

**MINUTES**  
**CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
7:00 PM – June 8, 2015  
City Council Chambers – 155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

---

**PRESENT:** Commissioners John Savory, Shawn Hensley, Larry Boatwright, and Kris Rocha

**ABSENT:** Tyler Smith, John Serlet

**STAFF:** Bryan Brown, Planning Director and Laney Fouse, Planning Staff

**OTHERS:** Clint Coleman, Councilor and Planning Commission Liaison, Pat Sisul, Morgan Will, Kim Ragain, Darren Monen, Bob Backstrom, Rob Meeks, Gordon Root, and Rick Waible

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Savory called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

- 2. CITIZEN INPUT** – Bob Backstrom, Canby resident, spoke about the increase in traffic that had happened over time on N Birch. The street was not a collector or arterial, but a neighborhood route. Traffic is using the street to bypass going through downtown. There will be a new overlay put on the street next summer and the neighborhood has been working on including traffic calming devices. He requested the Commission to think about future applications that would increase the traffic on this street. The Traffic Safety Commission is meeting on the first Friday of every month at Public Works and any Planning Commission member is welcome to attend these meetings.

**3. MINUTES**

- a. April 13, 2015 and April 27, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes

***Motion:*** A motion was made by Commissioner Hensley and seconded by Commissioner Boatright to approve the April 13 and 27, 2015 minutes as written. Motion passed 4/0.

**4. NEW BUSINESS** – None

**5. PUBLIC HEARING**

- a. Consider a subdivision application to develop an 18 lot subdivision for single family homes Franz Meadow Subdivision (SUB 15-02)

Chair Savory read the public hearing format and opened the public hearing. He asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest or ex parte contact to declare. There was none.

Bryan Brown, Planning Director, entered the staff report into the record. This application was for 4.47 acres of land that was annexed into the City in 2014. The property was designated R-1, Low Density Residential. The layout proposed was for 18 single family lots which fit in with the neighborhood. Pine Meadow was to the north and the internal streets would connect to that

subdivision as well as to Plum Ct. He explained the layout of the subdivision. The property fronted on N Pine which is under the jurisdiction of Clackamas County and the County would have to approve the improvements proposed for N Pine Street. The plan was to match what was already existing including a curb tight sidewalk. Public input reminded staff that bike lanes are required on N Pine Street so a condition of approval for the developer to stripe the bike lane is included. Internal to the subdivision, sidewalks and street trees would be placed in the public right-of-way. For street trees the City was now collecting a fee and the City is to plant the trees when the homes and sidewalks are finished. A traffic study was done when the property was annexed and at that time there was no indication of need for any off-site improvements except the adjacent Pine Street improvements to City standards. There was one lot, Lot 6, that was less than the 7,000 square foot minimum, however the Planning Commission had the ability to consider lot size averaging. If the lot sizes were averaged, and the average was over the 7,000 square feet the Planning Commission could approve it. The applicant was trying to make efficient use of the property and accounting for the curves and distances between the lots.

Applicant:

Pat Sisul, Sisul Engineering in Gladstone, was representing the applicant. This site was located south of a subdivision that was currently being developed by the same company. It was roughly the same size as that subdivision and he explained the street layout. There were two pedestrian access points already existing, and there was not a need for another in this new subdivision. The applicant was proposing 18 lots, which generally were over 8,000 or 9,000 square feet. Lot 6 was proposed to be 6,100 square feet because they were trying to create 50 foot wide building footprints for all the lots. The smaller lot would not be noticeable because all of the homes would be approximately the same width and it was in the middle of the development. The Code allowed the Planning Commission the flexibility to grant smaller lots if it met all the criteria listed in the Code, and it did meet the criteria. He discussed the shadow plat of the area. Regarding Pine Street, they proposed to rebuild the half street on the east side and rebuild a ten foot travel lane on the west side. There would be a new 30 foot wide roadway constructed in front of the subdivision. They did not have trouble getting County approval as the standards for County local streets matched the standards for the City's collector streets. Plum Court would be built to a 34 foot wide width with planter strips and six foot sidewalks on one side and curb tight sidewalks on the other side. The public improvements were totally in the right-of-way. Regarding 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, it would slope and tie in to Plum Court. He explained the storm drainage system, which would tie into the improvements that were already installed in the adjacent subdivision, a water line would be installed in Pine, and sanitary sewer would be connected through Pine. There would be a street tree plan.

Proponents: None

Opponents: None

Neutral: None  
Rebuttal: None

Chair Savory closed the public hearing at 7:39 pm.

Commissioner Hensley asked about the small lot and if the Commission had to do anything special to allow it. Mr. Brown clarified the Commission could note there was no problem with the small lot per the explanation provided by the applicant and the lot size averaging provision in the Code.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Hensley and seconded by Commissioner Boatright to approve Subdivision 15-02, acknowledging there was a smaller lot and it was allowed because of the use for this particular development. Motion passed 4/0.

- b. Consider a Site and Design Review for Western Storage, Phase III, development of a RV storage building with 4 offices, 300 S Redwood (DR 15-01)

Chair Savory opened the public hearing.

Mr. Brown entered the staff report into the record. This was a site and design review for Western Storage, Phase III development of an RV storage building with four offices. It would be a 20,160 square foot building. He explained the location of the site and where the building would be constructed. A detention facility was proposed on a separate adjacent lot that was common ownership. There was a unique condition of approval that they either combine lots or provide an easement for the facility to ensure the detention facility would not be removed in the future in favor of development or that they would forget that it had a purpose for being there. A trip generation letter was done so they would know how much additional traffic it would generate, and there were no concerns or issues. The zoning was CM, Commercial Manufacturing, and the property was part of the Canby Downtown Overlay District in the Outer Highway Commercial subarea. He questioned why this property had been included in the District as it could not be seen from the highway and it did not take access from the highway. The property was originally master planned with three phases, and two phases were already built prior to the adoption of the Overlay District design requirements. The applicant was asking for a waiver due to the inapplicability of the overlay requirements and because the requirements were difficult to meet. Setbacks did not make sense when they were on a private street and the public façade did not come into play. Regulations did not fit every situation and staff thought the Planning Commission could waive them as the applicant was proposing something that was equal value or better than the standards, and if it made no sense to apply they could make a finding that the regulations were inapplicable citing this was not really new development but implementation of a third phase of a previous Master Plan.

Pat Sisul, Sisul Engineering in Gladstone, was representing the applicant/owner Kim Ragain. He confirmed the applicant would rather have the storm water easement on the neighboring property. The property was 1.09 acres. It was in the Downtown Overlay Zone and the outer highway subareas were generally along Highway 99E. He read from the Development Code regarding the purpose of the Overlay Zone. Since this was the third building on the site located 280 feet from Redwood Street and hidden behind the other two buildings, it did not meet the purpose of the zone. He also read from the applicability section of the Overlay Zone, and pointed out this site did not have highway access or orientation as the building would not be visible from Highway 99E. He explained the two accesses, one off of Redwood and one off of Third. He described the various buildings surrounding the property and compared how this new storage facility would incorporate windows and more pleasant design features including landscaping to make it more visually appealing. The improvements would also include driveways and access all around the building. The offices would be on the four corners with large storage bays next to them. He discussed the floor plan, architectural elevations, landscape plan, utility plan, and storm water facility. The Overlay Zone required a ten foot minimum setback and a certain percentage of the building had to be placed along the public right-of-way. In this case, the public right-of-way portion of the property had already been developed and there needed to be access around the whole building. He did not think these requirements applied. The staff report mentioned that the building did not meet the floor area ratio requirements, but he thought that they did. He requested a waiver from the requirements of the Downtown Overlay.

Proponents: Darren Monen, Canby resident, encouraged the Planning Commission to waive the design standards for the Downtown Overlay because they were a costly expense.

Opponents: None

Neutral: None

Rebuttal: None

Chair Savory closed the public hearing at 8:19 pm.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Hensley and seconded by Commissioner Rocha to approve DR 15-01 as proposed, and to waive the design standards because they applied only to new development and this project was a Phase III development of a previous project that was approved in 2001. Motion passed 4/0.

## 6. FINAL DECISIONS

a. Franz Meadow (SUB 15-02)

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Hensley and seconded by Commissioner Boatright to approve the final findings for Franz Meadow (SUB 15-02) as written. Motion

passed 4/0.

b. Western Storage (DR 15-01)

Mr. Brown noted that staff would fill in the last words missing under procedural conditions, “in the public works design standards.”

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Hensley and seconded by Commissioner Boatright to approve the final findings for Western Storage (DR 15-01) as written. Motion passed 4/0.

Commissioner Rocha asked staff to provide a separate sheet for suggestions on motions.

**7. ITEMS OF INTEREST / REPORT FROM STAFF**

a. Next regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Monday, June 22, 2015

Mr. Brown said the Commission would be reviewing the Hope Village project at the next meeting. He reported that McDonald’s had submitted their building permit.

**8. ITEMS OF INTEREST/GUIDANCE FROM PLANNING COMMISSION – None**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** Commissioner Rocha moved for adjournment, Commissioner Boatright seconded. Motion passed 4/0. Meeting adjourned at 8:34 pm.

The undersigned certify the June 8, 2015 Planning Commission minutes were presented to and APPROVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Canby.

DATED this 30<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2015

  
Bryan Brown, Planning Director

  
Laney Fouse, Minutes Taker

Assisted with Preparation of Minutes – Susan Wood

