

**CANBY CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION MINUTES  
February 13, 2008**

**Presiding:** Mayor Melody Thompson

**Council Present:** Paul Carlson, Wayne Oliver, Teresa Blackwell, Walt Daniels, Randy Carson, and Tony Helbling.

**Planning Commission Present:** Dan Ewert and Jan Milne. Commissioners Jared Taylor, Bruce Holte, and Misty Slagle were absent.

**Staff Present:** Matilda Deas, Project Planner and Kim Scheafer, City Recorder Pro-Tem.

**Others Present:** None.

Mayor Thompson called the Work Session to order at 7:07 p.m. in the Council Chambers. The City Council and Planning Commission met to review new annexation criteria.

Matilda Deas, Project Planner, said they wanted to make sure that everyone was on the same page regarding annexation criteria. Changes in the statutes would be included in the process. The current Code required a half page ad that had to be put out to voters. They wanted to make sure that when development came in it addressed community concerns and to help people make decisions as to what an annexation proposal would do. A matrix had been developed for the public that showed different categories that were being done as part of the development. The categories were very broad but there was flexibility within the categories. Most annexations would probably be small ones that had a different requirement. Staff had been given direction that they should be looking at master planning for areas that were left undeveloped. A development agreement would be required on small annexations rather than a master plan.

Ms. Deas said she wanted to make sure that master planning was what they wanted to require for larger annexations. The Council and Commission said they did. Ms. Deas said they could have developers address infrastructure and let them know what needed to be done. They would work on a process with the people in their proposed area and show the City the draft of who they worked with and if they could agree to it and how it addressed the issues. Staff would work with them and that would be the information brought forward to adopt. This was for a large area that needed to be master planned, otherwise they would do a development agreement. She wanted to know whether they liked the idea of the master plan that addressed the major infrastructure components that were of major concern to the City and have the applicants work with the people to come to an agreement.

Councilor Carson asked if they wanted to make a minimum area size that they would not have to do a master plan. A map with proposed residential master planning areas was reviewed.

Ms. Deas said the direction staff had received over the years was that the A,B,C criteria did not function well. If the criteria for annexation met the same functions it would be a moot point.

Mayor Thompson said now the criteria would be what would be provided in addition to the basic criteria, how many amenities or features the application would provide.

Ms. Deas said they wanted to make sure that people realize every annexation brought forward met the basic criteria.

Commissioner Milne said it showed the developer what he might need to do.

Ms. Deas said they had made the categories broad in the matrix and asked if there was a big area they thought they might have missed.

Councilor Blackwell said she was comfortable with the criteria in the matrix. She asked if there would be a list of ideas that developers could do along with the criteria.

Ms. Deas said yes, they have a working sheet that they would be giving out to people. It would contain what might fall under the categories. Staff would come up with a list and bring it back with the text.

Councilor Helbling said from the developer's point of view, if they made a comparison chart, it would allow the voters to compare annexations against each other. They met Code requirements, but for the City to put them in the position where they were going to publicly display what they were or were not doing, could it be construed as the City campaigning against them.

Commissioner Milne thought they were just providing information to the electorate.

Councilor Helbling said if each one was its own chart, it was putting a comparative analysis done on the part of the City in the paper.

Ms. Deas said on the flip side, they would be giving credit to those who were doing special things.

A discussion took place about how information was listed.

Ms. Deas said they could do a separate matrix for each annexation instead of putting them together.

Councilor Helbling said they should delineate between a basic requirement and an extra and should not mix them.

Commissioner Milne suggested if they were going to separate it out and list the added benefits for each, they might not need a grid as proposed. Maybe they just needed to put it in a bulleted list.

Commissioner Ewert thought the headings of the matrix were what they needed to decide and did they want to add anything to them. He agreed with Councilor Helbling that they not be lined up and instead of bullets, if it was a required thing, they had a certain symbol next to it and if it was an extra, they had a different symbol. He also thought they should define the headings.

A discussion took place about what headings should be added to the matrix. They decided infrastructure should be added.

Commissioner Ewert asked if they could use a different word for the transportation heading.

Ms. Deas said staff would discuss it.

Councilor Carson discussed the difficulty a developer might have of master planning an area when other property owners in the area were not willing to work with him.

Ms. Deas said staff would come back with the proposed text for the modification of the criteria, a modified map, and a mockup of the annexation notice that appeared in the newspaper. She welcomed suggestions from the Commissioners and Councilors.

Mayor Thompson adjourned the Work Session as 8:20 p.m.



Kimberly Scheafer, CMC  
City Recorder Pro Tem



Melody Thompson  
Mayor

Assisted with preparation of minutes – Susan Wood