

MINUTES

CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

7:00 PM February 28, 2005
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2nd

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Jim Brown, Commissioners Tony Helbling, Geoffrey Manley, Randy Tessman, Barry Lucas and Dan Ewert

STAFF: John Williams, Community Development and Planning Director, Darren Nichols, Associate Planner, Carla Ahl Planning Staff

OTHERS PRESENT: Ahren Spilker, Terry Tolls, Allen Patterson, Heinz Rudolf, Charles Burden, Debbi Pearson, Charles Rhodes, Leslie Rhodes, Don Knight, Buzz Weygandt, Jennifer Nicholson, Darrell Nicholson, Roger Reif, Douglas Gingerich, Andy Rivinus, Gene Bivens, Tim Van Blaricom, Patti Ryall, Patrick Ryall, Deborah Sommer, Christie Schwary, Tom Wolfe, Donna Wolfe, Teresa Blackwell

II. CITIZEN INPUT

None

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

DR 04-09 / CUP 05-01 Canby Middle School - The applicant is requesting approval to construct a new Middle School on a 37 acre parcel located south of SE Township, east of Trost Elementary School, currently zoned for residential development. Site plans propose to construct one middle school building with vehicle parking and bus transportation facilities. Site design also proposes construction of two soccer fields, two softball fields and one baseball field at the south portion of the site. The new school facility would accept approximately 1/2 of the current student body from Ackerman Middle School (initially estimated at 550 students).

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.

Darren Nichols, Associate Planner presented the staff report. He explained that this is a two part application, a conditional use permit application

which determines if a school is appropriate at this location, and the design review which determines if this school should be placed on the site. He stated that the applicant has proposed a LEED rated building, which stands for leadership in energy and environmental design. LEED buildings are highly rated for energy performance, efficiency and indoor environment quality. They are built to conserve storm water and to reuse wastewater. He stated this would be a model project and is the first of its kind in Canby.

Darren explained the proposal places the building in the middle of the site abutting the Logging road on the east side with a small buffer between the school and the trail. Between the new school and Trost there will be a private access drive with parking for cars and bicycles, a bus turnaround and an unloading zone. To the south of the site there are 2 softball fields, 2 soccer fields and one baseball field.

Darren stated that during the pre-application process with utility providers it was determined that there will need to be some extra work done to bring sewer to the site. No natural hazards are associated with this property.

Darren explained that N. Teakwood would stop at the schools southern boundary and at that point become a private drive for the school; it will be well signed and marked as a private drive. A north/south pedestrian way was proposed by the applicant along the private drive, connecting S. Teakwood to S. E. Township, staff has recommended moving the pedestrian path from the west side of the driveway to the east side to make it easier for neighbors and students to use, and minimize the number of parking access crosswalks that students would have to use traveling to and from school.

Darren stated that the Fire Department had concerns regarding access to the rear of the building; the applicant has worked with staff and the Fire Department to utilize the existing Logging Rd to provide access to the rear of the building.

The Traffic Safety Committee has recommended that the southern entrance be signed to designate the road as being a private access road. There has not been a design presented at this time, but it would need to be clear that they were leaving a public roadway and entering a private roadway.

Darren stated the neighbors have expressed concerns regarding traffic impacts. He explained that a traffic study had been done and the traffic engineer had determined that there would not be a dramatic change in traffic. The same number of students will still be traveling to and from school. Darren stated that if this property were built out to R1 standards it would accommodate 150 to 160 new homes. The traffic impact of that development would be the same if not higher than the middle school. He stated that staff believes the systems

surrounding the middle school are adequate to handle the traffic and the impacts are about the same as if it were built out in homes.

Darren stated that 911 Emergency Response has requested a legion of the school be placed at the front entrance to assist emergency responders in locating rooms in the facilities, this can be accomplished in the pre-construction conference.

The Bike and Ped Committee has made recommendations regarding bike lanes and sidewalks along Township and a crosswalk on Township to have access from North of Township to the school site. The Traffic Safety Committee also expressed concerns regarding the speed of traffic along Township coming up from under the bridge; visibility is somewhat limited in that area. These issues will be incorporated into the design.

Darren stated this application complies with the comp plan and the use of low-density land for a school is an acceptable use in Canby. He believes the site is appropriate for development due to the sites design and existing structures already in place such as the Logging Rd.

Darren stated that all public facilities and services appear to be adequate to serve this development. And it is not anticipated that there will be any undue negative impacts on the neighborhood.

Darren received a letter from Ronald J. Knight stating his concerns regarding these applications. He asked the entrance to the site from SE Teakwood should be gated and used for emergency access only. He recommended that the following conditions be added; all construction traffic access from Township, the Teakwood access blocked until the school is open, dust mitigation measures be put in place, lights must not infringe upon the neighborhood, including lights from the playing fields, trees should be planted to lessen the noise from the fields and limit the hours the fields could be used at night and on weekends, delivery vehicles and buses must enter via Township, and the pedestrian path needs to be completely paved to reduce foot traffic through the neighborhood.

Darren addressed the concerns expressed in the letter. It would be logical for construction traffic to use the Township entrance. He explained that blocking the Teakwood access until the school opened had not been discussed with the applicant but could be part of the hearing tonight. Canby already has an erosion control and sedimentation ordinance and the public works department does a good job of monitoring constructions sites. The lighting standards in a neighborhood zone require that lights are hooded or shaded in such a way that limits the amount of light that crosses the property line is less than one-foot candle. Darren stated that the tree issue could be discussed. Canby already has ordinances that limit the noise levels after hours and on weekends. Having

all delivery vehicles and buses entering from Redwood is an issue that could be discussed with the applicant.

A neighborhood meeting was held on February 10th and 40 to 50 people attended. There were concerns discussed regarding use of S. Teakwood St. for buses and delivery vehicles, student drop offs. An issue was brought up regarding this facility being a central kitchen for the school district, it was explained that the kitchen would generate 4 to 6 trips a day, so the impact would be minimal. The City's Traffic Engineer has stated that the street system could easily accommodate the school traffic that would be generated and it would still be performing at the C and D level in 20 years.

Staff's conclusion is that this application meets the criteria and recommends the Commission approve the application with the condition that it be limited to the middle school with parking areas, ball fields as designed and any other development would need to obtain further approval from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Tessman questioned what the speed limit on Township from Redwood St to the Molalla Forest Rd. It was determined that the speed limit coming into town was 45 mph dropping to 35 mph at the Molalla Forest Rd and dropping to 25 mph at Redwood. John stated that the road would most likely have a 20 mph school zone designation.

Darren addressed the Site and Design review application. He explained that the current site is vacant with grass, shrubs and trees at this time. The landscaping that is proposed easily meets the design standard.

The applicant has proposed 150 parking spaces. Darren explained initially there would be about 60 employees; the parking standard requires 2 spaces per employee for a total of 120 spaces. Potentially there could be a staff of 70 to 75 employees so parking will be adequate for future expansion.

There will be a common access entrance from Township and an extension of S. Teakwood St. (which will be adequately marked as a private street. Mr. Brown asked what the distance from the centerline of the private drive to the center of the bridge was. Darren believes it is in the area of 475'. Mr. Brown clarified that there is a 14' vertical feet difference between the railroad tracks and the entrance. Darren explained that the Traffic Engineer had determined there is adequate site distance; if the speed limit were dropped to 25 mph then the site distance would be more than adequate.

No signs have been proposed with this application and questioned if the Planning Commission would like to have the applicant bring back a proposed design for further review.

Darren stated the application scored 26 points of a possible 28 on the compatibility criteria for a total of 93%. He explained that 65% is considered adequate. Darren stated the site meets the site and design review requirements for conditional development, is compatible with adjacent uses, the design has met the basic criteria, services are available and facilities are or can be modified to meet this proposal, it should not affect the cost of housing in Canby although it does use up 32 acres of land. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the application with the suggested conditions.

Mr. Ewert addressed the parking issue and questioned if the parking would be adequate on parent, teacher conference night. John stated there had been a lot of discussion regarding parking at the public meeting regarding sporting events and nighttime events, the code requires 2 spaces per employee. Mr. Ewert clarified that the applicant has proposed just enough parking to meet the code. Darren stated that if the applicant goes over the 100% mark for parking there are points deducted.

Mr. Ewert stated that the Canby Police Department had made no comments, but he believed there would having the wedged shaped area north of the ball fields and west of the Logging Rd create a problem. Darren stated the plan calls for a 6' high fence all along the Logging Rd. Darren explained the area that abuts the Logging Rd is very brushy at this time, which has created a problem area. The applicant has proposed grubbing all that out and creating good visibility. The area to the south will some day be annexed and may become a neighborhood, so the area between the ball fields and that potential neighborhood is a proposed pedestrian path so hopefully there will be enough accessibility and enough visibility to alleviate those kinds of problems in the future.

Mr. Ewert explained that the City has had problems with parks that were created that had large dark areas, with this property abutting the Logging Rd it has the potential to become a problem. Darren stated the Logging Rd is accessible for emergencies and is accessible by vehicles.

Mr. Ewert questioned if lighting had been proposed for the pathway between the schools. Darren explained that nothing had been proposed. Mr. Ewert questioned if the only details the Planning Commission had were the black and white elevations that were included in the packet. Darren stated that the applicant had brought examples of the materials that would be used and would show them during their presentation.

Mr. Brown stated the applicant's proposal is to use 37 acres for this development, but they haven't used the area along the western margin along the private drive and the entire area to the north. He questioned if there was a master plan for the area. Darren stated he had heard some ideas, but would let the applicant address this issue.

Mr. Brown questioned why staff believed having Teakwood dead-end and creating a private drive was the best alternative. Darren explained that there had been discussion with the City Engineer and Public Works and it was decided that the City was not interested in having it as a public street. Mr. Brown stated he understood not wanting to maintain the street, but why wouldn't the City want it built to public street standards. Darren stated that they wanted to discourage people from using it as an access point through the school, due to the conflict of vehicles and students.

Mr. Brown stated there would be approximately 900 trips a day that will be dumped out on Township without traffic control. John stated there would be a stop sign at the driveway for vehicles exiting. Darren stated it did not meet the warrants for a left turn lane or a four way stop. John added that those measures are not in place at the other schools in town.

APPLICANT:

Hienz Rudolf, Architect for the School District addressed the Commission. He stated that there have been 30 or 40 people involved with creating the design of this project over the last year.

Mr. Rudolf stated the middle school program is designed for 800 students in addition of a central food service kitchen that will provide food for the entire district and three technology offices that provide repair facilities for the district.

Mr. Rudolf stated there would be ball fields for the middle school that could also be used for the community. There will be 150 parking spaces and 80 bicycle parking spaces located near the building with 40 covered spaces.

Mr. Rudolf explained the school was designed to retain the existing view of Mt. Hood for both the middle school and for Ackerman. The fields are located to the south of the school and include 2 football fields, 1 baseball field and 2 softball fields and a running track.

Mr. Rudolf stated there were areas that have been left as buffer zones, and that a master plan had not been developed at this time. It is possible that another elementary school could be located on the property. Some areas could be used for expanded ball fields or for expanded parking if it was found there was a need in the future.

Mr. Rudolf stated there had been much discussion regarding whether the road should be a private or a public road. It was opted to be a private drive it does not have to be as wide as a public street and the district would be responsible for maintenance. He stated that there would be a change of curb and a change of speed to designate that they would be leaving the public roadway and entering a private drive.

Mr. Rudolf believes that the pedestrian walkway should be left as designed. He stated there is clear traffic separation with a pedestrian island with a wide boulevard that is landscaped. There is an increased area for parents to pick up and drop off their children directly at the school front. There is a separate entry for bus drop off and pick up and a separate delivery and service area.

Mr. Rudolf believes this is a safe secure location for a school. He explained that a LEED project puts emphasis on lighting, the transparency of the building and making sure daylight gets into the building so there are no nooks and crannies for people to hide in. He explained that the emergency land comes in from the bus land and continues back to the Logging Rd, he believes it would allow for the Police to patrol the area, and provide turnouts for them to return to the entrance.

Mr. Rudolf explained the applicant would prefer that the pedestrian pathway be moved to the area between the ball fields and the hard surface play area so there would not be a straight path coming from Trost School.

Mr. Rudolf addressed the lighting issue, he explained that there will be cut off angles on the lights so there will not bleed over into the neighborhood. The parking lot lights will be on sensors, so when no one is on site the lights will be dimmed down to about half-light and if someone drives up the sensors will bring the lights up gradually.

Mr. Rudolf explained the plan for the school and explained it is broken down into distinct zones. The northern zone would be the arts area. The main entrance is toward the middle of the school leading to the administration offices, media center, computer labs and the long distance learning labs. This area will be available to the community after hours. There is a courtyard situated in the middle of this segment and it will provide daylight and natural ventilation for the building. The classrooms are designed with portable partitions so they can work together and there is a common teacher planning/conference area.

Mr. Rudolf explained that the commons is the dining area that can also be used as an auditoriums, the core area can be opened up and form a stage to be used for performances.

Mr. Rudolf explained that the southern building would house the science classes and physical education. There will be two heated and ventilated gymnasium instead of one larger gym, which allows for more flexibility in use. The central kitchen will also be located in this area.

Mr. Rudolf stated that the geological information shows they will not have to dig into the rock like which had to be done at Trost, (except for the sewer, which will have to go deep).

Mr. Rudolf explained they want to build a 100+ building so materials are being selected that are highly energy efficient and durable. The building will have a brick veneer and metal panels with white fascia boards. The emphasis is on a simple building that is well built and flexible to accommodate future uses.

Mr. Rudolf explained they are having modeling done to assure maximum daylight and energy usage, they are aiming for R16 insulation rating which far exceeds the requirements, but they believe that as energy consumption becomes more expensive it is important to insulate. There will be natural ventilation that will come in below the windows and by the changes in air temperature will exhaust itself without the use of a fan.

Mr. Rudolf stated that the State of Oregon has used their LEED buildings in model projects such as Clackamas and Ash Creek High Schools and they have created a lot of interest from supporters of these type projects, including Portland Schools. He stated that the High School students would be building a model mock up classroom at the High School. The Energy Foundation/Energy Alliance has already agreed to donate \$5,000 to pay for lumber and materials. The State of Oregon has given the School District \$60,000 for promoting high-energy efficient design.

Mr. Rudolf explained that there will be 2 phases of construction, the grading of the site, and putting the fields in place so they can be seeded and have a years growth on them prior to the school opening. Then in September or October the construction of the building will begin and most of the building would be ready for occupancy by September of 2006, except for the gymnasium and the kitchen, which will be completed in December of 2006.

Mr. Tessman questioned the construction costs of a LEEDS building compared to conventional construction and asked if they were able to stay within budget on the Clackamas High School building. Mr. Rudolf stated they were 15 to 19 dollars below conventional costs and explained how using an unpainted ground faced concrete block for the gymnasium wall, it would support the structure, provide an impact resistance surface, be acoustically limiting, and never needs to be painted, there is an overall savings for using that system. He explained that the key is to make a flexible, high quality building that performs well and requires minimal maintenance.

Mr. Helbling questioned what the plan was for the area near the bioswale. Mr. Rudolf stated it would be landscaped. Mr. Helbling asked if there would be a conflict between students going to the ball fields and the service vehicles. Mr. Rudolf explained that most service trucks are scheduled to be at the school around 6:00 am, but there could be an occasional truck during the day. He explained that there is a pedestrian walk along the fields.

Mr. Brown questioned why the building was fronted to the private drive instead of Township. Mr. Rudolf stated it was easier access to the site, would allow the creation of any width of building and works with the natural grade of the property.

Mr. Brown questioned what the sculptural mound was in the bus drop off area. Mr. Rudolf stated that had been removed from the design since the Planning Commission had received their copies.

Mr. Brown questioned what the linear pathway connects to. Mr. Rudolf stated it was a treed area that was not paved and the pedestrian paths were at different locations. Mr. Brown questioned why the southern 450' of the private drive needed to connect to Teakwood. Mr. Rudolf stated it was for convenience especially for the people on Teakwood and fire truck access.

Mr. Helbling stated that the design shows a walkway that goes across the parking lot and clear across the schoolyard. Mr. Rudolf stated it was a landscaped area.

Mr. Brown stated his concern that access to the back of the building was through a one way bus drop off lane, he questioned why there wouldn't be a fire lane around the entire building. Mr. Rudolf explained that the bus lane was 26' wide and adequate for a fire truck to pass a school bus. Mr. Rudolf stated the use of the existing roadway would save resources, money and would be more efficient. He added that the Fire Marshal had approved the use of the existing roadway with the addition of vehicle turnarounds. Mr. Brown stated that the lift that is on the Logging Rd is intended for pedestrian use.

Mr. Brown questioned why the parking lot is located so far away from the gyms, he believes this design is great place for the kids, but questioned how easy it would be for the parents to navigate. Mr. Rudolf believed it is a functional design.

Mr. Brown asked if there was enough distance between the central kitchen and the neighborhood. Mr. Rudolf stated the fields create a 400' to 450' buffer and the kitchens are designed so that everything is contained behind the walls.

Mr. Brown questioned why the trees on the site are placed in a strong east west linear line. Mr. Rudolf stated they go with the bars on the inside of the building. He added that trees had been removed from the plan because Canby Kids did not want trees near the fields since it is possible that they will install artificial turf.

Mr. Brown asked how the middle school relates architecturally to Trost. Mr. Rudolf believed there was a relationship in the materials that will be used and they are both 2-story buildings though they have different looks.

Mr. Ewert stated his concern that when schools are planned the open space and fields are figured into the Parks and Recreation. The building seems very functional, but Canby is an area that draws soccer tournaments, which can be beneficial to a city but if we plan on drawing that activity to town, we have to plan on the facility is functional. He stated that he would not want to come to a game on any of the fields, because you can't get to them, cars will end up parking on Teakwood.

Mr. Ewert stated the private drive they are creating would be lined with cars; every other field in Canby is the same way. He doesn't understand why Canby doesn't learn from the past mistakes when we build a new school. Mr. Brown stated it was partly the City's fault because the code allows them to have parking for 150 cars. Mr. Ewert stated if tax dollars are going to be spent on something it should be functional. Mr. Rudolf stated this issue had been discussed and there is overflow parking at Trost which connects with a pedestrian path to the fields.

Mr. Ewert stated that hooking the private drive up with Teakwood didn't make sense. He believes the backside of the building could become a problem. Every time the City has built anything that is for public use, and there are far off places in the back, it becomes a problem. Mr. Ewert questioned if there was an accident on the backfield, there is quite a distance from the trail to the field, and it would be difficult in inclement weather.

Mr. Ewert stated that there would be hundreds of people attending the tournaments and believed they would park as close to the fields as possible. He did not believe this design was functional. Mr. Rudolf stated that the solution would be to add more parking, but explained it is a cost issue that needed to be balanced with the building, site development and code requirements. Mr. Rudolf explained there was enough lane room to allow off street parking on the interior private streets. He explained there were several locations on the site that could accommodate parking if they could do it within the budget restraints.

Mr. Lucas stated he was also concerned about the parking issue and suggested that one of the soccer fields be moved to the north of the school which would utilize the north parking and put then have parking on the south side where the second field was planned to be.

Mr. Brown cautioned that the Planning Commission shouldn't be designing the project, and pointed out that there are grade issues with the site. Mr. Ewert stated he was not trying to design it, but it would be affecting the surrounding neighborhoods then it becomes an issue.

PROPONENTS:

None

OPPONENTS:

Darrel Nicholson, He explained that his neighborhood is one that will be affected by Teakwood being an access drive. He suggested closing that access and using the area for parking for games, if that was not an option at least have the access be one way in.

Mr. Nicholson was concerned regarding speeding, he stated there are 23 children on his street alone and suggested speed bumps were needed to slow traffic. He agreed that parking is a big issue and believed the school should provide more parking to accommodate the fields and after hours school functions. Mr. Brown explained that the applicant is trying to meet the code and the Planning Commission is trying to analyze the design, he asked Mr. Nicholson if there were an emergency at the school wouldn't he want them to have access off Teakwood. Mr. Nicholson stated he would have the Teakwood Dr. access one way since this development will increase the traffic through the neighborhood by hundreds of cars a day.

Patty Ryall stated she lives across the street from the proposed private drive. When she purchased her home she contacted the City and the School District and was told that Teakwood would not go through, that the access would come off Township, and before they did anything there would be a lot of public input. She stated that her neighborhood was not included in the planning of the traffic and the access to the school and asked if they had missed a meeting. Mr. Brown explained that the school district had put together a sub committee to act as a steering committee for the whole school that was made up of volunteers and have been meeting for a year and a half. He explained that there had been notices in the paper and a lot of public outreach to invite people to become involved with the process and that the rest of the public input process is this meeting.

Ms. Ryall asked if this application was a "done deal" because if it was there were issues that needed to be discussed for their neighborhood. Mr. Brown explained that this is a quasi-judicial and the Commission can determine that additional conditions are needed for the development. Ms. Ryall stated the neighbors had some ideas regarding permit parking or speed bumps.

John Williams, Community Development and Planning Director explained that is the meeting for neighbors to make sure they bring up any issues they want to discuss to be sure they get in the record and be considered. Mr. Brown clarified that if Ms. Ryall had specific suggestions this is the time to tell them.

Ms. Ryall believed there should be no parking along Teakwood and 10th or permit parking only, which would be a solution for the ball fields, which she acknowledges would be difficult to enforce.

Ahren Spilker He stated he was also concerned about traffic issues. He has 3 children and traffic speed is an issue now, he believes increasing traffic through that area is asking for problems.

Mr. Spilker agreed that if the private drive from Teakwood needs to go through he requested it be made a one-way street to reduce the traffic going through the neighborhood. He stated with the completion of the road at Fred Meyer it would become a major thoroughfare and suggested adding speed bumps.

Mr. Spilker agreed that parking was a major issue for the neighborhood. He believed that the addition of the fields was a great access for Canby but there was a lot of wasted space in this design and believed it could be used to alleviate the parking situation.

John Maxwell stated that this access would be the only entrance from Redwood and would funnel all the traffic through the neighborhood. He agrees with Mr. Ewert that the ball fields are a benefit for Canby but a nightmare for residents. He stated that the district owns 10 acres that are not being used and suggested the applicant redesign it with adequate parking.

Don Knight stated the neighborhood realizes the school will be built and agrees the sidewalk along the west edge be moved to the other side of the drive, if it goes through, but did not understand why there needed to be a connection to Teakwood.

Mr. Knight stated that currently no cars park on 10th St. but he believed that when there are tournaments at the school 10th St. would become just like Trost with the parking lot full and cars parking on Redwood.

Mr. Knight believed that the entrance from Township should be built to City standards to handle bus and delivery truck traffic. Mr. Brown clarified that building the drive to City standards means the width of the street and the improvements on the sides (sidewalks, curbs and gutters), he explained that the school will be required to have a sub base that will handle the buses.

Mr. Knight stated that during the neighborhood meeting they had asked if the traffic study had looked at cut through traffic on both 10th and 11th to Redwood, and it had not.

Pat Ryall, asked if parking was typically a part of a traffic study. Mr. Brown stated it is not. He stated his concerns that when there are games at the new school his neighborhood will look like Redwood St. and believes this issue should be dealt with. He questioned how many additional parking stalls could be provided by utilizing the food service parking for game parking. He asked that

the Planning Commission assist the neighborhood in making this school be functional for the community and the school. He believes that if the school were allowed to be built as proposed it would drastically change their lives, they wouldn't be able to enjoy their home. He stated he has had discussions with his neighbors and they have the same concerns he does.

Mr. Ryall stated that Teakwood is a straight shot through from 13th and 10th, even as a private road people will speed through. He believed that making the streets no parking would just encourage more speeding and suggested adding traffic calming measures.

Mr. Ryall spoke with the Fire Marshal regarding gating the Teakwood entrance during non-school hours and was told "absolutely not". He suggested that if there were an emergency access road around the school, the Fire Marshal would be willing to relook at gating Teakwood.

Mr. Ryall stated that when Sequoia Parkway is completed there would be an issue with cut through traffic. He asked that the Commission address his issues.

Tom Wolf Agreed with Mr. Ewert that this is a great looking school, but this will be a community-gathering place that will be used for games and events. He stated the designer had designed a great school but had not included the community or has consideration for the community.

Mr. Wolf addressed the traffic study stating the vehicle trips on Teakwood is currently at 47 trips a day he stressed that when the school is at peak enrollment there will be 541 vehicle trips a day. This design is not community friendly and did not believe it is a viable design. He stated that there are a lot of children on this street and believed increasing traffic would be dangerous.

Mr. Wolf questioned why there couldn't be a road between the school and the backyards of the homes to the south. John Williams explained that Redwood St. curves at that point so it would not be a safe intersection. He hopes that the Commission takes into consideration that there are no proponents for this design and many people against it.

Cary Steves stated she has the same concerns that her neighbors do. She did not like the idea of a road running from Redwood between the school and her property.

Ms. Steves stated she voted for the school bond issue and her children will be able to take advantage of the soccer fields, but the parking is not adequate for the use.

Patrick Ryall addressed the Commission again and suggested the school be reoriented to utilize more of the space to the top.

REBUTTAL:

Mr. Rudolf addressed the need for additional parking and explained that after hours the interior lanes can be used to park about 100 cars, John asked if the streets would be signed to indicate parking would be allowed after hours. Mr. Rudolf stated they would be.

Mr. Rudolf stated that gating Teakwood maybe an option and it would alleviate the concern regarding speed. Mr. Rudolf stated there would be additional costs associated with additional parking and that it is beyond the requirements of the City's codes and ordinances.

John explained that the Cities Transportation Plan has always designated as a neighborhood connector, which would have a moderate amount of traffic and built to a 40' width with homes not fronting onto it. The staff report noted that prior to the school purchasing the property it was intended to be built out as a subdivision with Teakwood extending through it. After the school purchased the property the thinking changed they did not want a street running through their property or in front of the schools and some of the concerns from the neighbors became apparent.

John explained that the current design was a compromise between the City's long-term connectivity goals, the school's site issues and the neighborhood concerns. He stated that the private drive would be designed to discourage some of the cut through traffic. He believed traffic would use Redwood St. especially if the speed limit is lowered on school grounds.

John stated that the Commission also has to consider the people living on Redwood St. who would not like it if all the surrounding neighborhoods had to go up Redwood to Township. So the application spreads the traffic to minimize the impact.

Mr. Brown questioned the process the applicant went through prior to this meeting. John stated he was not a part of the applicant's process, but the City sent out 2 notices, one for the neighborhood meeting that was held at Trost and one for this meeting.

Darren stated that 37 acres of R1 land would allow 156 homes to be built, the average home creates 10 trips a day for a total of 1560 vehicle trips a day compared to the 900 trip initially to 1300 at full build out the school use creates a couple hundred vehicle trips a day.

Darren stated that both soccer fields would average 160-170 people, at 2 people per car they would need 80-85 parking spaces and if all 3-ball fields were used at the same time they would require 112 parking spaces. He believes the issue is the configuration of the parking rather than the amount of parking.

John added they are looking for ways to calm traffic speeds throughout the City. There have been discussions with the Fire Department regarding installing speed bumps and they have always stated they did not want them. John stated that the City is aware of the concerns and will be holding public meetings to find some solutions.

Mr. Brown asked if there were concerns from the Commission regarding the Conditional Use Permit, should the school be allowed at that location.

Mr. Ewert believed that the application did not meet criteria "D" and that it would alter the neighborhood. He stated that the application seemed rushed and believed there should be more thought put into it.

Mr. Ewert believed that Teakwood should not go through and there should be a crash gate for emergency vehicles, widen it out and put some parking there. He stated that the parks and open spaces need to serve the public not become burdens to the neighborhoods. He believed they would be creating a problem along the backside of the school along the Logging Rd.

Mr. Ewert stated that if the interior streets were allowed to have parking on them, they would not be controlled and in the event of an emergency, access could be blocked. He did not believe those amounts should be considered into the parking. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Ewert if the use of the school would be causing the problems he has referred to. Mr. Ewert stated that he does not have a problem with the school being there; it is the design that is causing the impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. Tessman agreed with the architect who asked who would pay. He stated that the school not only provides education for our children apparently they provide athletic fields for other organizations in the city. Do we require the school district to pay, will it become part of the Parks responsibility or will it be the responsibility of Canby Kids. He stated he understood Mr. Ewert's concern but the main job of the school district is to educate the kids, and from that point it does meet the criteria.

Mr. Brown stated that Canby is unique in that it piggybacks the schools, Eccles and Knight, Lee and Ackerman and now Trost and this school. There are some benefits by having them together, but play fields are linked and we have vested in the school districts responsibility to provide open space for our community because we have so few actual parks.

Mr. Ewert stated his job is not to figure out who pays for the parking it is to plan it. He stressed that he is not against the school or the ball fields but if they are going to build something that will affect the traffic flow and the neighborhoods, that's what he's looking at. He wouldn't want it going in next to his house unless it is planned right.

Mr. Manley believed that the application does meet the criteria. He believes that the application will not alter the characteristics of the neighborhood since there is already a school there.

Mr. Lucas believes the application meets the criteria for a conditional use permit the issues he has with the application are in the design review.

Mr. Helbling stated he did not believe the application met criteria "D". There is an elementary school in the neighborhood, but putting another school there is asking the neighborhood to absorb another schools load of issues and it does affect the neighborhood.

Mr. Helbling stated that everyone is paying for the parking through the bond measure. When schools are designed we make them a part of the community and are not just to be used 8 hours a day, 9 months a year it's extended hours year round. The school needs to be a functional part of the community.

Mr. Helbling asked if granting a conditional use to the school would also grant them conditional use of the unused property to the north. John clarified the conditional use criteria in the code and explained that the criteria for the site and design review does not include criteria "D" which is the one that addresses altering the character of surrounding neighborhood. He explained that the conditional use is specific for exactly what the applicant is proposing, if they want to create another school on the property it would require a complete new conditional use application.

Mr. Brown stated he agreed with Mr. Ewert on a lot of the issues he brought up, but believed that a school would not alter the character of the neighborhood, he believes the design of the school is the issue.

Mr. Ewert agreed that the application meets the criteria for a conditional use permit.

Mr. Brown addressed the site and design review application. He believes that the building is attractive and functional. He liked the separation between the parking uses, bus lanes and pedestrian uses. He approved of where the play fields are located and maintaining the view corridor from Trost school. He had a concern regarding the grade difference of 9' between the school and the property to the north, and didn't see how it could be utilized without bringing in a lot of fill.

Mr. Brown did not understand why there should be a connection to the south, either Teakwood should continue as a public street or not at all. He had an issue with the design of the school that put all the recreation uses (gymnasium and ball fields) in the most remote area from the parking. He believes there needs to be some alternative parking or overflow areas (gravel or other unpaved area) need to be incorporated into the plan.

Mr. Brown did not believe the life, health, and safety issues were adequately addressed. He believes there needs to be a Fire and Police access lane around the entire perimeter of the building, there needs to be access across the north of the building for emergency vehicles and the Logging Rd needs to be widened and illuminated along the eastern property line to gain access to the property around the drainage swale.

Mr. Brown stated that increasing the amount of parking was an expensive issue and did not give the school much benefit. Darren stated that a parking space cost was approximately \$1,000.

Mr. Brown suggested continuing the hearing to give the applicant the opportunity to address the Commission's concerns.

Mr. Tessman agreed to the continuance and believes that the private drive issue needed to be looked at. He believed the pedestrian access to the ball fields were important. He believes there needs to be signage at the access.

Mr. Helbling questioned if the driveway could be connected between Trost and this school. Mr. Brown believed they could be connected and questioned if the school had a master plan for the whole complex.

Mr. Lucas stated his main concern was the parking issue, he believed the Logging Rd was adequate access for the back of the school. Having the street be private was what the applicant and the city wanted. He stated there are crash gates at several locations on the Logging Rd and believed they could be used on Teakwood. He would like the applicant take another look at the parking issue since there is a great program that brings a lot of people to town for tournaments.

Mr. Ewert suggested that the school look at other options besides hard surface for parking areas, that would cost less. John explained that it is possible the city would be going back to gravel parking lots due to storm water and run off. It just is not in the code at this time. Mr. Brown believed the Commission could find that this is a special circumstance. John explained that the last time there were discussions regarding gravel parking lots the Fire Department had issues regarding the weight of their trucks. Mr. Brown stated that 65 to 75% of the time the parking is adequate, there just needs to be a solution to where the cars go at the other times.

The Commission discussed the fact that the school was going to be there and there needed to be a win/win solution to the traffic and parking situation. It was decided to continue the hearing, giving the applicant some direction and letting them come back with a new proposal. Issues the Commission would like addressed are;

- *Emergency access around the school.
- *Illumination of the school by the Molalla Forest Rd
- *Removal of the 10' sidewalk as suggested by the architect.
- *Alternative to the extension of Teakwood (turnaround, gated, one-way).
- *Enhanced parking during tournaments etc., alternatives to concrete.

The public hearing was continued until March 14, 2005, 7:00 pm.

SUB 05-02 Burden - The applicant seeks approval to partition one 20.4 acre industrial parcel into 8 separate tax lots located on the south and east side of Sequoia Parkway, the north side of SE 4th Avenue on the south side of Hwy 99E, for the sale and development of industrial building sites. Newly created parcels would continue to use existing access points until eventual industrial development is approved through Site and Design Review. The application meets zoning and comprehensive plan designations for the M-1, M-2 and I-O Zones.

Chairman Brown read the public hearing format. When asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, Mr. Ewert stated he has had business dealings with Mr. Burden but not on this issue, and he intended to participate in the hearing. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, Tony Helbling stated he is the President of CBRD and has seen the design earlier but intends to participate. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Darren presented the staff report. He explained that existing access points would continue to be used until eventual industrial uses are approved. Currently the property is being used for nursery stock propagation.

Darren stated that the property would be able to utilize access points both on Sequoia and on Fourth. No roads or drive accesses are proposed with this application future site and design reviews would propose whatever type of access would be needed.

Darren explained that property to the south and east are outside the City limits but designated for eventual light industrial development. This property is designated for both light and heavy industrial development. Recent utility and access improvements on Sequoia and on Fourth provide adequate access and facilities to serve the parcels.

Darren stated that the proposal does not create any traffic impact upon the area, but subsequent development of the parcels would require traffic impact studies to be done. Sidewalks and bike lanes will be required upon further development.

Darren stated that the City Engineer has suggested a lot line adjustment be done between lots 5 and 6 which would clean up the area and facilitate better access to the corner parcel and can be done at a later time.

Darren explained that the Public Works Supervisor has concerns about getting an easement. There is a 6" pvc sleeve under Sequoia Parkway that serves to irrigate nursery stock. Staff is working on language at this time.

Darren explained that Jean Rover had written questioning what types of development might be built on the lots, Mr. Bill McCormack who is a developer of 2 adjacent properties has requested that the interior easements be limited to the common north/south lot line. Darren explained that with industrial development easements are provided to facilitate development. Mr. McCormack's request would allow him to develop to the property line and run the utilities down the center, this would not preclude future developments access to facilities. The width of the easements could be decided when more is known about the businesses that will go in.

APPLICANT:

Charles Burden, Representative for the Burden Family. Mr. Burden asked if the letter regarding easements could be read into the record. John read a letter from Roger Rief and Charles Burden regarding creating smaller parcels and recommended creating 10' easements to more efficiently utilize the land.

Mr. Burden explained the size and layout of the parcels and the proposed location of the access points and asked if there was any further information the Commission would need.

Mr. Brown questioned why there was a small odd shaped parcel in the upper left corner. Mr. Burden asked Mr. Tolls to answer that question. Mr. Tolls explained that the parcel (which would house a fiber optics unit) was placed there in an attempt to improve the appearance off Sequoia Parkway. He also explained that the shape of the lots was affected by the relocation of Sequoia Parkway.

PROPONENT:

Terry Tolls explained that Mr. Bill McCormack had concerns but was unable to attend the meeting tonight. Mr. Tolls explained that originally it had been planned to have a roadway down the middle of 4 lots. He explained that

they are negotiating with purchasers but nothing is finalized at this point and they may need to come in for a lot line adjustment in the future if needed.

OPPONENTS:

None

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

Mr. Ewert asked for clarification on the water line under the road. John explained it was an existing irrigation line, and the City has not typically approved private water lines but this line was needed to irrigate the nursery.

Mr. Helbling questioned where the utilities would be brought. Mr. Tolls explained that it would probably come across Mr. Parson's property.

Mr. Brown questioned if 4th St. would go through to Mulino Rd. John stated it is not sure how 4th will be constructed, it will depend on future users and they type of development needed. Mr. Brown questioned how the city would get the other half of the road; John stated it would be obtained through negotiations with the landowners.

It was moved by Mr. Tessman to approved 05-02 as written. Seconded by Mr. Ewert. Motion carried 6-0

Mr. Tolls questioned if approved as written meant the easements were changed as requested. Mr. Manley explained it was the conditions that were proposed by staff.

V. FINDINGS

MLP 04-05 It was moved by Mr. Manley to approve the findings for MLP 04-05 as written. Seconded by Mr. Helbling. Motion carried 5-0-1 with Mr. Ewert abstaining.

MLP 04-06 It was moved by Mr. Manley to approve the findings for MLP 04-06 as written. Seconded by Mr. Tessman. Motion carried 5-0-1 with Mr. Ewert abstaining.

VI. MINUTES

January 14, 2005 Mr. Manley stated that Mr. Ewert's name was misspelled. It was moved by Mr. Manley to approve the minutes for January 14, 2005 as amended. Seconded by Mr. Tessman. Motion carried 5-0-1 with Mr. Ewert abstaining.

VII. DIRECTOR-S REPORT

John stated that Mr. Nichols has accepted a job with the State of Oregon, working on Measure 37 claims. John stated the recruitment for a new Associate Planner next week.

John stated that he and John Kelley are working on what the process will be for the Northwoods project, the Commission will have hearings again on the application in late April unless the Commission did not want to hear it, since it doesn't seem to be a requirement. The Planning Commission stated they wanted to hear it. It will be the exact same issue with a new legal approach.

Mr. Tessman asked for a synopsis of what has happened on this application. John will supply the Commission with the information.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT