

**CITY OF SUTHERLIN**  
**Council Workshop Meeting**  
**Sutherlin Civic Auditorium**  
**Monday, August 10, 2015 – 7:48pm**

**COUNCIL MEMBERS:**

Tom Boggs, Frank Egbert, Wayne Luzier, Karen Meier, Forest Stone, Wes Anderson  
**MAYOR:** Todd McKnight

**CITY STAFF:** City Manager, Jerry Gillham  
City Recorder/HR Manager, Debbie Hamilton  
Deputy City Recorder, Diane Harris  
Community Development Director, Vicki Luther  
City Planner, Lisa Hawley  
Chief of Police, Kirk Sanfilippo  
Assistant Fire Chief, Troy Brevik  
City Attorney, Chad Jacobs (via Skype)

**AUDIENCE:** Mike Meier, Denny Cameron, Brian Burke Sr.

Workshop called to order by Mayor McKnight at 7:48pm.

Roll Call: Excused – Councilor Luzier

**WORKSHOP**

• **Sign Ordinance Review**

Staff Report – Community Development Director, Vicki Luther – City Manager, Jerry Gillham, requested Staff put together a committee to review current Sign Ordinance. The standards are very comprehensive and include sign definitions, requirements, exceptions, prohibited signs, processes and signs declared a nuisance. The standards also specify types of signs permitted in various zones.

Luther turned the Workshop over to Douglas County Planner and contracted Planner for City of Sutherlin, Lisa Hawley, to report on the review and findings.

Hawley – Current ordinance was adopted October 2008. Staff reviewed the ordinance for possible updates and modifications.

Points to consider:

1. Moving list of sign definitions from Section 3.7.110 to front of book in Section 1.3.
2. Revise current definition of “sign”. [Staff report includes other communities’ definitions].
3. Modifying Section 3.7.160 [Issuance of Permits], Item A.
4. Reviewing Section 3.7.210 [Certain Signs Declared a Nuisance].

Staff is requesting direction from Council regarding the modifications.

Points of concern raised by Council:

- What is the cost of a sign permit? **\$50.**
- Questioned constant ever changing signs at area businesses placed on City right-of-way. According to the ordinance need to be charged a sign permit fee. ***Many of those signs are listed in Section 3.7.140 and fall under the “exception” portion of the code.***
- Understood this review was to help Staff with guidelines on new permits, not necessarily an ordinance to send Code Enforcement Officer to cite every sign in town that doesn’t conform.
- Questioned current code, Section 3.7.160 [Issuance of Permits] referring to “all existing signs on the premises” may be too excessive. ***City must have had an intent regarding that portion of the code. Not sure why the mention of all existing signs and then make a provision for non-***

*conforming signs. However, can see the point from this point forward signs would need to conform to the new standards regarding any new changes that are being made.*

- The sign issues are complaint driven, correct? *Yes.*
- That would follow under the nuisance portion, right? *Yes.*
- Referred to “sign” [Magic Mushroom property] being complaint driven. *They didn’t get a permit. Is that the purpose of that violation? Correct.*
- Do not like the idea of “complaint driven”, concerned just because one person doesn’t like the sign they can complain about it and prohibit it.

**City Attorney, Chad Jacobs – If signs met previous zoning standards, they will be grandfathered in. That is known as a pre-existing permitted use; can continue to have that sign even though it is not in compliance with new code.**

Discussion continued with mention of signs in city limits that may not be in compliance. Concerns were voiced regarding non-conforming signs; references were made to Sections 3.7.160 and 3.7.260. Feel there are standards that do not fit the realm of the community. **For clarification purposes, when you looking at the standards regarding the industrial zones, there are different kinds of signs, depending on the location will depend on the type(s) of signs permitted.** What about 3.7.280 #4. **That’s why there is such a broad range of definitions, to define the type of signs such as ground, wall, projecting, etc. Each has a different standard.**

- Need to focus on from here forward, not on existing signs. **Hamilton, who was one of the Staff involved with the Planning Commission at that time, stated that their intent was that any signs prior to the ordinance change would be left alone.**
- Concerns were expressed regarding new “Canna King” billboard and if permit was given and whether it is outside or inside city limits. The billboard structure already existed; just the face of the sign changed.
- Concerns were voiced regarding sign requirements and costs associated if variances are filed.

Mayor McKnight asked for Council’s opinion on what they would like to see in the ordinance.

Suggestions:

- To not obstruct traffic and have esthetic value.
- Set standards to follow – uniformity.
- Anything added or changed needs to meet new standards.
- Need to involve business community.
- Modify definition of “sign”.
- Some businesses may feel their business is affected by another business’s sign, whether it’s “art” or “verbiage”.
- Would like to add or modify nuisance code regarding issues that are complaint driven to become a percentage of complaints needed rather than just one complaint. **Nuisance code can be modified easily, it is in a different chapter of the Municipal Code, and wouldn’t have to go through a Land Use amendment. Changes to the sign code would have to go through a legislative amendment.**

Luther – Sent a letter to the owner of the business [Magic Mushroom], as well as owner of that property. The biggest reason for the letter is Council stated they were making a complaint *and* they did not have a permit. Does Council want me to follow through with that?

- Heard there were all types of responses regarding that letter. **Yes, received 11 emails, 8 said to take it down, 3 said to leave it up.**

**Jacobs – Would like to urge caution. According to the current development code, if there is an enforcement action, it first must go to the Planning Commission and then appeal to the Council. Does not want Council to get into details of a specific enforcement action at this time, precluding them from hearing the appeal.**

- In favor of the “signs” definition that Roseburg uses.
- Would like to see what other communities do regarding their complaint driven process.

**Gillham – Concerned with relocating definitions to front of the code. But, as long as the definitions as they relate to the sign code are part of the packet given to the customer, that would be okay.**

- Does City want to implement an ordinance such as a vision/image on what is allowed around I-5?

**Luther – Could go back to the previous sign ordinance (included in packet as part of Ordinance 991).**

*Hawley – Section 3.7.100 - Page 6 of 1 [Ord. 991] has the old sign ordinance, which is a much simpler version.*

*Gillham – Whatever is decided needs to go through the Planning Commission.*

- Council could provide direction to the Planning Commission.
- Would like to keep it as simple as possible.

**ADJOURNMENT** –

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:32pm.

**Announcement** –

Mayor McKnight announced a 5-minute break before going into Executive Session. ORS 192.660(2) (e) – Real Property Transactions. To deliberate with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions and ORS 192.660(2) (f) Exempt Public Records. To consider information of records exempt by law from public inspection.

Executive Session called to order at 8:37pm.

Executive Session – ORS 192.660(2) (e) – Real Property Transactions and ORS #192.660(2) (f) Exempt Public Records.

Executive Session adjourned at 8:52pm

Respectfully submitted,

*Diane Harris*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Diane Harris, Deputy City Recorder

Approved:

*Jerry Gillham*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jerry Gillham, City Manager

*Todd McKnight*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Todd McKnight, Mayor

*APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL AUGUST 24, 2015*