



CITY OF OREGON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

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

Monday, March 10, 2025, at 7:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Present: 7 – Chair Paul Espe, Vice Chair Brandon Dole, Commissioner Greg Stoll, Commissioner Bob LaSalle, Commissioner Karla Laws, Commissioner Dirk Schlagenhauser, Commissioner Victoria Meinig

Staffers: 3 - Community Development Director Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Planning Manager Pete Walter, Administrative Assistant Kay Neumann

2. MEETING MINUTES

A. Meeting Minutes for Approval: February 24, 2025.

A motion was made by Commissioner LaSalle, seconded by Commissioner Laws to approve the meeting minutes for February 24, 2025.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: 7 - Commissioner LaSalle, Commissioner Laws, Commissioner Schlagenhauser, Commissioner Stoll, Commissioner Meinig, Vice Chair Dole, Chair Espe

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Community Director Hurd-Ravich introduced the Climate Friendly Equitable Communities consultant, Brian Davis. Brian went over the process and adoption timeline. The public outreach process will be complete after the City Commission Work Session on March 11.

1. Brian responded to questions that were raised during the Planning Commission Work Session on January 13.
 - a. DLCD confirmed that Oregon City cannot require a parking study for redevelopment of parking spaces required per OAR 660-012-0050(1)(b).
 - b. He also said that if the frequency of Line 33 was reduced, the corridor would still qualify for the parking requirements under OAR 660-012-0440.

- c. And it was confirmed that Oregon City cannot require EV charging stations adjacent to asphalt area with new development because an asphalt area would qualify as a parking space per 660-012-0005(32).

There was discussion about the definition of a parking space. Question was raised if land could be set aside for parking spaces and require the EV stations at time of development. It was answered that by doing so, we would be going against existing rules. We cannot designate land as parking spaces and comply with the CFEC regulations. Where we cannot require a minimum number of parking spaces, we cannot require EV charging stations. Maybe the City could come up with some type of incentive to get developers to reserve space for charging stations.

- 2. Brian then provided public feedback and recommendations on the code requirements.
 - a. For the Underused on and off-street parking spaces being redeveloped for other purposes was generally supported by the public. Recommendation is to define “underused” as “Parking lots or facilities that are below 50% of capacity most or all of the time.”
 - b. Regarding the requirement of at least one of three climate mitigation actions from new parking lots over one-half acre in size. Public supported prioritizing tree canopy with some support for the solar option. The public was not in support of having a fee-in-lieu, and the commissioners agreed with the recommendation not to have a fee-in-lieu option. Recommendation is to add code language requiring tree canopy and allowing solar panels if site constraints render tree canopy infeasible.

Commissioner asked if we can require using the NRC tree lists for development? There are approved street tree lists that are already in effect. The City Commission has not been in support of further regulating trees in the city. Commissioner expressed interest in requiring more diversity in tree plantings and using more native trees. It was also stated that it is important to have the right tree in the right place.

- c. For the EV charging requirement for 40% of parking spaces at new multi-unit (>5) residential developments. The public did not support more than 40% and want to be sure that the sidewalks are kept clear of equipment. Recommendation is to add code language to require the 40% and to ensure design requirements specify that charges are installed such that sidewalks are kept clear.

Question was asked if there is a definition for “EV ready”. Brian said there is some wording about Level 2 Charging in the conceptual report. And the OAR does state it is required to have conduit in the ground. Further clarifying questions were asked about required amps being listed. Director Hurd-Ravich would like to check with the Building Department and if the amps would be part of the code required for the building permit and not put this in the land use file. She will find out what Level 2 is defined as in the Specialty Code.

- d. For providing bicycle and small-scale mobility device parking in climate-friendly areas and at “key” destination. The public was generally supportive of providing and/or requiring secure parking but again wants to be sure to maintain clear sidewalks. The recommendation was to do some minor updates to the requirements since Oregon City is already largely in compliance. On-Street requirements would be addressed in the next TSP update.

- e. Regarding the adoption of parking maximums in climate friendly areas and within the ½ mile transit line, Oregon City's existing maximums are in compliance except for some multi-family housing. The public seemed to support one consistent requirement citywide. Recommendation is to amend the multi-family maximum and scale back to 1.2 off-street parking spaces per studio unit and 2 off-street parking spaces per non-studio residential unit.

Commissioner asked about retroactivity plays into this for parking lots that already exist but need to be updated or are redeveloped. Brian said there are sections in the requirements that address what can be required or not required for certain redevelopments. Planning Manager Walter said that we will need to look at our pre-existing non-conforming structures code and make some provision in there and define what the thresholds are. This might need to be more prescriptive, and we need to get some clarification from DLCD. Director Hurd-Ravich was to get clarification on the maximum parking element specifically. Concern was raised that the cost to re-do a parking lot could be extensive and if the requirements change so that a business owner can't fix their deteriorating parking lot for fear of losing parking spaces as that seems counter-productive.

A commissioner asked about mega churches and how this would apply to them. Director Hurd-Ravich indicated that the maximum parking spaces applies to multi-family residences with a parking lot over ½ acre, so it would just be the tree canopy that would apply.

A question was raised about ADUs and being more creative long term to make them more affordable with SDCs and using empty lots. Director Hurd-Ravich said there is no discussion about SDCs having the methodology changed in how they are determined. The purpose of the CFEC is to reduce the cost because parking is a cost. So, if there is less parking required, then costs will go down. There is not any discussion in this about ADUs, so that would be a different discussion.

The point was made that when dealing with non-conforming uses and structures, repairs and alterations are generally permitted as long as they comply with current building codes and don't expand the non-conformity. So, it needs to have been legal when it was originally built. If you repair or rebuild it when it was not legal, then you have to redesign it to bring it into compliance.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. There is no meeting on March 24th.
- B. On April 14th there will be a Work Session at 6 p.m. for a Thimble Creek Update. The meeting at 7 p.m. will include a public hearing for the Clackamas Community College Master Plan and there will be a 1st reading of the CFEC amendments.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Espe adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.

