



## PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, April 12, 2022, at 7:00 PM

---

### APPROVED MINUTES

**Members Present:** Chair Cary  
Vice Chair Hubbard  
Commissioner Webster  
Commissioner Semling  
Commissioner Toschi

**Members Absent:** Commissioner Pugsley  
Commissioner Lawrence

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

**Others:** Brady Preheim  
Tina Curry  
Molly Matchak  
Colleen Ohlert

#### CALL TO ORDER & FLAG SALUTE

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

**Preheim, Brady.** He said the documents on the website were not working. He said that he felt the Planning Commission never denied any variances brought to them. He asked what the percentage was of variances that were denied. He said he agreed with the Planning Commission's idea of becoming a more proactive group.

**Ohlert, Colleen.** She asked if citizens who were not on the Planning Commission were allowed to participate in a committee or sub-committee so they could be a part of the the different projects the proactive Planning Commission might work on. City Planner Graichen said that it would depend on the topic and if an ad hoc committee was formed by City Council. Ohlert said she thought citizen involvement would be important if they were compassionate about the subject.

**Matchak, Molly.** She mentioned she was a business owner on First Street and thought it was great to have more involvement in the development taking place. She thought the idea of a Proactive Planning Commission would be great for making sure projects were looked at in more depth.

**Curry, Tina.** She asked what the Planning Commission's role was as the Historic Landmark Commission. She was curious what the difference was between them and the Museum Association. Councilor Birkle advised they only dealt with changes to buildings or places that were considered Historic.

#### CONSENT AGENDA

**A. Planning Commission Minutes Dated March 8, 2022**

**Motion:** Upon Commissioner Webster's motion and Commissioner Semling's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Draft Minutes as amended dated March 8, 2022. [AYES: Vice Chair Hubbard, Commissioner Webster, Commissioner Semling, Commissioner Toschi; NAYS: None]

**WATER MASTER PLAN – Keller Associates**

Keller Associates presented the report for the Water Master Plan. They shared the differences between the existing water system and the planning criteria to be used for the development of the future system. They compared the water facility current capacities and what the future demands will be. They shared the information on their recommendations for improvements to the existing and future water systems and how they coincide with the capital improvement plan. They also showed a complete document and adoption process to implement these recommendations. The Commission asked a few clarifying questions about the Water Master Plan.

**PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA** (times are earliest start time)**B. 7:30 p.m. Variance at vacant lot on S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street north of the lot addressed as 484 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street - Bonilla**

Associate Planner Dimsho presented the staff report dated March 1, 2022. She said the Variance is for a front yard setback. She showed where the property was located. She said there were two lots right next to each other that the City owned, and the subject property was one of them. She said the City owned the lots because there is a storm line that runs through the property. She said the storm line used to run down the center of the properties making them undevelopable, but in 2019 there was a storm re-routing project that took the line and moved it so that it more closely followed the property line. This made the subject property developable. She said there is a decommissioned pump station on the second lot, but not on the subject property.

She said recently the City declared this property as surplus and the applicant was in the process of purchasing it.

She said Variance was for a four-foot front setback for a bedroom in the front of the house. Without the storm infrastructure on the backside of the house, there would be no need for a variance as they could just shift the house back.

She walked the Commission through the criteria for an approval of a Variance. She talked about the impact the variance would have to neighbors. She said because there was a 90-foot right-of-way and reducing the setback would still leave 38-feet from the structure of the house to the roadway.

She said there was about 500-square feet of the storm easement that encumbers the buildable area which creates a unique circumstance for the property. She also mentioned that in the code, there are circumstances that allow for four-foot setback exceptions when there are porches, overhangs of eaves and patios without a variance needed. She also said the code allows for changes of up to 20-percent reduction to setbacks for remodels of a home without a variance, so the request is in line with other code exceptions.

She said that even with the setback variance request there would still be two off-street parking spots available.

**Bonilla, Nacia. Applicant.** Bonilla was called to speak. She said the amount they were requesting was very minimal. She mentioned currently there was about 401-square feet of impacted buildable area, and they were requesting to use 54-square feet of that impacted area. She said they did try to minimize the building footprint and the plan first and even changed the porch that would encroach on

the setback to be a recessed entryway instead. She said they were making every effort to meet the front setback.

**In Favor**

No one spoke in favor.

**Neutral**

No one spoke in neutral.

**In Opposition**

**Preheim, Brady.** Preheim has a residence at 495 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street. He said he did not think the lot was buildable and should remain in City ownership. He said the area floods during the winter. He said there was a drainage added to the area, so it does not flood as bad now. He did not want the Commission to allow the variance.

**Rebuttal**

**Bonilla, Nacia. Applicant.** She mentioned they will still be required to meet all drainage standards and tie into the storm line. She said the footprint will not modify the hydrology of the site as it exists today. She said she knew that any additional runoff related to the new development will tie into the stormwater drain. There should not be impact to the neighbors because of increased development.. She was not concerned about her house being flooded. She said even without the variance, it would not make the lot unbuildable, it would just mean they have to modify the footprint and plans for the building.

**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 small discussion about each criteria required to approve the Variance.

**Motion:** Upon Commissioner Webster's motion and Vice Chair Hubbard's second, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Variance as recommended by staff. [Ayes: Vice Chair Hubbard, Commissioner Semling, Commissioner Webster, Commissioner Toschi; Nays: None]

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

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

C. Preferred Alternatives for Grey Cliffs Park

Associate Planner Dimsho presented the Grey Cliffs Park Concept Presentation prepared by the Oregon State Marine Board (OSMB). She said the Parks and Trails Master Plan recommends an in-water facility for fishing at Grey Cliffs Park. Currently, there is a shoreline area to launch kayaks. The OSMB offers a technical assistance program where they will help design and permit a facility at no cost to the City. So, the City started that process and this presentation was to give the Commission a chance to comment on the design.

She said the facility is being designed for two types of users: paddlecraft users and anglers. She said she convened a group of stakeholders for feedback on the design along with the Parks and Recreation Commission. She also said in early May there would be a public forum to receive feedback from the public and the City Council on the design. She said the facility would ultimately be grant funded.

She showed the Commission where they plan to place the facility and explained the elevations and conditions that required it to be located there. She also showed them a survey that the OSMB had conducted. It shared the low and high of tidal influence and the effect it will have on the ramp, ADA accessibility and other access items.

She said the goal of the project was to provide an accessible and permittable dock for both paddling and fishing.

She said all the designs had common features such as accessible routes, a double gangway, and light penetration decking. There was more discussion on the design for the paddle docks and launch.

Vice Chair Hubbard mentioned he could see the dock being busy and suggested they add another dock on the other side of the paddle dock to help with congestion.

Commissioner Toschi also suggested, to avoid congestion, to offer a second dock for equipment to create easier launch space. He expressed it could be an issue with people going out or coming in and creating major congestion. He also expressed concern about enough parking and if the park was going to facilitate the need for this activity.

Chair Cary expressed concern about the narrowness of the ramp and shared some examples of issues with other venues and how the narrowness causes congestion. He suggested adding notch outs for passing along the ramps.

#### D. Proactive Planning Commission Framework Discussion

Commissioner Toschi presented his memo that he had prepared. He said he took what he thought were the main ideas and concerns for the framework, based on discussion in previous meetings, and created some procedural elements.

There was a discussion on the framework and how to move forward with procedures of the Proactive Planning Commission. Graichen mentioned we needed to have a sub-committee report each time for the agenda to avoid any type of surprises to the Commission. He also said the sub-committee should have a rotation of Commissioners to help with organization and input.

Commissioner Semling expressed concern about being organized on what subjects they should be proactive on and where to start. Commissioner Toschi said he felt that is why they needed to implement these processes.

Chair Cary expressed that he would like to keep proposed subjects of discussion to a minimum to respect the time of all the Commission and the Planning Department's agenda items.

There was discussion on more details of the different elements of the proposed procedural framework.

Commissioner Toschi said he would take this discussion and refine the procedures for the next meeting to present to the Commission.

#### E. Planning Commission Interview Committee

City Planner Graichen told the Commission that Commissioner Lawrence had resigned and there was an immediate opening. He asked who was interested in being on the Planning Commission Interview Committee. The same individuals from the previous committee were nominated: Commissioner Pugsley, Vice Chair Hubbard, and Commissioner Webster. Commissioner Pugsley was not present to accept so they nominated Chair Cary to be a back-up member if Commissioner Pugsley did not accept.

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

- F. Sign Permit at 524 Milton Way – Carrick, Inc.
- G. Site Development Review, Minor at 1370 Columbia Blvd - Tanner
- H. Sign Permit at 2774 Columbia Blvd & 2750 Columbia Blvd (x2) – SHHS
- I. Sign Permit at 1421 Columbia Blvd – Columbia Pacific Food Bank
- J. Sensitive Lands Permit at 150 Belton Road – Schlumpberger
- K. Home Occupation at 724 McBride Street – Herbert
- L. Site Design Review Modification at 454 Milton Way – Crown Castle
- M. Extension of Time for Temporary Use Permit at 2225 Gable Road – Kniffin

There were no comments on the Planning Director Decisions.

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT ACTIVITY REPORT**

- N. Planning Department Activity Report – March

**FOR YOUR INFORMATION ITEMS**

Associate Planner Dimsho reminded the Commission about the Annual Appreciation Dinner for Boards & Commissions. She also mentioned the RFQ for the Riverfront Development solicited two potential developers. She said there was a selection committee, which included the City Council and three Planning Commission members, would meet and look over their presentations and their overall vision for the site throughout May. She said they would decide on a developer, or to re-solicit if needed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned 9:57 p.m.*

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Christina Sullivan  
Community Development Administrative Assistant*