

MINUTES
KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, October 14, 1998
Keizer City Hall - Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Abbott at 7:07 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dan Nelson, June Abbott, Dick Inman, Bruce Anderson, and Jere Clancy. Bill Wolf and Manny Martinez were excused.

Also present were: Council Liaison Jim Keller, City Attorney Shannon Johnson, City Planner Amy Drought, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - September 9, 1998

The minutes were approved as submitted.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

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

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Development Activity

Ms. Drought had nothing new to report. She answered questions about developments previously reported on. She had no information with regard to an article in the *Keizertimes* reporting that a casino is proposed for property north of Chemawa Road.

6. PUBLIC HEARING

6.1 Amendment to the Keizer Development Code - Allowing Recreational Vehicles in the Public Zone for Stadium or Commercial Sports Facilities

Vice Chair Abbott opened the public hearing.

Presenting testimony was:

FMAGIC

Rick Nelson, Vice President of Operations for the Salem-Keizer Volcanoes, 6700 Field of Dreams Way, Keizer, spoke in support of the proposed Development Code text amendment. He noted that the Volcanoes baseball team requested that the City consider an amendment to the Development Code to allow a motor home to be parked in the stadium parking lot to house a caretaker/security person. Mr. Nelson commented on incidents of theft that have recently occurred at the site. He also noted the need for someone on site to monitor the watering and irrigation systems at the facility. He emphasized that allowance for only one motor home was being proposed; in this case, a late-model 35-foot RV to house an elderly couple who would watch-over the facility.

Mr. Clancy asked why an RV was being proposed, as opposed to a structure. Mr. Nelson answered that in addition to the monetary consideration, siting and constructing a structure would take considerable time. He also perceived that a dwelling structure might not fit in with the facility. That with an RV would come the option of moving it to another location on the site if the need arose. Mr. Nelson acknowledged that the caretaker would live at the site year-round.

Mr. Clancy asked about the possibility of siting a pre-fab manufactured home rather than an RV. Mr. Nelson, again, was unsure whether such a structure would fit in with the facility, but indicated that it could be looked into. Mr. Clancy asked about Code provisions for a manufactured home. Ms. Drought answered that dwellings to house a caretaker are allowed in the Public Zone. However, a manufactured home is subject to standards for placement. City Attorney Johnson concurred that a manufactured home would qualify under the dwelling definition. In such a case a Code amendment would not be necessary, however, a conditional use permit application would be required. Mr. Johnson commented on why the Volcanoes decided to pursue the Code amendment. Mr. Clancy asked if the Volcanoes would consider placing an RV at the site temporarily with the idea of coming back with an application to site a manufactured home. Mr. Nelson answered that it had not been considered as an option, but that he could carry the suggestion back to the ownership team.

Mr. Inman asked why the plural "recreational vehicle [s]" appeared in the draft text amendment presented for the Planning Commission's consideration. City Attorney Johnson answered that the draft verbiage was intended as a starting point for the Commission's discussion.

Mr. Anderson wondered if some type of temporary permit process might be more appropriate than a Code amendment. Mr. Johnson answered that the City has no process or procedure for a temporary placement. And also, that the request from the volcanoes was not for a temporary placement. He emphasized that since an RV does not qualify as a dwelling, the conditional use process cannot be applied.

Mr. Anderson wondered why the bracketed [or other staff] was included in the draft text as a user of the RV, rather than just "security personnel." Mr. Johnson reiterated that the draft was intended to generate discussion. He suggested that if the Commission decided to recommend adoption of a text amendment, it might wish to change the verbiage to "caretaker/watchman" or something to that effect, to limit the use. He also noted that the draft left open the total number of days an RV would be permitted in a calendar year--another issue for the Commission to consider.

There being no further testimony to come before the Commission, Vice Chair Abbott closed the public hearing.

Ms. Abbott declared a potential conflict of interest because of a business relationship with the Volcanoes. She indicated that she would abstain from voting on any motion put forth.

Ms. Abbott read into the record a letter from Planning Commission Chair Bill Wolf. Mr. Wolf opposed the proposed Development Code text amendment on the basis that it appeared to him to be spot zoning to benefit a single entity. He also cited concerns about the lack of sanitary facilities, and the possibility an RV might at some time be visually unsightly. Mr. Wolf believed existing provisions for modular structures would allow opportunity to have a caretaker at the site.

Mr. Anderson shared some of Mr. Wolf's concerns particularly with regard to sanitary facilities and possible deterioration of an RV over time. He also had concerns about the lack of a permitting process which he perceived as perhaps a better avenue than amending the Code.

Mr. Inman had the same concerns. He indicated his preference for a conditional use process rather than a text amendment. He, too, was particularly concerned about sanitary issues, and commented on the need for electric, sewer and water hookups.

Mr. Clancy believed allowing an RV at the stadium would open the door for similar requests from other businesses. He again pointed out the opportunity for a manufactured home, in his opinion, a better alternative. Mr. Clancy was also concerned about provisions for electricity and sewer.

Dan Nelson saw benefits in having a caretaker on site. He believed conditions could be imposed with regard to the appearance of the RV to prevent any visual unsightliness. If the sanitation issue could be resolved, he could see no reason for not allowing the proposed unit to house a caretaker.

Ms. Drought noted that staff had also been concerned about the sanitary facility issue. The City Engineer called Salem and found that they would allow a sewer hookup as long as the unit is considered a part of the baseball facility. Ms. Drought commented on the conditions

mentioned by Salem. Public Works Director Kissler added that siting of the RV would be critical in determining if it could be hooked up to the sewer system.

Mr. Inman asked about the process if the Planning Commission were to reject the proposed text amendment. City Attorney Johnson noted that the Council will still hold a public hearing on the proposal at which time they will consider the Planning Commission's recommendation as well as public testimony.

Mr. Inman moved to recommend to the City Council to adopt a Development Code text amendment to add the following use to the Public Zone: "Recreational vehicle space for one recreational vehicle for no more than 365 days. Such recreational vehicle to be used only for caretaker/security personnel in conjunction with stadium or ballpark with a seating of 4,000 or more persons. Such vehicle must be placed and used in conjunction with all applicable public works, health and other regulations, plus sanitary hookup. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Clancy asked if it would be possible to add to the motion that any continuation of on-site caretaker/security housing after the 365-day period would require a permanent structure such as a manufactured home. City Attorney Johnson reminded the Commission that the additional verbiage would not be necessary since a manufactured home would be allowed under the conditional use permit process.

Councilor Keller questioned the appropriateness of doing a text amendment that applied to only a one-year period. City Attorney Johnson suggested that the ordinance, when finalized, include a one-year sunset clause. By doing so, the text would be removed from the Code after one year. He acknowledged that the effect would be somewhat like doing a conditional use except in this case it would be a temporary use.

The motion carried, all present voting aye except Ms. Abbott who abstained from voting due to a potential conflict of interest.

Staff will carry the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council.

7. DISCUSSION

7.1 Bike Element of the Transportation System Plan

City Planner Drought brought to recollection last month's discussion of the Bike Element of the TSP, which concluded with a request for more information from staff and a clearer recommendation from the Bikeway Committee. Ms. Drought again went over the four types of facilities identified as bikeways. She reported that subsequent to the September Planning Commission meeting, the Bikeway Committee met and developed a prioritization of bicycle facilities for the City of Keizer. The material distributed to Planning Commissioners

included a copy of a matrix developed by the Bikeway Committee listing locations for bikeways in the order of their priority. Highest priority locations were rated priority 1, second highest, priority 2, and third highest, priority 3. The matrix identified existing conditions, necessary improvements, and locations requiring right-of-way acquisition. The Bikeway Committee's recommendation also included a list of streets to be deleted from the Plan. Ms. Drought noted that Preston VanMeter, representing the Bikeway Committee, would be commenting in greater detail on the list of priorities.

Ms. Drought recalled that last month the Commission also briefly touched on the related issue of Street/Roadway Classifications. She noted that Keizer Traffic Engineer Dick Woelk was present and would later lead a discussion of street designations. Accident data and traffic counts requested last month were included in the agenda material.

Ms. Drought hoped to get from the Commission a consensus on the Bikeway Committee's recommendation, and some direction with regard to designating other local streets as collectors.

Ms. Drought introduced COG Planner Johnathan David who replaces Anna Braun as the project consultant. Ms. Braun has left COG for other employment.

Preston VanMeter, a member of the Bikeway Committee and also a member of City Engineer Bill Peterson's staff, presented the Bikeway Committee's recommendation for bike facilities. He talked about the process the Committee used in developing priorities, and went over the list in greater detail. As he commented on specific locations, Mr. VanMeter pointed them out on a map depicting existing and proposed bike facilities.

Mr. VanMeter responded to questions and comments from Commissioners. Because of the amount of right-of-way acquisition necessary to extend a bikeway the length of River Road, Mr. Inman believed it should be a priority 3 rather than a priority 1. Mr. VanMeter noted that from a bicyclist's perspective the preference would be for the direct route down River Road. Even though the Bikeway Committee realized a direct River Road connection might be unrealistic at this time, they wanted the opportunity available in long-range planning. Mr. Clancy was concerned that the number of driveway accesses to businesses along one section of River Road presented a safety issue for bicyclists. Mr. VanMeter acknowledged the problem. He commented on KURB's efforts to pursue driveway closures, but agreed that alternate bike routes might be the only answer at this time. Mr. VanMeter also answered questions about how costs factors were used in determining the degree of improvements needed in order to put in bikeways.

Mr. VanMeter commented on the relationship between street classifications and bikeway location identification. He yielded the floor to Mr. Woelk to talk about Keizer's street classification system.

Traffic Engineer Dick Woelk commented on criteria for designating a street as an arterial, minor arterial, collector, or local street. He distributed copies of a handout defining each of the street types, and pointed out the correlation of the characteristics of each street type with average daily total traffic volumes (ADT). Commissioners had also received copies of a map showing traffic volumes for various streets in Keizer. Mr. Woelk commented on the ADT figures for several streets on the traffic volume map. He pointed out major arterial and collector streets in Keizer, and explained how traffic flows from local streets to collectors and then to arterials. He mentioned the need to periodically review volumes and usage to determine if streets should be reclassified because of increased traffic.

Mr. Woelk talked about impacts relative to classifying streets as collectors. He reminded the Commission that the TPR calls for bikeways on collector streets. He pointed out that to accommodate bike lanes, parking will have to be removed, an issue that should be taken into consideration particularly when reclassifying a local street as a collector. Mr. Woelk and Mr. VanMeter responded to questions about specific streets listed on the bikeway priority list. The Commission talked about whether O'Neil Road, Park Meadow, and McLeod should be designated collectors. It was pointed out that the impacts of bike lanes should be taken into consideration when making that determination. The Commission got into a discussion of what constitutes a bikeway and what constitutes a bike lane. Mr. Woelk conceded that a collector street might require any of the four types of bike facilities. He pointed out that the standard in the City of Keizer has been that all new collector streets will have bike lanes. He believed that once the TSP is adopted, the Bikeway Committee's matrix could be used as a guide for the type of bike facility for future streets or street improvements. Ms. Drought mentioned changes to Bair Road that may suggest it be classified as a collector.

Mr. Johnson asked if approval of the Bikeway Committee's matrix would result in its incorporation into the local TSP. Ms. Drought answered that it would.

Mr. VanMeter briefly commented on a potential Alder Street extension that should be included in the TSP. The concept is a connection between Cherry Avenue and Verda Lane, the point of connection with Cherry Avenue probably at Iris Lane; with Verda probably in the area of Claxter Street. The street would likely function as a collector. Ms. Drought anticipated hearing more about the proposed Alder Street extension in next month's continued discussion of the street system.

In concluding the discussion of the Bikeway Committee's matrix, the priority 1 designation for River Road was again mentioned as a concern. The Commission talked about alternative bike routes to connect north and south Keizer. Mr. Johnson had interpreted Mr. VanMeter's comments on how the Bikeway Committee determined priorities to mean that the priorities were neither "build or dollar priorities," but preferences from a bicyclist's standpoint. Mr. Woelk believed the prioritization done by the Bikeway Committee represented what the plan was looking for. Mr. Johnson suggested adding to the draft ordinance lead-in verbiage to more clearly define the basis for the prioritization of bike facilities.

Mr. VanMeter talked about the potential for grant funding of improvements based on what is in the local TSP. He pointed out that identifying River Road as a priority 1 would allow opportunity to pursue grant funding possibly as a major street improvement. Public Works Director Kissler reminded the Commission that KURB is working on a River Road Design Plan update. He cautioned against doing any projects that might later be torn out when other improvements are done. Ms. Drought agreed on the need to coordinate efforts.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission to include the Bikeway Committee's matrix in the draft Plan, with inclusion of the lead-in verbiage suggested by City Attorney Johnson. Mr. VanMeter indicated that he would bring back a final copy for review next month.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

8.1 Reschedule November Meeting

Ms. Drought noted that the November regularly scheduled meeting falls on a holiday. She asked if there was interest in rescheduling the meeting. It was the consensus to reschedule the meeting for November 18.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned by Vice Chair Abbott at 8:47 p.m.