

CITY OF DUNDEE  
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA  
City Council Meeting Chambers  
620 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Dundee, OR 97115  
P.O. Box 220

---

**MEETING DATE: September 16, 2015**  
**Meeting Time: 7:00pm**

---

- I. Call Meeting to Order.**
- II. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meetings**
  - 1) February 18, 2015
  - 2) July 15, 2015
  - 3) August 19, 2015
- III. Public Comment**
- IV. Public Hearing:**  
**LURA 15-12, City of Dundee Sign Code Amendments**
- V. Planning Issues from Commission Members**
- VI. Adjournment**

The City Council chambers are accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired, or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities, should be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to Melody Osborne, Planning Secretary at 503-538-3922.

# CITY OF DUNDEE

---

**Meeting:** Joint City Council / Planning Commission Meeting

**Location:** Dundee Fire Station  
801 N. Highway 99W  
Dundee, Oregon 97115

**Date:** February 18, 2015

**Time:** 7:00 p.m.

---

## I. Meeting called to order.

Planning Commissioners present were Gerald Fiedler, David Hinson, Danny Sikkens, Isaiah Cox, Gary Rodney, Francisco Stoller, and Michelle Kropf.

Council members present were Mayor David Russ, Doug Pugsley, Ted Crawford, Storr Nelson, Kristen Svicarovich, and Ted Weaver.

Absent: Councilor Jeanette Adlong.

Also in attendance were City Administrator Rob Daykin, City Engineer Charles Eaton, City Planner Jessica Pelz, Carl Springer with DKS, Shayna Rehberg with Angelo Planning Group, and Terry Cole with ODOT. Property owners and citizens Tom and Kay Edwards were in the audience.

Mayor Russ opened the meeting and gave a brief statement about the importance of the TSP, and voicing any opinions or concerns.

## II. Transportation System Plan Workshop

Councilor Svicarovich also stated for the record that she is an employee of DKS Associates, the consultant working on the TSP; she worked with the Oregon Government Ethics Commission to help make a determination on potential conflict. She stated that in terms of the discussion occurring that evening she did not believe she had a statutory conflict of interest. Her actions, decisions or recommendations as an individual and as a group member of the voting party would only become a potential conflict of interest if it resulted in a (word unintelligible) gain or detriment via a contract amendment to the contract held between DKS Associates and the Oregon Department of Transportation. Mayor Russ paraphrased Councilor Svicarovich's statement affirming that she would need to directly make money for her to have a conflict of interest.

Mr. Springer began by giving an overview of the agenda for the evening, planning process, and history of the progression leading up to this meeting. He also reviewed the key changes that the Draft TSP made to the existing TSP and then began the presentation.

### Points of Discussion Included:

*(\*\*Please Note: Many of the following discussions were drowned out due to background noise and simultaneous talking, or unintelligible due to the distance of the speaker to the microphone.)*

## Maps

- 1) The current and future name of SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street. Concern was expressed that the future name should be given in the draft/final version. CA Daykin responded that it wasn't on the map because there were variables as to specific location.
- 2) Discussion about why a future road was not shown on the map. The explanation given was that since it would be very difficult to get the road built by the county/state, it was not (yet) reasonable to identify it on the TSP.
- 3) Questions about why the 11<sup>th</sup> street connection was not identified. City Engineer Eaton responded that there were some corrections that had not been put on/changed on the map being shown.
- 4) Questions about Linden Lane and the potential connection and how it was meant as a possible means off/around Highway 99W.
- 5) It was confirmed that C2 and C3 (referring to traffic control signals) were funded with the Transportation Enhancement Grant. Answer was affirmative that they were part of the highway upgrades. Continued discussion regarding the type and style of intersection crossings.
- 6) There was argument about whether the SW 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Alder Street connection was necessary. Viewpoints expressed included that from a pedestrian standpoint it was a nice walk; concern that the connection would pull people from 9<sup>th</sup> down to 7<sup>th</sup> and traffic would back up; that people would likely take Alder once it was developed. It was noted that the connection could be made for emergency access only and that the connection was a request from the Fire Chief.
- 7) Councilor Weaver stated that he wanted more crosswalks in downtown, specifically at 10<sup>th</sup> Street. CA Daykin noted that the City did not have jurisdiction of the highway.
- 8) Discussion about traffic on Worden Hill Road down to 9<sup>th</sup> and concern over whether they would be bottlenecked in.
- 9) It was noted that City Council had discussed connectivity from the SW to the SE side and that the options reviewed were 9<sup>th</sup> Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and 11<sup>th</sup> Street. Ultimately, 11th Street was chosen.

Planner Pelz asked for a consensus on the Alder/7<sup>th</sup> connection. Voting results: Take the connection out. The question was then asked whether a policy should be drafted to explore the possibility of keeping the connection in the plan as a bike/pedestrian or emergency connection. The consensus was to draft policy.

## Streets

- 1) A question was posed about skinny streets and whether the City should allow 28-foot streets with parking on both sides as an option. Voting results: yes- in constrained situations.
- 2) Discussion was held on collector streets widths and sidewalks.
- 3) Discussion about how the Code could be manipulated to adjust for special circumstances constraints.

## Implementing Code:

There was discussion regarding sidewalks and how the determination was made as to which sidewalks were aspirational, likely, etc. This was answered that the decisions were made via a scoring system. A lengthy discussion regarding shifting priorities took place and concluded with City Planner Pelz suggesting that the Council and Commission look at the sidewalk priorities and see what they might shift on the priorities list in order to move W11 (Elm Street area between SE 9<sup>th</sup> and SE 10<sup>th</sup> Streets) up on the list and to send these suggestions in an email.

Staff requested direction on whether collector streets should have sidewalks on both sides; and, if infill development should be required or if a deferral would be allowed. There was discussion on

this topic that neared conclusion when the City Engineer informed the joint bodies of the rule that some cities used to have in place allowing a contractor to delay putting the final lift of asphalt in until 75% of the homes were built- at which time the developer would need to come back and install it. He stated that he felt sidewalks should have a similar requirement. There was a comment made that the 50% rule could apply to both infill and subdivisions, but that there should also be a sunset clause.

Planner Pelz suggested language All new development, including single-family homes, should put in a sidewalk unless granted a deferral by the City. There was clarification on infill and whether the requirement meant that if 50% of the street had deferrals or if 50% of the sidewalk on a street was built. It seemed that general consensus was that it should be for both. A reminder was given that a sunset clause had been suggested.

Conversation moved to collector streets. The consultants explained the proposed policy regarding sidewalks was that there should be sidewalks on both sides unless there were constraints. There were different variables and streets discussed and measured against the proposed policy. It was suggested to require sidewalks on both sides for new development, but only on one side for redevelopment. Clarification on this last that and whether deferrals should be granted and how the determination would be made about which side of the street should get the sidewalk. Concern was expressed about needing language to show the public how the side of the street was going to be determined. A language suggestion was made for all new collectors shall have sidewalks on both sides, however old ones will be developed on at least one side determined by topographical and environmental constraints.

It was commented on by several members present that at this time a deferral was effectively a waiver. The response to this comment was that they would like to see those deferrals acted on and those sidewalks built.

Questions on the tech memo included whether it was a possibility to delete the word new with regard to the bypass design instead of deleting the entire section (which led to some discussion regarding the buffer design). This concluded with the request to leave the language in for possible future need.

The consultants, engineer, and planner requested that any additional comments the Council and Commission had be submitted by the 25<sup>th</sup> after which the final draft would be drafted and published on the website. The overall timeline was discussed.

## **VI. Adjournment**

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

---

Gerald Fiedler, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Melody Osborne, Planning Secretary

# 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

ATTEST:

---

Melody Osborne, Planning Secretary

# CITY OF DUNDEE

---

**Meeting:** Planning Commission Meeting

**Location:** City Council Meeting Chambers  
620 S.W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Dundee, Oregon 97115

**Date:** August 19, 2015

**Time:** 7:00 p.m.

---

## I. Meeting called to order.

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

Also in attendance were City Administrator Rob Daykin and Interim City Planner Jim Jacks.

## II. Sign Code Discussion

Planner Jacks read the staff memo into record. He stated that although the example pertaining to illumination from Keizer was written with %nits+after discussion with the City of Keizer it turned out that %nits+are very difficult to measure. He therefore stated that instead of relying on the objective number standards to change the language to give the City Administrator the ability to make a determination-- in effect, using a nuisance approach. He also stated that he'd like to do more research prior to the public hearing to come back and see if there is any wording in the general Ordinances that can be changed to better address the lightening standards.

Commissioner Cox stated that a lot of cities do not allow white and blue. He also stated that he wasn't sure about whether he agreed with the trademark statement due to other widely known businesses having to change their trademarks. Planner Jacks responded that it was a risk depending upon the business and how determined they are to have their logo on their sign.

Vice-Chairman Kropf stated that the cities represented were larger and had more traffic; she also commented that it seemed simpler to take them out of the code since that's what the Planning Commission had talked about the last two meetings.

Commissioner Cox agreed that Commissioner Kropf did have the simplest approach. However, he stated that if it was something that was going to go forward he wanted to try to make sure that some safety measures for colors were in place. He noticed from the Dark Sky Ordinance that the language was almost directly taken from the International Dark Sky Association website and that their recommendation was to remove white and blue bulbs as these colors were a safety concern.

Commissioner Stoller stated that he believed electronic signs were trashy.

Commissioner Rodney stated that he had a concern that if they were to adopt standards for electronic signs his concern about not allowing dissolving or fading copy would unintentionally create a flashing copy. He believed that the dissolving would be a more pleasing effect.

Chairman Fiedler stated that the one minute came from the original sign code revision because it had to do with time and temperature. It was the intent to not have scrolling or flashing signs. He also stated that a person wasn't going to be able to see the entire message and there were safety concerns regarding a driver watching the sign instead of a road.

Commissioner Hinson stated that it was his recollection that the conversation had to do with safety.

Commissioner Stoller stated that he did not see a fit for Dundee when a changeable copy sign or banner worked as well without the flashing and changing.

Commissioner Cox asked if it was possible to make a recommendation to City Council that they did not want electronic message signs with a contingency that if they decided to adopt the allowance that Planning Commission recommended certain things.

It was questioned who initiated the process and what that process was to be; also whether CA Daykin had an idea of which way Council would vote. CA Daykin responded that he did not have a determination.

There was talk about the concerns- rather than stating that Planning Commission didn't want electronic signs period- there was explanation of the specific concerns. (Examples given were the concerns that the entire town would be blanketed with electronic signs; and that they wanted to maintain a small-town feel.)

There was discussion about using lumen standards. CA Daykin stated that they were still looking into this possibility but hadn't found a workable one yet. It was suggested to look at cities that were the same size as Dundee for the standards they had in place. It was also suggested to look at the National Dark Sky website since they had recommendations for city planners.

Planner Jacks asked for staff direction on what to bring forward for the public hearing next month. It was questioned whether the Order of Recommendation could start being worked on now. Worry was expressed that Council would only look at the message that the Planning Commission did not want electronic signs and not received the message as to why they were opposed to them. It was expressed that they wanted to make sure that City Council would look at the reasons behind the opposition.

Planner Jacks reviewed the proposed changes point-by-point. He also added that the City could make it a requirement that specifications be submitted with a sign permit application giving the nits/lumens/light measurements.

Commissioner Cox stated that when he was researching nits on Google all he could find was that it was used to measure the light emitted from a computer screen. He stated that what he also found was that there was a heat index.

Continued discussion on how to measure light; what types of copy changes would be best; and, safety regarding bulb colors.

The workshop discussion was concluded with a final discussion on the desire to write the Order of Recommendation in such a way that expressed the Commission's desire to not allow electronic signs, but also recommend standards should the Council desire to keep these types of signs in the code. An explanation of the hearing process and when the recommendation would be written was given.

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

There were no issues presented by the Commission.

### **IV. Adjournment**

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

---

Gerald Fiedler, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Melody Osborne, Planning Secretary

# Memorandum

TO: Dundee Planning Commission  
FROM: Jim Jacks, Interim City Planner  
CC: Rob Daykin, City Administrator  
DATE: September 16, 2015  
SUBJECT: LURA 15-12, Sign Regulation Amendments  
Proposed Sign Code Amendments -- Section 17.306, Development Code  
Proposed Adjustment/Variance Clarification – 17.406, Development Code  
Proposed Definition amendments – 17.501, Development Code

---

## Background

Early in 2015 the City Council initiated amendments to the Dundee Development Code's Sign Regulations. On April 15, 2015 the Planning Commission received a Memo from the City Planner, Jessica Pelz, which listed four bullet points identifying issues for the Commission to consider and it included proposed draft sign amendments to Section 17.306 and proposed definition amendments to Section 17.501.

Interspersed in the proposed draft amendments were comments and questions about specific subsections. The last page of the proposed draft amendments included additional issues for the Commission to discuss.

The four bullet points addressed the following issues.

1. Ordinance 498-2010 addressed nonconforming signs and was adopted October 19, 2010. It was effective on November 19, 2010. It is now Section 17.306.040, B, 1, b, which states (see b in italics):

"1. A nonconforming sign shall be removed upon verification that any of the following conditions have been met:

a. The use of the property with such nonconforming sign has been abandoned for more than two consecutive years:

b. *The regulation or amendment to these regulations which made the sign nonconforming has been in effect for 10 years or more; (emphasis added)*

c. The development site is granted land use approval for a Type II or Type III request; or

d. The sign is a temporary sign."

Subsection b, above, requires all signs made nonconforming after Subsection b was effective on November 19, 2010 are to be removed within 10 years of the date the sign became nonconforming. Subsection b is not retroactive, i.e., a sign made nonconforming before November 19, 2010 is not affected by Subsection b. The April 15 memo asked if a date of January 1, 2021 should be set for signs that were made nonconforming before November 19, 2010. The Commission decided the final version of the proposed amendments should not include a January 1, 2021 date.

2. Does the four square foot limit for electronic changeable copy signs in Section 17.306.060, D, need to be clarified so it is clear the four square feet refers to the sign face and not the entire sign? The Commission decided

the final version of the proposed amendments should clarify the language making it clear the four square feet refers to the area of the sign face.

3. Should island lots (no street frontage or access via an easement) or flag lots (lots with limited street frontage) be granted some allowance for an additional freestanding sign on an adjacent street fronting lot to benefit the island lot or flag lot? The Commission heard oral comments regarding allowing more signage for flag lots in the commercial districts and allowing signage for landlocked parcels (parcels with no frontage on a public street). The Commission discussed the proposed amendments and the written and oral comments. The Commission decided the final version of the proposed amendments should not include additional signage for island lots and flag lots.

4. Should freestanding signs be allowed within the right-of-way in areas otherwise used for landscaping? The specific issue was related to a landscaped area in the right-of-way for Highway 99W. ODOT was contacted and they indicated they do not allow signs by private parties in their rights-of-way. An April 15, 2015 letter from Mr. Joe Buck of Gubanc's/Babica HenHarvest was received by the Commission. It inquired about allowing signage in the Highway 99W landscaped right-of-way in front of the Inn at Red Hills and Babica Hen Cafe. The Commission discussed the proposed amendments and the written and oral comments. The Commission decided the final version of the proposed amendments should not allow freestanding signs in street rights-of-way. As part of the discussion for Item 4,

On July 15, 2015 the Planning Commission received a Memo from the Interim City Planner, Jim Jacks, which included language consistent with the consensus achieved on April 15 regarding the amendments and issues discussed that evening. It also included additional proposed draft sign amendments to Sections 17.306, Signs, 17.406, Adjustments/Variances, and 17.501, Definitions.

The proposed changes to Section 17.406 were related to ensuring clarity between the terms Adjustment and Variance, i.e., an Adjustment is for 20% or less of a quantifiable standard and a Variance is for more than 20% of a quantifiable standard.

On July 15 the Commission also discussed electronic changeable copy signs and asked staff to return on August 19 with additional information. The concerns related to brightness, hold time, transition and color. On August 19, 2015 the Planning Commission received a Memo from the Interim City Planner which included information regarding electronic changeable copy signs and proposed draft language to address the concerns. The Commission discussed the additional information and the language in the September 16 proposed amendments is consistent with that discussion.

### List of Proposed Amendments

The following list describes the proposed amendments. A "mark-up" copy of the proposed amendments is attached to this staff report.

1. 17.306.030, C. Design Standards. The reference to the Victorian Overlay is deleted because the Victorian Overlay was deleted previously through a Development Code update.
2. 17.306.030, C, 1. Design Standards. The term "primarily" is replaced with "At least 50%..." to replace a subjective criterion with an objective criterion. The sign permit program is intended to be an "over the counter" issuance based on objective criteria. Provided the criteria are objective, no notice to surrounding land owners and no appeal is provided. If the objective criteria are met, there is no issue upon which to appeal. Additionally in C, 1, the phrase "letters and graphics" is used in the first sentence and it is proposed the reference to only "letters" in the second sentence be changed to "letters and graphics" to ensure the first and second sentences are consistent.

3. 17.306.030, C, 2. Design Standards. The term “predominantly” is replaced with “At least 50%...” to replace a subjective criterion with an objective criterion.
4. 17.306.050, B. Appeals and Variances. The title is changed to read “Adjustments and Variances” because with objective criteria no appeals will be allowed. The references to appeals are deleted because no appeals will be allowed due to the objective criteria. The references to Minor Variances and Major Variances are replaced with Adjustments and Variances because Adjustments and Variances are the terms used in 17.403. It is clarified that no adjustments to the sign regulations are allowed and any changes to the regulations must be approved by the Planning Commission through the Variance process.
5. 17.306.060, D. Changeable Copy. Add "of sign face" to clarify that the 25 square foot and 4 square foot figures refer to the sign face. Add regulations for electronic display signs to address brightness (0.3 footcandles), hold time (at least 1 minute), transition (fade/dissolve within period of not more than 2 seconds), and design (electronic signs must be freestanding monument type signs, not pole signs or wall signs).
6. 17.306.060, E, 4. Prohibited Signs. Add "of sign face" to clarify that the 4 square foot figure refers to the sign face.
7. 17.501. Definitions. Amend L, "Changeable copy sign" to delete "(for example, time and temperature units)". Local government sign regulations cannot control the content of signs, thus referring to the content of a sign in the definition is inappropriate.
8. 17.406.030, A. Adjustments. The current language differentiating between an Adjustment and a Variance defines an Adjustment as less than 20% and a Variance as more than 20%. It is not clear if exactly 20% is an Adjustment or a Variance. Clarify that an Adjustment is for 20% or less of a quantifiable standard and a Variance is for more than 20% of a quantifiable standard.

## Proposed Amendments

The “mark-up” copy of the proposed amendments is at Exhibit “A” to the attached Planning Commission Order of Recommendation.

## Findings

The findings are at Exhibit "B" to the attached Planning Commission Order of Recommendation.

## Staff Recommendation

At the September 16, 2015 hearing, staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Consider the staff memo and any public testimony.
2. Accept the findings (Exhibit "B") showing the proposal is consistent with city and state policies.
3. Pass a motion recommending the City Council adopt the draft proposed Sign Amendments. The Planning Commission recommendation would be forwarded to the City Council for a public hearing and final decision.

### **Attachment:**

Planning Commission Order of Recommendation with:

Exhibit “A”: Draft Proposed Sign Amendments

Exhibit “B”: Findings



EXHIBIT "B"

PLANNING COMMISSION ORDER OF RECOMMENDATION

PROPOSED SIGN AMENDMENTS

The proposed new language is in **bold underlining** and the language proposed to be deleted is with ~~strikeout~~.

The amendments are found at:

Page 5, at Section 17.306.030, C. Design Standards.

Page 10, at Section 17.306.050, B. Sign Review Procedure.

Page 12, at Section 17.306.060, D. Changeable Copy.

Page 14, at Section 17.306.060, E, 4. Prohibited Signs.

Page 15 at Section 17.501. Definitions.

Page 16 at Section 17.406.030. Adjustments.

Sections with no proposed changes are shown with the Section Heading and ~~No changes.~~

**Chapter 17.306  
SIGNS**

Sections:

- [17.306.010](#) Purpose.
- [17.306.020](#) Measurement standards.
- [17.306.030](#) Development standards.
- [17.306.040](#) Nonconforming signs.
- [17.306.050](#) Sign review procedures.
- [17.306.060](#) Supplemental considerations.

**17.306.010 Purpose.** 

---

No change.

**17.306.020 Measurement standards.** 

---

No change.

The development standards contained in this section are categorized by nonresidential zones and residential zones. The residential zone category, for the purposes of this chapter, shall include the R-1 single-family residential, R-2 single-family residential, and the R-3 medium density residential zones. The nonresidential zone category shall include all other zones.

**A. Wall Signs.**

**1. Nonresidential Zones.**

- a. At least 20 square feet of wall signage shall be allowed for each building frontage.
- b. For single story structures the basic allowance for wall signs shall be limited to one square foot of sign area for each linear foot of building frontage length. Additional permitted sign area may be increased by one-half square foot for each additional building floor above one floor. The total sign area on a building frontage shall not exceed 150 square feet. Each building frontage may have multiple wall signs as long as the total wall sign area does not exceed the allowances established for wall signs.
- c. The projection of the sign face shall not exceed a distance of 12 inches from the face of the wall to which the sign is attached, except as allowed for projecting signs under subsection (A)(1)(g) of this section.
- d. The sign shall be placed on the wall that is used to calculate the total area allowance.
- e. Awning signs shall be considered wall signs for the purposes of this code and permitted according to the following:
  - i. Awning signs are permitted only as an integral part of the awning to which they are attached or applied.
  - ii. The awning shall maintain a minimum height of eight feet above grade.
  - iii. An awning shall not extend to within two feet from the curb face.
  - iv. The awning sign shall extend no more than eight feet from the building face.
  - v. An awning shall not project above the roofline.

f. Roof signs shall be considered wall signs for the purposes of this code and permitted according to the following:

i. The signs shall not exceed the highest point of the roof to which they are attached.

ii. The signs shall be located on the roof directly above the building frontage used to calculate the permitted area.

g. Projecting wall signs shall be considered wall signs for the purposes of this code and permitted according to the following:

i. The bottom of the sign shall be a minimum of eight feet above grade; the sign shall not project more than four feet from the wall of the building on which the sign is placed and may not be closer than two feet from the face of the curb; and the height shall not exceed the highest point of the wall to which it is attached.

h. An exterior window sign shall be considered a wall sign for the purposes of this code.

i. Canopy signs are permitted, in addition to the allowance for wall signs. Canopy signs shall have a maximum area of six square feet; the bottom of the sign shall be a minimum of eight feet above the sidewalk; the height shall not exceed the highest point of the roof; the sign shall not project more than 12 inches from the face of the canopy; and adjacent canopy signs shall not be closer than 25 feet.

## 2. Residential Zones.

a. The basic area allowance for wall signs is as follows:

i. Single-family and two-family (duplex) dwelling: the total sign area shall not exceed six square feet.

ii. Multiple-family dwelling: the total sign area shall not exceed 24 square feet.

iii. Nonresidential uses: the total sign area shall not exceed one square foot for each foot of building frontage, not to exceed a maximum total area of 100 square feet.

b. Each lot may have multiple signs. The total aggregated sign area shall not exceed the allowances in subsection (A)(2)(a) of this section.

- c. The sign shall not be a roof sign.
- d. An exterior window sign shall be considered a wall sign for the purposes of this code.

## B. Freestanding Signs.

### 1. Nonresidential Zones.

- a. One freestanding sign shall be allowed per lot frontage. One additional freestanding sign shall be permitted for every 150 feet of lot frontage. Each sign shall be located a minimum distance of 50 feet from another freestanding sign located on the same lot.
- b. The combined area of all freestanding signs along one lot frontage shall be a maximum of four-tenths square foot for each foot of lineal lot frontage. The maximum area of any single sign shall not exceed 50 square feet. At least 20 square feet is allowed per frontage.
- c. The maximum height shall not exceed 12 feet.
- d. No portion of a freestanding sign shall be in, or project over, a public right-of-way.

### 2. Residential Zones.

- a. The basic area allowance for freestanding signs is as follows:
  - i. Single-family dwelling, two-family (duplex) dwelling, and vacant lots: the total sign area shall not exceed six square feet.
  - ii. Multiple-family dwelling: the total sign area shall not exceed 30 square feet.
  - iii. Nonresidential uses: the total sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet.
  - iv. Monument sign for subdivisions: the monument sign area shall not exceed 30 square feet. Monument signs are permitted as described in subsection (B)(2)(f) of this section.
- b. One sign shall be permitted for each lot frontage.

- c. The height of the sign shall not exceed six feet, measured from the ground to the top of the sign face.
- d. The sign may be located in any yard.
- e. No portion of a freestanding sign shall be in, or project over, a public right-of-way.
- f. In addition to the allowance for freestanding signs in residential zones, one monument sign may be permitted at each street entrance of a residential subdivision that comprises 20 or more lots. The height of the additional sign may not exceed a height of six feet. The additional sign may be located in any yard.

C. Design Standards.

<b>SIGN DESIGN STANDARDS</b>
<p>These design standards apply to:</p> <p>All signs larger than six square feet in nonresidential zones.</p> <p>Institutional uses in residential zones if the use abuts Hwy 99W.</p> <p><del>The sign design standards supersede other development code requirements for signs, including those in the Victorian overlay and DMC <a href="#">17.203.040</a>.</del></p> <p>All signs must incorporate at least two of the design elements below, except signs with internally illuminated faces must include at least three of the design elements.</p>
<p>1. <b>At least 50 percent of</b> <del>±</del> the sign <del>primarily</del> includes raised or engraved individual letters or graphics on a background wall or sign face (raised or engraved depth at least one-half inch). Letters <b>or graphics</b> made from neon tube lighting are one type of raised letters.</p>
<p>2. <b>At least 50% of</b> <del>±</del> the outline or top of the sign frame (or the letters and graphics if no frame) is <del>predominantly</del> curved or nonrectangular.</p>
<p>3. The sign incorporates stone, masonry, sculpted metal, wrought iron, or natural wood as a frame or background (not plywood, particle board or other wood composite).</p>
<p>4. The sign is indirectly illuminated or non-illuminated.</p>

<b>SIGN DESIGN STANDARDS</b>
5. If internally illuminated then no more than 50 percent of the face is light-colored.
6. Freestanding sign is no more than six feet tall.
7. For wall signs, total sign area is at least 20 percent below maximum allowed on that building frontage. For freestanding signs, sign area is at least 20 percent below the total area allowed for that sign.
8. Installing only one freestanding sign on a lot that qualifies for two or more freestanding signs.

D. Temporary Signs.

1. Generally Permitted. Each lot may be permitted one temporary sign. The sign shall not exceed six square feet. The sign may be in any yard, but not in the public right-of-way. The sign is permitted for 90 days out of any consecutive 365-day period.

2. Additional Temporary Signs. In addition to the generally permitted temporary signs, a lot may contain any of the following additional temporary signs during the time periods specified below:

a. Election Events. An election event begins 90 days prior to and ends 14 days after any public election. During this event a lot may contain up to 12 square feet of additional temporary signage in a residential zone, and up to 50 square feet of additional temporary signage in nonresidential zones. These signs shall not be located in the public right-of-way.

b. Special Events. Each lot may be permitted additional signs for other events including, but not limited to: grand openings, clearance sales, garage sales, local festivals, birthdays, religious events, and/or federal holidays. Each lot may be permitted to have signage for one special event in one consecutive 30-day period. The signage may be permitted for three consecutive days. Each lot may be permitted an unlimited number of signs not to exceed a total of 12 square feet in a residential zone, and 50 square feet in a nonresidential zone. These signs shall not be located in the public right-of-way.

c. Construction Events. Signs may be placed during a construction event pursuant to a permit issued by the city on the lot, provided total number does not exceed four and total

cumulative size does not exceed 64 square feet. For the purposes of this subsection, a construction event begins on the date of local structural permit approval and ends on the date the permit is final or expires. These signs shall not be placed in the public right-of-way.

d. Sales Event.

i. On property which has received subdivision or development approval from the city, from that approval until issuance of a building permit for the last lot to be sold or completion of the development project, one temporary sign not exceeding 32 square feet in area and eight feet in height is allowed on properties less than four acres in size, or two temporary signs not exceeding 32 square feet in area each and eight feet in height are allowed on properties greater than four acres in size.

ii. Existing Development. A post-style sign not exceeding six square feet in area and five feet in height, or a hanging-style sign not exceeding six square feet in area and six feet in height, during the time of sale, lease or rental of the property; provided, that the sign is removed within 15 days of the sale, lease or rental of the property. An additional sign of the same size may be erected if the property borders a second street and the signs are not visible simultaneously. On lots of more than two acres the sign area may be increased to 32 square feet. In no case shall the sign or signs be erected for more than 12 months.

e. Portable Daily Sign. A portable sign may be permitted to be located in the public right-of-way or on private property in any nonresidential zone, provided the following:

i. No more than one sign per business with the permission of the owner/operator of the adjacent business. An exception is allowed for single businesses with long frontages; an additional sign is allowed for every 100 feet of frontage.

ii. The sign area shall not exceed a total of six square feet per side. The area of the sign within the right-of-way shall not be included in the total allowed area for other temporary signs on the adjacent lot.

iii. The sign is self-supporting (e.g., A-frame or sandwich board sign). The sign shall not be attached to any structure or object including, but not limited to, utility poles, mailboxes, trees, and governmental signs.

iv. A minimum five-foot horizontal travel and fire hydrant clearance shall be provided on the sidewalk. The sign shall not be placed on the street or in any on-street parking area, and shall not interfere with the vision clearance requirements of this code.

v. The sign shall be removed during nonbusiness hours of the adjacent business.

3. Signs for Temporary Businesses. Temporary businesses may display temporary or portable signs, other than trailer-mounted reader boards or any sign that includes flashing or rotation lights or moving parts. The cumulative size of all such signs may not exceed 32 square feet. All temporary signs must be placed within 10 feet of the structure or vehicle used for the temporary business and may not be placed within any public right-of-way.

4. Design.

a. All temporary signs shall be portable signs.

b. The maximum height for temporary signs shall not exceed six feet.

E. Signs Allowed Without Permit. The following signs are permitted in all zones without a permit but still shall meet all requirements of this code and the Oregon Structural Specialty Code. All other signs not listed in subsection (D) of this section, including but not limited to wall signs and freestanding signs, require permit approval prior to construction. The following signs shall not be included when determining compliance with total allowed area or number of other signs that require a permit.

1. Temporary signs that meet the standards of subsection (D) of this section.

2. Signs entirely within a building including interior window signs.

3. Signs not visible from a right-of-way.

4. Address identification signs.

5. One flag display is permitted on each street frontage. An unlimited number of displays is permitted on any legal holiday or city council designated festival.

6. Driveway Signs. In addition to the other signs allowed, a lot in any zone may contain signs with the following conditions:

- a. For lots with one driveway, two signs shall be permitted at the driveway entrance or exit.
- b. If a lot has more than one driveway, one sign shall be permitted for each driveway; and
- c. One sign shall be permitted at each internal drive aisle intersection.
- d. The area of each sign shall not exceed four square feet.
- e. The sign may be located in any yard.
- f. The height of the sign shall not exceed three feet. [Ord. 521-2013 § 3 (Exh.A)].

---

#### **17.306.040 Nonconforming signs.**



No change.

---

#### **17.306.050 Sign review procedures.**



A. Application Requirements. An application for sign permit approval shall be made on a form provided by the planning official. The application shall include, at a minimum:

1. A sketch drawn to scale that includes: the design, location, height, area, and type, shielding, and wattage of illumination.
2. A sketch drawn to scale showing the location and size of all existing signs on site.
3. Name, contact information, and address of the sign designer and/or contractor.
4. Signature of the property owner.
5. Application fee.
6. Submittal of a structural permit and application fees.

B. Appeals **Adjustments** and Variances. All appeals **applications for adjustments** and major variances regarding this chapter shall be heard by the planning commission **submitted, reviewed and decided in accordance with the process and approval criteria for a variance**. Minor variances **Adjustments** shall not be permitted regarding the sign standards contained in this chapter. [Ord. 521-2013 § 3 (Exh.A)].

**17.306.060 Supplemental considerations.** 

---

A. Construction Standards. The construction, erection, safety and maintenance of all signs shall comply with the current edition of the Oregon Structural Specialty Code and all of the following:

1. Signs shall be structurally sound and located so as to pose no reasonable threat to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
2. Banners are allowed only as temporary signs.
3. All freestanding signs shall have self-supporting structures erected on, or permanently attached to, concrete foundations.
4. Signs shall not be in locations that interfere with safe vehicular and pedestrian circulation or public safety signals and signs.
5. No signs shall be erected, constructed or maintained so as to obstruct any fire escape, required exit, window, or door opening used as a means of egress.
6. Signs may be illuminated by external or internal means; provided, that:
  - a. Light sources shall be shielded from all adjacent buildings and streets.
  - b. The lighting shall not create excessive glare to pedestrians and/or motorists, and will not obstruct traffic control or any other public informational signs.
  - c. The illumination meets the standards of Chapter [17.303](#) DMC, Exterior lighting.
  - d. The sign is not an animated sign.
  - e. In addition, signs in residential zones may only be indirectly illuminated by a concealed light source, shall not remain illuminated between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., and shall not flash, blink, or fluctuate.

B. Maintenance. All signs shall be maintained in accordance with the following:

1. The property owner shall maintain the sign: in a condition appropriate to the intended use; to all city standards; and has a continuing obligation to comply with all building code requirements.
2. All signs, excluding the sign structure, for a business shall be removed within 30 days after that business ceases to operate.
3. Illegal and abandoned signs which are not removed or are erected in violation of this chapter may be removed by the city of Dundee following notice to the property owner. The property owner will be assessed the cost of sign removal if the owner fails to remove the nonconforming, illegal or abandoned sign and the city exercises its authority under this provision.
4. If the sign is deemed by the planning official to be in an unsafe condition, the owner of the business shall be immediately notified in writing, and shall, within 72 hours of receipt of such notification, respond to the city with a plan to correct the unsafe condition, remove the unsafe sign, or cause it to be removed. If, after 30 days, the unsafe condition has not been corrected through repair or removal, the planning official may cause the repair or removal of such sign, at the expense of the property owner or lessee. If the total costs are not paid in full within 30 days of the repairs or removal, the amount owed shall be certified as an assessment against the property of the sign owner, and lien upon that property, together with an additional one percent penalty for collection as prescribed for unpaid real estate taxes.
5. In cases of emergency, the planning official may cause the immediate removal of a dangerous or defective sign without notice.
6. Whenever any sign, either conforming or nonconforming to these regulations, is required to be removed for the purpose of repair, relettering or repainting, the same may be done without a permit or without any payment of fees; provided, that all of the following conditions are met:
  - a. There is no alteration or remodeling to the structure or the mounting of the sign itself;
  - b. There is no enlargement or increase in any of the dimensions of the sign or its structure;
  - c. The sign is accessory to a legally permitted, conditional or nonconforming use.

C. Sign Lighting. Except as provided elsewhere in this code, all permanent signs may be internally illuminated, externally illuminated, or illuminated by exposed neon. The illumination of signs shall comply with the following standards:

1. When neon tubing is employed on the exterior or interior of a sign, the capacity of such tubing shall not exceed 300-milliampere rating for white tubing or 100-milliampere rating for any colored tubing. Exposed neon tube illumination is permitted on permanent signs in nonresidential zoning districts only.

2. No exposed reflective type bulb, PAR (parabolic aluminized reflector) spot or incandescent lamp, which incandescent lamp exceeds 250 lumens, shall be exposed to direct view from a public street or highway, but may be used for indirect light illumination of the display surface of a sign.

3. Exterior lighting shall meet the standards of DMC [17.303.020](#). The illumination level of all exterior sign lighting shall not exceed that necessary to illuminate and make legible a sign from the closest adjacent public right-of-way.

4. When fluorescent tubes are used for interior illumination of a sign such illumination shall not exceed:

a. Within residential districts, illumination equivalent to 425-milliampere rating tubing behind a sign face with tubes spaced at least seven inches, center to center.

b. Within nonresidential districts, illumination equivalent to 800-milliampere rating tubing behind a sign face spaced at least nine inches, center to center.

D. Changeable Copy. Changeable copy by non-electronic means may be utilized on any permitted sign, and is limited to a maximum of 25 square feet **of sign face**. Changeable copy by electronic means is limited to a maximum of four square feet **of sign face provided the electronic display sign is constructed, operated and continuously complies with the following provisions:**

**1. Illumination**

**a. An electronic display sign may not have an illumination intensity of more than 0.3 footcandles over ambient light measured at a distance from the sign face calculated as the square root of the product of the sign face area times 100.**

**b. The sign shall have a mechanism that automatically adjusts the illumination level to comply with the standards in Subsection 17.306.060, D, 1, a.**

**c. Electronic display signs shall be equipped with a mechanism that automatically adjusts the brightness in response to ambient conditions.**

**d. In addition to the standard of Subsection 17.306.060, D, 1, a, no electronic display sign shall be brighter than necessary for clear and adequate visibility, or of such brilliance or intensity as to present a hazard to persons traveling in the right-of-way. Upon notice by the City Administrator that a sign is out of compliance with these standards, the owner or operator of an electronic display sign shall immediately adjust the illumination of the sign.**

**2. No sign shall be of such intensity or brilliance that it interferes with the effectiveness of an official traffic sign, device or signal.**

**3. The party owning or controlling an electronic display sign shall adjust the sign to meet the brightness standards in accordance with the determination of the City Administrator or designee.**

**a. The adjustment shall be made within two (2) days of notice of non-compliance from the City Administrator or designee.**

**b. The party owning or controlling the electronic display sign may appeal the determination of the City Administrator or designee to the Planning Commission, using the public hearing process for Type III actions set forth in Section 17.401.**

**4. Electronic display signs shall be equipped with a means to immediately turn off the display when it malfunctions. The party owning or controlling an electronic display sign shall, within one (1) hour turn off the sign or lighting when notified by the City Administrator or designee that it is not in compliance with the standards of this section.**

**5. An application for a sign permit shall include documents from the sign manufacturer showing the illumination standards in Subsections 1, a, b, and c, and 4, above, are met.**

**6. A sign with an electronic display shall be a freestanding monument sign.**

**7. The message on an electronic display sign shall change no more than once each minute. The method of change shall be by fading or dissolving within no more than 2 seconds.**

E. Prohibited Signs. The following signs are prohibited:

1. Abandoned signs.
2. Animated, rotating signs and festoons, inflatable signs, tethered balloons, banners, pennants, search lights, streamers, exposed light bulbs, strings of lights not permanently mounted to a rigid background, and any clearly similar features, except special event signs or banners permitted in DMC [17.306.030\(D\)](#).
3. Interior window signs that exceed 25 percent of the total window area.
4. Electronic changeable copy signs that exceed four square feet **of sign face**.
5. Roof signs that project above the highest point of the roof.
6. Signs containing any words or symbols that would cause confusion because of their resemblance to highway traffic control or direction signals. Signs that obstruct required vision clearance area or obstruct a vehicle driver's view of official traffic control signs and approaching or merging traffic, or which present a traffic hazard.
7. Signs located on trees or utility poles.
8. Signs that emit odor, visible matter, or sound.
9. Signs that use or employ guy lines of any type.
10. Signs on unimproved property, unless allowed as a temporary sign by the provisions of this code.
11. Vehicle Signs. Signs on vehicles when the vehicle is placed in a location not otherwise permitted for parking such vehicles, any sign attached to an unlicensed or inoperable vehicle in the public right-of-way or on private property, and signs not permanently attached to any vehicle parked in the public right-of-way or on private property.

12. Any sign not permitted by this code.

F. Exempt Signs. All governmental signs located within the public right-of-way and any other notice or warning required by a valid and applicable federal, state or local law, regulation, or resolution are exempt from meeting the provisions of this chapter. [Ord. 521-2013 § 3 (Exh.A)].

### 17.501 Definitions

\*\*%Sign+means any name, figure, character, outline, display, announcement, or device, or structure supporting the same, or any other device of similar nature designed to attract attention outdoors, and shall include all parts, portions, units, and materials composing the same, together with the frame, background, and supports or anchoring thereof. A sign does not include any architectural or landscape features that may also attract attention. Additional sign definitions applicable to Chapter [17.306](#) DMC include the following:

A - K. No change.

L. "Changeable copy sign" means a sign or portion thereof on which the copy or symbols change either automatically through electrical or electronic means (~~for example, time and temperature units~~), or manually through placement of letters or symbols on a panel mounted in or on a track system.

M - MM. No change.

## Chapter 17.406 VARIANCES AND ADJUSTMENTS

Sections:

- [17.406.010](#) Purpose.
- [17.406.020](#) General provisions.
- [17.406.030](#) Adjustments.
- [17.406.040](#) Variances.
- [17.406.050](#) Expiration.

### 17.406.030 Adjustments.

A. Applicability. The planning official may authorize an adjustment when the request would result in ~~less than a~~ 20 percent change **or less** to a quantifiable standard, and where the criteria in subsection (B) of this section

are met. Any request to change a quantifiable standard by more than 20 percent would require a variance application.

B. Approval Criteria. An adjustment request shall be granted if an applicant demonstrates compliance with the following criteria:

1. The adjustment is consistent with the purpose and intent of the code standard(s) to be adjusted;
2. The adjustment would not create a conflict with or unreasonably impact adjacent uses; and
3. Approval of the adjustment does not create a violation of any other code standard or previous land use action. [Ord. 521-2013 § 3 (Exh.A)].

END OF PROPOSED SIGN AMENDMENTS.

EXHIBIT "B"

PLANNING COMMISSION ORDER OF RECOMMENDATION

FINDINGS

1. The Dundee Development Code (DDC), Section 17.405.020, Procedure, Subsection A, states:

"A. Except for corrections, amendments to development code or comprehensive plan text are legislative actions. Text amendments can be initiated by the city council or planning commission."

Finding. LURA 15-12, Sign Regulation Amendments, proposes changes to the DDC text, therefore it is a Legislative amendment per DDC, 17.405.020, A.

2. The DDC, Section 17.401.060, Type V (legislative review - city council decision), Subsection C, 3, states:

"3. At least 10 days before the scheduled city council public hearing date, public notice shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the city. "

Finding. Subsection 17.401.060, C, 3, does not apply to the Planning Commission hearing. At least 10 days before the scheduled city council public hearing date, anticipated to be October 20, 2015 at this time, public notice will be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the city.

3. The DDC, Section 17.405.020, Procedure, Subsection C, states:

"C. Proposals for a development code amendment must comply with applicable comprehensive plan goals and policies, statewide planning goals, and Oregon Administrative Rules."

Finding. The following findings address applicable comprehensive plan goals and policies, statewide planning goals, and Oregon Administrative Rules.

4. Applicable comprehensive plan goals and policies.

Finding. The Dundee Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies were carefully reviewed and it was concluded none of the goals or policies apply to the proposed sign regulation amendments.

5. Statewide Planning Goals.

Goal 1 - Citizen Involvement.

The purpose of Statewide Planning Goal 1 is, "to develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process."

The City of Dundee Planning Commission discussed the proposed sign amendments in public meetings on April 15, July 15 and August 19. Citizens attending those meetings were allowed to comment on the proposed amendments. The Planning Commission's public hearing is September 16 and the City Council public hearing is anticipated to be October 20 and citizen comments will be accepted at those hearings.

Finding. The proposed amendments meet Goal 1.

Goal 2 . Land Use Planning

Finding. The proposed amendments are based on inventory information, analyses of the information, considers alternatives and makes conclusions based on the information, the analyses and alternatives. Goal 2 is met.

Goal 3 . Agricultural Resources.

Finding. Goal 3 does not apply because agricultural resources are not affected.

Goal 4 . Forest Resources.

Finding. Goal 4 does not apply because forest resources are not affected.

Goal 5 - Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces.

Finding. Goal 5 does not apply because natural resources, scenic and historic areas and open spaces are not affected.

Goal 6 - Air, Water and Land Quality.

Finding. Goal 6 does not apply because air, water and land quality are not affected.

Goal 7 - Areas Subject to Natural Hazards.

Finding. Goal 7 does not apply because natural hazards are not affected.

Goal 8 - Recreational Needs.

Finding. Goal 8 does not apply because recreational needs are not affected.

Goal 9 . Economy.

Finding. Goal 9 does not apply because economic elements are not affected.

Goal 10 . Housing.

Finding. Goal 10 does not apply because housing resources are not affected.

Goal 11 - Public Facilities and Services.

Finding. Goal 11 does not apply because public facilities and services are not affected.

Goal 12 . Transportation.

Finding. Goal 12 does not apply because transportation resources are not affected.

Goal 13 - Energy Conservation.

Finding. Goal 13 does not apply because energy resources are not affected.

Goal 14 . Urbanization.

Finding. Goal 14 does not apply because the UGB is not affected.

6. Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR).

Finding. The Oregon Administrative Rules, Division 660, is the division of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission OAR's. The Division 660 OAR's were reviewed and it was concluded they do not apply to the proposed sign regulation amendments.