



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

Monday, May 18, 2015

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair McGriff called the meeting to order at 7 PM.

Present: 5 - Robert Mahoney, Zachary Henkin, Paul Espe, Denyse McGriff and Damon Mabee

Absent: 2 - Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Staffers: 4 - Kelly Reid, Tony Konkol, John Lewis and Carrie Richter

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Public Hearing

Proposed Moss Campus Master Plan and Oregon City School District Transportation Maintenance Facility (Planning Files CP 14-03: Master Plan, DP 14-04: Detailed Development Plan, and NR 14-10: Natural Resource Overlay District Review)

Vice Chair McGriff opened the public hearing and read the hearing script. She asked if any Commissioner had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare including a visit to the site.

Commissioner Mabee had visited the site numerous times as he was a substitute teacher.

Commissioner Espe said his wife worked for the School District as an Educational Assistant and his children attended the High School.

Commissioner Henkin had visited the site several times.

Commissioner Mahoney had visited the site.

Vice Chair McGriff had visited the site.

Kelly Moosbrugger, Planner, presented the staff report. She outlined the quasi-judicial hearing process. This was an application for a Master Plan, Detailed Development Plan, and Natural Resource Overlay review for the Oregon City High School Moss campus. It was located in the Caufield neighborhood and she gave an overview of the site and surrounding area. The 10.5 acre site was north of the proposed future Glenn Oak Park and Meyers Road dead ended into the property. Part of the project would extend Meyers Road along the southern boundary of the

property. The proposed Master Plan had a ten year timeline. She explained what would be done in each of the five phases. The Detailed Development Plan included a 30,000 square foot office and maintenance building, 138 parking spaces for staff and visitors, bus storage for the School District's bus fleet, fencing of the area, storm pond, and partial extension of Meyers Road. The property was in the Natural Resources Overlay District. The applicant turned in a Natural Resource Overlay District application to delineate the wetland on the property and proposed very limited tree removal in the buffer area to add a storm outfall. David Evans and Associates reviewed the application and found the mitigation plan proposed for the tree removal met Code. The Meyers Road extension was a major project in the Transportation System Plan. The alignment in the TSP was conceptual. The applicant proposed to have Loder Road run along the western boundary and staff added a condition for the applicant to dedicate up to 54 feet of right-of-way on the east side where the current High School Avenue private drive was located instead of the west for the Loder Road extension. This was Condition #28, and she suggested adding "not to exceed" 54 feet. The applicant requested several adjustments. One was proposing modern architecture for the structure and staff recommended conditions for the architecture. Another was to allow chain link fencing for security of the bus storage area, and the proposed mitigation was to use black powder coated material with decorative elements and to use landscaping to soften the visual effect. Staff found the chain link on the north and west sides were not visible and an adjustment wasn't required, but for the south and east sides, staff found the chain link would be integrated into the overall design of the site and would be mostly obscured by landscaping. Another adjustment was to allow the building to be set back further from the property line with a parking lot placed in front of the building, and the suggested mitigation was to make the parking lot available for public use after hours. Staff recommended enhanced landscaping along the southern and eastern edges of the site, the fencing should be decorative, there should be pedestrian elements, and the corner of the intersection of Meyers and future Loder Road should be particularly emphasized. The applicant proposed 138 new parking spaces that would be available to the public after 4 or 5 p.m. This would exceed the maximum number of parking spaces allowed. Staff came up with two options, one was using the parking ratio of "warehouse" for the bus storage area which combined with the building got to 76 minimum and 101 maximum parking spaces. The other option was using a ratio from the City of Hillsboro for employee parking. By using that ratio, there were 81 school bus drivers, which would be 41 to 81 spaces, and the total would be 71 minimum and 121 maximum. Staff was looking for direction from the Planning Commission on which option to use. The applicant provided a tree removal plan that included the entire site as the construction area. Staff thought the definition of construction area could be interpreted in two ways, the building footprint plus the footprint of the bus storage or the building footprint only. There was a condition of approval that the applicant revise the tree removal mitigation calculation because there were areas that needed to be counted as outside of the construction area and required a higher mitigation count. Staff was asking for direction from the Planning Commission for how the definition should apply in this case. She added the following items into the record: Clackamas Fire District comment and recommendation for a fire access and water supply plan, correspondence regarding fencing, tree mitigation, and building design, and her presentation. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

There was discussion regarding whether or not the current parking was being utilized at the high school, alignment of Loder Road, and transportation impact.

Vice Chair McGriff said she went to the School District office to ask for a copy of the minutes for this item.

Wes Rogers, Director of Operations for the School District, said the School District

was well aware of their impacts and responsibilities in the City. They wanted to be collaborative and a good partner in the community. They were building a transportation and maintenance facility because the current facility was not adequate and they would have had to make a large investment to make the current site work. They were also getting a premium price for the current property and the new facility met the long term needs of the District. The reason for putting the parking in front of the building was the more parking they could put in for the nearby park and ball fields the less people would park in the neighborhood or illegally park and jam up the streets making it less safe for pedestrians. Quite a few parking spaces would be lost when Loder Road was built. There was a walking path from the parking lot on the High School campus, but people would rather not have to walk. They also wanted the noise of the building facility to be towards the back of the property and as far away from the residential development as they could get. He had been giving the School Board monthly updates on the project and the School Board had discussed it in Executive Session and public meetings. He explained the discussions with the neighborhood regarding parking.

Ron Lee, BBL Architects, said due to the geometry of this site there was a need for separation of the public and office spaces and the bus parking and maintenance. Regarding Condition #22, he suggested changing the requirement for 100 foot right-of-way to a 93 foot right-of-way for the Meyers Road extension. Regarding Condition #43, they wanted to make sure the shared use path would be located where people would use it and made sense where it connected to the High School and park. He suggested it go on the north end of the property and that it would not be built until the rest of the path was ready to be used. Regarding Condition #44, before a Building Permit was issued the applicant was to provide details about temporary coverings for products or vehicles, and they wanted to know what materials would be acceptable. The area these would be stored was already going to be screened by landscaping and the chain link fence. Regarding Condition #45, they would have to verify they had 60% openings along the horizontal length of the south facade and they would work with staff to refine the calculation. For Condition #50, they would have to provide documentation that the refuse area was designed with sturdy materials, and he clarified this area would be disguised by landscaping and decorative fence. The intention was not to add screening above and beyond that. Regarding Condition #56, they would provide bicycle parking at the High School, and they were unsure of the timing for the condition as the High School's construction class would design and construct the bike racks and there needed to be safe pedestrian and bicycle paths built first. For Condition #61, it stated they needed to provide trees 35 feet along the pedestrian walkway on the west side of the parking lot, but they were concerned about adding the trees because dispatchers needed good site vision to the bus parking area. They would like to discuss options with staff for where the trees would be placed. Regarding Condition #64, they thought the species of trees they selected were on the approved list, and for Condition #66, they thought the bus parking area was part of the construction area. Regarding tree mitigation, they were having challenges finding trees that would meet the City's requirements and places to plant the trees. They were going to plant as many trees as they could on the High School campus and other areas in the District. For Condition #75, they would have to plant smaller trees within the natural resource area, and he clarified they would have to plant more trees if they were smaller.

There was discussion regarding the flow of traffic for the bus parking area, lack of pervious paving, leasing parking overage to the park, noise mitigation, good neighbor agreement for the parking, and Loder Road extending to High School Lane.

Todd Mobley, Lancaster Engineering, discussed the traffic impact study for this application. He was concerned about the scope and intent of the Transportation

Demand Management Plan for parking. Their intention was to use the plan to know how to strategically use the parking among the different uses, not as a tool to quantify how much parking ought to be on the site. He explained what was looked at in the parking calculations, which had three uses, bus storage, office, and industrial for the maintenance facility. The sum of the three got them to 150 maximum parking spaces, which would allow them to have 138 spaces. In their parking analysis they came under the maximum number. He explained the quantity of buses and distribution pattern, peak hours, and projected growth of the fleet.

Doug Neeley, resident of Oregon City, said there had been comments about using the buffer area or wetland for the detention facility. He was concerned about anything going into the wetland area to make sure it did not become part of the detention facility. He agreed it would be good to have more pervious area on the site. He asked for clarification on the building envelope.

John Lewis, Public Works Director, clarified the entire impervious area would be looked at for stormwater treatment. The building envelope in this case was meant to mean the building, parking lot, and all other impervious areas. There was still time for the School District to make design decisions that would be more beneficial to stormwater treatment and infiltration.

Mr. Neeley said in regard to tree planting, he suggested trees could be given to the horticulture department of Clackamas Community College for planting to fulfill the requirement. He hoped the detention facility would be kept out of the wetland and buffer zone.

Ted Dicken, president of the Sequoia Landing Homeowners Association, discussed the issue of people parking in the neighborhood. He would like to work with the School District to come up with ideas to help the situation.

Amy Willhite, resident of Oregon City, thought there would be more traffic impact on Meyers and Glenn Oak, especially during the peak afternoon hours. She was concerned with the amount of buses that would be coming through that intersection. The Gaffney Lane Neighborhood Association had sent to the Transportation Advisory Committee issues with that intersection. A lot of children walked that area, which was a safety concern.

Carrie Richter, City Attorney, said due to the applicant's testimony regarding revisions to the conditions, she proposed continuing the hearing to June 8 and leaving the record open. She also suggested the applicant submit their concerns in writing within the next seven days. The rebuttal could be done on June 8 and the Planning Commission could tell staff the questions they had so staff could bring back answers on June 8.

Commissioner Espe would like to see an example of the fencing to know whether or not it would be better than what was in the Code. He wondered if there would be a parking study or agreement to clarify who would be using the parking and when. He would like to know more about the storm system and detention facility and where they would be constructed in relation to the wetland and buffer zone. He also wanted to know the species of trees, number of trees to be replanted, options for pervious surfaces and bioswales, good neighbor agreement to keep people from parking in the neighborhood, Transportation Demand Management Plan to be done sooner rather than later, and construction zone mitigation.

Commissioner Henkin wanted more clarification on parking utilization, bicycle parking requirements, and adding pervious pavement, bioswales, and green roofs.

Vice Chair McGriff wanted to know more about the conditions from 2001 that were not met and why they were not met and were postponing them to another phase, wildlife on the site, salvage instead of demolition, definition of a small addition, fencing, proposed sign plan, if the number of staff would be more or less than what they had currently, tree removal and off site mitigation at other schools, doing the Transportation Demand Study now rather than later, bike parking, and the number of conditions that staff said would most likely be met, not that they were clearly met.

Ms. Moosbrugger reviewed the items for Commission direction which included the fence that the Commission wanted more detail on, adjustment to allow the parking lot in the front of the building, parking for the transportation facility, and tree mitigation calculation.

Commissioner Mabee wanted to see the comparison of staff's and the applicant's calculations for the parking and wanted to know the tree mitigation impact of what the applicant's and City's counts were.

A motion was made by Commissioner Henkin, seconded by Commissioner Mahoney, to continue the proposed Moss Campus Master Plan and Oregon City School District Transportation Maintenance Facility (Planning Files CP 14-03: Master Plan, DP 14-04: Detailed Development Plan, and NR 14-10: Natural Resource Overlay District Review) to June 8, 2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Robert Mahoney, Zachary Henkin, Paul Espe, Denyse McGriff and Damon Mabee

4. Communications

Mr. Konkol gave an update on the Sign Code, staff support for the CIC and codifying the role of the CIC, appeal of the live/work apartment complex on Beavercreek Road, re-adoption of the Beavercreek Road Concept Plan, and adoption of the Transportation System Plan. He then discussed food carts, which would be brought to the Planning Commission because there was nothing in the Code that specifically addressed them. He also gave an update on the Willamette Falls Legacy Project funding and River Walk design.

Vice Chair McGriff said work was being done to create an Oregon City Parks Foundation.

5. Adjournment

Vice Chair McGriff adjourned the meeting at 9:45 PM.