



CITY OF OREGON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Commission Chambers, Libke Public Safety Building, 1234 Linn Ave, Oregon City
Monday, May13, 2024 at 7:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Stoll called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Present: 6 – Chair Stoll, Vice Chair Paul Espe, Commissioner Dirk Schlagenhauser, Commissioner Bob La Salle, Commissioner Karla Laws, Commissioner Brandon Dole

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Daphne Wuest

Staffers: 2 - Community Development Director Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Senior Planner Christina Robertson-Gardner, Planning Manager Pete Walter, Deputy City Attorney Carrie Richter

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

MEETING MINUTES

1. Meeting Minutes for Approval: April 8, 2024.

A motion was made by Commissioner LaSalle, seconded by Commissioner Schlagenhauser to approve the meeting minutes.

The motion carried by the following vote: Yea: 6 - Commissioner LaSalle, Commissioner Laws, Commissioner Dole, Commissioner Schlagenhauser, Vice Chair Espe and Chair Stoll

GENERAL BUSINESS

2. McLoughlin Boulevard Enhancements Project Update.

Senior Planner Christina Robertson-Gardner presented the update presentation and explained the design alternative analysis, what came out of the December public comment process. The PowerPoint presentation was provided by our consultant firm, Kittelson & Associates, which was presented to the City Commission in April.

Christina covered 1) the technical review of the “Most Promising” alternatives; 2) Structural and Constructability Screening which was to determine the technical feasibility of the initial three most promising alternatives; 3) Revised “Most Promising Alternatives; and 4) Next Steps – May 15 City Commission

direction.

The Planning Commission will be asked to adopt a plan in the fall so that the City is in a position to apply for grant money. By having an adopted plan, even though it may be a while before the plan is implemented, it provides the City with nimbleness to apply for grant money or other funding that may come along.

There were some questions and comments by the commissioners. Some of the questions need to be passed on to the bridge engineer who has been involved in the process and they were regarding flood, lifespan, seismic, sway and possibility of making it able to handle emergency vehicle traffic.

3. Park Place Concept Plan Code Refinement

Community Development Director Aquilla Hurd-Ravich provided a presentation with an overview of the Legislative process for this revision.

The goal of these refinements is to create clear and objective code criteria to review when processing land use applications for housing. Since the Park Place Concept Plan was adopted changes in State land use regulations occurred and the review of a master plan application illuminated where the code revisions were needed after being appealed to LUBA. Revised code will provide more legally defensible standards to base decisions on when approving or rejecting the applications for housing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Jackie Hammond-Williams of Oregon City provided a written testimony which the commissioners received prior to the meeting. She spoke about keeping the initial vision of Park Place Village with connectivity (Holly Lane and Redland Rd). She spoke to the fact that volunteers spent numerous hours along with staff to create the initial PPCP and wants the City to keep to the intent of the initial vision in mind as code revisions are made.
- B. Jim Nicita of Oregon City provided a written testimony which the commissioners received a copy of prior to the meeting. He had a couple of supplementary comments to his written testimony. First, he spoke about weaknesses of the concept plan that is not part of the clear and objective standards which includes the connectivity issue and that there was a LUBA case that said that a municipal government can plan and develop roads even outside their city limits which provides a tool to make sure that the concept plan goes correctly. The success of the plan is contingent on making that connection to Redland Road and Holly Lane. Secondly, he feels that the City should consider establishing an independent Park Zone because it would be more precise and clear and objective. Reemphasized that the Concept plan calls for Main Street standards which are different from design standards. He does not believe the Main Street standards have been implemented and he hopes that they are a part of this process.
- C. Paulette Merrill of Oregon City spoke about the initial Concept Plan work. She asks that with the new clear and objective standards, the intent of the plan is not lost.

3. Park Place Concept Plan Code Refinement cont.

Planning Manager Pete Walter went through the PPCP Key Elements: 1) 2 primary north-south transportation connections; 2) 2 mixed-use neighborhoods; 3) Commercial nodes; 4) Area of civic institution; 5) Mix of housing types and affordability; 6) System of trails, pedestrian and bicycle connections; 7) “Green” on-site stormwater treatment; 8) Protect sensitive areas; 9) Solar access orientation; 10) Green edges to define neighborhoods; and 11) Integrates parks and open space into neighborhoods

There was discussion about the definition of “affordability”.

A break was taken and then Planning Manager Pete Walter covered 3 chapters of code that have revisions suggested.

- a. Chapter 17.04 which covers Definitions with suggested additional terms to be added to code.
- b. Chapter 17.10 which covers Medium Density Residential Districts with proposed revisions to address a transition for new development at edges of the PPCP boundary and minimum lot sizes abutting existing development outside the PPCP boundary.
- c. Chapter 17.21 which covers Residential Design with proposed revisions to remove discretion and increase design elements to improve visual interest and compatibility.

There was some discussion of SB1573 which just passed this last session which said that an applicant for housing who comes to the City and says that the design standards are making it too expensive to build, they are entitled to adjustments of particular design and development standards that are talked about in the bill itself. They do not have to prove the hardship; they only have to say it is a hardship.

The commissioners made the decision to move forward with reviewing the code revisions presented tonight at the next meeting. Then get the next set of code revisions for review at the following meeting. The final draft of the code will then be available for the Public Hearings meetings. They requested staff comment under each section of revisions as to why the change.

COMMUNICATIONS

There will not be a meeting on May 27th as it is a holiday. Next meeting will be June 10.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Stoll adjourned the meeting at 9:25 PM

