AGENDA

BURNS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, August 5, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

Burns City Hall
242 S. Broadway
Burns, Oregon 97720

Chairperson Forrest Keady
Commissioner Jamie Attleberger
Commissioner Bryan Garo
Commissioner McKiah Schroeder
Commissioner Ron Bolles

COMMISSIONERS AND CITIZENS ARE WELCOME TO JOIN THE MEETING VIA ZOOM AS WELL AS IN PERSON.

Members of the public and media wishing to address the commission during any public comment period will be able to join the webinar as an "attendee." Attendees will be able to view the Webinar on a desktop, laptop or mobile device such as a smartphone or iPad by using the following link:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/9020143459 Meeting ID: 902 014 3459

1. Call Meeting to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call
4. Approve Agenda
5. Approve Minutes
   5.1 July 1, 2026, Meeting Minutes
6. Public Comment

7. Old Business
8. New Business
9. Public Hearing
    9.1 Development Code Amendments
10. Adjourn

The Burns Planning Commission meetings are available via Zoom and in accordance with ORS 192.610 to 192.690, these meetings conform to guidelines set forth on public meeting law. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this meeting location is accessible to person with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for person with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours before the meeting to City Recorder Tiffany Leffler (541) 573-5255.

Updated Agenda Posted: July 31, 2026, at Burns City Hall, Burns Post Office, Harney County Courthouse, City of Burns Website, and City of Burns Facebook Page.

BURNS PLANNING COMMISSION

July 1, 2026

The Burns Planning Commission held a meeting July 1, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. Members present were as follows:

Chairperson Forrest Keady
Commissioner Jami Attleberger – Absent
Commissioner Bryan Garo
Commissioner McKiah Schroeder
Commissioner Ron Bolles

Also, present were City/Planning Clerk Tiffany Leffler and the President of Telos Development Company David Glennie. Via Zoom was City Land Use Planner Jay Harland.

Chairperson Keady called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

SUMMARY

The Planning Commission held a work session to discuss two main agenda items: Code modifications for parking lot paving requirements and Telos development conditions of approval. Jay Harland presented proposed changes to the parking code that would implement a stepped system with different requirements based on the number of parking spaces, where lots with 20 or fewer spaces would have no paving requirements, lots with 21-40 spaces would need to pave 25% of the minimum required spaces, and larger lots would maintain the current 100% requirement. The commission discussed concerns about maintaining aesthetic standards on Main Street while providing flexibility for smaller businesses, with Commissioner Garo suggesting additional triggers based on project cost or location requirements. Regarding the Telos development conditions, the commission reviewed 27 conditions of approval, with the main points of discussion focusing on HOA requirements, the step system for sewer treatment, and infrastructure concerns. The commission expressed support for the Telos development moving forward while addressing specific concerns about sewer capacity and the need for better communication between the city and developers.

AGENDA

Commissioner Garo moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner Bolles seconded the motion. All Ayes. **(4/0)**

MINUTES

June 3, 2026, Meeting Minutes –

Commissioner Bolles moved to approve June 3, 2026, minutes. Commissioner Schroeder seconded the motion. All Ayes. **(4/0)**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no new business.

NEW BUSINESS

8.1 Development Code Amendments for Parking Lot Improvements –

Land Use Planner Jay Harland presented a memo regarding parking lot requirements, explaining that the council directed staff to develop a step system based on lot size, with smaller lots (20 or fewer spaces) having no paving or landscape requirements, medium-sized lots (21-40 spaces) requiring 25% paving of minimum spaces, and larger lots maintaining the current 100% requirement. He also wanted to mention that currently you are required to demarcate the individual spaces and provide wheel stops. He said staff would strongly recommend that be retained. Those wheel stops are not that expensive. It's super hard for them to figure out how the parking is supposed to work, and it can also create some issues. He wanted to make it clear that staff was not proposing changes for the spaces that are required to be paved.

The discussion focused on implementing consistent standards across all developments while addressing concerns about cost burdens.

They also addressed the timeline for implementing new paving requirements, with Commissioner Schroeder asking if the council had given any directions on a time frame for when a project would need to be paved by.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland informed her that it wasn't discussed at the council meeting but given the weather conditions in Burns, but at a staff level he would support a little bit of flexibility. He suggested a standard code provision rather than an after-fact compliance approach and discussed how the county's project might be affected by any changes to the code. They also briefly discussed how to handle interconnected parking lots across multiple parcels

Parking requirements and paving standards for businesses were discussed, with the city suggesting additional flexibility based on project costs and location. They debated the benefits of paving versus gravel surfaces, while emphasizing aesthetic improvements, and voicing concerns about costs potentially impacting small businesses. The discussion focused on potential modifications to current standards, particularly for Main Street frontage and smaller developments, with agreement that existing gravel lots would be grandfathered in until future development occurs.

Commissioner Garo said he'd like there to be another trigger for smaller budgeted projects that, for some reason, may end up with a higher number of parking spots, just due to some nuance. He'd like there to be something saying if the total cost of the development is under $10,000 or $15,000 or something to that nature, then the paving is also waived.

Chairperson Keady said one of the things that he would like to see is things being cleaned up. He said it kind of runs contrary on the main strip. He would not like to see a lot of gravel parking lots and things like that on the highway or Main Street. He informed them he would be up for a block off having all these requirements. He just thinks it's a better look.

Commissioner Schroeder said she agreed and they have come a long way. She thinks it's important to realize when people are coming through, the route that they are going through is going to be how they remember Burns and they want it to look appealing and attractive.

Chairperson Keady asked if they could add that businesses on Main Street frontage still have to pave. There's no minimum, but there could maybe be a nice grace period.

After much discussion, Chairperson Keady asked if they had enough to move forward.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland said he believed they did.

8.2 Telos Conditions of Approval –

This part of the meeting focused on clarifying conditions of approval for the Telos project, where staff aimed to consolidate four different sets of conditions into a clean and concise set.

The Planning Commission discussed conditions of approval for the Telos development project. Key points included: 1. The commission reviewed 27 conditions of approval, with most being agreed upon without discussion. 2. There were specific concerns about the step system and potential HOA requirements, which were clarified by staff. 3. The commission expressed support for the development moving forward while emphasizing the need to address infrastructure and sewer capacity issues. 4. It was agreed that the step system is approved in principle, but final approval depends on DEQ's assessment of treatment capacity. 5. The city agreed to provide quarterly updates on sewer system improvements to help with planning. 6. The commission approved the conditions of approval as presented, with Jay agreeing to provide the final order.

Chairperson Keady pointed out that instead of going over all the conditions of approval, he thought they should go over the ones that staff and Telos were having an issue with. Then they could clarify with Commissioner Garo what the intent of his motion from the previous meeting was.

David Gennie informed the Planning Commission that Land Use Planner Jay Harland created the first list of conditions for the meeting. He asked him for a red line version with only those clauses that had discrepancies or disagreements so they could clearly look at them, and he didn't want to do that. He said it was confusing because the numbering and the subjects of many of these conditions have changed so he thought it may be easier to start with Commissioner Garo's motion and what his intent was.

Chairperson Keady informed Mr. Glennie that if there were certain conditions they were already agreeing on, he did not want to get lost in the weeds of it all. He wanted to just focus on the conditions that have discrepancies.

David Gennie said he would try. He said just off the top of his head, it had to do with the potential to come to some agreement on this step system and the demand that they have an HOA. There were two or three others that they were concerned about, because ultimately, they were being asked to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, and there's no criteria under which to judge whether they're good enough. He said they have tried to meet and discuss details on these few items a number of times, but they can't get a hearing or anybody to talk to about how they could come to some agreement. He felt the best example of that would be how to pay for the step system, or how to reimburse the city if they have actual risks. Until that matter was resolved, they are dead in the water, because they have to resolve the sewer issue before anything could happen in the way of construction.

Chairperson Keady informed Mr. Glennie that he was in support of housing in Burns and wanted to see this move forward in a positive and productive way. He believed that all city staff as well as the Planning Commission felt the same way but wanted to give them a chance to speak for themselves.

Commissioner Garo said no matter what, his goal was to get development moving, otherwise his seat on the Planning Commission is kind of worthless if they are not moving towards development. He felt the document of conditions Jay Harland provided seemed longer than the previous set of conditions that were laid out at the last meeting and believed his instruction was to make it significantly shorter. He said he was a little perplexed as to why that is.

Commission Bolles said he supported getting housing, but as far as the infrastructure and everything else, he didn't want to see the Public Works personnel be stretched to thin. He also worried about it becoming Section 8 housing.

Chairperson Keady reminded Commissioner Bolles that it had already been approved. They were just going through the conditions of approval. He thought DEQ would keep them out of trouble with Public Works because DEQ was not going to allow anything they couldn't handle, and they've already said that. He then asked Commissioner Garo what the intent behind his motion at the prior meeting was.

Commissioner Garo said specifically the discussion of an HOA. He said they had a long discussion over whether or not they should force them to have an HOA, and they ended that discussion saying, no, they don't think they should have an HOA, so he was surprised to see in there.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland said he could speak to that and pointed out to the Commissioners that it was condition # 21. As it stands, the Planning Commission has approved it, and as they've proposed it, there are not any common areas, and there won't be any. He informed them that this was written because sometimes when they get into the final design, they figure out they do need a little common area or some common infrastructure. This is written so that if that happens, there will need to be to be an HOA to maintain that common area thing, but, as it says in the last sentence, no HOA is expected at the time of these conditions.

David Glennie felt that this was a complicated issue, because many of these conditions are ultimately written so that the city judges whether it exists. He said they could have a disagreement about whether something was a common area or not, but if the city staff determines in their opinion that it is, then are are forced to have an HOA.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland informed Mr. Glennie that was not how things worked.

Chairperson Keady asked Jay Harland if while going through the process he gets his final plan done, and somewhere, somehow, the city decides that some corner is common area, and they need an HOA. He wanted to know if he would have the ability to come back to the Planning Commission and get a variance or better ruling, or if he would be stuck with what the staff says.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland informed them that he would think Mr. Glennie would go straight to the council.

David Glennie let the Planning Commission know that he and his engineer Steve Ward had spoken with DEQ in Bend. They ended up walking away very frustrated because it kept coming back to a capacity issue. He asked if there was any way to gain capacity for at least a phase 1, and their reply was that it would be up to the City of Burns. He said he just doesn't understand why they can't sit down and discuss the potential for a step system, and how they can pay the city if it is in any way at risk. He thought they should be able to talk business. That way they can figure out whether there's common ground that would allow them to go forward with that system. If not, they need to know that before they start engineering the site.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland's understanding of Commissioner Garo's message was that the step system was approved and these are the conditions of approval. They don't have to talk about conveyance capacity, all they are talking about is treatment capacity at the actual plant, which is not something they can put in these conditions of approval, because it is a citywide amount of water, or sewage that it can process at one time. He clarified again that the step system, in the conditions of approval, is approved, and that it can be designed. It's a separate matter as to whether DEQ is going to say there is sufficient treatment capacity for additional development.

Chairperson Keady asked City Manager Brenda Engebretson if they could have a quarterly update with the city and Telos to go over where they are at with the sewer.

City Manager Brenda Engebretson said she was sure they could have a quarterly update. She said as they were speaking at that moment, they are working on lining out what they are going to be doing, but they don't have plans developed yet. When they start addressing the I&I issue, they are hoping that they can start addressing that within the next year. She said it was a very timely process.

David Glennie said they don't need a quarterly update. They would like to just be able to call and ask the questions they have.

Chairperson Keady said he believed it was better to have a set time for regular communication because he didn't want to keep rehashing the same issues and wanted to continue to see things move forward. He then gave David Glennie time to look over any other issues he had with the conditions of approval that Land Use Planner Jay Harland created, opposed to the ones he had himself created.

Chairperson Keady asked Commissioner Garo if there was anything in the conditions that his previous motion was not intended to have or if he had any concerns.

Commissioner Garo said that nothing jumped out at him, but he was not the developer. He felt it had gotten back to the point where this seemed pretty standard. He said this is what they would ask from any development coming in and putting in any number of houses in any location in the city, and that is his goal for these conditions of approval. He feels they should look substantially similar to the last developments that have gotten their approvals. Obviously, there's nuance with the step system, but otherwise, these should look substantially similar to the last development and the next development.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland informed him that was staff's intent. There are specific things, such as the specific phasing plan they have. There are conditions around that, so that the city has adequate emergency fire access (condition 4). He clarified that was talked about at the hearing and agreed to by the applicant.

David Glennie had a few more questions for Land Use Planner Jay Harland and asked about number four. He said he changed the language so that there's additional street improvements necessary before Phase two, and in the earlier draft, it was Phase three and he wanted to know why that had changed. Before, it had stated they had to finish McGowan Street to get to Phase two, and now they have to finish three Streets to get to Phase two. It's a money thing. They had talked before about having bulbs for a fire trucks to turn around, but not full street improvements

Land Use Planner Jay Harland said there were two steps, and this one he tried to match what the engineer said he wanted it faced.

Chairperson Keady asked Mr. Glennie if there was a version of number four that was different and that they had liked or that read differently.

David Glennie informed them that it was number three on his red lined version and number four on the recent one Jay had presented to the Commissioners. He said he would read it allowed and they could follow along to determine what had changed. He read what was written and it said, "Development phasing of the subdivision shall be arranged such that Phase two is not plotted until South McGowan's Avenue is improved up to the Burns Mini Storage Facility. Providing two street access points. Grant Street and South Imperial Avenue shall be fully constructed as shown on the applicant's drawings and connected so that adequate emergency fire access to said lots will be provided prior to planning Phase three.

The Planning Commission agreed it was word for word.

David Glennie said that was perfect. He explained that this had come down from one of his team members. He has to pay people to review this stuff, and sometimes they make mistakes.

Chairperson Keady asked if he had any further concerns about the conditions they were presented that evening.

David Glennie said the only other one was condition number twenty-one, and they agreed that had already been discussed. He said he guessed he would leave it lying and have faith that cool heads will prevail.

Chairperson Keady had a question about number 25 and 26 on the conditions of approval. He wanted to know if Miller Springs had to meet these requirements before they started construction of homes.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland informed him that Miller Springs was required to do number 26 but 25 he would say was a standard condition, but usually cities that are trying to encourage development can make a choice to modify that. They would do the same thing for Telos that they did for Miller Springs. Miller Springs was about 80% of the way done with their infrastructure, so at that point, they wanted to try to be flexible. Once they're getting close to being done, if they want to start a house, they have a form that they sign that says they're taking all the risk of getting it started before it's recorded.

Chairperson Keady said it sounds like they had some agreement on the conditions and thought they could move forward with the terms that were presented.

Land Use Planner Jay Harland said he would get the final order over to them with the agreed upon conditions of approval attached.

There was no further discussion.

The next meeting will be on August 5, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

Chairperson Keady adjourned the meeting at 7: 10 p.m.

_____

Tiffany Leffler, City Clerk

_____

Forrest Keady, Chairperson

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 29, 2026

PROJECT: Development Code Amendments

PLANNING FILE: LAPF-001-2026

APPLICANT: City of Burns

NATURE OF APPLICATION: A proposed legislative amendment to revise parking lot paving and landscaping standards, update residential sign regulations, and implement minor "housekeeping" corrections to the City of Burns Development Code.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The proposed amendments to the Development Code are based on issues identified during its application across multiple development projects. The primary changes focus on parking lot paving and landscaping standards, as well as residential signage requirements, while additional minor "housekeeping" updates are intended to improve clarity and usability of the Code.

The City's current Development Code has generally functioned well since its adoption in 2023, with numerous planning applications reviewed and approved under its provisions. However, one area that has consistently presented challenges is the application of paving and landscaping standards for new parking lots. Staff has received feedback from multiple applicants indicating that the current requirements can be cost-prohibitive and may hinder development.

Following discussion with City Council, a resolution (Resolution No. 26-283) was adopted directing staff to prepare Development Code amendments to revise parking lot paving and landscaping requirements, along with other necessary updates.

I. AGENCY COORDINATION AND PUBLIC NOTICE

Pursuant to State legal requirements the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments were provided to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) for review and comment. Public notice for this hearing was published in the newspaper and posted to the City's website in accordance with requirements in Section 18.20.035 of the Development Code. At the time this report was prepared, staff had not received any comments from DLCD or members of the public.

II. APPLICABLE CRITERIA

As a legislative amendment proposal, the Planning Commission is authorized to provide a written recommendation to the City Council. The Council will decide whether to adopt the proposed Development Code amendments.

III. KEY ISSUES & TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION

The primary focus of this code amendment is to revise parking lot paving and screening standards. The current code requires full paving and landscaping regardless of the size of the parking lot or scale of development. Based on recent development applications, this requirement has proven to be a constraint, often hindering smaller projects or resulting in variance requests. Based on feedback from the Planning Commission at a study session held

on July 1, 2026, Staff is proposing a scaled approach that maintains paving and landscaping standards for larger developments while allowing greater flexibility for smaller sites.

Following Planning Commission direction, additional provisions have also been included to allow for paving grace periods/time extensions during inclement weather conditions.

Amendments to residential freestanding sign regulations are also proposed. This change is prompted by the recent Veterans Village development, which highlighted that the current code does not permit freestanding signs for residential developments, including multifamily projects and subdivisions. The proposed revision addresses this issue by providing for one freestanding sign (not to exceed 4 feet in height and a maximum area of 32 square feet) per street frontage on multifamily residential developments. The proposed amendment also includes text making it clear that any signs not expressly permitted in the Code are prohibited.

Lastly, an amendment to Table 18.30.130 is included to correct an error identified by staff. This revision clarifies standards related to commercial outdoor storage areas in proximity to residential properties.

IV. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

The proposed Development Code amendment was initiated by the City Council and has been prepared in accordance therewith. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments, including any modifications thereto that the Planning Commission would like the City Council to consider making.

V. EXHIBITS

A. Proposed Development Code Amendment Text
B. City Council Resolution No. 26-283
C. Copies of Required Notice Materials

CITY OF BURNS PLANNING & ZONING DEPARTMENT

By: Jay Harland
Contract City Planner

Date: July 29, 2026

Table 18.30.130
Uses Allowed By Zoning District

USE CATEGORY	SPECIFIC USE	SFR 4	SFR 7	MFR	GC	BP	I	OS	USES SUBJECT TO SPECIAL STANDARDS
COMMERCIAL / SERVICE / EMPLOYMENT USES									
On-Site Sales of Goods	Retail Sales Within Enclosed Building	X	X	X	P	P	~~P~~$_s$	X	~~18.30.230~~
	Retail Sales With Less Than 30% of Site Area for Outdoor Sales & Storage	X	X	X	P	P	~~P~~$_s$	X	~~18.30.230~~
	Retail Sales With Greater Than 30% of Site Area for Outdoor Sales & Storage	X	X	X	P_s	P	~~P~~$_s$	X	~~18.30.340~~ Prohibited within Downtown Commercial Core Zoning Overlay Area
Services	Durable & Electronic Goods Repair or Services with Less Than 30% of Site Area for Outdoor Storage	X	X	X	~~P~~$_s$ P/(C)	~~P~~$_s$ P/(C)	P	X	~~Uses prohibited outside enclosed buildings in GC and BP zones within 200-feet of residential zone~~ CUP in GC and BP zones if within 200-feet of residential zone
	Durable & Electronic Goods Repair or Services With Greater Than 30% of Site Area for Outdoor Storage	X	X	X	~~P/(C)~~ P_s	~~P/(C)~~ P_s	P	X	~~CUP in GC and BP zones if within 200-feet of residential zone~~ Uses prohibited outside enclosed buildings in GC and BP zones within 200-feet of residential zone

18.50.300 Landscaping, Fences, Walls, and Exterior Lighting

* * * * *

4. **Parking Lot Landscaping.** The following standards shall be met for all new parking lots.~~If a development contains multiple parking lots, then the standards shall be evaluated separately for each parking lot.~~

Table 18.50.315.44
Parking Lot Landscaping Requirements

Parking Stalls	Requirement
0-20	No interior landscaping required
21-40	~~Full~~ landscaping required only within the paved portions of the parking lot.*
41+	Full interior landscaping

* For parking lots with 21-40 spaces, only 50 percent of paving is required as outlined in Table 18.50.410.4.

A. A minimum of 10 percent of the total surface area of all paved parking areas, as measured around the perimeter of all parking spaces and maneuvering areas, shall be landscaped. Such landscaping shall consist of canopy trees distributed throughout the parking area. A combination of deciduous and evergreen trees, shrubs, and ground cover plants is required. At a minimum, one tree per 12 parking spaces on average shall be planted over and around the paved parking areas.

B. All parking areas with more than ~~25~~ 30 spaces shall provide landscape islands with trees that break up the parking area into rows of not more than 10 contiguous parking spaces. Landscape islands and planters shall have dimensions of not less than 48 square feet of area and no dimension of less than six feet (including curbing), to ensure adequate soil, water, and space for healthy plant growth.

C. All required parking lot landscape areas not otherwise planted with trees must contain a combination of shrubs and groundcover plants so that, within two years of planting, not less than 50 percent of that area is covered with living plants.

D. Wheel stops, curbs, bollards, or other physical barriers are required along the edges of all vehicle- maneuvering areas to protect landscaping from being damaged by vehicles. Trees shall be planted not less than two feet from any such barrier.

E. Trees planted in tree wells within sidewalks or other paved areas shall be installed with root barriers.

5. **Screening Requirements.** Screening is required for outdoor storage areas, unenclosed uses, and parking lots with more than 30 parking stalls, and may be required in other situations as determined by the decision-making body. Landscaping shall be provided pursuant to the standards of subsections A – C, below:

* * * * *

B. Parking Lots. The edges of parking lots with more than 30 parking stalls shall be screened to minimize vehicle headlights shining into adjacent rights-of-way and residential yards. Parking lots abutting a sidewalk or walkway shall be screened using a low-growing hedge or low garden wall to a height of between three feet and four feet.

18.50.410 Automobile Parking

* * * * *

4. **Parking Stall Design and Minimum Dimensions.** Where a new off-street parking area is proposed, or an existing off-street parking area is proposed for expansion, the entire parking area shall be improved in conformance with this Ordinance. The minimum number of required new parking spaces and the associated drive aisles for new vertical development shall be paved with asphalt or concrete, or may be surfaced with gravel where permitted pursuant to Table 18.50.410.4. All parking spaces and drive aisles ~~and~~ shall conform to the minimum dimensions in Table 18.50.410.5 4.

~~Where additional parking spaces are proposed beyond the minimum requirement for commercial, industrial, or multi-family development with more than four units, the decision-making body may authorize the use of alternative parking area surfacing, such as permeable pavers or laterally stabilized gravel (i.e., gravel parking with interconnected plastic grids that prevent erosion and keeps gravel in the designed location). Through a Type III procedure, the Planning Commission may allow the use of alternative parking area surfacing for required minimum parking spaces.~~

~~Unpaved parking areas shall demarcate individual spaces using wheel stops or other similar methods. All off-street parking areas shall be maintained in a dust-free condition at all times, and contain wheel stops, perimeter curbing, bollards, or other edging as necessary to prevent vehicles from damaging buildings or encroaching into walkways, landscapes, or the public right-of-way. Parking areas shall also provide for storm drainage and surface water management, pursuant to Section 18.40.030.~~

Pursuant to Table 18.50.410.4, parking areas that are not required to be fully paved shall be surfaced with gravel and maintained in a compacted, firm, and dust-free condition. Unpaved parking areas shall clearly demarcate individual parking spaces through the use of wheel stops or other similar methods. All off-street parking areas shall be maintained in a dust-free condition at all times, and shall include wheel stops, perimeter curbing, bollards, or other approved edging as necessary to prevent vehicle encroachment into buildings, pedestrian walkways, landscaped areas, or the public right-of-way. Parking areas shall also be designed and maintained to provide adequate storm drainage and surface water management in accordance with Section 18.40.030.

Table 18.50.410.4

Parking Area Surfacing*

Minimum Required Parking stalls	Required Paving of Parking Area & Associated Drive Aisles
0-20	None required.*
21-40	50% paved*
41+	100%

*Subject to Timing and Exception provisions under 18.50.410.5.

5. Paving Timing and Exceptions

A. Required paving improvements must be completed within 12 months after issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, unless otherwise authorized by the approval authority. The approval authority may extend this deadline based on seasonal weather, site conditions, or other practical constraints affecting construction.

B. For projects subject to paving requirements, the approval authority may grant a waiver or reduction to paving standards where the estimated project valuation or construction cost falls below a threshold established by the City Council.

C. Properties located within the Downton Commercial Core zoning overlay shall be subject to the full paving requirement regardless of the size of the parking area, unless a specific waiver is approved pursuant to subsection (B) above.

D. Any waiver, reduction, extension, or grace period may be conditioned on a performance guarantee, improvement agreement, or other form of assurance acceptable to the City.

~~5.~~6. **Adjustments to Parking Area Dimensions.** The dimensions in ~~subsection 18.50.420.4~~ Table 18.50.410.5 are minimum standards. The decision-making body may adjust the dimensions based on evidence that a particular use will require more or less maneuvering area.

~~6.~~7. **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).** Parking shall be provided consistent with ADA requirements, including, but not limited to, the minimum number of spaces for automobiles, van-accessible spaces, location of spaces relative to building entrances, accessible routes between parking areas and building entrances, identification signs, lighting, and other design and construction requirements.

Table 18.50.410.45
Parking Space Minimum Dimensions*

Parking Angle	Space Width	Space Length	Drive Aisle Width (1-Way)	Drive Aisle Width (2-Way)
90 degrees	9 feet	19 feet	24 feet	24 feet
60 degrees			16 feet	
45 degrees			12 feet	
Parallel	8 feet	24 feet	12 feet	

*See also, Section 18.50.130 Commercial Building Orientation and Design for parking location requirements; Section 18.50.220 Vehicular Access and Circulation for driveway standards; and Section 18.50.300 for requirements related to Landscaping, Screening, Fences, Walls, and Outdoor Lighting.

* * * * *

18.50.500 Signs

* * * * *

3. **Exemptions.** The following are exempt from the provisions of this section:

   A. Signs not oriented toward or intended to be legible from a public right-of-way, private road, or other private property.

   B. Signs inside a building, except for strobe lights visible from a right-of-way, private road, or other private property.

   C. Street and traffic signs legally erected in the right-of-way.

   D. Building numbers as required by the City of Burns.

   E. Signs carved into or part of materials, which are an integral part of the building.

   F. Government, fraternal, civic, or religious organization flags on permanent flag poles, which are designed to allow raising and lowering of flags.

   G. Painted wall decorations and painted wall highlights.

4. Prohibited Signs. The following types of signs are prohibited.

A. Off-premise signs (i.e., signs advertising products or services that are not sold or offered on the site at which the sign is located).

B. Strobe lights and signs containing strobe lights, which are visible beyond the property lines.

C. Signs placed on or painted on a motor vehicle trailer and parked with the primary purpose of providing a sign not otherwise allowed for by this code.

D. Signs constructed in the public right-of-way in whole or in part, except signs legally erected for informational purposes by or on behalf of a government agency. Overhead signs shall be a minimum of 14 feet above a sidewalk and shall not extend into the street and the owner agrees to hold the City harmless of any claims resulting thereof from the signs.

E. Signs placed on rooftops exceeding the 35-foot building height limitation.

F. Flashing or blinking light rooftop signs, excluding seasonal decorations.

G. All signs that not expressly permitted under subsections 18.50.500. through 18.50.500.9, or that are not exempted from regulation in accordance with subsection 18.50.500.3, are prohibited.

* * * * *

7. **Signs in Residential Districts.** The following signs are permitted within all residential zones.

   A. One nonilluminated name plate, not to exceed one and one-half square feet in area, placed flat against the building for each dwelling containing a home occupation.

   B. One temporary nonilluminated sign not to exceed five square feet in area pertaining to the lease, rental, or sale of a building or premises upon which it is located.

   C. One bulletin board not to exceed 12 square feet in area for each church, public library, neighborhood, or community center.

   D. Multi-family residential developments are allowed one monument sign per street frontage, not to exceed 4 feet in height when measured from the adjacent grade, and a maximum overall sign area of 32 square feet.

Exhibit B

RESOLUTION NO. 26-823

A RESOLUTION TO INITIATE A PROJECT TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR THE CITY OF BURNS

WHEREAS, the City of Burns seeks to amend its adopted Development Code to establish new development standards related to the improvement of parking lots; and

WHEREAS, the City also seeks to make technical edits and housekeeping amendments necessary to refine Code text and improve the clarity, consistency, and usability of the Development Code for City staff, applicants, and the public; and

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF BURNS RESOLVES to initiate a project to amend its adopted Development Code and directs City staff to work with the Planning Commission to review, discuss, and make recommendations regarding proposed amendments to parking lot standards, as well as related technical edits and housekeeping amendments intended to improve the Development Code.

PASSED by the City Council and signed by me in authentication of its passage this 10th day of June, 2026.

Jen Hoke, Mayor

Attest: Tiffany Leffler, City Clerk

Department of Land Conservation and Development

PAPA Original Submission: Burns - Amendment 003-26

Submitted On-line/Sent To DLCD: 06/29/2026

Local File #: LPAF-001-2026

1st Hearing: 08/05/2026 **Days Difference:** 37

Final Hearing: **Days Difference:**

Proposal Type:

- ☐ Comprehensive Plan Map Change
- ☐ Zoning Map Change
- ☐ Comprehensive Plan Map & Zoning Map Change
- ☐ Comprehensive Plan Text Change
- ☑ Land Use Regulation Change
- ☐ UGB using Simplified Method (div 38)
- ☐ UGB amendment by city with population less than 2,500 within UGB (div24)
- ☐ UGB amendment of 50 acres or less by a city with population 2,500 or more within UGB (div 24)
- ☐ UGB amendment adding more than 50 acres by city with population 2,500 or more within UGB (div 24)
- ☐ UGB amendment that adds more than 100 acres by Metro (div 24)
- ☐ Urban Reserve designation by Metro or a city with population 2,500 or more within UGB
- ☐ Urban Reserve amendment to add over 50 acres by a city with population 2,500 or more within UGB
- ☐ Urban Reserve designation or amendment by a city with population less than 2,500 within UGB
- ☐ Urban Reserve amendment by Metro
- ☐ Urban Reserve Other
- ☐ Annexation
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Periodic Review Task

Topics:

- ☑ None of these apply
- ☐ Housing Capacity Analysis
- ☐ Transportation System Plan
- ☐ Economic Opportunities Analysis
- ☐ Manufactured and prefabricated housing, including HB4064
- ☐ Public Facility Master Plans (e.g. non-transportation-related master or special area plans for stormwater, wastewater, or water; capital improvement plans, etc.)

Summary of Proposed Change: The city will be making minor code amendments to parking lot paving and landscaping standards. Along with other minor housekeeping items to ensure consistency and improve code useability.

An exception to a statewide planning goal is proposed: No

Goals Subject to Exception:

Total Acres: 0.00

Locations:

Contacts:

Jay Harland

Documents: