

MINUTES

CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

7:00 PM January 9, 2006
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2nd

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman, Jim Brown, Dan Ewert, Geoffrey Manley,
John Molamphy, and Randy Tessman.

STAFF: John Williams, Community Development and Planning Director,
Kevin Cook, Associate Planner, and Carla Ahl, Planning Staff.

OTHERS PRESENT: Geraldine Wild, Sean Marison, Reese Conrad,
Wendel Mueller, Jack Gallagher, Bob Beard

II. CITIZEN INPUT

None.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

DR 05-05 (Sterling Development) – An application to develop an 85,348 square foot CM zoned parcel located at the SW corner of Highway 99E and Berg Parkway. Chairman Brown asked if there was any conflict of interest. There was no conflict, all intended to participate. Chairman Brown asked if there was any ex parte contact and there was none.

STAFF REPORT: Mr. Cook said this was for a multi-tenant retail development. It would be heavy commercial manufacturing. There were three buildings proposed. The applicant was asking for approval of two different designs for building B. They met all parking and landscaping requirements. ODOT approved right in only access from 99E but it was being appealed to have both right in and out access. The second access was through Berg Parkway. There were no anticipated traffic volume issues. The colors would be stucco and stone colors which would compliment the area. They received 27 points out of 31 available on the Design Matrix, so they were compatible. They would be putting sidewalks on 99E and Berg Parkway and ODOT was requiring a striped right hand turn lane. It met signage requirements. Because restaurants were involved, staff recommended that if required by the wastewater treatment plant supervisor, they obtain an industrial wastewater discharge permit prior to any discharge into the system. The Fire Department requested access through the west property line which would result in the loss of three parking spaces.

APPLICANT: Geraldine Wild representing Sterling Development introduced their project team. They were asking for approval of two options mainly for building B

and she explained the differences. They were in negotiations with ODOT to get the right in, right out onto 99E and they would comply with whatever they decided. They would keep the access where it was. Wendel Mueller talked about the building elevations and design of the buildings. They were planning to have an anchor tenant, and then smaller tenants surrounding it. They tried to create a natural character for the buildings and to look similar to other buildings near it.

Chairman Brown asked about the size of the sign, and Ms. Wild said it was for visibility and competition. It met the standard, and they still had 400 square feet of signage they were not going to use at this time.

Reese Conrad said they were in agreement to the conditions staff recommended and he explained how they had changed their design to meet those conditions.

PROPOSERS: None.

OPPOSERS: None.

REBUTTAL: None.

Chairman Brown closed the public hearing and opened Commissioner deliberations

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Molamphy liked the proposal, and he thought it would be appropriate for that side of town. He wanted to make sure what happened with building B if they went with option two that it would come back to design review because he was concerned about fast food service and the type of building they required. He also wanted to make sure there was no problem with the 24 foot access for the Fire Department.

Mr. Brown said he did not understand why they would approve two options for a site. They needed to decide what they were going to do first. The elevations were also a problem as it was cheaply done. Also, on building C they had small parapet caps and they would see mechanical equipment. He thought the sign was out of scale for the development.

Mr. Williams said there wasn't that large of a material difference between the two options for building B.

Mr. Helbling said his concern was this was the gateway development to the community. This was an improvement of what was there currently. He also did not like the large sign.

Mr. Tessman said he was looking for more inspiration, but it was an improvement from what was currently there. He did not have a problem with the plan.

Chairman Brown re-opened the public hearing.

Ms. Wild said they could work through some of these issues. Regarding the options, the only changes were building B and it would come back through architectural review if they went with option two. They needed the options for flexibility. Mr. Cook said they could add a condition that only one option would be chosen. Mr. Brown was still concerned that if they approved it, they could change it to whatever they wanted. He thought either one was good, but he did not want to approve both.

There was no further public testimony.

Chairman Brown closed the hearing.

Mr. Helbling said he hoped the back of the buildings would be made more appealing by landscaping.

Mr. Manley said even though they did not like the elevations, they met the code requirements. He thought they should approve option one, and if they wanted to go with option two, to bring it back as a new business item.

Mr. Helbling said he was concerned there was a potential client that was decision dependent on option two.

Mr. Helbling moved to approve DR 05-05 option one with the conditions as specified. Motion seconded by Mr. Tessman and passed 4-1, with Mr. Brown opposed.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Path Closure – This was a request to close a path between SE 7th Place and SE 6th Place.

Mr. Cook said this was a pedestrian path located between both cul-de-sacs. The property owners thought it was not necessary. If they approved it, the easement that formed the path would be abandoned and the four property owners would be free to fence off the path at their own expense. They received three citizen comments in favor. He received one additional letter from Mr. Beard that he read into the record stating it was unsafe to keep the path. Staff recommended approval. Mr. Cook also contacted the Bike & Pedestrian Committee and they did not have a concern with the closure. He also talked to the Police Department and they indicated that some gang members hung out there on occasion.

Bob Beard, resident on 6th Place, said the crime decreased slightly when the path was taken out from Township to 6th. Young teenagers started frequenting the area. It was a dark area at night and not safe.

Mr. Molamphy moved to approve the path closure on SE 6th and 7th Place. Motion seconded by Mr. Tessman and passed 5-0.

V. FINDINGS

DR 05-08 – Mr. Molamphy moved to approve the findings, conclusion and final order for DR 05-08 with the change of Mr. Brown and Mr. Manley's names being switched. Motion seconded by Mr. Manley and passed 3-0 with Mr. Brown and Mr. Helbling abstaining.

ANN 05-06 (Beck) – Mr. Manley moved to approve the findings, conclusion and final order for ANN 05-06 as amended. Motion seconded by Mr. Molamphy and passed 3-0 with Mr. Brown and Mr. Helbling abstaining.

ANN 05-07 (Netter) – Mr. Molamphy moved to approve the findings, conclusion and final order for ANN 05-07 as amended. Motion seconded by Mr. Manley and passed 3-0 with Mr. Brown and Mr. Helbling abstaining.

MLP 05-08 – Mr. Molamphy moved to approve the findings, conclusion and final order for MLP 05-08 as amended. Motion seconded by Mr. Manley and passed 2-1 with Mr. Tessman opposed and Mr. Brown and Mr. Helbling abstaining.

VI. MINUTES None

VII. DIRECTORS REPORT

Planning Director John Williams said they were discussing with Canby Business Revitalization about Highway 99E design standards. They wanted to combine the design standard work with gateway treatments. The Commission consensus was to move forward with the project.

Mr. Williams said Mr. Helbling was approved to serve another term on the Commission, but they still had one vacancy.

Mr. Williams said they were changing their application submittal requirements so they could file electronically and submit smaller drawings. He also discussed ongoing projects and upcoming meetings.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT