

**PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
May 20, 2019**

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

7  
8 **2. ROLL CALL:**

9 **Present:** Commissioners Garry Conner, Joseph Sullivan, Lori Gibbs, Steve Boggs,  
10 Jeannine Gay, Peggy Yoder, and Chair David Stein.

11  
12 **Staff:** Chris Workman, City Manager; Patrick Depa, Planner; and Ashley  
13 Howell, Building Permit Clerk.

14  
15 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

16 **3.1 April 1, 2019, Minutes –**

17  
18 **MOTION:** Commissioner Boggs moved/Commissioner Gay second, the April 1,  
19 2019, minutes be approved. Motion APPROVED 6-0. (Yes: Conner, Gibbs, Boggs,  
20 Gay, Yoder, Stein. Abstained: Sullivan)

21  
22 **4. OLD BUSINESS**

23 **4.1 Annexation Criteria and Open House Discussion–** Commissioner Yoder asked for  
24 clarification on 18.135.030 and C4, Sufficient information for city staff to allow for the  
25 completion of an impact analysis. She explained that there was a comment made by  
26 the public expressing concern for the City’s water supply. She asked if the concern  
27 was addressed by criterion T, The City is under no obligation to condemn, exercise  
28 eminent domain, or pay for the extension of services to an annexed property. Mr.  
29 Workman explained criterion T, that the city would make services available to the  
30 annexed property, but that it would be up to the property owner to provide access to  
31 such services.

32  
33 The public commenter, at the open house meeting on April 15, 2019, suggested that,  
34 “and future,” be added to criterion 18.135.030 C4, Sufficient information for city staff  
35 to allow for the completion of an impact analysis on existing *and future* City services  
36 including, etc.

37  
38 Mr. Workman discussed current and future supply and treatment of the City’s water.  
39 He explained that this information comes from continual studies done by the City  
40 Engineer who then creates a report that is sent to Public Works. These reports  
41 consist of information that shows current water supply and treatment and an impact  
42 analysis of future developments.

43  
44 **MOTION:** Commissioner Conner moved/Commissioner Yoder second, to accept the  
45 annexation criteria as written and amended previously in this meeting. APPROVED  
46 6-1. (Yes: Conner, Sullivan, Gibbs, Boggs, Yoder, Stein. No: Gay)

47  
48 **4.2 Public Hearing for Annexation Criteria Schedule Discussion-** Mr. Workman  
49 discussed the process for the Public Hearing for Annexation Criteria. He explained that  
50 the Department of Land Conservation and Development requires the city to give a 35-  
51 day notice before any changes are made to the City’s development code (Chapter 18-

52 Zoning & Land Use). He explained that a date would need to be set for a formal Public  
53 Hearing discussing all the changes, take public comment, close the hearing and then  
54 the committee would vote on final criteria to send to City Council for approval. The City  
55 Council would also hold a Public Hearing, which would be advertised at the same time  
56 as the Planning Commission Public Hearing. City Council would then vote on final code  
57 revisions. He explained that the public would have vast opportunities to provide public  
58 comment.

59  
60 Mr. Workman asked the committee if they would like to hold one Public Hearing for  
61 Annexation Criteria and Zoning, or hold a Public Hearing per topic. The decision was  
62 made to review the recommended code changes and then decide on the previous  
63 question.

64  
65 **4.3 Review of Development Code Updates under Consideration-** Mr. Depa discussed  
66 the revised development code language that was presented to the commission. He  
67 explained that these criterion are the most likely to be approved and have had the  
68 most discussion.

69  
70 Plan Approvals - Mr. Depa discussed Plan Approvals and the expiration process. He  
71 explained that this process was brought to attention due to a project that was started  
72 25 years prior and is now closing and current staff have no say in conditions of  
73 approval due to code.

74  
75 Commissioner Stein asked to address the grammar on line 3 under Plan Approvals,  
76 Expiration of Site Plan Approval. The correction, "Is not complete," was agreed upon.

77  
78 Manufactured Home Parks - Mr. Depa discussed Manufactured Home Parks. He  
79 explained that he wanted to increase parcels from one acre to five acres. He  
80 discussed the requirements that the development code lists as of now and is hoping  
81 to add additional requirements that would be more fitting to today's atmosphere. He  
82 discussed that it is mostly aesthetics, buffering, and separation from low-density  
83 residential. Commissioner Yoder asked for clarification as to why the 720 sq. ft.  
84 requirement is listed. There was discussion regarding minimum size of lots and how  
85 many homes could potentially be on the five acres. There was discussion regarding  
86 Tiny Homes versus Manufacture Homes. There was discussion regarding whether or  
87 not there would be a variance for homes on foundations that are smaller than 720 sq.  
88 ft. The committee decided to remove the minimum square footage.

89  
90 Multi-Family Commercial Zones - There was discussion regarding Multi-Family  
91 Commercial Zones. Mr. Depa discussed that this topic is being addressed to  
92 eliminate developers from focusing on commercial property for multi-tenant and  
93 higher density residential. The intention is to streamline street frontage in the  
94 downtown area for commercial use only. Current residential street frontage would be  
95 grandfathered in. Mr. Workman explained that this code addition would allow the City  
96 to protect and preserve retail space and commercial use buildings.

97  
98 Temporary Storage - There was discussion regarding Temporary Storage. Mr. Depa  
99 discussed the proposed addition of this criteria and how temporary storage affects  
100 property value and possibly that of surrounding properties. There was discussion of  
101 commercial properties in town that are using tractor trailers for additional storage.  
102 There was discussion regarding the temporary storage zoning code being too

103 stringent. There was discussion of established/on-going use being grandfathered in.  
104 There was discussion regarding the financial impact on the public and local  
105 businesses that currently use tractor trailers for storage if not allowed to continue to  
106 do so.

107  
108 Mr. Workman discussed existing tractor/trailer temporary storage areas that have  
109 been established and on-going. He discussed the impact of existing tractor/trailer  
110 temporary storage and whether or not current practices will prove to be a repeated  
111 habit in new development. He explained that business owners using temporary  
112 storage would most likely have to build for extra storage if restrictions were put on  
113 tractor/trailer storage.

114  
115 Robert Biscoe - Philomath, OR – Mr. Biscoe explained that he believes criteria  
116 Temporary Storage criteria H, which prohibits temporary storage of semi-trucks or  
117 tractor/trailers, is overreaching. He also believes that it is not necessary to have a  
118 permit to store tractor/trailers in an industrial zone area temporarily. He explained  
119 that he agrees that some areas may need to be screened from the public if it is an  
120 eye sore. He discussed that he agrees there needs to be some regulation in retail  
121 spaces.

122  
123 Gary White - Philomath, OR – Mr. White explained that the screening would look  
124 better if at least covering the undercarriage part of the trailers. He discussed having  
125 more affordable options for lessees.

126  
127 Catherine Biscoe - Philomath, OR – Ms. Biscoe discussed that from a visibility  
128 standpoint, it makes no difference if the tractor/trailer is full or empty. She asked the  
129 commission who would be regulating the temporary storage throughout the City. She  
130 asked what is acceptable and what is not and what storage is allowed in Commercial  
131 versus Industrial zoning.

132  
133 There was discussion regarding regulating temporary storage in industrial and  
134 commercial zones and pre-approval by the City for storage. There was discussion  
135 regarding allowing temporary storage in industrial areas and storage in commercial  
136 zones being screened.

137  
138 The committee decided on the following proposed language for Temporary Storage:  
139 Remove provisions of empty or full trailers, remove requirements of screen in  
140 industrial zones, add screening requirement in commercial zones.

141  
142 Urban Tree Canopy - There was discussion regarding Urban Tree Canopy. Mr.  
143 Workman explained that City Council and previous Planning Commission committees  
144 have reviewed this criteria in efforts to preserve the existing urban tree canopy in the  
145 city. He explained that there were some provisions regarding private land owners that  
146 City Council did not like and ultimately voted it down. He clarified that this code  
147 pertains to new development only, although there is existing language regarding  
148 residential land owners.

149  
150 There was discussion regarding the existing large commercial and industrial  
151 properties within city limits that have vast amounts of trees on them currently, and that  
152 this criteria would be to protect against or regulate the removal of those. He  
153 explained that as of now developers can remove them at any time. Mr. Workman

154 asked the committee if there was an interest to protect stands of trees in undeveloped  
155 commercial, industrial or residential zone property prior to an application being  
156 submitted. If so, then language can be re-written to be geared specifically toward that  
157 requirement. Mr. Workman explained that in the current development code it does  
158 state that there is requirement that a tree preservation plan be presented and agreed  
159 upon by the city.

160  
161 Catherine Biscoe - Philomath, OR – Ms. Biscoe explained that she has a number of  
162 dying trees on her property. She explained that she does not want to have to go  
163 before Planning Commission to get approval to cut down a tree on her own property  
164 that could be hazardous to her home. She discussed newer developments  
165 throughout the city that did not get prior approval from the City to remove a number of  
166 trees and have already done so.

167  
168 The committee agreed on the street tree language. The committee agreed that  
169 existing single-family, private residential properties do not need a permit to cut down a  
170 tree.

171  
172 There was discussion regarding a size requirement, or amount of land that is exempt  
173 from City approval should they wish to remove a tree or trees. The Committee asked  
174 that proposed language include an acreage requirement that would be exempt from  
175 City approval for any tree removal.

176  
177 Parking - There was discussion regarding Parking. Mr. Depa explained that the  
178 parking recommendations are designed to keep streets less congested and parking  
179 be limited to land owners. Commissioners asked for clarification regarding the  
180 amount of bedrooms and how that pertains to the amount of parking spaces allowed.  
181 The Committee agreed to the following proposal; reduce ii from 4 to 3 spaces. The  
182 committee agreed on the rest of the language.

183  
184 **MOTION:** Commissioner Sullivan moved/Commissioner Conner second to approve  
185 the proposed changes as presented and discussed and direct staff to prepare for a  
186 public hearing before the Planning Commission. APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Conner,  
187 Sullivan, Gibbs, Boggs, Gay, Yoder, Stein. No: None)

188  
189 Jeff Lamb - Philomath, OR – Mr. Lamb explained that he attended the open house on,  
190 April 15, 2019, and suggested to add the words, “and the appropriate licensing  
191 officials.” He also explained that instead of having the words should or could, to use  
192 the word, “shall.”

193  
194 Sandy Heath – Philomath, OR – Ms. Heath asked if the City is currently operating  
195 with the old criteria. Mr. Workman explained that the City is still operating under  
196 current criteria until the new criteria is voted and approved by City Council.

197  
198 **5. ADJOURNMENT:**

199 There being no further business, Chair Stein adjourned the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

200  
201 SIGNED:

ATTEST:

202  
203 \_\_\_\_\_  
204 David Stein, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ashley Howell, Building Permit Clerk