



CITY OF OREGON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Monday, April 25, 2022 at 7:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Schlagenhauer called the meeting to order at 7:08 PM.

Present: 5 - Chair Dirk Schlagenhauer, Commissioner Patti Gage, Commissioner Mike Mitchell, Commissioner Christopher Staggs, and Commissioner Bob La Salle

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Daphne Wuest and Commissioner Gregory Stoll

Staffers: 3 - Community Development Director Aquila Hurd-Ravich, Senior Planner Christina Robertson-Gardiner, and City Attorney Carrie Richter

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

PUBLIC HEARING

1. CONTINUANCE OF GLUA-21-00045 / MAS-21-00006 / VAR-22-00001 Park Place Crossing General Development Plan.

Chair Schlagenhauer opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Commissioner had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare including a visit to the site.

Commissioner La Salle had ex parte contacts due to being the land use chair of the Park Place Neighborhood Association and presenting the Association's opinions and desires to both the Planning and City Commissions on several occasions. He had also discussed the development on several occasions during conversations with members of the community and had been involved with the development since its first application for annexation. He thought he could maintain a neutral position on the matter before them.

Commissioner Mitchell said members of the neighborhood had spoken to him in the past, but nothing specifically about this application. He visited the site and surrounding subdivisions. The applicant, ICON Construction, had built his home 15 years ago and when he ran for City Commission they contributed to his campaign.

Commissioner Gage had been to nearby subdivisions, but not on the property itself.

Chair Schlagenhauer had attended the Beavercreek hamlet board meeting where this development was discussed. He left as soon as he realized what they were talking about. He had seen photos of the site.

Jed Peterson, resident of Oregon City, thought Commissioner Mitchell should be recused given his connection to ICON. He asked how much was donated to Commissioner Mitchell's campaign.

Commissioner Mitchell thought he could base his decision on the materials submitted in the record and evaluate them against the approval criteria. He did not think there was a conflict of interest. ICON contributed \$1,000 to his campaign.

Kelly Reid, Planner, presented the staff report. This was a request for a General Development Plan and a variance. A continuance was needed to incorporate new information from the applicant into the staff report. She discussed the subject site, history of the property, Park Place Concept Plan, zoning, overlay zones, existing conditions, project summary, proposed General Development Plan, General Development Plan process, next hearing, and Planning Commission options.

There was discussion regarding a letter from Metro that disputed one of the parcels had not been annexed into the Metro boundary. It was clarified the parcel was in the Urban Growth Boundary.

Linda Smith, representing the Park Place Neighborhood Association, said the Association was involved in the Park Place Concept Plan and they thought this plan was not what they had envisioned. The application would impact livability due to traffic and circulation.

Enoch Huang and Roya Mansouri, residents of Oregon City, discussed their relation to the proposed development, Land Use Planning Goal 1 and lack of citizen engagement, request for a setback of 100 feet at the southeastern portion of the development to maintain privacy and security, and that the tall trees at the border be left in place for privacy. They also discussed the street modification/variance and need for an alternative to the Holly Lane extension. They thought the development should be separated into two detached developments. They continued discussing the future streets and how the City needed to explain why they would allow the developers to plan for a road through property that was not in their possession. They were concerned about Land Use Planning Goal 5 and natural resources, deforestation, and loss of habitat. They requested the developer and City to initiate a periodic review of Goal 5 rules to ensure that they were up to date and appropriate and conduct a local inventory of all natural resources on the property before approval was granted. They were also concerned about Goal 6 and environmental impact. They requested the developer show no damage to adjacent water supplies, consideration of natural approaches to stormwater management, and reduce the percentage of land that was covered by impervious material. They also requested the developer provide more detail on how this project would minimize light and noise pollution.

Pavel Olaru, resident of Oregon City, was concerned about his well and if he would have to hook up to City water. He was also concerned about stormwater runoff and flooding on his property.

Jed Peterson, resident of Oregon City, said notification was inadequate to comply with Goal 1. He discussed Goal 12, transportation. He thought the traffic impact study was flawed and bottlenecks would be created by the increased traffic.

Elizabeth Peterson, resident of Oregon City, discussed Goal 7, natural hazards. The site had a number of documented hazards and clearcutting to put in houses would cause risks to other properties and possible flooding or landslides. She was also concerned about the amount of impervious surface and loss of habitat as well as the traffic bottlenecks and inadequate infrastructure.

Tom Geil, resident of Oregon City, discussed his newspaper article and the history of the property including its contentious annexation and traffic concerns. He extended an invitation to the Commission to come to the Holcomb area to see these issues for themselves and walk the property.

Aaron Wahnstall, resident of Oregon City, discussed his concerns about citizen involvement and minimum lot size. He described his neighborhood on Edenwild Lane, Goal 1, objections to the application, and request to keep the record open past May 9 to inform everyone in Park Place who would be impacted by the development and allow members of the community to familiarize themselves with the issues. Regarding the variance request, he thought the developer needed to define "common-sense construction" and the City should exercise its right to maintain minimal lot sizes and require the developer to redesign their master plan to minimize the impact on supporting infrastructure, environment, and neighbors.

Linda Smith, resident of Oregon City, thought a 20% reduction in lot size was egregiously small in her opinion. They just set standards for street widths and new construction ought to be held to them. She discussed the number of units and denser population, which would increase the number of trips and impact services that the current infrastructure was inadequate to handle.

Kenneth Niche, resident of Oregon City, discussed the amount of water that came down the hills and erosion and movement of soil. There was no landslide insurance for homeowners.

Steve Mundall, resident of Oregon City, thought the notification needed to be sent more than the 300 feet as the project affected the whole community, especially on Livesay. He also was concerned about the traffic and small lots, which did not fit with the area. This was a rural area, but that would change with this development.

Adella Bell, resident of Oregon City, said she had not been aware of this application until recently. There would be lots in direct contact with her property and the plans were difficult to understand. There were future off-site streets and one would go across her property. She was unclear on what was a street and paved walkway as well as preservation plans for the trees. She did not think they should allow the reduction of lot sizes by 20%. She was concerned about livability, increased traffic, and impact to her well.

Chris Goodell, AKS Engineering, representing the applicant, supported staff's recommendation to continue the hearing to May 9 at which time they would present the project.

There was discussion regarding HB 2001 and code revisions, making clear additional or revised items in the record, and need for printed maps for the Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner La Salle, seconded by Commissioner Mitchell, to continue the hearing for GLUA-21-00045 / MAS-21-00006 / VAR-22-00001 Park Place Crossing General Development Plan to May 9, 2022. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Chair Dirk Schlagenhauser, Commissioner Christopher Staggs, Commissioner Patti Gage, Commissioner Mike Mitchell, and Commissioner Bob La Salle

COMMUNICATIONS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Schlagenhauser adjourned the meeting at 8:32 PM.