

MINUTES
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
September 13, 1999
7:00 PM

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairman Keith Stewart, Commissioners Jim Brown, Jean Tallman, Derek Bliss, Teresa Blackwell and Geoffrey Manley.

Staff: Jason Kruckeberg, Planning Director, John Williams, Associate Planner

Others Present: Larry McBride, Charlene Koenig, Kim Renner, Andy Mortensen, Curtis Gottman, Lila Gottman and Jerry Pineau.

II CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Jerry Pineau, Community Development Director presented the Commission with the city's Urban Renewal Package. Included was several draft documents and a schedule of how the UR is coming along. His purpose for giving the information to the committee at this time was so they would have time to look at it, formulate some questions and get an idea of what is proposed before the formal meetings on October 11 and October 25.

He has included the Urban Renewal Area Report on the Urban Renewal Plan (which is a state requirement). There is also a map that shows the Economic Improvement District. He noted the South East portion on Ivy is not included in the Urban Renewal District. Jerry also stated that Wednesday Sept. 15, 1999 the City Council will take the formal step of establishing an ordinance that would make the City Council the Urban Renewal Agency, so they can get the process going. Then in January or February the Task Force will bring forth some possible options for other ways the City Council could establish an agency. Chairman Stewart asked if there was a target date to take this to the City Council. Jerry responded that it is scheduled to go before the City Council November 3, 1999, which means he needs the Commissions final recommendations by October 25th 1999..

III MINUTES

June 28, 1999

Commissioner Brown made a motion to approve the minutes of June 28, 1999 as submitted. Commissioner Bliss seconded the motion. Motion passed 6 to 0.

July 12, 1999

Chairman Stewart asked for input regarding a statement on page 5. Stated that he would like quotations on a remark. Commissioner Brown asked for clarification on the amount of parking spaces that would be required on the Casa Verde Project. Commissioner Manley made a motion to approve the minutes of July 12, 1999 with amendment of quotation marks on page 5. Motion passed 6 to 0.

IV FINDINGS

SUB 99-01 A request for approval of a 4 lot subdivision at S. Township Rd. and S. Redwood St.

Chairman Stewart stated he would abstain from the vote on this finding due to the fact that he was unable to attend the meeting at which it was discussed. Commissioner Brown asked if there could be some wording regarding the easement of unused County right-of-way (that no precedent has been set with what they are doing with the right-of-way in this case). Commissioner Tallman made a motion to approve the findings, conclusion and final order of SUB 99-01 with the addition of the discussion item, and the additional condition that the house numbers be visible from the street. Mr. Brown seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0 with one abstention.

V PUBLIC HEARINGS

CPA 99-01/TA 99-01 Transportation System Plan Update.

Chairman Stewart 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 ex-parte contact or conflict of interest, Commissioner Bliss and Commissioner Blackwell replied they had read articles, drawing no conclusions.

Jason Kruckeberg, Planning Director stated that the workshop on this project was held two weeks ago, a newspaper article had invited citizens to ask questions on the TSP and the Access Management Policy. He introduced Andy Mortensen from W&H Pacific. Jason gave the history of the TSP, and Access Management Policies, and explained that the update is in response to growth in the city and changing ideas of projects that need to take place to add detail to the TSP in terms of code language.

- Adopting more specific bicycle and pedestrian information and recommendations.
- Change some street classifications to reflect current development patterns.
- Review and improve the System Development Charge Methodology and project list.
- Improve mapping.
- Modify street cross sections.
- Add compliance with state requirements.
- Update projects like signalization and street improvement projects.
- Incorporate some of the recommendations of the Industrial Area Master Plan.
- Incorporate Access Management policies

A technical advisory committee was formed which included representatives from Clackamas County, ODOT, DLCD, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, Public Works, City Engineer and the consultant. They have met several times to discuss the plan and the direction it is headed. Jason stated that in a couple of years (when the review process is over) the TSP will need to be revisited again, not in as much details but to look at some numbers and keep the TSP as current as possible.

The Comprehensive Plan goal is to develop and maintain a transportation system that is safe, convenient and economical. There are different time lines for different projects, 1-5 year, 6-10 year and long term projects, which are based on Mr. Mortensen's best estimate of when these projects would be necessary to keep our system functional. The TSP also identifies different financing alternatives that are used now including Local Improvement District, Advanced Financing District, System Development Charges, Private Financing Grants, Capital Funds etc. For each project there may be a mix and match of funds available.

The Planning Staff feels that these policies are consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and will be able to adapt and change with growth and development. The reason for having a TSP is to made to make sure street classifications and functions move traffic through the urban growth boundary and the city limits as efficiently as possible and to meet state wide planning goals.

Jason stated that he was asking for approval of the TSP so it could go on to the City Council. The main issues raised at the workshop were:

- Ms. Elmore a member of the Traffic Safety Committee had asked to be kept informed on what decisions were being made at the Planning Commission Meetings. The information is waiting for her at the office, but the staff had been unsuccessful at contacting her.
- Addressing the Bike Parking requirements. The school district has sent a letter asking that the amount of bike parking required be reduced due to the volume of riders the school currently has. The TSP wording has been modified, it's more flexible with bicycle parking to be determined as needed.
- City Councilman Terry Prince has requested that the intersection at Bremer Rd., Otto Rd. and First Ave., be added to the TSP project list, he has presented the idea to the Clackamas County.
- The removal of the word "most" from the local street sidewalk requirements.
- The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is in flux, especially with what the time frame is for addition of bike lanes in the downtown area. Most of the arterials and collectors will require bike paths at some point

Jason asked since there is no closure on the bike plan, the Planning Commission forward the TSP in its entirety with the caveat that the bike plan is undecided and the commissioners recognize that the bike plan will be an ongoing issue.

At this point Commissioner Harper arrived, stating that there was an error on the agenda stating the starting time as 7:30PM. He was asked by Chairman Stewart if he had any conflict of interest or ex-parte contact, he stated he had none.

Commissioner Bliss asked for clarification on what Jason had requested. Would the Commissioners have any more input on the Bike Plan or would it go directly before the City Council for decisions? Jason said it would go to the City Council, but the commission could request all Bike Plan recommendations come before the Planning Commission as well. Commissioner Brown asked if the commission could give the City Council it's recommendations. Chairman Stewart responded that he felt the Commission did not have enough information at this time to give any recommendations. Commissioner Brown stated that his recollection was that there were only two or three items that the commission could make specific recommendations on.

Mr. Mortensen, W&H Pacific addressed the Commission regarding the company's involvement with revising the TSP. Fundamental changes have been made to the 1994 interim draft including modifications to the street cross sections, standards and functional classification policies. In the last four years there have been a number of projects that didn't fit the previous classifications of Arterial, Collector and Local streets. A new classification of Neighborhood Connector has been established, and an Adequacy Standard has been applied. Many of the existing streets have curbs, gutters and sidewalks, the cost of removing them to acquire 2 more feet of pavement would not be economically feasible for the city.

Mr. Mortensen also stated that they looked at the street project list, revising the Systems Development Charge Methodology to include more accurate and current cost estimates. Revisions were made to the project list by examining where development pressures are and where the community has expressed their desires to invest in the TSP. The implementation strategy to pay for part of those projects over time was revised, (some projects underway are being financed through private development) to insure the city wasn't having to front load public investment on a lot of public street infrastructure improvements in the first 10 years as opposed to the whole 20 year period.

Mr. Mortensen stated that all Collector and Arterial roads need Bike Lanes to assure safe travel due to the high traffic volume. Making the designation of Neighborhood Connector enabled the distinction to be made between a road that will never have a volume greater than 2-3 thousand cars and one with a higher volume that would trigger the need for a bike lane. Implementing the bike plan would (when comparing density with the number and length of bike lanes and multi-use lanes) rival Corvallis and Eugene's present bike system.

Mr. Mortensen discussed Appendix D, the Comprehensive Plan Policy and

Implementation Ordinance and stated that adoption of this policy would put the city in a good position to attain TPR compliance. There was good feedback from representatives from ODOT and DLCDC as to how well the city of Canby was set to meet the State Wide Planning Goals as well as the individual requirements of the Transportation Planning rule. Mr. Mortensen felt that with the implementation of the TSP Canby was in good shape to plan its own future for the next 20 years and also meet the state wide requirements that many communities are struggling with.

Commissioner Tallman commented that she thought requiring no parking on 4 streets excessive. Mr. Mortensen replied that this was a recommendation, the Planning Committee has to balance providing bicycle facilities and adequate widths for travel lanes with on street parking. Comparing needs with what the citizens input has been and what is in the best interest of the city. He stated that he had to make a technical recommendation in regards to all of those things and give the city the best and safest Transportation System possible. Removal of on street parking is a very difficult thing to do, because it affects adjacent landowners and occupants who want to utilize that public street for their parking needs. When recommendations are made, it is expected that either city staff or a committee, will review particular and dire segments and come up with additional plans to provide compensatory parking by other means. A public street is a big investment and the recommendations were made in the city's best use and not for individual users themselves. Commissioner Tallman clarified that the decisions need to be made on a piece by piece basis.

Commissioner Brown pointed out that the map (4.2) still contained two errors, Mr. Mortensen noted them and said they would be corrected.

Mr. Brown asked if the bridge across the Honda Pits was a viable project. Mr. Mortensen responded that it would not be a project for the city to take on alone. He also explained that the state was recommending closing railroad crossings due to high speed rail movement. The project was a compensatory plan if any additional railroad crossings were closed, further splitting the city in half. It's a safety net for the city and would improve the Industrial Area ability to do business. Commissioner Brown asked if Cedar wouldn't be a better choice of location for the project. Mr. Mortensen responded that it could be moved to a more convenient location since no engineering or surveys have been done. Having it in the plan is not committing the city to the project it is a bargaining chip in future negotiations with the state.

Commissioner Harper wanted clarification regarding the comparison between Canby, Eugene and Corvallis. Commissioner Tallman stated using college/university towns as criteria for bike lanes would not work since Canby's bicycle traffic volume would never be what theirs is. Mr. Mortensen explained that both Eugene and Corvallis are bicycle friendly communities, and they expect more growth in the near future and are going to expand their bike system. Eugene and Corvallis were not used as evaluation criteria for bike lanes, it was an antidotal summary.

Chairman Stewart asked about the designation of bike lanes on Grant St. Mr. Mortensen stated his views on the safety of having designated bike lanes especially on connectors to

schools. The users would be young inexperienced riders, and having a place and space for them is important. In his opinion there is enough width on the existing streets to accommodate everything. It will be a struggle for the city to decide whether on street bicycle lanes will be striped downtown.

Commissioner Bliss asked why N. Ivy was selected as the major arterial instead of N. Holly? Mr. Mortensen explained that in 1994 when the interim plan was first drafted, N. Holly was the designated arterial. The change was requested by city staff due to citizen involvement and input. The local community wanted Ivy to be the North South arterial connector, and from a technical aspect it made sense. Commissioner Bliss stated his concerns about street hopping, since N. Holly doesn't dead end like Ivy does. Mr. Mortensen stated that there were no technical reasons to go against community wishes.

Proponents

none

Opponents

Lila Gottman, Chairman of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee stated that the Committee is not in favor of any shared road areas or of the designation of the Neighborhood Connector. The reasons being that installing a sign that says shared roadway does not make it any safer for bicyclists, it would be a waste of money. She stated that this is about a Transportation Plan, not a Parking Plan, the idea was to move traffic, not to store it on public streets. Commissioner Brown asked if there were any state guidelines regarding signing for shared roadways. Mr. Mortensen stated that current state policy is not to post for bicycle. Commissioner Blackwell asked if the state recommends not posting signs can they be installed anyway. Mr. Mortensen replied that the state was discouraging it, but there was no statute prohibiting the signs. Some jurisdictions are still signing their bike paths.

Commissioner Harper asked if the designated shared road bike routes were made into bike lanes would the streets be wide enough. Mr. Mortensen responded that each of those streets would either require the removal of on street parking on at least one side of the road, if not the widening of the street. The dollar figure for that project was unavailable then but he stated that he could report back with it later.

Commissioner Manley commented that on N. Holly where it turns into a collector north of Territorial is currently marked as a shared path, if this will be the arterial going out to the Ferry then it should be marked to have bike lanes when it gets to the full width. Chairman Stewart asked if Clackamas County had a bike project going out to the park. Lila Gottman stated that Clackamas County has applied for and received a grant that would improve Territorial Rd bike paths from the Logging Rd over to Holly where it turns North and hopefully have the funds to get to the park. It will be widening the road and putting in drainage only enough to add bike lanes. Planning to see it start this spring.

Chairman Stewart closed the Public hearing.

Chairman Stewart asked for an informal straw vote on how to proceed.

Commissioner Bliss stated that it was suggested by Commissioner Brown do discuss and make recommendation on the 3-4 issues and pass it on to the City Council, but he did not feel comfortable even though he has taken a poll of his neighbors, wanting to get more feed back from those folks, he would be willing to give the commission the information that he has already obtained. Chairman Stewart stated that Mr. Bliss should be careful, the Planning Commission was not in the business of running petition drives. Commissioner Brown stated he thought it was inappropriate. Commissioner Bliss said he thought this was for Periodic Review. Commissioner Brown and Commissioner Stewart agreed it was a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Mr. Brown stated this is a little different, the Commission is not supposed to create advocacy groups, they don't have a constituency, they are the people who institute the policy that has been created for them by the council, and they should operate on that basis.

Commissioner Bliss stated that no signatures had been gathered, however isn't it the Commissions job to get feed back from the community, and asked for suggestions on how to get that feed back. Commissioner Brown stated that the Planning Commission Public Hearings are where they get their feedback, everything else is ex-parte contact, or has the ability to be so.

Commissioner Bliss asked for clarification on Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Periodic Review. Jason responded that this is a Land Use application. If they were talking about overall transportation policies, then folks that had issues with the transportation system plan would ideally come to the meeting and present their issues. On the TSP we do have to follow the Land Use Process of Public Hearing, Notice and ex-parte contact and then provide recommendations to the DLCDD. After the City Council approves the transportation plan then the state would still have to validate it. Periodic Review is a different process. It's more free formed because it's not tied to a specific Land Use Application with dates, notice and appeal requirements. The TSO is a part of our Periodic Review, it sets the tone of what we are basing Periodic Review on and the policies that we will start from, but it is not part of our Periodic Review work plan. If there are a number of folks (as you mentioned) that have issues or problems with the plan, the place to do it is at Public Hearings.

Jason stated it is the Commissions prerogative to say they don't have enough information to make a recommendation at this time and hold the plan over. There is no 120 day rule, the only time line we are under is the consultants contract. The issue is if you are comfortable with the plan you can make a recommendation, if not you can hold it for more information.

Chairman Stewart stated that was why he had asked for a process of how the commission wanted to go forward. He recounted that Jasons initial recommendation was to go ahead and approve the plan but hold those elements with bike lanes out of it pending City Council review. The options are to approve, deny, or table for more information. Mr. Brown proposed a fourth option, move to approve with a list of recommendations or discussion points that could be

forwarded to the council for their review.

Jason reminded the Commission how the Comprehensive Amendment process has worked in the past, on the Industrial Area Master Plan which was also a Comprehensive Plan amendment the commission had 4-5 public hearings on that action then approved it to the Council with a caveat that the council had to work out the financing. In that case, the financing was a policy decision that had not been made yet, but the commission had all the technical aspects and criteria they needed.

Commission Tallman asked whether there was to be another public hearing on the bike lane issue before the City Council. Lila Gottman answered that at this time the downtown merchants are bringing a plan to the bike committee, she hopes that an amicable plan can be reached between the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, Downtown Merchants, and the State of Oregon that everyone could work with and then take to the City Council in the near future.

Chairman Stewart asked if anyone on the Planning Commission feels that this is such a significant issue that these problems should be resolved before it goes before the City Council. Commissioner Blackwell stated she thought it was. Commissioner Tallman concurred with Commissioner Blackwell, Commissioner Brown stated that he didn't think so, there have been opportunities and there will be further opportunities for citizen input. Commissioner Harper doesn't feel he has enough information to make any decisions. Chairman Stewart clarified that the original proposal was to remove the segments dealing with bicycles and pass the rest of the plan. He further stated that his opinion was if the plan was forwarded as proposed, the City Council would not be getting the best input from the Planning Commission.

Jason asked if the commission wanted a workshop on bike plans. What further information does the committee need. How does the Commission come to a decision based on a process that has involved the bike/pedestrian committee, professional consultants etc.? Would another meeting help you make tangible decisions to pass on to the City Council?

Commissioner Harper stated that if the city has to expend a lot of money to widen roads to put in bike lanes (for example the road going out to the ferry needs to be updated) the council should get the benefit of these discussions.

Jason stated that all the substantive issues that came out of the workshop were listed in the staff report and will be recommended to be incorporated in the plan. He also had 4 issues to incorporate from the meeting tonight. The reason staff recommended approval of the plan tonight (with the exception of the bike issue) is because the Planning Commission can be involved in the bike discussion. It wouldn't be a planning commission hearing necessarily, but it would be a public process in front of the City Council that any Planning Commissioner could be involved with, if you have no problems with the functional classification and the street cross sections then you won't need to see the entire TSP again.

Commissioner Brown stated that most of his concerns had been addressed by tonight's discussion. That he is in agreement with the plan as it stands.

Commissioner Tallman would like to see the recommendation of no bike lanes in the high traffic areas of downtown. She stated that precedence has been set by several other cities, and the police chief has indicated to her that it is not a good idea. She strongly recommends that there are no bike lanes directly behind diagonally parked cars, as its channeling bicycles into the dead vision area, if they were back further toward the middle as the law enforcement officer who does the bike training suggests to his children (to stay out closer toward the center of the lane), so people backing out can see them. She stated that it was clear to her that the downtown merchants do not want bike lanes at the cost of any downtown parking. She stated her understanding of Oregon law is that bike lanes are mandatory in any new development, retrofit or relocation, other wise they are at the discretion of City Council as they fulfill the basic requirements of bike traffic through the area. It does not mandate it to go down Grant St.

Mr. Harper stated he can understand the safety concerns of the bike paths behind the parallel parked cars, but does not know enough about this issue to make any recommendations. He did feel that some streets should be off limits to bicycles but he is not sure which streets they should be.

Commissioner Manley stated that he could agree with the concept of not having bike lanes behind diagonally parked cars. But is not opposed to finding different ways of configuring streets so that you have bike lanes and diagonal parking. With Ivy St. being marked for bike lanes it's not a place where we currently have diagonal parking and that does provide the connection for people to get through the downtown area.

Commissioner Bliss spoke about his concerns regarding the guidelines for an amendment to the Comprehensive plan. Is there a "public need for the change" he didn't think that there was, judging from the people he's talked with or the people that have talked to him. He stated there was a small percentage of the population who have a strong feel for what they think Canby needs. Chairman Stewart asked Commissioner Bliss if any of the conversations were ex-parte contact, or was it at the point when we had the TSP on the table for the Planning Commission. Bliss replied it was through the Planning Commission meeting he attended that was open to the public and conversations with neighbors through the bushes. Commissioner Bliss continued with whether the proposed change would serve the public need better than any other change that might be expected to be made. And whether the change would preserve and protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the residence and the community. To him public welfare is what's going to make our community happy. As for the street paving and improvements, people are excited about that. The only issue he has is the bike lanes, if they were to be removed he could move forward with the TSP. There is a lot of polarizing with this issue, he suggested that people keep level heads and feels there is a compromise, and suggested citizens go to the next public meeting and give their input.

Commissioner Tallman recommended the acceptance of the City of Canby Transportation

System Plan with the exception of Appendix D (the bicycle plan section which has yet to be resolved). It was seconded by Commissioner Blackwell.

Jason Kruckeberg went over other modifications:

- The addition of the bike connection to the Logging Road from Redwood. Changing the yellow line at 4th Ave. where it crosses over to Shimazu, to green which is the designation of a collector.
- Adding language for reasons of validating the overpass from south to north Canby at Baker to Berg.
- Changing the bike plan: the lanes on Holly St. be ungraded from a bike route (which is green) to an actual bike lane from Territorial north to 22nd.

Mr. Bliss proposed leaving the last modification out due to tabling the bike path part of the TSP, and questioned whether the intersection at Otto Rd was included. Jason responded that it will be added as part of the workshop notes and it is in exhibit one in the staff report.

Mr. Brown asked Jason what the timing was in the Urban Renewal district for the implementation of the placement of the Sequoia Parkway. Mr. Brown stated that he hoped that utility would be provided as soon as possible so that the Industrial Plan can be built out. He proposed that the portion of the Sequoia Parkway from 99E to at least Township be changed to a 1-5 year project. All a function of how quickly the money would be available through the district, if the funds are not available, the point is moot.

Chairman Stewart asked that the motion on the floor be removed, since it is being modified. Commissioners Tallman, and Blackwell withdrew the motion.

Commissioner Brown thought one of the best things the Planning Commission had done was the Industrial Area Master Plan, the Sequoia Parkway was important to that project and suggested it be moved up in the time frame. Jason reviewed the modifications, and

Commissioner Tallman moved to accept the TSP as written with the exception of the bike plan, and with the 4 amendments read by the staff. Commissioner Blackwell seconded the motion. Commissioner Bliss had some questions regarding striping for bike lanes on new construction. Jason responded that the decisions would have to be made on a case by case basis.

The motion passed 5-1 with Commissioner Stewart voting nay.

PUBLIC HEARING

CUP99-03 To provide additional child care at Canby United Methodist Church

Chairman Stewart if there was anyone in the audience who did not hear the public hearing format, there was none. Then asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest or ex-parte contact, no conflict of interest or ex-parte contact was indicated.

John Williams, Associate Planner, gave the staff report. The site is located on the Southeast corner of Holly and Territorial. The applicants were unaware that a Conditional Use Permit would be needed and had originally planned to open the daycare Sept 1st before school started. The applicants asked if there was a way to hurry the application through the process. The staff has included the findings in the packets for tonight so that if the CUP was approved the Commissioners could also approve the findings.

John stated there is a sidewalk located on Territorial Rd. but nowhere else on the property. John pointed out that unless there were other applications from the Church this might be the only opportunity to have the church absorb the cost of installing sidewalks which is estimated at approximately \$10,000. There was a discussion between the Commissioners regarding where sidewalks were existing in the local neighborhood.

Commissioner Bliss asked if there would be additional signage, the response from staff was that there was nothing in the application, but if new signs were wanted they would have to get a sign permit.

APPLICANTS

Charlene Koenig, Chair of the Early Childhood Committee of the Canby United Methodist Church. Ms. Koenig stated that the committee felt there was a need in the Canby area for low-cost child care. It would be a licensed facility accommodating up to 29 children, from 6 weeks to 5 years of age, Monday through Friday, 6:30AM to 6:00PM. Traffic would enter from Territorial and they would encourage people to come in the side door.

Mr. Brown asked if they were opposed to other suggestions for entering and exiting. Mr. Bliss asked if there was an existing fire system. Ms. Koenig stated that as part of their licensing procedure they have had to install a monitored fire system.

Commissioner Stewart questioned the age range of the children, since the applicant had stated from 6 weeks to 5 years, but the applications reads from 6 weeks to 12 years. Ms. Koenig replied that when they submitted the application, they had planned to accept older children, but during the licensing process they dropped the older children due to complications in the procedure. Jason Kruckeberg asked if the Church had any plans to expand in the future. Ms. Koenig responded that it would be great if they could expand, and incorporate after school care for latch key children, where they would be safe and protected. Commissioner Bliss asked if the CUP would change the tax status of the church. Chairman Stewart responded that it would not.

Larry McBride, Property owner of the business located across from the church on Territorial Rd. Stated that the church committee has involved him from the beginning. Asking for his input on how the daycare would impact his business especially the increase in traffic. He saw no detrimental impact, his business hours vary from the church daycare hours. He also stated that employees of his business could use the facility and hoped the Commission would approve the

application, without the need for the church to install sidewalks.

Chairman Stewart asked if there was any rebuttal, there was none. He closed the Public Hearing and opened it for discussion.

Commissioner Manley asked if there were striped walkways in the parking lot for the children to use when they went to the playground. Ms. Koenig responded that it was not striped but they had thought about coning off one of the driveways due to traffic that uses the parking lot as a shortcut, but still would be accessible for emergency vehicles.

Commissioner Brown stated his opinion that there was no additional square footage which mitigates against requiring the installation of sidewalks, conditioning the hours as the applicant has indicated, closing the north parking lot to all but employee parking during business hours and traffic enter and exit from Holly St. That would eliminate the need for cross walk stripping. Commissioner Harper concurred with the idea of coning off the north parking lot. Commissioner Bliss was not in favor of the cones, stating that employees would arrive throughout the day and have to leave their cars running while they got out and moved cones or maneuver around them. Chairman Stewart responded that those people could park in other areas and that the cones were to prevent through traffic. Commissioner Bliss wondered if this condition could or would be enforced. Commissioner Brown stated it would be to the church's benefit to comply with the amendment for the safety of the children. Mr. Bliss also stated that the commission was setting a precedent for not forcing them to put in a sidewalk, and suggested giving the church a time line for installation.

Commissioner Harper moved to approve CU" P 99-03 as amended. Commissioner Brown seconded it. Motion passed 7 - 0.

FINDINGS

John Williams stated that two conditions (normal hours of operations, and the closing of the north parking lot during business hours) will be added to the findings. Mr. Brown moved to approve the findings as modified, Mr. Manley seconded. The motion passed 7 - 0.

NEW BUSINESS

None

COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Brown questioned Jason in regards to the Grant for downtown redevelopment, stated that TGM will want to be involved in that, wondered if the selection committee had been formed. Jason responded that no committee had been formed, but he will be meeting with Bill Adams, Grant Manager from the Transportation Growth Management Program. They will go over the project, how much money was asked for, and whether is it enough. The time line for sending out the request for proposals will likely be the first part of

October. Canby is in the first tier, it was clear from the application that we are ready to go.

Chairman Stewart stated he was very impressed with Jason's ability to acquire grant money. Jason reminded the Commission that the Code Audit meeting will be Oct. 22nd at the Adult Center, a consultant and city staff will be there to explain what issues they are studying in our Land Development Planning Ordinances (set back requirements, residential development standards, accessory housing and commercial zones etc.). The second phase of the grant (which he hopes will be awarded), is to actually input the changes to the code that the city has agreed to.

Jason mentioned that included in the commissioners packets are seven applications for Citizen's Involvement Committee for Periodic Review. He will take the applications to the city council Wednesday night, Sept 15th.

Jason stated that the meeting for 9-27-99 is a light meeting and asked for input on items the Commissioners would like to discuss Commissioner Tallman stated that she thought some more information on Urban Renewal would be helpful. Jason said that Jerry Pineau said he would be available at that time. It was decided that the meeting will start at 6:30.

ADJOURNMENT