



22500 Salamo Road
West Linn, Oregon 97068
<http://westlinnoregon.gov>

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 18, 2017

5:30 p.m. - Meeting –Bolton Conference Room

Present: Chair Thomas Tucker, Russ Axelrod, Bob Martin, Ken Pryor, Gary Walvatne, Emily Smith

Citizens Present: Ed Turkisher

Staff Present: Megan Thornton, John Boyd

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the April 4, 2017 minutes

The review of the minutes were deferred to the next meeting. Citizen Comments

Resident Turkisher noted he is intending to become informed on the process.

3. Planning Process Review: Pre-Application Process (Second in a Series)

Staff members Thornton and Boyd presented information on the planning process starting with the neighborhood contact, which is when an applicant approaches the Neighborhood Association to schedule a meeting and reviewing up to the point when an applicant comes to the Planning Counter at City Hall and files an application for their project.

Attorney Thornton proceeded through the training exercise.

Questions raised by CCI members asked if there was a need for potential code changes.

Staff responded that an addition of a definition of “Material Misrepresentation” would be helpful.

Round table discussion on the role of the Neighborhood Association (NA), Planning Commission (PC) and City Council (CC) in the land use review process. Staff noted the applicant is responsible to set up a meeting with applicable NA's and that is determined

by those NA's within a 500 foot boundary of the subject property. There was additional discussion on the benefit of multiple NA meetings, applicant's reluctance (in some instances) to conduct additional meetings, and methods that could be improved in the NA outreach when making information available.

Staff Boyd continued on the review of the completeness check review process.

Members continued to ask questions regarding the number of required NA meetings in the process. In a recent example, they noted the applicant completed a meeting with both NA's in the 500 foot area but a request from the NA members for a second meeting was refused.

CCI Member Martin asked how plans were reviewed for completeness versus review for compliance to the code. Staff noted that the completeness review follows the CDC requirements listing required submittals. In some instances, staff suggest changes to project submittals to assist the decision maker with an improved explanation of the project goal. This request is voluntary and staff has found most applicant will make the suggested changes.

Member Axelrod discussed his past consideration of architectural design consistency.

Staff reviewed the City of Wilsonville's experience to set up architectural design standards in their code and have them reviewed by an architectural design board. There was also a discussion of the existing Willamette Falls Drive Commercial Design District and how that CDC chapter provide guidelines for the development of that district.

Attorney Thornton resumed the presentation with a review of the statutory requirements in ORS 227.178 including the 120 day rule, time frame to determine completeness and the goal post rule – the version of the code in effect at the time of application remains in effect for the permit review.

Member Martin asked about potential changes to the application. He expressed a concern that citizen involvement was considered only up to that point. His concern was changes to the application could nullify previous citizen input. The group thought that point needed additional discussion. Member Pryor asked when the NA member input is considered. He was concerned that the NA concerns are not addressed until late in the process. The group discussed the process and noted that the review process is completed by the decision making body and submitted concerns were addressed at that point in the process. It was noted the completeness check is the starting point (the acceptance of the application) and the City was allowed thirty days to review and determine if the application was complete and met the submittal requirements.

Member Smith asked about the 120 day rule and how it is enforced. Attorney Thornton explained the statutory requirements and the options that are available but under the control of the applicant.

Member Axelrod asked about the completeness check; is the city's process more diligent than the statute? Attorney Thornton noted the CDC does outline the steps that are in greater detail than the statute. There was a general discussion on the next steps, such as notice, coordination with agencies and other assigned duties.

Member Walvatne questioned the process for completeness versus the technical adequacy. The concern was the use of conditions of approval. The hope is would there be a process that allows for additional review. The discussion closed with a consideration of the need to make the process more informative and what next steps could be developed toward that path.

4. Member Comments

Discussed upcoming meeting. Member Martin asked for a quorum check to consider availability. Member Martin wanted the CCI to hold a meeting to review what had been accomplished and look forward to what needs to be done. He felt this discussion by the CCI was important and should start to consider what code revisions may be needed.

5. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.
