

Chairperson Cary Johnson called the Clatsop County Planning Commission meeting to order at 10:01 AM. Planning Commissioners (PC) present: Christine Bridgens, Marcia Harper-Vellutini, Cary Johnson, Brian Pogue, Clarke Powers. Mike Autio joined the meeting at 10:30 AM.

Staff present: Blair Henningsgaard, County Counsel, Ed Wegner, Clatsop County Director of Transportation and Development Services, Will Caplinger, Clatsop County Development Services Manager, Jennifer Bunch, Clatsop County Planner.

Business from the Public

No one from the public asked to speak.

Minutes

PC Powers noted that his name was used and/or spelled incorrectly in the April 13, 2010 minutes.

PC Pogue moved and PC Powers seconded to approve the minutes as presented [with corrections noted above]. Motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearings

Lindsley, Conditional Use Permit: request for a **Mixed Commercial & Residential Development** in accordance with Clatsop County's Land Water Development and Use Ordinance 80-14 Section 3.260 ss2. The site is located at 34742 Highway 101 Bus, and is described as Township 8N, Range 09W, section 30AC, Tax Lot 3400.

No ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest were reported.

Jennifer Bunch, Planner, presented the staff report. The applicant's dwelling on subject property was damaged beyond repair during the December 2007 storm and the zoning only allows a new residence as an accessory to a commercial use. The applicant applied for a conditional use permit to replace the non-conforming structure with a manufactured home and to operate a firewood sales business.

Ms. Bunch recommended the application be conditionally approved subject to the conditions of approval as stated in the staff report.

Charlene Larsen, Clatsop County Long Term Disaster Committee, representing Ms. Lindsley, stated that Ms. Lindsley understands the conditions outlined by staff.

Betty Artman, 92387 G Road, Astoria, questioned whether or not the manufactured home was going to fit in with the neighborhood. In response, Ms. Bunch stated that the

1 county makes no differentiation between a stick built and a manufactured home. In
2 addition, Clatsop County's Building Official has inspected it and deemed it suitable for a
3 dwelling.

4
5 Public testimony was closed.

6
7 **PC Powers moved and PC Bridgens seconded a motion to accept staff's**
8 **recommendation and approve the application for a conditional use permit.**
9 **Motion passed unanimously.**

10
11 At 10:15 AM Chairperson Johnson called a brief recess. Meeting reconvened at 10:23
12 AM.

13
14 **Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Refinement Plan:** An amendment to the Clatsop
15 County Transportation System Plan and associated text amendments to the Land and
16 Water Development and Use Ordinance.

17
18 Ms. Bunch presented the staff report with accompanying PowerPoint presentation
19 (Exhibit JG-1). In 2003 the Clatsop County Transportation System Plan (TSP) was
20 completed. At that time upgrades to the Astoria-Warrenton Parkway (US Hwy 101
21 Business or Highway 105) were recommended. This Refinement Plan was developed
22 through the involvement of a Project Management Team (PMT), Project Advisory
23 Committee (PAC) and members of the public. In addition to the project website which
24 provided opportunity for participation, two PMT meetings, two PAC meetings and four
25 public workshops were held to gather a broad range of comments and suggestions.

26
27 Some of the topics covered by the staff report:

- 28 • connectivity of the local street network
- 29 • right-of-way improvements
- 30 • coordinated review
- 31 • environmental impacts
- 32 • quality of life for the residents of the area
- 33 • safety concerns
- 34 • 202/101 Business do not meet ODOT standards
- 35 • all intersections failed mobility standards

36
37 Ms. Bunch went on to describe some of the short and long term goals of the plan,
38 including intersections, deceleration lanes, left turn pockets, property access control,
39 curbs, gutters, sidewalks, signage, roundabouts. There is a potential for displacement of
40 one business, but didn't know which one would be affected until the final design plan
41 was completed. She emphasized that this is a conceptual plan.

42
43 Following questions from PC Powers and PC Harper-Vellutini, Ms. Bunch stated that
44 one of the business owners that could be affected was on the advisory committee. She
45 continued to describe the extensive public process that has resulted in this refinement
46 plan, along with lots of positive feedback regarding the roundabouts.

47
48 Ms. Bunch talked about traffic signals vs. roundabouts, and stated that bridges are a
49 priority of this plan for Clatsop County. She continued by stating that the plan identifies
50 potential funding sources.

1 Cheryl Johnson, 35063 5th Lane, Astoria, expressed concern that the plan did not
2 include a proposal for build out of county roads.

3
4 Virginia Hall, 92192 Clover Rd, Astoria, expressed her concerns about changes affecting
5 the water table, stating that her house is sinking and there is a drainage problem in the
6 area. She went on to state her concerns regarding paying more taxes.

7
8 Ms. Bunch answered Ms. Hall's concerns by emphasizing that this is a conceptual plan
9 and there have been extensive conversations regarding the drainage issues.

10
11 Wayne Ledford, 92313 Clover Rd, Astoria, stated his concerns about flood issues and
12 that his building is settling. He also expressed his concerns about bottlenecks and
13 speeding traffic in the area.

14
15 Ken Klee, 37211 Labiske Ln, Astoria, owns a rental property at 410 Olney and stated his
16 support of roundabouts, but had concerns about access to his property.

17
18 Ms. Bunch restated that the plan is a conceptual plan. In the planning and engineering
19 stage, Mr. Klee would not be left without access to his property.

20
21 Betty Artman, 92387 G Road, Astoria, stated that the sewers aren't improving the
22 ground water system.

23
24 PCs Pogue and Johnson questioned the use of the word "shall" in underlined addition to
25 Section 2.045 Pre-application Conference. PC Pogue expressed concern that the
26 language opens the door for ODOT to veto everything and that they have a long history
27 of denying access.

28
29 Ed Wegner, Director of Transportation and Development Services, stated that he
30 thought it was a good coordinating statement: ODOT, the county, and the cities have to
31 work together. He further stated that it's a good idea to invite ODOT up front and not
32 after the fact.

33
34 Erik Havig, ODOT NW Region Planning & Development Manager for Region 2 talked
35 about recent SB 10-24 which redefines access. He went on to state that ODOT would
36 not have any veto authority, and that many jurisdictions throughout the state have very
37 similar language in their transportation plans.

38
39 PC Pogue and PC Johnson expressed their concerns that it is a red flag and doesn't
40 need to be in the plan, the county could be going down a slippery slope with ODOT.

41
42 Following a question from PC Pogue, Mr. Havig stated that from ODOT's standpoint,
43 having ODOT invited to pre-app conferences is very critical because the details start
44 getting worked out at that time and that's it's important to get that notification. Ms.
45 Bunch added that this issue was discussed amongst the project management team.

46
47 In response to a question from PC Pogue, County Counsel Blair Henningsgaard agreed
48 with staff and that inviting ODOT to pre-app conferences is really a benefit to the
49 applicant. He went on to state that state land use planning requires coordination and
50 that this sentence puts the requirement on staff to invite ODOT to the table and that's
51 good.

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

PC Autio expressed his concern of ODOT imposing their will when it isn't required.

Following a question from PC Johnson regarding the 750' notification requirement, Mr. Havig stated that if the property does not have direct access to highway, ODOT has no authority. ODOT does not want to direct or take authority from the county.

Public testimony was closed.

PC Pogue moved and PC Harper-Vellutini seconded to approve the Refinement Plan as presented by staff with the deletion of underlined sentence Section 2.045 Pre-application Conference. Motion passed unanimously.

The Public Hearings were closed by Chairperson Johnson.

Following a brief discussion, a 2:00 PM start time was chosen for the May 25th Citizens Advisory Committee work session.

As there was no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:44 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

SIGNED ORIGINAL ON FILE

Cary Johnson
Chairperson - Planning Commission