



PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, August 10, 2021, at 7:00 PM

APPROVED MINUTES

Members Present: Chair Cary
Vice Chair Hubbard
Commissioner Webster
Commissioner Semling
Commissioner Lawrence
Commissioner Pugsley

Members Absent: Commissioner Cavanaugh

Staff Present: City Planner Graichen
Associate Planner Dimsho
Community Development Admin Assistant Sullivan
Councilor Birkle

Others: None

1. 7:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER & FLAG SALUTE

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Planning Commission Minutes Dated July 13, 2021

Vice Chair Hubbard voiced concern about how to handle the individuals who come before the Planning Commission during Topics From the Floor and asked how the Planning Commission were to address their concerns. He asked if they should refer them to the City Council, or if they just have no response at all.

There was a small discussion on who would address those concerns.

Motion: Upon Commissioner Webster's motion and Commissioner Pugsley's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Draft Minutes dated July 13, 2021. [AYES: Vice Chair Hubbard, Commissioner Pugsley, Commissioner Lawrence, Commissioner Webster, Commissioner Semling
NAYS: None]

3. TOPICS FROM THE FLOOR (Not on Public Hearing Agenda): Limited to five minutes per topic

There were no topics from the floor.

4. PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA (times are earliest start time)

B. 7:05 p.m. Subdivision Preliminary Plat at undeveloped property at the intersection of Columbia River Hwy & Howard Street – St. Helens II, LLC

City Planner Graichen presented the staff report dated July 28, 2021. Graichen talked about the commercial subdivision and where it would be located. He said there was not a lot of development history, but the original subdivision plats involved dated back to 1891. He shared some of the land use decisions that were made during that history. He said the area was zoned Highway Commercial with a small portion of General Commercial.

He said there are no wetlands on the property and no trees to preserve. He also mentioned the property fronts the highway and that the applicant did not propose access from the highway. He also said there were already sidewalks in place along the highway. He said the only street that would need to be built is Howard Street that abuts the property. He said there was an access easement on the adjacent property as well.

Graichen mentioned they would need an easement that ties all these properties together. This would provide a shared access agreement for new development.

Graichen discussed the utilities of the site. He showed the original plan and that both water and sewer were in the right-of-way to the south. He said they propose to extend water to the southern boundary of the northernmost lot and sewer all the way to the north boundary of the site. He said the applicant did express concern about extending the sewer further north because of the difficulty of excavation and has requested the sanitary sewer end the same place as water. He said the Comprehensive Plan Policies mentions that the water and sewer are to be properly designed to serve designated Urban Growth areas and that those services are provided to vacant properties that may anticipate those needs. He said the other policy mentions that adequately sized water mains and sewer lines are to be installed initially to avoid costly expansion when the area becomes intensely developed. Graichen discussed in more detail the different options for developing these utility extensions.

There was a small discussion about the sewer being developed all the way north on the site or not.

McDonald, Bob. Applicant.— McDonald was called to speak. He mentioned that the extension of the sewer seemed unfair as the other abutting site owners did not develop their sites because of the cost of the sewer. Now he was being asked to develop the sewer to benefit all the locations there and take on the whole cost. He said the depth to make it all happen is very expensive and why they, as the applicant, would prefer to have an easement verses the whole development of the sewer line to the north side of the property. He also asked, if possible, to have the other properties help pay for the extension of the sewer. He also expressed concern not being able to add additional signs because of existing signs.

There was a small discussion about the signs.

The applicant also spoke about the different access points to the property and the impact it would have on the parking he was proposing.

There was a small discussion on different access points.

In Favor

Petersen, Al. Petersen was called to speak. Petersen is an architect working on the project. He said the criteria that is applicable to a subdivision approval is listed in the subdivision ordinance and that was all. He said there was no discussion about signs in the subdivision ordinance and did not apply to this application. He also raised concern there were too many conditions included that would later be reviewed after the development begins. He said he did not agree with adding the sewer line across the property all the way to the north. He said it seemed impractical. He said he felt the conditions including in the potential decision are for future development and seemed irrelevant to approval of a subdivision.

Neutral

No one spoke as neutral testimony.

In Opposition

No one spoke in opposition.

End of Oral Testimony

There were no requests to continue the hearing or leave the record open.

Close of Public Hearing & Record

The applicant waived the opportunity to submit final written argument after the close of the record.

Deliberations

There was a discussion about the conditions and whether they applied. Graichen mentioned conditions can be removed, but a footnote should be added as that would achieve the same purpose for a couple of items.

Commissioner Pugsley said she agreed with listing the conditions since they explain what the process for completion which is helpful for people not familiar with the process. She said listing the conditions makes it easier to understand.

There was a discussion about sewer extensions and sewer easements. Commissioner Pugsley agreed that it was the Planning Commission's obligation when approving a new subdivision that the property has proper access and utilities. She wants to ensure that they are not putting any undue burden on the adjacent property owners.

Vice Chair Hubbard did not see the need to extend the sewer line the whole length of the property and suggested a manhole right on the property line, pushing the easement a little to the side of it.

There was a discussion about how far to run the sewer line and where the public utility easements could be located.

Motion: Upon Commissioner Webster's motion and Commissioner Hubbard's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Subdivision Preliminary Plat as recommended by staff with amendments to conditions 5 and 6 to be considered a footnote and condition 2(c) as described in the memo to allow sanitary sewer to extend as far as the water line (south property line of the northernmost lot), for sanitary sewer construction and its easement to accommodate future service of properties to the north, and an additional condition noting this subdivision decision is not a Site Development Review or Conditional Use Permit. [Ayes: Vice Chair Hubbard, Commissioner Semling, Commissioner Webster, Commissioner Pugsley, Commissioner Lawrence; Nays: None]

Motion: Upon Commissioner Webster's motion and Commissioner Lawrence's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Chair to sign the Findings when prepared. [Ayes: Vice Chair Hubbard, Commissioner Semling, Commissioner Webster, Commissioner Lawrence, Commissioner Pugsley; Nays: None]

5. ACCEPTANCE AGENDA: Planning Administrator Site Design Review

1. Site Design Review (Minor) at 2290 Gable Road – Wilcox & Flegel
2. Site Design Review at 495 S Columbia River Hwy – PM Design Group

Motion: Upon Commissioner Webster's motion and Commissioner Lawrence's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Acceptance Agenda. [Ayes: Vice Chair Hubbard, Commissioner Semling, Commissioner Webster, Commissioner Pugsley, Commissioner Lawrence; Nays: None]

6. PLANNING DIRECTOR DECISIONS (previously e-mailed to the Commission)

None

7. PLANNING DEPARTMENT ACTIVITY REPORT

C. Planning Department Report - July

8. FOR YOUR INFORMATION ITEMS

Associate Planner Dimsho reminded the Commission of her discussion on the Certified Local Government pass-through grant program for exterior historic work. She said they solicited over a hundred applicants through the mail and announced it on social media and received no complete applications. She said they had a few people ask about it. One for signage which is not eligible, one for an exterior paint job which is also not eligible, and the other request was not ready to proceed with renovations in time. So, there were no projects to review. She said they did have a backup project: the Bennett Building (aka the Court/Utility Billing building). She showed the renovations that needed to be done to this building. She talked about the metal cornice and the terracotta parapet roof. She said this would be a great way to spend the money for preservation.

Dimsho also showed the Commission the full Riverwalk design that was approved by the City Council. She said the construction of the Columbia View Park and the stage area would hopefully begin Summer of 2022. She shared some more details of the design and why it was designed this way. She did mention they are planning to get as close to the river as possible and increase the park size.

9. ADJOURNMENT**NEXT REGULAR MEETING: September 14, 2021**

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Christina Sullivan
Community Development Administrative Assistant*