

Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 14, 2025

Remotely via Zoom

6:30pm

I. Call to Order

A regular session of the Gresham Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Tim Kamp on the 14th of July, 2025, at 6:31pm. The meeting was held online via Zoom and was digitally recorded. Minutes were prepared by Hayley Hamann

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Tim Kamp, Chair
John Hartsock, Vice-Chair
Greg Schroeder
Frank Stevens
Doug Walker

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Chloe Anderson
Delmi Manzanares
Kent Zook

COUNCIL LIAISONS PRESENT: Jerry Hinton

STAFF PRESENT: Justin Douglas, Economic Development Director
Michael Gonzales, Urban Renewal Project Coordinator
Hayley Hamann, Administrative Assistant
Jay Higgins, Senior Transportation Planner
Mary Phillips, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison
Carly Rice, Planner II
Terra Wilcoxson, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Ellen Van Riper, City Attorney

CONSULTANT PRESENT: Elaine Howard, Elaine Howard Consulting

II. Public Comment

There were no written comments submitted for the Planning Commission's review. No individuals signed up to make a public comment at this meeting.

III. Gresham Downtown/Civic Urban Renewal Plan Recommendation

Justin Douglas and Elaine Howard introduced the proposal and explained the proposed plan boundary. The Planning Commission was asked to review the Urban Renewal Plan for conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and make a recommendation to Council.

After a feasibility study was completed by Elaine Howard Consulting and Tiberius Solutions in 2023, an Urban Renewal Task Force was created to help shape a draft urban renewal plan. This group met four times over the year and one central theme that emerged centered around enhancing the community identity for the area. Other stakeholder engagement included meeting with the GRDC Advisory

Committee, Chamber of Commerce, the Historic Downtown Gresham Business Association, the Neighborhood Coalition, and Northwest Neighborhood Association.

The project team then reviewed the proposed boundary for the Plan, and the maximum indebtedness for the project which is projected to be \$381,000,000 over the next 30 years. Mary Phillips gave an overview of the vision goals for the project and how each of the goals are tied to the Gresham Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion

Chair Kamp stated that he ultimately agrees that the Plan conforms to the Gresham Comprehensive Plan. He also asked about the allocation of dollars and how they differ compared to the Rockwood Plan that has been developed.

- Elaine replied that various departments within the City were consulted on which projects were needed or desired within the plan area which were then prioritized by the task group with the neighborhood identity goal in mind. The projects selected that were selected are those the group felt would provide both the infrastructure and support toward development in the area. The allocating of money was brought to the task group as a consultant proposal, and the decisions were made with input from both sides- the City and consultants, as well as the task group.

Vice-Chair Hartsock stated that he has concerns over the reduction in tax income, particularly when the City currently faces financial strain to maintain police and fire at an appropriate level and said that he hopes that in this process the City can make sure that this project will not further affect those two agencies.

- Chair Kamp added that he had also been thinking about this issue but is hopeful that some of the incoming future projects can alleviate some of the stress in terms of the infrastructure that they would be providing.

Motion

Commissioner Stevens motioned that the Planning Commission finds that the Gresham Downtown Civic Urban Renewal Plan conforms to the Gresham Community Development Plan.

Commissioner Schroeder seconded the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Hartsock	Aye
Schroeder	Aye
Stevens	Aye
Walker	Aye
Kamp	Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) Work Session

Jay Higgins gave a reminder and overview of the purpose and intent of CFEC, which was initiated by the state and became effective in 2023- to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reduce vehicle transportation. Phase 1 of the project removed required parking near frequent transit, and reduced parking requirements for community beneficial uses such as shelters, affordable housing, and childcare

establishments. During work sessions with Council, staff recommended removing parking minimums per the CFEC guidelines, and Council agreed.

Phase 2 requirements included allowing/facilitating shared parking, providing pedestrian connections through parking lots, add flexibility for redevelopment of parking lots, allow opportunities for “low -car districts” in residential and mixed-use areas. This phase also includes creating new requirements for large parking lots, providing climate mitigation. The project team requested the Planning Commission’s input on the options allowed within the guidelines of CFEC: Solar panels anywhere on the property, a tree canopy covering 40% of the new parking lot area, or a combination of the two.

Discussion

Commissioner Walker asked if other cities are considering these changes, and if there are any anticipated repercussions to the market for the reduction of parking requirements.

- Higgins explained that the idea is that the market would drive the parking spaces provided. The developments will likely still provide the amount of parking anticipated to suit the needs of their business, etc. The majority of cities in Oregon have elected to have no parking minimums aside from Sherwood, which has decided to take a policy approach, and initiate some paid parking.

Commissioner Stevens asked about the 40% minimum canopy coverage in parking lots and how this number came to be selected.

- Phillips clarified that CFEC requires a canopy cover of at least 40% by the 15-year mark of development and that the rules allow some flexibility with adding solar panels as an option if that level of canopy coverage cannot be obtained. She suggested that research has shown that a canopy coverage of at least 40% is the threshold for seeing significant improvement for urban heat impacts.

Commissioner Hartsock asked if there is a plan for a potential onslaught of complaints if a situation arises where a large development comes in and not enough parking is provided, and people end up filling residential neighborhoods with parked cars. He asked how to balance the reality of a lack of parking with the CFEC rules being implemented.

- Higgins replied that this is something that Council has considered as well, and that it means that the City will have to take a more proactive role in parking management. He suggested that it may not be a problem immediately, but as development grows, and potentially less developers choose to provide an adequate ratio of parking spaces that congestion on the street can grow, but that there are tools to manage it. The City is currently developing a parking management manual to help think through these problems. He also suggested that often lenders will want to see that development plans include enough parking spaces to satisfy the expected income, again tying back the idea that the type of development will dictate the amount of parking supplied.

Commissioner Schroeder commented that he has concerns with allowing solar panels in parking lots as a trade off for less canopy coverage. The concern is that the solar panels do not contribute to the reduction of heat and suggests that he wouldn’t want to see the trade off for solar panels decrease the amount of canopy coverage by a significant amount.

- Chair Kamp agreed with this sentiment and mentioned that the tree canopy aligns more with the City’s strategic priorities in terms of how we want the community to be built out from an environmental and livability standpoint- saying that offsetting a tree canopy for solar panels is not the way we would want the community to grow.

- The overall consensus from Commissioners was that they would prefer not to allow a reduction of tree canopy coverage in trade for solar panels.

V. Other Commission Business

a. Vice-Chair Elections:

Commissioner Hartsock's term as vice-chair expired on July 13, 2025. He had been filling in the end of Chair Kamp's previous vice-chair term. Commissioner Hartsock volunteered to continue as Vice-Chair. No other Commissioners volunteered themselves or others for the position. The Planning Commission voted unanimously to re-elect Commissioner Hartsock as Vice-Chair.

b. Staff Update:

Mary Phillips gave a scheduling update. A joint work session with City Council is scheduled for July 15th. Council break runs from July 21 through August 15. The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for August 18th, which is an off-schedule meeting to accommodate project scheduling.

c. Council Liaison Check-In:

Councilor Hinton announced that four of the five appropriations that were submitted to federal legislators have been approved.

- i. Main City Park Revitalization Project: ~\$2 million
- ii. Wastewater Treatment Nitrification Project: ~\$5 million
- iii. Real Time Information Center and Enhanced Communications Project: ~\$1 million
- iv. Youth Violence Prevention Program: ~\$1 million

Councilor Hinton also asked of Staff an update on the outcome of the Veranda Project.

d. Subcommittee Liaison Check-In/Commissioner Round Robin:

Commissioner Schroeder reported that The UFS recently had a work session in the field at Sunset Village to inform them for future discussions pertaining to the Tree Code. It was observed that the variety and placement of trees planted did not match the development plans. The UFS would like to take action to try to ensure that the canopy is preserved through the development process.

Several Commissioners voiced the desire to have a joint meeting with subcommittee members, or at least the chairs of the subcommittees.

No other Commissioners had any pertinent updates.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:46pm

Chairperson

Recording Assistant

Date

Date

A full recording of this meeting is available upon request.

*These minutes were unanimously approved by the Planning Commission on August 18, 2025.