



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Monday, February 10, 2014

7:00 PM

Pioneer Center, 615 5th St., Oregon City, OR

Note Revised Location

WORK SESSION (6pm - 6:50pm)

Chair Kidwell called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Present: 5 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Absent: 2 - Damon Mabee and Robert Mahoney

Staffers: 5 - Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Tony Konkol, Pete Walter, John Lewis and Laura Terway

[PC 14-013](#)

Willamette Falls Legacy Project Update

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, said they were moving out of the public involvement process and moving towards preparing the land use application. She introduced Mike Zylas, Walker Macy, and Ben Schoenberger, Winterbrook Planning, who would be giving the Willamette Falls Legacy Project update.

Mr. Zylas gave a site status update. He then reviewed the public involvement process and core values for the project. Four primary buildings had been identified for redevelopment potential. Public access to the site, especially to the water, was key. He explained the proposed trails and water access points and gave examples of other successful public open spaces near water ways. A healthy habitat and economic development were also key. The implementation key words were transformative action, contingent relationships, and patience. With the falls and the public access, they could create a market that would spur redevelopment. The idea was to get access as soon as possible, implement the open space early in the project, and work on public infrastructure development and private development.

Mr. Schoenberger discussed the timeline of the 20 year planning process. The land use application was the next thing to work on and would be brought to the Planning Commission in April. He explained the content of the land use application, including a zone change and general development plan. The zone change would be a range of allowed uses with provisions for other uses that respected the history of the site and development standards of the City. The general development plan was the first step of a two step master planning process which addressed the big issues of development.

Commissioner McGriff suggested having a unique look for the area and buildings, making sure the McLoughlin House site was preserved, and adaptive reuse of as many historic features as possible.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner explained the goal was to create a balance between certainty and flexibility.

Commissioner Espe wanted to make sure the general development plan was set up in a way to leverage as much grant money as possible.

Commissioner Henkin thought it would improve walkability in downtown and other areas of the City. He thought having public access as soon as possible was vital.

Chair Kidwell thought there should be an emphasis on connecting the existing Main Street to this site.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said they might not be able to solve everything this year, but the ideas could be embedded in the plan to look at in the future.

Chair Kidwell adjourned the work session at 6:53 PM.

PUBLIC HEARING (7pm)

1. Call to Order

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

Present: 5 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

Absent: 2 - Damon Mabee and Robert Mahoney

Staffers: 5 - Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Tony Konkol, Pete Walter, John Lewis and Laura Terway

2. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments on items not on the agenda.

3. Public Hearing

3a. [PC 14-012](#)

L 13-03: South End Concept Plan Adoption

L 13-04: Code Amendments

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing.

Pete Walter, Planner, said this was the fourth hearing to review the South End Concept Plan. He gave a recap of the Plan, vision, values, benefits, and what had been discussed so far. He then reviewed the matrix of issues that had been raised. The first was transportation methodology. He explained the issues and how they were addressed in the Plan. He entered the report from DKS and Associates into the record.

Carl Springer, DKS and Associates, discussed his memo explaining the tools that were used for the traffic forecasting for the South End area and why the methods suggested under public comment were not appropriate.

Mr. Walter said staff suggested as a possible Planning Commission recommendation going forward to continue to update and refine traffic count information as it became available, continue to review and monitor traffic intersections for adequate levels of service and volume over capacity ratios as development occurred, continue to review

the transportation system development charge structure to make sure it was appropriate, and continue to refine the capital improvement program to accurately reflect the costs of identified improvements as time moved forward. He explained the second DKS report which was an updated existing report that was in the record that discussed the levels of service and how they were affected by the improvements in the Transportation System Plan. He entered the report into the record.

John Lewis, Public Works Director, stated the Transportation System Plan included all three concept plan areas at full build out and all the developments would be analyzed within the bigger picture and many would have to include improvements with the development.

Mr. Walter said the Transportation Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Plan and found the transportation methodology to be acceptable. He entered the minutes of that meeting into the record as well as three letters in support of the Plan. He then discussed the next issue on the matrix, concern about restoring transit and public transportation to South End Road to improve mobility to seniors and other transit dependent citizens. There were recommendations in the Plan that would be acted on moving forward. The Planning Commission could direct staff to continue working in the framework of the Tri-Met Service Enhancement Plan process to emphasize the southeast side of their district. The next issue was when there was an accident on 99E and what happened to South End Road when it occurred. This issue was not identified in the public process and there were no actions to address the concern. Residents could be notified through use of additional signage and early public information alerts via the web and standard media outlets. The next issue was in regard to wetlands, drainage, impacts to water quality, and off site impacts. There was a natural resources component in the Plan for standards for development. There were also other City Codes, a Natural Resources Overlay District, and Storm Water Plan.

Mr. Lewis discussed the City's storm water design standards and what developers would be required to install.

Mr. Walter said the potential Planning Commission recommendation could be adoption of best management practices for low impact development and to direct staff to maximize public involvement and input on this process when it began. Another issue was senior dwellings and mobility. Staff suggested the Commission direct staff to draft incentives for single story plans or ground floor master bedrooms in the residential design standards. The next issue was an additional access road beyond what was considered in the Plan. There could be a coordination of future studies with Clackamas County, Metro, and ODOT via the Public Works Director and Transportation Advisory Committee if resources became available. The next item was adequacy of infrastructure and the Commission could request regular updates regarding public infrastructure plans and costs. Another item of concern was adequacy of water capacity, and a letter was received from the South Fork Water Board confirming that they could provide water service to this area. The Planning Commission could direct staff to promote and publicize South Fork Water Board's conservation plan tools on the City's website. There was concern about landslides, steep slopes, and geologic hazards. The Planning Commission could direct staff to include references of the online DOGAMI tools in the Code and publicize them on the City's website. Another issue was habitat and tree preservation, and the recommendation was to review the tree protection code to determine if further protection or mitigation was needed. In regard to trails and open space, there were 47 acres planned for that purpose in the Plan. Trail dedication would be part of the Code amendments that would be done later this year. Development might not happen for some time, as it was the desire of the property owners and market

conditions. The next public hearing for the South End Concept Plan was set for February 19 with the City Commission.

Kirsten Green, Cogan Owens Cogan, discussed the public engagement process, values and vision of the Plan. She hoped that the Planning Commission would recommend approval to the City Commission.

Mr. Walter entered an email to the Commission from Paul Edgar and a letter from Greater Oregon City Watershed Council into the record.

Paul Edgar, resident of Oregon City, said Mr. Springer provided new reports that day and he would like the public hearing to be continued so he could review them. He did not think that 54% of the developable lots should be planned to be 12-14 dwelling units per acre. The trip generation that would come out of development would be around 2,500 vehicles in the 20 year build out. Kids would be playing in the streets and most of the trips would be heading north to Warner Parrott. South End could not be made into three lanes. The City Commission in 1990 voted for all R-10 houses and lots south of Partlow Road.

Ingra Rickenbach, resident of Oregon City, was concerned about the traffic on South End Road as it would directly effect the livability of her house. By doubling the number of people who lived in the neighborhood, she worried she would not be able to get out of her driveway safely.

Tom O'Brien, resident of Oregon City, thought the Concept Plan was wonderful, however the hill on South End Road was a problem. He thought the traffic engineering counts in the Plan were wrong. The County had not looked at improving South End nor was it in their future plans. There were areas of South End included in the Plan that shouldn't be and others that should be. He asked that the hearing be continued to review the latest information that was passed out that night.

Mr. Lewis said the South End hill was owned by the County and it was not addressed in their Transportation System Plan because they left the planning for that roadway to the City. The City's Transportation Plan did not have a project on the hill, but there was one for 2nd and South End and Warner Parrott and South End. There was no intent to widen South End Road. He had a few options for repairing the roadway due to the slope and moving soils.

Mr. Walter said there was no plan for additional intersections on South End. The capacity of South End was adequate to carry traffic generated from the Concept Plan. He explained the traffic count methodology that was used.

Mr. Springer addressed Mr. O'Brien's issue of the counts at a particular location being different than the model. There would be growth in traffic volumes and congestion, but it was the City's job to design a street system that was consistent with City standards and would support the planned growth.

Chair Kidwell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner McGriff thought the community concerns were well addressed in the Plan. The region was going to experience more congestion and transportation options could be planned for over time. She recommended approval of the Plan with the Planning Commission recommendations laid out by staff.

Commissioner Henkin agreed there would be more traffic in 2035 and he was ok with a marginal increase in the Concept Plan. He expressed urgency about talking to

Tri-Met for South End service. He felt comfortable moving forward.

Commissioner Espe gave credibility to the traffic study and transportation master plan that had been done. It made sense to have a master plan rather than not have one. He put more weight on the transportation engineer's findings over the public testimony. He thought all of the issues had been adequately addressed. He supported the Plan.

Commissioner Geil had been impressed with the attention to detail in addressing the concerns done by staff. The Concept Plan ensured that developers did responsible things under the guidelines of the Concept Plan. Citizens could still voice their opinions to the City Commission and in the future on annexation measures on the ballot. He also supported the Concept Plan and thought it was necessary to protect the citizens.

Chair Kidwell said doing nothing was not an option. He applauded the efforts of staff and citizens. He thought this was a balanced plan that addressed most of the concerns that had been raised. This was the first step in a long development process. It created a framework for orderly development. He supported the Plan as presented with the recommendations from staff.

A motion was made by Commissioner Geil, seconded by Commissioner McGriff, to approve L 13-03: South End Concept Plan adoption, L 13-04: Code amendments, and the recommendations presented by staff in the issues matrix. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

3b. [PC 14-011](#)

Portland Metro Men's Center.

Conditional Use Permit (CU 13-01), Site Plan and Design Review (SP 13-11) and Lot Line Abandonment (LL 13-04)

This item will not start before 8pm.

Chair Kidwell opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if the Commission had any ex parte contact, conflict of interest, bias, or statement to declare including a visit to the site.

Commissioner McGriff had visited the site, saw the notice of the land use application when it was posted, and read two articles in the paper regarding this issue, but the articles did not contain any information that she had not already reviewed in the packet.

Commissioner Henkin visited the site and also saw the articles Commissioner McGriff mentioned.

Commissioner Espe had visited the site.

Commissioner Geil had driven by the site. He was contacted by a friend who wanted to talk about the situation and he told his friend he could not talk about it.

Chair Kidwell was familiar with the site and saw the articles mentioned.

Jennifer Bragar, City Attorney, explained the public process for the hearing. There was an email requesting a continuance, so the hearing would be continued to February 24.

Laura Terway, Planner, presented the staff report. This application was for property located at 405 Warner Parrott Road. It was previously a church facility and was surrounded by single and two family dwellings. She explained the subject site, notices sent, review of the application submittal, and application of the criteria. This was an application for a Christian drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility.

Ms. Bragar discussed the City Attorney's memo regarding federal overlays on the application. While the City had the authority to regulate land use under the Fair Housing Act, it was unlawful to deny housing because someone was recovering from alcohol or substance abuse. The City could not place the religious assembly use on less than equal terms with a non-religious assembly use and they could not apply a land use regulation in a way that imposed a substantial burden on the religious activity unless they could show the burden was in furtherance of a compelling government interest and was the least restrictive means of furthering that governmental interest.

Ms. Terway then reviewed the proposed use and development including the proposed office building, exterior renovations to the existing structure, accessory structures, and proposed dormitory. Staff recommended a condition of approval to limit the number of people in the dormitory to 62, two of which had to be staff, and a condition that the total number of staff on site be limited to 10 people. There were other conditions regarding minor alterations to the windows and enclosing the stairwells which were to be used for emergency access only. She explained how the application qualified for Conditional Use under a religious institution and group home facility. One of the issues for the Commission's consideration was if the density proposed was appropriate. She then discussed the mitigation. Staff proposed conditions for the mitigation including a good neighbor agreement with the South End Neighborhood Association and installing landscaping adjacent to the dormitory stairwells as a buffer. She then reviewed the Planning Commission's options. Staff recommended approval with conditions. She recommended amending Condition 2 to add the following sentence, "If the City Engineer identified the existing facilities were in acceptable condition, the applicant might not be required to construct that portion of the improvements." She entered the PowerPoint presentation and public comments received into the record.

There was discussion regarding the good neighbor agreement and density chart.

Rick Givens, planning consultant for the project, stated the subject property was zoned R-10 surrounded on three sides by R-3.5. The only issue regarding density was whether the proposed use would alter the character of the surrounding area. He did not think they were out of line with the character of the neighborhood in terms of the number of people on the land. The site plan showed the property was centrally designed with 20% lot coverage, it was not crowding the character of the site but providing for the housing to be more dense with the dormitory. There was buffering around the project. The property had been occupied by the applicant where classes and religious services had been taking place since November 2012 and there had been no complaints. He explained how the site would be used. There would be very little traffic impact because everyone was bused to and from the site as they were not allowed to have cars. More cars would be present on graduation days once a month in the evening and visitation days on Sundays.

Brian Mason, landscape architect for the project, explained the landscape design including the six foot wooden fence around the perimeter and landscaping on all sides of the property including trees for buffering which would add to the residential character. There would be a significant upgrade to the parking lot as well. Storm water would be incorporated into the landscape, there would be large grass areas,

and a garden area.

Mike Reader, attorney for the applicant, disagreed with the staff report regarding if this was denied, the activity on the property currently would not be allowed. This property had been in religious use since the 1970s. The site was still in religious use and did not require a Conditional Use. The request was for a Conditional Use for the addition of the dormitory and office. The land use impacts would be more students on the site and they would be sleeping on the site. He explained this was a legal non-conforming use and they were not in violation of the law.

Mr. Givens explained the traffic study showing traffic was not an issue.

There was discussion regarding moving the garden location, the people enrolled in the program, and allowing up to 60 people in the dormitory.

Mr. Reeder suggested an alternative Condition 1, they would provide a contact person for the neighborhood organization and hold an annual meeting to discuss the Teen Challenge operation. They did not want to bind themselves to a good neighbor agreement where another party might not enter into that agreement.

Ms. Terway said proponents would testify first, then those who were neutral, and then opponents.

Sandra Jelnick, resident of Oregon City, gave an example of a house next door to hers that was a house for recovering alcoholics and addicts and how she had approached it through communication and understanding. Being fearful of the unknown did not help anyone. She explained the need for 24 hour, 7 day a week supervision in a good neighborhood. She had worked with people from this facility who were trying to make their lives better.

Tom Wilson, resident of Oregon City, served on the Board of Directors for a non-profit organization to aid the community who wished to recover from alcohol and drug addiction. He was a recovering addict himself. There was a misconception that having a recovery center in the neighborhood would bring drug addicts into the neighborhood. They should be more worried about the practicing addicts in the neighborhood than the ones seeking recovery. He was a proponent of any recovery program that worked. There was a huge need for recovery and treatment centers and if they saved one life, it was worth it.

Dwayne Younger, resident of Oregon City, was impressed with the character of the people at Teen Challenge. His church was helping to fund the organization and the people in the program were working hard to change and become good citizens. Several volunteered at his church. He thought they were good neighbors and would continue to be good citizens of Oregon City.

Ken Scivy, resident of Oregon City, had a variety of personal contacts with Teen Challenge members who came to his church on a regular basis. Every one of the experiences had been positive. They would be good neighbors and he hoped the Planning Commission would approve the application. Fears could be alleviated by spending more time with these people and learning about the program.

Alice Hayden, resident of Oregon City, had been a financial supporter of Teen Challenge. It was a good program that did what they said they would do. They wanted to be part of the Oregon City community. The members of the program were good people and volunteered at the food pantry. They wanted to be good neighbors and were showing that already.

John Garrick, resident of Oregon City, spoke on behalf of Teen Challenge in the Portland Metro area in response to the misunderstanding in the media and community. He thought this was a quality program and there was a need in the City for this service. He had personal interaction with the people in the program and had hired them to do work. They had been good citizens and he was grateful to have them in Oregon City. The program also incorporated vocational development which was also a need in the City.

A resident of Oregon City attested to Teen Challenge as good neighbors and thought they would continue to be good neighbors. The men and leadership of Teen Challenge made him excited they were part of the neighborhood.

Darren VanDyken, program coordinator for Portland Metro Med Center, had enrolled in the Teen Challenge program in 2011 and his life was transformed. He was a productive member of the community and he was grateful for what Teen Challenge had done for him.

Jason Groshock graduated from Teen Challenge in August 2013. He thought Teen Challenge from an economic standpoint was adding human capital to the City. Any resident of Oregon City could join the program and better their life as well as growing the economy.

Leanne Maxwell Muir stated her husband was the education coordinator for Teen Challenge. In regard to picking and choosing neighbors, she knew the men at Teen Challenge that their goal was to become better law abiding men and examples to the community. She thought they would make every effort to make the housing fit in with the neighborhood and would improve the neighborhood. They had strict regulations and wanted to be good neighbors.

Kevin Hunt, resident of Oregon City, was a criminal defense attorney and gave statistics of criminal behavior due to drug and alcohol addiction. These people were already in the community and this was the opportunity to treat people for addiction. This was an organization that did what they believed was right and he urged them to approve the application.

Bill McConnell, resident of Oregon City, was the Chair of the South End Neighborhood Association. He gave a history of the neighborhood's experiences with Teen Challenge. When they first came to develop the site, they had been asked about the impacts to the neighborhood and had assured the Association that the impacts would be minimal. Unfortunately that had not been the case. Several neighbors had complained about not being able to enjoy the benefits of their property because the people in the program were often wandering around the site and attempting to converse with the neighbors. They could not enjoy a Saturday afternoon nap because the residents were outside playing games loudly. The neighborhood voted to be opposed to this application. They all thought the Teen Challenge program was worthwhile, but there were negative impacts to property owners and their ability to enjoy their property.

Paul Edgar, resident of Oregon City, agreed there was a need for drug and alcohol rehabilitation, but this was about being a good neighbor. Property values were going down. They needed to find an area that was not tightly interwoven with young families and people's backyards. One area of the property could not be fenced off due to the Fire Department access, and he did not think it was the right place for this kind of facility.

Paul Bell, resident of Oregon City, was opposed to the development. The Conditional Use permit allowing as many as 60 people to live on the site which was out of character with the small and close knit single family residential homes in the area. The development would destroy his property value and make it nearly impossible to sell. He was concerned about renting his house out to tenants who were deeply worried about men with felony records living right next door. When he looked into subdividing and developing his own property into several units, he was told that the eight inch sewer line in the middle of Warner Parrott was already at peak capacity. The increased traffic and density were also issues.

Kris Englekey, resident of Oregon City, said this was not just an impact on the immediate neighborhood but also across the street was Chapin Park. She was concerned if the residents were unsupervised, they might migrate over to the park. They had no control over what Teen Challenge did and she was concerned about it changing over time to less supervision.

Matt Nelson, resident of Oregon City, questioned their status as a group home, as some group homes did not need a license to operate. If they were not operating under the same guidelines as every other group home, it made him question what kind of facility they were operating. If the dormitory was granted, he requested a condition that they be licensed as a group home or allow a day use facility only.

Mackenzie Nelson, resident of Oregon City, discussed discrepancies in the application. They provided a religious based drug and alcohol recovery program, but since they did not provide any medical treatment they were not licensed by the State of Oregon. She thought it was a residential treatment facility because Center staff handled the resident's money, transportation, and medication. She read the definition of a residential treatment facility. She was also concerned about the ratio of staff to students was not adequate, concerned they did not have an emergency preparedness plan as a licensed facility, and did not feel safe with a drug and alcohol recovery program that did not have to follow State laws or have a license. She requested the Commission either deny the request for a larger facility or impose a condition that they become licensed.

Mandy Klebinger, resident of Oregon City, had issues that the applicant said no one in the neighborhood had contacted them with a concern previously when they quietly moved into the neighborhood. She had called and was told it was a day use only and no one would be on the facility at night. There had not been a neighborhood meeting. There was loud cursing, smoking, and running around the facility that only recently had been stopped. She thought if they were going to call themselves a school, they needed to follow the standards that schools had to follow. However, in their application they said certain restrictions did not apply because they were not a school.

John Rudy, resident of Oregon City, discussed the many duplexes and low cost housing in the area that typically housed young families with kids. He did not think they should risk the chance that any child would be harmed. Chapin Park was across the street and also had a lot of children playing there. All of the residents were concerned about the safety of the facility. He was opposed to the location of this facility.

Phyllis Rudy, resident of Oregon City, challenged the statement that there had been no neighborhood complaints. People came to Oregon City for a rural, low crime area with good schools for the kids. This project would lower property values, safety, and privacy of law abiding citizens who chose Oregon City as their home.

Tony Paola, resident of Oregon City, said the application was not supposed to alter the character of the surrounding area. The facility proposed would be a 10,590 square foot dormitory that would dwarf the medium density residential properties at a scale of over 5 to 1. The sheer size would alter the character of the neighborhood and the noise of the operation disturbed the neighborhood already. Up to 60 occupants would significantly double the noise. This was not the place for this facility. He was also concerned for the safety of the women and children of the area.

Greg Smith, resident of Oregon City, was opposed to having this facility in the neighborhood. The Commission could legally turn down this application if they did not think it met the criteria. The facility did not fit in with the character of the neighborhood full of families. Property values would go down and people would not reinvest in their homes. He urged the Commission to consider all of the evidence and problems with Teen Challenge.

Brandon Boyd, resident of Oregon City, gave some examples in the Code for why this application should not be approved. They wanted to build a dormitory, but it was not an acceptable use as a religious institution. Religious institutions were non residential places of worship. If the facility was approved, he asked that the following conditions be placed on it: church services should be open to the public, limited to day use only, and the proposed dormitory be limited to the size and scale of the largest building within 300 feet of the surrounding area.

Donny Selvi, resident of Oregon City, said when he compared the local zoning code to the definitions used in the application, he found discrepancies regarding the 60 unit dormitory. He requested the Commission deny the application, although he did think Oregon City would benefit from a faith based counseling center. If it was approved, it should provide a service to the community like a counseling center open to the public. They should also have a pastor assigned and provide Sunday services to the public as a church.

Ingra Rickenbach, resident of Oregon City, said in order to keep the neighborhood vision on Warner Parrott, there were single family homes on Birchwood and in the back were duplexes. She was concerned about having a two story dormitory that could house 62 people in the neighborhood. She was opposed to it being an overnight facility and having an office building on a neighborhood street.

Mary Lopez, resident of Oregon City, was concerned about the Conditional Use Permit application where they considered themselves a group home but they were not licensed by the State. Residential houses surrounded the proposed facility and with no oversight from the State, she could see this as an unsafe situation for her and her neighbors. Prescription medications would be given to residents, but there was no medical staff and no oversight. Licensed staff should be required to administer these medications as required for other group homes. This was the wrong location for this type of facility.

Luke Lopez, resident of Oregon City, was not opposed to what Teen Challenge did, but was opposed to the location. He would not have purchased his home had he known it would be 300 feet away from a drug and alcohol recovery center, especially an unlicensed center. The proposed facility would impair the neighborhood and diminish its character. It would affect property values and the quality of life of the neighbors. There were safety concerns as well. The landscaping would not be able to screen that large of a building in the neighborhood. He requested that they only allow building administrative buildings for day use only. He submitted a petition of 170 signatures from people who agreed that this facility should not be built in this location.

Angela Kelly, resident of Oregon City, believed in Teen Challenge's program, but did not want the community jeopardized. She thought the number of staff would be inadequate and thought the dormitory should be locked down at night so people could not sneak out. She was concerned about a possible rise in crime, safety of the children in the neighborhood, and lowered property values.

Dave Hinkle, resident of Oregon City, had concerns about the impact to the infrastructure on the water and sewer lines and keeping the fire lane open. He thought there would be impacts to transportation as well as traffic was already bad in the area.

Mark Boyd, resident of Oregon City, supported Teen Challenge, but this was not a church facility. The location needed to be somewhere else as it was not proper for the area. He encouraged the Commission to deny the application.

Mark Epperson, resident of Oregon City, did not think Teen Challenge had been good neighbors. They should have gone around the neighborhood and spoken to residents when they first moved in. He did not think there would be enough staff for the number of residents. There had been a continual storm water problem with development on Warner Parrott and putting in a 10,000 square foot facility would reduce the perk in the groundwater.

Mr. Konkol said there had been a request for a continuance that had to be granted because this was the first evidentiary hearing. The record would remain open and the hearing be continued to February 24. The rebuttal by the applicant would be held over until all of the public testimony had been received.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGriff, seconded by Commissioner Espe, to continue the public hearing for CU 13-01: Conditional Use, SP 13-11: Site Plan and Design Review and LL 13-04: Lot Line Abandonment to February 24, 2014. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Paul Espe, Zachary Henkin, Denyse McGriff, Charles Kidwell and Tom Geil

4. Community Development Director Communications

There was no Community Development Director communications.

5. Adjournment

Chair Kidwell adjourned the meeting at 11:24 PM.