

# MINUTES

## CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

7:00 PM December 13, 2004  
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup>

---

### I. ROLL CALL

**PRESENT:** Chairman Jim Brown, Commissioners John Molamphy, Tony Helbling, Geoffrey Manley, Randy Tessman and Dan Ewert

**STAFF:** John Williams, Community Development and Planning Director, Darren Nichols, Associate Planner

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ryan Zygar, Tom Ferrin, Keith Galitz, Richard Freeman, Ron Tatone, Don Perman, Melody Thompson, Bill Gould, Sean Bowen, Darla Cole-Bowen, Teresa Blackwell, Randy Carson

### II. CITIZEN INPUT

None

### III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

**MOD 04-04 Willamette Valley Country Club**, located at 900 Country Club Place. The applicant is requesting permission to expand their membership to 200 social members while limiting their "golf membership" to 500. Current membership is limited at 500 member's total (note: the applicants contend that this was intended to apply only to full members).

Chairman Brown read the public hearing format. When asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, none was expressed. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, none was stated. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

John Williams presented his staff report. John explained that the Willamette Valley Country Club requested an expansion in their social membership. A review of the prior files found that in 1996 when the original clubhouse was built there was a condition on that application (conditional use permit and design review) which stated that the Country Club would continue to operate with no more than 500 members. The Planning Commission found that the increase in membership would have an adverse effect on local traffic and required that the conditional use permit be revisited. It was determined that this request could be either a brand new conditional use application or it could be a modification, depending on what the impact was. There had never been a traffic

study so the Planning Commission requested one is completed. The traffic study was done and found that the traffic generation increase would be no more than 5% on North Maple. It was decided to do this change as a "new business" item. On October 11<sup>th</sup> the Planning Commission heard this request. After public testimony on that date and discussion by the Commission the request was approved. Staff then sent out a public notice stating the decision the Planning Commission had made. Through that public notice there was a request to hold a public hearing.

The hearing on this date is on that issue. The application is putting to use the same criteria as used in the original. The staff report is the same that was used in the prior discussion. John then reviewed his staff report. He stated the club currently has 430 full members and 70 social members, 500 total. The representatives from Willamette Valley Country Club believe that when the original permit was issued that it would be for 500 full memberships, not including the social memberships. Social members have limited golf access but do have access to the restaurant and clubhouse. Willamette Valley Country Club is now asking to change their conditional use to include 500 golf memberships and 200 social memberships.

In review of the comprehensive plan analysis and the staff report John noted that there were not too many things that were of interest as we went through the criteria. The impact on the neighborhood is unclear. In a hearing a few years ago WVCC filed a request to build a pool and increase their social membership. Most of the people who testified commented on the site itself and the noise generated by the pool which was to be located near the property line. Some other comments were that if you increase the membership there will be more noise due to the increase of special events and the noise generated by the people who attend them. It was not an issue that was identified originally.

The main issue that was discussed in October was the traffic and the fact that Maple Street is a substandard street. There is 22 feet in some areas and enough room for two travel lanes but no parking. In October there was an extensive discussion about Maple Street, what the problem was, what the solution might be and who should pay for it. The transportation plan included North Maple from 10<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> as a project that would include repaving and the addition of sidewalks. The cost was attributed to systems development targets and to new development along the way. John was unsure what new development that was going to be, he stated there are some in-fill spots and partitions happening on North Maple Street. The problem is houses that do not have sidewalks in front of them, nor adequate street width. The city does not fund "just sidewalk" projects.

The Planning Commission's decision in October was to approve the application and to deal with North Maple Street separately rather than attributing an allegation of cost from this application to that project. With that in place the

Commission found that the proposed use would not have a significant impact on the surrounding areas. Planning Staff recommended approval.

John reviewed two written comments he had received since the Planning Commission packets had gone out. The first was from Norma Jean Vandenberg on North Territorial. Ms. Vandenberg states that she agrees that the Country Club should be given approval. She says it will be good for the club to utilize its facility and good for Canby citizens who want to enjoy the ambience of the Country Club setting. The second was from Frank and Dorothy Barrett on Country Club Road. They state they are in favor of the application as requested to increase membership.

Jim Brown then asked the applicant to speak. **Keith Galitz** stepped forward. Mr. Galitz is the Vice-President of the WVCC Board. He stated that the club is a vital asset to the community. He reminded the Commission of the prior hearing when the Commission recognized that the Club provides something to the community that if the club was gone the community would not have. He stated that the club has experienced financial difficulty over the past few years and that increasing the social membership numbers should provide financial stability. Mr. Galitz stated that the traffic study shows this increase will have minimal impact. He stated there is very limited objection in the record. He stated that the issue raised by Mr. and Mrs. Bowen is one of noise rather than traffic. He believes that the club does everything it can to comply with noise ordinances. He stated there is one major outdoor event that could cause noise is a summer concert, "Concert on the Green", that occurs in late summer. That concert shuts down promptly at 10:00 p.m. He also noted that most of the activity that an increase in social membership would have would be inside the facility.

John Williams inquired into the weddings that are held at the club. Mr. Galitz stated that weddings held at the facility are not just for club members and weddings have always been available to the public. The weddings are held outside on the lawn during the day only. Receptions are held inside the facility.

Mr. Galitz presented a map of North Maple Street. He pointed to a residence that is owned by a Mr. Sean Carol who is not a member of the club. Mr. Carol lives at 810 North 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. Mr. Galitz stated that Mr. Carol had faxed directly to the club a letter of support of the application. Mr. Galitz pointed out that because of Mr. Carol's proximity to the club, if anyone should have an objection to noise or traffic, Mr. Carol would be that person. Mr. Carol, however, is in full support of the application in the best interest of the community. Mr. Galitz then reviewed the area that the Bowen's reside in, stating that Mr. Bowen lives beyond the club and at a distance greater than Mr. Carol. Mr. Galitz stated that he agrees the club should be sensitive to noise issues. He summarized by stated that WVCC has met the criteria set for the change and requested that the Commission grant the Conditional Use Modification. He solicited questions, if any.

Mr. Brown asked some questions regarding parking. Mr. Galitz stated there is adequate parking even for the larger events. Mr. Galitz stated he had never seen any parking flow over onto Maple Street. No traffic regulation has ever been required.

The Commission then heard from **Bill Gould** of 2550 North Maple Court who spoke in favor of the proposed changes. He stated that social members and playing members do not come to the club at the same time. He stated he is a neighbor of Sean Bowen. He stated that he did not dispute Mr. Bowen's position on the noise, but that he, Mr. Gould, had lived in the neighborhood for 17 years and noise had never been an issue with him. Mr. Gould told the commission that he is a playing member of the club and can only remember one event that caused a lot of noise. This was a rally prior to the Oregon/Oregon State game. Mr. Gould summarized by stating that he thinks the increase in membership is a good idea and this will be one more place in the community for people to enjoy themselves. He believed WVCC is an asset to the community.

**Wayne Spencer** then addressed the Commission. He spoke in favor of the proposal. He advised that he lives 2327 N Maple. He stated he does not hear much noise from the club and believes the idea of adding more social members is a good idea. He stated that the club is a "class act". He believes the events are always controlled and that the number of attendees at the events will not change as the facility can only hold so many people in certain areas of the club, especially in the clubhouse. He stated he has been a member of the club since 1981 and knows that if members do not get their reservations in quick enough they are unable to attend. He thinks the Club is establishing good property values. He thinks the change is a positive change and will benefit the city of Canby by drawing new people to the area. He believes traffic will not be impacted by the increase in social memberships. The biggest traffic comes from golf events and these are limited to set numbers of participants.

**Sean Bowen** addressed the Commission. He stated he lives at 2555 North Maple Court. Mr. Bowen is an opponent of the proposed change. He stated his concerns about the increased membership are with regard to how it will affect the livability of the neighborhood. He stated he is concerned that the club will increase the number of events and the amount of individual's attending these events. He stated that he has already been affected by the noise that accompanies the current membership. He stated that the increase in membership will likely increase the number of noise variance permits. He stated his property is directly across from the club and has a clear view of the patio on the north side of the country club. He stated this area tends to be a gathering place for a number of people. He requested that the commission give careful consideration to this matter and think of it in terms of their own back yard. He described listening to loud music not of his choosing and loud partying crowds of people when he tries to sit and enjoy a quiet sunset on his back porch. He stated

that if the Commission decides to grant the modification he would like to requested request consideration be given to compensate for the increased noise levels. This would include installation of noise barriers such as fencing and fast growing evergreen shrubs.

**Ron Tatone** addressed the Commission. He requested that the Commission understand that by living in a city, regardless of where you are, that all are impacted by different noises. He cited some examples of noises he hears from his house at different times of the year such as the Clackamas County Fair. He stated he is in favor of the social membership increase

Keith Galitz re-addressed the Commission stating the increased social members would not allow an increase in those attending the different events. He suggested that Mr. Bowen, upon moving into a neighborhood directly surrounded by a country club, could have expected that there would be social activities at that club that could impact him. He concluded by stating that this change is what needed so that the WVCC could continue to be an asset to the community.

Chairman Brown questioned Mr. Galitz regarding what he believed Mr. Galitz was stating. That was that the increase in social members will not increase the number of events nor the allowed attendance at the events. Mr. Galitz agreed that what was he was saying. He stated that the noisy events, the Member/Guest, Concert on the Green, weddings are all limited and the hope is that the increase in social memberships will increase the use of the club, i.e., the dining facilities. The club is only open for dinner on Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights. They are open for lunch and light meals around the golf season Tuesday through Sunday. The social memberships will hopefully increase the use of the dining facilities which are not be used fully.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Helbling inquired as to the frequency of noise variance permit requests. John Williams responded by stating that if the club concludes their events by ten at night they are in compliance with the noise ordinance.

Commissioner Tessman asked John Williams about a comment letter received from Elan Landridge. This letter was concerning speeding cars near the Christian School. The school zone is not marked. John responded stating that he does not believe any of the private schools are marked. He intends to bring this issue before the Traffic Safety Committee. John was not aware of any private school zones that had been marked in Canby.

Commissioner Tessman continued speaking directly to Mr. Bowen and empathized with the noise issue. He spoke about neighbors he has dealt with who began parties at 9:00 p.m. and continued into the early morning hours on a

work night. He does not believe however this application will increase the amount of noise. He believes the increased membership will be using other aspects of the club.

Chairman Brown spoke about acoustical screens and says his personal experience is that they are not very helpful. He believes the only thing that would really stop the noise would be a 20' high wall, thick, like those used near freeways. The distance from the wall determines how much sound reduction occurs and he believes Mr. Bowen would not be far enough from the wall to have much effect.

Commissioner Molamphy agreed with the other Planning Commissioners. He believes their use will be within the clubhouse for lunch and dinners. The facility is full with the activities already taking place. The weddings in the summer can generate noise but as far as he knows complaints have not been registered by other members of the public.

Commissioner Ewert stated that he feels the application meets the criteria. He agreed with Mr. Brown's comments as far as the sound barrier is concerned. They sound like a good idea but in this situation they just would not be helpful. He also stated he agreed with Mr. Tatone's comments about living in the city. He expressed sympathy with Mr. Bowen but said living in the city can get noisy.

Commissioner Manley made a motion to approve MOD 04-04 as written. Motion was seconded and approved 6-0.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**MOD 04-06 Perman** Application to modify Dr. Donald Perman's CPA/ZC 04-2/ZC04-03.

John Williams summarized the application stating that is an unusual item. He reminded the Commission of Dr. Perman's appearance before the Commission earlier this year to change the Comprehensive Plan and current zoning for some parcels on South Redwood Street. The parcels that were approved for the rezoning were from M-1 (light industrial) to C-M (heavy commercial manufacturing). The problem is a thin strip (approximately 708 feet by 575 feet) north on his parcels zoned M-1. When the properties were rezoned to CM the strip north of it was not included, this was the city's fault. Now there is a thin strip of industrial stretching back to the north of this property which is sandwiched by the CM zoning. It looks a little strange on the zoning map. It does not have a functional impact as the parcels are not developable. One of them is landscaping in front of the business center and the other is a publicly owned piece of property that was deeded to the city as part of Mr. Anderson's development. Dr. Perman has approached the city and Mr. Anderson with a plan to modify, subject to design approval, and has changed the scope of his thinking

and reconfiguring the accesses of the parcels. The plan that he has put together will expand his use into the thin strip under discussion. He is looking to obtain some area from both the city and Mr. Anderson. That proposal is not in front of the Commission because Dr. Perman has not submitted a design review. He is working to achieve his design.

John summarized stating there are two issues for consideration. There is the fact that if nothing else comes before the Commission there will be this odd strip of industrial zoning north of these properties. Secondly the possibility of a site plan that will utilize this strip in which case the zoning will need to be consistent. The application is a modification request and if a positive decision is made staff will send out notices and the process will be similar to WVCC. Notice will go out and if anyone appeals the decision there will be a public hearing.

Chairman Brown asked John questions regarding the modification process and the public hearing. He does not believe the Commission has ever changed anything without a public hearing. John agreed stating that John Kelly, the City Attorney, found that this process could be used since the applicant has an existing CPA/ZC that has just been completed. It can be modified to expand the area. He said if the Commission does not approve the proposal before them then there will not be any need for a notice. Commissioner Manley asked if the City Council would still need to agree with the change and John responded in the affirmative. If it is not approved it will not go to the City Council. If it is, it will. The council would then adopt it by ordinance like a normal zone change.

Commissioner Molamphy asked about the city property. John responded stating that Dr. Perman is in discussion with city staff regarding the different options. It is not part of what is under discussion this evening.

Chairman Brown began the public hearing. **Don Perman** stepped forth to address the Commission. He stated that when he first got approval he started looking at what existed presently in considering the excavation of the property and the walking path between Redwood and the jogging road. The walking path was a separation between what was thought to be commercial and industrial. In reality there were two skinny strips of industrial property on the other side of the walking path. It seemed natural to add these two little strips to this commercial development. These strips are not usable and do not function for the city with their strip which is 60 feet by approximately 200 feet. The area will need to be excavated. The walking path has different depths. Since the walking path needs to come out to go he planned to excavate the entire area until reaching the property owned by Dave Anderson.

Commissioner Molamphy questioned Dr. Perman regarding the replacing the walking path. Dr. Perman responded stating that he intends to give a right of way to the city for another walking path. He pointed to the map and described the area the walking path would be replaced in, along the road from Redwood to

the jogging road. It would be incorporated with the road in cement block.

Chairman Brown stated that while it is worthwhile to see what Dr. Perman is proposing it has no bearing what the decision is regarding the zoning because the application is not in the Commission's hands. He stated they are only looking at a determination of whether or not it makes any sense to include this parcel in the existing application. Commissioner Helbling pointed out that to save time the applicant should talk to Canby Utility. Helbling stated he talked to Gary Stockwell at CUB. The walking path is there for two reasons, the first to access the logging road and secondly, underneath that walking path is a concrete encased duct bank which feeds the industrial park. Canby Utility has the right of way and they will not allow anything to be built over it or allow it to be excavated.

The Commission agreed to make a decision on the zoning at this time and leave other matters for a later date and the design review. Commission Manley stated he did not think it should be left industrial zone in between two CM zones. The other commissioners agreed. John Williams pointed out that when the zoning was changed in the original application there was a development restriction placed on it so that it could only be used for medical and dental office uses. This property would not be under that restriction and would be considered publicly owned property. Chairman Brown stated that Dr. Perman owns the south portion and Anderson owns the other portion. Anderson is not the applicant. The City owns the third portion and the City is not the applicant. How can the Commission make a decision on two pieces of property that do not belong to the applicant and was not the party making the application? John responded stating that it would be a matter of modifying the application. As long as public notice goes out. Brown asked if Anderson had submitted a letter acknowledging that this was the intent. John stated that the city had approved their portion and Don Anderson has discussed this matter with planning staff and has approved it verbally. Brown stated that something in writing should be placed in the file. John agreed.

A discussion followed regarding the staff recommendation that this not be under the same medical/dental restriction as the original application and how the final order would be written. John stated the change would not include that condition. It will be adopted by separate ordinance.

Manley made a motion to approve MOD 04-06 as written; motion seconded by Ewert and approved 5 to 1. Nay vote-Commissioner Helbling. John stated that public notice would be sent out this week on the matter.

### **Apollo Homes Review of Wall design**

Darren Nichols addressed the Commission regarding the Apollo Homes issue. The Commission reviewed and approved an application by Apollo Homes to develop a 15 acre parcel for a 136 lot subdivision. One of the conditions that



were placed on the subdivision approval was condition No. 19 stating that the developer shall construct an 8' tall non-combustible wall for the full frontage of the subdivision along railroad property to the south. The purpose of that wall was both a security feature but also to help block some of the noise from the wheels of the train and to lessen the impact on some of the homes, especially those that are adjacent to the railroad tracks. The wall was to be placed at the southern most property boundary, essentially the property line that separates the railroad from this development. The wall and materials were not to include wood, metal or plastic and should be approved by the Planning Commission prior to the installation. The developer has submitted a couple of different wall options for review.

Darren then presented some literature from Ultrablock. Ultrablock is currently installed at Garden Crossing. It is fairly large blocks that creates a ten foot wall. The second option, Verticrete, is made up of panels installed between some concrete pillars. The panels have different options, i.e. slate and river rock. The applicant is proposing to install the Verticrete wall. The original wall design included a berm, which would mean there will be an eight foot wall on top of the berm to get the right height and get the right noise mitigation. Included in the materials presented to the Commission was engineering info. Sound mitigation of these types of walls decreases the decibels along a roadway. The further you get behind the wall the better the noise abatement is. The top 20% of sound is decreased by bouncing it up off the train. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission look at this literature and determine if it that meets the intent of condition 19.

The Commission discussed the products and expressed key points regarding the wall, first that it be eight feet and second, that the interior wall be as nice in appearance as the exterior. Ryan Zygar of Apollo Homes appeared before the Commission and responded to the Commission's inquires and stated that the product that they had chosen is the concrete colored product. The Commissioners agreed that this meets the intent. While not aesthetically pleasing it does meet the requirement. All agreed to approve the wall as proposed with no opposing votes.

### **Construction Traffic and Residential Traffic on North Aspen Court**

Darren Nichols stated that the Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider Subdivision Application 04-05 (Dupont Estates). This was for 13 acres that lies along the Molalla River. The Planning Commission approved the subdivision but also heard some concerns from neighbors about increased traffic. Specific concerns were expressed about a narrow section of North Aspen Court at the intersection of NW Knights Bridge Road. The Planning Commission at the time of the approval asked for a formal recommendation from the Traffic Safety Committee.

Darren wrote a memo to the Traffic Safety Committee that included four options. The first option was to leave North Aspen as it is with parking with allowed and two lanes of traffic. The second was to designate North Aspen as a "No Parking" zone for the 120' section of narrow pavement. The third was to close one lane of traffic and allow parking on one side only. The fourth was to close North Aspen access to NW Knights Bridge, in effect creating a cul de sac but allow traffic from those homes in both directions. The traffic safety committee has discussed this at the last four meetings and was not able to come to a conclusion until their last meeting. This information was placed before the Commission. Darren referred to the minutes from that meeting. He quoted stating that the Traffic Safety Committee has viewed the site, they talked to neighbors, they discussed it among themselves, they talked to Roy Hester of Public Works, they talked to the Fire Marshall and they got some traffic counts. They decided with the newly painted yellow curb the parking issue has been resolved with enough room for traffic. The traffic safety committee was satisfied. At the same time Planning Staff got a letter from one of the neighbors, Lucy Freeman. Lucy had testified about traffic issues, she was concerned about the narrow section of road and the fact that it is very difficult for neighbors to pass each other if anyone is parked on the street and they were concerned about how much more traffic the new subdivision would generate. Ms. Freeman talked to her neighbors. Several signed a petition, which supported closing the street.

Darren stated he thought it was time to bring this matter back before the Commission to see if they were ready to make a decision with the information available. Darren mentioned that Roy Hester had done a 24 hour study and found that the volume on that street was not tremendous. Commissioners were concerned about the potential increase of commercial and truck traffic as construction begins. Darren stated that the pre-construction phase will include a conference with the contractor/developer and staff will stipulate that no construction traffic would use that section of road. All trucks will use Birch and go out NW 9<sup>th</sup>. The unknown is what percentage of the new traffic will use that street what kind of impact it will have on that neighborhood. Commissioners agreed that the road cannot be closed without a public hearing. John stated that this issue of street closure falls between committees but stated he thought it was firmly the Planning Commission's duty. He read duties "A" from the Planning Commission Manual. He quoted "The planning commission shall have power to recommend and make suggestions to the City Council and all the public authorities concerning lying out, widening, extending, locating streets, relief of traffic congestion, etc." Chairman Brown stated he thought there was another option that had not been discussed and that was to condemn the rest of the street and fill it out. Commissioners discussed input from the fire department. Darren advised that during informal discussions the fire department said although it was problematic, they could serve it.

Commissioner John Molamphy said he uses that street every morning. He is concerned with closing the street, and believes that the street should be

condemned, the house purchased, torn down and turned into a park. He said right now traffic flows very well. He said that these few new homes will not add that much because of the timing when everybody leaves. The Commission reviewed the Traffic Safety Committee's recommendation that no further action needed to take place. Option 2 has already taken place. John said once the city has decided what is to take place then they will take over the signage and striping. The street has had signs installed; they have been removed continuously. The Commission agreed that the signs should be installed, the curb should be painted and the code enforcement officer should enforce.

## **V. FINDINGS**

**MLP 04-03 Krishchenko** Chairman Brown stated Mr. Krishchenko had given him a formal request to gain access across the property. This had been given to Brown because he is the Bishop of the Second Ward of the Church of Latter Day Saints. Brown said that he turned this over the physical facilities people for the Church of Latter Day Saints. The property is actually owned by the presiding bishop of the LDS Church in Salt Lake City and so the church will have to figure out how that is to be done. Brown's understanding is that the church is going to seek possession of the triangular piece of property that the city currently owns.

John Williams stated that he had received a phone call from Church officials in question from Salt Lake City and was advised that the property that was the subject of the Krishchenko addition plus the one that is on the church's' property were taken when 13<sup>th</sup> avenue was platted to go in that direction. The right of way was given but ultimately not needed. John Williams and John Kelly, the city Attorney, agree that since the road will not be built it should go back to the original owner, the church. 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue has now been built clear past this point. Chairman Brown said one of the conditions of the approval of this MLP was that access be granted through a street other than 13<sup>th</sup>. John stated he would like the Commission to know that staff didn't want a lot created that did not have access. What the staff is recommending is that the plat not get signed unless there is proof of access to some other street. Commissioners agreed that this made sense. Commissioner Ewert made a motion to approve final order for MLP 04-03 as submitted. This was seconded and approved. Motion carried 3 yes, nay vote by Brown, Manley & Tessman abstained.

## **VI. MINUTES**

Minutes for November 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2004 were reviewed. No modifications noted. Commissioner Ewert made a motion to approve, motion seconded. Carried 4 yes, two abstentions by Manley & Tessman.

## VII. DIRECTOR-S REPORT

John Williams stated there has been a lot of activity. The first was the Arndt Road meeting that was held on Wednesday, December 8<sup>th</sup>. There was a lot of testimony and a lot of discussion. The meeting was quite long and there was a mixed recommendation that went to the Council. Because the meeting had gone on so long, the Councilors deferred their decision until Wednesday, December 15<sup>th</sup>. An item is on the agenda for their decision at that time. Clackamas County has requested an answer by the end of 2004.

Commissioner Helbling who had attended the meeting stated that there were two main issues, one was the bridge question and the other was the extension of 13<sup>th</sup>.

Starting with the extension of 13<sup>th</sup>, there are some people who are adversely affected. There are 10 to 12 homes along that street, single-family dwellings, whose driveways face 13<sup>th</sup>. There is also one down all the way at the end of 13<sup>th</sup>. Although these homes are adversely affected he felt that it makes sense to go through that section.

The Bridge is the second issue. The question is funding. Where does the money come from and at what risk do we expose ourselves? If you look at it from the total point of view, at \$17.9 M, it seems expensive. There were people who came to the public meeting, such as Canby Utility, who were asking for additions or changes to the engineer's proposal at \$17.9 M. It comes down to the fact that the City get's a bridge for about \$8.5 M. There will be some cost overrun. Helbling stated he made a statement at the meeting about the cost being at \$12 M for the TSP, but that was incorrect, it was \$6 M. He felt the cost would inflate 5% per year. He does not believe that is far off from what the City had planned to spend on a bridge. The added benefit is it is more than a bridge to service the inside of Canby; it also serves as access to Canby. There is a lot of added value there. It comes down to whether the \$8.5 M will make enough of a difference in the City to attract and help fill up empty URD property. Other benefits include easing commuter strain, increasing and enhancing tourism, improving fire and life safety issues. Feeding the industrial park is not the number one issue, there are a lot issues. The overall consensus was positive. There were a couple of committees represented, the parks committee was not necessarily opposed to the idea, they felt they might lose some ground where they had planned on putting two ball fields and they were hoping that if the city makes a decision to use that for the highway or the bypass that some other ground in the city's land would be designated for ball fields. The bicycle & pedestrian committee wanted to see bicycle pedestrian lanes on the bridge and they also wanted to explore other options rather than building a road to attract business in town.

John Williams said the traffic safety committee mentioned that this would relieve traffic on some of the interior streets like Ivy, Elm and 99E. He said we

don't have a traffic study completed; we are working on one right now and we have traffic engineers and metro developing a model. This model will allow us to plug scenarios into and see what the traffic does in 10, 15, 25 years. There may be increased traffic as the people try to funnel through this project, or it may relieve traffic in areas.

Helbling stated that one of the ideas that was brought up by the traffic committee is that this town has a projected population of 56,000 by 2045. He said now we have the opportunity to get the bypass plus enhance the accessibility to the town at no additional cost at net present value to the city. He stated that if we don't do this, that opportunity goes away. And to do that on our own is going to be \$18 M. It is a bridge "on sale".

The Commissioners discussed the pros and cons of the bridge "on sale". They questioned using the funds and will it take stress of our other roads? John stated an example of improvements scheduled for 99E, Ivy and Township. He said when adding the 13<sup>th</sup> avenue connection alone a lot of traffic will come off Ivy and can allow the delaying of the project. Helbling said there was talk in town that the maintenance of roads is what will be delayed and that this is not true since there are two different pots of money. The money that will pay the \$8.5 M is not and cannot be used to repair potholes, etc. It is an unfounded fear.

John said there was a lot of discussion by people who just thought it was a bad idea to have better access to I-5, that it is better to be a bedroom community and liked the remoteness and isolation of Canby. Some thought that Canby should not be surrounded by industrial parks and felt comfortable with the way things are now. There could be ripples that come from constructing this road. The community will change anyway. Jim Brown stated the city has already made some investments in what the community will be and that discussion has been going on for the last 20 years (referring to the Industrial Park).

John stated that the Planning Commission did not have a quorum at the meeting last week, a lot of the other committees did, so if the Commission wanted to forward a recommendation John would be happy to convey that the Council at the meeting on December 15. The Commission decided to write a letter and send it to the Council. John Williams stated he would write the letter after the meeting for their signature.

John talked about some of the upcoming agenda items. Included in these were a workshop scheduled to talk about the North Redwood Street Master Plan. Additionally there is a NE Canby Master Planning Taskforce meeting scheduled for January. He said the Council will be meeting soon regarding the buildable land question.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**