

CITY OF JEFFERSON

Planning Commission Meeting

September 2, 2021

6:30 pm

COMMISSIONERS

PRESENT IN PERSON: Dave Jones, Joseph Moore, Bruce Forbes, Edie O'Neil, Ron Gilles

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Jacquelyn Deeds

COUNCIL LIASION: David Watkins

STAFF PRESENT: Deanna Donato and Kiel Jenkins, COG
Planner Via Zoom

APPLICANT: Lisa Hoefer Carter

- I. **Call to Order:** Ron Gilles called the meeting to order at 6:36 pm. He stated he was mixing up the order of the agenda some and moved approval of minutes from July 14, 2021 to first item.
- II. **Approval of Minutes: July 14, 2021:** Dave Jones moved to approve the minutes as written and Bruce Forbes seconded. All were in favor to approve.
- III. **New Business:** Ron stated he would need to recuse himself from this portion of the meeting as he had a direct conflict as he was within the 100ft notification. Meeting was then turned over to Vice Chair, Edie O'Neil.
Application for SPR 2021-01 and LLA 2021-03
- IV. **3.1 Background & Summary Staff Report:** Edie began with reading the Declarations and Order for a Type A procedure. There were no objections the notice that was sent for written comment and no objections to the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to consider the matter. She then asked about any declarations of conflict or bias or ex-parte contacts by members of the Commission. Ron had already voiced his declaration. Edie stated that she had ex-parte contact with her brother-in-law who lives on N 3rd St. but felt that she was able to deliver a non-biased decision. Dave stated he knew the applicant but had no conversations regarding this project. Edie continued to read the Declarations up to time for the presentation of the summary. She then turned the meeting over to Kiel Jenkins, COG Planner for his report. Kiel stated the summary would be quite lengthy and he would summarize the items as best as possible and go over any questions/comments at the end. He stated that this was SPR 2021-01 and LLA 2021-03 and that since there had never been any development on this property, there was currently no address available yet and referenced the Tax Map/Lot number of 103W01CCTL200 which is approximately 0 Bates St. He stated this was a split zone property making it both Mixed Use and Commercial.

The SPR 2021-01 is an application for a two-building mixed-use development. The proposed development includes 56 multi-family residential units along with 5177 sq ft of retail space and 1663 sq ft of office space. This will also include a fitness center for residents and a leasing office along with support space for commercial development. This also includes improvements to the currently unimproved Bates St. right-of-way and to portions of 3rd St that bisects the property. There will also be an addition of a sidewalk to the 2nd St. right-of-way.

The applicant has also submitted a lot line adjustment application

(LLS 2021-03) to consolidate the existing legal lots of record into one lot.

Written comment notices were sent out to all property owners within 100 ft. of the property on August 11, 2021, 21 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting. The property was also posted with the same information on August 6, 2021. Kiel again stated that this was not a public hearing; it was a Type A procedure and decisions are made by the Planning Commission. He then began with the criteria required for both applications.

For the Lot Line Adjustment, there are 4 criteria that needed to be met:

Criteria A: The development of any property under same ownership can be accomplished in accordance with the Development Code.

Criteria B: Adjoining land can be developed or is provided access that will allow its development in accordance with the Development Code.

Criteria C: The proposed street plan affords the best economic, safe, and efficient circulation of traffic possible, under the circumstances.

Criteria D: Conditions necessary to satisfy the intent of the Development Code can be satisfied prior to final plan approval.

Kiel's findings show that all of the above criteria are satisfied without condition of approval

Kiel then listed the criteria required for a Site Plan Review.

Criteria A: Streets: Bates St. will need full street improvements from Bates & 3rd to the highway and connect to the highway. This will require a permit from ODOT as well.

Criteria B: Off Street Parking: All residential parking to be in the parking lot and lot must be developed per the PW Design Standards. The commercial use has sufficient on and off-street parking within 400 feet of the building. The parking lot must also meet landscaping requirements and a landscape plan will need to be reviewed before approval of final construction plans. Kiel's finding shows this criterion has been met.

Criteria C: Public Facilities: They must meet be able to provide potable water, fire hydrants and all buildings to be sprinkled. Sewer will also need to be provided and will be constructed. The storm water drainage must also not flood any other surrounding properties. There are currently no front yards for this development and staff has recommended a little more green space be added to the design.

Kiel's findings show all of this to have been met.

Criteria D: Signs: No signs are proposed however, any future signage will require a separate permit and any MC Building permits as well.

Criteria E: Site & Landscaping Design: Complete landscape plan admitted prior to approval and issuance of a certificate of occupancy. As for the buffer matrix, it is not required and has not been proposed however; screening is needed and a fence will be required as a condition of approval. Findings are that this has been met.

Criteria F: Surrounding & adjoining uses: The property is bordered by developed mixed use properties. The findings are that this development falls within the guidelines.

Criteria G: Drainage & Erosion Control: All storm drains are to be designed to the city's PWDS. The final design must be approved by the City Engineer and the proposed grading plan does not block drainage from other properties.

Criteria H: Public Health and Safety: The applications must be reviewed by City Planner, the Fire Department, City Public Works, City Engineer, and ODOT as applicable. Any concerns these entities had were addressed within their sections. No comments in denial were submitted.

Criteria I: Traffic Safety, Circulation, and Parking: There were no comments from ODOT showing any concern. Staff finds the standards related to circulation and safety are met as shown.

Criteria J: Provisions for adequate noise and/or visual buffering from non-compatible uses: Staff finds that this development is compatible with the surrounding uses. There is the required screening along the southern border of the property as a condition of approval.

Criteria K: Retention of Natural Features on Site: Some trees were removed from the property and 11 more will also be removed in order to improve the street and placement of building. The remaining trees will be retained as part of the landscaping plan.

Criteria L: Problems that may arise due to development within potential hazard areas: As defined by the Jefferson Code, Hazard areas are flood and wetlands and this property does not contain either.

Criteria M: Connectivity of internal circulation to existing and proposed streets, bikeways and pedestrian facilities: A ten-foot sidewalk will be provided along the exterior of the property for continuous pedestrian access. Must be ADA accessible. All parking spaces are accessed by raised pedestrian accessways and will be ADA accessible. Also, a permit from ODOT to have access permits must be submitted prior to construction. Findings are that all proposed sidewalks are 10 feet in width, exceeding the 5-foot standard.

The Staff recommendation the Planning Commission to direct staff to prepare a planning commission order approving LLA 2021-03 and SPR 2021-01 with conditions.

Edie O'Neil then called for any questions. Ron Gilles-868 Jefferson-Marion Rd-asked about the extension to the East and wanted to know if it extended all the way. Kiel responded and stated that it does not extend that far as the applicant chooses to save for later development.

Ron then asked if the parking lot would be lighted. Kiel said he believed it would be however, at this time no lighting plan has been submitted.

Ron also had questions regarding Jefferson-Marion Rd. He wanted to know if Bates St. was going to run from Hwy 164 to Jefferson-Marion Rd. The applicant, Lisa Carter, stated that was not the plan at this time. Kiel expanded on that answer by stating that when the expansion happens the applicant will be required to have MC approve it and permits through them as well.

Bruce Forbes: He stated that looking at the plan for 3rd St., the newer portion is bigger than the existing portion of 3rd St. and wanted to know how that was going to work. Were those residents on existing 3rd be required to give up property. Kiel responded that at this time the road is not extending that far, but if further development happens that could be a possibility to gain sidewalks.

Bruce then noted that there was only one elevator on the plans and wanted to know if that was code for 56 units.

Kiel stated that was more of a building code question, and when MC Building does the review, they will then instruct the applicant if more than one is needed.

Edie asked for any other comments or questions. Hearing none she asked if the applicant wanted to speak.

Lisa Carter stated they had no comments as Kiel had done a good job explaining. She did want the Commission and neighboring properties to understand that it is not their intent to disrupt neighbors or the City. They are just trying to add more retail space for more business and also create a few jobs as they plan on hiring local companies & contractors. She also stated the need for affordable housing within Jefferson needs to be expanded as well.

No other questions for the applicant.

This was followed by general discussion and concerns regarding traffic on Hwy 164, Jeff-Marion Rd, ODOT's plan, and the city's Transportation System Plan (TSP). Deanna stated the TSP was in the process of being updated.

Edie asked if ODOT had any plans for upgrading the area and adding a light.

David Jones stated they are still working on the plan but have nothing definite from ODOT as of yet. Kiel again stated that ODOT had opportunity to comment on this and they had no concerns or comments to add to the report.

Bruce then asked about the notice sent stating he had heard that several people in the area received no notice. Kiel stated that notices were mailed out

to all properties within 100 ft. of the proposed development, so not ALL of 3rd St was within the 100 ft.

David Watkins informed everyone that there are two City Councilors that are heavily involved with ODOT transportation and suggested that if they had any questions or concerns to reach out to Dave Beyrl or Walt Perry.

1.2 Decision: Hearing no other comments or concerns, Edie called for a motion from the Commission. Joseph Moore moved to adopt the findings from the staff report and direct staff to prepare a planning commission order approving SPR 2021-01 and LLA 2021-03. Bruce seconded.

All were in favor, no opposes. Motion carried unanimously with a 4-0 vote. Edie ended with informing everyone that the notice of decision shall be mailed to all those who attended or wrote in comments with information of the rights of each party to appeal the decision.

V. Visitors: Dennis Person-1878 Talbot Rd- stated he had nothing to say regarding the decision, and then gave some general information regarding his position on the MC Planning Commission.

Jan Leisinger-PO Box 84- stated that she would like to be invited to the next TSP meeting as she had concerns regarding the intersection of North Ave and Hwy 164 when traffic backs up on the freeway.

Hearing no other visitors wishing to speak, Edie moved on.

VI. Commissioner Questions & Comments: None

VII. Adjournment: Ron moved to adjourn and Bruce seconded. Meeting ended at 7:45 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16 DAY OF September 2021.

Ron Gilles

RON GILLES, CHAIR

ATTEST:

Deanna Donato

DEANNA DONATO, DEPUTY CITY RECORDER