

**MINUTES**  
**CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
7:00 PM – June 30, 2015  
City Council Chambers – 155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

---

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Shawn Hensley, John Savory, John Serlet, Larry Boatright, Kristene Rocha, and Tyler Smith

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

**OTHERS:** Robert Price, Nancy Beejee, John Williamson, and Clint Coleman, Councilor and Planning Commission Liaison

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None**

**3. MINUTES – June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes**

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Hensley and seconded by Commissioner Rocha to approve the June 8, 2015 minutes as written. Motion passed 4/0/1 with Commissioner Smith abstaining.

**4. NEW BUSINESS - None**

**5. PUBLIC HEARING**

- a. *Consider a Planned Unit Development, Conditional Use Permit, and Site & Design Review applications to develop six residential duplex structures clustered around a private cul-de-sac for Hope Village (PUD 15-01, CUP 15-02, DR 15-02).*

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

Bryan Brown, Planning Director, entered his staff report into the record for Hope Village (PUD 15-01, CUP 15-02, DR 15-02). This was a planned unit development that involved six duplex buildings on a single property. Associated with a planned unit development was an automatic conditional use permit. There was also a design review for the buildings, similar to a multi-family project. He explained the location of the site on S Fir Street. The applicant was proposing six duplex buildings, each unit to have two dwelling units with variety of living spaces. They were also proposing a private road, which changed the right-of-way requirements and applicable setbacks. However, they were proposing adequate setbacks to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and it fit in well with the Hope Village development across the street. The landscape plans showed street trees which Hope Village would plant and maintain themselves. There would be seven parking spaces including a handicap space and there would be a common mailbox. Hope Village would be responsible for maintaining the entire property, open space, condition of the street, and guaranteeing the street trees would stay alive for two years. The utility plan showed a public easement for water and sewer lines. The traffic study recommended that Hope Village improve one half of the frontage of the public street along S Fir Street. The improvements would match the existing street. The study also suggested putting in an ADA ramp for an informal pedestrian crossing so residents could cross the street to the Hope Village campus. There was not an

ADA ramp on the other side and construction might need to happen on both sides of the street. Staff recommended an outdoor bicycle rack near the visitor parking. Hope Village was using the multi-family design review matrix and they gave themselves a point for the buildings being 80 feet or less in size. Staff measured them and they were 90 feet, so they were not able to meet the point total for the design review matrix. Staff did not think it was a design negative to be 90 feet and suggested the Planning Commission consider that provision to not be applicable. He reviewed the conditions of approval. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Applicant:

Nancy Beejee, Chair of the Hope Village Board, (copy of her written report?) gave a background on Hope Village, which was a non-profit retirement community that was started in 1997. There were now 226 independent living homes, 80 assisted living apartments, and 50 rooms for skilled nursing. They had 100 staff members and served over 400 people. They were good neighbors and there was a strong market for their services as baby boomers approached retirement age. They would like to expand their service as there was a backlog of customers ready to move into these garden homes. This site was ideal to accommodate them. There was room for 12 ground level cottages in walking distance to the community center and activity buildings.

Bob Price, consultant, said there was a need at Hope Village to provide additional living facilities. At the neighborhood meeting only two individuals came, and they wanted to move into the new facility. This was a part of Hope Village's growth expansion and development and would be a credit to Hope Village, the neighborhood, and the City. The conditions were acceptable. They had an irrigation well and wanted to continue to use it. They were working with DEQ on the issue. The 20 foot wide street was fine with the Canby Fire Department as long as there was no parking on either side. The street curbs would be painted no parking. There would be seven parking spaces for the site and there would be 43 on site parking spaces across the street. They would also install bike racks and have 16 parking spaces for bikes. They wanted to keep the street private so as not to lose duplex space on the site. They had designed the project that would meet all of the needs of Hope Village, be an asset to the City and neighborhood, and would look the same as the development on SW 14<sup>th</sup> Court.

John Williamson, LRS Architects, explained the design was to connect this development with the existing campus. There would be ADA ramps on both sides of the street. They wanted a private road to give all the units a garage and parking in front of the units. The fire trucks had enough space to get in and out. The units would be about 1600 square feet, single story, and would have a neighborhood feel. Hope Village would take care of the grounds. Regarding the 80 foot length, they had to conform to the multi-family design standards and he thought the intent was to prevent monotonous and incompatible design. They did not want big blocky buildings and the way the duplexes were designed left plenty of space between the units for an open and neighborhood feel. They had broken up the exterior and elevations and they were not monotonous in design.

Commissioner Serlet asked about a fire hydrant on the property. Mr. Williamson said they would be providing a fire hydrant.

Opponents: None

Neutral: None

There was no rebuttal.

Chair Savory closed the public hearing at 7:46 pm.

Commissioner Deliberation:

Commissioner Smith thought a finding should be included that stated the multi-family criteria of 90 feet did not apply due to the architectural distinction between this application and an apartment or townhome building.

Commissioner Hensley did not like the bike rack requirement on a private road.

Commissioner Rocha did not think they should force anyone to have a bike rack requirement on a private road.

Commissioner Smith said in order to get Comprehensive Plans approved through DLCD, they had to provide alternative transportation options.

Mr. Price said it did not need to be a condition. Hope Village would make the commitment to do it.

Commissioner Smith said if they made the interpretation that bike rack requirements did not apply to private residential property that would make sense. The Conditional Use only applied to this application, and it would not carry over to other applications.

Commissioner Hensley questioned requiring the sidewalks and planter strip on Fir Street as the other nearby streets were curb tight sidewalks.

Mr. Brown explained they had adopted a new Transportation System Plan and the design standard was separating the sidewalk from the street with planter strips.

MOTION:

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the three applications as recommended by staff with the amendment that Condition 8 on bike racks is not necessary or required in order for the Conditional Use to be approved in this circumstance, and that because of the unique design and architectural characteristics of the single story buildings in this application that the 80' width requirement does not apply for this duplex development. Commissioner Hensley seconded the motion. Motion passed 6/0.

## 6. FINAL DECISIONS

*(Note: These are final, written versions of previous oral decisions. No public testimony.)*

### a. Hope Village (PUD 15-01, CUP 15-02, DR 15-02)

Mr. Brown said the findings could be amended to include what was said in the motion. Condition 8 would be removed and the 90 foot standard was not applicable due to the architectural style of this development versus apartments.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Rocha to approve the Final Findings for Hope Village (PUD 15-01, CUP 15-02, DR 15-02) as amended. Motion passed 6/0.

**Motion:** Commissioner Smith moved to authorize Chair Savory to sign the Final Findings with the deletion of Condition 8 and addition of the other interpretation on the 80' width for multi-family homes

## 7. ITEMS OF INTEREST/REPORT FROM STAFF

a. *Next Planning Commission Meeting July 13, 2015*

Mr. Brown said the July 13 meeting would most likely be canceled. There was a meeting tentatively scheduled for July 27.

**8. ITEMS OF INTEREST/GUIDANCE FROM PLANNING COMMISSION**

Commissioner Smith said he would stay on the Planning Commission until someone else could fill his position.

Mr. Brown said staff was trying to schedule the pre-construction meeting with Fred Meyer for the new fuel station. They hoped to break ground by September 1.


**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Rocha and seconded by Commissioner Hensley to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed 6/0. The meeting was adjourned at 8: 05 pm.

The undersigned certify the June 30, 2015 Planning Commission minutes were presented to and APPROVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Canby.

DATED this 24th day of August, 2015

  
Bryan Brown, Planning Director

  
Laney Fouse, Minutes Taker

Assisted with Preparation of Minutes – Susan Wood