M I N U T E S

Creswell Planning Commission
Creswell Community Center—99 West 1st Avenue

June 21, 2007
7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Keith Morgan, David Christopher, David Grice, Wes Olson, Mike Ufford, members; Denise Walters, staff.

ABSENT: Blake Oelke, Lloyd Safley

Mr. Morgan called the meeting of the Creswell Planning Commission to order.

Minutes of May 17, 2007

Mr. Christopher, seconded by Mr. Ufford, moved to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2007, meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 4:0.

Mr. Grice arrived at 7:40 p.m.

Audience

Mr. Morgan called for comments from the audience on items not on the meeting agenda. There was no one wishing to speak.

Poll Members for Conflicts of Interest

Mr. Morgan polled commissioners for conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts. No members declared a conflict of interest or *ex parte* contact regarding any of the items on the agenda.

Commissioner Comments

There were no comments from commissioners.

I. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

II. NEW BUSINESS

Application A: Type II Administrative Decision - Case No. SITE-2007-01, a request by Creswell Court 2nd LLC for site plan review for development of rental storage units (Creswell Storage Facility), site management office, and residence for caretaker (assessor's map 19-03-14-12, tax lots 200, 400 and 500). The site is located on Highway 99 north of Art Lott Lane. The site is zoned General Commercial and designated as Commercial on the Creswell Comprehensive Plan Lane Use Map. The application was reviewed under the following sections of the Creswell Development Code Ordinance No. 411: Section 3.2.3.A.2, Limited Lane Use Decisions; Section 3.6.0, Site Review; Section 6.0, General Commercial Zone; Section 14.0, Development Standards; Section 17.0, Parking and Access Standards, and other applicable sections of the code. (Old Code: Ordinance Nos. 390 and 411)

Ms. Walters said the applicant had submitted changes to the phasing plan, which she had just received today. She distributed copies of the revised site plan and comments from the applicant on some of the conditions of approval. She said Phase I originally included the entrance on tax lot 400, emergency vehicle access on tax lot 200 and construction of buildings A, B and C with the paving as shown. She said future buildings would be constructed as needed based on market demand. She said the applicant was uncertain what market demand would be and was requesting that Phase I include options as shown on the revised site review plan for constructing one or more of the buildings alone or in combination, dependent on market demand. She said the applicant assured there would be adequate infrastructure—fire protection, water, turnaround area, lighting and landscaping—would be included regardless of which option was implemented.

Mr. Morgan asked if it was common to have options for a phase. Ms. Walters said it was unusual and since the information had just been provided, the commission could defer action until staff had time to conduct a review of the proposed changes, as well as obtain comments from Public Works and the fire marshal.

Mr. Ufford asked if the changes to the application would affect any of the staff recommendations. Ms. Walters said some revisions to the findings would likely be required, including more specificity regarding the options in Phase I. She said it would also be helpful to have time to review the applicant's comments. She reviewed the written comments submitted by the applicant in a May 7, 2007, letter and noted that the application had been submitted and reviewed under the old code. She also reviewed comments from the applicant dated June 15, 2007, relating to landscaping and buffering requirements and the proposal for a fence with slats and a hedge and trees planted at 50-foot intervals on center on the south and west sides of the site. She requested direction from the Planning Commission regarding the applicant's proposal.

In response to a question from Mr. Ufford, Ms. Walters clarified the location of the proposed fence and hedge.

Mr. Morgan asked if the proposal constituted a change to the plan. Ms. Walters replied that the applicant was providing clarifying information and the commission could determine whether or not a fence was an acceptable buffer.

Mr. Ufford indicated he did not have concerns with the landscaping.

Mr. Grice asked about the height of the proposed buildings. Don Mogstad, Poage Engineering and Surveying, Inc., explained that the buildings would be 16 feet high and primarily used for recreational vehicle storage. He said the adjacent residential properties would see less than a 12-foot building from a distance of 25 feet. He said the code allowed buildings to be five feet from the property line but the plan called for a 15-foot setback on the north side and 25-foot setback on the south side to further buffer the buildings from residential properties. He described the proposed fencing and shrubbery on the site.

Mr. Olson asked if buildings would be accessed from the north side. Mr. Mogstad replied that access would be only from the center, not the perimeter. He said the site plan indicated a 5-foot setback on the south in error.

In response to question from Mr. Olson, Ms. Walters said the existing structure on tax lot 500 would be removed, the existing home on tax lot 400 would be converted to an office and manager's residence, the house on tax lot 200 would remain and the drive aisle would be strictly for emergency vehicle access and bollards would be installed and tax lot 300 was not part of the proposal.

Mr. Grice asked if the site would be open. Mr. Mogstad stated that the site would be fully enclosed.

> Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Olson, moved to direct staff to amend the findings regarding buffering to reflect that the applicant's proposal adequately met the standards. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Ms. Walters asked if the commission had other questions regarding the application or wished to have additional information before making a decision.

Mr. Olson requested an aerial photograph of the site.

Mr. Christopher asked for better clarification of the four options for Phase I.

Mr. Morgan asked for amended findings in accordance with the commission's direction to staff.

Mr. Mogstad stated that the primary purpose of the phasing options was to have occupancy in one building before construction the other buildings. He said that the infrastructure for future buildings would be in place; the buildings just would not be built yet.

Ms. Walters asked the applicant to submit a written description of a phasing plan so staff and the commission could review that information before the commission took action on the application.

> Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Olson, moved to table the application. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Application B: Type II Administrative Decision - Case Nos. VAR-2007-01 and VAR-2007-2, requests by gLAs Architectural Group on behalf of the Creswell School District for variances to the standards for maximum number of parking spaces. [Section 3.3.300(C)] and number of vehicle stacking spaces [Section 3.3.600(C)]. The maximum parking allowed is 19 spaces and 122 are proposed. Forty-five stacking spaces are required and 11 are proposed. The site is located at 655 West Oregon Avenue. The site is

zoned Public Facilities/Government on the Creswell Zoning and Comprehensive Land Use Diagram. The application was reviewed under the following sections of the Creswell Development Code: Section 4.1.300, Type II Procedure; Section 5.1.400(E), Class B Variances-Variance to Parking and Loading Standards (Chapter 3.3); Chapter 2.6, Public Facilities District; Article 3, Community Design Standards and other applicable sections of the code. (New Code: Ordinance No. 442)

Ms. Walters said that VAR-2007-01 related to the vehicle stacking variance. She said the proposal was consistent with the Public Facilities/Government zone as it was for a school and a reduction in the amount of vehicle stacking area required for drive-through facilities was allowed if deemed appropriate. She said because the development was a school, safety required that bus lanes to be separated from all the other parking lanes and circulation areas. She said this need requires considerable space and was the reason for the request to reduce the vehicle stacking area. She said student population data and drop-off information supported approval of the variance. She noted the following correction to the draft findings for VAR-2007-01: page 3, II. Summary and Conclusions: Based on the findings stated above, the variance request meets the requirements of the Creswell Development Code for approval, ~~subject to conditions~~.

Mr. Ufford, seconded by Mr. Christopher, moved to approve VAR-2007-01, with amended findings. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Ms. Walters reviewed VAR-2007-02 and said the request for additional parking was based on the building's use not only as a middle school, but a community center and sports center. She said all of those uses could occur simultaneously and supported the request for a variance from the maximum number of parking spaces allowed in the code. She noted the following correction to the draft findings for VAR-2007-01: page 3, II. Summary and Conclusions: Based on the findings stated above, the variance request meets the requirements of the Creswell Development Code for approval, ~~subject to conditions~~.

Mr. Ufford, seconded by Mr. Christopher, moved to approve VAR-2007-02, with amended findings. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Application C: Type III Quasi-judicial Decision - Case No. SITE-2007-02, a request by gLAs Architectural Group for site design review approval to replace the existing middle school with a new school. The proposal includes assessor's map 19-03-14-23, tax lot 12500 and assessor's map 19-03-15-40, tax lots 100 and 700. The site is zoned Public Facilities/Government and designated as Recreation and Open Space/Public Facilities, Government on the Creswell Zoning and Comprehensive Land Use Diagram. The application was reviewed under the following sections of the Creswell Development Code: Section 4.1.400, Type III Procedure; Section 4.2.300, Lane Use Review Procedure and Approval Criteria; Chapter 2.6, Public Facilities District; Article 3, Community Design Standards and any other applicable section of the Creswell Development Code. (New Code: Ordinance 442)

Ms. Walters reviewed the staff reported and entered into the record a letter from the Oregon Department of State Lands dated June 14, 2007, acknowledging receipt of the Wetland Land use Notification forms. She said that the wetland protection overlay zone did not apply to the subject site. She said the development would be phased, as the existing school would be used while the new school was being built and primary access for construction would be off D Street so Oregon Avenue would be clear for school and regular traffic. She highlighted conditions of proposal that were unique to the proposal, including conditions Nos. 1, 3, 10, 22, 34, 38, 39, 45, 46, 50, 53, 54, 56 and 57. She proposed eliminating conditions Nos. 8 and 9

after the applicant had raised concerns about a raised walkway and pointed out that the perimeter gate was just for construction and not during the regular school year: She said condition No. 37 was a duplicate and should be eliminated. She said staff recommended conditional approval of SITE-2007-02

Mr. Morgan opened the public hearing and called for testimony. He determined there was no one wishing to speak and closed the public hearing.

> Mr. Christopher, seconded by Mr. Ufford, moved that the Creswell Planning Commission approve SITE-2007-02 with amended conditions and accept the staff report and adopt the amended findings of fact. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Mr. Christopher observed that the sign indicated the school entry should be larger. A representative of the applicant said that the community wanted to save the original school entry and while that was not possible, it would be replicated on a larger scale.

III. OTHER

Riparian Protection and Wetland Overlay Zone

Ms. Walters distributed a memorandum from her dated June 21, 2007, related to implementing Chapter 2.10 Riparian Protection and Wetland Overlay Zone. She said the City was responsible for making decisions about wetlands as a significant resource and the related procedures included a local wetland inventory that identified all of the wetlands, designated those that were significant and described protections. She said the City, along with other small communities, did not have a wetlands inventory because of the cost involved and consequently was out of compliance with Goal 5.

Ms. Walters said her memorandum outlined the State's recommendations for implementing the wetland component of Chapter 2.10 and pursuing Goal 5 compliance. She said the State was attempting to identify funds to help jurisdictions conduct their local wetland inventories necessary for compliance with Goal 5.

Ms. Walters said the Planning Commission's next meeting was scheduled on July 19, 2007, and the agenda would include the Creswell Storage Facility application and possibly two final plats.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Morgan adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)