

The Junction City Planning Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, September 29, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City Oregon and remotely via internet and phone.

Present were: Planning Commissioners, Jeff Haag (Chair), Jim Creech, Doug Easterday, James Hukill (Vice-Chair), Cindy Montgomery, and Jack Sumner; Planning Alternate, Jesse Newman; City Attorney, Carrie Connelly; and Planning Secretary, Tere Andrews

Absent: None

1. OPEN MEETING

Chair Haag opened the meeting at 6:30pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

none

3. PUBLIC COMMENT (FOR ITEMS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA)

none

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **July 21, 2021**

Motion: Commissioner Hukill made a motion to approve the July 21, 2021 Planning Commission minutes as written. Commissioner Montgomery seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 7:0:0. Chair Haag, Commissioners, Hukill, Creech, Easterday, Montgomery, Sumner, and Newman voted in favor.

5. PUBLIC HEARING: CONDITIONAL USE AND CONCURRENT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, 582 LAUREL, FILE # CUP-21-13/DEV-21-14

Chair Haag opened the public hearing for the Conditional Use and concurrent Development Review request at 582 Laurel Street, file # CUP-21-13/DEV-21-14 on September 29, 2021 at 6:34 p.m.

Commissioners participated in the public hearing only if they could do so without undue bias either for or against the application.

Chair Haag asked the Planning Commissioners if there were any disclosures of conflicts of interest, ex-parte contacts, or bias related to the proposal or applicant.

Commissioner Creech stated he was a patient at the applicants' dental office. He also stated he could make an unbiased decision.

Chair Haag asked if there were any challenges from the audience as to conflicts of interest, ex parte contacts, or bias related to any member of the Planning Commission.

There were none.

Vice Chair Haag asked staff to review the staff report.

Technician Andrews stated before the Commission was a request for a Conditional Use Permit and concurrent Development Review. Development Review was normally a staff level review. According to the Junction City Municipal Code, it was a Type I review. Development Review was before the Commission now because the Code required, when land use applications were reviewed together, the stricter process applied to both applications. A Conditional Use application was a Type III review.

The applicant requested Conditional Use and Development Review approval (File # CUP-21-13/DEV-21-14), for an addition to an existing dental office at West 6th Avenue and Laurel Street. The proposal included, moving the required parking to the lot behind the dental office directly to the south (554 Laurel Street). Both lots were owned by the applicant. As part of the proposal, the existing single-family dwelling at 554 Laurel Street would be demolished. The existing dental office addition would be where the parking was currently located.

The subject site contained two different zoning districts on two legal lots (582 Laurel and 554 Laurel). The existing dental office was in the Commercial Residential zone with required parking expansion proposed at 554 Laurel in the Duplex Residential (R2) zone.

Under Junction City Municipal Code section 17.15.020(E) the Planning Commission could approve a proposal for a neighborhood commercial use with floor area less than 5,000 square feet.

The applicable Junction City Municipal Code chapters were 17.15, Duplex Residential; 17.40 Commercial Residential; 17.85 Access Management; 17.90, Off-Street Parking and Loading; 17.130, Conditional Uses and; 17.160, Development Standards.

Neighborhood Commercial uses, such as the existing dental office at 582 Laurel Street and accompanying on-site parking were outright permitted uses in the Commercial Residential zone. However, Neighborhood Commercial uses permitted in Duplex Residential zones were Conditional Uses and required a public hearing before the Planning Commission.

The application was submitted on August 26, 2021 and deemed complete on August 27, 2021. Public notice to property owners and residents within 300-feet

were mailed September 1, 2021. Notice published in the Register Guard newspaper on September 8, 2021.

A records search was conducted on the subject site. There was a Variance granted in 2000 for construction of the existing dental office, and a Property Line Adjustment approved in 1999 which increased the square footage of Lot 6 and decreased Lot 7.

Notices of the public hearing were mailed to property owners and residents within 300-feet of the subject site. Two written comments were received, both in favor of the proposal.

When the dental office was built in 2000, the variance granted allowed an 18-foot front yard setback rather than the required 20-feet. The front of the building would not change as part of the proposal. The Variance noted the north property line, West 6th Avenue, was the front property line.

Off-street parking was a required element of the dental office. Because the subject site contained two legal lots, and the parking would be on the south lot a condition of approval in the staff report, called for a Lot Combining Covenant, recorded with Lane County which mandated, if sold, the two lots must be sold together so long as a building was on the site. Other conditions of approval were a sight-obscuring fence along the south property line between the parking lot and the neighboring property, and an approved landscape plan.

Commissioner Sumner asked if there was a fence along the existing parking lot.

Technician Andrews responded there was.

Commissioner Montgomery asked if the parking lot would open onto the alley, and if it did would they be required to pave the entire alley.

Technician Andrews replied, the portion of the alley currently being used by the dental office was paved. Public Works would require the other portion of the alley, for the parking expansion, also be paved, if not already paved.

Commissioner Easterday asked if there were landscape criteria for the east side of the property along the alley.

Technician Andrews responded; the Code required a percentage of landscape for the subject site. The Conditional Use process provided the Planning Commission an option of setting conditions for landscaping on the east property line.

Applicant and Others in Favor May Speak

Chair Haag asked if the applicant or their representative, or others, would like to speak.

Mr. Nicholas Whisman, 555 Kalmia Street, Junction City OR 97448 asked how far south the dental office addition would extend. He explained his alley access was across from the current dental office parking lot.

The Commission reviewed the site plan as it related to Mr. Whisman's question. Technician Andrews stated the alleys were 20-feet wide. Commissioners noted the 34-foot addition placed the building across from Mr. Whisman's alley access. However, the proposal did not change Mr. Whisman's alley access.

Mr. Whisman requested a copy of the documents.

Technician Andrews responded the documents were available on the city website or if preferred a copy could be sent.

Commissioner Montgomery asked Mr. Whisman if he was concerned with being able to get on/off his property from the alley because of the building addition being there, or additional traffic.

Mr. Whisman was aware the proposal would not affect the alley width. The current location of the dental office allowed for ease of access to his property. He wanted to understand how that might be affected by the proposal.

Chair Haag commented the addition would take up nearly the whole lot. The new angled parking spaces would be in tax lots 6201 and 6202.

Mr. Whisman also expressed some concern about the additional traffic in the alley. He then thanked the Commission.

Chair Haag thanked Mr. Whisman for his testimony.

There was no other testimony.

As there were no requests to keep the record or the public hearing open, Chair Haag closed the record and public hearing at 7:15p.m.

Deliberations

Commissioner Montgomery asked what the City ordinance was for alleys.

Technician Andrews responded the alleys were public. As far a development was concerned, Public Works Design Standards required if a developer proposed to use the alley, the developer was required to pave. She was not aware of an ordinance that limited traffic in the alleys.

Chair Haag added his property along an alley was across from a high school parking lot. The alley became one of the main access points for that parking lot 15-20 years ago. He had not noticed a significant increase with that change.

Motion: Commissioner Creech made a motion to approve the proposed Conditional Use Permit with concurrent Development Review, File: CUP-21-

13/DEV-21-14 to allow an addition to an existing dental office in the Commercial Residential zoning district with required parking expansion in the Duplex Residential (R2) zone based on the findings presented in the Final Order. Commissioner Hukill seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 7:0:0. Chair Haag, Commissioners, Creech, Hukill, Easterday, Montgomery, Sumner, and Newman voted in favor.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION FORECASTER AGENDA

Technician Andrews reviewed the forecaster with the Commission.

7. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Easterday noted he would not be able to attend the October 20, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Hukill made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Creech seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 7:0:0. Chair Haag, Commissioners, Creech, Hukill, Easterday, Montgomery, Sumner, and Newman voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 7:26p.m.

The next Standing Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for Wednesday October 20, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tere Andrews, Planning Commission Secretary

Jeff Haag, Planning Commission Chair