

A G E N D A

CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

WORKSHOP MEETING City Council Chambers

Wednesday, April 8, 1992
7:30 p.m.

OBJECTIVES

- Outline Agenda for next year
 - Agree on how to accomplish it
 - Other . . .
1. Discussion by Conference Attendees regarding what was learned
 - a. Kurt Schrader notes
 - b. J. Wheeler notes
 - c. Others
 2. Excerpt from Growth Management Study - 5 minutes maximum
 3. Work Program

Commission notes from March 9, 1992
Robert G. Hoffman Memo of April 7, 1992
Other
 4. Process for Scheduling Regular Commission Consideration of "General Planning" Matters

Alternatives:
 - a. "Protected Time" - every second meeting
 - b. Special Scheduled Workshop - every 3rd or 4th meeting
 - c. First item each meeting - 1/2 hour
 - d. Last item each meeting - 10:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m.
 5. Other

- M E M O -

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Robert G. Hoffman, Planning Director
RE: Work Program Discussion Items
DATE: April 7, 1992

RGH

A. Major Staff Commitments (1992-1993) (4.5 persons)

1. Staff Historic Preservation Task Force (\$10,000 grant)
 - a. Revise Historic Ordinance
 - b. Designate additional structures
 - c. Revise list of significant structures on inventory
 - d. Prepare National Register nominations where owners desire (4 max.)
2. Acquire GIS Capability (\$25,000)
3. Update Trafficways Plan (\$35,000)
 - a. Prepare Trafficways SDC Ordinance
 - b. Prepare methodology
4. Provide Current Planning for Applications (40%)
5. Provide Building Code Enforcement (33%)
6. Provide Administrative Services (10%)

7. Initiate Socio-Economic Plan (Block Grant \$30,000)
8. Update Design Review Ordinance
9. Inventory Natural Resources
10. Map Resources and Publicize
11. Respond to State Requirements
 - a. Urban Reserve Rule - new
 - b. Transportation Rule - new
 - c. Periodic Review Rule - new
 - d. Lower Cost housing - new (not yet adopted by State)
12. Participate in "Community Feedback" Project and "Visioning" Project

B. Possible Work Projects - Advanced Planning (.75 person)
(suggested by staff and not including Commission list)

1. Continue Annexation of Logging Road - south of 99E
2. After survey, increase application fees to better approximate costs (in some cases, the fees do not cover postage costs)
3. Aid in Promoting Economic Development
 - a. Roadway improvements
 - Berg Parkway to Baker connection
 - Pine/Redwood - 99E to Township/13th
 - b. Development Site Promotional Packages
 - c. Support Chamber's efforts to remove barriers
 - d. Support County/State Access Improvements to I-5/Aurora Airport and to Mulino Airport
 - e. Encourage computer-oriented home occupations and small businesses

4. Amend Development Ordinance
 - a. Allow residential as a mix within commercial zones (may need Comprehensive Plan definition changes)
 - b. Allow special adaptive reuses of historic structures, particularly in downtown district.
 - c. Redefine PUD regarding minimum size, requirements for common open space and recreation, and partition vs. subdivision
 - d. Consider revising home occupation section to clarify degree of allowed impact, including "nameplate"
 - e. Improve definition of "yards"
 - f. Allow accessory use on separate parcel
 - g. Revise "temporary trailer" requirements regarding "7 consecutive days within a 60-day period," etc.
 - h. Variances - drop language re "deliberate violation of these or other regulations"
 - i. Subdivisions - revise to prevent construction prior to final plat, strengthen language regarding "adequate" service facilities
 - j. Formulation of "cross section" standards for roads
 - k. Signs - revise to strengthen and publicize
 - l. Make "similar use" language consistent in all zones
 - m. Design Review - **staff** function? allowed by State law
 - develop clearer approval criteria for architecture, access, parking, landscaping
 - n. Staff Approvals - increase areas where staff decision with rights to appeal to Commission.
 - o. Explore better "complaint" system
 - p. Strengthen enforcement regulations and procedures.
 - q. Revise zoning to be more consistent with Comprehensive Plan Maps

5. Amend Comprehensive Plan

- a. Review policy that 15% of city proposed for industrial development - not much since 1984. Any alternatives for tax base and employment? Plan proposes 10,000 labor force - 1/2 reside outside City.
- b. Review consequences of almost all growth being residential - taxes paid vs. service costs.
- c. Decide on strategy regarding "urban reserves"
- d. Review Canby attitude toward METRO
- e. Review use of potentials for river frontage, including access
- f. Review Urban Growth Boundary, especially along rivers and IFA properties
- g. Strengthen Historic Preservation policies, especially regarding neighborhoods
- h. Prepare Joint Use Policy regarding schools and recreation
- i. Get adopted revised Park Plan policies, in Comprehensive Plan
- j. Review lack of proposed collector streets in UGB areas outside City limits.
- k. Update population forecasts and look at consequences
 - increased senior citizen population, increasing Hispanic population (large number of children per household)
 - increased households without children
 - review relationships with Clackamas County
 - relate density proposals to population characteristics - more apartments needed?
- l. Remove remaining small area of light industry northeast of Redwood?
- m. Strengthen/clarify definitions of "adequate" or "overburden" regarding public facilities and services
- n. Policies regarding need to preserve trees and provide street trees
- o. Review stormwater polices in light of likelihood of new/stronger State groundwater protection
- p. Review "positive aspects" of City and formulate protection plan/policies

- q. Explore potentials for exploiting "views"
- r. Explore how to make downtown more visible
- s. Continue to develop "trails" concepts
- t. Explore greater role/relationships for Fairgrounds
- u. Clarify problems vs. advantages of annexation and whether there are any limits
- v. Explore major land ownership patterns and develop ideas for City benefits
- City/County/State/Private/Institutional
- w. Role of "Barlow Flats" in Canby's future?

WORKSHOP - ORDINANCE/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

(Planning Commission March 9, 1992)

Concerns discussed (possibly requiring amendments to Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code):

1. Whether duplexes should be allowed in R-1 (single family resident) zoned areas.
2. Including a description of the duties and responsibilities of the Planning Director and staff, within the Development Code.
3. Reviewing Home Occupation Regulations, including signage.
4. Tightening up regulations regarding the Hazard Overlay Zone.
5. Improving the Historic regulations.
6. Reviewing and improving the Tree Ordinance with regard to private lands.
7. Gaining greater guidance regarding sidewalk regulations for land developments.
8. Reconsidering permitted or required conditions on land development resulting from Measure #5.
9. Reviewing enforcement procedures and authority related to conditions of approval. Possibly reviewing what other cities do to enforce them.
10. Considering expanding Design Review requirements (i.e. 30% landscaped areas vs. 15% now; tree retention and planting, etc.)
11. Improving language regarding need for "adequate" public facilities for land division, especially in subdivisions.
12. Reviewing requirements to provide parks as part of subdivisions.
13. Recodifying Development Ordinance to include all additions and modifications.
14. Revising PUD regulations to limit minimum size and exclude major and minor partitions and require "common" areas.
15. Strengthen City/DEQ relations.

16. Having more 'experts' available to the City, such as Wetlands Experts, Landscape Architect, Arborist, etc.
17. Investigating experts who might be available through OSHA for consultations (noise, etc.).
18. Reviewing Comprehensive Plan with relation to amount of industrial lands and apartment needs vs. manufactured housing.
19. Scheduling regular status reports from public service providers, with regard to adequacy.

The Commission will also consider the following details which were submitted by Commissioner Fenske:

20. Re Section 2.28.010
 - a. Adding all new "blurbs" that Commission is required to read at each public hearing (to part B).
 - b. Part F regulates the close of the hearing. So there should be a prior step somewhere, to open the hearing. Something like a new Part A - "The hearing shall be formally opened by the presiding officer and the official hearing title and number shall be read aloud." Then the existing part A, which would become Part B.
 - c. A section should be added that describes how physical evidence brought to the hearing is submitted as evidence.
21. Re Section 2.40.110 - As this section seems to be very important, a more comprehensive listing of priorities for service would be in order. Something to the effect of: . . . priority for available service shall be given to developments according to the following:
 1. Existing developments within the City limits having the legal responsibility to connect to existing City service facilities.
 2. Existing developments within the City limits having the financial capability to connect to existing City service facilities and making application to do so.
 5. Proposed developments that will be annexed prior to development, but not requiring zone changes or conditional use permits.

6. Proposed developments that will be annexed prior to development and will require zone changes or conditional use permits.
7. Existing developments outside of the City limits, but within the urban growth boundary.
8. Proposed developments outside of the City limits, but within the urban growth boundary.
9. Existing developments outside of the urban growth boundary.
10. Proposed developments outside of the urban growth boundary.
22. Re Section 4.04.020 - It would be nice if there was a listing of those conditions or circumstances under which the Council should consider initiating public improvements, and a priority list which would be periodically updated by the City engineer to keep the Council advised of where public improvements are needed.
23. Re Section 4.08.030 - Part C should be updated to reflect more current economic conditions for senior citizens.
24. Re Chapter 4.12 - Planning Commissioners should become more aware of "advance financing" and how it could be used as a tool in writing conditions. Possibly a workshop held with the City Manager and City Attorney to help guide Commission in how it might be used. After guidelines are developed, a mechanism could be enacted to allow the Commission to write conditions requiring developers to enter into "advance financing agreements" with the City.
25. Re Chapter 12.04 - The responsibility for naming thoroughfares in accordance with this section should be changed to a ministerial function of the Planning Director. When necessary for a Council resolution to designate thoroughfare names, the Planning Director could deal directly with Council and skip the Planning Commission role.
26. 13.12.010 - As soon as the plant capacity upgrade is complete, more attention should be paid to the requirements of this section for all buildings to connect to the public sewers.
27. Is 13.12.150C consistent with the Tree Ordinance?
28. 15.12.070 makes the Planning Commission the board of appeals for Flood Hazard Protection.

29. 15.12.020 - The definition for floodplain needs to be added, and the relation between base flood and floodplain needs to be explained, to be consistent with current guidelines. The text in the chapter needs to be changed to reflect current guidelines too. All the definitions need to be checked to ensure they are consistent with current COE and DSL requirements.
30. 15.12.060 - Part 2 under this section requires that the Building Official review all development permits to determine that all necessary permits have been obtained from other agencies. We have learned that many of these other permits cannot be obtained until Canby has issued a permit. We need to decide if we will allow obtaining permits concurrently and, if we will, then get the method for doing so into the ordinance.
31. 15.12.090 - This section references a guidebook which we concluded is outdated. It also permits other methods which are not defined. There should be specific documents referenced in this section along with provisions that the most recent edition of these documents be in effect.
32. 15.12.100 - Useless as written. If the section is to be kept, it needs to have specific materials and methods listed which are approved, or specific materials and methods that are not permitted.
33. 15.12.130 - This section is probably not necessary since all of the flood hazard areas are covered on the flood maps.
34. Chapter 16

The position of Planning Director and the concept of planning staff should be added. Both the director and staff need to have the appropriate definitions, duties, powers, etc., added. It must be decided which functions will be ministerial and which will be done at the Commission level. Duties of the Director should include, but not be limited to:

- a. Ministerial duties as listed in the Code.
- b. Day-to-day liaison with the development community to answer questions concerning ordinances, permits, hearings, etc.
- c. Maintain current knowledge of state, federal and county laws, rules, regulations, programs, etc., and how they impact the City.
- d. Review applications and prepare or oversee the preparation of staff reports; where applications are incomplete or improper, make a recommendation to the Commission for disposition.

- e. Identify those portions of the ordinances which need changing because of the confusion, lack of specificity, new rules and regulations, oversights, bad codification, etc., and prepare recommended changes for presentation to the Commission and, subsequently to the Council.
 - f. Schedule and coordinate C.P. updates at the frequency required by law or at an interval which best serves the interests of the City.
 - g. Ensure that conditions attached to Findings, Conclusions and Order's are followed and initiate corrective actions where they are not; prepare and present to the Council or the Commission, recommendations for action in cases where conditions are not being followed after corrective actions on the Director's part have failed.
 - h. Act as the liaison between the Council and the Commission to keep each other advised as to the others' actions, intents, schedules, etc.
 - i. Act as the liaison between the Council and the various City departments (particularly Public Works) to keep each other advised as to the others' actions, intents, schedules, etc.
 - j. Coordinate and schedule workshops with Council and/or various City departments when issues of special interest or importance arise.
35. 16.02.010 - This section gives the title of the ordinance, but the title page of the ordinance doesn't even use the title given. Either call the title "Planning and Zoning" as the book does, or change the book to call the title "Land Development and Planning Ordinance of the City" as the ordinance calls for.
36. 16.04.010 - Make the ordinance gender-neutral instead of waiting for somebody to make a big deal out of it later.
37. 16.04.010 - Change this definition to include the concept of being adjacent through a public right-of-way or through a railroad right-of-way as well as through a public street -- otherwise we have problems right now as the City limits currently exist.
38. 16.04.165 - Add definition for "Director." "Director" means the Planning Director of the City (City Planner is used in the Ordinance).
39. 16.04.495 - Add same as #38.
40. 16.04.505 - Add definition for "planning staff."
41. 16.04.510 - The term plat is defined in terms of subdivisions, but later in the title, is used with partitions also. The definition should be changed to include both uses. Under this definition, three different plats are described -- preliminary, tentative, and final. There is no further definition of what is included in any of them. We need definitions either in this section as separate

definitions, or later in the title, for each one. They should include a detailed listing of those things that are required to be included on each of the three levels of plats. (Refer to State law.)

42. 16.04.530 - Definition of "right-of-way" is confusing. It probably should be defined more in terms of areas reserved between lot lines and set aside for streets or other purposes.
43. 16.04.565 - Add definition for "staff." Staff means planning staff of the City.
44. 16.04.590 - The definition of "structure" and the one in 15.12 are different. They should be the same.
45. 16.04.666 - The definition for vicinity introduces the subject of putting greater requirements on larger projects or those with greater impact. Somewhere in the title, we need to formalize this concept so we don't keep getting asked questions like, "Why don't we require a traffic study for small subdivision?"
46. 16.04.670 - Interesting definition since it is so comprehensive compared to some others, which are so sketchy. Several other definitions probably warrant this level of detail. The only thing this definition leaves out is the case where the tree grows to become greater than 18 inches in diameter -- then what?
47. 16.04.690 - Rather than "street" - it should read ". . . and an interior lot line and measured horizontally to the interior lot line."
48. 16.06.010 - Add words to describe the Commission's envisioned role in updating the Comprehensive Plan, and its role as the Design Review Board, and its role as the Flood Hazard Protection Appeals Board, and any other obscure function that may be lurking out there.
49. 16.06.040 - Change the last sentence to include Planning Director and planning staff instead of City staff in general. There probably should be provisions also for other City staff to participate at the invitation of the Planning Director.
50. 16.06.070 - Change the reference to the secretary to be a member of Planning staff.
51. 16.06.080 - Would anyone notice if we change this section?
52. 16.06.090 - Change this section to reflect the function of the Planning Director and Planning staff.

53. 16.06.140 - Turn this function over to the Planning Director and, through his discretion, to Planning staff, where appropriate.
54. 16.06.150 - Confusing section. Within it, should be a listing of those specific cases in which the Commission can accept property.

Insert new Division II, and bump all others down one step. New Division II would be entitled PLANNING DIRECTOR AND STAFF. This division should treat the Planning Director and staff positions to the same level as the previous division treats the Planning Commission.

55. 16.08.050 - Why is this in the Zoning Ordinance? It should be in Title 10 - Vehicles and Traffic.
56. 16.08.080 - Eliminate first two sentences. It doesn't seem to be good planning to permit additional nonconformance simply because the neighbors are nonconforming.
57. Table 16.10.050 - In part 3, under the heading 'Church' of should be or.
58. 16.10.070 - In Part D, is this consistent with the access ordinance we just recently sent to Council. If this section is inconsistent, we should change it now.
59. More to come

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Hoffman reported on the status of the City budget and explained that the Budget Committee will meet again on March 23, 1992.

Mr. Hoffman reported on the work of the Historic Task Force, and explained that a grant application for \$10,000 was submitted.