

**MINUTES  
FAIRVIEW CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
FAIRVIEW CITY HALL  
1300 NE VILLAGE STREET  
FAIRVIEW, OREGON 97024**

---

**January 16, 2002 -- 6:15pm**

**I. CALL TO ORDER/  
ROLL CALL**

Mayor Vonderharr called the Work Session to order at 6:15pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Roger Vonderharr  
Councilor Ken Quinby  
Councilor Sherry Lillard  
Councilor Steve Owen  
Councilor Len Edwards  
Councilor James Raze  
Councilor Barbara Jones

STAFF PRESENT: Mary Jo Briggs, City Administrator  
John Andersen, Community Development  
Director  
Caren Huson, City Recorder

**II. DISCUSSION -  
Sign Regulations**

Mary Jo Briggs, City Administrator, commented that no specific action was being requested of Council; staff simply would like to review the sign regulation process with Council and discuss the underlying premises that created the sign ordinance.

John Andersen, Community Development Director, reported that the recent Target store sign process was as follows: the sign process was separated from the Planning Commission public hearing on the store itself; the building wall signs were issued without comment; to resolve the conflict over placing a sign in a wetland area, Holt & Haugh met with the City; concept developed regarding combining a municipal sign with the Target commercial sign; concept was reviewed with the City Administrator at that time; negotiations occurred (wetlands were avoided, sign size was reduced, Town Center image was added, no cost to City for sign or electricity); and, Target/Pacific Neon proceeded to place the sign. Director Andersen commented that sign permits in wetland areas require Planning Commission review; however, signs not proposed to be located in a wetland area does not require Planning Commission review.

Councilor Quinby questioned if Target had chosen to place their sign in the wetland area, would it have been accessible from the roadway for maintenance. Director Andersen responded yes, that some allowances would have had to been made to access the sign.

Councilor Owen asked what makes a sign a "municipal" sign, and weren't they only informational and directional signs. Director Andersen responded that a municipal sign is actually a city sign; it is owned by the City and it does direct individuals to municipal buildings. Councilor Owen questioned what would happen if, in the future, other businesses came forward with their sign proposals which included

municipal directions, would the City have to accept the sign. Director Andersen responded that negotiations would have to occur.

Councilor Raze stated that he did not have a problem with the Target sign as it saved the City money, it was smaller than it could have been, and there were no wetlands impacted; the problem was that citizens thought they were not allowed to participate in the decision process. Councilor Raze thought that at least a notification should have been sent to residents around the area as they were under the impression that a public hearing was going to be held. Administrator Briggs mentioned that the Council could take different directions regarding the sign ordinance, including the addition of new language.

Councilor Owen stated that if a sign was going to be placed in public right-of-way, that a Planning Commission hearing should be held as it would allow a discussion among the public. Mayor Vonderharr added that whenever there was a sensitive issue, that the topic should be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission or City Council who would then decide if they wished to discuss the item or allow a staff decision.

Mayor Vonderharr reminded the Council that the Fairview Village overlay zone did allow additional options that did not apply to other areas of the City. Director Andersen added that there was an approval for directional signs in the Village and designs and specifics are incorporated into the Fairview Village Development Code. Councilor Edwards mentioned that the original Village design allowed signs at each entrance to the Village and that they could be no more than 10-feet in one direction, and 15-feet in the other direction.

Councilor Owen questioned who would approach the City to propose a free-standing monument entry sign to the Village. Director Andersen responded that the property owner would have to approach the City, and that the property owner for the Village entry signs was Holt & Haugh; a temporary directional sign for the Village will be installed soon. Mayor Vonderharr stated that he had concerns regarding directional signs in a couple entrances to the Village as it is basically a residential area.

Councilor Lillard asked if sign approvals were normally separated from a Planning Commission hearing. Director Andersen responded that normally, a sign proposal comes into the City after the Planning Commission has held a Design Review on the proposal.

Mayor Vonderharr commented that if the sign ordinance was to be amended, that it should be amended for the City overall, not changed just for one small neighborhood within the City. The sign ordinance should be consistent throughout the City.

Councilor Lillard questioned if a sign was proposed for placement on private property, would the public be allowed to comment on the proposal. Director Andersen responded that a sign proposal on private property is a staff decision, and that notification is sent to residents within 150-feet of the proposal. A staff approved sign permit may be appealed to the Planning Commission, but that would be after the staff approval process. Director Andersen added that the current sign ordinance stated that staff may approve all signs no matter where they were proposed to be located, and that that was common throughout the region and state. It would be unusual to have a sign permit reviewed by a public body.

Councilor Edwards commented that as long as the sign proposal met the City's Code, that there was no reason why staff shouldn't approve simple, straightforward proposals.

Mayor Vonderharr asked how Fairview's sign ordinance compared with other cities around it. Director Andersen responded that Fairview's sign code was very similar to surrounding jurisdictions', but maybe a little stricter.

Councilor Raze stated that he thought the decision-making process should be left as is, but if Council wanted to review the Code itself, that was a different discussion, but we must be consistent. Councilor Owen commented that the only thing he would like to have added to the sign code would be language regarding signs placed in public right-of-way need to go before the Planning Commission for a decision if it involved commercial advertising. Council consensus was that the current City sign values be maintained, such as safety, community character, balancing needs with directional needs/aesthetics, etc., but that language be added for commercial signs requiring a public hearing if they are to be placed in the public right-of-way. Staff commented that they would return to Council at a later date with a proposed amendment to the sign code.

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

Councilor Owen moved and Councilor Raze seconded the motion to adjourn. Mayor Vonderharr adjourned the Work Session at 7:25pm.

AYES: 7  
NOES: 0  
ABSTAINED: 0

—

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Roger Vonderharr

—

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dated:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Caren C. Huson Quiniones  
City Recorder