

**MINUTES**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

JANUARY 8, 2001  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 155 NW 2ND

---

---

**1. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Keith Stewart, Vice-Chairman Jim Brown, Commissioners Jean Tallman, Geoff Manley, Corey Parks

**ABSENT:** Paul Thalhoffer

**STAFF:** John Williams, Planning Director, Clint Chiavarini, Associate Planner, Matilda Deas, Project Planner

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ben Settecase, Gerry Kelly, R. Wolf, Mike Foley, Pat Crowell, Jeff Bolton, Lila & Curtis Gottman, Frank Cutsforth, Pat Johnson, Randy Tessman, Tracy Boyce, C. Finden, Ryan Oliver, Bill Paterson, Dale Dohman

Mr. Stewart informed the audience that **DR 00-08** Milgard Manufacturing, had been continued until the 22<sup>nd</sup> of January.

**II. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON AGENDA ITEMS**

None

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**ANN 00-05** Mountain West Investment Corp. An application to annex 1 lot totaling 4.7 acres, bordered by the Molalla Forest Road and North Pine Street.

Mr. 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 stated. When asked if any Commission had ex-parte contact, Commissioners, Manley, Brown, Tallman, Parks, and Stewart visited the site, but drew no conclusions. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Clint Chiavarini, Associate Planner, gave the staff report. He explained the property is located off North Pine Street, near Territorial Rd, it is designated Priority A for annexation, and zoned high density residential in the comprehensive plan.

Clint addressed the need for additional land in the City and explained that most of the available buildable land is zoned R1, low density residential property, very few parcels are zoned high density.

Clint stated that there were no access problems, and a traffic study that was done for the site shows no problems and does not warrant additional signalization or traffic realignment for the affected intersections. Clint added that all utility providers had stated there are or will be adequate services available.

Clint stated that the parcel abuts the Logging Rd Trail, and an access would be required at the time of the site and design review.

Clint addressed the School Board's comment that Knight School is close to capacity and this annexation would exceed available space, he explained the School District is in the process of balancing enrollment in the City, and plans to submit a construction bond in the year 2004.

Clint explained that if the Planning Commission and City Council approved the annexation, it would not go to a vote of the people until May, with the site and design review process the apartments would not be occupied until the winter of 2002, and the school district would have implemented their balancing of enrollment in the city.

Clint stated staff believes the application meets all the criteria, and recommends the Planning Commission send a recommendation of approval to the City Council.

Mr. Brown asked if there were any conclusions on Curt McLeod's comments regarding whether there was enough grade or capacity for the sewage. Clint stated his interpretation of the comment was since Mr. McLeod stated that services were available, what followed was a note that the plans may be inaccurate as to what is in actually in the ground.

**APPLICANT:** Ben Settecase, Mountain West Investment Corporation, addressed the Commission. He stated his company was encouraged that the City had recognized this site in the comp plan as being favorable for multi-family development.

Mr. Settecase stated he was pleased with the thoroughness of the staff report, and comfortable with the service providers comments, and traffic site analysis. He stated the application meets the major approval criteria for annexation and requested the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council.

Mr. Parks questioned the needs analysis of developable lands and asked what the volume of developable R2 land in the City was. Mr. Settecase responded there is a total of 214 acres available inside the City and in the Urban Growth Boundary, of that land 193 acres are designated R1 (low density), 2.3 acres R1.5 (medium density), 1.2 acres Residential Commercial and 17.7 of R2 (high density).

Mr. Parks stated there needs to be an analysis of what the amount of developable R2 land

already annexed into the City. Mr. Brown stated currently what is designated R2 inside the City is being occupied by R1 housing, and the amount of R2 land that is undeveloped is minimal.

**PROPOSERS:** None

**OPPOSERS:** Dale Dohman, 1825 N Pine, stated he moved into his home 3 years ago, at that time he was told it was zoned for 5 acre minimum lots. Clint explained the residential/rural/farm/and forest was a Clackamas County zoning designation. He stated this property is located inside the Urban Growth Boundary and has been designated to be urbanized as Canby grows. Clint added that the property will be zoned R2 high density per the comprehensive plan, as would Mr. Dohman's if he chose to be annexed.

Mr. Dohman questioned what the economic impact would be to his property if low cost multi-unit housing were built there. The Planning Commission was not able to speculate on the economic impact to his property, and stated any proposed development would be speculative and not binding on the applicant.

Mr. Brown stated comments such as Mr. Dohman's are frequently received by the Planning Commission, he explained the Planning Department has maps available that show the Urban Growth Boundary, and the comprehensive plan by designation and he encouraged all listeners to check the comprehensive plan's designation for any property prior to purchasing.

Mr. Dohman stated he had contacted the City prior to purchasing this property and was told there "no plans for that area". It was explained by the Commissioners that there probably were no "plans" for development until this application was submitted.

Mr. Parks stated the overlay zone had been in place for approximately 20 years, he explained the owners could sit on their property for 100 years and never be annexed into the City, but at any time they could put in an application for annexation, and build R2 high density residential housing. He stated the City will hold the applicants to the letter of the code, but the code allows this process.

Mr. Dohman asked if the code would allow low income housing there. Mr. Brown stated it would be at the owners discretion, they would have to come before the Commission for a site and design review, and people would have an opportunity to present concerns to the Commission at that time.

Mr. Stewart explained that there were two processes at work here, one was the annexation, the second was the site and design review. He stated a public hearing would be held for the site and design review, and specifics of the building such as the materials and the colors used could be discussed, they would also look at issues such as possible impacts on the neighborhood.

Mr. Brown suggested Mr. Dohman contact the applicant prior to the design review process and discuss specific concerns he might have, maybe some agreements could be made before the application was submitted.

Mr. Stewart closed the Public Hearing, and opened Commissioner Deliberations.

Mr. Manley stated his belief that there was not a 3 year supply of high density buildable lands, and he was in favor of recommending approval for this annexation.

Mrs. Tallman stated the application was Priority A, and bring in an island to the City. She added that there is a need to balance the amount of high density with the amount of low density the City now has available.

Mr. Brown discussed the criteria the application needed to meet for approval. He addressed the issue of "need" stating that a good point had been made regarding the City's need for high density land. He addressed the availability of public facilities stating he believed all of the infrastructure was in place except for the schools, and that was the one criteria that the Planning Commission can not solely deny on.

Mr. Stewart agreed with Mr. Brown that the application came down to the issues of "need" and the availability of public facilities. He encourage people to find out what the zoning and the comprehensive plan designation for a property was before they purchase it.

Mr. Stewart stated he agreed with the condition that requires the applicant "to participate on a proportional basis for the benefitted properties in future improvements agreed upon by the City and ODOT at the intersection of Territorial Rd and Hwy 99E".

Mr. Brown moved that the Planning Commission form a recommendation to approve ANN 00-05 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Tallman. Motion carried 5-0.

**CUP 00-05 Bob Wolf, Jerry C. Robinson Architect.** An application to approve extension of commercial use onto light industrial land and extend light industrial use onto commercial land as a part of a land swap deal.

Mr. Stewart asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, none was stated. When asked if any Commission had ex-parte contact, Commissioners Manley, and Stewart visited the site, but drew no conclusions. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Clint presented the staff report, he explained that usually conditional use applications were connected with other land use applications such as a design review, but in this case the owners were trying to attract a certain tenant to this property and in order to do that they need to increase the amount of square footage. In order to do this they have worked out a land swap deal with OBC Northwest, where the shopping center would receive the northern most 70 feet of OBC property, and in return OBC will receive a unused piece of property.

Clint explained the current zoning boundary follows the property line so until the lot line adjustment is done, it will be necessary to have a conditional use permit for the companies to expand onto the other property.

Mrs. Tallman asked what will happen with OBC's entrance, Clint explained it will need to be realigned. Mr. Brown questioned if OBC was going to have to realign their driveway again for the expansion of Berg Parkway, or if this application facilitated that, Clint responded that by both of the applicants redeveloping at this point it would allow the City to move forward on the connection of 13<sup>th</sup> St. a little quicker.

There was a question as to why the Conditional Use was being done before the site and design review, Clint explained that the tenant wanted assurances that their intended use would be allowed before they signed a lease agreement. Mr. Brown questioned why this wasn't a zone change application, Clint stated the zone change process takes approximately a month longer, the applicant has stated they would do a zone change at a later time.

Clint stated staff's opinion was the application met the criteria of approval by being consistent with the comprehensive plan, the characteristics of the site is suitable for the development, adequate public services and facilities are available, and the use will not negatively impact the surrounding area.

Clint stated staff was recommending the Planning Commission approve the application with the following conditions:

- the land designated under the land swap be executed under LLA 00-06
- that it is approved for expansion of existing light industrial/commercial uses until the land is zoned highway commercial
- all expansions will be subject to site and design review approval
- the conditional use permit shall not extend to parts of the property not designated in LLA 00-06
- any expansion or redevelopment of the property needs to be approved through the site and design review process
- expansions of structures will not be allowed over existing utility easements
- any utility relocations would have to be approved and be at the expense of the developer.

Mr. Stewart opened the public hearing.

**APPLICANT:** Bob Wolf, PO Box 82699, Portland, OR 97282 stated in this land swap OBC gains the land they need to expand, and Canby Square gets rid of a piece of property they can't use. Mr. Wolf stated he would be applying for a zone change in the next 7-10 days but by applying for the conditional use permit they will have gained time in the planning phase. Clint explained the site and design review and the zone change can run concurrently.

Mr. Stewart asked how much expansion Canby Square was going to go through. Mr. Wolf stated it is still under negotiations.

**PROPONENTS:** Mike Foley, 26927 Chively Rd, Colton, OR, stated he was a Realtor and is spearheading the negotiations with the proposed tenant which requires the expansion on the retail side, and explained it is a time sensitive situation with the tenant.

Mr. Stewart asked if the Mexican restaurant was moving, Mr. Foley stated it will be a second location for the restaurant, they were still going to be in the original location.

**Tracy Boyce**, 3027 Turner Rd, West Linn, OR, owner of OBC Northwest. He stated they have out grown their current space, and hoped the application goes through, explaining they plan to build warehouses on the property.

Mr. Parks asked if the applicant understands the nature of Mr. Boyce's business, and if there could be a conflict between the two uses. Mr. Boyce stated the applicant knows what his business does, and he knows what they do, and does not see any future conflicts. Mr. Stewart stated to the best of his knowledge there has never been any complaints regarding OBC.

Mr. Stewart asked if Mr. Boyce has had any problems with transients. Mr. Boyce stated that in the last 5 years there have been 2 break-ins and that camps have been set up on the vacant property.

**Pat Crowell**, 9029 Siletz Dr., Tualatin, he stated he is serving as Mr. Boyce's Real Estate Broker and would like to "ditto" what had been said at the hearing so far.

**OPPONENTS:** None

Mr. Stewart closed the public hearing and opened Commissioner deliberations.

Mrs. Tallman stated the application made sense, and understood negotiations with prospective tenants can be tricky. They want to know their use will be allowed, and agreed that the a zone change is needed for the long term, adding it is important to the City and the school that the empty lot be cleaned up.

Mr. Brown stated this process is routinely done in real estate to acquire property to develop, but wanted to be sure the Planning Commission did not lose any ability in future land use applications.

Mr. Parks questioned if the application was approved and Canby Square was allowed to expand in the direction they want then for some reason the deal didn't go through, what would the remedy be. Mr. Brown stated this was a preapproval for a zone change, but questioned what binding power it would have on the land. Clint responded that the lot line adjustment has already been received in the office, the notice of approval will be sent out tomorrow if the application is approved, at that point the applicant will have the ability to execute the land swap, without having to wait for the zone change.

Mr. Park's clarified that the Planning Commission would only be conditioning the expansion of the two current uses, not providing additional uses in the light industrial zone. John stated that was the difference between this application and a zone change amendment, this covers just the existing uses, specifically that it is ok for a shopping center to exist on one section of land, and a warehouse to exist on the other, not that it would be acceptable for any light industrial use.

Mr. Manley stated he thought the application would benefit the police department as well as the applicants, and help the development of the Berg extension to 13<sup>th</sup> St.

Mr. Parks moved to approve CUP 00-05 as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Manley. Motion carried 5-0.

#### **IV NEW BUSINESS**

##### **MOD DR 99-07 Frank Cutsforth, Canby Station, parking modification**

Matilda Deas, Project Planner, addressed the Planning Commission. She explained that due to the removal of parking spaces due to backing problems, and the restriping of the parking lot due to customer complaints, the parking ratio had fallen below the conditioned amount of 4.4 per thousand. She stated the applicant was asking the conditioned amount be reduced to what currently exists, taking into consideration there are 21 on street parking spaces.

Matilda stated that the Fred Meyer complex was approved at 4.1 spaces per thousand, noting that the code does not address this use exactly and gave an example that if the formula for a mixed use facility had been used it would have changed the amount of parking spaces need from 279 to just 235.

Matilda stated she had contacted the "smart development" organization and asked how they dealt with parking and was told their retail formula is 1 space per 350 square feet, using those figures the applicant would have required to have 169 spaces.

Matilda stated that staff's recommendation was for approval of the modification.

Mr. Parks asked if this would trigger notification of the surrounding neighbors. John explained that after a modification notices are sent out to neighbors and if they object they can request a public hearing.

Mrs. Tallman stated she agreed the original spaces at the grocery store were too narrow and needed to be widened.

**Lila Gottman**, from the Bike and Ped committee,

Lila: "Originally my understanding is that the bike parking has been consolidated to the main grocery store that is supposed to be facilitating these places out here, is that correct?"

Mr. Stewart: "No I don't believe it is, I believe they are 2 separate entities."

Matilda: "That's not correct, they just provided more than they were actually required to provide in Phase 1, and they have other bicycle parking planned in Phase II."

Lila: "Well the bicycle parking that is being provide at the grocery store is just way out of line, I

mean we need to take and look at the needs, of what they really need, and what you are recommending or what your putting in for this particular structure is not even close to being accurate.”

Mr. Stewart: “In what sense?”

Lila: “Well they got a bicycle rack there that is just humongous and is taking up way more space than it ought to, and it is therefore not being used by bicyclists, and it’s in their way to use for their business so, the type of bicycle racks that are going in, are actually prohibiting the use of them by bicyclists. and they are creating a hazard, or an obstacle course for the store, so there needs to be better recommendations for how many parking spaces for bikes need to be there, even though you might have a code that says you have to have, what is it? I think it’s 1 per 7, I think, it’s a ratio for the cars, and at this point in time we need modify that so there is not, we have a much less need presently, and it can mean if we put in different types of racks, and use them, you could add more as they’re needed later, rather than putting in these humongous racks improperly installed and in the wrong spots, and in everybody’s way, it makes a bad situation for everyone.”

Mr. Stewart: “Can you provide us some written comments, or comments from Mr Cutsforth on what he might do to make it more advantageous.”

Lila: “I think we already have, a couple times. Um, there should be a recommendation of staple racks and how they’re installed. Do we not have those? At least as far as I know, to the Planning Department.”

John: “Yeah we do have that, and we usually do provide that to applicants, it’s not in our code, exactly, but we do have that drawing.”

Lila: “So do we need to provide it to you guys every time one of these things comes along? The specific things?”

Mr. Brown: “Isn’t there, basically there a ribbon rack installed in concrete.”

Lila: “That’s what’s there now, yeah.”

Mr. Brown: “If I understand what your complaint is that there is too much facilitation in bikes.”

Lila: “Well in that particular instance there is, that rack is so long, it’s installed not, it’s not installed correctly for a ribbon rack, and so it’s taking up way more room than it needs to it could have been accommodated by 2 or 3 of the staple racks, but most of the time.”

Mr. Parks: “So why does that keep people from using it?”

Lila, “Because most of the time there is stuff in front of it blocking it, because it’s, the only place they could find to put it was, some where they were using the facility for something else. So therefore, most of the time, it’s being taken up by other structures, shopping carts are usually in



front of it, so therefore it can't be used. So it's not doing any good for the bicyclist and it's not doing any good for the store. It's in the way of the store, therefore it's not being useful for the bicyclists."

Mr. Brown: "So in an attempt to accommodate more bicycles than he is required to by code, he has done some disservice to the community?"

Lila: "I would say so on this particular case, yeah, and, it became more expensive to him. We could have made him happier by having less racks, having a different style of rack that would have been more accommodating, in a different location. Than where it's at presently."

Mr. Stewart: "Well, our code doesn't specify where a store owner needs to put a bike rack, and I hope it never does, I mean we have to leave flexibility for them."

Lila: "Actually it does."

John: "It does to some degree"

Mr. Stewart: "To some degree, not to the extent that we are going to start dictating, and I hope we never get that way, because I think store owners need the flexibility. If I recall, Mr. Cutsforth, when this application came through, said he wanted to provide more bike racks to make it easier for people, apparently that is in fact the case, but you say that now he has provided too many bike racks, as I understand, it there is too."

Lila: "I think that the problem is that is the style of bike rack and the fact it is in place improperly, so it can not be used the way it's supposed to be used."

Mr. Stewart: "Is the bike rack he used, is it an approved bike rack, is it used in other places."

Lila: "Yes it is, but it is installed incorrectly, and therefore is not usable in it's present site."

Mr. Brown: "When you say installed, you mean located, because he can't install it any better, unless he sinks those things 4 miles into the concrete."

Lila: "Ok, alright, if you want to say that, it's location is incorrect. It was not installed with correct clearances."

Mr. Stewart: "Ok, what I would recommend is, put these notes down and give them to the staff, we will see what we can do to make things better, I don't have an easy answer for you."

Mr. Brown: "Do you prefer the hoops?"

Lila: "Yeah, they are easier to locate and they will actually accommodate more bikes."

Mr. Brown: "And they support the bike better than the ribbon racks."

Lila: "Yeah"

Mr. Brown: "Do you know what she's talking about, they're the half circle racks, and you park in between them, your bike is actually can lean against them, doesn't tip over as much, and the ribbon racks, since it's just your wheel, or part of your frame, they are tippier."

Mr. Stewart: "Is there only one approved, or are several that are approved."

Mr. Brown: "They are both approved."

Mr. Stewart: "So they are both approved then, they both must be viable."

Lila: "They are both approved only because, I think it was structured after the state's recommendations that way, but our committee only sent approval for one, and that was the u-shaped, and not to have the ribbon style, I don't know how the ribbon style ever came into being. Do you?"

John: "Not off the top of my head."

Mr. Stewart: "It's a state standard, I mean."

John: "Well, and we do have the drawing that Lila is referring to, and we do hand them out to folks, so I think what we have here is just a case that someone tried to provide more than the requirement, and it didn't quite work out, possibly."

Lila: "So then we need to be more sensitive, because even though they tried to be generous here, it kind of back fired."

John: "We will try to work on this outside of this, doesn't really obviously have a bearing on the parking thing that we are talking about here, but we will see what we can do about it."

Lila, "Thank you"

Mr. Stewart explained to the audience that the City standard used to be 5.5 spaces per thousand square feet, several years ago it was reduced to keep from paving over the City, Cutsforth's application was approved at 4.4 spaces per thousand square feet, this is a request to go slightly below that level.

Mr. Brown stated he had been an employee of MGA Architects, and had worked on Phase I of this project, he stated the request shows the good intentions of the applicant for the needs of his customers. He added it did not reduce the standard below what has been approved for other projects including Fred Meyer development, and thinks it should be approved.

Mrs. Tallman asked Mr. Cutsforth if the amount of parking they currently have is adequate. Mr. Cutsforth responded that like all retail facilities, there are times of the year when parking lots are full such as Thanksgiving and Christmas, but it has never been a problem.

Mr. Cutsforth stated the grocery carts created a problem in Phase I, going between parked cars, causing scratches, he explained there will be no carts in Phase II, enabling the use of smaller parking stalls.

Mr. Stewart stated he was not comfortable going below 4.2 per thousand and thought Mr. Cutsforth's request for 4.3 per thousand was reasonable, since he agreed a grocery store needs wider stalls.

Mr. Brown asked since he abstained from the original design review, did it preclude him from voting on this application. Mr. Stewart stated it did not, it was a separate issue. Mr. Brown moved to approve MOD DR 99-07 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Tallman. Motion carried 5-0.

## V. FINDINGS

**ANN 00-03** Willow Creek Estates, Inc. An application to annex 14.5 acres located on the west side of N Redwood St., north of the Heritage Park subdivision.

Mr. Parks moved to approve ANN 00-03, as amended by the chair. Seconded by Mr. Brown. Motion carried 5-0.

**ANN 00-04** John & Bette Vaudt, an application to annex 1.66 acres into the City located on the west side of N redwood St. south of the Conner's Corner subdivision.

Mrs. Tallman moved to approve ANN 00-04, as amended by the chair. Seconded by Mr. Parks. Motion carried 5-0.

## • PUBLIC HEARING

Clint stated that Milgard Manufacturing has applied to build a facility in the industrial park, there are some conditions in the staff report that the applicants are going to ask to be modified, they have requested a continuation of their hearing for 2 weeks until the next Planning Commission meeting in order to come up with arguments as to why the conditions should be altered. Mr. Brown asked if the applicant had waived the 120 day rule. Clint stated they had not, but the application is still within the 120 time frame.

Mr. Stewart opened the public hearing for DR 00-08 Milgard Manufacturing, an application for approval of a 188,504 square foot manufacturing facility in the Canby industrial park. Mr. Stewart stated that at the applicants request the hearing has been delayed to date and time certain of January 22, 2001 at 7:00p.m. Mr. Stewart continued the public hearing.

## VI. MINUTES

**November 27, 2000** Mrs. Tallman reworded a sentence on page 8, regarding Ms. Blackwell's question on criteria for withdrawing from a historic district. Mr. Parks stated he had

been misquoted on page 9 and asked it be corrected. Mr. Stewart asked for clarification on Mr. Weygandt's question regarding funding the infrastructure for the industrial park.

Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes of November 27, 2000 as amended. Seconded by Mr. Parks. Motion carried 5-0.

**December 11, 2000** Mrs. Tallman moved to approve the minutes of December 11, 2000 as written. Seconded by Mr. Parks. Motion carried 5-0

- **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

John Williams, Planning Director addressed the Commissioners, he stated that parking has always been an issue in Canby, and suggested applicants be informed that the 8.5 foot wide by 18 foot long parking stalls are a minimum, applicants are free to make them larger. It was suggested by Mr. Brown that during the code review the minimum standard width be increased and the parking ratio be looked at.

Clint stated that when Fred Meyer came in they were required to provide clear and objective findings showing they did not need 5.5 parking spaces per thousand, they had enough stores to show their need would allow the lower amount of parking stalls.

Mr. Brown explained that large stores want to get 5 spaces per thousand because they believe it's a benefit to them, he cited Albertson's stores which require 9 x 18 foot angled parking spaces.

John stated there is a continuing issue with people not knowing the comprehensive plan zoning designation for their property and the property around them. The Planning Commission and the City Council have discussed how to get increased notifications to people. John stated the City is working with the Real Estate Industry to make sure they are getting the correct information to pass on to their customers, and we help people who come into the office, the problem is that few people do check into it.

Mr. Parks stated they could help people by sending periodic notices to landowners informing them of their zoning designation and what the possible zoning could be in the future, making it an issue of concealment if they don't disclose it when they sell their property.

John stated the City Council is considering notifying all residents regarding the zone work that is being done. There was a discussion concerning the obligation of Real Estate Professionals to inform prospective buyers of the comprehensive plan and whether the property is located inside the City's Urban Growth Boundary.

It was decided to have the Planning Department give citizens as much information as possible when they contact the office regarding a piece of property, they should be told the zoning designation, the zoning of the surrounding neighborhood, and what the comprehensive plan

designation is.

John reminded the Commissioners that there will be a Residential Zoning Task Force meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January, 7:00pm in Council Chambers. Mr. Stewart stated he did not think there was too little R2 Zoning, the problem was that there are areas that are designated R2 that will never be developed to R2 standards.

John informed the Commissioners there will be a Transportation Task Force meeting January 18<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm, at the Adult Center.

John asked for dates that would not work for the possible joint meeting between the Planning Commissioners, City Council, Fire Board, and the School Board, and stated the Commissioners would be noticed when a final date is established.

John stated there will be 3 public hearings for the next meeting. Clint explained it includes a remodel for the Canby Care Center, the Milgard Manufacturing application, and an application from a gentleman who wants to relocate his antique car restoration business on a lot located behind the Post Office.

Mr. Brown questioned how it would be determined where the street will be on the north side of Milgard. Clint stated the City has been designing it the way it is on the application, but how it gets from Fred Meyer to Milgard is still up in the air. Clint explained that Milgard has time constraints, and if Sequoia isn't opened when Milgard is built, they will still have access off of 4<sup>th</sup> St.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**