

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

7:00pm February 11, 2002  
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup>

---

---

**I. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Keith Stewart, Commissioners Jean Tallman, Paul Thalhofer, Geoffrey Manley, Jim Brown  
**ABSENT:** Tom Sanchez, Randy Tessman  
**STAFF:** John Williams, Planning and Community Development Director, Carla Ahl, Planning Staff  
**OTHERS PRESENT:** Carolyn Anne Carson Graybill, Tony Helbling, Wilson Construction

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

None

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

MOD 02-01 of DR 95-17 Wilson Construction. A modification to the approved plans for an office addition and remodel at 1190 NW 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. The proposed new construction will necessitate the removal of existing parking and landscaping.

John Williams, Planning and Community Development Director, presented the modification to the Planning Commission. He explained that with small modifications to design reviews an expedited process could be used, the Planning Commission makes a decision, then notices are sent out to surrounding property owners, if someone wishes to appeal it then a public hearing is held.

John stated the applicant is proposing to add 1200 sq ft of floor area and to relocate the parking and landscaping. He stated staff had recommended approval of the modification.

Tony Helbling, Wilson Construction addressed the Commission, he explained they would be adding on to the front of the building which would require the relocation of 2 parking spaces, and landscaping. He stated they would be extending the parking island further into a wide turn-around so there would be no net loss of parking. Mr. Helbling stated they would be gaining landscaping with the expansion of the parking island so the everything would basically stay the same. Mr. Helbling stated he had met with both of his neighbors who looked at the plans and have no problems with any of the modifications.

Mr. Brown asked for clarity on the loss of parking spaces. Mr. Helbling explained they would be removing a total of 5 parking spaces, but they would be adding 5 spaces to the rear so there would be no loss of parking.

It was moved by Mr. Thalhoffer to approve MOD 02-01 of DR 95-17 as presented tot he Planning Commission. Seconded by Mr. Brown. Motion carried 5-0.

## V. FINDINGS

**SUB 01-06** The applicant is requesting approval of the fifth phase of the Faist Addition subdivision south of Trost School and north of Faist IV, which contains 24 single family homes on 5.77 acres. In all, the first five phases of the subdivision will contain 130 lots on 29.6 acres.

Mr. Brown questioned if the Planning Commission would be able to look at the revised plans, since they have conditioned the relocation of the pathway. John stated a revised site plan could be brought back to the Commission.

Mrs. Tallman questioned if the Commission had conditioned lighting for the proposed pathway. Mr. Brown explained that the pathway to the west would be illuminated by the lighting in the park, but the Planning Commission had not conditioned any lighting for the pathway on the west side of the subdivision.

Mrs. Tallman questioned if it was too late to add a condition of approval. John explained that any time something is conditioned after the public hearing, the applicant has the ability to appeal it.

Mr. Brown asked if there was some provision in the code that would require some type of lighting. John explained there was no provision at this time, but the issue will be looked at during the residential design process. Mr. Stewart recommended that if there is a question regarding the lighting, that the application be brought back and the public hearing reopened.

Mr. Brown stated the application had proposed street lighting, and suggested that there may be adequate lighting provided by the street lights if they were in the right location.

Mr. Manley stated there were no lights on the walkway on 12<sup>th</sup> Street the lighting comes

from the street lights which are about 30-40' off set from the path. He added that when he walked the existing pathway he had found the sidewalks end at the neighboring property lines and that there is a 10' section that has no firm path. John stated he would look into it.

Mr. Brown questioned how the pathways should be lit, pole lights can be a nuisance to the neighbors and ballard lights are hard to maintain. Mr. Manley suggested having the lighting standard require street lights to be located at the end of the paths if the pathways are only one lot deep. John stated that it might be easier to try and get the street light positioned to light the pathway, instead of renoticing the public hearing.

Mr. Stewart clarified that staff would get together with Canby Utility and see if the street light can be located in close enough proximity to light the pathway. Mr. Brown asked if a set of the modified plans could be brought to the next meeting. John stated it was possible.

Mr. Brown questioned what the process would be to add a condition. John stated that a condition could be added without having a public hearing, but the applicant would be able to appeal the condition to the City Council. John stated he would be bringing a proposed code change to the Planning Commission that would establish a modification process. He explained that the design review is the only land use application that can be modified at this time.

Mr. Stewart stated the findings would be held until there was an answer from Canby Utility regarding the placement of the street light and the Commission would know whether a public hearing would be necessary.

**DR 01-10** The applicant is requesting to increase the height of an existing AT&T wireless telecommunications tower located at 1976 South Township Rd, from 167 feet to 187 feet. co-locate new Sprint PCS antennas on the top of the tower (total height 190 feet), expand the equipment area by 10 feet, install up to seven (7) Sprint PCS equipment cabinets, and add a 5-foot landscape buffer.

It was moved by Mr. Brown to approve the findings, conclusion and final order for DR 01-01 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Tallman. Mr. Stewart explained that cell towers are limited to 199' in height, they have to have a beacon on the top and if they go over 200' high they go into the low altitude enroute air structure for light air craft and would have to be painted red and white. He stated he would not be in favor of a red and white cell tower off Township Rd. Mr. Stewart explained when the first applications for cell towers were approved they were conditioned to notify the FAA, the Oregon Aeronautical Association and Life Flight. Motion carried 4-0 with Mr. Stewart abstaining.

## **VI. MINUTES**

None

Mr. Stewart stated that this was Jean Tallman's last Planning Commission meeting, she

would be sworn in as a City Council member on February 20<sup>th</sup>. He stated that the Commission is delighted that she was chosen from a fine list of applicants but that she would be missed by the Planning Commission.

Mrs Tallman stated the only down side to joining the City Council is leaving her colleagues on the Planning Commission, she has enjoyed her time working with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Brown stated Mrs. Tallman will be where she needs to be, it will be sad for him personally, but it will be good for the City.

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

- A residential design meeting will be held February 12<sup>th</sup>. He invited the Commissioners to attend since they would be recruiting a citizen task force to lead the urban residential design standards. Jean Tallman stated she would be able to make the meeting.
- The City Council has directed the Planning Commission to go ahead with the community involvement process for the Transportation Utility Fees. It was decided to hold two open house meetings during the week of March 11<sup>th</sup> and a public hearing on March 25<sup>th</sup> at the Adult Center, articles and notices will be put in the paper.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**