

**NEWBERG ELECTRONIC SIGN
AD HOC COMMITTEE MINUTES
3-5 p.m., Thursday, June 3, 2010
Newberg City Hall, Permit Center Conference Room
414 E. First Street, Newberg, Oregon**

I. ROLL CALL:

Present:	Nick Tri, Chair Stephen McKinney Dennis Lewis	Michael Sherwood, Vice Chair Fred Gregory
Absent:	Claudia Stewart (excused) Loni Parrish (arrived 3:35 pm)	Kristin Horn (unexcused) Julie Want (unexcused)
Staff Present:	Barton Brierley, Building and Planning Director Steve Olson, Associate Planner Tami Bergeron, Recording Secretary	

II. OPEN MEETING:

Chair Nick Tri opened the meeting at 3:05 p.m. and asked for roll call.

III. MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION #1: Michael Sherwood/Fred Gregory moved to approve the May 6, 2010 minutes as submitted. (5 Yes/ 0 No/4 Absent [Stewart/Parrish/Horn/Want]) Motion carried.

IV. WORKSHOP: Electronic sign code amendments/recommendation:

Steve Olson summarized the items for discussion at this meeting: electronic scoreboards, site element review, and size incentives. Other revisions for review: brightness dimmer controls apply only to new signs, not existing; temporary signs – allow temporary EMC for grand openings and other events. Refer to meeting packet pages nine through eleven for additional specifications.

Steve mentioned that the intent of this meeting is for it to be the final committee meeting unless the committee decides additional time is needed to complete their task.

Steve referred to page nine of the meeting packet that illustrates electronic scoreboard options that need to be reviewed. Steve's presentation showed designs of various scoreboards in existence outside of Newberg, Oregon.

Steve reviewed "Option A - treated as a sign if visible from the public right of way", "Option B - no size limit but has a curfew", and "Option C - no size limit or curfew - could operate as an electronic billboard before or after events".

Fred Gregory and Dennis Lewis stated that they do not want the sign code to be so restrictive that businesses could not sponsor local sporting events by advertising on their scoreboard. Steve Olson said

that normally scoreboards would be set back fairly far from the road. Dennis Lewis said that the backside of scoreboards could be used as a sign or billboard, advertising local upcoming events. Steve said if the backside were facing the street, it would need to meet the general regulations for signs. Stephen McKinney said when considering these scoreboards and/or billboards that the committee needs to consider all of the potential users of the fields. He suggested as a community field, the users such as Chehalem Park and Recreation District, George Fox, Newberg High School, etc. might all benefit from the advertising of their upcoming events.

Steve Olson then posed the question of the impact to nearby residential homes if the scoreboard was located close to a neighborhood. This could be addressed by increasing the setback or limiting the size when operating as a sign. Fred Gregory summarized his understanding that no scoreboards would be facing residents any less than the length of a football/soccer field. He reiterated that only a few houses would be behind some of the scoreboard signs, which would negate the reason to have the backside billboard. The necessity for setbacks would apply to some of the potential scoreboard sites. Stephen McKinney said the necessity for a scoreboard being "on" 24-hours would be limited as the costs for electricity would be prohibitive and with no public at the facility during non-use hours, it would not be logical to run the sign. Fred Gregory agreed it would be illogical to run a sign during non-use of athletic field hours.

Barton Brierley asked if the committee would agree to Option C if it included a 100-foot setback limitation. Dennis Lewis agreed that Option C is fine, with the understanding that the backside of the scoreboard would not need additional regulations as all other sign regulations would apply at that point. Barton Brierley asked for confirmation again, whether the committee was comfortable with Option C as written. They agreed they were in favor of Option C, as written.

3:32 pm

Steve moved the committee to review the site element review process as it is depicted on the top of page nine of the meeting packet. Dennis Lewis asked how the signs would be restricted if an apartment complex were built nearby. Would residential buildings affect the use of commercial electronic signage during the off business hours if the committee agrees to these restrictions? Steve Olson mentioned that apartments in a commercial zone would not trigger any restrictions, as they would not be in a purely residential zone. Loni Parrish proposed that a change of wording to the restriction hours might resolve the problem. Michael Sherwood asked what purpose is served by a sign being on day and night if no one is around. Dennis Lewis said his sign stays on all the time and it is his cheapest advertising, so he sees value in leaving it on. Barton Brierley responded that wording could be changed to read that it is visible from "abutting residential district" rather than merely "a residential district". Steve Olson said many of the zoning restrictions are already defined on the chart on page eight of the meeting handout.

The committee discussed item 1.a. ii and the potential that signs may shine on bedroom windows in residential districts. Dennis Lewis suggested combining items ii. and iv. to reach a good definition. Michael Sherwood said that much of the current verbiage allows legal review to interpret a problem where one may not be prevalent.

Steve Olson summarized the committee's standpoint after conversation that item ii should be eliminated and add the words "visible and abutting residence" to item number iv. Michael Sherwood asked Steve Olson if he had reviewed McMinnville's sign codes. Steve Olson responded that McMinnville deals with sign illumination issues by virtue of the sign's size. Barton Brierley suggested changing the

wording on number iv to include “may be determined by the Planning Director” to allow some flexibility on this issue instead of being overly rigid.

4:05

Steve Olson asked the committee to review the bottom of the site elements items 1.a.i. and 1.b. Dennis Lewis suggested that the restriction be noted as “2” or more businesses on site and Nick Tri agreed. Stephen McKinney agreed that “2 or more” businesses would be good. Loni Parrish asked why two or more businesses could not fit. Dennis Lewis explained that this would encourage businesses to coordinate on signs.

Steve Olson summarized the committee’s discussion to say remove item 1.a.vi.f. Dennis Lewis suggested that this item be left in but changed to read “more than 40% of the sign is EMC”. Barton asked for the committee’s thoughts on this proposed change. The group discussed the change and agreed to it.

The committee moved to the topic of size incentives for signage. Steve asked the committee if they generally liked that wording. Conversations ensued and the committee agreed to item 2 as written. They did agree that Size Incentive as a topic should be emphasized more in the review process.

Steve said that all highlighted items in the packet have been discussed at this meeting. Dennis Lewis asked to review Electronic Message Centers on vehicles and trailers as it was presented on page 7 of 13 in the meeting packet. Steve Olson explained that about three meetings ago, the committee discussed the topic of messages displayed on vehicles. Fred Gregory asked to add taxis to the restricted vehicles. Dennis Lewis asked how this would be enforced if someone from out of town came into town with an electronic message on their vehicle. The question was posed if this restriction is necessary or would it be covered under Newberg’s nuisance ordinances. Barton confirmed it could be dealt with as a nuisance and the committee agreed to omit the ban on vehicle signs.

Steve referred to page 11 of the meeting packet to review the temporary signs for events. Stephen McKinney said that quite a bit of time is spent on code enforcement of sandwich board signs. Dennis Lewis suggested as a future idea, that the City loan out these signs as a way to regulate them.

Steve Olson asked if the committee wanted to review the changes before sending the recommendation to Council. The committee wanted to review the changes first, but agreed to do that by email. Barton Brierley asked for and heard committee consensus that they are satisfied with the proposal as is with noted changes as were discussed today.

Stephen McKinney hopes that what is sent to City Council shows coordination between the work this committee has done over the months and what the Downtown Coalition will do regarding signage. Several members of this ad hoc committee mentioned they are also on the Downtown Coalition which should help with this transition.

Dennis Lewis asked about signage for institutions such as the Chehalem Cultural Center. He knows that there is a problem when institutions are not able to communicate with the community. Steve Olson said ODOT restricts the off-premise signs along the highway, thus preventing new billboards but also limiting the cultural center. Dennis Lewis concluded that the Downtown Coalition could address the civic corridor signs, if needed.

Barton Brierley thanked each committee member for their time and energy on this committee throughout the past few months. Steve Olson confirmed he would send out the updated Recommended Development Code Amendment with regard to signage for this committee's review and vote. Those present agreed that they did not need to meet again as it would slow this proposal being presented to City Council.

V. **OTHER BUSINESS:** No other business was brought forward.

VI. **NEXT STEP – Present recommendation to City Council – July 6, 2010 (tentative)**

VII. **ADJOURN:** Meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

Approved by the Electronic Sign Ad Hoc Committee on this 11th day of June, 2010.

AYES: 5 **NO:** 0 **ABSENT:** 4 **ABSTAIN:** 0
(C. Stewart, L. Parrish, K. Horn, J. Want)


Recording Secretary


Electronic Sign Ad Hoc Committee Chair