M I N U T E S

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

March 15, 2007
7 p.m.

PRESENT: Keith Morgan, David Christopher, David Grice, Wes Olson, Mike Ufford, Lloyd Safley, Blake Oelke, members; Megan Banks, staff; Roy Sprout, Public Works Director.

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

Minutes of January 18, 2007

Mr. Morgan noted that the minutes of July 20, 2006, were still pending from the City.

> *Mr. Safley, seconded by Mr. Morgan, moved to approve the minutes of the January 18, 2007, meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.*

Audience

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 conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts regarding any of the items on the agenda.

Commissioner Comments

Mr. Christopher observed that one again the commission was holding a public hearing without a public address system. He hoped that one would be available before the next meeting.

I. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

II. NEW BUSINESS

Application A: Public hearing on Case No. SUB-2006-08, David Evans & Associates has submitted a preliminary subdivision plat application for a six (6) lot residential subdivision (Assessor's Map 19-03-14-33, Lot 309) on behalf of Palisades Estates LLC. The site is located in southwest Creswell, at the existing terminus of Kings Row, east of Holbrook Lane and west of 2nd Street.

Ms. Banks distributed a March 15, 2007, letter from Larry Kine, property owner of the subject subdivision, indicating that the conditions of approval recommended by staff were acceptable. She referred to the vicinity map to illustrate the location of the property and noted that the Planning Commission had previously approved a preliminary plat; that plat had expired and the owner had reapplied. She said the property, which contained slopes between 15 percent and 20 percent, would be divided into six residential lots.

Ms. Banks said in order to develop the property Kings Row would be extended to 2nd Street. She said that Kings Row would be the primary access for the site and the Creswell Transportation System Plan designated Kings Row as a major collector. She said the applicant was proposing the following modifications to the standards typically required for a major collector to minimize potential adverse impact from development on steep slopes:

- paved width of 20 feet from the existing portion of Kings Row at the northern most portion of lot 1 with sidewalks on the east side only expanding to 36 feet paved width with sidewalks on both sides of the remainder of the lot 1 frontage;
- half-street paved to a width of 25 feet with sidewalk on the east side from the west property line of lot 5, decreasing to a paved width of 20 feet at the east property line of lot 5;
- sidewalks range from five feet to four and a half feet; and
- no bicycle lanes.

Ms. Banks reviewed the staff report and draft findings of fact and decision and noted that a geotechnical report found groundwater at or near the surface. She said the site also contained a number of significant trees. She indicated there were 33 conditions of approval applicable at various stages of development that would mitigate any adverse impacts. She said that no public comments had been received and staff had determined that the application could meet the code requirements, subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Ufford asked how the developer had control over fire hydrant flow. Mr. Sprout explained that the line could be moved if necessary or a pressurized system installed.

Mr. Oelke asked if the previous application had also been approved with half street paved. Ms. Banks said that the City could not require a full street to be paved because there was a different property owner on the other side. Mr. Sprout illustrated on the vicinity map the proposed street configuration.

Mr. Morgan opened the public hearing.

David Head, 785 South 2nd Street, Creswell, stated that he lived to the east of the subject property. He asked where sidewalks would be located in the development, the width and relationship to the street. Ms. Banks indicated the locations on the map and said the sidewalk width was four and a half feet.

Mr. Head said there were several springs coming off the hill in his backyard. He asked about the location of catch basins.

Mr. Oelke said that catch basins would only deal with runoff from streets. He said the geotechnical report and City engineers would assure that the street was not built over a spring.

Mr. Head said he was also concerned about the impact of tree and topsoil removal on water runoff.

Mr. Oelke said that the catch basins should improve the situation by directing runoff into the stormwater system, resulting in drier property below the street. Ms. Banks indicated the location of catch basins on the map.

There was a general discussion regarding whether the slope and lack of a sidewalk would cause problems with respect to runoff. Mr. Sprout said that the most appropriate solution would be determined during constructions. Ms. Banks pointed out the applicant had proposed several alternatives for addressing runoff concerns.

Mr. Oelke asked if the geotechnical report addressed tree removal impact on runoff. Mr. Sprout said the report addressed drainage and any problems would be dealt with at the time of a building permit. Ms. Banks added that approval of construction documents was contingent upon a report indicating what vegetation would remain, what would be removed and any mitigation that was necessary.

Mr. Morgan closed the public hearing.

Mr. Ufford said he still had concerns about the paved half street.

Mr. Oelke asked if there was an assumption that when the other property was brought inside the urban growth boundary (UGB) the other half of the street would be built. Ms. Banks said the street was the UGB.

Mr. Oelke said a half road was better than no road at all.

Mr. Ufford observed that the developer had met the criteria and it was not possible to deny the application. Ms. Banks replied that the commission could deny the application, but would have to draft new findings to justify the denial.

Ms. Banks noted that condition #12 had been modified to include the phrase "vegetation, including trees." She said the earlier version only addressed trees.

> *Mr. Safley, seconded by Mr. Christopher, moved to approve the staff report and adopt the findings of fact with conditions, including the modification to condition #12. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.*

III. OTHER

Comprehensive Plan Update Phase 1 Work Program Draft

Ms. Banks reported that the Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC) meeting had preceded the commission's meeting and a public workshop would be scheduled in early May to discuss land use issues within the city limits and whether the UGB should be expanded and in what direction. She said the next committee meeting would be in mid-April to review technical information.

Mr. Morgan suggested that the Parks Department be involved in the CIC meetings.

Ms. Banks stated that the Court of Appeals had affirmed the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) decision on the Fairways project. She said the City Council was in the process of dealing with remanded items and she did not think the commission would need to become involved.

Ms. Banks announced that the City Council had approved the new development code, but it had been appealed because of changes to language related to resort/commercial and the issue was going to LUBA.

Mr. Ufford asked if the old code was being used until the matter was settled. Ms. Banks replied the new code was in effect and it was a developer's decision whether to proceed. She said the only outstanding issue was the resort/commercial subzone.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Morgan adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

LCOG: L:\SMALL CITY PLANNING\CRESWELL PLANNING\PLANNING\MINUTES\2007\CRESWELLPC070315.DOC
Last Saved: April 3, 2007