

# MINUTES

## CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

7:00pm September 24, 2001  
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup>

---

---

### I. ROLL CALL

**PRESENT:** Vice Chairman, Jim Brown, Commissioners, Jean Tallman, Paul Thalhofer, Geoffrey Manley, Tom Sanchez, Randy Tessman, Chairman Keith Stewart (arrived late)

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF:** John Williams, Community Development/Planning Director, Clint Chiavarini, Associate Planner, Carla Ahl, Planning Staff

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Wanda Center, Ed Netter, Mike Holmes, Gary Davis, Lynn Olsen, JillMarie Wiles, Janet Milne, Greg Page, Virgil Montecucco, Donna & Leonard Walker, Teresa Blackwell, George Forsman, Larry Housen

### II. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON AGENDA ITEMS

None

### III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

**SUB 01-05.** A request to subdivide the 9.92 acre parcel into 41 lots. Continued from September 10, 2001. Clint presented the Commission a letter from the applicant requesting their Public Hearing be postponed until 7:00pm, October 8, 2001.

**TA 01-03** Modifications to Canby's Residential Zoning Code, and other sections of the Land Development & Planning Ordinance.

Mr. Brown reviewed the hearing process, procedure and format. He referred to the applicable criteria posted on the wall and on page 2 of the staff report. When asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, none was stated. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, none was stated. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

John Williams presented the staff report. He explained these code amendment suggestions came out of the periodic review process required by the state. The State suggested areas in the code that could be updated, and the City hired a consultant to make some suggested code changes. The City also sponsored local neighborhood meetings to get citizen input on the suggested changes and mailed notices to every land owner in Canby informing them of this meeting. The Planning Commission has held two workshops: one on the actual zoning, (what uses would be allowed) and one on the process (how to deal with applications).

John addressed the issues the new code covered, and informed the Commission that the City is not required to adopt the States proposals.

- Duplexes are a conditional use in an R1 zone at this time, this change would make them an allowed outright use on corner lots of at least 10,000 sq ft with each units driveway accessing a different street. John explained this was a recommendation from the State, and addressed the State wide planning goal of increasing livability.
- “Granny Flats” small secondary units typically used as housing for relatives are currently not allowed in the R1 zone. This change would allow attached units outright, and detached units as a conditional use. John explained there had been a lot of support for this change in the public meetings.
- Zero lot lines, where lot lines are located at the foundation giving each house one large side yard rather than 2 narrow side yards.
- Maximum lot sizes and lot size averaging. Currently the code only establishes a minimum lot size of 7,000 sq ft. This would establish a maximum lot size of 10,000 sq ft., the minimum of 7,000 sq ft would remain. An exception would be for an existing home that a subdivision is developing around, or where the Planning Commission determines that due to lot shape, or existing features the requirement cannot be met. Lot size averaging would allow a developer to create lots of 6,000 sq ft provided the average lot size would be between 7-10,000 sq ft. This would enable developers to include parks or natural areas in their averaging (as long as it is not a required park).
- Covered porches would be allowed to extend into the front yard setback to within 10' of the front property line.
- Side yard setbacks would be changed to 7' on each side instead of the 7' and 10' setbacks in place now.
- Detached dwelling structures could be 2 stories tall, currently the code allows 1 story not over 22' tall, (this would allow converting garages into living quarters)
- Clarifying vision clearance requirements, this would reword the existing code to help end some confusion regarding the present wording.
- Allowing 4-plexes as an outright permitted use in an R-1.5 zone.
- Creating minimum and maximum lot sizes of 5,000 sq ft to 6,500 sq ft, and allowing lot size averaging in the R1.5 zone.
- Neighborhood commercial uses would be permitted in the R 2 zone with a conditional use permit. This would allow a developer to create a small community center within a development.

- R-2 density standards would require a minimum density of 14 units per acre with no maximum on density as long as all other restrictions were met.

Mr. Manley questioned why mobile and manufactured home developments would be allowed to build out at 8 units per acre instead of the 14 units that the new code required. John explained that mobile and manufactured homes had state requirements, and he would look into what the specific requirements were.

- Creating a minor variance process for allowing a 10% deviation from setback restrictions.
- Moving all related variance information into one section of the code.
- Create an interpretation procedure.
- Create a standardized procedure for land use applications. This would increase the notification area for annexations, major and minor land partitions, site and design review, subdivisions, and text amendments. Requiring neighborhood meetings for annexations, minor and major land partitions, comp plan amendments, site and design reviews, subdivisions, and text amendments.

Mr. Manley questioned the wording regarding who would have standing on an application, and if it included oral testimony. John agreed the wording needed to be clarified.

- Revise parking standards for duplexes. Currently parking is not allowed in the front yard setbacks, which has created duplexes with aprons of concrete around them to comply with the regulations. This would allow the driveway to be counted as a parking space, as it is with single family homes.
- Allowing food related businesses as a conditional use in the residential/commercial zone.
- Change the definition of City Planner and add the definition of a porch.
- Allow extensions to land use approvals. Currently extensions are allowed for subdivisions only. This would allow extensions to be granted for lot line adjustments and partitions.

John stated these changes that could be beneficial to the City and allow some new types of projects. He explained that during the neighborhood meetings a lot of people were not comfortable making more changes until there were design standards for residences in place.

Mr. Brown explained that during periodic review it was found that a large majority of the housing in R1.5 and R2 has already been developed with R1 standards and that Canby is lacking in R1.5 and R2 zoning areas, which does not allow options for less expensive housing.

Mr. Brown explained that there has been a lot of public input into this process, and it is the City's intent to reach some consensus with the issues. He suggested that John go through the items one by one, and if members of the audience had questions to ask them at that time.

- Allowing duplexes in R1 as an outright use.

**George Forsman**, expressed his concern that when the density increases around existing subdivisions it creates nuisances such as the lack of sufficient parking (forcing people to park cars in the existing subdivision), trespassing, and vandalism. He stated at 14 units per acres there is not enough room allowed for parking.

Mr. Forsman questioned who would enforce code violations such as multiple families living in single family units. He stated that absentee owners contribute to the problems because they have no idea what is going on with their property.

Mr. Forsman discussed what effects Measure 7 may have upon the City and questioned why the city is pursuing this type of zoning when it will not benefit the City. Mr. Brown stated he believed it would benefit the City, at the present time the standard price of a house in Canby is \$210,000 to \$225,000, he believes without changing the zoning it's possible that his children will never be able to afford homes of their own.

- Accessory Units

Ed Netter addressed the Commission, he stated he was in favor of allowing granny flats. He questioned if the dwelling would be allowed to have it's own cooking facility. John stated the current code only allows for one cooking facility in a single family home, this code revision would allow a second cooking facility, with restrictions such as it's own parking space, and the owner living on the premises.

Mr. Brown asked if Mr. Netter had any problems with a detached structure being 2 stories high. Mr. Netter said he would have no problem if the dwelling was within the setbacks. Mr. Brown questioned if 800sq ft seemed an acceptable size. Mr. Netter stated for 1 or 2 people, 800 sq ft is a good starting point.

- Zero Lot Line Housing

Ed Netter questioned if the development had to build up to the lot line, or if they could leave a small area in the back for a dog kennel. John said it would be up to the developer but typically the houses are build on the lot line, but you are not required to build up to the lot line.

Mr. Netter stated he liked changing the sideyard setbacks to 7' on each side, as lots get smaller it is harder to meet the 7' & 10' setbacks, and gives the developer more flexibility in home designs.

Mr. Forsman questioned if these developments would be like the homes in San Francisco, where they are built next to each other, right up to the street. John explained that common wall housing share a wall, with zero lot lines the houses are separate but the back of one house sits on the property line, making larger side yards between houses, instead of 2 small 7' and 10' side

yards. Mr. Forsman questioned if you had to trespass to paint the back side of your home. John explained there would be easements which would allow you access to the back side of the house.

**Lynn Olsen** stated she lives on a flag lot with a 20' driveway, they have granted an easement to allow their neighbors to use the driveway to access the neighbors accessory building. She questioned if the accessory building is used as a dwelling unit, will the new family have the right to use her driveway with out getting her permission. Clint explained a detached structure would have to obtain a conditional use permit which requires neighbors be notified and given an opportunity to testify regarding the application. Then the Planning Commission can apply whatever conditions it deems necessary to make the application work, or can deny the application.

- Minimum/Maximum lot sizes.

Mr. Brown explained that the City has no maximum limit on lot sizes, but most developers try to build as close to the minimum lot size as possible to create the maximum number of lots.

Mr. Forsman questioned if there will be any controls on the size of the buildings that will be allowed. Mr. Brown stated as long as the house meets the setbacks they can build it as large as they want.

- Lot size averaging

John explained this would allow developers more flexibility in breaking up lot sizes, creating some smaller, some larger lots, and to include wetlands and parks in the average.

Mr. Forsman informed the Commission that in Tualatin lot size averaging allowed a developer to create a denser development by including the wetlands (which were not developable) in the averaging. John responded that he had thought about that possibility and had included the phrase "non-required" areas to avoid that possibility.

- Allowing Porches (only) to extend into front yard setbacks.

Mr. Netter believed it was a good idea. He stated he is currently working with a lot that is wide and not very deep, the people want a front porch, but it pushes the house back 10' into the back yard. Allowing the porches to set into the front yard would give them a bigger back yard. Mr. Forsman questioned if existing homes could add porches. John explained they could.

- Allowing 7' side yard setbacks on both sides of the house.
- Height of Accessory Buildings

Mr. Brown believed the major concern was with infill developments, putting 2 story buildings in among single story homes. John explained an accessory building would have the same set backs as the house.

**JillMarie Wiles** stated if she was a home owner of a single story home it would concern her if someone built an apartment over their garage which would tower over her home and look down into her back yard. She values her privacy in her backyard and believes accessory structures should be consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. Mrs. Tallman stated that a single story house was torn down and a 2 story house was built in her neighborhood and it does not fit, she suggested all detached accessory structures be single story units. John explained the Commission could require all detached units be single story, but in the current code people are allowed to build a second story onto existing single story homes.

Mrs. Wiles suggested that the dwelling units be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. John stated the City has been looking at creating design standards for in fill developments, he suggested tabling the second story issue until design standards are in place.

Mr. Thalhoffer suggested granny flats that were attached to the main residence would tend to be occupied by relatives, and not change the neighborhood as much as having detached 2 story structures might.

Mr. Sanchez questioned if it was possible to have a 2 story building less than 22' tall. Mr. Brown stated it would be possible with a shallow roof pitch.

Mr. Forsman questioned what would be in place to prevent someone with a 2-3 car garage from converting that space into a living unit and making a duplex out of their residence. Mr. Brown explained there are conditions that require a certain number of parking spaces per dwelling unit. Mr. Manley explained the owner has to occupy the property, and only one unit can be rented out. Mr. Forsman stated there is no enforcement available to prevent it from happening.

John stated that these issues came out at the public meetings, a lot of citizens want to be able to have a relative live with them on their property, they were aware that this could be a problem, but on a whole this is what the people wanted, even if it is abused in a few cases. John stated the language was written to allow it to be enforced the best it could be.

Ms. Wiles commented that people are becoming more involved and moving in a pro-active direction, making developers become accountable. She agreed that Canby needs duplexes and apartments but public input is needed to figure out where to put them and what kind of impacts they are going to have on the neighborhood.

Mr. Forsman stated that if granny flats are built there should be double wall construction so the units could be created which could be sold separately.

Mr. Stewart arrived at the meeting. Mr. Brown asked if Mr. Stewart had either a conflict of interest or had any ex parte contact, Mr. Stewart stated he did not have a conflict of interest or had any ex parte contact.

- Accessory Structure Height

Mr. Stewart stated that in the course of the many public meetings the community has said they want the Planning Commission to have more information on conditional use applications so the design review process can be more critical. He stated he appreciated Mr. Forsman's views and stated the Planning Commission was listening, but believed this would be a benefit to the community. Mr. Stewart agreed that enforceability is a concern, but this is something the community believes is important.

- Uses Permitted Outright (allowing 4-plexes in R 1.5 zones)

Mr. Stewart explained that Canby as a community has not been building to density. This will allow the developers to build closer to density, if not the City will be forced to go out and take farm land.

- Development Standards (creating maximum lot sizes & lot size averaging)

John clarified this would create a maximum lot size of 6500 sq ft and a minimum of 5000 sq ft. in the R1.5 zone with the Planning Commission having the ability to approve 4000 sq ft lots if there was a benefit offered in exchange. Mr. Stewart stated the primary issue was that developers have told the Commission that more flexibility was needed in terms of lot sizes. This would assist in the development of neighborhoods within the community.

Mr. Forsman stated his property on 8<sup>th</sup> Place is one of the larger lots in a cul-de-sac, and the building lots in the area are so small they can only accommodate single garages, as a result their extra vehicles are parked in the cul-de-sac. He stressed that small postage stamp sized lots have no room for children to play and it forces them to play in the streets. Mr. Brown explained there is more to the code than this one issue: the parks SDCs have been increased and the City will be able to accept land in lieu of SDCs. Mr. Brown agreed that in other areas there are 3000 sq ft lots with 2000 sq ft homes being built on them, but that is not the case in Canby, and the Planning Commission understands Mr. Forsman's comments regarding providing adequate parking for multi-family applications.

John explained that developers had asked for smaller lots for common wall housing because they believed that 45' X 100' lots are too large. But going smaller than the 3000 sq ft minimum was not something that the people who attended the meetings had wanted to do until some design standards were in place.

- Allowing Neighborhood Commercial Uses in Residential Zoning

John explained this would allow commercial uses as a conditional use with design review standards as part of a Planned Unit Development. There has been some interest in creating mixed use developments with their own commercial centers allowing pedestrian oriented businesses under 3000 sq ft. as part of a high density development.

Mr. Stewart explained the Planning Commission is trying to build better neighborhoods. One of the things people have told the Commission is that small, family run convenience stores would be a benefit to the community, and keep children from crossing Hwy 99E. Mr. Brown stated people are concerned that their next door neighbors will open a deli, he explained this is only allowed in a planned unit development.

Ms. Wiles stated she has seen this concept work very effectively in gated communities and assisted living facilities, where residents don't have to go outside of the community to go to the beauty shop or purchase a gift item with a court yard atmosphere where people can gather. It's not that traffic would be coming to the facility, it would be that residents would not have to create traffic to get some of their basic needs met but she would not like to see a strip mall go into neighborhoods.

Mr. Stewart stressed there would be no strip malls, it would be a court yard atmosphere, and be a benefit to the community by helping to create better neighborhoods. Mr. Brown explained the PUD process is a severe review, and people have an opportunity for input, a developer would not be able to sneak something.

Mr. Netter believed a development like this would be a benefit for people in the north side of Canby around Territorial Rd, and for people who use the Logging Rd. At this time there is no place to pick up a loaf of bread, except to get in the car and drive to Thriftway or Fred Meyers, a facility like that would allow Moms to send their kids to the store on their bicycles for a loaf of bread.

Mr. Stewart explained the idea of having this type of development was recommended years ago for the north side of town, for the reasons Mr. Netter has stated. He also expressed his hope that Canby never has gated communities. John explained this was originally proposed as an outright neighborhood commercial use in some areas, but people were concerned about how it would look and not wanting 7-11 stores popping up next door to them, that is how it got wrapped up in the CUP and PUD design process. John suggested that when the City adopts residential design standards, people may be more comfortable allowing this use in more places.

Mr. Stewart questioned if there was an outline of what design standards that are being looked at what the process the City is going through. John said he did not have an outline, but the City did get the grant to hire a consultant. Mr. Stewart stated that during the public meetings citizens have stated they want the Commission to have tougher design standards. They have not liked some of the in fill that has occurred because they believe it has changed the environment of



their community.

- Development standards for R1

John explained it would create a minimum density of 14 units per acre, where feasible.

Gary Davis stated he has lived on Territorial Rd for twenty years, and is concerned about the changing standards in his neighborhood. When they first moved there it was single family, then rezoned to R2 but permitted to be built out at R1 and R1.5 standards. Most of the surrounding homes are single family dwellings, with the exception of a condominium development, and an extension of the apartments on Maple St.

Mr. Davis explained there are properties that are still in the county, and acreage that the owners have already decided to develop at R1 standards and that under these new requirements the owners of these properties would be forced to develop at R2 standards even though they have already planned single family units to be built there.

Mr. Davis stated his concern that if R2 is required to be built it would create a hopscotch affect in his neighborhood. He understood the need for high density and believed that new developments should build to density, but infill developments should match existing neighborhoods.

Mr. Brown explained the current code is nested (R1.5 allows R1 to be built, and in R2 anything allowed in R1.5 can be built) which has created less dense zoning inside each one of the other ones. He explained that the City zones need to be remapped, removing high and medium designations from areas that are already built out at R1 standards, it is too expensive for a developer to buy 6-8 lots and raze the homes to build apartments. The City needs to place the R1.5 and R2 land in areas where it is most reasonable and where it can actually happen.

Mr. Stewart stated he believed that as the City builds out there will be buffers between the zones. Mr. Tessman stated the City is lacking in R1.5 and believes it should be a buffer between R1 developments and R2 that having R2 right next to R1 creates a hodge podge type of zoning.

John explained it is the current zoning rules that allows the hodge podge, and this code would eliminate the hodge podge. After that is done it may be appropriate to look at the map and decide if zones need to be remapped, and if zones are removed they will have to be replaced somewhere else.

Clint clarified that Mr. Davis' concern was that this new code would require his neighborhood to be built at R2 standards instead of giving people the choice of how to develop their land. Mr. Brown stated that another problem is the only place to put R2 is around the perimeter area of the City, which would create a ring of high density around the City, you would come from farmland straight into the apartment buildings then into the houses.

Mr. Forsman explained that in the future the houses that were built in Canby around the 1920s with oversized lots and without foundations, will become deteriorated to the point where the land will be of more value without the house on it. That would allow developers to come in and rebuild denser developments.

Mr. Stewart stated that tougher neighborhood design standards for melding into neighborhoods would eliminate some of Mr. Forsman's concerns. Mr. Forsman stated that the street in front of his house on Aspen Street becomes real narrow because the developer was allowed to develop the 20 acres behind the original farm house instead of having to move the house and build the street to code, he cited other examples of Canby streets making odd jogs to accommodate existing homes, and believes there should be no exceptions the City should have purchased the houses so the streets were built to standards. Mr. Brown explained the City has been very reluctant to condemn property.

It was agreed by the Planning Commission that requiring 14 units per acre when possible was a reasonable expectation for development.

- Allowing Minor Variances

The Planning Commission agreed this was acceptable.

- Creating an Interpretation Process.

John explained this would set up a process where staff would interpret the code, and if someone disagreed with staff's interpretation they could bring it before the Planning Commission. Mr. Brown explained there was no procedure in place at this time.

- Neighborhood Meeting Required for Certain Applications

Mr. Brown suggested requiring neighborhood meetings for Conditional Use Permits and Planned Unit Developments. Mr. Stewart suggested not overloading neighborhood associations with land use applications and suggested expanding the notification area to 300'.

Ms. Wiles stated that the increase in the cost for mailing the extra notices would not be a lot to pay to let people know about what is going on in their neighborhood. She proposed increasing the area of notification for a Conditional Use to 500'. Mr. Stewart clarified that he proposed increasing a Conditional Use Permit notification area from 200' to 300', and not requiring a neighborhood meeting. But suggested requiring a neighborhood meeting for a Planned Unit Development.

Ms. Wiles asked for clarification on what a Conditional Use was. John explained there are two kinds of uses in each zone, what is allowed outright and what is allowed as a conditional use. A conditional use is one that is considered to be compatible with certain conditions being

met, such as a school in a single family zone. He stated there are criteria that must be met such as not having a negative impact on the surrounding area.

Mr. Stewart explained that he believes you can have too many neighborhood meetings, and people would get tired of them, so instead of requiring a neighborhood meeting for a conditional use permit, expanding the notification area from 200' to 300' with the option of holding a neighborhood meeting. But requiring neighborhood meetings for Planned Unit Developments since they have a larger impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. Tessman suggested 500' for the notification area instead of a three tiered system. Ms. Wiles stated she believed the notification area should be 500'. Mr. Brown stated that a 200' radius notified approximately 25 to 30 properties and a 500' radius would notify over 100 properties, the issue is not the increased cost of mailing, but the increase in the amount of work involved.

Mr. Stewart suggested there are no active neighborhood associations, and he did not want to inundate a new association with so many land use actions they would get turned off. Ms. Wiles stated she is active in her neighborhood and would like to be notified of things that are going on within 500' of her home. She suggested the City set up an e-mail system for notifications. John stated there is no issue in increasing the notification area, it is just a matter for the Planning Commission to decide how much work they want the applicants to go through.

Mr. Brown asked if there were any issues the audience would like to address before the Commissioners went into deliberations.

Ms. Wiles stated she wants to be very proactive and make sure that when developers come into town they will be held accountable for how their developments impact the community down the road, and neighborhood associations are one way to accomplish that.

Mr. Netter stated he agreed with most of the changes that were discussed, and felt it would give developers more flexibility with their designs.

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

The Commission decided to go through the proposed changes page by page, and discussion would be by objection only.

- There was a discussion regarding whether duplexes should be left as a conditional use or if they should be allowed outright. It was decided for the time being to leave them as a conditional use so they could be decided on a case-by-case basis.
- Should detached accessory buildings be allowed to build a second story above the garage for a granny flat. It was decided to allow additions within an existing roof line, but that new detached accessory structures could only be one story no taller than 22'. This would

- retain the look of the original neighborhood.
- John was to bring back language clarifying that only porches would be allowed in the front yard set back, not garages, and language defining what “required natural areas” are.
- There was a discussion regarding limiting the size of houses, or if the setback regulations were enough of a limit. It was decided to discuss this issue during the design process.
- It was agreed by the Commissioners to make 4-plexes a conditional use in an R1.5 zone.
- There was a discussion regarding allowing 8 or fewer mobile or manufactured home subdivisions in the R2 zone since the new code requires 14 units per acre. John and Clint will research state law and come back to the Planning Commission with what the City is allowed to do.
- Language will be changed to say a “minimum” of 14 units per acre.
- It was decided to increase the radius of notification for a Conditional Use Permit to 500' but whether a neighborhood meeting was required would be at the Planning Director’s discretion. And to leave the notification area for a Planned Unit Development at 200' but require a public meeting.
- To clarify the language for who has standing at Public Hearings.
- It was decided that a porch would be “not enclosed”.

John summarized the letters that were received. Mr. Shinn wanted to preserve farmland and generally supported higher density with a strong design review process. Mr. O’Shea was not supportive of lot size averaging, granny flats, or the minor variance procedure, but agreed with the interpretation process proposed.

It was moved by Mr. Stewart to approve TA 01-03 as amended. Seconded by Mrs. Tallman. Mr. Manley questioned approving the amendment prior to John obtaining the information on mobile and manufactured homes. Mr. Stewart suggested that there could be a vote on just that section after the Commission receives the information, but to forward this recommendation onto the City Council at this time. The motion carried 7-0.

#### **IV. FINDINGS**

**MLP 01-04** A request to partition 15 acres located southeast of Tofte Farms Phases I & II into a 5.17 acre parcel and a 9.92 acre parcel.

It was moved by Mr. Stewart to approve the Findings, Conclusions and Final Order for MLP 01-04 as written. Seconded by Mr. Manley. Motion carried 5-0 with Mrs. Tallman and Mr. Brown abstaining.

#### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

None

#### **VI. MINUTES**

None

## **VII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

John congratulated the Planning Commission on the efficient manner in which they handled the 40 page Text Amendment staff report.

John stated there will be a joint workshop with the Planning Commission and City Council October 3<sup>rd</sup> on the street maintenance issue at 7:00pm at the Canby Utility Boardroom. It will not be a hearing on the subdivision, but a general discussion on the issue.

John asked the Commission if they would be available on October 16<sup>th</sup> for a joint meeting with City Council and the Parks and Recreation Board on the Parks master plan.

John stated that Tri-Met will be holding its last public hearing regarding Canby's withdrawal, Wednesday September 26<sup>th</sup> at 9:00am in downtown Portland. He encouraged everyone to come because even though it seems like a sure thing, when the agenda was issued it has both the ordinance to approve and the ordinance to deny on it. He explained that Tri-Met has expressed concerns that at the public hearing held in Canby more people testified against the petition than for it.

John stated he would bring back the amendments the Planning Commission had asked for on the Text Amendments at the next meeting.

Clint updated the Planning Commission on the results of the meeting between the Canby Grove Apartments and the Park and Recreation Board. The Parks and Recreation Board decided it was worth forgoing some SDC money to add a water fountain, and two additional benches at the beginning of the trail facing the Logging Rd. Mr. Stewart questioned if the Parks and Rec Board had obtained City Council approval prior to waiving SDC fees. John explained that the Parks Department has the Logging Rd project listed as an SDC project and the Director has some authority to spend those funds as she sees fit.

Mr. Brown explained to the audience that there are two more portions of this process that will be coming up, the remapping and the actual design standards. He encouraged people to become involved in both issues.

Mr. Stewart thanked John, Clint and Matilda for the job that they did on the Text Amendment.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**