

MINUTES
KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, September 9, 1998
Keizer City Hall - Library

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Abbott at 7:28 p.m., absent a quorum. City Attorney Johnson reminded the Commission that in the absence of a quorum, no decisions could be made.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dan Nelson, June Abbott, and Bruce Anderson. Bill Wolf arrived at 7:41 p.m. Dick Inman, Jere Clancy and Manny Martinez had asked to be excused.

Also present were: Council Liaison Jim Keller, City Attorney Shannon Johnson, Staff Liaison Amy Drought, COG Consultant Anna Braun, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'.

Present in the audience were Keizer Traffic Engineer Dick Woelk and ODOT Planner Bonnie Heitsch. Keizer Bikeway Committee members Hersch Sangster, Joe Edgell, and Preston VanMeter were also present, and were invited to participate in the Bike Element discussion.

Vice Chair Abbott proceeded to the discussion item on the agenda.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Bike Element of the Transportation System Plan

City Planner Drought noted that Commissioners received in their agenda packets copies of the Bicycle Element drafted in June 1997. She deferred to COG Consultant Anna Braun to guide the discussion of the Bicycle Element of the Keizer TSP.

Ms. Braun called attention to a supplemental agenda she had prepared to help guide the discussion. Her goal was to make sure that everyone had a clear understanding of the plan's contents, and to get tentative approval of the plan.

Ms. Braun emphasized the importance of delineating Keizer's arterial and collector streets in order to designate streets for bikelanes and bikeways. Ms. Braun directed attention to a map of recommended bike facilities, taken from the 1997 Bicycle Plan draft. It identified roads recommended for bikelanes, those for bikeways, and those for multi-use paths. As a supplement to the map, Ms. Braun had developed a table listing streets designated in the plan as arterial or collector, and the type of bike facility for each, either existing or proposed. She called attention to the "Standards" in the 1997 draft which included definitions for bikelanes and bikeways. She explained that the primary difference between bikelanes and bikeways is the intent. Although bikelanes and bikeways have the same dimensions, bikelanes are dedicated for exclusive bicycle use; bikeways provide a suitable area for bicycling but do not have the same exclusivity.

Ms. Braun noted that the TPR requires that all arterials and collectors have bikeways or bikelanes. She pointed out that as part of the TSP process, street designations can be changed. She briefly reviewed the list of arterials and collectors, and called attention to current bike facility deficiencies.

(Chair Bill Wolf arrived and took his seat at the head of the table.) **At 7:41 p.m., a quorum was present.**

A lengthy discussion took place with regard to current street designations and streets that should be considered for reclassification. The group talked about specific streets where meeting the standards would necessitate additional right-of-way acquisition. Ms. Braun called attention to a second page included with the table of arterial and collector streets. It listed streets in the bike plan which are not (yet) designated as arterials or collectors, but serve as bikeways for connectivity purposes. The group commented on alternative connections that would provide a continuous bicycle route through Keizer. It was pointed out that designating and stripping bikelanes would do away with on-street parking, and could be objectionable to residents. Ms. Braun suggested that if there was concern about losing parking, it might be appropriate to designate some streets as minor collectors and not apply the rule. In that case, it would be necessary to develop a designation between major and minor as part of TSP process. Traffic Engineer Woelk explained why designating major and minor collectors might not be appropriate for Keizer's streets. It was pointed out that the low traffic volume on some local roads makes it unnecessary to have stripped bikeways or bikelanes.

Traffic Engineer Woelk responded to questions about criteria for street classifications. Ms. Abbott indicated an interest in having updated traffic counts on arterial and collector streets to see if there should be a change in priorities. Mr. Woelk indicated that he could provide updated traffic counts. He reaffirmed that the City has a policy that when improvements are done to arterial or collector streets, bikelanes are included. Ms. Braun

pointed out that the Planning Commission needs to either concur or disagree with the City's policy.

Ms. Braun indicated that she would like the group to consider the list and prioritize which streets are most important for bike facilities. There was further discussion of having a direct bike route through Keizer on River Road. It was pointed out that right-of-way acquisition would be necessary in the section between Chemawa Road and Manbrin Drive in order to have bikelanes continuous along River Road. Mr. Edgell from the Bikeway Committee (and public works staff) pointed out that curb improvements are planned in the future, and possibly acquisition for bikelanes could be looked at with those improvements. In developing a plan for 20 years into the future, he believed River Road should not be removed from the recommended bike facilities. In the ensuing discussion, the preference for now seemed to be for combining sections of River Road with alternative routes for a continuous connection.

From the comments so far, Ms. Braun perceived an interest in making changes to the 1997 plan draft. She believed it would be necessary to continue the discussion next month after receiving responses to some of the comments made tonight. She noted that the TSP schedule would have to be pushed back a month. Ms. Drought suggested that Mr. Woelk provide data on traffic counts, plus information on the criteria staff normally works with for collectors and arterials. Mr. Woelk indicated that he and Mr. VanMeter would also provide a list of street widths and right-of-way widths so that the group can get a better picture of the impacts of designating local streets as collectors with regard to the parking issue. Mr. VanMeter indicated that the Bikeway Committee would meet before next month to come up with more specific recommendations.

Ms. Braun concluded her comments by drawing attention to material in the agenda packet listing the Goals, Objectives and Policies for the proposed Bicycle Element. She had reformatted the verbiage in the Regional Plan to make it more relevant for Keizer, and easier to read. She suggested that Commissioners review the material, and provide written comments to Ms. Drought.

Members of the Bikeway Committee left the meeting room.

Chair Wolf returned to Item 3 on the agenda.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - August 12, 1998

It was moved by Mr. Anderson that the minutes of August 12, 1998 be approved. The motion was seconded by Ms. Abbott. The motion carried unanimously by those members present.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

There was no public testimony to come before the Commission.

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Development Activity

With regard to commercial activity, Ms. Drought reported that a software business will be going in at Inland Shores; and, the owner of "Cafe Diva" on River Road is proposing to put in a "Mail Boxes Etc." on property he owns just next to the restaurant. For residential development, partition applications remain strong; and, the public hearing for the proposed Brooks Avenue 10-lot subdivision continues this month.

Ms. Drought responded to questions about the type of development that can go in on River Road. When the possibility of limiting driveway accesses was mentioned, Ms. Abbott recalled discussion by the urban renewal board of limiting accesses and pursuing driveway closures in some locations.

Update on Appeal of Partition Case 97-22 and Partition/Adjustment Case 98-03

Ms. Drought brought to recollection the two issues that represented the basis for the appeal: is the front lot line for Parcels 2 and 3 the side that faces the street or the side that faces the easement; and, if the easement, where exactly should lot depth be measured from (what constitutes the front lot line). She reported that Council's determination was that the side that faces the easement is the front lot line; and, that the edge of the easement represents the front lot line. Ms. Drought noted that Council's determination gives new direction to staff as to how to review and approve partition applications. City Attorney Johnson added that as a result of Council's determination on both appeals, this application was denied.

Mr. Wolf commented on Council's recognition of the need to come up with some better-defined standards to avoid misunderstandings with the next similar application. Councilor Whalen had talked with him, Ms. Drought, and Joel Stein at the Fire Department regarding possible changes to the Development Code. Mr. Wolf welcomed comments from other members of the Commission to carry back for further discussion. Ms. Drought indicated that next month she would bring back a map delineating what properties have the potential to be divided.

While on the subject of possible changes to the Development Code, Mr. Nelson suggested that the Commission look again at the provision that accessory structures can be two feet from the property line. He noted that the Building Code requires a fire wall for structures

less than three feet from the property line. As a building inspector he has encountered strong resistance to the requirement from property owners doing small projects. He indicated that he would like to see it changed to a three-foot setback.

Ms. Drought noted that staff is keeping a file of potential changes to the Code. She recalled that it was expected that possible deficiencies would surface once the new Code was put into application.

In a preliminary look at Mr. Nelson's suggestion, the Commission talked about possible options. Suggestions included better communication of the requirement at the time of application for a permit, putting an annotation in the handout sheet, and possibly amending the Code, at the time other amendments are done, to require a fire wall for structures two feet from the property line, but not for structures set back three feet. Mr. Johnson explained the lengthy process for a text amendment to the Code. Ms. Drought agreed that for now, she would work with Mr. Nelson in the area of education, and that she would include the suggestion in the Code amendment file for discussion with other possible Code revisions. It was pointed out that encouraging more space between the structure and the property line might not be a good idea since people tend to store junk in those out-of-sight areas.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

7.1 Regular Meeting - October 14, 1998 - 7:00 PM

Ms. Drought reaffirmed that the Bike Element will be scheduled for further discussion in October. The discussion of street designations, possible new streets, goals regarding roads, and transit routes will be set back on the schedule. The open house planned for the end of October will probably be rescheduled for November.

Ms. Drought introduced Maria Meier, the newly hired Planner for the City of Keizer. Ms. Meier previously worked for the City of Salem.

8. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Wolf at 9:05 p.m.