

# CITY OF DUNDEE

---

**Meeting:** Planning Commission Meeting  
**Location:** City Council Meeting Chambers  
620 S.W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Dundee, Oregon 97115  
**Date:** July 15, 2015  
**Time:** 7:00 p.m.

---

## **I. Meeting called to order.**

Vice-Chairman Michele Kropf called the meeting to order. Commissioners present, which consisted of quorum, were Isaiah Cox, David Hinson, Gary Rodney, and Danny Sikkens. Chairman Gerald Fiedler and Francisco Stoller had excused absences.

Interim City Planner Jim Jacks and City Administrator Rob Daykin were also present. Citizen Stan Hutchens was in the audience.

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

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from April 15, 2015. Motion passes unanimously.

## **III. Public Comment**

Mr. Hutchens stated that he was in the audience to listen, but did not have any comments.

## **IV. Sign Code Discussion**

CA Daykin gave a brief overview of the reason the sign code was coming before the PC (the FD request for an electronic reader board sign); and then gave a summary of what had taken place since the last work session on the sign code.

Points of discussion centered on:

- 1) If it would be possible to limit colors of the electronic signs.
- 2) Worry that enlarging the size of the electronic face would encourage everyone to go electronic and create a look that is unwanted in Dundee.
- 3) Whether the Fire Department had a big enough need to justify allowing a larger electronic sign face.
- 4) If it would be possible to limit the code to allow only government/public agencies to have certain signs. This was answered by Planner Jacks who stated that recent legal rulings meant that the municipality needed to have a very compelling reason to have a regulation differing from the majority.
- 5) Discussion about the land use process for amending the code and whether amending the code at this time would set a precedent for other people to come in and change the code. CA Daykin clarified the process of updating the code and who has authority to initiate an amendment. Reiterated that in this case the amendment was initiated by the City Council.
- 6) The speed of copy change on electronic signs.

7) Whether it is possible to limit the lumens of electronic signs.

CA Daykin suggested that the planning commission look at adding additional design standards to restrict the types of sign that have reader boards—for instance, restricting the height of sign, making stricter standards, allowing them on monument signs only for example.

There was a general consensus that electronic signs would cheapen the look of the town; also a consensus that the manual changeable copy signs were okay. Commissioners stated that they'd like to eliminate the electronic signs all-together.

Vice-Chairman Kropf also stated that she'd like to remove the allowance of temporary flags on properties. In response to this statement the other Commissioners questioned and began discussion on whether American flags are okay; whether there should be an allowance for holidays; whether new businesses should be given 30 days to advertise; and questions of the Planner if State and American flags could be allowed without allowing the others. Planner Jacks responded that State and American flags were generally not recognized as a "sign".

There was a discussion about changing the term "predominately" to a standard so that the requirement was not subjective. Staff's suggestion was 50% so conversation regarding size took place from this mark, with comments stating that they believed 50% was a good number. There was a comment that the clarity of the standard would make it easier to follow.

Conversation began on "island lots" and highway frontage and whether businesses without highway frontage should be allowed to have it. The general unanimity was that if businesses were off the highway they were aware of the inability to advertise on the highway and should expect the need to use other means of advertising.

Back to electronic signs. Commissioner Rodney asked CA Daykin and if we have them did he hear him say that CA Daykin was suggesting that they only be allowed in a monument sign. He also stated that City Council's goal was to have an electronic reader board sign. Comments about if they were going to do it then it should look as aesthetically pleasing as possible and one way to do that was the monument sign. It was also noted by the Commission that they didn't need to agree with City Council's goal.

Planner Jacks talked about making a change regarding minor and major variances, which no longer are allowed in the code overall. There was also discussion about changing the language regarding the percentages dictating the type of land use process to be more specific (to "20% or less" = adjustment; "more than 20%" = variance). General agreement that the suggested language would work.

Conversation began about the date of conversion requiring all signs to be compliant to the sign code. There were comments that the date should be moved up to January 1, 2018 to coincide with the opening of the bypass and highway improvements. Concern about whether some people already had their current signs on an amortization. CA Daykin stated that when the code was written the thought process was that when a new business came in all non-conforming signs for the property needed to be brought current. Vice-Chairman Kropf stated that she would like the recommendation to move the date be included in the recommendation to City Council. The Planning Commission agreed with this request.

There was a question about who could go out and measure signs and make the list of non-conforming ones. It was suggested that a volunteer group be formed to do this job. Planner Jacks responded that due to liability issues this would not be a good idea. There was a comment that the City had employees and that if something was a priority—like the sign code— the employees could be pulled off of what they are doing for a week. Planner Jacks stated that in his experience it would take more than a week.

A brief review of the code requirements for a-frame signs took place in conjunction with a question by the Commission about whether there were any standards the Commission wanted to change.

CA Daykin asked for final clarification about whether the Commission wanted to retain the current standards on electronic signs. Remove = 5, Keep = 1. Commissioner Rodney stated that he wasn't crazy about having electronic signs but felt that the difference between 4sqft and 6sqft is minimal, but he would like to see design standards addressing the aesthetics if it was to move forward.

CA Daykin stated that the public hearing would be in September; he believed that marijuana issues might be in the August meeting. CA Daykin also stated that there might be a need to clean up the language regarding lighting standards in the sign code so that might also come back for discussion.

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

CA Daykin stated that they submitted the streetscape design to the state and finally received comments back. He gave a summary of those suggested changes.

## **VI. Adjournment**

Moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Meeting was adjourned.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
~~Gerald Fiedler~~, Chairman (Vice)  
Michele Kropp

ATTEST:

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