



# PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, April 09, 2024, at 6:00 PM

## APPROVED MINUTES

- Members Present:** Chair Dan Cary  
Vice Chair Jennifer Shoemaker  
Commissioner David Rosengard  
Commissioner Brooke Sisco  
Commissioner Scott Jacobson
- Members Absent:** Commissioner Charles Castner  
Commissioner Ginny Carlson
- Staff Present:** City Planner Jacob Graichen  
Associate Planner Jenny Dimsho  
Community Development Admin Assistant Christina Sullivan  
City Councilor Mark Gunderson
- Others:** Julie Wheeler  
Roy Wheeler  
Brady Preheim  
Tina Curry

### CALL TO ORDER & FLAG SALUTE

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

**Preheim, Brady.** Preheim was called to speak. He said he wanted to protest Commissioners Charles Castner and David Rosengard being on the Planning Commission. He said he would like to see the Planning Commission add the Plaza Square and a 50-year water and sewer plan to their Proactive Item list. He said he would like to see the sewer and water systems merged with Scappoose to help both locations with their infrastructure issues.

**Curry, Tina.** Curry called to speak. She shared some information on the Masonic Building. She said they would like to replace the old second story aluminum windows on the building. She said she would like to get an idea of what the Planning Commission would require for this exterior change. She said there could be other modifications made to the interior of the building instead but would prefer to put more energy efficient windows into the building.

### CONSENT AGENDA

#### A. **Planning Commission Minutes Dated March 12, 2024**

**Motion:** Upon Vice Chair Shoemaker's motion and Commissioner Jacobsen's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Draft Minutes dated March 12, 2024, as written. [AYES: Vice Chair Shoemaker, Commissioner Sisco, Commissioner Jacobson, Commissioner Rosengard; NAYS: None]

#### B. **Joint Planning Commission / City Council Minutes Dated March 13, 2024**

**Motion:** Upon Vice Chair Shoemaker's motion and Commissioner Jacobsen's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Draft Minutes dated March 13, 2024, as written. [AYES: Vice Chair Shoemaker, Commissioner Sisco, Commissioner Jacobson, Commissioner Rosengard; NAYS: None]

**PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA** (times are earliest start time)

C. **6:05 p.m. Variance at 240 N Vernonia Rd - Wheeler**

Chair Dan Cary opened the Public Hearing at 6:13 p.m. There were no ex-parte contacts, conflicts of interests, or bias in this matter.

Associate Planner Jenny Dimsho presented the staff report dated April 2, 2024. She mentioned it was an L-shaped lot and was a very large lot at over 14,000 square feet. She said this is a corner lot that fronts Mayfair Drive and Vernonia Road. She said the main drive is off Vernonia Road. She said the proposal is part of a remodel of their house.

She said when looking at the plan submitted with the building permit, there were some setback requirements not met. She said they will build a new addition off the back of the house and extend the existing roofline. She said they would like to maintain the existing setback line of the house. Since Mayfair Drive setback is considered an exterior side yard, it has a larger setback requirement of 14 feet. Their house currently sits at eight feet.

She noted that corner lots are more rare than interior lots, helping with the unique circumstance criteria.. She shared a reduction that could be used without a variance which makes the setback request only three and a half feet needed to meet the standard. She said all other setbacks were met and they were meeting their maximum coverage requirements.

**Wheeler, Julie. Applicant.** Wheeler is the owner of the property. She said the house was built in the year 1930 and Mayfair Drive was built several years after that. She mentioned aesthetically it will look better for the addition to just keep in line with the existing setback line. She also said they planned to keep all their trees and current screening.

**In Favor**

No one spoke in favor of the application.

**In Neutral**

No one spoke as neutral of the application.

**In Opposition**

No one spoke in opposition to the application.

**Rebuttal**

There was no rebuttal.

**End of Oral Testimony**

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

**Close of Public Hearing & Record**

**Deliberations**

Chair Dan Cary said this is a corner lot, but the house is back away from the street, and they are not decreasing what is there already and would just be extending the current setback line. He said it would be a nice addition to the lot.

There was a discussion about the screening. The Commission agreed there was no need for additional, or replacement of screening that may be needed to be removed.

**Motion:** Upon Commissioner Rosengard's motion and Commissioner Sisco's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Variance as recommended by staff. [AYES: Vice Chair Shoemaker, Commissioner Rosengard, Commissioner Sisco, Commissioner Jacobson; NAYS: None]

**Motion:** Upon Vice Chair Shoemaker's motion and Commissioner Rosengard's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Chair to sign the Findings. [AYES: Vice Chair Shoemaker, Commissioner Rosengard, Commissioner Sisco, Commissioner Jacobson; NAYS: None]

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **D. Planning Commission Representation on Economic Opportunities Analysis Technical Advisory Committee**

Dimsho shared that the update of the Economic Opportunities Analysis had just started. She said there will be a Technical Advisory Committee for it. She said they would like to have someone from the Planning Commission on the committee. She said there would only be three meetings. She said there would also be discussion of this at two of the Joint Planning Commission and City Council meetings as well. Vice Chair Shoemaker said she would like to be the representative for the Planning Commission. The Commission agreed this was a good choice.

### **E. 2024 Development Code Amendments Draft Review**

City Planner Jacob Graichen shared that they drafted the text amendments proposal for the Commission to review in detail. He said the Commission would go through each item and then it would go before the City Council to move it forward for legislative approval.

He started with the question of single room occupancy development where there is a building that has multiple sleeping areas but the common areas, such as the kitchen and bathrooms, are shared. He said at the Joint Planning Commission Council meeting, the Mayor had discussed having an option of detached dwellings that may not have a lavatory or kitchen, but those facilities would be in another building. He mentioned that he spoke with the Building Official about this option and Building Code could make this not a feasible option. Graichen asked the Commission to provide feedback on this idea and whether it was an idea to include. Commissioner David Rosengard asked if the goal of this idea was just to increase the housing options available to the citizens? He said he did not think anyone would use this type of detached housing. Graichen said he did think this was the thought behind the idea. It would be different than cottage clusters, as they would have a building where some/all the facilities were located for sharing.

The Commission agreed they did not like the idea of single room occupancy in detached dwellings being allowed.

Graichen moved to the topic of definitions. He talked about some of the wording in the code and updating how they were spelled and adding, changing, or updating the definitions to clarify and make it easier to understand. The Commission agreed with the definition changes proposed.

There was a discussion on the manufactured dwelling definition. Graichen shared the different types and kinds of homes that are included in the definition of manufactured dwelling. Chair Cary asked about where manufactured homes and travel trailers could be located. Graichen said there was a specific code that said where these types of homes could be placed.

There was a small discussion on the types of new technology being created to build houses and how the code will acknowledge them.

He also discussed the definition of single room occupancies (SROs). For each zoning district, he described the density allowed for SROs, as required by the state.

He mentioned they updated the validity periods and added in clarification on the notice areas that should be notified for time extensions.

He talked about the zoning districts and how it states that anywhere there is a single-family dwelling, they will now need to allow single room occupancy with a maximum of six units. He also said the provisions for childcare will not allow them to impose a conditional use permit in a residential area.

He discussed the conditional use permits and specifically the multi-dwelling units and how it could be attached housing and/or detached housing. If there are three or more units, you can mix and match. He discussed the standards for zoning district R5 and that the number of units allowed must be capped.

There was a discussion on using "travel trailer park" versus "recreational vehicle park" as the use listed in the zoning districts. The Commission agreed "recreational vehicle park" was preferred over the code's current "travel trailer park."

He moved the discussion to the Highway Commercial zone and discussed some of the language used to make it easier to understand. He mentioned there was no residential allowed on the ground levels in Highway Commercial. He also said there were no density standards mentioned in the code for this zone. So, he said they updated it to say no more than two units on the property.

Vice Chair Shoemaker asked why congregate care is included in the Riverfront District, Plaza subdistrict. Vice Chair Shoemaker said she would like to strike that from the code if able to. Graichen said he would bring this question to next month's meeting.

He also discussed having to allow prefabricated structures and other types of units in manufactured home parks. He said they had a standard of a 10-foot separation between buildings. To stay consistent with the new rules they put into place in previous years about duplexes and single-family dwellings, they changed the language to match those interior yard standards for buildings within a manufactured home park. Chair Cary said he thought they should keep a larger separation to provide livability for neighbors. There was a small discussion about keeping ten feet between principal living units and allowing six feet between accessory structures. The Commission agreed with this change.

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

- F. Sign Permit (x2) at 465 N Columbia River Hwy – Than Tussing
- G. Site Design Review (Minor) at 134 N River Street – Steve Toschi
- H. Temporary Use Permit at 555 S Columbia River Hwy – Hacienda Las Juanitas, LLC
- I. Temporary Use Permit at 2225 Gable Road – Paintner
- J. Partition (x2) at 475 N 12<sup>th</sup> Street – Weigandt

There was a small discussion on the Weigandt partitions and the proposed development.

#### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT ACTIVITY REPORT**

- K. Planning Department Activity Report – March

There was no discussion on the Planning Department Activity Report.

#### **PROACTIVE ITEMS**

- L. Architectural Standards

There was no discussion on Architectural Standards.

- M. Vacant Storefronts

Vice Chair Shoemaker discussed the creation of a sub-committee to discuss and start working on vacant storefronts. She said she met with the Mainstreet group to discuss how to format the committee. She mentioned that Councilor Sundeen agreed to be on the committee, the President of Mainstreet, Erin Salisbury, wanted to be on the committee, and Vice Chair Shoemaker said two or three Planning Commissioners should be a part of the committee as well. She also said they should include two or three citizens. Commissioner Scott Jacobsen and Commissioner Brooke Sisco agreed to be a part of this sub-committee for the Vacant Storefronts.

She also said that the other commissioners should take on the different proactive items, as it doesn't make sense to have one person in charge of all of them.

There was a discussion about removing Architectural Standards. The Commission agreed they should keep it on the agenda but narrow down the district to start with these standards. No one volunteered to take the lead on the item.

There was a discussion on adding the Plaza as a proactive item. They discussed preparing a proposal to present to the County Commissioners on what the plan would be to restore it. The Commission agreed this should be added to the agenda with a possible sub-committee that includes the Parks and Trails Commission.

### **FOR YOUR INFORMATION ITEMS**

There were no For Your Information Items.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

*There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:51 p.m.*

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Christina Sullivan  
Community Development Administrative Assistant*