

**MINUTES (DRAFT)**  
**CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
7:00 PM – Monday, September 24, 2018  
City Council Chambers – 222 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

---

**PRESENT:** Commissioners John Savory, Larry Boatright, Derrick Mottern, and Shawn Varwig

**ABSENT:** Commissioners John Serlet, Tyler Hall, and Andrey Cherishnov

**STAFF:** Bryan Brown, Planning Director, and Laney Fouse, Recording Secretary

**OTHERS:** Rick Givens, Craig Gingerich, Allen Manuel, Ed Netter Regina & Robert Taylor, Carolyn Adkins, Don Adkins, Drew Cornedi, Matthew Stoffregen, Araceli Ibarra, Marisa Ibarra, Tom & Julie Rushton, Darren Gusdorf, Shirley Hollar, and Jeff Hollar

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Savory called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** – None

**MINUTES** – Not available for this meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS** – None

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- a. Consider a request from ICON Construction & Development, LLC for an Annexation and Zoning Map Amendment to annex 9.61 acres consisting of 3 tax lots and adjacent right-of-way located between N Pine St and N Oak St at NE 15<sup>th</sup> and NE 16<sup>th</sup> Avenues and rezone from County RRF-5 to R-1 Low Density Residential. (ANN 18-03/ZC 18-03 N Pine)

Chair Savory opened the public hearing and read the public hearing format. He asked if any Commissioner had ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare. There was none.

Bryan Brown, Planning Director, entered his staff report into the record. This request was for an annexation of 9.61 acres and a zone change from County to City zoning. The Comprehensive Plan showed R-1 zoning for this property. The surrounding zoning was R-1 and R-1.5. Usually single family homes were built in the R-1 zone and that was what the applicant was proposing. However, the applicant only submitted a preliminary plat and they were not reviewing a subdivision plan tonight. There were three tax lots and two existing homes on the site. He then explained the approval criteria. The land needs analysis was based on population projections, and said that the City needed 421 new household units. Instead of evaluating all available land, which was not a very good measure because availability of the land was not always relevant, they evaluated existing platted lots, which was a good indication of a ready supply. A three-year supply was the policy to base their decisions on. There had been concern about increasing development resulting in increasing traffic and one way to address how quickly they would grow was through metering annexations in accordance with the available land supply. This annexation

brought the inventory close to the three year land supply if they utilized every existing plat and assumed they would all be developed within the next two to three years. He questioned whether that was realistic.

Mr. Brown stated the applicant indicated the City needed 43 more lots to reach the three year land supply, and his application would provide 40 lots. The applicant had left out of the analysis one subdivision of 90 lots. This was a minimum standard and they could always have more inventory. The consumption rate for the past ten years was about 45 lots per year, but more recently it had been about 65 lots per year. Right now as quickly as a home was being built, it was purchased and filled. He thought as many lots as they could bring forward would be consumed. It took two to three years before the lots were actually for sale. This annexation was not in a development concept plan area, but it was in a development agreement area. The intent was that whatever the City wanted to ensure that the development application would demonstrate, it would be put in the development agreement. Staff had added in where the streets would connect and that the applicant would provide all of the necessary infrastructure to serve the development. He reviewed the preliminary plat for the single family detached lots. N Oak Street would be completed. He did not anticipate the City taking over N Pine Street at this time, however frontage improvements on Pine would be done. Staff thought the application met the approval criteria and conformed to the Transportation Planning Rule. A traffic study was not needed as the adopted Transportation System Plan fully anticipated the level of traffic that annexation, rezoning, and development of this property would contribute to the City. A more detailed traffic analysis would be done when the development application came in. Staff recommended approval of the application.

**Applicant:** Rick Givens, Planning Consultant, was representing the prospective purchaser of the property. The main concern from the neighbors was the condition of Pine Street, however they were just talking about the annexation into the City, not development and the necessary improvements that would be required. Regarding the housing needs analysis, he noted that the subdivision that was not included was approved after this application had been submitted. Most of the lots in the analysis that were listed for this year would be used up before the end of the year. What they were seeing throughout the area was that lots closer into the Portland area were eaten up quickly and there was increasing development pressure on outlying communities to pick up the slack. This property was surrounded by properties in the City limits. It was an island in the middle of the City with undeveloped streets. This property was essential in providing links that would complete the traffic system in the area and allow roads to be brought up to City standards. The site was well served and annexation and development would make better more efficient use of existing City facilities. The intent was to build 7,000 square foot plus lots. This property was ideal for development. It was flat, easily developed, and was a missing piece of the puzzle.

### **Opponents:**

Jean Robinson, Canby resident, gave testimony about the poor condition of Pine Street. The County would not do anything about it and she had put concrete in the holes in front of her driveway. The City would not do anything until the County brought it up to standard. They did not need any more cars on Pine Street. She suggested the new development only have access

onto Oak and not Pine Street. She thought Pine Street should be taken care of first before development was allowed. Pine Street was dangerous and funding should be used to fix it.

Chair Savory thought that the developer would work with the County to take care of Pine Street. He agreed it was in terrible condition.

Mr. Brown concurred about the condition. There would be improvements with this development, but this property was not adjacent to the whole length of Pine Street. It would be an incremental improvement of the road over time as development occurred until there were funds to improve it.

Commissioner Varwig clarified N Pine was owned by the County and it was the County that had to repair it at this time.

**Proponents:** None

**Rebuttal:** None

Chair Savory closed the public hearing at 7:34 pm.

Commissioner Deliberation:

Commissioner Varwig understood the concern about Pine Street. He thought the application met the criteria and would be voting in favor.

Commissioner Boatright agreed. The property was in the middle of the City and some of Pine Street would be improved when the property was developed. He would also vote in favor.

Commissioner Mottern agreed with the previous comments.

Commissioner Varwig asked how soon the City and County could come to an agreement about N Pine. It needed to be a priority.

Mr. Brown explained about the grant funding the City had been awarded for N Pine to improve a small portion of the street. The City decided not to move forward with it at that time. N Pine was one of the City's top priorities.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Commissioner Mottern and seconded by Commissioner Varwig to approve ANN 18-03/ZC 18-03 N Pine. Motion passed 4/0.