FOREST GROVE OREGON
A place where families and businesses thrive.

Planning Commission
Community Auditorium and Zoom
1915 Main Street, Forest Grove, OR
Monday, October 3rd, 2022, 7:00 pm

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Chair Phil Ruder called the Planning Commission public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom Video Conference.

The meeting was held in person in the Community Auditorium and remotely video conferenced by Planning Commission Coordinator Shannon Reynolds. To view the recorded meeting, please visit the City of Forest Grove website. The public was allowed to attend via Zoom or observe in the Community Auditorium.

Roll Call:

Planning Commission Present In Person and via Zoom Remotely: Chair Phil Ruder (in person); Commissioners Lisa Nakajima (in person), Ginny Sanderson (in person), Teri Bjorn (in person), Tim Farrell (in person), Joel Redwine (in person) and Julie Danko (in person).

Planning Commission Excused: None

Staff Present: Amy Kreimeier, Senior Planner (in the Community Auditorium); Cassi Bergstrom, Community Development (in the Community Auditorium);

2. PUBLIC MEETING:

A. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS:
None.

B. PUBLIC HEARING:

(1.) File No. 311-22-000024-PLNG - **Site Development and Design Review of proposed 32-unit multi-family apartment complex**.

Chairman Phil Ruder opened the Public Hearing at 7:03 p.m. by reading through the quasi-judicial hearing procedures. Commissioner Nakajima recused herself to the audience to provide testimony due to a relationship with the property noted. Commissioner Bjorn stated for the record that she lives in the Forest Place Apartments to the east of this development but is a tenant only and feels she has no bias or conflict of interest with the application.

Mrs. Amy Kreimeier provided the Commissioners with a staff report of the proposed site for development located at Fir Road and Pacific Avenue, Tax Lot 1S305AB00501. This proposal is for two, three-story buildings totaling 32 multi-family unit apartments. Forty-eight parking spaces will be designated. Plans include a wall separation between the Stonewood Center and Ace Hardware. Associated site improvements proposed include off-street parking, open space and site landscaping. There were several conditions of approval mentioned by staff. Removal of secondary residential access doors proposed on the units 102 and 103 is required. Installing a separate pedestrian pathway from dwellings by a minimum of 3 feet. Replacement of the proposed CMU wall with a 6-foot-tall landscape hedge has been conditioned. Lastly, the 2-foot-wide planting area along the southern property line shall be planted with a mixture of groundcover and shrubs. Ms. Kreimeier mentioned two optional conditions of approval; provide private open space for all ground floor units and provide an architecturally defined entry space for all exterior accessed ground floor units.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the Design Review and Site Development Review application for the Stonewood Apartments as conditioned.

Applicant:
Matt Newman, NW Engineers, 3409 NE John Olsen Avenue, Hillsboro, OR 97124
Mr. Newman provided a presentation of the site and some the design constraints. Safety concerns were a high priority during the design process. Accessibility throughout each building was important as well as adequate lighting. The condition requiring a 3-foot landscape strip on the North and East side of the buildings will be difficult to meet. They would need to shift the entire site westward. They are asking for a reduced setback of 4 feet. The condition proposed for the wall hedge would require more room than what is available.

Phil Crawford, Stonewood LLC, 8200 NE 99W McMinnville, OR 97128
Mr. Crawford discussed the separation wall to be constructed. He would like to propose constructing the CMU block wall while also adding mosaic options along with additional landscape hedging that would protect the wall from possible vandalism. This would be a compromise to meet in the middle while still allowing them to meet the required setbacks.

Barry Newdelman, Architect, 2340 SE Tamarack Avenue, Portland, OR 97214
Mr. Newdelman gave a brief description of the project. Mr. Newdelman feels they can adequately reduce the width by 1foot 8 inches to meet the code requirements.

PROPONENTS:
None

OPPONENTS:

<u>Matt Brake, 3754 Pacific Ave #341, Forest Grove, OR 97116</u>
Mr. Brake stated the lot proposed for the apartment site is way too small and completely surrounded with other buildings. Traffic issues will continue to be a problem and just get worse with the proposed development. He encourages people to go look at this site and see for yourself it is too small. There will not be adequate parking. The commercial residents will have difficulty keeping their parking lots available for their own patrons.

<u>Kathryn Brake, 3754 Pacific Ave #341, Forest Grove, OR 97116</u>
Mrs. Brake wanted to reiterate Mr. Brakes comments, and stated that you can see the developer is having difficulty fitting on this site. There is not enough room and she is in opposition to this type of development at this location.

OTHER:

<u>Lisa Nakajima, P.O. Box 408, Forest Grove, OR 97116</u>
Mrs. Lisa Nakajima stated she is the daughter of the landlord for Ace Hardware. They have had fifty years of experience with this property and its development. They do have some sway in the way this property will be developed according to how the deed was written. When it was determined to place apartments on this site, it was important to them to have an impervious wall constructed, for the safety of the residents. A hedge will need to be maintained and will eventually fall apart. A CMU wall is noise canceling, keeps children and pets safer and can be made more attractive in various ways as previously mentioned. They are asking the Commissioners to respect their perspective.

<u>Mark Nakajima, P.O. Box 408, Forest Grove, OR 97116</u>
Mr. Nakajima agrees with the same concerns and statements as Mrs. Nakajima. The concrete wall is the best solution for this project. A hedge is a fire hazard and requires maintenance. Mr. Nakajima stated he is a proponent of the CMU wall construction for this site.

REBUTTAL:

Mr. Newman provided a rebuttal. Parking is always a neighborly concern. The Development Code is clear on parking requirements and density and they have been met. They believe the CMU block wall will provide adequate separation between uses.

Commissioner Sanderson asked for clarity on their position with the staff recommended Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Danko inquired on the electrical vehicle parking spaces and if that could be used for other types of vehicles when not in use.

Chair Ruder closed the public hearing at 8:11 p.m.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

Commissioners deliberated and discussed various elements of the proposed apartment complex and the CMU wall construction and placement. Commissioner Bjorn inquired of staff for clarity of wall requirements, height and landscape. She also asked staff to clarify the density requirements of this location. Amy confirmed this site meets the density code requirement and is very close to the maximum number of allowable units. Commissioner Farrell asked for clarity on the optional conditions of approval. Mrs. Kreimeier stated the 3 feet of separation between the building and the sidewalk could potentially be used for the "private open space area" for the ground floor units. This could possibly still mee the "intent" of the Code.

Commissioner Sanderson moved a motion to approve file number 311-22-000024-PLNG - The Design Review and Site Development Review application for the Stonewood Apartments as stated in the staff report with the following amendments to conditions; Condition #10 to have language added excepting the east-side and northern most facing areas of the building from the 3 feet minimum separation requirement; Condition #12 shall be eliminated and replaced with construct a 6 foot CMU wall with a 2 foot landscape buffer on the north side of wall as well as reduce the southern sidewalk to an allowable 4 foot width. Commissioner Danko seconded the motion.

<u>Roll Call Vote on Motion:</u> AYES: Chair Ruder; Commissioners Sanderson, Danko, Bjorn, Redwine and Farrell. NOES: None. ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None. MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

C. <u>ACTION ITEMS:</u>
None.

3. <u>BUSINESS MEETING:</u>

A. <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</u>
Chair Ruder requested the minutes have a formal name recognition moving forward such as "Commissioner" or "Chair" when notating who's speaking. The September 19th minutes were approved by acclimation.

B. <u>DIRECTOR'S REPORT:</u>

No Director's report was given.

Chair Ruder discussed the letter being drafted to submit to City Council regarding the cannabis decision to overrule the Planning Commission's recommendation. Commissioner Sanderson recommended discussing this issue with the newly elected Mayor and City Council members sometime in January. Chair Ruder inquired if the Development Code was reviewed for updates/amendments on a recurring basis. Mrs. Kreimeier stated that Code revisions were generally addressed once a year for any small Code amendments unless a major Code amendment is needed.

E. **<u>ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING:</u>**
The next meeting is TBD.

F. **<u>ADJOURNMENT:</u>**
The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

____
Shannon Reynolds
Planning Commission Coordinator