



City of Tualatin

www.tualatinoregon.gov

OFFICIAL

TUALATIN PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF April 18, 2019

TPC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Beers
Alan Aplin
Janelle Thompson
Travis Stout
Mona St. Clair

STAFF PRESENT

Steve Koper
Erin Engman
Lynette Sanford

TPC Member Absent: Naomi White

GUESTS: None

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Mr. Beers called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm and reviewed the agenda. Roll call was taken.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS/PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATION:

A. Introduction of new Planning Commissioner Naomi White

Steve Koper, Planning Manager, noted that we have a new Planning Commissioner, Naomi White. She was not present.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Beers asked for approval of the March 21, 2019 TPC minutes. MOTION by Aplin SECONDED by Beers to approve the minutes as written. MOTION PASSED 5-0.

4. COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC (NOT ON THE AGENDA)

None

5. COMMUNICATION FROM CITY STAFF:

Erin Engman, Associate Planner, asked the Planning Commission to consider potential administrative amendments to land use procedures and application criteria from the Tualatin Development Code Chapters 32 and 33. Ms. Engman stated that identified potential code changes may form the basis for the Commission to make

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request.

recommendations on future on plan text amendments to City Council.

Ms. Engman stated that the development code modernization project included outreach efforts to applicants, which revealed that we do not have the best tools to proportionally size the application process to the scope of development projects. Our code lacks common exemptions to land use review and thresholds for application procedures are not clearly defined. Potential amendments to application exemptions and procedure thresholds is a small effort that will likely improve the customer service we deliver.

Ms. Engman presented the current land use review process and exceptions. Ms. Engman noted that a Type I procedure includes modification to previous architectural review approvals, Type II includes alteration to unimproved property, and Type III encompasses large-scale alterations to unimproved properties, which also requires Architectural Review Board (ARB) approval. Mr. Aplin asked for a recent example of a Type III approval. Ms. Engman responded that the Legacy Hospital expansion and the Majestic industrial building were the last two we reviewed. Ms. Engman added that an ARB decision is required for commercial buildings over 50,000 square feet, industrial buildings over 150,000 square feet, and new multifamily housing projects with 100 or more units.

Mr. Koper added that a Type I review does not include discretionary elements, yet sometimes it involves a Type II review due to the high thresholds in the code. Ms. Thompson asked if people are not submitting for projects due to the amount of paperwork involved. Ms. Engman replied that sometimes the work completed goes unpermitted. Mr. Koper added that the fees between Type I and Type II projects are substantial, which is frustrating to the public.

Ms. Engman noted that a Type II procedure is required for small improvements to unimproved property including the removal of more than four trees, any grading activity, minimal paving, and a new shed or storage building. Our code does not have flexible setback standards for accessory structures. Mr. Aplin asked if neighbor approval is required for retaining walls. Ms. Engman replied that it does not, but if a neighbor complains, code enforcement may get involved.

Mr. Beers inquired about the threshold for grading. Ms. Engman replied that Clean Water Services mandate grading. Their standards require review if you are within 200 feet of a wetland; an erosion control permit is required if you disturb more than 500 square feet of land.

Ms. St. Clair asked how the value of a project is determined regarding building permit fees. Ms. Engman responded that it is up to the applicant to determine.

Mr. Aplin stated that he believes most of the improvements discussed should require a simple review. Ms. Thompson inquired about the enforcement of projects completed. Mr. Koper replied that there is not a lot that filters back to us. In general, it is encouraged for neighbors to work things out.

Mr. Stout inquired about the percentage of Type 1 versus 2 and 3 reviews. Mr. Koper replied that the percentage is 5 to 1.

Ms. St. Clair added that since the current code guidelines are frustrating, they should be revisited. Ms. Thompson added that she likes the idea of coming back with options and to explore comparisons with other cities.

It was determined that the direction is for staff to further explore the topic areas and return with draft code language and clarified exemptions.

5. FUTURE ACTION ITEMS

Mr. Koper stated that City Council voted to approve the Basalt Creek plan text and plan map amendments and the majority voted in favor to adopt the ordinance. Since the vote wasn't unanimous, the Council will return on April 22. A vote in favor will formally adopt the ordinance.

Mr. Koper commended Ms. St. Clair on her presentation of the TPC annual report to Council. Mr. Koper added that another part of the administrative amendment process is to increase visibility with the Council. Having a member of the Commission attend furthers the relationship.

Mr. Koper noted that we mailed Kenneth Ball a certificate to honor his service with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Koper stated that in June or July, we will be giving a formal update on the Tualatin 2040 project. Since the joint advisory meeting, we held 16 hour-long stakeholder interviews. A common theme included preference for a civic/performing arts space, a new City hall, and concerns regarding housing. Other topics of discussion were recreation, parks, trails, the downtown area, and the former Haggens' site.

Mr. Koper stated that there is an opportunity for continuing education. The Urbanism Next conference will be held on May 7-9. A session specifically for policy makers will be conducted on May 7. If the Commissioners would like to attend, the City will cover the cost.

Mr. Koper noted that we have a vacancy on the Planning Commission. Our new Commission member, Naomi White, has not been attending and we have been unsuccessful in contacting her. Ms. St. Clair offered to reach out.

8. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Thompson to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 pm.



Lynette Sanford, Office Coordinator