



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Monday, June 9, 2014

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Present: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell, Tom Geil and Robert Mahoney

Staffers: 3 - Tony Konkol, Pete Walter and Kelly Moosbrugger

2. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

There was no public comment on non-agenda items.

3. Public Hearing

3a. [PC 14-051](#)

Portland Metro Men's Center -
Conditional Use Permit (CU 13-01), Site Plan and Design Review (SP 13-11), Lot Line
Abandonment (LL 13-04), and Nonconforming Use Review (LN 14-04)

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing and read the quasi judicial hearing procedure. He asked if the Commission had any ex parte contact, conflict of interest, bias, or any other statement to declare including a visit to the site since the last hearing on this matter.

Commissioner McGriff had gone by the site several times for other purposes.

Commissioners Mabee and Espe had visited the site.

Tony Konkol, Community Development Director, explained the additional information the applicant submitted since the last hearing. Staff had not had time to respond to the information and requested the hearing be continued to July 14.

Mike Reeder, attorney representing the applicant, discussed the sanitary sewer issue. He concurred with the February 3 staff report that stated the utilities were present and adequate to serve the proposed use. The site currently had a six inch sanitary sewer pipe that served the current use on the property. The services had been in use since the 1960s. Before the last hearing, a draft sanitary sewer master plan had been done showing concern about the adequacy on Warner Parrott Road. The applicant hired a civil engineer to come up with a solution to the problem. The City was required to abide by its currently adopted Comprehensive Plan and all of its documents including the 2003 Sanitary Sewer Master Plan. He distributed a letter that outlined the applicant's position. The 2003 Sanitary Sewer Master Plan showed the Warner Parrott area with no deficiencies for the 20 year planning period and the City had to abide by the adopted Comprehensive Plan. He gave two cases as examples, the DS Parklane Development case and 1,000 Friends of Oregon vs. City

of Dundee. He explained the Court of Appeals said the statewide planning goals controlled, and especially Goal 2 required there be an adequate factual basis the applicants could rely on. The proposal they were making was not required, however the applicant had committed to move forward with the plan to install three underground tanks that would hold any peak flows.

Pete Miller, civil engineer for the applicant, said the tanks could be placed anywhere on the site. He wanted to work with the City and find a good location and determine how much flow would need to be stored. These would be septic tanks that would be storage for a period of time and pumped out to the City's system. The tanks were standard concrete units and used throughout the state.

Mr. Reeder said in regard to compatibility with the neighborhood, they had proposed significant vegetative buffering. He questioned whether there would be opposition if this use did not have people recovering from drugs and alcohol. A lot of people who were in opposition were more concerned about the residents than the physical structure being compatible with the neighborhood.

Commissioner McGriff suggested the building be redesigned to look less like an office building and more like a residential structure. In its current configuration it was not compatible.

Commissioner Geil thought it was not the residents who would live there, but the structure itself that was the issue.

Rick Givens, planning consultant for this project, said there were two separate issues, compatibility in terms of use and the other was capatibility of the design of the building. He did not think there was a problem with the use itself given these kinds of things happened in residential neighborhoods all of the time. Regarding the design, he thought it was compatible with the character of the neighborhood. He could look at design options if the Commission recommended it.

Jinny Barksdale, resident of Oregon City, lived behind the church. She wanted to know if the applicant was aware of flooded basements in the area. She was concerned that after the structure was built, her property would flood as well. The church had blocked the storm drainage on their property and the new structure would make the property less permeable.

Mary Lopez, resident of Oregon City, lived in the nearby neighborhood. She read a letter from her realtor regarding the negative impairment of her neighborhood and property values. Ms. Lopez was trying to sell her home and when potential buyers found out about the dormitory, they all backed out. The dormitory was greatly diminishing her ability to sell her home at the market value price.

There was discussion regarding whether or not to make a decision that night and the issues to be brought back to the next meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabee, seconded by Commissioner Espe, to continue the hearing for Portland Metro Men's Center - Conditional Use Permit (CU 13-01), Site Plan and Design Review (SP 13-11), Lot Line Abandonment (LL 13-04), and Nonconforming Use Review (LN 14-04) to July 14, 2014. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell, Tom Geil and Robert Mahoney

3b. [PC 14-049](#)

ZC 14-01 / TP 14-01 (Continued from May 12, 2014): Zone Change from R-10 to R-8 with 29-Lot Subdivision between Ames Street and Holcomb Boulevard.

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing. He asked if the Commission had any ex parte contacts or statements to declare since the last meeting.

Commissioner Geil drove down Ames Road to look at the site. He was at Wednesday's City Commission meeting and heard a discussion regarding the drainage, but it was the same information he had already heard.

Commissioner McGriff visited the site again.

Commissioner Espe said his wife was a teacher at Holcomb Elementary.

Commissioner Henkin was familiar with the neighborhood and his wife also worked at Holcomb Elementary.

Commissioner Mahoney had visited the site.

Pete Walter, Planner, presented the staff report. The applicant had revised the previous proposal from 29 to 27 lots. They were still requesting a zone change from R-10 to R-8 on the southern portion of the property. He showed an aerial photograph imposed on a shadow plat of the development. He then discussed the proposed zoning, revised layout and site plan, lot sizes, depths, and widths. He noted the lots were slightly larger than average. He discussed the reduced block length which eliminated the need for a pedestrian access way. He also discussed the easement for the Barlow Road corridor which was included in the proposal without modification.

Commissioner McGriff wanted to add restrictive covenants on the individual deeds for each of the properties with the Barlow Road easement which would be six lots.

Mr. Walter reviewed Condition of Approval 29 regarding the Barlow Road easement. He then discussed the application's Oregon City Transportation System Plan compliance through local street connectivity, addressed concerns regarding Holcomb Boulevard and Holcomb School Road intersection and Swan Avenue and Ames Street intersection. The applicant offered to pave additional road to widen the current paved width of pavement. Engineering staff would need to review the proposal. He then discussed the off-site road dedications on Pastures Way and Holcomb School Road, drainage impacts and the drainage ditch, storm pond design, lot dimensions around the existing house, and speed bumps and traffic calming. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions. Staff would prepare a revised staff report with formal findings for the next Commission meeting. He entered several items into the record.

John Replinger, City Traffic Engineer, had reviewed the applicant's traffic impact study. The applicant provided all of the relevant information, used appropriate methodology, and showed the intersection could operate in conformance with City standards. The application would increase connectivity of the City's system.

Commissioner Geil was concerned about the traffic safety on Holcomb as there were many unreported crashes there and also was concerned about how narrow Swan Avenue was with ditches on either side and the safety of buses on that road.

There was further discussion regarding the flow of traffic and access on these streets and concern about the safety for the school children walking to and from school.

Rick Givens, planning consultant for the applicant, said this application was only two lots over what would be allowed if all the property remained R-10; it was 27 lots instead of 25. The plan was revised because of the portion of the site affected by the Barlow Trail. This development abutted the school, a County housing project, and R-3.5 density. It made sense to use the facilities that were available.

Bruce Goldson discussed the issue of erosion, sedimentation, and storm drainage off-site to the north of Stables. He discussed the drainage ditch along the property line that the development would drain into. The majority of the silted water came from the farmland nearby. There would be a detention pond for the development. The development would not be impacting downstream. They submitted pictures taken after a major rain event. The pictures showed that the detention pond was not filled to capacity and the issue with the silt build up in the drainage ditch was from the nearby agricultural fields. The storm sewer system would be built to City standard and they would not be exacerbating the current problems.

There was discussion regarding the run off from the farmland due to lack of vegetation or solid ground cover.

Mr. Givens addressed the perception of the neighborhood that there would be a reduction of property values if the R-10 was changed to R-8. Lots as small as 8,000 square feet were allowed in R-10 neighborhoods and many nearby neighborhoods had taken advantage of the averaging provisions allowed for developments. He entered into the record the tax assessor's estimated market value for the homes in the neighborhood and also photographs and marketing materials on homes that were currently under construction by Icon and were zoned R-8. These would be homes similar to what would be built in the development, and they did not anticipate any loss of value by approving this development. He then addressed the safety of school children and improvements of a culvert and gravel surface on Ames that the applicant was proposing.

Todd Mobly of Lancaster Engineering discussed access onto School Road. The report talked about clear and objective standards and the traffic study did show there was adequate level of service and cut through traffic volumes were low. These met all of the performance standards. It took a development like this to mitigate the problems. There was congestion on Holcomb School Road, but congestion and slow traffic was a desired operation in a school zone. There was some mitigation through connectivity through the neighborhood. All of the problems could not be solved by one subdivision.

Mr. Givens said they could do traffic calming to slow things down in the development and reduce cut through traffic. He thought the School Board and County would approve the easements needed for the half street improvements. He had no objection to adding the restrictive covenants to the Barlow Road properties.

Michael Shaw, resident of Oregon City, discussed the traffic on Holcomb School Road especially when school let out and cars and buses were there to pick up the children. It needed to be made safer. People had to pull past the crosswalk to see down the road. It was a crowded road with people parking on the sides. He then showed pictures of Holcomb School Road and Ames that better explained what he was talking about. He also showed pictures of the drainage ditch and his concern that there was only one retention pond for the proposed development. The ponds were only designed to take pollutants out of the water that came from run off, but when it rained hard, the water just went straight through.

Shirley Patton lived on the property along the drainage ditch. She said the

development in this area had added to the drainage problem. Her basement flooded three times in two years. When the rain was heavy and soaked the ground the ditch got full and ran to the top and overflowed into her pasture. They had to sandbag it twice. This development would bring in three times the amount of houses. Their property line had been washed away and it was devaluing her property. Something needed to be done. The retention pond held minimal water and when it rained hard and the ground was soaked, it would drain into the ditch. Her backyard had sunk and she had to bring in dirt to level it.

Bob La Salle, resident of Oregon City, said at the last meeting, the applicant went over the allotted time for his presentation and rebuttal, and the citizens were only given three minutes each. He thought the neighbors should be given additional time to make it a fair process. He passed out a list of lot discrepancies where he found the lot dimensions on the map and developer's square feet did not match. He also passed out his idea for how to retain all of the lots as R-10. If the R-8 was approved, he asked that the developer retain the R-10 front setback so they would be further back from the street.

Gary Martin, resident of Oregon City, also noted there was a lack of time equity at the last meeting. He thought based on the water, road width, traffic, safety, and property values that it should remain R-10. He did not think there was a compelling reason to change it to R-8.

Steven Brower, resident of Oregon City, was in favor of keeping it R-10. Although there was a lot of information in the traffic study, about the retention pond, and how the development would not affect the neighborhood, these were just theories. After it was developed, it would be too late. There was a neighbor who never had any issues with the water and flooding until development came. All of the calculations and reports said it would meet standards and would work fine. After it was developed it would be too late.

Debbie Fuller, resident of Oregon City, passed out copies of a petition from the neighborhood to retain the current R-10 zoning. She was still advocating for R-10. She appreciated the quality of life in her neighborhood and wanted to maintain it. She was concerned about setting a precedence. The developer said if the neighborhood agreed to R-8, there would be improvements made to the corner of Ames and Swan, but there had not been any plans to do that other than graveling it and that would not help with traffic. She thought it should be brought up to City Code. She and her husband went out to Holcomb School Road and witnessed the speeding on Holcomb Boulevard and the difficulty people had turning left onto Holcomb School Road from Holcomb Boulevard.

Laura Hogan, resident of Oregon City, gave a PowerPoint presentation. She requested the zoning stay at R-10 due to the quality of the neighborhood where there was room for parking and space between houses. She also thought it would improve quality of life as it would be quieter and peaceful with fewer neighbors and low traffic. She discussed the zoning in the area and how the R-3.5 was the only exception to the R-10 and R-8 and most was R-10. The County land was zoned low density residential and if annexed into the City she assumed it would be zoned R-10. Why would they create more R-8 in an area that was predominately R-10? There was a perception that Icon already received preferential treatment. The trees planted after Icon took over the Sunnybrook Estates site did not meet City requirements. She had chosen Oregon City over other cities because of the large lot sizes and the peace and quiet.

Woody Barons, resident of Oregon City, said he had been contacted by the

developer to ask around the neighborhood to see if there was support for street improvements on Ames and Swan with speed bumps in the new development section in exchange for two extra lots in the R-10 zone. He thought it was a good compromise. It was not an ultimatum, but a business offer. The street was only 19 feet wide near his driveway and people parked on the side to take their kids to and from school. When the street was blocked, people would use his driveway and he was concerned someone would get hurt in his driveway. If it remained R-10 there would be no improvements to Ames. He hoped for two extra lots they could get the dangerous street improved.

Brian Fraley, resident of Oregon City, said they had been drawn to this area due to the low density and lack of traffic because there were no sidewalks and the streets were narrow. Unless there was a plan to improve the roads, this development would make his property value go down. Regarding the fact this would open up a way for kids to walk to school, it would only impact half of the school population as the higher grades would still need to be picked up by bus on Swan and bilingual students would be picked up on the corner of Holcomb and Swan. He requested the zoning not be changed as it was a dangerous precedent and would cause contention between neighborhoods. There were more water issues at stake, as there was an underground stream and the ditches were full in heavy rain. It was not just widening the street, but covering the ditches to widen the street which would cause drainage problems.

Barbara Renkin, Park Place Neighborhood Association Co-Chair and CIC representative, expressed concern about Mr. Konkol stepping away from the last meeting to discuss continuing the hearing with the applicant instead of doing it during the meeting. She thought it looked suspicious and that the City was giving them special treatment.

Christine Kosinski, resident of unincorporated Clackamas County, discussed traffic on Holcomb Boulevard. She handed out a DOGAMI map showing a large land slide area and wondered why a geotechnical study was not done. This area was susceptible to land slides, and the City was ready to approve more homes, but home owners would not be able to obtain insurance for land slides. Development already changed the way water was drained in this area, and she was concerned about continuing to approve development in these areas.

Leroy Stodmeier, resident of Oregon City, said the applicant stated there would be no more run off than what was there now, but when this area was covered with streets, driveways, and roofs, that water was not able to soak into the ground and would have to go into the detention pond. The mud from the farm was washing down through the ditch. There was a lot of water already, and the ditch could not handle anymore. He thought the pipe on Ames might not handle truck traffic. There were other pipes in the area and he was concerned about connecting the 12 inch and 8 inch pipes and the water going out through the manhole onto the street.

Mr. Givens gave a rebuttal. Regarding the retention ponds, there were procedures in place that calculated the amount of flow that was allowed to go through during the hard rains. It was designed to store water during storms. The standards required they be sized in accordance with the City's standards to maintain the rate of run off at pre-development levels based on the design storms. The lot discrepancies were due to the preliminary plat being done by computer and the final plat would include calculations done by a surveyor and would make sure the preliminary plat was accurate. They were creating a new intersection to the school, pedestrian way, off-site pedestrian improvements for kids to the school site, and improving the intersection of Swan and Ames. Having the extra lots was a way to be able to afford

these improvements. The homes would provide three car garages and additional parking wherever possible, they would have large lot widths, and would be a nice neighborhood that would not impact property values. Regarding land slides, there were no hazards flagged on this property and no geotechnical report was required. Regarding impervious areas, the storm detention design was built for an amount of water during peak times that the ditch system could accommodate. He explained the conversation regarding proposed improvements on Ames and Swan in exchange for neighborhood support of R-8. The conversation between Mr. Konkol and the applicant was after the Barlow Trail issue had been raised and Mr. Konkol had said there might need to be a continuance so it could be researched further.

Chair Kidwell closed the public hearing.

Mr. Walter stated the revised layout showed the internal block length between Stables Place and Pastures Way would be shortened. An off-site pedestrian way to the school was being proposed that was not required by Code and there was a proposal to widen a portion of pavement on Ames Street that also was not required. The staff report would need to be modified to address these three items. Condition 29 would also be added regarding the Barlow Trail restrictive covenants. The reason the water went to the drainage ditch was that it was the natural drainage way that had been rerouted and put into a ditch. It went from City to County to the Clackamas River.

Todd Martinez, Public Works, assisted with the review of the application. He explained the run off from the impervious areas went into the detention ponds where it slowly dispersed the existing outfall based on pre-development rates. The pond was releasing the water as required in 2005 for the Sunnybrook Estates. It was being released out at the same rate as if it was not developed. The numbers were estimated using empirical knowledge, but had not been measured.

Mr. Martinez said they were required to detain a 25 year occurrence, 24 hour period storm up to a 2 year, 24 hour storm.

Ms. McGriff was empathetic to what the neighborhood said, but there were certain criteria the Planning Commission had to address. She thought the application met the criteria for traffic and mitigation. She appreciated the reduction of lots and did not think it would set a precedent for R-8. Her only concern was resolving the drainage issue.

Chair Kidwell reminded the Commission that they were talking about the difference of two lots that would add a percentage of traffic and impervious area.

Commissioner Espe said the question was adequacy of public services. He did not think zone changes should be approved if there were conditions. They had to have public facilities to serve the requested density. If there were deficiencies, they needed to be mitigated. He questioned whether the improvements on the corner of Swan and Ames was all that was needed to be done. Other improvements might be needed.

Commissioner Henkin did not see a compelling need for the zone change. However he wanted the pedestrian pathway and corner improvements. The two additional houses would not impact the traffic or drainage. He questioned which would be best for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Mahoney said the economy was driving the higher density because of the cost for development. He thought if they waited ten years, it would be requested

to be R-6. The street improvements were costly, and the City did not have the funds to make those improvements. There had been an inadequate traffic system in the City for quite some time. The developers had done their due diligence and could only do so much. Any acreage was subject to possible development. He was in support of the zone change.

Chair Kidwell said the area zoned for R-8 was near Holcomb Boulevard and one of the trade offs they were offering was to connect Ames and Holcomb. If there was not approval for R-8, that connection would not happen. He thought that road was important, and the applicant agreed to add traffic calming. The off site improvements would also be beneficial. He challenged the developer to consider the larger setbacks in the front yards of the R-8 to match the R-10 lots.

There was discussion regarding a condition that would address the drainage issue.

Mr. Konkol clarified the Commission wanted restrictive covenants for the Barlow Road Corridor and traffic calming on the connection between Ames and Holcomb School Road.

There was further discussion regarding changing the speed limit on Holcomb Boulevard from 40 mph to 20 mph by the school.

The Commission wanted to make the R-10 setback in the front yard of the R-8 lots a condition. The Commission was comfortable with the amendments to reduce the application by two lots.

Mr. Konkol said if approved, the application would be taken to the City Commission on June 18.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mabee, seconded by Commissioner Henkin, to recommend approval of ZC 14-01 / TP 14-01: Zone Change from R-10 to R-8 with 29-Lot Subdivision between Ames Street and Holcomb Boulevard as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Charles Kidwell and Robert Mahoney

Nay: 3 - Paul Espe, Denyse McGriff and Tom Geil

3c. [PC 14-050](#)

Proposed zone change from R-8 single-family to R-6 single-family and a10-lot subdivision for properties located at 19751 and 19735 Meyer Road (Planning Files ZC 14-02 and TP 14-02)

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing. He asked if the Commission had any ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or statements to declare.

Commissioner McGriff visited the site.

Commissioner Mabee had driven by the site.

Commissioner Espe had driven by the site.

Chair Kidwell had driven past the site.

Kelly Moosbrugger, Planner, presented the staff report. This was a ten lot subdivision and zone change from R-8 to R-6. There were two separate parcels each with a single family home and associated accessory structures. One of the homes and accessory structures were proposed to be demolished and the other

home would stay on the lot. The site was two acres in size and annexed into the City in 2001. The site was surrounded by R-8 zoning. The site received R-10 zoning when annexed and in 2004 the City initiated a zone change to R-8 through the Comprehensive Plan update. She reviewed the zone change criteria and Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. There were adequate public facilities and services. A traffic analysis had been done and found the transportation system could handle the additional trips. The application met all of the approval criteria with conditions. She reviewed the subdivision proposal. The site included a cul-de-sac which was generally discouraged but the code did allow cul-de-sacs when a through street was impractical due to physical constraints. The physical constraints in this case was existing development patterns. No off-site improvements were suggested. The maximum amount of lots for R-6 would be 13, but the applicant was proposing 10 lots. The applicant was also proposing a pedestrian accessway from the end of the cul-de-sac to the adjacent church property. Meyers Road had existing seven foot sidewalks and five foot planter strips with a bicycle lane and staff recommended the applicant match it instead of the full 10 to 12 foot length Oregon City Trail path. There was a condition to put in a crosswalk along the mouth of the cul-de-sac. Staff recommended approval with conditions and she entered items into the record. She suggested Condition 15 be changed to say "the applicant shall dedicate right-of-way to be 31 feet from the center line." Condition 17 referred to the intersection angle of the new cul-de-sac from Meyers Road. The last sentence of the condition said it shall be 90 degrees, but the applicant proposed 82 degrees. She suggested changing it to "shall be greater than 80 degrees."

Mr. Konkol suggested adding to Condition 22, "the applicant shall dedicate or provide an easement to the City."

Ms. Moosbrugger said the applicant had an alternative layout that staff did not review as it did not meet all of the Code requirements for right-of-way width and street improvements.

It was pointed out in Condition 2 that the house numbering needed to be adjusted.

Tom Sisul of Sisul engineering was representing the applicant. The applicant had no problem with the conditions of approval and the changes made. Regarding access to lots 8, 9, and 10, there had been many subdivisions with rear entry garages. They would share the same access to the proposed street and would have a common easement. Regarding the detention pond, it was a four or five foot high retaining wall and access to the pond would be from Meyers Road. He reviewed the alternative design proposal which was done in response to the neighborhood association comments. The lots were wider in the alternative and would allow better placement of the homes on the lots. It did not meet code because it was a constrained street.

Doug Zimmerman, resident of Oregon City, questioned the value of zoning as the City had the latitude to change it over time. He also questioned how the planning process worked and how residents had surety when they bought property with their hard earned dollars that their investment could be devalued with the stroke of a pen. He thought property values were part of enhancing the livability of the community, goal 3. He bought his home in October in this neighborhood. Bike lanes and sidewalks existed by this property, but four blocks down heading to the north there was none. The traffic was going at 35 mph and speeding was not enforced. He did not think the application told all of the truth. Just because they could adjust the zoning, it did not mean it was beneficial to do so.

Sharon Herr, resident of Oregon City, thought the development would be an eyesore. It was going up a hill and all the new homes would be two stories. It was too much

on too small of a property.

William Roberts, resident of Oregon City, said the surrounding neighborhood was R-8. Meyers Road used to have little traffic, but it had increased over time and there were plans to change it into a major access road. During peak times it was hard to get out onto Meyers Road from the side streets due to backed up traffic. His neighbor had been rear ended trying to turn left off of Meyers onto a side street. This development would attract families with children and those children would be trying to cross through the traffic to school. The City could get more taxes off of the ten lots and the builder and realtors could make more money in the short term. However, the neighborhood had to live with the consequences. The elevation would also make it difficult on icy days and cars may slide out onto Meyers Road and major traffic.

Mildred Foster, resident of Oregon City, lived across the street and would see the development out of her living room window. The houses would be tall and ugly and did not fit with the neighborhood. She thought it should remain R-8.

Mr. Sisul gave a rebuttal. Streets were improved in Oregon City either when development came in or through SDC funds. Meyers Road was a minor arterial and if they were looking at extending it, he assumed some SDC funds would be used for the improvements. The City was responsible for making improvements to the nearby streets. Whether this was R-8 or R-6, the infrastructure costs and street slopes would be the same. The applicant would also be building the homes and there would be different home configurations and possibly single story homes on the larger lots. They would build homes the neighborhood could be proud of. For the property owner to get out of the land what they wished it would require more lots than the R-8. The surrounding neighborhood had oversized lots and could be redeveloped to R-6 in the future. An R-8 would look similar to what this proposal looked like but there would be fewer lots. There would still be a cul-de-sac, and the development costs would still be the same. An R-8 would give them seven lots. The property owners believed they could build a nice product that would fit in with the character of the neighborhood. If it was not approved that night, someone would else would come with the same request in the future, or possibly request higher density.

Chair Kidwell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Mabee did not think R-6 fit in this location. It was surrounded by R-8 and he did not think economic reasons were compelling enough to support the zone change. It would look awkward next to a wide open space like the church.

Commissioner Geil said it was surrounded by R-8 and he did not think there should be a pocket density in the middle of R-8.

Commissioner Henkin agreed that it should remain R-8. He did not think there was a compelling need for the change.

Commissioner Mahoney agreed as well. He thought they needed to protect the R-8 neighborhoods.

Commissioner McGriff did not support a cul-de-sac in this location because there was a future connectivity that could occur. She did not think this was a constrained street. Development was constrained by the existing house. She could not support an R-6 in this area because it did not fully meet all the criteria, the connectivity issue, and surrounding zoning.

Commissioner Espe was torn between achieving and maintaining the level of

consistency for folks buying property in this area and the need to economize on the infrastructure the City provided to these properties and number of lots being served. This was more of an infill development and in the center of town with more amenities to serve the site.

Chair Kidwell thought it was a problem to put an R-6 island in an R-8 area. He did not see a compelling reason and did not think that economics was a valid reason. This property could be developed similar to the proposed development as an R-8, but it would be good to have a connection to Noble Road.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Espe, to deny the proposed zone change from R-8 single-family to R-6 single-family and a 10-lot subdivision for properties located at 19751 and 19735 Meyer Road (Planning Files ZC 14-02 and TP 14-02). The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Damon Mabee, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell, Tom Geil and Robert Mahoney

4. Communications

Mr. Konkol discussed the Sanitary Sewer Master Plan update.

5. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 12:05 AM.