

PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, February 09, 2021 at 7:00 PM

APPROVED MINUTES

Members Present: Chair Cary

Vice Chair Hubbard Commissioner Webster Commissioner Semling Commissioner Lawrence Commissioner Pugsley Commissioner Cavanaugh

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: City Planner Graichen

Associate Planner Dimsho

Community Development Admin Assistant Sullivan

Councilor Birkle

Others: Kathryn Frank

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

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Planning Commission Minutes dated January 12, 2021

Motion: Upon Commissioner Webster's motion and Commissioner Pugsley's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Draft Minutes Dated January 12, 2021. Commissioner Lawrence, Commissioner Cavanaugh and Commissioner Semling did not vote due to their absence at that meeting [AYES: Commissioner Pugsley, Commissioner Webster, Vice Chair Hubbard 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. 7:00 p.m. Annexation at 35526 Firway Lane Mark & Elizabeth Sell

Associate Planner Dimsho presented the staff report dated February 1, 2021. She showed a map where the property was located. She mentioned that most who apply to annex to the City want to connect to the City utilities. This applicant would like to annex because they want to be in the City. She mentioned it was about a half-acre property, no sidewalks, but a curb you can see. It is currently connected to McNulty water, and there is sewer available. She mentioned the zoning and that it was abutting property inside city limits. She said it is currently zoned County General Commercial. The Comprehensive Plan says this property is classified as Unincorporated Highway Commercial, so upon annexation Highway Commercial (Incorporated) would be the only option for zoning. If the house was ever destroyed the applicant would not be allowed to rebuild it due to its zoning.

Staff's recommendation is to annex it and to zone Highway Commercial.

Commissioner Pugsley asked when properties are annexed into the City why is it done one at a time rather than an entire block. Dimsho said it requires certain permissions from the applicant and the City has never forced an Annexation.

In Favor

No one spoke in favor.

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 were no deliberations.

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

C. 7:15 p.m. Annexation at 58830 Firlok Park Street - Kathryn & Charles Frank

Associate Planner Dimsho presented the staff report dated February 1, 2021. She showed a map where the property was located. She said the Applicant would like to connect to City water and that the property was not currently serviced by City sewer. She mentioned the property was abutting City limits and is zoned County Multi-Family Residential. Once they annex in, the only option for zoning is Apartment Residential. She mentioned frontage improvements cannot be required at annexation, but when the property is developed.

Vice Chair Cary asked about the insufficient sewer and what it would take to have sewer available. Dimsho mentioned it was a substantial improvement that would need to be done and was complicated for multiple reasons.

There was a small discussion about the sewer capacity and different types of private systems.

Frank, Kathryn. Applicant. Kathryn Frank was called to speak. She mentioned that she asked the City to connect to the sewer system but were denied. She said they do currently have approval for a septic system. She said they only plan on building a single-family dwelling.

In Favor

No one spoke in favor.

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 were no deliberations.

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

5. ST. HELENS INDUSTRIAL BUSINESS PARK (SHIBP) MASTER PLAN

D. SHIBP Master Plan Document

Associate Planner Dimsho said this was on the agenda so the Commission would be aware of the Plan. She presented a map that showed the three different Waterfront areas the City was currently working on. She said the City was actively working to get the Veneer property ready for development. She said the City was working on studying the repurposing of the oversized Wastewater Treatment Plan. Lastly, she discussed where the St. Helens Industrial Business Park would be located, just south of the wastewater lagoon. She talked about a grant received to do some planning efforts on the site. She said the goal of the parcelization plan was to guide development of the site. She talked about some of the existing operations already on the site. She showed a few of the undeveloped rights-of-way. She also showed the phased plan for utility development.

There was a discussion about access roads and their location.

Dimsho presented a phase one cost summary and existing revenue sources.

There was a small discussion on what the City plans for selling different parcels.

There was a discussion about wetlands and how they would be treated in the development plan.

6. 2021 DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS REVIEW

E. 2021 Development Code Amendments Document

City Planner Graichen presented an update of the Amendments Review. He said a notice was sent out to about four thousand property owners concerning the code change.

There was a small discussion about reviewing the changes and preparing for the Public Hearing in March.

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

- a. Sign at 2296 Gable Road Ste. 230 Integrity Signs of Oregon
- b. Sign at 254 N Columbia River Hwy H & I Stonecasting
- c. Sign at 150 N 15th St Frank Robison, People, Pets & Vets
- d. Sign at 150 N 15th St Frank Robison, People, Pets & Vets

8. PLANNING DEPARTMENT ACTIVITY REPORT

F. January Planning Department Report

9. FOR YOUR INFORMATION ITEMS

Dimsho mentioned she submitted for the Certified Local Government grant. She said they will have tenthousand dollars to award to an eligible historic property for exterior historic preservation work. She mentioned the Planning Commission would be scoring the applicants and eventually award the money.

Graichen mentioned there were two Public Hearings next meeting. He mentioned the Belton Road partition was coming back to the Planning Commission after the original application was withdrawn from the Land Use Board of Appeals.

Graichen also brought up that meeting in person is in the future. He said they would follow the City Council's lead on how to modify meetings for in-person.

Chair Cary welcomed Commissioner Cavanaugh to the Commission. Commissioner Cavanaugh discussed why she was interested in the Planning Commission and why she felt she would be a good fit to their team.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: March 9, 2021

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned 8:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina Sullivan Community Development Administrative Assistant