

MINUTES
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 13, 1995
7:30 P.M.

APPROVED

I. ROLL CALL

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

Staff Present: Robert Hoffman, Planning Director, and Joyce Faltus, Secretary.

Others Present: Tony Crawford, Laurie Ferrell, Evelyn Surdam, Neal Keefer, Craig Piland, Linda Goatcher, Bob Christiansen, Larry Sharp, Scott Beck, Betty Crawford, Edward Hall, Justin Brown, Joseph Forsythe, Gay Forsythe, Bob Westcott.

II. MINUTES

The balance of the minutes of **January 23, 1995** [pages 22-25] were approved as submitted.

The minutes of **February 27, 1995** were approved as submitted.

The minutes of **February 13, 1995** were carried over to the March 27, 1995 meeting.

III. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

None

V. FINDINGS

None

VI. NEW BUSINESS

None

VII. COMMISSION DISCUSSION OF PLANNING ISSUES

Commissioner Ewert reported that METRO consultants are moving ahead regarding the different plans for the Canby's future pattern. The committee has given the consultants direction about the way to go, including opening lines of communication with Barlow. In terms of the density proposed, Commissioner Ewert explained that a half-mile square area is planned for 5,000 people. No other transportation routes in or out of Canby are proposed, leaving Highway 99-E as the only access. To permit such growth as METRO foresees, Highway 99-E would have to be a 6 or 8 lane highway from Canby to the Portland metropolitan area, he added. The rail system, possibly a high speed rail system, was discussed as a possibility to bring people in and out.

Chairman Schrader explained that the consultants have submitted three options for Canby's growth:

1. To fill in to the north of town to the river.
To include S. Central Point Road as a boundary
2. To increase density in certain areas from 6/acre to 8/acre
3. To increase density in certain areas from 8/acre to 10/acre

No growth was projected in the Barlow area or south of the Molalla River due to the flood plain. But, Barlow, he added, was counted towards the industrial/commercial equation for the Comprehensive Plan, but not included as part of the tax base for Canby. The quality of the soils in the north part of Canby drew a lot of discussion. Nothing about the visioning process was included in the METRO consultant's recommendations.

Dr. Schrader explained that the fate of Canby is being decided at these meetings, but that only 10 people attended the last meeting, 40% of whom were from outside Canby City limits. He stated he is considering writing a "Point of View" article to try and induce more people to attend. A flyer had been included in the Canby Herald newspaper but, possibly, the significance of it was not stressed.

Dr. Schrader passed out information from the Parks, Recreation, and Natural Resources Vision Group. He explained that in trying to make this vision a reality, dovetailing it with the school district is very important. The short term goal of the task force, he explained, is to have a tax-base funded recreation district in place by July, 1996. The district will offer, encourage, and support a broad range of recreational and leisure opportunities throughout the South Clackamas County area, which will encompass the general Canby school district area, with the exception of Charbonneau, which is part of the Wilsonville Park and recreation service area.

Chairman Schrader referred to an agenda included in the packet, which addresses discussions with the school district and City Council regarding school capacity. **Superintendent Steve Miller** distributed a Final Recommendation Report submitted to the Superintendent, by the Canby School District Boundary and Grade-Level Configuration Committee. Mr. Miller explained that an **Education Summit**, sponsored by the school district and City Council, was planned for the end of April. Afterwards, he plans to submit a long-range planning timeline which would address current issues of concern, with additional specific issues identified and added - to identify how to best utilize the facilities and accommodate growth. One important aspect would be to have monthly meetings between the Superintendent, Board Chair, City Administrator, County and City planners, and Mayor in an effort to connect the agencies and get really involved in the Education Summit. In June, a long-range facility planning committee will be formed to plan beyond the current level and take on a major detailed study of a long-range, 20-year plan that would take a look at capacity, and general/student population connected growth and to set benchmarks for actions to respond to that growth. Professional assistance would be brought to that planning process to enable bringing in qualified criteria for updating of the growth projections. Further, Mr. Miller explained that a host of information came out of the boundary change report, in both the demographic study and in the recommendations given to the Board. A critical page summarizes the capacities and where the changes would place the district in relation to those capacities. Additionally, Mr. Miller stated that the need to come forward and connect, in a multi-agency

way [school district, City, County] was very important because it offers us the opportunity to control and direct our own destiny without METRO pulling the strings.

The Commission thanked Superintendent Miller for his time and input. Chairman Schrader explained that in light of Mr. Miller's presentation, he considers schools as public facilities for the City and should be relied upon as such when considering future planning needs for the City. Chairman Schrader requested a copy of the Barmack Study.

Chairman Schrader asked what the Growth Task Force Visioning Committee, a major group who was supposed to be reaching out to the community to make the Visioning Process work, was working on officially. Mr. Hoffman explained that the group has disbanded. Dr. Schrader suggested that if they reached a point where they were unable to move forward, the Commission might help fill in some of the technical blanks, like percentage of growth rate, number of apartment ratios, etc. This group most represented the residents of Canby, and should continue, he added. The Commission requested that Mr. Hoffman invite the citizen who chaired the group, or members of the group, to come before the Commission and explain what the sticky points were - whether it was burnout, or lack of agreement on various issues, or whatever. It was agreed that it would be helpful to distribute copies of the visioning results to the Commission prior to issuing that invitation.

Regarding Design Review Landscaping, the Commission asked if the condition that allows 3-years of growth to full coverage before limiting the bark dust, was successfully implemented. Mr. Hoffman explained that three years have not passed since starting to apply the ODOT planting standards. Chairman Schrader asked for a list of design review projects that have been approved more than 3 years ago, so the Commission could go out and check the landscaping.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

DR 95-05, an application by Sharpcor, Inc. for Design Review approval to construct *Canby Apartments*, a 28-unit, 2-bedroom apartment complex on S.E. Township Road and S. Pine Street. The project will have three 2-story buildings, on site laundry facilities, and a manager's office. The project perimeter landscaping has been designed to provide an aesthetic "buffer" between this project and neighboring sites [Tax Lot 1700 of Tax Map 3-1E-34C].

Chairman Schrader asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact or conflict of interest. None was indicated. He then reviewed the hearing process and procedures and referred to the applicable criteria.

Mr. Hoffman presented the staff report. The proposed project is located east of S. Pine and north of S.E. Township Road, with direct access taken from Township, just east of S. Pine. It is a permitted use in this R-2 zone, and the issue before the Commission is to see if the design is consistent with development in the area and compatible with it, not the use itself, Mr. Hoffman explained. He reminded the Commission that this site was reviewed as a Minor Land Partition approximately a year ago, and the site under review at this hearing is Parcel #2 of that partition. Two of the conditions of approval, Condition # 10 and #11, address half-street improvements for the **full** frontage along Township and Pine [including Parcel #1], which must be constructed prior to occupancy of any development on Parcel #2 [or bonding provided], and access to Parcel #2, which would be limited to the easternmost leg off Township Road, were reviewed. Although sewers have been developed in this area [S. Pine] as part of the Logging Road Project and the Pine Crossing Manufactured Home Park, this area is part of Area "O" - Areas of Special Concern - in the Comprehensive Plan, and the applicant will need to provide for widening of Pine Street and Township Road, and has done so by proposing to widen Township, and putting money in escrow for the eventual widening of Pine at such time as other parcels are developed. Public services, including sewer, is available to this site. Storm water will be treated on-site. Approximately 5,000 square feet of the site is proposed as recreation space, and 27,000 square feet is proposed to be landscaped.

With the traffic circulation indicated on the proposal, the Fire Marshal has not requested additional emergency access. If one is required, the applicant would prefer it be provided for off the western leg of the site, from Township. The Highway 99-E/Pine intersection is programmed to have traffic lights installed in the early summer;. The County has programmed improvements for the S. Ivy/S. Township intersection, and Mr. Hoffman explained he would look into the timeline, which he does not believe is scheduled yet. Redwood Street to Highway 99-E would probably be a preferable route for most people heading north on 99-E, while people heading south would probably use the S. Ivy/Township intersection. The single access to the site meets the ordinance at the present time. This project will pay approximately \$15,000 in Transportation SDC charges, which is intended to pay for off-site necessary improvements that are caused by the project's impact. The light at Township/Ivy and 13th/S. Ivy are included as part of that SDC plan.

Applying City-wide rates, this project projects .6 children per dwelling unit, approximately 17 school aged children added to the school system. The school system has indicated that there are adequate facilities to provide service to this project, by making use of the capacities that are available in Carus and 91 schools. Sewer is available, both in Pine and via the Logging Road project, and Township has capacity available also. In terms of the need for housing, Mr. Hoffman explained that there is every indication of high demand for rental housing in Canby, based on the less than 1% vacancy rate. The structures on the northern property, where the impact on adjacent property would be, are no closer than 30 feet and are 2-story buildings [less than 35 feet], which is sufficient to meet the solar requirements. The total site being just less than 2 acres, this project would require 24,000 square feet of landscaping and the applicant has provided 27,000 square feet, which proposes more than 35 trees and 320 shrubs, in addition to the grassy area. Sixty two parking spaces are required and 65 are proposed. The accessway is a 24 foot drive, off Township, and the entire road system is 24 feet wide, to allow 90 degree parking. The number of units, as related to access roadway width, would allow for 36 dwelling units if the drive is at least 24 feet wide - this project is 28 units. There is a special provision which states that all the units must be within 50 feet of access and the block of buildings to the northwest does not, which will require some additional means of access to those units. The architecture is standard, in many ways, similar to Township Commons, to the north. Mr. Hoffman reviewed the colors and materials, adding that the architecture is appropriate for the project and the vicinity. The applicant has proposed a fence to separate the area immediately to the east, which is zoned for industrial development. When that area is developed, a sight-blocking fence may be more appropriate. Recreation space required is 2,800 square feet, and the applicant has proposed 5,000 square feet, with no facilities proposed in that area. The project covers 28 percent of the site although the ordinance allows up to 40 percent. The Fire Marshal's request for an 8" looped water line and fire hydrant, have been incorporated into the conditions of approval. As no phasing for the project has been proposed, Mr. Hoffman amended proposed condition #7 to delete "for each phase." Although there are no immediate solutions to the traffic conditions at the intersection of Ivy/Township, Mr. Hoffman stated that he recommends approval with conditions.

Applicant

Scott Beck, 361 N.E. Third Avenue explained that the partition of the entire site was approved prior to the applicant purchasing the property, and was under the assumption that the owners of the home on Parcel #1 were responsible for

their parcel's frontage on Township. Mr. Hoffman explained that the conditions of approval for the minor land partition required the developer of Parcel #2 to ensure improvements are made along the entire frontage on Township, including Parcel #1 prior to development of Parcel #2. That would be an issue between the seller and the purchaser, he added. Mr. Beck stated he would like to meet with the CUB and the Fire Marshal regarding the 8" water main looping through the complex to investigate whether that design is the only alternative for the system. He submitted an amended site plan that illustrates parking provided within 50 feet to every entrance to a dwelling. A trash enclosure was relocated, and parking added closer to the end building in the northwest corner. Regarding the emergency access, Mr. Beck stated that although major entrance to the parcel is not permitted through the western leg, it will be developed as a parking area within 20 feet of the frontage and it would be a logical progression if the applicant could also develop that to provide emergency access with a crash gate, or chain. A curb cut in that area would not really be necessary either, as emergency vehicles could jump the curb. The applicant has also made a strong attempt to maintain the existing landscaping on the site and to provide a good solid buffer between the neighbors. Mr. Hoffman explained that unit "C" is more than 60 feet from the parking area, but that the ordinance only states "access" to the unit must be available within 50 feet. Mr. Beck stated that he intends to bring the parking stall inward to be within 50 feet of unit "C", and to comply with the criteria.

Proponents

None

Opponents

Gay Forsythe, 792 SE Township stated that when Pine Street is opened as a through street, it will become a big traffic problem as it is too close to the entrance to this project, which might require a traffic signal. Mr. Hoffman explained that this project is not proposing to bring Pine Street out to Township, only to set money aside for when that happens, some time in the future, nor is it providing access from these units to Pine Street, only to Township. The distance between the access road and Pine's eventual improvements is approximately 300 - 400 feet. At the time of the partition, the Commission did not permit the western leg of the parcel to be used as an access point as it felt it was too close to the eventual tie-in to Pine Street, once it was improved to Township.

Betty Crawford, 570 S. Pine Street stated that her property abuts the northwest corner of the proposed project. Ms. Crawford explained that she was concerned about the buffer that would separate her property from the apartments and expressed concern about protecting her family's privacy. Mr. Hoffman explained that no specific buffer was specified between the two residential properties and that the back of the apartments are no less than 30'6" from the property line, which is more than the ordinance requires. There are some existing trees on Ms. Crawford's property, he added, and the applicant proposes to add an additional 4 trees. Furthermore, Ms. Crawford explained that her apple trees would afford little privacy, but the area of concern is her patio area, which would not be protected at all. Ms. Crawford also stated that the Ivy/Township intersection is very dangerous and that she goes out of her way to avoid using it.

Joseph Forsythe, 792 S.E. Township stated that he is concerned about the emergency access, with respect to his liability because the residents of Marlon South apartments cross Pine Street and walk across his property to get into the Marlon apartments. If the emergency access to this project is secured only by a chain, he feels additional people will cross his property, as a shortcut home, especially children on bicycles. He asked for clarification with regard to not having to build fences between differently zoned residential uses. A visual barrier should be required, at least, between multiple housing and single family housing, he added, questioning whether it was a deficiency in the Code that it was not so required.

James E. Surdam, 480 S. Pine stated that his lot, on the corner of Pine and Township, abuts this site to the west. He explained he would prefer that a fence would separate his property from this project. Mr. Hoffman explained that on the revised drawing, a sight-obscuring 6 foot fence is shown along the property line where it abuts this project.

Rebuttal

Scott Beck discussed the issues of a fence along northerly property line. Mr. Beck indicated where fences are proposed, on the revised site plan. No fencing was proposed along the northerly portion of the site because the applicant was not aware of the sensitivity of the issue, and because it was not required as both parcels are zoned R-2. Mr. Beck stated that the applicant might look at the situation and consider planting arborvitae hedges for that portion of the site that would directly abut the residence.

Commission Deliberation

1. The Commission discussed the intersection of S. Ivy/S. Township. Mr. Hoffman explained that the County has not scheduled improvements at that intersection, after cancelling them last year. To date, he has not been able to get a response to that issue from the County. The Commission agreed that although various options now exist, like the extension of Redwood, to avoid using that intersection, Mr. Hoffman was instructed to pursue the issue with the County.
2. The Commission discussed the emergency access. It was agreed emergency access to Pine Street was not necessary and that emergency access would be provided to Township Road from the western parking leg, with a break-away chain, or something similar, to be approved by the Fire Marshal and Police Chief.
3. As the development will be responsible for improving Pine Street, because pedestrian-friendly accesses are promoted throughout town to limit resident use of vehicles, and to limit access across private property, the Commission agreed to add a condition requiring a pedestrian sidewalk and gate to Pine Street from the development, near unit "C," in the northwest corner of the site. The Commission agreed the pedestrian sidewalk should meet Canby's recently adopted standards.
4. Based on testimony by the adjacent neighbor to the northwest, the Commission discussed the need for buffering to insure the neighbors privacy and to discourage trespassing on the neighbor's property, the Commission agreed to add a condition requiring the planting of sight-obscuring vegetation, such as Arborvitae or Photinia, along the northern property line to protect the privacy for the adjacent home on Tax Lot 1100.
5. The Commission discussed the recreation area. It was agreed that two or three different play structures should be provided, with appropriate safe materials provided as the ground surface below the structures.
6. The Commission discussed the fence setbacks on Township Road. It was agreed that fencing should be conditioned to step down as it nears the sidewalk, so as not to obstruct vision clearance from the end of the driveway of oncoming traffic on Township Road.

7. The Commission discussed parking lot lighting. The applicant explained that lights would be mounted on the buildings. Mr. Hoffman explained that it is customary, as part of the construction review, that CUB reviews all lighting and makes recommendations. The Commission asked that a condition be added regarding adequate lighting for the driveway and parking areas.

Based on the findings and conclusions contained in the staff report dated March 3, 1995, testimony at the hearing, and Commission deliberations, Commissioner Maher moved to approve application DR 95-05 with the following conditions:

1. Half-street improvements shall be provide along S. Pine Street and Township Road [including both Parcel #1 and Parcel #2], and shall include pavement, five (5) foot concrete sidewalks and curbs, urban-type street lighting, and shall meet Canby Construction Standards. Right-of-way designs and construction designs shall be approved by the Public Works Supervisor or acting City Engineer. The applicant shall reimburse the City, or sign an agreement for the reimbursement of infrastructure improvement costs in accordance with an approved advanced financing agreement applying to the site. [County road permits and approvals will also be needed.]
2. The applicant shall provide a waiver of remonstrance for any traffic improvements needed for S.E. Township Road and S. E. Pine Street.
3. Prior to occupancy, the required Advanced Financing Agreement fee, Transportation Systems Development Charge, Recreation Systems Development Charge, and Construction Excise Tax shall be paid, or a satisfactory arrangement for payment shall be agreed upon between the applicant and the City.
4. During construction, erosion-control shall follow the Erosion/Sedimentation Control Plans Technical Guidance Handbook for Clackamas County, August 1991 (as amended.)
5. An 8-inch water main shall be installed in the complex, as approved by the Canby Utility Board and the Fire Marshal. The main shall be looped through the complex from Township Road to the main on S. Pine Street. A fire hydrant and water main shall be provided at a location approved by the Fire Marshal, as shown on the plans in his office and/or as approved by the Fire Marshal and Canby Utility Board.

6. The applicant shall participate in a preconstruction conference with City staff, Canby Utility Board, the fire district, etc., prior to construction.
7. A landscape **construction** plan shall be submitted to the City Planning Department as part of the building permit application. The plan shall include a permanent underground irrigation system, planting schedule, plant locations within the landscaped areas, plant types and sizes, and the plant spacing. The landscaping shall be installed prior to the final building inspection, or a bond shall be posted for the amount of landscaping to be completed (plus 10%) with a date certain for completion of the landscaping improvements.
8. "Vehicular Access" shall be provided to a point at least within 50 feet of the entrance to all units, including unit "C" in the northwest corner.
9. "Emergency Access" shall be provided to Township Road from the western parking leg. The emergency entrance /exit shall provide a break-away chain or other feature, as approved by the Fire Marshal and Police Chief.
10. Prior to occupancy, the proposed recreation areas shall be developed to include play structures and the surfaces below the structures shall include safe materials, not including wood chips and potential splinters. The City Planner shall review and approve the proposed recreational development and surface treatment.
11. A pedestrian concrete sidewalk and gate to S. Pine Street from the development shall be provided near unit "C" in the northwest section of the site.
12. Sight-obscuring vegetation, such as Arborvitae or Photinia, shall be provided along the northern property line, adjacent to the home on Tax Lot 1100.
13. Parking lot and driveway lighting shall meet CUB requirements.
14. The fence on the easterly property line extending out to Township Road shall be stepped down so as not to obscure vision clearance of oncoming traffic on Township Road.

Commissioner Mihata seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

DR 95-06, an application by Sprague Controls for Site and Design Review approval of a 45,000 square foot building on the southerly 4.79 acre property. The 45,000 square feet is the 'footprint' size of the building, which includes 31,500 square feet for manufacturing/warehousing space and 27,000 square feet of office space [37% expansion area of office]. The property is located on the northwest corner of N. Baker and N.W. 3rd Avenue [Tax Lot 1500 of Tax Map 3-1E-32D].

Chairman Schrader asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact or conflict of interest. None was indicated except that Commissioner Ewert stated he lived in very close proximity to the site and will be affected personally, but not financially. No one in the audience had any problem with Commissioner Ewert sitting as part of the hearing body. He then reviewed the hearing process and procedures and referred to the design review criteria.

Mr. Hoffman presented the staff report. He explained that the design of the building is exactly like the design presented previously for another site. The site is more regularly shaped than the previous site under consideration. The building is 45,000 square feet, with 27,000 square feet of office space, half of which is designated for a later phase on the second story of the building. The design meets all the parking, landscaping, and other site requirements. Regarding the lighting in the area, CUB explained that it would be their normal procedure to investigate the lighting level and require that it be brought up to CUB's standards for street lighting. The stormwater would be by use of the City storm sewer on N.W. 3rd. Both the loading berth and headlights from vehicles will be screened, he explained. Furthermore, Mr. Hoffman explained that there is no effect from this project on the cost or availability of needed housing. After reviewing input from the contract City Engineer, Curt McLeod, Mr. Hoffman explained that the initial staff report expressed some concern about the potential use of N. Baker as a main route to get to access this site, and from this site to Knights Bridge Road, and suggested providing a turnaround at N. Baker/N.W. 6th. Police Chief Giger expressed concerns that might be created if N. Baker Street was to be dead-ended or blocked off in an area where activity is usually non-existent in the evening hours. On June 10, 1993, Johnson Controls submitted a report justifying why their parking should be reduced. That report showed that, at all points in time, 24-hours a day, they had in excess of 150 employees on-site in the evening. After talking with other industries in the area who expressed similar concerns, Mr. Hoffman submitted a revised or "alternate" condition #7,

that the applicant shall provide an affidavit promising that Sprague Controls will inform all their employees and trucking companies regularly servicing their business at N.W. 3rd/N. Baker, that access to their business will be taken from N.W. 3rd/N. Cedar rather than N.W. 6th/N. Baker, and that all through traffic on N.W. 6th/N. Baker should be avoided. A copy of that written notice should be provided to the planning office.

Applicant

Neal Keefer, General Manager of Sprague Controls, 4025 NE Couch Street, Portland explained that Sprague Controls is a very good neighbor, with very responsible employees who are very involved in the community. Mr. Keefer explained further that the alternative to proposed condition #7 is acceptable and that if the employees are asked not to drive north on N. Baker, they would respect the request. Sprague also is sure that the shippers that service them, once requested not to use N. Baker, north of this site, will respect that request. Sprague does take exception to the originally proposed condition #7 because there was no design to the turnaround proposed, and it would be hard to commit to a design without seeing it. Additionally, as Sprague would not be the only business in the area, traffic control costs should be shared by all the businesses. Mr. Keefer proposed adopting the alternative condition. In conclusion, Mr. Keefer explained that the site is more suitable for the company as it is flatter and easier to grade, and the property was more reasonable in price.

Proponents

Laurie Ferrell, 453 S.W. 7th Avenue stated that she has been an employee of Sprague Controls for the last 12 years, and that the company is very community-conscious. If the employees are asked not to use the N. Baker/N.W. 6th as a commuter route, they would respect that request. Furthermore, she explained that it is a very inconvenient route, with all the twists and turns.

Evelyn Delker, 650 N.W. Baker Avenue, also an employee of Sprague Controls, stated that she has used N. Baker as a commuting route in the past, and it is a very difficult route. Using N.W. 3rd to Cedar to Knights Bridge would be more convenient, she added. Ms. Delker also concurred with Ms. Ferrell, that the employees would respect the request not to use N. Baker as their commuting route.

Craig Piland, 315 S. Locust, #6 stated he has been an employee of Sprague Controls for 15 years and the issue of traffic on N. Baker has been discussed at work. None of the employees have raised problems with using a route other than N. Baker.

Bob Westcott, 1073 N. Grant addressed the issue of street lighting in the industrial park. He explained that when the design review hearing was held for "Hot Off The Press" the lighting issue was overlooked on N.W. 3rd. There are only 2 street lights in the entire are of N.W. 3rd, N.W. 5th, N. Baker because no transformers were installed as they were unsure of what kind to install until the businesses located there. Therefore, when the streets were developed no street lights were installed. There was no design review when Potters went in, although there are some lights for their parking lot. Regarding the issue of security, Mr. Westcott explained that a burglary took place at Mr. DuPont's site shortly after the handicap knobs on the doors. Someone who lives in the residential area nearby was driving through the park and was able to halt the burglary. Especially on weekend evenings, just the possibility that residents might be driving through the area, offers uncertainty to would-be burglars. For that reason the local businesses would prefer that N. Baker remain open so residents can freely drive south towards the business community.

Commission Deliberation

1. The Commission discussed the traffic patterns in this industrial area. Included in the discussion was:
 - a. The Police Department's recommendation that N.W. 6th/N. Baker not be closed. The Commission discussed the possibility of requesting additional enforcement for the area.
 - b. Installing a sign indicating that there is a truck turnaround in a cul-de-sac on N.W. 5th Place, without barricading N.W. 6th/N. Baker
 - c. Adopting staff's proposed alternative condition that Sprague will inform their employees and trucking companies that regularly service them, that access shall be taken from N.W. 3rd/N. Baker direction rather than N.W. 6th/N. Baker, and that all through-traffic on N. Baker is to be avoided. Sprague would also provide a copy of their written notice to staff. Requesting the same action by other businesses in the area was also discussed.
 - d. The possibility of "No Thru Truck Traffic" signage on N.W. 3rd/N. Baker.
 - e. The possibility of prohibiting trailer parking on N.W. 3rd/Baker.

]

The Commission agreed to refer the issue to the Traffic Safety Committee to evaluate what signs are needed, investigate what other traffic control devices or actions might be necessary or helpful,, etc., in order to reduce the City's liability and still reduce potential traffic through the neighborhood along N. Baker, north of N.W. 6th Avenue. Additionally, the Commission agreed to adopt staff's proposed condition that Sprague would inform employees and trucking companies that access should be taken via N.W. 3rd/N. Baker.

2. The Commission discussed the issue of inadequate street lighting and agreed to include a condition of approval that Sprague shall provide street lights adjacent to the property, to the satisfaction of the Canby Utility Board.
3. The Commission agreed the landscaping plan should include an underground irrigation system.
4. The Commission agreed that, rather than planting wildflowers, the expansion area should be planted and maintained as a grass area.

Based on the findings and conclusions contained in the staff report dated March 3, 1995, the supplemental staff report dated March 9, 1995, testimony at the hearing, and on Commission deliberations, **Commissioner Mihata moved to approve DR 95-06** with the following conditions:

Prior to the Building Permit Application :

1. A preconstruction conference shall be held prior to the issuance of the building permit. The conference shall be coordinated through the Planning Office.

For the Building Permit Application :

2. A "Data Disclosure Form" for the industrial pretreatment program regarding disposal of wastewater to the City's sanitary and storm sewer system shall be completed prior to occupancy.
3. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted with the building permit. The detailed landscape plan shall show: the number of plants, plant spacing/location of planting, the type of plants, the size of plants, the schedule of planting, and underground irrigation plans (except in the future expansion area which may be irrigated above ground). The area which had been proposed to be planted with "wildflowers" shall be planted and maintained as a grass area until the expansion takes place.

4. The landscaping shall be planted at such a density so as to provide a minimum of 95% coverage of the landscape areas with vegetation, within a 3-year time period. Bark mulch and similar material shall consist of not more than 5% of the total landscape area after the 3-year period. The plant spacing shall meet the ODOT plant spacing standards.

Prior to Occupancy:

5. Storm water design and connection to the City's storm sanitary systems and construction of the paved area of the property shall conform to the Canby Public Works Department standards.
6. The compact parking spaces shall be designated as such either by signs posted at the head of the parking spaces, or by paint on the asphalt at the foot of the parking space.
7. The applicant shall provide an affidavit promising that Sprague Controls will inform all their employees and trucking companies regularly servicing their business at N.W. 3rd Avenue and N. Baker Street, that access to their business shall be taken from the N.W. 3rd Avenue and N. Cedar Street direction, rather than N.W. 6th and N. Baker Street. All through-traffic on N. Baker Street is to be avoided. A copy of their written notice shall be provided to the City Planner.

Other Notes:

8. The total signage area shall not cover more than 600 square feet, not inclusive of traffic directional signs as provided in Section 16.40 of the Land Development and Planning Ordinance. Only the signs located at the intersection of N. Baker Street and N.W. 3rd Avenue and at the entrance to the N.W. 3rd Avenue parking lot entrance are approved at this time. No other advertising signs are permitted until six months after the occupancy has occurred.
9. Sprague controls shall provide for street lights adjacent to their property, as recommended by Canby Utility Board, after site-analysis by CUB.

Commissioner Maher seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

IX. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The *Canby School District Boundary and Grade-Level Configuration Committee's Final Recommendation Report to the Superintendent* was discussed. Specifically, page 6(f), paragraph 2, which would adopt a policy enabling the district to reassign, as a group, all students who would reside within a newly-proposed housing development if their attendance at the local school would overburden it, and another school has space available. O.R.S. Section 195.110 of the Oregon Revised Statutes was also discussed, regarding School Facility Plans for High Growth School Districts.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Joyce A. Faltus".

Joyce A. Faltus