Minutes
Aurora Planning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, December 01, 2015, at 7:00 P.M.
City Council Chambers, Aurora City Hall
21420 Main Street NE, Aurora, OR 97002

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

STAFF ABSENT:

VISITORS PRESENT: Richard Rothweiler, Salem
Craig Johnson, Aurora
Gayle Abernathy, Aurora
Judi Aus, Canby
Lance Lyon, Aurora
Karen Townsend, Aurora

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

   Meeting was called to order by Chairman Schaefer at 7:00 pm

2. **CITY RECORDER DOES ROLL CALL**
   Chair Joseph Schaefer - Present
   Commissioner Craig McNamara- Present
   Commissioner Bud Fawcett - Present
   Commissioner Jonathan Gibson - Present
   Commissioner Mercedes Rhoden-Feely - Present
   Commissioner Tara Weidman - Present
   Commissioner Aaron Ensign - Present

3. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   a) Planning Commission Minutes – November, 2015
   b) City Council Meeting Minutes – October, 2015
   c) Historic Review Board Minutes – October, 2015

   Motion to approve the consent agenda as presented was made by Commissioner McNamara and is seconded by Commissioner Fawcett. Motion approved by all.

4. **CORRESPONDENCE –**

5. **VISITORS**
   Anyone wishing to address the Aurora 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 Aurora Planning Commission could look into the matter and provide some response in the future.

Schaefer and Commissioner Ensign were both absent at the last hearing and both declare no ex-parte contact except a site visit by Chair Schaefer.

CITY OF AURORA
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT: Variance 2015-03 [VAR-15-03]
DATE: December 1, 2015

SUPPLEMENTAL MEMO FOR VAR-2015-03, Christ Lutheran Church

MARION COUNTY ASSESSORS

AURORA HISTORIC INVENTORY
Date of construction
Date of Demolition

There has been additional information submitted as your staff report shows as follows the original date of construction and when it was demolished along with a 1952 remodeling permit. There is an article that shows the original tower at 114ft along with a few pictures of the earlier church.

It is the staff recommendation that the applicant has met the variance criteria and to approve with the previously stated 3 conditions as the Historic Review Board has already recommended allowing the height variance. There are no additional exhibits to present at this time.

Applicant Representative Richard Rothweiler, states that we did as you asked and provided proof of height of the original steeple when it was built and a comparison of the trees and again we do not feel as though this is going to be a large impact on the street. We are well below the neighboring trees.

No questions at this time from the Commissioners.
Chair Schaefer does a quick run through of various dates as presented. Applicants Pastor Craig Johnson state that there will be no shadow cast and there will be no cross on top.

Pastor Craig states he is in favor of this change as it is a part of a pledge that was made to the congregation to improve the safety and access to the church for the better.

Karen Townsend 15058 2nd Street states she is opposed as I do like the drawings and the concept of the church changes I have definite concerns regarding the height that is proposed and the impact I believe it will have on the neighborhood. One of my concerns is that there is pressure to change this in the future to a commercial zone there are 7 homes on this block and I personally fear that this could take place in the future as there a more than one conditional uses that have been approved. Additional since the last time you met I would bring to the Commissions attention that at the HRB meeting you are referencing we did not have a full board and we had new members that may have thought there pressure to pass this along as being a good neighbor so to speak.
Chair Schaefer states that there is no pressure to change to commercial it did not come from the city.

Gayle Abernathy, 2nd street neighbor discusses the same potential issue/pressure to become a commercial district and again Chair Schaefer states that is not coming from the Planning Commission. Abernathy goes on to say that she dislikes how visitors to the site often stare at her driveway and her property at times not realizing it is a residents. Chair Schaefer states that he has always thought the parking in that area too wide and so there fore to make it look more residential you could increase the setbacks from the street to allow better landscaping for the residence and for the feel of a neighborhood.

City Planner Wakeley does comment that 90 feet is wide however on topic I would remind Commissioners that there is a certain criteria and the decision needs to be based on that.

No one else spoke at this time,

The applicant Rothweiler, points out that the additional 6 feet shouldn't make that large of an impact in their opinion. We feel as though we are addressing the concerns and just trying to bring back the original look and feel of the building.

Hearing closes at 7:41 PM

Deliberations,

The Commissioners discuss various criteria's and whether or not they are met at this time. Commissioner Rhoden Feeley states that in her opinion criteria E and F are not met. Chair Scheafer does not necessarily agree with Feeley criteria E its always been a church and F I think it wouldn't fit without a steeple. As far as the original church members who tore down the original steeple they probably didn't realize the magnitude of that decision and what it meant in the future. 23 years ago there was not really code to follow. Commissioners state a few more comments and it is clear they are leaning towards allowing the increased height.

Eventually a decision is made.

A motion to approve the height variance not to exceed 48 feet maximum is made by Commissioner Weidman and is seconded by Commissioner McNamara. Ayes 6 Nayes 1 Feeley. Motion passes.

Townsend at this point responds to the parking idea and states the width of the street would be needed for the many events that take place. In her opinion.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**
   a) Discussion and or Action on Maletis Property Development South of the Willamette River. Chair Schaefer updates the group regarding this situation where they want to bring the Langdon Farm property into the Urban Reserve area. They brought suit against Clackamas County. There is a brief discussion back and forth no decision or action is made.
   b) Discussion and or Action on Urban Growth Boundary Expansion for Industrial and Aviation Land Article. Chair Schaefer explains to the group that this was a court case from the City of Scappoose that actually was approved which doesn't happen very often. No decision or

action is taken. Commissioner McNamara asks the difference in this case that it passed Schaefer it was very employment specific showing a need.

8. OLD BUSINESS

a) Discussion and or Action on Orchard View Subdivision. Tabled until January.
b) Discussion and or Action on/Feedback on Code Sections from (LA-15-02) made minor changes, the Commissioners discuss various comments from the Council regarding the text most of which are minor changes such as 16.14.040 on J and K they are concerned with materials vs style. They recognized the need but didn't want us to be too restrictive. Regarding 16.36.050 the council had discussed not being to restrictive again and suggesting they were thinking no more than 1 visible and possibly the other not more than 15 feet. The discussion between Commissioners was leaning more towards no more than one stored outside and there was no resolution regarding being stored or parked.

9. COMMISSION/DISCUSSION

a) City Planning Activity (in your packets) Status of Development Projects within the City.

10. ADJOURN

Chair Schaefer adjourned the December 1, 2015 Aurora Planning Commission Meeting at 8:40 P.M.

Chair Schaefer

ATTEST:

Kelly Richardson, CMC
City Recorder