

**Planning Commission Meeting  
Gresham City Hall/Civic Center  
Council Chambers  
October 28, 2019 - 6:30 p.m.**

**I. Opening/Call to Order**

A regular session of the Gresham Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Paul Drechsler on the 28th of October 2019 at 6:31 PM in the Council Chambers at Gresham City Hall & Civic Center located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. Meeting was recorded digitally, and minutes prepared by Tammy Richardson.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Richard Anderson, Vice Chair  
Mike Bennett  
Stephen Butler  
Paul Drechsler, Chair  
Jef Kaiser  
Laura Pramuk  
Sue Ruonala  
Alison Wood

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Phil Wich

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Berniker, Urban Design & Planning Director  
Ricardo Banuelos, Urban Design & Planning  
Katherine Kelly, Urban Design & Planning  
Kevin McConnell, City Attorney  
Brian Monberg, Office of Governance & Mgmt.  
Tina Osterink, Urban Design & Planning  
Tammy Richardson, Urban Design & Planning  
Jim Wheeler, Urban Design Manager

**COUNCIL LIAISONS PRESENT:**

**II. General Comment Period**

No one wished to speak during this time.

### **III. Public Hearing**

#### **Type III Plan Map Amendment Hearing James Conger – PMA 19-26000341**

Chair Drechsler opened the public hearing. The proposal is for a change in land use designation from Industrial-Springwater (IND-SW) to Low Density Residential-Springwater (LDR-SW) on a 2.26-acre portion of a split-zoned parcel located at 6742 SE Telford Road.

No Commissioners wished to abstain from the proceedings. No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. Commissioners Kaiser, Pramuk, Ruonala and Wood had visited the site.

Ricardo Banuelos, Associate City Planner, described the proposal and summarized the staff report, and provided an executive summary of findings addressing approval factors. He said after reviewing the applicant's materials and City's comprehensive plan policies, staff concludes that the proposed LDR-SW designation can meet all four of the City's criteria for Plan Map amendment. The proposed change is anchored on the point that the subject property is poorly suited for industrial use due to access limitations and slopes greatly exceeding those marketable for industrial users. The access limitations and slopes make the site better suited for a residential development alternative.

Mr. Banuelos addressed two letters submitted prior to the hearing. First is a letter from the Fair Housing Council with respect to compliance with State Goal 10 – Housing. He said for the reasons cited in the staff report and reiterated in the presentation, staff continues to be confident there is sufficient information submitted to demonstrate compliance with Housing Goal 10. In regard to the DLCD letter, staff also feels the findings are sufficient to comply with Goal 9, Economic Development, as well. Mr. Banuelos stated that staff finds the application complies with City of Gresham policies, State goals and Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

Mr. Banuelos gave staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed plan map amendment to the City Council based on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the staff report with the additional findings for Oregon Goal 9 and Goal 10 clarified during the presentation.

Commissioner Butler talked about the term negligible impact, is that staff's term or from the applicant.

Mr. Banuelos said that is based on data information submitted by the applicant in their Johnson Economics report with respect to number of jobs we would be losing and population to employment ratio.

Commission Anderson asked about capacity for wastewater and water, and does the applicant or the city pay for that?

Mr. Banuelos said his understanding is the applicant or developer pays for upgrades when they submit for a development permit.

Commissioner Bennett asked if the map on page 1 of the application is just a colored map that shows the site as being split zoned, industrial to the right side. He said he doesn't disagree with the zoning changes and in fact thinks a lot if the entire area should be rezoned to residential. In his option, it does not fit industrial. He said his concern is piecemealing these together. He asked if the city is going to do a comprehensive relook at this whole area at some point?

Mr. Banuelos said as far as he is aware, this is the only property that is split-zoned like this in the area. Everything else would be either LDR-SW or IND-SW.

David Berniker, Urban Design and Planning Director thanked Commissioner Bennett for the question. He said at the moment, it is not on the council work program. He noted that the issue has come up before. There are issues of zoning and infrastructure and topography as they relate to Springwater, but we have not been given direction by Council yet to tackle it and has not risen to council's agenda.

Commissioner Bennett asked if he agrees it is something that needs to be looked at, especially since we are starting to piecemeal zoning changes.

Mr. Berniker said he believes it has been proven or explained in different places that the area does not always lend itself to the industrial uses that are proposed.

Commissioner Ruonala thanked Ricardo for sending all the information and a little bit of the history that she had requested since she was not around when this area was zoned. She would like to see the Planning Commission have this as a topic and a work session if that's at all possible in the near future. When the last PMA went through she stated that this would be an orphan piece and that is indeed what has happened. In looking at residential, she does have some concerns. Residential would be part of it, but we are not seeing any neighborhood commercial such as shopping or little commercial centers near any of these residential parcels. The intersections that are around there are at capacity. She would like to see a work session to discuss this more and see if we feel this should be brought to the attention of City Council.

Mr. Berniker said staff can definitely bring that topic to the Commission and included in that bring in some high-level understanding of what he and the director of Environmental Services have shared, as well as information from Economic Development staff. Then the planning commission can decide where they want to go with that.

Commissioner Anderson said he was on both the Pleasant Valley and Springwater master planning efforts and knew when the mater plans were done some tweaks and tune-ups would need to be done because we were looking at a big massive area with kind of broad-brush planning applications. He spoke to the ODOT land and the limited access to highway.

Commissioner Kaiser stated that he doesn't disagree with the merits of the proposal, but in the bigger scheme this seems like death by 1000 cuts. This is the third plan map amendment that within the past several months, all using the same set of reasons. At the first one that we heard, we received testimony that by making these small partial changes, it is just going to build momentum to encourage others to do the same thing, so it was recommended at that time that a bigger comprehensive look at industrial land, maybe even just focusing on the Springwater area was merited. He thinks the need continues to grow. He said he printed out a topo sheet and

overlayed it on the Springwater area. Using the 5% slope criteria, almost a quarter, if not a third of the Springwater industrial area won't pass muster for development for that reason. He said in fairness to property owners out there, to the planning commission and the City of Gresham, a bigger picture look is needed.

Commissioner Drechsler said he would just add that on the vacant industrial land map that may need to be updated, a lot of the industrial in the north seems like it has been slated or is under serious conversation so it may be a little misleading on how much is available in that area.

Mr. Banuelos said he believes that is a Metro map and is not sure what their turnaround time is to update it or how often they do.

Commissioner Drechsler said his understanding is that quite a bit of that is spoken for. He agrees with the sentiment that we probably need to take a comprehensive look at the industrial Springwater map, maybe in combination with efforts with Metro and of course with City Council support. He concurs there is a need for a future work session on this topic.

**James Conger, Applicant and Tracy Brown, Representative**

Tracy Brown said he represents the property owner on this application. They have owned the property for about 20 to 25 years. When the property was annexed in 2002 it was split zoned and is not sure what the reasoning was at that time. He noted that it is not typical to split zone a property, however it is the situation we have today.

Mr. Brown addressed the comments they received from the Fair Housing Council and DLCD. He pointed out that they did provide the public needs analysis, which Mr. Banuelos mentioned. He said this change would increase the number of dwelling units and would not take away any units upon approval of this application.

James Conger provided some background information on the property. He said he appreciates everyone considering this. He feels it is an unusual split zoning on this site. It wouldn't make sense to have a small industrial development in the middle of the residential parcels.

Mr. Brown said they appreciate the conversation of the Planning Commission. The site is unusual with split zoning. It is an orphan piece which doesn't make sense to have two very different zones. He said they agree with the staff report and findings and appreciates the work of staff. He feels staff has made appropriate and sufficient findings to address the concerns noted in the Fair Housing Council and DLCD letters.

There was no public testimony given either in support or opposition to this proposal.

It was the unanimous consensus of the Commission to close the hearing.

Commissioner Kaiser asked if the Commission could agree with passing the recommendation but have rider recommendation to go to City Council that there be a more comprehensive look at the Springwater area?

Commissioner Drechsler stated that he feels it would be separate from this hearing, but we could discuss that recommendation to staff as guidance.

Kevin McConnell, City Attorney, said he believes the Commission will have an opportunity after the public hearing is closed to broach any subject they would like and after the decision is made.

Commissioner Kaiser said he is concerned that a separate recommendation would not have the same weight.

Mr. McConnell stated that his recommendation is that you have an application before you, and you make a decision based on the staff report and the testimony given tonight. He does not believe it is proper to add a rider recommendation to the public hearing you have in front of you today. The Commission would have an opportunity to delve into that subject outside of this application.

Commissioner Drechsler agreed that a decision should be made on the criteria in in front of them by this application but can certainly address the larger issue and a recommendation in a future conversation.

**Commissioner Butler moved to recommend approval of Application PMA 19-26000341 to the City Council based on the findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in the October 17, 2019 Staff Report. Motion seconded by Commissioner Anderson. The motion passed 8:0 as follows:**

<b>Commissioner Anderson:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Commissioner Ruonala:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Bennett:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Commissioner Pramuk:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Butler:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Commissioner Wich:</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Commissioner Drechsler:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Commissioner Wood:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Kaiser:</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

#### **IV. Other Business/Adjournment**

##### Parks Concept Planning

Tina Osterink provided a background overview and summary of the Parks Concept Planning project.

Commissioners Butler and Ruonala thanked Tina and staff for her hard work and effort to keep council informed. They also thanked David Berniker for being in attendance at the park sessions.

Commissioner Bennett offered a suggestion of mazes, recalling seeing some made out of trees.

Commissioner Kaiser advised that there are resources of volunteers that could accomplish the objective of the parks, but just need guidance. He said the planning commission is also a resource to accomplish objectives.

Commissioner Anderson questioned whether a grant can be accepted now that there are master plans being developed.

Ms. Osterink said this is currently in the concept planning stages. Other facets of planning will be proceeding such as consultants, funding, cost estimates for each parks and funding strategies. Next steps are a listening session, meeting with stakeholders, youth groups. Then the plan will be refined and taken back to council in February or March.

Commissioner Kaiser noted that the community supports park improvements but also has hesitancy for improvements if there isn't enforcement and monitoring for what we do, providing a comfort factor that the City will respond when concerns present themselves.

Commissioner Bennett suggested contacting Metro East for information if necessary.

Chair Drechsler thanked Tina for her work. He brought up that the recommendation was to have a master plan each year and that even though the process has changed a bit with concept planning, we do not want to lose sight of the goal of completing a master plan. He would also like to see a "likelihood to be developed" category in the master plan, believing that incremental improvement in a few smaller parks is preferred to long-term bigger projects that don't get done.

### Metro Housing Bond Discussion

Brian Monberg gave an overview and explained key component of the Metro Housing Bond.

There was discussion about the inclusion of transitional housing as well as affordable housing and how that is translated.

There was some question about ability to build anything of quality for the amounts anticipated.

Mr. Monberg assured the commission that the goal is for the structures to be long-lasting and of high quality and there have been recent examples by Human Solutions and Habitat for Humanity. Also, coupling with services as mentioned before to maintain the units and keep them financially performing.

Commissioner Bennett asked who will be scrutinizing quality.

Mr. Monberg said staff will provide oversight as well as state requirements

Commissioner Wood talked about home ownership and barriers to housing and incompatibility.

Mr. Monberg said the primary focus will be on deeply affordable rental units. There is an interest to look at least one investment to include ownership opportunity. Ownership can also decrease subsidy. In regard to safety and criminal history, exploring how to use screening criteria similar to other cities and developers will be done.

Commissioner Anderson asked what other subsidy sources are available.

Mr. Monberg said discussions are ongoing with the basic component, which HUD offers in rental subsidy vouchers. The City is pursuing every opportunity and looking at a combination of current assets and future or existing contracts with HUD that may be outside Section 8 but may provide rental subsidy.

Commissioner Kaiser noted that visual amenity objectives will go through the Design Commission. He wondered if there is a way to ensure developments will go through design commission even if outside the design districts.

Commissioner Drechsler stated concerns regarding residual income and also keeping the housing as affordable and not having it be owned; those two things may contradict. He suggested instead of getting more units, maybe get more quality or larger units.

The Commission thanked Mr. Monberg for the opportunity to provide feedback on this bond.

Meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date