

CITY OF DUNDEE

Meeting: Planning Commission Meeting
Location: City Council Meeting Chambers
620 S.W. 5th Street
Dundee, Oregon 97115
Date: August 17, 2011
Time: 7:00 p.m.

I. Meeting called to order.

Vice-Chairman Hinson called the meeting to order. Commissioners present, which consisted of quorum, were Hinson, Baird, Wymore, Mock, Lietz, and Manning. CA Daykin and Planner Nunley were present. Jim McMaster, representing Chehalem Park and Recreation (CPRD) was also in attendance.

II. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting(s)

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of July 20, 2011 as written. Motion carries unanimously.

III. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VI. Public Hearings

CPRD, MP 11-12, Master Plan Approval for a Park Located between SE Maple and SE Locust Streets

1. Objections to Notice

Vice-Chairman Hinson began by reading the statement of interest into record. He then questioned whether there were objections to notice. No objections were heard.

2. Objections to Jurisdiction

There were no objections to jurisdiction.

3. Declarations of Ex-Parte, Bias, or Conflict of Interest

It was noted that Commissioner Baird was a member of the Parks Committee but that she felt she could continue without bias.

4. Staff Report

Planner Nunley read the staff report into record, with the conclusion that staff recommends approval.

Preliminary discussion centered on the specific requirements of the Park zone, specifically acreage and drinking fountains. The recommendations of the Park Committee were also discussed. Commissioner Baird noted that the list was meant as more of a suggestion, rather than conditions of approval.

There were questions regarding the results of the neighborhood meeting and whether the Master Plan met all the public concerns and recommendations. Staff stated that they believed so, with the exception of the comments regarding Maple Street being developed as a through street. There were questions regarding what things might trigger street improvements.

The requirement for a fence along the railroad track was also discussed.

5. Proponents

Jim McMaster addressed each recommendation made by the Park Committee.

Sign-- He stated that there were no issues, but that they'd like to add the parks hours.

Drinking Fountain— He stated that this was not discussed with the committee, but they would look into whether the neighborhood would like to have it. However, he also noted it was not an expense they had planned on.

Asphalt Trail-- He stated that they weren't sure they wanted to build out the entire asphalt path at this time because if the entire property was built out as a park they didn't want to waste tax payer money by putting it in now and having to tear it out later to rebuilt it all the way around both tax lots.

Trees—They were okay with planting a few more trees.

Basketball Court—He stated they were uncomfortable with moving the court because they didn't want to take away the open space.

Bench: This was not a problem.

Rubber Matting: He stated this was going to be a large problem because it was expensive and cost nearly as much as the park.

Tables: The district was okay with affixing them.

Fence: He stated that he was going to talk with City staff about the fence because they would rather keep it on the property line and steer around a large oak tree that was on the property.

He concluded by stating that he expected to meet with the neighborhood committee and make a decision regarding specific play equipment within the next week.

Questions from the Commission of the applicant and staff focused on the future plans of the second, adjoining, tax lot; demographics of the area; the drinking fountain; exact layout of the asphalt path; what would trigger the need to come back to the Planning Commission and City Council if the master plan were revised; access of the sidewalk to Locust; and, the possible extension of Maple Street.

Mr. McMaster stated that the District would rather see the listed conditions as recommendations rather than conditions of approval, but that they would do the things if it was necessary. He noted that the exception to this was the condition of the rubber matting, which would delay the project due to cost.

Commissioner Lietz asked whether Mr. McMaster had talked to the neighborhood about the speed concerns. Mr. McMaster recommended that "Children at Play" signs be installed.

6. Opponents

There were no opponents.

7. General Testimony

Melody Osborne spoke and stated that the neighborhood committee specifically tried to stay away from play equipment that would deteriorate over time and requested that the rubber matting requirement be removed from the conditions of approval due to its tendency to deteriorate over time. Further, she stated concerns over probable latex content being used in the rubber matting material. She also requested that the drinking fountain be removed from the conditions, noting that as a neighborhood park most people would bring water with them.

Vice-Chairman Hinson closed the public hearing.

8. Deliberation

Commissioner Baird stated that she would recommend that the Conditions of Approval be revised to recommend language about the signage, some verbiage regarding the asphalt path, and language regarding the trees.

There was some continued conversation regarding rewording the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioners went down the list and determined that the Conditions of Approval should be revised as follows:

- Condition 1: Deleted.
- Condition 2: Revised to state "Install a drinking fountain."
- Condition 3: Revised to state "Install an asphalt path that will provide a connection between Locust Street and Maple Street."
- Condition 4: Deleted.
- Condition 5: Deleted.
- Condition 6: Deleted.
- Condition 7: Deleted.
- Condition 8: Deleted.
- Condition 9: Deleted.
- Condition 10: Deleted.

It was noted that the conditions would need to be renumbered to "1." and "2."

A new condition, "Consult with City Engineer to address potential hazards posed by traffic on Locust Street" was added as number "3.". The "Other Conditions" were renumbered as "4., 5., and 6."

There was a question about whether the City Council would receive the original memo. Planner Nunley responded that they would get the memo, but that she would explain what transpired in the commission meeting. She then restated proposed conditions.

It was questioned whether the map needed to be updated in the meeting. Planner Nunley clarified that the map update would take place after the final decision was rendered by City Council.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the staff recommendation with the amendments to the Conditions of Approval as read. Motion carries unanimously.

V. Planning Issues from Commission Members.

There was a question about the number of nameplates displayed on the table and answered that there were still seven commissioners, but one was taken off the table due to the known absence.

There was a question about whether it was possible to put pressure on ODOT to put a crosswalk at 9th Street so people could use it to cross to the bus stop. CA Daykin stated that in 2013 a reconstruction project was going to take place on the highway that would take out the existing sidewalks, but that ODOT thought Dundee already had too many crosswalks so it would be an uphill battle.

There was a comment about the concrete island on 5th street and the impact on traffic ability to turn. CA Daykin responded that it was installed intentionally.

There was a question about whether there is a leash law in Dundee. CA Daykin responded that he believed it was in the nuisance ordinance. There was a question about whether it could be put in the next newsletter.

VI. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion carries, unanimously.



~~David Hinson, Vice Chairman~~ Gary Manning, Interim Chairman

ATTEST:



Melody Osborne, Planning Secretary