

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main Street
TUESDAY, April 14, 2009
6:30 PM**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Jeff Klein, Chair
Lisa Batey
Scott Churchill
Teresa Bresaw
Paulette Qutub
Chris Wilson

STAFF PRESENT

Katie Mangle, Planning Director
Susan Shanks, Senior Planner
Bill Monahan, City Attorney

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Dick Newman, Vice Chair

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Klein called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m. and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

2.0 Planning Commission Minutes

2.1 February 10, 2009

Commissioner Bresaw moved to approve the February 10, 2009 meeting minutes as written. Commissioner Batey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2.2 February 24, 2009

The Commission briefly conferred whether the use of the word “Congress” on Line 829 on 2.2 page 25 of the packet was a correct reflection of the funding being discussed. No changes were made.

Commissioner Wilson asked whether a Commissioner who was absent for the meeting should abstain.

Bill Monahan, City Attorney, advised that a Commissioner could choose to abstain but did not have to. The Oregon Public Records Law did allow someone not present at a meeting to vote on the minutes. He suggested that Commissioner Wilson let those who were present provide their comments and if they appeared satisfied, he could vote or abstain.

Commissioner Churchill moved to approve the February 24, 2009 minutes as written. Commissioner Bresaw seconded the motion, which passed 5 to 0 to 1 with Commissioner Batey abstaining.

3.0 Information Items –None

4.0 Audience Participation –This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda. There was none.

5.0 Public Hearings –None

6.0 Worksession Items

6.1 Community Service Use Modifications –Director’s Interpretation briefing
Staff Person: Katie Mangle

Katie Mangle, Planning Director, explained that Staff had developed an internal practice for handling properties being used according to the list in the Community Service Use Code section, like old churches, schools, and the Johnson Creek Blvd (JCB) facility, which was permitted in the County and then annexed into the City.

- Staff had developed and used an internal practice for handling permits for older sites with the Community Service Overlay (CSO) designation, like old churches and schools, and for other community use facilities permitted in the County before being annexed into the City.
- After some recent applications, including the Johnson Creek Blvd (JCB) modular office building application, staff realized the interpretation regarding old CSU-type properties needed to be more thorough and added to the Code fix list because the CSU Code did not provide sufficient direction for such circumstances, which came up often.
- Staff worked with Bill Monahan, City Attorney, to develop the Director's Interpretation Memorandum (6.1 page 2 of the packet) to clearly outline the interpretation for staff and potential applicants.
 - * She wanted the Commission to understand the background because the issue would come up during the North Clackamas Park application where the ball fields would lead to a CSU for one corner of the site.
- She specifically reviewed the seven categories listed and defined in her memorandum (6.1 page 4) which addressed how to handle a property that had not received a CSU permit. She reminded that CSU applications were previously called Community Service Overlay (CSO). The CSU process replaced the older CSO in 2006.
- She responded to comments and questions from the Commission as follows:
 - * The Immovable Foundation Church was a CSO property under Category 2; although it was treated as a CSU under the current code.
 - * Using a diagram, she indicated how applications for improvements to existing CSU properties within a Water Quality Resource (WQR) area would be subject to CSU review to ensure WQRs were protected.
 - * A complete CSU process would not be required for an improvement such as a bridge in North Clackamas Park, unless it was within a WQR area. Normally a major modification would have been required, but for this site the Commission would review whether [the bridge] alone was a CSU, rather than the whole park. A Code amendment was needed to clarify the approach and avoid confusion.
 - * She explained a 50-ft setback existed from the high bank of the creek, specifically within the mapped area of the WQRs or Willamette Greenway (WG) Zone. If the footprint of a structure touched within one of the setbacks, then the structure would come under the CSU review process.

Commissioner Churchill asked if the potential for abusing the intent of the CSU Code by avoiding a review was possible, such as extending the bridge so as not to touch the setback.

- * **Ms. Mangle** responded that the application would then fall into a different category and requires a major modification to the CSU, and so it would not avoid review.

Commissioner Bresaw added that a bridge would create shade over the creek, and so would not escape the WQR area review.

Commissioner Churchill asked what qualified as "touching the zone"; trees also created shade. He wanted to be sure the definition was exact enough to avoid future problems. He suggested that if the footprint touched the zone, the radius around the structure should be treated the same as the actual footprint, which would encompass such details as a cantilevered structure hanging over the 50-ft setback.

- * **Ms. Mangle** agreed that good questions were raised, clarifying that the intent was the building footprint in the WQR area or WG Zone.
- * **Mr. Monahan** stated that the footprint could be addressed as a disturbance-impacted area in the Code rewrite, which would trigger a review.

Chair Klein added that once the Director's Interpretation triggered a review, the application would then come to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Bresaw expressed concern about private property owners who fertilized lawns next to the creek, impacting the creek even though the house was 50 ft back.

- * **Ms. Mangle** responded that issue was covered in the WQR Code. Even if site changes outside of the 50-ft buffer affected the water quality, enforcement was possible. For example, if construction occurring on a hill caused erosion into a creek below, erosion control requirements would be enforced. She asserted that the WQR Code addressed many situations.
- * The issue was how much flexibility should be offered to sites in terms of use or expansion if they were not properly permitted originally. Generally, "properly permitted" was being interpreted pretty broadly because the City did not believe it was appropriate, reasonable, or fair to require every CSU in the city to obtain new permits.

Chair Klein confirmed that additional survey requirements were only triggered if a structure was proposed in the WG Zone.

- * **Ms. Mangle** clarified that the 50-ft setback was based on Code maps, which had to be verified by an official survey provided by the applicant.
- Understood the statement "Changes of name and ownership are irrelevant" in Category 5 on 6.1 page 5 was true for all the categories.
 - * **Ms. Mangle** agreed, clarifying that it applied unless specified in the conditions of approval, which had been done in some applications.
 - * Churches could change owners and still operate under the same CSU. She recalled at least one church changing to a different congregation and relying on a previous CSO permit. The new congregation was held to the same conditions and operating assumptions and if not met, then a CSU modification review was needed.
- Was concerned about CSUs converting over without some review of whether the new use was an intensification of use.
 - * **Ms. Mangle** noted staff did not always know that a CSU was converting to a new use, but the Planning Commission had the ability to reconsider CSU permits if it

was believed the use intensified or did not meet the original conditions. A new full hearing was not necessarily required, but an opportunity was provided to bring the owner in and impose additional conditions.

- * **Mr. Monahan** agreed, adding if a church historically only had church services once a week, but then converted to another church that provided an array of other related uses, the impact could be reviewed.

Commissioner Churchill asked if an existing church would trigger a CSU review by increasing the number of services offered, thus increasing the use.

- * **Ms. Mangle** responded that it depended on what the conditions of approval were, which was why staff now tried to be very specific about what was approved. If a concern existed, staff could research the original CSO approvals and conditions to investigate specifics.

Commissioner Batey commented it was ironic that the older CSOs had a greater chance of intensified use over time, but the City had less ability to do anything about it.

Chair Klein agreed, adding that compared to when a church turned over, the intensification of use would probably not be as great.

Susan Shanks, Senior Planner, interjected that sometimes the process did work, although was not always noticeable.

- The Bridge City Community Church had a day care approved through the old CSO process, which was very specific about the number of teachers and students, hours of operation, and number of parking spaces required. A year later, the approved day care went out of business.
- Just recently, the church wanted to utilize the empty space with a new day care. Upon review, staff discovered that a land use decision had approved a day care with a certain level of operation. The church tailored the use to meet the requirements to receive approval for the day care. Any variations would have been an intensification or alteration.

Chair Klein recalled that he liked what the Commission did with Sweet Pea Preschool because they supported the owner, not just the day care.

Commissioner Batey commented that was a little dangerous.

6.2 Planning Commission Bylaws Review Staff Person: Katie Mangle & Bill Monahan

Ms. Mangle explained that over the past 2 years, she and Mr. Monahan had compared notes regarding bylaws that should be reviewed. Their suggestions were being presented for discussion only and for input from the Commission.

Mr. Monahan presented the proposed changes, as noted in his memorandum 6.2 page 1 of the packet dated April 3, 2009. He noted that staff would incorporate the Commission's suggestions and return with another draft for review.

The Commission reviewed the proposed changes to the bylaws, discussing and consenting to key changes with additional comments as follows:

- Article V.A. Meetings: Planning Commission meetings were targeted to end at 10:00 p.m. with the option of voting at 10:00 p.m. to extend to 10:15 p.m., and then voting at 10:15 p.m. to determine whether to continue the meeting.
- Article V.C. Voting: A tie vote would result in denial.
- Article V.E. Parliamentary Authority: References to Robert's Rules would be deleted.
- Article VII.C: Language stating that Commissioners were encouraged to visit the site was preferred. The expectation or obligation to complete site visits should be removed.
 - * Relying only on the packets was a clean process, but through site visits, the community could see that the Commissioners were aware of the full picture.
 - * Actually seeing the site provided a better perspective of topography and other details.

Key additions to the current bylaws, under Article VII.C.II (6.2. page 3) were also addressed as follows:

- Language regarding conflict resolution should be included in Article V.
- Item 2: The expectation of someone voting in a future continuation hearing should be clarified. Commissioner discussion was as follows:
 - * **Commissioner Churchill** expressed concern because the minutes could not completely capture the tenor or language of a hearing, making it difficult to step into a continuance and fully participate. He preferred that a Commissioner absent from the first hearing not be allowed to participate in the continued hearing because they would be less than fully effective in the second session.
 - * **Commissioner Qutub** agreed that capturing the intensity of what really took place at a meeting was not possible for someone not in attendance.
 - * Not having a quorum could lead to a forced denial, so not allowing a Commissioner who missed a meeting to vote in the continued hearing was a risk.
 - * A resignation or long-term illness that kept a Commissioner from attending a second hearing would prompt the need for a method to enable someone to get caught up. Perhaps videotapes or MP3 files could be utilized in some situations.
 - * Meetings could be videotaped and stored on a hard drive or DVD should someone have to miss a meeting. Having a video of the meeting was more realistic.
 - * Though funding was an issue, video recording meetings on the cable access channel was a new project that had never been discussed. If the project was important, staff could tackle it as a project, although it would be at least a year out.
 - * **Commissioner Churchill** stated that if meetings were videotaped, he would revise his position about attendance being required at all hearing sessions.
 - * The difference between excused and unexcused absences might be a consideration.
 - * If a quorum were necessary, or someone who was ill wanted to participate, attendance could be achieved by telephone. It was important that the individual be able to participate in questions and answers and that the public could hear their comments.
 - * **Mr. Monahan** agreed to develop options regarding attendance and suggested:
 - If an earlier meeting was missed, participation at the second meeting would not be allowed.
 - A list of requirements to enable someone to get caught up before participating in a second meeting if the first meeting was missed.

- An exception could be made if the Commission needed a quorum.
- * **Chair Klein** stated the difficulty was that if a quorum were not possible at the last minute, it was important to not appear as if another Commissioner was brought in to break a tie vote.
- * The lack of a quorum could result in denial because of the 120-day land use clock if a decision was not made in time. An applicant could waive the clock and have a do-over or appeal to City Council, but only if enough time was available on the 120-day clock for the required public notices. Otherwise, the City lost its decision-making power.
- Item 3: Duties of Chair. The Chair should be allowed to vote but not make motions.
 - * The order and rotation of voting was also discussed. There would be no set order for the motion and second, but the Chair would call for staff to poll the vote based on the order of which Commissioner was next in line to vote first.
- Item 4: Abstentions would be allowed with the reason for abstaining was explained. Items from other cities' bylaws under Article VII.C.III (6.2 pages 3-5) were discussed, including:
 - Item 2: Open Meetings. A reason must be declared to hold executive sessions, such as informing the Commission about likely litigation, etc.
 - * Members of the media were allowed to attend executive sessions, unless the session regarded litigation involving the media or were related to labor negotiations with a union. They could not disclose the discussion of the session.
 - * No tight definition of "members of the media" existed, which was a concern because anyone with a blog on the Internet was considered "media." Having a policy in place before confronting someone who may not be qualified was best. The recommendation was that someone would need to prove they were a member of the media by showing press credentials, etc.
 - Item 5: Vote to Reconsider. A vote to reconsider should not take place later than the meeting at which the original vote occurred. After the original vote, the public typically left the room, so if a vote was reconsidered it could be damaging because of public perception. A motion to reconsider could only be made by someone who was in the majority.
 - * While a majority vote was required for approval, nothing in the bylaws stated that another vote could not be taken if a tied vote occurred; an alternative motion could be made.
- The bylaws did not say that when a tie vote occurred there could not be another vote.

Chair Klein noted Article III.A of the current bylaws and asked if the new Mayor could decide to appoint a new Planning Commission.

- * **Mr. Monahan** replied no, because Article III.B established the term of office as a period of 4 years. The Mayor, with the consent of City Council, appointed Commissioners for a specific term. The appointment was the final action; the text should indicate they were nominated by the Mayor and approved with the consent of Council. The language could not be changed, however, because it was part of the Municipal Code.
 - Nothing addressed the situation where Council did not consent or take final action regarding the Mayor's appointee. The Mayor then had to return with another name.
- * **Ms. Mangle** noted that Commissioners' terms were staggered so all the Commissioners did not change at the same time. She clarified that filling a partial

term did not count toward the 2-term limit. Vice-Chair Newman was about to be reappointed for the third time, but his first term was a partial term that fulfilled another's spot for a year.

- * **Mr. Monahan** confirmed that "pleasure of the Council" meant that if Council felt someone was acting inappropriately, they could ask for that person to resign. He agreed the language was awkward and could be changed.

Commissioner Bresaw believed "pleasure of the Council" should be retained to help address situations where a Commissioner might be difficult to deal with or acted unprofessionally.

- * **Mr. Monahan** added the language might be included rather than forcing Council to find a specific reason why someone was no longer fit for duty.

Mr. Monahan concluded that when the Commission forwarded the proposed bylaws to Council for adoption, he suggested drawing attention to sections the Commission believed could not be changed because of the Municipal Code, such as the language regarding the Mayor nominating potential Commissioners, and suggest that Council review them as well.

6.3 NE Milwaukie Sewer Extension project briefing Staff Person: Susan Shanks

Susan Shanks, Senior Planner, explained that the sewer extension project would extend City sewer into the northeast section of the city, to the north and east of existing City boundaries. She briefly reviewed the project and responded to comments and questions from the Commission as follows:

- She clarified that it was not a Streets project, but a Wastewater project. Although the project would pave the streets, leaving them in better condition, there would be no sidewalks. Curbs would create more challenges because of stormwater, and were not part of the project either.
 - * The Engineering Department's goal was to have 20 ft of 2-in asphalt on every existing street, which would be a big improvement.
 - * Under the County Urban Growth Management Area (UGMA) agreement, the County was supposed to improve the streets when the City took over jurisdiction, but the money was not available.
 - Other options were available, including federal stimulus money and a change in the existing loan structure for the project. A limited amount of cash was available, but it was hoped that as many street improvements as possible could be built into the project.
- A special loan was being used for the \$3.8 million project through the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) that was specifically for sewer projects and would be repaid when residents tapped into the new sewer lines. The loan would not pay for a full asphalt overlay, but the loan would cover paving over the trenches.
 - * The longer a homeowner waited to be annexed and connect to the sewer line, the more interest they would pay, which provided an incentive to join sooner rather than later. Other incentives were being considered.
- She noted that as properties were annexed, the City would discuss how to respond to Code compliance issues. Public outreach would be done to help ease the transition between the City and County jurisdictions, and address the different development standards as much as possible.

Chair Klein reviewed several pictures of the subject neighborhood, noting an open septic tank, uninhabitable homes, and unmaintained streets. The City had no jurisdiction and so could not address any problems. The County had certainly not done the area any favors as it did not want to deal with the area because it was in Milwaukie's UGMA.

- He supported the concept of annexation of the subject area, but recognized it was not financially prudent for the City to do. It was, however, socially prudent because some houses in the area were in very poor condition. The main issue was Code compliance.
- In talking with residents in the area, many did not want to be part of the City because of the increased money required. For those residents, paying the City's portion of taxes was a massive increase.
 - * Annexing the area would provide needed services like police and fire. The City would also give residents representation, whereas the County did not care.
- He suggested that the City annex all the properties at one time and ask the County to reduce their tax by the amount that the City would tax the residents, enabling residents to pay the same amount in the first year. Then the amount would increase incrementally each year until the County returned to its normal tax code in 20 years, which would provide Milwaukie the revenue needed at the beginning of the extension project.
 - * Bringing in properties one by one through the years would cause problems with Code enforcement, police, and fire services provided to one neighbor but not another, along with other problems. Annexing the entire area would eliminate many issues.
- He had not discussed his ideas with Council, but understood where its outspoken members stood on the issue about not forcing annexations.
- At present, no promises or benefits were available to the residents who annexed, except that the building moratorium would be lifted from their structures. He wanted the whole area annexed because providing added City services to the residents would incentivize them to become part of the City. Perhaps a small urban renewal district could be created so funds generated from the area could be spent right in that area to build streets, lighting, and other needed services, providing further incentive to residents.
- He believed the County wanted to get the properties off their books. He noted City police would have to respond to all homes on a street, if they responded to one, so many issues needed to be considered.
- Though Council had given staff clear direction about not forcing annexations, he believed if other viable options were presented, people would consider them.

Ms. Shanks responded that staff had been discussing the same issues, adding it would be much easier to bring all the properties in at once. However, the City had to back up what was promised, which cost money and only so much could be built into the project.

- She noted that once the area was in the City, some streets could be eligible for the street resurfacing maintenance program, competing with other City streets for the program's funds. Unfortunately, there were no easy answers or magic pots of money.

Commissioner Churchill supported the project from an environmental perspective, but also looked at the value of the homes when purchased, which probably reflected a lower mortgage rate due to not having City services. He was not as concerned about creating

large incentives, although it was a Council decision.

Commissioner Bresaw agreed with Commission Churchill.

- She noted that residents were likely thinking in terms of dollars they did not have; the \$6/\$1000 assessed value, the \$20,000 fee to connect to the sewer, as well as the increased tax-assessed value.
 - * **Ms. Shanks** clarified that connecting to the sewer system did not necessarily increase the assessed value of a home. The assessed value was the private property and improvements on the private property.

Chair Klein added that the owners would also be able to do home improvements that they could not do at present, which was an important issue.

Ms. Shanks noted that the City was not willing to do improvements to the area at the expense of other City projects. Incentives would only be offered if they were made to work within the confines of the project.

- She noted that approximately 30% of the homes were rented and about 70% were owner-inhabited. Many homes were well-kept and residents were widely diverse in age, background, etc.
- She confirmed that the new sewer charges would be included on water bills. No stormwater fees would be incurred because no stormwater system was proposed.

Chair Klein:

- Noted that the new home built at Lovena Farms on Stanley Ave was classified by the County as 'replacement of a structure.'
 - * **Ms. Mangle** explained that the structure would have been considered new construction if the property was in the city. The City had the owners sign a non-residence agreement so that they knew that annexation into the City was required because of the sewer provision. The construction was allowed because the property was in the County, but they would be required to do a sewer connection, though she was unsure about the timing.
 - * She stated she would research the facts about Lovena Farms and report back to the Commission. She agreed that something slipped through the system with the construction of the house. The City did approve a sewer connection and the engineer who approved it felt that he was taken for a ride and it was not clear.
- Asserted the City did everything it was supposed to, but the County did not adhere to its own code.

Ms. Shanks noted that most properties were County zones R-7 and R-10, which would readily convert to the City's R-7 and R-10 zones. Some properties were zoned industrial, commercial, or residential but were not utilized as such and might want to change their zoning once in the City. Any annexations wanting to convert to a different zone than what automatically transferred would have to come before the Planning Commission.

- She noted that the neighborhood impacted Milwaukie residents in different ways, although she hoped the sewer project would benefit Milwaukie in general.

Chair Klein noted that all City maps were incorrect because Ball-Michel Park was not included.

Staff confirmed that Dual Area Interest B was to the south and in a different part of the

UGMA.

- The two special interest areas were known as dual special coordination areas for the City and County. The rest of the UGMA was not called out that way.
- UGMA meant that the area was all unincorporated, and essentially the City of Milwaukie could annex it first.
- The County was also doing a parallel sewer project for the area east of the dual interest areas.

Chair Klein commented that many islands existed that the City wrapped around with no foreseen annexation. He noted that annexation could be forced if a failing septic system was within 500 ft of the City's boundaries, as well as for other reasons.

Commissioner Wilson asked if a new Neighborhood District Association (NDA) would be created.

- **Ms. Shanks** responded that it was not yet known if the existing NDAs in Milwaukie wanted to grow to include the neighborhoods or if the neighborhood being annexed wanted to maintain their own identity and have their own NDA.

7.0 Planning Department: Other Business/Updates

Ms. Mangle updated the Commission on the following items:

- Despite what she reported at the Design & Landmark Committee (DLC) joint session on May 24, 2009, the Code assessment project was on track due to federal, not state, funding being provided. The State wanted to schedule the project management team meeting and get started. She would provide a full briefing at the next meeting.
- The North Clackamas School District had proposed expanding the project on Fuller Rd, but the proposal had been pulled due to a lot of controversy. The school district was doing a preapplication conference with staff on Thursday to look at expanding office space at the Lake Rd facility.

The Commission proceeded to Item 8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items, before hearing Ms. Shanks' request.

8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items

Chair Klein said that Commissioner Batey, Commissioner Churchill, Ms. Mangle, and he had attended the South Downtown Concept Plan discussion meetings, most recently last weekend. The idea was to look at a design for making open space and mixed use for the South Downtown area. He made comments and addressed questions as follows:

- He had been skeptical of the plan going in. However, after attending the meetings he had completely changed his opinion of the plan, although he was not certain how achieving the plan would be possible.
 - * The consultant, Center for Environmental Structure (CES), assured that they had models to follow, means to implement the project, and people interested in investing in the project.
- He was most intrigued by how absolutely different the project was from any process or project the City had ever done or considered, adding it involved responsible social engineering.
- The next steps involved using refined pattern language to create a design on paper and to construct a 3D model of the South Downtown Concept Plan, which would be reviewed again by the group for changes, if needed. Presentations would then be

made to the NDAs, the farmers market, as well as the Planning Commission and DLC because a master planning process would need to occur.

- The project would add density, not like at North Main, but a manageable density; putting people in an area but not overpopulating the area. Creating flow and use, while minimizing the impacts on the area.

The Commission returned to Item 7.0 for comments regarding the Transportation Code Amendments.

Ms. Shanks stated that City Council had requested another worksession to discuss in detail the single-family remodel expansion aspects of the proposed Transportation Code Amendments that the Commission had forwarded to Council for approval on March 10, 2009. Council was asking the same questions that the Planning Commission had about finding the right threshold and other ways to address single-family remodels.

- The second worksession was planned for April 21, 2009, with the City Council hearing to be held on May 5, 2009.
- She asked if any Planning Commissioners could present the Commission's perspective to City Council and explain why the Commission had recommended the approach currently on the table. The staff report was available online.

Chair Klein agreed to attend.

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| April 28, 2009 | 1. Worksession: Urban Renewal project briefing |
| | 2. Worksession: Main Street Initiative project briefing |
| May 12, 2009 | 1. Worksession: Title 13 Habitat Conservation project briefing |
| | 2. Public Hearing: CSU-09-02 Portland Parks & Recreation Maintenance Facility – <i>tentative</i> |

Ms. Mangle briefly reviewed the Future Meetings Forecast.

Commissioner Churchill asked that a balanced approach be presented regarding urban renewal, and not just the rose-colored glasses view of the subject.

- * **Ms. Mangle** agreed. She assured that no urban renewal proposal existed yet. The project was to simply help formulate what urban renewal could look like for Milwaukie.

Chair Klein stated he had concerns about the feasibility report being completed by a consultant who also did urban renewal facilitation.

- * **Ms. Mangle** replied the briefing would be the time to ask all the questions.

Ms. Mangle updated the Commission about the following items:

- When to begin construction on the Jackson St Improvement Project had not yet been decided. Introducing federal stimulus funds for street improvements might have complicated and delayed the project because federal requirements had to be met, such as categorical exclusion from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Staff was trying to determine the critical path and how quickly the project could get done.
- Staff was reviewing the park and ride plans for a building permit. The primary

concern was how the site would handle stormwater because new standards had been adopted since the land use approval was obtained.

- * A new CSU would be required if the applicant wanted to construct a restroom, but they were not interested at this point in time.
- * She reminded that stimulus funds were for shovel-ready projects. The project was shovel-ready because they already had land use approval. If the applicant returned to the Planning Commission, they would not receive the stimulus money, though that did not mean the plans could not be modified.
- * The project would exceed the City requirements with regard to the video surveillance cameras, more than what was required would now be installed on day one.
- Portland Parks and Recreation was using part of a building in the North Industrial Area as a maintenance facility to store materials, supplies, and equipment, while the rest of the building was used as an industrial use. Portland Parks and Recreation needed to expand to use the whole building, but were only allowed to be there if the rest of the building was used for industrial use. If they wanted to expand, a CSU was required because their use did not meet the standards for the M Zone.

Meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription, Inc. for
Alicia Stoutenburg, Administrative Specialist II

Jeff Klein, Chair

Dick Newman
Dick Chair
