

**CANYONVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
JULY 9, 2025**

I. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance:

Commissioner Emory called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and all joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Roll Call:

COMMISSION PRESENT: Chairman Emory, Commissioners Hill, Gully, Hoff, and Knowlton

COMMISSION ABSENT: Commissioners Gross and Sales.

STAFF PRESENT: Planner Bennett

STAFF ABSENT: None

III. Approval of the minutes: May 14, 2025

Commissioner Knowlton moved and Commissioner Hoff second a motion to approve the minutes of May 14, 2025. All voted yes. Motion passed

IV. Agenda Review/Additions:

None

V. Public Hearings: Opened Public Hearing at 7:03 pm.

1. Legislative amendment to the Variance Criteria to Chapter 17.36 Exceptions and Variances.

*Chairman Emory inquired if any Commissioners wished to declare contact or a conflict of interest. There were none.

*Chairman Emory called for the staff report.

*Planner Bennett read the hearing disclosure and recapped the following staff report.

I. REQUEST

The proposed action is an amendment to the City of Canyonville Municipal Code Chapter 17.36, requesting the variance criteria to be codified into the Canyonville Municipal Code.

II. BACKGROUND

At present the variance code criteria only appears on the variance application form. The variance approval is not new; it just does not exist in the proper place.

III. PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT

The amendment proposes adding the existing variance approval criteria from the variance application as follows:

Variance Approval Criteria:

A variance may be granted only if all the following criteria are met:

1. Unique circumstances, such as lot size, shape or topography, apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same zone or vicinity.

The subject property has physical conditions (e.g., irregular shape, topography, natural features) not shared by most properties in the same zone that create hardship under the existing code.

2. The variance is necessary in order to allow the applicant to use the property in a manner consistent with the intent of the zoning district within which the property is located.

The hardship is not self-imposed or the result of actions by the current or prior property owner.

3. The variance will conform with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and will not be materially detrimental to other people or property in the vicinity.

The variance requested is the minimum deviation from the code necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.

4. The variance being requested is the minimum variance necessary in order to allow reasonable use of the property consistent with its zoning.

The variance will not harm the public interest, health, safety, or welfare, nor conflict with the intent of the zoning code.

5. The need for the variance is not a consequence of improper actions by the property owner, nor otherwise the result of a self-created hardship.

The variance is consistent with the goals and policies of the adopted comprehensive plan.

IV. DECISION CRITERIA & FINDINGS

The following decision criteria from [Municipal Code Section] apply to text amendments:

1. The amendment is consistent with applicable statewide planning goals.

Finding: The amendment aligns with Statewide Planning Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement), Goal 2 (Land Use Planning), and Goal 10 (Housing) by ensuring clear and equitable standards that allow reasonable use of land while maintaining public review and input.

2. The amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Finding: The proposed amendment reinforces the City's goals for fair and transparent land use decisions and supports appropriate development flexibility, consistent with the comprehensive plan's land use and housing policies.

3. The impact to the public facilities by this amendment.

Finding: The proposed amendment does not change the allowable use in the existing zones so there is no impact on the public facilities.

4. The amendment does not change the public interest.

Finding: The proposed amendment will not make any change in the neighborhood or community conditions or correct a mistake or inconsistency in the comprehensive plan.

5. The amendment will not significantly affect transportation facilities.

Finding: The proposed amendment does not impact on the transportation facilities.

6. The amendment will not adversely affect the health, safety, or welfare of the community.

Finding: The updated criteria continue to prioritize public safety and neighborhood character by limiting variances to only those justified by unique site conditions.

V. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Public notice was published on June 24, 2025.

VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend **approval** of the proposed text amendment to update the variance criteria.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:10 pm.

Commissioner Hill moved and Commissioner Knowlton second a motion to adopt the proposed code amendment to update the variance approval criteria, as presented in the staff report dated July 3, 2025, based on the findings contained herein." All voted "yes". Motion passed.

VII.

Adjourn:

adjourned at 7:45 pm.

SUBMITTED BY:

APPROVED BY:

Dawn Bennet, Planner

John Emory, Chairman

DRAFT