



City of McMinnville
Planning Department
231 NE Fifth Street
McMinnville, OR 97128
(503) 434-7311

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

April 20, 2017
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting

6:30 pm
McMinnville Civic Hall, 200 NE 2nd Street
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Chair Roger Hall, Vice-Chair Zack Geary, Commissioners: Erin Butler, Martin Chroust-Masin, Susan Dirks, Lori Schanche, and Erica Thomas

Members Absent: John Tiedge

Staff Present: Chuck Darnell – Associate Planner, Ron Pomeroy – Principal Planner, and Heather Richards – Planning Director

1. Call to Order

Chair Roger Hall called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

2. Citizen Comments

None.

3. Approval of Minutes:

A. March 16, 2017 Work Session

Chair Hall called for action on the Planning Commission minutes from the March 16, 2017 Work Session. Commissioner Chroust-Masin MOVED to APPROVE the minutes as presented; SECONDED by Commissioner Dirks. Motion CARRIED 7-0.

B. March 16, 2017 Public Hearing

Chair Hall called for action on the Planning Commission minutes from the February 16, 2017 meeting. Commissioner Chroust-Masin MOVED to APPROVE the minutes as presented; SECONDED by Commissioner Dirks. Motion CARRIED 7-0.

4. Public Hearing (Quasi-Judicial)

A. Conditional Use Permit (CU 1-17)

Request: Approval of a conditional use permit to allow for the construction and operation of a social relief facility. The social relief facility would be operated by Yamhill

County Health and Human Services and would provide housing for individuals that are in need of assistance pertaining to individual independence.

Location: 1944 NE Baker Street and is more specifically described as Tax Lot 3400, Section 16CB, T. 4 S., R. 4 W., W.M.

Applicant: TDJC, LLC

Chair Hall opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. He asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin was acquainted with Mr. Haworth and worked for Yamhill County, but he did not think it would prevent him from making a decision.

Chair Hall asked if any Commissioner needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing. There was none.

Chair Hall asked if any Commissioner had visited the site. If so, did they wish to discuss the visit to the site? Most of the Commission had visited the site. There was no discussion regarding the visits.

Associate Planner Chuck Darnell presented the staff report. This was a Conditional Use request to allow for the construction and operation of a social relief facility on 1944 NE Baker Street. The facility would be operated by Yamhill County Health and Human Services Department. The primary purpose would be to provide housing for individuals in need of assistance pertaining to individual independence. He described the site location. It was zoned C-3 PD, General Commercial Planned Development. There was a Planned Development ordinance that applied to the property that was put in place in 2007 when a commercial office use was proposed for the site. That use was never established and the site was vacant.

Associate Planner Darnell said that the facility being proposed was a conditionally permitted use in the C-3 zone. The areas surrounding the property were zoned R-4 with apartment buildings, office residential, and general commercial. He then discussed the site plan for the facility. There would be 16 residential units, 6 of which would be one bedroom units and the other 10 would be two bedroom units. Social relief facility was defined in the Code as a home or private institution operating for the care/treatment or boarding/housing for socially impaired persons.

Associate Planner Darnell explained that the application was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies and zoning district standards and requirements. The required parking was one space per unit and the applicant proposed 18 spaces. Staff thought that would be adequate, based on the fact that many of the residents of the facility would not drive or own vehicles. Staff believed that the development was compatible and had minimal impact on the surrounding area. A landscape plan was included with the application and was approved by the Landscape Review Committee. Staff also believed that there were no significant adverse impacts to the surrounding area and the location, design of the site, and structures were attractive. The facility would look like a traditional apartment complex and

would be similar to the existing uses in the area. There was a variety of exterior building materials being proposed for the west elevation which would front Baker and was the most visible. The north and south elevations would have a regular window placement pattern, horizontal trim, and a step down approach which reduced the overall bulk and impact to the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the application.

Commissioner Schanche wanted to make sure a sidewalk would be included in the project. Associate Planner Darnell confirmed a sidewalk would be part of the development.

Applicant: Troy Haworth, applicant, thought staff explained the application well. He was there to answer any questions.

Commissioner Schanche asked if they intended to have a long term lease with the County. Mr. Haworth said they had a similar building on 17th. It was a five year lease that could be renewed. This had been a great success and it was a need in the community.

Commissioner Schanche suggested adding more landscaping on the side closer to Baker Creek by eliminating two parking spaces. Mr. Haworth said there were 16 parking spaces in front of the building and two in the back for an overflow area. If they took out two from the 16, someone might have to go further in a wheelchair or walker. They wanted the parking as close to the building as possible.

Silas Halloran-Steiner, Director of Yamhill County Health and Human Services, was in support of the staff report and application. He thought 30% to 40% of the tenants would have a car, but because this was permanent, long-term, supported, affordable housing he thought it would be wise to have that ability. Many of the individuals they served could drive or would learn those skills to become more independent.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin suggested having more than one ADA parking space. Mr. Haworth thought one could be added later if needed. His other facility only had one, and he had not seen anyone use it yet.

Associate Planner Darnell said ADA spaces were wider and if one more was added, it would reduce the landscaping area and would impact the site plan.

John Eshelman, applicant, said although their intention was to rent from the County indefinitely, they might need to go with another investor or entity. He was concerned if they had to sell, someone might want to make it private but there wouldn't be enough parking spaces. He did not have an issue with more ADA parking if it was warranted. He thought the two parking spaces in the back were for a fire truck turn around.

Associate Planner Darnell said there was a condition of approval that in the event that the property was no longer being used as a social relief facility and was a standard multi-family residential facility, the design would have to be upgraded to whatever the design standards were at that time.

Proponent: JW Millegan, McMinnville resident, thought there was a need for this type of housing in the community. He asked if they would pay the full amount of SDCs and how much would that be.

Planning Director Heather Richards said the City adopted a program that provided relief for SDC charges and Planning and Building fees for qualified projects. The applicant had applied for that reduction.

Opponents: Ruby Villarreal, McMinnville resident, was unclear about who the residents of this facility would be and if there would be oversight of the residents. There was already a lot traffic in this area and it would be difficult to back out onto Baker Street. She was also concerned about property values going down.

Marvin Penrose, McMinnville resident, thought for applications like this people within 300 feet would receive notice. He had not received any notice, but was told by a neighbor about the application. He also wanted to know who would be using the facility and how many units there would be. There was an issue with people from adjacent apartment complexes parking on the street taking up most of the parking on the street most of the time and neighborhood residents could not park in front of their own homes. He was concerned about exacerbating the traffic and parking problems in this area.

Rebuttal: Mr. Halloran-Steiner said the proposal was to provide safe, affordable housing for individuals with significant mental health challenges and possibly other co-occurring challenges, such as physical health, disease, or disability. With proper support and treatment, they would be able to function independently in the community and be good neighbors. The model was to have 15 of the 16 units available for housing, and one was for the on-site housing specialist for peer support. There would be on-site eyes, ears, supervision, and support. They would be adults who had disability status as defined federally, but had skills, strengths, and capabilities. These were not people who would otherwise be housed in a mental institution and causing harm or neighborhood values to decrease.

Mr. Haworth said regarding backing out onto Baker, the parking would have adequate backing space per Code requirement. There was an adequate turning radius where people could back up and pull out onto Baker moving in the forward position. The facility had adequate parking and should not add to the on-street parking issue.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin asked about nearby transit services. Mr. Halloran-Steiner said the bus ran down Baker and was walking distance to many shops, food, and some health care.

Planning Director Richards said some of the audience came in late. She asked for clarification on the number of units, which was 16, and number of parking spaces, which was 18.

The applicant waived the 7 day period for submitting final written arguments in support of the application.

Chair Hall closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin thought the application met all of the criteria. There was a need for this type of facility in the City and he was in favor of the application.

Commissioner Schanche suggested adding a condition for the applicant to provide additional detailing on the structure to echo the west side of the building to fit in with the adjacent properties. Mr. Haworth clarified the detailing would be on all four sides of the building. Commissioner Schanche was comfortable with the design based on that.

Commissioner Geary thought more asphalt would be welcome in terms of providing more on-site parking, although what they had proposed was acceptable. He was concerned about the possible future if someone else acquired the property, but that was not something the Commission could control.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, and materials submitted by the applicant, Commissioner Chroust-Masin MOVED to approve CU 1-17 subject to the staff recommended conditions of approval. SECONDED by Commissioner Geary. The motion CARRIED 7-0.

B. Conditional Use Permit (CU 2-17)

Request: Approval of a conditional use permit to allow for the expansion of the existing Parkland Village Assisted Living Facility. The expansion would allow for the addition of 18 units to the overall facility, resulting in a total of 68 units between the existing and proposed new buildings.

Location: 3121 NE Cumulus Avenue and is more specifically described as Tax Lot 100, Section 22DD, T. 4 S., R. 4 W., W.M.

Applicant: RJ Development

Chair Hall opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. He asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none.

Chair Hall asked if any Commissioner needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing. There was none.

Chair Hall asked if any Commissioner had visited the site. If so, did they wish to discuss the visit to the site? Most of the Commission had visited the site. There was no discussion regarding the visits.

Associate Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow for the expansion of the existing Parkland Village assisted living facility located on Cumulus Avenue. The facility would be expanded by 18 units for a total of 81 residential beds. He explained the site location and surrounding area. The site was zoned R-4 PD. The property had been rezoned previously to allow for the expansion. The expansion would be occurring on the north side of existing facility. It would be 18,000 square feet to construct 18 two bedroom units. There were a significant number of natural resources on the site. Parking was based on the number of residential beds in the facility and based on the number of beds after the expansion, they would be required to have 41 spaces. They already had more than that on site now as 45 spaces existed there today.

Associate Planner Darnell explained that the expansion would be consistent with the existing use. As a residential care facility, the intensity of the use was low and should not have a significant increase in traffic, especially as the residents did not drive. There was a stream that ran along the north side of the property that connected with the Yamhill River and there were many trees on site. The applicant intended to preserve as much of the natural area as possible. A portion of the property was located in the flood plain, but the construction was not located in that area. There were steep slopes on the site on the north side of the property. A geotechnical report had been completed to evaluate the soil. The report identified a 35 foot setback area which was identified in the site plan. The building footprint needed to stay outside of the slope because the area was more vulnerable during seismic activity. Staff recommended some conditions of approval regarding the geotechnical report. They included that if the Building Official determined something needed to be done to the building relating to the geotechnical report, it would be done and that any mature trees that were not being impacted by the construction site would be protected during construction.

Associated Planner Darnell explained that there were a number of assisted living facilities in this area and the proposed expansion was compatible with the surrounding development pattern. There were single family residential uses to the west. To mitigate for that, a condition of approval was recommended to require that landscaping would be installed along the west to provide screening. The proposed expansion was a single story building and should not have bulk or large visual impact on the adjacent properties. It should also be a quiet facility and there should not be any noise issues. The design would be consistent with the existing building and staff recommended a condition that the design and elevations be provided at the time of the building permit. Landscaping would be required and the landscape plan would be reviewed by the Landscape Review Committee. Staff recommended approval of the application.

Applicant: Josh Snodgrass was representing the applicant. Their demand study had shown that assisted living facilities were a need in the community. This would be a low impact development. It would be a one story building and they were keeping the current architecture of the existing building. The steep slope in the back and mature trees would be maintained as much as possible. The building was out of the flood zone. It was a quiet community and there would be a fence on the west side and heavier landscaping to screen the residential area.

Commissioner Schanche confirmed the units would not have patios. Mr. Snodgrass said that was correct. There would be an interior courtyard and a courtyard between the existing building and the new building.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin asked how many trees would be removed. Mr. Snodgrass did not know the exact number, but it was minimal.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin asked if trees were removed, would the applicant be required to replace them? Associate Planner Darnell said there was no requirement to replace them, however the landscape plan would most likely have trees included.

Commissioner Geary asked what energy efficient techniques they were using in the construction of the expansion. Mr. Snodgrass said they would be following the current energy codes and the units would have high efficiency air conditioning and heaters.

Commissioner Butler asked about the people furthest north, would they have to go through the original building and all the way back. Mr. Snodgrass said the existing figure eight was the assisted care and there would be a door between that and the new facility. If a family member brought them back, they would check in with the front desk and walk through the building.

Commissioner Dirks asked if they intended to incorporate all of the recommendations in the geotechnical report. The residents would have a difficult time in a seismic event and she wanted to make sure the recommendations were followed. Mr. Snodgrass said the engineers for the project would follow the report.

Associate Planner Darnell said it was in the conditions that the Building Official would require what needed to be done to make sure the facility was structurally sound. Planning Director Richards stated the Building Code was a mini-maxi code where a standard had to be achieved and the Building Official could not ask for more than that. If there were recommendations in the geotechnical report, but the Code did not require them, it was the owner's decision to move that forward or not. The Building Code had a higher standard for vulnerable populations.

Commissioner Dirks said a certain number of units would be reserved for moderate income individuals and asked exactly what that meant. Mr. Snodgrass said they would accept Medicaid.

Proponents and Opponents: None.

The applicant waived the 7 day period for submitting final written arguments in support of the application.

Chair Hall closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin thought the application met all of the criteria. There was a need for this type of facility in the City. He was in favor of the application.

Commissioner Dirks stated the applicant had done a good job of placing the expansion where they did. It was a good plan and a good application.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, and materials submitted by the applicant, Commissioner Chroust-Masin MOVED to approve CU 2-17 subject to the staff recommended conditions of approval. SECONDED by Commissioner Dirks. The motion CARRIED 7-0.

C. Zone Change (ZC 3/4-17)

Request: Approval of a zone change from R-2 (Single-Family Residential) to R-4 (Multiple-Family Residential) on approximately two (2) acres of land and a zone change from LDR-9,000 (Low Density Residential – 9,000 Square Foot Minimum) to R-4 (Multiple-Family Residential) on approximately 2.6 acres of land.

Location: 2501 NE Evans Street and 2640 NE Baker Street and more specifically described as Tax Lots 3200 and 3201, Section 16BC, T. 4 S., R. 4 W., W.M.

Applicant: Premier Development, LLC

Chair Hall opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. He asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none.

Chair Hall asked if any Commissioner needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing. There was none.

Chair Hall asked if any Commissioner had visited the site. If so, did they wish to discuss the visit to the site? Most of the Commission had visited the site. There was no discussion regarding the visits.

Principal Planner Ron Pomeroy presented the staff report. He entered an additional item into the record, a memo from staff to address two items of testimony that were provided after the issuance of the staff report. One of the items was a neighborhood petition and the other was an individual letter. He summarized the main concerns. Some of the criteria, policies, and goals identified in these two items were not applicable as review criteria as they spoke about other things that did not factor into the decision making of zone change requests. Most of the other items related to traffic and neighborhood fit. Those would be addressed in his presentation. He discussed the location of the site, which was made up of two parcels. It was located east of North Baker Street and west of Evans Street. The property was zoned R-2 on the eastern portion and LDR 9,000 on the western portion. The request was to change the zoning to be all R-4. The criteria for the zone change included being consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, the proposal was orderly and timely, and it could be adequately served by municipal utilities and services. The proposal had direct access to collector and arterial streets and was in an area not prone to flooding. There were adequate services from existing facilities and public transit services were located within a quarter mile. It was not geographically constrained and it could be buffered from low density residential development which was adjacent to the property to the north and south. The property was also within one quarter mile from commercial services. The written testimony that had been received was summarized in the staff report. In terms of neighborhood fit, there were existing multi-family developments within a quarter mile and a half mile. Included in these multi-family developments were assisted living and retirement facilities. There were three schools located within a half mile of this location. Two parks were located in a quarter mile and there was a pocket park located adjacent to the property on the southern edge. He thought the R-4 matched the existing development pattern. Regarding street classification, Evans Street was a minor collector and was located on the eastern edge of the property. It had a carrying capacity of 10,000 trips per day. The Transportation System Plan assumed a density of R-2 for this site. The applicant commissioned David Evans and Associates to provide a transportation analysis if the property was rezoned to R-4 and built out to its fullest extent which would be 133 apartment units. When the consultant modeled what impacts there would be through 2037, he found negligible impact and had no recommendations for any different traffic improvements than what would be required for the property remaining R-2. The City's Engineering Department concurred. There is transit service on Evans adjacent to the eastern edge of the property. Staff recommended that the Commission recommend approval of the zone change to the City Council. There were no conditions of approval because there was no development plan included.

Commissioner Schanche said there was a condition in the David Evans traffic study, to add a sidewalk along Evans Street. She wanted to make sure there was pedestrian access to the park on Baker Street. Principal Planner Pomeroy said that would be part of the standard street improvement requirements. Planning Director Richards said that condition could be added to this application.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin asked if the applicant owned both properties. Principal Planner Pomeroy said the applicant owned one and was in the process of acquiring the other. The existing business on the eastern property was legally non-conforming as to use.

Commissioner Geary asked for clarification on the next steps in the process. Principal Planner Pomeroy explained if the zone was changed to R-4 and there was an application for multi-family development, they would be allowed to proceed through the building permit process. There was no planned development overlay or other requirement to come back to the Planning Commission for review. If they did not develop to R-4 but wanted to put in a subdivision, if it was ten lots or less it would be a Planning Director review. If it was 11 or more lots, it would come back to the Planning Commission. Whether the Commission saw this property again for development review and a public process depended on what the applicant ultimately proposed to develop.

Commissioner Geary asked if they could include a condition that it come back to the Planning Commission regardless. Planning Director Richards said the process for the types of land use applications and how they were reviewed was spelled out in the zoning ordinance and there were no exemptions to that. If there were concerns about safe access to the park or full sidewalk construction, those could be added as part of the zoning decision and those would run with the property. Multi-family was an outright permitted use in this zone and there was no process for reviewing multi-family development in the City's code. They could change that for the future, as most communities had a review process for multi-family development. When there was a building permit application, there would be a site and design review by staff. There would be no land use decision and no notice would be sent out.

Commissioner Dirks said Yamhill County was concerned about access from Baker because the street was already full, but the neighborhood was concerned about traffic on Evans. She asked what the process would be for site and design review about those issues and whether those opinions would be factored into the review. Principal Planner Pomeroy said yes, the City had long held that the property would not be able to access Baker because of distance from a nearby intersection and because Baker was an arterial. Access would be on Evans and the design and access point would be taken from the David Evans traffic study and Transportation System Plan. Planning Director Richards said the traffic analysis was reviewed by Engineering and was based on a national manual in terms of the science that was applied to it. The City relied on it for forecasting traffic and the impacts to intersections.

Applicant: Lori Zumwalt, representing the applicant, stated staff had described the application well and she was there to answer any questions.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin asked if they were planning to purchase both properties and what was the plan for the properties. Ms. Zumwalt said yes, they had purchased the property

to the west and were in contract with the one to the east. The plan was to develop multi-family housing as it was the most cost effective for the site.

Commissioner Butler asked if they planned to develop 133 units. Ms. Zumwalt said they used that number because it was the City's criteria for evaluating how many units could go on the site. Physically they were not sure if that many would fit with the amount of landscaping and parking required.

Proponent: Mark Davis, McMinnville resident, was in support of the application as the City was lacking in R-4 land. The neighbors had some valid objections, but more land needed to be available for higher density, and the only way to get it currently in the City was through zone changes. This application was a good idea because of the need for R-4 land.

Dennis Lauber, McMinnville resident, said buffering between the low density and high density was one of the objectives, but it was not addressed. He wondered how that would be handled. Ms. Zumwalt said it was required to have 25% of the land used for landscaping and it would have to be reviewed by the Landscape Review Committee. Buffering would be one thing the Committee would look at. Associate Planner Darnell said when the landscape plan came to the Landscape Review Committee, it would be a public meeting and citizens could provide input at that time. Planning Director Richards said it could be a condition of approval that there would be buffering on the sides of the property adjacent to single family residential. They could also make a condition that when the landscape plan was submitted to the Landscape Review Committee that notification be sent to surrounding property owners within so many feet. The Landscape Review Committee reviewed applications against Code criteria.

Opponents: Gloria Martin, McMinnville resident, lived directly beside this property on the north. She did not think they needed more multi-family housing in this area. There had been multiple accidents on Evans and 27th as it was an unsafe intersection and there was heavy congestion on Evans in the peak morning hours. There had been a shooting at the park. She thought this would deplete property values. This was not the area for more multi-family housing.

Mr. Lauber asked when a traffic study was done if they took into account the number of parked cars on the road that caused additional congestion. He thought they should take into account that directly across from the commercial property entrance there were houses that emptied onto the road. If they weren't going to make improvements, that would be a big mistake.

Principal Planner Pomeroy said traffic studies relied on the previous modeling that was done for the Transportation System Plan. It took into account current traffic flows and traffic flows that were anticipated based on future zoning that was incorporated in the model in 2010. It also took into account the number of vehicle parking spaces that were along existing streets. It could not take into account speeding or other crimes.

Chair Hall clarified the conclusion was not that there would be no effect, but that the effect would remain within acceptable limits of the designed infrastructure. Planning Director Richards said in regard to the on-street parking, the traffic analysis looked at the street specifications for each type of street. If the street was designed to accommodate parking it would be taken into account. In terms of land use impacting parking on the street, ideally there should be enough off street parking required so people were not parking on the street. The

traffic analysis looked at the types of street, how it was designed, and the type of traffic it would accommodate.

Dewey McClure, McMinnville resident, owned property adjacent to this site. He thought this development would clean up the mess that had been on the site for a long time. He was concerned about the traffic, density, and the effect on property values. He was specifically concerned about drainage on his property. During the winter, there was standing water in his backyard as it did not run off to the street or tax lot behind him due to the way the drainage was set up. He did not think they should approve a zone change without a development plan. He also requested there be mitigation for the drainage problem. Planning Director Richards said when it came in for building permit review, part of the review was drainage. Stormwater had to be retained and drained on site.

The applicant did not present rebuttal. She waived the 7 day period for submitting final written arguments in support of the application.

Chair Hall closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Schanche suggested a condition of approval that stated "future development shall include construction of a sidewalk along Evans Street and pedestrian access to Baker Street consistent with the City's Transportation System Plan and Safe Roads to Schools Plan and Policy 132.15 to provide pedestrian connections with adjacent neighborhoods". There should be no access onto Baker Street for vehicles, and that might also need to be a condition.

Commissioner Dirks said there was concern about what this development would be like. She asked if it could come back before the Commission so the neighbors could have input on the land use. She would like to build in as much review as possible for the public to know what was going to happen and to comment on it. Planning Director Richards said staff would have to come back with information on that option.

Commissioner Schanche also wanted to add in the condition that buffering techniques would be provided to screen the existing residential homes in the form of vegetation, fencing, and berms.

Principal Planner Pomeroy said if this application was approved, the Code allowed them to proceed with a multi-family development without additional public land use review. Staff could check with legal counsel to find out if there was a way to require a public land use review.

Chair Hall was in favor of continuing the hearing for staff to draft some conditions to address the concerns that had been discussed and to research the possibility for a future public land use review.

Commissioner Butler thought there was a need for multi-family housing and was in favor of approving the zone change without conditions.

Commissioner Thomas agreed with Commissioner Butler.

Commissioner Geary concurred that R-4 was greatly needed in the City. The application exposed a weakness in the process which could be addressed at a later time. This was a straightforward request and he was confident the end product would be of benefit to the area and the concerns would be alleviated.

Commissioner Dirks thought there was a need for R-4 and the zone change should be approved. Her suggestion was to give the neighbors awareness and the opportunity for more input on how the property would be developed as they went forward.

Commissioner Schanche agreed there was a need for R-4, however in this situation there were too many questions. She preferred to have the conditions included.

Commissioner Butler was in favor of a condition notifying the surrounding area when it went to the Landscape Review Committee.

Planning Director Richards said the Commission could make a decision based on the decision document in front of them tonight, the Commission could amend the decision document and add conditions of approval, or the Commission could continue the public hearing to have staff draft conditions and a decision would be made at the next hearing.

Commissioner Geary MOVED to DIRECT staff to draft conditions addressing the concerns that were raised and to CONTINUE the public hearing to the May Commission meeting. SECONDED by Commissioner Schanche. Motion PASSED 4-3 with Commissioners Chroust-Masin, Butler, and Thomas opposed.

5. Old/New Business

None.

6. Commissioner Comments

None.

7. Staff Comments

None.

8. Adjournment

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 9:08 p.m.



Heather Richards
Secretary