

# MINUTES

## CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting  
August 23, 1999  
7:00 PM

---

### ROLL CALL

**Present:** Vice-Chairman Jim Brown, Commissioners Jean Tallman, Derek Bliss, Teresa Blackwell, Geoffrey Manley.

**Staff:** Jason Kruckeberg, Planning Director, John Williams, Associate Planner, Dixie Harms, Planning Secretary.

**Others Present:** Jerry Pineau, Community Development Director, Terry Prince, City Councilman, Mike McCarthy, W&H Pacific, Betty Ramey, Craig Standring, Jim Standring, Doug Gingerich, Patrick Johnson, Ethan Manuel, John Harpster and Joan Jones.

### MINUTES

Commissioner Tallman made a motion to approve the minutes from April 26, 1999 as written. Commissioner Geoffrey Manley seconded the motion. Motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

### FINDINGS

None

### SPECIAL PRESENTATION/WORKSHOP

#### Transportation Systems Plan Update

Jason Kruckeberg gave a presentation on the Transportation System Plan and the Access Management Standards, two projects that have been on going. An article was sent to the paper inviting public input in an informal setting, before taking it through a formal adoption process this would provide a better opportunity for comments.

The TSP was originally completed in 1994, and was adopted as interim draft due to the fact that the Access Management Plan for Highway 99E had not yet been completed. We are now toward the end of 1999 and the Access Management Plan is still not completed. The TSP

needs to be updated every 3-5 years as changes occur, and this process will allow some closure on the Access Management Plan.

In 1998 Mike Jordan and the Planning Staff proposed updating the TSP, not a complete reworking, but updating the bicycle & pedestrian recommendations, street classifications, projects & financing, and mapping improvements.

Through the TSP updating process the City formed an advisory committee made up of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, Oregon Department of Transportation, Canby Public Works Department, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, and Clackamas County. This group met several times to talk about the direction of the update process, and focus in on what kind of work we want to do. The main chapters that have been updated are, Chapter 4, Functional Classification, Chapter 5, Financial Plan, Chapter 6, Transportation Planning Rule Compliance.

The City has an excellent opportunity to mold the two projects together. To get the Access Management Policies into the TSP where they belong will allow them to be implemented along with other TSP Policies.

Mike McCarthy (consultant from W&H Pacific). He first looked at the streets within the city of Canby, and asked if they are adequately serving the current needs of the city, and the expected future needs.

Street classifications are designated by the relative importance of moving traffic. A **Regional State Highway** would carry the highest volume of traffic, (Hwy 99E). Arterials which carry traffic into and out of the city, and carry traffic between regions of the city, which include such streets as Territorial Road, parts of Ivy St. S. 13<sup>th</sup> St. and eventually the connection between Berg Parkway and Knights Bridge Road.

The next classification down is a Collector, a road that carries a high volume of traffic, but access mostly areas within the city, such as Township Rd., Neighborhood Connector, which includes Cedar and Pine St., that carries more traffic than a typical local neighborhood street. Neighborhood connectors focused on moving traffic through adjacent neighborhoods, and Local street whose primary function is access to and from adjacent property. Mr. McCarthy then went through Construction Standards.

#### New Construction Standard

- **Arterials** would include 12' travel lanes, 12' landscape median or left turn lane depending on need, 6' bike lanes on either side, 7' sidewalks with planter strips or landscaping between the sidewalk and the road way to provide a more pleasant walking environment for people using the sidewalks.

- Collectors would be similar to arterials somewhat smaller, would include 12' travel lanes, 6' bike lanes, 5' sidewalks, and a 5'10' planter strip. There is also an option for a Collector that allows for parking on one side.
- Neighborhood connectors are quite a bit smaller, no provision for bike lanes, due to traffic volume, and speeds being lower there. So it's a more comfortable to ride bikes on the street there.
- Local streets are just a bit smaller than a neighborhood connector.
- Alleys are an option if appropriate for the type of development.

Many of the existing streets are just slightly smaller than the construction standards. What it would take to widen those to meet the Construction Standards, and the cost of moving curbs and sidewalks, in order to get what would be a minor improvement might not be the best use of funding. W&H Pacific developed a set of Adequacy Standards, the idea being if streets met these adequacy standards they could be left as is, due to the limited funds available.

### **Adequacy Standard**

**Arterials** travel lanes could be 11', bike lanes could be 5', sidewalks could be right up against the curb. If the street is in existence now, then that street would be considered acceptable. **Collectors** would be 11' travel lanes, 5' bike lanes, neighborhood connectors could be 34' wide total instead of 36'. The city would be saving a considerable amount of money by doing that.

He showed a map that had designated which streets would fit under the adequacy standard, where future development was expected and where future traffic problems may develop. Projects coded red would be done in the next 5 years, the projects in purple, 6-10 years, darker blue would be 11-15 years, and green would be 16-20 years out.

Short term projects (1-5 years) include a traffic signal at the intersection of Ivy and Township, improvements at the traffic signal at Ivy and Hwy 99, widening along SW 13<sup>th</sup> St., and Township Road, and portions of Pine St. and Territorial and Hwy 99. Later improvements (6-10 years) including widening Territorial Road where needed, Maple St., more of Township, some of the Industrial area plan. Longer term projects (15-20 years) include widening of Knights Bridge Road, construction of Otto Road when future development necessitates it, and widening S. 13<sup>th</sup> to accommodate development when that occurs.

W&H Pacific has updated cost estimates for each of the projects they changed or added (in 1999 dollars). The total is approximately 39 million dollars for all the projects listed.

The Transportation Planning Rule, (the Oregon State rule that governs local jurisdictions) has been revised since the last iteration of the plan, there are a number of changes that have been

recommended and in particular there is an appendix which includes changes to city codes, that would take some of the city plan and adopt it into the code.

Vice-Chairman Brown asked if there were any questions from the audience.

**Marlene Elmore**, Chairman of the Traffic Safety Committee requested that they receive information regarding this meeting, so they would be better informed when they get questions from citizens. It was agreed they would get the information.

**Doug Gingerich**, Operation Manager with the Canby School District, had a question if there would be a discussion of the bicycle parking requirements tonight. Jim Brown stated that he had received inquiries on this issue and that he would hear his comments.

Regarding provisions relating to Public Schools, he stated he thought that the figures were out of proportion to current practice. A typical elementary school would be required to provide 60-65 bicycle parking spaces, Canbys typical bicycle traffic is about 20. At the middle school they would be required to provide 130 spaces and they have about 20 riders at that campus. At the high school using this formula we would be required to create over 300 spaces with only about 10 students riding bikes.

Mr. Gingerich asked if the intent was to generate bicycle riding around the schools, then he asked that they consider the safety factors, increasing the amount of students riding bikes at the time school starts and ends could bring up some safety related issues. Vice-Chairman Brown asked if Mr. Gingerich had a recommendation of what the appropriate numbers might be ( He did not at this time, but would be willing to do some research on the issue), and stated going with language that would be more general, such as schools must provide adequate bicycle parking for the number of students currently riding bikes.

Mr. Gingerich stated that vandalism and theft are also issues regarding the schools responsibility that may be implied when they start adding structures. Parents might interpret that as the school will be responsible for students bikes during the school day; That is a responsibility that is difficult to take, and could be expensive. As for sheltering bikes, bicycle traffic goes way down when the weather is bad. He stated that they would be willing to write a letter if that would help the process.

Commissioner Bliss asked if the 300 spaces would be a recommendation or a requirement if this plan went into effect. Jason Kruckeberg replied that the recommendations were taken from a state recommended document, not only for schools but for all types of uses. We need to get bike parking requirements into our design review processes, so when a new school comes in or a school expansion, we could work with the district as part of their design application.

Mr. Kruckeberg stated that it likely would not be a matter of us saying they have to provide so many acres of bicycle parking. More likely it would be the school district coming in

and saying we don't have the use or need for that many bike parking spaces, can we reduce it? Then the commission could consider it.

Commissioner Brown asked if they would have to produce some findings to reduce the standard for bike parking. Jason replied that is vague at this point, unlike the vehicular parking portion of the code where there are specific findings that need to be provided.

Commissioner Tallman asked if a recommendation from the school district could change the number. Jason said if the school district wrote a letter stating that these numbers don't reflect usage, we could modify that portion of the code quite easily. She strongly recommended that it be done.

Terry Prince, City Councilman addressed the Commission stating that he agreed with changing the figures for the bicycle parking. As for the bike plan itself there should be some criteria that would allow public safety to be part of the process of where bike lanes are located.

Mr. Prince identified an area on the map where Mulino comes together with 1<sup>st</sup> St. and where Bremer Road comes in at a right angle, and suggested making it a four way stop instead of a 5 way stop, in the the 16-20 year range. Commissioner Bliss asked that this be identified as a possible problem area and the alignment should be changed. Mr Bliss asked if there was a tracking mechanism, some way to flag a certain intersections. Jason replied there is always the possibility of amendments, plans are modified as conditions change.

Betty Ramey spoke about her concerns regarding the widening of N. Ivy St. and the possibility of the removal of on street parking to install bike lanes. Ivy from 5<sup>th</sup> St. north was a residential area, where were people supposed to park? She is very opposed to the elimination of parking.

Mike McCarthy addressed the plan for N. Ivy. It is classified as an 2 lane Arterial, at the construction standard. Which means two 12' travel lanes, two 6' bike lanes, (a 36' section of pavement without parking).

Jason Kruckeberg Planning Director explained that the elimination of parking in Canby will be the biggest issue the City Council faces with the TSP as Canby grows, Arterials in Canby don't function like larger city arterials do, for example an arterial in Beaverton is an access limited street that handles a large volume of traffic. Ivy St. and Knights Bridge Road have a lot of driveways that access right on to the street.

This is a 20 year project, as streets get built to standards (either Adequacy or Construction), the decision on how to stripe it and how to deal with parking, will be made on a case by case basis. For example, if the build out of the street calls for no parking in the interim the volumes might not require us to eliminate parking altogether. Commissioner Brown asked if there was something the Commissioners could do to assist the City Council in making these decisions. Jason replied that the 20 year plan should call for a safe functional roadway, in a

classification hierarchy of streets that moves traffic, and preserves neighborhoods. Local streets preserve neighborhoods, neighborhood collectors preserve neighborhoods, collectors, and arterials move traffic out of neighborhoods to the Highway. That's what this plan tries to do. It becomes a community decision on how to deal with parking, and the people who live there are the most affected.

**Jerry Pineau** and recently held a neighborhood meeting with Curt Mcleod and residents on Township Road, to talk about the new improvements. Township Road calls for no parking at eventual build out. There are options, and political decisions that can be made that leave parking on one side of the road at this time as the volume may not require total elimination of parking.

In the Township Road case we are not swapping bike lanes for parking, we are going to eventually add the bike lanes. The issue is a center turn lane or parking lane. These are the kind of decisions that really depend on the function of the street. We look at this plan as the "ideal" to serve the function of Canby as an organism, but as a case by case, neighborhood by neighborhood process, this will require a lot of public input.

Commissioner Tallman stated that the plan calls for the total elimination of parking on Ivy St., Elm St, Redwood St. and 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. There are 4 streets that call for the removal of ½ of the parking, N. E. Pine St., S.W. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave., S.E. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. and N.W. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. That is a lot of parking to be eliminated and stated how important it is to let neighborhoods know that this is proposed.

Vice- Chairman Brown stated that when you are looking at "How wide do we make the streets", and cases like Ivy St. where widening it is really undesirable, and the idea of taking an established neighborhood and expanding the street that runs through it significantly would be detrimental to the quality of life for residents on Ivy St.

Jason stated that in formulating this plan, they are trying to avoid widening as much as possible, avoid spending city dollars on this project if it would probably be unpopular. If the choice comes up to bike lanes or parking, in keeping with some of the recommended policies, they had written in the idea of using bike lanes in place of parking. That is something that could possibly be changed if the city believed that is the proper direction to go.

Commissioner Tallman stated that if it's a question of bike lanes against parking we have to ask, how many people are affected by the parking against how many are affected by the bike lanes. Because the bike lanes aren't there, doesn't mean that bikes can't go down the streets. They already have the right to flow along with traffic. In areas where traffic is not a high volume, that is not as big a safety issue as perhaps some of the other things that could happen.

Jason stated that this is an issue that the City council has been dealing with. They recently had a workshop with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, and there is another meeting planned (Sept 1, 99) before the Council Meeting. It's an issue that is being discussed on two fronts right now. That's why we are doing this plan as an informational meeting, because we don't want to adopt something that is just going to turn around and get changed by council

action.

There are some requirements that the state has when transportation projects and street improvements are funded by state dollars, or when the city is the recipient of state funding. Bike lanes are required in some cases, but it will be difficult for us to just make a blanket statement that bike lanes will replace parking. Although the neighbors are most directly impacted, there is a whole city perspective that we have to take into consideration when we make improvements to roads.

Commissioner Tallman read section 366.514 State Highway Ordinance that says foot paths and trails are not required to be established under sub section 1 (one) of this section, where the establishment of such paths and trails would be contrary to public safety. At this point she brought up the Grant St. parking. She believes that this ordinance applies to the bike lanes that are in back of the nosed in parked cars, that in this case, bike lanes should be removed and not made permanent in that area. She has collected 329 signatures of people who want those bike lanes removed.

Commissioner Tallman stated that the main issue is safety in the areas behind the parked cars, and agreed with Mr. Prince that the bike lanes on Grant St. be stopped at 4<sup>th</sup> St. That's where the diagonal parking starts. The big danger of the bikes on Grant street is not the bikes being there but that they are channeled right behind the park cars. If the bike lane is there, that's where the bikes are supposed to go, not out where the people backing out could see them. In that area there is a stop sign at every corner and slow traffic. Ms Tallman stated she thinks it's safer for the bikes to be out a little further in the traffic lane where they can be seen.

Jason replied that John Kelly is putting together a presentation for the City Council that incorporates the Oregon Revised Statute, discusses what it says, what it means and how it might affect our policies on providing bike lanes in our projects. Whether it's a new street, reconstruction, or realignment, what the triggers are for requiring bike lanes and when will we proceed with doing that.

Vice-Chairman Brown asked about areas where there are existing Master Plans, referenced the grant for Downtown Master Planning, assuming bicycle planning will be a part of that, as well as implementation of the TSP. Which one trumps which? We have the business park right now, there was a transportation component that was part of the Master Plan. What we have here is precisely what is in that plan. What happens if there are differences between the TSP and the Master Plan.

Jason replied that the process with the creation of the Industrial Area Master Plan, was a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, and a Text Amendment so that when the Master Plan was created the policies over-rode what was existing. The Master Plan was written to incorporate the existing zones. But the policies, street scapes and the issues that were found in the master Plan would supercede what was on the existing TSP

This update incorporates what is in the Master Plan, if a Downtown Master Plan would come later, it would be an overlay zone, a special district, or a Master Plan, that would be written over what ever is existing. We would start with what the policies are, so we would take the TSP at the first meeting of the Downtown Master Planning Group and say here's what we have, what do we need to change about this, and then it would become the document that would over-ride the existing policies.

Vice-Chairman Brown interjected that this does create the mechanism to be able to clarify very specifically what would take place with Bike vs Parking in a Downtown area.

Mr. Bliss asked for clarification regarding 10<sup>th</sup> and Territorial on North Ivy where the new construction is taking place, how is it laid out, is on street parking allowed?

Jerry Pineau explained that the plan for North Ivy is to bring them up to standard width with curbs, gutters and sidewalks. A determination has not been made at this time to put bike lanes in, or to have no parking. Jerry mentioned that the City Council has directed staff that before we put out for bid or do anything with these streets, the City Council will make these decisions because they are very legislative and political decisions. What the City is doing on Ivy and at Township is talking to the people and telling them what may occur.

On Township Road according to the TSP there is going to be no parking on both sides, a center lane, with bike lanes on both sides. However in the mean time if something warrants that, (whether it's the City Council by policy or the traffic), the worst case would be to disallow parking on one side, and allow parking on the other side. But that decision hasn't been made, it's still going through the process. Jerry commented that within the next sixty days he will probably have an answer on how the city would like to have that striped.

Commissioner Bliss asked if the Council was looking at making a decision that would just affect 10<sup>th</sup> St. to Territorial Road of all of N. Ivy. Mr. Pineau stated that the decision on N. Ivy would not be made for quite some time. They will start the engineering, and contacting the property owners S. of 10<sup>th</sup> on N. Ivy all the way down to the Cutsforth Project. Though he's not sure what the decision on Territorial Road will be.

Commissioner Bliss asked what opinion the people in the area had. Mr. Pineau had talked to approximately 25 of the 40 property owners that were affected by Phase Two. They were not too upset with the parking situation, and the installing of bike lanes, but the situation may have been different if the city would have just gone in and done away with parking, it would not have gone over very well. There are modifications to do in a few blocks due to physical structures and trees, to make it strictly conform to the TSP. Overall it will probably have bike lanes on it with parking on one side at least.

Commissioner Bliss asked whether the curbs that had been installed years ago on N. Ivy from the 500 block to about 10<sup>th</sup> would have to be removed to meet the standard. Mr. Pineau responded that he did not have that answer, that is what the preliminary engineering would tell

him. Mike McCarthy added that the ideal they had drawn up, looking at the 2 lane section with the bike lanes would fit between the existing curbs. Mr. Spineau added that they would need some additional right of way for sidewalks.

Commissioner Bliss added that arterials in Beaverton maybe 45 mph, Canbys' arterials will be mostly 25 mph zones. This makes a profound difference on the safety issue. Just because there is no bike lane doesn't mean you can't bike there, however if there are bike lanes you can't park there. The response to two polls of neighbors, show his neighbors are in favor of being able to park on their city streets.

Vice-Chairman Brown had a correction on the map, the yellow line shown on Redwood, that intersects with the diagonal green line, is not a bike only path, it is actually the bridge that goes to Shimadzu. The designation needs to be modified to an existing collector. The bike path is actually north of that location. Mike McCarthy noted the change on the map.

Vice-Chairman Brown also noted that on the Berg Parkway extension, shown as a three lane extension on the Sough West part of town, especially the part north of 99, is by far the most expensive project in the city, (a bridge over the Honda Pits and the train tressel), and wondered why it is still in the plans. Is there a significant need for that project?

Jason replied that when the Comprehensive Plan was written nearly 20 years ago that project was in the 1-5 year list. That area of town is all zoned for Industrial Use. There was a perceived need to provide direct access for the industrial users to Hwy 99. It has always been in the iTSP as a plan to get truck traffic off of Hwy 99E as it goes through town. W&H Pacific has put all the cost of that on the State of Oregon, (6.8 million). John Williams stated that it is also emergency access to the north side of the railroad tracks if a train is stopped in town. Commissioner Tallman stated that she does not think it is a cost effective plan.

Vice-Chairman Brown expressed concern for an area of Se 10<sup>th</sup> Ave., where it connects to Township Road is already a problem, it is classified as a Neighborhood Connector at the Adequacy Standard, is the intent that there not be a continuation of that road? Mike McCarthy agreed that the plan does not show a continuation of the Neighborhood Connector.

Jason Kruckeberg explained that it could be a local street connector, and a recent land use application, we talked about the connection of 10<sup>th</sup> on through, but it was not required as part of the First Phase of that sub division The door was left open by the commission to potentially require it to be a connecting road through to the proposed neighborhood. That was one of two issues with that sub deviation that were not closed with the approval of the First Phase. The designer was asked if at a later date, they were required to put a road through would it damage your Master Plan for your lots. He said no, that there are ways to accommodate it, there is 20' of existing to the south of the school maybe 25'.

Mr. Brown suggested creating a traffic circle that would connect Township Road, Knights Bridge, Ivy and Holly. So that all of N. Ivy would become a Neighborhood street. Mr.

Bliss questioned who it would benefit. Mr. Manley stated that when the Berg Parkway was in place there would be no problem going up Barlow Road.

Vice-Chairman Brown had a questioned if the Intersections at Redwood and Territorial Road were the minimum spacing ODOT allowed how could another intersection go in at Otto Road. Mike McCarthy replied that it depends on where ODOT draws the line for Canby Urban Area. Designating Hwy 99E an Urban Business Area would require reducing the speed to 35 mph, which would be appropriate with the higher level of development.

Vice-Chairman Brown questioned the time frame of 6-10 years for the Sequoia Parkway. Mr. McCarthy responded that they had referred to the Industrial Area Master Plan.

Commissioner Blackwell asked when the Ivy St. project would be done. The project manager had just left so the question went unanswered. Anyone curious about that could call 266-4021 and ask for Jerry Pineau.

Jason Kruckeberg gave a report on the status of the Access Management Plan. It was drafted in 1995 with a grant from the Department of Transportation, involving the city and a group of property owners. It was envisioned to be a portion of the TSP, and had been started through the adoption process, but never adopted. It was shelved for a variety of reasons, including the community felt there had not been an adequate amount of input.

In 1998 with the current staff and Gail Curtis, ODOT, Region 1, the project was started up again. There have been interviews with some of the people who were on the original Access Management Committee, Property Owners along the highway, and we have formed a Citizens Advisory Committee. There have been a number of meetings, and have found that a lot of misinformation had been spread, leading to mistrust of the original process. We will work with ODOT and the citizens to make this as open a process as possible.

The original plan was never adopted, it will be used as background information, and will create implementation policies that will go into the TSP, which the city will then be able to use as Access Management issues arise. Access Management Standards for Hwy 99E and other major arterials, are typical standards like closing and. Or reconfiguring driveways, putting in medians, and requiring internal vehicular connections. These standards evaluate each on a case by case basis. They will not close driveways in existing locations unless there is redevelopment, or if a safety issue arises.

Canby is unique in the fact that the railroad runs through the town. Businesses on Hwy 99E are usually narrow lots, and the highway is their only access. During redevelopment of these areas we will work with the property owners, and ODOT to work out some solutions, our goal is to consolidate and share access.

There is a new collaborative process with ODOT and the City of Canby. Sometimes an

applicant would have to go ODOT to get their access permit, and through the city for their site design review. Now Property Owners will come to the city, then the city gets with ODOT, they all meet and talk about what the options are available. A much more flexible procedure.

A letter from ODOT explained some of what their vision of Canbys' future is. They see no medians, and no major driveway closures, but through case by case analysis and traffic studies, there may be modifications as redevelopment occurs. There are new traffic counts and accidents counts included. They acknowledge the Citizens Advisory Committee that met a number of times on this project, and did some really good work. Commissioner Tallman commented that she was impressed with the fact of what a unique thing that was happening. No other municipality has done just this, and Canby can be proud, this is one of the cases where community input has paid off.

Jason talked of starting the adoption process of the TSP at one of the meetings in September, depending on the modifications we hear about. There will be one public meeting in front of the Commissioners, and one public meeting before the City Council.

Vice-Chairman Brown questioned the process of modifying the plan. Jason explained that they anticipated some changes throughout the process and we will incorporate them as they come. Vice-Chairman Brown wondered about the issues that had been brought up this evening and some recommendations had been suggested, example, the council has the opportunity to select the options for bike lanes based on safety, and giving the school district the opportunity to reduce the amount of bicycle parking.

Jason stated that they would be writing a formal Staff Report for the adoption process, and recommended that any changes would go in it along with the Commissions approval, as an addendum.

Commissioner Tallman suggested that on page 15 of the appendices it is stated that sidewalks shall be required on Arterials, Collectors, Connectors and most Local streets, she would like word most removed. Why would some Local streets not be required to have sidewalks?

Jason responded that there could be instances of streets (through a planned unit development), where they could have no sidewalks and narrower streets. Mike McCarthy stated that topography could also be an issue, due to slopes or streams, fitting in the sidewalks could present a major hardship. Commissioner Tallman stated she just wanted to be sure they didn't "undo" the requirements for sidewalks and was assured by Jason that the Planning Department was pretty strict on that issue.

Commissioner Bliss wanted clarification of the phrase of "new signal" could it also mean stop sign? Mr. McCarthy stated that it meant a new traffic signal would be installed at that intersection.

Commissioner Bliss wondered if it could be noted on the map so that the intersection at

1<sup>st</sup> Ave. and Otto Rd be designated as a project with a 16-20 year time frame. Response from Mr. McCarthy was that this would be adding a project and that there would be a cost figure associated with adding it.

Vice-Chairman Brown asked for any further comments. None were offered.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

**SUB 99-01** an application by Asset Development Group seeking approval on a four lot subdivision located at the SW corner of S. Township Road and S. Redwood St.

Vice-Chairman Brown reviewed the hearing process, procedure and format. He referred to the applicable criteria posted on the wall and on page 2 of the staff report. When asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, or ex-parte contact, except for visiting the site, but drawing no conclusions, none was expressed.

John Williams, Associate Planner presented the Staff Report. Tax Lot 100 of Tax Map 41E3BB. The applicant is requesting approval of a four lot sub-division on approximately .6 acres, consisting of one existing house, one new single family house, and two duplexes, with a single access to all four of the lots.

The property is High Density Residential. There is a property to the west out side of the city limits, but inside the Urban Growth Boundary, on the east and the south there is low density residential. The property is located within the Logging Road Advanced Financing District, (recommended condition 22). Suggested name is Township Corner.

The property is located within one of the areas of special concern in the Comprehensive Plan, (to create high and medium density residential housing). Few environmental concerns. One reason to annex was to solve the health risk of broken septic systems. The house has been connected to city sewer.

The first plan submitted by the applicant had each dwelling with its own access. This plan is much preferable with one access off of Redwood, but using this plan the applicant needs a little extra room. They have stated that they need 5' - 7' of property on the east side along Redwood St. Currently there is 65' of right-of-way along Redwood, the TSP plan tags that area fro 3 car lanes, (2 travel lanes and a turn lane), with bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides. This design would require 60' of right-of-way. Clackamas County Traffic Analyst said it didn't appear to be a problem if it meets the city standards, to give up some additional right-of-way. The city would get 60' for its design, the applicant would get what he needs for lot sizes.

Recommended conditions are that applicant needs to get necessary approval (flexible for whatever it takes to get the right-of-way away from Clackamas Co.), meet the lot size requirement, and have 60' of right-of-way, frontage improvements on Redwood St., as Township Rd is existing. And the other side of Redwood does have the sidewalk and curbs that were put in

when the school was built. The new lot will not encroach on existing right-of-way, (it appears on the plot map that the property and right-of-way overlap, this needs to be cleared up). The hedge on Township Road creates a visual hazard at the intersection and needs to be cut back.

The access into the property must be at least 20' wide, and have a sidewalk on one side with reciprocal access easements. Public works supervisor requested "the existing single connection on the existing house should be removed and a connection needs to be made that can serve all four of these lots". CUB noted standard conditions. Solar Access Standard is met. Some existing trees to be preserved and 4 more need to be added. With these conditions met the Staff feels the application meets all the city's requirements.

Commissioner Tallman questioned if no parking was allowed on the access, Johan stated that condition could be added. Manley asked if the frontage improvements on Redwood would include room for the turn lane. Jason found nothing called out in terms of extra improvements for the approach. That the TSP has it called out to full Collector width. The question is whether it was built to full Collector width in the original project. Jason suggested leaving the conditions as is, and check for any additional, and if we need to reopen we can do that, and bring back findings if needed, but thinks if the Public Works Director didn't put in any comments for additional improvement none would be required.

Commissioner Bliss asked about the recommendation from Chief Giger regarding street curb alignment. John stated that Township is slightly angled with respect to the property, and the curb on the east side is set down, so the curbs are unaligned, which adds to the vision problem at the corner.

Commissioner Bliss was unclear about the applicant's getting some right-of-way deeded back to him, and if it would affect the alignment of the street. John explained that currently the county has 65' of right-of-way there and 5'