

Minutes
Aurora Planning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, May 01, 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**

1. Call to Order of Planning Commission Meeting

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chair Joseph Schaefer at 7:10 p.m.

2. City Recorder Did Roll Call

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

3. Consent Agenda

Minutes

- I. Aurora Planning Commission Meeting –April 03, 2012,**
- II. City Council – March 13 , 2012**

Chairman Schaefer states that there are a few small typos on the Planning Commission April minutes which I had handed to the recorder. Renata had a few questions on intent of motion for the street tree list and the concerns that if someone had a tree that would meet all categories would it be in fact accepted.

A motion is made by Commissioner Braun to approve the minutes with the corrections as given by chairman Schaefer and is seconded by Commissioner Gibson. Motion Passes Unanimously.

Correspondence

- I. Email and update on Water Master Plan and Storm Water Master Plan,** The water master plan has been done and will be removed from the City Planner report.
- II. DLCD Issues Report Partially Remanding Metro’s Urban Growth Boundary Decision,** no discussion.

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.

None of the visitors present spoke at this time. Councilor Graupp was in attendance.

5. New Business

A. Discussion and or Action on Updating Vision Action Plan, this is a lengthy document and this is a yearly update or peek at the document to see if this needs any updating. There were a few updates discussed in a few sections 1.3, 2.3, 3.5b, 3.5d, 1.1, 2.6b to name a few however there was no decision made and the document will be discussed at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

6. Unfinished Business

A. Discussion and or Update on 99E Corridor Study and meeting information, Chairman Schaefer attended the meeting and it appeared the primary focus was outside of the UGB its clear that inside the UGB was not the focus, a few of the flagged items were,

1. Intersection @ 99E and liberty at the light it is over capacity
2. Geometry of 99E and Main Street it is at a screwed angle its long and it takes a long time to walk across it.
3. Speed limit on the North bound 99E coming into town at 55 and would be good to be 35 it's a large drop and no transition.

- The question is asked if we currently have an active Traffic Safety Commission and at this time we do not.
- It's clear Aurora is not on their radar and very clear that individual accesses are not on the radar either.
- They are concerned with left turns and left hand turn lanes.
- City Planner Wakeley, comments that the focus or emphasis on this public meeting as to be outside of the UGB and this is the first that she has heard of this. The hope is that because ODOT is funding this study and if they are not considering Aurora then we will be out of any possible funding later when they attempt to address these issues, so we want to make sure they listen and turn some of the focus our way.
- Would they allow us to petition ODOT for a process to allow for the stepped speed proposal?
- What is the current classification for west of Ottaway for the speed step.

Councilor Graupp, brings up the fact that it was suggested that lights at the Ottaway crosswalk would be good and if this was a safety issue possibly this would help to petition ODOT for the speed step decrease.

B. Discussion and or Update on Historic Review Board Design Guideline and Consider revisions submitted by HRB on title 17. Chairman Schaefer states this is a memo dated April 17 from HRB, Chairman Schaefer would like to discuss 17.16,050A I would like to see approved with conditions (not modification) approved with conditions is the more lateral wording.

- Delete the Administrative Approval on signs, (Schaefer asks what is allowed now) the HRB wants it to be brought to the board. 17.20 is basically the entire sign code. Planner Wakeley states that this is probably based on the recommendation made by me, that this could be approved Administratively, Chairman Schaefer questions that there could be some signs in HRB that could be approved by administratively. Planner Wakeley is asking does she feel that this could be done administratively, if there were clear standards to follow. Currently the process for a sign in the HRB is constantly handled by HRB they do follow the process of title 17 and 1644.
- Wakeley states that she understood that the admin doesn't have to always mean her, it could be an HRB member or staff member. The Chairwomen Townsend of HRB is in favor of an HRB member approving the admin items and rotating the person who approves them either weekly or monthly.
- Commissioner Braun states that it is hard to get HRB members to come to regular meetings at times as stated by city staff and to have them come in approve items would even be harder.
- Possibility that existing signs could be done administratively where as a new sign application might need to go before the Board in an open meeting.
- Deleting admin approval on section 17.24 on accessory dwelling, (currently this is being approved by HRB and Planner Wakeley. (could look at this on the same concept of contributing and non-contributing property and a contributing property would need to go before HRB) Councilor Graupp asks would the County have records on when the main structure date was built.
- Commissioner Fawcett states that the sign code could be a problem because essentially it could be a problem with newer businesses who could have a modern look to the sign. And then the consistency is lost.
 - **First we need to figure out which properties are contributing or non-contributing and then we work on the follow up questions.**
- The consensus from HRB is that the radius around the contributing property within 300 feet. HRB wants a large buffer zone. Planning Commission is saying the exact property not a buffer zone or radius.

Questions what are the next steps, Chairman Schaefer states HRB literally opened chapter 17 and started going through it all the way. I do not think we need to get ahead of that but keep us up to date.

 - Chairman Schaefer informs planning members, that at the council meeting Mayor Taylor is considering combining HRB and Planning together he asked all the members of the Council to give comment at the next council meeting. Chairman Schaefer really doesn't have an opinion however when the cycle picks up again the work load will be greater.
 - Commissioner Gibson, states that consistency would be improved, however it sure seems you could run into busy schedule at times and limit then be forced to limit the agenda
 - Commissioner Fawcett asks if City Council need to approve or have simple majority.
 - Councilor Graupp states that chapter 17 is a part of the Muni Code and so Planning Commission would need to give the City Council their recommendation.
 - It's more than just the vacancy issue it's all about working together.

- Also City Recorder, Richardson states that it is a quorum issue.
- How many people own rent or lease within the historic district 3 of the 5 that are here.
- A few comments are made that HRB needs to work more diligently on obtaining new members to fill the vacancies on the board.

C. Follow up to floodplain information and presentation from DLCD to City Council, follow up on the April Council meeting from Christine Shirley, she brought with her this hand out in your packet, Chairman Schaefer summarizes this and from her perspective the model ordinance and the single approach is poor at best and it won't work here in Oregon very well.

- A standard easy to understand straight forward approach is commendable Chairman Schaefer applauds her for the effort to come up with something better in Oregon than In WA but it is a tall order.
- To comply with goal 5 and go through a very extensive process and at same time trying to stay consistent with goal 5 rules will be challenging.
- CLOMR-F requires applicant to provide proof that the project will have no effect n proposed or listed species or adverse modification to critical habitat.
- DLCD advises local governments to document ESA compliance for all projects that involve fill as if the applicant will apply to FEMA for a C/LOMR-F.
- Most local government agencies do not want to make the distinction as to whether they are going to affect the salmon habitat.
- When they rolled this out there hope is to adopt the model ORD
- Most jurisdictions are doing it by permit by permit basis to NOA fishery and this is creating a problem.
- Most local government does not want to approve these because it would be there fault if something goes wrong.
- We are not just talking about fill but all construction.
- Folks upset and being upset and told to avoid flood hazard area when there are not specific rules. And I think that they need to understand that this might not happen for a while.

Councilor Graupp it was brought up that it is already in our code that it is limited in the 100 year flood plain however anyone that abuts it we need to be cautious. And look at what we may need to change. It was very clear we cannot approve fill up against the flood plain.

We need to come up with a process.

7. Commission Action/Discussion

A. City Planner Activity Sheet (in your packets) Status of Development Projects within the City: Attached.

- Chairman Schaefer asks for clarification on the Fidanzo situation, Planner Wakeley states I had a request from the Mayor for the next process/steps for him.
- Correspond on Bixler
- Update on Corridor study
- The Water Master Plan will be taken off since it is complete
- The Vision Action Plan should be on the next agenda and email please to each member.

8. Adjourn 9:22 P.M.

A motion to adjourn the May 01, 2012 meeting is made by Commissioner Braun and seconded by Commissioner Fawcett. Motion Passes Unanimously.



Chairman, Schaefer

ATTEST:



Kelly Richardson, City Recorder