



**CITY of THE DALLES**

313 COURT STREET  
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058

(541) 296-5481 ext. 1125  
Planning Department

---

**AGENDA**  
**CITY OF THE DALLES PLANNING COMMISSION**  
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
313 COURT SREET  
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058  
*CONDUCTED IN A HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE MEETING ROOM*  
**THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2014**  
**6:00 PM**

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL
- III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 4, 2014
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT (Items not on the Agenda)
- VI. WORK SESSION – Sign Code Review
- VII. STAFF COMMENTS
- VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
- IX. FUTURE MEETING – October 2, 2014
- X. ADJOURNMENT

**CITY OF THE DALLES PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**Thursday, September 4, 2014**

City Hall Council Chambers  
313 Court Street  
The Dalles, OR 97058  
*Conducted in a handicap accessible room*  
6:00 PM

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Lavier called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Bruce Lavier, Chris Zukin, Mark Poppoff, John Nelson, Jeff Stiles

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Dennis Whitehouse

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Planning Director Richard Gassman, City Engineer Dale McCabe, Administrative Secretary Carole Trautman

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

It was moved by Zukin and seconded by Nelson to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried unanimously; Whitehouse absent.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

It was moved by Zukin and seconded by Nelson to approve the July 17, 2014 minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously; Whitehouse absent.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None

**WORK SESSION:**

Regarding the agenda packet's draft Street Network Map, Director Gassman stated that the Planning Commission did not select a network street in the southeast area of the city due to lack of development, but at some point in the future the City may want to review the street grid and add one in that area. Zukin clarified by stating that the Commission's goal was to select a minimum number of streets for the network with the smallest impact as possible on property owners and, at the same time, meet state requirements. Gassman said many of the streets selected had established improvements and won't need additional improvements, and most had a sufficient amount of right-of-way. It was the general consensus of the Commission and audience members present to accept the proposed network of streets as presented.

There was discussion on what should be considered the definition of "full improvements." It was the general consensus the term "full improvements" would include fully a paved street, curb, and at least one sidewalk; with an understanding that there could be exceptions on some network streets where needed (i.e. some streets such as 10<sup>th</sup> Street may require two sidewalks).

Chair Lavier pointed out that the proposed Street Network Map needed a revision: delete East 10<sup>th</sup> Street from Kelly to Dry Hollow Streets as a grid street, and designate E. 12<sup>th</sup> Street from Kelly to Thompson Streets as a grid street.

Director Gassman then addressed the issue as found on Old Dufur Road. When people submit a building permit for Old Dufur Road, the storm and sewer are addressed at the time of the permit, but the property owner needs to pay for sidewalk improvements. Gassman asked what Planning staff should tell these people: 1) put the improvements in; 2) pay into the fund; or 3) sign some sort of an agreement. Gassman pointed out that there were only two opportunities for improvements: one was at the time of a land division, the other was at the time of a building permit application. If the property owner installs sidewalks on Old Dufur Road, then the street has the “island” appearance. With an agreement, such as a Delayed Development Agreement (DDA), it could be many, many years before there were any improvements. People forget over time what was required, or new property owners come along with no clear understanding of an agreement at the time of the property purchase, Gassman explained.

Nelson suggested requiring something less than full improvements in that area. Zukin reminded the group that one option was a DDA with a cap and a sunset clause. Poppoff suggested doing away with the curb requirement. Lavier suggested to widen the paving on Old Dufur Road and call it good. Stiles suggested reconsidering Option #1 of the Commission’s memorandum to City Council as a solution—to designate the increased tax revenues towards street improvements that occur from increased property values generated by development of a vacant parcel.

Lavier said the costs should be shared between the City and the developer. Director Gassman reminded the Commission that the City was helping by doing the engineering work and paying for the storm water system.

After further discussion Gassman suggested that the Commission may want different requirements for different areas. Zukin suggested a DDA with a cap and a sunset clause that had specific numbers attached to them. There was general discussion regarding using a cap amount based on: 1) a percentage of the assessed or market value of the property at the time of develop; or 2) a cost estimate. If the latter was proposed, storm and engineering would need to be removed from the equation since the City was taking on those responsibilities, Gassman stated.

Taner Elliott, 397 Summit Ridge Drive, The Dalles, Oregon suggested another option whereby if a property owner signed a DDA at the time of development then later on wanted to be unencumbered by the DDA, the property owner could pay into the fund at that point in time.

After further discussion it was the general consensus of the Commission to develop several case scenarios of recent building permit developments in various areas and apply various options. Zukin requested cost estimates for sidewalks, paving and curbs. Staff will present the various case scenarios for further discussion at a future work session.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

Director Gassman outlined a strategy of topics for future Planning Commission work sessions as follows:

- September 18 – Sign Committee Recommendations
- October 2 – Residential Infill Staff Feedback
- October 16 – Sign Committee Feedback

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

None

**NEXT MEETING:**

September 18, 2014

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Lavier adjourned the meeting at 7:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Administrative Secretary Carole Trautman

---

Bruce Lavier, Chairman

**Richard Gassman**

---

**From:** Loyal Quackenbush <loyalq@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 03, 2014 9:55 AM  
**To:** Richard Gassman  
**Cc:** Stephen Lawrence; Taner Elliott; Alex Hattenhauer; Bruce Lavier  
**Subject:** Gene

Hi Dick,

Could you check with Gene on how he is doing with removing the non-remonstrance agreements?

Hopefully this will not be a year long process.

I cannot make the meeting tomorrow and have read the agenda. Before anyone is forced by the City to sign a delayed development agreement it needs to be defined. What the cost is, what is demanded and when does the agreement end. In my mind this cannot go back to council until the commission has something for the council to address on the brother of the non-remonstrance agreements.

Network streets..... There is no reason to have the southeast corner included in the network. It is basically farmland and at this time should not be included. It is rural and any developing will be minimal at best. How do you justify this?

I have paperwork on these issues dating back in 2005 and not much has changed.

The only constant is the inability to build in this town!

Loyal



## CITY of THE DALLES

313 COURT STREET  
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058

(541) 296-5481 ext. 1125  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

# MEMORANDUM

**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Richard Gassman, Director  
**Date:** September 18, 2014  
**Re:** Sign Code Discussion

**Introduction.** Last year the Planning Commission directed staff to form an advisory committee to review and propose changes to the City's sign code. A committee of seven citizens was selected and that group has been meeting since last fall to systematically review provisions of the sign code. The committee has recommended a variety of changes, both big and small. If approved, these changes will require amendments to the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance (LUDO).

**Process.** Any changes to the City's LUDO require public hearings at the Planning Commission and at the City Council. Prior to scheduling a public hearing, it is standard practice to use a work session like this to familiarize the Commission with the proposed changes. If the Commission decides to pursue any changes, the proposed LUDO amendments must be sent to LCDC for the required 35 day notice. After that time period, a public hearing can be scheduled for the Commission to hear public testimony and then forward a recommendation to the City Council. The Commission can hold any number of work sessions prior to a public hearing.

**General Comments.** The committee met approximately 20 times over a period of almost a year. The committee reviewed a wide variety of topics including murals, the historic districts, the downtown business zone, the general sign allowance, temporary signs, new technology, enforcement, signs in the right of way, and more. One of the main goals of the advisory committee was to simplify the sign code. Another was to allow as much flexibility as possible.

**Proposed Changes.** The language of the proposed changes is not yet in final form. Final language will be prepared after the Planning Commission has determined if these changes should be considered. At the work session on September 18, staff will go over each of the proposed changes, explain the reasoning behind the proposal, and answer questions from the Commissioners. If additional time is needed, another work session can be scheduled. Once the Commission is fully informed on the proposed changes, a public hearing will be held.

**Committee Proposals.** Here is the list of proposed changes forwarded by the advisory committee. For convenience, the list has been divided into groups by current code section. A few of the more significant changes include the following:

1. Allow business owners to place signs on more than one frontage, up to allowable square footage allotment. 13.050.040 A.
2. Allow freestanding signs in certain zones without the current restrictions. 13.040.040.
3. Change definition of mural to allow more art work. 13.030.010 L.
4. Restrict rapid changes in digital signs. 13.030.030.
5. Allow window signs on either inside or outside of window. 13.010.030.

Listed per current LUDO code sections.

A. Definitions: 13.010.030

1. 13.010.030. Delete the word “arterial” from the definition of shopping center.
2. 13.010.030. Add a definition for mural to read as follows: “Mural means any depiction, other than a business logo, not using words. A depiction which is a combination of scenes and words can be divided so that the sign area is limited to the area around the words.” **NEW**
3. 13.010.030. Add a definition for “ghost sign”: “Ghost sign is any sign, at least 50 years old, on a wall or other portion of a building which advertises a business, service, or product no longer found at that location”. **NEW**
4. 13.030.010. 1. Change heading to “garage/yard sale signs”.
5. 13.010.030. Define window signs as any sign “located on the outside of a building, but affixed to the window and within the boundaries of the window frame”. **NEW**
6. 13.010.030. Define “framed sign”. “A sign placed within a rigid border which prevents the sign from moving. A framed sign may be allowed within the total sign allowance, if possible. If not, then it is treated as a temporary sign and is allowed for up to 90 days.” **NEW**

B. Exempt Signs 13.030.010

1. 13.030.010. One 20 sf name sign in the CFO zone. **NEW**
2. 13.030.010. Window signs. **NEW**
3. 13.030.010 L. Murals not containing words or logos;
4. 13.030.010 T. Allow 32 square feet for “for sale” signs in commercial areas. Limit the allowance of one additional “For Sale or Open House” sign to residential zones.
5. 13.030.010 V. Allow 32 square foot maximum for subdivision signs.

6. 13.030.010 X 6: add “similar to ODOT regulations for number of signs.”

7. 13.030.010 Y. Ghost signs. **NEW**

C. Temporary Signs 13.030.020

1. 13.030.020. One temporary sign per street frontage is allowed in addition to the regular sign allowance, up to 90 days in duration. A no fee permit is required.
2. 13.030.020 D. Balloons and other inflatable devices, except during community events, are allowed only for a period of 7 days, and are allowed in addition to any other temporary sign. **NEW**

D. Prohibited Signs 13.030.030

1. 13.030.030: C. 5. Signs that resemble traffic signs. **NEW**
2. 13.030.030 D. Distinguish between signs on the sides of vehicles (allowed) and signs placed in stationary vehicles to avoid sign code restrictions (not allowed).
3. 13.030.030 E. Delete “tree or rock”.
4. 13.030.030 H. Digital signs that have any change of the sign display in less than 15 seconds, or have more than three lines of text at any time; or exceed the brightness allowed under regulations of the State of Oregon. **NEW**

E. Others

1. 13.040.020 NC zone. Add a new C. No sign shall be internally lit. Currently the NC zone does not have this restriction.
2. 13.040.040 CFO District. Allow one maximum 48 square foot sign either flush mount or freestanding in the CBC zone. Freestanding sign limited to 8 feet in height. Currently a freestanding sign is allowed only if the building is set back 20 feet from the property line and the sign is limited to 35 square feet. CHECK with Committee on this.
3. 13.040.080. Highway District. Change the distance from “land within 100 feet of ROW” to “any parcel within 100 feet of ROW.”
4. 13.040.100. Historic Districts. Notwithstanding other provisions of this code, signs in historic districts must meet the historic district guidelines for signs, or seek approval from HLC. **NEW**
5. 13.050.030. Allow each property one free standing sign per street frontage, up to a maximum of 100 square feet, in the CBC, CG, and CR zones, separate from other allowances. Currently freestanding signs are restricted to certain buildings.



6. 13.050.040 A. Allow total signage of 50% of building front, to be placed on any side, not just on front face.
7. 13.050.040 A 7. CR zone. Allow maximum of 50% of building front in the CR zone. Currently at 25%.
8. 13.050.040 to 13 .050.090. Add minimum allowance of 20 square feet. Currently no minimum allowance.
9. 13.050.040 B 2. Flush signs may be erected on any exterior wall up to maximum allowed. Each separate flush sign shall require a permit. Currently allowed only on front of building, with provisions for second street frontage.
10. 13.050.080. Home Occupation Signs. Add non-illuminated.

## NOTES

1. 13.070.010. Discussed non-conforming signs and decided to support current language.
2. No time limit to remove a non-conforming sign. Non-conforming signs to be brought up to current code requirements when structurally altered, as currently required in 13.070.010 C.
3. 13.070.050. Complaint driven enforcement is okay, but should not be limited to complaints. There should be consequences for non-compliant and for repeat offenders. Use existing fines.