

**MINUTES
KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
KEIZER CITY HALL - LIBRARY
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1997**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Smith at 6:08 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dick Inman, Alan Youse, Bill Wolf, Manny Martinez, June Abbott, and Elaine Smith.

Also present were: City Attorney Shannon Johnson, Community Development Director John Morgan, City Planner Amy Drought, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'.

Eric Meurer, representing the Salem Area Homebuilders, was present in the audience.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Development Code

Mr. Morgan distributed copies of an October 1 revision to the matrix handed out at the September 17 meeting. The matrix listed the relevant section of the Code, the topic, the issue under contention, an analysis of the issue, and the recommendation based on previous discussion by the Planning Commission. Mr. Morgan also distributed copies of Salem's Bicycle Parking Standards and Public Accessways provisions.

Mr. Wolf commented to the effect that Salem's way of doing things might not be appropriate for Keizer. Ms. Smith echoed his comments.

The Commission decided to begin its review at the first page of the matrix and work through. In the course of discussion, Mr. Morgan made note of inconsistencies in numbering that need to be corrected in the final draft.

In the RS Zone, the Commission concurred with a recommendation to change Section 2.102.02.D to read: "**Public or private utility substation**, but excluding communication towers and electrical substations. The Commission also agreed with this change in the **RL Zone** Section 2.103.02.F, **RM Zone** Section 2.104.02.F, and **RH Zone** Section 2.105.02.D.

In the RS Zone, the Commission agreed with changing Section 2.102.06.G, **Lot Coverage**, to read: "The maximum coverage allowed for buildings, accessory structures and paved parking shall be 70%."

In the RS Zone, the Commission discussed at length **back yard setback requirements** for two story dwellings, as defined in Section 2.102.05.B. MPBIA had objected to the proposed increase from 14' to 20'. The Commission agreed with the recommendation to stay with the 20' requirement. There was discussion of applying variance procedures in the case of alterations to existing structures.

In the IBP Zone, Development Standards, the Commission concurred with the recommendation for no change to Section 2.110.05.A.4 which allows right of way and street improvements to be required.

In the FPO Zone, Chapter 2.120, the Commission discussed at length **flood plain management provisions**. It was reluctantly agreed to adopt the language as proposed, but to revisit the issue in about six month when additional study is completed.

In the ACO Zone, the Commission concurred with the recommendation for no change to provisions in Section 2.123.05.B, which establishes requirements for **pedestrian/bicycle circulation** within an activity center.

Under General Development Standards, the Commission discussed **public facility standards**, specifically with regard to **transit facilities**. Proposed provisions were reflected in Section 2.301.03, Section 2.305 (Transit Facilities), and within Section 2.310. Mr. Morgan noted the redundancy of including the provisions in sections other than 2.305 since it exclusively speaks to transit facility requirements. It was agreed to eliminate transit facility provisions from Sections 2.301.03 and 2.310. With regard to Section 2.305, the Commission discussed toning down the requirements. There was talk of requiring a pad, but not a transit shelter. The Commission discussed the possibility of taking out design requirements, and deferring to Transit District specifications. However, Mr. Johnson felt having objective standards in place left less chance for argument in the development approval process. The Commission also discussed the possibility of using the number of units within any development as a basis rather than the number of trips generated. After discussion, there was agreement that the current numbers were too excessive. Mr. Morgan and Ms. Smith will meet to further examine the issues, and come back with a recommendation.

Under General Development Standards - Street Standards, the Commission concurred with suggested language to substitute "allow" for "require" in Section 2.302.03, to read: "Frontage Streets. If a development abuts or contains an existing or proposed arterial or collector street, the City may *allow* frontage streets, or may require reverse frontage lots . . ."

Under General Development Standards - Street Standards, the Commission concurred with the recommendation to add to Section 2.302.03M., Street Landscaping, wording to require that street trees be part of any improvement agreement for development of a property, to read: "Street trees shall be planted at a ratio of no less than one tree per 30 feet of property frontage. Street trees shall conform with the list of acceptable trees included in the City's Street Tree ordinance. Installation of street trees shall be included in any improvement agreement covering the installation of public facilities and services on a property."

Under General Development Standards - Street Standards, the Commission concurred with the recommendation to change the Street Standard table in Section 2.302.04 to indicate the maximum improvement width from curb to curb for a Major Arterial as 84 feet rather than 132 feet.

Under General Development Standards - Street Standards, Mr. Morgan had included in the matrix a reference to drop Section 2.302.08, Private Access Easements. It was determined that the intent was to drop from the opening paragraph the phrase "created as the result of an approved partitioning," leaving it to read "A private access easement shall conform to the following." A lengthy discussion followed regarding the proposed widths. Mr. Morgan indicated that there would be further discussion of this section next week.

(The Planning Commission recessed at 7:55 p.m. and reconvened at 8:10 p.m.)

Under General Development Standards - Off-Street Parking and Loading, the Commission discussed Bicycle Parking requirements in Section 2.303.08. Mr. Morgan referred to Salem's standards, which appeared more complex than those proposed for Keizer. He noted that Mr. Meurer had at first suggested looking at Salem's standards, but upon looking them over, he changed his mind. Mr. Morgan noted that the numbers of required bicycle parking spaces now proposed are significantly reduced from those originally proposed by consultants working on the City's transportation plan. There was discussion of changing the number of required spaces at high schools from 1 per classroom to 2 per classroom. It was the consensus to leave the ratio at 1 per classroom. No changes were made.

Under General Development Standards - Off-Street Parking and Loading, the Commission declined a request from the Bikeway Committee to change the distance requirements for locating bicycle parking, in Section 2.303.08.B.2, from a maximum 100 feet from a building entrance to 50 feet. No changes were made.

Under General Development Standards - Off-Street Parking and Loading, it was the consensus to change the bike rack design provisions in Section 2.303.08.B.3 to require that racks be designed to secure the bicycle frame and at least one wheel, rather than two. There were no other changes to the provision.

Under General Development Standards - Building Orientation and Pedestrian Circulation, the Commission discussed at length the proposed standards in Section 2.304.02.B, Internal Pedestrian Circulation, #8, Access to Adjacent Property. Mr. Morgan explained that the first sentence in Subsection 8 provides that pedestrian links between adjacent properties be identified. The second sentence addresses the issue of connections relative to the site plan review process. Mr. Wolf suggested that rather than changing the wording of #8 as recommended, the existing wording be split-out into two separate Subsections, 8 and 9. By incorporating the final sentence of the existing Subsection 8 into the new Subsection 9, Subsection 9 could then be worded to apply to all of the above standards, not just those in Subsection 8. The Commission agreed with the split-out, and applying the new Subsection 9 to standards 1 through 8. They suggested that the word "connections" in Subsection 9 be changed to "design requirements," or something similar, to appropriately apply to all the standards.

A final paragraph requiring "right-of-way or public easements for all walkways which provide a direct connection to adjacent properties," was deemed unnecessary. It will be taken out.

Under General Development Standards, the Commission deferred further discussion of **Section 2.305, Transit Facilities**, until Mr. Morgan and Ms. Smith come back with recommendations (as mentioned above).

Under General Development Standards - Development Standards for Land Divisions, for Section 2.310.04, Additional Design Standards for Subdivisions, there was no change to the standards listed under Subsection C, Connectivity. The Commission, however, agreed with a suggestion from Mr. Morgan to change under Subsection E, Design Standards (for pedestrian/bicycle accessways), #1, the minimum dedicated width, from 20 to 15 feet. #2, the maximum improved width, would remain at 10 feet. Suggestions were made for changes to #4 which deals with pedestrian scale lighting along walkways. Mr. Morgan will further investigate possibilities for the standard. Mr. Inman will check to see if there is an industry standard.

Under General Development Standards - Development Standards for Land Divisions, the Commission previously agreed to eliminate Subsection 2.310.04.F, Transit Facilities.

Under General Development Standards - Development Standards for Land Divisions, Section 2.310.05, Improvement Requirements - Partitions, the Commission concurred with changing Subsection G, Water system, to state that "... the City will not expect the developer to pay for the extra pipe material cost of mains exceeding **eight** inches in size," rather than ten, as currently stated.

Under Supplemental Standards for Special Uses, Section 2.413, Recreational Vehicle Storage - Single Family Residences, Subsection E, Setbacks, was discussed at length. Mr. Morgan explained that the recommended language reflects the current Code provisions

which allow RV's to be parked in the front yard, on a driveway or in an enclosed area meeting other Code requirements. The Commission discussed a provision in the proposed language prohibiting widening a driveway to accommodate an RV. After discussion, it was agreed to take out the language that prohibits widening a driveway to accommodate an RV, and to define the driveway width that will be allowed. Mr. Morgan noted that the appropriate location for defining the maximum driveway width would be in the Off-street Parking and Loading Section. It was agreed to amend Section 2.303.04.D.2 to add language to the effect that "no driveway shall be greater than 36 feet in width, other than in a side yard adjacent to an alley."

Under Application Requirements and Review Procedures, Section 3.103, Site Development Review, the Commission discussed Section 3.103.06, Evaluation of Site Development Plan. Mr. Morgan commented on MPBIA objections to some of the standards, and their suggestion that others be more specifically defined. A question came up with regard to the review process as it relates to environmental issues, particularly for sites likely to need hazardous materials cleanup. Mr. Johnson suggested adding wording to the effect that the criteria are "based on consideration of any possible violations of state and federal law." Mr. Morgan suggested adding language to subsections needing more clearly defined standards. He suggested adding language to Subsections B, C, and E to the effect (highlighted): B. Drainage and erosion control needs **in accordance with public works standards**; D. Traffic safety, internal circulation and parking, **in conjunction with review by the city traffic engineer to assure safety and efficiency in relationship to the public street**; and E. Provision for adequate noise and/or visual buffering from non-compatible uses. (Mr. Morgan suggested establishing some measurable standards for noise to add to Subsection E.) Mr. Morgan acknowledged that he would come back next week at the regular meeting with more specifics with regard to site plan review.

Mr. Morgan briefly commented on the remaining topics on the matrix. With regard to **Residential Sprinkler requirements**, Mr. Morgan believed that the previously discussed concerns might best be addressed by changing the definition of "story." It was pointed out that the definition would need to be worded so as to appropriately apply to other places where it is used in the Code. **Flood Plain Development** was deferred. As previously decided, **Design Standards** will be handled as a free-standing chapter. Mr. Morgan expected that a design standards draft would not be completed by next week's meeting. It was agreed that it might be necessary for a subcommittee to review the design standards when a draft is completed, before submitting the Code draft to the Council. With regard to **Notification**, the Commission agreed with posting the site and mailing to all properties within 250 feet. Ms. Smith suggested mailing a summary with a statement that interested parties can request copies of the whole decision.

Mr. Morgan reaffirmed that at next week's regular meeting the remaining unresolved issues will be discussed. He agreed to limit the agenda to discussion of the Development Code.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

Mr. Wolf conveyed a request from SEKNA for enforcement on abandoned buildings. He named several locations having dilapidated structures that had not been occupied for some time. SEKNA would like to see an ordinance in place that would speak to the condition of the building and a specified time without occupancy. Mr. Johnson suggested that if enforcement was not possible under the current Dangerous and Abandoned Buildings code section, that section could be amended. Mr. Morgan will look at the existing ordinances to see if enforcement is possible under the current code. He reiterated that a code enforcement officer will soon be on board, providing a tool not available in the past.

4.1 Regular Meeting - October 8, 1997 - 7:00 PM

5. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Smith at 10:00 p.m.