

MINUTES  
JOINT TROUTDALE CITY COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
TROUTDALE CITY HALL  
104 SE KIBLING AVENUE  
TROUTDALE, OR 97060-2099

---

7:00 P.M. ~ JULY 9, 1991

**ITEM 1.      CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL**

Mayor Cox called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

City Recorder, Valerie Raglione called the roll.

**PRESENT:**   Bui, Cox, Fowler, Schmunk, Thalhofer, Wakeman  
                  Postlewait [left 7:05 p.m.] Wolsborn, Ripma, Polly, Ragan

**STAFF:**     Christian, Cline, Collier, Gazewood, Raglione, Wilder

**PRESS:**     Dave Pinson, Gresham Outlook  
                  Steven Amick, The Oregonian

**GUESTS:**   Kris DeSylvia, Tom Dennehy, Tom Holmes, John Hall, John Spencer, Charles  
                  Kupper, Karen Burger-Kimber

**ITEM 2.      DISCUSSION/DIRECTION: Request for Direction on How to Proceed with  
Draft Response to DLCD Concerning City of Troutdale Periodic Review As  
Related to County Farm.**

John Spencer and Charles Kupper gave an overview of materials presented.

Spencer stated that the state land board was not requiring the City to remove the proposed designation, but required a response from the City that justified the designation. Defending the designation could be expensive and time-consuming.

Spencer stated the facts as: 1) DLCD staff position was 'opposed' to rezoning for potential use of a regional shopping center. [Conjecture] Nothing had been proposed for a regional mall. 2) Violation of goals. There was no violation since it had not been acknowledged by DLCD yet. This created a situation and raised questions. 3) Involvement of Light Rail and progress of Break Even Gresham-Winmar Shopping Center. A regional transportation plan was supported along the light rail line.

Spencer stated that it was his opinion a series of actions during the past 8 years regarding the opposition of a shopping center in Gresham. 1) Legal opposition from Tri Met, 100 Friends to continue zoning as currently is and the dollar costs there would be to maintain it; 2) City Council activated as an Urban Renewal Agency develop Urban Renewal Plan for downtown Troutdale was part of a way to attract shops to the site being linked together when the decision was made as to what to do with County Farm.

Spencer stated that Multnomah County was trying to market the property to the highest and best value for the County Farm property and sell it as soon as possible. The economics to market study indicated that the market would now support Industrial, Residential, and Commercial.

General discussion between the Planning Commission members and City Council members ensued.

Councilor Schmunk stated that there needed to be more discussion about an analysis regarding what the market would bear. Was the County doing a market analysis? If so, it didn't make sense for the City to do one. She felt it should be left in the study area and let the County do as they pleased. there was too much emphasis on regional transportation. The only reason it was an issue was because of the mall in Gresham. Sewer and water hadn't been mentioned.

Wolsborn stated that there were serious transportation problems. He didn't feel it was a good site for a mall.

Councilor Fowler asked Spencer if the County Farm property was suitable for a regional shopping center?

Spencer stated there were serious problems with it. He stated that the City should take a conciliatory position on a shopping center, step back and look at what the best use of the property could be. He stated there were a lot of other uses besides a regional shopping center that would be much better uses. We need to get off the idea of a shopping center and it needs to be done with as much public input as possible.

Christian stated that John Hall was in the audience and had done a Marketing Study on Troutdale which also looked at land use issues as well as marketing opportunities.

John Hall spoke to the issue stating that Councilor Fowler hit on the point of whether or not it was feasible to consider a regional shopping center on the County Farm site. It was also mentioned about the continued reference to Project Break Even. [1] Through a series of actions and decisions that have taken place somehow that has been decided as a regional mall site. Winmar has owned the site for approximately 20 years and there is an \$8 million dollar subsidy to attempt single development on that site which didn't speak well of the market potential. Additionally, the reason the site has limited market potential was the constrained market area. The urban growth boundary to the east and the river to the north. County Farm property suffers from the same problem in addition to all of the transportation issues. With respect to development of the upper portion and lower portion of the site on the map, one of the problems was the Comprehensive Planning process asked to anticipate what the market will do and that was difficult, at best, if not impossible. It was a completely legitimate question for the County to ask, as a property owner, 'tell me what I should be marketing the site as

today. Because I don't have a great deal of confidence that I can predict precisely how the market will decide the best use of the property in the future'.

Hall stated the property was within the jurisdiction of the City. Some control needs to be maintained based on goals and objectives over how the property will be developed.

Councilor Fowler stated that 5-7% of the customers would come from South of the County line regarding the Clackamas County line.

Hall stated that the rule of thumb for a regional center is the primary market area extends about twenty minutes. Within twenty minutes you can get to other regional shopping centers in this area. That would make the ability to develop the Winmar site where this site is a little more problematic.

Hall stated that in terms of usage on the upper portion or lower portion of map, as Cline stated in terms of running a major transportation system through there it probably makes sense to have some commercial and some residential but he didn't know how much other than the commercial portion would be considerably smaller than a regional center.

Mayor Cox stated he would like to see the RMU remain but reduce the size. He asked for comments.

Wolsborn stated he would like to see the RMU remain and probably the southern General Commercial returned to an R-7. He would like to RMU to include the McMinneman property. There had been a study on the McGill Nursery property developed as some type of community planned development. That was how he saw the City using the RMU to tie the whole property together. The property south of Halsey and North of Cherry Park. He thought reducing the RMU destroyed its real affect. If that was going to be done, he thought it best to go back to the previous plan map designation. He was concerned that whatever alternate was followed [alternate 2 appeared to be the Planning Commission and City Council desire] - should continue as soon as possible with as much public input as possible. More studies were not necessary. Studies already made can be reviewed for major changes that have been made.

Councilor Schmunk was under the impression that Edgefield Children's Center was in the process of buying that piece...Christian stated there was an option on another piece also. Councilor Schmunk stated it was important to remember that use would be there.

Wolsborn was frustrated with the fact that it had been stated the property wasn't being sold until these issues were settled, however, there was property being sold and people 'picking at the pie'. McMinneman's had purchased additional property, as well as the Children's Center. He wanted to see the issue settled as expeditiously as possible.

Christian stated that after staff had talked with the County representatives, the opinion was that the County's charge was to sell it. They were willing to cut the property up to meet demands. She stated it was important to address, with Commissioners and Councilors direction, some options for CAC, public input review. Not for the purposes of studying it to death but to come to a decision before there isn't anything left but a mash of development on the property that doesn't fit anyone's vision or concept.

Councilor Fowler asked if it was possible to drive a vehicle in a straight line up the hill, other than a jeep.

Cline stated there were slopes in excess of 30%.

Councilor Fowler stated there were actually two pieces of property divided by the green line? A road couldn't be constructed without it winding all around to accommodate driving a vehicle.

Cline stated that tying it together, without cutting the property all together -- hold it together as one development could be a mandatory part of development. There are two pieces that something could be done to, with a parkway in the middle. How can they be developed to tie the tie together. The RMU would mandate that some type of connection be maintained to preserve the integrity. If it is stated that this is such a severe condition that it can't be overcome and we don't want it as one RMU then these are the decisions we need to make.

Christian stated that the 30% constraint is based on development code, not on an engineering restriction making it impossible to construct.

Cline stated that by having the RMU it means they have to be tied together in some way. They would have to acknowledge and play off of one another as opposed to several pieces being mixed together.

Councilor Schmunk stated that was one reason why the one piece of open space was left, however, it wasn't necessarily ground in stone.

Councilor Thalhofer stated that the CAC should meet, have a public hearing with the Planning Commission and City Council -- a Type 4 hearing process and put this 'baby to bed'.

Mayor Cox stated that shedding the mall issue would solve some of the problems with the County Farm. He liked the idea of some commercial along where the parkway would be.

Cline, for clarification, stated the direction received, aside from the input specifically on the land use, was that the process be to go back develop some alternatives and ideas - go to the CAC [for however many meetings necessary] with a recommendation from CAC to the Planning Commission for public hearings and input; then from the Planning Commission forward a recommendation for action to the City Council -- a Type 4 process.

Councilor Thalhofer wanted a spirit of cooperation should be shown by working with the County as much as possible. We want to get the property on the tax rolls.

Councilor Bui stated that he understood that the RMU would remain and increase it to cover McMinneman's....

Christian stated that the CAC devises a report which is sent to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission can accept that report; amend it; change it; add to or delete from it. The same

process is taken then from the Planning Commission report to the City Council. The public input at all levels can be included.

Councilor Schmunk stated it had been a pleasure to work with the Planning Commission and she thought it should be done more often.

**ITEM 3.      ADJOURNMENT.**

Mayor Cox adjourned the Joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting at 8:55 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sam K. Cox, Mayor

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Valerie J. Raglione, CMC

City Recorder

F:\AGENDA\7991PCCC.AGE