

**MINUTES  
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION  
Monday, February 8, 2021**

---

**PRESENT:** Commissioners John Savory, Larry Boatright, Jennifer Trundy, Jeff Mills, and Michael Hutchinson

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Jason Taylor

**STAFF:** Don Hardy, Planning Director, Erik Forsell, Associate Planner, Brianna Addotta, Associate Planner, and Laney Fouse Lawrence, Recording Secretary

**OTHERS:** Rick Givens, Bruce Goldson, Darren Gusdorf, Mark Handris, and Allen Manuel

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** – None

**MINUTES**

- a. Approval of Planning Commission Minutes for January 11, 2021

Commissioner Mills suggested a change in the wording under *Questions* to read, “*Commissioner Mills requested that staff always try to define an acronym when it is first used in a document.*”

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Boatright and seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson to approve the January 11, 2021 Planning Commission minutes as amended. Motion approved 5/0.

**NEW BUSINESS** - None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. **THIS PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE CONTINUED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF FEBRUARY 22, 2021.** To consider a request to build a two-story, 56,000 SF assisted living facility building with 102 units with a memory care endorsement, and 8 cottages on site for Independent Living that will be in separate 1-story, 700 SF duplexes, at the corner of 1300 S Ivy St. **(DR 20-03, CUP 20-02 Memory Care Facility).**

Brianna Addotta, Associate Planner, said the applicant had requested more time to get the proposal together.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Trundy and seconded by Commissioner Boatright to continue the hearing to a date certain of Monday, February 22, 2021. Motion approved 5/0.

- b. To consider a request to subdivide three parcels consisting of approximately 4.59 acres into 44 separate legal lots located on N Redwood St. **(SUB 20-04 Redwood Landing III Subdivision).**

Chair Savory opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Commissioner had ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare. There were none.

Staff Report: Erik Forsell, Associate Planner, entered his staff report into the record. This was a request to subdivide three parcels into a 44 lot subdivision on N Redwood Street. This was Redwood Landing Phase 3 and was zoned R-1.5, medium density residential, and R-2, high density residential. There were three existing dwellings on the property. Two would be demolished and the third would remain and be subject to the non-conforming use criteria. The site was generally flat, sloping downward to the eastern portion of the parcel near the Willow Creek wetland/drainage area. The mixture of lots was proposed to contain 11 single family detached dwellings, 32 single family attached dwellings, and 1 existing oversized lot to remain, subject to non-conforming use standards. Public improvements would be required including local street infrastructure, sidewalks, power, water, and sewer as well as frontage improvements along N Redwood Street as required by Clackamas County. He reviewed the N Redwood Development Concept Plan and applicant's preliminary site plan. He then discussed the approval criteria. Regarding the split zone concept, the layout of the street and lots conformed to the zoning boundaries. The transportation impact analysis included two intersections: OR 99E/N Redwood/Sequoia Parkway and NE Territorial/N Redwood. Approximately 31 a.m. peak hour trips, 42 p.m. peak hour trips, and 396 daily trips would be generated from the proposed site. Trips from approved but not fully occupied developments were added to the study intersections to account for trips that were not counted in the original traffic count data but would be added to area roadways as the individual developments built out. A 1% compound annual growth rate was applied to all movements at study intersections to capture other background regional trip growth not related to city wide development. No safety issues were identified. Crash rates at study intersections indicated the frequency of collisions was typical for the volume of traffic served. No intersection capacity issues were identified. None of the study intersections were identified as having an impacted based on projected growth from the proposed project. He discussed the staff findings and conditions. Special conditions for Planning Commission consideration included a condition that had to do with the future extension of streets for a cul-de-sac and another had to do with alternative permeable surfaces and getting approval from the Public Works Department. Staff did not recommend adding these two conditions, however they were available for deliberation. Agency comments were received from the City Engineer, Canby Fire, DirectLink, and Clackamas County Transportation Planning. No public comments had been received. Staff recommended approval of the application.

Questions by the Hearing Body: Commissioner Mills asked about the configuration of the turnarounds. Mr. Forsell said they were hammerhead turnarounds. Canby Fire would have to approve of the turnarounds.

Commissioner Mills asked if all of the private streets would be no parking. Mr. Forsell said that was correct due to the width of the road and access for fire trucks.

Commissioner Mills asked if there was a need for additional parking for visitors. Mr. Forsell said at the building permit phase the development would be reviewed for parking. It was difficult to know until the applicant constructed the structures as to how they would meet the parking requirements.

Commissioner Mills asked about access to Lot 100, the cul-de-sac. Mr. Forsell said the plan specifically said that future developments might not be consistent with the exact map in the plan. They did not have to be a carbon copy of what ended up being developed. The applicant made the argument that this was not a good location for a cul-de-sac due to topography and sewer pumping issues. A significant portion wasn't on the subject property's boundary and they would be creating a stub to a cul-de-sac and he did not see value in that for the City or developer. That was why they did not recommend it as a condition of approval.

Commissioner Mills wanted to make sure they did not preclude development of the land for residential use in the future. Mr. Forsell said the current trajectory of the roads in this area was to intersect at that tax lot which would provide access to the property. The current owners of the property did not want to annex and develop at this time, but there would be access to allow future residential development.

Chair Savory was also concerned about parking. He did not think there would be adequate parking for the development.

Commissioner Mills thought it was an unrealistic expectation that there would be enough parking. He supported encouraging solar easements and installation of rear access on alleyways for six or more units. Mr. Forsell said if Canby Fire was comfortable with the drive aisles as they were, an alleyway would not be required.

Applicant: Rick Givens, representing the applicant, said this was a mixed use development for 12 single family detached new lots on the north side of the property, 31 single family attached lots on the south side of the property, and one lot for the existing residence that would be retained. The turnarounds were per Fire District standards. The no parking on the street was a new requirement from the Fire District. He thought they would be able to meet the standard in the code for two parking spaces per unit by providing parking in garages and on driveways. Regarding access to lot 100, he explained the grading and fill that would be required for the sanitary sewer lines. It would take access from N Sycamore. Regarding solar easements, all of the townhouse units were oriented east/west and there was no potential for solar access. Lots one through nine were oriented north/south and the street would provide adequate protection of the solar access to those lots and there would be no reason for an easement. Regarding rear access onto an alleyway, the building length was 120 feet and firehoses required 150 feet. The Fire District did not require rear access and it would take away the privacy of the lots. Regarding the conditions of approval, he did not think a condition was needed for solar easements or future extension of streets for the cul-de-sac. There was a shadow plat from Redwood Landing Phase 2 that showed how Lot 100 could be developed. For Condition #18 regarding the temporary fire truck turnaround, this project would be developed after or at the same time as Redwood Landing Phase 2 and there would be a fire truck turnaround at the north end of Sycamore.

Questions: Commissioner Mills asked if they were going to provide a turnaround on the easternmost driveway for fire equipment. Mr. Givens said yes, however if the Fire District wanted something different, they would work with them in the final design.

Commissioner Mills thought solar easements were needed, but they were not possible for the R-2 development. Mr. Givens did not think they were needed for any of the site because all of the lots oriented for solar access had enough separation with the setbacks between the buildings and an easement was not necessary. It was not possible to make the R-2 solar access homes.

Mr. Forsell clarified he just learned today that the solar easement requirements had been removed from the design standards.

Proponents: None

Opponents: None

Neutral: None

Chair Savory closed the public hearing.

There was discussion regarding the conditions that should be removed.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Boatright and seconded by Commissioner Trundy to approve SUB 20-04 Redwood Landing Phase III Subdivision with the conditions as written except for striking Condition 1 regarding solar easements and future extension. Motion approved 5/0.

## **FINAL DECISIONS**

### **a. SUB 20-04 Redwood Landing III**

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Mills and seconded by Commissioner Boatright to approve the Final Findings for SUB 20-04 Redwood Landing Phase III Subdivision with conditions except for striking Condition 1. Motion approved 5/0.

## **ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM STAFF**

- a. Laney Fouse Lawrence, Recording Secretary, wished Senior Planner Ryan Potter a happy birthday.
- b. Next Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Monday, February 22, 2021

## **ITEMS OF INTEREST/GUIDANCE FROM PLANNING COMMISSION - None**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Trundy and seconded by Commissioner Boatright to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved 5/0.

**Meeting was adjourned at 8:26 PM.**