



# City of Oregon City

625 Center Street  
Oregon City, OR 97045  
503-657-0891

## Meeting Agenda Planning Commission

---

Monday, October 13, 2014

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

---

### Revised Agenda

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

- 2a. [14-557](#) Approval of Planning Commission Minutes for May 12, 2014.

**3. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items**

**4. Public Hearing**

- 4a. [PC 14-117](#) CU 13-03: Conditional Use and SP 13-22 Site Plan and Design Review for a wireless communication pole on the McLoughlin Elementary School property, located at 19230 South End Road

**5. Communications**

- 5a. **Natural Resource Committee Presentation - Bryon Boyce**

**6. Work Session**

- [PC 14-118](#) L 14-01: Sign Code Update

**7. Adjournment**



# City of Oregon City

625 Center Street  
Oregon City, OR 97045  
503-657-0891

## Staff Report

File Number: 14-557

---

**Agenda Date:**

**Status:** Agenda Ready

**To:** Planning Commission

**Agenda #:** 2a.

**From:** Planner Pete Walter

**File Type:** Minutes

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes for May 12, 2014.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION (Motion):**

Review and approve with revisions, if needed.

**BACKGROUND:**

Please see attached draft minutes of the May 12, 2014 Planning Commission meeting.



# City of Oregon City

625 Center Street  
Oregon City, OR 97045  
503-657-0891

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

---

Monday, May 12, 2014

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

---

### 1. Call to Order

*Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.*

**Present:** 6 - Paul Espe, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell, Tom Geil and Robert Mahoney

**Absent:** 1 - Zachary Henkin

**Staffers:** 2 - Tony Konkol and Pete Walter

### 2. Citizen Comments

*There were no citizen comments.*

### 3. Public Hearing

#### 3a. [PC 14-046](#)

ZC 14-01 / TP 14-01: Zone Change from R-10 to R-8 with 29-Lot Subdivision between Ames Street and Holcomb Boulevard.

*Chair Kidwell read the quasi-judicial hearing procedure. He asked if any Commissioner had any ex parte contact, conflict of interest, bias, or statement to declare including a visit to the site.*

*Commissioner Mabee drove by the site.*

*Commissioner McGriff visited the site.*

*Commissioner Geil lived in the neighborhood, but had never been to the site.*

*Commissioner Espe said his wife worked at Holcomb Elementary and he had visited the site often.*

*Chair Kidwell was vaguely familiar with the area, but had not visited the site.*

*Pete Walter, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. This was an application for a 29 lot subdivision and zone change from R-10 to R-8. The three tax lots included in the application were located on Ames Street and Holcomb Boulevard. The parcel was annexed into the City in the 1990s. The zone change from R-10 to R-8 was on the southern 5.17 acres and the northern portion of approximately 3 acres would remain R-10. He showed an aerial phot of the area. One existing home would be moved, and the other existing home would remain. The accessory structures would be demolished and there would be some tree removal. He explained the existing zoning, lot calculations, zone change criteria, subdivision approval criteria and review, and transportation analysis. Staff recommended approval with conditions. He then entered new items into the record. He read the*

*revised Condition of Approval 18.*

*Commissioner Geil was concerned about increasing traffic on Holcomb Boulevard, especially near Holcomb Elementary, as there was a speeding problem on that road. Mr. Walter said it was not a criteria for denial of this application as the speed on Holcomb Boulevard was a traffic issue that the City had to deal with.*

*Commissioner McGriff was concerned about unintended consequences and people cutting through the neighborhood to get to the school. She thought there should be a left hand turn from Holcomb Boulevard into Holcomb School Road.*

*Mr. Walter discussed the right of way dedication between the applicant and School District. There was a verbal agreement, and a written agreement was to follow. The applicant was in the process of getting an agreement with Clackamas County Housing for right of way dedication also, which would take a few months. He addressed public comments that had been received regarding the adequacy of the detention pond and drainage impacts, lot size, traffic impacts on Ames and Swan Roads, on street parking, street improvements, pedestrian access, school capacity, driveway blockages, construction hours, and property values. He thought this subdivision and zone change was a minor impact, the layout was good, and would have similar quality housing as the surrounding area with better connectivity. He explained the half street plus 10 feet of pavement improvement and emergency vehicle access.*

*There was discussion regarding a better way to redesign Holcomb School Road.*

*Rick Givens, Planning Consultant, and Bruce Goldson, Project Engineer, were representing the applicant. Mr. Givens discussed the reasons for the zone change. He thought R-8 made sense because there were no physical limitations on the property, it was located right next to a school, the infrastructure costs would be the same, and it was adjacent to property zoned R-3.5. Currently Ames Street was a long dead-end fire trap and this application proposed a connection to Holcomb School Road which created better vehicle and pedestrian access. He did not think peak traffic times to and from this neighborhood would coincide with school hours and the new access would provide another way in and out of the area. He explained how the intersection would be reconfigured and the pedestrian access to the school. The City's traffic engineer agreed with the applicant's traffic study that stated there was adequate sight distance both directions and all of the standards were met. The development would improve traffic circulation. He read an email from the County Housing Authority who was in support of the dedication of the right of way, but the final decision was still pending from their office in Chicago and would likely be resolved in 60 days. If approved, the dedication would be taken to the County Commission for their approval. The Chair of the School Board and School Superintendent agreed with the proposed improvements and were finalizing their dedication documents as well.*

*Commissioner McGriff suggested making a condition that there was approval from the School Board for the dedication.*

*Mr. Givens said regarding the intersection of Ames Street and Swan Avenue, when the area was redeveloped, there would be right of way dedication and a half street improvement. The intersection was in the traffic study and the traffic volume was sufficiently low and would operate well within Oregon City's performance standards on full build out of the site. Regarding lot size averaging, the minimum standard was 80% and this application was not close to that on any lot. He thought the lot sizes made sense and the homes would be good quality and would not affect the property*

values of existing homes. He explained why the pedestrian pathway was placed near Lot 10.

There was discussion regarding the location of the Barlow Road in relation to this development. There was further discussion regarding the traffic speed in the area and a blind spot going north bound on Holcomb.

Mr. Givens said the traffic study showed the development would not adversely impact the area, and speeding was a police enforcement issue. This application would improve the circulation in the neighborhood and it would allow children to walk to school safely.

Commissioner McGriff suggested putting in speed humps.

Mr. Goldson discussed the storm drainage. The Sunnybrook Estates subdivision to the north had a detention pond. In the analysis for that development, they took into account this property being developed in the future and had oversized the line. He had analyzed the line and found that it was sized to allow discharge at various levels and met the City Code. There would be little or no impact downstream. All of the lots would drain into the detention pond. There was a drainage ditch along the east side of the existing subdivision to the north and a drainage ditch open channel beyond that subdivision. There were no channels on this piece of property.

Louise Davis, resident of Oregon City, said she lived on Ames Street. Ames was a dead end street which cut down on traffic and speed and was a safe place for children and pets. There were no sidewalks, so people walked on the street. She was concerned about having additional houses put in between Ames and Holcomb as it would be a significant increase in traffic and safety issues. She wanted to keep the current quality of life in the neighborhood.

Woody Berends, resident of Oregon City, lived on the corner of Ames and Swan. He was concerned about the safety of that intersection. The street was narrow, there were no sidewalks, and if there were two cars passing each other they had to go in the ditch. That would be one of the main entrances into this development. He had already dedicated property to the City for the intersection. He thought one day of traffic study did not tell them what people who lived there all the time could tell them. He thought there was more traffic than what the study showed and it was a lot more dangerous.

Debbie Fuller, resident of Oregon City, lived on Ames Street. She was opposed to the zone change and subdivision. She had moved to her current property for a more country feel and for her grandchildren to come and play safely and now she was tucked in between new developments. She questioned putting so many houses so close to the City boundary. She thought it should be lower density. She was also concerned about the traffic safety for the school. Most of the neighborhood thought it was too high of a concentration of homes especially since it was one way in and one way out. She was concerned that school buses would use Ames and might cause problems as well. She thought there would be a loss of quality of life with this development. The zoning should be at least R-10.

Shirley Patton, resident of Oregon City, lived on Forsythe Road. Her property bordered Sunnybrook Estates to the north. Sunnybrook Estates drained their water runoff into the Sears Farms drainage ditch that ran along the edge of her property line. The drainage ditch was washing away her property line. The more water that drained into the ditch the worse the problem got. Before Sunnybrook Estates was built, there were times the ditch ran full during the winter. The ditch could not handle

more water. The proposed subdivision planned to drain their runoff into the same area. Once they laid all the pavement for Sunnybrook Estates, her basement flooded three times. She had to dig a ditch across her property to stop the flooding. She showed pictures of how the drainage ditch was eroding her property and her fence was leaning and would soon fall over. She did not understand how the study said the subdivision would not impact the drainage.

Leroy Staudenmier, resident of Oregon City, lived in this area. He was concerned about increased traffic on Ames Street. He also had concern about the amount of truck traffic there would be during construction, especially with children playing in the street, and he wondered how much damage the trucks might do to the street. He had concern about the drainage and mud that was going into the Clackamas River. He thought it should remain R-10.

Steven Brower, resident of Oregon City, lived adjacent to the property. He was opposed to the zone change to R-8 and thought it should stay R-10. He thought it would affect the quality of life and reasons he had moved to the area. He was opposed to the development because of the safety and transportation issues. Ames, Holmes, and Swan were not able to handle more traffic and the traffic study did not take into account the affects of inclement weather and safety on those roads.

Gary Martin, resident of Oregon City, lived in the area. He was opposed to an exception to the current zoning. He did not think there was a compelling reason for the zone change that would impact the value of the surrounding properties. The parcel in question was at the end of the Urban Growth Boundary and he thought lower density should be on the borders of the City. The Park Place neighborhood had more than its share of high density property and he asked that the small amount of less dense property not be eroded further. He asked that his property values be protected. All of the concerns raised would be exacerbated by more homes and relieved by fewer homes. He thought the R-10 should be retained.

Barbara Renkin, resident of Oregon City, lived in the Park Place neighborhood and was a member of the CIC. She had moved to the neighborhood to live in a rural area. The property behind her was annexed into the City and planned to be developed as R-10. She was concerned about a developer coming in and wanting to change that zoning. Holcomb Boulevard was not a safe road due to speeding. She was concerned about the overall plan for Oregon City and high density on the outskirts. She did not think high density belonged in the country. She was not against development as long as it was done with thought for the quality of life, safety, and remained R-10.

Ray Renkin, resident of Oregon City, lived in the area. He bought the property 10 years ago. Since then the property behind him had been annexed into the City and it was planned to build 100 homes there. These homes would add to the concerns that had been expressed that night. He preferred the rural atmosphere and he thought R-10 should be the minimum size lot in a rural area. The transportation study did not include potential developments that would impact the design for the roads. With the closure of other City schools, Holcomb School bus traffic had doubled. It was a very busy intersection during school hours. He wanted it to remain R-10.

Janice Vandomelen, resident of Oregon City, also lived in the area. She moved there because of the amenities a large lot afforded. She was concerned about safety. Ames Street was not equipped to handle increased traffic.

Bob La Salle, resident of Oregon City and Chair of the Park Place Neighborhood Association, asked the Commission to consider all of the issues. There had been

many applications where developers were attempting to reduce zoning. The Comprehensive Plan designated this area as low density and R-10. He thought the reason for the requests for denser zoning was to be able to build more homes and make more money. He read sections from the Comprehensive Plan and explained how he did not think R-8 protected the integrity of the existing neighborhoods, how the plan facilitated cut through traffic, and how the subdivision did not conform to the traffic requirement. He thought the traffic study had serious flaws and omissions of important intersections such as Swan and Ames. He referenced the Type 4 application staff report and recommendation, Goal 12, Transportation, that stated traffic operations should be adequate at all analyzed intersections and that off site mitigation for traffic impacts was not required. He thought there would be a traffic impact at Ames and Swan and it did not take into account the new traffic on School Street. There was already an existing drainage problem, and the drainage for this development would discharge into the existing storm collection system. The existing system was overloaded already. He entered a map highlighting the R-8 zoning in the City into the record. He thought there was plenty of R-8 zoning already and about a third of Park Place was already zoned R-8. He reminded the Commission of their responsibility to the citizens rather than to the developer.

Mr. Givens gave a rebuttal. He said the difference between the R-10 and R-8 was four houses. In terms of traffic impact, it was a difference of 40 trips per day and four trips during the peak hours. He was sympathetic to those who bought their house to live in the country, and he encouraged everyone to find out what City plans were for the area before purchasing a house. He said under the City's Comprehensive Plan, R-8 was low density. He was asking for the zone change for planning reasons as well as monetary. More development provided more economic development, SDCs, construction jobs, and more tax base. It was a more efficient use of facilities and streets. It made sense for properties like this one with no constraints and was served well by facilities and services and adjacent to a public school and R-3.5 zoning. If it remained R-10, the developer would only put in an access from Ames Street and emergency vehicle access only from Holcomb because the additional cost of making the connection would not be borne by the development. The proposed plan allowed the project to be served by two accesses and for the school to have another way in and out. He did not think cut through traffic to the school would be a problem as it would delay people during school hours. All of the homes would have three car garages and room for an RV pad and would have CC&R's that would prevent people from parking on the street.

Mr. Goldson said the existing detention pond was a vegetated pond, there was no dirt. This property and property to the north all drained there currently. The real issue was the farmland to the east and most of the water that was dirty was coming from the farm fields. The water was clean coming into the detention ponds and the water was currently going there now, they were not changing the basin. The water to the east was contributing to this, and came from the farms. There would not be more water from this development. He explained further how the drainage system worked.

Mr. Givens requested a continuance of the public hearing to gather additional information on the storm drainage and transportation issues. He would grant an extension to the 120 day rule for the continuance.

Commissioner Espe wanted to see what the detention pond looked like. He asked that information be brought back showing it was thoroughly vetted through the School District that the access to Holcomb Elementary Way was acceptable. Commissioner McGriff wanted to see what portion of the School District property and what portion of the Housing Authority's property was being requested. Chair Kidwell asked if Mr. Givens could also address the concern that there would be cut through traffic to get

to Holcomb Boulevard. Commissioner Mabee asked for the shadow plat for the development.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Espe, seconded by Commissioner McGriff, to continue the public hearing for ZC 14-01 / TP 14-01: Zone Change from R-10 to R-8 with 29-lot subdivision between Ames Street and Holcomb Boulevard to June 9, 2014. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Paul Espe, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell, Tom Geil and Robert Mahoney

**3b. [PC 14-041](#)**

**L 14-01: Sign Code Update**

*Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing.*

*There was no public testimony.*

*Due to the lateness of the meeting, the hearing would be continued to June 23 to take public testimony and then the Commission would hold a work session on the Sign Code.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Espe, to continue the public hearing for L 14-01: Sign Code Update to June 23, 2014. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Paul Espe, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell, Tom Geil and Robert Mahoney

**4. Communications**

*Mr. Konkol said regarding the Willamette Falls Legacy Project, Mega Rock LLC closed with the trustee and took ownership of the property. City staff would meet with them soon. Staff was also working on the land use application and strategic document for funding.*

**5. Adjournment**

*Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 10:04 PM.*





# City of Oregon City

625 Center Street  
Oregon City, OR 97045  
503-657-0891

## Staff Report

File Number: PC 14-117

---

**Agenda Date:** 10/13/2014

**Status:** Agenda Ready

**To:** Planning Commission

**Agenda #:**

**From:** Community Development Director Tony Konkol

**File Type:** Land Use Item

### **SUBJECT:**

CU 13-03: Conditional Use and SP 13-22 Site Plan and Design Review for a wireless communication pole on the McLoughlin Elementary School property, located at 19230 South End Road

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION (Motion):**

The applicant has requested a continuance until the meeting on November 10, 2014. Staff recommends continuing the hearing until the November 10, 2014 meeting.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The applicant is requesting approval of a conditional use and site plan and design review permit for the installation of a wireless communication pole on the McLoughlin Elementary school property at 19230 South End Road. The project includes a 75-foot pole designed to resemble a fir tree and an equipment cabinet. The applicant extended both the 120-day deadline and the FCC shot-clock to January 8, 2015.

## Kelly Moosbrugger

---

**From:** Kim Allen <kim.allen@wirelesscounsel.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 24, 2014 3:01 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Bragar; Kelly Moosbrugger  
**Cc:** Tom McAuliffe; FIEBIG, TODD; Ken Lyons  
**Subject:** Re: AT&T Cell Tower - Request for a Continuance of the Planning Commission hearing

Jennifer:

AT&T agrees to extend the 120-day and shot clock by 35 days to January 8, 2015. Please confirm that our matter has been removed from the October 13, 2014 calendar.

Regards--

**Kimberly Allen**

Busch Law Firm PLLC  
93 S. Jackson St. #75604  
Seattle WA 98104-2818  
425-628-2666 Office  
kim.allen@wirelesscounsel.com

---

**From:** Jennifer Bragar <[JBragar@gsblaw.com](mailto:JBragar@gsblaw.com)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 23, 2014 at 2:58 PM  
**To:** Kim Allen <[kim.allen@wirelesscounsel.com](mailto:kim.allen@wirelesscounsel.com)>, Kelly Moosbrugger <[kmoosbrugger@ci.oregon-city.or.us](mailto:kmoosbrugger@ci.oregon-city.or.us)>  
**Cc:** Tom McAuliffe <[T.McAuliffe@velocitel.com](mailto:T.McAuliffe@velocitel.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: AT&T Cell Tower - Request for a Continuance of the Planning Commission hearing

Kim,

Based on our discussion this afternoon, I understand that you will confer with your client to determine whether AT&T is going to make a request to extend the 120-day and shot clock by 35 days to January 8, 2015. Upon confirmation from you, the City will include AT&T's further request for a continuance on the October agenda. Thank you.

This e-mail is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It contains information that is confidential and/or legally privileged. If you believe that it has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information by someone other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

**JENNIFER M. BRAGAR**

Associate | 503.228.3939 x 3208 Tel | 503.226.0259 Fax | [jbragar@gsblaw.com](mailto:jbragar@gsblaw.com)

**GARVEY SCHUBERT BARER** | 11th Floor | 121 SW Morrison Street | Portland, OR 97204 | ► [GSBLaw.com](http://GSBLaw.com)  
► land use | condemnation | real estate e-forum: [www.northwestlandlawforum.com](http://www.northwestlandlawforum.com)

---

**From:** Kim Allen [<mailto:kim.allen@wirelesscounsel.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 23, 2014 10:01 AM  
**To:** Jennifer Bragar; Kelly Moosbrugger  
**Cc:** Tom McAuliffe  
**Subject:** Re: AT&T Cell Tower - Request for a Continuance of the Planning Commission hearing

Good morning, Jennifer and Kelly—

The negotiations with the school district are still ongoing so AT&T is requesting to remove this from the October Planning Commission agenda and add it to the next month's agenda as a placeholder. I realize that the city requires time to address a new location on the school site and we can extend the deadlines further once the lease negotiations are concluded and we have a defined proposal to bring to the Commission. Please let me know if this is acceptable to the City.

Thanks—

Kim

**Kimberly Allen**

Busch Law Firm PLLC

93 S. Jackson St. #75604

Seattle WA 98104-2818

425-628-2666 Office

[kim.allen@wirelesscounsel.com](mailto:kim.allen@wirelesscounsel.com)

## Kelly Moosbrugger

---

**From:** Francesca Anton <francescairena@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 25, 2014 11:24 AM  
**To:** Kelly Moosbrugger  
**Subject:** CU 13-03

Dear Ms. Moosbrugger,

As a former educator and long-time resident of Oregon City, I would like to formally voice my opposition to the proposed placement of a cell tower at John McLoughlin Elementary School in Oregon City; this email is an encouragement to the Oregon City Commission to deny AT&T's entirely inappropriate application to use our school grounds for their business operations.

School grounds are for families and children and not distractions from business interests. What is particularly offensive is that I recently learned the amount of money the school district would be paid is minimal, and would not even help John McLoughlin Elementary School. And most importantly, the verdict is not yet out about the effects of RF radiation on children. It is unthinkable that the OC Commission would even consider such a lunatic idea.

Please make sure this letter is included with your packet for the October 13 meeting.  
Thank you very much,

Francesca Anton  
123 High Street  
Oregon City

503.305.7483

## Kelly Moosbrugger

---

**From:** Bill Hurt <hurt.bill@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 14, 2014 10:53 AM  
**To:** Kelly Moosbrugger  
**Subject:** Support for cell tower at school

Hello Kelly,

I am writing in support of the city and school doing whatever they think is best regarding school grounds and cell towers.

It turns out that citizens like me don't know what the school's budget looks like, what the details of the plans for these grounds are, or any of the other details that some people have full time jobs to think about and I don't.

I saw a sign directing me to go to [stopthecelltower.info](http://stopthecelltower.info) and what I saw just made me mad. The idea that some ridiculous busy body with nothing better to do would take the time to make a web site (even if it does look like an iWeb template from 2002) to try and get people riled up and spread unscientific disinformation is just unimaginable to me.

I live on Shelby Rose drive and fully anticipate that the child my wife and I are expecting soon will be going to that school, and a cell tower in the field behind it doesn't bother me in the slightest.

Thanks,  
Bill

## Kelly Moosbrugger

---

**From:** Imes, Danny <Danny.Imes@sim.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 09, 2014 10:46 PM  
**To:** Kelly Moosbrugger  
**Subject:** cell tower at John McLoughlin Elementary

Ms. Moosbrugger,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to CU 13-03, which would allow AT&T to install a cell tower on the grounds of John McLoughlin Elementary. We are new residents here in Oregon City, and we chose our neighborhood so that our children could attend John McLoughlin. I learned this evening that the city is actively considering the possibility of a cell tower on school grounds, and I am deeply concerned.

I do not want my children to spend 6 hours of every day, 5 days a week, in close proximity to high frequency radio waves, when the safety of long-term exposure is not yet adequately understood. Multiple studies suggest a host of medical complications that could result, as well as decrease in children's ability to concentrate and learn. The added distraction of a large structure with ongoing maintenance is not what our school children need. I want my children to learn in a safe environment that is free from distraction. The negligible financial benefit to Oregon City schools is not worth putting our children's health, safety, and focus at risk. AT&T should pursue other viable options.

I hope you will oppose the proposal to build a cell tower on school grounds when you meet to vote on October 13. If a tower is built, we will no longer feel comfortable sending our children to school at John McLoughlin.

Sincerely,  
Carmen Imes  
18845 Allegheny Dr  
Oregon City, OR 97045

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: CU 13-03 John McLoughlin Elementary Cellular Tower

On July 31, 2014, I contacted Todd Fiebig, Site Acquisition Manager, AT&T Mobility, Washington and Northern Idaho. I told Mr. Fiebig that we have land very close to the current proposed site that might be available for a cell tower. He said that he would look at internet aerial photos, talk to engineers and look at their situation at the current site and make a decision.

On August 18th, 2014, I sent him an email as we had not heard from him. He replied on August 19th that it isn't easy to get AT&T to change course. He noted that they had invested time/money in the current site but that if it fails they will be looking for a backup plan. He said that if a new site is needed, engineers must study the site to determine if it would work. He wrote that it is surprising how moving a site just a small distance can severely change the balance of the network.

We have heard nothing further from anyone regarding our proposed site.

Sincerely,

Patti Jarrett  
19775 Central Point Rd  
Oregon City, OR 97045

RECEIVED  
CITY OF OREGON CITY

2014 OCT -7 PM 2:23



# City of Oregon City

625 Center Street  
Oregon City, OR 97045  
503-657-0891

## Staff Report

File Number: PC 14-118

**Agenda Date:** 10/13/2014

**Status:** Agenda Ready

**To:** Planning Commission

**Agenda #:**

**From:** Planner Laura Terway

**File Type:** Land Use Item

### **SUBJECT:**

L 14-01: Sign Code Update

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION (Motion):**

No action is required by the Planning Commission at this time.

### **BACKGROUND:**

After nearly 20 years without a significant change, Oregon City has been working to review the sign regulations to better meet the needs of Oregon City residents and businesses now and into the future. The Oregon City Municipal Code currently has limitations on the type, quantity, size and material of signage allowed on public and property in chapter 15.28.

A comprehensive public process has resulted in many community discussions and recommendations to City staff for revisions to the signage standards. The Planning Commission has held work sessions to review the proposed code on February 24, 2014, March 24, 2014, April 28, 2014 and June 23, 2014 and hearings on April 14, 2014, May 12, 2014, June 23, 2014, July 28, 2014 and September 22, 2014. At this work session the public participation process and draft code for the Sign Code Update project will be summarized and any outstanding issues identified. The next Planning Commission hearing is scheduled for October 27th.

### **BUDGET IMPACT:**

Amount:

FY(s):

Funding Source:





# City of Oregon City

625 Center Street  
Oregon City, OR 97045  
503-657-0891

## Staff Report

File Number: PC 14-118

**Agenda Date:** 10/13/2014

**Status:** Agenda Ready

**To:** Planning Commission

**Agenda #:** 6a.

**From:** Planner Laura Terway

**File Type:** Land Use Item

### **SUBJECT:**

L 14-01: Sign Code Update

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION (Motion):**

No action is required by the Planning Commission at this time.

### **BACKGROUND:**

After nearly 20 years without a significant change, Oregon City has been working to review the sign regulations to better meet the needs of Oregon City residents and businesses now and into the future. The Oregon City Municipal Code currently has limitations on the type, quantity, size and material of signage allowed on public and property in chapter 15.28.

A comprehensive public process has resulted in many community discussions and recommendations to City staff for revisions to the signage standards. The Planning Commission has held work sessions to review the proposed code on February 24, 2014, March 24, 2014, April 28, 2014 and June 23, 2014 and hearings on April 14, 2014, May 12, 2014, June 23, 2014, July 28, 2014 and September 22, 2014. At this work session the public participation process and draft code for the Sign Code Update project will be summarized and any outstanding issues identified. The next Planning Commission hearing is scheduled for October 27th.

### **BUDGET IMPACT:**

Amount:

FY(s):

Funding Source:



# OREGON CITY

Community Development - Planning

221 Molalla Ave. Suite 200 | Oregon City OR 97045

Ph (503) 722-3789 | Fax (503) 722-3880

## OREGON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

### Tally of Votes

Planning Commission Hearing Date: 10/13/14

Board Members Present

Staff Present

D. McGRUFF

T. KONIKOL

D. MABEE

L. TERLWAY

Z. HENKIN

J. BRAGAR

B. MAHONEY

C. KIDWELL

LATE - T. GEIL

Agenda Item: 2a: MINS FOR MAY 12, 2014

Decision: Approve with Conditions Approve Deny Continue to \_\_\_\_\_

	Motion:	Second:	Aye:	Nay:	Abstain:	Comments:
Commissioner Geil						
Commissioner McGriff		8	8			
Commissioner Mabee	8		8			
Commissioner Henkin			8			
<del>Commissioner Espe</del>			<del>8</del>			
Commissioner Mahoney			8			
Chair Kidwell			8			

Agenda Item: 4a: CV13-03 + SPB-22

Decision: Approve with Conditions Approve Deny Continue to DDU 10, 2014

	Motion:	Second:	Aye:	Nay:	Abstain:	Comments:
Commissioner Geil	8		8			
Commissioner McGriff		8	8			
Commissioner Mabee			8			
Commissioner Henkin			8			
<del>Commissioner Espe</del>						
Commissioner Mahoney			8			
Chair Kidwell			8			