

MINUTES
KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
KEIZER CITY HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBERS
JULY 9, 1997

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Smith at 7:07 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dick Inman, Manny Martinez, June Abbott, Elaine Smith, and Jere Clancy. Bill Wolf was excused.

Also present were: Council Liaison Jim Keller, Community Development Director John Morgan, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Ms. Abbott that the minutes of May 14, 1997 be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez and carried, all present voting aye except Mr. Martinez and Mr. Clancy who abstained from voting inasmuch as they were not present at that meeting.

It was moved by Ms. Abbott that the minutes of June 11, 1997 be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clancy and carried, all present voting aye except Ms. Smith who abstained from voting inasmuch as she was not present at that meeting.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

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

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Development Activity

An update was not given.

Mixed Use Zone

An update was not given.

Transportation Plan

Mr. Morgan made reference to the draft Bicycle Element, and Alder Street extension analysis prepared by COG. Copies of the documents were included in the agenda packet. He suggested that Commissioners review and analyze the documents and be prepared to discuss them in September. He noted that staff has been working on a street inventory, and now has a list of streets, by condition. He displayed a color-key map of city streets developed on the GIS. It will be used in preparing an analysis of deficiencies. Of particular importance will be an analysis of pedestrian and bike facility deficiencies in locations where there are no curbs and sidewalks. Mr. Morgan also called attention to a letter from the principal of Cummings Elementary School speaking to the lack of bicycle and pedestrian facilities around the school. He noted that the City's Bikeways Committee and the Cummings School LSAC representative are working on a grant proposal to address the safety needs at the school.

ADDED ITEM

Resolution - Initiation of Legislative Amendment to Amend Chapter 23 of the Zoning Ordinance Relative to Child Foster Care Homes

Copies of the draft resolution were distributed to Commissioners prior to the meeting. Mr. Morgan explained that Jim Seymore, president of Catholic Community Services and also an active participant in Keizer United, came to Council Monday night with a request for a zoning ordinance amendment to allow building of a foster care home that would house five to eight children in a permanent home environment. Although foster parents living in the home might change from time-to-time, the kids would remain in the stable environment. Mr. Morgan noted that no tax money is involved in the project; it would be built and maintained by way of a private benefactor and the support of the community. The home would be specifically available to Keizer kids.

Mr. Morgan noted that the current Residential Single Family zoning limits child foster care homes to five or fewer children. Whereas the more-commonly-known foster home provides care for siblings, the proposed home would allow up to eight individual children. It was felt that allowing eight children would better justify the costs to build and run the home. The proposed change in text would allow foster care homes for greater than five children.

Mr. Morgan noted that the City Council directed staff to bring the requested text change to the Planning Commission to consider initiating the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. If the Planning Commission agrees to initiate the amendment, it will later have opportunity to consider whether to recommend adoption of the amendment. After public

hearing by the City Council, if the amendment is passed, the foster care home proponents can file for a conditional use permit, allowing public comment on the specific proposal.

Councilor Keller provided more information about Mr. Seymore's specific proposal. The proposed foster care home would target children five to seven years of age. It would be located near Sir Lancelot Court. He noted that currently there are no neighborhood associations in that area, however, Cynthia Vannoy, president of the Claggett Creek Neighborhood Association, was invited to last Monday's Council meeting, and to talk with Mr. Seymore about any concerns. Councilor Keller reemphasized that a benefactor would construct the home, and another benefactor will handle the annual operating expenses. Councilor Keller saw the project as a benefit to the community.

Mr. Inman asked if the building itself would have to go through the conditional use process. Mr. Morgan answered that the building would not; the occupancy would.

Mr. Inman questioned the proposed "...six or more children" language. He wondered if there would be a maximum number. Mr. Morgan answered that "six or more" is language used the RL (Residential Limited) zone. He picked it for that reason, however, the Planning Commission could choose to put a cap on the number.

Mr. Martinez was concerned about the lack of a cap. He also felt the Planning Commission should get neighborhood and public input before taking any kind of action. Mr. Morgan reiterated that the resolution to initiate the amendment would merely put the matter on the table. The Planning Commission could later recommend either approval or denial of the text amendment. He also noted that the resolution before the Commission was merely a draft. In initiating the amendment, the Commission could specify a maximum number if they so chose. They could also set the first public hearing before the Planning Commission rather than the City Council, as the draft resolution currently states. Mr. Morgan emphasized, however, that Mr. Seymore's specific proposal would not come to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Smith asked if as part of the conditional use process the number of children could be limited as a condition of approval. Mr. Morgan answered yes. He also explained the conditional use noticing requirements that would allow opportunity for comment from the neighbors.

Mr. Clancy moved that the Planning Commission adopt the proposed Resolution to Initiate a Legislative Amendment to Amend Chapter 23 of the Zoning Ordinance Relative to Child Foster Care Homes. Ms. Abbott seconded the motion.

The motion carried, all present voting aye except Mr. Martinez who abstained.

6. PUBLIC HEARING

6.1 Development Code

Chair Smith noted that the public hearing continued from June 11 remained opened for public comment. She indicated that she would attempt to group the testimony to concentrate on one specific issue at a time. She first called Fire Marshal Joel Stein to the podium.

Multi-Family Sprinkler System Requirements

Fire Marshal Joel Stein, representing the Keizer Fire District, indicated that he was present in support of the fire district's proposal to incorporate code requirements for sprinkler systems in residential multi-family structures. He asked if there were any further questions regarding the material provided by him on June 11.

Ms. Smith noted that staff was recommending a stand-alone ordinance rather than incorporating the requirements in the development code. Staff had suggested the following language: "Every apartment house, lodging house, dormitory, convent, monastery, rooming house, condominium or hotel two stories or more in height and containing more than four apartments or guest rooms shall have installed therein an approved automatic sprinkler system throughout the premises." She questioned Mr. Stein's reaction to the staff recommendation for a stand-alone ordinance. Mr. Stein had no objection; he merely wished to see something adopted.

Mr. Morgan refreshed memories regarding the sometime-used practice to build a lower floor beneath grade and avoid the current sprinkler system requirement for multi-family developments with three or more floors. Mr. Stein passed around a drawing depicting the practice. Mr. Morgan also explained why it was felt that a stand-alone ordinance would be preferable. He and Mr. Stein confirmed that the proposed requirement would be stricter than the Uniform Building Code requirements. They also confirmed that current buildings would not have to be retrofitted; the requirement would apply only to new construction.

Mr. Clancy was concerned about the costs that ultimately would be borne by the renters of not only the apartments meeting the requirement, but all apartments in Keizer since others would raise rents correspondingly. Mr. Stein could not predict the impact on rents. He noted, however, that there are currently apartments in Keizer with sprinkler systems. He suspected that the \$1.25/sq. ft. cost figure he provided was probably on the high side since it was based on figures for a single-family dwelling. He felt \$1/sq. ft. would be more realistic for an apartment complex. He noted the value of sprinkler systems in saving lives and property, and acknowledged that he would like to look at retrofitting sometime in the future.

Ms. Abbott and Mr. Inman indicated support for the proposed requirement. Mr. Inman felt that a sprinkler system could be a selling point for leasing or renting apartments. He also suspected that fire insurance premiums would be lower for buildings with sprinkler systems. Mr. Stein indicated that the insurance savings to an owner would be about 15%.

Mr. Martinez agreed on the benefits for hotels, apartments, etc. He, however, was also concerned about the costs. Rather than adopting more regulations, he thought a better approach would be to sell the idea to developers.

It was agreed that the issue needed to be examined further other than in the context of the development code discussion. Ms. Smith asked Mr. Morgan to schedule it as an agenda item at a subsequent meeting.

Vision Clearance Ordinance

City Planner Amy Drought deferred to Traffic Safety Commission Chair Mike Kirby to present the Commission's recommendation.

Mike Kirby, Keizer Traffic Safety Commission Chair, 492 Hollyhock Place N, Keizer, presented the Traffic Safety Commission's proposal for revisions to vision clearance regulations. He noted that City Planner Drought worked with the Commission to put together the draft. The Traffic Safety Commission's only disagreement with the staff-recommended revisions was with regard to enforcement provisions. Staff was proposing that violations be subject to the City's Civil Infraction Ordinance rather than the provisions originally drafted by the Traffic Safety Commission. Mr. Kirby reviewed the Commission-recommended enforcement provisions. In comparing the two, the Traffic Safety Commission saw its proposed enforcement provisions as being less complicated and more enforceable. Mr. Kirby noted that enforcement of current regulations has not been pursued by the City.

Chair Smith asked for staff's perspective. Mr. Morgan explained that staff would be recommending that under the Development Code there be only one consistent enforcement procedure. Separate enforcement procedures for separate parts of the Code would create confusion and inconsistency in application. Mr. Morgan agreed that there had been a lack of enforcement, but pointed out that this year's budget includes a code enforcement position to more effectively deal with code violation issues.

In reviewing the specifics of the proposed revisions, Ms. Smith wondered if sections on trimming of trees and diseased trees belonged in the tree ordinance rather than vision clearance sections. It was Ms. Abbott's recollection that much of what was being proposed already existed in the tree ordinance. Mr. Morgan agreed that some redundancy was found.

For clarification, City Planner Amy Drought explained that staff was recommending that the section dealing with diseased trees and shrubs be added to the code under the chapter dealing with *Planting and Maintenance*. Ms. Drought responded to questions about right-of-way obstructions.

Mr. Kirby explained for Mr. Martinez why requirements for trimming of trees and shrubs projecting over streets were being proposed. He emphasized the need to remove low-hanging or projecting branches to avoid having them torn away by refuse disposal trucks, delivery trucks, etc. He acknowledged for Mr. Martinez that although some of the regulations are applicable to streets in general, some are specifically applicable to intersections.

Recreational Vehicle Parking

Mr. Morgan noted that about two years ago, the Commission received testimony objecting to the unsightly and sometimes hazardous way recreational vehicles were being parked on some properties. Staff was directed to draft standards to regulate parking of RV's, to address some of the concerns. Mr. Morgan went over the five proposed provisions. He noted that the first three dealing with space limitation, location, and surfacing are in the existing code. The remaining two dealing with screening, and setbacks are new.

Mr. Morgan advised that in addition to the written objections included in the agenda packet, several calls were received, all in opposition to the proposed standards.

Tom Gilkey, P.O. Box 20478, Keizer, noted that the proposed regulations say nothing about existing RV parking areas. He noted that he and his neighbor have side-by-side RV pads that don't allow room for a six-foot fence to divide and screen the pads. He suspected that there were similar situations in other neighborhoods. He wondered if existing RV parking areas would be grandfathered. He indicated support for most of the proposals for new construction.

Mr. Morgan pointed out introductory language indicating that the requirements would apply to new situations. For existing pads, he perceived that the first four requirements would be appropriate for grandfathering. He suspected that the setback requirement would not, unless so specified. He felt that grandfathering with regard to setbacks would be difficult to regulate, property-by-property.

Bob Clausen, State Director for the Oregon Good Sam Club, P. O. Box 96, Albany, was present at the request of a Good Sam member who is a Keizer resident. Mr. Clausen noted that the Good Sam Club has an RV Parking Counsel that has put together a manual

of various ordinances from around the country. He indicated that they would be happy to provide staff with use of the manual, or other assistance in developing parking standards.

Mr. Inman asked Mr. Clausen if other cities or counties in the state had similar regulations proposed or in force. Mr. Clausen was unsure, but indicated that he would check with the Chair of the Counsel.

Ted Shaver, 771 Cummings Lane, Keizer, indicated that he bought his home eight years ago because it had an RV pad. He parks his motor home on the pad which is the third section of a triple-wide driveway. He would be unable to meet the proposed five-foot side setback. Also, because there are no storm sewers on the street, he has a problem with standing water in his driveway, and might not meet the surfacing requirement.

Bob Dozler, 782 Cummings Lane, Keizer, questioned the City's noticing procedures. He was unsure how a flyer with the proposal and the meeting date and time reached his door, but was concerned that citizens don't receive notice of proposed actions until its too late. Also, Mr. Dozler requested that the setback requirements apply to new development only since many existing parking areas would not comply.

Ms. Abbott emphasized that the regulations are proposed and in draft form, not adopted. There would be other opportunity for public input.

Agnes Ewing, 595 Manbrin Drive N, Keizer, a 20-year resident at that location, indicated wholehearted support for the proposed RV parking standards. She felt that it was within her right, as a property owner, to protect her property. She noted that more and more RV's are showing up in neighborhoods, and stressed the need for parking rules and guidelines. She also felt that the proposed setback regulations should be applied to existing spaces.

C. L. Bergersen, 1020 Orchard Street N, Keizer, a Keizer resident since 1965, wished to chastise City administration for not making people aware of the hearing process now underway. He would not have known if another RV owner had not taken it upon himself to let RV owners know about the hearing. Mr. Bergerson brought up what he perceived to be changes in the City's priorities, and questioned the direction of the City.

Mr. Morgan conceded that although the *Keizertimes* contained an article about what would be discussed at the hearing, the paper would not reach the general public until tomorrow. He pointed out, however, that the Planning Commission hearings are for the purpose of finalizing the draft and making a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will hold hearings on the draft code, probably sometime in the Fall. With regard to noticing, he noted that it would impossible to include in a newspaper hearing notice everything addressed in the code. He indicated appreciation that RV owners spread the word.

Gil Arendt , 878 Greenwood Drive, Keizer, felt that word should have got out that the proposed requirements apply to boats, trailers, etc. as well as motor homes. He felt that it would be unreasonable to require residents to put their vehicles in storage areas that are expensive and sometimes unsafe.

Les Frels, 875 Ventura Street N, Keizer, questioned side setback requirements mentioned on the flyer he received.

Mr. Morgan pointed out that Mr. Frels was looking at the draft of proposed standards for commercial storage, not home storage.

Charles Moiseve, 3848 - 5th Avenue N, Keizer, suspected that a majority of homes in Keizer have no access to back or side yards. The proposed setback requirements would prohibit them from parking RV's on their property. He noted that there are only a limited number of commercial lots nearby, and most are already full. He wondered what the City might do to make parking spaces available or accessible for people unable to park on their own property.

Steve Robinson, 1290 Rafael N, Keizer, believed that his RV parking area would comply with the proposed regulations. However, even though he has no objection to his neighbor parking his 30-foot RV right up against the property line, his neighbor would not be in compliance. Mr. Robinson stated that he would not like to see his neighbor have to move his RV, and indicated his opposition to the proposed ordinance. He agreed that many people could not afford the rent to store an RV.

Archie McCurry, 1815 Dixon Street NE, Keizer, stated that neither his car nor pickup would meet the 10-foot setback requirement for RV's parked in driveways. Although the City was now talking RV parking, he questioned how long it would be before regulations would be placed on parking cars in driveways.

John Hinsley, 4235 Shoreline Drive N, Keizer, 22 years at that location, believed that many people had moved to Keizer because it was known as a place not over-burdened with political regulations. He also suspected that RV pads, included as a selling point in some of the new subdivisions, would not comply with the proposed side setback requirements. He called attention to the large group in the audience opposed to the proposed regulations, and urged that the impact on the community be considered.

Milton West, 3385 Willamette Drive N, Keizer, circulated a bound folder of photographs, with commentary, showing his 30-foot RV parked in his driveway, and also showing other areas of his property that would require remodeling if he were to try to meet the proposed standards. Mr. West talked about the alternatives available to him to park on his property which, in his opinion, were all unreasonable. He questioned what

was being proposed for properties with physical limitations, and what financial provisions the City would make in order for people to remodel. He also questioned what alternatives were being proposed for people unable to park on their properties.

Mr. Morgan explained that for situations where grandfathering could not be applied, there were no provision for an alternative. A person would be compelled to find some other place to park the RV. In response to a question from Mr. West about the penalty for violations, Mr. Morgan described the maximum penalty that could be invoked under the Civil Infraction Ordinance. Mr. West commented that because of the potential costs to RV owners, he considered the ordinance "very punitive."

Arlie Williams, 5168 Verda Lane, Keizer, referred back to the issue of **vision clearance**. He lives on a curve and has difficulty getting from his property onto Verda Lane due to speeding traffic combined with trees to the north that project over the right-of-way. Other trees to the south also obstruct vision. Neighbors have indicated that the trees are on City property. Mr. Williams indicated that he would like to see the trees trimmed to make the street safer.

Dusty Huffman, 1233 Larchwood, Keizer, stated that he and his neighbor have side-to-side RV pads. As he understood the ordinance, he would have to build a fence six-feet in height between the two pads, which would block access between the two homes. Mr. Morgan explained that although they would be required to park 10 feet apart, they would be grandfathered insofar as the physical construction. Mr. Huffman indicated that he would have no problem with the ordinance if everything now in place were to be grandfathered. He did object, however, to the premise that many who had invested a lot of money in building RV pads would now not be able use them. He strongly objected to taking away something already allowed, and was concerned where restrictions might go from here.

Bob Dozler, who spoke earlier, felt that if the purpose of the ordinance was to get RVs off the street, then the ordinance should be written to get them off the street, not to prohibit parking in driveways.

Chuck Pursey, 4810 Gobert Avenue NE, Keizer, stated that when he moved to Keizer three years ago, he called City offices to ask about putting in an RV pad. Nothing was said about setbacks, only that he must have an all-weather surface that would drain. He noted that when parked on the pad, his present trailer extends to about two feet from the street. Because he lives on a corner, by definition, he has two front yards. Under the proposed requirements, he is unable to put the pad anywhere else on his property. He pointed out the work it took to put in the existing pad.

Don Fairley, 4520 Shoreline Drive N, Keizer, was unsure whether the area where he parks his 16-foot boat would qualify under the proposed setback standards. He was most

concerned that rather than trying to preserve the freedom of people working things out amongst themselves, the City was considering more legislation. He wondered how many people in Keizer were truly complaining on an on-going basis.

Mr. Inman asked what recourse a person might have if a neighbor chose not to get along. Mr. Fairley indicated that he could speak only for himself; that he would consider the other person's rights, and if the current regulations were met, that stand should prevail.

Nonie Hinsley, 4235 Shoreline Drive N, Keizer, felt that the issue should be handled within a neighborhood, not regulated by the City. She strongly disagreed with the proposed setback requirements.

Agnes Ewing, who spoke earlier in favor of the proposed regulations, explained why she approached the City Council a couple years ago. After living in her home for about 20 years, new neighbors next door parked a 45-foot long, 12-foot tall RV in their single-car driveway, completely obstructing any view down the street. The new neighbors were unwilling to consider finding another location to park the RV. Ms. Ewing felt that rules needed to be in place to protect the rights of property owners who might have to deal with people unconcerned about the rights of others.

Fred George, 974 Koala Street North, Keizer, objected to the proposed regulations. He noted that the proposed setback requirements would force him to sell his 20-foot boat which he now parks on his side yard. It was his feeling that there must be some alternative other than forcing a person to store his recreation vehicle on a lot away from his property.

Rhonda Rich, 5273 Verda Lane, Keizer, considered the proposed ordinance discriminatory against people with RVs. She felt that other situations existed within the City that could be considered far greater eye-sores, such as junk cars in driveways, etc. She noted that although stored away during the winter, during the summer her camper and boat are parked on a pad right up against the property line, and very likely would not be in compliance with the proposed regulations. In Keizer's rural atmosphere, she considered the setback requirements too restrictive, and she questioned the need for the surfacing requirements.

There was no other testimony on RV parking. Ms. Smith stated that the Planning Commission would not deliberate on the issue at tonight's meeting. Noting the new information, and strong feelings demonstrated, she requested that Mr. Morgan bring back information as to what other communities are doing, and alternatives that might work better for all the people in the community.

(The Commission recessed at 9:14 p.m. and reconvened at 9:30 p.m.)

Ms. Smith allowed one additional comment with regard to vision clearance standards.

Karen Truckee, 6330 14th. Avenue NE, Keizer, was concerned about the restrictiveness of the proposed vision clearance ordinance. She noted that she lives on a noisy corner lot with a street on one side and an alley on the other. If a stop sign were to be put in at the alley, under the proposed regulations she would be unable to put up a noise barrier such as a wall or hedge greater than 30 inches in height. She felt that controlling speed would better address the safety issues.

Ms. Smith deferred to City Planner Drought as to the rationale for the 30-inch height requirement. Ms. Drought noted that 30 inches is the standard now in place for intersections other than controlled intersections. It was the feeling of the Traffic Safety Commission that the standard should apply to controlled intersections as well as others.

Ms. Smith recalled that 30 inches is the typical standard for vision clearance at corners.

Building-related Issues

Eric Meurer, 385 Taylor NE, Salem (office), 412 Lakefaire Circle N, Keizer (home), presented testimony on behalf of the Marion-Polk Building Industry Association and the Salem Association of Realtors. He noted that representatives from the building industry have had several meetings with Mr. Morgan to discuss the proposed development code. Issues still under contention revolve around transit, building orientation, connectivity between building sites, and possibly some bicycle parking requirements. Mr. Meurer indicated that he is looking forward to a "clean copy" of the draft since many changes have been made to the originally-proposed language.

Mr. Meurer provided comment on issues addressed in the following sections of the draft:

Section 2110.05 A 4 (page 2.1-61) under Location Standards for IBP districts - that the possible requirement of street right-of-way and improvements for streets abutting and within IBP districts might discourage the development of IBP districts.

Section 2.123.05 (page 2.1-108) under Conditions of Approval in activity centers dealing with that transit orientation, building orientation, and pedestrian/bicycle circulation - that placing the buildings on the site as though every building would be served by a transit facility or by a bus is a mistake. It was the building industry's feeling that such requirements in this section, and similar ones in other sections of the draft, would not appropriately apply in Keizer. He suggested that restaurants such as Shari's or Denny's be consulted since they are not oriented as proposed. He also noted that the City of Salem has dropped similar requirements from their code because of liability issues associated with rear parking lots, and the requirements were considered unrealistic.

Mr. Morgan conceded that the requirements might not be appropriate for some areas of Keizer, and noted that the language leaves room for discretionary application of the requirements. Mr. Morgan gave examples of developments where staff has worked with the developer to come to a win/win situation. He felt that once the final language is crafted, there would be no impasse.

As a bus rider, Ms. Smith indicated that she would like to see language in the ordinance to say that the building has to be oriented towards the pedestrian facilities. She felt that it would be possible to orient buildings to serve both pedestrian and automobile traffic.

Section 2.301.03 (page 2.3-5) under Application of Public Facility Standards - that the column dealing with transit facilities be removed from the Public Facilities Improvement Requirements Table. Mr. Morgan concurred.

Section 2.302.03 K (page 2.3-9) Street Standards - General Provisions - that the word "allow" be substituted for "require" with regard to the inclusion of frontage streets. Mr. Morgan concurred.

Section 2.302.04 (page 2.3-12) General Right-of-Way and Improvement Widths - Street Standards - that the table be changed to show the maximum width for a major arterial street as 84 feet rather than 132 feet. Mr. Morgan agreed with the recommendation to lower the maximum standard to 84 feet.

Section 2.303.08 A (pages 2.3-20 and 21) Bicycle Parking - that the Commission reconsider the proposed ratios for bicycle parking spaces to specific land use activities. It was felt that many were unrealistic. Mr. Morgan indicated that he would check to see what Salem ended up adopting.

Section 2.303.08 B3 (page 2.3-22) Bicycle Parking Development Requirements - Rack Design - that the proposed requirement that racks be designed to secure the bicycle frame and both wheels be dropped, leaving the language to say that the rack must accommodate the bicyclist's own locking device. It was the preference to stay with the conventional rack-types being used today. Mr. Morgan noted that at the last public hearing session, the Bikeways Committee indicated a preference for the type of rack installed just outside the Council Chambers. Although it would meet the standards, it is less expensive than others. Mr. Morgan noted, however, that it takes a longer locking cable than some others.

Section 2.305.01 and 02 (page 2.3-28) Transit Facilities and Design Requirements - that language not be included that would provide for building bus facilities for bus lines that don't exist. Mr. Morgan agreed that it would be possible to end up with pads put in that buses would never stop at. He, however, wondered about the process if the transit district were to at some time in the future require a stop. Mr. Meurer pointed out that Salem

decided not to make it a requirement, but to leave it up to the transit district to negotiate, when appropriate, to achieve their goals.

Section 2.310.04 C (page 2.3-60) Additional Design Standards for Subdivisions - Connectivity - that connectivity requirements be removed inasmuch as connectivity is very onerous, very expensive, and also very unpopular in some places. It was requested that the Planning Commission look closely at the issue to consider the actual need.

Section 2.310.05G (page 2.3-63) Improvement Requirements - Subdivisions - Water Systems - that the language be changed to provide for reimbursement for lines over 8 inches rather than 10 inches. Mr. Morgan agreed.

Section 2.310.05N (page 2.3.64) Improvement Requirements - Subdivisions - Grading & Fills - that the language be changed to require engineering for fills in excess of 3 feet rather than 12 inches. Mr. Morgan agreed.

Section 3.1 (page 3.2) Application Requirements and Review Procedures - that further discussion is needed regarding the issue of site review or design review. It was the building industry's contention that site review and design review oftentimes elongates projects and generates discussion of issues difficult to resolve due to differing opinions.

As a final note, Mr. Meurer commented on the issue previously discussed regarding sprinklers in multi-family developments. He had no objection to requiring sprinkler systems in three-story buildings being represented as two stories by having one level below ground. He did oppose, however, requiring sprinklers in buildings two-stories from the ground up. He noted that banks are reluctant to loan on the additional expense.

There was no further testimony to come before the Planning Commission at this time.

Karen Truckee questioned whether there would be opportunity for further comment at a future meeting. Ms. Smith anticipated closing the hearing to oral testimony, but leaving it open to written testimony for a specified period. She noted that staff will be bringing back information regarding the issues commented on tonight.

Fire Marshal Stein advised that he would be willing to meet with representatives of the building industry prior to the next meeting to discuss the sprinkler system issue. He asked if he should provide any additional information in writing prior to the next meeting, in lieu of oral testimony. Mr. Morgan pointed out that the rules of testimony are lenient in cases such as this. It would be possible to invite people back to the table to present specific information.

Chair Smith closed the hearing to public testimony, but left open the written record until the next meeting.

Ms. Smith directed staff to summarize the testimony presented tonight; provide additional information, comment, and other ideas on the RV issue; and, bring back more information on the vision clearance enforcement issue.

Mr. Inman requested that staff provide a clean copy of the proposed development code. Mr. Morgan reminded the Commission of the current constraints on staff. He indicated that an appropriate course might be to bring back the information requested, and then, after deliberation, incorporate the Planning Commission's recommendations in the final draft.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

7.1 Regular Meeting: August 13, 1997 - 7:00 PM.

Because of vacation schedules, it was the consensus to cancel the regularly-scheduled August meeting. The next regular meeting is September 10, 1997 at 7:00 PM.

Mr. Morgan reminded the Commission of an upcoming conference sponsored by the American Planning Association's Oregon Chapter and the Home Builder's Association of Metropolitan Portland. The one-day conference will be held on October 16 at the Oregon Convention Center.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Smith at 10:35 p.m.