

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
November 8, 1999
7:00PM

I. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Commissioner Jim Brown

Staff: John Williams, Associate Planner, Jerry Pineau, Community Development Director, Matilda Deas, Project Planner, Carla Ahl, Planning Staff.

Others Present: Bill Seidl, United Grocers, Frank Cutsforth, Cutsforth Thriftway, Jennifer Riboli, United Grocers, David Kelly, Traffic Engineer, Bruce Powers, Landscape Architect, Bill Patterson, MGA Inc.

II. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON AGENDA ITEMS

NONE

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

DR 99-07 Applicant: MGA, INC. **Location:** 225 NE 2nd Ave.

Phase 2 of Cutsforth Thriftway, a proposal to construct a 11,550 sq. ft. building parallel with NE 2nd Ave. and a 7,950 sq. ft. building parallel with N. Ivy St.

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 a conflict of interest, none was expressed, when asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact Mr. Manley stated that he had visited the site, seen the diagram in the store but drew no conclusions, Ms. Tallman stated that she had visited the site, seen the diagram in the store but drew no conclusions, Mr. Bliss stated that he had visited the site but drew no conclusions, Ms. Blackwell stated that she had visited the site but drew no conclusions, Mr. Stewart stated he had visited the site, seen the diagram but had drawn no conclusions. No questions were asked of the Commissioners

Matilda Deas, Project Planner presented the staff report. She stated that this is Phase 2 of the Cutsforth Thriftway development and pointed out that the criteria for Design and Site Review was posted on the wall. Matilda stated that she had made references to Phase 1

throughout her report because Phase 1 and Phase 2 have been designed to function as one site and decisions made in Phase 1 impact Phase 2. She added that this project is a cornerstone of what redevelopment of the downtown area might look like.

Matilda stated that the proposed landscaping meets the criteria, enhances the pedestrian & visual experience, softens the hard scape of this project and buffers between parking lot and building. Matilda stated that in Phase 1 they were required to have 5 parking spaces per 1000 square feet but there is nothing in the code that addresses grocery store parking requirements and felt that the figure was arrived at as a safety measure (retail establishments are required to have 4 spaces per 1000 square feet). Matilda stated that originally the applicant proposed 5 compact parking spaces at the entrance from 2nd St., but the Planning Staff had suggested that this would not be an appropriate place due to the access from 2nd St. and the applicant removed those spaces. Without these spaces the rate on Phase 2 alone is 3.8 spaces per 1000 sq ft. but when combined with Phase 1 the total rate is 4.4 spaces per 1000 square feet. She added that the 5 spaces per thousand sq. ft. applied to retail establishments over 100,000 square feet and that this project is substantially under that amount. She added that the ADA requirements have been met and that 12 bicycle spaces have been proposed .

Matilda stated that in Phase 1 the applicant reconfigured the parking lot from 5 accesses along NE 2nd to two) twenty four foot accesses and they were granted full access to the site from N. Ivy subject to review, and possible at the time of development review of Phase 2. She added that they are allowed 800 sq. ft. for signage (since they have frontage on more than one street) but according to her addition the monument sign is 806 sq. ft., she stated the applicant says they can reduce the sign to make the 800 sq. ft., or that the Commissioners can choose to look at the total for the entire project (of which they have 365 sq. ft. that has not been used).

Matilda said that when using the compatibility matrix the applicant scored 85% with bonuses and that the applicant has made all of the requirements for minimum lot width and frontage. She added that a traffic impact study was done, the basic recommendation was all intersections operated at level "C" or better and with full build out of the site all intersections will operate a level "D" or better.

Mr. Stewart asked for clarification regarding comments from Mr. Jerry Pineau, Community Development Director regarding curb cuts and pavement in the designated park area. Matilda stated that she had questioned Mr. Pineau about the statements, his response was that the details of the development would be based on the agreement with Cutsforth, he just wanted to make sure that there were adequate ADA access.

Mr. Manley asked if there were requirement for bicycle parking spaces to be covered. Matilda responded that where 10 or more bicycle spaces where required at least 50% would have to be covered, and stated that it could be condition that they have to meet the bicycle code, she added that they have provided more spaces than the code required so the applicant would have the option of covering bicycle spaces or decreasing the number of bicycle spaces provided.

Mr. David Kelly, Traffic Engineer, gave the traffic study report and stated that there

has not been any accidents reported at the intersection of N. Ivy and 1st St. in the past 3 years. He would not recommend full access at the driveway due to Ivy being an arterial road, that N. 1st St. just serves the development, it's close proximity to Railroad tracks and queuing that extends to 2nd St. at times. He stated that at peak times this intersection handles approximately 600 vehicles, and with build out of the project, approximately 80 vehicles at this driveway, if a left turn is allowed then don't restrict any turns since the left turn from that driveway is the worst one. Mr. Kelly added that with this project at it's design stage, to have the intersection designated at a "D" level is undesirable, if vehicles only coming into the site from the south, the intersection would then operate at level "A".

Ms. Tallman asked if cross traffic was a concern, Mr. Kelly stated that there were only 7 cars and that was minimal. Mr. Stewart asked for clarification regarding restricting cross traffic. Mr. Kelly stated that if the commission was not going to restrict the left turn coming from the development, it made no sense to restrict the cross traffic due to small volumes of cross traffic.

Mr. Bliss asked if people coming across from west to east was part of this Site and Design Review, Mr. Stewart stated that it was something he felt should be looked at because it concerns removing a stop sign on Ivy and restricting turn movements, the whole intersection should be looked at.

Mr. Stewart asked if they restricted left turns at that intersection wouldn't that negatively impact the intersection at N. Ivy and 2nd. Mr. Kelly responded that he looked at numerous options for that intersection including one that removed the driveway access on Ivy St., and the intersection at Ivy and 1st operated at a "C" level or better so there is no justification for a driveway Ivy and 1st Ave.

Mr. Stewart asked if Mr. Kelly thought the intersection as proposed was unsafe, Mr. Kelly responded that he thought it was undesirable, but with there being no reported accidents there in the last 3 years he could not classify it as unsafe. Mr. Stewart stated that the only major difference would be the elimination of the stop sign in the southbound travel lane on Ivy. Mr. Kelly responded that he thought the stop sign was installed at that location was because of the limited sight distance at Canby Builders Supply, and that stopping 600 cars for just a few is not a good design.

Ms. Tallman asked if a right in right out design would cause any problems, Mr. Kelly stated that very few vehicles turn right from that intersection. Ms. Tallman added that with the speed bumps and stop signs removed on 1st Ave. that might impact the volume at the intersection. Mr. Kelly stated that the elimination of the access would shift the cars to 2nd Ave., and on that 4 way stop most of the traffic was moving in a north-south direction, and that there could be a large increase in volume in east-west traffic without having a detrimental impact upon the intersection.

APPLICANT:

Frank Cutsforth, representing the Cutsforth Family, stated they listened to the Commissioners very carefully at the last session and have taken it to heart, and feels they have put together a very good plan.

Mr. Bill Paterson, MGA Inc., stated that when he was before the City Council a few months ago, many issues were discussed that were pertinent not only this site but to the broader aspect of urban design in Canby. He described the project as 2 buildings that front on 2nd and N. Ivy with internal parking and a pedestrian plaza on the corner. He stated that they have created a design with a great deal of texture and color that will embellish the pedestrian experience. The signage will be flexible so the total could be balanced on both sides and intended to be individual letter signs as opposed to large block signs. Mr. Paterson discussed off site developments and stated the design, materials, and colors that have been used were tied into the existing development of Phase 1.

Mr. Paterson addressed the concerns regarding access on N. Ivy St., and stated that this is not a dangerous intersection, the proposed design is not unsafe, traffic can easily be pulled off northbound on Ivy relieving congestion in a north/south direction. He reminded the Commissioners that Mr. Kelly stated that a “D” level intersection was acceptable.

Mr. Bill Seidl, United Grocers, developer for the project, stated that he looks at access, visibility, signing and parking when evaluating a project, he added that if no left turn was allowed at the intersection on N. Ivy street there would be a negative psychological impact, he stated that they have a big competitor in the Fred Meyer complex, not only for customers but also for potential lessees. Mr. Bliss asked if semi-trucks could use the intersection at N. Ivy. Mr. Siedl stated that it was possible but not probable that delivery trucks would use the intersection (since loading bays are located on 2nd Ave.). Mr. Stewart asked for clarification regarding the detrimental effect on lease ability. Mr. Seidl responded that any time you restrict customers movements there is a detrimental effect, and when potential tenants look at the property one of the first questions they ask is how do my customers get in and out.

PROPOSERS

NONE

OPPONENTS

NONE

REBUTTAL

Mr. Cutsforth stated that the truck situation at the intersection would not be a problem since deliveries are monitored. In regards to the intersection at Ivy St., this project is suggesting movement restrictions to an intersection that hasn't had an accident. He also stated that the

mobility of the intersection was important to the marketability of the project.

Mr. Stewart closed the public hearing

DISCUSSION

Mr. Bliss asked for clarification on the amount of parking they have proposed, whether that included the on street parking on 2nd Ave. and whether or not the area east of the intersection at N. Ivy was 1st St. or if it was a private driveway and maintained by the applicant. Matilda responded that the blended parking was 4.4 per 1000 sq. ft. of building area and it did not include on street parking, that 1st Ave. as shown is a private driveway. Ms. Blackwell stated that the driveway has always been privately owned. Mr. Manley asked if there were plans for tables in the pedestrian plaza, or is it just for benches, Mr. Paterson responded that the plan is just for fixed benches.

Mr. Stewart stated his opinion was that the 5 compact parking spaces at the entrance on 2nd Ave. should be removed, he felt the blended rate between Phase 1 and Phase 2 of 4.4 per 1,000 spaces is sufficient, the 24' access from NW 2nd is appropriate, blending the sign allotment between the 2 Phases should be allowed and that the bicycle parking is acceptable. Mr. Stewart drew a diagram showing how he felt the intersection should function, which included a left turn lane coming out of the driveway, he stated maintaining the left turn is important to this project and agreed with Mr. Siedl regarding it affecting the projects leaseability.

Mr. Manley commented that the applicants proposed plan was similar to Mr. Stewarts drawing allowing a left turn out of the driveway, Mr Stewart responded that he like the idea of getting cars turning left out of the way so that the cars wouldn't start queuing up. Mr. Manley responded that there were few cars that actually turned other directions and felt that it would not have an impact on the intersection. Mr. Kelly stated that vision clearance was critical as vehicles come out of the driveway. Mr. Stewart asked Mr. Kelly if a left turn was allowed, should the stop sign remain southbound on N. Ivy. Mr. Kelly responded that the sight distance was more important and that in his opinion the stop sign should be removed.

Ms. Tallman asked for clarification on how the intersection would function. There was a discussion regarding possible configurations at the access, (whether to allow through traffic from eastbound traffic on NW 1st, left turns from south bound Ivy, etc.). Mr. Kelly diagramed possible intersection designs and stated that in his opinion either restrict left turns or allow full access.

Mr. Manley stated that he did not have any problems with the design presented by the applicant and he was in agreement that a full access intersection would also work. Ms. Tallman stated that she was uncomfortable with the removal of the stop sign southbound on N. Ivy. Mr. Stewart interjected that there was an application on the table and that the Traffic Engineer has recommended either full access or right in only, he stated that his modification was to insure that no one could come across from west to east. Ms Blackwell commented that if the modification was made she would feel very comfortable with the intersection as it stands. Mr. Bliss stated that he was concerned about the visibility at the intersection, and if the sight

allowance was adequate to meet codes, ordinances or recommendations. Matilda had a consultation with the traffic engineer and stated there was adequate sight clearance as the application sits right now. Mr. Bliss stated that he also had concerns regarding pedestrian traffic at the intersection especially if they create a park on the southeast corner.

Mr. Patterson presented the Commissioners with an option for the intersection that showed full access, Mr Stewart stated that he was reluctant getting into something this major without the benefit of having the City Engineer present.

Mr. Stewart summarized the Commissioners position in that Mr. Manley feels that a full access would work and is alright with the present application. Ms. Tallman believes that it should be a right in right out intersection, Ms Blackwell thinks a left turn should be allowed and asked Mr. Bliss what his ideas were. Mr. Bliss commented that he would like to see the left turn eliminated and only one exit lane from the driveway. Mr. Manley stated that after studying the intersection he was satisfied with what the applicant had suggested and felt with staff recommendations it was a good proposal.

Mr. Bliss had concerns regarding the signage allotment, and if the applicant was manipulating it to get a larger sign in Phase 2. Matilda stated that the 6 sq. ft that the applicants design was over could very easily be a mistake on her part when measuring the plan. Mr. Stewart stated that he didn't feel that was the case here, that recommending a blending of the signing between Phase 1 and Phase 2 was to allow flexibility in tenant signing. Ms. Tallman asked if any colors had been selected for signing and Mr. Patterson responded that the applicant would abide by whatever the code requires. Ms. Blackwell asked what would happen to the surplus sign allotment, would the applicant lose it or could they apply to use it at a later time. Mr. Stewart stated that they would be able to use up to the maximum amount as per the sign code and that some sign area was left so that there could be flexibility in future tenant signing.

Mr. Bliss stated that he would like to have some feedback regarding the intersection from the police department, Matilda responded that the police department had the opportunity to comment but it was a moot point with them.

Mr. Manley moved that the Commission approve DR 99-07 with the amendment that the signage allotment be blended in both Phases. Seconded by Ms. Tallman. Mr. Bliss commented that he would like more concise recommendations from the Traffic Engineer and some input from the Police and Fire Departments regarding the safety of the intersection. Motion was approved 4 to1, with Mr. Bliss having the minority vote.

Mr. Stewart stated that there was no new business, and held the minutes over two weeks.

IV. MEETING ADJOURNED