



PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE DRAFT MINUTES HAVE NOT BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

**CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO
Planning Commission Minutes
January 25, 2016**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Randy Arthur called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. in the Council Chamber of City Hall, 380 A Avenue, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

2. ROLL CALL

Members present were Chair Randy Arthur, Vice Chair John LaMotte (arr. 6:10); and Commissioners Adrienne Brockman, Ed Brockman, William Gaar, Robert Heape and Bill Ward.

Staff present were Scot Siegel, Planning and Building Services Director; Sarah Selden, Senior Planner; Erica Rooney, City Engineer; Amanda Owings, Traffic Engineer; Evan Boone, Deputy City Attorney; and Iris McCaleb, Administrative Support.

3. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Joe Buck updated the Commission on Council activities.

4. LEGAL ISSUES TRAINING

Mr. Boone briefed the Commissioners on the topic of "Takings" and Measure 49.

5. CITIZEN COMMENT – Regarding issues not on the agenda

None.

6. COMMISSION FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT – GENERAL UPDATES

Announcements included that Commissioners had attended an Uplands Neighborhood Association meeting as well as an update on the Mayor's meeting with Neighborhood Association Chairs.

7. PUBLIC HEARING

7.1 Southwest Employment Area Plan – Amendments to Comprehensive Plan and Community Development Code (LU 15-0077)

A request by the City of Lake Oswego for adoption of the Southwest Employment Area (SWEA) Plan as a Special District Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, with implementing Community Development Code amendments. Staff coordinator was Sarah Selden, Senior Planner.

Chair Arthur opened the hearing. Mr. Boone outlined the applicable criteria and procedure. At time of declarations Commissioner A. Brockman related that she had met with two citizens to explain the hearing process.

Staff Report

Ms. Selden and the following members of the Project Advisory Committee were present: Chair Lynne Barra, Rebecca Crew, Terry Keyes, Joseph Taylor, Lisa Volpel and Commissioner E. Brockman.

Ms. Selden pointed out the proposed Southwest Employment Area (SWEA) Boundaries, noting that most of the 90 tax lots within the boundaries were not large parcels and the area was one of three employment centers designated in the Comprehensive Plan. She indicated that they were areas focused on higher intensity employment uses with supporting retail, office and residential areas. She clarified that current zoning in the area was primarily Industrial Park (IP) Zone with areas of Industrial Park Overlay (IPO); General Commercial (GC); Neighborhood Commercial (NC); and Public Facility (PF).

Staff clarified that the purpose of the plan was to provide opportunities for development if and when an owner wished to redevelop and there was no intent to force development by property owners. Staff pointed out that separate but related projects were the private development on Jean Road, which included the Lakeview Boulevard and Jean Road intersection realignment; Code streamlining of permitted uses for commercial and industrial zones in the City; and neighbors' request for a McEwan Road pathway that was outside of the SWEA.

Ms. Crew, the liaison from the Chamber of Commerce, reported what the Committee had observed when they walked the district, which included the proximity of the residential area to the commercial area; how traffic flowed; some eyesores; and that the area was not pedestrian-friendly due to lack of sidewalks. She hoped for a win/win situation with greater and safer walkability, nice buffering of the industrial area, and traffic lights. Mr. Taylor related that companies like Micro Systems wanted to be in areas with good food options, ability to walk to work safely, and with places to go during and after work.

Ms. Owings reported on current transportation conditions which included a high level of truck traffic (truck trips were about 20% of overall trips per day with a recent count of 282 truck trips in a day on Lakeview Boulevard); and trucks parked on roadways because of poor access and awkward intersections. She clarified that there were three ways into the district: on Jean Way, Pilkington, and McEwan. Staff advised that the code considered any road in the IP area a truck route; it did not allow trucks to park on city streets longer than 30 minutes between the hours of 12 a.m. and 6 a.m.; state law did not allow local governments to regulate idling of trucks; and the current mechanism for dealing with noise was the Nuisance Code. Ms. Selden suggested the approach of neighborhood/business "good neighbor" agreements and installing signage to let drivers know the truck parking prohibition would be enforced. She clarified that while "good neighbor" agreements were generally not enforceable by the City, the City had experience successfully mediating issues through such agreements.

Ms. Barra stated that her business on Lakeview Boulevard, across from a residential area, manufactured and distributed foods and had about 25 employees. She advised that the code and zoning of the district should be consistent with the rest of the City while not pushing light industrial out. She noted that manufacturing brought higher employment and wages. She indicated that her company's 53-foot trucks used the intersection at Jean/Lakeview because the one at McEwan/65th was very narrow and constrained by a telephone pole. She advised that Lakeview Boulevard was neither pedestrian- nor truck-friendly and there was no place for a truck to park to wait for a dock to become available.

Ms. Barra reported that the Committee had made a good start solving problems by suggesting signage and diverters to discourage trucks from driving off of Lakeview into the neighborhood. She observed that part of the problem could be that truck drivers got lost and that realignment of the Jean Road/Lakeview Boulevard intersection would help trucks. She commented that the Jean Way extension would help divert truck traffic away from homes and away from a bad intersection. She clarified that the neighborhood could use it as well so they could avoid the Jean/Lakeview intersection driving home. She suggested moving the telephone pole at McEwan/65th and filling in a pothole there. She indicated that she did not think there was a lot of truck traffic after 5:00 p.m. and that most dock traffic was between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. She clarified that trucks that had come long distances and arrived early in the morning needed a place to wait for businesses to open. Ms. Barra discussed that adequate stormwater management infrastructure was needed; she showed a photograph of a pond that was the result of a failed pervious paving project.

There were various suggestions from Commissioners to require the loading docks to be in the back of a property; to brand the area as a business or industrial park; to plan for wayfinding signage; to have a traffic control plan; and to find a designated area for trucks to wait to unload.

Ms. Barra discussed that the Committee was not “development-driven” but was a diverse group of people with many differing opinions and perspectives who had made a lot of compromises. She reported that they had agreed on the following: Lakeview Boulevard needed improvement; trucks should not use residential streets; intersections needed to be improved for the benefit of trucks; they should not drive existing light industrial uses out of the area; they should add office and restaurant amenities within IP restrictions; there should be some amount of setback from the residential area; there should be no residential use in the IP zone due to functionality; and there should be no height increases. She reported that the Committee did not agree/find consensus on the following: the Jean Way extension; front setbacks and a Build-to line for new development; and the amount of retail and/or the maximum size of retail north of Willow Lane. She noted that Metro allowed up to 60,000 sf of retail in total on adjacent lots and that 35,000 sf was the maximum for a retail use in the IPO.

Mr. Keyes, a city engineer in another jurisdiction, advised that the Jean Way extension was key to the plan and that it would improve the district infrastructure by providing access to internal parcels and help to divert traffic away from Lakeview Boulevard thereby buffering the residential area. He commented that Lakeview could be improved with a sidewalk on one side and landscaping to buffer the neighborhood. He advised that a diverter island could prevent trucks from turning onto Kenny Street.

Ms. Selden showed conceptual illustrations of how buildings pulled up to the street would look with parking on the side or rear of lots. She discussed that the Plan recommended many infrastructure improvements for truck access and safe pedestrian passage, including improvement of the intersections at McEwan/65th and at Jean/Lakeview.

Ms. Volpel and Mr. Keyes each offered their opinions about a build-to line requirement. Mr. Keyes advised that an urban feel caused people to drive more slowly. He recalled that some neighbors who came to Committee meetings preferred strip development with cars parked in front. Ms. Volpel stated that buildings right up at the sidewalk looked too cold and the blinds were often closed; that kind of development along Lakeview Boulevard and 65th Avenue would not be a sufficient buffer or mesh well with the neighborhood character and their unusual lot configurations; and it would impact many existing trees which helped mitigate existing stormwater issues, noise and lights.

Ms. Selden advised that there was a build-to line exception to save trees and the concept along Lakeview Boulevard was to have the build-to line set at 20 feet and require that buildings be pushed up to this line for only 30% of the lot frontage. Staff discussed suggestions for improving residential-industrial compatibility which included a Kenny Street truck diverter and signage prohibiting through truck traffic; and a flexible Lakeview right-of-way cross section that featured buffering with trees, and swales on one side.

In regard to permitted uses Ms. Selden reported that the Committee recommended retaining existing permitted uses except for self-storage and incorporating other use-related changes into the citywide code streamlining updates. She advised that they had recommended a food cart pod pilot project with specific use-related standards; however, there had not been consensus about retail size in the area north of Willow Lane. She added that the Committee agreed the specific types of retail uses should just be one retail category going forward.

Proposed Southwest Overlay District Code

Ms. Selden presented the proposed code, providing more details about the build-to line requirement to place buildings no farther than 20 feet back from the property line, except along Lakeview, where buildings had to be set back 20 feet. She highlighted that the code included standards for facade articulation; prohibited some building materials; required ground floor fenestration along Boones Ferry Road, Pilkington Road, Jean Road and Jean Way; set the minimum height at 20 feet; required a setback from a residential zone but no setback from abutting industrial/commercial uses; allowed up to 85% lot coverage in the NC zone (allowing 15% landscaping); and expanded the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in the NC zone from .25:1 to 1:1. Staff advised that building to maximum lot coverage and FAR would be a challenge because of other standards.

Staff concluded by listing key items to be considered by the Planning Commission:

- Retail square footage north of Willow Lane
- Extending Jean Way south to Lakeview Boulevard
- Building setbacks/siting.

Questions of and Comments to Staff

Suggestions and comments offered by individual Commissioners included that private development could create the Jean Way connection and it could be a staging place for trucks to wait in the morning; that the plan was in sync with the new Comprehensive Plan; and that the City could test the concept of owning and maintaining a larger regional stormwater facility instead of requiring individual property owners to have facilities on individual sites. Ms. Rooney related that the City did not own any property in the area that could be used for a large facility but perhaps there could be private-public partnerships.

Committee members were asked how important they thought improving the McEwan/65th intersection was to alleviating problems in the plan area. Ms. Volpel indicated it was very important, recalling that a neighbor had been delayed at the intersection on the way to seeking emergency medical attention, and explained that big trucks used Kenny Street because it was hard to get around the McEwan/65th corner. She compared fixing the intersection so it worked better for trucks with picking low-hanging fruit. Ms. Ownings advised McEwan was a high traffic road with over 5,000 cars and trucks per day. Mr. Keyes observed that intersection was the access to the south for a third of the district and that the intersection problem was a barrier to development.

Ms. Owings confirmed that if road width was sufficient so that on-street parking spaces could be provided on Jean Road that would work to the benefit of retail businesses on Jean Road. Ms. Barra confirmed that businesses in the area were hoping to get better bus service, closer to their businesses. She clarified that the buses could use the intersections that had been fixed for trucks. Ms. Selden advised that TriMet was looking at a route that would go into the industrial park.

Public Testimony

Christine Roth, 18951 Indian Springs Road, Lake Oswego, 97035, representing the Rosewood Neighborhood Association, reported that the Association opposed extending Jean Way to Lakeview because they anticipated it would increase cut-through traffic; it would cause backups at peak hours from a Jean Road/Jean Way stop; and because roads were in poor condition and it was not safe to walk along them. They asked the City to remove the build-to-line provisions from the Building Siting section to give owners more flexibility, arguing that this was an industrial area, not an urban area. They expressed concern that TriMet Bus 36 service was important to the neighborhood but there had been a steady decrease in frequency of stops. They clarified that they understood the plan was to bring more employees to the area, which would increase traffic, but they wanted more effective management of the traffic and more opportunity to use mass transit.

Peter Klæbe, 5438 Tree Street, Lake Oswego, 97035, Co-Chair of the Rosewood Neighborhood Association, anticipated that if a stop sign or signal was installed at Jean Road and Jean Way it would impact a major access route from I-5 to Westridge.

Josh Carter, 18408 Don Lee Way, Lake Oswego, 97035, discussed that increased truck traffic did not balance with maintaining quality of life and that there was already a large amount of retail square footage available in the city. He related that his son walked to school along streets with heavy truck traffic where there were no street lights and sidewalks. He submitted photographs of a turning truck that went over a curb into his yard; a blind curve on Lakeview where a truck was backing into the road as he was coming around the curve; and a truck idling at his back yard for 30-45 minutes between 7 and 7:30 in the morning. He asked the Commission to do due diligence and find a way to balance quality of life. He held that extending Jean Way was not going to mitigate the traffic – it would actually make it worse. He clarified he was not saying they should not approve the plan – he was asking them to address traffic and keep it from impacting the quality of life of residents. He noted some residential driveways were on Lakeview. He discussed that many residents had no idea a plan was being considered.

Suggestions by individual Commissioners included having the business owners and residents work together to come up with a plan related to how to create a positive interface (addressing aspects such as how to handle truck loading, landscaping, entrances/exits etc.) that would become a design overlay; a truck waiting area during off hours that could be the foot cart area during the daytime; and encouraging Mr. Carter to offer the Commission specific recommendations on how to improve things for residents.

Mathew Ramey, 16470 Phantom Bluff Court, Lake Oswego, 97034, who owned a restaurant in the NC zone, indicated he was troubled that a food cart pod would not face the same challenges (such as setbacks, etc.) that he had faced when he established his business. He clarified that it was businesses, not just a plan for buildings that would increase employment. He mentioned that he had first received information about the plan when it had been mailed to his restaurant about 10 days prior.

Steve Patzer, 19363 SW Suncrest Lane, Beaverton, 97007, owner of a business on Jean Road, asked for flexibility of the build-to line so car repair shops could add bays and thus employees. He related that some shops had moved from the area because they could not expand there. He indicated he was in favor of the plan but wanted it to be done intelligently. He pointed out some mistakes in the SWEA Land Use Concept Plan in Attachment B, including a tree in the middle of an existing driveway. He advised that there needed to be a left turn lane from Jean Road onto Lakeview Boulevard so that traffic did not back up to Pilkington and block access to a business. He pointed out that developments had already installed almost all of the parking spaces and landscaping on the north side of Jean Road, so if the road was to be widened it should not be on that side.

Anita Reuther, 5870 Lakeview Court, Lake Oswego, 97035, submitted photographs of light trespass into her windows. She noted the plan seemed to be missing a soils report and asked for a copy of the soils report to ensure that environmental contaminants from past businesses would not move into her neighborhood in runoff. She indicated that residents were in favor of proper redevelopment that mitigated increased traffic on Lakeview Boulevard, noise, pollution, and light trespass. She cited Comprehensive Plan Goal 6, Section 4, Sound Quality. She indicated the plan should address ongoing stormwater issues and Clackamas County should be involved. Ms. Selden advised that a soils report was not typical in a district plan.

Alan Parker, 5916 Kennycroft Way, Lake Oswego, 97035, asked the Commission to look at the traffic situation. He indicated that traffic had increased since Micro Systems expanded, that employees used the side streets going to and from work and that drivers also used the side streets when the larger roads were congested. He was concerned that the Jean Way extension would bring more of them. He mentioned experiencing speeding cars on his street and that there was no place to walk safely along Lakeview Boulevard.

Victor Pizarro, 5824 Lakeview Court, Lake Oswego, 97034, was concerned that one result of the Jean Way extension would be that he would experience lights shining into his house. He stated that it would also make the current problem of noise from idling trucks and drivers talking at 4 a.m. every weekday in the parking lot of the recycling company even worse. He clarified that the court was large and drivers used it as a turnaround. Commissioners encouraged him to think of a potential design solution to suggest that would prevent trucks from using his cul-de-sac as a turnaround.

Tiffany Mak, stated that her cul-de-sac was across the road from an industrial access and that trucks used it as a staging area while they were waiting to use the access early in the morning. She clarified that traffic and loud noise was generated outside of standard business operating hours. She also indicated that there was light intrusion due to business lights and vehicle headlights and there was industrial debris on residential lawns from improper disposal. She stated that she had decided to move to a different part of Lake Oswego and that she viewed calling the police to enforce codes that were repeatedly broken as misuse of law enforcement and that the violators would be gone before the police arrived anyway. She urged the Commission to reconsider the use of this access point and entrance and look for ways to have proper separation between industrial and residential development. She clarified she had found out about the current planning process by word of mouth from neighbors.

Karla Davis, 5836 Lakeview Court, Lake Oswego, 97035, indicated she was concerned about too many lights, speeding drivers on Lakeview Boulevard, and trucks parked on Lakeview by her cul-de-sac. She did not support the Jean Way extension because it would increase traffic in the neighborhood and increase the risk for kids riding bikes. She suggested that trucks did not need to use Lakeview Boulevard – the plan could be for them to loop around internally.

She asked for a lot of buffering trees, more signs, and more restrictions on times for trucks. Ms. Selden showed a slide of the land use alternative for the area that she thought Ms. Davis was referring to. She clarified that the Committee recommended the plan that included the Jean Way extension.

Caroline Park, 5441 Bay Creek Drive, Lake Oswego, 97035, discussed that she had observed and also heard from others about truck traffic problems when she took her kids to Rivergrove Elementary School, and that it was unsafe to walk due to missing sidewalks. She questioned why her kids' friends should be awakened in the middle of the night because of truck lights. She opposed the road extension because it would cause more traffic on a road with a 25 mph speed limit in a residential area. She suggested installing speed bumps and enforcing traffic laws.

Billy Davis, 5836 Lakeview Court, Lake Oswego, 97035, asked if there was any way the City could regulate idling of trucks. Ms. Owings recalled that state law said they could not idle more than five minutes per 60-minute period, but it allowed some exceptions to preserve cargo, which made it a challenge for police to enforce. Mr. Davis indicated that the main concern of residents was trucks that parked on the road, idling. He also commented that they did not feel the City was communicating with them as there were no public notice signs posted. He said they did not want the road connection [extension], they did not want cut-through traffic, they wanted to limit truck and business hours of operation, and they wanted a significant buffer to block noise and to block lights after hours. He indicated that developers, not taxpayers, should pay the cost of roads, noting that there had been no sidewalk to Rivergrove School for decades, which put kids at risk.

Lisa Volpel, 5655 Kenny Street, Lake Oswego, 97035, indicated that light pollution from the IP zone was terrible and the noise level was such that they had not been able to sleep with the window open for ventilation. She questioned whether the plan aligned with Metro Title 4 requirements related to size of retail/commercial in an employment area. She noted that retail was supposed to be small and limited to meeting the needs of the area and the immediate residential neighborhood, it was never supposed to be a draw. She commented there were existing GC and NC areas with retail. She discussed that the traffic report that she had submitted indicated that if land use changed to uses that increased traffic it eventually triggered the need for more infrastructure. She recalled that a representative with Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had discussed that with the Committee. She pointed out the need to have infrastructure to manage runoff that ran from the former truss factory property into the residential area and flooded homes and septic systems. She questioned that stormwater could actually be managed through facilities on individual sites because some facilities on newer developments did not work. She recalled that the City had claimed they could not fix facilities on private properties. She suggested that if the road was opened it would be nice to have the sewer line replaced and designed to allow residents to hook up to it. She indicated she did not favor the "urban flavor" of the plan.

Jim Cassidy, 3601 Wren Street, Lake Oswego, 97034, ceded his time for testimony to Dianne Cassidy.

Dianne Cassidy, 3601 Wren Street, Lake Oswego, 97034, asked the Commission to table the plan. She expressed her concern about what the plan did not say. She stated that the process should be put on hold to ensure the plan and purpose were in sync, that the plan had the solid support of the community, that code streamlining was done, and that it was clear what the permitted uses would be. She suggested the purpose of removing barriers to mixed-use development might be at odds with the needs of the residents and existing businesses.

She asked for the purpose and limits of each zone to be defined. She stated that she was concerned about a push for higher density. She contrasted that she was all for a plan that accommodated a range of uses including light industrial, office and supporting retail, but the proposed plan only talked about employment growth. She discussed that she would retain the existing Comprehensive Plan wording and that food service or limited retail should be considered as additions to Policy 9. She did not support allowing housing in the employment area because it diluted the purpose of the area. Ms. Cassidy noted that Metro Title 4 called for limiting the types and scale of nonindustrial uses in industrial and employment areas. She suggested the fenestration, facade offsets, and 20 foot setbacks were more urban than industrial form and that over time industrial uses would be pushed out. She indicated that development should fund infrastructure and pointed out that drywells failed. She discussed that the Committee had been told there would be no housing, but the plan spoke about mixed-use with housing.

Questions of Staff and Advisory Committee

Staff clarified the following: the GC and NC zones, where mixed-use was already allowed and proposed as a permitted use, comprised about 10% of the plan area. They clarified that the bulk of the permitted uses the plan recommended would be in the new use table after code streamlining code changes were adopted. Staff advised that most of the uses allowed in the existing zones would be maintained. Ms. Barra clarified that having the Jean Way extension was not a “deal breaker” for the Committee and that some thought it might help alleviate residents’ concerns by providing a way for truck traffic to get to the south end of Lakeview and avoiding the north end.

Deliberations

Chair Arthur closed public testimony and opened deliberations. Individual Commissioners in turn offered their thoughts/suggestions.

There were differing opinions related to the extension of Jean Way including to not allow a “punch-through” of Jean Way; that if it was done right it would improve connectivity in the area; that traffic could have easy access to the core of the industrial area with the flow coming in and going out on the north end; that it should be configured so trucks did not have to make too many turns to follow an internal loop; to not to take the extension “off the table”; an observation that no one had been adamant that the extension was necessary, it was just an idea about how to respond to residents’ concerns; that the extension was where they could extract capital from developers for both road and stormwater infrastructure; that they should not expect developers to pay for everything – the City should participate to some extent; and that developers could not do it all and the City needed to prime the pump and clean up the district so it looked like a first class jewel of a little business park. There was a suggestion to look into the issue they had heard related to traffic back-up from a potential future stop at Jean Road/Jean Way.

Comments and suggestions in regard to Lakeview Boulevard included the idea of establishing a special design; having a process where residents and businesses could participate in developing the design; determining the correct side of Lakeview to have the sidewalk and buffering vegetation on; handling the build-to line on Lakeview differently than on other streets in the district; that the City could try to mitigate commercial-residential interface issues and come up with a solution, but they could never reach the perfect solution when residential and commercial faced each other across a road; that Lakeview should be improved with all

systems all at one time and not done piecemeal; that the build-to line provision and other design standards should require truck loading bays/docks, parking and idling areas to be behind the buildings.

There were suggestions to the effect that trucks arriving early in the morning and waiting for business to open could park in the internal district because the general parking areas there would be empty; there should be devices to prevent trucks from using neighborhood streets and some agreement about the design and the signage; and staff should advise regarding regulating idling and the circumstances under which it could be required to be reduced.

Comments in regard to retail north of Willow Lane included that the district was supposed to be an employment area with smaller sized retail uses that supported the existing uses (they should agree on a size limit); an observation that Walmart and its grocery store predecessor did not stay; a suggestion that the area should be office/technical industrial uses; and an observation that small retail tended to flip and turn over.

There was discussion of a suggestion that on big sites along Boones Ferry Road, and perhaps at the Taylor Made site, redevelopment should be allowed to be as large as the existing developments because of the demand for large facilities along Boones Ferry Road. Related comments included that a large manufacturing company might have relatively few employees, but they could be highly paid employees, such as mid-level engineers; retail uses were high traffic generators and every exit and entrance would pose similar risks as an intersection; and that the existing large uses were not aesthetically pleasing at the gateway to the city.

Other comments related to permitted uses were that the City should protect light industrial in the SWEA (including manufacturing and automotive shops) because there was no other place in the city for a home-based business to locate when it grew; the retail uses should support/be ancillary to it; the key to quality of development was what uses were allowed so people could move there assured their investment was well-placed and would be protected; the uses should support each other and not detract; how buildings were sited and landscaped would be very important; the City should avoid overregulation in favor of supply and demand if they wanted businesses to move to the district. Ms. Selden clarified that both existing and new light industrial uses would be allowed.

There were other comments in support of branding/signing the area as a quality little business park; in support of having a better noise ordinance/stopping the 4:00 a.m. noise problem; incorporating fixing/removing the telephone pole at the McEwan/65th Avenue intersection into the plan; ensuring that Metro Title 4 requirements were met; in support of identifying bus service in the plan. There was concern about the problem of light throw and there was a comment to the effect that having the plan would carry out the Comprehensive Plan policy to protect neighborhoods because it would mitigate and manage many existing problems related to aspects such as stormwater and traffic that were otherwise going to get worse.

Comments regarding the build-to line included recollection of testimony against having it on Lakeview, but no indication it would not be acceptable on other streets; and that having buildings right up at the front property line made it safer for people to walk to a bus stop than go through a big parking lot at night.

Comments about food carts included that allowing them would reduce the traffic because people would not have to drive to get lunch; and they could be controlled by a special set of regulations. Comments in regard to allowing housing in the district included that allowing it in more than the existing 10% commercial area did not make sense in a business area like this; and residential use was not what the district was for.

Various other suggestions/observations from individual Commissioners included that the Comprehensive Plan called for industrial, office and supporting retail; and the City should not change the Comprehensive Plan policy except to replace the word "locate" with "utilize." Staff agreed to categorize and track the key issues identified during the public hearing process and return on February 8 to suggest how they might be addressed or discuss where they needed more direction from the Commission in a subsequent meeting.

Chair Arthur **moved** to continue LU 15-0077 to February 8, 2016. Commissioner Gaar **seconded** the motion and it **passed** by unanimous vote.

8. SCHEDULE REVIEW

Mr. Siegel reported that the updated forecast and work program summary had been posted on the Planning Commission webpage.

9. OTHER BUSINESS – PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

10. ADJOURNMENT

~~There being no other business Chair Arthur adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.~~