



**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**  
**CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**

6:00 PM – April 27, 2026  
City Council Chambers – Virtual Meeting via Zoom

---

- PRESENT** – Commissioners: Dan Ewert (Vice Chair), Leah McCarthy, Jennifer Driskill, and Judi Jarosh
- ABSENT** – Matt Ellison (Chair), Craig Lewelling, Michael Hutchinson,
- STAFF** – Don Hardy, Planning Director, Ryan Potter, Planning Manager, AICP, and Emily Sasse, Recording Secretary
- OTHERS** – Martin Meskers, Erin Sprando, Craig Carpenter, Petronella Donovan, Danelle Isenhardt, Edward Redalescu, Bryan Dickerson, and others
- 

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

- a. Pledge of Allegiance

**2. CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. Draft Meeting Minutes – February 10, 2025

Approval of the minutes from February 10, 2025, will be considered at the June 8, 2026, Planning Commission meeting, due to a lack of quorum of Commissioners present at said meeting,

- b. Draft Meeting Minutes – December 8, 2025

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commission Driskill and seconded by Commissioner Ewert to approve the meeting minutes from December 8, 2025, as written. Motion approved 4/0.

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

**4. OLD BUSINESS** – None

**5. NEW BUSINESS** – None

**6. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. **Senior and Memory Care Center (DR 25-03/CUP 25-02) – Brianna Addotta, AICP, Associate Planner**

The project applicant, Waterstone Investments LLC, has submitted a request for Conditional Use and Design Review approval for a Senior Living and Memory Care Facility with 102 beds and four independent living duplexes, with associated parking and site improvements. The proposed facility would be located at 1300 S Ivy Street.

### **Conflicts of Interest:**

The Commission body unanimously stated that there were no conflicts of interest.

### **Ex Parte Contact:**

All commissioners stated they have not had any ex parte contact, however several of the commissioners shared that they do drive by the site frequently.

### **Staff Presentation: Brianna Addotta, AICP, Associate Planner**

Associate Planner Brianna Addotta began the presentation with a brief summary of the proposed project and the associated land use application requests. Staff provided an overview of the site's existing conditions, followed by a review of the current R-1 zoning designation and the zoning of the surrounding properties. The facility proposed for 1300 S Ivy Street would include 102 beds (80 assisted living and 22 memory care) and 54 parking spaces, and four independent living duplexes.

Staff highlighted project details such as parking requirements and design review standards, including traffic analysis scenarios projected for 2031. The presentation covered anticipated traffic impacts, showing that the intersection would maintain adequate capacity with a volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.62 in 2031. Staff also discussed proposed parking standard modifications and expressed support based on industry experience and the specific staffing numbers provided by the applicant team.

Staff shared that the applicant was requesting a deviation from the off-street loading bay standards. Staff supported the request due to unclear standards for a residential facility, which does not directly fall under commercial or industrial classifications. The proposed loading bay would be slightly wider than required for commercial use while still meeting the industrial-use length standard. Associate Planner Addotta also noted that the applicant proposed pervious pavement for parking spaces and the emergency turnaround area in order to meet the 60% impervious surface standard.

Property signage was briefly discussed, with staff highlighting that the proposed design would be cohesive with the surrounding area. Outdoor lighting standards were also briefly discussed, with staff explaining the lumen calculations and how the proposed lighting would not negatively affect neighboring properties. The lighting plan conforms to the LZ1 lighting zone standards, which are typical for parcels within the R-1 zone.

Access spacing and related limitations were presented, with staff explaining the applicant's request to deviate from the standard 330-foot spacing requirement from an intersection or driveway along arterial roads. The project proposes one full-access driveway on SE 13th Avenue and one right-in/right-out restricted-access driveway on South Ivy Street, both classified as arterials. The deviation request includes approximately 240 feet of access spacing along SE 13th Avenue and 200 feet of access spacing along South Ivy Street from the intersection. Staff emphasized that an exception would be required regardless of the access location due to existing site constraints. It was also noted that vision clearance was evaluated in the traffic study and is expected to meet applicable standards, although final verification would occur during the pre-construction phase of the land use process.

Staff then discussed the Site and Design Review standards and applicable criteria. The point system used in the Design Review process was explained, with the applicant scoring above the minimum required standard. Proposed developments are required to achieve at least 60% of the total possible points, with a minimum of 10% coming from the list of Low Impact Development (LID) elements. Staff shared that the applicant achieved a total score of 67%, including 19% from LID elements, demonstrating compliance with the Site and Design Review standards.

Conditional Use criteria were also discussed, with staff stating that the proposal is consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan and that the site's characteristics are suitable for the proposed use, including the required frontage improvements. Public utility and service provider comments were briefly

summarized, with staff stating that adequate public facilities and services exist to support the proposed development.

Staff also addressed public comments claiming that the proposal was not compatible with the characteristics of the surrounding area and development pattern. Staff stated that the proposal meets the applicable design standards for the zone and noted that private business competition is not a consideration under the applicable approval criteria and standards.

The presentation concluded with staff recommending approval of land use applications DR 25-03 and CUP 25-02, subject to the 48 conditions of approval and based on the facts, findings, and conclusions presented in the staff report.

### **Commissioner Questions for Staff Presentation:**

During this portion of the hearing, the Planning Commission asked staff a series of detailed questions regarding the proposed senior care facility, focusing primarily on system development charges (SDCs), emergency access, traffic analysis methodology, site design scoring, stormwater management, and the project's approval history.

Commissioner Jarosh began by asking how SDCs for the proposed senior care facility would be calculated compared to a standard residential housing development. Staff explained that while senior care facilities may utilize a different Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) land use classification, SDC calculations generally follow similar methodologies based on factors such as square footage and projected impacts.

Several commissioners then raised concerns regarding emergency access, site circulation, and traffic operations. Questions were asked about how fire apparatus and emergency vehicles would maneuver through the site, particularly near the rear loading zone and designated fire truck turnaround area. Staff stated that the fire district had reviewed the plans and did not identify concerns regarding emergency access or maneuverability. However, Commissioner Ewert expressed concern that delivery trucks occupying the loading area during busy periods could interfere with emergency vehicle access or create congestion near the intersection. Staff acknowledged the concern but noted that no formal objections had been received from the fire district.

Staff clarified that the Ivy Street driveway would function as a right-in/right-out access only, while the 13th Avenue entrance would provide full turning movements and likely serve as the primary emergency access point. Commissioners questioned how effectively the full-access driveway would operate given existing congestion in the area associated with nearby schools, buses, and peak traffic periods. Several Commissioners expressed skepticism regarding whether the traffic study accurately reflected real-world traffic conditions experienced by residents.

Questions were also raised regarding the methodology used in the traffic analysis. Commissioners asked whether the consultant had conducted new traffic counts at nearby intersections or relied primarily on projected background growth assumptions. Staff responded that the study appeared to rely on standard background growth calculations and did not include newly collected traffic count data. Commissioners noted concerns that school-related congestion, long wait times, and bus activity may not have been fully represented in the analysis.

In response, staff stated that the applicant would dedicate additional right-of-way improvements and emphasized that the proposed facility was anticipated to generate relatively low traffic volumes, with most trips associated with employee shift changes rather than resident traffic. Staff also referenced the traffic analysis prepared by DKS, which indicated the nearby intersections would continue operating within acceptable level-of-service standards. Despite those findings, commissioners continued to express concern that even a single delivery vehicle entering or exiting the site during peak traffic periods could significantly impact circulation and queuing near the intersection.

Additional questions were asked regarding the proposed duplex portion of the development. Staff confirmed the duplexes were anticipated as part of a future second phase of the project, though no timeline had been provided by the applicant. Commissioners also inquired about the proximity of the Ivy Street driveway to the nearby Hope Village access point. Staff stated the driveways were not directly aligned and appeared to maintain reasonable separation distance, although exact measurements were not immediately available.

The discussion then shifted to the project's Design Review Matrix scoring. Commissioners questioned several categories where points had been awarded and suggested portions of the scoring may have been overly generous. Questions were raised regarding discrepancies between the number of parking spaces shown on various plan sheets and application materials. Commissioners also questioned the awarding of points related to driveway spacing from nearby intersections, noting that the constrained nature of the site near the arterial intersection of 13th Avenue and Ivy Street may limit applicability of certain standard criteria. Staff explained that because the application was processed as a conditional use permit, the project remained subject to the standard Design Review Matrix criteria, although some categories had already been deemed not applicable.

Commissioners further questioned the project's scoring for public art amenities, stating that the plans did not appear to include traditional artistic features such as murals, sculptures, fountains, or decorative bike racks. Staff generally agreed that portions of the scoring may warrant additional review. Concerns were also raised regarding the project's low-impact development and pervious paving scoring. Staff clarified that approximately 60 percent of the site would consist of impervious surface area and that pervious paving materials represented only a limited portion of the overall paved area. Following discussion and recalculation of several categories, Commissioner Driskill estimated that the project's total Design Review Matrix score could potentially fall below the minimum threshold required for approval. Staff stated they would revisit portions of the scoring and verify stormwater-related calculations prior to final deliberations.

Stormwater management was also discussed extensively. Commissioners questioned plan references showing connections to the City stormwater system while simultaneously describing the project as utilizing on-site stormwater retention. Staff responded that the applicant intended for the on-site stormwater facility to manage the site's drainage needs, while connections to the City system may function as backup infrastructure. Staff further noted that Public Works and engineering staff would continue reviewing those details during preconstruction review and through conditions of approval.

Commissioner McCarthy mentioned that despite concerns regarding certain scoring categories and circulation issues, they generally found the proposed building aesthetically pleasing and believed the architecture contributed positively to the overall project design. The Commissioner also expressed interest in hearing additional clarification from the applicant regarding parking and access operations.

The discussion concluded with questions regarding the project's prior approval history. Staff confirmed that a substantially similar version of the proposal had previously received approval but later expired after the applicant failed to proceed within the required timeframe. Staff explained that one of the primary revisions in the current proposal involved updated fire access and internal circulation improvements requested by the fire department, including expanded paved maneuvering areas for emergency vehicles. Staff further confirmed that City staff had coordinated extensively with fire officials throughout the current review process.

#### **Applicant Presentation: Danelle Isenhart, Edward Redalescu, and Bryan Dickerson**

The applicant team, represented by Danelle Isenhart of Isenhart Consulting, provided an overview of the proposed senior care facility and responded to questions previously raised by the Planning Commission regarding site design, circulation, stormwater management, and emergency access. The

applicant was joined by representatives from EPR Design and Northwest Architecture and Design, as well as the project's civil engineer Bryan Dickerson participating remotely.

The applicant team thanked staff for the preparation of the staff report and acknowledged that the proposal represented a re-review of a previously approved project that had expired after the required development timeline was not met. It was explained that one of the primary revisions made since the prior approval involved updated fire access and circulation improvements that had been identified during the earlier review process. The project team stated their overall support for the proposed conditions of approval, with the exception of a condition requiring the sanitary line to be public infrastructure rather than private, which the applicant noted would increase project costs due to additional pipe length and sizing requirements. The applicant indicated that discussions with staff regarding potential alternatives were ongoing.

Project architect Edward Redalescu addressed several questions related to the project's Design Review Matrix scoring and site amenities. He explained that the development would include the required 20 bicycle parking spaces, with the intent to incorporate decorative or artistic bicycle rack designs rather than standard hoop-style racks, although final designs had not yet been selected. Additional site amenities were highlighted, including proposed gazebos, landscaped plaza areas, built-in benches, and pedestrian-oriented gathering spaces near the corner intersection, which were intended to enhance the overall appearance and functionality of the site.

Questions regarding stormwater management were answered with the applicant team explaining that the site would incorporate multiple on-site stormwater detention facilities, including landscaped rain gardens near the front plaza area and additional stormwater planters distributed throughout the property. It was stated that the stormwater facilities were designed to manage runoff on-site under normal conditions, with connections to the City stormwater system functioning primarily as overflow protection during major storm events.

Discussion also focused on emergency access and delivery operations. The applicant explained that the proposal included two fire truck turnaround areas designed to meet fire district maneuvering standards. One turnaround area would be located near the primary entrance from 13th Avenue and another near the loading and delivery area. They stated that deliveries to the facility are anticipated to occur primarily through smaller box-style delivery vehicles rather than large semi-trucks and noted that deliveries could be scheduled to minimize operational conflicts. It was further explained that the building's covered entrance canopy was designed with sufficient clearance to accommodate ambulances and fire apparatus if needed.

Mr. Redalescu also addressed questions regarding site access and circulation improvements developed during the redesign process. He stated that significant coordination had occurred between the applicant team, civil engineers, City staff, and fire officials to refine the site layout and access configuration. It was explained that the final design, including the right-in/right-out access on Ivy Street and the full-access driveway on 13th Avenue, was determined to provide the most effective circulation pattern for the constrained site conditions.

The presentation concluded with the applicant offering to answer additional questions from the Planning Commission regarding the proposal.

#### **Commissioner Questions for Applicant:**

During the Commissioner questioning portion of the hearing, the Planning Commission engaged in an extensive discussion with the applicant team regarding emergency response impacts, fire access, traffic circulation, landscaping, parking requirements, and the overall intensity of the proposed senior care facility development.

Commissioners first raised concerns regarding the anticipated number of emergency service calls generated by the facility. Commissioner Jarosh referenced research indicating that assisted living and memory care facilities of similar size can generate between 190 and 500 additional emergency calls annually and expressed concern about the resulting burden on the local fire department. She noted that Canby Fire currently responds to approximately 2,800 medical calls annually and suggested the project could significantly increase emergency response demand. The applicant acknowledged they did not have specific projections regarding emergency call volume or occupancy rates beyond stating that the facility would include 22 memory care beds and 80 assisted living beds, with some anticipated level of vacancy.

Commissioners also discussed how emergency service impacts relative to SDCs, questioning whether the facility's SDC calculations adequately reflected the potential strain on emergency services compared to standard residential development. Several Commissioners emphasized the importance of evaluating both the positive community benefits and potential service impacts associated with future senior care developments.

Additional Commissioner questions focused on emergency vehicle access and fire operations within the site. Commissioners questioned whether fire trucks could safely utilize the Ivy Street entrance and whether turning radius and site circulation were adequate for large emergency vehicles. Staff and the applicant clarified that the plans had been reviewed extensively with Canby Fire District and that conditions of approval required final fire district sign-off on the access configuration. The applicant further explained that the building's elevators exceeded the minimum dimensions requested by the fire district for gurney access and confirmed that all bathrooms and circulation areas within the facility would comply with current accessibility standards, including required wheelchair turning radius.

Questions were also raised regarding the overall access configuration on 13th Avenue and Ivy Street. The applicant explained that earlier design concepts had proposed eliminating Ivy Street access entirely, but after coordination with City staff and fire officials, the current right-in/right-out Ivy Street access and full-access 13th Avenue driveway were determined to be the preferred circulation arrangement. Commissioners continued to express concern regarding the proximity of the 13th Avenue driveway to the nearby left-turn lane and school traffic congestion. During the discussion, the project's civil engineer, Brian Dickerson of Langan Engineering, shared aerial exhibits and roadway diagrams illustrating the proposed driveway alignment relative to existing pavement markings and turn lanes. Dickerson explained that the driveway would align between the taper and beginning of the existing left-turn lane and that no restriping of the roadway was currently proposed. Commissioners remained concerned that vehicles exiting the site and attempting to travel eastbound or southbound may experience operational difficulties during periods of heavy traffic and school congestion.

Landscaping and buffering between the project and adjacent residential properties were also discussed. One commissioner questioned the appropriateness of several proposed tree species, noting that mature tree sizes appeared potentially incompatible with the limited setback areas between the development and neighboring homes. Concerns were raised regarding potential future encroachment into adjacent yards, impacts on emergency egress, and potential fire hazards associated with large trees located close to structures. The applicant responded that the landscape plan remained preliminary and could be refined during the building permit process. The applicant also noted that a six-foot fence would be installed along the property line and acknowledged that some tree species or placements may ultimately require modification.

Commissioners also asked questions regarding the project's stormwater facilities and fire hydrant placement. The applicant explained that the proposed infiltration planters and rain garden systems were designed to accommodate major storm events, including the 100-year storm standard, and stated that the exact location of the proposed fire hydrant would continue to be coordinated with the fire district during final engineering review.

Significant commissioner discussion focused on the internal circulation of emergency vehicles, delivery trucks, and resident traffic within the site. Commissioners expressed concern regarding potential congestion near the loading area and rear fire truck turnaround spaces, particularly if multiple delivery vehicles and emergency responders were present simultaneously. One commissioner commented that the project appeared to combine several levels of senior housing and care—including assisted living, memory care, and independent living duplexes—onto a relatively constrained parcel and questioned whether the site was being overdeveloped.

In response to commissioner questions, the applicant explained that the duplexes were intended to provide transitional “step-care” housing for independent seniors who may later transition into higher levels of care within the main facility as their needs change over time. The applicant stated that the goal was to create a continuum of care within a single campus environment.

Commissioners also inquired about emergency backup power for the facility. The applicant confirmed that the development would include standby generator systems to provide backup power during outages and identified the proposed generator location near the loading and mechanical service area.

Additional commissioner questions focused on parking calculations and code requirements for the facility. Questions were raised regarding discrepancies between required and proposed parking totals, particularly when considering the independent living duplexes separately from the assisted living and memory care components. Staff acknowledged that current standards may not fully reflect modern senior housing operations, particularly given that many residents would not drive. Commissioners also expressed concern that the number of visitor parking spaces appeared limited for a facility of the proposed size. The applicant confirmed that the site would provide 70 total parking spaces, including parking associated with the duplex units.

Following the applicant’s responses and Commissioner questions, the Vice Chair concluded the Commissioner questioning portion of the hearing and proceeded to the next item in the public hearing process.

During the public testimony portion of the public hearing, the Planning Commission received testimony from two members of the public regarding the proposed senior care facility development.

**Proponents: None**

**Opponent: Erin Sprando, representing Marquis Companies**

Erin Sprando, Director of Operations for Marquis Companies and operator of Hope Village Assisted Living & Memory Care, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Director Sprando stated that her concerns primarily related to parking demand, site logistics, and emergency service impacts based on her operational experience managing a similarly sized assisted living and memory care facility. She noted that Hope Village contains 80 assisted living residents and 22 memory care residents, matching the scale of the proposed development.

Sprando stated that while the staffing estimate of 38 employees appeared reasonable, the projected visitor parking demand discussed during the hearing seemed significantly underestimated. She explained that Hope Village averages approximately 25 assisted living visitors and 8 memory care visitors daily, primarily during daytime hours, and stated that the proposed parking supply would likely be insufficient when accounting for staff, visitors, and residents who still drive independently. She further noted that several residents at Hope Village maintain personal vehicles on-site and that many family members visiting elderly residents are themselves older adults who may have difficulty parking at greater distances from the building entrance.

Sprando provided operational observations regarding emergency medical service calls, stating that the assisted living and memory care portions of Hope Village average approximately one to two EMS calls per day, while the nursing facility portion averages approximately two to three calls daily due to higher

acuity levels of care. She further commented that although project's economic feasibility was not directly within the Planning Commission's review authority, she believed the long-term viability of a project of this scale should still be considered given the site's intended use.

**Opponent: Craig Carpenter, Canby Resident**

Craig Carpenter, a Canby resident, provided testimony regarding neighborhood traffic and circulation concerns near the proposed development site. Mr. Carpenter stated that traffic congestion in the area, particularly during school-related peak periods, already makes left turns from nearby residential streets onto 13th Avenue difficult. He expressed concern that additional traffic generated by the proposed facility could increase congestion and encourage drivers to use nearby residential streets, including Larch Street, as cut-through routes to avoid the intersection at 13th Avenue and Ivy Street.

Mr. Carpenter also raised concerns regarding neighborhood safety, noting the presence of children and elderly residents in the surrounding area. Additional concerns were expressed regarding on-street parking and parking overflow associated with both the proposed development and nearby school and recreational activities. Mr. Carpenter stated that vehicles frequently park along 13th Avenue near the site, creating visibility and circulation challenges, and questioned whether the proposed parking supply would be adequate during employee shift changes and peak activity periods.

During commissioner questioning, Mr. Carpenter confirmed that on-street parking is currently permitted along portions of 13th Avenue near the project site and reiterated concern that increased traffic associated with the facility could further impact nearby residential streets and intersections.

**Applicant Rebuttal: Patronella Donovan, Owner, and Danelle Isenhardt**

Applicant and facility owner Petronella Donovan provided rebuttal testimony in response to concerns raised during public testimony. Ms. Donovan clarified that her professional experience extends beyond five-bed foster care facilities, stating that she has operated larger care facilities and has worked in the senior care industry for more than 30 years. She emphasized the growing demand for assisted living and memory care services, noting projected increases in Oregon's senior population over the coming decades.

Ms. Donovan addressed comments comparing the proposal to Hope Village Assisted Living and Memory Care, stating that the facilities are not directly comparable due to differences in services provided, including Hope Village's rehabilitation component, which she stated generates additional traffic and activity levels. She further stated that there is a strong regional need for senior care housing and described the proposal as complementary rather than competitive with existing facilities.

Danelle Isenhardt explained that the previous land use approval expired due to timing and expiration deadlines rather than issues with the project itself. Ms. Donovan stated that updated engineering and site design work had since been completed, resulting in improvements to the proposal for residents and the City. Additional testimony from Danelle Isenhardt noted that the Fire Department and consulting Traffic Engineer had reviewed and approved the revised access configuration and traffic circulation plans associated with the development. It was indicated that approximately six additional on-street parking spaces could potentially be accommodated along 13th Avenue if permitted by the City.

Commissioner questions focused on the applicant's prior experience operating larger facilities. Ms. Donovan stated that she previously developed and operated a 30-bed memory care facility in addition to several smaller facilities and confirmed that her current operations also include assisted living services.

**Vice Chair Ewert closed the public hearing item to move into Commissioner Deliberation.**

Staff suggested moving to a continuance to allow the applicant to address the concerns of the Commission and any public comments that were mentioned.

**The Commission agreed in a 3/1 vote to reopen the public hearing. The public hearing was reopened.**

The applicant requested a continuance of the hearing item regarding land use applications DR 25-03 and CUP 25-02, Senior and Memory Care Center.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Jarosh and seconded by Commissioner McCarthy to grant a continuance for land use applications DR 25-03/CUP 25-02, Senior and Memory Care Center to the meeting scheduled for June 8, 2026. Motion approved 3/1.

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

- a. Planning Director's Update
- b. The next Planning Commission meeting is planned for **Monday, May 11, 2026**, at 6:00 pm in the Council Chambers.

Planning Director Hardy made the Commission aware of future Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings, scheduled for May 13, 2026, from 6-8 p.m. Staff let the Commission know that both May PC meetings will be cancelled due to a lack of hearing and discussion items. The conversation ended with updates on upcoming UGB planning activities and a code audit project.

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

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Jarosh and seconded by Commissioner Driskill to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved 4/0.

**The meeting adjourned at 8:18 P.M.**