

# MINUTES

Creswell Planning Commission  
Creswell Community Center—99 West 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue

November 27, 2007  
7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Keith Morgan, Chair; David Christopher, Lloyd Safley, Dennis Grice, Blake Oelke, Wes Olson, Jack Gradle, members; Denise Walters, staff.

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

## Audience

There was no one wishing to speak.

## Commissioner Comments

There were no comments from commissioners.

## Poll Members for Conflicts of Interest

Mr. Morgan asked commissioners to declare any conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts. No conflicts or *ex parte* contacts were declared.

## Minutes of October 18, 2007

Mr. Safley pointed out that his name had been misspelled.

Mr. Safley, seconded by Mr. Morgan, moved to approve the October 18, 2007, minutes as corrected. The motion passed, 7:0.

Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Christopher, moved to approve the September 20, 2007, minutes as corrected. The motion passed, 7:0.

## I. OLD 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), a 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 Land 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 Land 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.

Ms. Walters distributed a diagram demonstrating the building's solar access and a three-dimensional schematic of the buildings to illustrate their appearance when constructed. She reviewed some issues related to the application, such as a 20-foot discrepancy between the lot width and ownership. She said staff was requiring a title report and legal description verifying the survey as a condition of approval. She said there would be a secondary access for emergency vehicles and that would meet the fire marshal's requirements. She indicated stormwater would drain to the east beneath Interstate 5, which was an Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) facility and ODOT and the City would be involved in the design of the stormwater system to assure it was adequate. She said the findings had also been revised to reflect the applicant's agreement to a strict application of the code for buffering plantings.

Ms. Walters stated that one public comment had been received from Robert and Mary Ann Hamilton, 575 North Mill Street, expressing concern about drainage; however, the proposed project would drain to the east and not impact the Hamilton's property. She noted that on page 1 of the findings of fact, the reference to Ordinance 411 was removed in items A, C and D. She continued a review of the findings, highlighting those sections that had been revised and said staff was recommending conditional approval of site design review 2007-01.

**Mary Bridget Smith**, Leahy & Cox LLP, 223 A Street, Springfield, stated that the applicant had reviewed and understood the conditions.

Mr. Morgan noted that there were an unusually large number of conditions of approval. Ms. Walters replied that the conditions were based on the very specific landscaping requirements, stormwater issues, the scope of the project and the number of agencies involved. She said the conditions would provide a checklist for the City and the applicant.

Mr. Christopher, seconded by Mr. Christopher, moved to approve the revised staff report and adopt the revised findings of fact as amended by staff. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

## **II. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

## **III. OTHER**

Ms. Walters said that abolishment of the Boundary Commission meant that cities would assume responsibility for annexations. She said annexations would come to the Planning Commission for recommendation to the City Council and the council would approve or deny the annexation request. She distributed and reviewed the policy questions that the council would be addressing at its December 10 meeting when the submittal and review criteria were adopted. She asked commissioners to be present at

the December 10 City Council for adoption of the code related to annexations. She indicated the Planning Commission would be provided with the same information as the City Council prior to the meeting. She noted that annexations would not be subject to the 120-day rule.

Ms. Walters announced that the December 20, 2007, Planning Commission meeting was cancelled.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Morgan adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

*(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)*