

MINUTES
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION
7:00 PM – Monday, August 27, 2018
City Council Chambers – 222 NE 2nd Avenue

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

ABSENT: Commissioner Shawn Varwig

STAFF: Bryan Brown, Planning Director, and Laney Fouse, Recording Secretary

OTHERS: Tucker Mayberry, Matt Newman, Bob Cambra, Jay Hinrichs, Regina Taylor, Roger Steinke, Ed Netter, Julie Rushton, and Tom 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 July 27, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Serlet and seconded by Commissioner Mottern to approve the July 27, 2018 Planning Commission minutes. Motion passed 6/0.

NEW BUSINESS – None

PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Consider a request for approval of a 90-lot subdivision located in the SW Canby Development Concept Plan approved annexation area. **(Riverside Park Subdivision SUB 18-04).**

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. There were none.

Bryan Brown, Planning Director, entered his staff report into the record. This was a request for a 90 lot subdivision located in the SW Canby Development Concept Plan area to potentially be done in four phases. He described the subject site and the adopted SW Canby Development Concept Plan. There was a buffer along the Molalla River that was intended to be a future trail and he explained how the trail connected from Ivy Street to Elm Street with access to parks. There were three parks proposed for the subdivision. There would also be a future roundabout on Ivy that would be a future capital improvement item and would be added to the City's Transportation System Plan for future funding through SDCs. There was a plan for the City to construct a sewer pump station that would serve the entire development. He discussed where the R-1 and R-1.5 zones were located and the proposed plat map with the phases and Tract C as part of the park to be dedicated to the City. If the project was phased as planned, most of the traffic would head towards S Fir Street. A traffic impact study was done for the entire Development Concept Plan area which stated the increase in vehicle trips would not significantly impact traffic operations along the surrounding transportation network. Site intersections needed to be kept clear of objects that could potentially limit vehicle sight distance. Public input was received from Susan Gallagher, who stated the Molalla River and adjacent area was a wildlife refuge and was in favor of putting in a

fence along the bank of the bluff. Testimony was also received from Tom and Julie Rushton and Ed Netter. Mr. Netter was concerned about his water well because the nearby development could contaminate the water. He was advocating for the developer to help him connect to the water system. A letter was received from Diane Fataua who was concerned about the impact of the construction stage. Before construction would start, a traffic management plan would be developed which would indicate where the construction traffic would be directed. Mr. Brown was open to guidance from the Commission about that issue. Right now he thought the construction traffic would be on Fir Street. Another public comment was received from Don and Judy Stone who questioned why they were approving these developments all at once. Mr. Brown said the City did not control that, it was the private market. He did not know how many lots would be developed in the next few years due to the phasing and changing market demand. The Stones also brought up the need for a stop sign at SE 13th and S Fir St. That topic had been thorough addressed through the Traffic Safety Commission who thought the solution would be the eventual connection to Elm Street that would provide another means of access to 13th. They were reluctant to put additional stop signs on an arterial so close to the existing signal light on Ivy and 13th. Another comment was received from Clackamas County who shared that they accepted the traffic study results. They did however recommend a safety improvement that could be paid for in part by the subdivision developer. The improvement was to change the signal heads at the 13th and Ivy intersection from a traditional five section signal to a flashing yellow arrow head. This could reduce turning accidents. Staff was comfortable with that suggestion, and Mr. Brown proposed to add a condition for the developer to contribute a proportional share of the cost for the conversion of the existing five-section signal light head at 13th and Ivy to a four section flashing yellow arrow head. He showed a picture of the two different signals. Staff recommended approval with the conditions listed in the staff report and the additional safety improvement condition recommended by Clackamas County.

Commissioner Cherishnov asked if there was an emergency access for the site. Mr. Brown said there would be two accesses for this subdivision, Fir Street and Elm Street.

Chair Savory confirmed the construction hours would be from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Applicants: Tucker Mayberry, applicant, discussed the accesses to the project, and how they would share the cost with Hope Village for continuing 17th to Ivy. This project was almost exactly what had been proposed in the Development Concept Plan.

Matt Newman, NW Engineers, explained the phasing of the project. They wanted to have an equal number of the 5,000 square foot lots and 7,000 square foot lots for the phases, and the park would be done in the first phase. The water would have to be looped down 18th and there would be a temporary hammer head for turning around until the Hope Village property developed.

Mr. Mayberry said he was open to putting in a four foot chain link fence at the top of the bank, as long as that was the City wanted.

Chair Savory was concerned about trespassing and the safety of the homeowners from people wandering onto their properties. Mr. Mayberry thought the lots would have backyard fences as well.

Commissioner Mottern asked about Mr. Netter's concern about connecting to the water. Mr. Mayberry had not talked to Mr. Netter about that. Mr. Newman said the water line would be going down that street in phase 1 and the connection could be provided. They would work with Mr. Netter on this issue.

Proponents: Craig Gingerich, Executive Director of Hope Village, was in support of the development and was representing the Hope Village Board. He confirmed Hope Village would be working with the developer for access onto Ivy.

Opponents: Bob Cambra, Canby resident, thought this development would have a significant impact on the roadways and traffic in the area. He requested the access to Ivy become a priority and that it be completed before any houses were constructed. This development would funnel traffic toward Fir Street, which was already very busy in the peak hours. There needed to be an additional outlet, which should be Ivy. He thought the development would negatively impact the existing homes on Fir Street and Hope Village. He also thought there would be more traffic than the traffic study suggested.

Rebuttal: Mr. Mayberry said as far as the traffic numbers, they had to rely on what the traffic engineer said. He asked about the timing of the fencing and if it should be done before the trail was put in.

Commissioner Hall asked about putting in the connection to Ivy before the home construction. Mr. Mayberry thought that would happen in phase 2, and he was not sure if it would be a permanent or a gravel road.

Chair Savory closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioner Boatright asked about the installation of the roundabout at Ivy. Mr. Brown replied the installation of the roundabout was not critical to the subdivision being developed. It would help calm traffic as well as manage the volume of traffic from the full build out of this area. It was an expensive project. There could still be a normal street connection to Ivy until the funding for the roundabout was collected. The City was in negotiations with the County now to take over jurisdiction of S Ivy to the pump station.

Chair Savory said the population of Canby was projected to double in 20 years. He was concerned about the traffic and thought the roundabout should be a priority.

Commissioner Cherishnov asked if the City could require a second construction access. Mr. Brown did not think it could be required. If the Beck Pond subdivision was completed before this subdivision, there would be access onto Elm.

Commissioner Hall thought the application met all of the requirements. The City could not require the Ivy Street access, but it would be done in phase 2.

Commissioner Mottern thought this was a good, well thought out development. He thought the access on Ivy would be done and he commended the applicant for working with the neighbors.

The rest of the Commission was also in support.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Mottern to approve SUB 18-04 Riverside Park Subdivision with the conditions listed in the staff report and including the condition proposed by Clackamas County that if the City's consulting traffic engineering firm concurs with the County recommendation, this development shall be responsible for contributing a proportional share of the cost for the conversion of the existing five-section signal light head at 13th Ave and S. Ivy St to a four-section flashing

yellow arrows. The proportional amount shall be determined from an estimate for the conversion cost and the percent of additional peak hour traffic added by the development to the intersection. Motion passed 6/0.

FINAL DECISIONS

(Note: These are final, written versions of previous oral decisions. No public testimony.)

- **Riverside Park Subdivision SUB 18-04.**

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Cherishnov and seconded by Commissioner Hall to approve the final decisions for Riverside Park Subdivision SUB 18-04 as amended. Motion passed 6-0.

ITEMS OF INTEREST/REPORT FROM PLANNING STAFF

- a. Next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting – Monday, September 10, 2018

Mr. Brown discussed the applications scheduled for the September 10, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

ITEMS OF INTEREST/GUIDANCE FROM PLANNING COMMISSION – None

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Hall, and seconded by Commissioner Boatright. Motion passed 6/0. Meeting adjourned at 8:01 pm.