



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Agenda Planning Commission

Monday, September 23, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Public Comments**

3. **Presentation**

Willamette Falls Legacy Project Update

4. **Public Hearing**

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes for January 14, January 28, February 11, February 25, March 11, March 18, March 25, and April 8, 2013.

Attachments:

PCMeetingMinutes01_14_2013_Draft
PCMeetingMinutes01_28_2013_Draft
PCMeetingMinutes02_11_2013_Draft
PCMeetingMinutes02_25_2013_Draft
PCMeetingMinutes03_11_2013_Draft
PCMeetingMinutes03_18_2013_Draft
PCMeetingMinutes03_25_2013_Draft
PCMeetingMinutes04_08_2013_Draft

5. **Communications**

6. **Adjournment**

Public Comments: The following guidelines are given for citizens presenting information or raising issues relevant to the City but not listed on the agenda.

- *Complete a Comment Card prior to the meeting and submit it to the staff member.*
- *When the Chair calls your name, proceed to the speaker table and state your name and city of residence into the microphone.*
- *Each speaker is given 3 minutes to speak. To assist in tracking your speaking time, refer to the timer at the dais.*
- *As a general practice, Oregon City Officers do not engage in discussion with those making comments.*

Agenda Posted at City Hall, Pioneer Community Center, Library, and City Web site(oregon-city.legistar.com).

Video Streaming & Broadcasts: The meeting is streamed live on Oregon City's Web site at www.orcity.org and is available on demand following the meeting.

ADA: City Hall is wheelchair accessible with entry ramps and handicapped parking located on the east side of the building. Hearing devices may be requested from the City staff member prior to the meeting. Disabled individuals requiring other assistance must make their request known 48 hours preceding the meeting by contacting the City Recorder's Office at 503-657-0891.



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Staff Report

File Number: 13-550

Agenda Date: 9/23/2013

Status: Agenda Ready

To: Planning Commission

Agenda #:

From: Community Development Director Tony Konkol

File Type: Minutes

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes for January 14, January 28, February 11, February 25, March 11, March 18, March 25, and April 8, 2013.

RECOMMENDED ACTION (Motion):

Approval following consideration.

BACKGROUND:

The attached transcribed minutes, along with streaming videos from the meetings, will be available for download or viewing on the "Meetings" section of the Oregon City website. Staff is working through a backlog of minutes for the Planning Commission from 2012 and 2013.

BUDGET IMPACT: N/A

Amount:

FY(s):

Funding Source:



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, January 14, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

Present: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Staffers: 1 - Tony Konkol

2. Approval of the Minutes

- a. [13-063](#) Approval of Planning Commission Minutes for September 10, 2012.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabee, seconded by Commissioner Espe, to approve the Planning Commission minutes for September 10, 2012. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Robert Mahoney and Charles Kidwell

Abstain: 1 - Tom Geil

3. Public Comments

Todd Last, resident of Oregon City and Co-Chair of the Tower Vista Neighborhood Association, asked for help in addressing two problems in the rezoning and subdivision on Pease Road. The proposal was to put 13 R-6 homes directly across the street from R-10 homes. Neighbors were not noticed properly and the text of the letter did not address specific zoning proposals for the property. He did not think the process met the criteria for informing the maximum number of people for participation. He requested the Commission review the zoning for the Pease Road property and the perimeter area of the Nadine Joy Acres and address the rules for notification for future rezoning to better include the citizens. He then discussed the subdivision plan. The building of R-6 homes on the opposite side of the street from existing R-10 homes with no accommodation to minimize the impact to the existing neighborhood was an example of what should not be done. He was concerned it would make the property values decline and would not address the low water pressure of the area. He thought the zoning should be R-8 or if it must be R-6, create a subdivision that blended in with the existing homes.

Nicole Last, resident of Oregon City, said there was no due process for notification for them to determine they were going to be purchasing land across the street from R-6 zoning. Equity had already been lost in their home and more would be lost if R-6 went in across the street.

Ann Meter, resident of Oregon City, supported the comments made by Mr. and Mrs.

Last. She questioned why the City was allowing high density housing in the more rural areas that were not served by transportation. This would increase traffic and decrease property values. It was also not conducive for people aging in place.

Commissioner McGriff arrived at 7:10 PM.

Glen Richardson, resident of Oregon City, was surprised at what was being planned for the property. Many homes were going up in the R-10 zone a block away from this development. He did not think R-6 fit the area. He asked for review and reconsideration of the R-6.

William Gifford, resident of Oregon City, was in support of what had been said. This would have been reviewed better had the Neighborhood Association been active at the time. The process was not done as well as it could have been done. There needed to be a transition as R-10 across from R-6 was a big jump.

Tony Konkol, Community Development Director, stated the subdivision application was a Type 2 decision made by staff. The decision could be appealed to the City Commission. At this time there was no zone change being requested. The upzoning was done through a City-wide Code update.

There was discussion regarding the low water pressure issue in the area and the noticing process.

Mr. Last said when they moved in there were no blue notices on the property and he checked the GIS maps. The zone change was not posted on the blue signs. He agreed more participation of the citizens was needed.

Mr. Richardson clarified it was too late except to appeal to the City Commission.

There was Commission consensus to review the land use noticing process and what was done for the Code update.

4. Public Hearing

a [PC 13-001](#) CP 12-01 and DP 12-01

Mr. Konkol stated this was the application for the Red Soils Master Plan. The applicant was requesting a continuance to January 28, 2013.

William Gifford, resident of Oregon City, said as Land Use Chair of the Hillendale Neighborhood Association, the neighborhood did not know an additional continuance was requested by the applicant and the steering committee met last night to discuss it. He would not have rescheduled the meeting had he known it was to be postponed. One of the core issues was the fencing. The city ordinance said no chain link and a maximum of six feet high. He did not think there were any compelling arguments for a variance. There was also a question of whether the County paid franchise fees for the dark fiber cable. The County's Library District asked to purchase a piece of the campus, and they said no because they did not have a Master Plan yet. Now the Master Plan was developed, he thought they should be able to negotiate a deal with the Library District.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Henkin, to continue CP 12-01 and DP 12-01 to January 28, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

5. Planning Commissioner Training

Jennifer Bragar, City Attorney, presented training on the legal limitations for decision making, types of land use review in Oregon City, quasi-judicial vs. legislative decision making, quasi-judicial hearing disclosures, impartial tribunal, public hearing procedures, public meetings and records requirements, and deliberation and the decision.

There was discussion regarding the pros and cons of conference calls. Staff would bring it back for further discussion. There was also a suggestion of providing a Land Use 101 to the CIC and Neighborhood Associations so they would understand the process better.

6. Communications

Mr. Konkol reported on proposed legislative text amendments. In order to get information for meetings sooner, when staff sent out the public notice of the hearing date, staff would also forward the application to the Planning Commission. He gave an update on the Blue Heron site and visioning process and the update to the Sign Code and lack of current enforcement.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabee, seconded by Commissioner Henkin, for Charles Kidwell to continue as Planning Commission Chair. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

6. Communications

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Mabee, for Denyse McGriff to continue as Planning Commission Vice Chair. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Abstain: 1 - Denyse McGriff

7. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 10:02 PM.



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, January 28, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

Vice Chair McGriff called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Present: 4 - Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney and Tom Geil

Absent: 3 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin and Charles Kidwell

Staffers: 2 - Tony Konkol and William Kabeiseman

2. Public Comments

Paul Edgar, resident of Oregon City, discussed the possibility of high speed passenger rail coming through Oregon City and what it meant to the City and the existing tracks. Most likely extra tracks would be put in along the I-5 corridor. Oregon City could become the south station with more people coming through. Canemah was a national register district and if it came through Canemah a lot of historic houses would have to be taken out. It would make crossing the tracks problematic and walls would need to be put up to make it safer for higher speeds. He thought it should be looked at by some experts who would be representing Oregon City and its neighborhoods. Both freight and passenger rail were needed and the City needed to think smart to make it happen, such as using the Canemah Bowl. He requested putting the topic on a future agenda for more discussion.

3. Public Hearing

3a. [PC 13-008](#) LE 12-1 Administration and Procedures Amendment

Bill Kabeiseman, City Attorney, explained the legislative public hearing process and asked if the Commission had any conflict of interest to declare. There was none.

Vice Chair McGriff opened the public hearing.

Tony Konkol, Community Development Director, said this hearing had been continued from December 2012. The City Commission had discussed this in a Work Session where the Commission decided not to pursue the option for a Hearings Officer and that proposal had been removed. If the changes were approved, they would be taken to the City Commission on February 20. The changes staff was requesting approval for were in regard to the appeal process for Type 2 decisions to be consistent with the Oregon Revised Statutes.

There was discussion regarding what constituted a Type 2 decision and how the hearing was noticed.

William Gifford, resident of Oregon City, questioned if there was a burden of proof for

claiming a person was adversely affected by the Type 2 decision.

Mr. Kabeiseman explained what State law required for proving one was adversely affected.

There was no further public testimony.

Vice Chair McGriff closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabee, seconded by Commissioner Mahoney, to approve LE 12-01. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney and Tom Geil

3b. [PC 13-007](#)

CP 12-01 and DP 12-01

Mr. Konkol stated the applicant requested the hearing be continued to February 25, 2013, for additional time to work on the outstanding issues specifically the fencing material, height, and size around the Silver Oaks building. An extension of the 120 day rule had also been granted. He entered an email into the record from Ms. Epstein, representative for the County, as Exhibit 1 which was the request to continue the hearing.

Ken, resident of Oregon City, thought a 12 foot fence was ridiculous, extreme, and in excess. He did not want a 12 foot fence in the neighborhood and thought there should be another option. He thought the fence should be placed two feet inside the curb.

William Gifford, resident of Oregon City, said the Neighborhood Association came to the conclusion that there was not a need for a 12 foot fence along a pedestrian walkway in that neighborhood.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabee, seconded by Commissioner Geil, to continue CP 12-01 and DP 12-01 to February 25, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney and Tom Geil

4. Communications

Mr. Konkol announced the State's Park and Recreation Commission was taking a tour of the Blue heron site on January 29. The South End Concept Plan meetings and process was ongoing. The land use process for the Transportation System Plan update was beginning with the goal for the Plan to be adopted in July. Staff had a pre-application meeting with Walmart, but no application had been submitted yet.

Vice Chair McGriff reported on Citizen Advisory Team meetings. There would be an Open House on February 27 to discuss the South End Concept Plan.

Commissioner Mabee said a meeting on the McLoughlin Phase 2 Gateway project would be held on January 29.

5. Adjournment

Vice Chair McGriff adjourned the meeting at 7:50 PM.



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, February 11, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

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

Present: 6 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Absent: 1 - Denyse McGriff

Staffers: 1 - Tony Konkol

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Public Hearing

- a. [PC 13-009](#) Benchmade Request for Direct Access to Beaver Creek Road - Application Withdrawn

Tony Konkol, Community Development Director, said the applicant had withdrawn their application at this time.

4. Work Session

- [PC 13-010](#) Review Public Noticing Procedures for Planning Applications

Mr. Konkol reviewed the Oregon City Municipal Code that dealt with public noticing for land use applications.

There was discussion regarding emergency annexations, notification boundaries, appeals process, and lack of public interest.

The Commission then discussed ideas for getting the information out better such as adding notices on the cable TV channel and doing a better job of posting notices on the website where people could find them easily.

5. Communications

Mr. Konkol gave an update on the South End Concept Plan, Sign Code review, Blue Heron site visioning and master planning, and Transportation System Plan update.

6. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 8:27 PM.



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, February 25, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Present: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Staffers: 2 - Tony Konkol and Laura Terway

3. Public Comments

Todd Last, Co-Chair of the Tower Vista Neighborhood Association, read the Comprehensive Plan regarding the policy of maximizing new public facilities and services by encouraging new development within the Urban Growth Boundary at the maximum densities allowed by the Comprehensive Plan. He thought this was a bad policy as it ignored the specifics of the situation. He shared the policy with the Neighborhood Association who were unanimously opposed. He gave examples of situations where the results of this policy led to large scale removal of old growth trees and high density to be built near low density. He requested the Commission review the policy and put in language to weigh and balance the many factors that needed to be considered in development density issues.

4. Public Hearing

- 4a. [PC 13-012](#) 19370 Pease Road: Request for a Zone Change and approval of an 11-lot subdivision and geologic hazards review. Planning Files ZC 12-01, TP12-04 and US 12-01.

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing.

Jennifer Bragar, City Attorney, read the hearing statement describing the hearing format and correct process for participation. She asked if the Commission had any ex parte contact, conflict of interest, bias, statements to declare, or visit to the site. Commissioners Mabee, Espe, and Henkin visited the site.

Chair Kidwell used to live in the neighborhood, but had no conflict of interest.

Commissioner McGriff was familiar with the applicant's representative and the applicant as she had worked with them in the past.

Commissioner Espe had known the applicant for quite some time.

Laura Terway, Planner, presented the staff report for a zone change, 11 lot subdivision, and geologic hazards review for 19370 Pease Road. She gave a background on the subject site and adjacent properties. She then discussed the

zone change from R-10 to R-6 and zone change criteria, subdivision, geologic hazards, and approval criteria. Staff recommended approval with conditions. She submitted the staff presentation into the record.

There was discussion regarding the easement, fill on the property, retention of the trees, and lack of a tree mitigation plan.

Rick Givens, Planning Consultant, and Bruce Goldson, Civil Engineer, were representing the applicant. Mr. Givens explained the existing services to the area, the constraints for the design, transitioning from high density to lower density, and the reasons for the R-6 development. This was a dense development and there was no way to adapt for the existing trees. The trees along the north side of Pavilion Place were in the ten foot utility easement required by the City and had to be removed. There was no mitigation plan at this time as they were waiting for approval on the density before spending funds on a detailed mitigation plan. They would carry out that obligation if the plan was approved. Regarding the fill history, when the sewer was put in for Pease Road, the spoils excavated were put on this property. This was done without a permit, and the applicant had done an investigation on the lots. It was found the fill was not an engineered fill, and it would be excavated and replaced with engineered fill. He was in agreement with the staff report and conditions of approval with one exception. He questioned Condition 13 for frontage improvements along Pease Road. He asked that language be added that if the applicant came up with an acceptable plan with the city staff that the applicant could arrange one or two parking spaces on the northeast side of lot 9.

Mr. Goldson explained the shape of the easements on the property.

Commissioner Mabee questioned the lack of connection to Pease Road. Commissioner McGriff wanted to make sure the buildings on the property were properly deconstructed.

Mr. Konkol said the Code included residential yard landscaping to single family home design standards which included placement of trees within the front yard setback. The replanted trees as part of the mitigation would be protected by a covenant or easement. On street parking was allowed on a collector street.

Todd Last, resident of Oregon City, expressed concern over the transportation infrastructure. A lot of development had been happening on Pease Road and the mitigation for transportation had been the developer fixing Pease Road along the development. This application would add more homes. He referred to a map he submitted showing the typical travel patterns for residents in the area. There were different lane striping, widths, curve, and sidewalks on Pease Road. There needed to be a comprehensive approach to the increased vehicular and pedestrian travel with all of the new development. He did not think the public facilities and services were adequate.

William Gifford, resident of Oregon City, asked for clarification on shadow platting.

Nicole Last, resident of Oregon City, asked the Planning Commission to take a look at the piecemeal development that was occurring and that City staff make sure the most current zoning maps were on the City's website. She was concerned about realigning the road for one house. There needed to be a long term look at this road and she wanted the piecemeal to stop. She was also concerned about the safety of the road access and for pedestrians. Pease Road was a busy road and more houses were going in. She was not sure if adequate analysis was being done for the resources in the Tower Vista neighborhood especially due to the low water pressure

in the area and more research needed to be done before approval of anymore large developments.

Christine Kosinski, resident of unincorporated Clackamas County, discussed the importance of the drainage and stormwater retention due to the steep sloes and landslides in the area. She thought the Commission should require the Oregon City Geologic Hazards Chapter 17.44 apply to this application. She recommended the NROD designation not be removed from this property due to the fact that the intermittent ditch may point to underground water conditions. She was also concerned about the fill in a fragile location and drainage or water issues. DOGAMI would be releasing new susceptibility and land slide maps in May. The City may want to adopt them in their geologic hazard regulations. She entered a map of the property and cluster of landslides nearby into the record.

Mr. Konkol sid the DOGAMI map was adopted into Chapter 17.44 and Chapter 17.44 was applied to the application.

Linda Stroehecker, resident of Oregon City, stated this land to be developed was filled illegally with any kind of land fill the previous owner was given. On the property line between her property and those to be developed were boulders which had been used to shore up the land. There was a storm ditch behind her home and there used to be very little water there even during the heavy rainy season, however since construction on Pease Road it had pooled out into her backyard. It wasn't always clear water and had brought mosquitos to her backyard. It had made her backyard unusable and the water was eroding her garage. She was opposed to building on this piece of land. Any kind of backup of water or sewer backed up into her property because it was a lower elevation than all the other properties around.

Tracy Owens, resident of Oregon City, lived directly across from the property. The prior owner did say he filled the property with many miscellaneous items. She questioned the ability to build on the property. There was a lot of traffic and speeding on the road and it was not being monitored by the police. She thought speed bumps should be installed. She was also concerned about where the road for the new development was coming out, which was at her driveway. All of the cars being added to this roadway needed to be addressed with some traffic calming device. The road didn't need to be wider, but sidewalks needed to be added.

Tom O'Brien, Co-Chair of the Hazelgrove and Westling Farms neighborhood, asked the Commission to deny the zone change. In 2004 the City envisioned this area in the Comprehensive Plan to be an R-10 community. It was important to develop in an appropriate fashion. If a person did not take into account the plans the City had put together for growth and appropriate design measures to move the City forward to answer Metro's needs, there would be a large number in the City who would be opposed to such things as the South End Concept Plan. Things like this were causing friction in the whole area because it was understood to be R-10. He thought the applicant planned to continue the development in the future to land that was not yet in the City limits, and that was the reason for the alignment of the road.

Mr. Givens stated regarding cohesive development for Pease Road, development paid for the improvement of the road to match City standard, and it was a hodge-podge system. The amount of traffic generated by this development was looked at by a traffic consultant and showed minimal added traffic impact during peak hours and the level of service met City standards. It was a necessary completion of the traffic pattern in the area, provided connectivity, and due to the riparian area and grade change it was not practical to run a street through it. They were doing nothing that would impact the landslide area.

Mr. Goldson explained the storm drainage for the area which was a natural, seasonal drainage way. They were not adding more storm water from impervious areas to the site as a result from this development.

Mr. Givens explained why they were requesting the change from R-10 to R-6. Low density residential included R-10, R-8, and R-6, and when annexed it came in as R-10 automatically. When developing the property, developers had to look at what made sense. He thought R-10 did not make sense due to the street pattern and depth of the lots which was already preset. There were also cost factors involved and the development pattern was already laid out for R-6. He did not think R-10 or R-8 made sense or fit here.

Mr. Givens also discussed the geologic testing for the fill. The area would be excavated and engineered fill put in. He presented the application to the Tower Vista Neighborhood Association in September and no objections were raised at that time. He explained the traffic study and projected extra trips this project would bring during peak hours and how the off site storm water impact would be addressed. The drainage basin and flow was not being changed and would be compensated for by the retention facility.

There was discussion regarding how the project would affect the Stroehecker's property. Mr. Goldson explained the water would no longer be on their property. There should be a decrease in the flow after the development. There was further discussion regarding the placement of the road.

Chair Kidwell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner McGriff did not agree with the findings regarding the storm drainage collection.

Commissioner Mabee was not convinced that R-6 was the only possible development. He did not have a problem with the road realignment request, but wanted to know what it would look like before approving it. He was also concerned about the storm drainage.

Commissioner Geil was concerned about Pease Road and the safety of pedestrians. He wanted to know what the alignment would look like as well.

Commissioner Espe was in favor of having a variety of different zoning types in a neighborhood. He weighed R-10 vs. R-6 in the retention of trees, fewer lots, and more room. He thought R-10 was good for areas with issues and lower density created a lesser impact on traffic. The storm water needed to be re-evaluated and geotechnical report did not include the peripheral area. He thought an alternative development size should be looked at. He did not think they should use public right of way for private parking, but it should be dedicated on the property itself and the lot size should be larger to accommodate for the parking. He was leaning more towards R-10 for the property.

Commissioner Henkin stated he liked the design and that R-6 fit in the area. There were issues with the property and neighborhood that were not improved upon by developing to R-6. The fill and drainage were concerning and he wanted to see how they would be abated at build out before he could recommend transitioning to an R-6 development.

Commissioner Mahoney said the Commission was uncomfortable with this plan. The

Commission had to take into consideration the comments that had been made by the public. He thought public safety, health, and welfare came first and he was concerned about the storm water run off. There were not a lot of alternative designs for the property, but the water needed to be dealt with. He was not in support of the application.

Chair Kidwell was concerned about the density of the development especially in light of the testimony of the applicant as they did not show the Commission an alternative development for R-10 or transitional R-8. This site had minimal impact on the traffic on Pease Road. The speed on Pease Road was the issue which was not relevant to this application. The traffic counts in the traffic study were not realistic. His major concern was the storm drain issue and lack of mitigation of the additional net run off from the site. An alternative R-8 or R-10 zoning and alternate road layout could be designed. He did not think the zone change was appropriate.

Commissioner Geil was concerned about the safety of people backing out of their driveways onto Pease Road.

The Commission discussed a continuance of the hearing to get more information on the storm detention system, transportation analysis, geotechnical analysis, and an alternative R-10 or R-8 design.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Henkin, to reopen the public hearing. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Givens said if the hearing was continued to April 8, the applicant would extend the 120 day rule.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Geil, to continue TP 12-04, ZC 12-01, and US 12-01 with the record left open, to April 8, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

4b. [PC 13-011](#)

Clackamas County Master Plan: Planning Files CP 12-01 and DP 12-01

Mr. Konkol stated staff recommended continuing the hearing to April 8, 2013. The applicant had granted an extension for the decision deadline to May 31, 2013. Regarding the use of a chain link fence, it was prohibited if it could be seen from a visible location, and the City was not allowed to grant an adjustment. Staff was continuing to work with the applicant on alternatives.

William Gifford, Land Use Chair of the Hillendale Neighborhood Association, appreciated staff's recommendation that because it was a prohibited material, chain link would not be considered in the variance. He discussed the end of the staff report that stated the adjustment may be pursued for existing and future chain link fence on the original master plan tax lot. He thought they were looking at the entire master plan that was done in 2005 and if the entire plan was being reviewed, he questioned why they could pursue adjustments for future chain link fence on the property.

Mr. Konkol explained the safe harbors on the property and that even if the Code changed down the road the properties that were in as part of the master plan had the option of using the Code that was in place on the day they were approved or the newer Code. In this case they had an original master plan in 2005 which did not include the Silver Oaks property. The properties in the original 2005 master plan could use the Code that was in place in 2005 which did not have a prohibition on

chain link fence. The County planned to come back with an amended proposal.

A motion was made by Commissioner Geil, seconded by Commissioner McGriff, to continue CP 12-01 and DP 12-01 to April 8, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

5. Communications

Mr. Konkol reported on a tour of the Blue Heron site with the Clackamas County Commission. Staff was working on an Intergovernmental Agreement with the County for the framework of the master planning process, planning agreement with the trustee, and the City would be the project manager for the planning process of the Blue Heron site.

Ms. Terway announced a Transportation System Plan Open House on March 7. Mr. Konkol announced a South End Concept Plan meeting on February 27.

6. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 10:36 PM.



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, March 11, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM.

Present: 6 - Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Absent: 1 - Paul Espe

Staffers: 4 - Tony Konkol, John Lewis, Christina Robertson-Gardiner and Laura Terway

2. Work Session

a [PC 13-018](#) Transportation System Plan Update (Ordinance 13-1002 and 13-1003)

John Lewis, Public Works Director, gave a presentation on the Transportation System Plan update. He introduced the project team and explained the public involvement process.

Carl Springer, DKS Associates, discussed the TSP update process, vision, trends, key changes, investments, funding, the Plan, outcomes, and next steps.

Paul Edgar, Land Use Chair of the Canemah Neighborhood Association, suggested reducing speeds in Canemah to 20 mph, putting yellow slow signs around the neighborhood, and ensuring the trail network and roads adapted to the interconnection need. There were many pedestrians on the street as there were no sidewalks and it was unsafe due to speeding. He then discussed South End Road and how it was not fixable. If the City expanded the travel on this corridor, there would be problems with the intersections of Warner Parrot and South End and 2nd and High Street. An alternative route off the bluff needed to be created.

Christine Kosinski, unincorporated Clackamas County, thought the people on Thayer, Maple Lane, Holly Lane, and Redland were the most affected by the TSP, but they had not been sent notification of the changes and how they would be impacted. Health and safety were issues that needed to be addressed.

Todd Last, resident of Oregon City and the Tower Vista Neighborhood Association, asked about growth projections and upzoning properties in the City. He thought there would be traffic impacts with the growth, but it was not shown in the TSP. He would like the Commission to consider retrofitting roads like Pease Road to make them more holistic instead of piecemeal.

Mr. Springer, Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Konkol addressed the citizen concerns including explaining the triggers for development, addressing increase in traffic with increase in growth, models for the transportation analysis and land use assumptions, mailing areas, traffic counts, and enforcement of speed limits.

Commissioner McGriff wanted to look at ways to move traffic in a manner that was conducive to a liveable community.

Commissioner Mabee suggested edits to the draft TSP document.

There was discussion regarding the funding and how growth would pay for the improvements.

Commissioner Mahoney wanted emphasis made on safety and speeding enforcement.

Commissioner McGriff suggested adding alternate designs and standards for new streets and retrofitting existing streets to make it safer for bikes and pedestrians and to slow down cars.

There was discussion regarding associating SDCs collected in a neighborhood with that neighborhood and ways neighborhoods could address road improvements.

Commissioner Geil thought there should be a better way to designate the projects that were expected to be funded. It looked like the City already had the funds to do the projects when actually they were subject to be funded.

The TSP document would come back to the next Commission meeting.

3. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 9:08 PM.



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, March 18, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

Present: 5 - Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney and Charles Kidwell

Absent: 2 - Paul Espe and Tom Geil

Staffers: 4 - Tony Konkol, John Lewis, Laura Terway and Christina Robertson-Gardiner

2. Public Comments

Jackie Calwell, resident on Holly Lane, said any changes the City planned to make above and below Holly Lane would affect those in the middle. There was a plan to put in bike lanes and sidewalks and increase the street width. Adding 11 to 16 feet to the width of Holly Lane would put sidewalks in her front yard and driveway. If Holly Lane was extended to Holcomb it would increase traffic due to Park Place residents using Holly Lane rather than Highway 213 to access shopping at the top of the hill. If Holly Lane was extended to Thayer Road, it would increase traffic from Beaver Creek residents and new Maple Lane and Thayer subdivision residents using Holly rather than Highway 213 to access I-205. These changes would reduce congestion on Highway 213, but it would be to the detriment of Holly Lane residents.

There was discussion about the location of the right of way on Holly Lane.

Paul Edgar, Land Use Chair of the Canemah Neighborhood Association, discussed public safety in Canemah. There were no sidewalks in Canemah and there was a lack of connection to Canemah from the rest of the trails in the City. He also wanted the travel speeds through Canemah reduced to 20 mph. This should be a high priority in the Transportation System Plan. He then discussed issues regarding the portion of South End Road that was in the slide zone. The road was already at capacity and high density residential units were being planned to go in along this road. Tri-Met would be reducing service and there was not a way to build more capacity.

John Lewis, Public Works Director, said in regard to the right of way width on Holly Lane, most of it was 40 feet.

A report from Scott Burns was submitted by Christine Kosinski and was entered into the record as Exhibit 2. Ms. Kosinski lived in unincorporated Clackamas County. She discussed Scott Burns, professor of geology at Portland State University, who in 1992 did a study on Newell Creek Canyon and recommended the site not be built upon. The City allowed construction of apartments, and there had been continuing problems with land slides. Homes on Holly Lane had also been destroyed by land slides. What happened in Newell Creek Canyon and in Holly Lane could have disastrous effects on Highway 213. She gave the example of Thayer Road which

had problems with land slides as well. The area planned for development in Park Place was in a sensitive area of waterways, flood plains, wetlands, and slopes. Did the City want the risk of bringing Holly Lane up to Holcomb in an area where development was limited? She also questioned construction of the Swan Road extension in an area where wetlands abound.

3. Work Session

3a. [PC 13-018](#) Transportation System Plan Update (Ordinance 13-1002 and 13-1003)

Mr. Lewis reviewed the Oregon City Municipal Code amendments associated with the Transportation System Plan update.

Laura Terway, Planner, discussed the reasons for changing the Code, highlighted the Code amendments proposed for applicability, modifications, street design, maximum street intersection spacing standards, minimum driveway spacing from street interesections, and pedestrian and bicycle accessways.

Suggestions were made by the Commission to bring more clarity in the Code.

John Ripplinger, transportation engineer with Ripplinger and Associates, gave a brief overview of the change from level of service standards for measuring traffic to a volume to capacity ratio standard. This would bring the City into uniformity with ODOT's expectations. It would be a significant change.

Mr. Lewis stated most of the critical signals in Oregon City were ODOT's signals and it made sense to use the same standard.

Mr. Ripplinger said the significant change was they would be allowing more intense development and more traffic before a developer had to mitigate for it.

There was discussion regarding the pros and cons of this new standard and how it was different from the previous level of service standard. There was concern about developers not implementing system improvements with the new standard. These concerns would be addressed at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Terway explained the changes in the Code for cul-de-sacs and dead end streets.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, discussed the Parking Study recommendations and creation of a Downtown Parking Overlay District with a 50% reduction in parking and McLoughlin Commercial Parking Overlay District with a 35% reduction in parking.

Commissioner McGriff was concerned about increasing the amount of people parking in the McLoughlin neighborhood.

Mr. Ripplinger discussed the criteria for Planning Commission adjustments to the parking standards. The adjustment criteria were: function and use of the site, compatibility, safety, and services.

There was discussion regarding how the parking recommendations met the vision for mixed use and higher density and the problem of on street parking for residences.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner compared the current parking requirements and proposed changes.

Mr. Ripplinger gave examples of how Oregon City compared with the City of Portland and City of Lake Oswego in how those cities were reducing parking. The current parking standards for Oregon City were for stand alone suburban communities and did not apply well to a regional center like Oregon City and they were trying to make advances along that direction.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner gave examples of two projects on hold because the applicants did not want to move forward with a Planning Commission variance to the current parking standards, one on 7th street and one on 12th and Main.

Mr. Ripplinger discussed recommended literature regarding parking. There was discussion regarding the concept of paid parking in McLoughlin.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner stated this was one way to create a multi-modal, mixed use, safe, amenity rich downtown and McLoughlin area. She had been working with Lloyd Purdy, Downtown Manager, and Blaine Meier, member of the Land Use Committee with the Chamber of Commerce, regarding the parking reduction. She invited them to the speak at the next meeting.

Commissioner Mabee asked for the numbers for 25% reduction in the McLoughlin District. He did not have a problem with the 50% reduction for downtown. Commissioner McGriff asked for numbers for 20% reduction.

Chair Kidwell thought people would go elsewhere if they could not find a place to park, and he wanted to know the current inventory of parking as a ratio to the businesses in downtown. One way to encourage a parking structure was charging for on street parking so people would want to pay for a less expensive parking structure. He suggested having metered parking in the business district that customers and business owners had to pay for and the surrounding areas have a permit only parking for residents.

The first Planning Commission public hearing on the TSP would be March 25.

4. Communications

There were no communications.

5. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 10:07 PM.



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, March 25, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

Present: 5 - Zachary Henkin, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Absent: 2 - Paul Espe and Damon Mabee

Staffers: 4 - Tony Konkol, John Lewis, Christina Robertson-Gardiner and Laura Terway

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Public Hearing

[PC 13-021](#)

L 13-01: Transportation System Plan (TSP)

L 13-02: Associated Amendments to the Oregon City Municipal Code

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing.

John Lewis, Public Works Director, introduced the topic for discussion and said the questions raised about the TSP earlier would be addressed that night.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner and Laura Terway, Planners, presented the staff report. They discussed what a Transportation System Plan was, criteria for the TSP, how the TSP update was different from the existing TSP, next steps, and recommendation to continue the hearing to April 8. The titles of the chart had been changed to Likely To Be Funded and Not Likely To Be Funded and the Code amendments had been updated. Items that had been changed were in red.

Carl Springer, DKS and Associates, discussed the TSP update process, vision, investments, funding, the Plan, and Code changes.

There was discussion regarding the Likely and Not Likely to be Funded projects, land use forecasts used for the TSP, and stakeholder meeting process.

Mr. Lewis stated the Transportation Advisory Committee reviewed and approved the draft TSP.

Christine Kosinski's written documents were entered into the record. Ms Kosinski, resident of unincorporated Clackamas County, said those representing Neighborhood Associations had five minutes to speak and those living on Holly Lane were not represented by a Neighborhood Association. She could speak for the hamlet of Beaver creek, but the hamlet was not recognized either.

Tony Konkol, Community Development Director, stated it was up to the Commission's discretion as to how they would like to afford the time.

The consensus of the Planning Commission was to allow Ms. Kosinski five minutes to speak.

Ms. Kosinski provided the preliminary geotechnical evaluation for the Park Place Concept Plan which included extending Holly Lane to Holcomb Boulevard and building the Swan Road extension. There were high slopes and flooding in this area as well as land slides occurring on the slopes. Holly Lane had steep grades with narrow shoulders and steep slopes and land slides were near where Holly Lane was proposed to be extended to Livesay. The GRI report recommended the City require a geotechnical evaluation as part of any future development in areas with slopes of 15% or steeper. She questioned why only steep slopes of 25% or greater were regulated in the Oregon City Municipal Code. She asked that the City undertake a full and complete geologic and geotechnical evaluation of the entire study area including all areas for roadways even if they were outside of the study area and to include Thayer Road before any approvals were made. She questioned the safety of the Swan Road extension over the river and landslides.

Tom O'Brien, representing the Hazel Grove-Westling Farm Neighborhood Association, discussed the overview map of the neighborhood. In his neighborhood about 85% to 90% had paid System Development Charges. A street extension on Westwood Drive from the south was shown on the Natural Resources Overlay District as a park. He asked for clarification whether it was going to be a City park when another map showed a street was going to be put there. He did not think the TSP was ready for approval. The neighborhood had paid Park SDCs and there was no park in the neighborhood.

Mr. Lewis agreed the street extension needed to be removed.

Mr. O'Brien had found other corrections that needed to be made, and he would email them to staff. He was concerned about the outcomes in Section 8. If the goal was to reduce the amount of time in peak hours for freight traffic by 10%, why were they increasing traffic another 14%? He also questioned inclusion of a short stretch on South End Road in the upcoming high volume traffic area as South End was a problem currently.

Dan Fowler, resident of Oregon City, discussed the map for minimum parking standards in the downtown district which currently stopped at 17th Street. He asked the Commission to extend it to the Amtrak station. In the street design chart, he suggested adding standards for design of a couplet and a one way. Regarding driveway spacing, if the distance was shorter would a ride in, ride out qualify for a smaller standard?

William Gifford, resident of Oregon City, said the proposed projects would be funded by growth. Urban Renewal might be able to address some of the deficiencies in funding. He thought there needed to be a plan to prioritize the projects beyond the cut line so when the money was available, there would be a plan. He had heard from citizens regarding the intersection of Molalla and Gaffney Lane about congestion and he did not see it included in the plan.

Mr. Lewis said the intersection would be included in the Molalla Boulevard project list.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Henkin, to keep the record open and continue L 13-01: Transportation System

Plan (TSP) and**L 13-02: Associated Amendments to the Oregon City Municipal Code to April 8, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:****Aye:** 5 - Zachary Henkin, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil**4. Work Session**[PC 13-022](#)

L 13-01 and L 13-02: Discuss outstanding items identified at previous Transportation System Plan Work Sessions.

Mr. Springer and Kevin Chewick?? discussed the comments from the last Planning Commission work sessions including funding mechanisms, what to do about speeding, truck routes, label colors, Figure 20 correct labeling, how land use forecasts were developed, alternate corrections to South End Road, and transportation solutions trade offs.

There was discussion regarding how this TSP correlated with the Clackamas County TSP and where they overlapped, proposed roadways and the need for improvements to Redland Road due to flooding, how those improvements would be triggered, and reduction of parking in the downtown and bringing those changes to the Amtrak station.

The Commission consensus was for staff to send them a link of the 2009 parking study for a statistical basis on the the 50% reduction of parking downtown, staff would also bring back a revised map including the northern border extending to Amtrak and a revised graph showing the option of 25% reduction of parking for the McLoughlin district as opposed to the proposed 35%.

Commissioner McGriff questioned the 2035 projections in the TSP. Mr. Springer explained this was to show the corridors that would be running slower during certain hours of the day. Mr. Lewis said growth was going to happen and this document planned for the growth.

Commissioner McGriff said if Beavercreek was recognized as a hamlet and people were speaking on behalf of the hamlet, those people should have the same courtesy as speakers representing neighborhood associations. She thought the residents of Holly Lane should organize themselves and get involved.

Commissioner Geil emphasized the importance of Redland Road and the need for improvements. There was discussion regarding the lack of funding for the project.

Chair Kidwell was concerned that the TSP would not be ready for approval at the next Commission meeting. If there were known issues, they needed to be addressed in order to have a clean plan.

Mr. Konkol said the focus was on the policies. He did not think it would be ready for approval at the next meeting. He asked if the Commission found errors to email staff.

Ms. Terway said at the next meeting staff would bring back information regarding parking reductions and percentages and levels of service and send a request to Clackamas County to come talk to the Planning Commission about the County's Transportation System Plan update. Staff would also send the Commission the link to the 2009 parking study.

5. Communications

There were no communications.

6. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 9:54 PM.



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, April 8, 2013

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM.

Present: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Staffers: 5 - Tony Konkol, Carrie Richter, Laura Terway, Christina Robertson-Gardiner and John Lewis

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Public Hearing

[PC 13-027](#)

Pavilion Park 2: Request for an 11-Lot Subdivision, Zone Change and Geologic Hazards review.

Chair Kidwell reopened the public hearing.

Laura Terway, Planner, stated the applicant was requesting a continuance to April 22, 2013, to address concerns about storm water.

Tracy Owens, resident of Oregon City, lived across the street from the property. Her concern was about the smaller size lots which added more cars to the area and caused a safety issue. She had young children and there was already a problem with speeding. There were also issues with water drainage.

Linda Stroehecker, resident of Oregon City, lived adjacent to the property. She appreciated that City staff had come to look at the problems on her property that she discussed at the last public hearing on this application. She was concerned about chemicals in the water that ended up dumping onto her property. Regarding the rezoning to an R-6, the more houses that went up around her the more sunlight was blocked from her property in the backyard which kept it damper with the water.

Commissioner Geil was concerned about the driveways going onto Pease Road and suggested putting in a side road instead.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Espe, to continue TP 12-04, with public comment to remain open, to April 22, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

[PC 13-026](#)

Clackamas County Red Soils Master Plan: Planning Files CP 12-01 and DP

12-01.

Chair Kidwell reopened the public hearing. He read the hearing statement describing the hearing format and correct process for participation. He asked if the Commission had any ex parte contact, conflict of interest, bias, or statements to declare.

Commissioner McGriff spoke with the County's representative for clarification on the proposed iron fence.

Commissioner Mabee visited the site.

Chair Kidwell was familiar with the site and had been to the site on several occasions.

Ms. Terway presented the staff report. She explained the subject site in the Redsoils campus off of Beavercreek Road owned by Clackamas County and adjacent properties, master plan amendment to include the Silver Oak site for the Sheriff's evidentiary storage facility, Detailed Development Plan, revision to the 12 foot chain link fence to an 8 foot wrought iron fence, landscape mitigation, and Oregon City Municipal Code adjustments. Staff recommended the applicant have three months after occupying the Silver Oak facility to complete all of the construction before occupying it for evidentiary storage use. The building could be used for office without any approval from the Planning Commission. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Becky Epstein, SERA Architects, and Kevin Poppin, Clackamas County Sheriff's Department, were the applicants.

Commissioner Mahoney disclosed he was the next door neighbor of Mr. Poppin.

Ms. Epstein said there would be other tenants in the building, not just the Sheriff's department. The State's court records facility and emergency management would also use the building. She explained the wrought iron fence proposed and passed around a sample.

Mr. Poppin said the storage of evidence was vitally important and discussed how this site would have daytime shifts instead of 24 hour shifts and security was a concern. The fencing would not provide guarantees that there would not be a breaching of security, but it would provide additional deterrant as one of the security measures in place.

Commissioner Mabee was concerned about children running into the fence since the park was nearby.

Ms. Epstein said the colors for the fence would be black for the infill material and the columns would be painted the same color as the building. They could occupy the building now for office and other storage, but when evidence and State court records went in they would need the fence to be up.

Mr. Poppin said there would be many security measures and a monitoring system for the building.

William Gifford, resident of Oregon City, was the Land Use Chair for the Hillendale Neighborhood Association. He thanked the applicant for their response to the neighborhood's concern about the fence. He thought it would provide the security needed and with the additional landscaping in front of it, it would be adequate for the neighborhood. He asked about the conditions of approval regarding replacing

existing fencing that did not specify the material for the fencing.

Ms. Terway said it did not specify material because the applicant did not propose any adjustments and it would have to be a permitted material either in the current Code or the Code that was in place when the master plan was approved in 2005. Chain link was a permitted material in 2005.

Mr. Gifford asked if landscaping included fencing? Ms. Terway said all development proposed had to be completed within three months which would include the landscaping and fence.

Mr. Gifford clarified the fence columns would be every 48 feet. He discussed buildings 11 and 12 which were for retail and office, were those the areas not to be considered for a library? The County had said no to the City purchasing property here for a new library and he did not see any footprint that would not be eligible for a library. He asked the applicant if they would look at the possibility again.

Ms. Epstein stated the court records was going to move into the building in May/June of this year and would already be in place before the evidence area. Regarding the library, it was not a conforming use on the site.

Tony Konkol, Community Development Director, said the library was not included in the original master plan that was approved. Those two buildings were later phases of the whole master plan. There was no discussion regarding putting a City facility on the County property at the time the master plan was approved. The master plan could be amended to include a library if there were negotiations in the future.

Chair Kidwell closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabee, seconded by Commissioner Henkin, to approve CP 12-01 and DP 12-01. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

[PC 13-028](#)

L 13-01: Transportation System Plan (TSP)

L 13-02: Associated Amendments to the Oregon City Municipal Code

Chair Kidwell reopened the public hearing.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, and Ms. Terway presented the staff report. Ms. Terway gave an overview of the Transportation System Plan update. She entered the PowerPoint presentation and public comments received on the website into the record.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner gave an update on the parking code amendments. Two districts would be created, a McLoughlin Commercial Overlay District and Downtown Parking Overlay District. She entered the revised parking overlay map into the record to extend the Downtown Overlay to the Amtrak station. She discussed a letter from Rick Williams of Rick Williams Consulting who did the parking study for downtown. Mr. Williams looked at the proposed changes and he not only supported the changes, but also suggested to continually work with the City Commission, Code Enforcement, and parking management to keep on the pulse of how to actively manage the existing on street parking. She discussed what a 25% reduction would look like for the McLoughlin District as opposed to the 35% and what the 50% reduction for the Downtown District would look like. She then discussed the parking management for how they could be enforced. She explained these districts were for

new development for off street parking.

There was discussion regarding concerns about the parking proposal and clarifying the letter from Mr. Williams.

Commissioner McGriff was concerned about people parking in the McLoughlin neighborhood and suggested a neighborhood parking management plan before approval of the proposed change in McLoughlin.

John Ripplinger of Ripplinger and Associates gave an update on mobility standards. He discussed the shift to a volume to capacity ratio to determine the performance of an intersection and the increased congestion it would allow. There would be no performance standard applicable for minor streets. There would be more congestion than there was today during peak hours. The proposed recommendation was: where they were obligated to apply the Regional Transportation Plan within the regional center and designated arterials and corridors, the City would apply the volume to capacity ratio. For those entirely within the City's jurisdiction, the level of service standard would be retained.

Commissioner Mabee pointed out the boundary of the regional center was not adopted by the City and was something that needed to be done moving forward.

Mr. Ripplinger said they would be abandoning the am peak hour as a performance area to be analyzed and would need to change the Code language and traffic impact study guidelines to match what was adopted. The highest and second highest of the peak hours would be analyzed, which were typically the pm peak hours.

Ms. Terway said four intersections would not meet the mobility standards and were State facilities. Staff proposed to look at these four intersections in greater detail.

Gail Curtis of ODOT said the Highway Commission had recognized the problem with these intersections and had developed policy language that allowed for an alternative mobility standard. This was a region wide problem and it was possible there would be a region solution. She recommended adopting the TSP with the recommendations of staff and agree to a refinement plan effort for these State facilities that would not meet the current mobility standards in 2035. They could not build their way out of the problem and it was a balancing act between the local and State interest. The State was committed to working with the City and would help look for funding opportunities.

There was discussion regarding how the lack of capacity would affect development and the need for a refinement plan.

Ms. Terway then discussed the concerns regarding development of Holly Lane. Mr. Konkol explained what was meant by urban and rural reserve areas, Urban Growth Boundary, and City limits.

Ms. Terway said part of Holly Lane had been planned through the Park Place Concept Plan, but no planning had been done for the part outside of the Urban Growth Boundary and City limits. She said the question was how would it develop over time, was the City on the same page as the County, and how did it work with the TSP to the year 2035. Both the City and County designated the road as a minor arterial, but the County would have a rural minor arterial standard and the City would have an urban minor arterial standard. For all of Holly Lane to develop to City standards, the street would have to have a concept plan and come into the Urban Growth Boundary and be annexed.

Carl Springer, DKS and Associates, discussed the projects proposed for Holly Lane including sidewalks and better pedestrian facilities and the funding.

Paul Edgar, resident of Oregon City and representing the Citizens Involvement Council, discussed the downtown parking issue. The Clackamas County Courthouse was used by the whole county, people did not usually have a choice to come, and one in five were legally handicapped. There was no parking for the people coming to the Courthouse or the employees of the Courthouse and they wanted to reduce parking further. Tri-Met was reducing bus service and there were no handicapped parking spots downtown.

Bob Nelson, resident of unincorporated Clackamas County, submitted a letter into the record as Exhibit 2. He lived on Holly Lane and thought this would degrade the lifestyle of the current residents and increase the potential for traffic, safety hazards, and landslides. If the City upgraded the road to urban standards, 50 homes would be destroyed. He requested Holly Lane be taken out of the TSP, to stop putting more traffic on Holly Lane with other roads leading to it, and to work with the County to develop a good, viable alternative system.

Wendy Nelson, resident of unincorporated Clackamas County, submitted a letter into the record as Exhibit 3. She lived on Holly Lane and thought this fragile neighborhood needed to be protected. Increased construction and traffic would aggravate the known landslides in the area. There was already too much traffic on Holly Lane and it was too fast. It was a major route for school buses and she questioned the safety of the children. If the road did come into the City and was improved, the road would come 24 inches within her house.

Kristi Byer, resident of unincorporated Clackamas County, submitted a letter into the record as Exhibit 4. She lived on Holly Lane. Holly Lane was a narrow two lane road with no shoulder and deep ditches. It had severely limited site distance and there had been numerous accidents due to speed and traffic flow. There were pedestrians on the road as well. Since the development on Maple Lane, the number of average daily trips had increased. She suggested checking again to make sure Holly Lane traffic was not surpassing what was originally predicted by the development and school. The County had reduced the speed to 40 mph and improved a sharp curve, yet the City had not improved conditions on their boundary. Newell Creek Canyon was a protected wetlands and there would be impacts if Holly Lane was improved. The TSP was lacking in very important data and she requested the Commission answer the questions presented before moving forward with the TSP.

Jackie Calwell, resident of unincorporated Clackamas County, lived on Holly Lane. She thought it was inconsiderate of Oregon City to plan changes to Holly Lane without consideration of the impact those changes would have on the residents on Holly Lane. Those changes would adversely affect the quality of life on Holly Lane. The increase in traffic would substantially affect them.

Christine Kosinski, resident of unincorporated Clackamas County, submitted a handout into the record as Exhibit 5. She was on the hamlet of Beaver Creek board and read a letter from the hamlet. Most of Holly Lane was in the boundaries of the hamlet, yet there was no representative on the City's transportation committee from the hamlet of Beaver Creek to represent their concerns. The City had not addressed the speeding on Holly Lane or discussed the dramatic impacts the proposed changes would have on the hamlet of Beaver Creek. The extension of Holly to Henrici was based on a concept plan that had not been approved. The hamlet of Beaver Creek voted for denial of the proposed changes to the TSP based upon the lack of safety.

Ms. Konsinski then read a portion of a letter she had written regarding the landslides in the area which could not be mitigated. She explained the landslide map she provided to the Commission and the effects of widening Holly Lane. A new north/south connector needed to be created. She requested keeping the hearing open until the DOGAMI susceptibility maps were released in May and a complete geologic study was performed for the entire length of Holly Lane and the proposed extension of Holly Lane to Holcomb. She did not think a decision on the TSP could be made without this new information. The two biggest threats to Holly Lane were landslides and safety. She thought the City was liable for anyone who might be hurt on Holly Lane due to the increased traffic and speeds.

Kevin Manning, resident of Clackamas County, lived on Holly Lane. Widening Holly Lane and putting in sidewalks would make him lose his front yard, he may be forced to hook up to City sewer, and backing out into more traffic would be a problem. Currently the livability was excellent and he had invested a lot of money into his house. Now he thought he might not want to live there anymore if this was what was coming down the pike. He was behind Ms. Konsinski and her recommendations.

Donna Gates, resident on Holly Lane, lived near Redland Road and had a lot of road frontage and canyon on her property. If it had not been for filling the canyon, Holly Lane would have been washed out. If Holly Lane was enlarged, the City would have to fill in the canyon first to stabilize the road.

Leslie Fish, resident on Holly Lane, said the school buses drivers told him that they had been told to use Holly Lane and not Highway 213. There was construction at the intersection of Holly Lane and Maple Lane. The trucks far exceeded the weight limit for the bridge at the bottom of Holly Lane.

Chair Kidwell suggested keeping the record open and postponing the Commission discussion until the next meeting.

Commissioner Geil suggested adding a project D48a, which would add a natural resources evaluation with a complete geotechnical survey and wildlife impact report.

The Planning Commission was meeting in a joint Work Session with the City Commission on April 9 to discuss the hot topic issues. The parking proposals and parking management plan, Courthouse parking, Holly Lane, regional center adoption, and refinement of the mobility standards would be issues brought back to the next Planning Commission meeting on April 22.

Commissioner McGriff encouraged the residents on Holly Lane to be involved in the County's Transportation System Plan update process as well. The County would be coming to the Planning Commission in May regarding the County's TSP.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabee, seconded by Commissioner Espe, to continue the Transportation System Plan hearing to April 22, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Robert Mahoney, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

5. Communications

Mr. Konkol gave an update on the Blue Heron project and stated the RFP applications were due April 15. Commissioner McGriff volunteered to serve on the RFP review board.

6. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 10:38 PM.