Andrew Doremus (285 Hill Court) indicated he had a different interpretation of the 300 linear feet,  
2 as he would interpret the definition of linear feet of frontage to include empty lots. He also did not  
3 agree with the prohibition of LED lights in the digital sign code. He believe the language was  
4 conflating a technology for generating light with the definition of a type of sign, arguing that LED  
5 lights are some of the most energy efficient ways of generating light.

6  
7 Urban asked Doremus if he had a better definition. Doremus suggested the Commission better  
8 define what they are trying to accomplish.  
9

10 Anderson explained and open/closed sign could be part of the 50 square feet allotted for a free  
11 standing sign and the lighting issue would be addressed when the Planning Commission took up  
12 trespass lighting in the Code. Kerti noted the definition states the light source is used "to produce  
13 an illuminated image, picture, or message of any kind..." thus the definition focuses on producing  
14 the image versus illuminating the image.  
15

16 Anderson closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.  
17

18 Lewis noted the definition of Size needs to be moved to before Temporary Sign.  
19 Shrock moved to approve the draft of Chapter 9.44 Signs as amended and to forward to Council  
20 for adoption as an ordinance: Aye – 7; No – 0.  
21

22 Anderson closed the public hearing on 9.44 Signs.  
23

24 **III. Citizen's Concerns - none**

25 **IV. Public Hearings - none**  
26

27 **V. Other Business**

28 **A. From the Commission**

29 Bloch asked if the Commission was going to provide Mr. Connor with an update on the code  
30 changes relative to his request from the Planning Commission. Lewis noted the public hearing  
31 would be in October. Commissioners consented for Anderson to send Mr. Connor an update on  
32 the proposed code.  
33

34 **B. From Staff - none**  
35

36 Anderson adjourned the meeting at 3:51 pm.  
37  
38  
39  
40

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

42  
43 Minutes prepared by H H Anderson on September 11, 2018.  
44