



# CITY OF OREGON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

---

Commission Chambers, Libke Public Safety Building, 1234 Linn Ave, Oregon City  
Monday, July 22, 2024 at 7:00 PM

---

## CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

*Vice Chair Espe called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.*

Present: 5 – Vice Chair Paul Espe, Commissioner Bob La Salle, Commissioner Daphne Wuest, Commissioner Brandon Dole, Commissioner Karla Laws (Virtual)

Absent: 2 - Chair Greg Stoll, Excused; Commissioner Dirk Schlagenhauser, excused

Staffers: 2 - Community Development Director Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Senior Planner Christina Robertson-Gardner, City Engineer Dayna Webb, City Attorney Bill Kabeiseman

## MEETING MINUTES

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

Commissioner LaSalle commented that he would not approve these minutes because they do not include enough detail. The Commissioners were reminded that we are doing “Action Minutes” and not transcription minutes.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wuest, seconded by Commissioner Dole to approve the meeting minutes for July 8, 2024.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yea: 3 - Commissioner Dole, Commissioner Wuest, Vice Chair Espe**

**Nay: 2 - Commissioner LaSalle, Commissioner Laws**

There was additional discussion about the minutes and the desire to have more key points included that are brought up by the Commissioners. Director Hurd-Ravich noted that it is hard to find the point on the wide spectrum between action minutes and verbatim for what to include or not include. If there are things missing specifically, the Commissioners can send information to the staff to have the minutes amended for the next meeting.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

None

## **PRESENTATION**

2. Transportation System Plan Prioritization Process presented by Dayna Webb, City Engineer. In response to the Key Element in the Park Place Concept Plan regarding providing 2 primary North-South connections between Holcomb Blvd and Redland Rd, Dayna was asked to come to explain the prioritization process and what it looks like for future projects.

The TSP is a long-term guide for transportation investment incorporating the vision of the community into an equitable and efficient system. It looks at the needs of walking, biking, driving, transit and freight and tries to balance the needs of every user of the system.

The current TSP was created in 2013. They have a 5-point Vision for the Plan, and they created 8 goals which were then ranked in a priority order by the committee and the stakeholders. Each goal then has objectives and evaluation criteria. There are currently 354 projects that have been scored based on goals, objectives and evaluation criteria. The highest-ranking projects are then the priorities.

For the Park Place Concept Plan, the Swan Avenue and Holly Lane Road connectivity is ranked 332-334 of the 354, so it is considered a Long-Term project and most likely will not be funded.

Projects are funded by grants, partnerships and leveraging opportunities. Grants are the primary source of funding.

SDCs fees come from development and can only be spent on building capacity. An example is the Meyers Rd Extension including the stormwater, water and sewer pipes that were paid for by SDC funds. Walking, biking or access to transit is 60% SDC eligible and 40% Gas Tax eligible.

When developers come in with a project to a pre-application meeting, the TSP is analyzed to determine what transportation needs would need to be included in the developer's project or not included to keep within the TSP vision and goals.

When damage to the infrastructure happens at a development, the City will put in a Change Order with the Developer to get the damage done fixed. Where there is City work with Developer work, and the work to be done is more extensive than originally planned, they look at the plan and the goals and determine the best way to address the issue.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

3. **GLUA-24-00004, AN-24-00001 and ZC-24-00001 for 14389 & 14421 Maplelane Rd**

Vice Chair Espe opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He then asked for any ex parte contact or conflicts of interest by any of the Commissioners. There were none stated. Most of the commissioners present had driven by or visited the site.

Senior Planner Robertson-Gardner presented the staff report. She had 2 items to enter into the record. First, Clackamas River Water was late in providing comments, but their comments were the standard for an annexation and asked that if the City desires to serve these properties in the future, that they follow the withdrawal process as stipulated in statute. Second, she added the Housing Needs Analysis from 2021 because this proposed annexation and zone change is consistent with the HNA.

Annexation request is for 2.5 acres, and they are asking to be zone R-6. The applicants do not currently have a plan to develop the property. The Commission must determine if this proposal meets the annexation factors and the criteria for the zone changes.

Staff is asking for direction for two items. Item 1 is regarding Historic Considerations as the 2011 citywide historic survey deemed the two houses on these properties as potentially eligible to be Historical Designated. Does the Planning Commission want to ask City Commission to add a condition or additional requirements that address this or not?

The 2<sup>nd</sup> item that staff would like some direction about is regarding the trees on the property. The City does not have a Residential Tree Program so once these properties are annexed, the applicant could remove trees. The commission could ask City Commission to make the site subject to OCMC 17.41 until there is a development plan which would protect the mature trees along the street frontage.

Commission discussed the Historic consideration. The homes are not designated historic by the County, but they could be eligible for a local listing. It takes owner consent to get designated as well.

Brad Kilby, representative for the applicants, and Graeme Newhouse, one of the applicants, gave a presentation. Applicants are not developing the property at this time; they are trying to preserve the value of the property as the parents are aging.

Commission deliberated and had discussion about what information the 2011 historic survey did. They just looked for any building over 50 years old. It would need a more in depth survey, Historic Review Board vote and owner consent. Planning commission agreed that the Historic aspect was not for them to determine.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Dole, seconded by Commissioner Wuest to leave the question of Historic Review to the City Commission for consideration without requiring further action from the applicant at this time.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yea: 5 - Commissioner LaSalle, Commissioner Laws, Commissioner Dole,**

## **Commissioner Wuest, Vice Chair Espe**

Commission deliberated and had a discussion about the mature trees on the property. Commissioner Laws would like to see future work done on a Residential Tree program. Ultimately, the Planning Commission agreed that

**A motion was made by Commissioner Dole, seconded by Commissioner Wuest to move the application forward to City Commission without requiring tree protection.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yea: 4 - Commissioner LaSalle, Commissioner Laws, Commissioner Dole, Commissioner Wuest**

**Nay: 1 – Vice Chair Espe**

Commissioner Laws expressed again getting an agenda item in the future for getting a Residential Tree Program.

Deliberation then occurred regarding just the annexation and zoning change. There were questions about middle housing and land division on this property. There are many options.

**A motion was made by Commissioner LaSalle, seconded by Commissioner Wuest to approve GLUA-24-00004, AN-24-00001 and ZC-24-00001 for 14389 & 14421 Maplelane Rd.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yea: 5 - Commissioner LaSalle, Commissioner Laws, Commissioner Dole, Commissioner Wuest, Vice Chair Espe**

## **DISCUSSION**

### **4. Park Place Concept Plan Code Refinement continuation**

Director Aquilla Hurd-Ravich gave a review of the code amendment changes that have resulted from the past few meetings. She covered sections: 16.12.026, 17.04, 17.08, 17.10, 17.21 and 17.65.

- a. 16.12.026 – Street Design – Alleys added two reasons a modification could be requested
- b. 17.04 – Definitions no changes
- c. 17.08.040 – Low Density Districts – Dimensional Standards cleaned up the table to make it more readable
- d. 17.08 & 17.10 – Low Density & Medium Density Residential Districts had a few changes about lot sizes and setbacks with some numbering changes
- e. 17.10 – Medium Density made a change to more discretionary wording. It also

cleaned up the table for readability.

Commissioner LaSalle asked why if there are no R-3.5 zones in the Concept Plan the wording in the code references R-3.5. Director Hurd-Ravich explained that there is not currently R-3.5 but the Comprehensive Plan for the area covers Medium Density includes R-3.5 and R5.

f. 17.21 – Residential Design had some changes to the applicability and modifications sections had minor changes. The Roof Design, Massing, Porches & Entries, Approved Siding Materials and Housing Diversity Standards sections had some changes.

Vice Chair Espe asked about the shed roof definition. It was suggested that “shed roofs” be removed and just leave it as “Flat roofs”. There was some discussion, and it was determined to leave it as is, but add a definition for a Shed Roof.

Commissioner LaSalle is concerned that by removing the solar access it changed the concept plan which is not the intent. Director Hurd-Ravich explained that striking this only means that someone does not have to orient their roof in a way to provide solar access, but it does not preclude them from doing it.

Commissioner Wuest asked about aluminum or vinyl siding being allowed. Director Hurd-Ravich pointed out this shows wood or composite as being allowed. Commissioner Wuest also asked about window trim being required or not required. The way this is written, yes, there could be windows without trim.

g. 17.65 – Master Plans and Planned Unit Developments added a section to clearly distinguish between a discretionary path and a clear and objective path.

Next steps are to review the rest of the code revisions at the Aug 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. The CIC and Park Place Neighborhood Association meetings to explain what is happening in August. There will also be a check-in with City of Commission. The Legislative steps will begin in September.

Commissioner LaSalle requested a copy of the cleaned up version of the code be provided to the commissioners at the next meeting. Director Hurd-Ravich agreed that a red-lined and a clean copy will be provided when the legislative session commences.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

Next meeting is August 12th. Only agenda item at this time is to finish the review of the revisions to the PPCP that were not covered this evening.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*Vice Chair Espe adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.*

