



CITY OF TROUTDALE

"Gateway to the Columbia River Gorge"

AGENDA

TROUTDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Troutdale City Hall Council Chambers
219 E. Historic Columbia River Hwy. (lower level, rear entrance)
Troutdale, Oregon 97060

Wednesday, November 18, 2015
7:00 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
September 30, 2015 Regular Meeting
September 30, 2015 Work Session
3. **CITIZEN COMMUNICATION – NON AGENDA ITEMS**
4. **OLD BUSINESS - None**
5. **NEW BUSINESS – None**
6. **DEPARTMENT REPORTS**
7. **COMMISSION INITIATIVES AND CONCERNS**
8. **ADJOURN**
9. **WORK SESSION**
Consideration of Development Code amendments.

This meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made in writing at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to Chris Damgen 503-674-7228, or by email at chris.damgen@troutdaleoregon.gov

**MINUTES
TROUTDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
Special Meeting
Council Chamber
217 E. Historic Columbia River Highway
Troutdale, Oregon 97060
September 30, 2015**

1. Roll Call/ Pledge of Allegiance – The session was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Sandy Glantz, Frank Grande, Jamie Kranz, Shirley Prickett, Brian Sheets, Tanney Staffenson and Marv Woidyla

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff: Steve Winstead, Building Official and Planning Director
Chris Damgen, Senior Planner

Guests (see list): Alex Mauck, 931 NE Harlow Pl, Troutdale
Stephanie Cole, 1240 SW Wright Pl., Troutdale
Terry Blosser, 1558 SW Wright Pl., Troutdale
Kevin Young, 1551 SW Wright Pl., Troutdale
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist

Chair Staffenson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. There were no agenda updates. Chair Staffenson proposed moving item 8 off this evening's agenda; this meeting will be adjourned and then he will open the Work Session. The Commission agreed.

2. Approval of Minutes of August 19, 2015.

Commissioner Woidyla moved, with a second by Commissioner Kranz, to approve the minutes, as amended (Commissioner Prickett was not present and the spelling of Commissioner Kranz's name corrected). The vote was 5-yes, 2-abstain (Prickett and Sheets) and the amended minutes were approved. (Commissioner Sheets did not receive this evening's agenda packet so did not review the minutes.)

2a. Agenda Update. Mr. Winstead said staff has not heard from John Morgan, who is not present and he will call him to see.

Chair Staffenson proposed moving Item 8 Work Session to a separate meeting following this meeting. The Commission approved.

3. Citizen Communications. None.

4. Hearing Procedure. Chair Staffenson read out loud to the audience the public hearing procedure. He explained that this hearing was left open in order for Mr. Mauck to provide the appropriate materials and for citizens to have the opportunity to provide testimony on this Case File. At this request, no Commissioners said they had any ex parte contact, bias

Exhibit A. 9-24-2015 copy of memo from John Bushard, Troutdale Public Works Department, regarding Case File No. 15-039).

Exhibit B. 9-16-2015 copy of memo from Joanna Valencia of Multnomah County Transportation Planning regarding 15-039 Gateway Estates.

or conflict of interest with this case. As before, Chair Staffenson said he has spoken with the applicant to clarify a procedural issue regarding a question on timing for housing; he also stated that the applicant pumped his septic several years ago; there were no challenges. Chair Staffenson then reopened the public hearing (from September 16, 2015) on the following agenda item.

5. Continued Public Hearing – Type III Quasi-Judicial Procedure

Case File No. 15-039 Gateway Estates Subdivision

A 17-Lot subdivision with variance, lot line adjustment and tree removal.

Mr. Winstead said the applicant provided within a few days of their request the pertinent documents on this Case File, e.g., a tentative plat, and a new written narrative addressing the actual number of lots; also, staff has received input from the various agencies. He distributed a report from the Public Works Department (see **Exhibit A**) with general comments and five proposed conditions. He said he also spoke with Multnomah County and he asked if the applicant would respond to the Commission regarding the County's request.

There was some public interest in this application and inquiries but nothing written was received. The Planning Department agrees that this is a viable project and concurs with the responses from other agencies; we have not changed our position and this project is now good to go.

Applicant: Alex Mauck had not seen the Public Works' recent memo and was given a copy. He said, regarding the traffic count, that he assumed there were some standard numbers that could be looked at. The A2 lot is something we can address later, Mr. Winstead said. Access to 257th was discussed by the Commission and Mr. Mauck. We had ingress and egress to 257th when this project was previously approved, Mr. Mauck said. Mr. Winstead said if Mr. Mauck leaves the development as is, he has grandfathered access to 257th from Multnomah County; beyond that, and to be fair to Mr. Mauck, Mr. Winstead said if he goes beyond that he will be required to go back through the process. Mr. Mauck said he had no other concerns. He was given a copy of the Findings of Fact and Final Order with Conditions of Approval to read while the Commission heard public testimony.

Proponent Testimony. None.

Opponent Testimony. Terry Blosser resides on the east side of SW Wright Place and said he and his wife decided to comment. Their concern is that the access to 257th will create a main drag; there will be approximately 17 homes here with probably two cars per house and they are concerned about the children in the neighborhood. He said he is open to what Mr. Mauck wants to do and hopes he will address the traffic. He also asked what Mr. Mauck proposed for the fenced property.

Kevin Young, who lives across the street from Mr. Blosser, said he thinks Mr. Blosser was trying to say that are open for development as they love seeing growth in the city, but it sounds like the A2 section will be developed into apartments and will generate more traffic than the houses. We would like to see a mitigation of traffic coming onto Wright Place from 257th, and would like to see that in the plan, if possible. This is a quiet street with animals and kids constantly running around, and one or two cars per home will create more

traffic, and there are people who will want to divert from 257th to Wright Place to cut time. Maybe another street would help.

We don't control access to 257th, Chair Staffenson said. Mr. Winstead said, for clarification, that Multnomah County had wanted to block access to 257th and have the only access to the A2 lot from Wright Street. Mr. Blosser said their concern could possibly be mitigated; possibly an option to put in speed bumps or some other fix.

Neutral Testimony. Jennifer Barry, Multnomah County Transportation Planner, spoke of Joanna Valencia's memo submitted last week (see **Exhibit B**). The County at this point is most interested in how the residences will impact the level of service there and they want to make sure they know what that impact will be. She said she is aware that what is being presented now does not include development on A2. The County prefers no access to 257th as a less busy road would be their preference, but this does not sound like it's an issue before the Commission now. Their primary concern this evening is that there be an analysis of what will happen at that intersection and the level of service there. Chair Staffenson confirmed that Ms. Barry was asking for a traffic analysis. He asked her what the level of service is now; she said she did not know. Ms. Barry said she will find out what the current traffic count is and provide that. We do not know what the threshold is now. Commissioner Grande said we have already put the applicant off by another two weeks and now you want us to put him off again. Commissioner Prickett said a study had been done two years ago (approximately) and based on that, would that be feasible to use instead of reinventing the wheel; traffic patterns have not changed much. Using that existing information makes a lot of sense, Ms. Barry agreed. She said she assumed, explaining that she was not a traffic engineer, that the process would be to look at what was done previously and look at the new numbers generated and how those vehicles will move through the property given the new road and how that will affect the intersection. Mr. Winstead asked if she had looked at the traffic study done in 2008; Ms. Barry said no, that would be interesting.

Mr. Winstead said it was curious that the County approved this project before when it had more lots (18); now there are fewer lots (17) and he did not think that would be an issue with less density. Ms. Barry said they were looking for that information but did not have it. A simple resolution would be to provide her with that again, if he would. She said that makes sense and that they will look at it.

Alex Mauck said he reviewed the Public Works document and did not see anything new that he would need to consider. Regarding traffic, he said he already has approval for access to 257th which was hashed out the first time this came up. He also said has never before heard of a County asking a City to do a traffic study for the County; they are very expensive and that's one reason he is trying to avoid it. The last study he saw was, he believes, in 2010. He believes it states that 257th has about 22,000 vehicles per day going up and down, and currently he limits access onto his property because you need to pick your time of day for that. He said he knows from talking with the County and other landowners there that the County does not really want access there and want him to somehow go another way onto 257th.

Addressing Mr. Blosser's concern about the fence, Mr. Mauck said he has no current plans to remove it. He will have no control over that, however, if someone buys that property. Regarding the expressed concerns about traffic on Wright Place, he said he does not think people will be racing on those streets as it won't save anyone time and he explained why. He was asked if he could mitigate speeding vehicles and he said he would not be opposed to that. Commissioner Grande asked if they could add something to the Final Order recommending some mitigation. Mr. Winstead said perhaps Public Works could help with that. Commissioner Grande agreed but added that he does not want to add more expense to the project. When asked, Mr. Mauck said he will be open to what Public Works may recommend.

Regarding stormwater, Mr. Mauck said for the initial project he had obtained the necessary permits for stormwater for a dry well, and that permit is still in effect.

Mr. Young asked why the Commission did not address the traffic in Lot A2. Chair Staffenson explained that at this hearing they were looking only at the other lots and that A2 will be addressed at another meeting in the future.

Commissioner Sheets moved, with a second by Commissioner Grande, to close the public hearing. The vote was unanimous and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Prickett, moved, with a second by Commissioner Sheets, to rewrite the Findings of Fact to add the following: A. The staff report with attachments, dated September 16, 2015; and B. The Planning Commission received public testimony from residents regarding safety concerns about potential through-traffic through the neighborhood on Wright Place. A friendly amendment by Commissioner Woidyla asked that these items be alphabetized like the rest of the document. Commissioners Prickett and Sheets accepted the amendment. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Commissioner Sheets moved, with a second by Commissioner Glantz, to recommend adding to the Public Works Conditions a new Condition 6: The Public Works Street Maintenance Department analyze possible mitigation for hazardous traffic on Wright Place. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Commissioner Sheets moved, with a second by Commissioner Glantz, to approve the Findings of Fact and Final Order, and the Conditions of Approval, both as amended above. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed. Mr. Mauck thanked the Commission.

- 6. Department Reports.** Mr. Winstead told of a few projects that would be coming forward soon – a Plan amendment and a zone change, probably in November. Chair Staffenson asked for a staff update on the Kite property, possibly at the next meeting.
- 7. Commission Initiatives and Concerns.** Commissioner Woidyla shared information from the last Master Plan meeting at the Port of Portland where they proposed some new alternatives with more industrial use. He also mentioned a new proposal to reduce the airport runway length to 3,000 feet (it's now 5,400 feet) which will eliminate a lot of business. Their next meeting is in November. The Mayor was at this last meeting, but Commissioner Woidyla said he thinks the Port's agenda is set. Commissioner Prickett said

too much dust is flying around from the property being developed across 242nd at 22nd Street at the LSI property (the old tree farm); if the workers would keep it watered down it when they aren't working, it wouldn't be so bad but they're not. That property is in Gresham but it affects Troutdale. Mr. Winstead said he will register a formal complaint with Gresham on her behalf. Commissioner Grande reminded everyone about the upcoming Fall Festival of the Arts at Glenn Otto Park.

- 8. **Next Meeting.** The next scheduled meeting is Wednesday, October 21, 2015.
- 9. **Adjourn.** Commissioner Prickett moved to adjourn, with a second by Commissioner Glantz. The vote was unanimous and the meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Tanney Staffenson, Chair

Date

Attest: _____
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist

**MINUTES
TROUTDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
Work Session
Council Chamber
217 E. Historic Columbia River Highway
Troutdale, Oregon 97060
September 30, 2015**

1. Roll Call. The session was called to order at **8:43p.m.**

Commissioners Present: Sandy Glantz, Frank Grande, Jamie Kranz, Shirley Prickett, Brian Sheets, Tanney Staffenson and Marv Woidyla

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff: Steve Winstead, Building Official and Planning Director
Chris Damgen, Senior Planner
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist

Guests (see list): None.

Chair Staffenson called the meeting to order at **8:27 p.m.**

2. Work Session. *Consideration of Development Code Updates.*

Chair Staffenson distributed copies of Code chapters for Commission review (see **Exhibits A and B**).

Chapter 8 – Site Orientation and Design Standards

p. 15 – Section 8.058.C. Building Orientation. This Section was previously deleted and Chair Staffenson distributed proposed replacement text (see **Exhibit B**). At the October Work session, it was noted that deleting this will take Troutdale out of compliance with Title 4, and the Section was also based on Ordinance No, 819 to comply with Metro’s Functional Plan. Mr. Winstead said the proposed text may be a way to meet the Metro requirements and still be in compliance.

Chair Staffenson said if we have to retain some of the original language, he asked how the Commission felt about adding this proposed text as Item C. Mr. Winstead said we should try to find a way to say yes to an applicant, a way to mitigate things. Chair Staffenson said he tried here to give other options to the 30-foot setback for buildings on transit streets. The alternative language gives the applicant more direction and a way to comply. Commissioner Sheets said it gives it more clarity. We need to vet it first, though, Chair Staffenson said. The Commission said they will see what Metro says, and take it to the public hearing – from there they can see which way they want to go. Mr. Winstead said we

Exhibit A. (Undated) Copy of changes previously made and newly proposed at Work Session meeting of September 30, 2015, in Chapter 8 – Site Orientation and Design Standards, submitted by Chair Staffenson.

Exhibit B. (Undated) copy of proposed replacement text for Section 8.058.C., submitted by Chair Staffenson.

also need to incorporate design review here in the first paragraph, and he suggested the following: “. . . development proposal may incorporate the following design features through the Design Review process in such combination . . .” and this puts it back into the procedure and gives some clarity.

p. 15 – Section 8.056 Transit Facility Design. This was also previously deleted. When Commissioner Glantz asked about it, Chair Staffenson said if we are required by Metro to put Section 8.058 back in, this may also go back in.

Chapter 10. Signs

pp. 2 & 3 – Section 10.015 Definitions, Item .13 Electronic Display System, and Item 14 Electronic Message Center. Chair Staffenson said he thought we may want better definitions and some standards such as for along I-84 and other areas. This has come up before, particularly the differences. Mr. Winstead said if we call them ‘automated’ that should cover it. Commissioner Sheets said we don’t need to reinvent the wheel but should research this and be cautious with that. He agreed that we could possibly find better definitions if we research it. Chair Staffenson recalled the Harvest Church application and the discussion at that time. Mr. Winstead asked him to task staff with coming up with better definitions and the Commission can determine the best one. Chair Staffenson said he’d pulled a few cities’ definitions; Mr. Winstead said he is the person who wrote those for the City of Wilsonville and it was a headache back then. Mr. Damgen said he has been through three different sign code definitions and it was not easy. As well, the outdoor advertising industry watches everything regarding signs. The Commission agreed that staff will bring newly crafted definitions for them to review.

At this point, Chair Staffenson asked if any Commissioners had any more comments or questions on the Code. He said he will bring a few new items back at their next meeting. Mr. Winstead said staff would prefer having the Kight discussion at an Executive Session after the October 21st scheduled meeting, as well as the balance of the Development Code to review Chapter 5, 15, 16 and 17 at that time. He said he will put together a new updated version for the Commission with all the changes made to-date, full-page with numbered pages. He said he will review it with Mr. Morgan before he delivers it to them. That will slow our process a little, Chair Staffenson said, but he also feels it is necessary. He said he would like to review the Code, with staff, prior to it being distributed; that was agreed. We will have another Work Session before we do the two public hearings, and that is before we take this to the Council, possibly in January.

- 3. **Adjourn.** Commissioner Prickett moved, with a second by Commissioner Glantz, to adjourn. The vote was unanimous and the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Tanney Staffenson, Chair

Date

Attest: _____
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist