



Planning Commission Meeting Brief

(Full audio is available on the City Web site www.Cityofprineville.com)

Commission Members Present: Marty Bailey, Bob Orlando, Erika Montgomery, Priscilla Smith, Corey Engstrom, Ron Cholin

Commission Members Not Present: Bret Nelson

Staff Present: Joshua Smith (Planning Director), Casey Kaiser (Associate Planner)

Provided Testimony: Gary Deavers, Susan Tannock, Angie Gorton, Ronnie Ralls, Harry Nott, Bill Zelenka, Jim Hussey, Tim Gorton, Mark Genz

Regular Meeting (6:30)

I. Call to order: Chair Called the meeting to order

II. Public Hearing: The Planning Commission will review and consider action for the following items:

a) Cu-2019-103 for a 135 Unit Multi-family complex.

Staff: The Planning Director gave a presentation of the proposal including history of the Buckhorn Acres Subdivision, an overview of the project, details of the traffic study, conditions of approval, and how the project fits within the current land use code.

Applicant: Mark Genz provided testimony on behalf of the applicant. Mark provided additional details of the project and an explanation of some of the design features. He stated that he agreed with the conditions of the staff report as written and was willing to flip building 2 so that the balconies faced east instead of west. The Planning Commission asked about management and lighting. Mark discussed the benefits of having one owner and stated that there will be a live-in onsite manager. He also stated that lighting will be night sky compliant but they have not completed a lighting analysis yet.

Public Comment: Six people spoke in opposition and two had general comments about the project.

The six people in opposition had a range of concerns. These concerns included traffic congestion, proximity to garbage enclosures, compatibility, property value, privacy, noise, views, smoking and construction dust. One property owner had submitted written comments with suggested conditions. One of the people with general comments asked about the build out rate of the project. The other asked about the direct connection to a collector street, explained that he thought the Commission could deny the application and discussed a potential need to revise an easement agreement. Staff responded to questions as they were asked and the applicant responded in rebuttal on three different occasions.

Staff & Applicant response summary:

Staff commented on concerns throughout the hearing, summarized as follows:

Traffic: Staff explained that the project does have direct access to a Major Collector Street. Staff believed closing the access to the north would prevent cut through traffic in the neighborhood. Explained that the City uses the P.M. Peak hour traffic counts to justify requiring street improvements.

Garbage enclosures: Staff explained that the placement of the enclosures were aligned with access points in coordination with Prineville Disposal. There are not likely any better places to put the enclosures and ensure the garbage truck has room to maneuver. The City does have nuisance ordinances that could be used if the enclosures are not properly managed.



Property rights: Many of the comments at the hearing had more to do with property rights than land use criteria of the zone. There seemed to be a lot of confusion about what could or should be allowed on the property and what may have been advertised. In response, staff explained that the property is zone R2 and allows a wide range of residential uses. Staff encouraged people to always check with City Planning Staff if you live next to vacant property because you can't assume to know what will be developed. Staff mentioned there were many conceptual ideas of how the property could be developed but it ultimately comes down to the rights of the property owner. Potential issues with noise, smoking, dust and the like all fall under management or City nuisance ordinances and are not grounds to deny an application. The City also does not have specific view shed or solar setbacks.

The applicant stated that he expressed his opinions based on his experience with these projects being well built and well managed and understands that there are different perceptions of multi-family developments. He also acknowledged that poor management can have a negative impact. He stated that he designed the development based on staff comments to have the least intrusion possible while maintaining a certain density. Buildings were moved inside, setbacks were increased and landscaping and fencing are being provided to buffer neighboring properties. In response to the written comments the applicant stated that he would agree to flip building 2 but cannot agree to swap the building with the recreation building & pool due to construction feasibility and would not agree to build a taller fence due to maintenance and wind loads. In response to timing of the project he stated that the first buildings would be ready for occupancy in the spring of 2020 and potentially complete by early 2021.

Planning Commission Deliberations: The commission asked questions throughout the meeting about traffic, management of the complex, lighting, building design and bike racks. A question concerning A.M. peak hour traffic was specifically asked. Staff acknowledged that the A.M. peak traffic could have higher delays but that P.M. Peak is generally higher and is what the City uses to justify the failure of an intersection. After the hearing was closed, a Planning Commissioner essentially asked staff and the other Commissioners if they felt there was any doubt whether the laws and requirements of the City were being followed. Staff clarified that the Commission would have to agree that the project had direct access to a Major collector Street as determined by staff. There were no objections to that finding and no member of the Commission raised objection to the project meeting the City standards. Before a motion was made staff reminded the Commission that a condition would need to be added to flip building 2 as agreed by the applicant.

Decision: Bob Orlando made a motion to approve the application as written adding the condition as discussed to flip building 2. Erika Montgomery seconded the motion and the motion passed with 6 in favor and none opposed.

III. Planning Commission Matters:

- a) Staff informed the Commission that due to budget meetings we will hold our May meeting on the 7th of next week. No hearings are scheduled but we would have the consent item for the multifamily development just approved.
- b) Staff presented the Commission with a list of applications applied for since the beginning of the year.

IV. Planning Director's Report

- a) Update on City projects

V. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned: 9:02 P.M.