

Baker City Planning Commission
Meeting of February 21, 2007

The meeting was called to order by Sharon Rudi at 7:02 p.m.

Commission members present included: Ken Rockwell, Wayne Burnside, Sharon Rudi, Laurie Woodworth and Rick Rembold. Chair Alan Blair and Vice Chair Rob Ellingson were not present at the meeting. Staff present included City Attorney David Fine and Jennifer Murphy

Approval of January 17, 2007 Meeting Minutes – Rick Rembold mentioned a correction in the fourth paragraph of the first page regarding the individual that read the hearing procedures. Ken Rockwell mentioned additional wording that he believes needed to be included in the fourth paragraph of page four regarding the Lifestyles Senior Housing case decision. Rockwell stated that he had mentioned in January's meeting the additional criteria of Section 15.3.400(1) and (2) of the Dev. Code. With such changes, Burnside MOVED to approve the meeting minutes. Rockwell SECONDED the motion. The motion CARRIED with all members in favor.

Planning Commission Case No. 07-SDR-04 – A request by Bill Harvey to construct a 10,885 sq. ft. commercial office building within the General-Commercial zone.

Sharon Rudi read aloud the hearing procedures. Mr. Fine briefed commission on the staff report. Mr. Fine indicated that this application is unique in that the commission will need to determine their interpretation of “abut”. Applicant's commercial property touches (“abuts”) Ninth Street. Ninth Street is divided in the center, with the west portion included in the CG zone and the east portion included within the R-MD zone. Fine indicated that the commission will need to make a determination that if a city right-of-way separates zones, if those zones are in fact “abutting”. In such cases additional building setbacks could be required. Rudi mentioned that she believes it does not abut if a right-of-way is separating the properties.

Rudi asked if all commissioners had an opportunity to view the property and are familiar with the application. All commissioners assured that they are familiar with the site.

At that time Rudi indicated that the Harveys have been clients of hers in the past and that Lorrie Harvey was a former employee of Rudi's. Rudi stated that she feels that this is a straight-forward matter and that she would not have any bias in this case when reviewing it, but that if the commissioners felt that there could be a conflict of interest, that she would not participate in the hearing. All of the commissioners indicated that if she felt she could be impartial in this case, that they felt it was acceptable for her to participate in the hearing.

Applicant Bill Harvey, 3470 10th Street, Baker City, Oregon approached the podium. Harvey owns the property at 3370 10th Street, and will be extending the current building onto his property at 3470 10th Street. Harvey indicated that the new building will be similar to the building currently at the site (the DMV and Farm Bureau Services). Harvey indicated that he is currently proposing constructing the building shell of over 10,000 sq. ft. in an effort to generate more business on 10th Street. Harvey's current office at 3470 10th Street will be moving from the existing home at the site into this newly constructed building. Harvey indicated that he believes all of the criteria have been met and that in the past he has not had to block the refuge container, and that there are also two air conditioning units that are not blocked. He indicated that 9th Street is used more as an alley, not much traffic using it. Harvey stated that the trees on north property line will remain at the site and that the building will be 10' from the north property line.

Ken Rockwell indicated that it wasn't clear to him how big the proposed building will be. Harvey indicated that there isn't a set standard for what is and isn't considered to be a building's square footage. He stated that it was his understanding that it was the building's floor square footage and that staff had indicated that the covered area was also factored in. Rockwell indicated he came up with 19,000 sq. ft. Harvey stated that the existing building is 5,240 sq. ft. Harvey indicated that he had intentionally made the building less than 10,000 sq. ft.

Rockwell asked about the site's existing parking and that the development code would require one parking space per 350 sq. ft. of floor area. Rockwell indicated that the DMV office at the site currently uses much of the parking. Harvey indicated that the DMV will continue to be at the site and that the office building to be constructed will not produce a high volume traffic. Rockwell asked how much of the area is available for parking that is not being consumed by the DMV. Harvey indicated that at least half of the area would be used by DMV and that the parking could be reconfigured to accommodate additional needs.

Rockwell asked Harvey about the storm water system at the site. Harvey indicated that drywells are used at the site and indicated how that system works for the storm water collection.

Rockwell asked Harvey how he came up with an eight-foot building setback from the east property line. Harvey indicated that he does not like building on property lines. Harvey indicated that Ninth Street has a fairly large right-of-way and that he may pursue possible further efforts in the future to lessen the width of that right-of-way.

Rockwell mentioned pedestrian pathways, wondering how the application accommodates the walkway requirements set forth in the code. Harvey mentioned that the pavement has been painted with hash marks to designate the walking area. Harvey stated that raised sidewalks are in front of the buildings as well. Rockwell mentioned that based upon the criteria in the staff report he hadn't seen anything to really address it. Harvey mentioned that it has been this way for four years and has not been a problem.

There were no other questions from the commission members. Harvey indicated that this project was started 4 to 5 years ago, that a sidewalk will be going on H and 10th Streets adjoining this property. Harvey indicated that the house at the property will be removed from the property.

No other members of the public were present, and staff had not received any comments from the public regarding this case. The public hearing was closed at 7:30 p.m.

Murphy asked the commission regarding their determination of “abutting.” Fine indicated that he deemed their interpretation to be that there is no abutting when a street is located between lots. Commission members agreed.

Burnside **MOVED** to approve this case based upon the recommendations outlined in the staff report. Rembold **SECONDED** the motion. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

Other Business

Rockwell and Burnside are on the D Street Extension Committee and wanted the commission’s feedback on a few matters.

Rockwell went to the dry erase board to illustrate the proposed D Street bridge location near LAMP and the Powder River, showing a proposed bike path on either side of D Street to funnel onto the existing pathway and would also connect to Cedar Street, which also has a bike path.

Rockwell stated that the group had discussed bike lanes for D Street and if they felt it was necessary to have them. Rockwell stated that the committee decided that because bike lanes were on Cedar Street and a connector was wanted, that the committee would continue to recommend bike paths for D Street project.

One concern discussed by the committee was traffic heading west on D Street and possibly having three travel lanes (a left turn lane for traffic heading south on Main, one for traffic heading west on D Street, and one for traffic off of Main onto D Street heading east) – if it was justified to have three lanes, which would require the future bridge to be bigger – it could add 50% to the cost of bridge.

Rockwell illustrated the location of the bridge, with sidewalks on each side and travel lanes. Rembold asked if the bridge will be metal. Rockwell stated that there were varying proposals for the material: a rock bridge (concrete forms being used to look like stone), a brick bridge, and that there has also been mention of a metal bridge. The bridge would include lights and railings.

Rockwell asked commissioners about the discussed three traffic lanes, asking commissioners if they feel there will be enough traffic to warrant three lanes. Rudi indicated that lunch hour traffic would warrant it. Rembold indicated that he does not

feel that the three lanes could be justified regarding the additional cost of the larger bridge. Rockwell indicated that the bike lanes coming to D Street in this area may have a crossing like Campbell Street currently does for its crossing onto the LAMP, a raised concrete area for public crossing.

Rudi mentioned a roundabout instead of a three-lane bridge in the area of D and Main Streets. Rembold stated that he thinks a lot of local traffic is going to use D Street as opposed to Campbell Street. Rockwell mentioned that ODOT stated that based upon their traffic counts, the street extension did not warrant three lanes.

Rockwell indicated that the committee had discussed with ODOT that if any funds were left from this \$1.6 million project (ODOT funds), that money would be used to improve Birch Street north of Campbell Street.

The commission discussed possible future development in this area and future growth in Baker City and concluded that they agreed that the three-lane bridge would be ideal.

Rockwell stated that there is no north route in the city, only Cedar and 10th Streets. Rockwell mentioned that at some point in the future right-of-way availability to accommodate another north/south route in town will need to be planned for.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.