

**City of Madras
Planning Commission Meeting
Official Minutes
November 4, 2009**

I. Call to Order

The City of Madras Planning Commission public meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Kowaleski at 7:02 p.m. on Wednesday, November 4, 2009 in the Madras City Hall Council Chambers.

Members in Attendance were:

Vice Chair Lynn Kowaleski; Commissioners: Allen Hurley, Michelle Varley and Commissioner/City Councilor Tom Brown.

Members Absent:

Chair Shelly Tack and Kasey Cousens (both work related absences)

Vacancy:

There were two planning commission vacancies. (One was Councilor Brown's position)

Guests:

Mr. Richard Ladeby; Mr. George Hawes and Mr. Joe Krenowitz.

Staff Members in Attendance were:

City Administrator, Mike Morgan; Community Development Director Nick Snead and Community Development Specialist Tammy McHaney.

II. Consent Agenda

- a. Adoption of Agenda
- b. Minutes from the October 7, 2009 meeting

Director Snead requested two minor changes to the agenda under #IV. He added subsection b. "Reappointment of Planning Commissioners" and under subsection a. "Planning Commission Vacancies" he added Joe Krenowitz as a potential candidate and presented a letter of interest from Mr. Krenowitz.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BROWN TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH THE PROPOSED CHANGES AND ADDITIONS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HURLEY AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. Visitors Comments

There were no visitor comments.

IV. Planning Commission Vacancies

a. Letters of Interest from George Hawes, Richard Ladeby and Joe Krenowitz

Director Snead presented a matrix of the existing membership which showed the two current vacancies. He pointed out that one of the vacancies was a "City Resident" position and the other was a "County Resident within three miles of the City limits" position. He noted that three letters of interest had been received, one from Mr. Richard Ladeby, Mr. George Hawes and Mr. Joe Krenowitz.

He stated that Mr. Ladeby was the only City resident of the three who would be eligible for the City position. The other two would be candidates for the County Resident position.

Vice Chair Kowaleski welcomed all three candidates and asked if each one would provide reasons for their interest in becoming a Planning Commission member.

Mr. Richard Ladeby approached the Commission and explained that he had been involved with every community he had lived in and truly believed that to make a difference you needed to be involved. He moved to Salem, Oregon in 1991, and noted that through a combined family he has eight children, two of whom were still at home. He said he planned to retire here as Madras had everything he and his wife wanted.

1981 as corrected in the minutes 12/2/09
8m

Chair Kowaleski requested questions from the Commission.

Commissioner/Councilor Brown noted that he had heard Mr. Ladeby speak at both Planning Commission and City Council meetings and understood where he was coming from. He did suggest Mr. Ladeby look at the direction the City was taking and make sure he could be on board.

1984 as corrected in the 12/2/09 minutes
8m

Mr. Ladeby noted he had been involved in construction projects since the late 60's and had been with the Corrections Department since 1989 looking at expanding facilities and community needs. Prior to that, he was in the private sector. This background allowed him to be able to look at all the facts before making an opinion.

He said he knew that if you don't change, nothing changes and he was excited about the things happening in Madras as well as the planning. He saw only positive things happening and he would like to be part of that and be able to do the leg work to make that happen. He noted however, he did speak his mind, respectfully.

Vice Chair Kowaleski pointed out that he was very busy and questioned if he had the time to commit.

Mr. Ladeby said he liked to be busy and noted several different organizations he was currently involved with. He said he did not like sitting home doing nothing, he wanted to be active in the community.

The Commission thanked Mr. Ladeby.

Vice Chair Kowaleski welcomed Mr. George Hawes and mentioned their previous conversation. She asked him if there was any additional information and if he would provide some background on his previous Planning Commission membership.

Mr. Hawes noted he had been on the Planning Commission seven or eight years ago and had to resign due to a move outside the City limits, because at that time all members had to live inside the city limits.

He noted his past membership had been a learning experience. He said you start out naïve but then you learn the parameters of how it works and therefore his previous Commission experience would make him a good Commissioner as there would not be as much catch up.

He did point out some frustrations as a Commissioner with the fact the City Council could override the Planning Commission's decision.

Vice Chair Kowaleski noted that did seem to be part of the process.

Commissioner/Councilor Brown pointed out that this was a recommending body and so that would always be the case. He asked Mr. Hawes, as he looked at downtown, would he have done anything different.

Mr. Hawes responded and said no if he put himself in the position of the people who were making the decisions. He noted that in the past he had felt at odds or that they were off base where they were coming from, but later on once he put himself in their shoes, he could see understand their decision.

He noted his reason for his interest with the Commission was that the whole society was going through an enormous change and considering the current economic situation, he thought one thing the community could do was create jobs.

He said he personally was still in business part time, licensed and bonded as Hawes Construction, LLC but due to his age he was only part time.

Commissioner Hurley confirmed his resignation had been due to his move outside City limits, and questioned what had changed now. He asked if Mr. Hawes had moved back into the City or did the City expand the boundaries.

Director Snead explained that since Mr. Hawes was on the Commission, the boundary area for membership had been expanded.

Commissioner Varley asked Mr. Hawes what years and how long he had served on the Commission.

Mr. Hawes wasn't sure of the exact years but estimated it a couple years, 2002 to 2004.

Vice Chair Kowaleski thanked Mr. Hawes and noted this was exciting as the Planning Commission has not had this experience before.

Mr. Joe Krenowitz approached the Commission and noted he was married with two grown children. He had move to Madras in 1979 when the interest rates were 21%, the Country was in a recession and close to a depression. He said he was vitality interested in Madras and its surrounding area. He noted that he had held about every available appointed/elected position within the City, with the exception of City Administrator.

His interest in the Planning Commission was to be involved. He noted he was a positive outcome result type person who liked to see things happen. He said he had been in conversations regarding the City's brick project as well as narrowing out the streets in the late 80 and early 90's and had been a major debater on these projects as a City Councilor. He felt even though this was a recommending body, it was still an important part of the process.

Commissioner/Councilor Brown asked how many terms did he serve as Councilor.

Mr. Krenowitz said he was a Councilor for eight years and Mayor for two years. He also noted he was on the budget committee for four years prior to that.

Commissioner Hurley noted that was a lot of experience and questioned why now, why this?

Mr. Krenowitz informed the Commission that he had recently sold his business and that freed up a lot of his time. He also said this was the first time he could be on a board and not have a conflict with customers. He said he had just started a new career, which was taking up a lot of time, but it was at a point where he was comfortable taking this on. He noted he was on the budget committee board for COCC.

Commissioner Hurley asked if this was going to be a stepping stone to City politics.

Mr. Krenowitz replied and said he did not live in the City and therefore could not run for offices in the City; however the Planning Commissions were typically a stepping stone and a good training tool for people to step into Council positions.

Commissioner Varley asked if his position on COCC's board was in regard to the new campus.

Mr. Krenowitz replied and said no. He explained his group would meet about six times a year from April through June. He compared it to the City of Madras' budget committee.

Vice Chair Kowaleski thanked Mr. ~~Kowaleski~~ ^{Krenowicz - as corrected on 12/2/09} and requested direction from staff. (sm)

Director Snead said the Commission needed to have a discussion amongst them selves and explained the two types of vacancies. He reiterated that Mr. Ladeby was the only candidate eligible for the City resident position and that the Commission would need to decide if they want to appoint him to that position.

The other position could be filled by either candidate Mr. Hawes or Mr. Krenowitz and therefore two decisions were needed.

City Administrator Morgan corrected Director Snead in that the Planning Commission was making a recommendation to the City Council and not an actual appointment. The City Council made the appointment.

Commissioner Varley asked if that needed to be voted on at this meeting.

Director Snead replied and said if they so chose.

Mr. Krenowitz suggested the candidates leave the meeting so the Commission could discuss this without them being present.

The candidates agreed and left the meeting.

General consensus was to recommend appointment of Richard Ladeby.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER VARLEY TO CONSIDER RICHARD LADEBY FOR CITY CANDIDATE AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HURLEY. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Administrator Morgan clarified that the intent of the Planning Commission was to recommend to the City Council the appointment of Richard Ladeby to this position.

He pointed out that this position expired at the end of December 2009 and questioned if their intent was to recommend the appointment continue through the next expiration date.

Director Snead noted that was his second agenda item and explained to the Commissioners that the open City position did expire at the end of this year and recommended they appoint Mr. Ladeby to a new three year term.

Administrator Morgan clarified that this was a recommendation not an appointment.

A general discussion took place and it was explained that the terms of each appointment are staggered so terms do not expire at the same time. Mr. Ladeby would start as soon as the Council appointed him to fill the term that ended December 2009 and then if the Commission made a recommendation, the Council would consider his appointment for another three year term.

Chair Kowelski questioned if another motion was needed.

Director Snead replied yes they could do that now.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HURLEY TO RECOMMEND RICHARD LADEBY BE REINSTATED FOR A FULL THREE YEAR TERM AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VARLEY. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Varley asked if this meant Tom Brown would be leaving the Commission.

Chair Kowaleski responded yes.

She continued onto the second position and noted she personally knew Mr. Krenowitz but did not know Mr. Hawes at all. She noted they both seem to have good qualities.

Commissioner/Councilor Brown said that he thought Joe would be a good catch as he was up to speed, he knew a lot, he was quick to learn and was really dedicated. He also pointed out Joe

could not move onto City Council as he mentioned. Plus he was very interested in the City and thought he would be an ideal candidate.

Commissioner Hurley noted that he did not know Mr. Hawes but he did know Joe Krenowitz. He said he didn't know if the Commission wanted that kind of impartiality but he had done a lot for the community and maybe he could do more.

Commissioner Varley noted she knew Joe somewhat and agreed he would be a good catch for the Board. She noted she had some concerns with Mr. Hawes considering his comments at the last meeting he attended. She noted she leaned more to Joe Krenowitz.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HURLEY TO RECOMMEND JOE KRENOWITZ TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY THREE MILE RESIDENT POSITION AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VARLEY. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

b. Reappointment of Planning Commissioners

Commissioner Hurley noted that Commissioner Varley's term was expiring and that she had submitted a letter requesting reappointment.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HURLEY TO RECOMMEND REAPPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER VARLEY FOR ANOTHER THREE YEAR TERM AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER/COUNCILOR BROWN. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Administrator Morgan noted that he had been questioned about quorums. He clarified that a quorum of this seven member board was four; however, once a quorum of four was constituted, the majority of vote of that quorum was three.

V. Public Hearing

a. Appeal from Joel Gisler/Park Place Subdivision (AP-09-1)

1) Open Public Hearing

The Public Hearing opened at 7:32 pm.

- 2) Planning Commission to Declare any Potential or Existing Conflicts of Interest or Ex parte Contact
- 3) Planning Commission to Indicate Whether they will be Abstaining From Participation in the Public Hearing
- 4) Those in Attendance to be Provided with an Opportunity to Challenge Planning Commission Impartiality
- 5) Staff Report

Director Snead informed the Commission that the appellant, Mr. Gisler had requested the Public Hearing on the Appeal of AP-09-1, for the Park Place Subdivision be continued to the December 2nd regularly scheduled planning commission meeting.

His recommendation was to continue this hearing to a date determined that being December 2, 2009 and on that date a public hearing would be held to hear the appeal.

Administrator Morgan enquired for the record if the applicant had in writing agreed to waive the 120 day requirement.

Director Snead replied and said yes and noted that each Commissioner had a copy of the letter of request from the applicant.

- 6) Applicant Comments
- 7) Proponent Testimony
- 8) Opponent Testimony
- 9) Neutral Comments
- 10) Rebuttal – Applicant
- 11) Close Public Hearing

The public hearing closed at 7:34 p.m.

- 12) Planning Commission Deliberations
- 13) The Planning Commission will either approve or deny the application, or will continue the hearing to a time and date certain.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HURLEY TO HONOR THEIR REQUEST AND ALLOW A CONTINUANCE TO DECEMBER 2, 2009. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VARLEY AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

VI. Additional Discussion

a. November 18, 2009 meeting

Vice Chair Kowaleski asked if there would be a second meeting in November.

Community Development Specialist McHaney noted there were no agenda items, so there would not be a meeting.

Commissioner Hurley questioned if a work shop was possible.

Director Snead responded and said that due to the holidays, he thought he would use that time to prepare for January's public hearings on the proposed text amendments. However, it was up to the Commission.

Consensus was not to have a meeting on November 18, 2009.

b. Council Appointments for the Planning Commission

A discussion was held regarding appointments. It was noted that if the two recommendations get appointed by Council on November 10, 2009, Director Snead would call the applicants so they could attend the next meeting. The discussion continued and it was noted that Commissioner/Councilor Brown would no longer be needed as a Commissioner as there would be seven members which constitutes a full Commission.

c. Park Place Appeal

Commissioner Kowaleski questioned the appeals process and asked if the history would be reviewed.

Director Snead replied absolutely and noted that he would provide a staff report. He and the City Attorney would both be at the hearing. It was his intent to generally provide the history and how we got to this point. The Attorney would provide the legal matters and why he was involved.

He noted that it really was an interpretation issue.

Administrator Morgan noted that the goal was to reach a settlement before the next meeting.

Director Snead agreed and noted that was the reason the hearing was being continued. He said the plan, was the applicant and City staff would meet to find a solution and then at the December 2nd meeting they would withdraw the appeal.

d. Seaside Oregon Conference

Director Snead presented a newspaper article he came across at this conference regarding Cities who fight blight in their communities. He explained that Cities mow the lawns of foreclosed homes to keep the blight down and then file liens on the property to recover their costs.

e. Living Hope Christian Center Homeless Shelter

Vice Chair Kolaleski enquired if anyone had heard on the status of the New Hope Community Church's homeless shelter.

Director Snead noted he had heard from the pastor and the insurance cost was so prohibitive, they would not be going forward.

He continued and informed the Commissioners that there were some temporary housing cabins that were available, however the ordinance does not allow this as noted in previous meetings. He said in the next couple of months this issue will be coming in front of them for text amendments to the ordinance.


He noted his frustrations were that while he could find a way to site these free shelters, the reality was the probable dissent from citizens. This told him that they have not engaged the citizens to the extent to address the issues.

He said this was a discussion that really needed to take place so the Commission could really understand the issues and make an informed decision.

Commissioner/Councilor Brown spoke and noted the City would not be the applicant for a shelter, but a sponsoring agency.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.



Vice Chair, Lynne Kowaleski



Tammy McHaney, Community Development Spec.