Minutes
Aurora Planning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, July 03, 2012 at 7:00 P.M.
Aurora Commons Room, Aurora City Hall
21420 Main St. NE, Aurora, OR 97002

STAFF PRESENT: Kelly Richardson, City Recorder
Renata Wakeley, City Planner

STAFF ABSENT:

VISITORS PRESENT: **Bill Graupp, Aurora**
Karen Townsend, Aurora
Gayle Abernathy, Aurora

1. Call to Order of Planning Commission Meeting

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chair Joseph Schaefer at 7:02 p.m.

2. City Recorder Did Roll Call

Chairman, Schaefer -	**Present**
Commissioner, Willman	**Present**
Commissioner, Gibson	**Present**
Commissioner, Graham	**Present**
Commissioner, Fawcett	**Present**
Commissioner, Braun	**Present**

3. Consent Agenda

Minutes

I. Aurora Planning Commission Meeting –June 05, 2012
II. HRB Minutes Aril 2012
III. City Council – May 08 , 2012

Correspondence

I. Flyer from Marion County Public Works

A motion to approve the consent agenda as presented was made by Commissioner Graham and seconded by Commissioner Wilman. Motion Passes Unanimously.

4. Visitor

Anyone wishing to address the Planning Commission concerning items not already on the meeting agenda may do so in this section. No decision or action will be made, but the Planning Commission could look into the matter and provide some response in the future.

No one spoke at this time.

5. Public Hearing, Came to order at 7:06 pm and closed at 7:25

A. Discussion and or Action on Anthony Fidanzo 15233 Ottaway Rd NE Application #CPMA-12-01.

Ex-parte Contact is declared by Chairman Schaefer, He has had conversation with the applicant and Christine Shirley from DLCD. Other Commissioners also state that they have walked the site and are familiar with it.

Chairman Schaefer reads script for public meeting,

City Planner Renata Wakeley, summarize the staff report, and recommends the staff report and exhibit A to be put on hold until he receives his LOMA approval. Additional recommendation is to keep the public hearing open, until such a time that more information is provided as requested by the applicant Joe Fidanzo. City Planner Wakeley noticed all needed parties and that included Christine Shirley from DLCD.

Chairman Schaeffer states this property does have a portion in flood plain and another portion is clearly not and the applicant wants to simply draw a line in the sand to change it so the higher elevation property could then be brought out of the flood plain overlay. So simply put when the comp plan amendment was done at that time they followed the property lines.

Mr. Fidanzo has hired John Newberg and he has shot the grade and he is knowledgeable in this area he helped finish the Netter property. Mr. Fidanzo states that Newberg thinks that possibly the wrong maps are being used and he has calls into Christine Shirley from DLCD for some answers. The intent or hope is within 90 days I should have the LOMA decision in hand.

Applicant is not putting anything into the record at this time.

No one present put anything in favor or against.

A motion to continue application CPMA-12-01 Public Hearing until October 2nd 2012 was made by Commissioner Braun and seconded by Commissioner Fawcett motion passes.

6. New Business

A. Discussion on Land Inventory, discussion on buildable land map provided by Chairman Schaefer, there are many properties that are not accurately marked but many properties are marked redevelop able. What struck me as odd here several properties have no color at all including vacant properties so It is not quite clear what the criteria was for coming up with this buildable land inventory. Renata, states that the City used DLCD safe harbor rules and GIS data which was done in 2009. Chairman Schaefer to spur the growth of new businesses I want to look at it in a different realm and focus on property by property to determine what they are able to do with the property, help them to find out what they can do with the property and set them up so the property owner can sell or develop their land. City Planner Wakeley stated that the City had received a grant to accomplish the land inventory and the tool here was to complete and inventory for the Urban Growth Boundary not necessarily to promote it as a marketing tool.

Commissioner Braun, in regards to the Mayors request to form an Economic Growth Committee I had contacted Edward F. Wagner, along with Peggy Yates from Multnomah County and they would be very interested in coming to our August meeting. Ed Wagner is interested in starting a cluster group and they were both interested in a community group for interested municipalities. A study was done by, a young lady. (Nancy Walters) the study was based on information gathered in Multnomah County.

Commissioner Braun recommends that we have Ed and Peggy come and help us with questions that we may want to put into a survey for the citizens.

Many of the Commissioners are interested in hearing what Ed and Peggy have to say. They think it will be interesting. Chairman Schaeffer states that not much if any is in Aurora farm land is mostly out of city limits.

City Planner Wakeley would like to get info to Commissioner Braun on the feasibility study.

It is the consensus of the Planning Commission to have Peggidy Yates and Ed Wagner come to the August meeting.

B. Discussion on Economic Development Committee, proposed by the Mayor
Chairman Schaefer asks if this is moving forward City Recorder, Richardson states yes and that it will be on council agenda.

7. Old Business

A. **Discussion and or Update on 99E Corridor Study and meeting information.** No more updates at this time. We need the letter signed for Aurora's recommendations to ODOT. Karen Townsend, Aurora makes a comment on traffic calming in the plan in regards to Recorder Richardson comments about the citizen who came in and stated that on a daily basis where he has almost been hit just trying to cross the road, Townsend suggests an incident file when we receive those types of complaints so we can forward them onto ODOT.

Commissioner Graham states we need to extend the speed limit out and make it more realistic within the city limits currently the 50 mile hour posted speed is to far north. No more comments.

B. **Discussion and or Update on Historic Review Board Design Guideline,** discussion begins on the memos from the packet that came out of June HRB meeting. Chairman Schaefer at this time hands the discussion over to Townsend and Abernathy of the Historic Review Board both of which own and or live within Aurora City limits. What you have in front of you is the finalized document with our proposals. With this structure we can go back into the guidelines to which portion of the guidelines is unclear. The board decided that it is better to use dates either old colony era up to 1921rather than contributing and non contributing verbiage the board agrees that this is a better language and easier to understand.

Commercial again date verses contributing or non- contributing.

Discussion ensues over the following material as proposed by HRB
HRB Code/guideline updates
June 2012
Draft passed HRB June 28, 2012

Property Classifications (cont)
"Historic Character" Neighborhoods and Certain Streets

This was passed as a second part to the finalized property classifications. Still to be done is the final wording and determination of standards on this category.

What is "Historic Character" in a neighborhood or street?
Jacksonville defines it as: "'Character criteria' are those features which define a neighborhood's own visual and physical composition." Historic Character is used in other historic districts to protect the unique features of certain areas.

This may be a helpful way to classify "non-contributing" or Level III properties that are located near historic Level I or II resources or are in high visual impact areas rather than by their location within so many feet of Level I or Level II properties.

What does it have to do with Aurora?
Aurora is much smaller than other cities with historic districts such as Jacksonville and Salem so that what is done in our city's HD is immediately obvious and can have a major visual impact on the city's few remaining historic resources as well as the appearance of the district as a whole.

When visual standards are relaxed or eliminated on non-historic properties in close proximity to historic properties, it can change the "character" of a whole neighborhood or street. By establishing a "Historic Character" classification of certain areas, such as is done in Jacksonville and other cities, consideration is given to keeping an area from being "watered down" to where it no longer seems to reflect the original settlements.

Goal
To maintain the historic character of Aurora's areas that have historic structures and settings which define the national historic district and to give more flexibility to standards in new areas that have little impact on those within the historic overlays.

Proposal
- Designate certain streets and or neighborhoods to be HC or Historic Character streets or neighborhoods.
- Form criteria for what these areas must have for the designation. (# of Level I & II structures, location, old growth vegetation, historical significance, etc.)
- Tailor guidelines for Property III classifications (post 1920 within xx yards of I or II properties) to reflect the impact that relaxed standards would have on nearby historic resources.
- Some Level IV neighborhoods would probably not have any HC classifications. An isolated infill property on a HC street would.

Details:
Historic Character areas (within the Historic Overlay only)

Residential:
1. 2nd Street stub from Liberty east
2. Liberty Street plus alley off Liberty
3. 3rd Street
4. Main Street from 3rd St south, Main St stub from Ehlen Rd/1st St
5. Ehlen Road (maintain sense of arrival as outlined in Vision Statement)
6. Airport Road from Ehlen Rd to Kasel Court

Commercial
1. Main Street, 1st to 4th
2. Hwy 99E all that is within the HD (Northeastern city limits to Bobs Ave)
3. 2nd Street (Liberty to Martin St)
4. Martin Street

Criteria for HC Areas
1. Majority of Level I & Level II structures present
2. Colony landmark settings (undeveloped original Wm Keil subdivision)
3. Location of high visual impact areas such as city entrances and thoroughfares through town such as Hwy 99E
4. Commercial area continuity
5. Should name landmark views even if not in city limits

Standards for Level III properties

All post-1920 properties within a Historic Character area would be under special standards, not just those within xx feet of historic resources.

Criteria for Standards

= *compatibility* is the key (see Jacksonville)

Materials – how strict?

Infill or redesign: compatibility with the Historic Character of the street/neighborhood in proportion of facades, openings, scale, rhythm of spacing, stylistic features, color, texture, roof shapes, height, etc.

Discussion is as follows from the above material.

Categories, use of materials

- **Level 3 properties newer than 1921 but** these are near and within so many feet, and instead of 300 feet as previously stated we looked at Historic character of the building either by neighborhood or by street. The board discussed area and however we could do it by street, and have a Historic character area (new Characteristic Street), the reason this is important is that the historic area is so little and it has been chopped up so much and so street is a good way to separate, we feel this would protect our zone but we have not come up with standards yet.

Chairman Schaefer points out the last page of the June memo and there are 10 road segments that you are proposing 6 residential and 4 commercial. There are some areas that are not developed yet. Is this a first draft of a suggested list? Townsend states yes this is.

This reads like there is a level 3 and level 4 and level 4 properties wouldn't be in a historic character area, however a level 4 could meet the date but not the character area or street. So let me get this correct the proposal is to make a smaller area or character area within the district itself and level 3 would essential be stricter because they are in a sensitive area and level 4 would not.

Level 4 would be less restrictive or liberal standards, for a situation where we have a new build happening and this will allow them to use updated materials and such.
So essentially there would be 4 different levels or district. Hopefully this would address what was requested by the City Council.

A lot of citizens would ask why are they even in the district because the building is not historic. Realistically stated this is simply a line that was drawn in the sand and this would allow for more liberal guidelines.

Are there any questions of Townsend or Gail Abernathy, Commissioner Gibson are you doing this to make the admin rule easier over time. First of all Townsend states you need to determine what the standard is or level this is the framework. Gail states that many properties should still be in the areas because of them upholding the historic character in the area.

Even the historic properties outside of the city limits should be protected at least for character.

City Planner Wakeley asks if the land in the County is it subject to HRB regulations. Townsend says no because it is outside the city limits. So in other words if they wanted to build a building then they could do that without HRB approval.

<u>Consensus from PC the memos dated June 28th 2012 come back before the PC in the August meeting after been reviewed.</u>

Discussion is now brought back to the Administrative Decisions process as presented by HRB Chairman Townsend of the HRB explains. Townsend explains the following information as presented, Discussion is as follows.

Application Decision Responsibilities

All exterior changes to any property within the Historic Overlay zones must be approved through an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Administrative Decisions:

A member of the Historic Review Board, designated by the Board, may approve, deny or approve with conditions, applications for the following exterior changes using Aurora Municipal Code Title 17 and City of Aurora Guidelines for Historic District Properties:

Painting
Roofing
Significant Landscape changes under $2500 (does not include annual plantings)

Applicants may choose to present their application to the full board. In the case of a denial from an administrative decision, the applicant may reapply by modifying the application to meet requirements or reapply for a board decision if the applicant can provide findings that the original application meets all requirements.

The designated Historic Review Board member administrator (*historic administrator*) will volunteer to review completed applications that include samples, visit the property, and may meet or telephone the applicant to discuss the application on a time schedule that is mutually determined by the historic administrator and city staff.

(Note: the historic administrator and city staff will need to determine within how many days the historic administrator will begin to process an application and then how long that should take. For instance, is the historic administrator notified at the end/beginning of each week that applications arrive or each time an application comes in? At certain times of the year, multiple applications could be accepted in a week's time.)

Note: An addendum is attached giving more details on the responsibilities of the administration.

Discussion points,

- Commissioner Braun asked for a time line for this to take place, Chairman Townsend states 2 weeks.
- Chairman Schaefer I presume you will make this same presentation next week at the City Council meeting, discussion ensues however it is decided that the original plan was for Planning Commission review the documents and revisit at the August Planning meeting.
- Townsend states this is a start and we have to have a structure in place first. Then we can go into the guidelines.
- City Planner Wakeley discusses the possibility of a work session between PC and HRB and City Council so we know if this basic structure is going to work for Council before we get into text amendments and these should be done all at once.
- And again Wakeley states all of the Commissioners have asked for more time to review these documents.
- City Recorder Richardson reminds Chairman Schaefer that in the last meeting in the minutes the Planning Commission reviewed the first draft of these documents and made some significant changes and therefore states it may not be ready to go to City Council yet
- There is a brief discussion on the feel of the Historic District and what that really is and why.
- Chairman Schaefer encourages the board to research and inform the Commission on what happens outside of the character area that you have clearly defined here today. Really you have not touched a lot on what happens outside of the character area.
- Commissioner Fawcett asks if there is a list of properties that identifies them, there will need to be one.

C. **Discussion and or Action on Updating Vision Action Plan,** City Planner Wakeley lets Planning Commission know that the updates have been made as suggested and it is now ready to go before the Council for the acknowledgement and review.

A motion to accept revisions as agreed was made by Commissioner Graham and seconded by Commissioner Gibson. Passes Unanimously.

8. Commission Action/Discussion

A. City Planning Activity (in Your Packets)
Status of Development Projects within the City.

- 15045 Park Ave, Addition on back of cape code house.
- 21200 Hwy 99E, Four Season Auto body with chain link fence, a new business license for Ross RV and Food Karts. The chain link fence was in before the City prohibited it, however now in your code you prohibit it. Now with this situation at hand it is a good time for enforcement of the fact that none of the landscaping or screening material that was proposed to be installed has not been installed.

I will put together a memo on what is out of compliance.

- 21358 The Miller house, conversation was discussed.
- 99E Corridor Study letter Chairman Schaefer will sign this.
- Commissioner Gibson has added the comp plan map on to the city web site.
- Councilor Graupp states that as of the end of this month the HRB will not have a quorum and this will force City Council to take action. The proposal is to suspend the HRB responsibilities for 1 year and place responsibilities and approval with the PC.
- Chairman Schaeffer feels it crucial to get immediate approval for applications and I am more than willing to pinch hit for the HRB.

9. Adjourn 9:05 P.M.

A motion to adjourn the July 03, 2012 meeting is made by Commissioner Braun and seconded by Commissioner Gibson. Motion Passes Unanimously.

Chairman, Schaefer

ATTEST:

Kelly A Richardson

Kelly Richardson, City Recorder