

# CITY OF DUNDEE

---

**Meeting:** Planning Commission Meeting  
**Location:** City Council Meeting Chambers  
620 S.W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Dundee, Oregon 97115  
**Date:** June 19, 2013  
**Time:** 7:00 p.m.

---

**I. Meeting called to order.**

Commissioners present, which consisted of quorum, were Davis, Mock, Hinson, Manning, and Fiedler. Commissioner Baird had an excused absence. Also in attendance were Planner Nunley and City Administrator Daykin.

Chairman Hinson called the meeting to order.

**II. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting(s)**

It was moved and seconded to approve the April minutes as written. Motion passes unanimously.

**III. Public Comment**

No public present.

**VI. Public Hearings**

**LURA 12-11, City of Dundee - Revision of the Dundee Development Code**

**1. Objections to Notice**

The script was read into record. There were no objections to notice.

**2. Objections to Jurisdiction**

There were no objections to jurisdiction.

**3. Declarations of Ex-Parte, Bias, or Conflict of Interest**

There were no declarations.

**4. Staff Report**

Planner Nunley read the staff report read into record and then passed out a memo regarding cross-reference errors and typos that the codifiers had found. She also handed out a new section 4.5 and noted the changes from the previous draft.

The public hearing opened. As no public was present, hearing was then closed.

#### **5. Staff Recommendation**

Planner Nunley re-capped staff recommendation.

CA Daykin stated that the draft had been sent to the codifier because the future intent is to add it to the Municipal Code. He further noted that the final draft would have a slightly different look and that the numbering scheme would be consistent with the municipal code. There were questions about what would be included by the codifiers and how tables and references would be addressed. CA Daykin retrieved the municipal code and showed pages to the Commission of what the development code chapters might look like.

CA Daykin noted that there was a large list of items to readdress and that the City had secured a technical assistance grant for review and recommendation of policy changes. The focus would be on the commercial zones and the incorporation of future developmental master plans.

Call for questions. Hearing none, the Commission moved to deliberation.

#### **6. Deliberation**

The following items were discussed.

- a. There were some typos noted and it was questioned whether the errors had already been caught.
- b. There was a question about whether text was missing from the Bottling/Distilling section.
- c. Service Station Signs were discussed and questioned whether it was meant to have been removed in earlier revisions. CA Daykin stated that it was on the list for redress during the policy changes workshops and adoption. He also noted that it was possible to have additional sign standards for different uses. There was a question about whether a conflict would be addressed by staff if a future sign application came in for a service station. Commissioner Mock stated that the section was a special circumstance for service stations specifically. He felt that there wouldn't be many conflicts as it only applied to service stations. Planner Nunley noted that the sign design standards in the sign code superseded any other regulations. There was more conversation about whether future redress of the service station section would allow for altering of the sign standards. The question was answered affirmatively.
- d. On page 331, paragraph b, strikeouts to be removed.
- e. On page 268, letters and numbers in a list (formatting error).
- f. There was discussion regarding private streets and whether the number of dwelling units in the draft was the correct number decided upon in earlier workshops. Commissioners were in agreement to let the numbers stay as written in the draft.

MOTION: It was moved to recommend to the City Council for adoption the current version of the proposed changes to the development code, including the new section chapter 4.5; and, all the changes that are listed on the memorandum; and, the fixes to the table of contents on page 4.3; and, authorize the staff to make any other purely typographical and formatting changes that are needed for consistency. The motion was seconded.

Motion carries unanimously.

### **V. Planning Issues from Commission Members.**

It was announced that the Comprehensive Plan Map adoption would be coming to the July meeting. It was discussed that the upcoming vacancy would not be able to be filled until the

second meeting in July and also noted that Commissioner Baird may not be able to attend. Both matters might make a quorum questionable. It was agreed to postpone the hearing to August. Planner Nunley and CA Daykin noted that some UGB amendments had been made that were not shown on the zoning map and that they were waiting for confirmation from the state as to whether the amendments were formalized.

Jessica and Rob noted that a meeting had been held regarding the riverside district and roadway connections and gave a brief overview.

Commissioner Mock was thanked for his service.

## VI. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion carries, unanimously.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Hinson, Chairman / Gary Wanning, Vice-

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Melody Osborne, Planning Secretary