



**APPROVED MINUTES
CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**

6:00 PM – August 25, 2025

City Council Chambers – Virtual Meeting via Zoom

PRESENT – Commissioners: Matt Ellison (Chair), Dan Ewert (Vice Chair), Michael Hutchinson, Craig Lewelling, and Leah McCarthy

ABSENT – Judi Jarosh and Jennifer Driskill

STAFF – Don Hardy, Planning Director, Brianna Addotta, AICP, Associate Planner, Emma Porricolo, Associate Planner, and Emily Sasse, Recording Secretary

OTHERS – Andrea McGrady, Curt McLeod, and Aaron Adame

1. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Pledge of Allegiance
- b. Welcome to Commissioner Leah McCarthy

Chair Ellison gave a warm welcome to the new Commissioner, Leah McCarthy. He provided a brief introduction, noting her extensive background in risk management across both the private and public sectors. He stated that Commissioner McCarthy would be observing the meeting as part of the onboarding process and, accordingly, would not participate in deliberations or voting on the two public hearing items.

2. CONSENT ITEMS

- a. Draft Meeting Minutes – November 25, 2024 (continued from March 24, 2025)
- b. Draft Meeting Minutes – August 11, 2025

Both draft meeting minutes will be considered for approval at the next Planning Commission meeting anticipated for September 8, 2025.

3. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Andrea McGrady, a resident of Ivy Ridge Estates, expressed frustration over drainage issues affecting her property, asserting that flooding conditions are attributable to inadequate drainage associated with the proposed Ivy Ridge Subdivision park. She indicated that she had previously attempted to engage with the City but had experienced difficulty obtaining a response. Director Hardy advised that Public Works is the appropriate point of contact for such matters and offered to collect her contact information to facilitate coordination between the relevant parties.

4. OLD BUSINESS – None

5. NEW BUSINESS – None

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. **Canby Christian Parking Lot Expansion (CUP 25-01/VAR 25-01) – Brianna Addotta, AICP, Associate Planner**

The applicant, Canby Christian Church, has submitted a Conditional Use and Major Variance application package in a request to expand their existing parking lot into the property at 489 N. Ivy Street. The parcel is owned by the applicant, and they recently demolished the single-family home that previously occupied the property. Approval of the proposed project requires six (6) Major Variances from adopted development standards.

Staff Presentation: Brianna Addotta

Associate Planner Brianna Addotta presented applications CUP 25-01 and VAR 25-01 and associated review criteria for the Canby Christian Church parking lot expansion. The applicant requested an expansion of their conditional use permit (CUP) to taxlot 31E33CA10900 in order to expand their parking lot by 26 stalls to serve their existing church congregation. The request also includes six major variances to applicable design standards found in the Canby Development Code, including the following:

1. To allow two drive aisles at a width of 21.5 feet, 2.5 fewer feet less than the required minimum drive aisle width of 24 feet;
2. To allow a new access point on NW 5th Ave 36.75 feet from the intersection of N. Ivy St. and NW 5th Ave., 13.25 feet less than the minimum required separation of 50 feet;
3. To allow 92% impervious surface coverage, 22% more than the 70% allowed in the R-2 zone;
4. To reduce the landscaping required in the R-2 zone from 30% to 10% of the total lot area;
5. To reduce the parking lot landscaping required from 15% to 10%; and
6. To allow a row of 11 adjacent parking spaces without an internal landscape island, when the standard is one landscape island every 8 parking spaces.

The presentation began with an overview of the subject property, including its location, zoning designation, and surrounding land uses. Addotta summarized the scope of the proposal, including key site features and intended use. The presentation included the proposed site plan, highlighting key elements such as building placement, parking layout, access points, landscaping, and any proposed phasing of development. Infrastructure considerations were also addressed, including availability of utilities such as water, sewer, and stormwater management, and any required improvements or conditions tied to those systems.

Addotta outlined the evaluation criteria used in her analysis, emphasizing consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, compatibility with surrounding development, and potential impacts to neighboring properties. Specific attention was given to site design elements such as access, circulation, and general layout.

Brianna also discussed any identified constraints or considerations, including access, and potential environmental factors. She noted how these issues were addressed either through the proposal itself or through recommended conditions of approval.

The presentation concluded with staff's recommendations, including proposed conditions intended to ensure compliance with applicable standards and to mitigate potential impacts. Based on the application submitted and the facts, findings and conclusions of the staff report, Planning Staff recommended approval of applications CUP 25-01 and VAR 25-01, subject to the identified conditions of approval as presented.

Applicant Presentation: Curt McLeod, McLeod Engineering

Curt McLeod, representing the applicant team, provided a brief overview of the proposed development, building upon the staff presentation and addressing the purpose and intent of the request.

The presentation began with a description of the project, including the current use of the property as a church. The applicant explained the need for the proposed parking and the anticipated benefits to the community, along with its intentions to serve and respond to identified local needs.

Key components of the proposal such as access points, parking configuration, and internal circulation were discussed. Specific attention was given to how the site functions operationally, including how users would access the site, navigate the property, and utilize the existing facility. The applicant clarified that additional directional signage will be added to minimize traffic safety impacts, specifically focusing on entrance and exit signs at the Ivy Street and 5th Avenue accesses.

Additional details were provided regarding operational characteristics of the proposed use, including anticipated hours of operation, expected number of users or occupants, staffing, and general day-to-day activities associated with the development. The applicant emphasized how these operational elements were designed to be compatible with surrounding land uses.

The presentation concluded with the applicant requesting approval of the application as submitted (or with proposed conditions) and offered to answer questions from the Commission body.

Opponents: None

Proponents: None

Chair Ellison closed the public hearing.

Commission Deliberation:

The Commission discussed the applicant request for variances to expand the parking lot, including reducing drive aisle widths and increasing parking stalls. While some Commissioners supported the proposal due to downtown parking needs, Commissioner Hutchinson expressed concerns about granting multiple variances for what seemed like a basic parking lot redesign.

Commissioner Ewert questioned the applicant regarding allowing the general public to utilize their parking lot at all. Pastor Adame stated the church is more than happy to have the lot used as public parking during non-church function hours. He urged that the proposal would help create the additional parking needed for the anticipated growth within the downtown community as a whole.

There was brief discussion regarding lighting improvements, which staff clarified is not a required standard according to the development code. Pastor Adame briefly detailed the current lighting conditions on the site, to appease any concerns from the Commission. Additional concerns regarding directional signage and circulation arose during discussion with the applicant team mentioning future expansion and development plans.

The Commission discussed a continuance of the hearing item to September 22nd rather than deny it outright, allowing the applicant time to address concerns, particularly regarding variance #2.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Lewelling and seconded by Commission Hutchinson to grant a continuance to application CUP 25-01/VAR 25-01, Canby Christian Parking Lot Expansion. Motion approved 4/1.

b. Housing Production Strategy (HPS) – Don Hardy, Planning Director and Emma Porricolo, Associate Planner.

City staff sought a Planning Commission recommendation to approve the Housing Production Strategy (HPS) which will take the form of a resolution with City Council approval. The housing strategies are intended to promote the development of needed housing based on the Canby adopted Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) and identified tools, actions and policies the city can implement to promote affordability and choice related to identified housing needs. The strategies were drafted by a coalition of parties including a housing advisory committee, City staff, its consulting team (3J and FCS), the Planning Commission, and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

Staff Presentation: Emma Porricolo, Associate Planner, and Don Hardy, Planning Director

Associate Planner Porricolo began the presentation with a brief overview of the goals of the HPS, and its impact on the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) for the newest Commissioner. Most of the strategies will be implemented by a formal ordinance process within the next few years, if adopted.

Discussion items from July 16th, 2025, City Council work session were highlighted along with the three new strategies to be added to the HPS. The strategies were added due to encouragement from DLCD to include more financially backed strategies that address affordable housing:

1. SDC payment plan – Bancroft Bonding Act
2. Full or partial SDC waivers for regulated affordable housing
3. Waive Construction Excise Tax (CET) for regulated affordable housing

The strategies aim to meet the 0-60% medium family income (MFI) range for regulated affordable housing. Financing options were discussed along with reservations, acknowledging the state's requirements while emphasizing the need for careful financial consideration. Porricolo added that Council reviewed the existing regulated affordable housing in Canby and other ownership model examples as well as possible restrictions. It was clarified that Council would prefer to focus on entry-level ownership opportunities to create long-term community investments. Council provided direction on the conditions and approval process developers must follow under the new strategies. Approval would require a City Council hearing and evaluation of the financial impact on the City's operational budget.

Porricolo mentioned that staff had received comments from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) regarding some of the housing needs analyses, which should help identify a clearer standard for what they are looking for.

Overall, the presentation focused on the City Council's upcoming decision regarding the adoption of the HPS. The conversation ended with staff outlining next steps which involve presenting the recommendation to City Council at the meeting anticipated for October 1st, 2025, followed by a 45-day review by the Department of Land Conservation and Development.

Opponents: None

Proponents: None

Chair Ellison closed the public hearing to begin Commissioner deliberation.

Commissioner Deliberation:

Following the close of the public hearing, the Commission entered into deliberation on the proposed HPS and associated implementation measures.

Commissioners discussed the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed strategies, with particular attention to how they would be implemented and monitored over time. Several Commissioners expressed interest in ensuring that the strategies remain flexible enough to respond to changing housing needs, while still meeting state requirements.

Discussion included the role of DLCD in reviewing the HPS. Commissioners acknowledged that submitted strategies may be subject to revision or rejection and emphasized the importance of aligning the City's approach with state expectations to avoid delays. Director Hardy mentioned the deadline to submit with DLCD is December 1st, 2025.

Commissioners also considered the financial and operational impacts of the proposed strategies. Questions were raised regarding the City's capacity to implement certain programs, including staffing, funding, and long-term administrative responsibilities. There was general agreement that strategies should be realistic and achievable within existing or anticipated City resources.

Additional deliberation focused on balancing regulatory incentives with development feasibility. Commissioners discussed how incentives could encourage desired housing types while maintaining compatibility with existing neighborhoods.

Throughout the discussion, Commissioners emphasized the importance of clear metrics and accountability to evaluate the success of the strategies over time. There was also recognition of the need for ongoing coordination between staff, the Commission, and City Council as the HPS moves forward.

The Commission ultimately indicated general support for advancing the proposed strategies, with the understanding that refinements may be necessary based on DLCD feedback and further analysis. Discussion concluded with the Planning Commission recommending approval of the strategies.

7. ITEMS OF INTEREST/REPORT FROM PLANNING STAFF

- a. The next Planning Commission meeting is planned for **Monday, September 8, 2025**, at 6:00 pm in the Council Chambers.
- b. Planning Director's Update

Upcoming meetings and deadlines were discussed, including a Community Summit #5 and Comprehensive Plan Update anticipated for September 8th, 2025. Director Hardy shared that the fence code update was approved unanimously by City Council on August 20th, 2025. A reminder was given to Commissioner to submit comments and questions by September 5th, 2025, over the draft goals and policies for the Comprehensive Plan.

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

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Hutchinson and seconded by Commissioner Lewelling to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved 5/0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 P.M.