

MINUTES
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

7:00 PM – Monday, June 25, 2018
City Council Chambers – 222 NE 2nd Avenue

PRESENT: Commissioners John Savory, John Serlet, Shawn Varwig, Tyler Hall and Andrey Chernishov
ABSENT: Commissioners Larry Boatright and Derrick Mottern
STAFF: Bryan Brown, Planning Director, and Laney Fouse, Recording Secretary
OTHERS: Mike Patterson, Scott Beck, Tom & Julie Rushton

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Savory called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

MINUTES

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes for June 11, 2018

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Varwig and seconded by Commissioner Hall to approve the June 11, 2018 minutes. Motion passed 5/0.

NEW BUSINESS

None

PUBLIC HEARING

Consider a request for a Site and Design Review for approval to construct a 9,420 SF multi-tenant industrial building at the northeast corner of S Pine St. and SE 3rd Ave in an M-1 Light Industrial Zone. (**DR 18-04 Patterson Multi-Tenant**)

Chair Savory opened the public hearing and read the public hearing format. He asked if any Commissioner had ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare.

Commissioner Chernishov declared a conflict of interest because his company had a contract with the applicant's architect Scott Beck.

Bryan Brown, Planning Director, entered his staff report into the record. This was a request for a site and design review to construct a multi-tenant industrial building. He discussed the decorative aspects of the proposed building which included four foot high masonry wainscoting and stained wood accents for the entrance. These made a really attractive building. The location was what he was calling a corner lot that was in a bend of S Pine Street. When the bend straightened out, the street name changed to SE 3rd Avenue. This was considered a redevelopment to the site as there was an existing house on the property. The house would be demolished and there were conditions of approval for County permits for the demolition process. The use was proposed as a warehouse facility. It could be any other use allowed in an M-1 Zone, such as a fabrication type business. One of the requirements was to have a loading bay. This was one of the difficulties in laying out the design for this site to fit the required parking, building space, and loading bay. The applicant owned the property to the east which was the location of Oregon Machine Works. It was adjacent to this site and the applicant proposed to share the loading space. The code discussed shared parking arrangements and required the use of legal documents to guarantee the shared parking. This was to make sure the agreement was tied to the properties so if

the ownership ever changed, the obligation remained. The code did not specifically address shared loading bays, but staff thought with the appropriate legal documents it could be considered. The site was surrounded on two sides by M-1 zoning, with the Fire Station to the west zoned C-2 Highway Commercial and residential uses to the south zoned R-2, high density residential. He then discussed the site plan. There were two different suites with two separate covered entry doors that were recessed. The doors in the back would lead to the shared loading area. The applicant did not know who would be leasing the building at this time. The building was proposed to be 9,420 square feet. The driveway location proposed was recommended by DKS, the traffic engineers. Due to the sight limitations, the other driveway locations did not meet the standards. The driveway was placed right in the curve, which seemed counterintuitive to both the applicant and to Mr. Brown, but DKS insisted that this was the only safe location they recommended. The driveway had the potential to be 40 feet wide, but it could be 36 feet. It was up to the applicant how wide it would be. There would be 11 parking spaces; however the parking lot could not accommodate a large truck. That was one of the reasons for the alternative loading bay on the adjacent property. The building, signs, and street trees were outside of the site distance for the driveway. The application met all of the landscape and parking requirements. He reviewed the conditions of approval. No written public input was received except for comments from the City Engineer. There was a condition that the applicant would meet those items, which were typical construction requirements. The applicant was only going to use wall signs and would need to meet the requirements of the sign code. They should not have a ground or pole sign due to the sight distance issue. There would be a recorded easement agreement for the loading bay. The applicant would use their attorney to draw up the proper documents for the agreement. A demolition permit would be necessary as well. Staff recommended approval of the application.

Chair Savory noted on Page 53, the dates of the pre-application meeting and the neighborhood meeting were dated 2018 not 2017.

Applicant:

Mike Patterson, property owner, and Scott Beck, architect, showed an aerial photo with the sight distance lines for the driveway. The photo showed there was nothing impeding the sight distance. They then showed a diagram of how a truck could enter and exit the site if a second access was allowed. This was done for the initial sight studies, but when the traffic report came back it specifically stated there could only be a single access driveway. Trucks would not be able to turn around on the property and the applicant addressed that issue by proposing the shared loading bay. Another aerial photo was displayed indicating how trucks would access the loading bay on the adjoining property. There would be a 30 foot opening on the rear of the property that would allow for fork truck traffic. There was also a man door on the back to allow easy access and movement back and forth from the properties. The benefits to the shared loading bay were not having the concern about people backing onto Pine Street and the loading bay was hidden from public view. They were proposing to build close to the property line on the north side of the building and a one hour fire wall with a fire parapet would be installed. The back wall would be ten feet from the property line and there would be a setback and buffer on the south end along with a storm swale rain garden. There would be pedestrian accesses to the building. To break the building up, they were proposing a five foot indent in the center with a masonry divider fin to define the two entrances and provided cover. They were proposing a pre-engineered steel building with pre-finished metal wall and roof panels. There would be a 16 foot eve and 12 foot tall doors. There would be a service man door on each end with a transom window above the doors. The main entrances would have store front windows and doors. There would be man doors and overhead doors on the back of the building to service the off-site loading. They did not know who the tenants would be yet, but there were sign areas already designated that met the sign code for wall signs. They explained how all utilities were available to the site and how overflow piping from the storm swale would pipe to the drywell and how the catch basins would tie back to the man hole and drywell. They explained the grading plan, sidewalks, and depth of the storm swales as well as the landscape plan. The property was currently an eyesore and this development would improve the site and add to the tax base. They tried to go beyond the plain industrial building look and add to the character of the area. It would clean the area up and give it a commercial feel.

Chair Savory asked about the bay doors in the front. Were they for delivery vans? Mr. Patterson said yes, one of the possible tenants was Amazon which would use the building as a distribution center. Mr. Beck said the doors would also help with ventilation of the building.

Proponents: None

Opponents: None

Neutral: None

Mr. Brown stated the applicant was using drought tolerant plants and were not proposing to install an irrigation system. The code allowed that if they provided hose bibs within 150 feet of all the landscaping. The applicant was hoping the tenants would be able to wheel their trash carts out to the sidewalk rather than having a built in trash enclosure.

Chair Savory closed the public hearing at 7:44 p.m.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Varwig to approve DR 18-04 Patterson Multi-Tenant. Motion passed 5/0.

It was noted the project would break ground at the end of August.

FINAL DECISIONS

Final Findings DR 18-04 Patterson Multi-Tenant

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Varwig and seconded by Commissioner Serlet to approve the final findings for DR 18-04 Patterson Multi-Tenant. Motion passed 5/0.

ITEMS OF INTEREST/REPORT FROM PLANNING STAFF

- a. Next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on Monday, July 9

Mr. Brown said the Commission would be reviewing the Canby Townhomes development application at the next meeting. Staff had received an appeal of the Beck Pond subdivision to the City Council. It would come before the Council on July 18.

ITEMS OF INTEREST/GUIDANCE FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

None

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Chernishov and seconded by Commissioner Hall to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed 5/0. Meeting adjourned at 7:49 pm.