MINUTES

KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
KEIZER CITY HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBERS
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1995

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Matiskainen at 7:07 p.m.

2. SWEARING IN

Bill Pearl was not present to be sworn in.

3. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Marty Matiskainen, Dick Inman, Bill Wolf, June Abbott, and Manny Martinez. Elaine Smith arrived at 7:10 p.m.

Also present were: Council Liaison Jerry Watson, City Attorney Shannon Johnson, Community Development Director John Morgan, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

No one came forward to present any issues to the Commission.

5. PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Chemawa Activity Center

Chairman Matiskainen advised that the October 11 public hearing was continued to tonight and remained open for public testimony. He set forth the procedure for receiving comments and testimony.

(Ms. Smith arrived and took her seat at the table.)

Mr. Morgan distributed to Commission members and members of the audience copies of preliminary draft plan language and asked that the Commission give particular attention to the issue of design standards beginning on page 7 of the draft with *Objectives of the Design Standards*, and then on page 8, the actual *Design Standards*.

FMAGIC

Mr. Morgan also distributed to commission members copies of two documents as examples or possible models for zoning for the proposed Industrial Business Campus Zone: (1) a revision of Salem's Industrial Business Campus Zone; and (2) the City of Hillsboro's M-P (Manufacturing/Park) Zone.

Mr. Morgan also distributed copies of a letter dated October 16, 1995, from ODOT DLCD Transportation and Land Use Planner Eric Jacobson. The letter was a response to the City's proposed comprehensive plan amendment and zone change for the Chemawa Activity Center property, and more specifically, the Kampe Associates report. Mr. Morgan pointed out that Mr. Jacobson's concerns were with regard to the lack of adoptable material in the report, and the fact that it didn't address many transportation issues. Mr. Morgan noted that Mr. Jacobson's concerns would be addressed in drafting the final plan.

Mr. Morgan advised that over the last couple weeks he had worked with the property-owner group representing the area north of Lockhaven on details of their ideas for the land. He noted that throughout the hearing he would be available to respond to their comments and testimony, as well as the testimony of other interested parties.

Presenting public testimony to the Planning Commission were:

Dale Nason, 2200 Chemawa Road NE, Keizer. Mr. Nason expressed dismay with the time it was taking the City to make a determination regarding what would happen to properties in the Chemawa Activity Center Plan area. He noted that ten to twelve residents from Area C/ the Southwest Quadrant, were present at the October 11 public hearing, and were extremely disappointed that no discussion and deliberation took place at that meeting.

Mr. Nason recalled Councilor Watson's question at the October 11 hearing of what the property owners within Area C wished to see happen with their property. Mr. Nason reviewed the history of testimony from those property owners, beginning in July, 1993 and extending into 1995. He emphasized their continuing participation, and wondered if their input had been taken into consideration.

With respect to the question before the Commission of whether Area C should be in or out of the Chemawa Activity Center Plan, Mr. Nason felt that before residents could present their opinions, they needed an idea of the possibilities for the area.

For clarification, Councilor Watson pointed out that he had asked for information in order to give the residents of Area C, at this time in the hearing process, an opportunity to put their ideas into the record.

Randy McCool, 5530 St. Croix Way NE, Keizer. Mr. McCool submitted a letter dated November 1, 1995, signed by seven property owners in the Southwest Quadrant (Area C). He read the letter expressing support for a land use plan of Campus Light Industrial/Commercial, but unanimous disapproval of medium density or multiple family dwellings. He noted, therefore, their reluctance to support a mixed use designation for the property. The letter also pointed out the property owners' different ideas about street access to the area, but their agreement with implementing some kind of formal land use and zoning as a first step. The property owners specifically asked that a reasonable time schedule be attached to any plan, to allow property owners to make realistic decisions regarding the future of any real estate investments.

Mr. Inman asked what zone designation was being suggested by the residents of Area C. Mr. McCool indicated support for the original designation of Campus Light Industrial/ Commercial Retail. In that context, Mixed Use was acceptable, however, they opposed the inclusion of multi-family dwelling, and therefore did not support the Mixed Use designation.

Ms. Smith asked what concerned the residents about multiple-family. And, also, for exactly what did they wish to see a time schedule.

Mr. McCool, stating his own personal opinions, indicated that he would like to see something similar to the Hawthorne business park visible from I-5. He could not picture such a development with apartments and duplexes mixed in. He pointed out the extra traffic and congestion that would be generated by their inclusion. He also noted the lower property values for multi-family development than for retail and commercial.

With respect to a time frame, Mr. McCool noted that he had lived in the area since 1983, and a plan for this land had been in the works since 1987. He was reluctant to make changes to his property without knowing a time frame, and pointed out that a map included in the report indicates a road going through his house. He emphasized his lack of ability to make decisions regarding normal upkeep of his property due to the uncertainty with regard to the City's plans for the land.

Mr. Morgan advised that Council-adopted goals called for adoption of strategies for the Activity Center by December 1996. The process provides for adoption of the Master Plan, the zoning, and the Comprehensive Plan changes the first part of 1996. The first several months of next year would then be spent developing a financing strategy for the infrastructure, proceeding to implementation of the strategy by the end of 1996. Mr. Morgan noted that the intent is that the improvements will be in place by Summer, 1997, followed by the beginning of new construction. He emphasized that the stated time frame assumes that the financing can be put together in 1996.

Mr. McCool encouraged the Planning Commission and City Council to try to stick to the stated time frame.

For Clarification, Mr. Martinez asked if Mr. McCool and his neighbors supported the Industrial Business Campus zoning. Mr. McCool confirmed that they do support a Campus Light Industrial or Commercial use--not the multi-family dwellings.

Ken Sherman Jr., 687 Court Street NE, Salem. Mr. Sherman, representing property owners in NW Quadrant of the Chemawa Activity Center, explained his involvement in the area as a land use lawyer on other occasions over last ten to twelve years. He credited Rod Stubbs with Eldred Realty and Dale Johnson from the neighborhood with bringing the property owners together, and emphasized that they were getting very close to being able to speak with one voice for all property owners in the NW Quadrant.

Mr. Sherman noted the frustration also experienced by the property owners in the NW Quadrant due to delays in establishing a plan. He emphasized that the owners of the properties who make up the quadrant are ordinary people without money to put into infrastructure, and stressed the need to go to market with the infrastructure in place. Mr. Sherman felt that the best road to development would be through a public and private partnership.

Referring to Mr. Morgan's staff report, Mr. Sherman indicated agreement with the suggestion to focus on industrial activity on the property north of the PGE power line, and to look to the south part of the property for hotel/commercial/restaurant usage. With respect to the proposed hotel, Mr. Sherman felt that there should be some flexibility in terms of the size of the facility, and the number, possibly allowing for two or three smaller hotels rather than one large one. He stressed his desire to see the master plan kept as flexible as possible.

Mr. Sherman considered inclusion of a conference facility a desirable objective, but felt that it should not be an absolute requirement.

Mr. Sherman suggested that the maximum size for any one retail store be adjusted from 100,000 to 150,000 square feet. He stated that he was not talking about anything that would approach a regional shopping center--it would be, at most, about one-third that size. He envisioned that the uses would be primarily oriented to the freeway traffic, not designed to compete with local merchants.

With respect to landscaping plans, Mr. Sherman suggested that there be flexibility in place. He also requested flexibility with regard to the Radiant Drive alignment. He acknowledged the impact of the Transportation Planning Rule, but felt that the proposed standard for buildings to be not more than 50 feet from the street would create problems not only for this development but for others. As an example, he pointed out that delivery trucks must have access to the stores, and suggested that the standard be more carefully thought out. He pointed out other problems with retail located close to the street, and again suggested flexibility at the front end of the process.

Mr. Martinez asked if the group had a position with regard to multi-family development. Mr. Sherman responded that multi-family was not suggested for the NW quadrant, and was therefore not discussed.

Ms. Smith felt that although there had been much talk about traffic generated by multi-family development, the real traffic generator would be the commercial development. She wondered if Mr. Sherman saw a necessity for commercial development, or if all of the property could be absorbed with the campus light industrial uses. Mr. Sherman felt that the proposed mixture was appropriate given the location of the property. He pointed out Mr. Stubbs projections for 1400 new jobs on the property, and noted that they would lead to a fair amount of traffic regardless of the types of uses. Mr. Sherman acknowledged that the pressure on the local road system could put some limits on the amount of development on the property, but emphasized the importance of creating a balanced development.

Ms. Smith restated her question, asking if Mr. Sherman if he thought there was enough demand for campus light development to absorb the total northwest area.

Rod Stubbs, 3460 Southwood Drive, Salem. Mr. Stubbs responded to Ms. Smith's question, stating that there was no question about the demand. He pointed out the need for industrial development to support the newly established high-tech businesses in the Portland area. He also saw a demand for the commercial aspect of the development, pointing out a need for hotel/motel facilities to support the engineering-intensive plants.

Ms. Smith noted that a hotel/conference center is also suggested for the east side of the freeway. With hotels on both sides of the freeway, she wondered if there would be any business left for a hotel in downtown Keizer, should one be developed.

Mr. Stubbs pointed out that 24-million people a year drive by Keizer's "front door." He felt that the market was ample.

Mr. Sherman described two types of hotel markets available to Keizer, the freeway-oriented market, and a market to serve people coming to the community for a specific purpose. He acknowledged that at some point at the freeway a point of saturation could be reached. He explained that before any hotel is built a careful market study would be done by any developers in question with regard to the site they are looking at.

No further testimony was presented to the Commission.

Mr. Morgan advised that after tonight's discussion and Planning Commission input he would finalize the draft plan. It was his intent to mail to a copy to everyone on the mailing list. He suggested leaving the hearing open, allowing everyone an opportunity to speak to the draft one last time.

Councilor Watson felt that it would be appropriate to close the public hearing at this time. He suggested that Mr. Morgan take the ideas generated by the Planning Commission and finalize the draft for submittal to the City Council as soon as possible. Any additional public comment would be received at that time.

Mr. Martinez asked what advantage there would be in holding the hearing open.

Mr. Morgan responded that the only advantage would be that the Planning Commission could receive comment on the final draft. He acknowledged that the public would have an opportunity to give testimony at a City Council level.

Councilor Watson concurred that if after discussion and deliberation the Planning Commission felt that further public testimony was needed in response to any unresolved issues, the public hearing could be reopened.

> It was moved by Mr. Wolf to close the public hearing and after discussion and deliberation go forward to the City Council with recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez.
>
> The motion carried, all present voting aye except Mr. Inman who voted no.

Chairman Matiskainen closed the public hearing. He advised that the testimony received would be taken into consideration, and after deliberation the Planning Commission recommendations would be forwarded on to the City Council.

The Planning Commission recessed at 8:00 p.m. and reconvened at 8:15 p.m. Councilor Watson did not return to the table.

Mr. Morgan suggested that the Planning Commission focus discussion on two issues raised during the public testimony; the land use mix in the NW quadrant, and the housing in the SW quadrant. He highlighted specifics that needed to be addressed dealing with development size and type, and pointed out the type of retail that could occur within different square footage limitations. He also noted limitations governing development of a proposed hotel on the east side of the freeway, and the advantages for a more significant facility on Keizer's side. He responded to comments made about hotels, conference, retail, and housing development, and suggested that the Commission consider the public testimony and then develop recommendations for what they would like to see ten years from now.

Ms. Smith disclosed her employment with the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and advised that the DLCD letter submitted into the record would not affect her decision.

Mr. Matiskainen surmised that much of the concern expressed related to determining what was meant by mixed use. He noted that two mixed uses are included in the new development code that will be submitted to Council early next year--one, a residential-based mixed use, and the other a commercial mixed use zone. He felt that the commercial mixed use which has only limited emphasis on residential was the one to be looked at for any quadrant within the plan. He noted, however, that multi-family did not necessarily mean low-income housing. He suggested that another option might be to keep the emphasis on commercial for the SW quadrant and have the hotel/motel conference facility in that quadrant.

Ms. Smith wondered why commercial was desired for the area considering the level of congestion that would result from traffic coming off the freeway and along Lockhaven. She questioned whether a 300,000 SF development was really wanted for the community. She indicated that she would like to introduce the idea of thinking more about industrial use in the area, limiting commercial to uses that will serve the industrial such as a hotel, a restaurant, and a gas station or two. Ms. Smith had no strong opinion with regard to the issue of apartment uses.

Mr. Matiskainen agreed that the idea of heavy commercial for the area was troubling considering all the time and effort being spent to create a center within Keizer. He felt, however, that hotel/motel could be permitted within the commercial designation since that square footage was available at only one other location within Keizer. He agreed that industrial uses would present an opportunity for employment for Keizer residents, and also by employing people from other areas, they would be drawn into Keizer to support the business community.

Mr. Martinez liked the idea of light industrial business campus with limited commercial, but indicated that he would like to eliminate all multi-family. He felt that multi-family uses were not compatible with the other uses.

Mr. Inman relayed his preferences for the various quadrants. For the north part of Area A he envisioned light industrial or campus business type uses. For the south part of Area A he saw an extension of the north part of Area A, possibly incorporating the hotel/motel concept. For Area B, the narrow strip north of Lockhaven/west of the rail road tracks, Mr. Inman envisioned a commercial mix. He saw Area C as campus light industrial, and envisioned the property south of Lockhaven and east of the railroad as park-n-ride/commercial mix. Mr. Inman confirmed that Area C was the only section he saw different from the study recommendation, suggesting light industrial rather than mixed use.

Ms. Abbott agreed, and noted that her main objection was to the recommendation for Area C. She also felt that allowing heavy commercialization at the interchange would be contrary to the objective to bring business to River Road. She could see some commercial at the interchange in the form of a service station to service the hotel and some light retail such as gift shops and specialty shops, but certainly no gigantic retail business. For the remainder of the NW section Ms. Abbott disagreed with the multi-family portion of the mixed use designation because of the burden it would place on the already overcrowded schools. If the mixed use designation were to remain, she felt that it should be specific, eliminating the multi-family designation. On the remaining corner, Ms. Abbott felt the mixed use designation should be dropped entirely.

At Ms. Abbott's request Mr. Morgan explained more clearly the Industrial Campus Business Zone, and noted that there would be a transition period for development of any type for Area C because of the time it would take to assemble the smaller lots with homes now on them.

Mr. Inman asked if the southwest area could be removed from the plan.

Mr. Morgan answered that the southwest area was included in the original activity center in 1985 because it was generally undeveloped and it related economically to the interchange. From 1990 to 1993 a question was raised as to whether it should be taken out. Because the City did not have any campus industrial zone and since the underlying Comp Plan designation was Industrial, it was felt that if it were removed there would be little control over what might be developed.

Mr. Morgan also pointed out another factor, the importance of the disconnection of Ridge Drive at Lockhaven, and realignment. He explained the effect of the transportation element on potential land uses. He noted that if a renewal district or assessment district is formed, that group will have to pay to realign Ridge Drive.

Mr. Inman asked about the possibility of changing the zoning to single family residential. Mr. Morgan responded that it could be possible, but that Ridge Drive would still have to be realigned. He felt that there was some sense that the market may not support it developing single family.

Mr. Wolf agreed with the recommendations for the NW Quadrant. He didn't want to see incredible activity, but felt that some kind of commercial would be appropriate. He also liked the idea of industrial where proposed. He felt the proposed mixed use office/retail/multi-family was appropriate for the small area just north of Lockhaven, and noted that the burden is on school district to ensure enough schools. He also felt that the proposed type of mixed use was appropriate for the south side of Lockhaven. He was supportive of the idea of getting away from the campus light with its lack of restrictions.

Referring to the transportation study determination that cutting off Chemawa would cause the project to be too dirty, Mr. Wolf asked if consideration had been given to veering Chemawa Road straight across as soon as is possible and crossing the tracks.

Mr. Morgan responded that the traffic engineers, Kittleson Associates, had such a plan in their first draft. It included an elevated interchange at the rail road tracks. Mr. Morgan conceded that it would probably be the ultimate answer, but the $12 million cost was prohibitive. He confirmed that the proposed plan assumes that Chemawa is still connected to Lockhaven, and explained how the plan was adjusted to meet the air quality standard.

Ms. Smith stated that after hearing the comments of the other Commission members and more clearly visualizing the possibilities, she was beginning to see a more defined plan. For the area north of Lockhaven and west of the interchange, she felt that the entire north and south portions should be industrial of some kind. She felt that any kind of commercial should be restricted to the proposed commercial area south of Lockhaven, north of the park-n-ride. She felt that commercial services such as the hotel/conference, gas station, etc. would be appropriate in that area to serve freeway users and the industrial users. West of the rail road tracks, north of Lockhaven, Ms. Smith felt that the mixed use office/ retail/multi-family made a lot of sense. She could see a limited amount of multi-family, or single family adjacent to the existing residential in that area, and felt that the retail uses should be more oriented to the neighborhood area. She felt that the area south of Lockhaven, west of the rail road tracks represented a challenge because of the existing single family. It was her feeling that this area should be looked at separately, and that a specific plan should be developed for it. She conceded that some multi-family near Lockhaven might be appropriate, and possible some limited commercial, and some single-family further south, but stressed the need to be cautious and specific about what is permitted. She agreed with the proposed location for a park-n-ride.

Mr. Morgan summarized the points on which he would proceed with the draft in response to the Commissioner's comments. He felt that the direction most generally was to minimize the commercial in Area A, and limit it to the hotel complex and some associated freeway-oriented retail. For Areas B and C, he noted the hesitation about housing. He pointed out, however, that a market exists for the housing and suggested doing a little medium or higher-density in the area. He suggested allowing the housing, but possibly limiting it to second story in a mixed-use setting. He noted that it might be appropriate to apply the proposed River Road Commercial Mixed Zone in these areas, especially on the north side of Lockhaven. For the south, Mr. Morgan had a concern that if it were designated for industrial/retail/office there would be no market to absorb it. He pointed out the hazards of zoning unrealistically, and noted that it might be necessary to make more of it residential.

Ms. Smith ask if anyone had a response to her suggestion not to have commercial in Area A north of the freeway.

Mr. Morgan confirmed with her that she meant the hotel as well as other commercial, and agreed that it would be a possibility to put all the commercial on the south side.

Mr. Morgan also called attention to recent comments regarding the potential of using the Burlington Northern for commuter rail. He suggested that the Commission think about setting aside land to use as a station should it ever occur. He pointed out the potential for supporting uses around such a commuter station.

Mr. Inman asked if there would be any problem with down zoning. Mr. Morgan answered that there was no problem legally.

Mr. Morgan indicated that an updated draft would be available at the November 8 meeting.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

6.1 Regular Meeting: November 8, 1995 - 7:00 PM

7. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Matiskainen at 9:05 p.m.