# MINUTES CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

7:00 PM – Monday, September 11, 2017 City Council Chambers – 222 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

**PRESENT:** Commissioners John Savory, Larry Boatright, Derrick Mottern, Shawn Varwig, Tyler

Hall, and Andrey Chernishov

**ABSENT:** Commissioner John Serlet

**STAFF:** Bryan Brown, Planning Director, and Laney Fouse, Recording Secretary

**OTHERS:** 

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

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

- 2. CITIZEN INPUT None
- 3. MINUTES None
- 4. **NEW BUSINESS** None

#### 5. PUBLIC HEARING:

a. Consider a request for a Minor Land Partition to partition two lots located at 2570 and 2590 N Maple Court into three parcels to create a flag lot between 2 single family dwellings (MLP 17-04 David Harris).

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. This was a request for a minor partition of two lots on N Maple Court into three parcels to create a flag lot. The two existing lots each had a home on them and were much larger than the surrounding lots in the subdivision. That allowed for the creation of a flag lot behind these homes. Flag lots generally did not cause a problem, but it was becoming a little more difficult to meet all of the ordinance and Public Works residential design standards. The setbacks had been met and there was a 12 foot arm that was required to be paved its full width to the street. The standards said there needed to be a ten foot separation between driveways at the right-of-way, however there would be a seven to eight foot separation from the existing property boundary and a three foot separation from the adjacent existing drive. They had done everything they could to put this driveway in the best position it could be in. The new lot would be subject to the residential infill standards. If a utility service agency requested a utility easement along the front of the property on the arm, the applicant would be required to dedicate the easement. All of the utilities were already in the street, and there should not be a need for an easement. There was a utility easement on the existing property line between the two lots and that would become the new building site for the new lot. The applicant would have to vacate the utility easement on the plat. Staff recommended approval of the application.

## Public Testimony:

Applicant: Pat Sisul, Sisul Engineering, was representing the applicant. The applicant had lived at the home on 2570 N Maple Court for many years. He had always viewed the deep corner as a location for another home and when the opportunity came to buy the neighboring property, he purchased it. He had owned the neighboring property for a little over a year. The two properties combined had nearly 33,000 square feet. The R-1 zone allowed for lot sizes of 7,000 to 10,000 square feet. Even with a third parcel, the properties would average more than the maximum permitted in the R-1 zone. It was a good spot to add one new home with little impact. There were no utilities in the easement between the property lines and it should not be a problem to vacate that easement. Regarding the driveways, the separation was usually for curb tight sidewalks and ADA access, but there were no sidewalks in the neighborhood. The applicant would like to maintain a parking space between the driveway and the approach. Fully meeting the design standard eliminated the space by a couple of feet.

# **Proponents and Opponents:** None

Chair Savory closed the public hearing.

*Motion:* A motion was made by Commissioner Varwig and seconded by Commissioner Mottern to approve MLP 17-04 David Harris with conditions. The motion passed 6/0.

#### 6. FINAL DECISIONS

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

a. MLP 17-04 David Harris

*Motion:* A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Varwig to approve the final decisions for MLP 17-04 David Harris. The motion passed 6/0.

# 7. ITEMS OF INTEREST/REPORT FROM STAFF

- a. Parking spaces Mr. Brown asked the Commission to continue thinking about when it was appropriate for developers to delay putting in parking spaces. They could think about certain circumstances, such as warehouse uses, where there could be different parking standards than what was used for manufacturing uses. It could be a future text amendment.
- b. Next Planning Commission Meeting September 25, 2017 Mr. Brown said there would be two minor land partitions and a proposed subdivision on N Maple on this agenda.

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

### 9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:29 pm.