

MINUTES
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
March 28, 1994
7:30 p.m.

APPROVED

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairman Schrader, Vice-Chair Mihata, Commissioners Ewert, Gustafson.

Staff Present: Robert Hoffman, Planning Director; James Wheeler, Assistant Planner; and Joyce Faltus, Secretary.

Others Present: Henry Fenske

II. MINUTES

The minutes of March 14, 1994 were approved unanimously, as submitted.

III. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

None

V. FINDINGS

Commissioner Gustafson moved for approval of CUP 94-03 Findings, Conclusions and Order. Commissioner Ewert seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner Gustafson moved for approval of DR 94-02 Findings, Conclusions and Order. Commissioner Mihata seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner Gustafson moved for approval of DR 94-03 Findings, Conclusions and Order. Commissioner Ewert seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner Gustafson moved for approval of MLP 93-08 Findings, Conclusions and Order. Commissioner Mihata seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

None

VII. COMMISSION DISCUSSION OF PLANNING ISSUES

Mr. Turkell reviewed the history of METRO, which was created in the late 1970's by the Oregon Legislature. The jurisdictional boundary was set, based on what legislators saw from the air. At the onset, Canby was included in the METRO area, but was withdrawn after a petition was submitted requesting such removal.

He showed a slide presentation depicting the alternatives METRO is considering regarding growth concepts. The Satellite Cities alternative, which proposes a balance of jobs and households received the most attention, but how the concept could be accomplished was unclear. The advantages Mr. Turkell suggested could be obtained did not appear feasible without an increase in the commercial and/or industrial base which would provide jobs. Mr. Turkell explained that although METRO does not actually do land use planning or zoning, it controls the urban growth boundary projections for communities that are part of METRO because urban growth boundaries are regional in nature as they must be planned so as to accommodate future growth. Whereas METRO is concerned about light rail and mass transit and freeway access which are regional concerns in nature, METRO is not involved with streets that serve individual communities.

A survey taken by METRO of approximately 400 people in four counties, indicated that common values existed in almost all communities like love of nature, transportation, worries about growth, concern for the environment, etc. He explained how population projection data was gathered, based on in-migration and out-migration figures. Further, Mr. Turkell informed the Commission that another survey was forthcoming in June. He proposed that the Commission and/or Council submit suggestions to METRO Council about questions that could be included on the survey to find out what methods the public thinks could be endorsed to accommodate growth. At the present time,

METRO is looking at the costs and consequences of the various alternatives by holding formal presentations before METRO Council.

In response to a question from the Commission, Mr. Turkell explained that although METRO has the responsibility of dealing with the UGB, unless LCDC and the State agree, it does not have the authority to make the changes. He explained that once the framework is in place from METRO, after working with local jurisdictions, they will be presented to LCDC and the State. If a local jurisdiction finds, even after the framework is in place, that it has a different way to solve the problem, if it fits within the realm of METRO's regional framework, it could be instituted.

For the Portland Metropolitan area, Mr. Turkell suggested that some of the answers may be provided in having higher density single family residential areas - smaller lots sizes which would help to accommodate a significant portion of the growth. Some other suggestions are a mix of duplexes and single family homes, all built to the same style. Under certain circumstances, a mixture of commercial and residential uses can even work, he added.

If jobs would eventually be located in smaller communities, thus reducing the need for commuting, the Commission asked what the smaller communities would gain from the additional taxing. Mr. Turkell stated that improving access to smaller communities would encourage businesses to locate there. The Commission suggested that a major road to connect Canby to the job market and METRO region would be a bypass from I-5, and none of the concept plans include any improved access roads to Canby, other than 99-E. Mr. Turkell discussed "Urban Reserves," "Redevelopment," and "Greenbelts" within urban areas, and fielded additional questions from the Commission and audience.

A discussion was held regarding market driven economic development. The Commission questioned why communities could not market themselves. Discussions could be held with the County regarding maintenance of green space such as forest land, EFU, park space, etc., which could remain as Urban Reserves. Mr. Turkell was asked what Canby would have to do differently if it did cooperate with METRO's Alternative C, which is to continue the current rate of growth at 4% a year for 50 years, which is 30 years beyond Canby's Comprehensive Plan timeframe. The Commission asked what the advantages and disadvantages were. One advantage, he responded, was that METRO might suggest increased densities in order to accommodate the growth, rather than expanding the Urban Growth Boundary, while preserving green space.

[Mr. Turkell telephoned Tuesday morning, March 29th, and told Mr. Hoffman he would submit answers to the questions he fielded, in writing.]

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Joyce A. Faltus