

**MINUTES**  
**CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
7:00 PM – September 27, 2010  
City Council Chambers – 155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

---

**PRESENT:** Chair Dan Ewert, Commissioners Chuck Kocher, Misty Slagle and Randy Tessman

**ABSENT:** Commissioners Jan Milne, Sean Joyce and John Proctor

**STAFF:** Bryan Brown, Planning Director; Matilda Deas, AICP, Project Planner; Markus Mead, Associate Planner; Jill Thorn, Planning Staff; Matt Hastie of Angelo Planning Group; Consultant; and Rachel Ferdaszewski, Department of Land Conservation and Development

**OTHERS**

**PRESENT:** None

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Bryan Brown introduced Markus Mead, Associate Planner to the Commission.

**2. CITIZEN INPUT      None**

**3. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**a. Sign Code Revisions of Chapter 16.42 of Canby Municipal Code TA 10-03 –**

The purpose of the proposed sign code amendments is to follow through on an evaluation commitment after working with the new code, address administrative issues, improve clarity and consistency, and incorporate recommendations for improvement collected from the business community since using the new code. Proposed revisions address: number and square footage of commercial tenant wall signage allowed, change to temporary sign limitations and establishment of system for registering same, change in marquee sign measurement, alteration to blade and awning size limitation and vertical clearance, add cross reference to design standards simplify and clarify sign right-of-way encroachment requirements, and improve consistency of graphic representation.

Chair Ewert read the public hearing format.

Bryan Brown, Planning Director, entered the September 1, 2010, staff report into the record. He stated that one written comment had been received from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) regarding OMIA requirements that signs visible on Highway 99E must be approved by ODOT.

Matt Hastie presented an overview of the proposed changes and modifications.

Commissioner Ewert asked about lighting on digital signs. Mr. Hastie said there had been no changes on electronic message signs and currently there is no color restriction.

Commissioner Ewert asked about the size and brightness of the Canby Cinema sign. Mr. Hastie said that a variance had been granted.

Commissioner Tessman inquired about when a national retailer comes to town, what type of variance is in the code to help them meet the requirements with a national logo. Mr. Hastie said that a change of 10% or less would be a minor variance and the same criteria for a major variance would apply when the issue would be before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Tessman asked where garage sales signs fit into this code and would directional signs for garage sales be allowed. Mr. Brown said that directional signs are not permitted.

Commissioner Tessman asked about enforcement procedures for people who don't remove garage sale signs after the sale. Mr. Hastie said that was not an issue that was discussed on this round of changes.

Mr. Brown said that code enforcement would be responsible for picking the signs up.

Commissioner Ewert wondered if any changes had been made for "lollipop" signs on Highway 99E. Mr. Hastie stated that in the original sign code revisions, the committee had discussed the issue, but had not made significant changes.

Chair Ewert closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Slagle moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of TA 10-03, based on the record of the September 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission public hearing and findings in the September 1, 2010 Planning Commission staff report and modifications to the language to require garage sale signs to be removed within 24 hours of the close of the sale and clarify in the code the ODOT requirements for sign approval visible on Highway 99E.. It was seconded by Commissioner Tessman. The motion passed 4-0.

**b. Canby Municipal Code Amendment TA 10-04** - specifically amending the Land Development & Planning Ordinance (Title 16) pertaining Low Impact Development Standards, Outdoor Lighting Standards, and Fencing Standards.

Chair Ewert read the public hearing format.

Matilda Deas, AICP, Project Planner entered the September 17, 2010 staff report into the record. She also said tools for implementing the code changes would be adopted at a later date and a revised tree ordinance was in the works.

Matt Hastie presented an overview of the proposed changes and modifications.

Commissioner Ewert asked about shared parking on multi-family projects. Mr. Hastie said that was a mistake and would be removed from the chart.

Commissioner Slagle asked if that would refer to mixed use projects. Mr. Hastie said no.

Commissioner Ewert expressed some concerns about alleys and narrow streets. Ms Deas explained they were an option available to applicants.

Commissioner Ewert asked about storm water retention, dry wells and bioswales and what the applicant was required to do. Mr. Hastie responded that it was to be treated on-site following our standards. Ms Deas said that was one of the items being covered in the public works standards that were being developed.

Commissioner Ewert asked what is in the public works standards to cover the City when such things fail.

Commissioner Kocher said he had recently been directed to a web-site that dealt with pervious surfaces and their maintenance.

Commissioner Slagle asked about the difference in parking requirements between grade schools and the high school. Mr. Hastie said that grade schools generally had more teachers per student ratio and the parking requirements had not changed.

Commissioner Ewert asked if cars that park on Cedar at 3<sup>rd</sup> and Cedar are allowed as there are no signs stating "no parking". Ms Deas said parking was allowed.

Commissioner Ewert stated that he felt there were more cars per dwelling unit now which was causing more cars to be parked on the street and wondered how that was being dealt with in the code amendments. Ms Deas responded that it was not part of these amendments but that one way would be to require cluster parking lots in subdivisions which is how Charbonneau handled the situation.

Commissioner Tessman asked if intersection sight lines were part of the same issue. Ms Deas responded that was an enforcement issue.

Commissioner Ewert felt there should be verbiage to eliminate on-street parking. Ms Deas said that could be handled as part of the scoping of traffic studies when an application was received.

Chair Ewert closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Slagle moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of TA 10-04, based on the record of the September 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission public hearing and findings in the September 17, 2010 Planning Commission staff report. It was seconded by Commissioner Kocher. The motion passed 4-0.

**4. NEW BUSINESS None**

**5. FINAL DECISIONS None**

**6. MINUTES**

**August 23, 2010** - Commissioner Slagle moved to approve minutes of August 23, 2010 as presented. Motion seconded by Commissioner Tessman and passed 4-0.

**7. ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM STAFF None**

**8. ITEMS OF INTEREST/GUIDANCE FROM PLANNING COMMISSION None**

**9. ADJOURNMENT at 9:00 PM.**