

MINUTES

CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

7:00 PM, July 8, 2002
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2nd

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Keith Stewart, Commissioners Jim Brown, Paul Thalhofer, Geoffrey Manley, Randy Tessman.

STAFF: John Williams, Planning And Community Development Director,

OTHERS PRESENT: Don Staehely, Canby School District

II. CITIZEN INPUT

None

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

IV. NEW BUSINESS

MOD 02-02 (modifying DR 01-09). A request by the Canby School District to expand an existing utility shed at the southeast corner of the Canby High School campus.

John stated that this storage shed was not a part of the original application for the High School improvements so that is the reason it is being heard as a modification. He explained that if the Planning Commission approves a modification to a design review, then notices will be sent to surrounding property owners. If anyone objects to the approval then a public hearing is required.

John explained that there are 2 alternatives to the location of the shed, the school district is unsure which site they will use, so they are asking for approval of both sites.

Don Staehely, Business Manager, Canby School District explained that this was a proposal to extend the storage shed on the south end of the campus. He stated that storage has always been a problem for the schools. It is a bigger issue now that one building has been removed due to safety issues raised by the Fire Department, the quonset hut is coming down due to the expansion of the track, the concession stand has been relocated into the maintenance building and the 2 sheds that housed the FFA and AG Programs equipment were removed to make space for the parking lot. He stated that most of the equipment is located at employees houses now because of the

lack of storage.

Mr. Staehley stated the proposed shed is 96' X 36' with 3 bays which will house the district's maintenance equipment, the FFA and AG program equipment and other storage needs.

Mr. Staehley explained there are 2 proposals they are asking for approval of, one as a maintenance shed, and one as a shed that will provide a temporary classroom for such programs as the tractor renovation program. He stated that the reason they are asking for approval of both designs is because the school district is currently analyzing the cost of both proposals and how it fits into the schools program. Mr. Staehley stated they hope to have the storage shed built by the second trimester.

Mr. Brown questioned the difference in the design of the 2 proposals. Mr. Staehley explained the size of the buildings are the same, the only difference would be in the use of the building

Mr. Brown moved to accept the design modification to DR 01-09/CUP 01-03 as presented. Seconded by Mr. Tessman. Motion carried 4-0 with Mr. Thalhofer abstaining.

Mr. Stewart asked if Mr. Staehley would give an update regarding the schools system. Mr. Staehley stated that work was done last year to Ackerman, 91, Carus and Lee. This year the work is being done to the High School, Eccles and Knight schools. The work being done at the elementary schools include asbestos abatement, tiling, new wiring, up grades to the fire alarm system and roof work. He stated all work is scheduled to be done by August 19th to meet the school's needs.

Mr. Staehley stated the High School is a much bigger project, started in February, the main building will be done by the start of school. The projected date is August 26th with in-service day being held the day after and teachers will be in their classrooms a week later. So the schedule is very tight.

Mr. Staehley explained that the new professional technical building will not be completed until around the beginning of December. The work that has been done there include a new fire alarm system, new HVAC, new centrally monitored security system (which will also be installed at Eccles and Knight School).

Mr. Stewart asked what the emergency action plan encompasses Mr. Staehley explained it starts when the student gets on the bus in the morning until they return home. Having all records of the student, how to release the students, to who and when. Doing monthly earthquake and fire drills. In depth emergency response plan that deals with every possible incident.

Mr. Brown thanked Mr. Staehley and the School District for working with all parties involved in cleaning up the access on Aspen St., and believes it is a lot safer for the students and the City.

Mr. Staehley informed the audience that the bond oversight meetings will not be held in July but will start again in August with a walk through at 5:30 PM and invited the Planning Commission to attend.

V. FINDINGS

ANN 02-01 An application by Renaissance Development to annex two tax lots totaling 49 acres into the City of Canby. The property is located on the south side of SE 17th Avenue, north of the Molalla river and east of S. Ivy Street.

Mr. Stewart explained to the audience that the Planning Commission forms a recommendation regarding the application, sends the recommendation to the City Council, who if they approve the application, send it on for a vote of the people. He believes that all information and insight should be included by the Commission in that recommendation. He led a discussion regarding how this application fit the required criteria for approval.

Mr. Stewart stated this application would not follow the annexation priority list. Discussion included that to master plan a neighborhood it would require large parcels of land. Currently the land that is designated A and B priority are smaller parcels.

Mr. Stewart stated that the City has no minimum requirement for the amount of available land that is needed, and currently there is a 2 year supply.

Mr. Stewart stated that the criteria requires smaller farmland be annexed prior to larger pieces of farmland. This is a large piece of farmland that is still in production. It was discussed that the willingness of the applicant to adhere to a construction schedule which would develop approximately 10 acres of the land a year, and the fact that the owners would continue to farm the undeveloped land mitigated that condition

Mr. Stewart added that public services and facilities need to be available, even with the bond measure passing, the school system will be adding \$300,000 worth of unfunded debt, which could double if there is a problem with construction, or if the bond does not pass. The school district recently went through a redistricting process, if there needs to be more redistricting done, there is a possibility that children who live a few blocks from one school will be forced to bus 8 miles to the 91 school. It was discussed that not all of the children from this development would be going to Trost school, during the redistricting process there was a line drawn through the subdivision and some of the students would be going to Knight or Eccles school.

Mr. Stewart stated there is not enough money in the street maintenance budget to maintain the streets that the City currently has, this project will add approximately 1.5 miles of new roads. It was stated that the City is going through the process of finding a stable source of funding for street maintenance at this time. There was a discussion regarding what constitutes a defacto moratorium.

The Commission discussed whether the 2 acre park designation and the dedication of land at the top of the bluff, (which by State and Federal law would have

been given to the City anyway) was a true benefit to the City. John stated it was unclear in the application whether the applicant was proposing to develop the 2 acre park. It was agreed to research this issue and add a condition if appropriate based on the applicants testimony.

Mr. Brown suggested adding language to the conclusions to address the special benefits of being able to master plan a 50 acre development. John stated he would add verbiage #1 under conclusions.

There was a discussion regarding whether the applicant could come to the Commission with a subdivision that had more than 36 units in it. It was explained that the applicant could apply for a subdivision that contained more than 36 units, but could only develop 36 building sites a year.

It was suggested that a meeting be held with staff and the City Council to discuss ways of getting a better summation of the Commissions discussion to the voters since the description in the voters pamphlet is very brief and neutral.

It was moved by Mr. Brown to approve the findings, conclusions and final order for ANN 02-01 as amended. Seconded by Mr. Tessman. Motion carried 4-1, with Mr. Stewart voting nay.

CUP 02-01 An application by Willamette Valley Country Club to expand their membership by 200 social members while limiting their "golf membership" to 500.

Mr. Stewart explained staff was requesting clarification regarding criteria C. It was decided to add that Maple Street is inadequate due to lack of adequate sidewalks, crosswalks and street widths.

It was moved by Mr. Thalhoffer to approve the findings, conclusions, and final order of CUP 02-03 as amended by stating that the application did not meet criteria C. Seconded by Mr. Brown. Motion carried 5-0.

VI. MINUTES

May 13, 2002

It was moved by Mr. Manley to approve the minutes of May 13, 2002 as written. Seconded by Mr. Brown. Motion carried 5-0.

VII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

John explained that he had a conversation with John Kelley, City Attorney regarding voting on findings. John stated that it was his belief, if a Commissioner voted against an application they should in turn vote against the findings. John Kelley's belief is that if a Commissioner agrees the written findings represent what the Commission

“found” then they can vote for the findings even if they didn’t vote for the application. It was agreed that this issue needed more research

VII. ADJOURNMENT