

**MINUTES**  
**CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
7:00 PM – Monday, April 10, 2017  
Council Chambers – 222 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 and Laney Fouse, Planning Staff

**OTHERS:** Tom Scott, Scott Beck, Brian Kromer, Kris Hetteema, Gail Gartner, Gordon Root. Laurie Bergstrom, Chris Downs, Bob Price, and Craig Gingerich

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. CITIZEN INPUT** – None.

**3. MINUTES**

a. No minutes available

**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.

Bryan Brown, Planning Director, entered his staff report into the record. This hearing had been continued from the last Commission meeting. The application had been tentatively approved, but the Commission wanted to see a revised site plan before final approval. The application was a request for a site and design review and a variance for a 58 unit apartment complex on Territorial Road. It was a 2.5 acre site and a high density zone. The changes the Planning Commission recommended were: the removal of two parking spaces to accommodate a longer throat depth for the driveway and changing six two-bedroom units to six one-bedroom units to decrease the required parking. They still did not meet the required parking, but there was a parking variance for up to three parking spaces, which was the amount they were short. The ADA accessible parking spaces were near the handicapped units. Included in the variance was flexibility for the banks of parking rows and to allow more than eight spaces between the landscape islands. There was other landscaping near the parking area and the landscape requirements had been exceeded.

Applicant:

Scott Beck, architect, discussed the changes that had been made to the site plan. They were able to add one more parking stall by making it 8.5 feet wide instead of 9 feet wide. They had taken out the two parking spaces for the driveway and converted six two bedroom units to six one bedroom units. There was an additional handicapped parking stall in front of building #3.

Tom Scott, applicant, thanked the Commission for letting them return with the modifications. They wanted to maximize the site and number of units for the community. They had significantly reduced the number of parking stalls needed for the variance. He thought this was a good plan.

**Proponents:**

Kris Hetema, Canby resident, managed the Willamette Grove Apartments. They had 86 apartments and had 186 parking spaces and it worked well. No one had to park on the street. She suggested caution around the variance and not to go more than a 3% reduction as it would set a precedent for future applications.

Gordon Root, developer in Lake Oswego, said he specialized in rural development and was supportive of this type of project in Canby. They needed affordability, balance, and choices for housing. They needed to use the land in the Urban Growth Boundary to its maximum benefit. The density allowed them to keep all of the green space and to continue to be a farm community outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. This would be affordable housing, which was needed in the City. It was the right place and right time for this development.

**Opponents:** None.

**Neutral Testimony:**

Gail Gardener, Canby resident, was sympathetic to the needs for more housing in the community. She thought this was a lot of construction on a small space. There were many other apartment complexes being developed in this area, and she questioned the need for more. She thought duplexes would more gracefully fill the space and keep more of the green areas. The corner of Pine and Territorial was already suffering the effects of high density living and excessive traffic. She asked if the traffic study was done prior to Pine Meadow and Franz Meadow projects. Those developments were adding 76 cars to Pine Street on the way to Territorial. There were 164 cars from the Willamette Grove Apartments and 40 cars from each cul-de-sac on Pine. If they added another 120 from Pine Crossing, that would be 400 cars total. This development would further exacerbate the problems with traffic, exhaust fumes, heavy on-street parking which decreased visibility, and ecology. Who in Canby would benefit from these apartments, would it be affordable housing, for the working class, seniors or retired/fixed income, or young adults? People lived in Canby because they loved rural living, green space, flowers, animals, and breathable air. If they wanted high density, they would move to Portland. She wanted to keep Canby as Canby.

Laurie Bergstrom, Canby resident, was not opposed to the development. She still thought parking would be an issue. If they had enough units that required 110 parking spaces, and they were only providing 107, there would be no place for guests to park. They did not have enough parking for those who lived there let alone any visitors. She discussed nearby apartments that had accounted for visitor parking. Visitors would park in the neighborhood and there was no bus or other transit options. They needed to accommodate the parking that was required for people to live there.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Scott said Canby was changing and housing needs were changing. There had not been new apartments developed in Canby for many years, and now there were several. They needed a variety of housing. He thought this was the right fit for Canby. This proposal maximized the site economically and complimented the City's needs. The traffic study took into consideration all proposed development and there were no issues except for the driveway width. There was a need for this type of housing. They were asking for a 2.5% reduction in parking from what was required. He intended to manage these apartments, and if he thought the parking would not work he would not be proposing it. He thought the reduction of three parking stalls would work.

Mr. Beck said the visitor parking was calculated in and there would be 12 visitor parking stalls. These were meant for families, seniors, and young adults, and would be rented at market rate. This could help with supply and demand issues and help stabilize rents in Canby.

Chair Savory closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hall said this was pretty much what they were asking for as far as getting the handicapped stalls near the handicapped units, getting rid of the two parking spots to extend the width of the driveway, and reducing the two bedroom to one bedroom units.

Commissioner Mottern said they brought forward what the Commission asked for. The applicant did a good job getting the parking between a 2% to 3% variance. He thought the application met the criteria.

Commissioner Serlet said they came in with the changes the Commission asked for.

Commissioner Cherishnov said the property was zoned for this type of use. He supported the project.

Commissioner Varwig appreciated the applicant doing what the Commission asked for. He thought the applicant cared about Canby and making this a good project. He understood the concerns about parking, but there was no other way to make it work and the applicant had done what they could to reduce the variance as much as possible.

Commissioner Boatright thought parking and density were going to be issues. They had to follow the code and the zoning for the property. Developers had to make money or they would no longer build. This was a good project, and they were within 3% for the parking.

Chair Savory appreciated the concern about parking. His concern was about the cumulative effect this and other projects would have on the traffic on Territorial. He was also in support.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Boatright and seconded by Commissioner Mottern to reapprove DR 17-02/VAR 17-01 with the revised site plan design and findings based on the design modifications included in the record and further explained in the staff report dated April 10, 2017. Motion passed 7/0.

## 6. FINAL DECISIONS

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

Motion: Commissioner Boatright moved to reapprove the final decisions for DR 17-02/VAR 17-01 based on the design modifications included in the record and further explained in the staff report dated April 10, 2017. Commissioner Mottern seconded. Motion passed 7/0

## **7. ITEMS OF INTEREST / REPORT FROM STAFF**

- Mr. Brown said the April 24 Planning Commission meeting was open for a work session on growth and the City's current Code.
- The May 8<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission would review a Minor Land Partition.
- A PC Training Meeting in Eugene would be held on Saturday May 20, 2017 and Commissioner Chernishov would be attending.

## **8. ITEMS OF INTEREST/GUIDANCE FROM PLANNING COMMISSION –**

Chair Savory wanted Council to examine some of the traffic problems and cumulative effect of the recent developments, especially on NE Territorial.

There was consensus for Chair Savory to raise the issue with Council.

Mr. Brown said these concerns could be addressed through the Transportation System Plan (TSP) which was updated every 7 to 10 years and that time was approaching. The City was collecting Transportation System Development Charges to do expansion and improvement projects. The prioritization for these projects was the list in the TSP which could be updated. Increased traffic was starting to be a concern. There were adopted standards for congestion and level of service, and there were only a few intersections on Highway 99E that had congestion problems.

Chair Savory said the Commission would be going into a Work Session to discuss growth and development in the community and related review processes and existing standards.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** Commissioner Hall moved for adjournment, Commissioner Mottern seconded. Motion passed 7/0. Meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.