

**MINUTES
KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
KEIZER CITY HALL - LIBRARY
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1997**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Smith at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dick Inman, Alan Youse, Bill Wolf, Manny Martinez, and Elaine Smith. June Abbott arrived at 7:50 p.m. Jere Clancy was excused.

Also present were: City Attorney Shannon Johnson, Community Development Director John Morgan, City Planner Amy Drought, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'. Council Liaison Keller had a family commitment.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The July 9, 1997 minutes were deferred until later in the agenda pending arrival of Ms. Abbott.

It was moved by Mr. Wolf that the minutes of September 17, 1997 be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Inman and carried, all present voting aye.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

Karen Trucke, 6630 14th. Avenue NE, Keizer, reminded the Commission that she had been unable to get a copy of the Traffic Safety Commission's vision clearance proposal prior to the Development Code hearing being closed to public testimony. She since had received a copy, and had drafted a letter in response to their recommendations. She wished to submit it for the record.

Chair Smith disallowed submittal of the letter into the Planning Commission public hearing record since the hearing was now closed to public comment. City Attorney Johnson agreed. He pointed out that although the letter could not be part of the Planning Commission public hearing record, Ms. Trucke could submit the letter when the City Council holds a public hearing on the Development Code. She also could leave a copy of the letter for review and comment by staff in its submittal to Council.

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Iris Lane

Mr. Morgan reported on the status of negotiations with the two property owners. Last minute requests by each of the property owners have delayed reaching an agreement. USA Properties asked for overlay of the parking lot. The Bi-Mart property owner wanted the City to be involved in acquiring the palm reader's house. Both requests were denied. Responses to the denials have not yet been received from either property owner. The delay in reaching agreement means the City will not be able to break ground by October 1, as previously planned. The project is now projected to begin the first of next year.

Cherry Avenue

The project is now underway. Salem Electric has begun its initial work and will be setting bulbs early next week. The goal is to break ground on the street improvement July 1 of next year. The project will involve 84 property acquisitions, some large and some very small.

Chemawa Activity Center

Mr. Morgan will meet this coming Tuesday with principals from OEDD to discuss their involvement in financing the infrastructure.

River & Chemawa Study

In response to Council's direction to R3B to look at the potential of the UNOCAL property, R3B directed staff to contact an economic consultant about doing a marketing study for the UNOCAL site and other properties at the SW corner of River and Chemawa. Leyland Consultants is now finalizing a scope of work. Earnest work on a study should begin soon.

Transportation Plan

Mr. Morgan reported that the requested grant was approved. It will allow COG to accelerate work on the Plan. He hoped to schedule it for discussion on next month's Planning Commission agenda.

River Road Redevelopment

Mr. Morgan reported that landscaping work at three corners of Lockhaven and River Road is underway. The goal is to see everything done by the first of November. He acknowledged that the fence along the mobile home park at the SW corner will be

screened. R3B, at their next meeting, will work on plans for a sign at that corner. Mr. Morgan responded to questions about ongoing maintenance of the landscaping.

The Walgreens project at the NE corner of River and Chemawa is progressing rapidly.

The issue of banners along River Road is still under consideration by R3B. Mr. Morgan noted that sample banners are on the decorative light poles in the City Hall parking lot. He welcomed comments and ideas from Planning Commission members. He talked about decorations already bought, what is proposed, and issues that remain unresolved.

Development Activity

Mr. Morgan reported that City Planner Drought is swamped with applications. More applications have been processed in the first three-fourths of this year than in any other year except 1994. Some very controversial cases indicative of the rapid growth taking place in Keizer are expected to end up before the City Council.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Development Code

Mr. Morgan stated that tonight, the Planning Commission would continue its discussion of unresolved issues. With the thought that agreement would be reached tonight on almost all topics, he planned to publish a "clean copy" of the draft code before the next Planning Commission meeting. Upon the Planning Commission's action at the November meeting, Mr. Morgan will publish a final Planning Commission-recommended draft for submittal to the City Council, probably December 1.

Mr. Morgan had prepared a report listing issues for discussion with proposed code revisions based on previous discussion by the Planning Commission. The following issues were discussed by the Planning Commission:

Vision Clearance

Mr. Morgan referred to a matrix prepared by City Planner Amy Drought. It summarized each issue, the corresponding draft Land Development Code proposal, and the Traffic Safety Commission's proposal. Three differences between the two proposals dealt with the specifications for legs at intersections, whether or not to require vision clearance at controlled intersections, and the definition of the vision clearance triangle.

With regard to the controlled intersection issue, Mr. Morgan noted that the Traffic Safety Commission's recommendation is to require vision clearance at all intersections regardless

of whether controlled or not. Concerning the vision clearance triangle, the Traffic Safety Commission proposed that vision clearance be measured from the inside edge of the sidewalk or the inside edge of the curb or asphalt, as opposed to being measured along the property line. Mr. Morgan called attention to the different legs lengths proposed by the Traffic Safety Commission for street-street intersections, and street-driveway/alley intersections. He indicated that staff had no specific objections to the three Traffic Safety Commission proposals.

Mr. Morgan explained staff's objections to the Traffic Safety Commission proposals dealing with trimming of trees and shrubs, and enforcement. Staff believed the proposal regarding maintenance and landscaping issues more appropriately belonged in the City's street tree ordinance. Because the City has an infraction/public nuisance ordinance, staff recommended against the enforcement procedure in the Traffic Safety Commission's proposal. He noted that all the City's Civil Codes use the same enforcement procedure.

Mr. Morgan called attention to another handout he had distributed to Commission members; a proposed Code section for "Access Control for Arterial Streets." He noted that the Planning Commission considered the provisions two years ago while discussing design standards, and had agreed with incorporating them into the Development Code. Vision clearance was addressed in this proposed Code section, using as a basis sight distance based on the posted speed for the arterial street. He named the six arterial streets in Keizer. Mr. Morgan noted that the other two vision clearance proposals apply regardless of the classification of the street. He suggested that the Planning Commission consider all three proposals in making its recommendation.

In looking at the Traffic Safety Commission's proposed definition of the vision clearance triangle, the following wording was suggested to clarify the point of measurement: "The vision clearance area shall be measured from the inside edge of the sidewalk **or where there is no sidewalk**, the inside edge of the curb and extend at right angles the **designated** distance in both directions along the intersection. . . . " **The Commission agreed to go with the Traffic Safety Commission definition as modified.**

(Ms. Abbott arrived and took a seat at the table.)

The Commission discussed whether to go with measurements or performance standards in defining the vision clearance area. They also discussed whether different provisions should be adopted for arterial streets. Mr. Wolf disagreed with using speed and sight distance as a basis in neighborhoods. He believed that arterials should be treated different from uncontrolled intersections. He pointed out the contradiction of the Traffic Safety Commission's proposal to the idea of putting buildings out at the street in commercial areas. The Commission also discussed whether the proposed arterial street specifications should apply at all controlled intersection. It was pointed out that the posted speed and sight distance schedule in the "Access Control for Arterial Streets" proposal were specific to Driveway Sight Distance.

After further discussion, there was agreement to apply the Driveway Sight Distances on page 265 of the "Access Control for Arterial Streets" proposal to driveways and intersections at arterial streets.

Mr. Morgan indicated that he would move the vision clearance provisions from the access control section to the vision clearance section of the Code.

Discussion now centered around vision clearance areas for intersections other than arterial streets. The Commission discussed whether or not to require the same standards for controlled street-street intersections as for uncontrolled. **After discussion, there was consensus to go with 20' legs along both street frontages at street-street intersections.**

The Commission continued on to the street-driveway/alley intersection standards. **After discussion, there was agreement to go with the Traffic Safety Commission proposal for 10' leg along street, and 10' leg along driveway/alley at street-driveway/alley intersections.**

Mr. Johnson suggested that the agreed-upon standards for arterial streets also be applied to collector streets. **The Commission concurred with applying the agreed-upon street-street and street-driveway/alley standards to local streets only.**

With regard to standards for controlled intersections, Mr. Morgan suggested drawing a distinction between a signalized intersection and one with a stop sign. He explained that right-of-way is determined by the signal at signaled intersections. **Under controlled intersections, there was concurrence to say signaled intersections do not require vision clearance.**

With regard to the issue of development within the vision clearance triangle, there was agreement to go with the Traffic Safety Commission recommendation for nothing greater than 30" in height, excepting trees > than 7' above grade.

There was agreement that Trimming of Trees/Shrubs Overhanging Public Right-of-way belongs in the tree ordinance, not the Development Code.

There was also agreement that enforcement should be consistent throughout the City's Code, and that the City's Infraction Ordinance should be applied.

Mr. Martinez questioned the need for the Traffic Safety Commission proposed changes. He stated that before he could accept any of their proposals, he would like to see statistics in support of the proposals showing that they are needed for safety.

Ms. Drought read other Traffic Safety Commission proposals she had not included in the matrix. Mr. Morgan noted that they are already in the Code. Mr. Morgan will meld the agreed-upon changes into the final draft for the Commission to take action in November.

(The Planning Commission recessed 8:30 p.m. and reconvened at 8:44 p.m.)

The Planning Commission continued discussion of the remaining proposed revisions listed on Mr. Morgan's October 8, 1997 report. Mr. Morgan reiterated that the proposed revisions were based on previous Planning Commission input.

Section 2.204.03.B Alteration (Under Nonconforming Uses - Continuation and Expansion of a Nonconforming Use)

The proposed language addresses rear setback requirements for future additions to single family residential or duplex structures. The Commission concurred with the recommendation.

Section 2.102.05.B(3) Setbacks (Under Single Family Residential - Dimensional Standards)

The proposed language addresses garage setback requirements.

Mr. Inman suspected that the proposed 10' setback would create a problem with placement of a utility box. Mr. Morgan pointed out that the problem would be resolved in the plan review process. The Commission concurred with the recommendation.

Section 2.302.08 Private Access Easements (Under Street Standards)

The proposed language clarifies that the defined standards apply to a private access easement created as a result of an approved subdivision, as well as an approved partitioning. The Commission concurred with the recommendation.

Section 2.102.05.B Minimum Yard Setback Requirements (Single Family Residential - Dimensional Standards)

The Recommendation was to add to all residential chapters a new footnote to Setbacks, defining how setbacks are measured from property lines. A final phrase in the proposed language specific to garage setback measurements was considered too complex, and unnecessary. It was dropped from the footnote.

That completed the issues listed on Mr. Morgan's October 8 report.

Mr. Morgan called attention to a handout entitled "Development Standards." It reflected the design standards defined by the Planning Commission several months ago. He indicated that he would like affirmation of the intent that the standards would be used in all the

commercial zones. There were no objections. Mr. Morgan also called attention to the access control handout referred to earlier in the meeting. He noted that the access management ordinance was drafted about two years ago, but was not included in the blue bound draft of the Development Code. He reviewed the access control provisions and responded to questions. He asked if the desire was to include this chapter in the final draft Code.

Ms. Smith felt that more time was needed to thoroughly review the proposed access control provisions. She suggested that after reading the draft, Commissioners call Mr. Morgan with comments so that he can include the chapter in the final draft of the Code.

Mr. Morgan responded to concerns and questions about topics previously discussed. He addressed concerns expressed by Ms. Smith about proposed street standards. He made note of reminders from Mr. Wolf for a clarified definition of "Neighborhood Association," and for notification requirements to include notification to a neighborhood association whenever any part of the association falls within the notification area. With regard to concerns expressed by Mr. Wolf about access to mobile home parks, there was support for making manufactured home parks a conditional use in the Single Family Zone. It would allow addressing access and connectivity issues. Conditional use review was also supported for the RL zone. It was agreed that mobile home parks should remain a special permitted use in the RM zone. Mr. Youse was disturbed at some of the comments made about mobile home parks in the course of discussion. He admonished the Commission against speaking condescendingly about mobile home parks.

Mr. Morgan acknowledged for Mr. Wolf that he would again review Mr. Wolf's e-mail corrections and suggestions.

Mr. Inman had questions about the following sections of the draft Code:

Section 2.102.06.I. Redevelopment Plan (Single Family Residential - Development Standards) Mr. Inman wondered why 1 acre was chosen as the minimum parcel size requiring a development plan. After discussion, the Commission supported saying 1/2 acre.

Section 1.200.04 Definitions Mr. Inman suggested that for "Utility" the reference be corrected to "Public Facilities and Services." Mr. Morgan acknowledged the typographical error.

Section 2.120.07.A.4.a. Flood Protection Standards With regard to fully enclosed areas below the lowest floor that are subject to flooding, Mr. Inman pointed out that the defined criteria for openings for the entry and exit of floodwaters lacked provisions for the placement of openings. Mr. Morgan will reword the statement to make some reference back to the stated purpose.

Section 2.124.02 Location (Resource Conservation Overlay Zone) There was agreement to redefine the Resource Conservation Overlay Zone as "the designated floodway along Claggett Creek."

Section 2.201.02.B. Completion of Structure (General Standards - Building Permits) Mr. Inman questioned the appropriateness of the occupancy requirement in cases of a self-constructed house. After discussion, Mr. Morgan suggested taking out the residential requirement to build in one year. The Commission agreed.

Section 2.301.03. C-4 (C=Conditional) Street Improvements for Commercial or Industrial Expansions (General Provisions - Application of Public Facility Standards) Mr. Inman questioned whether it was intended that access permits be obtained from the Marion County Public Works Department, as stated. Considering the possibility the issuing authority could change, Mr. Johnson suggested saying only "must obtain access permits."

Section 2.426.C. Screening (Supplemental Standards for Special Uses - Electrical Substation) Mr. Inman questioned the prohibition of barbed wire. It was agreed to allow barbed wire, but say that barbed wire shall be mounted to angle in.

Ms. Abbott voiced one objection to the proposed Sign requirements. Section 2.308.05.I. Window Signs (General Development Standards - Signs) Mr. Morgan confirmed Ms. Abbott's understanding that window signs exceeding the defined standard would have to be counted against the total allowed signage. Ms. Abbott strongly felt that indoor signs should not be counted as part of the total signage. After discussion, there was no change to the provision.

Mr. Morgan reiterated that a clean, up-to-date draft Code will be published for review by the Planning Commission in November.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - July 9, 1997 (continued from above)

It was moved by Ms. Abbott that the minutes of July 9, 1997 be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Inman and carried, all present voting aye except Mr. Wolf who abstained from voting inasmuch as he was not present at that meeting.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

7.1 Regular Meeting - November 12, 1997 - 7:00 PM

Mr. Inman announced that because of other commitments, he could no longer act as the Planning Commission's representative to SKATS. Mr. Morgan indicated that he would put "committee assignments" on next month's agenda.

8. **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Smith at 10:25 p.m.