

Minutes
Aurora Planning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, November 06, 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
Scott Brotherton, Aurora

1. Call to Order of Planning Commission Meeting

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chair Joseph Schaefer at 7:00 p.m.

2. City Recorder Did Roll Call

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

3. Consent Agenda

Minutes

- I. Aurora Planning Commission Meeting –October 02, 2012
- II. HRB Minutes
- III. City Council – September 11 , 2012

Commissioner Graham stated that the visitors for the October minutes are incorrect, and on page 5 porches after doesn't fit- ad (and others on Planning Commission disagreed).

A Motion is made by Commissioner Graham to accept the amended minutes as stated and seconded by Commissioner Gibson. Motion Approved.

Correspondence

- I. None

The material referenced in this section was the material following her staff report on the maps that were asked for on the 99E corridor study from the last meeting.

Chairman Schaefer states that option 2 of 99E/Main St. and 99E/3rd St would completely land lock the Eddy property on Main Street and lose a lot of parking. I further believe that option 1 closes off Main Street however it looks as though it would provide more parking options. Commissioner Sallee asks if the intention is to close off Main Street, Schaeffer I think the intent is to make a better intersection at 99E.

Councilor Graupp who is in attendance stated that the Historic Review Board is planning to write a letter to inform Council that they highly disagree of the option to block off Main Street. It would hurt businesses. He goes on to say this is a standard 7 year budget plan to see how many of the items would be approved.

City Planner Wakeley did let them know that because of lack of funding none of these items according to ODOT would be on this year's STIP.

It is the consensus of the Planning Commission that 3rd and Main on the East side of 99E be left alone and opposed to option 2.

As far as Main Street on the West side of 99E

Again I think this is an attempt to eliminate a skewed intersection. Most of the discussion between members is the fact that parking would be eliminated however they did think they made up for some of it on 2nd street. It would be a good Saturday market location and closer to 99E.

As the discussion went on most of the Planning Commission members agree that it is too constrictive to the local businesses.

99E/Ottaway section,

There are turning lanes everywhere a lot of traffic could move through this intersection along with bicycle traffic.

Chairman Schaefer states that really I cannot see fault with this option other than cost.

Commissioner Sallee on the less expensive option, I am not sure that rumble strips would be a help however most of the Commissioners like the less expensive options on this section.

Commissioner Sallee states that she might be able to attend the meeting on the 15th along with HRB Chair Townsend.

Let get the letter from the HRB and City Council to get a sense of what they want to see here.

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.

Councilor Graupp confirmed that everyone received the email on the 1,000 foot runway extension to the south from the ODA.

5. Public Hearing

A. Discussion and or Action on Extended/Continuation of CPMA-12-01 Anthony Fidanzo,

Was called to order at 7:35 by Chairman Schaefer

Let's start with a few housekeeping items, let's begin with presentation of Staff report then the applicant then onto any who might oppose or not. This is when you need to state ex-parte contact which Chairman Schaefer states he has spoken to the applicant and representatives with DLCD. I don't believe it would cause a bias. No one else on Planning Commission claims ex-parte contact.

Chairman Schaefer this is a property with 2 roughly level sections with a slope in between and the entire property is in the comp plan map in the flood plain. What the applicant is asking us to do is rather follow the topography rather than the property line.

City Planner Wakeley, states that originally the applicant asked to remove the western 225 feet from the flood Hazard overlay, adopted by the City in 2002. In order to do so, the applicant was directed to apply to FEMA for a letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) to document that the City's adoption of the FH zone on his property was erroneous. and additional info needed was a LOMA or map amendment, at the time I was not the planner and at the time it should have been considered differently. 16,76

FEMA responded to the LOMA request approving the western 150-175 feet (approximately) could be removed from the 100 year floodplain.

Staff is finding that all criteria for approval of a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment were met. Page's 7 and 8 and corrected versions were submitted to the Planning Commission and for the record. were wrong I have given two new pages, which corrects a few typographical errors I had found.

This application has been continued a few times and no one has come forward with comment or concerns and FEMA the LOMA was submitted to Christine Shirley at DLCD for comment as well. had no concerns.

Chairman Schaefer confirms the map amendment is exhibit E not B.

Mr. Fidanzo would was offered an opportunity to comment : you like to make presentation, not sure what to say other than with the hiring the professionals that I would hope this application would be approved and go to council especially with the expenses that I have endured.

I hope to have this all pass and bring my property back into buildable status. This references exhibit E 5 and E5 was accepted by FEMA so the survey was put into words in section E 3 the applicant is carefully aligning it with FEMA and the Map.

Commissioner Graham asks what exactly is in or above the 100 year flood plain in this map.

NO one states opposition or acceptance of this application from the audience or written.

Councilor Graupp asks, how do we update the maps and what is the process also is there other landowners that need to be updated.

COG is the keeper of the maps and the GIS data to update the maps, so the applicant doesn't pay for the printing of new maps, and so we would need prints made of the map and this is site specific and only pertains to this property. COG staff will amend the map but the printing costs of new amended maps are a the City's expense.

No more comments at this time

Chairman Schaefer closes the public hearing at 7:50 pm

At which time the Planning Commission begins their deliberation

Commissioners Sallee, Graham, Gibson and Chairman Schaefer are all ok with the application except Chairman Schaefer points out that that he does not agree with the recommended conditions of approval 4 and 5. He feels these should not be conditions of approval rather just facts and information as they are written.

City Planner Wakeley is fine with removing item 4 and 5 because currently we are not even within the city limits to build.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sallee to recommend the City Council approve the staff report and application as amended by the Planning Commission and striking items 4 and 5 from the conditions of approval and is seconded by Commissioner Graham. Motion Passes.

6. New Business

7. Old Business

A. Discussion and or Action on Historic Review Board Guidelines

• Review of Title 17 revisions,

Chairman Schaefer states that we had made it to porches so I would like to jump right in at:

Design Standards,

Windows, Commissioner Sallee states that there should be more cost effective options other than wood windows.

If we provide the other options then let's at least have wood trim all members agreed.

Doors,

New doors are allowed to the rear of the building on contributing structure.

Chimney, no comment

Roofs,

Black only, however discussion is to have HRB give direction on this one.

Foundations,

A- is ok

B- is of

C. a few options are discussed here the main one is to only allow wood skirting. City Planner Wakeley states that this may not be a cost effective or maintenance friendly option.

Siding,

A. – ok

B. – more information needed.

8. Commission Action/Discussion

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

Goes over her written report not much discussion ensued in this section.

The letter Commissioner Graham had written looks well that was requested at the last meeting on the STIP items.

/ / / / /

/ / / / /

9. Adjourn 8:50 P.M.

A motion to adjourn the November 06, 2012 meeting is made by Commissioner Sallee and seconded by Commissioner Gibson. Motion Passes Unanimously.



Chairman, Schaefer

ATTEST:



Kelly Richardson, City Recorder