

## CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING BRIEF

Tuesday, October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016

Full audio is available on the City Web site [www.Cityofprineville.com](http://www.Cityofprineville.com)

---

**Commission Members Present:** Marty Bailey, Bob Orlando, Bob Spaulding, Deb Harper, Corey Engstrom

**Commission Members Not Present:** Ron Cholin, Kim Kambak

**Staff Present:** Phil Stenbeck (Director), Josh Smith (Senior Planner)

**Provided Testimony:** Dennis Jordan, Phil Stenbeck, Deidre Stenbeck

### **Regular Meeting (6:30)**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Planning Commission Chair Marty Bailey called the Commission to order.

### **PUBLIC HEARING:**

A. Continuation of Cu-2016-106 for a 100 space worker housing RV park.

Staff – Staff presented the updated staff report from the first hearing, stating that the hearing was closed and acknowledged all comments that were received at the previous hearing. Staff stated that the second staff report was identical to the first report with the exception that the neighbor comments were inserted with statements about how the comments fit the criteria or not. Staff asked the Commission if they wanted Staff to go over each comment individually or if they were comfortable with the responses in the staff report. The Commission indicated that they did not need staff to address each comment, however there was a healthy conversation about how Peters Road will be extended in the future to ensure it lines up at the intersection with Main Street and Peters Road going east. Staff explained that at this time the RV Park does not warrant the alignment of the intersection and that an off-set tee intersection has been shown to be adequate. Staff also stated that future development on this property or others that impact this intersection would dictate when Peters Road gets properly aligned. With the hearing closed to additional comment, the Commission began their deliberations of the application.

Commission – The Planning Commission had a few more questions and comments during their deliberations. One comment was a clarification to the stormwater condition. Another asked if there would be an onsite manager. Staff stated that they would make corrections to the stormwater condition and that there would be an onsite manager. Several Commissioners stated that they were comfortable with the application as it pertains to the Worker Housing Code, however some discussion continued about how this project will move forward and whether the applicant is fully aware that this approval is temporary. Staff explained that condition 19 requires a covenant to be signed stating that they understand that this approval is temporary and that to make it permanent the applicant will need a Plan Amendment Zone Change to a residential zone and an additional approval meeting the full RV Park code.

Decision – Deb Harper made a motion to accept Cu-2016-106 as presented, Bob Spaulding seconded the motion and the motion passed with 5 in favor and none opposed.

---

## **B. Continuation of Cu-2016-104 for a 30 space RV Park.**

Staff – Staff gave a presentation starting with an overview of the property and then describing the submitted site plan. Staff explained that the property would need to annex into the City as evidenced by submitting the appropriate applications. Staff also explained the need for ODOT access approval as well as approval from BOR to extend utilities over or under their irrigation pipe in Combs Flat Road. Staff explained that the application meets the criteria for an RV Park with the exception of the density requirement. The applicant is asking for 4 additional spaces than would normally be allowed by code. Staff stated that the density requirement was most likely there to prevent overly dense parks but that in this case, 4 additional spaces seems reasonable and works with the design of the park. After the presentation the Commission asked questions about additional parking, landscaping on the west side, recreational areas, permanent residences and potential use of a cul-de-sac instead of a hammer-head turnaround to reduce conflicting movements. Staff responded to each question as asked, primarily demonstrating how the proposal meets the land use code with the understanding that as a conditional use the Commission can modify the proposal.

Applicant – The applicant provided some background into their experience with RV Parks and the reasons for developing this proposal. The applicant then began to answer the questions asked of staff and later answered questions raised during the public comment period. The applicant stated they had no problem landscaping the west side of the property and mentioned that there is room not shown on the plan. The applicant stated that they would need to control the parking on site and considered making the drive isle 30' wide to accommodate additional parking at each space instead of the 5 additional spaces by the office. The applicant agreed with staff that drainage should not be a problem and also agreed that they would need to correct any problems that may arise. The applicant stated that the choice of the hammer-head turn around versus the cul-de-sac was preferred by the Fire Department because it was wider and longer than the standard and provides for full backing movements. The applicant stated that they planned to make part of the existing home a recreation room for the park and that the open space around the office would be open to the park guests. The applicant mentioned that they don't intend to have permanent residences, stating that parks are more profitable when people are moving in and out. Finally they discussed their reasoning for exceeding the density standard, which was primarily economical. The applicant inferred that the extra spaces are compensation for the large expense of bringing water and sewer service to the other side of the Combs Flat Road that could be used by others.

Public Comments – Dennis Jordan the property owner to the south stated that he was not against the proposal but had some questions. He asked if he would be required to annex, how the park would function (yearly, monthly, daily), will they build a fence, is my livestock still allowed, will City services affect my property and how would noise be controlled. Staff stated that he would not be required to annex, that there is no restriction on how the park would be rented, the applicant is required to build a fence, he would not have to remove his livestock, City services would not affect his property and that noise is managed by the City noise Ordinance.

Commission Deliberations – During deliberations there was a little more discussion about parking, the recreation area and extra spaces, however; the Commission was essentially satisfied with the proposal and the answers they received from staff and the applicant. The Commission did ask for a change to the conditions to require a recreational area within the existing home as the applicant stated they intended to do.

Decision – Bob Orland made a motion to approve the application with stated changes. Deb Harper seconded the motion and the motion passed with 5 in favor and none opposed.

**Consent Agenda:**

A. Cu-2016-105 for a 12 room Boarding House.

Commission - The Planning Commission reviewed the final decision with one question about language that should have been deleted from the Staff Report. Staff stated that the language was changed in the Staff Report and those changes are reflected in the Final Decision. With no further comments the Planning Commission Chair signed the decision.

B. SUB-2016-100 or a 14 lot subdivision.

Commission - The Planning Commission reviewed the final decision with no comments and the Planning Commission Chair signed the decision.

**Planning Commission Matters:**

A. Bob Spaulding is moving out of town and has submitted his resignation from the Planning Commission.

B. Staff asked the Commission for their opinion on painted roof signs. The City sign code limits roof sign structures to 50 sq. ft. but does not specifically address signs painted on the roof. The City had a request for a very large painted roof sign near the Airport. Staff instructed the requestor that any sign seen from the road would need to meet the roof sign standards, even a painted sign and any exception to that code would need to be reviewed by the Commission. During the Commission discussion the primary concern was the aesthetics of the community. Painted roof signs would be visible not only from the road in some cases but also from the view point and other elevated places around town. It would be difficult to allow such a sign in on place and not in another.

**Directors Report:** The Planning Director updated the Commission on housing issues, Air Quality and the DSP committee.

**Meeting Adjourned: 8:22 P.M.**