MINUTES
KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 1998
KEIZER CITY HALL - LIBRARY

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Wolf at 7:01 p.m.

OATHS OF OFFICE

City Attorney Shannon Johnson administered the oath of office to new Planning Commissioners Dan Nelson and Bruce Anderson.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: June Abbott, Dan Nelson, Dick Inman, Manny Martinez, Bill Wolf, and Bruce Anderson. Jere Clancy were excused.

Also present were: City Attorney Shannon Johnson, Staff Liaison Amy Drought, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'.

Chair Wolf welcomed the new Planning Commission members. Mr. Nelson and Mr. Anderson each told the Commission a little about his background and interests.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 10, and June 23, 1998

The minutes of the June 10 and June 23, 1998 Planning Commission meetings were approved as submitted.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

Mark Grenz, with Multi/Tech Engineering, 1155 - 13th. Street SE, Salem, asked to address the Commission with regard to the new Development Code. He noted that he currently has two apartment projects under review, both of which are unable to comply with defined standards for ground floor window space. He made reference to Code Section 2.315.8.C. "Building Design," which requires for all street facing elevations that no less than 50% of the ground floor wall area be without windows, display areas or doorway openings. He saw two possible problems with the standard:

FMAGIC

the structure would be unable to meet the Energy Code; and, it most likely would not hold up with that much window space.

Mr. Grenz suspected that the standard was intended for commercial store fronts, not for apartments or buildings of that nature. He displayed drawings of two typical apartment buildings. In both instances, the amount of window space represented about 10% to 13% of the wall area. He suggested setting 12% as the minimum window area for multi-family dwellings.

Mr. Grenz was aware that any change to the Code would require formal action. He pointed out, however, the need for a speedy resolution in order to get the projects underway. He solicited direction from the Commission on how to proceed.

In the ensuing discussion, there was general agreement that the standard was not intended for multi-family development. Mr. Wolf reminded the Commission that "kinks" were expected to surface as the new Code is put into application. Mr. Inman, however, requested that before making any final decision, the Planning Commission be provided with a copy of the Development Code sections cited by Mr. Grenz, and background on the reasons the Planning Commission went with what it did.

City Attorney Johnson and Ms. Drought explained two alternatives that could be pursued in order for Mr. Grenz to proceed with his projects. The first dealt with an appeal to the Planning Commission of staff's denial of the application; and the second, an amendment to the Development Code. Mr. Johnson commented on the time-frame for each of the processes. He pointed out that regardless of which process is used to correct the immediate problem, a Code amendment should ultimately be done.

Mr. Grenz had concerns about delaying the start of the larger McNary Heights apartment project. Since there was preliminary agreement that a remedy would likely be approved, it was suggested that he apply for foundation permits only, to get the project started. Mr. Grenz acknowledged that his plans would work with the proposed 12% minimum window area.

Mr. Grenz indicated that he would proceed immediately with the Planning Commission appeal process, as explained. City Attorney Johnson indicated that he would also talk with City Manager Mull about fast-tracking a Code amendment on the Council agenda.

Noting that Mr. Grenz had referred to a draft code rather than a final publication, Mr. Anderson questioned why the newly adopted Code was not available. Ms. Drought answered that the document is not quite ready to be published. She pointed out,

however, that the draft is technically correct and needs only editing and format changes.

Mr. Grenz left the meeting.

(Note: Later in the meeting during a discussion of items for next month's agenda, City Attorney Johnson further examined the Code section cited by Mr. Grenz. Upon examining all references, he concluded that the standards did not apply to multi-family development. Ms. Drought will contact Mr. Grenz to inform him of Mr. Johnson's conclusion.)

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Development Activity

Ms. Drought reported that hearings are scheduled for next week for two infill subdivision applications: a 9-lot subdivision on Chemawa Road near Lockhaven Drive, and a 5-lot subdivision at the end of Cherry Blossom Avenue. Also, a proposal is in to place residential accessory units behind existing dwellings for two vacant corner lots in the Springridge Estates Subdivision. When the subdivision was approved in 1994, the lots were mandated for duplexes. The applicant is asking the hearings officer to remove the requirement that the corner lots be duplexes. His request is supported by changes in the new Development Code.

As referred to earlier, Mr. Grenz has submitted an application for an 8-unit apartment complex on Plymouth Drive. He has also submitted an application for apartments at the corner of Wheatland and River Road. As reported last month, a 12-lot subdivision is going in on Bolf Terrace just off Wheatland. And, within the Inland Shores development, on the north side of the lake, the first set of plans is in for town homes.

Ms. Drought reported that in addition to the strong new development activity, staff is receiving many requests for variances to build accessory units, and also to put up fences adjacent to the street, particularly for corner lots. She noted that there has been a lot of objection to the new Code's 600 SF maximum for accessory structures. Ms. Drought responded to questions about what constitutes an accessory structure, and what circumstances might warrant a variance. With regard to variances for fences, Mr. Inman pointed out the traffic safety issue.

Mr. Wolf asked about the status of **Cherry Avenue improvements**.

Mr. Johnson answered that the bids have been awarded for Cherry Avenue, Iris Lane and a project on McLeod. He anticipated that roadwork on Cherry Avenue would

begin within a month. Ms. Drought recalled that roadwork was projected for completion this Fall.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Transportation System Plan

Ms. Drought distributed copies of the Keizer Transportation System Plan Work Program Summary, and a list of concerns expressed at the Transportation Plan stake-holders workshop held on June 23.

Ms. Drought had hoped that COG Consultant Anna Braun would be present to talk about the work program. In Ms. Braun's absence, Ms. Drought briefly commented on the project timeline and what the Planning Commission could expect to discuss at next month's meeting. She anticipated that Ms. Braun, Mr. Rickert, and possibly representatives from the County, ODOT, the City of Salem and the Transit District would be present at the August meeting. She noted that a couple weeks prior to the meeting, a handout on TSP goals and policies will be mailed to Planning Commission members. The Commission will deal with Task 2 of the TSP Work Program.

In a discussion of what issues would be on the August meeting agenda in addition to the Transportation System Plan, City Attorney Johnson took additional time to look over the Code sections cited earlier by Mr. Grenz. He found them not to be applicable to Mr. Grenz's proposed development. Therefore, a Planning Commission hearing is unnecessary.

In connection with transportation planning, Mr. Nelson gave Ms. Drought a copy of a study done by the City of Portland on traffic calming devices. He found of particular interest their findings with regard to emergency response time. Ms. Drought noted that Keizer's Traffic Safety Commission is currently collecting information on traffic calming devices. She expected that Mr. George and Mr. Kirby from that commission would attend the August Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Wolf requested that staff provide Mr. Nelson and Mr. Anderson with the TSP material previously given to the Planning Commission, and also backup material relative to issues currently under discussion by the Commission.

Looking ahead at the TSP Work Program Time Table, Ms. Drought noted that at the September meeting COG will present a report on deficiencies and needs in the transportation system. Another public workshop will likely be scheduled for October or November.

Ms. Drought responded to questions about how the last transportation planning workshop was noticed. Mr. Inman was concerned that possibly only one side of an issue might be heard at a workshop. He stressed the importance of receiving input from all impacted

parties. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the City always tries to notice as effectively as is possible. He perceived that later in the process when the focus is more specific, notice will go out more specifically.

The Commission discussed ways to get the word out to Keizer's citizens. Mr. Anderson suggested holding public meeting at several locations. Ms. Drought noted that the Gubser Neighborhood Association requested that she and Ms. Braun or Mr. Rickert come and talk to them at their next meeting. KNAG also would like someone to come and talk about the TSP.

6.2 Floodplain Development Ordinance Revisions

Ms. Drought distributed copies of Metro's model ordinance dealing with water quality and flood management. She noted that demands on her staff time are preventing her from spending a lot of time on Planning Commission goals other than the TSP, specifically, the floodplain ordinance and design standards. However, she has gathered some information on what other communities are doing to address water and flooding issues. She briefly commented on what the Metro ordinance addresses.

Ms. Drought suggested that Commissioners think about what they want to address in revisions as well as a time-frame for accomplishing specific items. She mentioned as examples, protection of property, open space, water quality, and fish habitat. With regard to a time-frame, she suggested that they consider interim, short term, and long term possibilities. She believed that a meeting should be set aside to fully explore what an ordinance should include. She saw the floodplain ordinance as having the potential to be one of the biggest issues the Planning Commission undertakes.

Mr. Inman pointed out the need to know what kind of immediate impact a change would have on buildable land. To give a clearer picture of what land might be impacted, Ms. Drought indicated that she would bring back a map of Keizer showing available land, with an overlay of the floodplain map.

Mr. Wolf voiced his concerns about the reduced staffing in the Community Development Department. He considered elimination of the Community Development Director position as shortsighted of the part of the City. He believed that even with the additional Planner, critical issues would be set aside because of the volume of day-to-day work. He stressed the need for someone to do the visionary planning to ensure the City's viability in the future.

Ms. Drought pointed out that one other option would be to get someone from the outside to come in and spear-head the floodplain ordinance project.

> Mr. Inman moved to recommend to City management that the floodplain ordinance revisions be contracted to an outside entity. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion.

Mr. Wolf indicated his preference for using staff. However, in the absence of adequate staffing, he agreed that someone from the outside should be used in order to get the project underway. City Attorney Johnson was unsure whether Council approval would be needed. He recalled, however, that the concept in restructuring the Community Development Department was that urban renewal projects and certain other projects would be contracted out. He saw the recommendation to City management as appropriate. If necessary, the City Manager can carry it forward.

The motion carried unanimously by those members present.

Mr. Inman stressed the urgency of getting the floodplain ordinance project underway.

6.3 Update on Population Forecasting

Ms. Drought distributed copies of correspondence from SKATS (Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study) detailing UGB population projections for 2015 and 2020. She noted that State law requires that counties coordinate with cities within their jurisdiction to come up with population forecasts. To meet the requirement, she is working with the City of Salem and Marion County. This summer they will do a land use allocation to determine where growth will happen in Salem and Keizer in the next 20 years. She briefly reviewed the projections.

Ms. Drought indicated that she was providing the data as information only. No action from the Planning Commission is required at this time. She noted that the information will be very important when the Planning Commission gets into periodic review.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

7.1 Regular Meeting - August 12, 1998 - 7:00 PM

8. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Wolf at 8:29 p.m.