All right. I got 6:03 on Wednesday, December 8th. I'm going to call this meeting to order and start with roll call. Commission Collier.

Here.

Commission Aviles.

Here.

Commission Arthur.

Here.

Commissioner Nelson.

Present.

Commissioner Scherf.

Here.

I'm Eric Heesacker, I'm here. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss is out tonight. We do have a quorum. Do we have any introductions to make staff?

I might just point out that with us tonight, besides Donna Rupp and myself, is Tony Mecum. And Tony is the Urban Forester for the City of Grants Pass. He was very involved with the rewriting of the draft for article 23, which you have on your agenda tonight. So I just wanted to introduce Tony to you.

Welcome Tony. Thanks for coming. And thanks for all your hard work. No more introductions?

No.
Public comment. This is an opportunity for the public to address the commission on items not related to a public hearing or action item. It's my understanding we have nobody here for this, so I will skip reading the rest of it and move on to item 4A, Approval of Minutes From November 10th. Is there a motion to approve or a motion to amend?

I read most of them. I'll move to approve.

We have a motion to approve the minutes from Vice Chair Collier. Do we have a second?

I wasn't there, but I'll second it.

We have a second from Commissioner Nelson. All those in favor of approving those minutes signify by saying aye. Aye.

Aye.

Anybody opposed?

Abstain.

Nobody opposes, but we do have one abstention. Minutes are approved.

I also abstain.

Two abstentions. Commissioner Aviles. But they're still approved.

MOTION/VOTE
Vice Chair Collier moved, and Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion to approve the minutes for November 10, 2021. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: Commissioner Aviles. Absent: Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

The motion passed.

Item 5, Informational Items. Do we have anything there? Nothing there. There are no findings of fact that we need to review tonight. We are onto item 7A, which is a public hearing development code text amendment of articles 22, 23, 25 and 30. The file number is 405-00126-21. And at this time, I will open the public hearing to consider these text amendments. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by any public comment, and then the matter will be discussed and acted upon by this body. Is there anybody present or listening who wishes to challenge the authority of the planning commission to consider this matter?

Hearing, seeing no objections, are there any abstentions or conflicts of interest? Do any of you commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Nobody signifying. In this hearing, the decision of the commission will be based upon specific criteria. All testimony and evidence must be directed toward those criteria. The criteria which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal this matter. We will now begin the hearing with the staff report.
Thank you, Chair Heesacker. Let me get my stuff together here. I hope all of you have had a chance to read through all of these exciting landscape-related changes. Proposed changes I mean. Okay, let's see. So my name is Donna Rupp, I'm an associate planner in the Community Development Department. This text amendment is report number 405-00126-21. It's updating landscape design standards in articles 22, 23, 25 and 30. This started almost two years ago now at the request of the city council. The text amendments regarding residential and commercial landscape design standards were requested and we've submitted those. The majority of the updates are in article 23, but updates were also required in articles 22, 25 and 30 to provide consistency in the code, and also to meet parking lot standards requested by the Urban Tree Advisory Committee. Relationship to council goals is to facilitate sustainable, manageable growth and keep citizens safe.

So the background, as I referred to earlier, work on the edits began in early 2020 with the formation of an ad hoc committee to review suggested new design standards and review suggestions made by the UTAC in 2016, which were for different reasons, those suggestions were never adopted. So that text amendment in 2016 never came to fruition. After several city workshops, the drafts were created. And we also hired a contract illustrator to update the illustrations in article 23, because they're outdated, I'll just say that.

So in article 23, which is titled Landscaping and Buffering Standards, the majority of the amendments reside in article 23. The biggest impetus was creation of residential landscape design types that offered more than just the traditional design of a tree, some shrubs and grass. Developers had asked us for options that were not as depend upon lawn and sod and that would allow more installation of mulches and rocks and cobble as landscape design. So we, the ad hoc committee, which in your staff report lists out everyone who is on that, including Tony, myself, public works, a couple people from the community, as well as Councilor Faszer, DJ. So these were the four types, the fire safe, a low water use, which is drought-tolerant, a native plant pollinator wildlife habitat type, and the traditional, which is currently the only option for residential development.

In addition to this, we recalculated the required landscape materials based on net lot width, rather than square footage of the area. Our code currently goes on 1,000 square feet or any portion thereof of the required frontage. So if you had a required front yard of 10 feet, and even if your lot was not 100 feet wide, we were supposed to say, "Okay, you're supposed to have this many trees, even though you aren't at 1,000 square feet." So the planning staff, we've used this, we've gone through different iterations, and we actually really go on net lot width. So we go, "Okay, it's 80 feet wide and 10 feet deep, you're at 800, not 1,000," and we make adjustments to the required landscape based on that. So we thought we should codify the way that we're actually doing it and the way that the developers, the residential developers calculated as well. Mr. Nelson?

Just a clarification. So square footage would be depth and width.

Yeah.

And that wouldn't make sense if you're a narrow lot versus a wide lot, is that what you're saying? So it's basically based on the width of the lot on the frontage?

Right. So it's just the net lot width. And this schedule is in your packet, and it'll be easier to read than what's on this screen because I wanted to make it just fit on the slide. But it's packet page...
number 20. It goes through the different options that are now allowed. And we came up with the basic items that are still there, ground cover shrubs, trees, and then the minimum plant coverage at maturity. We also put in resources here that will be posted on the website. So what we do now is this traditional at the very bottom, which requires a 90% plant coverage at maturity, and the other options require less, but are also low-water, fire-safe, native plant pollinator, wildlife habitat, including open space for insects that actually burrow into the ground.

And again, this presentation is just a summary of what's in your packet, so all of the details are there within the article amendments. Another change we made was increasing the allowable vehicle intrusion into required front yard landscape areas for medium, high density residential. What that means is that, currently it's kind of all over the place. And talking to the other planners and how we talk to people over the counter and developers, we wanted to make this more clear. I did not mark the page number here in your packet. Okay. Thank you.

So on page 27, type A concept sketch, at the top of the page, this is what we draw out for people all the time at the front counter, and we're like, "Why don't we have this in the code?" Where it shows that in say a 10-foot required front yard landscaping, you can have a five-foot parking intrusion. Which means you still need that other five feet next to the sidewalk or the street. And we get a lot of people asking about this. You'd be surprised how many people come in and ask about what they can do in their front yard with parking. So this kind of addressed an ongoing misunderstanding between what was in the code and what people are doing in the city, and it's all for the beautification and improvement of the city overall.

So then the next one here on this slide are the parking lot design standards to meet the recommendations of the Urban ... Why do I always get this wrong, Tony? The UTAC, starting on page 39. So it's section 23 035 type E, Parking Lot Landscaping and Screening. And you'll see quite a few edits on this page starting on, well, page 40, the schedule was redone to make it clearer just for clarity's sake, as well as the illustration. And then on page 41, the landscape standards talks about increasing the canopy coverage to 50% of the parking lot surface area at maturity. Currently, we just have a count, one tree and 16 square feet of landscaping per ... What is it? 10? Per 10 parking spaces.

And so taking this approach is actually doing a number of things. The biggest one in my mind is reducing the urban heat island. So we're going to be able to shade more of this blacktop and hopefully help keep our city a little bit cooler. I never want to see 115 degrees again. In addition, of course it adds value to this city. People like to come to a place that has a nice tree canopy. It gives them a feeling of, "Oh, I'm in a park. This place takes care of itself. It cares about its residents." So it has multiple benefits. And in order to keep the trees alive, we're increasing soil volume, adding structural soils where needed, increasing the minimum size of parking islands from six feet measured inside the curbs to seven feet, and also including a landscape ratio of 120 square feet per eight parking spaces.

So what does that look like? I mean, that's what Brad said, "Donna, what does that look like?" So I'm like, "Okay, let me see." This is a landscape plan submitted by the new development going in over by Home Depot, the Absolute Motorsport, they're putting in a retail development for their retail business, as well as two other units. One will be a hairdresser and the other is up for lease. They don't have anything decided on it. Excuse me. I swallowed wrong. So let's see, where do I get that little pointer pen?
In this plan, they have approximately 24 or 25 parking spaces. I'm just going on memory. They have parking in front here as well in front of the building here, across over here, this little space here and this little space here, and a couple over here as well. So this plan as submitted is approved under the current code. It meets all the numbers, it has enough square footage, it actually has more landscaping than what's required. What would be required additionally under these new standards would be a descriptive text box over here where they would have to state the species and then the size of the mature canopy coverage, and then the square footage of the parking lot. And they'd have to show that at maturity, 50% would be covered.

They'd also have to calculate the 120 square feet of landscaping per eight spaces. So if there are 24 here, they'd have to show that there's 360 square feet of landscaping in this parking lot. They'd also have to indicate that all the parking islands are seven feet in width. Of course, in addition to that, there are the soils element and the construction pieces that I haven't gotten to, but the piece about how the canopy coverage in the parking lot is changing is basically covered by these three items. And this next slide eight is what I was getting at, is that based on great input from Tony and the tree committee, there's an increased focus on construction details for existing plant preservation, soil treatment, and types and landscape areas and soil content to ensure the survival of the plant materials.

So we need protection of existing trees. We also need a better inspection system for all industrial, commercial uses and multi-unit residential units of five or more. In addition, this last bullet point is clarified street tree standards. And our current list in the development code is just a list that whenever a new cultivar came out, we'd have to go through a whole text amendment for any new species. And so instead, we're going to adopt it by reference and post it on the website. And in your packet, the fold-out page, which is page 81, just gives you an idea of the different ways that we're going to be able to update the street and parking lot trees and let people sort them and look for the criteria that they need for their specific project. So we're going to work with IT to make this table easily sortable and easy to use. And thanks to having an urban forester on board now, we'll be able to get that updated on a regular basis.

So the other updates or text amendments, in article 22, which is residential development, the section was just adopted in August, but there were a couple of things related to landscaping that were overlooked at that time. Section 22, 1 04, 1B had pretty restrictive buffers for the pedestrian pathways that would take up too much land just for a walkway and take away possible building space. So we struck that out. And then the exemption section under the need for landscaping, we just made it ... This is another oversight from the August text amendment. We made the changes to make it in line with the established standards prior to the August 2021 update, which was, what is it, if it's under a half-acre and it's within a quarter mile of a park, then they're exempt from open space requirements for multifamily housing. So that was just kind of a cleanup.

And then article 25, Clarifier Replacement of Dead Parking Lot Trees. Right now, the language is pretty vague. And based on the tree committee recommendations, we made it more specific. As well as increasing the allowed maximum of compact spaces from 25% to 35%. That is not a requirement, that's just saying you can, if you want, have up to 35% compact spaces. And then we also wanted to codify that lighting, parking lot lighting, shall not be located in landscape islands with parking lot trees and shall not be located within 20 feet of required parking lot trees. Then article 30, that's our definitions article. And typically, any time we make changes to any of the other articles within the development code, we have little things to clean up in there.
So our current landscape, article 23 refers to living ground cover as defined in article 30, and there's no definition in there at all. So that was the first thing the ad hoc committee did, was all five or six of us worked together, came up with a definition of what living ground cover is. So there was a good group effort to get that defined. In addition, the net width of the lot, we want to clarify just so there's no guessing about it. We take out any of the paved surfaces, the driveways. Especially coming up next year, we're going to allow smaller lots, and this will be really important if we have town homes that have very narrow lots. We have to define these items just to make sure we're all on the same page.

The rocks, cobble and gravel for landscaping. We wanted to be clear that people couldn't put three quarter minus in their front yard and call it landscape, as well as DG, decomposed granite. We didn't put it in there, but the reason is, is that DG runs off quite a bit and it can cause quite a bit of clogging in our storm drain system. So that is excluded in the definitions. And then also structural soils. So when it comes to the point that a tree is in a parking lot and it doesn't have enough permeable ground around it, it's going to require structural soils. And what does that mean? So we had to define that as well, and we're going to have material on the website to help explain that.

Okay. So I believe, Brad correct me if I'm wrong, anytime we do a text amendment that may impact housing needs of any kind, we have to address the Oregon Goal 10 Compliance to show that what we're doing is not going to limit housing, is not going to make it a cost burden, is not going to delay the need for housing. So this slide addresses that. This is not in the staff report, but of course it will be incorporated in the findings and then added to the staff report for the council, should you decide to send this to the council.

I did receive one public comment from Justin Gerlitz of Gerlitz Engineering Consultants. I'm sure you're all familiar with Justin. And he took the time and read through it and had some good feedback that I wanted to share with you for your deliberations. The first point is about the 50% parking lot tree coverage. You can see his comment here, and this is a direct quote from his email. "As much as I like tree coverage, I don't think it will be feasible to achieve this in parking areas based on our hot summer climate. With the past 20 years, I've not seen trees grow to full size when located within parking lot islands. I did see you increase the interior island dimension to seven feet, which should help, but wanted to mention this." And then he also mentioned in a verbal conversation that the new soil requirements, including structural soils, may help in them reaching a mature size as long as irrigation is required.

His second item was, "Can we still create a square planter or diamond in the center of a parking area for a tree like Albertsons does? Would it need to be a minimum interior dimension of seven by seven?" And per the new section 23.035 subsection 3I, "Landscaped islands at compact stalls shall have a minimum internal width of seven feet and a length of 16 feet." This is all based on recommendations from the tree committee. And no more diamonds, that's my understanding in reading through all of the suggestions. So this would be more of a seven feet wide, 16 feet long and running perpendicular to the building with the parking off of it this way, rather than the little diamonds that we're familiar with, where the compact spaces can come up and park next to.

These are the last two comments. So the no lights in the tree planter island, again, this is quoting Justin, "This is an ongoing struggle. When you have trees every 10 parking spaces, it doesn't leave much room for lights. This often forces us to place lights within the parking lot, which requires elevated light pole foundations and creates vehicle conflicts. We had to do this at
the flying Lark. Could you put a light at the end of an island and a tree on the other? Any other options you can think of?” My response is that the tree committee has been adamant about this change, and Tony is here and he could address the reasons behind this if you have a question about that.

And his last one was a question about section 22.104, subsection 1B I, that parking lots for multiple dwelling residential units that are over 5,000 square feet in area must be separated from each other with landscaped planter bays that are a minimum of 18 feet in width and individual parking areas may be connected by an aisle or a driveway. And the question that Justin had is, "The 18-foot width seems excessive. And is it supposed to be length instead?"

And if you look at the image in your packet on page 93, you'll see the illustration. It seems that the intent is supposed to be length rather than width. And maybe Brad can address this because he did work with the consultants on coming up with this. I see the point. He wasn't sure how it was supposed to be applied. And basically, the intent is that, if you had a really large development, and say it had a 10,000 square foot parking lot, it couldn't all just be a parking lot with just the regular islands in it. It would have to be broken up and separated with drive aisles. So you wouldn't have as much blacktop, so it would be a more human-friendly space.

And then the criteria that we look at regarding text amendments and staff finds that all four of the criterion are met. The proposed amendments are consistent with the purpose of the subject sections and articles, they're consistent with other provisions of this code. And they are consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan, and most effectively carry out those goals and policies of all alternatives considered. The fourth one regards the master transportation plan, and that really isn't applicable to this situation. The cost implication is staff resources. And the planning commission called action is recommend approval by the city council as submitted or with revisions recommended by commissioners, recommend the city council deny or postpone and continue to as time certain. And because this is a legislative amendment, it is not subject to the 120-day time limit. So if you have questions for me or Tony or Brad, happy to take them.

I want to break in for just a second. You two ladies that came in late, you're not here to talk about RCC, are you?

[inaudible].

Yes. We're not entertaining that tonight. Sorry about that. I didn't want you sitting here all night. Well, you're welcome to stay.

[inaudible].
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You're welcome to stay.

[inaudible] county.

We have agencies.
Thank you. Any questions of staff? Commissioner Aviles?

Thank you. So article 23, the requiring of an arborist, do you think that would create any hardship for anybody? I mean, I'm not sure. Do you think that would create a hardship for folks?

The required what?

The requirement to have an arborist it's on the article 23 slide.

Oh, to have an arborist. This applies to new development. So usually developers have their whole array of professionals they work with. That was a recommendation by the tree committee. I don't know what an arborist costs. Tony, do you have any idea?

You can just take that mic over there.

Hello. So I can't speak exactly to what the Urban Tree Advisory Committee put into the recommendation now five years ago, but in conversation with some of those members, who are still on that committee, they had mentioned that in article 11, the development code there's mention of a tree professional and article 30 defines that. And so there's landscape architect and some other qualifications. And so granted this is not the committee, as a whole telling me their intent in 2016, but this was just conversation to fold in that certification as kind of part of the expertise needed for some of this code to be applied.

So then to paraphrase, it sounds like you do not believe requiring an arborist to be a hardship?

I don't think it would be an added hardship for the right of way, our municipal code states that there has to be prequalified contractors to work out on those trees. And so we have a list of seven arborists who are on that list and it's actually been quite competitive price wise for residents who have had to do tree care work. So there is a pretty robust certified arborist community in Grants Pass.

Okay, thank you. And other than Mr. Gerlitz, was there any other public comment, either supportive of, or not supportive of the stages?

Any other public comment?

Yeah.

None? That was it, Justin.
Other questions of staff? Commissioner Arthur?

I have a couple. Back to the issue about the no lights with the trees and the parking islands. I don't see how that will work either. What was it you said with the resolution of... Where would put them? You know?

Yeah. So what Gerlitz Engineering said they had to do is actually create separate spaces for lights that were built up, how they built them up on those concrete tubular things, and then put the lights up on them. That's how they are doing it out at the Flying Lark. Tony, do you have any input on the tree committee's justification for that requirement?

Why? Because I don't know what to begin with, that's the first question.

Oh okay.

Sorry, what's the first question?

Well, what's wrong with having light in the same space as the tree?

So I think it comes from having street lights and street trees next to each other, for that safety that is created from that lighting, the tree gets pruned back and that's how it just happens. And I could see that happening in the parking lot, the tree would be secondary. Again, this came from the tree committee. And so I believe that their intent was to preserve these trees as best as possible, so get them away from a conflict, which would be the lighting.

So they wouldn't be trimmed as much?

Yes.

Okay.

So I have something to add to that. We were talking about this, where I worked at the county not long ago and it didn't dawn on me until one of the engineers said, "Why are you putting a tree you have to water by this source of electricity?" So it wasn't the canopy and the light that they were worried about, it was the electricity and water mixing together. And that's why I thought Gerlitz probably suggested trees at one end and electricity at the other. I didn't even consider the canopy getting mixed up with the light. Those are both good points, I think. If that helps answer your question. Yeah.

I was just thinking, because we had a number of years ago, an injury in our church parking lot because somebody had parked next to an island and got out and tripped over the curbing of the island because it wasn't lighted. And I thought, how can you arrange to see it if you don't have light somewhere around it? Well, that was one question. There were a couple questions I had. I'm not clear how the lists of trees and things coordinates with the Firewise kind of thing. That one pull out, you showed us, says Firewise on it. But it's one column that says yes.

Oh, okay sure.
And I had to go in two or three years ago, we took out a whole line, a continuous line of Leland Cypress on our north property line, after watching all the Firewise videos of five or six years ago or seven years ago on the freeway where one of those continuous rows just exploded.

Yeah, they're pretty explosive.

And so I'm going in. And the only one I found at the time that really was easy to use was... Ashlyn had a list of...

Right and we are [crosstalk]-

These are ones you never have. And these are things you can have.

They've allowed us to adopt their list and so we will be putting that on the website and incorporating it. So the sample that I put in there was only one page and I'm pulling up the spreadsheet that Tony created with... Firewise has highlighted in red because that's how I sorted it. And you just have the first page. So scrolling down, it looks like we go down to about 23 different species that are Firewise trees. So that one page is just a sample because there are okay over a 100 and something species in here. And then you just sort by... Let's see Z to A, we want yeses at the top. So now we've got drought tolerant sorted, and you get the [inaudible] maple and flowering crab apple, and then you get all the other details about it. It's relative size, it's height, it's canopy area. So this spreadsheet, we're hoping to get it converted to a criteria sorting page on our website. Like you do when you go shopping, do you want women's shoes? What size? What color? Et cetera. And [inaudible]. Hmm?

Does this apply... This is trees. They're on page 40. They're in the drawing that we glanced at, for some other reason, it said six foot fence or evergreen screen.

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

And that's exactly the kind of thing that people were using those Leland Cypress rows for was screening from the highway. And I couldn't see where... And I realize we don't have everything here, but where would you find out what was, and was not an allowable evergreen screen in that case?

That's a good question, we weren't thinking of the screening species. I'm not sure what we would do with that because these are street and parking lot tree lists, these aren't specifically screening lists except for when you're screening a parking lot.

Or some other lot, some other kind-

Right.

Yeah. I don't think that we would actually, require that there'd be a list prepared to that, I mean, we would just... The applicant, the landscape architect, or whoever's doing the design would just, I think submit-

Yeah. They submit it for approval and then if Tony, or planning reviews it and says, "Hey, those are really flammable trees. We suggest you change that."
Yeah. And the screens, they serve an extremely different purpose than the public right of way, commercial parking lot kind of situations because you rarely have human interaction with those. I mean, they're intended just be that buffer. So I think we would probably, give more flexibility and just determine whatever it is that they're proposing. Does that meet the intent of the screen rather than having some kind of pre-approved list or something?

Well, I was just wondering, because those other towns I looked at had absolutely no, not allowed in the city for fire reasons. And so it was easy to identify if something was on the no list.

Right. So for the residential development, there are for the fire safe designs, which will be required in the high fire hazard area developments. There are some restrictions on what can be planted there. Typically, our screening trees, like Brad said, will be in commercial areas or industrial areas where you have... Say, we just had that daycare go in on [Dowel] road and the daycare on the south side of it was a residential lot and they had to plant some screening evergreens in there. And they know because it's only a few feet, so they typically go with those tall narrow, what are they? Arborvitae?

Arborvitae.

Yeah, some cultivar of arborvitae that creates a screen that meets the requirements.

It's discussed on page 39 and 40, a couple of times about property line screening and it's not... Well, the other part of my question about that, it was the external, we had an ongoing 15 year issue with Morrison and the property that WinCo is now on for all the years, that that was the recreational vehicle sales property up there. And it had a metal fence around it. And they were supposed to, from the very beginning of him, put in the required landscaping trees [ever so on] and 18 inch things and so on, and never really happened.

There were a few little spindly things, but they kept everything trimmed back because they had all of their stock pushed up against the fence. So everybody could walk by and see it and they didn't want it screened from view. Right. And there was a clear discrepancy there and they would come in and ask for... We need two more driveways. We need to expand and add this other's section and everything. And we kept granting it to them when they were not meeting the requirements of the first part ever and there apparently wasn't any enforcement or follow up on any of that, at that time. I'm just curious where it says-

Well typically-

How that's enforced.

When someone comes in for a site plan amendment or minor modification, they have to be, the rest of their development has to be up to current standards. So, whichever staff member gets that project. And what also say, "Hey, this parking lot is not cutting it and we need trees." And that'll be a requirement before they get approval to go ahead and do something else to the site.

It was also one of those circumstances where the council had directed us a couple of years before that when we had some seemingly... Some issues out in Redwood that were just not resolvable, that kept coming up again and again, and they said, "Well, propose solutions." And that case was one where the whole property was a display of RV vehicles and its goal was to
be visible to the public and was that compatible with the requirement in our rules that say, you can't see what's on the other side when that's the purpose of it?

And I thought about that again, when we did that little one out on Rogue River Highway, except there was no issue there recently, because they're down in a hole, you couldn't see them anyway.

Oh, right, auto repair place.

Yeah.

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

But maybe there's something that isn't fitting there with the kind of requirement for screening something when the purpose of the business is to display something. I'm just raising the question because we had ongoing issues with that one.

Yeah, the screening and buffering is intent to be between two different types of uses. So between commercial or industrial and residential. So, that's the intent of the use of that tool. It's not just to screen it from, I mean, if it's a commercial business and they're on the highway...

It was on the highway. It was on 199 or whatever it is at that point.

Yeah, okay.

All three sides were streets.

Do we have any other comments?

Other questions of staff? Commissioner Nelson?

You're probably going to hate me because I got a whole bunch.

Oh.

And you might as well come up to the mic, Tony.

So by this board... I don't know if you... For personal preference, but the city managers allowed testimony at that without the mask, unless you prefer it for your safety or whatever, but he dropped that requirement. Am I correct? Yep. It's up to you. If you want to wear it, I hear better without it, but it's up to you.

Yeah. I have a hard time hearing you with it.

It messes up my beard.

So the first question, Donna has public works, reviewed this document, the revisions?
I don't know. Did public works for review it? They get copied on the site plan reviews, they get notices. Like Jason gets notices, doesn't he?

Yeah. They have been notified of it, but there hasn't been a specific outreach to solicit public work comment on this per se. And they received notification of it with, along with all the other, yeah.

So the reason I ask is, I was looking at the vision clearance area. All you have is an equal lateral triangle in there. There is no distance on it. And I know there's many areas in Grants Pass already with shrubs, trees, et cetera. And you have to stick your nose of the vehicle, clear out into the intersection to see what's coming. And so I'd like specifics on where trees are going to be located near intersections and shrubs. So as not to block visibility to the vehicles.

We do have that in different article, in utilities. There's a whole section on vision blockage and stuff. And what we have here... Or is that in 11 about street trees and how far they are from the intersections at 11? So we have that all defined right now.

The five feet I don't think is appropriate.

No, it's more than that.

It's way more than that, it's like 20 feet back from a major arterial and 10 from a local, so it's not five feet.

All right, I'll come to that when I get to that. Okay?

Okay.

Maybe I was confused on it and you, I did have a question about arborist being on staff and you are the arborist?

Yes.

Could you tell us your certifications or your credentials?

Yes, so I have a master's of forestry from Yale and I'm a certified arborist since 2018 and a tree risk assessment qualified arborist through the international society of arbor culture.

Thank you. The second question I had is in regards to... Well, not a question, but a statement, but I think it was yours. I'm just having one pine tree cut down and it's over a thousand dollars and that's an arborist doing it to let you know. So it can be pricey to have a tree done by an arborist because of their certifications, their qualifications, as well as the liability insurances.

So hang on one second, a person cutting a tree does not have to be an arborist, right?

Correct. I could cut it down then I to pay for the damage to the neighbor's house.

Yeah, but you still don't have to have an arborist do that work.
But I'm what saying is if you want do it safely, you'll want an arborist involved.

Understood.

Most of the cutters are going to have an arborist involved for liability.

The question goes to is if you're doing a design plan for development, is it a requirement to have an arborist on your design team or a landscape architect, which is normal. The addition of arborist is-

My understanding.

I mean, you can tell me if I'm wrong, I'm not an arborist, but normally you guys don't do development and design. You guys assess trees, correct?

Actually there's a wing to being an arborist. There's quite a few consultant arborists that primarily do site plans.

Oh, perfect. Perfect.

Yeah.

In the ISA, International Society of Arboriculture it has published best management practices on tree protection during construction and they provide different continuing education unit credits and education on that.

So as an arborist you could do design and do that as well? I just didn't mean to stereotype you, but I just kind of look at as, you look at more of the health of the tree and the landscape architects is doing more of the design implemented within the development of that piece of property. That's where my brain goes to, but gotcha.

And then that's segue in regards to an arborist, you said that a single family, residential development does not require one?

I don't recall saying that. It's...

Because I was under the understanding residential units did require arborist, could have that wrong.

Talking about to design the landscaping?

If I'm doing a single family residence.

Just one off? Just a one off?

Yes, not a development.

No.
Okay.

Oh, and then that was the other thing. Has a landscaper looked at this plan as well?

Yes.

Okay, and who was that?

So we had on our ad hoc committee, the principal owner of... What's the name of her place out there on New Hope Road?

Oh, Mountain View Landscaping and then also [crosstalk].

Yeah, Mountain View Landscaping and then also the tree committee received the draft of this, so all of the expert knowledge on the tree committee, they reviewed this before we presented it to you.

Okay. And how is pruning going to be accomplished in the city?

How is what? I'm sorry.

Pruning.

Pruning, going to get accomplished?

Who does the pruning in the city?

Oh, in the city.

Currently? So if it's a right of way tree, the municipal code title 10 requires a certified arborist to do that. But if it's on private property, it can be anyone.

What I get confused of, and pardon me for this, but where is the private property and then where is the public domain? Is it the edge of the sidewalk on?

So...

Private property owner.

If the planter strip is in the right of way, then it's public, right?

Yes. This is the number one question I receive almost daily. Half of my time is customer service and it varies even within certain-

Now I'm nervous because you just told me the arborist goes out and does the pruning.

Well, it's a team effort. So like older part of town, my parents live on Second Street between [A] and Evelyn where there's no sidewalk. I check GIS for that. And I'm split between community
development and public works. So I'm 40% funded through the streets division, so my supervisor there, I work with her and I send out those code enforcement letters for the vision clearance triangle that you mentioned and then also determining if a tree is in the right of way.

Okay. So I go to you, if I have an issue with an intersection?

You would call public works and they would delegate it to me, yes. Most of the time.

Your first question then was just answered, public works has seen this. He works for public works.

I thought... Oh, you're not with planning. You're with public works.

I'm split between three different divisions.

So has public works people looked as far as compliance with this adjustment to the code currently for traffic visibility?

I would say with great, not 100% confidence, because I haven't talked to Jason and maybe you do know Tony, but they have not looked at that specific issue.

Okay, we can come back to that I guess.

But the visibility is actually dealt with in other articles, not the ones that we're amending right now. Just to be clear on that.

Yeah.

So that's what I'm asking because I have talked to other planners... Or I'm sorry, other developers and they find a lot of times in cities, not necessarily here, but conflict between what planning likes and what public works requires.

Right.

That's why I'm asking.

Yep. I understand.

And are we looking at 10 year or a 20 year plan on these plans?

In terms of the size of the trees and maturity?

Yes,

So it would be what's in the literature of what those species or cultivars would typically achieve. And so there's a really good resource that I've referenced. Unfortunately, the...

Really worked hard on that title.
The Tree Book, yes, very. But these are two leading nursery industry professionals and authors. And they actually reside in the Pacific Northwest because Oregon is a massive tree industry leader. And so they've worked for J Frank Schmidt nursery that has created so many new cultivars. So this is really the authority and if you go to the International Society of Arboriculture bookstore, this is your best seller. And so this provides information on tree, height and width and what you’d expect in an urban environment. And for every species in cultivar, they talk about if it's a good fit for a street tree, what would that look like? What are some soil requirements? So, that's where the information comes from. So it would be at maturity and probably the answer you're not looking for or hoping for is of course every species in cultivar reaches their maturity at a different time.

Anecdotally I had a 20 foot maple that was printed in the literature that would only grow 20 feet. And I had to have a topped at 30.

And just to let you know, I mean, Tony did all the research on putting this spreadsheet together and I highlighted the column that shows the canopy area and square feet. I imagine he used some sources like the Tree Book to provide all of this.

Well, the reason I ask is, is there a way of handling or how do you deal with in the future trees that become a danger? I don't see that in here where you talk about danger trees, particularly to residential or commercial properties or so forth.

Well typically if it's on private property, it's not the city's responsibility.

So in other words, if I have a tree that I feel is a danger, I can remove it?

On your property?

On the commercial property I have. When you just told me that if a tree is removed, it has to be replaced. Is that correct?

Are we talking about a commercial parking lot?

Yeah, or any commercial-

In a parking lot it does. So yeah, parking lot trees are very specific that if they die, they have to be replaced.

Or if they're a danger?

Sure, if it's deemed-

Tony, you can maybe talk a little bit, the hazardous tree section right? Of the code.

Yes, that applies though to the right of way. There is language in there that if a tree on private property is a hazard to the right of way, then there's a language on how we as staff proceed. But I do get questions on a neighboring tree is, the neighbor feels that their neighbor's tree might fall on their house. If it's not going to impact the right of way, I've been directed not to be a resource. And that's often difficult for me to say, but I do as I'm ordered.
Well, I can understand the difficulty. I'm going through that right now, where I can see where there's going to be a hazard tree on my property that would impact my neighbor's house. And I just soon not go through any difficulties that way.

The first statement in there, and I don't know why this was put in there, plant materials eliminate pollutants from our air and water and help maintain physical and mental. Why was and mental put in there? I mean, I understand-

Sorry, what page are you on?

This is page 19, the very first part.

Page 19. At the top of the page?

Right.

There we go. This was an introduction that was written quite a while ago and I was simply trying to clean it up and actually landscaping does provide mental health benefits. So, having trees and birds around and that kind of thing, it can have a calming effect on people.

Well, I also am a health provider and that worked in mental health as well. And there are people, that have anxiety problems and some of that can be in maintenance, it can be around shrubbery, it can be any number of reasons. So, when we use that term mental, I get nervous.

Well, it's mental health.

As I state, one person's mental health is another person's mental detriment.

Well, couple things there. One is the current language which you see right there is mental equilibrium. That's the current language, so I think part of the goal here was to make it... What is that?

Right.

I agree. Why?

So we weren't trying to strike the original intent of this code which is decades old. And you're sitting in a position where you can make a recommendation to the city council, however you want as a commission. So I think staff was simply trying to bring some clarity to the code there rather than using the word equilibrium. Mental health is a term that is a little bit more commonly used in our [inaudible] today.

Well, mental health is part of your physical health. I would remove anything to do with mental.

Or you could remove both and just say health.

Yeah. Or just say, maintain physical health. It's part of your physical body, it's part of who you are. And then that's obviously going to be determined by medical staff or people that are capable of understanding that person's conditions.
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What would we strike the?

I'd just strike and mental. So my motion would be just strike and mental and leave it as maintain physical health. All aspects of our body are governed by health or mental health, physical health, all of it is physical health.

Well, [inaudible].

Well, that's already struck.

It's already struck, okay.

I like that.

So, and help maintain physical health by fulfilling a need for contact with the natural environment period?

To the best of our abilities.

[inaudible].

Christine Benson.

And then-

Is now exiting.

What's that?

Motion.

No, not yet. I got some questions. Does anybody else have questions?

These are amendments so they can either be voted up and down. You're not voting on the whole package.

No yeah, he's just talking about the striking that he is just-

Okay, do we need to take votes on each of these amendments?

It's your call as the chair, if you want to do them one by one...

Do you think that's more efficient, do you?

It's almost more efficient.

Okay. Let's have a motion on that amendment.
I just said it.

Do we have a second?

I'll second it.

And we have a second from Commissioner Scherf, all those in favor of striking the words, and mental say aye.

Aye.

Aye.

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Anybody abstaining?

I abstain.

Who was that?

Commissioner Aviles abstained. Everybody else is an aye.

Then I had a quick question, and you referred residential was only in planned unit residential or residential planned units that this applies correct?

I'm sorry?

That's what I heard from you. Landscaping required under that, it says an all required front and exterior side yard in residential. That's all it says.

Right. So that would be any R zone.

So if I have a single family resident-

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [01:08:04]

... be it any R zone.

So if I have a single family resident, then I am under this. I have a lot and I want to build a house.

Yes. There are landscaping requirements in the R zones, which all of the new single family housing would be in an R zone.

Hang on. Even the one-offs? Remember you're just building one single-family home. You're subject to all this. Are we talking about a development or single-family homes?
Well, this section here, we're talking about landscaping shall be required. So this is just a broad statements in the front and exterior side yards in the R zone. So there are some requirements in here that apply to one single-family house. Yeah.

So if I, we're-

We're not going to require you to get an arborist.

Yeah. There's the different standards.

That was your earlier question.

That's where I was going. Am I going to have to get an arborist and to go through all the yada, yada, yada.

There's some exceptions all the way through here. This is just a very generalized opening.

I'm just making sure. And you had some stuff in there about mulching and materials, not next to the house, et cetera, et cetera. How is that enforced? Is that your job or is it just on the initial development that, that occurs and then after 10 years, five years, if they have other things next to the house.

Yeah. We don't have landscape police.

Okay. I just was curious.

So the development plan, the landscape plan that's turned in is approved or recommend changes.

Do you guys mind if I can continue real quick?

Go ahead.

Signage. I'm looking at these plans. For example, page 42, large trees out in front of these businesses, walking the main road. So how does a commercial owner sign? We already had the discussion about the RV parks, who would like to have their vehicles out there to show off what they do, how are you going to help people in our commercial districts and so forth to be able to say, "Hey, look, here I am."

Well, they are allowed to have a sign out there.

It just won't show up.

Excuse me.

It just won't show up.
No, the trees have to be trimmed up a certain height above the sidewalk. They can't be all the way down to the side.

I'm thinking of buildings that have the signs on them. As an arborist, does this make sense to you that you can do that? Have trees now you'd have to trim up. How tall is the building?

So in specific cases where there's a sign that they decided to put right behind a tree?

No, no. I have that sign on my building and let's say my building is what, one story? What is that, about 10 feet?

A little higher than that.

Maybe 12?

Yeah, the typical 10 to-

So my signs what, two by four or whatever, or four by eight size. So now it's dropped down four feet. So the limbs would have to be at least trimmed up 10 feet.

So it doesn't have to have the four trees as shown here. These are examples. This isn't like somebody comes in and says, "Oh, I have to have these four trees." It's what their plan is. We're just trying to show the concept that you have to have 50% coverage of the parking lot. This isn't designed to make-

I think this is road frontage is where you have that as the property line. It's one bordering the sidewalk. I also worry about that in commercial areas. If you've got trees and shrubs that are too close, which they grow and they get bigger. And if no, one's maintaining that the fire department and police can't even see residential numbers.

I don't know what to tell you, commissioner. These are just suggestions. They turn in their landscape plan based on what they're going to do with their business.

I guess that's kind of why I want... Okay. But we have nobody here. We have no money that's really looked at this. Public Works, we're not even sure if they've looked at this. There's a lot of worries in here. I don't know. I mean, it seems like a nice deal. I love trees and everything. I also see where problems occur when it's not done right. I've lived in forestry all my life. So I know what that can be.

So I might just add commissioner, we are in a legislative public hearing. So this can be talked about anytime, anywhere, by anyone. there's no restrictions on who gets to talk about this. This is not a site-specific case. And as Donna had on her last slide, it can be continued. And so if there's an opportunity that you feel staff has failed in making this available to a broader section of the community, we can make an effort to do that.

We can talk about that when it [crosstalk].

So I'm just pointing out that there's a lot more latitude with these kinds of applications than what you have with the site specific.
Yeah. I did talk to developers and so forth about various aspects. They didn't have major concerns. They said this goes on in all cities so this is quite common. One comment that I did get back was, "What one city is, is what one city is." In other words, it's how they developed in the past. That made that city, not what you do now forward, unless you're trying to change your image. So that's one thing I always thought was kind of interesting. In other words, up in Washington you have Leavenworth, made its image. That's what it is. Alpine City. I think ours is the climate and that pruning, I think you addressed that, that you would be in charge making sure the right away pruning is done through our departments. Pruning trees, if you don't prune them, they get diseased or they become a problem.

I don't understand, through the departments?

Well, I thought that's what you said your job was as an arborist to make sure that the pruning is done on trees within Grants Pass.

No, that's not what I said. If there is a tree permit, I oversee that. So we're complaint-driven. So if there's an issue with a right-of-way tree, then I go in and inspect it. But in terms of myself pruning, that-

No, no, no, no. I just want to know there's someone that they can address that and get it taken care of.

Yes. If there's a complaint in the city, it will likely get to me. And then we'll go through the process.

I'm please I say that. I moved in my new home a year and a half ago and they had never done any pruning and it was obvious. And I had to go out there and thin out a lot of limbs and get the trees back to health and bush out more to look nicer and water. That was the other question I have. Did anyone evaluate water usage based on what this would require now, if we are we increasing the amount of trees that we're going to have in Grants Pass? Is that a fair statement?

No.

You're requiring 50% tree-coverage in parking lots.

No, you're actually decreasing it if you look at all the numbers.

So you feel they're decreasing.

Oh, yeah. If you look at all the setbacks and the requirements, I'm seeing a decrease in a lot of the requirements for percentages. And so I think this actually decreases the burden on the developer to put landscape.

Okay. Then I just defer the fact that I was concerned about irrigation requirements. Although, you can go to the low water usage trees.

Well, and if the new newer development starts following more the Firewise style trees, they are more drought resistance, so they're going to require less water. So it's actually accomplishing that if they're pushing development into the right area.
If they're pushing the right ones. Yeah. That's answered. Pruning's answered.

So I have a clarification on his question. Does the city of Grants Pass have a maintenance and upkeep program for trees within the right-of-way or is it only complaint-driven?

It's only complaint-driven unless that right-of-way is adjacent to city property because the city's the property owner responsible.

I thought that's where your question was going. So basically my clarification is that the city has no program on maintenance and upkeep with the trees within the right-of-way, unless it's attached to city property. Okay. Thank you.

You do require that a development maintain the trees for a certain period a time?

Yes.

And within the right-of-way as well, adjacent to their development, right?

Right.

So when WinCo went in a couple of their trees along the frontage died and we sent a letter and said, you got to replace those because it's like a gateway to the city, like dead trees out there.

Yeah. We have the ability under the code to go to a private property owner and point to the code and say you are required to do this. But as Donna said there's not an individual that works for the city of Grants Pass that walks around the city and writes citations. But we certainly do have the ability in those instances where we get the complaints and it's very clear that they are responsible for maintaining. Particularly, if it is causing any kind of potential hazard.

There are local cyclists who strap pruning cheers to their bicycle when they go through town and the limbs are hanging over in the bike lanes.

Is that right?

You see these people actually trim the branches. So the citizens do-

And what do they do with the branch?

They leave it in the right-of-way because they know that there are city crews that come along and clean that up. The street sweeper gets it.

Anybody else have any... Are you done? Anybody else with questions? I do have questions. Okay. When I was reading this packet, I couldn't help, but notice the word solar in here a few times. I thought we jettisoned all that. Why am I seeing the word solar?

Did not.

What was it we got rid of?
So, there was a solar setback proposal to strike the entire section in Article 22, you are remembering that correctly, but what ultimately got approved was to keep that and rewrite it within one year. So by this coming to August, we have a deadline to bring back an amendment to that. But right now it's all still in there.

Okay. All right. Thank you for that. When we're talking about compact parking, you're letting developers now stripe up to 35% through this change. Does the city do anything to enforce that? I can't tell you how many times I come into compact parking and right next door to me is some dooly in another compact space.

Well that's because there's no space for me.

So there's no enforcement, I'm guessing?

No.

Okay. Can we prohibit Leyland Cypress trees in the city?

What is on our list? Are they prohibited? I think tree of heaven is definitely prohibited. The Ailanthus.

Yeah. It's not included for the street trees as an approved species, but on private property, not.

We can't.

Nothing we can do. Understood.

I'm not familiar with that restriction on that.

Okay. Thanks for that. Just an FYI. I find it a kind of a funny ha-ha that we're adopting a bunch of the Ashland code, but did you know in Ashland, if you cut down a tree on your private property, without permission from the city, you're getting tar and feathered in the Plaza and you have to replace that with something. I'm serious. There's been articles in the tidings over the Ashland newspaper. People cannot cut trees on their private property without permission from the city. And if they do there's fines levied. Usually it's the Gladys Kravitz sitting at home and looking across the street and seeing their neighbor going for it and they call and then that's what... Anyway, I just found that kind of contradictory. You said when we were talking about soil types and things, no DG, because it runs down into the storm system. And then you said no, three-quarter minus how come no three-quarter minus.

For a landscape rock, for landscape material.

Okay. How come?

It's not rounded.

It's an aesthetic thing?

Well, it isn't. And I don't mean to interrupt.
Go ahead.

It's the same thing as... It's three-quarter minus is more for compaction and landscape rock is more designed for aeration.

Okay. Thank you for that.

It's a simple term of it.

Thank you. That's a perfect explanation. You got to get air in the soil.

Okay, understood. So I want to get back to what Commissioner Nelson was talking about on page 42, this illustration. If somebody puts up a building and there's a business in it and they have a wall signed up there on their facade and they plant trees, as they're required to in a planting strip, and these trees grow to a place where they block the signage, then it's a simple matter of that person, owning business, getting out there and pruning the trees, right? And then there's no more blockage of the sign. If a business owner wanted trees pruned that are in the right-of-way, do they call you and say, "Hey, could you please come out here and do you do that?"

He does.

Not you, but does the city do that?

Yes, they would have to apply for a tree permit through the tree permit application. They would have to hire an arborist to do that. And if it's determined... Usually because the arborists, they're certified arborists, they all be in communication with them. And if the pruning that is proposed is not going to kill the tree, there's not a set amount of time in the code. So there's a little bit of flexibility there. What does that mean? Is it going to kill it in 30 years, 50 years?

If it's going to take out too much of the canopy, then at that point, fortunately that's actually never happened because our arborists have done a good enough job where they've only had to take out a branch or two and that's satisfied it. If were to kill the tree, then that would be a conversation... I would actually check in with my public work supervisor. And really the code says that if a tree is to be removed from the right-of-way so long as there's space for replacement, there needs to be a replacement. So it's nuanced, it depends on what would the impact be on that tree? Yeah. They can have an arborist do the pruning.

Okay. Understood. Thank you very much.

I got a clarification on that. Sorry to interrupt. So you're saying I heard a statement earlier, which I would totally believe, that trees and landscape being within the right-of-way on the private property, to maintain is the responsibility of the owner. Yet you're telling me that I have to get a tree permit to actually maintain that tree in the right-of-way that you told me I had to maintain.

Yes.
Okay. That's a little counter-intuitive. Is there a timeline on that maintenance that is required for the developer or the business owner within the right-of-way trees? Is there a timeline for that maintenance or is it life for the business owner?

If there's a complaint, you mean? Like how quickly you have to address-

I'm talking about regular maintenance because in the code it's written that the land owner is responsible for the maintenance of the trees within the right-of-way. Is there a lifespan on that requirement? Like only for 10 years?

No.

No.

Okay. But then if I have to touch my tree in the right-of-way, because the city code says I have to, I have to come and get a permit?

Yes. For the right-of-way trees. That's in the municipal code.

And I understand the logic behind it. It seems a little counter-intuitive to have... Both codes are kind of chewing against each other, but I understand your logic behind it as an arborist saying that you want to make sure that John Yahoo's not out there just cutting the tree down. I trimmed it six inches above the ground.

Part of the tree permit is also, we folded in the encroachment permit. That's required from Public Works. So there's a traffic control plan and they need to know if traffic are closed. It actually, before I started, there were multiple permits and it was very confusing. Thank goodness engineering allowed a tree permit to satisfy that and have a good relationship with the engineering tech. We get those out within the day for both permits.

Perfect. Thanks. Sorry.

That's okay. I just have one last thing to say. One of the reasons I'm on this commission, is for all the challenges of the new information and all this is new to me. I'm learning a lot and I'm enjoying the conversation. I'm done. Commissioner Arthur.

I want to back up a minute. Did I hear you say that you couldn't ban Leyland Cypress on private property, only in the front?

No.

Okay. That's surprising because when I was mentioning the towns I looked for when the Firewise man, I forgot his name, came to the property and suggested what we do, where three blocks from the wild land, where we are. It doesn't look like it, but we are, if you go one block that way and two blocks up you're into the open territory out there. And my house came with that whole north boundary of seven huge. They were probably 40 to 60 feet Leyland all grown together. And the lot across the street had kind of a derelict small empty lot, had a dog leg, a whole north or south side and a halfway across the front, which fortunately got all taken out when they built on the property last year.
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But that was a real issue. And there was discussion in the neighborhood, not just about our property, but about others like that in these really old areas about the danger and the danger from your neighbor's property of having those continuous lines of trees. And I'm quite sure that when I looked up the other towns that they said, you just can't have that tree here, not anywhere. And I'm surprised if our Firewise information isn't going that direction on some issues.

On the fire safe, if it were a new development and they chose that option, obviously it would not be allowed. We currently don't have a retroactive. We do have the Firewise coordinator who does a lot of outreach and get information out to people about the species that are highly-flammable. But from a planning standpoint, we don't have the ability to go back and tell people after they have something on their property, "Oh, you can't do that now." We don't have that kind of power.

I'm not really suggesting that. I'm saying if people do have to replace or want to plant trees, they shouldn't be allowed to plant a few of those. Right. And there should be somewhere, some kind of list telling you what those are. The last question I had was, within the last five years there've been many, many, many articles and media coverages and stuff about growing your own food and food forests specifically, and encouraging and some towns have taken on planting all the trees in their parks to be fruit trees. And we're specifically, I realize this was just referring to street trees, but specifically prohibiting fruit trees and nut trees. And I'm wondering what plan you have for a time when the community takes a turn and decides that we do want to have urban agriculture and grow as much food as we can on our property.

The deer will appreciate it.

Well, sell more fences. Yeah, I know of the deer. Because that's counter-productive. I mean, if we're banning it, it came up at our house this week because one of my roommates every year has two or three or four properties where she can always get persimmons off of people's trees who don't use them. And this year she didn't get any. And that gleaning of fruit around is something that theoretically ought to be encouraged.

Commissioner Nelson.

I'd like to, because I think it's worthy, to entertain motion to put Leyland Cypress on the list to not recommend in the city. And my reasoning is not only for the fire reason, but right now there's a big concern because of the beetle that infests it. They can infect other people's cypresses if they already have them planted and so forth. And maybe you can speak to that a little bit.

In terms of the policy of recommending or would it be prohibited?

I'm not following what you are saying.

Is that species on your approved list?

No.

Oh, it is not on your approved list.
You can't put something that says you can't [crosstalk].

I think that's what you were saying, we should have disapproved list.

We do have a short disapproved list. If you look at page 77, prohibited street trees. Again, we're talking about street trees. We aren't talking about private development and parking lots. So we have willows, cottonwood poplars, palm catalpa, black locusts. Even though we have tons of sweet gum it's going on there now. And, of course, Ailanthus, which is a tree of heaven and it's highly invasive.

And I would always take cottonwoods out.

So you're making a motion to put Leyland Cypress-

I would like to have a motion since there's not really an avenue under this.

Okay. We can do that.

Making a motion to what?

I was talking to him. Sorry.

No motion.

Oh, no motion. Okay.

Any other questions of staff?

I have one question for the commission. On page 42, the Type E2 concept sketch that created so much discussion about blocking the business. This illustration is newly done. Newly created. If we just had three trees in front of there, would that like help illustrate that it's not going to fully block the frontage of the building because those four trees, that was just a random choice. Oh, if you're looking at that and you're saying, "Oh, I have to have four trees and it's going to block my building and nobody's going to see my business. It's not to scale. If we were to have the illustrator, make that three trees, would that get rid of some of the anxiety over that illustration?

Possibly. I mean, if, if commissioners are having an issue with this, either taking out one of those trees or maybe putting just a word in here, I see at the top it says concept sketch. Is there a better word we could use? How about imaginary sketch or something that tells people, this is just an example.

I would even be better if it was some mention or some way that this is not to preclude business from being able to advertise their business.

Well, this is a landscape amendment.

Which we already have regulation for that.
And page 28, number four, it does say signs may be permitted in required landscape yards. It's explicit.

So what you're seeing and complaining about basically is, if somebody's on the street driving by, they're not going to see the sign that's over the door on that building, but this is a multi-business development. They're going to come through a driveway. The driveway's going to have signage on what is inside there as well. So, I don't know, I just don't see it as being, I understand what you're trying to say. You're just trying to say, is there too much density on the right-of-way that's going to preclude visibility of that business. And I don't know. I don't see it. I mean, for example, I think this tree density code that you were discussing is so light.

It's crazy. I do development in Arizona and we're talking 20 times the tree density. You have to put a tree on every 20-foot on-center on every property line that you do. And that's in the middle of this desert. We're talking about a forest and this code has actually been amended to decrease the amount of trees that are required. I don't know. And I think a lot of the signage is going to be worked out within their landscape plan because their objective as a landscaper, working for your developers to make sure that that product is going to be visible. So I think they're going to place the trees correctly.

That being said, I would be happy to take out one of those and at three, if that four just makes it too dense.

It wasn't the diagram that got me. I just wanted to throw the question out there because of how we're looking at the size. And I did pass this to developer and they said it might become excessive where you wouldn't be able to see the signage as requirement of growth for the tree.

I don't think it's necessary for you to have the illustration changed, that drawing changed.

Got to throw it out there.

Any other questions of staff? Is there still somebody online that might want to speak to this issue?

I think they hung up?

I think so, too, but I'm seeing that little icon on the corner of the screen up there that says

That's just Carolyn.

Oh, Carolyn Nealon?

Yeah. It's just your sign in, isn't it, for the meeting. Click on what, here?

No, the CN.

Here?

No.
Oh, on CN?

You're talking about-

Oh, yeah. That's Carolyn Nealon.

Nobody else there.

Okay. Nobody else is going to speak to this. No more questions to staff. I am closing the public hearing.

Thank you.

Do we have a motion?

I would move this forward to the city council as amended.

Second, Collier.

We have a motion and a second. Do we have any discussion?

Oh, I had one, shoot. I had still had a single question. Can I throw a single question back out?

Yeah, I don't see why not.

Just a clarification, and I absolutely apologized for my high school outburst there. Sorry. Just specifically to you, there was a comment that was made that said, and I just need clarification. The statement was, " Open-space requirements would be waived if the development was within a certain linear feet of a park." Is that true? Can you clarify the code?

It applies to multifamily developments. Yeah.

Within how many feet of a park?

I think it is a quarter mile.

Seriously. And that would waive any open-space requirements for that specific multifamily development. And for a multifamily development, what's the specific open-space requirement?

Well, there's a whole new section that the council, this group, recommended approval of and the council adopted about six months ago. It's three or four different categories of open-space, but if you have five units or more, then it does kick in an open-space requirement and a sliding scale depending on the amount and you have some-

But if you're over five units and you're within a quarter mile of, you said a quarter mile of a park, then, then you can wave all those requirements?

Right.
But it's for small amounts, isn't it?

Okay. Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

That's okay.

To clarify that it's on page 87 of the packet for exceptions. And it's in the general commercial central business district and riverfront tourist district zones or in mixed-use developments. "Recreation areas may be reduced or eliminated if the development is located within one quarter mile radius." So it's not a straight linear line of an existing public park or open space.

Not to hash something that we can't really hash, but that doesn't make sense to me, because I thought open-space requirements were basically not there for the enjoyment of public and private within that development. It just kind of seems like you're missing an opportunity to get nicer developments. If you're saying anybody within a quarter mile, doesn't have to do it because I don't... Anyways, sorry. The statement's done.

So we have a motion on the table to forward this to counsel with the single amendment that we have voted on. The motions been forwarded and seconded. Any discussion? Okay. We're going to do a roll call vote. Commissioner Collier.

Aye.

Commissioner Aviles.

Aye.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Nelson.

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

And I am voting yes as well. There are no abstentions, no opposition. The motion passes.

Well, thank you.

All right.

Thank you.
MOTION/VOTE
Commissioner Nelson moved, and Vice Chair Collier seconded the motion to recommend approval to the City Council on the Landscape Text Amendments as amended. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.
The motion passed.

Thank you all for that. I learned a lot. I appreciate it. Next item on the agenda, review up-zone scenarios for Allen Creek Road. This is going to be fun too.

So while I'm pulling this up, the little background on this. The city for over a year now has been talking about rezoning, about 540 acres of land within the urban growth boundary. Now that I'm standing up here, I can take this off, right? And I think we brought you up to speed. A couple of times the Oregon Department of Transportation has given us feedback about the concerns they have of up-zoning, all of this property without doing much more-
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Without doing a much more detailed traffic impact analysis on how upzoning 540 acres will impact the traffic system. That comes from the state statute. So we did hire a consultant, transportation consultant who started to look into this. We had several conversations back and forth with Oregon Department of Transportation staff, and really had come to the point where we had to make a decision about whether or not to continue with this rezone. So we took this to city council a couple of months ago, presented some options, and the city council’s general direction was cut the amount of acreage down. Don't look at all 540 acres of land in the urban growth boundary, highlight the Allen Creek area.

So that's where we are. So council said we would like feedback from the urban planning commission and from the housing advisory committee on the Allen Creek area specifically before proceeding with rezoning that. So that's why we're here. It's not a public hearing. It's just informational and really to give you this forum to give this some thought.

So I'm just going to pull up a couple of different maps here and show you what we're talking about. Then just a couple of other slides so that you can have a better understanding.

So what's up here on this slide now, let me see if I can, a little bit. So right down the middle of this is Allen Creek Road. Denton trail is down here. Even further than that is New Hope. And then up here is Harbeck. Then another quarter mile up there is the Albertson's shopping center.

So today this whole area comprises about 62 acres. The property right at the corner here at the north end, which is at Harbeck and Allen Creek, there's about 4.4 acres that was rezoned to our 4 that was approved for the Aurelia subdivision a couple of years ago. Well, I guess about 18 months ago. That's already got the city zoning on it. Other than that piece, none of this property has city zoning. It's all county zoning. RR-5 is a county zone.
So as a part of the urban growth rezone project ... Well, before I go onto that map, the green here, these properties are owned by the city of Grants Pass as future park reserve areas. The rest of them are privately owned.

So this map is just another different look at it showing you these ones that are owned by the city of Grants Pass crosshatched here. In the analysis that I'm going to bring up in a minute, those are excluded from the analysis, because even though it's possible that some of that acreage could be sold in the future for some kind of housing, at this point, our assumption is the city's holding onto those pieces and they would be developed out as park land in the future. But otherwise, these two parcels that you see on, what is that, the west side of Allen Creek that I have the dots, those are the two vacant parcels. Everything else has some kind of house on it. These two, this one's vacant. This one is actually connected to this piece that's outside the urban growth boundary, and it's an access road, or could be an access road in the future.

It is an access road for that [Sylvan] Heights subdivision that has been approved, 16 lots.

Oh, thank you. That's right. There was a planning, a development through Josephine county for ... Yeah, it's not built yet, but it's-

Oh no, it just got approved-

Just got approved.

... in the last month or two.

So let me go to this third map. So this map is showing you when we worked through the 540 acres and thought, okay, well where should these counties own properties, what city zone should be put on them? This was the proposal to have the R4 one, which has already been zoned, to have the R32 for a couple of parcels at the north end. Then all the rest of it have the R2 zone on it. So that's what currently is in the application. We technically have an application. It's become really null and void at this point.

So what can you do in the different zones? I'm just trying to walk you through here. So currently, here's what the types of residential dwellings you can do in the various zones. So again, we're really talking about R2, R3, R32, R4, and R42. The comprehensive plan doesn't really anticipate R1 zones of any kind. So the comprehensive plan is guiding us here because that's already in place. We're really not proposing to change the comp plan. The comp plan says it envisions the medium density in that whole Allen Creek 62 acre area, which is why most of it has got R2 right now, but it could have R3 under the comp plan without changing the comp plan. So under the R2, today's ordinance says you can do single family, residential zone, the P permitted, the one is a staff level approval. So you can see pretty much everything in the R2 until you get down to this attached three units or more, like a townhouse. That is a type two. Takes a little longer, but you can still do it. Then the multi-dwelling complexes, you can also do in the R2 zone.

So the main difference really comes to where we're going with this whole middle housing code update that the state has required. That kicks in July 1st of this coming year, which will allow for duplexes and triplexes, and quads in all of the zones. Under that, we have been playing around, if you will, with some ideas about what does that look like.
So this is an amendment that you're going to see after the new year in a formal public hearing. This will be an application and so I'm just giving you a preview of what is in there. What you're going to have a public hearing on this topic. This is, again, looking at changing some of the requirements for what's allowed for townhouses. Those would become allowed in the R2 zone as just a Type 1A versus requiring a hearing's officer. Triplexes also permitted across the board in all of these zones. The quadplexes, the same.

So the biggest difference is really when you get into the lot sizes in these zones. The lot sizes do shrink. When you get to the R3 and the R4 you can do smaller lots. There's also some other changes that allow for that higher density and make it easier to do higher density in the R3 and the R4 than in the R2. I didn't bring up all of that, but one other slide here, let's see, we looked at that. Is that the... No, it's the wrong.

So what we did in looking out the 20 year analysis on this, this is citywide. Projecting out 20 years for the single family detached there's about 2,500 units needed in single family, 750 townhouse, or plex type projects, which goes three plexes and four plexes, then 550 units that are in the multifamily. That's what's in the housing needs analysis in this column what the housing needs analysis did not do, is it didn't factor in the deficit that we already have today.

I think everybody recognizes there's a deficit of units in Grants Pass. We don't have a good number on what that is. But we feel pretty comfortable in saying that there's at least a 1000 unit deficit. If you factor in a 1000 unit deficit then that changes, that's what this third column is. That bumps up these numbers to 930 townhouse plexes in 20 years and 687. So basically, we have about 1600 units if you add just those two together, citywide. The reason I'm showing you this is because what you are being asked do is do you have some recommendations about which of these zones is the most appropriate to go in this Allen Creek area.

So this, again, this is showing citywide for just the town homes and the multifamily. The projected 20 year deficit is shown here on the left column, which is from the prior slide, then the gross density acres that are needed for the R3 and then the gross density acres needed for the R4 to accomplish this number of units. So citywide, we're saying 687 multifamily units over the next 20 years. If you had the R3 zone, that would take basically 40 to 55 acres, and then the R4, that would take 19 to 34 acres. So that's based on maximum density and minimum density. That's why there's a range there.

So again, how does that translate into this area? We're talking about 62 acres of land that we're rezoning. You clearly do not need all of that to be these zones, because this is going to be scattered around. From a planning perspective, it would actually probably be inappropriate to say okay, well, here's the one part of town where we're going to put all the multifamily. I think everybody knows that intuitively. That's not what we're saying. But it's where is that mix? What's the appropriate mix?

So this slide is just showing you what I said earlier. The moderate density residential allows you to use the R2. The moderate high density comp plan lets you use the R3. We can change the comprehensive plan designation.

So as you're talking this through, we didn't want you to necessarily be limited because it is possible to change the comp plan to go for using some of these other higher density zones, if you think that's appropriate. We did talk with the public works department and their basically does the sewer and water, is what's out there in Alan Creek today able to handle going to a
higher density if we did even up to a blanket upzone to R4, and they said yes. The master plans for sewer and water would be able to accommodate that.

Now Allen Creek itself is planned to be in arterial. It's just this little skinny goat trail today. But we're I think about 45% done with the new design on Allen Creek. That's going to take it to a 70 foot wide street.

That'll be a three lane facility, right?

Yeah.

Northbound, southbound, center turn lane.

Right. With the bike lanes and detached sidewalks. Yeah.

So I think we're also fairly comfortable saying that at least this section could accommodate what the anticipated design is going to be.

What's needs to happen is the traffic impact analysis is still going to have to be done on this area. So when we go to the engineer and say, "Please model this," they're going to model it based on either the R2, or the R3, or the R4, or a mix of all of that. They'll come back and say, "Well, here's the number of trips that's generated." But we're fairly comfortable saying, "Okay, they're going to say that the road itself will be fine." Now there may be some issues at, at the intersections, particularly Harbeck and where you have that weird pork chop looking that has the free right. There probably will be some recommendations there. But all of that's going to be premised on what the zoning is. So that's why we're starting with the zoning.

This turned out small, didn't it? This is just saying some of the figure figures that I already talked about, about 62 acres, 35 parcels of land. Two of them are vacant. There's 27 underdeveloped parcels out there. So, what we mean by underdeveloped is basically if it's a half-acre or larger and has a single dwelling, our assumption is it can be redeveloped and be subdivided, or otherwise adding density. So there's 27 of those.

Then we looked at the R2, the R3 and the R4 and said, "Okay, well what if you built out those two vacant parcels and the underdeveloped parcels. What if you built those out, assuming the maximum number of units?" The gross density is really not a very helpful number because you're never going to use the entire acreage [inaudible] housing. So is the net density where you're taking out some wetlands, you're taking out the right of way, you're taking out power easements. Subtract all that out and that leaves you with that 30% is what we used that. That gives you in the R2, still 533 units in that area, in that Allen Creek area. If you went with the R3, at the net density, about 746 units would be built out there. Then if you went with the R4, almost 1500 units.

So the housing advisory committee got this exact same information a couple weeks ago. Their motion was to submit three plans for council to be included in the traffic impact analysis. So those three are just do a baseline R2, which is what we currently have that would give you a bottom base, and then do the maximum R4, and then a strategic mixed zoning based on staff recommendation that uses unit type need identified in the housing needs analysis. That's basically saying look at a mix, just throw in there maybe around the future parks, for example.
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Maybe put some R4 where the future park land is, or maybe one on the other side, and then put some R2, and then maybe a couple of R3s.

So what we take to council is going to be a combination of what your motion is and what the housing advisory committee motion is. Then we'll go to the traffic engineer and say please model this one scenario or these two scenarios, and then they'll come back. So I know that's a lot to throw at you, but that's basically where we're at. So what do you think? What are some key points to move forward? Do you think there's needs to be some additional analysis? What are your thoughts?

Go ahead, Commissioner Nelson. Sorry.

I understand you talked to public works. Has school districts been made aware of this, as well, as a potential growth area? Are they prepared to deal with increased growth in that area?

Yeah, it's a good point. They received the original urban growth boundary rezone application that showed the 540, but there hasn't been any communication was with Grants Pass School District.

That's a big concern because I've seen where that has come back and bit us before when you change the zoning, but you hadn't contact the school districts, and they aren't prepared to deal with the increase of students that would be necessary for them to deal with water. Sewer, would you've answered at up to the maximum four, I think you said, correct?

Yep.

Then fire districts, have they been notified? It's all within the city of Grants Pass and I don't know what unit's over there. Are they capable of dealing with that increase?

Yeah. I mean the urban growth boundary, we're not talking about changing the urban growth boundary. That was-

No, I understand but you're changing the zoning.

Yeah, yeah.

Has it already been looked at?

The zoning, not the specific city zone, but the comp plan zone or comp plan designation was looked at in 2014 when the city approved the urban growth boundary. So there was an assumption at that point that you're going to build this out to this medium density. So-

A medium density.

Yeah.

Then my final comment was I'm more into the strategic mix concept. I think that makes better sense, particularly around parks, particularly around intersections or where you may have bottlenecks.
Okay.

Anybody else have any comments? Commissioner Aviles?

Thank you. Just to Commissioner Wards' question about school districts. I was under the impression that our school districts are not really bound by zoning as they're their own district, and so regardless of the zone you live in, the school you go to is not determined by your zoning. Isn't that accurate? Because there's Three Rivers and then there's Grants Pass School District and they're not aligned with zoning, I guess I don't understand.

[inaudible]

Yeah, I interpret it-

But those kids would've already been going there because they are in the district regardless of their zone.

But once the new [crosstalk] units are added, that adds families, adds-

You're increasing the density.

Oh, you're talking-

Increasing the numbers.

... about the developing of the properties and then the kids that come from that? Oh, okay. I guess I was confused because I was like it doesn't matter if you're an R1 or R3, you're still going to that school that's by you. Okay. I understand that more. Thank you for that.

I guess my question is this, you had talked about the premises based on zoning. So depending on what is ironed out, whether it's R2, or R3, or R4, that will then dictate the model that they use for the traffic analysis. So I guess just my question is this, I've sat up here for three years. I often see presentations on properties that are R2, R3, but they're built and developed as if they're R1. So I guess my question is just given there's no minimum requirement for density on these properties, I guess to me, it seems almost moot to distinguish between R2 and R3, given there's really no requirement to abide by those density requirements to begin with. I guess I'm just wondering, because I see a lot of properties built as, though they're R1, but they're in R3. So I guess I'm just curious about that.

Yeah. So the council last week did decide to forward on to you for a public hearing coming up soon, a minimum density requirement. That would say you have to build to at least 60% of the maximum. So there has been direction given now to prepare that code, which we did draft and there'll be hearings on that in February.

Okay. Thank you for that. Then I just had one other quote question. It was regarding just the traffic impact analysis and how just hearing the timeline of it all, I'm not sure how it all plays out, but to designate rezone with new designations and give it like a traffic analysis.
I guess I'm just wondering like that traffic analysis seems like it would be flawed because it's based on the assumption that folks are building as the density is zoned versus the actual. So I guess I was curious hey, of our R2 properties, how many are developed at 60% or more? I'd be curious. I would bet it's actually pretty low. So I guess I'm just, again, wondering like the traffic impact analysis is going to be predicated on information that is on an assumption versus an actual. I guess that's just more of a comment than a question now that I say it out loud. Thank you.

Sure.

Anything else Commissioner Aviles?

No, thank you.

Commissioner Arthur?

Of all of those 540 acres, this is one of the few areas that meets the criteria for high density zoning. It has basically the infrastructure, the utilities capable of being put in there relatively easily compared to some other areas. It has public transportation at the moment and it has, within a half a mile or a mile, basic shopping, grocery and Dollar Store, and that kind of thing, needs. So it's a perfect setup for an area to have the higher density ones.

So I think we definitely should recommend that some of those properties are higher than R2. If you put up that map again, clearly, it looks to me like some of them without having a developer buy multiple properties and combine them, some of them may be too narrow to really be able to fit large multifamily kinds of things. But I may be wrong. I just, I don't know, trying to figure how wide and how long your apartment buildings would have to be and how much street, and all that kind of stuff on some of those narrow [crosstalk]. What?

Half acre-

Yeah, this is the-

How can you see that?

Small [crosstalk].

.39 and .52 are the smallest.

Oh yeah. Well those are built on, those two, aren't they?

Yeah, they all have some development, other than this 1.06. I'm sorry. The 1.5 is vacant and then this future road. So it's really only talking about one property that's completely vacant. But you make a really good point. Some of these are several 100 feet deep.

Right.

What we have started to work with the city engineer on a concept of running a new road system through here that would be parallel to Allen Creek that would allow for some traffic movement
without coming onto Allen Creek. Because if you can imagine every single one of these having a driveway that comes out of Allen Creek and on a 70 foot wide arterial, there's, I forget what our code has, but I think it's about a 200 foot spacing between driveways on an arterial. So in order for that to really function, there's going to have to be some other way to move traffic other than just take each one of these and dump a driveway onto Allen Creek Road.

On and off ramps and grade separation will take care of that.

Nice little cheap project.

Don't forget the trees.

Other questions? Commissioner Collier?

I'd like to second Commissioner Nelson's concept or request for our additional analysis for the schools that that has to be part of the equation, schools, public safety, fire, but especially schools if you're going to get more kids in there, because I've been on a couple of times where we're trying to run bonds through for the south and north middle school and seen how they impact them. They're just going to a fit if we flood them with a bunch of kids. So it's just a concept. At the end of the day, how many more kids, school age kids, do we expect? The Goldilocks option of the three the housing advisory committee sent through, what does that look like for kids going to school. So yep, I'd throw that in there.

Okay.

There's some pretty good reliable data on the average household size and what number of kids are elementary and junior, and senior, so we can estimate that pretty easily. Yep.

Other points [crosstalk]. Go ahead.

The public safety, at least the fire response and all, this whole area is, I think, within both substation five minute zones, both Redwood and the one by the bridge, whatever we call it. So I don't think, other than capacity, but they're both within the five minute response time.

Anything else? I know that ... Do you have anything else for us?

No.

On this? Okay.

No, just wanted to-

So I know the agenda says to adjourn, but I didn't see on the agenda. Does anybody have anything they want to bring forward to us? We always go through that. Commissioner Aviles?

Yeah. Is it now items from commissioners?

This is a good time for that.
Oh, okay. Great. So yeah, just bringing up the city agenda from December 6th, it looks as though the council discussed minimum density. So I just had some questions, because I was under the impression that it would be a UAPC issue. My question was when was it coming before us? So do you know when that is coming before us?

We don't have dates set, but it's going to be in February.

Okay.

Sometime.

Okay.

Anything else? Commissioner Aviles?

Yeah, I guess I was wondering for a follow up on the UAPC goals, I don't remember seeing any finalized draft or version after the initial email just letting us know that we were needing to develop those. Did we as a commission complete that and submit that and if so, can I get a copy?

We did. It was the same set of goals that we had last year. We decided not to change anything. We still have a homeless problem in town. We still have a housing problem in town. We just stuck with all the goals that we had before. If you need a copy of that, I can forward it to you.

I have the old set. I just wasn't-

That's it.

Okay.

Thanks for checking on that.

Thank you. That's it.

Anybody else have anything to bring up? That leaves me and I promise I've practiced the speech in front of a mirror. It's only 22 minutes and 15 seconds.

So council approved me for another four year stint. Don't we do officer elections the first meeting of the year? Okay. So our next meeting we're going to be doing officer elections.

[inaudible].

 Aren't these four year terms.

Yep.

[inaudible].
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They elect the good people for four years. Yours is probably three.

Two and a half.

That could be. Anything else? Anybody? Meeting's adjourned. We'll see you all in January.

This is it, huh?

Merry Christmas, yeah. This is it.

Merry Christmas.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [02:14:41]
I. PROPOSAL:

The proposal is an ordinance amending Articles 22, 23, 25 and 30 of the Grants Pass Development Code (GPDC). All amendments relate to required landscaping, design standards and associated definitions.

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Section 4.102 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code provides that the Director, Planning Commission or City Council may initiate a text amendment. The City Council has initiated these amendments as a result of recommendations from the Urban Tree Advisory Committee.

Section 2.062 authorizes the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council and authorizes the City Council to make a final decision on an application for a Development Code Text Amendment, pursuant to the requirements of a Type IV procedure.

The text of the Development Code may be recommended for amendment and amended provided the criteria in Section 4.103 of the Development Code are met.
III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

The City Council’s final decision may be appealed to the State Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) as provided in state statutes. A notice of intent to appeal must be filed with LUBA within 21 days of the Council’s written decision.

IV. PROCEDURE

A. An application for the text amendments was received on October 20, 2021 and deemed complete on October 22, 2021. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.060 of the Development Code.

B. Public notice of the Type IV hearing was mailed on November 17, 2021 and published in the local newspaper on November 26, 2021 in accordance with Section 2.063 of the Development Code.

C. A public hearing was held on December 8, 2021. Written testimony received prior to the hearing and not addressed in the staff report was read into the record and presented in the slide presentation. The Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the application to the City Council with edits. The vote was 6-0-0, with Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss absent.

V. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the December 8, 2021 Staff Report which is attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein.

B. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on December 8, 2021, attached as Exhibit “B”, summarize the oral testimony presented and are incorporated herein.

C. The PowerPoint presentation given by staff at the December 8, 2021 hearing is attached as Exhibit “C” and is incorporated herein.

VI. GENERAL FINDINGS OF FACT:

The Urban Area Planning Commission found that, based upon the testimony given at the public hearing and staff report the proposal meets the criteria in Section 4.103 of the Development Code based on the reasons stated in the findings included below.

VII. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

In early 2020, an ad hoc landscape text amendment committee was formed to discuss additional design options for the residential landscape design standards at the request of the City Council. Additionally, the committee was tasked to review and update unadopted recommendations made by the Urban Tree Advisory Committee (UTAC) in 2016. The ad hoc committee met four times in the spring of 2020 and developed a list of recommendations. Members of the ad hoc committee included DJ Faszer (City Councilor), Donna Rupp (Community Development Staff Lead), James Love (UTAC), Tony Mecum (City Urban Forester), Christin Bryk (Principal, Mountain View Landscaping), and Kyrrha Sevco (City Public Works).
Two presentations were made at City Council workshops in the fall of 2020, with the Council requesting additional information and clarifications before going forward. A third workshop presentation in September 2021 provided more detail and received an affirmative vote by the Council to develop the proposed text amendments and submit an application for review.

In addition to the increased residential design options requested by the Council, changes to Article 23 addressed inconsistencies the Planning Department has been tracking for several years. All of the illustrations in Article 23 are outdated and some are unclear. A graphic designer was contracted to update the illustrations and provide staff with original electronic files that can be used across all City materials. Other changes include clarifying edits and corrections to errors.

Major changes to Article 23, Landscape and Buffering Standards include:

- Creation of four residential Landscape Design Types: Fire-safe, Low water use, Native plant/pollinator/wildlife habitat and Traditional.
- Recalculation of required landscape plant materials based on net lot width, rather than required landscaping area square footage.
- Increased allowable vehicle intrusion into required front yard landscape areas for medium-high density zones (R-3, R-3-2, R-4, R-4-2 and R-5) while retaining a minimum 5 foot width of continuous landscaped area between the inside of the sidewalk and the parking area.
- Redesign the “Buffering Between Zones and Conflicting Uses – Schedule 23-4” for clarity and to be consistent with the text narrative.
- Change parking lot design standards to meet the recommendations of the UTAC to increase canopy coverage and tree health.
- Increased descriptions of required soil treatment in landscaped areas.
- Clarification of spacing, placement and pruning of street trees.
- Adopting “by reference” the approved Street and Parking Lot Trees List in order to allow changes to allowable species and cultivars without the need for a text amendment. Per the Urban Forester, new cultivars are introduced every year. `The two words “and mental” shall be stricken from the Purpose and Concept Section 23.010 in the second sentence.`

While Article 23 provides the majority of guidance on landscape design standards, several other Development Code Articles also address landscaping standards which required edits to align with the proposed changes to Article 23, and the recommendations made in 2016 by the Urban Tree Advisory Committee.

Major proposed changes to the other three Articles are as follows:

**Article 22, Residential Development:**
- Edit Section 22.104(1)(b) to remove design standards regarding buffers around pedestrian pathways.
- Amends certain standards related to common open space in multi-dwelling developments.
- Other edits to the Article were made for clarity.

**Article 25, Parking and Loading:**
- Clarify replacement of dead parking lot tree standards.
- Increase allowable number of compact parking spaces from 25% to 35%.
- Clarify that lighting shall not be allowed in parking lot islands where trees are located, and shall not be located within 20 feet of a parking lot tree.

**Article 30, Definitions:**
- Add a definition for “Living ground cover”, which was previously referenced as being located in Article 30, but was not listed. The ad hoc committee created the definition and voted to approve it.
- Add a definition for “Lot, Net Width” for use in determining landscaping requirements based on linear frontage.
- Add a definition for “Rocks, cobble and gravel for landscaping” as these are being specified within landscape design standards added to Article 23.
- Add a definition of “Structural Soils”, which will be required in developments when trees do not have enough pervious surface surrounding them to support healthy growth and survival.

**VIII. APPLICABLE CRITERIA:**

*The text of the Development Code may be recommended for amendment and amended provided all of the criteria of Section 4.103 of the Development Code are satisfied.*

**SECTION 4.103:**

**CRITERION 1:** The proposed amendments are consistent with the purpose of the subject sections and articles.

**UAPC Response: Satisfied.** The proposed amendment is consistent with both the purpose and intent of the GP Development Code. Specifically, Section 1.020 states one purpose of the Development Code is to coordinate regulations governing the development and use of land. This proposal enhances and improves coordination between code sections that relate to landscaping. The purposes of the Articles remain intact. The proposed amendments will assist in providing green, safe landscaped areas across all development types.

**CRITERION 2:** The proposed amendments are consistent with other provisions of this code.

**UAPC Response: Satisfied.** The proposed amendments are consistent with other provisions and Articles in the Development Code as they relate to commercial and residential landscaping. The proposed amendment increases development standards and provides developers for varied development options.

**CRITERION 3:** The proposed amendments are consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and most effectively carry out those goals and policies of all alternatives considered.
**UAPC Response: Satisfied.** The proposed changes are consistent with the Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan, specifically Element 4, Section 3 encouraging the reforestation and revegetation of appropriate trees in the city to support water quality; and 7.4, supporting community appearance as a major concern, as beauty is a matter of basic economic significance, with street tree planting and landscaping being utilized to improve the environment.

**CRITERION 4:** The proposed amendment is consistent with the functions, capacities, and performance standards of transportation facilities identified in the Master Transportation Plan.

**UAPC Response: Not Applicable.** The proposed amendment does not affect the functions, capacities, or performance standards of transportation facilities identified in the Master Transportation Plan (MTP).

**IX. RECOMMENDATION:**

The Urban Area Planning Commission **RECOMMENDS APPROVAL** of the request to amend Articles 22, 23, 25 and 30 of the Development Code. The vote was 6-0 with Commissioners Arthur, Heesacker, Collier, Nelson, Aviles, and Scherf voting in favor. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss was absent.

**X. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this 12th day of January, 2022.**

________________________________________________
Eric Heesacker, Chair
I. PROPOSAL:

The application is a request for Site Plan approval for the development of a 120 space RV Park with associated bath, shower, laundry building, and storage structures. The applicant’s Site Plans are attached as Exhibit 3 & 4.

Following a recent water main line extension, no further water main extension will be required, but a sewer main extension is required in Greenfield Road along the subject property frontage.

This application is also associated with a concurrent request to vacate the common property line between tax lots 100 and 101. The Lot Line Removal is being presented to the City Council for approval in accordance with Chapters 2 and 12 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code.

II. AUTHORITY & CRITERIA:

Review procedures are provided by Section 2.050, and Schedules 2-1, and 12-2, of the Grants Pass Development Code (GPDC). In accordance with the Development Code the application will be reviewed as a Type III procedure, which requires a hearing before the Urban Area Planning Commission (UAPC).
The decision pertaining to a Major Site Plan Review must be based on the criteria contained in Section 19.052 of the GPDC, and review of an RV Park shall consider criteria contained in Section 22.532 of the GPDC.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Section 10.050, City of GPDC, provides for an appeal of the Urban Area Planning Commission’s decision to the City Council. An appeal must be filed with the Director within 12 calendar days from the date the written notice of decision was mailed, on a form provided by the Director.

IV. BACKGROUND:

A. Characteristics of the Property:

1. Land Use Designation:
   a. Comprehensive Plan: GC
   b. Zone District: GC
   c. Special Purpose District: Steep Slope, GPID

2. Size: 13.03 ac

3. Frontage: NE Greenfield Road

4. Access: NE Greenfield Road

5. Existing Public Utilities:
   - Water: 12-inch main in NE Greenfield Road, 6-inch stub to site
   - Sewer: 8-inch main bisecting subject site
   - Storm: existing canal

6. Topography: Sloped

7. Natural Hazards: None

8. Natural Resources: Unnamed seasonal stream

9. Overlay: None

10. Existing Land Use:
    a. Subject parcel: Previously developed as large home and orchard
    b. Surrounding:
       - North: R-1-12, Residential development
       - South: Greenfield Road and Interstate 5
       - East: R-1-12, Residential development
       - West: Commercial (GC zone)

B. Overview:

The application is a request for a Site Plan Review approval for a 120 space RV Park with amenities to include:

- Four bathrooms/washrooms totaling 2,280 square feet
- Forty-eight storage units totaling 5,547 square feet
• Swimming Pool & Patio
• Pickle Ball Courts
• Main House to be used as Guest House
• Studio to be used as Rental
• Existing Barn to be used as Rec. Room
• A building to be used as an office/café
• A building to be used as a wine room
• Existing garages to be used for storage
• Existing Gazebos and Pergolas to be maintained
• Demolition of one small existing building

A Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared by Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering and submitted to ODOT and the City Traffic Engineer for review. The study found no adverse impacts to the adjacent intersections of at the access location.

V. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

Section 19.052 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code states that the review body shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the request based upon the following criteria:

Criterion (1): Complies with applicable Base Development Standards of the Zoning District, Special Development Standards, Residential Development Standards, or standards as previously approved under the provisions of an optional development plan or other approved permit.

Staff's Response: Satisfied with conditions. The property is zoned General Commercial, and meets the Base Development Standards for the zoning district. The proposed buildings conform to the requirements of the Commercial Design Standards of Article 20 of the GPDC.

Section 22.532 of the GPDC outlines the standards for an RV Park, the applicant’s proposal addresses these standards and as conditioned will meet the requirements.

1. Each RV space meets the minimum of 625 square feet.
2. As conditioned below, all roadways shall be at least 18 feet in width.
3. RV spaces are proposed to be paved.
4. One tree per space is proposed in the tentative plan, landscaping meeting the requirements is proposed for the perimeter and interior of the park.
5. Water and sewer connections are proposed as required.
6. As conditioned below, each space shall be provided electricity.
7. An acceptable trash enclosure area has been proposed.
8. Parking has been proposed in excess of the required one vehicle space per RV space.

9. The proposed restroom buildings meet the restroom requirements.

10. Laundry facilities are proposed as required.

11. **As conditioned below**, the restroom/laundry buildings shall be lighted at all times of night and day, shall be ventilated, shall be provided with heating facilities which shall maintain a room temperature of no lower than 65 degrees Fahrenheit, shall have a floor of waterproof material, shall have a sanitary ceiling, floor and wall surfaces and shall be provided with adequate floor drains to permit easy cleaning.

12. Proper landscape buffering and fencing have been proposed as outlined in Section 23.034(3) of the GPDC.

13. **As conditioned below**, the park shall be maintained in a neat appearance at all times.

14. Each RV Space is proposed to have a patio of at least 8 feet by 12 feet.

15. No manufactured housing or site built housing shall be permitted on the site, except only one unit for manager of the RV park. The applicant is proposing to maintain the main house and a studio as guest or rental houses. **As a condition of approval**, only one site built unit may be utilized as housing, for managers quarters, on the site.

**Criterion (2):** Complies with applicable elements of the Comprehensive Plan, including: Traffic Plan, Water Plan, Sewer Plan, Storm Drainage Plan, Bicycle Plan, and Park Plan.

**Staff's Response: Satisfied with conditions.** The proposal conforms to the adopted plans either as proposed or as conditioned. **As conditioned below**, the applicant shall be required to pay all SDC's associated with the development. Additionally, the applicant shall agree to engineering plan check, sign a Developer installed agreement, and pay all associated fees, with the Engineering Division.

**Traffic Plan:** The project has an associated Traffic Impact Analysis which has been reviewed by ODOT and the City Traffic Engineer. **As conditioned below** the applicant will need to install half street improvements including curb, gutter and sidewalk along the NE Greenfield frontage. As conditioned, the project is consistent with the Master Transportation Plan.

**Water Plan:** A recent water main extension will allow the subject property to be serviced. The applicant has submitted a preliminary utility plan. **As conditioned below**, a final approved utility plan will need to comply with the following requirements from the City Engineer;

1. Design, construct and test all new water facilities in conformance with the City's Water Standards and Specifications.
2. Locate all service meters in the serviced property’s improved adjacent Right of Way. Service meters will not be allowed in easements. Wherever possible, install all service meters in the sidewalk per GP274. Do not install service closer than 5 feet to a front property corner. Locate meter boxes to avoid driveways and roof drains. Install water service lines in a straight line perpendicular to the waterline from the service meter. Install service line taps to not have less than 2 feet of separation between each other. Do not install a service tap in a main closer than 18” to a joint or fitting.

3. Determine the water service and meter size. The aforementioned determination is not required for single-family residential units, where a 5/8” x 3/4” meter per GP274 each unit shall be standard. Furnish and install meters 3” and above. The City will furnish and install all meters smaller than 3”.

4. Provide backflow prevention measures per City of Grants Pass requirements if onsite irrigation is utilized or if GPID is on site.

5. Properly abandon any wells on site, unless they are to be used for irrigation (See note 4, above).

6. Comply with all requirements found in the Public Works Comments (See Exhibit 5).

Sewer Plan: New development is required to connect to the city sewer. As conditioned below, the applicant shall submit a final utility plan showing compliance with the following requirements of the City Engineer;

1. Avoid installing service laterals in driveways. All service lines shall be located in the serviced property’s adjacent right-of-way and installed in a straight-line perpendicular to the Sewer Main.

2. Connect the new development to public sewer and do not use septic systems unless exempted by Section 28.071 (1).

3. Design, construct and test all new sanitary sewer facilities in conformance with the City’s Sanitary Sewer Standards and Specifications.

4. Install 4-inch or larger service laterals for single dwellings and small single stores or offices, provided the current Plumbing Code does not require the building sewer to be larger than 4-inches. Install 6-inch or larger and at least equal to the size of the building sewer all other service laterals. Do not connect sewer laterals into public manholes.

5. Abandon all un-used sewer laterals in conformance with City Sewer Standards.

6. Provide a mini-tv inspection video of existing laterals planned for use to the Wastewater Collections Division.
7. Comply with all requirements found in the Public Works Comments (See Exhibit 6).

**Storm Drainage Plan:** There is an existing storm drain main line on the subject parcel that lies on the easterly edge of the property. As conditioned below, the applicant shall meet the following requirements as outlined by the City Engineer:

1. Provide detention which limits the storm water run-off to not exceed .65 cfs per acre for the proposed area of development during a 25-year storm event (Reference Master Storm Drainage Facilities and Management Plan – May 1982). As an alternative, provide detention which limits the post development run-off to not exceed the undeveloped (not existing) site conditions run-off for the proposed area of development during a 25-year storm event.

2. Design and construct the development to not alter off-site existing drainage patterns.

3. Collect on-site storm runoff and discharge to City approved downstream drainage facilities.

4. Design, install, and maintain erosion and sediment control measures until disturbed areas are re-established.

5. Comply with all requirements found in the Public Works Comments (See Exhibit 5).

**Park Plan:** Not applicable, the subject property is not listed as park land in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

**Criterion (3):** Complies with all other applicable provisions of this code, including off-street parking, landscaping, buffering & screening, signage, environmental standards, and special purpose district standards.

**Staff’s Response:** Satisfied with conditions.

**Parking:** The applicant’s Site Plan indicates a total of 119 (or 120) RV parking spaces, and 144 (145) vehicle parking spaces 3 of which are ADA parking spaces. The GPDC requires 1 vehicle parking space per RV space. Therefore, the GPDC requires 120 parking spaces for the development. As conditioned below, the applicant shall confirm with the Building Official that the ratio of ADA parking spaces conforms to the requirements of the OSSC.

**Landscaping:** The applicant has submitted an initial landscape plan with the application for Major Site Plan review, the submitted landscape plan meets the landscape standards found in Sections 23.032 and 22.532. As conditioned below the applicant’s detailed landscape plan must be accompanied with a letter by the landscape designer stating the irrigation is adequate for the health of the plants. The landscape plan shall, at a minimum, include the following:

- The required 10 front yard shall have the following per 1000 square feet:
- Three trees at least eight feet in height, and one and one-half inches in caliper measured three feet from the base.
- Five five-gallon and ten one-gallon shrubs or accent plants.
- Remaining area treated with attractive living ground-cover

- Landscaping five feet (5') in depth is required for at least thirty percent (30%) of the face of the restroom / laundry building.

**Buffering and Screening:** The applicant’s Site Plan indicates an area for refuse storage. The location is near the entrance and has been described as a CMU block wall. This meets the requirements found in Section 23.036(1) of the GPDC, which requires trash enclosure screening.

Sections 22.532 and 23.043 require landscape buffering around the perimeter of the RV Park. The RV Park shall be buffered from surrounding use and development by a 5’ setback and landscape strip at all interior side and rear lot lines, and the required 10’ setback and landscape strip at front and exterior lot lines. Side and rear lot lines shall also be screened by a 6’ sight obscuring fence, and the landscape strip shall have as a minimum requirement that provided in Section 23.034 (3), Buffer Strip Landscaping. The proposed site plan complies with the landscape and fencing buffering requirements of both of these sections, with a CMU block wall and a buffering strip in excess of 3 feet separating all surrounding use and development and the front and exterior sides are proposed to have landscaping in excess of the required 10 feet.

**Signage:** No signs are being reviewed under this Site Plan Review, they will be reviewed under a separate application and are not part of this application.

**Criterion (4):** Potential land use conflicts have been mitigated through specific conditions of development as required by this Code.

**Staff’s Response:** **Satisfied.** The property is located in the GC zone, and is bordered on the west by commercial development and the south by NE Greenfield Road and Interstate 5. However, to the north and west the site is bordered by residential development. Proposed 6 foot sight obscuring fencing and a three foot buffer strip with evergreen should help to alleviate any potential conflicts.

**Criterion (5):** Adequate basic urban services are available, or can be made available by the applicant as part of a proposed development, or are scheduled by the City Capital Improvement Plan.

**Staff’s Response:** **Satisfied with conditions.** The site has access to City utilities with available capacity to serve the development. Specifics on the requirements for connection are detailed under criterion 2. As conditioned below, the applicant shall connect to sanitary sewer and have a water meter installed with appropriate backflow protection and pay for all required SDC’s.

**Criterion (6):** Provision of public facilities and services to the site will not cause service delivery shortages to existing development.
Staff’s Response: Satisfied with conditions. As noted in Criterion 5 above, City utility services are available to the property and the proposed development will not affect utility services for any of the adjacent parcels. Standard development requires the applicant to dedicate a 10 foot utility easement to the City along all street frontages. The applicant has requested that they not be required to dedicate the utility easement. As conditioned below, the dedication will be required, unless the applicant can provide evidence to the City Engineer that the easement is not necessary.

Criterion (7): To the extent possible, identified significant resources, such as intermittent and perennial creeks, stands of pine, fir and oak trees, wildlife habitats, historic sites, and prominent land features have been preserved and designed into the project. Alternatives shall be considered and the proposal shall represent the most effective design to preserve these resources.

Staff’s Response: Satisfied with conditions. National Wetlands Inventory mapping of surface waters and wetlands indicates that a seasonal non-fish bearing stream bisects the site. As a condition of approval, the applicant will be required to contact the Oregon Department of State Lands and notify them of their proposed development. The City shall be copied on any DSL response to the notice and will require compliance with any potential requirements of DSL, such as a wetland delineation or any necessary permits related to the development near a potential stream. Any disturbance of a delineated riparian area (within 20 feet of the bank of the seasonal stream) shall be mitigated through the planting of native plant species as recommended by ODF&W. The property has no other significant environmental resources identified that require preservation.

Criterion (8): The characteristics of existing adjacent development have been determined and considered in the development of the site plan. At a minimum, special design consideration shall be given to:

a.) Areas of land use conflicts, such as more restrictive use adjacent or across the street from proposal. Mitigate by orienting business operations away from use, additional setbacks, screening/buffering, landscaping, direct traffic away from use.

b.) Setbacks: Where existing buildings are setback deeper than required by Code, new setbacks to be compatible.

c.) Building Size and Design. Existing surrounding architecture and building size to be considered to insure compatible scale and balance to the area.

d.) Signs. New signs shall not block primary view to existing signs, and shall be sized consistent with Code of existing signs, whichever is less.

e.) Lighting. Exterior lighting shall not impact adjacent development or traveling motorist.

Staff’s Response: Satisfied with conditions. The development will not cause a new land use conflict. The proposed development conforms to all required setbacks, and the buildings meet the requirements of the Commercial Design Standards of Article 20. While the site plan indicates a sign location, any signage will be processed through a separate sign permit. As conditioned below, all lighting indicated shall be down lit and shall glare directly into neighboring residentially developed properties.
Criterion (9): Traffic conflicts and hazards are minimized on-site and off-site, as provided in Article 27.

Staff’s Response: Satisfied with conditions. Access to the development will be provided from the existing driveway NE Greenfield Road and a new secondary driveway off of NE Greenfield Road. As conditioned below, changes or modification to any driveway will require an encroachment permit from the City. It is not expected that this development would create any off-site hazards. A Traffic Impact Analysis has been reviewed by ODOT and the City’s Traffic Engineer.

Criterion (10): If phased development, each phase contains adequate provisions of services, facilities, access, off-street parking and landscaping.

Staff’s Response: Not Applicable. The does not include phased development.

Criterion (11): There are adequate provisions for maintenance of open space and other common areas.

Staff’s Response: Satisfied with conditions. The owner of the property will be bound by the conditions of approval contained in this staff report. As conditioned below, the applicant shall maintain the landscaped areas and open space throughout the year.

Criterion (12): Internal circulation is accommodated for commercial, institutional, and office park uses with walkways and bikeways as provided in Article 27.

Staff’s Response: Satisfied. The submitted tentative plan indicates stripped pedestrian walkways across the parking area to ensure safe and clear pathways for pedestrian ingress and egress.

Criterion (13): If the property contains existing nonconforming use or development to remain, the application and the Review Body’s decision shall also be consistent with the provisions of Article 15, including any additional standards, relief from the Code, or conditions imposed.

Staff’s Response: Satisfied with conditions. The property has unimproved frontage along NE Greenfield Road, the applicant will be required to complete half street improvements to the NE Greenfield Road frontage to include curb, gutter, sidewalk and pavement. No other nonconforming elements have been noted.

VI. RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission Approve the request for the development as submitted with the attached conditions of approval.

Conditions of Approval:
A. The following shall be accomplished within 18 months of the date this report is signed, and prior to issuance of a Development Permit:

1. The applicant shall receive approval for planning application file number 101-00151-21 and the associated lot line removal shall be formally recorded by Josephine County.

2. A revised site plan shall be submitted showing that all roadways are at least 18 feet in width as required by Section 22.532 of the GPDC.

3. Either provide written evidence that all utilities to include; gas, power, cable, water, sewer, storm, etc. can serve neighboring properties adequately without a utility easement to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, or provide draft language and map exhibits for the following easements:
   a. A 10 foot City Utility Easement (CUE) to be dedicated along all street frontages.

4. The applicant shall submit a letter from a landscape designer stating the irrigation is adequate for the health of the plants

5. A detailed Utility Plan indicating the irrigation water service will be fed from the meter serving the parcel.
   a. Show the location of water and sewer laterals serving all development on site.
   b. Indicate that existing landscape irrigation is served by the meter to be installed, and changed from existing supply.
   c. Locate all service meters in the serviced property’s improved adjacent Right of Way. Service meters will not be allowed in easements.
   d. Wherever possible, install all service meters in the sidewalk per GPSD # 203. Do not install service closer than 5 feet to a front property corner. Locate meter boxes to avoid driveways and roof drains.
   e. Install water service lines in a straight-line perpendicular to the waterline from the service meter. Install service line taps to not have less than 2 feet of separation between each other.
   f. Do not install a service tap in a main closer than 18” to a joint or fitting. Additionally, the irrigation service shall be protected by a DC backflow device, which shall be located within ten feet (10’) of the water meter.
   g. RP backflow devise shall be required on all water services as “premises” protection.
   h. DC backflow devices shall be required as “point of use” protection on all water services containing multiple zone irrigation systems.

6. The applicant shall design, construct and test all new sanitary sewer facilities in conformance with the City’s Sanitary Sewer Standards and Specifications.
   a. Install 4-inch or larger service laterals for single dwellings and small single stores or offices, provided the current Plumbing Code does not require the building sewer to be larger than 4-inches.
   b. Install 6-inch or larger and at least equal to the size of the building sewer all other service laterals.
c. Abandon all un-used sewer laterals in conformance with City Sewer Standards.

d. Provide a mini-tv inspection video of existing laterals planned for use to the Wastewater Collections Division.

e. The applicant shall complete and return to the Community Development Department a Sewer Use Survey.

f. Replacement of 398 feet of the 8 inch concrete main (G120-G121).

g. Where the private 8 inch sanitary sewer ties into the existing 8 inch concrete sewer main, use WYE fitting instead of a manhole per sewer standard 203.4.1.

7. The applicant shall provide detention, which limits the storm water run-off to not exceed .65 cfs per acre for the proposed area of development during a 25-year storm event (Reference Master Storm Drainage Facilities and Management Plan – May 1982).

a. As an alternative, provide detention that limits the post development run-off to not exceed the undeveloped (not existing) site conditions run-off for the proposed area of development during a 25-year storm event.

b. If the project site was incorporated into the detention design of a previous project, provide a copy of the storm water calculations.

c. The design and construction of the development shall not alter off-site existing drainage patterns.

d. Collect on-site storm runoff and discharge to City approved downstream drainage facilities.

e. The applicant shall design, install, and maintain erosion and sediment control measures until disturbed areas are re-established.

8. Provide six (6) copies of Civil Engineering plans (and a PDF file) to the City Engineering Division prepared in accordance with Grants Pass Specifications and Standards on 24” x 36” sheets for review and approval including:

a. Obtain an encroachment permit from the Engineering Division for any work in the public right-of-way.

b. A grading plan, if applicable. Note: A grading permit is required prior to any grading on site.

c. An erosion and dust control plan. Note: An NPDES 1200C permit is required prior to construction for areas greater than 1 acre.

d. Show Carnahan Drive improvements to full half street improvements including curb, gutter, and sidewalk in accordance with Article 27 standards.

B. The information provided below is for your information only. The following must be accomplished prior to issuance of a Building Permit:

1. Pay all System Development Charges including, but not limited to, water, sewer, parks, transportation and storm drain (See Exhibit 5).
2. Submit construction documents to the Building Division for their review and approval to determine compliance with all Building, Fire and Life Safety, and the adopted Oregon Structural Specialty Code requirements. Buildings plans shall be consistent with the approved site plan. The applicant shall confirm with the Building Official that the ratio of ADA parking spaces conforms to the requirements of the OSSC.

3. Building must comply with all applicable building and fire codes. The plans must be prepared by an Oregon-licensed design professional.

4. Complete all half street improvements to NE Greenfield Road.

5. If the City Engineer is not satisfied that a utility easement is not necessary than the applicant shall provide a recorded copy of the following easements:
   a. A 10 foot City Utility Easement (CUE) to be dedicated along all street frontages.

C. The following must be accomplished prior to issuance of a Certificate of Completion:

   (Note: The following may not be all inclusive as new issues, fees, or recommendations may be identified during the development of the lot.)

1. Development must occur according to the approved site plan, landscape plan, and construction drawings including the items listed below. The developer must contact the Community Development Department and arrange for a final inspection prior to occupancy to insure compliance.

2. Any alterations or modifications to the existing driveway shall require a City Encroachment permit.

3. Comply with all requirements of the Engineering and Utility Divisions.

   a. All new construction will comply with Article 22 of the GPDC.
   b. Addresses must be visible from the street and identified on the building. Any curb markings must be in conformance with 6.03.050 of the GPMC.

5. Obtain an encroachment permit from the Engineering Division for any work in the public right-of-way.

6. All new power, cable, phone and gas utilities shall be located underground and shall not cross other parcels, unless located within appropriate easements.

7. All driving, parking and maneuvering areas are to be paved with asphalt or concrete.

8. Each RV space shall be provided with electrical service.
9. Areas of trash disposal shall be screened by sight obscuring, solid wood fence or masonry wall 5 to 8 feet (5'-8') high.

10. Installed lighting shall be directional, non-glare, and shall not shine onto adjacent properties or roadways.

11. Install directional arrows or other pavement markings to direct vehicle circulation on site.

12. Install landscaping according to approved plans. Vegetation shall be maintained throughout the year.

13. The applicant will be required to contact the Oregon Department of State Lands and notify them of their proposed development. The City shall be copied on any DSL response to the notice and will require compliance with any potential requirements of DSL, such as a wetland delineation or any necessary permits related to the development near a potential stream.

14. Any disturbance of an identified riparian area (within 20 feet of the bank of the seasonal stream) shall be mitigated through the planting of native plant species as recommended by ODF&W. This mitigation shall include replanting of 1 stem per 64 square feet of encroachment into the riparian area, replanting consisting of approximately 50% native trees and 50% native shrubs, and a commitment to water mitigation planting for 5 years to achieve 80% survival. The mitigation plan shall be submitted to ODF&W for recommendation/review and then submitted to the Planning Division to verify that all necessary mitigation planting has been completed satisfactorily.

15. All existing unutilized private sewer laterals shall be properly abandoned as directed by the utility division. All lateral abandonment shall be field verified by the utility division or the City of Grants Pass Plumbing Inspector.

16. A DC backflow assembly shall be required a “premises” protection on any new or existing separate irrigation service serving the proposed development. All “premises” backflow prevention assemblies shall be located within 10 foot behind each public water meter.

17. Water meters shall only be located within the public right of way.

18. If private fire sprinkler systems are utilized, each fire sprinkler system shall be protected with a DC backflow device with a detector meter. If anti-freeze agents are utilized within the private sprinkler system, an RP backflow device shall be required in place of the DC backflow assembly.

19. All “on-site” public fire lines and fire hydrants, shall be located within a 20 foot unobstructed and drivable public water easement.

20. All utilities shall be placed underground.

21. Pay all inspection fees incurred by the Engineering and Utility Divisions, as well as all City bills due.
22. A sign permit is required prior to erection of any signs. Location of a sign within the CUE must be in compliance with Section 9.21.130 of the Municipal Code.

23. The restroom/laundry buildings shall be lighted at all times of night and day, shall be ventilated, shall be provided with heating facilities which shall maintain a room temperature of no lower than 65 degrees Fahrenheit, shall have a floor waterproof material, shall have a sanitary ceiling, floor and wall surfaces and shall be provided with adequate floor drains to permit easy cleaning.

24. Only one site built unit may be utilized as managers quarters on the site. No other site built housing units may be approved as part of an RV park in accordance with Section 22.532.

25. The park shall be maintained in a neat appearance at all times. There shall be no outdoor storage of materials or supplies except articles commonly used in travel, such as lawn chairs, table, hibachi and travel chest. Indoor storage shall be confined to those buildings identified for storage, built according to the Uniform Building Code.

VII. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. Approve the request
   1. As submitted.
   2. With the conditions stated in the staff report.
   3. With amended conditions (list):

B. Deny the request for the following reasons (list):

C. Postponement: Continue item
   1. Indefinitely
   2. To a time certain.

NOTE: State law requires that a decision be made on the application within 120 days of when the application was deemed complete.

VIII. INDEX TO EXHIBITS:

1. Location Map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Applicant's Tentative Plan
4. Applicant's TIA Summary
5. Public Works Comments
6. Public Safety Comments
7. City Traffic Engineer Comments
8. ODOT Comments
9. GPID Comments
10. ODF&W Comments
11. City Urban Forester Comments
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Major Site Plan Application Submittal

Attached is the major site plan application submittal for the Greenfield RV Park project located at 420 NE Greenfield Road. Located at a prominent location at the north entry to Grants Pass, this tourist destination will create a 119-space recreational vehicle (RV) park with supporting bathrooms, washrooms and storage structures for its patrons. An additional RV space will likely be added during final design for a total of 120 spaces. All existing structures, with exception of one storage shed, will be retained and repurposed for the new use.

The project was reviewed under City pre-application number 001-00373-21 and the proposed improvements reflect the comments/discussion from City Staff. In addition, a traffic study was completed for the project and submitted to the City for review/approval ahead of the formal submittal.

A separate Property Line Vacation application is also being submitted under a concurrent review to remove the common property line between the two development lots.

Existing Conditions

The existing site contains a single-family home and 14 different outbuildings/accessory structures of various shapes and sizes. It is currently used as a private “estate” with most improvements located within tax lot 100. The remainder of the property (tax lot 101) was previously used as the owner’s private apple orchard. The existing buildings are connected to a well and septic system which will be abandoned for the proposed uses. One of the existing wells may be maintained for irrigation purposes.

The property abuts commercial uses to the west, residential development to the north/east, and Interstate-5 to the south. The grade is hilly and slopes from the northeast to southwest corner of the property. A Grants Pass Irrigation District canal meanders its way through the southwest portion of the lot collecting most of the surface runoff.

The road frontage is improved with two paved travel lanes to County standards. A recently installed public water main and fire hydrants are located within the north shoulder. Various drainage structures convey runoff under the road and adjacent freeway. A public sanitary sewer main bisects the western portion of the property, serving the residential area to the north. There is currently no public sewer in Greenfield Road.

Proposed Conditions

The existing estate will be transformed into a destination resort with direct visibility to the adjacent Interstate. As shown on the attached site plan (see Exhibit “B”) the project will be completed in a single development phase and consist of the following amenities:

- (120) Recreational Vehicle spaces (119 spaces currently shown)
- (4) Bathrooms/Washrooms totaling 2,280 SF
- (48) Storage Units totaling 5,547 SF
- (N) Swimming Pool & Patio Area
- (N) Pickle Ball Courts
- (E) House to be used as Guest House
- (E) Studio to be used as Rental
- (E) Barn to be used as Recreational Room
- (E) Building to be used as Office & Café
- (E) Building to be used as Wine Room
- Maintain (E) Garages for Storage
- Maintain (E) Gazebos & Pergolas for continued use

All of the existing buildings except for one storage structure will be reused will be brought into compliance with public use/ADA codes which includes new walkways, adjacent ADA parking, and ramps (see Exhibit "E"). The storage buildings will be used by park patrons for temporary storage of their bicycles, kayaks, motorcycles, etc.

The development will be constructed along the hillside, creating views for most of the RV spaces. No major cuts/fills are anticipated based on the proposal and existing grades, but some fill will be required along the road frontage. Access to the site will utilize the existing approach locations. The main entry/exit will be widened to accommodate the RV use. The secondary driveway will be used as an exit for the handicap parking that will be constructed adjacent to the existing buildings.

Half street frontage improvements to local street standards will be constructed along Greenfield Road. This will include new curb, gutter, sidewalk, and planter strips. The existing street will be widened to a 14’ section (measured from striped centerline), utilizing the existing pavement.

Utility Plan

Storm drainage from the proposed improvements will be collected and detainted in a new storm system that discharges to the existing storm system in Greenfield Road. This includes the conveyance of existing off-site flows to accommodate existing drainage patterns. The open irrigation canal that currently collects the majority of the stormwater (discharging to an on-site winter spill), will be piped across the site.

Per the City’s Wastewater Master Plan, a sewer main extension is required in Greenfield Road to serve future development to the east. On-site sewer flows will utilize the existing sewer main that runs through the property, including a connection to the existing structures currently on a septic system.

A new master water service will connect to the existing main and be distributed throughout the development to serve all proposed uses. The two existing hydrants along the property frontage will be used for fire protection.

On-site lighting will be installed throughout the park for pedestrian safety. This lighting will be shielded to prevent glare onto adjacent properties and the freeway. It will also be dimmable to reduce the amount of light pollution in the evening hours.
Traffic

A formal Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared by Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering on July 30, 2021 and submitted to the City and ODOT for review and approval (see Exhibit "F"). The study found there were no adverse impacts to the adjacent intersections or at the access location. Based on the results of the study, the RV Park will generate approximately 33 PM peak hour trips and 330 daily trips.

Landscaping

Landscaping will be provided around the parking areas, RV spaces and surrounding property lines. Street trees, bushes, and groundcover will be installed in these areas to meet development code and State RV Park requirements. A solid 6' fence will be constructed or maintained along all interior property lines for buffering. Existing vegetation will be retained adjacent to the existing buildings to the full extent possible. A conceptual landscape plan is included with the application showing the general layout (see Exhibit "D"). A formal landscape/irrigation plan will be prepared for review prior to issuance of a development permit for the RV park.

Site Plan Criteria:

Below we have listed the applicable Development Code criteria for a Major Site Plan application and formal responses to each item:

1. Complies with applicable development standards: Base Standards of Zoning District, Special Development Standards, Residential Development Standards, or standards as previously approved under the provisions of an optional development plan or other approved permit.
   
   Response: The proposed improvements are allowed in this zone and will comply with all applicable State and local development standards.

   
   Response: The proposed improvements will comply with the Comprehensive Plan elements.

   Per the attached Traffic Impact Analysis, traffic impacts will be minimal due to the low impact of the proposed use and it being conveniently located adjacent to the I-5 Exit 58 interchange.

   Storm drainage will be collected in an underground storm system, detained to City standards, and discharge into the existing storm system in Greenfield Road (irrigation canal winter spill). A water main was recently constructed across the property frontage and a new sewer main will be constructed on the south side of Greenfield Road per master plan requirements.
(3) Complies with all other applicable provisions of this Code, including off-street parking, landscaping, buffering and screening, signage, environmental standards, and Special Purpose District standards.

Response: The new RV park will include adequate parking including one vehicle space per RV stall and additional overflow parking area near the office. Landscaping and perimeter buffering will be installed throughout the development, mitigating impacts to adjacent property owners.

(4) Potential land use conflicts have been mitigated through specific conditions of development.

Response: The project will provide a landscape/fenced buffer along all interior property lines. This will mitigate impacts to the adjacent residential and commercial properties. The slope of the site will also provide additional mitigation by placing the entire park below the neighboring residential yards.

(5) Adequate basic urban services are available or can be made available by the applicant as part of a proposed development, or are scheduled by the City Capital Improvement Plan.

Response: Adequate urban services are currently present in front of or on-site. New service connections will be made to serve the development. In addition, a new sewer main will be extended across the Greenfield Road frontage for future use by residential development to the east. Since this line is not required for the current development, the applicant is hoping to offset some of the installation cost through sewer system development charge offsets.

(6) Provision of public facilities and services to the site will not cause service delivery shortages to existing development.

Response: The proposed improvements will only require normal public service demands and will not cause shortages on the existing public systems.

(7) To the extent possible, identified significant resources, such as intermittent and perennial creeks, stands of pine, fir and oak trees, wildlife habitats, historic sites, and prominent land features have been preserved and designed into the project. Alternatives shall be considered and the proposal shall represent the most effective design to preserve these resources.

Response: No existing significant resources or vegetation is currently present at the site. Most of the existing vegetation around the structures at the southeast corner of the development will be maintained. The existing apple orchard will be mostly removed but replaced with a significant amount of tree cover throughout the park.

(8) The characteristics of existing adjacent development have been determined and considered in the development of the site plan. At a minimum, special design consideration shall be given to:
a. Areas of land use conflicts, such as more restrictive use adjacent or across street from proposal. Mitigate by orienting business operations away from use, additional setbacks, screening/buffering, landscaping, direct traffic away from use.

b. Setbacks. Where existing buildings are setback deeper than required by Code, new setbacks to be compatible.

c. Transitions between existing development and new development. New development should be consistent with the purpose statement of the base zone but also recognize compatibility with existing, adjacent development.

d. Signs. New signs shall not block primary view to existing signs, and shall be sized consistent with Code or existing signs, whichever is less.

e. Lighting. Exterior lighting shall not impact adjacent development or traveling motorist.

Response: The proposed development will blend well with the surrounding development patterns. The site is surrounded by a combination of residential and commercial uses. Proper screening will be provided through the installation of new fences and vegetative buffers along all interior property lines. In addition, the site slopes downward/away from the adjacent properties providing additional buffering.

On-site lighting will be installed throughout the park for pedestrian safety. This lighting will be shielded to prevent glare onto adjacent properties and the freeway. It will also be dimmable to reduce the amount of light pollution in the evening hours.

(9) Traffic conflicts and hazards are minimized on-site and off-site, as provided in Article 27.

Response: Based on the approved traffic impact analysis, no significant transportation impacts are expected from the proposed development.

(10) If phased development, each phase contains adequate provisions of services, facilities, access, off-street parking, and landscaping.

Response: The project will be completed in a single development phase.

(11) There are adequate provisions for maintenance of open space and other common areas.

Response: The commercial landscaping that will be installed throughout the park, including all common areas, will be maintained by a professional landscape company.

(12) Internal circulation is accommodated for commercial, institutional and office park uses with walkways and bikeways as provided in Article 27.

Response: Internal pedestrian walkways will be provided to connect the public roadway improvements to the common area buildings. In addition, there are an abundance of low volume interior drive-isles that will be utilized by the park patrons.
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as shared walkways. A trail is also included at the northwest corner of the
development to transition between the upper spaces and the storage buildings below.

(13) If the property contains existing nonconforming use or development to remain, the
application and the Review Body’s decision shall also be consistent with the provisions
of Article 15, including any additional standards, relief from the Code, or conditions
imposed.

Response: The site currently has non-conforming building encroachments along the
east property line into a 20’ strip of land owned by Josephine County. This was
originally dedicated in 1913 for roadway purposes, but it no longer needed due to
surrounding development patterns. Per discussions with Josephine County Public
works, they are agreeable to its vacation and we will process this under a separate
application with Josephine County.

Summary

Overall, the redevelopment of this area into a premier RV destination resort at a prominent
entry point to the City of Grants Pass will vastly improve the property, bring additional tourism
to our area and blend well with surrounding development patterns. We look forward to your
feedback and working with you through the planning and construction process.
Greenfield RV Resort Development

Traffic Impact Analysis

July 30, 2021

Prepared By:

Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering, LLC
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VI. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions

The findings of the traffic impact analysis conclude that the proposed Greenfield RV Resort development can be approved on the transportation system without creating adverse impacts. A summary of results is provided below.

1. Study area intersections and site driveways are shown to operate within performance measures under existing and design year no-build and build conditions during the p.m. peak hour.

2. 95th percentile queue lengths are shown to stay within available link distances at study area intersections and site driveways under all analysis scenarios during the p.m. peak hour.

3. Crash history was evaluated for the most recent five-year period. There were two reported collisions at the intersection of Scoville Road / I-5 Exit 58 northbound off ramp. Both resulted in minor injury and were single car collisions with fixed objects. Fatigue and physical illness were the reported causes. There were no reported collisions at Scoville Road / Greenfield Road or at either site driveway. No safety concerns were identified within the study area.

4. Turn lane criterion was evaluated on Greenfield Road at site driveways. Criterion was not shown to be met for left or right turn lanes at either location.

5. Sight distance was measured at site driveways on Greenfield Road. Minimum sight distance is shown to be met to the northwest at both locations but is not met to the southeast due to a horizontal curve. This is not concluded to create a safety concern based on low traffic volumes and no existing crash history. Sight distance will likely increase with site improvements.

This analysis was undertaken to address issues of compliance with the City of Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan, pursuant to the Grants Pass Development Code Section 27.121(2). Streets that serve the subject property will accommodate projected peak hour traffic volumes without significantly affecting any existing or planned transportation facility.
Public Works Staff Report

To: Planning Division, City of Grants Pass                        Date: December 14, 2021

From: Matthew Scott, Thornton Engineering

Project Name: Greenfield RV Park Major Site Plan Review
Address: 420 NE Greenfield Road
Map and Tax Lot: 36-05-05-CD, Taxlots 100 and 101
File: 201-00410-21

This Staff Report presents the comments generated during the review of the subject application on behalf of the City of Grants Pass Public Works Department. The objective of the review is to assist the City and the Applicant in determining requirements for public works improvements and other pertinent requirements as specified in the Grants Pass Development Code, applicable master plan documents, Standard Specifications, and current policy. The following comments are composed as either recommended conditions of approval directed to the Approving Authority and Applicant, or as an emphasis of select City policies and standards directed to the Applicant’s Engineer. Not all pertinent Codes and Standards are listed herein:

A. Prior to Issuance of a Development Permit:
The Applicant shall submit plans, maps and other required documents, for review and approval by the Public Works Department, which specify the design and construction of the public and private improvements in compliance with the following conditions and comments:

1. General:
   a. Submit a ‘Developer Installed Improvements’ application, including all required submittals and the appropriate fees specified therein. Refer to the application form for the submittal requirements. A partial list of the submittal requirements includes the following:
      i. A grading plan which includes all proposed earthwork and creation of building pads.
      ii. A detailed drainage and detention plan – if required.
      iii. A utility plan.
      iv. An erosion and sediment control plan.
      v. A digital file (PDF format) of the complete set of approved plans.
      vi. A CAD file of the complete set of the approved plans for the proposed public improvements.
   b. Submit a ‘Grading/Fill Permit’ application, if applicable, including all required submittals and the appropriate fees. Refer to the application form for the submittal requirements.
   c. Submit an ‘Encroachment Permit’ application, if applicable, including all required submittals and the appropriate fees. Refer to the application form for the submittal requirements.
   d. Provide written acknowledgement that the Applicant will retain the Engineer-of-Record (Engineer), to make visits to the Site at intervals appropriate to the various stages of construction to observe as an experienced and qualified design professional the progress that has been made and the quality of the various aspects of the executed work. Based on information obtained during such visits and observations, the
Engineer, will determine, in general, if the work is proceeding in accordance with the approved plans and specifications. The Engineer will notify the contractor and the City immediately if the work is not in accordance with the approved plans and specifications. The Engineer will provide the City with copies of each Site Visit Report within seven (7) days of the visit. The Applicant shall notify the City if an alternate professional engineer will provide the above mentioned services.

2. Streets:
   a. NE Greenfield Road. Classification – Local Collector Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required half street right-of-way equals 30 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 17 foot half street width, curb/gutter, driveway approach, 7.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.

3. Storm Drainage:
   a. Project specific requirements: Provide development of the storm drain facilities along the entire street frontage.
   b. All new, and substantially reconstructed, developments shall limit the storm water run-off from the development site to not exceed .65 cfs per acre during a 25-year storm event (Reference Master Storm Drainage Facilities and Management Plan – May 1982). The Applicant’s Engineer shall submit a storm water report which demonstrates how the proposed development satisfies this condition. Partially redeveloped sites shall apply the above condition to new impervious areas only, if the City Engineer determines that applying this condition to the entire site is not feasible.
   c. Design the development to not alter off-site existing drainage patterns.
   d. Design for the collection of on-site storm runoff and discharge to City approved downstream drainage facilities. Provide a storm drain extension from downstream facilities to the project.
   e. Design erosion and sediment control measures.

4. Sanitary Sewers:
   a. Project specific requirements:
      i. The wastewater collection Master Plan Phase III requires a replacement of 398 feet of the 8" concrete main (reach G120-G121) for system improvements.
      ii. No permanent structure may be permitted within the sanitary sewer easement area or obstruction that would impede access/maintenance within the sanitary sewer easement.
      iii. Protect all private sewer cleanouts located in paved driveways with traffic rated frame and threaded/sealed lid.
      iv. Where the private 8" sanitary sewer ties into the existing 8" concrete sewer main, use WYE fitting instead of a manhole per sewer standard 203.4.1.
   b. Design a minimum of one service lateral for each lot. Avoid installing service laterals in driveways. All service lines shall be located in the serviced property’s adjacent right-of-way and installed in a straight-line perpendicular to the Sewer Main.
   c. Connect the new development to public sewer and do not use septic systems unless exempted by section 28.071 (1).
d. Design all new sanitary sewer facilities in conformance with the City’s Sanitary Sewer Standards and Specifications.

e. Design 4-inch or larger service laterals for single dwellings and small single stores or offices, provided the current Plumbing Code does not require the building sewer to be larger than 4-inches. Install 6-inch or larger, and at least equal to the size of the building sewer, all other service laterals.

5. Water System:

a. Design all new water facilities in conformance with the City’s Water Standards and Specifications.

b. Design all service meters in the serviced property’s improved adjacent Right of Way. Service meters will not be allowed in easements. Wherever possible, install all service meters in the sidewalk per GP274. Do not install service closer than 5 feet to a front property corner. Locate meter boxes to avoid driveways and roof drains. Install water service lines in a straight line perpendicular to the waterline from the service meter. Install service line taps to not have less than 2 feet of separation between each other. Do not install a service tap in a main closer than 18” to a joint or fitting.

c. Determine the water service and meter size. The aforementioned determination is not required for single-family residential units, where a 5/8" x 3/4" meter per GP274 each unit shall be standard. Furnish and install meters 3” and above. The City will furnish and install all meters smaller than 3”.

B. Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit:

The Applicant shall substantially complete all construction items specified in A above.

C. Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Completion:

The Applicant shall substantially complete all construction items specified in A above, and perform the following:

1. General:

a. Pay all outstanding fees, including engineering inspection fees.

b. The Applicant shall retain the Engineer to prepare and submit ‘Record Construction Drawings’ prepared by the Engineer for all public improvements, and which includes a statement on the drawings as to the source(s) of information, surveying, and testing, including the dates of the site visits, the Engineer relied upon to complete the ‘Record Drawings.

2. Streets:

Sweep all adjacent streets regularly during construction.

3. Storm Drainage:

Maintain erosion and sediment control measures until disturbed areas are re-established.

4. Sanitary Sewers:

a. Test all new sewer facilities in conformance with the City’s Water Standards and Specifications.

b. Abandon all un-used sewer laterals in conformance with City Sewer Standards.

c. Provide a mini-tv inspection video of existing laterals planned for use to the Wastewater Collections Division.

5. Water System:
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a. Test all new water facilities in conformance with the City’s Water Standards and Specifications.
b. Provide backflow prevention measures per City of Grants Pass requirements if onsite irrigation is utilized or if GPID is on site.
c. Properly abandon any wells on site, unless they are to be used for irrigation.

6. Public Utilities:
   a. Place underground all utility facilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines and other wires, street lighting and communication and cable television services.
   b. If none exists, dedicate a City utility easement (C.U.E.) across the frontages of the development in conformance with the requirements of the public utility companies.
Site Plan Review # 6

Date of Review: December 14, 2021
Permit Number: 201-00410-21
Map/Tax Lot: 36-05-05-CD Tax Lots 100 & 101
Address of Project: 420 NE Greenfield Rd.
Planner: Ryan Nolan

Comments:

Submit for Change of Use through Building Official (CDD) [ Item # 7 Guest House to be used as RV Park Office & Café. Building used as wine Room]

Submitted By: Michael Meyer, Fire Inspector
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August 11, 2021

Mr. Jason Maki  
City of Grants Pass  
101 NW A Street  
Grants Pass, OR 97526

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS – GREENFIELD ROAD RV RESORT

Dear Jason:

In response to your request, I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) submitted in support of the proposed Greenfield Road RV Resort. The TIA was prepared under the direction of Kim Parducci, PE of Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering. The TIA is dated July 30, 2021.

The proposed development is in the north side of Greenfield Road east of Scoville Road in the north part of the city. The development is proposed to have 123 spaces for recreational vehicles.

Overall

I find the TIA addresses the city’s requirements. The TIA provides an adequate basis to assess the impacts of the proposed development.

Comments

1. **Study Area.** The city code requires analysis of intersections where the impact of the proposal causes an increase of 25 or more trips during either the AM or PM peak hour. Two nearby intersections and the site access points were analyzed to assess the impact of the proposed development.

The TIA provides an analysis during the PM peak hour of the following intersections:

- Scoville Road/NE Scoville (I-5 Northbound Ramp)
- Greenville Road/Scoville Road
- Greenville Road/main (west) driveway
- Greenville Road/secondary (east) driveway
The development was not analyzed for the AM peak hour because it develops fewer than 25 AM peak hour trips. The analysis area is appropriate and covers the key intersections impacted by the proposed development.

2. **Traffic Counts.** The traffic counts were conducted in May 2021. The engineer adjusted the May counts to account for seasonal variations using methodology consistent with Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) procedures. The traffic counts and adjustments appear reasonable.

3. **Trip Generation.** The engineer estimated trip generation for the RV park using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation Manual*. The engineer used the values for campground/RV park, ITE land use code 416. The engineer calculated the RV park will generate 23 AM peak hour trips, 33 PM peak hour trips, and 330 weekday trips. The trip generation estimates appear reasonable.

4. **Trip Distribution.** The TIA presents information on trip distribution. Since Greenfield Road is a dead-end road, 100 percent of traffic goes to and from the west to Scoville Road. The trip distribution seems reasonable.

5. **Traffic Growth.** The TIA accounts for traffic growth using ODOT's Grants Pass transportation model. The engineer assumed an annual growth rate of 1.5 to 2.45 percent for two years until the project is completed in 2023. The 2023 background volumes used in the analysis of future conditions appear reasonable.

6. **Analysis.** Traffic volumes were calculated for the intersections identified in #1, above. The analysis was conducted for existing 2021 volumes, 2023 background conditions, and 2023 conditions with the development.

Intersection level of service (LOS), delay calculations, and the volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c) were provided to assess operations relative to the city’s intersection LOS standard and ODOT’s v/c standard.

All study area intersections easily meet the applicable performance standards under the existing, 2023 background, and 2023 build conditions. The poorest performance for any movement at any intersection was calculated to operate at Level of Service (LOS) B, which meets the city’s standard. The poorest v/c was calculated to be 0.40, which meets ODOT’s 0.85 standard.
The TIA also provides an analysis of queuing at the study area intersections. Minimal changes are predicted with the development. Queue storage capacity is adequate at all locations.

The engineer shows that traffic operations at the study area intersections will meet operational standards during the PM peak hour and concludes that no off-site mitigation is required for this development proposal. I concur with this conclusion.

7. **Crash Information.** The TIA provides information on crashes in the vicinity of the site for years 2014 through 2019. During this five-year period, two crashes were reported at the intersection of Scoville/Northbound I-5 ramp. Both were single-vehicle, fixed-object crashes. The crash rate is low and is less than the critical crash rate for similar intersections.

The engineer concludes no further investigation is necessary. I concur. There is no reason to believe that the proposed development will disproportionately affect safety in the study area.

8. **Site Plan and Access.** Two driveways are proposed to provide access to Greenfield Road. The main (west) driveway is located near the center of the property; the auxiliary (east) driveway is located near the parcel’s east boundary. The site plan and access appear reasonable.

9. **Sight Distance.** The engineer assessed sight distance on Greenfield Road where the site driveways are proposed. Sight distance is restricted by horizontal curves to the east and to the west. For the main (westerly) access, the engineer indicates sight distance of approximately 495 feet to the northwest and 335 feet to the southeast. For the auxiliary (east) driveway, the engineer reports sight distance of approximately 565 feet to the northwest and 345 feet to the southeast. Sight distance to the southeast is less than desired for the statutory speed limit of 55 mph that is applicable to Greenfield Road. The engineer points out that traffic volumes are low; that travel speeds are likely to be less than 55 mph; and that there is no crash history. The engineer opines that it is not considered to be a safety concern due to these factors. She also notes that sight distance may be improved by development of the site.

10. **Turn Lanes.** The engineer evaluated the main site driveway for a left-turn lane and concluded that warrants for installation of a turn lane were not met. I concur.

11. **Conclusions and Recommendations.** The engineer concludes that the proposal does not cause intersection operations to deteriorate below adopted performance standards at any of the study area intersections. Adequate queue storage is available.
Mr. Jason Maki  
August 11, 2021  
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at all locations. Sight distance is adequate for the proposed driveways. The engineer concludes that no mitigation is required to address traffic operations or safety issues.

Conclusion and Recommendations

I find that the TIA addresses city requirements for analysis of the impacts of the proposed development. The applicant’s traffic engineer uses appropriate methods and accurately describes her analysis of traffic operations. I concur with the applicant’s engineer that no mitigation is required for operational or safety issues. I concur with the engineer’s conclusion that traffic operations at study area intersections meet standards with the development; storage for queuing is adequate; sight distance is adequate.

I recommend that the applicant seek to improve sight distance when developing the site frontage through grading, vegetative removal, and vegetative trimming. The applicant should take care to locate signs, gates and other features and undertake periodic maintenance of vegetation to avoid adversely affecting sight distance, especially to the southeast.

If you have any questions or need any further information concerning this review, please contact me at replinger-associates@comcast.net or at 503-719-3383.

Sincerely,

John Replinger, PE  
Principal

Grants Pass2021\Greenfield\RVTIA081121
Hi Ryan,

I was at the staff meeting on the 14th and passed along comments verbally. Please find a quick summary below:

I. ODOT is satisfied with the TIA provided in August 2021.
II. The site is above grade from an ODOT managed roadway facility. ODOT will need to review and approve drainage plans to ensure the proposal will not adversely affect state facilities. The applicant should reference the ODOT Hydraulics Manual, Chapter 4 Appendix C for standards and criteria. [https://www.oregon.gov/odot/GeoEnvironmental/Pages/Hydraulics-Manual.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/odot/GeoEnvironmental/Pages/Hydraulics-Manual.aspx)
III. The applicant will need to provide detailed plans showing any signage visible from the Interstate for review and approval by ODOT.

Best regards,
Micah

Micah Horowitz, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
ODOT Region 3 | Southwest Oregon
p: 541.774.6331 | c: 541.603.8431
e: micah.horowitz@odot.oregon.gov

Don Miller
GPID District Manager
541-476-2582
Good Morning Carolyn & Ryan,

With regards to the Greenfield RV Park at 420 Greenfield Rd (planning application #6), ODFW would like to recommend that no development or vegetation removal occur within the 20ft riparian setback. The proposed site plan appears to have several RV spaces within the regulated riparian setback. If the City chooses to approve the plan as presented, ODFW recommends that mitigation planting be a condition of approval.

Mitigation planting recommendations are:
- Replant 1 stem per 64 square feet of encroachment into the riparian
- Replanting consist of approximately 50% native trees and 50% native shrubs
- Commitment to water mitigation planting for 5 years to achieve 80% survival

Thank you for your consideration in protecting Oregon’s fish, wildlife, and their habitat.

Frank Drake  
Asst. Rogue District Fish Biologist  
Oregon Dept of Fish & Wildlife  
1495 E Gregory Rd  
Central Point, OR 97502  
541-857-2412  
541-975-4695 (cell)
**Tree Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.532(4)</td>
<td>The part of the space which is not occupied by the recreational vehicle, not intended as an access way to the recreational vehicle or part of an outdoor patio, shall be landscaped with turf, shrubs or other living ground cover. One large variety deciduous shade tree shall be provided per RV space, so located to provide mid-day and afternoon shade in summer. The tree shall be a minimum of one inch (1&quot;) in caliper and eight feet (8') in height upon planting.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>What species will be used? Submitted plan states &quot;201 – Typical.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.032(2)(a)</td>
<td>Required front and exterior yards shall be landscaped, and building setbacks shall be maintained, according to the Type B Concept Sketch and Schedule 23-2. Minimum landscape requirements per 1000 square feet of a required front or exterior yard, or any portion thereof, shall be the following: Three trees at least eight feet in height, and one and one-half inches in caliper measured three feet from the base. Select from street tree list, Section 23.076, and plant within 10 feet of the right-of-way as per Type B Concept Sketch. Trees may be offset to permit signs in the Landscape Yard. Trees shall be kept trimmed of branches up to 14' from base five years following planting. Any sign on the property shall be in compliance with the sign requirements for the use in residential zones as established in Title 9, Chapter 9.21, Sign Standards, of the City of Grants Pass Municipal Code.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>What species will be used? Submitted plan states &quot;201 – Typical.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041</td>
<td><strong>Landscape Plan</strong></td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Ensure that the Landscape Plan includes all requirements from 23.041, 23.052(2), 23.052(3)(b), and 23.052(3)(c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(1)</td>
<td>Identification and location of all existing trees over 8&quot; in diameter as measured 3' from ground level, with notations indicating whether they are to be removed or utilized in the development. Clusters of trees may be noted in approximate locations.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Identification of existing trees not provided. Existing and proposed tree symbology appears to be the same:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(2)</td>
<td>Existing and finished grades, with sections showing cut and fill for areas to be excavated below soils containing organic matter.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Existing 2’ surface contours are shown on the Utility Plan. Are finished grades shown anywhere? Sections are not provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(3)</td>
<td>Indication of general drainage flow with arrows, and location of all surface drains and subsurface drain ways.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(4)</td>
<td>Location of all required yards, screening and buffering areas, easements, and public rights-of-way, building foundations or pads, parking areas, walkways and other impervious surfaces, and all access ways and private streets.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(5)</td>
<td>A schedule showing the % of impervious surface, landscaped area, and recreation open space, as a % of usable site area.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Square footage of impervious surface is provided, but other information from this section is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(6)</td>
<td>Plant material, including identity and spacing, using both symbol and schedule if necessary.</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Identity of new tree species missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(7)</td>
<td>Typical sections at building mass, planters in paved areas, landscape strips 10' in width or less, and landscaped berms, showing excavation, topsoil fill,</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Appropriate details and specifications can be sourced online from the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A300 Part 6 (Planting and Transplanting) can also be referenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finished grade, plant materials and irrigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>For retained trees, this section and its requirements must be addressed in the Landscape Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The applicant shall provide methods for the protection of existing plant material to remain during the construction process. The plants to be saved shall be shown on the Landscape Plan or the Concept Plan and the method of protection shall be noted on the landscape plans. Example: Areas not to be disturbed can be temporarily fenced, as in snow fencing which can be placed around individual trees.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>For retained trees, this section and its requirements must be addressed in the Landscape Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(2)(a)</td>
<td>The location and variety of replacement trees in case of the subsequent death of existing trees.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>For retained trees, this section and its requirements must be addressed in the Landscape Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(2)(b)</td>
<td>Existing trees shall not have construction occur within the drip line, where possible. Trees to be saved shall be kept free from trunk abrasion or soil compaction during construction. The landscape plan shall provide for the location and variety of replacement trees in case of the subsequent death of existing trees.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>For retained trees, this section and its requirements must be addressed in the Landscape Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(3)(a)</td>
<td>Areas for required landscaping shall not be used as a waste dump or fill during the construction process. All waste material shall be removed from such areas prior to the application of topsoil.</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>Ensure that all persons involved in construction are aware of this requirement. Violation of this requirement may lead to the decline of plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(3)(b)</td>
<td>Soils devoid of organic materials shall not be utilized as topsoil for required landscape areas. Where such areas have been excavated to soil levels containing no organic material, the landscape plan shall provide for further non-organic soils removal and replacement with topsoil.</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(3)(c)</td>
<td>The landscape plan shall provide specifications for topsoil, including depth, organic matter requirements, limits to sand, clay, and gravel and other requirements designed to ensure the health and vitality of required landscaping.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Ensure that the topsoil specifications (e.g. limits to sand, clay, gravel, pH) are appropriate for required landscaping. These limits must be provided in the Landscape Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042</td>
<td>Irrigation Plan</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Ensure that the Irrigation Plan includes all requirements from 23.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042(1)</td>
<td>Location of connection to the public water main and location of stub-outs to separate landscape areas.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Plan notes that irrigation will connect to well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042(2)</td>
<td>Identification of the type of irrigation system to be used, the location of irrigation facilities, and coverage to be achieved by the irrigation system.</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Submitted plan does not explain the coverage to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042(3)</td>
<td>An accompanying letter from the designer of the landscape plan stating that the design of the proposed irrigation system can provide irrigation sufficient for the health and survival of the tree and plant species specified in the landscape plan.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>See 23.042(2) for information relevant to this letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.051(1)</td>
<td>Except single family residences and duplexes, all development shall provide an automatic underground irrigation system.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Irrigation plan does not explicitly state this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(1)</td>
<td>All landscaping materials and irrigation shall be installed according to approved plans.</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.071</td>
<td><strong>Street Trees.</strong> All development fronting on public or private streets approved following the adoption date of this Code shall be required to plant street trees in accordance with the following standards. Street trees to be planted shall be chosen from the recommended list of street trees found in Section 23.076 below. Approval for the planting of alternate species may be given by the Director.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.072</td>
<td>Location for Street Trees. Street trees shall be located outside of street right-of-way except in cases where there is a designated planting strip in the right-of-way, and as specified in requirements and restrictions in Section 23.030 and Section 27.313.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.073</td>
<td>Spacing, Placement, and Pruning of Street Trees.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Ensure that street trees are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01.500(D)</td>
<td>Muni Code: The Manager shall develop reasonable standards for the planting, maintenance and removal of trees to carry out the purposes of this ordinance. These standards will apply to trees within Grants Pass city limits on public or semi-public land. These standards may be amended as the need arises, by the Manager. The standards shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (D) Utility clearances including, but not limited to, sewers, storm drains, curbs, sidewalks, driveway aprons, streets, power or telephone lines, fire hydrants and water meters.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Right-of-way trees must not be planted where the base of their trunks are less than 10 feet from water meters, sewer lines, storm drains, or fire hydrants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is this symbol? Cannot find it on the plans. If this represents a storm drain inlet, water meter, or other infrastructure, the proposed tree is too close.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.125</td>
<td>Vision Clearance and Vision Clearance Area.</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>This tree appears to be within the vision clearance area:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Lot Requirements (if applicable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)</td>
<td>Landscape Standards. Parking lot landscaping shall be provided at the ratio of 1 tree and 16 square feet landscaping per ten parking spaces, in order to create a canopy effect. Trees and landscaping shall be installed as follows and as shown in the Type E-2 Concept Sketch.</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Missing trees at this parking lot next to proposed pickle ball courts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(a)</td>
<td>Landscaping shall be designed so there are no more than 5 parking spaces between any parking space and a tree. See Figure 23-1.</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>See comment above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(b)</td>
<td>The tree species shall be an appropriate large canopied shade tree, and shall be selected from the street tree list to avoid root damage to pavement and utilities, and damage from droppings to parked cars and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Ensure species is large canopied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(c)</td>
<td>The tree shall be planted in a landscaped area such that the tree bole is at least 2 feet from any curb or paved area.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(e)</td>
<td>Landscaped areas shall be evenly distributed throughout the parking area and parking perimeter at the required ratio.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(f)</td>
<td>Landscaped end islands shall be provided at the end of parking rows. End islands shall be a minimum of 6 feet wide to the inside of curb at a point adjacent to the midpoint of the adjoining parking space. When there are unique site constraints, the Director may authorize minor modifications to this requirement, provided equivalent landscaping is provided. See Figure 23-2.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEYED NOTES:
1. EXISTING PROPERTY LINE (TYPICAL)
2. EXISTING PROPERTY LINE TO BE VACATED
3. EXISTING NE GREENFIELD CENTERLINE (TYPICAL)
4. EXISTING PROPERTY LINE TO BE VACATED WITH CITY STANDARD GD/BD APPROACH (TYPICAL)
5. EXISTING RUAS
6. EXISTING DRAWING APPROACH TO BE REPLACED WITH CITY STANDARD GD/BD APPROACH (TYPICAL)
7. EXISTING RAS TO BE REPLACED WITH CITY STANDARD GD/BD APPROACH (TYPICAL)
8. EXISTING DRIVEWAY TO BE LEFT IN EXISTING CONDITION
9. EXISTING IRRIGATION CANAL/PIPE TO BE MODIFIED. SEE SHEET C1.1 FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS
10. EXISTING EDGE OF PAVEMENT (TYPICAL)
11. EXISTING 20' SEWER EASEMENT (TYPICAL)
12. PROPOSED 10' CITY UTILITY EASEMENT
13. PROPOSED BATHROOM AND LAUNDRY FACILITY (4 - TOTAL)
14. PROPOSED 10' X 10' STORAGE UNIT (4 - PER BUILDING - 48 TOTAL UNITS)
15. PROPOSED 5' CONCRETE SIDEWALK (TYPICAL)
16. PROPOSED PULL-THROUGH RV PARKING SPACE (TYPICAL)
17. PROPOSED BACK-IN RV PARKING SPACE W/ VEHICLE PARKING (TYPICAL)
18. PROPOSED 5' GRAVEL WALKING PATH (TYPICAL)
19. PROPOSED 6' SIGHT-OBSCURING FENCE AND 3' BUFFER STRIP (TYPICAL)
20. PROPOSED 8' X 12' CONCRETE PATIO SLAB (ONE PER SPACE)
21. EXISTING WOOD FENCE TO REMAIN (TYPICAL)
22. PROPOSED ON-SITE GUEST PARKING (TYPICAL - 32 SPACES)
23. PROPOSED 6' MASONRY TRASH ENCLOSURE W/ STEEL GATE (5 - TOTAL)
24. PROPOSED ASPHALT DRIVE AISLE AND MANEUVERING AREA (TYPICAL)
25. PROPOSED RETAINING WALL (TYPICAL)
26. PROPOSED PICKLE BALL COURT
27. PROPOSED GUEST PRIVACY IMPROVEMENTS @ STREETS - LOCAL (TYPICAL)

PROJECT NO: GP-430-21

DRAWN BY: JTRG/RLB
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www.gerlitzengineering.com

SHEET A02.10 FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS

FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS (TYPICAL)

SCALE: 1" = 40'
KEYED NOTES:  
1. EXISTING PROPERTY LINE (TYPICAL)  
2. EXISTING STORM DRAIN CULVERT (TYPICAL)  
3. EXISTING GUTTER (TYPICAL)  
4. EXISTING WATER MAIN (TYPICAL)  
5. EXISTING IRRIGATION CANAL/PIPE TO BE REMOVED/REPLACED (TYPICAL)  
6. EXISTING SURFACE CONTROLS - PRIVACY (TYPICAL)  
7. EXISTING SIDEWALK (TYPICAL)  
8. EXISTING UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE (TYPICAL)  
9. EXISTING UNDERGROUND POWER LINE AND TRANSFORMER TO REMAIN (TYPICAL)  
10. EXISTING 2' SURFACE CONTOURS - FROM SURVEY (TYPICAL)  
11. EXISTING SEWER MAIN (TYPICAL)  
12. EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT  
13. PROPOSED 10' CITY UTILITY EASEMENT  
14. PROPOSED RV WATER CONNECTION POINT (TYPICAL)  
15. PROPOSED SHARED WATER METER/SERVICE (MASTER METER)  
16. EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT  
17. PROPOSED SEWER MAIN EXTENSION. SEE C1.0 FOR FULL EXTENT  
18. PROPOSED RV WATER CONNECTION POINT (TYPICAL)  
19. PROPOSED ONSITE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM (TYPICAL)  
20. EXISTING UNDERGROUND POWER LINE AND TRANSFORMER TO REMAIN (TYPICAL)  
21. EXISTING WELL TO REMAIN FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES  
22. PROPOSED WATER CONNECTION POINT FOR ONSITE BUILDINGS  
23. PROPOSED RV WATER CONNECTION POINT (TYPICAL)  
24. PROPOSED ONSITE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM (TYPICAL)  
25. EXISTING UNDERGROUND POWER LINE AND TRANSFORMER TO REMAIN (TYPICAL)  
26. PROPOSED STORM DRAIN INLET  
27. PROPOSED STORM DRAIN DITCH INLET  
28. PROPOSED 10' CITY UTILITY EASEMENT  
29. PROPOSED ONSITE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM (TYPICAL)  
30. PROPOSED DRAINAGE SWALE (TYPICAL)  
31. APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF PROPOSED SITE LIGHTING (16 - TYPICAL)  
32. EXISTING IRRIGATION CANAL "WATER BYPASS"
CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE/IRRIGATION PLAN:

FRONT YARD (GREENFIELD ROAD):
- REQUIRED STREET TREES: (14) TREES (3 PER 1,000 SF)
- REQUIRED 5-GALLON SHRUBS: (20) 5-GALLON SHRUBS (5 PER 1,000 SF)
- REQUIRED 10-GALLON SHRUBS: (40) 5-GALLON SHRUBS (10 PER 1,000 SF)
- REMAINING AREA: TO BE TREATED WITH LIVING GROUNDCOVER

RV PARKING SPACE LANDSCAPING:
- EACH RV SPACE SHALL BE LANDSCAPED WITH TURF, SHRUBS OR OTHER LIVING GROUNDCOVER:
  - 1 TREE PER SPACE

IRRIGATION PLAN:
- THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM WILL BE A MULTIPLE ZONE Drip SYSTEM CONNECTED TO THE EXISTING DOMESTIC WELLS LOCATED ONSITE AT THE APPROXIMATE LOCATION SHOWN.

KEYED NOTES:
1. PROPOSED LANDSCAPE AREA
2. EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO REMAIN - INDIVIDUAL TREES NOT SURVEYED
3. EXISTING ESTABLISHED LANDSCAPING TO REMAIN
4. PROPOSED TREE (201 - TYPICAL)
5. EXISTING WELL (TO REMAIN FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES)
6. PROPOSED IRRIGATION POINT OF CONNECTION