



# CITY OF OREGON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

---

Commission Chambers, Libke Public Safety Building, 1234 Linn Ave, Oregon City

Monday, September 23, 2024, at 7:00 PM

---

## 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

*Chair Stoll called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.*

Present: 6 – Chari Greg Stoll, Commissioner Brandon Dole, Commissioner Bob LaSalle, Commissioner Karla Laws, Commissioner Dirk Schlagenhauser, Commissioner Daphne Wuest

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Paul Espe, excused

Staffers: 3 - Community Development Director Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Planning Manager Pete Walter, Deputy City Attorney Carrie Richter (Virtual), Assistant Planner Christina Robertson-Gardner, City Engineer/Public Works Director Dayna Webb

## 2. MEETING MINUTES

A. Meeting Minutes for Approval: August 12, 2024.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Schlagenhauser, seconded by Commissioner La Salle to approve the meeting minutes for August 12, 2024.**

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

**Yea: 6 - Commissioner Dole, Commissioner Wuest, Commissioner LaSalle, Commissioner Laws, Commissioner Schlagenhauser, Chair Stoll**

**Nay: 0**

## 3. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Didi Dahlsrud – spoke about trees and that the Climate Action Plan in Oregon City is not enough. We have an opportunity to reach out to new development to address this. Lots are so small that trees don't have an opportunity to grow to full maturity, and we are losing our canopy. We are losing insects and birds. We need to save every mature tree we can.
- B. Jed Peterson – spoke about rejecting the proposal for tonight due to missing checks and balances. Codified requirements that have been ignored in past proposals that are for safety purposes. The new proposal removes the protection for the public.
- C. Lee McCarty – spoke about concerns about the proposed urban growth boundary and zoning. The tract of land below Meadow Ridge Estates and Redland Rd. There is very dense zoning proposed for the near future. They see the recommended zoning for the tract as compromising to the core value

the City set as a growth boundary transition from zoning in one area to zoning in another area so that there is not a skyscraper built next to a residential estate. He would like to request that this transition of zoning be reviewed.

## 5. DISCUSSION

### 5a. McLoughlin Boulevard Enhancement Project – Phase 3 update

The Commission agreed to move the Staff report for the project to before the Public Hearing item.

Assistant Planner Christina Robertson-Gardner and Public Works Director Dayna Webb gave an update on the conceptual design for the project. The plan is to have this come before the Planning Commission as a legislative file on October 28.

Christina provided an overview of the purpose and needs of this project. The project area is from 10<sup>th</sup> St to the Railroad tunnel and from Main St to the river. The goal is to provide safety for all transportation modes and support Oregon City's tourism, economic and community development goals while opening up and using the waterfront.

The City is working with ODOT as well as a technical group regarding options. The initial ideas were not viable due to ODOT's needs and the geological make up of the area. They did come up with the Long Span option which City Commission has given the go ahead to continue working with that option. It is important to get this adopted into the Transportation plan for design grant applications.

Dayna spoke about the advantages and challenges of the Long Span option. Other opportunities looked at during this phase are to create a green linear park under the arch bridge and possible community space and programming opportunities in the area with landscaping, benches, picnic tables and bike parking. When we reach the refinement process these options will be decided upon with more detail.

She also covered how 99E would be adjusted for pedestrian safety. There would also be adjustments to parking. These would be further reviewed in the refinement design stage.

Christina explained how to receive updates regarding this project on the website and it is possible to request email updates through the website page – [McLoughlin Blvd Enhancements | Oregon City, OR \(orcify.org\)](https://www.oregoncity.or.gov/transportation/mcloughlin-boulevard-enhancements). Dayna and Christina are visiting the other committees as well as the downtown groups to update them and get feedback.

Dayna explained the grant application process. There are different grants we can apply for and the deadlines are coming up.

Commissioners had questions about the right of way on the Elbow on 99E and how parking would work in the right of way at the transmission shop. Reminder was given that this is a concept plan, and the details will be further worked out at the refinement stage. When the concept plan is adopted, it does not mean that we are locked into just the items listed. There was also a question about just having pedestrian walkways on just one side of 99E, but there would not be bike path because there is not enough space in certain areas. It was determined to be almost a no build option.

Could the towers of the span be made smaller so that it does not take away from the Arch bridge? The design was created based on what it would take to make the long span work in the area that it is intended to be.

Will there be signs on the bridge explaining the history and resources of the area etc.? There are signs listed on the concept plan as entrance signage and interpretive art included as well.

Will there be a way to tie the Rivershore Park to the Span Bridge area? At the conceptual level, that area is hatched out and will be further designed once we have The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde design for Tumwata Village.

Downtown is in transition, and there has been more homelessness so will there be more security for the bridge area. This a long-term project, and security can be noted in the concept plan so it is included.

Is this an addition to the Transportation Plan? This concept plan was already adopted 20 years ago. This would be a refinement of that. In theory this is in the not likely funded project category, but if grant opportunities come up it would be re-evaluated. Since this is part of the TSP already, it is part of the Transportation SDC calculations. It is also in the Regional Transportation Plan and it is identified as likely to be funded.

How could there be parallel parking along the river side in the area by the bridge with the speed of the traffic? Working with ODOT to meet the technical specs for providing that parking.

All the sidewalks and improvements along 99E would be ODOT's right of way, and we would have to get permits and work with ODOT for the specifications.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- A. Larry Morton – spoke about his business on the elbow of 99E. He said that he would be out of business in 6 months or less with the proposed changes. He spoke about how fast semi-trucks go around the curve there and have even hit his tool truck there. He sees curbs there as a hazard. He also mentioned that the acoustics of the room are horrible and suggested have a screen with close captioning.
- B. Paul Edgar – spoke about the proposal and concerned about getting people from the city side of 99E to the river side. Every time a crosswalk signal is hit, traffic stops. We could see 99E coming to a dead stop all day long. He lives in Canemah and if traffic is constantly stopped, the back up will keep him from getting out of his neighborhood. He suggests using a bridge over 99E with a nice view platform.
- C. Tom Geil – spoke about when he was on Planning Commission that this original plan he had suggested that an overpass was needed. He has a business on Main St and getting out even now at 5 pm is difficult with traffic backed up on 99E. The original idea was to have an overpass from Main St over to Tumwata Village.

#### **4. PUBLIC HEARING**

##### **4A. LEG-24-01 – Park Place Concept Plan Code Amendments**

Chair Stoll read the Public Hearing Script. Commissioners had no conflict of interest.

Planning Manager Pete Walter presented the staff report for the Park Place Plan Code Amendments. He gave an overview of the project and the goals. Some of the components of the Plan include extensions of Holly Lane and Swan Ave. These projects, D48-D50, are part of

the Transportation Systems Plan. They are part of the long-term plan and are unlikely to be funded in 10 years. Development can help fund these projects based on rough proportionality to the impact of development. Planning Commission has recommended reprioritizing these projects to short-term projects in the next TSP update. They have also requested that they be added to Clackamas County's TSP in order to have the projects be recognized.

Pete summarized housing regulations that have changed since 2008. He talked about Park and Trail Dedication as well as the Neighborhood Commercial Zone and Stormwater Management. He provided some of the outcomes from the Neighborhood Commercial Market Analysis completed by Johnson Economics.

Pete went over the identified revisions to the various code chapters that had already been addressed by the Planning Commission in previous meetings. Chapters and sections revised included:

- a. 16.12.026 – Street Design -Alleys
- b. 17.04 – Definitions – added new ones to help define design and architectural features in the Park Place area
- c. 17.08.040 – Low Density Residential Districts – setback modification
- d. 17.08 and 17.10 – Low and Medium Density Residential – created a transitional zone
- e. 17.08.055 and 17.10.055 – Additional Standards for the PPCP area – Perimeter Transition
- f. 17.21 – Residential Design – removed discretionary language and added clear and objective design elements and changed minimum % of middle housing lots based on acres in the land division application. The middle housing lots are to be dispersed among the development.
- g. 17.24 – NC Neighborhood Commercial District – eliminated ground floor residential use and created a new section of more limited list of permitted uses.
- h. 17.24.035 – Prohibited Uses – residential
- i. 17.24.040 – Dimensional standards – landscaping requirements
- j. 17.24.050 – Additional Standards for Park Place Concept Plan Area – Additional permitted uses.
- k. 17.24. 060 - Additional Standards for Park Place Concept Plan Area –Residential Uses.
- l. 17.62.61 – Site Plan and Design Review – park, trail and open space requirements in Park Place.
- m. Non-Residential development park dedication
- n. Residential development park dedication
- o. Fee-in-lieu of Dedication
- p. North Village Community Park (8 acres)
- q. South Village Neighborhood Park (4 acres)
- r. Trail Dedication Standards
- s. 17.65- Master Plans and Planned Unit Developments – states process available when applicant cannot or chooses not to meet the code

Commission took a quick break and then allowed for Public Comments.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- A. Garrett Stephenson, ICON Constructions (virtual) – audio was missing initially. They are asking for a continuance as they are just getting into the financial aspects of the proposed changes. There are some concerns about some of the changes and if the changes will

- affect the cost of development. They submitted a letter earlier about some concerns. They are concerned about the mandate of doing Middle Housing and the new disbursement of that housing. He also spoke about the Fee-In-Lieu park dedication and wondering if this is a double dipping situation with the SDC fees.
- B. Jennifer Arnold, Emerio Design with ICON (virtual) – Submitted a written document earlier today. It also talks about concern of cost being affected with the new code changes with garage and alley way revisions. It was a lot to review and would like a continuance.
  - C. Harlon Barow, Icon Construction – ICON has been working with the City to find mutually agreeable processes to meet the most important goals of the Park Place Concept Plan and other infrastructure master plans. The major areas of concern are the Park & Trail dedications and garage orientation standards.
  - D. Dolores Rund – indicated she no longer had a question.
  - E. Roya Mansouri – lives in a property adjacent to the Park Place area. She does feel like these changes are going to help keep the village feel. She would like additional information about the location of parks and trails will be and the street connections. Likes the idea of mixed use of homes on a block and likes the garages not being in front.
  - F. Gnoch Huang – He commented about not knowing that all of this work was being done until when a decision was being made tonight. He was pleased to hear about some of the code changes being made. He had questions about the 40 foot setbacks and the zoning between properties in the UGB and outside the UGB. Hearing about the buffer zone for the NROD, he knows that concerns about wetlands were raised in the past and he is not sure if those were addressed or not.
  - G. Barbara Cox – She is concerned for the Trail system but will address that at a later date. Her other concern is the connection of Swan Ave and Beemer Rd. Beemer Rd has a lot of young children and some parts are only wide enough for one car to get through. Sidewalk switches sides. She does not think this is a good idea.
  - H. Sam Wolf – left before making comment.
  - I. Tom Geil – He expressed concern that the agenda items were changed around for staff time, but people left who came for the PPCP hearing. He commented about how alley ways were part of the original concept plan and now ICON is trying to change it. City Commission denied the original development after listening to the community, but here we are working through code changes that would allow ICON over development into an acceptable land use application. He understands that code amendments are necessary, but the traffic issue has not been fully addressed. There is still just one way in and out. People will be making cut throughs existing neighborhoods and there is no evacuation plan.
  - J. Joyce Carlson – she lives off of Beemer and agreed with Barbara's comments about traffic. She is also concerned about the trails being put in their backyards. She lives where she does purposely with nature. She does not want all the traffic next to her yard and has a concern it will bring in crime and will destroy her safe haven. There is wildlife that will be affected. She does not see this as protecting the natural environment.
  - K. Michael Doran – He would like to request that Commissioners and Staff visit this area. There is so much going on in this area and traffic infrastructure need to be put in before any more development occurs. If they cannot be built ahead of the development, then the development plan should not go through. He is not against development, but just wants to be sure infrastructure is in place first.
  - L. Mark-Hult Bennett – He agrees what Tom and Michael already said. There is more and more development and Holcomb is only two lanes and it is increasingly busy. Holly Lane needs to be built first. He was in the evacuation for the fire a few years ago and traffic was so backed up. It is serious and the road extensions need to be built first or people will die.
  - M. Megan Keough – She lives on Holly-Crest Lane. She believes the PPCP is unnecessary and

proposes a significant threat to our community's integrity. The decision to add more traffic to Holly Lane is concerning. The PPCP is an unwelcome encroachment on the existing neighborhood. She does not understand the need to add retail on Donovan Road with the existing disruption with school traffic.

A commissioner had a question for Deputy Attorney Carrie Richter about developers getting relief for design standards that make development more expensive, would it apply to alleys? Alleys are not listed as an eligible item in SB1537, but Carrie said she would need to look into that a bit more before giving a definitive answer.

Commissioners held a discussion about allowing additional public comments at the beginning of the next meeting should the Public Hearing be continued.

There was also a Commissioner commented about the additional documentation that was submitted this afternoon. There were 38 pages that could not be reviewed while they were taking testimony. Two requests were given for continuation and some of the information provided was already rejected by City Commission. Have a continuation would allow time to further review.

A continuance would allow the word to get out to additional community members so that they could make an appearance and give testimony.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Laws, seconded by Commissioner La Salle to continue the Park Place Concept Plan Code Amendments Public Hearing to October 28, 2024 and the continuance would be the first topic on the agenda with public comments following a short summary.**

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

**Yea: 6 - Commissioner Dole, Commissioner Wuest, Commissioner LaSalle, Commissioner Laws, Commissioner Schlagenhauser, Chair Stoll**

**Nay: 0**

Commissioner La Salle addressed the audience and encouraged them to tell people that there will be opportunity to speak at the October 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **6. COMMUNICATIONS**

Next meeting scheduled is October 28.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

*Chair Stoll adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.*

