



CITY of THE DALLES

313 COURT STREET
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058

(541) 296-5481 ext. 1125
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

MINUTES

CITY OF THE DALLES PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
313 COURT SREET
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058
CONDUCTED IN A MEETING ROOM IN COMPLIANCE WITH ADA STANDARDS
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2020
6:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Lavier called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Brent Bybee, Cody Cornett, Sherry DuFault, Bruce Lavier, Steve Ross, and Jeff Stiles

Commissioners Absent: Mark Poppoff

Staff Present: Director Steve Harris, City Attorney Gene Parker and Senior Planner Dawn Marie Hert

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was moved by DuFault and seconded by Ross to approve the agenda as written. The motion passed 6/0; Bybee, Cornett, DuFault, Lavier, Ross and Stiles in favor, none opposed, Poppoff absent.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chair Lavier opened nominations for Chair. There were no nominations. Chair Lavier asked for volunteers; Commissioner Bybee volunteered.

Commissioner DuFault nominated Bybee for Chair; Commissioner Cornett seconded the nomination. The motion passed 5/0; Cornett, DuFault, Lavier, Ross and Stiles in favor, none opposed, Bybee abstained, Poppoff absent.

Chair Bybee opened nominations for Vice Chair.

Commissioner Lavier nominated DuFault; Commissioner Ross seconded the nomination. The motion passed 5/0; Bybee, Cornett, Lavier, Ross and Stiles in favor, none opposed, DuFault abstained, Poppoff absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Lavier and seconded by Ross to approve the minutes of January 16, 2020, as written. The motion passed 4/0; Bybee, DuFault, Lavier, and Ross in favor, none opposed, Cornett and Stiles abstained, Poppoff absent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

RESOLUTION

Resolution PC 588-20: Adoption of Denial of Adjustment 19-049, Taner Elliott

DuFault moved to approve Resolution PC 588-20, denial of Adjustment Application 049-19 of Taner Elliott for a reduction of the garage front yard setback from 20 ft. to 14.75 ft., a 26.25% reduction. In addition, DuFault moved for a subsequent approval of a 15% setback reduction for a 17 ft. garage front yard setback. Ross seconded the motion. The motion passed 4/0; Bybee, DuFault, Lavier, and Ross in favor, none opposed, Cornett and Stiles abstained, Poppoff absent.

QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING

Adjustment 050-19: Michael and Christine Irish

Director Harris stated this would come before the Commission at a later date.

Outreach Meetings for Quasi-Judicial Public Hearings

Director Harris provided background:

In response to citizen comments regarding the housing code amendments, City Council directed Staff to return with alternatives for additional noticing and/or neighborhood meeting requirements for projects in residential zones.

The Dalles Municipal Code, Title 10 Land Use and Development, Section 10.3.020.050 C. 7. states, "Prior to the public hearing the applicant is recommended, but not required, to conduct an outreach meeting with nearby residents and others who may be affected by the development."

An outreach meeting is not required, but could be viewed as best management practices or a way to increase public awareness or transparency.

Discussion topics included:

- At what point in the application process would a neighborhood meeting be required, prior to the application submittal?
 - Distance requirements for noticing, 100 feet, 300 feet, or greater?
 - Would neighborhood meeting verification be required at time of application?
- Once an application is submitted, would a neighborhood meeting be included in the list of completeness item?
- Would staff be required to attend or facilitate the neighborhood meeting?
- Running the neighborhood meeting necessitates an understanding of the process.
- Consider this as a completeness item. Application deemed incomplete until the public meeting.
- An application may go through a number of changes during review. Would a new neighborhood meeting be required for each change or minor update?
- Would a neighborhood meeting be scheduled before or after Site Team review?

- Consider the weight assigned to public comments. At what point would an applicant make a decision under duress due to public opinion?
- Staff reviews a wide variety of applications for compliance with the Code. A definitive standard for a neighborhood meeting would be necessary to establish.
- Similar neighborhood meetings have resulted in a poor response and attendance in the past.
- Concerns that a neighborhood meeting might make the planning process more cumbersome and confusing.
- Does the noticing timeline for the comment period (14-days) and the appeal period (10-days) need to be increased?
- Is there a way to include a list of what applications were approved or submitted during a week into the newspaper?
- What would be the qualifying factors for a development that might require a neighborhood meeting? High traffic counts as established in a traffic study, for example?
- General consensus that a clear and accessible webpage of an active list of development reviews would be helpful.
- The language in the code states that neighborhood meetings are “recommended” and not “require”. Larger applications do go through the Site Team process, which serves as a pre-application, to which it is stated to developers that a public meeting is recommended.
- Consensus from the Planning Commission was to keep the language as is and to further examining alternative methods to improve notification to surrounding landowners.

Annual Report

Senior Planner Dawn Hert presented the Annual Report. See attached PowerPoint document.

STAFF COMMENTS

February 20, 2020 is the next scheduled Planning Commission meeting.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Lavier adjourned the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
Paula Webb, Secretary
Community Development Department



Brent Bybee, Chair