

**PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

January 21, 2020

1
2
3
4
5
6 **1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Stein called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. at the City Hall
7 Council Chambers, 980 Applegate Street, Philomath, Oregon.

8
9 **1. ROLL CALL:**

10 **Present:** Commissioners Joseph Sullivan, Gary Conner, Steve Boggs, Giana
11 Bernardini, Peggy Yoder, David Stein.

12 **Absent:** Jeannie Gay

13
14 **Staff:** City Manager Chris Workman, Deputy City Attorney David Coulombe (7:30 p.m.)
15 Deputy City Attorney Carrie Greenshields, City Planner Pat Depa and Building Permit
16 Clerk Ashley Howell.

17
18 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

19 **2.1 Minutes of December 16, 2019** – Commissioner Yoder referenced line item 203, “Mr.
20 Coulombe stated that the Commission’s review authority does not extend to whether an
21 administrative decision-maker exceeded authority.” She asked for clarification as to Mr.
22 Coulombe’s statement pertaining to agenda item 5.2 (B) Major/Minor Modifications. There was
23 additional discussion about Mr. Coulombe’s comment.

24
25 **MOTION:** Commissioner Boggs moved, Commissioner Yoder second, to approve the
26 December 16, 2019 minutes as presented. Motion APPROVED 6-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner,
27 Boggs, Bernardini, Yoder, Stein; No: None).

28
29 **4. NEW BUSINESS**

30 **4.1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair-** Chair Stein stated that he would like to remain the
31 Chair. He discussed ongoing goals that he would like the opportunity to continue to work on as
32 Chair. This includes improving communication with City Council and to increase the Planning
33 Commission involvement with City Planning. Commissioner Sullivan thanked Chair Stein for
34 being the Chair for the past year. He asked the Commission for their consideration as he would
35 also like to petition for Chair of the Planning Commission. He discussed that he would like to
36 make sure all Commissioners have a voice and would like to continue to guide the vision for
37 Philomath. Commissioner Yoder asked if Commissioner Sullivan felt as if he could accomplish
38 what he wanted to for the Commission as a Co-Chair. Commissioner Sullivan explained that
39 with a small membered Commission this would be difficult to do.

40
41 Commissioners were given ballots to vote on one member as Planning Commission Chair.
42 Building Permit Clerk Ashley Howell collected the ballots and tallied the votes. The Planning
43 Commission Chair vote resulted in a tie. Three votes for David Stein and three votes for Joseph
44 Sullivan.

45
46 There was discussion to table the vote until the next meeting scheduled for February 18, 2020
47 due to the absence of one commissioner. There was additional discussion about tabling the
48 decision until the next meeting, and Chair Stein noted he is scheduled to be out of town.

49
50 **MOTION:** Commissioner Conner moved, Commissioner Boggs second, that the vote be tabled
51 until the February meeting. Motion APPROVED 6-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Bernardini,
52 Yoder, Stein; No: None).

53 Chair Stein invited City Council member Ruth Causey to sit at the bench. Ms. Causey
54 introduced herself and explained that she is present as a liaison for City Council. She stated
55 that City Council would like to know whether the Commission would like to have a consistent
56 liaison or revolving members.

57
58 **5. OLD BUSINESS**

59 **5.1 Urban Fringe Agreement-** Chair Stein asked Mr. Depa about the memo in the meeting
60 packet and how it is different from the memo in the prior meeting. Mr. Depa explained that he
61 simply added new wording. Commissioner Yoder explained that it would be nice to have
62 revised stated on the memo, which would indicate a wording change.

63
64 Mr. Depa gave a brief explanation of the Urban Fringe Agreement. He discussed zoning
65 districts that worked as a holding place. He stated that he added in mention of building permits.
66 He explained that the Urban Fringe Agreement pertains to delayed annexations within the
67 Urban Growth Boundary.

68
69 Commissioner Boggs asked if there are any delayed annexations pending with the City. Mr.
70 Workman confirmed that currently there are two delayed annexations. There was discussion
71 about "PR-1" and that on older maps used by the City and Benton County, "P" referenced
72 Philomath.

73
74 Commissioner Sullivan asked what group of people that this affects. He questioned any factual
75 or standardized differences that people would have to go through if they were to apply for
76 annexation. Mr. Depa explained that the Urban Fringe Agreement only governs delayed
77 annexations under contract with the City and everything else in the Urban Growth Boundary is
78 governed by Benton County. Commissioner Sullivan asked if there were any property owners
79 within the Urban Growth Boundary that had an agreement with the City prior to the
80 implementation of the Urban Fringe Agreement. He asked if those property owners then have
81 to follow current amendments to the Urban Fringe Agreements made after they entered
82 contracts for a delayed annexation.

83
84 Mr. Depa explained that there is no grandfathering of the agreement and property owners in
85 delayed annexation contracts will be expected to comply with the current Urban Fringe
86 Agreement at the time of their development.

87
88 Commissioner Sullivan asked if it would be appropriate to ask the two delayed annexations if
89 they are okay with the changes being made to the Urban Fringe Agreement. Mr. Depa
90 explained that he did not believe it was necessary to contact the property owners due to the lack
91 of substantial changes being made.

92
93 Commissioner Sullivan stated that he would not be able to vote on the updates to the Urban
94 Fringe Agreement if the property owners that this is affecting are not contacted and notified of
95 the changes. Commissioner Conner stated that his interpretation of the discussion regarding
96 the Urban Fringe Agreement is that there are not any changes being made to the agreement,
97 only specific line items being further clarified.

98
99 Commissioner Sullivan again stated that he would feel much more comfortable with this
100 agreement if those property owners were notified. Mr. Depa stated that property owners of
101 delayed annexations are making an agreement at the time to follow whatever the current
102 agreement might be.

103

104 Commissioner Boggs asked about the 12 delayed annexation agreements brought in a few
105 years ago. There was discussion about those delayed annexations. There was discussion
106 about the leniency of the County versus the City. Mr. Depa explained that the County is much
107 more strict than the City. He explained that delayed annexation is an agreement between the
108 City and the land owner and is initiated by the land owner.

109
110 Mr. Workman explained that if the property owner would like to do any developments to their
111 property, the Urban Fringe Agreement clarifies whether the property owner goes to the City or
112 Benton County. Mr. Workman discussed various reasons for delayed annexations. He
113 explained that this agreement clarifies to the property owner that any development to their
114 property would need to be approved by the City. There was discussion about whether or not
115 the clarification to certain line items of the Urban Fringe Agreement needed to be decided on
116 tonight. Mr. Depa explained that there is no reason for delaying the decision.

117
118 Chair Stein explained that the changes to the Urban Fringe Agreement only clarify the existing
119 line items.

120
121 Commissioner Sullivan explained that he would like the Commission to be overabundant
122 communicators and share this with the two existing property owners currently in delayed
123 annexation agreements with the City.

124
125 Commissioner Conner explained that this is an intergovernmental agreement and that he finds it
126 problematic to start a precedent such as contacting property owners when situations such as
127 the current, arise. Mr. Workman explained that one of the only possibilities for a delayed
128 annexation would be an island situation. There was discussion regarding possible properties
129 that may create an island situation.

130
131 There was discussion about the possibility of future delayed annexations that the City would
132 consider.

133
134 **MOTION:** Commissioner Yoder moved, Commissioner Conner second to approve the Urban
135 Fringe Agreement. Mr. Workman explained that he would be happy to contact the two property
136 owners currently in delayed annexation agreements and update them on the changes to the
137 Urban Fringe Agreement. APPROVED: 6-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Bernardini, Yoder,
138 Stein; No: None).

139
140 **5.2 Development Code Discussion**

141 **A) Major/Minor modifications: PMC 18.130** – Commissioner Yoder discussed her concern
142 about the major/minor modifications code language. She discussed a letter she wrote to the
143 City regarding the Boulevard Apartments and the conditions of approval. She also discussed
144 the Mill Pond Crossing development. She asked if there should be a discussion to further clarify
145 a major and minor modification. She also asked what the role of the City Manager is when it
146 comes to decision making regarding major and minor modifications. There was discussion
147 about the reinstatement of the Park Advisory Board. Mr. Workman clarified that the Park
148 Advisory Board was re-established by City Council in 2014. Commissioner Yoder explained
149 that she believed the reinstatement of the board was driven by the City Manager and not the
150 City Council, and that it should not have been so heavily influenced by the City Manager. Mr.
151 Workman explained that because there was a new Park Master Plan in place he suggested to
152 reinstate the Board in 2014. There was discussion about the creation of the Tech Advisory
153 Committee. Commissioner Yoder asked about the role of the Planning Commission in
154 relationship to the Parks Advisory Board.

155

156 Chair Stein asked the Commission if they would like to have a work-session to discuss major
157 and minor modifications. The Commission agreed by consensus to have a work session
158 discussing major and minor modifications. Mr. Workman explained that the Commission could
159 hold a short meeting for the vote of Chair and Vice Chair and then transition to a work session.
160

161 **B) Recreational Vehicle Park code considerations: PMC 18.50.010, 9.15.025 & 18.45-**

162 Ms. Causey explained that she listed to the Planning Commission audio regarding whether or
163 not the new campground is an RV park. She explained that the last portion of her memo was
164 an indirect response to the comments in the public hearing that Philomath would become an RV
165 town. She explained that she drafted the language to limit the number of RV spots to 175, thus
166 limiting the number of RV parks within the City. She explained that she sent the drafted
167 language to City Attorney Jim Brewer for review. She explained that this would prevent Mr.
168 Lepman from making more spaces for the RV park if in fact his boat storage units are not as
169 utilized as planned. Mr. Workman explained that if Mr. Lepman were to make more RV spaces
170 rather than boat storage, it would be classified as a change of use which is a Major Modification,
171 require an application and would go before the Planning Commission. There was discussion
172 about the potential for the Lepman project to have a monopoly on RV spaces.
173

174 Chair Stein explained that this discussion is a question of how many spaces the Commission
175 agrees on for the City of Philomath as a whole, not just the Lepman RV park.
176

177 Mr. Workman explained that he would like to make sure that the Commission is speaking
178 legislatively and not just about one project. He explained that he would recommend staying
179 away from putting in a hard number when it comes to writing code. He explained that he would
180 recommend replacing a hard number with a ratio as this would better accommodate City growth.
181 He stated the Commission could more strongly defend the code if there was such language as,
182 per capita, or a ratio to housing. There was discussion about capping the amount of RV spots
183 at a lower amount than what the City has already approved.
184

185 Ms. Greenshields explained that Mr. Workman's suggestion of a ratio or percentage as opposed
186 to a hard number is the best way to proceed. Ms. Causey suggested adding both a percentage,
187 as well as a number of spaces to the code language. Commissioner Sullivan suggested looking
188 into various comparable cities as to their percentage of allowed RV spaces.

189 Ms. Causey explained that she would research comparable cities and bring additional
190 information to the next work session.
191

192 There was discussion about distinguishing the difference in allowed property uses, heavy
193 industrial versus light industrial or conditional use. Mr. Depa explained that most of Philomath's
194 heavy industrial land is already developed.
195

196 Mr. Coulombe arrived (7:30 p.m.).
197

198 Catherine Biscoe- Philomath, OR – Ms. Biscoe explained that she was one of the parties that
199 filed the LUBA appeal on 11 arguments for the Beelart development. She discussed that the
200 Supreme Court denied to hear the appeal due to receiving the appeal late. She explained that
201 the F Street District property owners will be active when the subdivision application is heard to
202 speak about the impact on their quality of life.
203

204 Ms. Greenshields explained that the vote to appoint the Chair or Vice Chair must be done on
205 the first meeting of the year. Mr. Coulombe and Ms. Greenshields recommended that the
206 Commission hold another vote for Chair. Mr. Coulombe explained that a Planning Commission
207 member who is not present can be contacted telephonically. Chair Stein suggested that the
208 Commission vote again.
209

210 Commissioners were given ballots to vote on one member as Planning Commission Chair.
211 Building Permit Clerk Ashley Howell collected the ballots and tallied the votes. The Planning
212 Commission Chair vote resulted once again in a tie, three votes for David Stein and three votes
213 for Joseph Sullivan. Chair Stein explained that he would step down from his position as Chair so
214 that appointment of Chair could go to Commissioner Joseph Sullivan. There was discussion of
215 Commissioner Stein resuming as Vice Chair.

216
217 Chair Stein called for a vote to appoint Commissioner Sullivan as Planning Commission Chair.
218 All Commissioners voted in favor 6-0.

219
220 Chair Stein called for a vote to appoint himself as Vice Chair. All Commissioners voted in favor
221 6-0.

222
223 Ms. Greenshields and Mr. Coulombe passed out a training booklet to the Planning Commission.
224 Mr. Coulombe discussed ex-parte communication, citing comments made by a member of the
225 public just prior to his speaking that discussed details about a forthcoming application. He
226 further explained that decisions could only be made with information that comes to the Planning
227 Commission in a public forum as part of the record. He explained that the information Planning
228 Commission members obtain outside of the public hearing must be noted at the public hearing
229 so as to become part of the public record. He recommended minutes from this meeting be
230 printed out and included in the record should an application be submitted for the subdivision
231 discussed. He also explained that information obtained by public record pertaining to a
232 particular hearing still needs to be declared.

233
234 Mr. Coulombe went through the training packet presented by him and Ms. Greenshields. He
235 explained that this packet focuses on potential and actual conflicts of interest and the
236 differences. He discussed the extensive definition of the word "family" pertaining to conflicts of
237 interest. He explained how to declare a potential conflict of interest. He explained that in the
238 case of an actual conflict of interest, it is best if the Planning Commissioner leave the room as to
239 not influence the Commission with non-verbal cues. Mr. Coulombe recommended adding a
240 Land Conservation and Development Commission training module as well as other desired
241 trainings on the City's website for the Commissioners to review. He recommended they watch
242 the training and then schedule a Q and A to discuss the trainings.

243
244 **6. ADJOURNMENT:**

245 There being no further business, Chair Stein adjourned the meeting at 8:12 p.m.

246
247 SIGNED:

ATTEST:

248
249

250 _____
Joseph Sullivan, 2020 Chair

Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
February 18, 2020

1. **ROLL CALL:**

Chair Sullivan convened the work session at 6:45 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 980 Applegate Street, Philomath, Oregon.

Present: Commissioners Giana Bernardini, Gary Conner, Steve Boggs, Jeannie Gay, Peggy Yoder, Joseph Sullivan.

Absent: David Stein

Staff: City Manager Chris Workman, Deputy City Attorney David Coulombe, Deputy City Attorney Carrie Greenshields, City Planner Pat Depa and Building Permit Clerk Ashley Howell.

Guests: Mayor Eric Neiman, City Councilor Ruth Causey.

2. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

2.1 Development Code Discussion

Major/Minor modifications: PMC 18.130 – Commissioner Yoder explained that some of the minor modifications she has reviewed seem major. She is asking for clarification as to the process after the Planning Commission approves modifications, is it then out of the Planning Commission's hands as to making sure that the conditions put upon the modification are carried out.

There was discussion about the modifications approved by the Planning Commission for The Boulevard Apartments and Mill Pond Crossing.

Mr. Workman explained that there is a list of major modifications and everything that is not on that list is considered minor. Mr. Workman explained the minor modification notification and appeal process. He explained that a minor modification would only be brought before the Planning Commission if there was an appeal.

Commissioner Yoder mentioned the letter from Commissioner Boggs and herself in the current meeting packet concerning the change to the phasing of Mill Pond Development and how traffic would be affected on South 15th St. She explained that this change seems major to her and would like to know how she can go about changing things to make sure this is considered major in the code.

Commissioner Sullivan mentioned that this could perhaps be solved with more mutual understanding and cooperation between staff and local government.

Mr. Workman explained the minor modifications made to Phase Four and Five of the Mill Pond Crossing Development. He mentioned that during the appeal period for the modification nothing was submitted for appeal. He feels as though staff handled it appropriately and interpreted the code as it was intended.

Mr. Coulombe explained that as a reviewing body, it would not be proper for the Planning Commission to give direction to the Planning Official on a matter that could come back to the Commission as an appeal.

54 Chair Sullivan asked Mr. Coulombe what the proper way would be for the Planning Commission
55 to address any minor modifications that were approved that essentially differed from a very
56 important part of the Planning Commission's original approval.

57
58 Mr. Coulombe explained that it is out of the scope of the Planning Commission unless the
59 modification is brought back under the appeal process. He explained that conditions should be
60 clear and objective for staff to implement.

61
62 Chair Sullivan asked if it is appropriate for a Planning Commission member to comment on a
63 proposed modification.

64
65 Mr. Coulombe explained that Planning Commissioner's can make an appeal simply as a
66 member of the public. He explained that the body of the Planning Commission should not be
67 weighing in on an application that could come back to them in an appeal process.

68
69 Mr. Workman explained that the Planning Commission receives Planning notices because they
70 requested to be listed as Interested Parties.

71
72 There was further discussion about the major modification criteria language.

73
74 **6. ADJOURNMENT:**

75 There being no further discussion, Chair Sullivan adjourned the work session at 7:19 p.m.

76
77 Notes prepared by Ashley Howell, Building Permits Clerk

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

**PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

February 18, 2020

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. at the City Hall Council Chambers, 980 Applegate Street, Philomath, Oregon.

1.1 Roll Call:

Present: Commissioners Giana Bernardini, Gary Conner, Steve Boggs, Jeannie Gay, Peggy Yoder, Joseph Sullivan.

Absent: David Stein

Staff: City Manager Chris Workman, Deputy City Attorney David Coulombe, Deputy City Attorney Carrie Greenshields, City Planner Pat Depa and Building Permit Clerk Ashley Howell.

Guests: Mayor Eric Neiman, City Councilor Ruth Causey.

Chair Sullivan started the meeting with a warm up activity. Commissioners shared good news.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 Minutes of January 21, 2020 – Commissioner Yoder asked to amend Line 62 to read: Commissioner Yoder explained that it would be nice to have revised stated on the memo, which would indicate a wording change.

MOTION: Commissioner Boggs moved, Commissioner Conner second, to approve the January 21, 2020 minutes as amended. Motion APPROVED 6-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Bernardini, Yoder, Gay; No: None).

3. **REPORTS**

3.1 Reports 2040 Advisory Committee (Stein, Yoder) – Nothing to report. Committee has not met.

Ruth Causey joined the meeting and spoke about modifying the municipal code to limit further growth of RV Parks in the City. She discussed a packet that she brought forth to the Commissioners. The packet referenced data of various towns in Oregon with ratios of RV spaces versus population. She explained that she will present additional information of municipal codes of outliers at the next meeting. She plans to make some suggestions as to creating defensible language to add to the municipal code to control the amount of RV spaces in the City. Commissioner Bernardini will take point on this topic at the next meeting.

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

4.1 Commish Commingle – Commissioner Bernardini explained that being new to the Planning Commission she would like to get to know the Commissioners better since they will be working with each other. She explained that she knows there are some legal boundaries that need to be maintained at a gathering such as this. There was discussion that a gathering such as this would be required to be open to the public. Mr. Coulombe notified the Commissioners that there are very specific requirements to holding a public meeting. Commissioner Bernardini agreed to look into various options for the Commish Commingle.

51 **4.2 Philomath Vision** – Chair Sullivan asked the Commission if they wanted to meet
52 with Sadie from the Department of Land Conservation and Development. Commissioner Yoder
53 explained that the Commission had already worked with Laura Beuhl from DLCD and
54 questioned why the Commission would want to work with a different DLCD staff member.
55

56 Chair Sullivan noted his meeting with Patrick Wingard from DLCD and their discussion around
57 Committee for Community Involvement (CCI). He referenced goals outlined by the State of
58 Oregon, specifically public involvement. He explained that in some circumstances, the Planning
59 Commission can act as the Committee for Community Involvement. He discussed how Sadie
60 would be the person to speak with regarding the CCI, specifically Goal 1.
61

62 Commissioner Gay asked Mayor Neiman how he feels about the visioning that Chair Sullivan is
63 pursuing. Mayor Neiman explained that he has already expressed some concerns around the
64 matter. He explained that efforts have been made to update the Comprehensive and Strategic
65 Plans and would like to know how this visioning would be different or add value to either of
66 those documents.
67

68 There was discussion about the goals of the City Council leading that of the Planning
69 Commission.
70

71 Mayor Neiman passed out Imagine Corvallis 2040 booklets to the Planning Commission. He
72 explained that he does not want to duplicate or have too many visioning efforts going on.
73

74 There was discussion about Chair Sullivan’s intentions with the Philomath Vision efforts he
75 presented.
76

77 Mayor Neiman explained again that he would like to know how it does not duplicate efforts that
78 are already underway regarding the Comprehensive and Strategic Plans. He explained that the
79 School District has also launched a survey concerning school facility updates.
80

81 There was discussion on upcoming opportunities to collect public input.
82

83 Commissioner Gay stated that she believes the Comprehensive Plan is in fact the vision that
84 the Planning Commission should be following.
85

86 **5. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES**

87 **5.1** There were no staff updates. Mayor Neiman highlighted some of the talking
88 points from his upcoming State of the City Address. He spoke about the rise in enrollment at
89 Oregon State University since 1999 and how that may be affecting the uptick in housing
90 developments in the City. He explained that in speaking with apartment managers from Oak
91 Springs and The Boulevard, many units are occupied by students. His State of the City Address
92 will be February 20, 2020 at noon at Peace Lutheran Church. Mr. Workman mentioned there
93 will be a \$10 lunch available for purchase.
94

95 **5.2** Chair Sullivan made note of the next meetings.
96

97 **6. ADJOURNMENT** - Chair Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.
98

99 SIGNED:
100 Joseph Sullivan, Chair

ATTEST:
Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE KICKOFF MEETING
JOINT MEETING:
CITY COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMISSION
PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
7:00 P.M.**

Meeting called to order by Mayor Eric Niemann (via teleconference) at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 980 Applegate Street, Philomath.

A. ROLL CALL

Present:

City Council:

Mayor Eric Niemann
Councilor Ruth Causey
Doug Edmonds
Chas Jones
Matt Lehman
David Low

Planning Commission:

Chair Joseph Sullivan
Commissioner Steve Boggs
Commissioner Gary Conner
Commissioner Jeannine Gay
Commissioner Peggy Yoder

Project Advisory Committee:

Helen Bennett
Craig Hendricks
Bethany Langwell
Alyssa Lewis
Bill Mayer
Troy Muir

Staff and Guests:

City Manager Chris Workman
City Recorder Ruth Post
Planner Patrick Depa
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development Patrick Wingard
ECONorthwest Senior Policy Advisor & Project Director Beth Goodman

B. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mayor Niemann provided a brief history of comprehensive planning in Oregon and changes to the Philomath economy and population since comprehensive planning began in the 1980s. He noted the inclusion of resources from Oregon DLCDC and the City's consultant ECONorthwest. Everyone introduced themselves.

C. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

1. **Project Purpose** – Ms. Goodman provided a project overview and the impact the assembled representatives would have on it. Mr. Workman stated tonight's presentation would be provided on the City's Comprehensive Plan Project web page and a link would be provided to all of the participants.

Ms. Goodman reviewed the process to be completed in updating the Economic Opportunities Analysis and Buildable Land Inventory, the Housing Needs Analysis and Buildable Lands Inventory, and Main Street Planning. She provided more descriptions of the types of questions to be addressed in completion of the different analyses and the requirements for meeting statewide planning goals. She noted the use of the analyses to develop updated policies for the community.

Ms. Goodman described the types of community history to be analyzed and used to describe the present and provide guidance for the future. She spoke to identifying the differences between Philomath and other communities and addressing the unique qualities that are important to the community.

Ms. Goodman described the differences between forecasting population and economic growth for a large city compared to a small city like Philomath. She described the

challenges of attracting commercial business such as a grocery store and the difference between that and attracting industrial growth. She also provided more description of the Main Street Planning component of the project.

2. Scope and Schedule – Ms. Goodman provided an overview of the project timeline for the next 15 months. There was discussion about the meetings schedule and public hearings in March 2021, including provision for public input prior to the public hearings. Ms. Goodman described the types of open house or public workshops that can be held. She described the expected project deliverables.

3. Roles of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC), Planning Commission, City Council and General Public – Ms. Goodman provided an overview of the roles each of the groups would have. Commissioner Sullivan questioned how the Planning Commission would be involved to ensure that the documents that are presented to them are agreeable to them. Ms. Goodman described the use of interim check-ins with the Planning Commission. Mayor Niemann agreed with the interim check points. Ms. Goodman clarified the process of drafting policies over the course of the project. Commissioner Sullivan questioned if the process should start with a visioning process. Ms. Goodman described the smaller size of this project and visioning requires substantially more work and time than the scope of this project.

D. OVERVIEW OF EXISTING CITY POLICIES

1. Economic Development – Ms. Goodman noted the City does not have a substantial number of economic policies currently. She reviewed some of the policies that may or may not continue into the new plan in one form or another.
2. Housing – Ms. Goodman reviewed some of the current housing policies.

E. OUTCOMES OF THE PROJECT

1. Economic Development – The attendees provided input regarding their opinions on Philomath's biggest opportunities and challenges, including:
 - Challenges created by people commuting from Philomath to work.
 - Desires for more industrial employment.
 - Desires for more tourism attractions.
 - Challenges created by traffic, including public safety.
 - Growth and affordable housing. Constituency doesn't necessarily want growth.
 - Biggest opportunities being a good education system; but with the number of students moving away, the challenge of creating opportunities for them to come back.
 - Opportunities created by proximity to Oregon State University.
 - Obstacles created by lack of parking, transportation issues, and planning for 20 years.
 - Focus on livability and pedestrian access, issues with being a truck route.
 - Concerns about affordable housing causing more people to move to town.
 - Challenge with the community being split on the issue of growth. Concerns about kids moving away but finding balance of small town that can be sustainable.
 - Concerns about why Philomath has been unable to attract businesses to fill available spaces and what are the roadblocks to them locating here. Lack of parking. Opportunities for expansion on the south side of Philomath proximate to the schools for family-oriented activities.
 - Opportunities created by the OSU incubator businesses. Challenges with the highway, development hurdles in the permitting process to build industrial spec buildings. Some buildings downtown need to be torn down. Have to be ready to take businesses when they need a place to move to.

- The need for open shell business space. Policies in place slow down the process of development. The need for parking to support economic development. How to stop traffic from going through. The need for available building space for businesses to move into.
2. Housing Discussion – Attendees provided input on housing.
- Let the housing that has been approved be built out before approving any more.
 - Connectivity for bike and pedestrian mobility from housing to shopping.
 - Challenges of inadequate infrastructure to address infill housing.
 - Concerns that there are adequate buyers for the housing being constructed.

F. NEXT STEPS

Mr. Workman reviewed setting up a next meeting date for the Advisory Committee to meet.

G. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

**PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

June 15, 2020

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. via video conference due to the City of Philomath State of Emergency, Covid-19 impact.

1.1 Roll Call:

Present: Commissioners Giana Bernardini, Gary Conner, Steve Boggs, Jeannie Gay, Peggy Yoder, David Stein, Joseph Sullivan, Councilor Ruth Causey (ex-officio).

Absent: None

Staff: City Manager Chris Workman, Deputy City Attorney David Coulombe, City Planner Pat Depa and Building Permit Clerk Ashley Howell.

Guests: David Dougherty.

Chair Sullivan started the meeting with a warm up activity. Commissioners shared good news.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 Minutes of February 18, 2020 --

MOTION: Commissioner Yoder moved, Commissioner Boggs second, to approve the February 18, 2020 minutes as presented. Motion APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Bernardini, Yoder, Gay, Stein; No: None).

3. **REPORTS**

3.1 Reports: 2040 Advisory Committee (Stein, Yoder) – There was discussion about Philomath’s current economic status. There was discussion about the amount of residents that commute to and from Philomath for work on a daily basis and the median income.

4. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

4.1 Commish Commingle – Commissioner Bernardini explained that the Commish Commingle is tabled until further notice.

4.2 Philomath Vision – Chair Sullivan explained that the Philomath Vision is being withdrawn at the request of the City Council.

4.3 RV Parks in Philomath - City Councilor Ruth Causey discussed various options for code changes involving RV Parks for the City. Councilor Causey discussed the option of only allowing RV Parks in heavy industrial zone as recommended by the City Planner. There was discussion about creating a ratio of population versus number of RV spaces allowed.

MOTION: Commissioner Yoder moved, Chair Sullivan second, to ask Councilor Causey to return to the Planning Commission with a proposal to change the code with language that involves the proportions of other comparable cities. Motion APPROVED 6-1 (Yes: Conner, Bernardini, Gay, Yoder, Stein, Boggs; No: Sullivan).

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 "Goals 2040" from TAC Kickoff - There was discussion about input received regarding economic goals and concerns raised at the 2040 Comp Plan Kickoff meeting. There was discussion regarding concern of the length of the goal and that perhaps it should be a shorter amount of time. There was discussion regarding possible overlap of the SWOT analysis done by the Project Advisory Committee at its last meeting.

MOTION: Chair Sullivan moved, Commissioner Yoder second, that the Planning Commission send the TAC Kickoff transcript to the Advisory Committee and City Council and request that they correct any errors they see in their statements and invite them to supply any comments that they might amplify their original statements. Motion APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Gay, Boggs, Yoder, Stein, Bernardini; No: None).

5.2 Streetscapes Design Elements - David Dougherty presented a slide presentation on possible themes for the upcoming Streetscape Design in downtown Philomath. There was discussion of a business plan study with Eco Northwest and the support of recommendations and upgrades to the Streetscape. Mr. Dougherty explained that the goal of the project is revitalization. Mr. Workman explained the history of the streetscape project and how the work already completed serves as a starting point for the final design. There was discussion about the amenities of Philomath and how they may encourage design. There was discussion of various elements such as lighting, street furnishings and seating presented in themes such as modern, traditional and big timber. There was discussion about various opportunities for feedback from the public. Mr. Workman asked the Planning Commission to decide which options to present to the public for feedback, following which the Commission could make a recommendation to the City Council. There was a question about extended the project beyond 14th Street. There was discussion regarding ways in which to collect input from the public.

MOTION: Commissioner Conner moved, Commissioner Yoder second, that the Planning Commission coordinate the effort for community outreach for the downtown development plan, Commissioner Conner being the point person. Motion APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Boggs, Yoder, Stein, Gay, Conner, Bernardini; No: None).

There was a decision to hold a meeting on Monday, June 29th, 2020 to discuss the Streetscape design elements and schedule dates for public outreach.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES

6.1 Staff Updates - Mr. Depa discussed the concept of a downtown design manual. He explained that the manual would list code specific to building designs and the theme that is chosen. He explained that this manual would allow the Planning Commission to enforce the code to ensure congruence. He discussed the Planning Commission gathering information on elements of designs from other cities that they would like to present to the public.

Commissioner Yoder asked about what happened with the staff meeting with Laura Beuhl to discuss her involvement and partnership with the downtown design.

MOTION: Commissioner Yoder moved, Chair Sullivan second, to have City staff answer the question of what happened at the August meeting when they were requested to use Laura Beuhl's offer. Motion APPROVED 6-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Conner, Bernardini; No: None).

The committee discussed the next meeting will be held on Monday June 29th, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

7. **ADJOURNMENT** - Chair Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 7:38 p.m.

SIGNED:

ATTEST:

Joseph Sullivan, Chair

Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk

**PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

June 29, 2020

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. via video conference.

- 1.1 **Roll Call:**

- Present:** Commissioners Gary Conner, Steve Boggs, David Stein, Peggy Yoder, Joseph Sullivan, Giana Bernardini (arrived at 7:02 p.m.)

- Absent:** Jeannine Gay.

Staff: City Manager Chris Workman, Deputy City Attorney David Coulombe, City Planner Pat Depa and Building Permit Clerk Ashley Howell.

Chair Sullivan started the meeting with a warm up activity. Commissioners shared good news.

City Councilor Ruth Causey joined the meeting at 6:08 p.m.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- 2.1 **Minutes of June 15, 2020** – Chair Sullivan requested to amend the vote for section six, page 2 of the minutes. The motion states that the motion was approved 7 to 0 and should be 6 to 0 because Jeannine Gay did not vote.

MOTION: Commissioner Yoder moved, Commissioner Conner second, to approve the June 15, 2020 minutes as amended. Motion APPROVED 5-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Yoder; No: None).

3. **REPORTS**

- 3.1 **Reports 2040 Advisory Committee (Stein, Yoder)** – Nothing to report. Committee has not met.

- 3.2 **Downtown Streetscapes (Conner)** - Commissioner Conner discussed his conversation with Mr. Workman and David Dougherty, the City's contracted landscape architect, regarding the streetscape project. He explained that this project is fully underway including plans for funding and a schedule. The project is in the early phases of design and the City is currently working with ODOT on a preliminary plan to be approved in August or September. The project is scheduled to begin construction Spring 2022. He explained that the design team would have a time frame of around December 2020 to January 2021. He explained that he would like to propose having an open house, in whatever form possible, to discuss themes with the public and inform them of the project.

There was discussion about releasing possible themes to the public the week of July 13, 2020.

There was discussion of providing information of the streetscape design project at the Farmers' Market.

There was discussion about providing commissioners with pictures of the themes to share with friends and neighbors.

There was discussion regarding only displaying themes to the public that coincide with the project's budget.

There was discussion of displaying possible themes to the public at the July 13, 2020 City Council meeting, at the Farmer's Market and on the City Facebook page.

Mr. Workman discussed budget constraints to the streetscape project and the difficulty in extending the scope of the project to 15th Street.

Commissioner Conner explained that he would like to see ground level changes at the entry way of the Chevron gas station to prevent wrong way traffic leaving the gas station eastbound. He explained that he would like to discuss the possibility of gathering more funds to cover this area at the time construction is taking place.

Commissioner Stein discussed parking availability bridging Applegate Street and Main Street. He explained that it would encourage people to stop and cross the block between the two streets. Mr. Workman explained that the city recently purchased an empty lot where Commissioner Stein discussed.

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 RV Parks in Philomath – Councilor Causey discussed a packet that she emailed to the Commissioners regarding RV Parks. She discussed that excluding RV Parks out of the code entirely could leave the City somewhat vulnerable to the possibility of yet another RV Park. She explained that she does advocate for outlined code language about limiting RV Parks and where they will be allowed throughout the city. She discussed the differences of some of the cities that she reviewed and their code language regarding RV Parks and that she did not find any city with a numerical limit on RV Parks. She explained that after speaking with Jim Brewer, conditional use permits would likely give the public the most control when deciding on whether to allow another RV Park in the city. She explained that the committee might want to wait to discuss this matter further until there is an updated comprehensive plan.

There was discussion regarding whether or not RV Parks should be limited based on city population.

Mr. Coulombe discussed defensibility with the proportionate plan versus enforcement at the local level as the population changes. He discussed conversations with Mr. Brewer and Councilor Causey, explaining a great flexibility with the conditional use permit process. He explained that this allows both flexibility at the time the application is received and it is considered. He explained that the conditional use permit process would give City Council a chance to determine whether or not the timing was right, if or when they received an RV Park application. He explained that a proportionate plan based on objective factors would have limited flexibility for the decision maker, or City Council.

There was discussion regarding using both conditional use and a numerical limit in regards to RV Parks.

There was discussion about whether or not the commission should wait to develop code language until the comprehensive plan is updated.

MOTION: Commissioner Stein moved, Commissioner Yoder second, that the commission put off a final decision about how to limit RV Parks until the next meeting. Motion APPROVED 3-0 (Yes: Stein, Yoder, Boggs; No: None; Abstained: Sullivan, Conner, Bernardini).

Discussion: Commissioner Yoder discussed that she would like to pursue Councilor Causey's offer to draft code language that uses both conditional use permits and a numerical limit.

4.2 Inquiry, Action on Transportation Problems - Mr. Workman discussed that the Department of Land and Conservation Development approached the city with an offer for a free program to review and do an audit of the development code. He explained that after discussing that offer with Mr. Depa, they both agreed that it would be a good idea discuss and pursue with the Planning Commission. He explained that the idea was then presented to the City Council. He explained that after his and Mr. Depa's review of the model development code from DLCD, they determined that it seemed metro-centric and tailored more to larger cities with larger downtown areas. He explained that he and Mr. Depa felt they could develop a better fitting development code tailored to the city. He explained that the opportunity to first get the comprehensive plan updated came up, and then the focus could be to draft the development code so that it matches the goals and policies in the updated comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Yoder read from August City Council meeting minutes and explained a motion addressed by the City Council granting authority to city staff to apply for the TGM Assistance grant and work with the Planning Commission to update the city's development code.

Mr. Workman explained that he would go back to the City Council and explain his reservations on moving forward with the DLCD program.

Commissioner Yoder explained that she spoke with Laura Beuhl at DLCD and that Ms. Beuhl explained that she was anticipating working with the city but had not heard from staff.

Mr. Depa discussed writing a development code that would regulate commercial districts in the downtown area. He explained that city staff, at the time the grant from DLCD was offered, was unsure of whether or not the budget would allow for a comprehensive plan update, which needed to be done before the development code. He explained that the correct order of process is to first update the comprehensive plan and then follow with the development code, never the opposite. He explained that with city staff experience and the help of the Planning Commission, a more tailored development code can be written for the city instead of using model code from DLCD.

Commissioner Yoder explained that Ms. Beuhl works with cities that have extremely old comprehensive plans and that bringing in a professional who is offering free services may help alleviate staff hours.

Mr. Depa explained that as a professional himself with several years of experience, his participation with the current state of Philomath provides a more insightful perspective allowing for a more customized development code.

Chair Sullivan asked Mr. Depa to review DLCD's sample development code again.

Mr. Workman explained that the current priority is updating the comprehensive plan and ensuring policies are set in place before a development code is written. He stated that the grant being discussed currently is not the same program that was spoken about a year ago when originally presented. The original program was to review and audit the current development code and staff chose to pass on that program so that the comprehensive plan could be updated first. He explained that when the city finishes updating the comprehensive plan and ensuring policies are set in place, they will then be ready to move forward with DLCD and the development code.

Mr. Workman explained that the City Council has directed him to now work on a comprehensive plan grant and that he will not be able to work on both grants at the same time. The comprehensive plan grant must come first.

There was discussion of a letter being drafted by Commissioner Yoder to the City Council, that would explain that Mr. Workman did not notify the Planning Commission or City Council that he was halting on pursuing the Transportation Growth Management grant.

MOTION: Commissioner Yoder moved, Sullivan second, that the Planning Commission present the Transportation Growth Management's findings to the City Council. Motion DENIED 6-0 (Yes: None; No: Sullivan, Stein, Yoder, Boggs, Conner, Bernardini).

MOTION: Commissioner Boggs moved, Commissioner Stein second, that Commissioner Yoder draft the Planning Commission a memo to review on the July 20, 2020 meeting for the commission to discuss, approve and forward to the City Council so that there is written record. Motion APPROVED 6-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini; No: None).

Discussion: None

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Downtown Design Manual - Tabled.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES

6.1 Mr. Workman explained that the Land Use Board of Appeals upheld the City Council's decision on the Lepman development.

6.2 Proposed Next Meeting Date - Public Hearing, July 20, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. -

Chair Sullivan asked staff to please ensure that the public be notified that the next meeting will be streamed on Facebook Live.

MOTION: Commissioner Stein moved, Commissioner Bernardini second, to adjourn the meeting. Motion APPROVED 6-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini; No: None).

7. **ADJOURNMENT** - Chair Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 7:39 p.m.

SIGNED:

ATTEST:

Joseph Sullivan, Chair

Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk

**PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
July 20, 2020**

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. via video conference.
 - 1.1 **Roll Call:**

Present: Commissioners Gary Conner, Steve Boggs, David Stein, Peggy Yoder, Joseph Sullivan, Giana Bernardini, Jeannine Gay Ruth Causey (ex officio member from the City Council)

Absent: None

Staff: City Manager Chris Workman, Deputy City Attorney David Coulombe, City Planner Pat Depa

Chair Sullivan started the meeting with a warm up activity. Commissioners shared good news.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - 2.1 **Minutes of June 29, 2020** – Peggy Yoder asked to verify if three members indeed abstained from the motion. Commissioner Conner and Chair Sullivan confirmed that they abstained.

MOTION: Commissioner Yoder moved, Commissioner Stein second, to approve the June 29, 2020 minutes. Mr. Coulombe explained the appropriate time and manner in which to abstain from a vote. Motion APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini, Gay; No: None).

3. **PUBLIC HEARING**

- 3.1 Planning File PC20-01 Keady
505 & 507 Fawn Lane, Tax Lots 5700 & 5800 on Map 12-6-11AB
Variance to the maximum allowed lot size of 10,500 sq. ft.

Chair Sullivan opened the Public Hearing at 6:14 p.m.

City Attorney Coulombe read the following statement:

For those testifying tonight, please direct your testimony to the criteria as described in the staff report or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or land use regulations which you believe applies to the decision.

Failure to raise an issue, with sufficient detail to give the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue, means that no appeal may be made to the State Land Use Board of Appeals based on that issue.

Failure of the applicant to raise Constitutional or other issues relating to proposed conditions of approval with sufficient detail to allow the local government or its designee to respond to the issue precludes an action for damages in Circuit Court.

Before the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may ask the decision maker for an opportunity to present additional relevant evidence or testimony that is within the scope of the hearing. The decision maker shall grant either a request to hold the record open for 7 days to provide additional written evidence or testimony or the Planning Commission shall grant a request for a continuance. The Planning Commission will consider the effect of the 120 day rule in determining whether to continue the hearing.

Are there any conflicts of interest or bias concerning the application to be declared by any member of the Commission? None.

Are there any ex parte communications to disclose? If so, please include in your disclosure the substance of the communication.

-Commissioner Stein and Commissioner Yoder disclosed they performed a site visit. No disclosures were made.

Does any participant wish to rebut any disclosures of conflicts of interest, ex parte communications or ask questions about disclosed site visits? None.

Is there any objection on jurisdictional grounds? None reported.

DECIDE IF THERE IS ANY NEED TO DECLARE A TIME LIMIT FOR TESTIMONY.
None needed.

Presentation of the Staff Report

Mr. Depa explained the different types of various procedures, explaining this is a Class C Variance, which requires the applicant to show some sort of hardship that meets the six criteria identified in the code.

Commissioner Yoder asked who owned the second lot.

Commissioner Bernardini asked to clarify that if they owned both lots, then they are wanting to combine the two lots into one large lot. Mr. Depa confirmed this. Commissioner Bernardina asked what difference it makes whether it is one lot or two.

Presentation by Applicant

Kay Keady, the applicant, explained they own both the vacant lots in front of the current house. They bought with the intent not to develop, but they will eventually develop lot 17.

Commissioner Stein asked why they want to combine the two, as keeping them separate gives them additional options.

Ms. Keady stated environmental reasons, including benefits of grass and disadvantages of a house going there. She stated it would impact the tax value.

Commissioner Yoder asked if the variance was denied, if they would sell either property.

Ms. Keady replied, no.

Commissioner Yoder stated then they can do what they'd like with the lot and keep them separate.

Ms. Keady stated that when the lot was first developed, she was told the City objected to it because of the slope behind the existing house.

Commissioner Bernardini asked for confirmation that if the Commission approves the variance the City would actually collect additional taxes. She asked Mr. Depa if the objection was that in the future the City would not collect future taxes on a new house.

Mr. Depa explained the objection is that the applicant does not meet the criteria for a hardship. He explained that the City has a code that sets a maximum lot size, and the only way to get a variance is if you meet the criteria for the variance.

Commissioner Bernardini noted that that parcel is smaller than others on that street and that any house built there would not be in confluence with the other houses on the street.

Commissioner Yoder asked if Ms. Keady was surprised that there were no utilities to the lot. She stated they had locates called for lot 18, as well.

Ms. Keady confirmed.

Commissioner Yoder asked if it was normal to not have utilities in when the lot is sold.

Ms. Keady stated the utilities would have to come up the flag of the flag lot.

Commissioner Stein asked if they bought the lot bare and then bought their house.

Ms. Keady confirmed.

Commissioner Stein then asked if they knew what they were buying when they bought it, what has changed.

Ms. Keady replied that as other lots sold and developed, they realized how tight the lots would be. The owner offered them a better price if they bought 17 and 18 together. However, they noticed there was no green space as the lots started to develop. They currently use the lot to access the other open areas.

Commissioner Bernardini asked if they park cars in the garage.
Mrs. Keady confirmed that they do.

Commissioner Bernardini asked if they plan to keep it green and if they intend to add a driveway.

Mrs. Keady replied that it is not impossible without, but it would be easier to add a driveway.

Chair Sullivan explained that the section of the code in which they are asking for an exception specifically looks at hardships. He asked the applicant to explain her hardship.

Ms. Keady explained that they came to the City and stated what they wanted to do and the City told them this was how to do it. She explained that she was told if they were to build a home on that site, they are not providing for the neighborhood or the environment. She was told that they can leave it as is, but if they combined both lots, then no matter who buys it is going to have a green space, and so will the neighbor. This will not be a hardship on them, but would benefit others.

Public Testimony in Favor: None

Public Testimony in Opposition:

Ginny DeHerdt - 502 Fawn Lane

Ms. DeHerdt explained that she gave the Commission a letter of objection that was displayed in the meeting packet and was submitted by their attorney. She explained that she lives to the lot south of the subject lot. She stated the other letter of objection was submitted by a neighbor, Christine Kastella. She asked the Commission to read the letter of objection. She stated that she believes one of the objectives is the driveway, which there is a gravel driveway there now. She stated there was history of the lots getting replotted and difficulty of finding utilities. She explained that she understands the Keady's can't find existing utilities, but stated they installed new utilities for their home. She stated that there are rules in place and people need to follow the rules. The letters submitted explain the reasons for their request to deny the variance.

Neutral Public Testimony: None

Rebuttal by the Applicant – Limited to issues raised in opposition to the Application

Ms. Keady stated they looked for utilities and could not find any.

Does the Applicant waive the 7 day period to submit final written argument?

Ms. Keady replied, yes.

The applicant waived right to seven days appeal.

3.2 Discussion and Decision:

Commissioner Conner stated he felt the Commissions hands were tied. He stated that their job is to look at the evidence and he has not heard anything contrary to what Mr. Depa has stated.

Commissioner Gay explained it is a shame our own code does not allow them to be free to do what they wish, so she cannot go along with the motion. She explained that she supports them because they bought the land with the intent to have green space. She explained that it is no fun to buy land and not be able to use it the way you wish.

Commissioner Yoder stated she is convinced Ms. Keady will still do what she has planned.

Chair Sullivan asked for clarification on the role of the Commission to interpret the code as best as they understand, if they can make any judgement calls.

Mr. Coulumbe replied that they only have ability where there is room for interpretation.

Chair Sullivan brought up the issue of refunding the application fee.

City Attorney Mr. Coulumbe read the following statement: This decision of the Planning Commission will become final when written and mailed to participants. A written decision will be mailed within 5 days of this decision. An appeal to City Council must be presented consistent with Chapter 18 of the Zoning Code and state law.

MOTION: Commissioner Conner moved, Commissioner Stein second to deny the variance application. Motion APPROVED 6-1 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini; No: Gay).

Recess called at 7:11 p.m.

Meeting called to order at 7:16 p.m.

4. REPORTS

10 min

4.1. 2040 Advisory Committee update (Stein, Yoder)

Commissioner Stein reported that a meeting was held and there was discussion about economic development. The meeting went long and the draft policy report had not been distributed prior to the meeting, so the meeting was concluded prior to completion of the topic. There is a joint meeting scheduled for July 28 2020 and the Planning Commission is invited

4.2. Downtown Streetscapes (Conner)

Mr. Conner reviewed the data collected at the Farmers' Market and the online survey. Both showed support for Timber themed amenities. The raw information has been passed on to the architect and the topic will be revisited in September or November.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

20 min

5.1. RV Parks in Philomath-

Ruth Causey suggested to leave the first item unchanged. She explained that she looked for a simpler definition of an RV Park, and the planner recommended not using the term, facilities, and it is best list, RV Park, and she read the definition provided.

Councilor Causey discussed conditional use permit process and is concerned that the process she had recommended previously could be problematic as it could be seen as a deliberate effort to deny a future application. She noted the City Attorney recommended the provided language to the conditional use criteria. She feels this language would give the Commission the tools to approve or deny future RV Parks.

Commissioner Yoder asked if a letter from Sam's Club or some other entity claiming, we need one, could demonstrate this condition.

Mr. Coulombe stated both the subsections are highly subjective and up to the discretion of the decision maker. He explained even if a developer did a survey and brought in white papers laying out objectively the need for a 100 space RV park, the decision maker could still say it did not meet either subsection a or b and therefore deny the application. The language gives the decision maker a lot of discretion to either approve or deny the application.

Mr. Columbe advised that the Commission did not need to take formal action at this time. Additional discussion in support of the language provided.

5.2. Inquiry – Action on TGM offer

There was discussion of the letter presented by Commissioner Yoder (Supplemental Agenda Item #5.2).

MOTION: Commissioner Boggs moved, Commissioner Stein second to send the letter to the City Council for discussion. Motion APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini, Gay; No: None).

6. NEW BUSINESS

10 min

6.1. Downtown Design Manual

Mr. Depa explained the reason for the manual is to provide standards of what we want the downtown area to look like. It will be in line with the Streetscapes theme and the development code. He explained that it will actually strengthen the code, keeping the downtown attributes and giving ideas for someone coming in with a building design. He stated that it deals with signage that is complementary and doesn't distract from the theme. He explained that it deals with materials, doorways, other aspects. He is looking for input from everyone on each of the different areas identified in the index. His plan is to bring different sections to the Commission each month for feedback and review.

There was discussion about different areas of town having different requirements, with more stringent requirements in the C-1, less in the C-2, and potentially less in a future C-3 zone for more corporate commercial areas.

Commissioner Gay complemented what has been put together so far and stated the Commission should have no problem approving this once it is all worked through.

Commissioner Yoder asked if someone would have to go through a various process if someone comes in with a new plan.

Mr. Depa stated it won't be so stringent that it discourages good ideas. But that it allows the Commission the ability to deny something that doesn't fit the vision. He explained that it will be used more to get what is wanted than to discourage something.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES

5 min

7.1. Staff update (staff) – None

7.2. Proposed next meeting date: August 17 6:00 PM

8. COMMUNITY COMMENTS

5 min

-None

9. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Yoder moved, Commissioner Conner second to adjourn the meeting. Motion APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini, Gay; No: None).

Meeting adjourned 8:11 p.m.

SIGNED:

ATTEST:

Joseph Sullivan, Chair

Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk

**PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

August 17, 2020

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. via video conference.

1.1 Roll Call:

Present: Commissioners Gary Conner, Steve Boggs, David Stein, Joseph Sullivan, Giana Bernardini, Ruth Causey (ex officio member from the City Council

Absent: Peggy Yoder; one vacancy

Staff: City Manager Chris Workman

Chair Sullivan started the meeting with a warm up activity. Commissioners shared good news.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 Minutes of July 20, 2020 – Pg. 4 Motion to deny variance to be moved

Recess noted, reconvened not noted

“She” should be identified, (pg. 5, item 5.1)

Page 6, item 5.2; include attachment.

MOTION: Commissioner Boggs moved, Commissioner Stein second, to approve the July 20, 2020 minutes with the amendments by Mr. Sullivan. Motion APPROVED 5-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Bernardini; No: None).

3. **REPORTS**

3.1. 2040 Advisory Committee update (Stein, Yoder)

Commissioner Stein reported that a joint meeting was held and covered what work had been done so far. He expressed concern about the primary concern Philomath has on how it will attract people to come here. Specifically, appropriate businesses.

Commissioner Boggs asked if an alliance with the Chamber of Commerce could be made. Commissioner Stein said he would bring it up at the next PAC meeting. There was additional conversation about where retail businesses decide to locate and how the city can advocate for new businesses.

Councilor Causey commented that the development code could be revised to make moving to Philomath easier and attention should be given to the OSU incubator program.

Commissioner Stein suggested widening the tax base through manufacturing and industrial business rather than residential development.

Mr. Workman added that the consultant will come with policy recommendations with the Economic Opportunities Analysis.

3.2. Downtown Streetscapes (Conner)

Commissioner Conner – no report. Will pick up again at the next meeting.

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1. Being Better Communicators

Commissioner Bernardini stated her discomfort in making decisions about the Streetscapes project without adequate input from citizens. She stated she feels the Commission's greatest weakness was social media. She argued we are missing a lot of valuable input by not using social media, but recognized that many people still don't use social media.

Ms. Bernardini suggested the need to improve use of the city newsletter, reader board, and other medium.

There was additional discussion about various social media platforms, benefits of additional outreach opportunities, quality of the information provided, and legal limitations on social media.

Mr. Workman explained the recent Council approval of a website upgrade and the focus on improving the site between now and the end of the year, including new features that might link the website to social media platforms.

Mr. Sullivan suggested an exercise in which the Planning Commission would send news items to staff to then vet and post as appropriate for a month. There was discussion about how to currently get news in Philomath, and limitations of current staffing levels.

There was a suggestion for the Planning Commissioners to collect news articles that they believe should be posted and send them to Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan will review the plan with the city attorney's office and reply.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES

6.1. Staff update (staff)

Mr. Workman reported on a meeting earlier today with the City's contracted engineer for the Streetscapes Project, Murrsmith, and ODOT in which stormwater treatment was discussed.

6.2. Proposed next meeting date: September 21 @ 6:00 PM

7. COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Jessica Andrade - commented on importance of community outreach and listed ways residents likely are not receiving information such as Facebook, and the city newsletter. She asked the Commission to reconsider the potential negative consequences of the outreach plan, including wasted time and energy. She believes this effort will require a paid position. She requested the Zoom chat room be opened up so she can communicate with commissioners during the meeting and stated concerns with the current website.

In response to a question from Commissioner Bernardini, Ms. Andrade said the plan she was referring to was the trying out of gathering noteworthy events and then posting them on Facebook. She asked if any of the commissioners followed the Facebook page for

Philomath, to which there was no response. She stated it is good, and many people are posting comments to it, but it won't get followers if it doesn't actively engage people.

Anissa Teslow - stated that the Commission is suppressing community engagement by it lack of social media and how the website is laid out and designed. She recommended using contingency funds to hire a social media specialist to help keep the website up to date and engage people on social media.

8. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Boggs moved, second by Commissioner Conner to adjourn. Motion approved 5-0. Meeting adjourned at 7:20.

SIGNED:
Joseph Sullivan, Chair

ATTEST:
Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk

1
2
3 **PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION**
4 **MINUTES**

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

September 21, 2020

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

1.1 **Roll Call:**

Present: Commissioners David Stein, Peggy Yoder, Joseph Sullivan, Van Hunsaker, Giana Bernardini. City Councilor Ruth Causey

Absent: Gary Conner, Steve Boggs

Staff: City Manager Chris Workman, Deputy City Attorney David Coulombe, City Planner Pat Depa.

Chair Sullivan started the meeting with a warm up activity. Commissioners shared good news.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 **Minutes of August 17, 2020** – The minutes were tabled until the October 19, 2020 meeting.

3. **REPORTS**

3.1 **Reports 2040 Advisory Committee (Stein, Yoder)** – Commissioner Yoder reported that Beth Goodman was available for questions regarding zoning code changes that could be presented to the public. Commissioner Stein reported on the current low-income housing issue in Philomath. He also mentioned the possibility of population growth due to the current climate crisis and wildfires.

3.2 **Downtown Streetscapes (Conner)** - No report.

4. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

4.1 **Being Better Communicators** - Commissioner Bernardini asked about the new City website.

Mr. Workman explained that Ruth Post is currently managing the roll out of the new website. He further explained that a draft version would most likely be released sometime in November or December and be fully updated sometime in January.

Councilor Causey asked Commissioner Bernardini if she could expand on how she gathered feedback from the community due to lack of recorded correspondence.

Commissioner Yoder explained that a citizen did not know about the meet and greet on October 3, 2021 and asked how the Commission can ensure that the public is being notified of such events.

Chair Sullivan explained that he suggested ideas of public events be sent to City staff and be posted on the website. He explained that because of lack of staff time, he would be accepting informational articles and posting City events. Due to his belief that there is a lack of communication between the City and its citizens, he as a private citizen, decided to make a website that he is hoping is more accessible. He stated that the city

52 attorney explained that he would not be allowed to create a website to then be run by the
53 Planning Commission. He also noted that after having a discussion with Mr. Coulombe,
54 it was explained that perhaps a different committee be formed to serve as the committee
55 for citizen involvement.

56
57 Councilor Causey explained that she believes there should be some sort of a platform
58 that more clearly communicates events and information with the citizens of Philomath.
59 She stated that she would be happy to discuss the addition of a committee for citizen
60 involvement. She also stated that she does not think the website created by Chair
61 Sullivan, although operated as a private citizen, is appropriate and that if he would like to
62 continue to do so then he should resign from the Planning Commission.

63
64 Chair Sullivan explained that the State gave the City permission for the Planning
65 Commission and Committee for Citizen Involvement to be one in the same.

66
67 Commissioner Hunsaker explained that the Committee for Citizen Involvement was
68 included in the Comprehensive Plan back in the 1970's.

69
70 MOTION: Commissioner Hunsaker moved, Commissioner Stein second to request the
71 City Council remove the duties of the Committee for Citizen Involvement from the
72 Planning Commission.

73
74 Discussion: Commissioner Bernardini asked what the process would look like of forming
75 such a committee.

76
77 Councilor Causey urged the Planning Commission not to take action on the proposed
78 motion until the body has discussed and understands the implications of removing these
79 duties.

80
81 Commissioner Hunsaker explained that until the City Council decides what they would
82 like to do with the committee, the Planning Commission would still be carrying out the
83 duties of the Committee for Citizen Involvement.

84
85 Chair Sullivan suggested that the Planning Commission write a letter to the Council with
86 their suggestions for not only separating from the Committee for Citizen Involvement, but
87 what they think that committee should oversee.

88
89 Mr. Workman shared material from the Comprehensive Plan of the intended citizen
90 involvement program. He summarized the history of formation of the idea of the
91 Committee for Citizen Involvement and its intended operation and use. He explained
92 that neither the State nor the City has the original document that explains the roles of the
93 Committee for Citizen Involvement. He explained that perhaps a good starting spot
94 might be to reach out to the City Council and other entities seeking guidance on roles of
95 current similar programs.

96
97 Commissioner Yoder explained that she believes the Planning Commission should wait
98 to send anything to the City Council and instead further study the roles of the Committee
99 for Community Involvement.

100
101 Commissioner Hunsaker withdrew his motion.
102

103 Mr. Workman stated that he would work on coming up with examples of duties of the
104 Committee for Community Involvement and have them available within the next month.
105

106 **4.2 Results from the Letter to the Council** - Chair Sullivan asked Councilor Causey
107 to report on the June 15th, 2020 letter asking for corrections to the goals.
108

109 Councilor Causey asked to go back to the council and confirm if there were any specific
110 corrections from that letter.
111

112 Councilor Causey spoke to the July 20th, 2020 letter to the City Council. She explained
113 that given the amount of times the Planning Commission has brought up the topic of
114 TGM (traffic goals management?), she is left wondering whether one or more of the
115 members of the Commission have a personal or professional relationship with Laura
116 Buehl due to a persistent effort to address this issue. She discussed that Mr. Workman
117 made a decision that was accepted by all but the Planning Commission, and apologized
118 for not informing others and now the City Council has adopted a quarterly reporting of
119 the status of grants. She explained that she fails to understand why this issue is still
120 being brought up and is led to believe that there may be ulterior motives involved.
121

122 Commissioner Yoder explained that she doesn't believe there are any ulterior motives
123 involved or that any members of the Planning Commission have a personal or
124 professional relationship with Laura Buehl. She explained that the main issue was, the
125 Planning Commission was told that the grant had been applied for and then later found
126 that the grant had not been applied for. She stated that she believes the issue should be
127 dropped and not pursued anymore.
128

129 Chair Sullivan expressed that he wanted to revisit the main points surrounding the TGM
130 issue.
131

132 There was discussion surrounding the issues that Chair Sullivan originally had with the
133 TGM.
134

135 Mr. Workman explained that he does in fact feel as though there are ulterior motives due
136 to the persistence and pursuance surround the TGM. He further explained that this was
137 a program and was incorrectly and repeatedly referred to as a grant.
138

139 There was discussion regarding an effort to better the working relationship between City
140 staff and the Planning Commission.
141

142 Commissioner Bernardini stated she believes that City staff have knowledge and
143 experience that is valuable to the Planning Commission and that it is a mistake to not
144 ask for their input.
145

146 Chair Sullivan stated that he would like Mr. Workman to call out Commissioners by
147 name as to whom he believes has ulterior motives and why he believes they do. Or to
148 redact his earlier statement indicating this belief.
149

150 Mr. Workman addressed Chair Sullivan that he believes Chair Sullivan has worked with
151 other individuals in the community to get on City Council for the sole purpose of trying to
152 remove Mr. Workman of his position as City Manager. Mr. Workman further explained
153 that it makes it difficult to operate as the City Manager with Chair Sullivan when he is
154 aware that the desire is to have him removed from his position.

155
156 Chair Sullivan discussed his various conversations with members of the community that
157 he spoke to about running for a City Council position.

158
159 Mr. Workman asked Chair Sullivan if he in fact discussed the removal of Mr. Workman
160 from his position with Mayor Niemann.

161
162 Chair Sullivan stated that he did not recall the exact words used in the conversation with
163 Mayor Niemann, but that he does hope that Mr. Workman is removed from his position
164 as City Manager.

165
166 **4.3 Downtown Design Manual** - Mr. Depa explained that there would be five to six
167 installments that will break down what the design manual will consist of. The first
168 installment he discussed pertained to facade. He discussed that it would primarily deal
169 with architecture and corresponding requirements. He explained that this would only be
170 in the core downtown area.

171
172 There was discussion of the specific requirements for buildings, signs and overall
173 design.

174
175 There was discussion and review of popular downtown street designs across America.

176
177 Commissioner Bernardini asked if the design manual would apply to existing buildings or
178 only new development.

179
180 Mr. Depa explained that a decision would need to be made regarding the percentage or
181 dollar amount that may be spent on bringing one's building up to standard, if the
182 commission chose to make that a requirement.

183
184 Mr. Depa explained the City of Philomath Design Committee is also the Planning
185 Commission. The Planning Commission would have an active role in implementing and
186 upholding the new design manual regulations.

187
188 Commissioner Bernardini asked if existing buildings in the downtown area will be
189 required to renovate to meet the design standards, even if the owner was not intending
190 to do so.

191
192 Mr. Depa explained that although there are a number of buildings that would be
193 categorized as non-conforming, there is a lot of open space for new construction. He
194 further explained that this will be a fairly long process but that will hopefully create a
195 vibrant downtown.

196
197 There was discussion regarding a design theme throughout the City.

198

199 Mr. Workman explained that he hoped to seek from the Planning Commission more of
200 an idea of which direction the Planning Commission wants to go regarding how
201 regulated the City's design standards would be.

202
203 There was discussion regarding reviewing towns that are more comparable to Philomath
204 and what their downtown design consists of.

205
206 There was discussion regarding towns that were smaller or like Philomath that created
207 and implemented a downtown design standard, and are now flourishing downtown
208 areas.

209 Chair Sullivan asked if there was a robust enough economy to support code changes
210 that would then be enforced without driving businesses out.

211
212 There was discussion regarding how the City might support or incentivize business to
213 implement the updated design code.

214
215 **5. NEW BUSINESS**
216 **5.1 Council Liaison** – Tabled until the next meeting.

217
218 **6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES**
219 **6.1** Mr. Workman discussed the active engineering on the streetscape project. There is
220 an issue with where to divert storm water.

221
222 No new land applications in.

223
224 Mill Pond Crossing is still working on phase two.

225
226 Newton Creek Estates just recently got their plat recorded.

227
228 Mr. Workman spoke about the upcoming event planned by the Philomath Frolic Board;
229 Meet the Candidates, for the upcoming City Council election.

230
231 **6.2 Proposed Next Meeting Date - October 19, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.**

232
233 **MOTION:** Commissioner Yoder moved, Commissioner Bernardini second, to adjourn the
234 meeting. Motion APPROVED 5-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Hunsaker, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini; No:
235 None).

236
237 **7. ADJOURNMENT** - Chair Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

238
239
240 SIGNED:
241 Joseph Sullivan, Chair

ATTEST:
Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk

**PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

November 16, 2020

1
2
3
4
5 **1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

6 **1. Roll Call:**

7 **Present:** Commissioners David Stein, Peggy Yoder, Joseph Sullivan, Steve Boggs, Van
8 Hunsaker, Giana Bernardini, Gary Conner. City Councilor Ruth Causey
9

10 **Staff:** City Manager Chris Workman, Deputy City Attorney David Coulombe, City
11 Planner Pat Depa.
12

13 Chair Sullivan started the meeting with an announcement regarding valuing input from all
14 present members of the Planning Commission, including staff.
15

16 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

17 **2.1 Minutes of August 17, 2020** – After discussion regarding amendments to the
18 minutes, the approval of minutes were tabled until the December 21, 2020 meeting.

19 **2.2 Minutes of September 21, 2020** – After discussion about amendments, the
20 approval of minutes were tabled until the December 21, 2020 meeting.
21

22 **3. REPORTS**

23 **3.1 Reports 2040 Advisory Committee (Stein, Yoder)** – Commissioner Stein
24 discussed the draft of the economic analysis presented at the Advisory Committee
25 meeting. He explained that he felt there were several improvements that needed to be
26 made to the draft including being less repetitive.
27

28 Commissioner Yoder explained that there has been a major shift in the committee due to
29 poor attendance and now the City Council is attending. She explained that she was in
30 favor of the technical analysis and felt that it was complete and thorough. She
31 expressed that she looks forward to presenting the analysis to the citizens of
32 Philomath.
33

34 Chair Sullivan explained that since Commissioner Stein has addressed issues now
35 regarding the PAC meetings for the third time, perhaps the Commission should write a
36 letter to the City Council expressing the Commissioner's concerns.
37

38 There was discussion regarding the concern of lack of public comment and involvement
39 in the PAC meetings.
40

41 Mr. Workman explained that the opportunity for the public to be involved would be later
42 in the process.
43

44 **3.2 Downtown Streetscapes (Conner)** - Commissioner Conner did not have any
45 updates, but did ask about the status of the Design Acceptance Plan (DAP) documents.
46

47 **4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

48 **4.1 Being Better Communicators** - Commissioner Bernardini explained that she
49 believes it may be beneficial to the Planning Commission to have a liaison from the

50 Commission attend City Council meetings. As Councilor Causey attends the Planning
51 Commission meetings.

52
53 Councilor Causey explained that the municipal code provides for a liaison from the City
54 Council to the Planning Commission but not the reverse. She explained that City
55 Councilors are actually discouraged from attending the Planning Commission meetings
56 and the intention is to not be inappropriately influenced by anything that may have been
57 observed in a Planning Commission meeting. She also explained that her presence
58 helps to clarify information that needs transmitted from the Planning Commission to the
59 City Council.

60
61 There was discussion about better utilizing Councilor Causey as a liaison for
62 communication between the Planning Commission and the City Council.

63
64 Mr. Coulombe explained that liaisons typically come from a super body to an inferior
65 body. He explained that the primary role of the City Council liaison would be to share
66 information and communicate matters to the City Council. He explained that appointing
67 a liaison to attend the City Council meetings would be problematic and
68 unauthorized. He also expressed concern about Commissioners collecting information,
69 communicating and deliberating outside of the public process.

70
71 **4.3 Downtown Design Manual** - Mr. Depa explained that he is presenting part two and
72 three of a three-part presentation. He explained that this is the Commissioner's
73 opportunity to add or strike out any suggestions made.

74
75 Mr. Depa first spoke about lighting. He explained that the lighting would be compatible
76 with what the City is going to do with the streetscape project. He discussed
77 requirements of lights on buildings.

78
79 There was discussion about neon lighting and why it is listed as, discourage, in the
80 manual.

81
82 Mr. Depa suggested that the Commission would be able to decide what limitations they
83 would like to put on neon lighting, if any.

84
85 Mr. Depa explained that the design manual would not be the code as it is too open
86 ended. He discussed that because something is not encouraged it does not mean that it
87 is prohibited.

88
89 Mr. Depa discussed parking in the downtown area. He suggested promoting parking in
90 the back of businesses and limiting parking in the front.

91
92 There was discussion regarding shared parking between businesses that may have
93 opposite business hours.

94
95 There was discussion about permeable asphalt and that it should be considered as an
96 option, specifically because of water runoff.

97
98 Mr. Depa stated that he would research the cost and practicality of encouraging or
99 requiring permeable asphalt and get back to the Commission on that topic.

100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147

Mr. Workman explained that businesses that use permeable asphalt receive a Storm Water SDC credit. He suggested that this might be a way to incentivize businesses to use this.

Mr. Depa explained that the design manual will be addressing the core area and not for the general commercial area. He explained that there would be code for all three districts.

Mr. Workman added that City staff would compare the design manual with the Main Street plan and ensure that they are consistent.

There was discussion regarding what area of the city the downtown core consists of.

There was discussion about potential expansion of the downtown core beyond the current zoning of 12th street to 14th street.

Commissioner Stein asked that there be more specification pertaining to the knee wall or landscaping requirements in separating parking spaces from the sidewalk.

Mr. Depa discussed the requirement of a brick wall between residential and non-residential areas. He explained that Commissioner Bernardini suggested using landscaping but that option may not be as sound proof as a brick wall.

Commissioner Bernardini asked why the design standards apply to such a small downtown core area.

Mr. Depa explained that there are already established businesses with a different style of commercial development.

Commissioners were encouraged to send comments to Mr. Depa.

Mr. Workman explained that there would be plenty of time for more comment and deliberation.

5 NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Guidance from City Council - Councilor Causey requested that this topic be tabled until the next meeting Planning Commission meeting, as there may be additional guidance discussed at the next City Council meeting.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES

6.1 Staff Report - Mr. Depa discussed the staff report and explained that it lists various projects that have happened and are currently happening.

Mr. Workman explained that the staff report Mr. Depa has presented is in response to the Planning Commission's request for a more thorough update about what is happening citywide and answer any questions Commissioner's might have.

148 With respect to Commissioner Stein's question about attracting businesses to Philomath,
149 Councilor Causey asked the Commission if this should be discussed with the City
150 Council. She expressed she believes it is important to have that question addressed in
151 context to what the Commission is working on.

152
153 **6.2 Proposed Next Meeting Date - December 21, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.**

154
155 **MOTION:** Commissioner Hunsaker moved, Commissioner Yoder second, to adjourn the
156 meeting. Motion APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Hunsaker, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini,
157 Conner, Boggs; No: None).

158
159 **7. ADJOURNMENT - Chair Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.**

160
161 SIGNED:
162 Joseph Sullivan, Chair

ATTEST:
Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk