MINUTES

KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, October 12, 1994
City of Keizer Library

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Goesch at 7:02 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Art Gottfried, Sam Goesch, Marty Matiskainen, Dawn Meier, and Denny Muchmore. Also present were: City Attorney Shannon Johnson, Community Development Director John Morgan, COG Consultant Mike Unger and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'. Council Liaison Jerry Watson arrived at 7:10 p.m.

Chairman Goesch announced that Elaine Smith was out of the Country, and Jeff Taylor was excused due to a prior commitment.

Mr. Morgan apologized for the late delivery of agenda packets and advised that measures have been taken to ensure their prompt delivery in the future.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Matiskainen that the minutes of September 14, 1994 be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Goesch. After allowing time for further review of the minutes, the motion carried, all present voting aye.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

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

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Chemawa Activity Center Land Use and Transportation Plan

Mr. Morgan gave a brief background regarding the COG grant for a transportation and land use analysis for the Kuebler and Chemawa interchanges. A $42,000 grant was received. In response to an RFP, the engineering firm of Kampe Associates was selected and awarded the contract. Larry Lewis, the Project Manager, is partnered on the project with Kennelton Engineering doing the traffic engineering. Spencer & Kupper is doing the

FMAGIC

market analysis, and Meyers Associates is doing the design work. The first meeting was held this past week to determine the direction for the project.

Mr. Morgan noted that after discussion four basic focuses were identified: (1) the regional nature of the interchanges; (2) land use alternatives; (3) both interchanges, and primarily Chemawa, should be considered for multi-modal activities; and (4) transportation and carrying capacity. Mr. Morgan advised that citizen involvement will be by way of a task force made up of two City Council members, two Planning Commission members, one representative of Salem, and probably one ex-officio representative from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

City Council Liaison Jerry Watson arrived at 7:10 p.m. and took his seat at the table.

Mr. Morgan described the scheduled work program. The consultant's work will be completed in June, and will presented at a Planning Commission hearing after July 1. It will then be submitted to the City Council in the Fall for adoption. It is anticipated that the project will proceed the first week of November.

Mr. Morgan noted that at the November meeting it will be necessary to target two Board members to sit on the task force. He will also be requesting that Council appoint two members to act as the steering committee. The task force will meet between three and five times during the planning process.

River Road Redevelopment Project

Mr. Morgan reported that PGE is working on the design for the northern portion of the project. The southern portion is moving very well. It was his understanding that the interconnect is now on. Councilor Watson asked when the poles would be pulled down. Mr. Morgan answered that it probably would not be before March.

Cherry Avenue Design Plan

Mr. Morgan shared some of the analysis done on the Cherry Avenue design project. He distributed drawings depicting the existing land use and development opportunities. He stated that a public forum is scheduled for Thursday, October 20, in the Council Chambers. Notices will go to all property owners and residents in the Cherry Avenue corridor.

Mr. Morgan recalled that focuses of the transportation plan are that a three-lane section will continue to be appropriate for 10 to 20 years. A cross section of 71 feet, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk is appropriate, however, R3B upped it to about 75 feet. Additionally, the traffic engineer recommended a 10- foot sidewalk on the east side of the street for bike and pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Morgan explained parking impacts as shown on aerial photographs. He described where parking would be lost from some front yards. Very few buildings would be affected. There would probably be only one building take. The analysis indicated that the best bet is to hold the center lane constant, and proceed down the middle of the current corridor.

Councilor Watson wondered what options could be gained by adding another five feet. Mr. Morgan felt that widening further would impact some buildings, however, it could be looked at.

Mr. Goesch asked if it was known what Salem has in their plans for the area south of the Parkway. Mr. Morgan answered that it was intended to be a five-lane section, however, the volume is not there to warrant five lanes.

Ms. Meier recalled that the owners of property across from the junk yard were afraid of loosing their front yard. She wondered if that was a possibility. Mr. Morgan indicated that it could be possible.

City Attorney Johnson asked if the middle lane would be without a median. Mr. Morgan answered that a median is not in the current draft. He felt that if a median were constructed there would be less right-of-way take to meet the landscaping need.

Transportation Planning

Mr. Morgan noted that origin/destination studies are proceeding well. The on-the-spot surveys are being done to determine travel patterns for the area. The completed work should result in a fairly accurate model of traffic on which to base future planning. He noted that the response has been higher than expected. Once the model is put together, staff will use it to focus on local transportation planning.

Tree Ordinance

City Attorney Johnson reported that the tree ordinance has been formatted in two separate ordinances. One, as an amendment to the zoning code, dealing with saving trees and having a landscaping plan for new development. It will have to go through review following zoning procedures. The other one covers other issues, such as heritage trees and trees in the right-of-way. It is now being reviewed by Councilor Miller's committee.

Sign Code Notification Project

Mr. Morgan advised that the statistics are not yet put together, however, the sign inventory is complete. Of approximately 220 businesses, 92 were not in compliance to one degree or another. Most were just over the acceptable square footage. He noted that the project would be submitted to the City Council sitting as the Renewal Agency on Monday night. It would be presented along with the R3B recommendation for a grant program focusing on driveway conformance and sign compliance. The recommended grants for driveway replacement would be up to $1,200 each. The R3B recommendation for sign compliance grants would allow 10% of the cost of the sign work or $500, whichever is greater. R3B did not recommend a loan program because it would be difficult to administer. Also, the City could work with local banks that have such programs.

Mr. Morgan noted that R3B had indicated that, after study, if staff came up with a different cost analysis for signs, those numbers could be taken forward to the Council. Staff's final recommendation, after analysis, is that sign compliance grants be made at 15% of the cost, with a minimum of $500 and a maximum of $1,500.

Councilor Watson suggested that the City put out a bid to sign companies to participate in a program to provide signs at a reduced rate, and limit the City's contributions to signs that are purchased under the program. No action was taken on his suggestion.

Mr. Morgan noted that, if adopted, this would be the first time that the Agency would actually be giving direct service to businesses, as was a focus in the Renewal Plan.

Project Schedule

Mr. Morgan advised that there is one change to the project schedule. Staff will begin work on the UT Zone change in January, and will try to wrap it up by April.

6. PUBLIC HEARING AND DELIBERATION

6.1 Periodic Review - Comprehensive Plan Revision relative to Amendments of the Urban Growth Boundary

Chairman Goesch opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Morgan stated that when the Periodic Review was approved by LCDC last May, there were three areas that were held out of the approval with specific direction for needed revisions. One was to revise the regional policies in cooperation with Salem, and Marion and Polk Counties to clarify the language in urban growth boundary amendments. Mr. Morgan explained the changes to the Comprehensive Plan Regional Policy G.3., which outlined the factors upon which changes to the UGB will be based. It also provides that changes to the Salem/Keizer urban growth boundary must be adopted concurrently by all four affected jurisdictions.

Mr. Morgan noted that another change is to eliminate Regional Urban Growth Boundary Policy G.4., which requires that when an expansion to the UGB is proposed, land that had been taken out of the boundary in the past will be the first considered for reinclusion. He noted that since no land has ever been removed from Keizer's portion of the UGB, and since Keizer officials have expressed that Keizer should not be bound by historical decisions in South and West Salem as future amendments are considered, it is proposed that this policy be totally eliminated as part of the Keizer Comprehensive Plan.

City Attorney Johnson asked if industrial regulations would be adopted separately. Mr. Morgan answered that because of Keizer's lack of industrial lands, Keizer is officially exempted by LCDC from the industrial regulation requirement. He noted, however, that Keizer may have to adopt a revision to the regional policy relative to what Salem comes up with.

There being no further testimony to come before the Commission, Chairman Goesch declared the hearing closed.

> It was moved by Mr. Matiskainen that the proposed language changes to the proposed comprehensive plan revisions, as presented, be forwarded to the City Council for their action. The motion was seconded by Ms. Meier and carried, all present voting aye.

7. DISCUSSION

7.1 Development Code

Planning Manager Mike Unger stated that he would be presenting a summary of the development concepts identified by the Commission at the September meeting.

Mr. Unger noted that for the commercial area, concepts identified were a desire for pedestrian-oriented development including increased office development, higher densities, and mixed use. This could be accomplished possibly through a site review process.

The direction indicated for residential low-density development was for traditional style neighborhoods. Residential areas should be designed to connect between neighborhoods and have access to commercial areas. Accessory dwellings should be permitted and attached housing should be encouraged. Mr. Unger suggested that incentives might be offered to developers to encourage this type of construction. He noted that he would bring back a menu of options to the development code for the Commission to consider.

For high-density residential development, the main concern identified was a need to require adequate buffers between those structures and low-density developments. It is also felt that architectural standards should be developed, and a site review process implemented.

Councilor Watson asked what would be the feasibility of developing standards addressing the size of development. Mr. Unger felt that it would be necessary to designate areas for higher density development to see that they are not all concentrated in one area. Mr. Morgan was concerned that there would be legal problems putting caps on multi-family units. He suggested that granny flats, etc. would be a means to provide multi-family or lower cost housing.

There was discussion of how spot zoning might be used. Councilor Watson had a concern about spot zoning to make density more spread out.

Mr. Morgan pointed out that the high-density apartments now on Wheatland seemed to work well among single-family homes. Mr. Unger emphasized the need for buffers in future development, and noted that the code currently doesn't address that area.

Mr. Muchmore wondered if there was any land left in Keizer of a size that multi-family development could be constructed. Mr. Morgan answered that two areas remained; one at the Saint Edwards property, and the other across the street from it. Mr. Muchmore suggested that the two remaining areas might be managed otherwise, possibly through other requirements.

Ms. Meier asked if there is any affordable multi-family housing in Keizer, and if more affordable housing is required. Mr. Morgan answered that it is not required. He noted that the CHAS found a real lack of larger family housing. Mr. Unger pointed out that "granny flats" are one way to create affordability.

Mr. Gottfried felt that the traffic study would prohibit building large multi-family development.

As a final issue, Mr. Unger noted the necessity to insure that the proper public facilities are available. He felt that a great lacking feature is that current regulations do not cover the provision of all needed facilities to serve a development.

Mr. Unger advised that a letter which included the summary of development concepts generated by the Planning Commission went out to 18 developers and other interested parties. His staff was now making phone calls back to these people who are key players in development in Keizer. At public workshops around the first of the year they will be invited to participate.

Mr. Unger stated that over the next couple months a draft development code based on these concepts and other problems identified by Mr. Morgan, would be drafted. The draft would be brought back in January for Planning Commission review. Staff would then spend about three months with public workshops, after which it would go to public hearing in April. He noted that the Development Code must be adopted by July.

Ms. Meier asked if the concept that new development should be responsible for public facilities and public facility impacts referred to development fees. Mr. Unger answered that noting now requires paying for roads connected with development, etc. He pointed out that the reference was to water, sewer and streets. He noted that SDC's are a different issue.

Councilor Watson wondered if the comments would be received from the 18 contacted before drafting the code, or after. Mr. Unger said that they were looking for feedback later this week and next week. Those individuals will be invited back to participate when there is a draft.

The Planning Commission recessed 8:05 p.m. and reconvened 8:15 p.m.

7.2 Willow Lake Noise and Odor Study - Implementation Strategy

Mr. Morgan advised that the proposed strategy now before the Commission will be presented to the City Council on October 17. He noted that comments from the last Planning Commission meeting have been incorporated. The major change deals with boundary location. He recalled that it was agreed to exclude property south of Lockhaven, and to reevaluate the boundary of the McNary Estates property at a point in the future. Mr. Morgan pointed out that language on page 3 of the Implementation Strategy dealing with the possible need to reevaluate the Special Policy Area as changes take place is reflected again on page 4.

It was noted that the language on page 3 states "The need for the Special Policy Area will change . . .," whereas the language on page 4 uses the less strong term "may change." it was felt that that page 4 should be changed to use the stronger language.

Mr. Gottfried was opposed to prohibiting development at McNary. He felt that the odor was not more noticeable just a few feet away inside the proposed boundary, and that a disclosure to the property owners should allow for development.

Mr. Morgan noted that two paragraphs in the Implementation Strategy, at the bottom of page 4 and at the top of page 5, are based on the idea that there will be no change to the Special Policy Area at this time, but that we will wait until the new master plan for the treatment plant is in place. The Special Policy Area would then be revised and changed, if appropriate, within six months. He also pointed out the sunset clause which puts a three-year maximum time limit on the Special Policy Area Agreement.

City Attorney Johnson suggested that even if the three-year sunset is not acceptable to Salem, it is a good starting place. The number of years could be changed.

Mr. Muchmore suggested that the Commission might want to remove the last sentence in the second bullet paragraph on page 4 of the Implementation Strategy. He felt that the language in the prior sentence stating "The developer had full knowledge of the restrictions on the property when it was purchased," was sufficient. The sentence that followed appeared to be redundant.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the changes to the language in the dual-interest agreement. He noted that Clause 1 in the agreement specifies the review period for boundary adjustment, and Clause 9 provides for cessation of the agreement

Mr. Muchmore asked If the agreement would have to be readopted by the four jurisdictions after the three-year period. Mr. Morgan answered that it would.

It was the consensus of those members present to substitute the word "will" for the word "may" on page 4 of the agreement as was previously discussed, and to remove the last sentence in the second bullet paragraph on page 4.

> It was moved by Ms. Meier to adopt the Willow Lake Implementation Strategy draft as revised, and forward it to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Muchmore and carried, with Mr. Gottfried voting no.

There was discussion of how the matter should be presented to the City Council.

Mr. Morgan pointed out that procedurally this is not the last time the Commission will see the Implementation Strategy. He noted that if Council approves the draft it will go to the other jurisdictions. It would then come back to the Commission for a formal hearing.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Goesch at 8:40 p.m. **The next regular meeting is scheduled for November 9, 1994 at 7:00 p.m.**