MINUTES

KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
KEIZER CITY HALL LIBRARY
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1995

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Matiskainen at 7:00 p.m.

2. SWEARING IN

City Attorney Johnson administered the oath of office to new member, Bill Pearl.

3. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Marty Matiskainen, Bill Wolf, Dick Inman, Bill Pearl, Manny Martinez and Elaine Smith.

Also present were: City Attorney Shannon Johnson, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'. Community Development Director John Morgan arrived at 8:25 p.m.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Matiskainen called attention to a typographical error on page 10 of the October 11 minutes. Ms. Oxe' indicated that a correction would be made on the original document.

It was moved by Mr. Wolf that the minutes of October 11, 1995 be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez and carried, all present voting aye.

5. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

No one came forward to present any issues to the Commission.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Chemawa Activity Center

Mr. Matiskainen advised that Community Development Director Morgan had to attend another meeting this evening, but should arrive between 8:00 and 8:30 p.m. Mr. Matiskainen distributed copies of the Planning Commission Draft of the *Chemawa Activity Center Plan - Part II* dated

November 8, 1995. He suggested that discussion center around the Summary of Actions on Page 3 of the document dealing with proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map.

Mr. Matiskainen reviewed the various proposals to amend the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that after considering the Comp Plan amendments, the Commission could proceed on to discussion of the related zoning for each area of the Activity Center.

Discussion followed regarding a proposal to amend the Comp Plan Land Use Map to include the land north of Tepper Lane as part of the Activity Center. The Commission also discussed the implications of the proposed Zoning Map amendment to designate the land north of Tepper Lane in the "Activity Center Overlay" zone.

> After discussion, it was moved by Ms. Smith that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council inclusion of the area north of Tepper Lane between the railroad tracks and the freeway and between Tepper Lane and the Urban Growth Boundary in the Activity Center Area A designation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Inman.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Smith if her motion was to not only add the area to Area A, but to also zone it the same as the rest of Area A. Ms. Smith felt that the zoning should be considered separately; her motion was to merely include it in the Activity Center.

Mr. Wolf asked if there would be a way to insure that there is adequate transportation should the Comprehensive Plan be amended to include the area north of Tepper Lane.

Mr. Matiskainen felt that including the land north of Tepper Lane in the Activity Center would enhance chances of making sure that whatever happens in that area fits in with the plan for the remainder of the area. Ms. Smith agreed that because of the access issue, inclusion of the area was an integral part of the plan.

> The motion carried, all present voting aye.

In looking at the map diagrams in the draft Plan, some concern was expressed that the various area boundaries were unclear. Mr. Wolf suggested that the Activity Center Plan include specific wording and a clear map to spell out and define the areas.

With regard to the Comp Plan amendment proposal to designate Area A Campus Light Industrial, there was considerable discussion regarding the definition of the Campus Light Industrial (CLI) zone. Mr. Johnson pointed out the difference between Comp Plan and zoning designations. He noted that initially the question would be whether the CLI Comp Plan designation is appropriate for the area; the more subsequent question would be with regard to the zone designation. Because there was still some uncertainty with regard to the Campus Light Industrial definition, Mr. Johnson suggested delaying a decision until Mr. Morgan could respond.

Mr. Matiskainen called attention to the proposal to amend the Comp Plan Land Use Map to designate Area B as Commercial. He noted that the current designation is Campus Light Industrial.

Referring to the zoning proposal for a Commercial Mixed zone designation for Area B, Mr. Martinez expressed his disagreement with the inclusion of multi-family for the area. He felt that the proposed zoning would promote low-income housing and overcrowding in the schools. He indicated that he would like to see the area remain Campus Light Industrial.

There was considerable discussion about the two different Mixed Use zone designations. Mr. Wolf pointed out that the Commercial Mixed use allows only 10 residential units per acre, just slightly above current residential. He also stressed the need for some multi-family in the area in response to the employment opportunities and transportation reduction goals.

Ms. Smith felt that the greater concern might be with the design of the area and its relationship to the development in the north and the industry to the east. She indicated that she wouldn't want to think that anyone would be excluded from any place in Keizer because of their income level. Also, it was her understanding that multi-family had a lower school age population. She indicated that she would like to hear from the school district regarding the impact on schools.

Considerable discussion followed regarding whether the area north of Lockhaven should be designated for commercial or industrial uses, and whether and to what degree multi-family residential should be included. Ms. Smith suggested that an alternative might be to make all of the area north of Lockhaven part of a master plan area.

Mr. Johnson interpreted Ms. Smith's comment to mean that Area B would be included in any master plan for Area A, with the developer driving what development would occur. He confirmed that the Commission would still need to deal with the idea of what the Comp Plan and zone designations need to be for the property.

There was further discussion about the need for different types of housing stock in Keizer. There was some feeling that residential should not be excluded from the area. Ms. Smith indicated that she would like the opportunity to explore multi-family with the people in the area once they are more informed about housing choices.

It was Ms. Smith's feeling that there were too many unanswered questions for the area west of the rail road tracks. She stressed the need to focus more specifically, and suggested involving potential developers and neighbors in developing a specific plan.

The Commission discussed further the relationship between Area B and Area C, and the degree of public interest exhibited for each area. Mr. Inman suggested that the Commission consider the Comp Plan and Zoning separately for Areas B and C.

It was moved by Mr. Inman that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council changing the Comprehensive Plan designation for Area B to Commercial. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wolf.

(Mr. Morgan arrived and took his seat at the table.)

Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Morgan could explain the correlation between the Comp Plan Commercial designation and the Commercial Mixed (CM) zone designation.

Mr. Morgan explained that in the new Development Code the CR and CO zone designations would be replaced by the CM zone. He confirmed that although there was an understanding that it would include a mix of uses including some residential, the language was not yet crafted. He explained how it could be possible to custom build zoning for the area by way of including policies with the CM zone designation. He suggested, however, that the Commission might wish to recommend that the Council adopt the Activity Center Plan but not adopt the zoning until the new zoning ordinance is adopted. Another option would be to hold in abeyance the entire Plan until the Development Code is in place.

Ms. Smith had concerns about designating Area B Commercial in the Comp Plan without knowing all the aspects of what will be zoned for the area.

Mr. Wolf suggested that rather than first making decisions regarding specific zoning, it might be more appropriate to begin by looking at design standards and the overall Plan designations.

Mr. Inman called for the question.

The motion carried, with Mr. Inman, Mr. Wolf, Mr. Matiskainen and Mr. Pearl voting aye. Ms. Smith and Mr. Martinez voted no.

Mr. Matiskainen asked Mr. Morgan to clarify what actions the Planning Commission needed to take before submitting any recommendations to the City Council.

Mr. Morgan responded that the City Council could adopt the Plan and not do the zone changing at the same meeting. He noted that the Planning Commission could delay making recommendations on any part or all of the Plan, and emphasized the importance of not rushing to any decisions.

Ms. Smith wondered how it would be possible to change a Comp Plan designation to Commercial while zoning for the area remained Industrial.

It was Mr. Johnson's opinion that any motions adopted by the Planning Commission would be contingent upon passing the entire Plan along to the City Council. He felt that the Council could not adopt the Plan without adopting the zoning, and that it would be cumbersome for the Planning Commission to submit the Plan to the Council followed by the zoning at a later time.

Mr. Morgan noted that the intent had been to do the Development Code as one package. He suggested, however, that the Planning Commission might wish to accelerate crafting the zoning applicable to the Activity Center and adopt those sections prior to adopting the remainder of the code.

It was felt that the Commission needed more time to review the entire *Chemawa Activity Center Plan - Part II* before trying to come to some agreement on further recommendations. After discussion, the Commission agreed to schedule a worksession to discuss the options and develop more detail in the Plan.

(The Planning Commission recessed at 8:47 p.m., and reconvened 8:55 p.m.)

The worksession was set for Thursday, November 16 at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Morgan responded to questions about planning as it relates to school overcrowding. He agreed that once the Commission comes up with alternatives he will provide numbers relative to housing and schools.

Mr. Morgan briefly reported on the meeting he had just attended; a joint meeting of the SKATS Policy Committee and Technical Advisory Committee. They met to discuss the State Transportation Planning Rule. Mr. Morgan noted the implications of the Rule on the Chemawa Activity Center Plan as well as other development in the City, and advised that he would be preparing a more detailed report for submittal to the Council, Planning Commission, and R3B.

Mr. Matiskainen announced an opportunity for the Planning Commission to meet with Marion County, etc. regarding the Chemawa Activity Center. The meeting will take place in the Salem Library Anderson Room on Tuesday, November 14 at 7:30 p.m.

6.2 River Road Zoning

Community Development Director Morgan called attention to the *River Road Design Plan - Phase II Summary of Recommendations and Action* included in the agenda packet. He explained how the matrix was to be used as a working document for R3B and the Planning Commission to evaluate recommendations from the various consultants with respect to zoning and renewal project activities in the River Road corridor. He noted that to date, R3B had partially reviewed the document. Their comments were included in the updated matrix. Although the Planning Commission would have greater involvement with respect to zoning for the area, Mr. Morgan requested that they also respond to the Renewal Project recommendations. Both R3B and the Planning Commission would be making recommendations to the City Council.

It was the consensus to start at the beginning of Mr. Morgan's summary and comment on each topic and recommendation.

Bicycle

With regard to recommendations for bicycle transit on River Road, Mr. Morgan noted that the recommendations for bike lanes already exist in the River Road Design Plan. He reviewed plans for striping Cherry Avenue and restriping on River Road. The Commission unanimously agreed with the bicycle recommendations.

Circulation

Under the general topic, Circulation, the recommendation was that internal driveways shall connect from parcel to parcel so that the major public streets do not have to be used. Mr. Morgan gave examples of locations where application of the requirement would improve circulation. The Commission concurred with the recommendation.

Corridor Focal Points/Design Plan

It was the consensus of the Commission to defer discussion of corridor focal points and a design plan for the River & Chemawa Center until after reviewing the remainder of the recommendations. The Commission did, however, concur with R3B's recommendation to have specific design requirements apply not only to the Center, but to all of River Road.

Design Standards

With regard to a recommendation specific to the River & Chemawa Center to require two-story buildings, the Commission discussed at length whether the requirement should be applied within focal points only. Mr. Morgan pointed out how meeting ADA requirements for elevators might preclude some development. After discussion, the Commission concurred with R3B's recommendation that a requirement for two-story buildings not be applied to zoning regulations. With respect to R3B's recommendation to provide financial incentive for multi-story buildings, the Commission agreed with providing incentives, but suggested that the word financial be dropped.

For a design standard requiring storefront windows along no less than 50% of building frontage, the Commission agreed with the R3B recommendation that the requirement should be limited to retail storefronts. Additionally, they recommended that for corner structures the 50% requirement apply to the entire street frontage.

Mr. Morgan noted that R3B deferred comment on a requirement for storefront facades to not exceed a 30 foot width. He noted R3B's reluctance to agree with the 30 foot restriction without more detail regarding the typical width of storefronts. The Planning Commission also deferred discussion of the recommendation.

The Planning Commission agreed with the recommendation to require roof designs that are consistent or complimentary such as hipped, gambrel, or gabled roofs.

With regard to a requirement for establishment of an overall design theme in each corridor focal point, the Commission concurred with R3B's rejection of the term "theme," and agreed on requiring overall design standards with regard to color, texture, facades, roof, etc. to present an overall congruent appearance.

The Commission agreed with the recommendation to require coverings (awnings, canopies, etc.) over sidewalks along building frontages. However, they stressed the importance of establishing standards for such coverings.

The Commission discussed a recommendation to require architectural relief on all walls to avoid blank walls. They agreed with the recommendation but added that it apply only to walls fronting streets.

The Commission discussed the following recommendation to require that buildings be put at the street: "Orient buildings to the street with primary entries facing the street or designated pedestrian way. Parking lots should occupy no more than 50% of street frontage. Facades should be between 0 and 15 feet of the street with intervening area landscaped or used for pedestrian purposes." After discussion of parking requirements, the Commission concurred with the concept but suggested that language from the draft development code be used.

The Commission rejected a River & Chemawa recommendation that no building, except Safeway and the proposed hotel shall exceed a 18,000 square feet ground footprint.

Due to the late hour it was the consensus to continue discussion of the matrix at the December meeting.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

7.1 Regular Meeting: December 13, 1995 - 7:00 PM

8. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Matiskainen at 10:05 p.m.