

MINUTES
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION
7:00 PM – Monday, March 13, 2017
City Council Chambers – 222 NE 2nd Avenue

PRESENT: Commissioners John Savory, Larry Boatright, John Serlet, Derrick Mottern, Shawn Varwig, Tyler Hall, and Andrey Chernishov

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Bryan Brown, Planning Director

OTHERS: Tom Scott, Scott Beck, Pat Sisul, Brian Kromer, Kris Hetteema, and Laurie Bergstrom

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. CITIZEN INPUT – None

3. MINUTES

- a. February 27, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Serlet and seconded by Commissioner Boatright to approve the February 27, 2017 Planning Commission minutes. Motion passed 7/0.

4. NEW BUSINESS – None

5. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Consider a request for a Site & Design Review and Variance applications for a proposed 58-unit apartment complex on 2.5 acres located at 1203 & 1295 NE Territorial Rd. **(DR 17-02/VAR 17-01)**

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 were none.

Bryan Brown, Planning Director, entered his staff report into the record. This was a site and design review and variance application for property located on NE Territorial Road. The existing house on the back of the property would be removed and the house in the front was not part of the proposed project and would remain. A house to the west would also be removed. There were multiple tax lots that would need to be consolidated so nothing was built over tax lot lines. There was a trail to the east and to the south was an apartment complex. There was low and high density zoning in this area. He then discussed the site plan. There would be seven buildings with a mixture of two to three story buildings. They were proposing 58 units with a mixture of two bedroom and three bedroom apartments. They were slightly deficient in parking and had applied for a variance to address it. A traffic study was done and one recommendation was made to provide adequate throat length in the driveway for cars coming in off of Territorial to adequately get off of Territorial and to

accommodate more than one car wanting to exit at the same time. They needed to supply 35 feet for the driveway, which would eliminate two parking spaces. The applicant was supposed to supply 115 spaces and they were 7 spaces short. This included a 10% reduction since they were over a certain density. They were also asking for a variance on the requirement of no more than eight spaces in a row in a bank of parking spaces on site without an intervening landscape island. Staff recommended approval of the site and design review. There could be room to support a partial variance. There was emergency access through the Logging Road Trail. All the public utilities were adequate and could be made available to serve the site. He then reviewed the conditions of approval. Staff did not know if there was enough shielding on the light fixtures to prevent light trespass on the neighboring properties. One condition was for clearer information on the lighting. Another condition was that there was a prohibition of parallel on street parking on Territorial near the driveway due to site distance.

Commissioner Hall discussed the need for handicapped parking, although it might reduce the number of parking spaces even more.

Chair Savory was concerned about tenants being able to use the emergency access on the Logging Road since it was blocked by bollards. He was also concerned about adding more traffic to the already heavy traffic on Territorial in the peak times. He suggested a left hand turn lane going into the complex from Territorial going north to south. Mr. Brown said the traffic study did not indicate they were at the level and would not be at the level with this development to justify the need for that kind of improvement. The applicant was dedicating 10 feet of right-of-way adjacent to the site and was building a sidewalk on Territorial. Emergency access was focused on getting an emergency vehicle in and out, not on the tenants to escape.

Chair Serlet was concerned about the amount of growth happening in the Redwood area. The increased traffic needed to be addressed or there would be serious problems on Territorial.

Applicant:

Tom Scott, applicant, and Scott Beck, architect, discussed the site, surrounding area zoning, and site plan. They were proposing 58 units, 48 would be two bedroom and 10 would be three bedroom. There would be seven buildings, a recreation center, playground, plaza/patio area, benches, barbecues, and a pocket park near the Logging Road. There would be a landscaping buffer abutting the R-1 property. A six foot privacy fence would also be installed. There would be pedestrian connections from Territorial through the site and a series of access curb ramps and crosswalks. They were under the threshold that required two accesses for the development. There would be a hammerhead turnaround for fire trucks and there was a secondary access on the Logging Road Trail. They discussed the architecture of the exterior of the buildings which would be done in a craftsman architectural style. Regarding the variance to exceed the required eight contiguous parking stalls, there was an abundance of landscaping proposed in the parking areas which softened the parking up. They would lose more parking if it had to be broken up more for landscape islands. The Sequoia Grove development that was currently under construction asked for the same variance and it was approved. They had more landscaping surrounding their parking lot than the Sequoia Grove development and they had less units per acre. There was a need for high density residential units in the City. They had tried to maximize the number of units on the site, which did not meet the parking code. They had researched the parking necessary for this type of development and had looked at

what other cities did. Canby's Code was more stringent than other cities. They also did a parking analysis of how many parking spots they would lose in different scenarios. In their research, they found two and three bedroom units were the most desirable. They discussed how they could potentially meet the parking standards if the variance was not approved by replacing some two bedroom units with one bedroom units. There was opportunity for more handicapped stalls.

There was discussion regarding the width of the Logging Road Trail and where the bollards would be placed.

Pat Sisul of Sisul Engineering clarified the issue of the bollards at the Logging Road. The edge of the existing pathway in the Logging Road right-of-way was 16 to 17 feet away from the edge of the property line. If they wanted to widen the trail in the future, there was room in the existing right-of-way to do it. The bollards would be private bollards owned by the complex and would be placed on private property, 18 feet from the existing pathway. Originally they had tried to make a second driveway onto Territorial, but it was a busy street with a lot of pedestrians accessing the Logging Road Trail. The City did not want to have another access at that point. There was also a provision to have 100 feet between driveways that made it difficult to create a second access.

Opponents: None.

Neutral Testimony:

Laurie Bergstrom, Canby resident, was not opposed to this development. Her concern was parking. Most people had two cars and did not use their garage to park. This was a bedroom community where many commuted to work every day. She thought the 58 units required 116 spaces and 11 extra spaces for guests. The application did not take into account guest parking and there was no other place to park except for in the nearby residential neighborhoods. She thought the units should be scaled down to create sufficient parking for the residents.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Scott understood they were a bedroom community and that Canby was different from a lot of jurisdictions. He thought the Code needed to be looked at as he thought it was too stringent. They were trying to maximize the number of units, which had been stressed as a need by the City. They were willing to add one bedroom units to meet the parking requirements.

Mr. Beck said the Code required 20% of the parking for visitors and that was taken into account in the parking proposed. He had worked on a number of projects in this area and a lot of jurisdictions required less for parking than Canby did. He thought a happy medium was 1.75 or 1.8 parking spaces per unit as a bottom threshold, and they were at 1.86.

Chair Savory closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Serlet said another issue was the school children residing in these apartments, and how school buses stopped both lanes of traffic to load and unload. He thought congestion on Territorial would become an issue in the future.

Chair Savory thought this was a nice development. However, taking the totality of what was going on with other developments, particularly along Redwood, it raised a lot of red flags on the traffic issue. That was not in the Commission's purview for this application, however, as they had to make sure the application met the criteria.

Commissioner Boatright understood the concerns regarding the traffic on Territorial and only having one entrance. The emergency entrance satisfied the Fire Department. The complex had a lot of space between apartment buildings. He thought the parking would be a problem even if they had all of the parking spaces, and did not think the parking was a good enough reason to deny the application.

Commissioner Varwig wanted to see more handicapped stalls.

Commissioner Chernishov thought they should have the applicant follow the traffic study's recommendation for the throat length in the driveway.

Commissioner Mottern thought there would be a lot of congestion with only one entrance and exit and they should follow the traffic study's recommendation. He thought parking was an issue and that one bedroom units should be added. He was fine with the variance on the landscape islands to allow more parking.

Commissioner Hall agreed about the islands. However, he thought parking would be an issue. Most people had two cars per household no matter how many bedrooms were in the unit. Typically apartments only gave residents one parking spot and it was sometimes difficult to find parking for a second car. The more spaces, the better the chance to keep the residents happy.

Mr. Scott thought the Commission wanted them to meet the Code except for the landscape island variance. If that was the case, rather than a denial, he asked to come back with a revised site plan or work with staff on a unit mix that met the requirements.

The consensus was for the applicant to come back with a revised plan. There was also consensus that the applicant would lose two parking spaces to widen the entrance on Territorial and that the landscape island variance was acceptable.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Varwig and seconded by Commissioner Hall to approve DR 17-02/VAR 17-01 with a revised plan to add one bedroom units and to add parking spaces subject to final Planning Commission approval. Motion passed 7/0.

6. FINAL DECISIONS

- a. Trail Crossing Apartments (DR 17-02/VAR 17-01)

Mr. Brown would bring these findings back to the next meeting for approval.

7. ITEMS OF INTEREST / REPORT FROM STAFF

Mr. Brown said the March 27 Planning Commission meeting was canceled. The Commission would be reviewing the revised Site Plan for the Trail Crossing Apartments on April 10.

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

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Serlet moved for adjournment, Commissioner Mottern seconded. Motion passed 7/0. Meeting adjourned at 8:34 pm.