



MINUTES
Planning Commission Meeting
Monday, September 26, 2022 Hybrid -
39250 Pioneer Blvd. and Zoom 6:30 PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Hollis MacLean-Wenzel, Commissioner, Jerry Crosby, Commissioner, Chris Mayton, Commissioner, Steven Hook, Commissioner, Breezy Poulin, Commissioner, and Darren Wegener, Commissioner

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Jan Lee, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT: Kelly O'Neill Jr., Development Services Director and Emily Meharg, Senior Planner

COUNCIL LIAISON PRESENT: Rich Sheldon, Councilor

1. MEETING FORMAT NOTICE

Instructions for electronic meeting.

2. ROLL CALL

Chair Crosby called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1. Draft Minutes for July 25, 2022

Chair Crosby asked for any edits. With no requested edits, Crosby declared the minutes approved as presented.

4. REQUESTS FROM THE FLOOR - CITIZEN COMMUNICATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

5. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Development Services Director O'Neill stated that the October meeting most likely won't occur and gave an overview of upcoming projects that will come before the Planning Commission, including additional code modifications. O'Neill also mentioned the upcoming November 7th work session on the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Systems Plan (TSP), and Future Fest on September 28th. He also mentioned that the TSP consultant, DKS Associates, will be seeking public input and Planning Commission input on priority projects. O'Neill stated that Sandy is kicking off

the transportation SDC methodology update as well in conjunction with the TSP update.

O'Neill let the Commissioners know that the City Council decided to reconsider the Bull Run Terrace application, which has been on stay at LUBA for a couple of years. The applicant is proposing a dwelling cap of 200 units. Commissioner MacLean-Wenzel asked if Planning Commissioners can testify at the hearing and O'Neill stated it's a public hearing and the Planning Commission is not the hearing body, so yes. O'Neill also mentioned that the City Council discussed the Pleasant Street Master Plan last week and that will be coming back through the Planning Commission for additional input in the future.

6. **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

None aside from Director's Report discussion.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

7.1. Industrial Design Standards Modifications (22-025 DCA)

Chair Crosby opened the public hearing on File No. 22-025 DCA at 6:46 p.m. Crosby called for any abstentions or conflicts of interest and no declarations were made by the Planning Commission.

Staff Report:

Development Services Director O'Neill provided an overview of the staff report. O'Neill stated that the landscape screening requirement for I-2 in Chapter 17.50 was adopted in 2012 but that Section 17.90.130 hasn't been updated since then. O'Neill stated the primary reason for code modifications to Section 17.90.130 is to remove some of the design requirements that won't be visible due to the vegetative screening requirement in order to reduce the cost of industrial development and make Sandy more competitive at attracting industrial uses. O'Neill highlighted a few specific design requirements that don't make sense, for example the roof pitch and window requirements. O'Neill also stated that Commissioner Lee provided feedback regarding not allowing wood shingles due to wildfire risk. O'Neill proposes striking wood shingles from the allowed roof materials per Commissioner Lee's comment. O'Neill stated that Economic Development Manager Snider is supportive of the code modifications.

Commissioner Wegener clarified that the code is being modified for I-2 and is also being applied to I-3. O'Neill explained that the only I-3 zoned property is located outside city limits and the existing development code is silent on design standards for I-3, so the proposal is to apply the updated code to both

I-2 and I-3. Commissioner MacLean-Wenzel asked a question about the language around existing trees being preserved “to the greatest extent possible” and who gets to decide that. O’Neill reminded the Commissioners that industrial code language doesn’t need to be clear and objective in the same way that residential code does.

Public Testimony:

None

Staff Recap:

None

Motion: Motion to close the public hearing at 6:57 p.m.

Moved By: Commissioner Mayton

Seconded By: Commissioner Wegener

Yes votes: All Ayes

No votes: None

Abstentions: None

Discussion:

Chair Crosby asked about screening from the “public view” and wondered where public view is exactly – on or off the property. O’Neill stated public view should be added as a definition in the code as part of the clear and objective audit. Crosby asked about “is prohibited” (in relation to T-11 siding) versus “shall not be used” and whether the code should be consistent. The Commission preferred “prohibited.” Crosby asked about the off-site screen and what that means. O’Neill explained that there are some properties that could be better screened by off-site vegetation due to topography or other reasons. Commissioner MacLean-Wenzel asked if an off-site screen is being relied on, what would prevent the vegetative screen from being removed later. O’Neill mentioned that enforcing an off-site screen could be difficult, but that the City should require a vegetative screen from a local street as well and not just screening from collectors and arterials.

Commissioner Mayton asked if Chapters 17.50 and 17.52 would need to be updated. O’Neill stated that in the future, during other code modifications, the vegetative screening requirement could be removed from Chapter 17.50 or added to Chapter 17.52 for consistency.

Commissioner Wegener asked about the Wippersnappers site and noted that it gets a lot of public visitors and wondered if I-2 and I-3 should have more robust design requirements for at least the entrance. O’Neill stated that that

particular property is currently transitioning from I-2 to I-1 so that there can be more diverse uses and, as part of that, the buildings are being required to have more Sandy Style elements.

Commissioner Wegener and Commissioner MacLean-Wenzel both stated that maybe a window or some architectural detail around the front doors might be a good idea. Crosby stated that a more robust SandyStyle public entrance could be “encouraged” since the code doesn’t have to be clear and objective. Commissioner Wegener suggested that the language could just state that there has to be a clear public entrance, so members of the public know where to go. Commissioner Mayton stated that B.1 already includes the requirement to have an attractive and functional primary entrance. Mayton further stated that C.1, which pertains to facades and is proposed to be stricken from the code, could remain. Crosby pointed out that the “varied and articulated” requirement adds cost. Commissioner MacLean-Wenzel suggested adding a reference to SandyStyle to help explain the attractive entrance requirement. Commissioner Wegener asked about subdivided buildings and whether they would have a single primary entrance and suggested B.1 should maybe apply to any public entrance, not just a primary entrance. O’Neill stated the developer may claim the building isn’t open to the public and also stated that “primary entrance” will soon be defined in the code. Commissioner Wegener suggested modifying to state, “primary entrance for each unit.”

Commissioner Mayton asked if the emphasis should be on the façade facing the public street. Commissioner MacLean-Wenzel stated that cities that have a “style” grow more because they’re nice but agrees the requirements should be loosened for industrial zones. Commissioner Mayton questioned whether the language in C.1 would necessarily result in increased cost and that it was more about creating a front façade that’s different from the back and that an applicant could ask for a variance but acknowledged that the variance process could also be a hurdle. Commissioner MacLean-Wenzel suggested using “encouraged” type language. O’Neill stated if it’s not required, most developers wouldn’t do it because it will increase their design costs, construction costs, and taxes.

Commissioner Wegener stated his fear is that we could end up with a giant metal building if C.1 is struck. Commissioner Poulin stated metal buildings can now look like stone or other siding. Chair Crosby noted that Chapter 17.10 does not include a definition of façade. Commissioner Mayton clarified that wood shingles will be stricken from D.4. O’Neill asked if the first half of C.5 gives better guidance than C.1 and the commissioners agreed that it does. The

commissioners' consensus is to reintroduce the first sentence of C.5, which would become C.3.

Chair Crosby summarized the Commission's proposed edits.

Motion: Motion to forward a recommendation to the City Council to approve the code modifications to Section 17.90.130 with suggested edits.

Moved By: Commissioner MacLean-Wenzel

Seconded By: Commissioner Mayton

Yes votes: All Ayes

No votes: None

Abstentions: None

The motion passed at 7:43 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Crosby adjourned the meeting at 7:43 p.m.



Chair, Jerry Crosby



Planning Director, Kelly O'Neill Jr