

MINUTES
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION
7:00 PM – September 28, 2015
City Council Chambers – 155 NW 2nd Avenue

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

ABSENT: Tyler Smith

STAFF: Bryan Brown, Planning Director, and Matilda Deas, Senior Planner

OTHERS: Ethan Manuel, Allen Manuel, Jim Boyle, Sharon Weaver, and Marty Moretty

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. CITIZEN INPUT – None

3. MINUTES

a. August 24, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Hensley and seconded by Commissioner Serlet to approve the August 24, 2015 minutes as written. Motion passed 5/0.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

a. Consider a legislative and quasi-judicial amendment application to adopt The North Redwood Development Concept Plan (NRDCP), update the Comprehensive Plan text, and modifications to multiple sections of the Land Development and Planning Ordinance in order to implement the NRDCP (**CPA 15-02/TA 15-01**).

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.

Commissioner Serlet visited the site and attended some of the public hearings on the matter.

Commissioners Hensley and Rocha also attended some of the public hearings.

Matilda Deas, Senior Planner, entered the staff report into the record. She clarified this was not an annexation or development, but would help the property owners develop a concept plan that was required by City Code prior to an annexation request. There had been a lot of attempts in the past to come up with a concept plan for this area. Because it was a large area

with numerous property owners and challenges with natural resources and abutting a collector street, it had been difficult for City staff and property owners to put it together. The City was able to get some grant funding in order to hire experts in the field to bring it forward. The property was 66 acres split in low, medium, and high density residential. No zone changes were being proposed. She discussed how it would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan regarding protecting the natural resources of Willow Creek and wetlands. This would become a park area in the future. The purpose of the plan was to provide the efficient and effective public facilities and infrastructure for new development. There had been a lot of public involvement in the project with a stakeholder advisory committee, technical advisory committee, several public meetings, and one on one interviews with property owners. Staff thought this plan was consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan. She then explained the Text Amendment criteria and how the application met the criteria. The proposed Code amendments implemented the draft plan. There were new provisions in the Comprehensive Plan to address infrastructure for newly annexed areas. For the text amendment, a North Redwood Plan District was created and another section was created as a placeholder for future plan districts. Some changes were made to the low density and medium density development standards. One change was that public park land being dedicated could be included in the lot size averaging calculation. Some of the properties had a lot of park and creek land on them and some had nothing. This would allow the lots that could not be fully developed to increase the number of houses on the remaining area to recoup the investment in their property but still provide the park and wetlands protection. They would be allowed smaller lot sizes, but no smaller than 5,000 square feet for low density residential and 4,000 square feet for medium density residential. There was also a provision if in the future there was a request to change the zoning that it had to be compatible.

Ken Pirie, Walker Macy, introduced Matt Hastie of Angelo Planning Group and Andy Parks of Leland Consulting. He summarized the project including the process so far, description of the study area, and criteria used in developing the concept plan. He then discussed the environmental areas, zoning, recommended concept, access points for the properties, pedestrian connections, housing choices, conceptual lot layout, streets, and parks.

There was discussion regarding maintenance of the park area.

Mr. Pirie continued to discuss water, sewer, and stormwater services and how the concept plan met the criteria.

Mr. Hastie discussed infrastructure and how it would be paid for. Other than parks, all of the infrastructure would be local and the responsibility of the developer. The parks would be paid

for through a combination of SDCs and land dedications. There would also be a density bonus for unbuildable land contributed as parks. The developers or property owners would pay for the local roads, sanitary sewer, and water improvements at the time of development. He then discussed the flexible elements in the plan if the essential elements were met.

There was discussion regarding the use of SDCs.

Mr. Parks explained how the Concept Plan would be implemented. The goal was to be consistent with future zoning and development standards. Any change to the zoning would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment. There were a number of essential plan elements that would become development approval criteria within this plan district and he reviewed the plan elements. He discussed the Development Code amendments which allowed for a transfer of density between constrained and unconstrained areas of a given property.

There was discussion regarding access and to and parking for the park.

Proponents: Ethan Manuel, Canby resident, was in support of the concept plan. It was an important step for the City to take. There had been a number of attempts, and all had failed in the past. It was a requirement for annexation of this area. He suggested the street on the east side from Teakwood should be put in by the City and the property owners reimburse the City as it developed or that the City take a leadership role to help make it happen. If not, the properties would have to develop one after the other and it could take a long time to get to the end of the street. This was a good plan that provided a flexible infrastructure while meeting the needs of the community.

Allen Manuel, Canby resident, was in support of the plan. The plan needed to move forward. He had been working on annexing into the City for 15 years, but he would not be able to annex until this plan was passed. In fairness to the property owners in this area, it was incumbent to pass a plan as the property had been setting there for a long time unused.

Opponents: None

Neutral: Sharon Weaver, Canby resident, said her property bordered this area and she was concerned about the traffic through Willow Creek Estates and what would happen to Willow Creek. Not all of the property owners wanted to develop, and she was unclear how that would work with infrastructure going through and if they would have to pay for part of the roads as well. She wanted to know if the park plan had to be done before anyone could develop. Would

the developers pick which lots would be 5,000 square feet in size, and would there be no change in taxes for the properties?

Rebuttal: Mr. Hastie said the properties would be reassessed at the time of development and there would be an increase in property taxes. Regarding local road funding, the developers would pay it. Whether or not there would be reimbursement agreements, it would be done at the request of the developers. The roads could be built piecemeal or at one time. It depended on what the City required and what the property owners worked out.

Ms. Deas stated the park master plan did not have to be done before development occurred. After the land was dedicated, the City would then determine the design.

Mr. Parks said there was nothing in the Code that required the 5,000 square foot lots be next to the park. It would be the developer's choice for the lot layout and they had to show how it was consistent with the plan.

Chair Savory closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Serlet thought there was a potential traffic problem at the north end of Redwood and thought a light or flashing yellow should be installed. Ms. Deas said the traffic was analyzed and it did not merit anything there.

In answer to several questions from Commissioner Serlet, Mr. Pirie said there could be 213 to 289 units on the property with potential of 500 to 600 people at full build out. Mr. Parks thought the development would provide more parks and trails for current Canby residents. Mr. Pirie said there would also be more housing choices provided to residents. Ms. Deas explained how the wetlands area was being worked on through grants and school projects. Mr. Pirie said there was a range of options for stormwater treatment and use of pervious pavement was up to the developer.

Commissioner Hensley was concerned about the shrinking of the lot sizes. Mr. Parks said it depended on how much park land was being dedicated, and not every lot on that property would be able to go down to that size. Ms. Deas said six of the 23 parcels would have the ability to reduce lot sizes.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Hensley and seconded by Commissioner Rocha to approve CPA 15-02/TA 15-01 and to adopt the North Redwood Development Concept Plan. Motion passed 4/1 with Commissioner Serlet opposed.

5. NEW BUSINESS – None

6. FINAL DECISIONS

- a. North Redwood Development Concept Plan Findings as Recommended (**CPA 15-02/TA 15-01**)

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Rocha and seconded by Commissioner Hensley to approve the final findings for CPA 15-02/TA 15-01 as written. Motion passed 5/0.

7. ITEMS OF INTEREST / REPORT FROM STAFF

- a. Next regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Monday, October 12, 2015

Mr. Brown said it was possible the meeting on October 12 would be canceled.

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

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Hensley moved for adjournment, Commissioner Serlet seconded. Motion passed 5/0. Meeting adjourned at 8:51 pm.

The undersigned certify the September 28, 2015 Planning Commission minutes were presented to and APPROVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Canby.

DATED this 11th day of November, 2015

Bryan Brown, Planning Director

Laney Fouse, Meeting Recorder

Assisted with Preparation of Minutes – Susan Wood