

**MINUTES**  
**CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**

7:00pm May 29, 2001  
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup>

---

---

**I. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:** Chairman, Keith Stewart, Commissioners Brown, Tallman, Thalhoffer, Manley

**ABSENT:** Commissioners Tessman, Sanchez

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Robert Wolf, Tracy Boyce, Matt Grady, Brian Polasky, Dan Doucette, Paul Fox, Laverne Mohning Beth Saul

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

None

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

**MOD 01-02** An application to modify DR 98-08, Gramor Development. Approval of this application is necessary for the Canby Market Center to maintain the parking ration of 4.1.

Clint presented the staff report. He stated the Gramor Development was approved with a parking ratio of 4.1, he explained no additional parking was proposed with DR 01-03, Denny's Dinner and with the development of the restaurant the parking ratio for the Canby Market Center would fall below 4.0.

Clint stated that Gramor is proposing to install 10 additional parking spaces behind the Fred Meyer complex, Fred Meyer's is agreeable to the alteration since their employees must enter and exit from the back of the complex. Clint explained this parking would be accessed by a one way drive, and protected from truck traffic by a landscaped median. Gramor is also proposing an additional 12 spaces on Pad D2, located in the northeast corner of the development.

Clint explained staff has suggested the pedestrian walkway that currently connects the rear exit of Fred Meyers with the bottle return area be continued to the Denny's Dinner. Clint explained Gramor is unsure if they would be able to meet this condition since Fred Meyer leases

the property the path would be located on making this an off-site condition.

Mr. Brown questioned why they would need a pedestrian connection to the bottle return area. Clint explained it would make a connection from Hwy 99E to Arneson Park. Mr. Brown stated there is currently a pedestrian path through the Fred Meyer complex that connects with Arneson Park.

**APPLICANT:**

Matt Grady, Gramor Development agreed with the staff report. He explained they were aware of the shortfall in parking spaces for the future developments due to the amount of space required for West Coast Bank's drive-thru facilities. He explained the development is still in compliance with the addition of West Coast Bank, but when Denny's comes in they will be short 22 parking spaces.

Mr. Grady stated the addition of the parking area would reduce the existing landscape from 14.6% to 14.3%, if Arneson Park was added, as it was in DR 98-08 it reduces from 25.9% to 24.4%.

Mr. Grady explained Fred Meyers owns the land the Fred Meyer complex is on, so the continuation of the pedestrian walk would be an off-site condition for the Denny's Diner. Mr. Grady faxed a copy of the condition to Mr. Clark, Fred Meyer Design Team who stated he did not see the validity of extending the walkway up behind Denny's garbage dumpster, and was concerned people would dispose of their left over bottles there. Mr. Grady explained if the Commission required the pedestrian walkway, he had no authority to grant the condition.

Mr. Grady stated they want to maintain the 4.1 parking compliance, but asked if it could be done in two steps. Creating the 10 stalls behind Fred Meyers with the construction of the Denny's Diner, but not constructing the other 12 parking stalls until the tenant for Pad D-2 was on board, so the parking spaces could be coordinated with the development of Pad "D2". He suggested a condition stating a design review for "D2" would be submitted to the City within a year, and if it's not, the parking spaces would have to be constructed.

Mrs. Tallman stated she did not see the need for the pedestrian path, and believes there is sufficient pedestrian walks through the Fred Meyer Complex. She agreed that waiting until the tenant is established for Pad "D2" before deciding the placement of the remaining 12 parking stalls would be appropriate.

Mr. Manley believed allowing the applicant 1 year for compliance would be agreeable.

Mr. Thalhoffer stated the condition could be tied to the development of Pad D-2.

Mr. Brown clarified that the applicant was asking for 12 months to design the site, the

actual construction could take longer. Mr. Brown appreciated the applicants willingness to maintain the 4.1 ratio for their parking, and they have proven their word is good. He believed their request should be granted.

Mr. Stewart explained that parking behind Fred Meyer had not been approved with the original application due to the maneuvering of 18 wheelers back there, with the landscape median there should be no problems.

It was moved by Mr. Brown to approve MOD 01-2/DR 98-08 with the condition that the construction of parking on Pad D2 be deferred to an application to be reviewed and approved one year from this date, with no condition for a pedestrian walkway. Seconded by Mr. Thalhoffer. Motion carried 5-0.

#### **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**DR 01-02** Continued from May 14, 2001. An application by OBC to build a 27,420 square foot warehouse in three phases on property recently acquired as part of a land swap with Essex Management on S Berg Parkway.

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 stated. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, Mr. Brown, Mrs. Tallman, Mr. Manley, and Mr. Stewart had all participated in the last hearing, Mrs. Tallman, Mr. Manley, and Mr. Stewart had visited the site, no conclusions were drawn. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Clint explained the applicant had proposed changes to their original application that addressed the concerns the Commissioners had.. The new application shows semi trucks would not have to use the northeastern access drive along side of Canby Square. They are working on obtaining an access easement along the southern edge of Canby Square which would allow all delivery vehicles to enter and exit on Berg Parkway.

Clint passed out a diagram of a truck turning radius, and how it worked inside their property. Staff has added an additional condition requiring all access to and from the site be by Berg Parkway, and any access easement for the north east gate would be reviewed at reconstruction of the Canby Square Shopping Center.

#### **APPLICANT**

**Robert Wolf**, explained they are working with Essex to established an easement along the southern border of Canby Square, the northern easement would be gated, with emergency vehicles having access to the gate. Mr. Wolf stated all truck traffic would now enter off of Berg

Parkway loop around and exit back onto Berg Parkway.

Mr. Wolf discussed the turning diagram that shows a minimum practical turning radius of 50' and believes the applicant has adequate room. Mr. Brown questioned how the Commission could be assured the northern access would not be used. Mr. Wolf explained the two facilities would have to police the roadway.

Mr. Brown questioned if 50' was large enough for an 18 wheeler to turn around in. Mr. Wolf stated that generally industrial sites do a 100' apron, but believed there was adequate room on the site for turning.

**PROPONENTS:**

None

**OPPONENTS:**

None

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

Mr. Brown asked if the turning diagram was from Graphic Standards, Mr. Wolf stated it was from the latest edition.

Mr. Thalhofer stated that according to the diagram there is additional margin for the truck turning radius. Mr. Thalhofer stated he had driven trucks in College and had seen worse turning situations.

Mr. Brown asked if recording the new access easement was a condition of approval. Clint explained if the access was necessary to approve the design review then it would be required to be recorded, in this case it is between the property owners whether this access would be acquired. Mr. Brown stated he would like to see a larger turning area, but the applicant had provided convincing data showing they have adequate space.

Mr. Manley agreed the information the applicant had provided had addressed the concerns he had with the original application.

Mr. Stewart questioned if the emergency access would be a locked gate or a break away gate. Mr. Wolf stated it would be a locked gate.

Mrs. Tallman stated she wanted the conditions to state the access easement next to the school would be abandoned and not used. She explained that twice a day the right turning movements are restricted due to bus traffic at the school, and did not think the unprotected access

onto Hwy 99E was safe. She agreed this modification addressed those issues.

Mr. Manley questioned if the new parking area would require the trees to be removed that the applicant had stated at the last meeting would be saved. Mr. Wolf said the trees would not be affected.

Mr. Brown asked if a condition stating all access to the site would be through Berg Parkway satisfied Mrs. Tallman's concerns. She stated it would. Clint stated he would renumber the conditions to include that condition.

Mr. Stewart questioned when the sidewalk and utility improvements would be done. Clint explained that decision would be up to Mr. Hester, Public Works Supervisor and Mr. Curt McLeod, City Engineer. Mr. Stewart asked if a Waiver of Remonstrance ever ran out, Clint stated it did not.

Mr. Stewart asked what the time frame was for the extension of Berg Parkway behind OBC. Clint explained the City is still waiting for Canby Disposal to completely vacate their property. Mr. Stewart requested staff to look into what the time table was for Canby Disposal to vacate their old facility.

Mr. Stewart asked if this application would affect the extension of Berg Parkway. Clint stated that as a condition of this application, the City would receive the right-of-way that's needed, and the applicant has agreed to do the frontage improvements whenever the City requires them.

Mr. Brown questioned if the City Engineer had any problems with the property line being only 5' from the existing building. Clint stated the 5' sidewalk will go right up to the corner of the existing building, as a condition of this application the fence line will need to be adjusted to allow for the new right-of-way. Clint explained the City Engineer is aware of the situation and believes the travel lanes and sidewalks can be accommodated without requiring OBC to remove part of their building.

It was moved by Mr. Thalhoffer to approve DR 01-02 with amendment of the numbering of the conditions. Seconded by Mr. Brown. Mr. Manley questioned if a condition should be added regarding the trees on the property, it was agreed that Clint would restate condition #1. Motion carried 5-0.

**DR 01-03** An application to build a Denny's Diner at the Canby Market Center. The diner will be located on Pad A, on the northwest corner of the site, adjacent to Highway 99E and the railroad tracks.

Mr. Stewart asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, none was stated. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, Commissioners Brown, Tallman, Manley, and

Stewart had visited the site, but drawn no conclusions. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Clint stated the application is to build a Denny's Diner on Pad A of the Gramor Complex. He explained this would be a sit down restaurant only, with no drive thru facilities.

Clint addressed the design matrix, with the modification that was approved earlier the application meets the required 4.1 parking ratio, the landscaping is mainly oriented toward the railroad right-of-way. A screened trash receptacle area will be coned off on pick up days to retain the parking spaces. Clint stated the applicant is proposing an outdoor seating area located on the southeast corner of the lot

Clint stated if the Planning Commission retained condition #13 requiring the pedestrian walkway, there would be off-site issues that would need to be dealt with.

Mr. Manley stated the majority of proposed parking spaces were designated as compact spaces, he questioned the difference between a regular space and a compact space. Clint stated that a compact space is allowed to be 2' shorter and ½' narrower than a regular space, but this application is just proposing shortening the spaces in order to maintain the 8' sidewalks.

Mrs. Tallman questioned how larger vehicles would be accommodated. Clint explained there is shared parking for all businesses in the compound. Mr. Brown explained that since the spaces would not be narrower, and the code allows a 2' overhang on 8' wide sidewalks instead of wheel stops, the proposed compact parking would accommodate large vehicles.

#### **APPLICANT:**

**Brian Polaski**, Architect, stated he has matched the existing building in regards to details, heights, and awnings as closely as possible. He explained there is an existing trash enclosure located in the parking area between Denny's and Starbucks, but for Denny's to use this facility it would require them to come from behind the building, restaurant trash can be messy and the applicant prefers having a receptacle located at the rear of the building.

Mr. Stewart asked how many times a week Denny's would have the trash picked up, and if it would cause a problem coning the 2 parking spaces off. Mr. Polaski stated the trash would probably be picked up 2 possibly 3 times a week, he saw no problem with coning off the spaces, since customers prefer to park closer to the front of the restaurant.

Mr. Polaski stated the applicant has proposed placing the bicycle parking 25' past the 50' requirement due to the congregation area in the front of the restaurant. The applicant is proposing an enclosed outdoor patio eating area, and are adding 2 additional lights on the site.

Mr. Manley clarified the applicant is proposing placing the bicycle parking 75' from the

main entrance to the building. Mr. Stewart stated it is important not to block the entrance to the building for safety reasons.

Mr. Stewart questioned if there will be a lounge planned for the dinner. Mr. Polaski stated the lounge will be located in the north east section of the building, and would seat 56 people.

**Paul Fox**, Owner of Denny's Dinner stated that all Denny's will soon be called Denny's Diners. Mr. Fox explained the restaurant will be a 24 hour establishment, but believed the lounge would close at midnight at this time, but if the demand requires it could stay open as late as 2:00AM.

Mrs. Tallman asked when the restaurant was planning to open. Mr. Fox stated as soon as Gramor okays the design, (which they are close to doing), and the Planning Commission gives their approval, they will put in for the building permits, and hope to be opened by Thanksgiving.

Mr. Stewart asked what type of signs were planned. Mr. Polaski stated the signs would be submitted at a later date and would match the existing style of signage in the complex at this time.

#### **PROPOSERS:**

**Matt Grady**, Gramor Development, stated Mr. Polaski has worked hard to match the existing complexes in the development. He stated he has read the staff report, and is troubled by condition #13, which requires the pedestrian trail. He explained this is not in Gramor control, he would be required to get Fred Meyers approval, and was not sure he could get Fred Meyer's consent, Mr. Clark from Fred Meyers did not see the justification for the pathway, and believe it would create problems with customers using the Denny's trash receptacle. Mr. Grady stated if the pathway connected to the Logging Road, across the railroad tracks Fred Meyers maybe more amiable to the pathway. He asked the Commission not include condition #13 in the conditions of approval.

Mr. Grady agreed having the wider sidewalks with shorter parking spaces is the best option for the front of the development. He stated they are working on the signage with the applicant, and believed something would be worked out soon.

Mr. Stewart asked what the applicant planned to do with the area where the proposed path was if the Commission removed that condition from the application. Mr. Polaski responded that extending the planned landscaping into that area would not be a problem.

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

Mr. Brown stated he understood how difficult it is to get owners to agree to as many

conditions as Mr. Fox has agreed to. He agreed condition #13 should be removed. Mr. Brown stated because of the exterior patio area, and the location of the front doors, he agreed it was reasonable to have the bike parking at the location the applicant has proposed.

Clint stated his concern was that if there was no bicycle parking at the entrance bike riders would chain their bikes to the fence, instead of taking them 75' to the bike rack. Mr. Brown believed most bike riders would not be coming from Fred Meyers, they would be traveling along Hwy 99E and the proposed bike parking would be convenient for bike riders to use. He believed it would detract from the architecture if the bike rack was placed in front of the entrance.

Mr. Thalhoffer stated he agreed with Mr. Brown's comments, he believes there should be no walkway, and the bike parking should be where the applicant has proposed.

Mrs. Tallman stated condition #13 (the pedestrian walkway) should be removed, and the bicycle parking should be located as indicated on the plan.

Mr. Manley agreed condition #13 should be removed. He stated that in the past the Commission has pushed for bicycle parking to be located within 50' of the entrance, but with the design of this building that condition may not work well, but he did not want to set a pattern of not requiring the location of the bike parking to be within 50' of the front door.

Mr. Stewart agreed with the Planning Commission. He stated it would be appropriate to remove condition #13, he would like to see the landscaping wrapped around, to give the development a cleaner look, he liked the outside dining aspect of the project, and believed the proposed site for the bicycle racks was the best location. He agreed with Mr. Manley that he did not want to set a precedent for not placing bicycle parking within 50' of the main entrance, but in this situation he believed it was appropriate to locate them where the applicant proposed.

Mr. Thalhoffer moved to approve DR 01-03 with the removal of condition #13, the modification of condition #12 (the location of the bike rack). Seconded by Mr. Brown. Motion carried 5-0. Clint asked if the motion included the landscaping wrapping around, the motion was modified by Mr. Thalhoffer to add the condition for the landscaping. Seconded by Mr. Brown. Motion carried 5-0.

**CUP 01-02** An application by E. W. Laitinen to allow the applicant to use more than 25% of the ground floor area of the house located at 410 NW Grant for residential use. The remaining ground floor area will be a print shop and office space.

Mr. Stewart asked if any member of the Planning Commission had a conflict of interest, none was stated. When asked if any member had ex-parte contact, Mrs. Tallman stated Mrs. Laitinen is a personal friend of hers and she had discussed moving into the location with her, but had not discussed the business, Mrs. Tallman intended to participate in the hearing, Mr. Stewart stated he lived approximately ½ block from the proposed site, but was unaware of the



hearing until he saw the notice on the site, Mr Stewart stated he would participate in the hearing. No questions were asked of the Planning Commissioners.

Clint presented the staff report, he explained the property is located in the Downtown C1 zone, the applicant intends to run a print shop in the downstairs portion of the building, and have a residence upstairs.

Clint stated when the applicant came to the Planning office to get information on an addition to the existing building he ran into problems with the building code which requires fire walls and fire door separations between the business use and the residential use. This created problems in efficiently using the building. The conditional use permit would allow the applicant to use more than the 25% limitation on residential use of the ground floor area of the building. Without the permit, the building could either be used totally for business or totally for residential.

Clint stated the applicant would be required to have 5 on site parking spaces, the applicant is asking the Planning Commission to allow 2 of the parking spaces to be stacked. Clint stated the intended use is a business with a residential manager, so the stacked parking would have little effect upon the customers, only to the residents of the building who may have to wait for a customer to leave.

Mr. Brown asked if there is a proposed garage. Clint stated the original garage has been removed, and the applicant is proposing to build a shop area for the print shop.

Mr. Stewart explained the building was originally single family home, it became a law office and used for a short time as a massage therapists office, since then it has become dilapidated. He believed this use would be an improvement for the property.

Clint stated the biggest deviation from the normal application would be to allow the stacked parking, he explained that for the applicant to provide 3 on site parking spaces 2 existing on street parking spaces would have to be removed.

Mr. Brown asked since the property is in the Downtown zone, couldn't they count the on street parking. Mr. Stewart explained that across the street from this location there is a several hundred foot strip that is never used that is available for parking. Mr. Brown expressed his concern that the on site parking would require the cars to drive over the sidewalk, which has never been allowed in the Downtown zone before.

Mr. Stewart explained that there are duplexes that wrap around this property, and a restaurant will be located on the other side, this is a problem the Commission will face again as the City rezones other sections, how to deal with property on the border of 2 different zones.

**APPLICANT:** The applicant was not in attendance.

**PROPOSERS:** None

**OPPOSERS:** None

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

Mr. Brown stated he would prefer an application that did not include parking spaces that required vehicles to drive across the Downtown sidewalk. He stated allowing backing movements on Downtown streets would be a mistake. He suggested allowing the on street parking to count towards the required parking for this application.

Mr. Manley questioned if the Downtown plan hadn't addressed this issue to allow on street parking to count toward parking requirements. Mr. Brown stated the intent was to access off street parking by an alley, not by across a sidewalk.

Matilda Deas stated she agreed with Mr. Brown, even though this is outside the designated "Downtown Streets" area she believed it would not be a good Downtown traffic pattern. Mr. Brown questioned what mechanism was in place that would allow the Commission to vary from the parking requirement. John Williams, Planning Director stated it could be applied for as a variance, he explained staff does not typically advise applicants to apply for variances due to the criteria stating the condition cannot be caused by the applicant, and it can be interpreted that bringing in the business is causing the problem.

Mr. Stewart stated the improvements this application will make to the area will far overshadow what may have to be varied in terms of parking. He agreed that having a driveway 60' away from an alley, across the street from a school that crosses the sidewalk was not a good idea.

Matilda stated that the applicant could conceivably put parking where they tore the garage down, so the applicant is creating the situation. John believed the Planning Commission could make a finding that would meet the criteria necessary for the variance.

Clint explained the applicant applied for the Conditional Use permit to allow greater than 25% of the ground level to be used for residential use, and to allow the stacked parking. He summarized that the Commission did not have a problem with allowing the additional use, but would prefer to see an application that would eliminate the need to back over sidewalks and onto Downtown streets, the Commission agreed they did not want that type of traffic pattern on Downtown streets.

Clint stated that the Planning Commission and made findings in the past that varied from the parking standards, and believed a finding could be made with the safety issue of crossing the sidewalk in this case.

Mr. Brown stated there was sufficient lack of clarity on this issue to warrant the application being continued. Mr. Stewart agreed and stated he would like the applicant present at the next meeting. Clint believed the applicant did not believe they needed the off street parking, they were trying to comply with the code and make the project work.

Mrs. Tallman stated the Planning Commission needed to consider the fact this property is located on the edge of the Downtown area, and should consider blending the edge together, and letting the property look more residential in this case, to create a buffer zone between Commercial and Residential zones. She added this application would be bringing a new business to Canby, and the Planning Commission should be as cooperative as it can.

It was agreed by the Planning Commission to continue DR 01-04 until the June 11<sup>th</sup> meeting 7:00 in Council Chambers.

**DR 01-04** An application by the City of Canby to build new restroom facilities replacing the existing facilities, in Wait Park.

Mr. Stewart asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, Mr Brown stated he was Chairman of the Committee that is doing this project stating he would not vote and excused himself from the discussion, no other Commissioner had a conflict of interest. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, Mrs. Tallman stated she had seen the plans prior to this hearing, Mr. Stewart stated he had visited the site, no questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Mr. Stewart explained this project is being done by volunteer workers from the "Neighbor to Neighbor" program of the Mormon Church. He explained the improvement of the restroom facilities in Wait Park is a project that has needed to be done for some time, but the City has not had the funding to do it.

Matilda presented the staff report. She stated the applicant has revised the plans for the restroom facility to meet City requirements, and has worked closely with both Jeff Snyder, Parks Department, and Beth Saul, Parks Director to produce a product that will service the needs of the City.

Mr. Stewart opened the public hearing.

**APPLICANT:**

**Jim Brown**, Chairman Community Service Program, stated the Neighbor to Neighbor program stated this application is just one of many scheduled to take place in July, there will be a food drive, some repairs to City Hall, Police Station, and the Eco Park. He anticipates 1000 people from the church will be in Canby to assist in the program and hopes an equal amount of Canby Citizens will volunteer.

Mr. Brown stated construction of the Wait Park restroom facilities will cost approximately \$80,000 to \$100,000 and all labor will be done Pro Bono by volunteers, with materials hopefully donated by local businesses.

Mr. Brown explained the new building will be located in the same location as the existing facility. It will be a little larger having 2-3 stalls and a storage area. He explained there were 2 directions the design of the building could have taken, making it bulletproof (hard to vandalize) or to make it easily repaired, since the facility has only been vandalized a couple of times probably due to it's close proximity to the Police Station, so the decision was to make it easy to repair.

Mr. Brown stated there will be a storage area located in the center of the building for the Parks Department to use, and an oversized electrical panel for scheduled activities in the Park. The building will be white with bark colored roof and a copula to match the existing gazebo.

Mr. Brown stated the fund raising will begin after approval and preliminary review. He anticipates the material costs alone will run \$48,000 to \$50,000. He stated they will begin only if they are assured they have the resources to finish the project.

Mr. Stewart questioned the external lights on the building, Mr. Brown explained it wasn't marked on the plans, but there will be a light above each door and a high flood light that would shine on the building. Mr. Stewart stated that is more light than the existing building has, and should increase park safety.

Mr. Brown stated the building will be equipt with skylights, and the interior lighting will be connected to a motion detector so police will be able to tell when there is someone in the building at night.

**PROPONENTS:**

**Beth Saul:** Parks Director stated she is thrilled with the design of the facilities. She added the Park and Recreation Advisory Board believes the design enhances the character of Wait Park. She hopes the donations will come rolling in to assure the project becomes a reality.

Mr. Thalhoffer asked if other service clubs had been approached to help. Mr. Brown explained that the fund raising will begin in earnest in June. Ms. Saul stated this could really be a positive project for the City, but City Staff can't do fund raising, and due to recent cut backs there would not be staff time available so the project is relying on the community to come forward to help, if this is something they want to see happen.

**OPPONENTS:** None

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

Mrs. Tallman stated she is excited about the changes, and believes it will be a great addition to Wait Park.

Mr. Thalhofer stated he hoped Canby's citizens would take ownership of the project and make things happen.

Mr. Stewart stated this would be a wonderful addition to Wait Park, and appreciated the Neighbor to Neighbor project working so closely with Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Brown asked the Planning Commission how informed they wanted to be with the Neighbor to Neighbor projects. It was agreed information could be placed in the Commissioner packets, and Mr. Brown could provide verbal updates at Commission meetings.

Mrs. Tallman stated things are already happening, at the Canby Adult Center they are organizing and receiving donated materials to make totes for walkers. Mr. Brown stated that the kick-off meeting was attended by 50-60 people. He hoped the citizens of Canby both North and South would link arms, get dirty, and celebrate together at the end of the day at Wait Park.

It was moved by Mr. Thalhofer to approve DR 01-04 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Tallman. Motion carried 5-0-1.

## **V. FINDINGS**

**SUB01-02** An application to subdivide 2.5 acres into 11 lots suitable for building single family homes. It was moved by Mrs. Tallman to approve the Findings for SUB 01-02 as written. Seconded by Mr. Thalhofer. Motion carried 4-0-1 with Mr. Stewart abstaining.

**CPA 01-03/TA 01-01** An application by the City of Canby to adopt the Canby Downtown Plan and amendments to sections of the Transportation Systems Plan, the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance to implement the Canby Downtown Plan.

It was moved by Mr. Brown to recommend approval of CPA 01-03/TA 01-01 to the City Council as written. Seconded by Mr. Manley. Motion carried 4-0-1 with Mr. Stewart abstaining.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**