



Community Development
 Planning Division
 501 SW Madison Avenue
 Corvallis, OR 97333

**DRAFT
 CITY OF CORVALLIS
 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
 August 19, 2015**

Present

Jasmin Woodside, Chair
 Ronald Sessions, Vice Chair
 Paul Woods
 Tom Jensen
 Roger Lizut
 Jim Ridlington
 Rob Welsh
 Penny York, Council Liaison

Staff

Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager
 Mark Shepard, City Manager
 Kent Weiss, Interim Community Development
 Director
 Blanca Ruckert, Recorder

Excused Absence

Carl Price
 Tucker Selko

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

	Agenda Item	Recommendations
I.	Visitor Propositions	None
II.	Discussion	
III.	Planning Commission Minutes July 1, 2015	Approved
IV.	Old Business	
V.	New Business	
V.	Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Attachments to the August 19, 2015 minutes:

- A. Email from Carl Price regarding Planning Commission Agenda.
- B. Annual Report of the City of Corvallis Planning Commission.

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

The Corvallis Planning Commission regular meeting was called to order by Chair Woodside at 7:03 p.m. in the Downtown Fire Station Meeting Room, 400 NW Harrison Boulevard.

- I. **VISITOR'S PROPOSITIONS:** None
- II. **DISCUSSION – Consider utilizing regular meeting dates when no land use applications are to be considered for purposes such as: review and discussion of Land Development Code provisions, review of the Unresolved Planning Issues List, discussion of recent public hearing issues and questions, etc.:**

Chair Woodside invited introductions of all present.

Chair Woodside stated the purpose of the meeting was to determine how to utilize regular meeting dates when there were no Land Use applications to be considered. She referred to Commissioner Price's testimony about his ideas along with the agenda items mentioning Land Development Code provisions, review of the Unresolved Planning Issues List, or a discussion of recent public hearings questions. She stated that it could also be opened up to new discussion. **(Attachment A)** The annual report was also distributed by Staff for reference. **(Attachment B)**

Chair Woodside asked for clarification of who receives the Planning Commission's Annual Report. Staff reported it was the Urban Services Committee, which currently includes Councilors Hogg, York, and Baker.

Staff stated the annual report was included to provide a summary of what has been done to date, and what is in the year ahead. The first page states the purpose of the Planning Commission, and the charge of the Commission, to keep in mind as things are discussed this evening.

Chair Woodside stated she liked the idea of using regular meeting dates to review the Land Development Code, and for questions. She invited Commissioners to share their ideas.

Commissioner Woods stated that it would be worthwhile to have a 'post mortem' after a hearing to discuss what happened, review misunderstandings, such as the situation at the last meeting with Habitat for Humanity. Commissioner Woods still is concerned about not addressing the little strip of planned development that appeared to be a hindrance, and the situation has arisen on other occasions and is never addressed.

Commissioner Sessions stated that part of the problem was that it is private property and in order to change that designation as planned development it would have to be changed by the property owners. The Commission has no authority or jurisdiction to take action unless initiated by the owners.

Chair Woodside directed the conversation back to the agenda of 'how to better utilize future meetings' rather than discussing specific situations.

Staff clarified that if an individual Commissioner did not understand a specific about an application, but the Commission as whole did not have the same concern, that Commissioner could follow up with Staff. As a body, the Commission can learn and discuss the LDC to improve knowledge or understanding, discuss Unresolved Planning Issues, or the hearing process.

There was more clarification discussion about a 'post mortem' between Commissioners Lizut and Woods and how that could be handled. Chair Woodside suggested using Old Business to discuss wrap-up questions. Commissioner Woods pointed out that would be after a long meeting and most Commissioners would be anxious to go home.

Staff cautioned that the discussions need to be centered on identifying a larger issue and wanting to understand it better, not re-evaluating a land use decision that was just made. Ultimately, getting the City Attorney's opinion on how to preface this kind of discussion would be necessary. Chair Woodside stated a desire to be freer in language instead of getting mired down in process.

Commissioner Jensen expressed an interest in how the Commission can implement or suggest code changes and whether it's through the Comp Plan. Staff stated the first step is reviewing the Land Development Code which would need to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Jensen suggested studying the Comprehensive Plan chapter by chapter and discussing where there was agreement, disagreement, understanding or confusion, and create knowledge all around. Chair Woodside concurred and reiterated that Commissioner Woods and Price seem to agree as well. Chair Woodside envisioned reviewing the Land Development Code, not necessarily making recommendations or changes with all the changes going on in the City already. Chair Woodside would like to review and capture concerns and add them to the Unresolved Planning Issues List.

Commissioner Welsh stated his preference would be that New Business be a section to introduce items to discuss at a future meeting, to get a notice of what these discussions are to be, and prepare for them. Discussion continued about how this process would develop and where on the agenda it should be placed.

Staff summarized a few ways to handle the discussions, one being having a schedule of discussion items, which could be a training or discussion for understanding of the Land Development Code or Comprehensive Plan. If on the other hand the Commission wanted to identify specific issues to focus on and discuss, that process might be different than what has been suggested so far.

Chair Woodside invited other Commissioners to share their views or add other things to might be discussed.

Commissioner Welsh asked for clarification as to whether calling it training would be off the public record. Staff stated that because the Commission was not making land use decisions there would be no record, other than meeting minutes and recordings.

Chair Woodside asked Councilor York about any opinion on the Commission's work in the past or how to move forward. Councilor York cautioned the Commission on making recommendations on items that were currently under review such as the Comp Plan and Vision/Action Plan. However if the Commission encountered issues during hearings, it would be beneficial to set them aside and re-visit them when the Vision Statement is revised.

Staff explained the process for a Comprehensive Plan amendment; there are two ways that this occurs. One is an application that comes in from the public or secondarily, the City Council can initiate a Comp Plan amendment. If the Commission is reviewing the Comprehensive Plan and has ideas about changes, those could be folded into the Planning Division work discussions, or included on the Unresolved Planning Issues list. This discussion occurs with the two-year Council terms. The Planning Commission is first asked for recommendations on the work program. And the City Council ultimately determines what the priority items will be. If the Commission felt strongly about some item that should be addressed immediately, a recommendation could be made to the City Council to consider initiation of a Comp Plan amendment. The Planning Commission does not have the authority to initiate a Comprehensive Plan amendment process.

Chair Woodside stated that the Commission could decide not to review the Comprehensive Plan now, but could deal primarily with the Land Development code, since that is what's used to deal with the applications. Commissioner Woods noted that part of the Planning Commission's mission is determined by what the Council determines needs to be changed in the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Woods concurs that understanding the LDC and the Comp Plan is good. Commissioner Woods commented that another item that would benefit the City and dovetail with some Council goals is the use of gray water. There's not code in the current LDC to handle that. The Commission could investigate what that means for the City and Code and could perhaps help builders and individuals implement gray water. This would dovetail into the Climate Action Plan to help the City use less water and adapt to less water dependence in the future. There's a good resource in Dave Eckard who has done some research about gray water use in Oregon and all the issues. This would be consistent with Item B, from the Commission's mission statement, noting that, after studying the information the Commission could make recommendations about changes necessary to implement comprehensive policies.

Chair Woodside questioned Staff about how that might work given the City tends to form task forces to handle specific items such as gray water. Staff invited the City Manager to comment since this particular topic would certainly involve Public Works. It's not an area of expertise for planning.

City Manager Shepard agreed it's not a land use issue, it's a Building Code, and potentially Health Department-type issue as it relates to gray water. It may touch land use but primarily it would be addressed under Building Codes.

Chair Woodside asked whether the Commission could at least start the process and make a recommendation to Council, recognizing that Commissioner Woods wants to delve deeper into matters. Commissioner Woods stated that the Commission has become just a hearing body, which is secondary to what is envisioned in State Code as the purpose of this body. He noted that, if there's interest, the Commission could give this item exposure and let the Council there are things that can be done that might fit into the

City's objectives. Commissioner Woods would not want to just drop this issue unless there's someone identified that can take the lead.

City Manager Shepard suggested it might be a good topic to give to The Climate Action Task Force. While their concentration might be on global climate change, water use is a piece of that and they would have to decide how to incorporate this into that. A suggestion to the task force chair or an email to the chair might be a way to address this concern. Chair Woodside asked if there was a formal recommendation the Commission could make to the Task Force that would hold some weight.

City Manager Shepard stated his concern is that the task force seems pretty focused on their agenda, plus there has been an expansion of the number of task forces which utilize a lot of Staff time. The Planning Commission is a state mandated body that needs staff time. It is his thought that the Planning Commission, which is more permanent than the task forces should not be pushing work off on bodies that are not meant to be permanent. Staff is stretched thin as it is.

Councilor York stated that task forces are a way for the Council to prioritize staff work. For this department, Land Use applications are a huge piece, the City is obligated to handle that process, and it is a critical role of the Planning Commission. If the Commission adds to its workload, it will add workload to staff. It isn't an issue of whether or not you have staff at a meeting; the City will have staff present if you have a meeting. It's a workload management issue for the City manager, staff needs to prepare for the meetings and then afterwards they have work to do. It seems more beneficial to concentrate on issues that arise from the work you are doing in the land use application process than an issue that outside the direct work of the Planning Commission. Any member of the Planning Commission is a community member who can go directly to their Councilor or testify in hopes that the City adjusts its priorities. Ultimately it's an issue for the City Manager and the Council to set priorities and resource utilization.

City Manager Shepard concurred that the initiatives of the Planning Commission are those things that are issues in the Code, where it doesn't seem to be working, or impeding development or there's negative impacts that are not considered that can be dealt with as the Code is written. The focus is on how the Land Use Code is operating for the City and whether it's meeting the needs that you see for the City.

Commissioners Woods wondered why ODOT, which is so inter-related with all the traffic and properties bordered with or affected by ODOT jurisdiction, is not involved in the process. He would like some understanding of how Planning Staff and ODOT staff interact; things like here's how ODOT participates, when does ODOT participate, how do they participate and what if anything can the Planning Commission, or the City do over State transportation rules, access rules and those sort of things. There have been significant changes in ODOT rules regarding process that make a big difference in developing property along ODOT frontage rights-of-way.

Chair Woodside suggested adding that question to one of the evening topics, How ODOT gets into the process. She thanked Councilor York for clarifying the role of task forces in prioritizing staff time and understanding that an issue like gray water is one that Council would need to add to the priorities. It would add staff research time and would require Council directive to tackle something like this.

Councilor York added that the next Council may have different goals. In the past they've engaged the community in the goal-setting process. Advice is sought, listened to, and incorporated into the process. Staff remind Council that resources are not unlimited in the goals set.

Chair Woodside asked if there were any other comments from Commissioners. Commissioner XX stated if any of the new commissioners were interested in refresher training? The Land Development Code is complicated, even the process which is quasi-judicial, knowing what is ex-parte contact; perhaps a session where Planning staff and the City Attorney jointly conduct a training.

Chair Woodside stated that past trainings included videos from Portland State University. Maybe a question and answer session would be more helpful. Commissioner XX stated that knowing which Staff members to approach regarding particular subjects would be important, knowing resources that are available to pursue information individually.

Chair Woodside also suggested having a session about how to build a case, like Commissioner Tony Howell was able to do. She noted that he was able to build his case based on code, and that such, training would be helpful.

Staff stated that could be done, and encouraged Commissioners to contact Staff with any questions that come up, before getting to a public hearing.

Chair Woodside also suggested getting some training or discussion on all the various documents and how they interplay with each other. There's the North Area Corvallis Plan, the South Area Corvallis Refinement Plan, the Good Samaritan Campus, and OSU. She wanted to know which are still valid, and what are the current statuses of these plans?

Commissioner XX asked Staff for an overview of two task forces, the BLI and the Housing task Force, whose work overlaps with the Commission and what is on the horizon. Staff stated that Kent Weiss was a better choice to speak on the Housing task force. As for the BLI, they are just starting on the Buildable Land Inventory update. All Oregon jurisdictions need to ensure that they are providing at least a 20-year supply of land within their urban growth boundaries to accommodate future growth. The BLI is a document that planning staff relies on to consider annexation applications. For example, if looking at making a change from general industrial to commercial, what does the BLI say about the anticipated need for more general industrial land and more commercial land? It gives a sense of how much land is left in the urban growth boundary at our current growth rate, for Corvallis to grow into. It identifies needs in terms of more residential land in the City, more commercial land, or more industrial land. It informs the Comprehensive Plan update because the Comp. Plan includes maps, and the designations for property within the urban growth boundary. Some adjustments may be made based on the Buildable Land Inventory; for example, there are hundreds of acres of industrial land that have been sitting in the City for some time and not developed. So one question that might be explored is, does it make sense to continue to hold that land in a general industrial designation or is there a need for some other type of land use? It's the sort of conversation that the Buildable Land Inventory will generate.

Interim Community Development Director Weiss reported that the Housing Development task force is one of the primary task forces charged by the Council to look at aspects of the community that will affect the Vision for affordable housing, and relates to the climate action plan and a sustainable budget. Specifically, the task force is charged with looking at the need for affordable housing for low-income, transitional housing needs or people with no income, and the need for workforce housing. The task force reviews policy options identified by Eco-Northwest in its housing policies study. They will evaluate options and make recommendations to the City Council regarding the things they think will achieve the goal of housing the people who want to live in Corvallis. The City has a history of providing assistance in creating affordable housing units and in rehabilitating housing units. The City's capacity to do those things is diminishing as resources diminish. An additional charge of the task force will be to see if there are means to increase the City's role in the production of affordable housing. To look at needs, to what can be done to facilitate the development of affordable housing, we need to know what land is there. We need to know what land is more developable versus what's more restricted land

In answer to Commissioner Jensen's question about the three groups of housing, Staff replied that instead of looking of them distinctly they are looking at them as a continuum of needs and not as distinct groups in need of housing. Commissioner Jensen asked if they were looking at family groups, like what might be considered family housing compared to a bachelor pad or student housing type of housing. Staff responded that it will be integrated, giving some thought to those distinctions and their specific needs as it relates to the Buildable Land Inventory.

Chair Woodside asked for other topics that needed to be discussed this evening. Commissioner Sessions stated that the bigger picture was to discuss the duties that are outlined for the Planning Commission as outlined in the Planning Commission Mission. This would be a framework of Code issues that arise from applications that have been reviewed. This would assure that either it is discussed at the moment of further review or that collectively, a decision is made to let it drop. Even though it's not clearly established how to proceed through the list, by having it on the list, we as Commissioners can anticipate that we will have an opportunity to discuss an item.

Chair Woodside stated there are two meetings coming up and asked for comments about what training or issues to tackle at the September 2nd meeting.

Staff said that September 2nd is clearly a date where no hearing will happen, on the 16th is still uncertain. Based on the Chair's comments, Staff could be prepared to discuss how a Commissioner builds a case. Also discussion of how all the different planning documents play together could be addressed. Staff suggested bringing the Unresolved Planning Issues List for review and discussion.

Chair Woodside asked about the training the City Manager mentioned for new members. City Manager Shepard responded it would mainly be planning staff and the City Attorney's office. If you bring in people from ODOT it would mix it up a little bit. He asked if that training is something that this Commission would want, would the Planning Commission be open to having the Historic Resource Commission be included as they are going through a similar process? Chair Woodside answered affirmatively.

Chair Woodside spoke about the idea of a post mortem talk as mentioned previously but with concerns about it being an official agenda item where the previous case is discussed and wondered about the best way to approach a discussion, have a question and answer session with less formality. Staff asked whether it could be as simple as, here's an issue from a recent hearing, I'd like that under new business to discuss at the next meeting. Chair Woodside clarified not wanting an official agenda item where a past land use hearing is being reviewed.

Commissioner Sessions stated it could simply be that after a public hearing, under New Business, the Commission could simply note that there was an issue on this application and identify participants to bring in to help understand the situation.

Commissioner Woods stated his frustration in not dealing with the strip of planned development on Technology Drive. He's concerned that if the Planning Commission doesn't deal with it, who will? Chair Woodside suggested framing the issue in such a way to get the information needed from Staff. Staff stated the best way to proceed with an item like this is to follow up with Staff about the history of the issue, concerns/issue and the process for making a change.

Commissioner Sessions stated that the questions about the planned development in question, where properties have been subdivided, changed, or partially developed is a discussion to be had with the City Attorney. He will be able to advise how to proceed and how to interpret it in the Plan and the whole development process.

Commissioner Woods asked what to do proactively to improve the situation where that strip of land exists as it does.

Staff responded that, years ago, the State required the City to remove those planned developments from residential properties because of the needed housing statute. In this particular situation the zoning is not residential, so the PD Overlay did not get removed. In general, planned developments operate like contracts that just run with the land until they're changed. To make them go away, the Planning Commission would need to nullify the PD (as in the GT Building). Commissioner Woods stated the owner of the GT building came forward as the applicant. Staff stated a potential process would be for this to occur administratively. There was some discussion about who brings the action forward, to which Staff stated the issue would need to be discussed with the City Attorney. Commissioner Woods stated that making the process easier was his goal.

Commissioner Jensen was concerned about creating more work, so going out and looking for situations where PDs are at issue will be making work for people and it's not really an issue until there's an application. In regards to the Habitat Store, they stated they would do something with that strip if they could have. In the Marriott Hearing, Commissioner Price asked the applicant if they were okay with the conditions. It led to more interaction, more personal and less formal interaction, but with ex-parte rules to deal with that probably would not be reasonable. Habitat could have contacted the owner and explained their situation.

Chair Woodside focused the group on wrapping up the agenda for September 2nd. On the meeting of September 2nd there could be training, reviewing the Land Development Code and if on September 16th there are no hearings, a question and answer session could occur.

Commissioner Woods stated that if the training couldn't be arranged, then at least the Commission could be prepared to talk about the LDC.

Commissioner Jensen suggested at minimum, review the Comp Plan and after the training be prepared to decide what to proceed on and which part each was to review. Chair Woodside asked for clarification about concentrating on Land Development Code versus Comp Plan. Commissioner Jensen agreed. Staff mentioned that all definitions are in Chapter 1.6 of the LDC. Chair Woodside agreed that the Land Development Code is what is applied to each application and the Commission should study the Code.

Interim Director Weiss commented on the difficulty of understanding complex land use regulations. His suggestion is to start by getting a better understanding of what are zone changes, what are Comp Plan amendments, what are lot development options, what our Plan Compatibility reviews, what happens in the Willamette River Greenway, what happens when all these things are applied in a land use decision. This might help the Commission put things in better context. Chair Woodside agreed, Commissioner XX asked if this approach was any different from just reviewing the LDC section by section as these processes would arise in conversation. Chair Woodside stated the process for an application is covered, but it would be worthwhile to understand how these applications come to be and how they interact. Commissioner XX stated that Article 2 deals with Public Hearings, Comprehensive Plan amendments, zone changes, conditional developments and so it seems that these items would be covered as the LDC is reviewed.

Staff stated the benefit is that Staff could provide an overview of all the different Land Use application types in one meeting. It would be generic in terms of the types of Land Use applications that are contemplated in code, who considers them.

Chair Woodside believes this information would be helpful and asked Commissioner Woods or others their thoughts on tackling this, reading Chapter One. Commissioner Woods commented Chapter One is mostly reference material, the Commissioners could just familiarize themselves with it and then dive into Chapter 2, Article 2. Chair Woodside reiterated then task one was to read Chapter One. Staff mentioned that the Land Development Code is divided into four sections; Article 1, 2, 3 and 4. In talking about Article 1 the Commission is looking at Chapters 1.1 through 1.6. There was discussion to insure all Commissioners had the latest version of the Code which would be the 12/11/2014 version which is available on the website

III. PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES:

July 1, 2015

MOTION: Commissioner Welsh moved to approve the July 1 minutes. Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

IV. OLD BUSINESS:

There was no Old Business to discuss.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

Staff reported the Campus Crest Remand was considered by the City Council on Monday night (August 17th). The City Council adopted the findings and affirmed the initial Council decision to approve the application. There will be a 21-day appeal period to the State Land Use Board of Appeals. He noted that the remand decision itself can be appealed.

VI. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Young, Kevin

From: Jasmin [jasminwoodside@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2015 10:18 AM
To: Young, Kevin
Cc: Carl W Price
Subject: Fwd: Planning Commission Agenda

Hi Kevin. Can you forward Carl's email below to commissioners and include it in our packet for Wednesday's meeting? Thank you.

Jasmin
sent from my phone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Carl W Price <carl.price@carlwprice.com>
Date: August 13, 2015 at 9:11:19 PM PDT
To: jasminwoodside@yahoo.com
Subject: Planning Commission Agenda

Jasmin,

I will be out of town for this meeting (first vacation in a few years we planned back in January). Anyway, I wanted to give you a few thoughts for the meeting.

When I was interviewing with the Council for this position, it was explained that the role of the planning commission was mainly legislative, but that it also holds hearings. I see the staff in the past as driving the Planning Commission in the opposite direction, one of mainly hearings, with very few opportunities to perform the main task of legislative review of issues, and when there is opportunity, the meetings have been cancelled. I feel this is a serious issue for the community at large, since we as a body have a unique position to see what issues we have with our code, and have been tasked with looking at this, and making recommendations to Council around changes needed to make things in Corvallis better.

I would suggest we can do this in a few different ways.

First, we could take the land code, and go through it chapter by chapter, whenever there is an opportunity, and make recommendations to Council when we finish a chapter. This is attractive, because we can focus in on one area at a time, and allows the public an opportunity to do the same. It also has the benefit of not being a time critical discussion, so can be done between any hearings we need to do. This also sets a great example for future iterations of the Commission, being an ongoing, never ending task. With the size of the LDC, I would expect it to take probably 2 terms between hearings to get through it all, at which time, the first section would have aged enough it would be time to revisit it. I really think the community has trouble digesting and understanding our 1300+ page LDC now.

Second, we could use these meetings as a place a Commissioner could raise issues that they have been seeing in hearings, but in a legislative setting. This would have agendas set based on issues we see during hearings, that we believe should be addressed when addressing them as in a quasi-judicial setting is not appropriate.

Finally, we could address things on the list that Staff keeps as needing addressed. I think it is better to address issues throughout the year, instead of as a large bundle at the end. This would have the benefit of allowing us to fully understand the issue, hear from the community, and not get lost in many, many issues presented all at once.

And of course, we could combine the three, schedule things that Commissioners see as issues as a priority, then the Staff issue list, and finally, the LDC review.

Sorry I have to miss this meeting, I believe it is an important discussion to have.

--Carl

Subject:Planning Commission Agenda

Date:Thu, 13 Aug 2015 22:17:17 +0000

From:Young, Kevin <Kevin.Young@corvallisoregon.gov>

To:'Carl Price' <carl.price@carlwprice.com>, 'G. Tucker Selko ' <tucker.selko@gmail.com>, 'Jasmin Woodside' <jasminwoodside@yahoo.com>, 'Jim Ridlington' <jim.ridlington@comcast.net>, 'Paul Woods (paul_woods@ieee.org)' <paul_woods@ieee.org>, 'Penny York' <york.penny58@gmail.com> Ward 1 <ward1@council.corvallisoregon.gov>, 'Rob Welsh (welshr09@gmail.com)' <welshr09@gmail.com>, 'Roger Lizut' <wwrw145@gmail.com>, 'Ronald Sessions' <sessarch@gmail.com>, 'Tom Jensen' <tomjensen37@hotmail.com>

CC:Crowell, Sharon <Sharon.Crowell@corvallisoregon.gov>

Greetings Planning Commissioners,

We will be meeting on August 19th. Since we're getting the agenda and minutes out a little late this week, I thought I'd give you a heads up. Here's the agenda:

We hope to get the agenda and July 1st minutes to you in the mail tomorrow, but they may not get to you until after the weekend.

Hope this helps,

Kevin Young
Planning Division Manager
City of Corvallis
(541) 766-6572
kevin.young@corvallisoregon.gov

<PC 08.19.15.pdf>

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CITY OF CORVALLIS PLANNING COMMISSION

August 12, 2015

Members: Jasmin Woodside-Chair, Ron Sessions-Vice-chair, Paul Woods, Jim Riddlington, Roger Lizut, Tom Jenson, G. Tucker Selko, Rob Welsh, Carl Price

Staff:
Kevin Young

Council Liaison:
Penny York

Purpose/Mission summary (from Ordinance 81-99):

The Planning Commission shall function primarily as a comprehensive planning body proposing policy and legislation to Council related to the coordination of the growth and development of the community. The functions of the Planning Commission shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a) Review the Comprehensive Plan and make recommendations to Council concerning Plan amendments which it has determined are necessary based on further study or changed concepts, circumstances, or conditions.
- b) Formulate and recommend legislation to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
- c) Review and recommend detailed plans including functional plans which relate to public facilities and services, and subarea plans which relate to specific areas of the community to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
- d) Assist in the formulation of the Capital Investment Plan \[Capital Improvement Program] and submit periodic reports and recommendations relating to the integration and conformance of the plan with the Comprehensive Plan.
- e) Review and make recommendations concerning any proposed annexation.

f) Conduct hearings, prepare findings of fact, and take such actions concerning specific land development proposals as required by the Land Development Code.

g) Advance cooperative and harmonious relationships with other planning commissions, public and semi-public agencies and officials, and civic and private organizations to encourage the coordination of public and private planning and development activities affection the City and its environs.

Prior Year Report: FY 2014/2015

Activities and work completed:

The Planning Commission (PC) reviewed multiple land development proposals throughout the year. Some of the projects that were considered over eight public hearings were Coronado, Tract B; Sylvia Subdivision; Parks and Recreation Master Plan; and Package #2 Land Development Code Amendments.

The PC also attended a joint work session with City Council in January 2015. The PC was involved in recommendations to City Council that helped form the OSU Plan Review Task Force that is reviewing Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies relating to OSU development.

The Land Development Hearings Board, which is a subcommittee of the Planning Commission, charged with hearing certain types of land use applications, met four times and conducted three public hearings.

In early 2015, three new members were interviewed and appointed by City Council to the Planning Commission. There have been two training sessions with the new commissioners, while portions of at least six meetings were dedicated to training with existing commissioners.

Activities and work in progress:

The PC is involved in the ongoing review of land development proposals that are brought forward through applications received by City staff.

Begin discussions with the PC on how best to review and become more familiar with the Land Development Code (LDC).

The OSU Plan Review Task Forces consists of four Planning Commission (one former as of this report) and three City Councilors. It is hoped that the

group will finalize their recommendations in September and will be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

The PC has heard presentations on the progress of the OSU District Plan Update and the City's Transportation System Plan Update. The PC is also aware of efforts to update to the City's 20/20 Vision Statement, the Buildable Lands Inventory and Wildfire Abatement issue. It is anticipated that these will be reviewed and recommendations given by the PC prior to consideration by the City Council.

Next Year Proposed Work Plan: FY 2015/2016

Regular activities and work (ongoing or annual):

The PC is involved in the ongoing review of land development proposals that are brought forward through applications received by City staff.

The PC will perform an annual review of the Capital Improvement Program.

Special activities and work for the year:

Some of the main goals for the PC is to apply the LDC to applications and provide recommendations for legislative updates to staff and City Council. The PC priority will be to become more familiar with the current LDC. One way to accomplish this is to have PC members review sections of the LDC and have questions for staff when there are no public hearings on the agenda. This will be the subject of an upcoming PC meeting on August 18, 2015. More information will be forthcoming on the PC's goals in this regard.

The PC will also maintain a list of Unresolved Planning Issues. This list is currently being reviewed on an annual basis. Our goal will be to update and review on a more frequent basis but also as the schedule allows. The annual review of this list was deferred at the March 18, 2015 PC meeting.

The PC will be prepared to give valuable input and recommendations based on our knowledge of the LDC and Comprehensive Plan for the many special projects that will be up and coming, as listed below:

- OSU Plan Review Task Force recommendations, which may initiate a Comprehensive Plan Amendments and/or LDC amendments.
- OSU District Plan Update which may initiate LDC amendments.
- Transportation System Plan Update
- Buildable Lands Inventory Update

- Wildfire Abatement/Significant Vegetation issue, which may initiate LDC amendments.

Resources:

Prior Year:

Training videos from Portland State University.

Staff availability for question and answers.

Needed for the next year:

Regular training set up for when there are no public hearings on the schedule. This training should be discussed with the PC and staff and have a list waiting so setting the agenda for a non hearing night should be easy. Training shall include Q&A sessions with staff, open discussions between staff and PC on how previous applications have been handled and what was seen as successes and failures, training videos from the Portland State University, etc.