M I N U T E S

KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, July 11, 1990
Keizer City Hall

CALL TO ORDER — The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Ray Hansen.

ROLL CALL — The following members were present: Lee Dunn, Dawn Meier, Ray Hansen, Mark Grenz, Jerry Watson and Al Wilson. Commissioner Alan Youse was absent. Also in attendance were Mike Hart, Don Otterman and Joe Hobson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES — Dawn Meier moved to approve the May 9, 1990 Planning Commission minutes, as written. The motion was seconded and put to a vote. The vote passed unanimously (Commissioner Youse absent).

VIDEO PRESENTATION
Manufactured Housing — Don Otterman announced a video presentation regarding manufactured housing, entitled "America's Home for American's Neighborhoods." Mr. Otterman said Mr. Don Miner, of the Oregon Manufactured Housing Association, was also present this evening to participate in discussions regarding this matter.

Basically, the video explained the advantages of purchasing a manufactured home for those people who are: young families, first-time home buyers, senior citizens on fixed incomes and many working singles and couples who are in the moderate income bracket.

FMAGIC — The video explained a manufactured home is one that is manufactured in a factory to comply with uniformed Federal standards, regulating home design and construction, including fire resistance products, strength and durability and energy efficiency. These standards also govern the installation and performance of heating, plumbing, air conditioning, and electrical systems. There is an enforcing agency to ensure all standards are met

by an inspection system required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The home is transported to the site in one, or more, sections on a steel frame. Manufactured homes account for approximately one-third of all new single family homes sold in America. They dominate the affordable housing market because they are mass produced in a controlled environment, and, therefore, construction costs per square foot are less than half of those for site-built homes, excluding the price of land.

The video explained that despite the critical demand for affordable housing, many zoning and land use regulations prohibit the location of manufactured homes within residential neighborhoods, or exclude them altogether. It was explained that outdated Ordinances prohibited homes which were "mobile" and do not address the permanent manufactured homes presently being built.

There are two distinct placement alternatives for manufactured homes. First, the most common placement is in a manufactured home land lease community where a home is owned as personal property and the residential lot is leased. About 42% of all manufactured homes are placed in these communities. The remaining 58% are placed on privately owned lots in either rural or urban areas, or in cooperative or condominium developments.

A concept known as "in fill" has taken place in Oakland, California, where a manufactured home is permitted in an established residential neighborhoods on vacant lots. The process works well where vacant properties are too expensive to develop for site built homes.

The video explained in order to allow manufactured homes in residential neighborhoods where they are presently prohibited, local government need only amend their present zoning ordinance to include these homes, built to the HUD code, within the definition of a single-family dwelling. The ordinance may require manufactured homes meet all provisions applicable to all other single-family dwellings, such as minimum lot size, set backs and public improvements (i.e. utilities, roads).

DISCUSSION

Manufactured Home Overlay Zone

In response to this topic, Mr. Miner said he

reviewed the proposed Manufactured Housing Overlay Zone the City of Keizer is considering. It causes him some concern how the overlay might be applied. To Mr. Miner's interpretation, the owners of a manufactured home would need to go through a zone change process. He feels this is too great of a burden to place on a potential home owner. He does not see the benefit to the city for the potential zone change, and, he does feel this process complies with State statutes. State statutes state cities are required to permit manufactured homes on individual lots, outside of a mobile home park and/or subdivision, he said. In addition, the statute states cities should permit manufactured homes in zones, or overlay zones, with sufficient buildable lands to satisfy that need. Mr. Miner feels the proposed ordinance will allow manufactured homes, but does not specify where within the city these homes will be permitted, or how much land will be made available for their placement. Mr. Miner requested the city consider zoning particular parcels of land, in advance, with a designated Manufactured Home Overlay Zone, so potential manufactured home owners are not dealt with in a case-by-case basis.

Al Wilson requested a summary of the law that the legislature passed which our ordinance was drawn from. Joe Hobson said Mr. Miner discussed most of the new State statute's regulations. Mr. Wilson was under the impression that as long as the manufactured home met all standards, it doesn't matter where the home was placed.

Mr. Hansen said the Commission was not comfortable with placement of manufactured homes only being limited to designated areas. He is of the opinion that they should be placed on any vacant parcel as long as the manufactured home is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and, of course, meets all standards.

Regarding in-fill parcels, Mr. Hart questioned how a newly placed manufactured home would blend into an established neighborhood that is 50+ years in age. Mr. Miner responded by saying that problem would exist if a manufactured home or a conventional dwelling was placed on such a parcel of land. Mr. Miner added that there are a broad range of manufactured homes on the market today.

Jerry Watson is not opposed to the proposed ordinance, but he feels some standards should be more reasonable, (i.e. eliminate the garage and

carport requirements). He is mainly concerned with split lots.

Ray Hansen summed up the Commissioners statements as one of major concern regarding item #5 of the ordinance which addresses exterior siding and roofing, etc., materials which the manufactured home must adhere to. It was also the consensus of the Commissioners that the manufactured home placement be consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Otterman questioned whether the city wishes to permit manufactured housing outright, to be located anywhere within the city, whether the city wishes to designate specific sites for manufactured housing, or whether the city wishes to stay with the Overlay Zone requirements.

It was questioned what standards the city has in determining the size and location of the Overlay Zone, once adopted. Mr. Otterman said, at present, if the Overlay Zone wording is adopted, persons wishing to place a manufactured home on a site of their choosing would be handled on a case-by-case basis.

It was questioned why garages or carports are required for manufactured homes on in-fill lots, when the same requirements are not imperative for conventional homes, as spelled out in the Zone Ordinance.

Looking at this issue from a Councilor's standpoint, Mike Hart said he liked the idea that manufactured homes must adhere to aesthetic values of the surrounding community. Rather than deciding exactly what type of exterior siding and roofing materials a manufactured home must adhere to, Mr. Hart thinks the surrounding neighborhood character should set the standards for placement of a manufactured home. If this alternative is initiated, each manufactured home placement must be considered on a case-by-case basis. In order to speed up the process, Mr. Hart would like to hear other alternatives to alleviate the waiting period for potential manufactured home owners.

Mr. Dunn questioned whether the time frame involved in obtaining a permit for a manufactured home would take any longer than presently obtaining a permit for building of a "stick-built" home on site. Mr. Otterman responded in the affirmative stating if said person is forced to go through the Overlay

Zone application process.

Mr. Otterman questioned whether the city could turn down an application for an Overlay Zone should a potential home owner wish to place a manufactured home on a parcel that is not conducive to the surrounding neighborhood (i.e. McNary Estates). Mr. Hart responded by saying McNary Estates, in this example, have their own Homeowners Association which dictates the type of dwelling that can be built on any given parcel within the neighborhood. It was noted that certain architectural restrictions for building also exist at The Meadows subdivision, etc.

In reference to LCDC letter, dated May 4, 1990, in which LCDC questions Section 41.04(5), which states: "The mobile home shall have exterior siding and roofing which in color, material and appearance is similar to the exterior siding and roofing material commonly used on residential dwellings within the community or which is comparable to the predominant materials used on surrounding dwellings as determined by the Building Inspector", Commissioner Watson feels LCDC has two grounds for their objections: 1) the discretion of the Building Inspector to determine what is commonly used or what is predominant on surrounding dwellings, and 2) existence of two standards which state "commonly used in the community" and "comparable to surrounding dwellings". LCDC suggests only one way to handle the discrepancies. Mr. Watson questioned how does the city come up with one set of standards and how does LCDC have the right to not allow the city to utilize language in the State statutes?

Mr. Hobson said the language used in Section 41.04(5) was derived directly from the State statute.

Chairman Hansen questioned whether Section (e) & (f) of the Manufactured Home Overlay Zone could read, "A manufactured home shall have exterior siding and roofing which in color, material and appearance is compatible to the predominate materials used in surrounding dwellings."

Mr. Watson said the word "compatible" is a subjective standard and a word which could be debated and contested. In addition, the word "comparable" is also a subjective standard, he said.

Mr. Miner pointed out that the House Bill 2863 law states the community can impose additional standards beyond those enumerated in the statute on the condition that those standards are imposed on conventional dwellings.

Mr. Hobson stated that Chapter 41 would simply set up the availability of an Overlay Zone, and would not impose an Overlay Zone on any particular location.

The imposition of granting a manufactured home on a parcel of land is not of concern to the property owner, but how that manufactured home will affect surrounding properties, Mr. Watson said.

Mr. Hobson said as a part of the Periodic Review process, a "needs analysis" is being prepared, with respect to manufactured housing on sites outside of mobile home subdivisions.

Another aspect to this topic which Mr. Dunn requested the Commissioners consider is one of purchasing and razing a home on a large lot and placing two manufactured homes on that subdivided parcel. This would raise the density ratio in the neighborhood and might not be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Wilson questioned the square footage required of a manufactured home, in conjunction and compatibility with the square footage of surrounding homes. Mr. Dunn said this is not a consideration in a single-family stick built dwelling.

Mr. Miner said the manufactured housing industry is not opposed to standards the city imposes upon the industry, as long as those standards are known "up front". Therefore, he is confused why an Overlay Zone process is needed. If a proposed manufactured home will be compatible to its surrounding neighborhood, why cannot the potential property owners simply be required to comply as a condition of a permit that the proposed manufactured home "look like" the surrounding neighborhood? Regarding square footage requirements, Mr. Miner does not foresee a problem.

If cases will be considered on a case-by-case basis, Mr. Watson questioned the need for a "needs analysis".

In reading the Ordinance, Mr. Hansen does not see a compatibility problem, however, he does foresee the Zoning Administrator being given too much leeway.

Regarding the previously mentioned concern regarding the wording "compatibility" and "comparable", Chairman Hansen suggested the wording "consistent" be utilized. Mr. Wilson said this wording is still discretionary.

Mr. Watson suggested utilizing the wording of the State statute and add to it, "The following materials for siding will be presumed to be commonly used in a community." This, he said, should eliminate any controversy on the matter.

Mr. Dunn suggested adding wording that lists materials that are absolutely prohibited under any circumstances. Mr. Hansen responded by saying the Ordinance already notes specifically prohibited materials, i.e. reflective metal roofing, etc.

To Mr. Hansen's viewpoint, the issue is not the type of materials used, but the compatibility issue which is at stake. He suggested one of three decisions be made: 1) drop (e) from the Overlay Zone; (2) change the wording in some manner; (3) leave the wording as is.

Don Otterman suggested staff return to LCDC and obtain clarifications regarding what they will and will not allow. Mr. Hansen suggested that in discussions with them, LCDC be informed that the wording regarding siting standards for mobile homes, Section 41.04(5), is noted in the HB and State statute regulations.

Chairman Hansen said the majority of the Commissioners are comfortable with the wording and implementation of an Overlay Zone.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Wilson questioned the outcome over the debate of subdividing one lot into two separate lots which the Commissioners discussed in the past. Mr. Wilson was informed this issue has yet to be resolved. However, Chairman Hansen said the consensus of the Commission was to leave the matter "as is" and not attempt to make any changes.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next Planning Commission meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, August 15, 1990, beginning 7:30 p.m.

ADJOURN Chairman Hansen adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By: Chris Moreland
Chris Moreland
Administration Secretary

Note: Minutes have been reviewed by City Manager.

f:\admin\plan.min