He should have a copy.

[inaudible].

You want to use my phone?

[inaudible].

Where would you like me to go?

[inaudible].

They paid well.

Yeah. Okay. Let's go.

Hey, sunshine. How are you?

[inaudible].

That's just the print that you emailed?

Yeah.

Okay.

There's four exhibits that were added.

Oh, okay. Okay.

Maybe I'm not-
I printed out what you guys emailed. So I don't know. It was only two letters that you... It's fine. I got all the information. Yeah.

There may be some that you've already received and some that [inaudible].


Right next to [inaudible].

Oh, A Street. Yeah. That's what I thought. Yeah. You're that way?

That way.

Yeah. Okay. Yeah. That's the way I go home.

Yeah. I figured that.

Well, as far as echo, Eric will give you a ride.

On bike?

Yeah. You sit on that neck.

Well, one night I rode with Clint. I could hardly [inaudible] was raised real high and it has the thing to hang onto, but it was taller than I could reach.

Well, mine has a step. It has a step there.

Oh, boy, I'm really... Trouble getting in the car. It's pretty bad.

Alicia Howard is now joining.

Are these all neighbors of [inaudible]?

Hi there, everybody. I got 6:02, time to get this ball rolling. I'm going to do a roll call. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Present.

Commissioner Arthur.

Here.

Commissioner Scherf.

Here.
Commissioner Nelson.

Present.

I'm Eric Heesacker. I'm here. Is there any introduction staff? Okay. As chair, I have the executive privilege of monkeying around with this agenda and I'm going to do just that. I'm going to move item 8A, the public hearing for the Greenfield RV park major site plan review, right up to the front of the agenda. So I'm going to dive right into that. I'm going to open up the public hearing. At this time, I will... Oh, bear with me. I have to read a bunch of stuff here. At this time, I will open the public hearing to consider an application filed by... Oh my goodness. I'm sorry. I'm not prepared for this. Property owner, Kenneth A. Roberts, property owners, Engineer Justin Gerlitz.

This application is for an RV park at 420 Greenfield Road, project number 201-00410-21. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant's engineer, statements by persons in favor of the application, statements by persons in opposition to the application, and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicant and staff. After that has occurred, the public comment portion will be closed and the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the commission. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the planning commission to hear this matter? No hands are raised. Abstentions conflict of interest to any of these commissioners, wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest. Seeing no declarations.

Prior ex parte contacts by commissioners. Are there any commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received prior to this meeting regarding the application? Again, no hand raised. In this hearing, the decision of the commission will be based upon specific criteria, which are set forth in the city's development code. All testimony which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. If you would like a copy of the report, please write that on a note to staff over here and one will be provided. 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 appeal to the land use board of appeals based on that issue. Public hearing will now keep proceeding with a report from staff.

Good evening, commissioners. Going to attempt to share my screen with those of us joining remotely. Do we have any commissioners joining us remotely?

Thanks for checking, Jason. I appreciate that.

Hearing none and seen none. I'm going to assume no. My name is Jason Maki. I'm an associate planner here with the city of Grants Pass. The assigned planner for this project is our contract principal planner, Ryan Nolan. I'm going to be filling in in his place this evening. The application that we're going to be reviewing is application number 201-00410-21. The location of the site is address 420 Northeast Greenfield Road. It's two parcels, both of which are general commercial zoning. The applicant, Barry Stone and the applicant's engineer, Justin Gerlitz, are in the audience tonight. So the site currently consists of two lots, which include an existing apple orchard, a large home built in approximately early 1900s. It's gone through several remodels over the years, various outbuildings, including barns, gazebos, Perus and Perus [inaudible]
structures. This application is associated with current property line vacation request that will be heard by city council on February 2nd.

Okay.

The proposal is a major site plan review for 119-space RV park with associated bath, shower, laundry buildings and storage structures. Here's an aerial view of the site. As you can see, there's two lots relatively adjacent to the north end of town on I-5. And again, both lots are in the general commercial zoning district. Here's just a couple of pictures of the frontage. This is the southeastern corner of the property generally in this area here, looking further up where the apple orchard is. And here's just another aerial view. Here's the site plan which, commissioners, you can find a full-size version in your packet, page 115. There's several larger format printouts towards the back of the packet, and this site plan here is just oriented north to south. Again, it is a major site plan reviewed under the criteria found under the minor site plan section of article 19. One of the requirements was that a traffic analysis be submitted, which was submitted by the applicant, reviewed by both ODOT and the city traffic engineer.

One of the conditions of approval was to vacate the property line, which you can see in this picture here, this black line that cuts through the middle of the property, which they're currently in the process of being approved for that through a council decision. The development includes landscaping and buffering designs that have been reviewed by staff and comply with development code standards. You can find those again in your packet towards the end there. There's a pretty significant sewer infrastructure improvement. Again, I'll point that out here. This green line that cuts through the center here, there will be an improvement to that main that cuts through the property, which is slightly out of the ordinary. And Northeast Greenfield will have again, some significant improvements to the street frontage. There is a section in the development code, article 22, section 532, that specifically addresses RV parks and some criteria around approval.

Staff has determined that the submitted site plan meets those conditions found in that section of code. Since the staff report was issued last week, staff has received four additional exhibits. I've passed those out and I'm happy to email them if needed. Exhibit 12, which is just a continuation of the exhibit list found in the original staff report is a letter from Trisha Black in opposition to the project. She cites some concerns around buffering, length of stay, crime, historical nature of the site, some traffic impact issues, and requests an extension of the hearing. I failed to mention at the beginning of this, we have had multiple requests for an extension. I'll have a slide at the end that gives some direction for UAPC on how you would like to extend or continue this hearing. Exhibit 13 is another letter in opposition from Terry Hogan. Some of the concerns that he addresses are the general commercial zoning and the RV park is adjacent to residential zoning, a subdivision to the north.

The proposal was described as being 119 spaces with a possible addition of another space to make 120 spaces in the future, addresses some concerns around that. Noise and drainage issues being a concern. Lighting and the potential for light to shine from the development onto the neighboring residential lots was a concern. The proposal does call out some storage on site and there were some concerns about that. There was a concern about the length of time that an RV could stay on the lot. There was a typo addressing Carnahan Drive, which is going to be later in this presentation, a recommendation by staff to make that edit to the findings. Some concerns about the trash enclosure and possible vermin nuisances that could arise from trash.
Also had some concerns about the traffic impact analysis and requested a continuance of the hearing. And Exhibit 14 is a response from Kim Parducci, which is the applicant's traffic engineer, basically addressing the traffic-related concerns of the previous two letters of opposition.

And Exhibit 15 is just an email correspondence between Grants Pass Public Works Department and the applicant's engineer, Justin Gerlitz, just clarifying some language of the public works memo related to those sewer infrastructure improvements. So staff did have some recommendations for edits to the findings. The first one is found on page eight of the staff report. Basically just editing some language about the requirement for city utility easement across the frontage of the development. And on page 10, condition A3, again, editing the language around the requirement of a COE. And as I mentioned previously, on page 11, condition A8, subsection D, there's just a typo. It states Carnahan Drive, but the reference should be Greenfield Road.

So because staff has received a request for continuance, staff recommends that in accordance with ORS197493, the planning commission either continue the hearing to a date and time certain at least seven days from today, or close the hearing and leave the record open for seven days, providing additional days for the applicant to review additional testimony and submit final written argument. Following the continuation of the hearing or the record, staff recommends the planning commission approve the major site plan review subject to the amended conditions of approval. Ending. Any questions for me? That's my presentation

Commissioners, any burning questions for staff? Commissioner Nelson.

Yeah, just clarification. The address on here was listed as, oh, hold on, I got to get to the right page, 420 Greenfield Road. It's supposed to be Northeast Greenfield Road?

We could make that edit to the staff report in the findings.

Anyone else have burning questions for staff? All right then. Thank you, staff. You did a great job. Would the applicant please come forward to make their presentation? State your name and address please, sir.

Good evening. Justin Gerlitz with Gerlitz Engineering Consultants, here on behalf of the applicant, Berry Stone, tonight for the Greenfield RV Park resort. Let me get this presentation loaded up here. All right. Well, we've got a fun project here tonight, something that we've been working on for a while now and we're very excited about. This project, as mentioned, is located at the North Grants Pass Interchange. It's a very, very prominent location to our city. As you know, we don't have much freeway frontage in Grants Pass, and this happens to be one of the big commercial lots that's situated just off the freeway off a ramp. This is an aerial. Try to go through this quick. I know Jason showed some of these, but the yellow represents the two properties that make up this project. It is adjacent to a couple of different zones. This is a zoning map there.

The two properties involved in the project are general commercial zoned, which support this project. You can see here, we've got, I'll switch my pointer here, another commercial project adjacent to this, and then we've got some lower density residential on the north and east sides. And then we've got Interstate 5 and the big interchange, which access a big natural buffer, and
we've got a lot of general commercial and business park, light industrial here to the south. This project, one of the most important things we're trying to accomplish here is to support tourism in the Grants Pass area. This is at the interchange of I-5 in Grants Pass and Highway 99. So we've got two major highways that come together at this location, and it's very visible from the I-5 corridor, which is really important for an RV resort project. This is some Google three-dimensional view of property. There's a lot of trees on here, but this is the existing structures, the older structures, and the newer ones that have been built to look historic.

This is where the current owner had an apple orchard, and then this triangle over here is more of a naturally agitated hillside. This is a view from the west and this is a view from the east, looking back to the west. These are a few pictures on the street upfront. Greenfield Road right now is improved to county standards. So it's a full two lanes, but it does not currently have any curb, gutter, and sidewalk, which will be part of this project along the frontage. This goes down along the frontage, heading to the west. This is the driveway that will be used for the main entrance, and this is looking towards the west side of the property where you can see that existing commercial use there. There's some pretty neat buildings on this site. I don't have a lot of good pictures of these buildings, but I'll show you a few. As mentioned, there's these historic structures on site that have been extensively remodeled by the current owner.

And then in addition to that, in the early 2000s, he actually built several additional structures to look like historic structures. So there's a lot of history here and that's very important to the applicant. They want to maintain that history. They want to maintain these structures and actually use all of them other than one small outbuilding for the RV resort. So it's going to be a destination spot with a lot of character as compared to what you see today that's brand new. This is just some of the character. This building here actually was built out of a flat-dimensional lumber. So the entire wall on this structure is solid wood all the way from top to bottom. And you can see some of the ornate detail there on those doors and the windows that have been constructed to look historic. Off of the distance here, this is the historic main house with some of the secondary homes. Many of you've seen the south side of the freeway, a barn style roof on it, and then this is just an up-close version of that existing structure with the siding.

So these structures have been elaborately remodeled. I mean, they're very, very beautiful structures in and out and we're really looking forward to using those for the tenants of the park. This is the site plan blown up. Again, this is looking to the... North is to your left here. So everything's rotated. This area up here is all those existing structures and existing trees. The owner was really into trees and a lot of the trees that are around all these existing structures were taken from historic places, famous places, their seedlings and planted there. Something that we're going to do as part of this project is we're going to put placards next to those trees to highlight that history. In the middle of this site, again, there was an apple orchard that had some historic trees in it as well, the seedlings. And then we got a lot of native vegetation over here. You can see here, all these little spots represent the RV spaces for rent.

They are going to be short-term rentals. This is a resort off the side of the freeway and I know that's one of the points the neighbors were concerned about, but this isn't a long-term stay park. This is a destination resort type facility. We do have access roads all to and through the whole project. There are going to be some storage units in this area right here, proposed, and these aren't the traditional storage units that you hear when we say, "Storage units for rent." So many people these days travel with their RVs and they have little motorcycles, and mopeds, and bicycles, and kayaks, and other things that they bring along with them. And one of the things
that the applicant would like to do is keep those out of the RV spaces. They're not piled up on the ground and the way he's going to do that is by proposing some of these little storage units, these little small units that the patrons at the park can use for their different things.

If you look in your packet, there is a summary of everything that is proposed here and this is a combination of new and existing. Just real briefly, we've got the 120 spaces. There's going to be four new bathrooms and washrooms, 48 different storage units in that area, a new swimming pool, new pickle ball courts, and then all of those existing structures are going to be reused and revamped for managers' quarters, recreational rooms, lacafe, wine rooms. So these are all going to be amenities that are available to the people that are staying in the resort. Also in your packet, we hired an architect to go through and look at all these existing structures to try and make sure that we make sure they're all ADA-compliant, and we're going to be doing a little bit of site improvement within that area over the top of the existing driveways, just to make sure that those surfaces are all smooth and adequate for people that need to use those parking spaces and whatnot.

Again, all this area is going to... Other than some walkways and some surface improvements inside of there, most of it is going to remain the same and we're really going to landscape it and make it an amenity to the resort. Also included in the packet is a utility and grading plan, which you can see here. Pretty extensive utilities on this project. One of the things that is required as part of the development is to improve Greenfield. That's going to include curb, gutter, and sidewalk and a planter strip. It also includes a very long sewer main. This area to the east of the project was designated as part of the new urban growth boundary. And as part of that, the master plan is requiring it to be sewered in the future. So this is part of that extension that's required as part of the master plan. There is an irrigation canal, Grants Pass Irrigation Canal, that's open for this portion of the site right here before it's piped on both ends. And as part of the project, we're also going to be piping that. So the whole thing will be contained.

And then we have to do our traditional water, sewer, and storm drain detention on site to make sure we comply with city standards. But generally, grading-wise, this thing slopes from the upper side of the site down towards the freeway. We're really hoping to take advantage of that. So all these RVs will be somewhat layered upon one another. The views up here, as most of you know, when you're sitting at the freeway, looking into Grants Pass are beautiful, and the whole point of this project is to try to take advantage of those views. Also included in the application is a conceptual landscape plan. The state of Oregon actually has a code requirement, which is reflected in local ordinance as well, that every single RV space has to have at least one tree planted right next to it. We're showing that on this conceptual plan, but one of the things that's not shown because we don't have every tree located yet is we're going to be maintaining as many of the existing significant trees as possible.

And that's going to be especially around the existing homes, but also layered in and out of the spaces here as we can, based on the grading restrictions that we're up against. This area in here, this little triangle, is pretty heavily vegetated now. So we're planning on keeping all those tall evergreen trees in there. And then there'll be additional landscaping along the frontage, both along the site and along the newer street improvements. And then we'll be providing a nice, really detailed landscape plan as part of the formal submittal permitting process. There are architectural drawings also included in the packet. This is the floor plan for the bathroom and shower area. One of the things that the applicant is trying to do is, again, try to tie the new
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buildings, because we are going to have a few of these new buildings into the old historic look, both color wise, roofing materials, and things like that.

So you can see here, if you look at this one compared to the mini-storage, they have a very similar look and the mini-storage isn't a long metal building. It's a broken-up section building. So this looks more historic in nature than what you would expect for a normal mini-storage structure. As mentioned by Jason, there were some concerns, one being from Mr. Haugan, on how the traffic study was calculated and how the data was calculated and obtained. So because our traffic engineer couldn't be here tonight, we had her prepare this memorandum. So this should hopefully address those concerns. Overall, we really believe that this location is extremely well-suited to what we're trying to accomplish here. The fact that it's located on the hillside next to the freeway at one of the main entrances to our city really makes it well-suited for this type of development. Again, we're really trying to take the historic aspect of this site too and bring it into the overall project, and create that destination resort that people are really going to find unique.

We do recognize the fact that there are six residences along the north and east property line. And there's concern about buffering from that. We are buffering this project per the codes, which will include a tall hedge screen along both of those entire property lines, along with a brand new six-foot solid fence along those property lines. We are willing to hear the neighbors' concerns and work with the neighbors as needed to help alleviate some of those concerns as we go through the project. And really with still the interstate frontage in Grants Pass, we just think this is going to be a huge benefit to residents and the community, really support the existing businesses in and around the area. So with that, based on this information, we're looking for approval of the Greenfield RV resort project tonight, and are happy to take any initial questions that the commission might have.

Hi, there. I have a question. Could you please reveal the ultra-secret location of this mysterious 120th space?

So we had prepared the application of 119 spaces. The traffic study was done, I believe, for 123. The applicant had requested that we keep the flexibility in there to add one additional space. We do not have that in here. Honestly, it would probably go right here.

Thank you.

This is really where we would assume it would be.

Thank you, sir. Any other questions?

Are we going to be able to ask questions later from the proponents?

From the applicants?

Yeah, the applicants and proponents.

I don't think we can do that. That's an exchange and we don't do that.
Generally, most of the commission's questions for the applicant would be now. But certainly after the public testimony, if things come up and you need clarification based on the testimony, then you could do that.


Go ahead, sir.

I did have a question for you on this traffic issue on the southeast corner, down the bottom, or, I guess, this side for you. You had a shot showing the intersection, I believe it would be going north.

Yes, this would be the southeast corner.

So that's going north, correct?

That's looking west. The maps are rotated. So I apologize for the confusion on it, but this would be heading to the west.


Yeah. Do you have one going the other way?

I do not in this presentation. The road looks similar, but this was... See, I could probably show you on here. So there is that intersection right there that we-

And that was a concern expressed in the traffic study information. I don't know how busy that intersection is.

It's a very low volume project, which I could show you here. This right here has-

Is Ed in?

This intersection right here has one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine houses off of it.

And that is zone as what?

Residential,

Residential urban area?

Yes. Correct. It's part of the new urban growth boundary. And one of the things too to point out is, if we back to the site plan, the main entrance for the facility is here. This is going to be our main in and out. This is a one-way out and the only reason that this is being maintained, this is existing driveway, is because we need to maintain ADA accessibility to the main office building.
So this will just be a one-way very low volume out only, not an in, and all of the main traffic for the development will come through this entrance.

Other questions? Yes, Commissioner Arthur.

I was having trouble figuring out the trash and recycling thing.

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

I saw these number 24s all scattered around in the middle of the street and I don't know if you could just explain a little bit more about that.

The trash enclosures are scattered throughout the site. It is a pretty big site. We’ve got one here. They have to be head in for the trash trucks to come pick them up, where the trash truck is driving and actually pick them up in the front. So we’ve got one here, one here, here, here, here, and then I believe that's the extent of them.

All right. [inaudible].

Other questions to the applicant? Mr. Nelson.

I had one final one. These are drive-through?

Some are drive-through and some are backend. So the ones that are connected at both ends here to the asphalt, the gray being the asphalt representation, are pull-through. The ones around the perimeter, there, there, and down here and over here are back-end.

Okay.

So they'll be the back of the unit.

Other questions. Thank you, sir. Anybody else want to speak on behalf of the applicant? All righty. Did you want to say something?

No, I want to make sure that we're [inaudible].

Thank you. Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of the application? Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the application? Okay. Before we get to that, if Mr. Haugan and Ms. Black are here, please don’t come up to the microphone and read your letter into the record. We have it here. It’s in the record and it’s ready to go. If the comments start to duplicate each other, I might call you on that. There’s a few of you here that want to have some testimony. We’re going to give you time. We’ll give you three minutes a piece. If you’re still talking, I’m not going to cut you right off, but I will say you have 20, 30 seconds left. So who would like to speak first?

Chair, I just would like to call out the fact we have several people joining us online, one of which is Terry Haugan who has his hand raised. So we’ll just need to navigate between in-person and the remote.
Sure. We'll try and take turns. How many people are remote?

Eight or so.

Oh yeah. We'll keep it at three minutes. All right. So I'll entertain somebody from the audience here in the room first. Come on up, state your name and address please and let it rip.

My name is Gretchen Boris. I live at 140 Spring Mountain Road, would be the road directly after the proposed entrance to the RV park. It was a great proposal. You've done a great job, but I'm sure it'll be beautiful and it is zone commercial. And you have every right to do what you want to do with that property. However, I would like to maintain some of our rights. As the road directly following, I think we should be able to put up a sign saying, "Private road," or, "Residents only," or, "No turnaround." If they miss that turnaround, which is going to happen, the only turnaround will be on our quiet street.

There aren't eight houses on the street, there are four. People have lived there for upwards of 30 years. They've raised their kids there. Many are now gracing their grandkids there. I know we've thought about putting up for sale sign in our home. We're definitely putting up a six-foot fence. This will horribly affect our property value, it will affect our quiet, peaceful way of life, it will affect our security. But that being said, he does have the right to do what he wants to do. I just want to protect the rights that we have as property owners right next to this proposed development. Thank you.

Thank you very much. Okay. I can't see who's remote here, but I'm ready to take somebody from the remote section.

I would call on Terry.

This is Terry Haugan, if you can hear me.

We can hear you, sir. Go ahead. Name and address.

My name is Terry Hogan, address is 261 Northeast Oak Dale Drive. I had submitted written comments, which I know are part of the record. I did want to highlight a couple of very important things in that. One is that privacy is very important to us since we are immediately on the backside of this property. And we understand that this will be a premier RV resort as being presented, that there will be large RVs which will be present, which we'll definitely be able to see over the top of a six-foot fence into our backyard. That impacts us directly. Additionally, if in the long term, this does not turn out as it is, and we do a lot of RV traveling ourselves. We go to a lot of parks where we see that it is turned into long-term residential, and that it becomes basically to some degree, low income multifamily property.

And again, within five feet of our backyard, we don't really like to have that close to our property. Nowhere within the plans do I see a lighting plan as sufficient, and we are concerned about future maintenance of any lighting that goes in so that it does not glare into our windows since we are very close to the property. We are concerned about occupancy limits. If this is to be a premier RV park, I believe that the property owner and the developer should not object at all to having any length of stay limitation placed upon this approval. As far as the traffic study goes, I
understand what has been stated, but I do also know that because we have an RV ourselves and we access the interstate from our property, that getting onto Sixth and Morgan and Seventh and Morgan with a large RV is difficult.

And our RV is not as large as many of them that are out there. And I severely believed that there will be a large impact to the traveling public at Sixth and Morgan and Seventh and Morgan with all these large RVs going through those intersections. And also because we do have RV ourselves, we do like to walk when we are going out and about, and there is a lot of restaurants within relatively close proximity to this proposed park. And we think that some type of pedestrian access should be allowed going all that way because it has been extremely difficult and will continue to be, going underneath the interstate to get down to those areas. So with that, I guess, we're just primarily concerned about privacy to our own property, as well as any traffic impacts there may be here.

Thank you.

Thank you and I would answer any questions if anyone has anything of me.

Thank you, sir. That was exactly three minutes. Good timing. Okay. Somebody else from the audience want to come up and speak at the podium? Go ahead, sir. Name and address please.

My name's Tom Papuk. I bought the property at 420 Greenfield. I'm the other commercial owner in this area. We build instrumentation. We sell it around the world. 75% of our business is offshore. We don't have the same type of passion that the people that live here do. But looking at it from a common sense standpoint, it's a stupid idea to put a lot of RVs and put that many people in a small space. Despite what the gentleman said earlier, it's a very busy intersection. People coming off the freeway make a hard right turn. And depending on the competence of the people driving the RVs, I can see all kinds of problems. Also, the motion of the people in the RV resort going into town would be using their cars, not their RVs, probably. And I talked to a gentleman today and he said about 50% of the RVs are carrying cars or some alternate transportation. That's not a great intersection and not a great [inaudible]. People don't want to walk through there, walking underneath that-

Could you get a little closer to the mic, please?

Excuse me.

A little closer to the microphone so we can hear you better. Thank you.

People walking into town under that bridge through that intersection are targets. People are driving too fast. I have a letter of... I think it was submitted to one of you from Chris Cobble. We have a letter of comment. Anyhow, we make our profit, but we're feeding them back into the city. We have 40 or 50 employees there. The forest service had 170 altogether. Anyhow, this is commentary I'm making on good sense. Thank you.

Thank you, sir. Anybody attending remotely, please raise your hand if you'd like to speak. I don't know where to see hands being raised on the at screen.
Hi, my name is Alicia Howard. I'm very versed in Teams. I use it at work all the time, which is actually why I'm not present due to the demands of COVID on the hospital.

Okay, perfect. What's your address please?

229 Northeast Oak Dale Drive.

Thank you very much. Go right ahead.

My property bursts right up to the back of this area. Every window in my house faces that wooded green area and an RV park with that many tenants, that's all I would see from my desk, my backyard, and every window in my home. I would feel like my privacy was being invaded. I'm concerned about the noise. I'm concerned about the traffic as everyone else has stated. And the other question I had was is this going to be on city water?

Yes, it will be on city water system.

Okay. Because that's a well and I didn't want to be concerned about competing for water. That was all.

Thank you very much. Anyone else here in the audience who would like to speak? Yes, sir. Come on up to the microphone. Name and address please.

Hello. My name is Rod Raybon. The address is 231 Northeast Oak Dale. I have several concerns, but I know I only have three minutes. One is I'm wondering how tall these trailers are going to be, because it sounds like you're saying there's a six-foot fence. And if we have a 10-foot trailer, where's the privacy? That's one thing I'm wondering about. I really enjoy looking at the stars at nighttime. That's one of the things I do. I have a website that's dedicated to astronomy. If he has those bright lights on, that's going to be the end of that. Plus, we'll have the lights shine in our windows at night. My bedroom faces that. I think that's outrageous.

Also, if you look at that street, that very, very narrow street, if you have... Let's just say, a third of the people who are there want to leave at a particular time to go someplace. So that road is completely stuffed with cars. How's that road going to be able to handle all those cars? How are we going to be able to get in and out when there's so many cars turning this way, turning that way? What have you. I'm also wondering, what kind of a fence are we talking about? Is it a six-foot wood fence with a 10-foot trailer, 15-foot trailer? I don't know how tall they are. Are we going to grow something? So my main concern is lighting, having the light shine into my backyard, which will be the end of the reason we bought that house, is so that we could sit up there and look up at the stars at night. That's what I do. That will be gone.

And also having the light shining into our windows because my bedroom and I think a lot of other people's bedroom windows face the trailer park. And also I'm concerned, as Terry brought up, will this eventually degrade into a typical trailer park? What happens to our property values? Is the city planning on reimbursing this for the loss of the values of our property? Which that will happen. Who wants to live next to a trailer park? So those are my concerns. Thank you.
Thanks for your time, sir. Anyone attending remotely, go ahead. Jump on in here. Okay. Then we'll switch back here to the audience. Yes, ma'am. Come right on up. Name and address please.

I'm Linda Blower. I'm at 322 Northeast Oak Dale Drive. So my property does not butt up next to this. I'm just down the Oak Dale Road, just away. My husband and I built the house 48 years ago. So I am very aware of the traffic issue. My real concern is when you go up 7th Street, and you're going to turn onto Scoville, and then you turn and you go from up to Scenic Drive to go home, there's a stop sign right there at, I mean, 7th Street and Scoville. For several years, you have to stop to make the right-hand turn. As of yesterday, they blacked that out and now you have to stop. So I asked my son how long his trailer is with his pickup. He said, "Mom, I don't have one of the longest trailers, but my trailer is 34 feet long."

Now I add my Tundra truck to it, we're 60 feet. If you have two or three of these rigs, because they travel together, trying to come up, stop at that stop sign, now try to take off and go and turn on the very first road onto Greenfield, they're going to miss that. They're going to go up and try to find another place to turn around so they can hit Greenfield. The congestion, add some semi-trucks into this, you're going to be backing up on 7th Street. I'm going to be backing up on 7th Street to try to get home, or you're going to have back up off the freeway to do this. Now years ago, they were going to make... The first Baptist Church was or River Valley, now it's called, was going to make [inaudible], change all the stoplights and do all this off-ramp stuff. What has happened to that?

We are going to have as much traffic then as if the church gets out on a Sunday morning. So you guys have got to figure out what to do with all the traffic that's going to happen at that intersection at Scoville and 7th Street or going down 6th Street. Right now, there's all this construction with the seismic overpass thing. But I can understand. I mean, the trailer park looks beautiful. I am also wanting to know not long-term resident. Five or six days, they move on. That's all it's for. It's not for long term. So we don't have a bunch of homeless... We have a very safe neighborhood right now. There's very low crime. I don't want it to increase. Like I said, I'm a born and raised resident of Grants Pass, very few of us, and I've lived in the house for 48 years.

So if you want to know some info... Oh, one other slight thing. This mountain or hill that it's on is called Spring Mountain for a reason. The water runoff of this hill is horrendous. You got to start preparing for that down on his property because it's got to have someplace to run off. And we have a ditch above our place. We border the city limits. We are in the county, very strange. We have county, I mean, city on three sides. There is a huge ditch that runs at the top of our property and a week ago when we had snow, it was full. Now, where are you going to put that? Because the storm drain water runs over the road and right close to this Terry Haugan's property and has flooded them out. So you better plan for all the water because now you put in a whole bunch of black top trailer park secess. Where does that water go? You're covering in the irrigation ditch. It can't go there. So where does it go?

Thank you very much. Anyone online want to jump in here with any comments? All right. Anyone else from the audience? Yes. Come on up. Name an address please.

Hi, I'm Lynn Erickson. We live at 201 Spring Mountain Road. We also have property on Oak Dale and on Greenfield. And the one thing that everyone has failed to comment on is the traffic. We're all talking about... Haven't commented on the fact that Greenfield is a dead end. There's
no way out of there. So Spring Mountain is a dead end. So is Oak Dale, a dead end. Whether it's the garbagemen, or an RV guy, or me in my little car, there's only one way to get out of my house from Spring Mountain, is to turn right, go down Greenfield Road, going right past the two roads that lead into this trailer park. He mentioned there's four people living on Spring Mountain, but there's a whole lot of people that live down on Greenfield that still have to come through.

So it doesn't just affect four of us that live there. And there's no way out other than getting out to Scenic. And I really agree with Linda, trying to make that 180-degree turn from the freeway to get on Greenfield is crazy in any car. Anyway, I was also at Jack's Landing, the RV park at the north end of town. They've got a lot of folks living in their cars there and it's not just a resort. The resort word sounds wonderful. But these people are staying long term and it creates a whole different atmosphere. So yes, we are very concerned about our neighborhood.

Thank you very much. Anyone online? All right. Back to the audience. Anyone else want to speak? Yes, ma'am. Come on up. Name and address.

Ivey Sanford, 1499 Granite Hill Road. I live past all of that. My concern is the traffic. I drive into town five, six days a week, because I work, and the traffic there at the intersection of Scoville and 7th is going to be horrible. When I come home from work, I had 18-wheeler truck hauling some cars, who had blocked the entire street because he went the wrong direction and he was trying to turn around, and held up seven cars. And the curve from coming off 7th Street onto Greenfield is a very sharp turn. It isn't an easy turn. It's not a lot of space. And I didn't see or hear anything about what they're going to do to make it... We have a trailer, we travel, and I'm concerned that there's going to be cars. As I'm trying to go into work or come home, I'm going to have trucks and RVs and fifth wheels pulling out and blocking the whole road and coming on the wrong side of the road.

I think the traffic, whatever they checked is not accurate because that intersection is a horrible intersection. Have cars almost three times a week coming the wrong way up 6th Street. Because they're out-of-towners, they don't know it's a one-way street. You can imagine what that will look like with an RV, or trying to make a left or right turn there on Morgan Lane off of 6th Street. It's a tough corner. Both sides are tough to get to, and they're going to be moving in to get onto the freeway. I think there needs to be more study of that section of the road of Scoville going 6th and 7th. Thank you.

Thank you very much. Anybody online want to speak yet? Back to the audience. Come right on up. Name and address please.

Dija Sky. I live at 241 Northeast Oak Dale Drive. I feel like having to think about your address. These are more questions that I thought about. Other things to traffic and safety and security have all been addressed. So I won't go over to those. But I do wonder, what guarantee do we have as far as the short term, meaning non-permanent housing? I know that in the presentation, he mentioned that the owner loves trees and yet he's going to tear out an entire oak grove and the apple orchard. The oak grove is directly behind my house. That's one of the things that drew me to the house. And I was told that they're actually planning to tractor-level the property. And it sounded like in the presentation, he's saying that it's not going to be completely leveled. So I'm a little bit confused about that.
And then he mentioned that there was going to be a hedge screen. How tall is that? What does that mean? Obviously, they've mentioned the six-foot fence, but that really doesn't give security and/or privacy. My house is probably the tallest house on the street. Meaning behind the RV park, so I really will have zero. I will literally look out and have a sea of RVs and the freeway. So the other questions are how often is the trash picked up? Because if it's a full park, it's going to have to be more than once a week. Having gone camping at campsites, what we have is they pick up trash twice a week at least. And then as the last person just mentioned, did they really do the I-5 intersection in 7th Street?

I've almost gotten hit or couldn't get over because traffic comes off the freeway so fast. And then it sounds like they really didn't communicate... This project wasn't communicated to the entire neighborhood. It was just communicated directly to the people that were abutting the property, and I think that the entire neighborhood should have been advised of what was going on. And also, you already know that we got less than 30 days' notice about this and the notification was sent out in the middle of Christmas and New Year's. That's all I have to say. I wish I could ask those questions to the presentation person, but you guys at least have them and can ask your questions.

Any questions? Apparently not. Thank you very much.

No problem. Thank you.

Anyone else in the audience want to speak? Yes, ma'am. Name and address please.

Hi, my name is Tammy Krauss. I live at 227 Northeast Oak Dale, and I don't want to stop the project. I don't want to prohibit anybody's use of their land, but I would like the city, if they are going to approve it, to at least entertain some of the resolutions that I would like to bring forth. The wall has been addressed, but I would rather see it be a wall, not a fence like most of ours. I'm to the side of the corner of the property, but our fences are pretty flimsy the way that they were built, and I would like to ask if the planning commission does approve it, that they actually make a wall that's much taller and an actual wall. Somewhat similar to what you would see like in Southern California along the freeway lines, when they're trying to block the traffic noise from various housing communities.

And I would also suggest and ask that if it is approved, that they would be required to have security footage and surveillance across the lines that are bordering all of the neighbors' yards. So that if we have a problem with theft, robbery, which we actually have had some of that already this past year, that they would work in conjunction with the neighbors in providing that security footage. And then the lighting that got brought up, I would like to... Obviously, the lighting is going to be required, but if we could make it, like at Gilbert Creek Park and some of the other places, so that the lights would face outward towards the freeway, and not shining towards the residential homes would be very beneficial. And then right now, currently, there are homeless people that have been living in and out of those historical buildings up on the hill.

And there is a homeless camp that sits up on top of the mountain too. And I know I've been there because we've fed some of those homeless people. So when you bring a resort in here and it looks nice and they did a great job presenting and I'm not prohibiting that, but the short-term stay, I have several clients that are my clients and the way they get around that short-term stay is they stay in a spot for a certain amount of days and then they go 10 spaces down. So I
don’t know what policing that needs to be, but it would be really nice if that was addressed as well. Thank you for your time.

Thank you very much. Anyone else? If you’ve already had a turn, I can’t talk to you again. Sorry. Anyone else? All righty. Anyone else online want to say anything? Okay. Applicant, you may come on up and address these concerns, if that’s what you’d like to do.

Can you hear me? There we go. Again, Justin Gerlitz, Gerlitz Engineering Consultants. I always appreciate the neighbors sharing their comments to hear their concerns, and I figured I’d try to address a couple of those, some specific answers. Traffic is always a concern with every project we do, whether it’s three lots subdivision or a shopping mall. And one of the things that the city requires is for us to hire a professional traffic engineer to do a traffic study. The scope of that study is determined by both the city’s traffic engineer and ODOT in this case, specifically on the city, more on this one, because it’s a city road. The traffic engineer then does counts, does analysis. There’s very specific ways to do that. And then that study is submitted back to the city and ODOT’s professional traffic engineer for review and concurrence.

So I know that there’s concern over traffic, but we did do those steps, which showed that the limits of the traffic impacts are not exceeded in such a way that they were concerned with the intersections adjacent to it. I did hear one of the neighbor’s concern about turnaround and I think that’s a very valid point. I think some signage at the main entrance to this facility that says, “Turn here, do not go straight,” would probably be an important feature to add and we’re very happy to do that because I want to see it function as well. Lighting was mentioned as a concern. We have no desire to shine lights back on the neighbors’ properties. Today with LED lights, there’s ways you can use different intensities and dim them down to certain levels. And we want it to be safe within development, but we definitely don’t want to be imposing direct lights on the neighbors. So that’s something we’re going to be doing, is hiring a professional electrical engineer to design that system.

There was a mention from a letter from Chris Cobble. I’m assuming we’ll get a copy of that in the record. I know one of the things... Somebody mentioned the church that was originally River Valley was going to be building a church across the street. One thing that’s a little different about an RV park is the traffic doesn’t come and go exactly at one time during the day like a church service would be, or a restaurant, or a coffee drive-through, or the peak hours on the way to work. I know that does help a little bit. It disperses the traffic out. People come and go different times during the day, and I’m pretty sure that was accounted for in the traffic study. The back fence, there’s a lot of comments on the screening. The city typically requires a six-foot fence and a three-foot landscape buffer.

But with RV parks, there’s actually state requirements that go along with it as well, that are in the code, which increases that to a five-foot buffer. And the city standards I specify, I believe, an eight to a 12-foot vegetated hedge screen, evergreen hedge screen. So it’s there all year long. So that’s the intention that’s actually drawn on the landscape plan, where we would plant a solid hedge screen along there, something similar to [inaudible] hedge, something that grows quickly and tall that could be trimmed up against the fence. And we found that that combination of a solid fence and vegetation is actually some of the best sound protection that you can install versus just a solid fence. So with that, I hope that answers some of the commission’s questions, some of the neighbors’ questions, and I’m happy to answer any additional questions that you may have.
Commissioner Nelson.

Curiosity. I know you have the desire to plant trees on each of these sites, but you have them next to the road. Is that for a reason?

Yeah. The state actually requires that each RV space specifically has a tree next to it. And then the city requirements along the roadway require a row of trees in the-

Terry Haugan is now exiting.

... 10-foot front yard. And then also additional trees down where we're going to be putting in a new planter strip on the roadway. So there'll be a combination of trees, not just at the RV spots themselves.

So on that backend, then you're saying is going to be the hedge row that will be eight to 12 feet?

Mm-hmm (affirmative) When it's fully grown. Yes. And then there'll be additional trees along those spaces as well as the hedge. It won't just be the-

Okay. That's what I didn't see.

Other questions? Commissioner Scherf.

So I've heard concerns about visibility and you've stated as well as I'm looking at the contours on your utility map here, can you basically explain a little bit more? To me, the contours look like the site slopes from the northeast corner down to the southeast corner. First question. How much relief from the top of the property down to Greenfield Road elevation-wise? What's it? 10-foot fall? Four-foot fall? Three-foot fall?

All across the entire property?

Yeah. Yeah. I just want to get a visual in my head.

It's substantial. I'd have to pull up the map up there, but each one of the contours on there are a foot, I believe. One to two feet. So there's a substantial fall. It's a slope. It's a consistent slope down from top to bottom and there's another cross slope in there at the northwest corner. Immediately at the north property line, there's not a drop-off right there, but it continues from that point all the way down to the freeway and then continues down the hill from the freeway into the city. So that constant slope from the top of the hill behind the project, all the way into town is there.

Okay. And there's concerns with the neighborhood to the north there that there would not be a visibility relief. Is there alternatives that you guys could look at in laying out the property where you took that furthest north row and dropped it in elevation a little bit to further the visibility relief?
There will be a little bit of a drop there for the... The RV stalls themselves will have to be pretty level and the slope is generally sloping right there. So we probably will excavate a little bit. I can't say exactly how much because we haven't gotten into that level of design, but-

Is this something that would be in your mind when you're actually going through this?

Yes.

Perfect. Thanks.

Anyone else have questions for the applicant? Thank you very much.

Thank you.

Staff, I think we're going to go back to you for any final comments you might have, and to see if any of the commissioners want to hit you up with questions. Thank you.

I'm happy to address any of the questions or comments, specifically related to the development code that any of the commissioners may have for me.

Questions, anybody. Commissioner Nelson.

Future development a long, I guess, it's Spring Mountain Drive, it's rezoned or zoned at 112. And how big of sites are those? Those are fairly large lots, aren't they?

The minimum lot size for the R112 zone is 11,000 square feet. So some of those may be larger than that as they exist today. But if somebody was to come in with a new subdivision, that would be the minimum.

Okay. That probably answers my question. So I was just curious if the city had right away or any plans for extending those dead-end roads that you know of.

Without having the master transportation plan in front of me, I'm not entirely certain, but I do look at that document often and I don't believe that it's identified for Greenfield to extend further to the east.

We can certainly check on that for your next hearing and bring that to you.

Yeah. I'd like to see what potential lies in the future on this commercial area as well as for the residential development buildout.

Okay.

Anybody else have questions for staff?

I do.
Go right ahead, Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Many of the pieces of information raised from lighting to fencing to whatever, it sounds like these things could be mitigated, but I am concerned about the access overall. I am concerned about if they should miss the entrance, even though it is going to be properly marked, I'm sure, we've got faith in that, it's not necessarily going to be upon the applicant to develop that access way outside of, I mean, the 7th Street, the 6th Street, the I-5 corridor. How can that be mitigated? And that goes beyond the applicant here, but these are valid concerns. That's a tricky space anyway, heading up Scoville Road and that whole area, what is being done? Is anything being planned, especially in light of this development?

Yeah. I guess, what I can confidently say is all the different city stakeholders, involve the city's traffic engineer, public works department, have all reviewed this application and provided comment. I do know that there's other projects going on in that area. I can definitely take back some of the comments that I've heard tonight and get some further clarification from both the city traffic engineer and the public works department to more specifically address some of the traffic concerns in the specific intersections that were mentioned.

Yeah, we do a staff-level look on a routine basis, especially as new growth happens in certain areas of town and the Redwood area is a good example where over time, you see those levels of growth and traffic really increase. And so it's routine to look at those as growth happens because the law is set up primarily around the impacts of just that one development. So if one development is going to cause the need for a traffic light, for example, then that developer would have to put in a traffic light. But legally, the city can't say, "Go and make all these improvements because we think that those are going to happen." It's all based on, as Justin said, the traffic study specifically to that development, but it is part of our responsibility as city staff and as a city as a whole to be looking at the cumulative impacts.

And so I think tonight, we heard some good points about over time, there have been increased impacts. And so I think there's nothing, as Jason said, on the books today that's a funded capital project that we can point to and say, "In 2024, this is going to happen." But that is a document that's living and breathing and it can change. And so capital projects can shift from one part of town to another part of town, depending on impacts. And so that's usually looked at after the development is done and it's operational and you see things. That's not to say there won't be some requirements that the [inaudible] may want to put on, especially related to signage at that Scoville-Scenic intersection, or the Scenic... That area.

Mr. Nelson.

I had a question. Justin, in regards to pedestrian walkway, where is that exactly from that side?

The pedestrian connectivity route to the right of way?

Right.

Can you pull it up on your-

Getting across the freeway.
Are you asking how would somebody like... Because they're going to be installing sidewalk, but it won't have connectivity down into town?

Oh, I believe someone out there mentioned that there was a walking way to town?

No. [inaudible].

So there is no connectivity into town from this site? Okay.

Right. There will be a portion of the entire frontage of Greenfield that will have some sidewalk and other portions not have sidewalk. The purview of the development code for this project is just the frontage of the property boundary.

Other questions to staff? So I have a question. Did you say at the beginning of your presentation that you have a slide showing us the two possibilities for continuing?

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

So here's our options. We can continue the public hearing itself, or we can close the public hearing and keep the record open. Does anybody have a preference? Commissioner Nelson.

I would be happy closing the public hearing, but keeping the record open. Simply, I think we've heard most of the concerns from the neighbors abutting up to this property, but I'd like to be sure that we've got this notification. Or is there going to be notification sent in a broader area?

So the ordinance doesn't require that. If you wanted that to happen, we could, but bear in mind that you only have the seven days. And so that would really not provide-

Wouldn't get too much time then. My preference, and I don't know how the rest of the committee feels, but would be just to close the public hearing, but leave it open for additional comment.

Is that a motion?

That would be my motion.

I need a second.

I second it.

We have a motion and a second to close the public hearing and leave the record open. It's for seven days. Correct. And then the applicant has those seven days to... Okay.

Yeah. The items that were submitted tonight, both to the commission as well as by people here on the record, we'll put on the agenda center section of our website. They'll be uploaded tomorrow, but we can also email those to anyone who signed up in the back. There's a sheet back there. And then of course, the applicant will receive that. Since the record's open for seven days, that's new information that was just submitted tonight. So that's one of the reasons that it's continued so that there's time to look at that new material and comment so that then the
commission will get all that. And then we'll receive the applicants, any new information they want to respond to that, so that you have that when you meet again.

Thank you very much. You people in the audience who bothered to come tonight, thank you very much. Did you hear him say to make sure your name is on that sheet back there before you leave? Okay. Mr. Nelson.

Now, would that include some additional traffic impact information? I'm still a little confused on whether or not we can impose on this site particularly, or this project, but I'd like to have a little broader understanding of what potential could be out there, particularly with intersections and so forth.

Sure. No, I mean, we'll send you a copy of that section of the master transportation plan. Yeah.

Does closing the hearing and keeping the record open mean that we have to schedule this for a date certain?

Yes. Yes. You definitely want to put a date certain on that-

Can we-

... which typically, it's your next meeting. By code, it's your next meeting.

Okay.

I mean, that's-

So how is our schedule looking for the next meeting? Is there room for this, is what I'm asking?

Did you bring the... I think we have one. So there's room. Yeah, yeah. Absolutely.

Great. Great.

This would be first.

Okay. So we have a motion to close the hearing and keep the record open. That's been seconded. All those in favor say, "Aye."

Aye.

Anybody opposed? All righty. Public hearing is closed. Thank you all for coming. We appreciate that. All right. I'm going to head back to the agenda.
MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Commissioner Scherf seconded the motion to close the public hearing, but leave it open for additional comment. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Aviles.

The motion passed.

Alicia Howard is now exiting.

And commissioners, we're going to have hot mics for a while. There's people still online. First item is election of chair and vice chair. Do we have any nominations for the chair? Commissioner Nelson.

I'm going to make it easy. My motion, if the rest of the group is amenable to it, is I would move Eric Heesacker for chair and Mark Collier for vice chair, unless someone else wants one of those positions.

Can we do both positions at once in one motion?

Nope.

Sorry.

You can. It's called a railroad.

Could you please modify your motion?

All right. Fine. I would move nominating Eric Heesacker as chair.

Do we have a second?

I second.

Does anyone else want to be chair?

[inaudible].

All righty. All those in favor of keeping me in chair, so do you mind if you say aye?

Aye.

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Thank you all. Consider that a vote of confidence.
MOTION/VOTE
Commissioner Nelson moved, and Commissioner Scherf seconded the motion to nominate Eric Heesacker as Chair. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Aviles.
The motion passed.

Do we have a motion for vice chair, Commissioner Nelson?

I would move Mark Collier for vice chair.

Second.

Second.

And we have a second. All those in favor say aye?

Aye.

Aye.

Anybody opposed? All righty.

MOTION/VOTE
Commissioner Nelson moved, and Commissioner Scherf seconded the motion nominate Mark Collier as Vice Chair. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Aviles.
The motion passed.

Takes care of that agenda.

No, I want to correct you a little bit. You should have called for, are there any other nominations? Are there other-

I should have. Sorry about... Are there any other nominations?

That's okay.

I think you have to retract everything and start over at this point.

Oh yeah.
Okay. I'm not-

All the way from the beginning.

I'm not doing that. I'm the chair. I have that off.

Well, now you're a dictator.

I love being up here.

You're in the right place.

All right. Public comment. I see two or three people online. Do any of you want to comment on anything that is not on tonight's agenda?

Where are you online?

Apparently not. Okay. Approval of minutes from December 8th. Do we have a motion?

I hear by move that we approve the minutes from-

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss moves that we approve those minutes. Do we have a second?

Second.

Commissioner Scherf seconds. All those in favor say aye?

Aye.

Aye.

Aye. Anybody opposed? We have some good minutes.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss moved, and Commissioner Scherf seconded the motion to approve the minutes from the December 8, 2021 meeting. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Aviles.

The motion passed.

The next item is findings of fact from the landscape-related text amendments. Do we have a motion there for those findings of fact? Commissioner Nelson.

I would move the approval of the findings of facts for the arborist presentation that we had in changing our landscape-related plan.
Do we have a second?

Second. Tokarz-Krauss.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconds Commissioner Nelson's motion. All those in favor say aye?

Aye.


**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconded the motion to approval of the findings of facts for the arborist presentation that we had in changing our landscape-related plan. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Aviles.

The motion passed.

Matters from staff and commission members. Staff, what do you have for us?

I don't think we have anything tonight. Welcome to 2022.

Thank you very much. Commissioners, if you have something you'd like to say, please raise your hand. Seriously? All right. Well, I'll thank you once again for keeping me as chair. I'm having fun doing this.

I was going to say Commissioner Aviles did step up to help man the warming center, which was a big step up. The numbers reported by the paper apparently were higher than in reality, but it still served its purpose and it was nice to see her. She apparently works with UCAN. I've dealt with her on that basis and it was a good thing. So I would like to say thank you to her. I sent her an email, but if you haven't, it's another sacrifice of time.

Thanks for that reminder. I think I read something about that in the courier. Is that possible?

You possibly did. Yes.

[inaudible]?

Yeah. I think her name was in the paper.

Yeah, it's funny. They mentioned her as a planning commissioner. I don't know if they mentioned her UCAN role, but that was primarily why she was there. So anyway, it's a good thing because that's certainly time.

That was very nice of her.
Yeah.

Anybody else have anything? Okay.

I did forget to say the city council starting next Thursday has their annual strategic planning workshop. So just let you know that as a result of that, there'll be a new strategic plan for 2022 and we'll bring the commission the results that are the high priorities that come out of that workshop so you can be aware of that. And Commissioner Heesacker will present your goals on behalf of you. So we'll keep you posted.

Can we revisit the chair election that we just had then? All right. Hopefully, I'll be prepared for that. Anything else? We are done tonight. Thank you all for coming. (Silence).
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.


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 6 foot solid wood fence 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. As conditioned below, the dedication will be required.

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. The application includes proposed use of existing accessory structures located on adjacent County owned public right-of-way (eastern edge of property). The application also includes existing landscaping in the adjacent County owned right-of-way as existing buffering. As conditioned below, no use of structures placed on adjacent County property, nor use of existing or proposed landscaping for required buffering, nor fencing for required buffering shall be approved as part of this application without County consent.
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. A revised site plan shall show that no use of structures placed on adjacent County property (County owned right-of-way on east property edge), nor use of existing or proposed landscaping for required buffering, nor fencing for required buffering shall be approved as part of this application without County consent or transfer of ownership.

4. 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.

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

6. 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.
7. 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) shall be completed by the applicant. City agrees to reimburse the developer for the replacement of the sewer line between manholes G120 and G121. The City requests that the developer receive three bids for the work to ensure that the lowest responsible bidder is chosen for this project.
   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.

8. 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.

9. 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 Greenfield Road 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 City owned public right-of-way.

6. Obtain an encroachment permit from Josephine County Public Works for any work in the County owned public right-of-way (access alley on east side of subject site).

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

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

9. Each RV space shall be provided with electrical service.

10. Areas of trash disposal shall be screened by sight obscuring, solid wood fence or masonry wall 5 to 8 feet (5'-8') high.

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

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

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

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. Water meters shall only be located within the public right of way.
19. 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.

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

21. All utilities shall be placed underground.

22. Pay all inspection fees incurred by the Engineering and Utility Divisions, as well as all City bills due.

23. 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.

24. 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.

25. 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.

26. 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
12. Black Comment
13. Haugen Comment
14. Applicant Traffic Engineer Response
15. Applicant Engineer Response
16. Pottberg Comment
17. DSL Comment
18. Haugen Comment
19. Lamont Comment
20. Black Comment
21. Erickson Comment
22. I-Petition
23. Swanburg Comment
24. Swanburg Comment
25. Wallenburg Comment
26. Woodburn Comment
27. Brooks Comment
28. Fairman Comment
29. Petition
30. Gasso Comment
PLANNING APPLICATION FORM

Property Address: 420 Greenfield Road
Grants Pass, OR 97528

Assessor’s Map & Tax Lot:
36-05-05 CD Tax Lot(s) 100 & 101

Zoning: GC

City: ☑ UGB: ☐

Property Owner: Roberts Jr Trust, A Kenneth
Address: 2003 Old County Road
Daphne, AL 36526
Phone: (251) 626-4046
Email: 4kentheroad@gmail.com

Applicant: Barry Stone
Address: 1212 Greentree Loop
Grants Pass, OR 97527
Phone: 541-660-6840
Email: whitehorse7501@gmail.com

Authorized Representative (if different from applicant):
Address:
Phone:
Email:

Surveyor or Engineer (if applicable):
Geritz Engineering Consultants - Justin Geritz, P.E.
Address: 223 NE 8 Street, Grants Pass, OR 97526
Phone: 541-344-2817
Email: justin@geritzengineering.com

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that the information on this application is correct and that I own the property, or the owner has executed a Power of Attorney authorizing me to pursue this application (attached).

Date: 12/1/2021

Signature of owner or Attorney-in-Fact

For Office Use
Date Application Received: 12-3-21
Date Application Complete: 12-6-21
Pre-App required: ☑ N Pre-App #: 001-00373-21
Fees Paid: $ 3058.06 Initials: CN
File Number(s): 201-00410-2-1
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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 detained 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 discharged into the existing storm system at 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-isodes that will be utilized by the park patrons.
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.

RECEIVED

DEC 03 2021

CITY OF GRANTS PASS
420 NE GREENFIELD RD
36-05-05-CD, TLS 100 & 101

Legend
- Tax Parcels
- Subject Parcels
- Water Mains
- Stormwater Mains
- Sewer Gravity Mains

CITY OF GRANTS PASS
Community Development Dept.
205 Northeast 14th Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526
Phone: (541) 427-0660
Fax: (541) 427-0218
Web: www.grantspassoregon.gov
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Greenfield RV Resort Development

Traffic Impact Analysis

July 30, 2021

Prepared By:

Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering, LLC
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:**
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
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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 to the northwest and 335 feet to the southeast. For the auxiliary (east) driveway, the engineer reports sight distance of approximately 585 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.
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

Grant Pase\GreenfieldRVTIA081121
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
MINOR LAND PARTITION PLAT

LOCHS, R.S.W. W.M.
JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREGON

NARRATIVE

APPROVAL

PARTITION PLAT NO. 1880-35

DRAWN: D. W. WICKS, PE.
SIGNED: D. W. WICKS, PE.

SCALE: 1" = 100'

DATE: JAN 27, 1930
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Page 86
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 choses 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 groundcover. 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 “201 – Typical.”</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 23.078, 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 “201 – Typical.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 23.041 Landscape Plan

**Insufficient** Ensure that the Landscape Plan includes all requirements from 23.041, 23.052(2), 23.052(3)(b), and 23.052(3)(c).

**Unclear** Identification of existing trees not provided. Existing and proposed tree symbology appears to be the same.

---

Exhibit 11

Page 88
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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, finished grade, plant materials and irrigation.</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>23.052(2)(a)</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.  For tree protection methods and specifications, you can reference:  - ANSI A300 Part 5 (Site Planning, Site Development); and  ISA Best Management Practices – Managing Trees During Construction, Second Edition (2016)</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.  For tree protection methods and specifications, you can reference:  - ANSI A300 Part 5 (Site Planning, Site Development); and  ISA Best Management Practices – Managing Trees During Construction, Second Edition (2016)</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</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Plan notes that irrigation will connect to well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>separate landscape areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042(2)</td>
<td>Identification of the type of irrigation system to be used, the location of</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Submitted plan does not explain the coverage to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>irrigation facilities, and coverage to be achieved by the irrigation system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042(3)</td>
<td>An accompanying letter from the designer of the landscape plan stating that</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>See 23.042(2) for information relevant to this letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the design of the proposed irrigation system can provide irrigation sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the health and survival of the tree and plant species specified in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landscape plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.051(1)</td>
<td>Except single family residences and duplexes, all development shall provide</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Irrigation plan does not explicitly state this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an automatic underground irrigation system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(1)</td>
<td>All landscaping materials and irrigation shall be installed according to</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approved plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.071</td>
<td><strong>Street Trees.</strong> All development fronting on public or private streets</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approved following the adoption date of this Code shall be required to plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>street trees in accordance with the following standards. Street trees to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planted shall be chosen from the recommended list of street trees found in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 23.076 below. Approval for the planting of alternate species may be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>given by the Director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.072</td>
<td>Location for Street Trees. Street trees shall be located outside of street</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>right-of-way except in cases where there is a designated planting strip in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the right-of-way, and as specified in requirements and restrictions in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 23.030 and Section 27.313.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.073</td>
<td><strong>Spacing, Placement, and Pruning of Street Trees.</strong></td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Ensure that street trees are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01.500(D)</td>
<td><strong>(Muni Code)</strong> 10.01.500 The Manager shall develop reasonable standards for</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Right-of-way trees must not be planted where the base of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the planting, maintenance and removal of trees to carry out the purposes of</td>
<td></td>
<td>their trunks are less than 10 feet from water meters, sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this ordinance. These standards will apply to trees within Grants Pass city</td>
<td></td>
<td>lines, storm drains, or fire hydrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limits on public or semi-public land. These standards may be amended as the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>need arises, by the Manager. The standards shall include, but not be limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to, the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Utility clearances including, but not limited to, sewers, storm drains,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curbs, sidewalks, driveway aprons, streets, power or telephone lines, fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hydrants and water meters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>23.05.03(c)</td>
<td>The tree shall be planted in a landscaped area such that the tree body is at 2 feet from any curb or paved area.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05.03(e)</td>
<td>Landscaped areas shall be evenly distributed throughout the parking area and parking space to the inside of each parking space.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05.03(f)</td>
<td>Islands shall be a minimum of 6 feet wide to the inside of each parking space 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 section.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Development Department  
101 Northwest A Street  
Grants Pass, OR 97526  

RE: Major Site Plan Review for 420 NE Greenfield Road, Grants Pass, OR 97526  

To Whom It May Concern:  

I am adamantly opposed to the proposal to construct a 119-space RV park at the above referenced address. I live at a property that adjoins the address, and will be directly impacted by the plan that is the subject of the Urban Area Planning Commission hearing. I have several reasons for my opposition and will explain them in detail within this letter.  

While I understand that my personal feelings do not qualify as a zoning law, development code, or other such legality, I do wish them to be heard. I have had the pleasure to reside in Josephine County for 31 years. For 17 of those years, I have called Oak Dale Drive home. I raised my son here and when my daughter was born, I brought her home from the hospital to Oak Dale Drive. We have celebrated graduations, birthday parties, Little League triumphs, engagements, and more in my home. One of my favorite things about where I live is my back yard. We have a pool, patio, hot tub, and a large open yard. These spaces have not only provided entertainment, but also relaxation, the quiet, peacefulness for reflection, and they are where I taught my children an appreciation for nature and living things. Needless to say, having an RV park next to my back fence will eliminate most of things that I love, and many things that I hold dear, about my family home. The idea of having strangers look into my personal space, and potentially see my children or me, in our cherished space shakes me to my core. I am especially concerned about the lack of privacy that my young, teenaged daughter will have while using our swimming pool and hot tub. For me, this is not solely about the business dealings and development of a commercial property. This is about my family.  

I have received and read the site plan proposal, staff report, and subsequent documents. I understand that a five foot setback from my property line, along with a six foot fence, have been planned and the staff is satisfied by said plan. I would ask that same, satisfied staff if they would feel the same way if it were their home and children that 119+ strangers would be potentially looking into on a daily and nightly basis. Would they feel that this is sufficient to “alleviate any potential conflicts”? Is it enough to feel safe in your home and yard? Again, I comprehend that nothing more is legally required of this applicant, however, I would appeal to your sense of justice in requesting that the setback be extended further away from the back property line to at least 30 feet and that fencing be increased in height to at least eight feet. Certainly, this won’t add much to the overall cost of the development and would give me more peace of mind that we are safe when we are at home.  

There is also mention, on page four of the Major Site Plan Submittal, that “The development will be constructed along the hillside, creating views for most of the RV spaces.” Yes, there is nice city view from the hillside. However, once there are RVs
parked there, my neighbors and I will no longer have that view. People who do not reside in Grants Pass, do not pay taxes to our local government, nor support our libraries or public safety departments will be enjoying the view that has been taken from us in the name of economics. The comment on page four of the staff report, "The slope of the site will also provide additional mitigation by placing the entire park below the neighboring residential yards" is misleading too. Where our properties meet, it is the same degree of slope and even with a five foot setback, the RVs will still sit above my property, thus eliminating my view and creating a view into my home and yard for these strangers.

As to the statement on page 5 of the Major Site Plan Submittal that reads, "The proposed development will blend well with the surrounding development patterns", there are just two commercially zoned lots mixed into two neighborhoods that contain 61 residences just on the streets of Greenfield, NE Scenic and NE Oak Dale. That equates to just 3% of the area being zoned as commercial and 97% zoned residential. I might add that the other commercial property on Greenfield Road has a buffer from the residential neighborhood of over 100 feet, not five.

In addition to my concerns about safety and peacefulness, I feel quite uneasy about the prospect of long term tenants residing in the RV park. I know that many areas in Oregon have limits of 30 days, and our state parks limit stays to just 14 nights in a 17 night period. There are a countless number of research papers and articles to support the fact that lower income areas have higher crime rates, including violence. My neighborhood has enjoyed virtually no crime in the 17 years that I have lived here. It is a peaceful, quiet and unassuming area. I would hate to risk that for the sake of a business enterprise. Additionally, ventures such as that proposed will certainly reduce the value of my property which seems overwhelmingly unfair.

Along with the assumption of a higher rate of crime, I would ask whether our already taxed public safety entities are prepared to handle the load of what is essentially another large neighborhood. If no additional employees, or service hours are added, but there is the expectation that this new neighborhood will require services, will other areas of our town then be without the aid that they need when it is necessary for their safety?

One only has to drive by White Horse RV Park to see a glimpse into our future neighbors. This RV Park was developed and is owned by the same person who plans to develop Greenfield RV Park. I don’t personally know a single person who would camp at White Horse, let alone be happy to live by it. They have taken a beautiful part of Josephine County and turned it into a transient residential area. This is just one example of what I foresee happening in my neighborhood and it is unnerving.

As I was researching the proposal, I came across an interview that the current owner (Ken Roberts, Jr.) gave in 2006. In the article, he references several historically significant trees. I found myself both impressed and surprised by how unexpected the origin of some of the trees in the orchard are. Beattie’s article contained the following:
"George Washington planted a tulip poplar with his own hand at his plantation at Mount Vernon in Virginia," Roberts said. "I have a seedling from that tree." "He does indeed. Roberts has the direct offspring of Washington's tulip poplar growing at his home in Grant's Pass, Ore. And he has offspring from thousands of other historical American trees, too." "I've got everything that will grow here," he said. "I have trees from Abraham Lincoln's birth site. I've got the pin oak from John Fitzgerald Kennedy's grave. I've got trees from Helen Keller's home." (Beattie, 2006)

Not only are the trees within the orchard historically significant, so are many of the buildings and the property itself. I saw that the original farm house was constructed in 1900 when the population of Grant's Pass, as it was known then, was merely 2,290 residents. This makes the property/farm home older than all, but 13, of the historical properties listed in the city’s "partial listing of the most significant buildings". While the applicant suggests that they will keep the original farm house, I wonder to what extent it will maintain its historical relevance and value. I also question the removal of all the historical American trees.

In addition my concerns about my family's peace and safety, the assumed higher crime rate, and the degradation of a historical site, I am also troubled by the destruction of the woodland and stream area that is home to many animals. I understand that wildlife is frequently displaced in the name of progress, however, to my way of thinking that still doesn't justify the complete dismantling of their home. In this situation, they cannot simply move down the road. Their home is between the heavily traveled freeway and another neighborhood. In my years here, I have observed raccoons, turkeys, deer, a myriad of birds, skunks and even a shy little fox residing in the orchard. Although they are near homes, I've never had any trouble with them and enjoy the feeling that there is still a little bit of country in our small section of Grants Pass. I am not just worried by the displacement of the animals, and subsequent reduction in biodiversity, I am also concerned about the land, stream, and woodland conservation.

Finally, I find fault with the traffic study impact analysis submitted on July 30, 2021 by Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering LLC. My first question is in regards to page 41 of the appendices which is a memorandum from the engineering company to the city planning division. In the memo, it states that they are accounting for 23 weekday, morning, peak hour trips into and out of the proposed RV park. They are also suggesting just 12 weekday, afternoon, peak hour trips in and out of the proposed park. Seeing as the applicant has proposed that they will develop a 119-space RV park, I question the assertion that only 19% of the 119 campers will be using the intersection at Greenfield and Scoville Roads in the morning, and only 10% will be using the same intersection in the afternoon.

Also, because of the tremendous effect that Covid-19 has had on travel and recreation, I do not believe that a study from May 2021, when many people were still working from home and not vacationing, is an accurate depiction of what the traffic will look like when tourism in Southern Oregon resumes to "normal". According to a graph in the Seattle Times, hotel occupancy in Seattle in April 2021 was at just 30.8%, with Portland's
occupancy at 34.4% and San Francisco’s at 38.7%. Nationally, only 57.5% of all hotels were occupied in April 2021. While I’m not an analyst, or traffic engineer, this signals to me that travel was significantly reduced at the time of this traffic study, which was conducted in May 2021. Additionally, Travel Oregon’s Research Dashboard shows that hotel/motel spending was down by 44.4% in Oregon in 2020, and campground accommodation spending was reduced by 52.3% in 2020. All of this data corroborates the idea that using a traffic study from the midst of a pandemic, isn’t truly indicative of the amount of traffic that will be produced as a result of an RV park opening two years in the future.

I appreciate that the traffic study took safety into account by looking at the number of traffic incidents at the intersection of the freeway off-ramp and Scoville Road, and the intersection of Greenfield Road and Scoville Road. However, was the intersection at Morgan Lane and Sixth Street taken into account? It doesn’t appear so. I have seen multiple collisions in that intersection. Additionally, I question the safety of having an RV attempting to reach the freeway from the Morgan Lane intersection. How will a large motor home, or trailer be able to make the left turn necessary from Scoville Road onto Morgan Lane without blocking traffic, or hitting vehicles at the light who are facing west on Morgan lane?

I would also like to point out that the underpass at the intersection of the I5 off-ramp and Scoville Road is undergoing a seismic update and is not scheduled to be completed until the middle of 2022. This limits traffic to one lane on the only road that will take travelers into Grants Pass, and to the freeway. It is hopeful that the work will be completed on time, but even assuming that it is, the amount of equipment needed to complete the construction of the proposed RV park will add to the overall congestion in the area.

My final issue with the traffic study is their usage of “comparable” RV parks for their study. They cited just two parks on pages 18-20. “The sites were surveyed in the 1990s, 2000s and the 2010s in Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington.” Park one had an average number of 57 occupied sites and park two had an average number of 81 occupied sites. I am unsure of where the data for the third park is, as I couldn’t locate it in their study. I also don’t know how these are considered comparable parks. I question why the Southern Oregon RV Park located in Medford wasn’t used. It was completed in 2016 and offers 92 spaces. Additionally, I question why the Seven Feathers RV Park was not included in the study. It was completed in 2006, is just 43 miles away in Canyonville, and offers 191 spaces. These are much closer in proximity to the subject property, were completed in more similar areas, in closer time spans and have more comparable, or as comparable site counts.

Overall, I find the traffic study impact analysis to be fallacious and misleading. I especially take exception to the following sentence found in the conclusion of the report on page 5: “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.” Obviously this opinion was written by someone who does not commute to and from this area.
In conclusion, there are numerous reasons why this RV park should not be approved as it has been presented. As I mentioned previously, it appears that they are meeting the basic, minimum requirements by law, but there are many parts of the application that need to be reconsidered. Additionally, only properties adjacent to the Greenfield lots received notice of this application despite the project affecting a tremendous number of nearby residents. My neighbors and I have not had adequate time to meet with a land use consultant, speak in person with city planners, or get our questions answered due to the fact that the hearing notice was not received until December 24, 2021. With major holiday closures, and less than 30 calendar days notice given, I would request an extension to the public hearing, so that we may better prepare.

I appreciate your time and consideration in looking further into these matters.

Sincerely,

Tricia A. Black
251 NE Oak Dale Drive
Grants Pass, OR 97526
https://abcnews.go.com/WNT/story?id=130366&page=1

Tracking the rebound of tourism by hotel room occupancy

Seattle has trailed several of its competitor cities in hotel room occupancy rate this spring. The post-pandemic tourism rebound has been slow here, but tourism industry officials hope to see that pick up in coming months.

March room revenue

March 2021 compared to March 2020

SEATTLE
Down 55.6%

STATEWIDE
Down 35.9%

April occupancy rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Occupancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. hotels</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Visit Seattle, Smith Travel Research, Washington Hospitality Association

MARK NOWLIN / THE SEATTLE TIMES

https://www.seattletimes.com/life/travel/the-tourists-have-returned-to-washington-state-but-some-areas-arerecovering-more-quickly-than-others/
### TRAVEL IMPACTS SUMMARY: 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>YOY Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spending</td>
<td>$6.5B</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>92.3K</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>$3.1B</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Receipts</td>
<td>$966.5M</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-27.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTERNATIONAL VISITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume (2020)</th>
<th>Spending (2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2M</td>
<td>$0.3B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Visitor Spending By Type of Accommodation: 2020

- **Hotel, Motel, STVR:** $1.24K, 55%, -49.1%
- **Day Travel:** $1.3K, 15%, -21.5%
- **Private Home:** $1.2K, 52%, -49.1%
- **Campground:** $13K, 5%, -18.8%
- **Vacation Home:** $1.1K, 3%, -27.4%

### Visitor Volume & Average Spending: 2020

- **Person Trips (2020):** 20.2M, -31.3%
- **Per Person Trip (2020):** $235.1, -19.8%

### TOP MARKETS: INTERNATIONAL VOLUME (PERSON-TRIPS), 2020

- **Canada**
- **Overseas**
- **Ohio**
- **Japan**
- **Jet Blue Airlines**
- **Germany**
- **Australia**
- **Spain**

### Sources:
- TravelStats.com dashboard/oregon

---

**https://www.travelstats.com/dashboard/oregon**
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City of Grants Pass
Community Development Department
101 NW A Street
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526

RE: Greenfield RV Park – Major Site Plan
Urban Area Planning Commission Public Hearing
Adjoining Property Owner Comments and Concerns

January 10, 2022

My wife and I own the property at 261 NE Oak Dale Drive, which abuts the proposed RV Park on its north property line. We are opposed to the proposed RV Park but will be unable to be present for the public hearing scheduled for January 12, 2022, thus we are submitting these written comments as per the Notice of Hearing.

Firstly, we would request an extension of the hearing to the next Urban Area Planning Commission meeting due to the fact that the Notice of Hearing was mailed on December 22, 2021 and due to the close proximity of the end of the year holidays we were unable to properly contact the necessary parties and put together a fully responsive presentation.

As for comments regarding the application and staff report, we would submit the following in no particular order:

1. It is stated that the proposed development is consistent with the neighboring development. We would disagree in that a single family residential neighborhood is not the appropriate location for the proposed RV Resort which is designed to attract and serve transient occupancy.

2. The application submittal states the park will have 119 spaces, but that an additional space will likely be added during the final design. Where exactly will the additional space be added to the site plan which has been provided during this process? Approval of the application without requiring the identification of the 120th space is unlawful and a disservice to the neighbors. The Planning Commission should either require identification of that space prior to approval or specifically limit the development to only 119 spaces.

3. The application states potential land use conflicts will be mitigated by a landscape / fenced buffer along all interior property lines and that the slope of the site will also provide additional mitigation by placing the entire park below the neighboring residential yards. A five foot setback and six foot solid fence will hardly provide a buffer from the increased traffic from the RV Resort and the location of motor homes / travel trailers within five feet of our property line. I can guarantee that our dog will be barking constantly due to the increased activity this development will cause this close to our property. Additionally, the height of current recreational vehicles will allow the occupants to look over a six foot wall or solid fence into our backyard thus eliminating any privacy we currently have. The elevation of the property in question is equal to, or ever so slightly lower than the
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elevation of our property in direct opposition to any statement made by the applicant. No buffering is provided by the claimed elevation difference since the facts on the ground are inconsistent with the representation by the Applicant.

Even if the Applicant were right that its property is lower than my adjacent elevation, a concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall constructed adjacent to and along our property would most certainly block the historic storm drainage that flows between our properties. Potentially, that will encourage drainage waters to pool on our side of the property line and, potentially, flood. How would this matter be mitigated? Where exactly would the new CMU wall be constructed in relation to our property? If it would be built right on the property line, how would this be accomplished without damaging the present landscaping on our property? If the new CMU wall would be constructed off the property line, how will the area between the wall and the property line be maintained to not encourage the growth of weeds and other vegetation within this area? The growth of such vegetation will increase the risk of fire to our entire neighborhood.

4. Lighting — Criterion 8 of the staff report states “all lighting indicated shall be down lit and shall glare directly into neighboring residentially developed properties”. No where within the documents do we find a lighting plan with examples of the lighting proposed, proximity of the lighting to our property and how it will be down lit. And we can only hope that it is a typographic mistake that the lighting shall glare directly into our property. We would be adamantly opposed to any lighting plan which would increase the light pollution within our community caused by this development, and specifically an increase of light spilling onto our property.

5. The application states 48 storage units will be constructed on the site with a total area of 5,547 SF. What is the purpose of these storage units? If this is to be a premier RV resort, there should be no long term occupancy of the spaces. Short term RVers would not require storage of their possessions. The storage units should be disallowed since they are inconsistent with the use applied for.

There should be a condition to any approval of this plan that occupancy within the development, except by the manager, should not exceed fourteen days consecutively, without a time gap of at least seven days between any permitted occupancy. It is our concern that in time this development will become a haven for long term housing of residents living out of their recreational vehicles. And in most RV parks for which this is occurring, the long term occupants are placed away from the immediate access point, thus in the back of the park in close proximity to our property, which will directly affect the livability and value of our property. I cannot overemphasize this concern. The informal conversion or evolution of premier RV resorts into run of the mill RV parks with fulltime occupancy is a frequent problem. Often such fulltime parks are not well maintained, and they unavoidably serve an entirely different segment of the RV-owning public. The limitation of occupancy strictly to a tourist or other temporary clientele is essential to preventing this transformation.

I would also point out that the Applicant itself has characterized this project as a "resort" that provides only temporary occupancy. The Applicant should have no objection to a condition of approval that limits occupancy to just that use. If the Applicant resists such a condition, it will call its intention for the project into serious question. That alone should raise concern by the City and increase the advisability of imposing the condition that we are seeking.
6. Staff Report Conditions of Approval – A.8. Where is Carman Drive and why is it important to this development? Greenfield Road, which is very important to this development, has developable property on its north side only. The south side of the road is Interstate 5 which will never have private development. The Greenfield RV Park developers should be required to make street improvements on the full width of the roadway.

7. Staff Report Conditions of Approval – C.9. Trash disposal enclosures tend to be eyesores and when left unmonitored will become vermin attraction areas. The fence / wall surrounding same should be at least six feet (and preferably eight feet) high to diminish the likelihood that trash is simply tossed over the wall and does not make it into the receptacles. Additionally, if this project is approved, affirmative and on-going control of vermin should be a condition of approval.

8. Traffic Impact Analysis – The vast majority of traffic into and out of the RV park will be coming from Interstate 5, yet it does not appear there was an analysis performed on the impact of the additional RV traffic at the intersections of Morgan Lane and Sixth and Seventh Streets, which provide the access to Interstate 5 going both northbound and southbound.

The existing conditions were evaluated during the month of May, which would not reflect the peak of summer travel. The study did not show any bicycle traffic and minimal pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the proposed RV park. This is probably indicative of the roadway construction which has been occurring on North 6th Street in the vicinity of Interstate 5. I personally was involved in a motor vehicle / bicycle incident at the intersection of Morgan and Sixth in May, 2020. Subsequently, I have avoided the Sixth Street corridor in the vicinity of Interstate 5 until after the ongoing road construction is completed.

The study does not look at the impacts of increased pedestrian traffic from the proposed RV park to the restaurants located on Sixth and Seventh Streets in relatively close proximity.

As adjoining property owners to the property in question we do not expect there is much potential to stop development of the property, but we expect attention will be made to lessening the impacts on our single family residential neighborhood. Your consideration of our thoughts and concerns is appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

Terry S. Haugen

Frances V. Haugen
January 11, 2022

Ryan Nolan, Contract Planner
City of Grants Pass
101 NW A Street
Medford, Oregon 97501

RE: Greenfield RV Park TIA – Citizen Comments

Dear Ryan,

Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering, LLC received citizen comments which raise questions regarding the traffic impact analysis prepared for the proposed Greenfield RV Park. The comments received are from two neighboring property owners. Responses are provided below to address each citizen. They are referenced by the citizen's last name to avoid confusion.

Haugen comment 1: The vast majority of traffic into and out of the RV park will be coming from Interstate 5, yet it does not appear there was an analysis performed on the impact of the additional RV traffic at the intersections of Morgan Lane and Sixth and Seventh Streets, which provide the access to Interstate 5 going both northbound and southbound.

Haugen Response 1: The intersections included in the traffic analysis are determined based on development trips on the transportation system and agency thresholds. The City's threshold is 25 peak hour trips on an arterial or collector or 500 average daily trips (ADT). ODOT's intersection threshold is 50 peak hour trips or greater than 400 ADT. This proposed development did not meet the ODOT criteria for a TIA so ODOT did not require one. ODOT stated that they were not requiring a TIA during the scoping process but that they would like to be involved in reviewing the TIA because one was required by the City. The City required a TIA based on the proposed development generating more than 25 peak hour trips. Once a TIA was required by the City, the study area was determined based on which intersections were reached with 25 or more peak hour trips (City's threshold). We distributed 100% of trips to/from the site through the Greenfield Road / Scoville Road intersection and then from that intersection 100% to/from the south. At the next intersection to the south, traffic was distributed based on existing splits with all inbound trips from the east and all outbound trips to the south, which are the only possible splits. Based on this, no other intersection downstream was reached with 25 or more peak hour trips. This is why the intersections of Morgan Lane / 6th Street and Morgan Lane / 7th Street were not included in the study area.

Haugen comment 2: The existing conditions were evaluated during the month of May, which would not reflect the peak of summer travel. The study did not show any bicycle traffic and minimal pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the proposed RV park. This is probably indicative of the roadway construction which has been occurring on North 8th Street in the vicinity of Interstate 5. The study does not look at the impacts of increased pedestrian traffic from the proposed RV park to the restaurants located on Sixth and Seventh Street in relatively close proximity.

Haugen Response 2: The traffic counts gathered at study area intersections were gathered in May. Counts are gathered throughout the year for traffic studies. Once gathered, they are seasonally adjusted to reflect...
peak conditions. This was done in our analysis for the proposed RV park. We adjusted raw count data based on an average commuter/summer adjustment from ODOT’s Seasonal Trend Table. This is stated in the report on page 9. Pedestrian and bike numbers were gathered with manual counts. The number of both was low (three pedestrians and no cyclists during the p.m. peak hour). We noted that the weather was sunny and warm on the count day. There was no visible construction at either intersection. If we applied our own judgment as to why there were low pedestrian and bicycle volumes, we would say it’s because of the rural conditions and proximity to nearest attractions. The nearest attraction for eating or shopping is a half mile away from the proposed RV park (Morgan / 6th Street) and further to reach a bigger variety of places. It is our assumption that people staying at the RV park will not likely walk to eat or shop based on the average distance walked by pedestrians to retail uses as well as the existing rural conditions. We also don’t think many people will bike based on the same rural conditions. If people do bike, however, Greenfield Road is shown to have low traffic volumes and cyclists can share the road with vehicles until they reach Scoville Road. Once on Scoville Road, there are adequate shoulders for cyclists.

Black comment 1: My first question is in regards to page 41 of the appendices which is a memorandum for the engineering company to the city planning division. In the memo, it states that they are accounting for 23 weekday, morning, peak hour trips into and out of the proposed RV park. They are also suggesting just 12 weekday, afternoon, peak hour trips in and out of the proposed park. Seeing as the applicant has proposed that they will develop a 119-space RV park, I question the assertion that only 19% of the 199 campers will be using the intersection at Greenfield and Scoville Roads in the morning, and only 10% will be using the same intersection in the afternoon.

Black Response 1: The memorandum in the appendices referenced was a trip generation assessment provided to the City during the scoping process to determine whether a traffic analysis would be required. The trips shown in Table 1 were for a proposed 123-unit RV park. The table shows that a 123-unit RV park would be estimated to generate 23 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 33 trips during the p.m. peak hour. The reference to 12 trips in the “Trip Distribution” section is in regard to southbound outbound trips at the I-5 Exit 58 northbound off ramp intersection with Scoville Road. What can be confusing about trip generations is when they’re assumed to occur. When trips are generated for proposed developments, they’re generated for the critical traffic period of the adjacent street system, which is referred to as the peak hour. Trips generated for the proposed RV park in our analysis were for a peak hour during the a.m. peak period (typically occurring between 7:00-9:00 a.m.) and the p.m. peak period (typically occurring between 4:00-6:00 p.m.). We understand why 23 a.m. trips and 33 p.m. trips could appear low to someone who is thinking about a full RV Park with 123 spaces, but what the studies for RV Parks show is that trips don’t coincide with the a.m. and p.m. peak hours of the adjacent streets, which are the time periods typically used to evaluate impacts in traffic studies.

Black comment 2: Because of the tremendous effect that Covid-19 has had on travel and recreation, I do not believe that a study from May 2021, when many people were still working from home and not vacationing, is an accurate depiction of what the traffic will look like when tourism in Southern Oregon resumes to “normal”.....Using a traffic study from the midst of a pandemic, isn’t truly indicative of the amount of traffic that will be produced as a result of an RV park opening two years in the future.

Black Response 2: Covid-19 has affected traffic volumes, and we definitely take that into consideration whenever we collect data in current times. Agencies and consultants have been monitoring traffic since March of 2020. What we’ve seen in Southern Oregon is that traffic volumes returned to “normal” volumes for year 2019 by the spring of 2021 and became the new baseline. The peak hour within the peak period differs in some cases possibly because, as stated, people are working from home more but overall volumes by the spring of 2021 had returned to normal status in most cases.
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Black comment 3: I appreciate that the traffic study took safety into account by looking at the number of traffic incidents at the intersection of the freeway off-ramp and Scoville Road, and the intersection of Greenfield Road and Scoville Road. However, was the intersection at Morgan Lane and Sixth Street taken into account?

Black Response 3: Please see Haugen Response 1 above for an explanation of why the study area did not include the Morgan Lane / 6th Street intersection.

Black comment 4: My final issue with the traffic study is their usage of "comparable" RV parks for their study. They cited just two parks on pages 18-20. "The sites were surveyed in the 1990s, 2000s and the 2010s in Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington." Park one had an average number of 57 occupied sites and park two had an average number of 81 occupied sites. I am unsure of where the data for the third park is, as I couldn’t locate it in their study. I also don’t know how these are considered comparable parks. I question why the Southern Oregon RV Park located in Medford wasn’t used. It was completed in 2016 and offers 92 sites. Additionally, I question why the Seven Feathers RV Park was not included in the study. It was completed in 2006, is just 43 miles away in Canyonville, and offers 191 sites. These are much closer in proximity to the subject property, were completed in more similar areas, in closer time spans and have more comparable, or as comparable site counts.

Black Response 4: The process of preparing a traffic impact analysis follows certain criteria. When we generate trips for proposed developments, we use the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, which is the nationally recognized resource for trip generations. The Trip Generation Manual provides a large variety of land uses, which provide trip rates developed from studies performed throughout the nation. We chose the closest land use to our proposed development, which in this case was Land Use 416 – Campground / Recreational Vehicle Park. Pages 18-20 of the appendices, which are referenced in the comment, are graphs from the Trip Generation Manual that provide a.m. and p.m. peak hour trip rates for RV parks. The referenced locations of Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington are the locations from the studies used to develop the a.m. peak hour and p.m. peak hour graphs. There is no park one or park two graph. The first graph provides a trip rate to be used for an RV park during the a.m. peak hour. The second graphs provides a trip rate to be used for an RV park during the p.m. peak hour. These were used to generate trips for the proposed RV park in our traffic analysis.

We hope this adequately addresses citizen comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Parducci PE, PTOE
Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering, LLC

Cc: Client
Ryan/ Jason,

Good morning. Please see the email below from Public Works addressing the sewer main replacement/reimbursement. Can you modify the condition to reflect this reimbursement at the hearing and/or include this email as part of the record?

Thanks,

Justin Gerlitz, PE
Gerlitz Engineering Consultants
223 NE “B” Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526
Office: 541-244-2617 Ex.100
Cell: 541-890-5955
www.gerlitzengineering.com

Hi Justin,

The City of Grants Pass Public Works Department is prepared to reimburse the developer/owner of the Greenfield RV Park for the replacement of the sewer line between manholes G120 and G121. This section of mainline is featured in the Wastewater Collections System Master Plan under project R&R-5- Phase 3 North of the Rogue River. This section of mainline is approximately 400’ in length and exhibits severe root intrusion from the existing trees. This section of pipe will be difficult to replace after the development is constructed and it would be in the best interest of the Developer and the City of Grants Pass to replace the pipe now. For reimbursement, the City requests that your developer receives 3 bids for the work to ensure that the lowest responsible bidder is chosen for this portion of the project.

Please call me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Wade Elliott PE
Assistant Public Works Director
Office: 541.450.6114
Fax: 541-479-6765
www.grantspassoregon.gov
January 12, 2022

Mr. Ryan Nolan
Grants Pass Community Development
101 Northwest A Street
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526

(Via email only)

Re: Proposed RV Park at 420 NE Greenfield Road

Dear Mr. Nolan and Members of the Urban Area Planning Commission

I represent Tom Pottberg in relation to this matter. Mr. Pottberg owns property adjacent to the proposed RV Park. He is opposed to the application.

Mr. Pottberg has several concerns that the commission and department have not addressed and that will significantly impact the value of his property as well as the livelihood of the local neighborhood. The significant increased traffic, as well as the increase in residents in the area caused by the RV park, are not conducive to the quiet enjoyment of the area, which are primarily residential properties.

My client is concerned about the level of traffic and the current infrastructure to support it. There is currently a two lane road, with drop offs on either side, that make the road marginal for car traffic and rather challenging for drivers of larger vehicles with varying degrees of driver skill. Moreover, the noise and general complications with increased traffic have not been addressed.

Additionally, the intersection at NE Greenfield Road and NW Scoville Road is a challenge for drivers and with the coupling of the Interstate 5 off ramp. When you have large RV’s trying to navigate this area, you will see more accidents and travelers on these roads will be at risk.
The additional car traffic is estimated to be a minimum of five times current traffic of the residents of the local area. We are unaware that any traffic study has been completed, or that any efforts will be taken to mitigate these issues.

Those who wish to walk must use the roadway and pass through the same congestion at the intersection and the speeding cars from the Freeway. The increased traffic and large RV’s will pose a significant danger to pedestrians in the area. There are no sidewalks for pedestrians in this area.

Based on the number of transient individuals that an RV park would invite, my client is concerned about incursions and trespass into his property. There has been nothing done or proposed to mitigate these risks.

My client has an open canal on the front of our property. This could constitute an “attractive nuisance” as it’s a danger for children, and adults. There has been nothing proposed that will mitigate or eliminate this risk. Not only is it a concern of my client that people could be hurt, he is concerned about his own liability risks he is being forced to assume.

My client reserves the right to supplement the record in this case and is insisting on proper notice concerning this application. Furthermore, he requests production of all documents concerning this application.

If you have any questions, please contact me or my client to discuss.

Very truly yours,

CAUBLE & WHITTINGTON, LLP

S/Christopher L. Cauble

Christopher L. Cauble
CLC/

encs.
cc:
From: christine.stevenson@dls.oregon.gov
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2022 8:44 AM
To: Ryan Nolan
Subject: WN2022-0027 Response to Local Case File #201-00410-21
Attachments: Wetland Land Use Notice.pdf; Wetland Land Use Notice Response.pdf

[NOTICE: This message originated outside the City of Grants Pass -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure content is safe.]

We have completed our review of the Wetland Land Use Notification that was prepared for Barry Stone - Kenneth Roberts. The WLUN form was submitted to the Department for review/response and given the file number WN2022-0027.

The results and conclusions from that review are explained in the attached pdf documents. If the attached documents are illegible or difficult to open, you may contact the Department and request paper copies. Otherwise, please review the attachments carefully and direct any questions or comments to Jurisdiction Coordinator, Chris Stevenson at 503-986-5246 or christine.stevenson@dls.oregon.gov. Thank you for your interest in the project.

Additional resources that may be helpful:
- DSL Coordinator List
- R/F Fee Schedule

Aquatic Resource Management Program
Oregon Department of State Lands
775 Summer St. NE, Ste. 100
Salem, OR 97301-1279
Fax: (503) 378-4844
www.oregon.gov/dsl
Wetland Land Use Notification

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS
775 Summer Street NE, Suite 100, Salem, OR 97301-1279
Phone: (503) 988-5200

This form is to be completed by planning department staff for mapped wetlands and waterways.

* Required Field  (?) Tool Tips

Responsible Jurisdiction

* City of  County of

Municipality*  Date*
Grants Pass  1/6/2022

Staff Contact

First Name*  Last Name*
Ryan  Nolan

Phone*  Email*
541-450-6062  ronolan@grantspassoregon.gov

Applicant

First Name*  Last Name*
Barry  Stone

Applicant Organization Name
(if applicable)

Mailing Address*
Street Address
1212 Greentree Lp
Address Line 2
City  State
Grants Pass  OR
Postal / Zip Code  Country
97527  USA

Phone  Email (?)
541-860-6840  whitehorse7501@gmail.com

Is the Property Owner name and address the same as the Applicant?*

* No  * Yes

Property Owner

First Name*  Last Name*
Kenneth  Roberts

Property Owner Organization Name
Kenneth A Roberts Jr., Trust

Mailing Address (If different than Applicant Address)
Street Address
2003 Old County Rd
Address Line 2

City
Daphne
State
AL
Postal / Zip Code
36526
Country
USA

Phone
251-626-4046
Email (*)
4kentheroad@gmail.com

Activity Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township (*) (?)</th>
<th>Range (*) (?)</th>
<th>Section (*) (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36S</td>
<td>05W</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quarter-quarter Section (*) (?)
CD

Tax Lot(s) (*)
100, 101
You can enter multiple tax lot numbers within this field, i.e. 100, 200, 300, etc.

To add additional tax map and lot information, please click the "add" button below.

Address
Street Address
420 Greenfield Rd
Address Line 2

City
Grants Pass
State
OR
Postal / Zip Code
97526
Country
USA

County (*)
Josephine

Adjacent Waterbody

Proposed Activity
Prior to submitting, please ensure proposed activity will involve physical alterations to the land and/or new construction or expansion of footprint of existing structures.

Local Case File # (*) (?)
201-00410-21

Zoning
General Commercial

Proposed
- Building Permit (new structures)
- Grading Permit
- Site Plan Approval
- Other (please describe)
  - RV Park

Conditional use Permit
Planned Unit Development
Subdivision

Applicant's Project Description and Planner's Comments:*
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.

Required attachments with site marked: Tax map and legible, scaled site plan map. (?)  
Greenfield RV Park Site Plans.pdf 9.52MB

Additional Attachments

Date  
1/6/2022
Response Page

Department of State Lands (DSL) W#*  
W2022-0027

Responsible Jurisdiction

Staff Contact: Ryan Nolan  
Jurisdiction Type: City  
Municipality: Grants Pass

Local case file #: 201-00410-21  
County: Josephine

Activity Location

Township: 36S  
Range: 05W  
Section: 05  
QQ section: CD  
Tax Lot(s): 100,101

Street Address: 420 Greenfield Rd  
City: Grants Pass  
State / Province / Region: OR  
Postal / Zip Code: 97526  
Country: Josephine

Latitude: 42.464519  
Longitude: -123.318701

Wetland/Waterway/Other Water Features

There are/may be wetlands, waterways or other water features on the property that are subject to the State Removal-Fill Law based upon a review of wetland maps, the county soil survey and other available information.

Your Activity

It appears that the proposed project may impact wetlands and may require a State permit.

Applicable Oregon Removal-Fill Permit Requirement(s)
A state permit is required for 50 cubic yards or more of fill removal or other ground alteration in wetlands, below ordinary high water of waterways, within other waters of the state, or below highest measured tide.

Closing Information

Additional Comments
There appear to be 2 drainages onsite. Removal and/or fill activities within these drainages may require a permit for impacts that are 50 cubic yards or greater.

This is a preliminary jurisdictional determination and is advisory only.

This report is for the State Removal-Fill law only. City or County permits may be required for the proposed activity.

A Federal permit may be required by The Army Corps of Engineers: (503)808-4373

Contact Information

- For information on permitting, use of a state-owned water, wetland determination or delineation report requirements please contact the respective DSL Aquatic Resource, Proprietary or Jurisdiction Coordinator for the site county. The current list is found at: http://www.oregon.gov/dsl/ww/pages/wwstaff.aspx
- The current Removal-Fill permit and/or Wetland Delineation report fee schedule is found at: https://www.oregon.gov/dsl/WW/Documents/Removal-FillFees.pdf

Response Date
1/14/2022

Response by: Chris Stevenson

Response Phone: 503-988-5246
January 17, 2022

City of Grants Pass
Community Development Department
101 NW A Street
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526

RE: Greenfield RV Park – Major Site Plan
Urban Area Planning Commission Hearing
Adjoining Property Owner Additional Comments

As previously stated in our correspondence of January 10, 2022, my wife and I own the property at 261 NE Oak Dale Drive, which abuts the proposed RV Park on its north property line. We are opposed to the proposed RV Park and we are submitting these additional written comments as per the Urban Area Planning Commission’s extended period for the submittal of additional comments.

Our additional comments regarding the application since the Public Hearing would be as follows:

1. We have not seen anywhere within the site plan drawings provided with the application, a location for a sewer dump station. I understand that all sites within the proposed RV resort will have a connection for sewer, but during our travels across the country with our travel trailer most, if not all, RV parks have a sewer dump station on the property. Will there be a dump station on the property and if so, where will it be located? If there is not a plan for a sewer dump station on the property at this time, can the owner establish same at a later date and will there be a process for the approval of the installation of the sewer dump station?

2. As previously stated the current plans show 119 proposed RV sites within the proposed RV resort. During the public hearing, the applicant’s representative stated they may wish to add an additional RV site to the proposed plans in the vicinity of the southernmost storage buildings. At what point in time will this potential RV site need to be added to the proposed plans and will the applicant be required to definitively state exactly where this 120th site would be located?

3. As several of the opponents to the proposed RV resort development stated there is not a good location for lost future occupants of the RV resort to turn around if and, most likely when, they miss their appointed turns into the property, both on Scoville Road and Greenfield Road. Is the City willing to address this concern with abundant signage directing traffic towards the RV resort and more importantly, construct a safe area for the lost travelers to turn their RVs around to return to the proper property? We do not wish to have lost RVs on our residential streets and most importantly, not on our private property attempting to turn around. I know from experience, signage to RV parks can be quite limited and if you miss a turn, it can be quite a challenge to get headed back in the right direction.

4. We find it extremely interesting that neither the City nor the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is concerned about the significant increase in the number of large RVs traveling through the already challenging intersections of Sixth Street and Morgan Lane and Seventh Street and Morgan Lane, as well as on the merging roadway of the Interstate 5 off ramp and Seventh Street extension.
would expect ODOT to be especially concerned with the intersection of Sixth and Morgan, as they just recently spent a large amount of money to make rather insignificant improvements to the intersection. The cost to make this already dangerous intersection safe for the large RVs, both in size and number, expected to now travel through this intersection safely would be outrageous. To compound the traffic concerns regarding Scoville Road in the vicinity of Greenfield Road, there are a number of school buses that travel this congested area, and particularly during the hours RVs will be arriving at the proposed RV resort. Has this potentially hazardous situation been accounted for anywhere?

5. As to the traffic engineer’s assessment of the pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the vicinity of the proposed RV resort during a relatively short period of time in May, 2021, I can personally attest to the fact that there are both pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the area because I walk and ride my bike on these roadways myself. Greenfield Road to the west of the proposed RV resort and Sixth Street from the Interstate 5 off ramp to the new sidewalk adjacent to the Hampton Inn are both narrow and dangerous sections of road for pedestrians with the existing traffic levels. It will only be worse with the proposed RV traffic added.

6. The site plans provided with the application do not indicate the proposed width of the asphalt drive aisles located throughout the site. A minimum width of eighteen feet is stated as a requirement within the City’s staff report.

7. To date, there has been very little response from the applicant or the City to the questions and concerns raised by the opponents to the proposed RV resort development. The applicant and City should be required to provide valid and complete responses to all of the concerns raised by the opponents as either written comments or verbal questions during the public hearing? The responses should be included into the formal record as a part of the Major Site Plan Review process.

As we previously stated in our first set of comments, we do not expect there is much potential to stop development of the property into a premier RV resort, but we expect attention will be made to lessening the impacts on our single family residential neighborhood. Your consideration of our thoughts and concerns is once again greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

Terry S. Haugen

Frances V. Haugen
CONCERNS FOR PROPOSED PROJECT

1. GENERATORS

2. ALL FIRE DANGERS AND RELATED SMOKE, FROM ANY FIRES,

3. VERY HIGH DENSITY FOR THE PROPERTY SIZE AND SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD, THEIR WILL BE TRAFFIC BOTTLENECKS ON GREENFIELD.

4. PLANNING DEPT PLOT PLANS AND SUBMITTED PLANS SHOW 20 FOOT COUNTY ACCESS ROAD BETWEEN LOTS 100, 101 KENROBERTS LAND AND MY LOT 103 JOAN LAMONT I AM 91 YEARS OLD AND DON'T GET OUT IN THE YARD MUCH, I WOULD LIKE AS SHOWN THE 20 FOOT BETWEEN OUR YARDS FOR A BUFFER ZONE. THE FENCES HAVE BEEN MOVED AND STRUCTURES BUILT ON THE ACCESS RD. AND NOW A MASSIVE PROJECT RIGHT UP TO MY PROPERTY LINE?
This project as proposed is fitted for maximum density and is not neighborhood friendly. The proposed drawing places improvements directly on the county access rd. Butting my property.

Thank you for listening.
Rose Joan Lamont
Rose Joan Lamont

P.S. A ten foot wall on his property line might help?
Community Development Department
101 Northwest A Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526

January 18, 2022

RE: Major Site Plan Review for 420 NE Greenfield Road, Grants Pass, OR 97526

To Whom It May Concern:

As I previously stated, I am adamantly opposed to the proposal to construct a 119-space RV park at the above referenced address. I live at a property that adjoins the address, and will be directly impacted by the plan that is the subject of the Urban Area Planning Commission hearing. Based on the hearing held on January 12, 2022, I have further questions and statements regarding the proposed RV park.

First, when Justin Gerlitz, an engineering consultant was asked about the lighting plan, he suggested that the lights wouldn’t impact the residential neighborhood. However, there were no specifics given regarding the lighting plan.

Second, when Mr. Scherf asked if it was possible to move the RV pads further down the slope to the south, and away from the residential property line, Mr. Gerlitz said that idea may be entertained.

Mr. Gerlitz had a similar response when it was requested to have fences in excess of six feet to provide safety and privacy to the neighborhood to the north of the proposed RV park.

While I have no issue with Mr. Gerlitz specifically, I left the meeting with far more questions than answers. The same "no commitment" answers were given when it was suggested that security be added, a larger setback from the property line and increased buffering with taller hedges be added to their plan. In regards to the conversation about limiting the stay of guests, the comment, “it is planned for short term stays” is not comforting. That means nothing; much like many of the replies that were given at the January 12, 2022 meeting.

I did not hear anyone suggest that Mr. Stone and/or Mr. Gerlitz submit a modified plan with the suggested revisions. I only heard that the applicant would try to work with the neighbors. I don’t know what that means. Does that mean that the surrounding, established neighborhoods full of taxing residents have no say in any of the conditions regarding this RV park? I understand that it is zoned as commercial property and that this proposal is an acceptable use of such, but there must be some way of enforcing concessions.

I would also like to address the traffic concerns again. Many points have been brought up regarding the increase in vehicles, the lack of space for pedestrians and bicyclists, the signage, and how dangerous the intersections at 6th and Morgan, and the off-ramp and Scoville Road are. I did not see in the traffic study that the angle of the turn from Scoville onto Greenfield was considered. This is a rather sharp turn even for a standard vehicle. I find it hard to believe that the longer trailers and motor homes will be able to make that turn on one try. Multiple attempts will leave them blocking Scoville Road in both directions.

Additionally, while the intersection at 6th and Morgan may not have been required to be a part of the study, it should certainly be considered. I cannot believe that anyone with a total
length of more than 35' feet, or so, will be able to successfully turn left at that intersection using just the left hand lane. Dismissing the safety and traffic flow of that intersection when considering the type and increased number of vehicles caused by this RV park is reckless.

I invite all of the commissioners to drive north on 7th Street, merge to the right of the I-5 off ramp and drive down to the residential neighborhoods on Greenfield, Spring Mountain, Scenic and Oak Dale. I think that they should see firsthand the traffic concerns that we have along with the extreme disruption that putting an enormous RV park into our neighborhoods will cause.

I would like to reference the response from Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering, LLC on page two. There were traffic programs, tables and other resources used to calculate the estimated number of trips that would be added to the area once the park is complete. I understand that those calculations are estimated to be 23 a.m. peak hour trips (7-9 a.m.) and 33 p.m. peak hour trips (4-6 p.m.). However, common sense dictates something much more than just 19% of a full park traveling in the morning to access food, entertainment, the outdoors, our historic downtown, and to depart. Again, common sense says that more than 28% of the park will be checking into spaces, heading into town for dinner, groceries, entertainment, refueling, etc. during the p.m. peak times. In addition, even if the numbers are as low as projected, given the width of the roads, size of modern RVs, and the varying skills of RV drivers, the increased traffic will make the area between the north side of Greenfield and the south side of the off-ramp extremely congested. Again, I know that traffic resources were consulted, but none of this sounds logical, especially to people who live and travel the roads of this area on a daily basis.

The second section (also on page 2) of the response says, “What we’ve seen in Southern Oregon is that traffic volumes returned to “normal” volumes for year 2019 by the spring of 2021 and became the new baseline.” Again, I would ask the commissioners to do some research regarding this statement. Talk with the owners and employees of our community’s gas stations, hotels, and restaurants. I believe that they would have a very different view of the opinion that traffic is back to normal, just as the publications I previously cited did.

Finally, I noticed that there was a hearing on Dec. 8, 2022, regarding a proposed change to Landscape and Buffering Standards. I'd specifically like to reference page four where Ms. Rupp discusses the urban heat island and the need for greater tree canopy in our city. She goes on to discuss how this benefits the soil, lowers the temperature of blacktop at parking spaces (the RV park will be mostly blacktop), and increases value to our area by creating the appearance of caring about the community. While the applicant’s plan meets the minimum standards for landscaping and buffering, as of the time of the proposal, perhaps it is more appropriate to require them to meet the standards prior to completion. Both the forester at the meeting, and Ms. Rupp made valid points about why the current Standards should be changed, and their reasons not only make sense environmentally and aesthetically, they would go a long way towards settling some of the neighborhoods’ unrest.

Thank you for your time,

Tricia Black
City of Grants Pass
Community Development Department
101 NW “A” St
Grants Pass, OR 97526

RE: Major Site Plan Review for 420 NW Greenfield Road, Grants Pass, OR

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

My wife and I attended the hearing for project #201-00410-21 and we would like to provide additional comment. We live at 201 Spring Mountain Road and also own the undeveloped lot at 175 Spring Mountain Road, which is immediately adjacent on the northeast portion of the project property. We also own two undeveloped properties on Oakdale and two undeveloped properties on Scoville. The property values of all adjoining neighbors will be immediately impacted in a negative way if this is allowed to proceed. We have some additional questions and comments.

1. I noticed that Ken Roberts is still listed as the owner of this land. Does that mean that the sale to Mr. Stone is contingent upon the approval of this project, or will Mr. Roberts continue to own this after development?

2. They are planning a six-foot solid fence and photinia bushes on the perimeter of the project. Considering the concerns of the neighbors about privacy, I would suggest you consider an eight-foot solid fence and densely placed evergreen vegetation to the outside of it in order to create a large green wall. Arborvitae plants spaced every 4 – 5 feet would eventually develop some screen that would make this more palatable for the neighbors. This is the city requirement for screening cell towers.

3. I would also suggest a wider buffer zone of around 30 feet on the perimeter inside the fence that would be planted with trees and bushes. This would reduce the total number of sites which would help with traffic problems and make the interior sites more appealing for the travelers. A higher rent for these sites could offset some of the costs for fewer sites.

4. I also echo the concerns others have mentioned about the potential traffic congestion. Spring Mountain, Greenfield, Oakdale, and Scoville are all dead-end roads. Scenic loops off Scoville, and Granite Hill Road is an artery from Colonial Valley. All the residents along these roads converge onto Scoville to funnel under the freeway in the morning to go to work in town. The terrain in this area has dictated all these roads are dead-end and do not connect. This creates a potential nightmare in the event of a fire or some other emergency if everyone needed to evacuate. To add another 120 potential evacuating families to this seems very dangerous.

5. The proposed sidewalk along Greenfield stops at the end of the property so is of little value if pedestrians want to walk anywhere.

6. Noise from barking dogs, generators, etc. are also a concern as well as light contamination.

7. The Community Development Department has a responsibility to the residents of Grants Pass to be judicious and intelligent about how they allow development to proceed in our community. This is an opportunity keep our neighborhoods safe and livable.
We are very much opposed to the approval of this project in its proposed form. Some of the above suggestions could make this a better development but my overall impression is that, if left as is, this is negative for all the residents in the vicinity. We appreciate your due consideration.

Thank You,

Mart Erickson

Linn Erickson
This petition has collected
17 signatures
using the online tools at www.ipetitions.com

Printed on 2022-01-19
Save Our Space - No Extra Traffic!

About this petition

There is a current proposal to demolish the orchard on Greenfield Road and turn it into a 123-space RV park. The amount of additional traffic generated from this project is "minimal" according a traffic study paid for by the developer. My neighbors and I disagree.

Please sign the petition to postpone this project until more research on the traffic impact can be done. If you'd like, you may also write a letter of opposition and send it to: Community Development Department, 101 NW A St. Room 202, Grants Pass, OR 97526. They need to receive it by 5:00 p.m. on Mon., Jan. 10, 2022. Better yet -- show up to the planning hearing next Wed., Jan. 12 at 6:00 at City Council Chambers, 101 NW A Street, Grants Pass, OR to be heard.

If you have any questions, please feel free to email me at: triciab13@charter.net
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date-Time</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Terry Haugen</td>
<td>2022-01-05 04:07:05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patricia Sanford</td>
<td>2022-01-05 04:54:28</td>
<td>The traffic impact this will cause will be a nightmare for those of us who live in this area and have to go back and forth to wirj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frances Haugen</td>
<td>2022-01-05 17:23:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ernest W Sanford</td>
<td>2022-01-05 19:06:03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sidney D Cole Jr</td>
<td>2022-01-06 03:49:49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shelly Beaudin</td>
<td>2022-01-06 04:00:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kevin Wynn</td>
<td>2022-01-06 13:11:46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ashley Mulder</td>
<td>2022-01-06 16:54:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Justin Spinner</td>
<td>2022-01-06 19:07:43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Melissa Calabro</td>
<td>2022-01-07 06:41:28</td>
<td>I oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Matthew Olmstead</td>
<td>2022-01-10 03:39:51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tricia Black</td>
<td>2022-01-10 04:31:33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kevin Olmstead</td>
<td>2022-01-10 13:53:38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Name: Tracy Leenknecht    on 2022-01-19 01:28:40
   Comments:

15. Name: Tami Krauss       on 2022-01-19 02:46:46
   Comments:

16. Name: Kim Kloke         on 2022-01-19 03:04:10
   Comments:

17. Name: Laura DuPont      on 2022-01-19 03:52:28
   Comments:
This is Mark Swanburg my wife Robin and I have been residence at 355 N. East Scenic Dr. grants pass for the past 30 years. We recently were informed about the RV trailer resort proposed on the old Ken Roberts Apple Orchard property. We are opposed to having the RV resort in that location. There is insufficient place for the traffic to turn around if the property is missed on the initial try. We believe that lighting and overall congestion of such a facility would not only inhibit the normal living of the residence in the surrounding areas but that it will also devalue the properties that the facility is adjoining to there are insufficient sidewalks throughout the areas closest to the park and I believe that we will find people walking their animals in the middle of the street creating an unsafe environment for everyone. Not sure if there will be campfires allowed but the continual smoke from campfires also would be a big negative. I also have a big concern for the adjoining properties having garbage, bowls and toys, animal feces ending up over the fence and people climbing fences to retrieve their toys etc. This area is simply not set up for such a facility.
From: Swanburg <555swanburg@charter.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:40 PM  
To: Ryan Nolan  
Subject: Proposed RV resort @ the old Ken Roberts apple orchard property.

[NOTICE: This message originated outside the City of Grants Pass -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure content is safe.]

Sent from my iPhone my name is Mark Swanburg. My wife Robin and I reside at 355 N. East Scenic Dr. grants Pass. We believe that there are several reasons as to why this property should not be developed into an RV resort. We believe that the frontage Road is not suited for a place to turn around in a truck and trailer if the opening is missed. We are also concerned about the residence on Oakdale having campers with the potential of campfires and noise as well as the commotion of people pulling in and out constantly and eventually devaluing their properties. Inevitably balls and toys etc. will end up over there fences and campers would potentially be climbing their fences to retrieve toys etc. The street that we live on-NE. scenic Drive will become a place where the campers would go for a walk into the neighborhood for exercise with their dogs and children and there are no sidewalks in this area to accommodate this. We also believe that many of the campers would want to make their way down to In-N-Out Burger and there are no sidewalks or safe passage to get people from the resort into town. We are also concerned about lighting and obstruction of our view into the city from our home. Please turn down this proposal and do not build this resort on this property.
Dear Mr. Nolan

I am a city resident, I live at 327 NE Scenic Dr. here in Grants Pass. I have just recently heard about the potential development of the Roberts property on Greenfield Dr. and I am a bit concerned. Most of my concerns lay around the traffic congestion where I-5, exit 58 merges with 7th st. Traffic in the north bound lane using this exist is often traveling in speeds exceeding the posted limits, sometimes in excess of 50mph. This traffic then has to cross from the right lane into the left lane in a very short distance. At the same time traffic entering this area from 7th st. has to merge over from the left lane into the right lane in that same short distance (about 100ft). Traffic from 7th st can not see the traffic using the I-5 exist until the vehicle is along side the 7th st vehicle. I drive this location several times a day and have had multiple near misses at this location. Now the potential development will add approximately 124 vehicle a day to the location. Many of those vehicle exceed 40ft in length.

On the other side is 6th St. and Morgan Ave. The congestion around In & Out Burger is horrible and now the RV resort will add an additional 124-240 vehicles (some in excess of 40ft in length) into this traffic. The left turn lane from 6th St. onto Morgan is almost impossible for a long vehicle to make the turn unless the stopped vehicles on Morgan back up. That whole intersection needs substantial improvements anyway.

A third concern of mine is the inability the RVs to be able to turn around on Greenfield. If the RV misses the RV park entrance it will need to proceed into a neighborhood to find a place to turn the large vehicle around; there is no place to do so, the street is a dead end.

I hope you take these traffic issues & concerns from a nearby resident into consideration before you approve this development.

Sincerely,

Michael Wallenburn
327 NE Scenic Dr.
Grants Pass, Or. 97526
541-450-2716

IF AT ALL POSSIBLE, AS FAR AS IT DEPENDS ON YOU, LIVE IN PEACE WITH EVERYONE ROMANS 12: 18

Exhibit 25
As a resident, homeowner and tax payer in the immediate neighborhood I am opposed to the park because of the traffic, noise, floodlights, fumes from the vehicles and generators and the transients it will generate in this peaceful and quiet neighborhood.

W.T. Woodburn
375 NE Scenic Dr.
Grants Pass, OR 97526
From: Susie Brooks <letsfixshd@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:29 AM
To: Jason Maki <JMaki@grantspassoregon.gov>
Subject: Re: Additional Exhibits - Greenfield RV Park Hearing - project# 201-00410-21

Jason- thank you for sending me this email. As per our phone conversation last Thursday I am sending you this letter listing my reservations/concerns over the proposed Greenfield RV Park development, project #201-00410-21.

First I'd like to address the timing and scope of the notification that was mailed. It was only sent to the property owners that are adjacent to the property lines of the proposed development. The notice was mailed on December 22, 2021, giving the people who received the notice very little time to wrap their heads around the proposal, let alone play detective to figure out who was notified and then let those not sent a letter know about the project. All the while trying to celebrate Christmas and New Years and now prepare for the hearing that took place on January 12, 2022, less of than a month from the mailing of the notice. Nowhere in the notification does it list who the notices were sent to, and a notice should have been sent to all property owners north of interstate 5 in this neighborhood since this development will affect all of the people who live in this neighborhood-on Scoville Rd., NE Scenic Dr., NE Oak Dale Dr., Spring Mountain Dr., and Greenfield Rd. The time frame was also too short, considering the time of year - and just before Christmas, that the few notices were sent.

As for the rest of my concerns, they align with all the other neighbors concerns-the egress and ingress of the RV's will have a negative impact on all who live on the above mentioned streets. The concern of increase in crime is valid, especially with the possibility of the park becoming a long term stay park in the future. Declining property values are also a valid concern, most immediate with the adjacent properties, but all of the properties will be affected. People getting injured as they try to walk/bike into town as there are no safe routes to take on foot or on a bicycle. Quality of life for the neighbors living in adjacent properties is the biggest detriment of the project.

If this project is approved, the set back needs to be increased-its 5’ as proposed. It should be no less than 40’, this would give a little better buffer zone and allow for some of the orchard to remain. The property owner and developer has said he'd leave as many trees as possible, but there's a concern that even if they try to bulldoze around trees, root structures get disrupted and trees die. A study by an arborist would be beneficial.

I'm also curious about the storage facility-Mr. Roberts stated that he doesn't want boats, ATVs, etc to be kept the RV sites, thus the storage area. That does pave the way for long term resident storage. Maybe make fewer, larger sites so boats etc. can be on the rv sites themselves. If the storage facility is allowed, maybe it could be relocated to the property line, creating a buffer for the residences.

In closing, I feel the public hearing time should have been extended. If more of the property owners knew about this project, there would have been a lot more input from the community. I strongly oppose this development as proposed.

Thank you,
Susie Brooks
272 NE Oak Dale Dr.
Dear Ryan Nolan,

I am a homeowner above the proposed Greenfield RV Park. I live on 337 Scenic Drive. FYI, my father was a city planner for many years including being Planning director of San Diego back in the 60’s and I witnessed him endure many sleepless nights over developer tactics to impose their will.

That said, I have to go on record as saying the notion of putting an RV park on Greenfield would be horrible planning, almost beyond belief. It would make a mockery of the concept of cohesive land use. My goodness, from the traffic ingress and egress issues to the imposition of a major eyesore right at the entrance to GP this seems like a fiasco.

How is a 35 foot RV towing a “smart” car going to navigate if they miss the turn off to Greenfield? Are they going to try to loop around NE Scenic Drive? How are they going to make that left to get to In’n’Out? And after going to In’n’Out, then they are going to try to merge in slow motion across the freeway exit to make the right onto Greenfield. The traffic flow in this area is bad enough right now. The addition of an RV Park just seems like pure insanity, to me.

Other negatives: Light pollution. Noise pollution from RV electric generators. There is no real recreational destination in this area. Wouldn’t it make more sense to do this in Merlin near the Rogue River? OR out in the Redwood area? We have lived here since 2013. We love it here! But, to be honest, our house goes on the market immediately if this is approved.

I am sure it would generate revenue for the city coffers, in theory. But at what cost? If am am driving on HWY 5 and see a big sign for a KOA Good neighbor RV development, I am hitting the gas hard. An RV Park at Greenfield would degrade the aesthetics and value of the north end of town along with adding a logistical logjam of epic proportions.

Don’t do it.

Sincerely,

Paul Fairman
337 NE Scenic Drive
Grants Pass Or, 97526
PETITION

TO: The Urban Planning Commission, 101 NW A Street, Grants Pass, OR 97526

WHEREAS there is a 119-space RV park planned for 420 NE Greenfield Road, Grants Pass, OR, and there has been insufficient time to prepare for the public hearing, and the traffic study dated July 2021 appears to be unsound;

WE the undersigned petition the Urban Planning Commission as follows:

We request a continuance to the public hearing for at least 30 days, so that we may gather further information regarding the construction proposal and confer with a consultant and/or attorney.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (printed)</th>
<th>Address (printed)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alissa Howard</td>
<td>229 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Courtney Howard</td>
<td>229 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deidre C. Shaar</td>
<td>241 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Terry Walsh</td>
<td>240 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dennis Walsh</td>
<td>240 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shiela Reyes</td>
<td>262 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Carson Simmons</td>
<td>263 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Linda Blower</td>
<td>322 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Larry Blower</td>
<td>322 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Caroline Bernard</td>
<td>265 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. [Signature]</td>
<td>265 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Susie Brooks</td>
<td>272 NE Oak Dale Dr</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Carol Maier</td>
<td>176 N E Campus</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. [Signature]</td>
<td>176 N E Campus</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Todd Ray Bone</td>
<td>221 NE Oak Dale</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Kim French</td>
<td>293 NE Sonic</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ryan Nolan

From: Kameron Gasso <kameron@gasso.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 9:48 PM
To: Ryan Nolan
Subject: Comments regarding Greenfield RV Park

[NOTICE: This message originated outside the City of Grants Pass -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure content is safe.]

Mr. Nolan,

Regarding the Greenfield RV Park, I and several other neighbors in the Scenic-Scoville area have concerns regarding the site. We understand that such use of a long-vacant parcel can undoubtedly bring positive economic impacts of tourism to the area, but we want to ensure that the site doesn’t also present other unwanted elements to our neighborhood.

It appears that some concerns (e.g. lighting of adjacent parcels) are already addressed in the site plan; others that the community hopes can be addressed (but which may be more difficult) are:

- Water run-off: This area is adjacent to steep slopes and significant water run-off from the hillside on Scenic and Oakdale, and has a history of culverts being clogged and causing flooding over Greenfield. Paving a significant portion of this property for sites, roads, and driveways could add to the runoff and further inundate an already struggling stormwater system.
- Traffic: Transient drivers may need help or extra signage to be aware of the unique freeway onramp situation adjacent to Greenfield with right-turning traffic not stopping. Currently, traffic on Greenfield primarily consists of residents who are familiar with the local traffic pattern, but the addition of drivers in RVs who may pull out in front of vehicles exiting the freeway could be disastrous.
- General quality of life: Ideally, some assurance could be made that the site would not morph into a long-term stay RV park, which frequently experience issues with drug use and other personal and property crime. Additionally, the concern of noise could be mitigated by ensuring that park management enforces quiet hours and city ordinances regarding noise.

Many of us would love to see the site cleaned up and maintained, as it has become quite dilapidated after years of vacancy; while we don’t feel that an RV park in and of itself is a bad idea, we do think that it needs to be built and managed in a thoughtful manner which respects the property rights and safety of everyone in the community.

Thank you for your time,

Kameron Gasso
kameron@gasso.org
541-218-1749
I. PROPOSAL:

The application is to request approval for a 10-lot residential subdivision named "Pemberley Meadows" in the R-1-8 zoning district. The applicant’s tentative subdivision plan is attached as Exhibit 3. The lots will range in size from 0.16 – 2.98 acres with a majority of lots ranging between 7,000 – 8,300 square feet. The larger lots are planned for future subdivision as indicated by the applicant’s future development plan which is attached as Exhibit 4. The Tentative Subdivision plan requires two major variances, one for over-length cul-de-sac, and the other to Street Section Design Standards.

The parcels, measuring 8.62 acres, are currently developed with one single family home, one accessory dwelling unit, and various accessory structures. The applicant’s information with regard to the size of the parcels differs from City data and will be addressed by the surveyor on the project.

The properties have frontage along Williams Highway via two points of access; a northern access of fifteen-feet (15’) in width, and a southern access that is twenty-five feet (25’) in width. Due to these restrictions the application also includes a request for two variances: 1) to over length cul-de-sac, and 2) street section design standards. The applicant submitted an extensive narrative addressing both the subdivision and variance criteria and is attached as Exhibit 5.
II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Section 2.050, Schedule 2-1, Section 6.050, and Section 17.031 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code (GPDC), authorize the Planning Commission to consider the request and make a decision to approve, approve with conditions, or deny.

The decision on the Tentative Plan and Major Variances must be based on the criteria contained in Sections 6.060 and 17.413 of the GPDC.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Section 10.050, City of Grants Pass Development Code, 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: Low Density Residential (LR)
   b) Zone District: R-1-8
   c) Special Purpose District: GPID
      Steel Slope Hazard Area (Class A & B)

2) Size *:
   TL 900: 4.15 ac
   TL 1000: 0.07 ac
   TL 1100: 4.40 ac
   Total: 8.62 ac

   * The applicant indicates tax lot numbers that do not match revised tax lot numbers assigned by the County Assessor. As conditioned below, a revised tentative plan shall reflect the most current tax lot numbers.

3) Frontage & Access: Williams Highway (State Highway)
   Coach Drive (future proposed)

4) Existing Public Utilities:
   a) Water: 12-inch main in Williams Hwy
   b) Sewer: 8-inch main in Williams Hwy (and stubbed to TL 2200)
   c) Storm: 21-inch main in Williams Hwy

5) Topography: Steep Slopes to the east

6) Natural Hazards: Steep slopes

7) Natural Resources: Heavily wooded

8) Existing Land Use:
a) Subject Parcel: Developed with multiple single family homes
b) Surrounding: Low Density Residential / Underdeveloped

B. Planning History

In September of 2016 a pre-application (File No. 001-00144-16) was conducted for tax lots 900 & 1100 for a proposed three (3) parcel partition. Tax lot 1000 is a fifteen foot (15') wide lot that serves as a flagpole to tax lot 900. The minimum size for a private street serving three dwelling units is twenty feet (20') wide in addition to a five foot (5') setback from adjoining residential development. The applicant had proposed securing an easement from an adjacent tax lot to provide the required access but was unsuccessful.

In June of 2017 a pre-application (File No. 001-00186-17) was conducted for tax lots 900, 1000 & 1100 with a modified access over the wider flag lot that is a part of tax lot 1100. This design utilized a private street but was problematic because of the inability to locate the required water meters in the public right of way, and also required long water laterals uphill.

A follow up meeting was held with City Staff August 10, 2017 to discuss a revised tentative plan incorporating comments from the previous pre-application. It was generally agreed that the revised plan, while slightly unconventional would be acceptable in principal to staff provided that certain conditions were met including limits on the number of dwelling units served by the sub-standard street.

GPDC provides standards for private streets serving between five – ten dwelling units as twenty two feet (22') wide. Based on this, until such time as the extension of Coach Drive connects to the development, providing it with City standard road way, the subdivision will be limited to no more than ten dwelling units. These restrictions will be documented in CC&R’s and will place deed restrictions on the property through the recording of an approved future development plan.

The project was previously approved on 10/25/17 in its same general configuration under project #104-001122-17 and #301-00120-17. This was followed by a minor modification in October of 2018 for the addition of an accessory dwelling unit on the existing home.

A development permit was issued on 10/15/18 and the infrastructure has been partially constructed to date. This includes grading throughout, installation of a new water main from Williams Highway to the proposed cul-de-sac, construction of a box culvert over the irrigation canal, and franchise utility conduits. Two development permit extensions were approved for the project, but the land use application expired on 4/15/21.

Due to the previous approval expiring, the applicant is requesting a new approval

V. DISCUSSION:

A. Subdivision Tentative Plan

"Pemberley Meadows" is a proposed ten (10) lot subdivision in the R-1-8 zoning district. The properties are roughly 8.62 acres and configured in such a way that there are two
access points to Williams Highway: a fifteen feet (15’) wide strip of land (Tax Lot 1000) provides 15’ of access which the applicant proposes will be used for a pedestrian access, and a twenty five foot (25’) flag pole of Tax Lot 1100 is proposed for vehicle access through a proposed temporary private street. The configuration of these three tax parcels is unique, but determined to be legal pre-existing non-conforming properties based on the date of the land divisions.

The parcel has existing trees of various species and size. Where possible, these trees will be saved. Any trees removed will be replaced/mitigated according to the tree re-vegetation plan that is required in compliance with the standards of Article 11 of the GPDC.

The property is within the Grants Pass irrigation District (GPID). The property owners will need to contact GPID directly to discuss requirements for development.

B. Variances Requested

The applicant is requesting three separate but related variances:

1) **27.123(1)(f)** – Cul-de-sac streets: These are a type of dead-end local access streets. Cul-de-sac streets shall be as short as possible and shall have a maximum length of 400 feet in the Slope Hazard District identified in Article 13.100, and 250 feet in all other areas, unless a variance is granted by the Review Body.

2) **27.123(12)(b)** – A private street serving five to ten dwelling units may use a minimum 22 foot wide private street, with a curb and 4 foot sidewalk along one side only, and no planter strip.

3) **27.123(14)** - In those cases where a proposed street abuts a developed neighboring residential property, the street itself shall be kept a minimum of 5-feet from the abutting property line. The sidewalk, if any, may be placed at the property line

VI. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

The applicant’s submitted responses to the Variance and Subdivision Criteria is attached as Exhibit 5.

A. Major Variance Criteria – Over Length Cul-de-sac: The applicant requests

Section 6.060 of the Development Code states that previously granted Variances shall not be considered to have established a precedent. The review body shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application. No Variance shall be granted unless the review body finds that all of the applicable criteria have been satisfied.

(Note: The application uses one response to address all three variance requests)

CRITERION (1): The Variance is necessary because the subject code provision does not account for special or unique physical circumstances of the subject site, such as
topography, natural features, adjacent development, or similar circumstances. A legal lot determination may be sufficient evidence of a hardship for purposes of approving a Variance.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. The new street, including the temporary connection, will have an overall length of 650’ as measured from the curb face on Williams Highway to the center of the hammerhead turnaround. Section 27.123(1)(f) limits the length of a cul-de-sac street to 400’ within the Steep Slope Development Area.

The applicant’s full response can be found in their submitted narrative, see Exhibit 5.

Staff acknowledges base development code standards do not address the historic development patterns of the surrounding area (Exhibit 2) or the topography challenges and their impacts on development of the subject site.

**CRITERION (2):** The Variance is the minimum necessary to address the special or unique physical circumstances related to the subject site.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. One thing to note about Pemberley Lane is that in the future when Coach Drive is constructed, it will nearly meet the 400’ maximum length standard (418’ as measured from the future Coach Drive right-of-way to the start of the cul-de-sac bulb).

**CRITERION (3):** The proposal’s benefits will be greater than any negative impacts on the development of the adjacent uses and will further the purpose and intent of this ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan of the City.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. Staff acknowledges that without approval of the Variance request, the total number of lots which can be approved will be significantly reduced.

**CRITERION (4):** The need for the Variance is not self-imposed by the applicant or property owner. For example, the Variance request does not arise as a result of a property line adjustment or land division approval previously granted to the applicant.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. This measurement is not the result of a property line adjustment or land division approval granted to the applicant. It is due to development patterns of adjacent subdivisions. Although the property can be developed without the variance it will significantly limit the number of lots that can be created.

**B. Major Variance Criteria – Private Street Width**

Section 6.060 of the Development Code states that previously granted Variances shall not be considered to have established a precedent. The review body shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application. No Variance shall be granted unless the review body finds that all of the applicable criteria have been satisfied.

(Note: The application uses one response to address all three variance requests)

**CRITERION (1):** The Variance is necessary because the subject code provision does not account for special or unique physical circumstances of the subject site, such as
topography, natural features, adjacent development, or similar circumstances. A legal lot
determination may be sufficient evidence of a hardship for purposes of approving a
Variance.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. Based on the existing flag lot widths at Williams Highway,
the “temporary” section of Pemberley Lane can only fit within the 25’ flag lot through the
approval of a variance request. The 4’ sidewalk that would normally be required adjacent
to this private street section is proposed to be relocated to the north flag lot for
pedestrian access to Williams Highway, which requires a variance to the private street
standards listed under Section 27.123(12)(b).

The applicant’s full response can be found in their submitted narrative, see *Exhibit 5*.

Staff agrees base development code standards do not address the historic adjacent
development patterns (*Exhibit 2*) and their impacts on development of the subject site.

**CRITERION (2):** The Variance is the minimum necessary to address the special or
unique physical circumstances related to the subject site.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. In the future when Coach Drive is extended to the east side
of the development, this temporary section of roadway will be converted to a
pedestrian/utility easement (only) and bollards will be placed at the connection to the cul-
de-sac bulb to prevent vehicular traffic to/from Williams Highway.

Staff agrees the variance request is the minimum necessary to address the unique
circumstances related to the subject site.

**CRITERION (3):** The proposal’s benefits will be greater than any negative impacts on
the development of the adjacent uses and will further the purpose and intent of this
ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan of the City.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. Staff agrees with the applicant’s attached response that the
proposed development is consistent with surrounding development and the benefits of
creating more developable lots outweighs any potential negative impacts of the
proposal.

**CRITERION (4):** The need for the Variance is not self-imposed by the applicant or
property owner. For example, the Variance request does not arise as a result of a
property line adjustment or land division approval previously granted to the applicant.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. This measurement is not the result of a property line
adjustment or land division approval granted to the applicant. It is due to development
patterns of adjacent subdivisions.

**C. Major Variance Criteria – Private Street Buffering**

Section 6.060 of the Development Code states that previously granted Variances
shall not be considered to have established a precedent. The review body shall
approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application. No Variance shall be
granted unless the review body finds that all of the applicable criteria have been
satisfied.

(Note: The application uses one response to address all three variance requests)

**CRITERION (1):** The Variance is necessary because the subject code provision does not account for special or unique physical circumstances of the subject site, such as topography, natural features, adjacent development, or similar circumstances. A legal lot determination may be sufficient evidence of a hardship for purposes of approving a Variance.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. Due to the narrow flag lot width, is the request to eliminate the 5' buffer normally required under Section 27.134(14) along the temporary private street access.

The applicant’s full response can be found in their submitted narrative, see **Exhibit 5**.

Staff agrees base development code standards do not address the historic adjacent development patterns (**Exhibit 2**) and their impacts on development of the subject site.

**CRITERION (2):** The Variance is the minimum necessary to address the special or unique physical circumstances related to the subject site.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. In the future when Coach Drive is extended to the east side of the development, this temporary section of roadway will be converted to a pedestrian/utility easement (only) and bollards will be placed at the connection to the cul-de-sac bulb to prevent vehicular traffic to/from Williams Highway.

**CRITERION (3):** The proposal’s benefits will be greater than any negative impacts on the development of the adjacent uses and will further the purpose and intent of this ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan of the City.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. Staff agrees with the applicant’s attached response that the proposed development is consistent with surrounding development and the benefits of creating more developable lots outweighs any potential negative impacts of the proposal.

**CRITERION (4):** The need for the Variance is not self-imposed by the applicant or property owner. For example, the Variance request does not arise as a result of a property line adjustment or land division approval previously granted to the applicant.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied. This measurement is not the result of a property line adjustment or land division approval granted to the applicant. It is due to development patterns of adjacent subdivisions.

**D. Subdivision Tentative Plan**

Section 17.413 of the GPDC states that the review body shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the request based upon the following criteria:

**Criterion (1):** The plan conforms to the lot dimension standards of Article 12, the base lot standards of Section 17.510, and the requirements of any applicable overlay district.
Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. Article 12 of the GPDC requires a minimum lot area of 7,000 square feet, and a minimum lot width of sixty-five feet (65’) for properties in the R-1-8 zoning district. In accordance with the requirements of Section 17.510 of the GPDC, the proposed lots do not exceed the lot width to depth ratio, nor does the subdivision create a through lot. The side property lines run at right angles to the street, and each parcel exceeds the minimum twenty (20) feet of frontage to a public right-of-way in accordance with Section 27.200. Finally, in accordance with Section 22.630 of the GPDC the lot layout conforms to the Solar Design Standards for new subdivisions. Many of the existing accessory structures shall be removed as part of development.

As conditioned below, a demolition permit will be required for any structures to be removed, and any well or septic system must be properly abandoned.

As conditioned below, the subdivision will be required to have CC&R’s that obligate the owners to common future maintenance of both Tract A and the multi-use / pedestrian pathway.

As conditioned below, the applicant shall submit a maintenance agreement for review and approval by the Community Development Department, including.

a. Maintenance of the full section of Pemberley Lane until such time that the City takes ownership.

Criterion (2): When required, the proposed future development plan allows the properties to be further developed, partitioned, or subdivided as efficiently as possible under existing circumstances, in accordance with requirements for typical permitted uses in the applicable zone and comprehensive plan district, and in conjunction with other development in the neighborhood.

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. The applicant submitted a future development plan that indicates a future development potential of twenty (21) total lots. Because the temporary roadway accessing the subdivision is built to the Private Street standards to support up to ten (10) dwelling units, the subdivision will be restricted to not more than ten (10) dwelling units until such time as Coach Drive is constructed and has interconnectivity with adjacent public right of way.

As conditioned below, In accordance with 17.544(2), the applicant will be required to dedicate as an easement the future Coach Drive right of way.

As conditioned below, access will be restricted to lots 3 and 10 and any future land division or development of Lots 3 or 10 will require the construction of frontage improvements to Coach Drive, as defined in Section 17.544(3).

As conditioned below, The future development plan, in accordance with Section 17.545, shall be recorded with the County Recorder as an exhibit to the approved plat. When a plan is amended, that amendment shall reference the original plan, and shall be recorded with the County Recorder.

Criterion (3): When one is required or proposed, the street layout conforms to the applicable requirements of the adopted street plans, meets the requirements of Article
27 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency and environmental compatibility.

**Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions.** Because the private street standards found in Section 27.123(12)(b) only support up to ten (10) dwelling units, the subdivision will be prevented from increasing beyond the ten (10) lots as proposed, including a prohibition on new ADU’s, until such time as Coach Drive connects.

As conditioned below, the subdivision will be restricted to no more than ten (10) dwelling units until such time as Coach Drive connects. Furthermore, the CC&R’s must require that the temporary access to Williams Highway be closed off for only emergency access once Coach Drive has connected. Additionally the applicant will be required to post “No Parking” on both sides of any street less than 24’ and on one side for streets less than 26’ and mark the hammerhead “Fire Lane No Parking.”

As conditioned below, the bridge to cross the canal shall be engineered in accordance with AASHTO HB-17 and be rated for a live load of at least 75,000 lbs. with the load limit posted on both ends of the crossing.

As conditioned below, the applicant shall contact ODOT Permit Specialist Julee Scruggs to obtain a new state highway approach permit. The applicant will also be required to demonstrate a complete profile of Coach Drive both to the North and South to ensure that it can be constructed as indicated.

As conditioned below, finally the pedestrian access shall be modified to be a fifteen foot (15’) multi-use path with bollards at the eastern end where it connects to the cul-de-sac bulb.

**Criterion (4):** The proposed utility plan conforms to the applicable requirements of adopted utility plans, the requirements of Article 28 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency and environmental compatibility.

**Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions.** The proposed utility plan meets the requirements of Article 28 and includes eight inch (8") water and eight inch (8") sewer main from Williams Highway.

As conditioned below, applicant must meet the standards as described in the attached Public Works Memo, see **Exhibit 6.**

Additionally, a ten-foot (10’) CUE shall be dedicated along the frontage of Williams Highway and along the entire frontage of Pemberley Lane. The applicant will be required to submit a revised tentative plan reflecting the CUE and record it on the final plat.

**Criterion (5):** The tentative plan allows for the preservation or establishment of natural features or the preservation of historic features of the property, and allows access to solar energy to the extent possible under existing circumstances, including:

(a) Providing the necessary information to complete the tree chart identified in Section 11.041.

(b) No cuts shall result in retaining walls greater than 15 feet high in a single wall from the finish grade or create any un-retained slopes greater than 100%.
(c) No fills shall result in a retaining wall within the required setback from a property not included in the development plan greater than 6 feet in height from the finish grade or create any slopes which are greater than 100%.

**Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions.** The applicant has submitted an “Existing Tree Canopy Cover” plan. The property is heavily treed, and efforts will be made to protect as many as possible but will require the removal of several mature trees. The site is very steep, and the applicant’s submittal indicates that no large cuts or fills are anticipated and that only minor retaining walls will be required between lots. No cuts or fills are indicated on the tentative site plan.

**As condition below,** a revised site plan must satisfy the comments provided by the City of Grants Pass Urban Forester, see Exhibit 7.

**As conditioned below,** the applicant will be required to submit a “Tree Protection Plan” prior to the issuance of a development permit, and a “Tree Re-vegetation Plan” accompanied by a $500 per lot Tree Deposit prior to Final Plat approval.

**As conditioned below,** the applicant will also be required to obtain an NPDES permit from the DEQ, provide an erosion control and dust control plan, and present engineered construction drawings prepared by a professional engineer.

**Criterion (6):** The plan complies with applicable portions of the Comprehensive Plan, this Code, and state and federal laws.

**Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions.** The tentative plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and subject to the conditions of approval will conform to the Development Code.

**As conditioned below,** the applicant will be required to sign a service and annexation agreement, submit a steep slope geotechnical report, and submit a letter from the engineer responsible for supervising the construction of the subdivision (per Section 17.423.1(a)). Finally the applicant shall contact GPID to coordinate any requirements they may have.

**VII. RECOMMENDATION:**

- Staff recommends the Planning Commission **APPROVE** the request for a variance to Cul-de-sac length standards.
- Staff recommends the Planning Commission **APPROVE** the request for a variance to Private Street Width standards.
- Staff recommends the Planning Commission **APPROVE** the request for a variance for Street Section Design Standards.
- Staff recommends the Planning Commission **APPROVE** the request for the ten (10) lot subdivision.

**Conditions of Approval:**
A. The following must be accomplished within 24 months of the Planning Commission’s Decision and prior to issuance of a Development Permit. The Director may, upon written request by the applicant, grant up to two extensions of the expiration date of six months each.

(Note: A Development Permit is required in order to obtain a grading permit.)

1. Submit four (4) copies of the revised tentative plan to the Community Development Department indicating the following:
   a. Tax lot numbers for each parcel shall reflect current assessor assigned Tax Lot numbers.
   b. A 10’ CUE along Williams Highway
   c. Indicate required “No Parking” on both sides of any street 24’ or less and on one side for streets less than 26.’

2. Submit two (2) copies of a revised future development plan to the Community Development Department indicating the following:
   a. Restricting access to lots 3 and 10 to future development and land division.
   b. Restricting the total number of dwelling units to ten (10) units, until such time that Coach Drive has interconnectivity to other public right of way.
   c. Require the termination of the temporary access at such time as Coach Drive connects.
   d. Obligates the owners of the resultant parcels of the Subdivision to common maintenance of Tract A, pedestrian pathway, and all streets until interconnection to adjacent public street completed.

3. The applicant shall provide a copy of the draft CC&R’s that will be attached to the property to the Community Development Department for Review and Approval.
   a. These shall prohibit the total number of dwelling units to ten (10) units, until such time that Coach Drive has interconnectivity to other public right of way.
   b. Require the termination of the temporary access at such time as Coach Drive connects.
   c. Obligates the owners of the resultant parcels of the Subdivision to common maintenance of Tract A, pedestrian pathway, and all streets until interconnection to adjacent public street completed.

4. The applicant shall obtain a demolition permit from the Building Department for all structures to be removed. The applicant shall be required to submit an Asbestos Survey completed by an accredited inspector.

5. Submit Steep Slope Geotechnical report prepared by an engineer licensed to practice in the State of Oregon.
   a. If any of the property to be developed lies in the Class B slopes this report shall be prepared by a Geo-Technical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist.
6. Any septic system shall be properly abandoned in accordance with DEQ guidelines and standards. Submit copies of DEQ permits if applicable.

7. Contact GPID to establish drainage accounts and to coordinate any development requirements they may have.

8. The applicant shall contact ODOT Permit Specialist Julee Scruggs (541-864-8811 Julee.Y.SCRUGGS@odot.state.or.us) to obtain a new state highway approach permit.

9. The bridge to cross the canal shall be engineered in accordance with AASHTO HB-17 and be rated for a live load of at least 75,000 lbs. with the load limit posed on both ends of the crossing.

10. The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed extension of Coach Drive to the North and South is possible and that there will be no alignment or problems with grade. The applicant shall submit to the Engineering Division for review a complete profile demonstrating that the extension of Coach Drive is possible as indicated to both the North and the South.

11. Submit draft language and maps to the Community Development Department prepared by a licensed surveyor for all associated easements or illustrate them on the revised Tentative Plan.

   a. A fifteen foot (15’) unobstructed and drivable easement centered on the sewer main including access across the canal.

   b. A twenty foot (20’) unobstructed and drivable easement centered on the water main through tract A.

   c. An easement shall be granted to the general public for ingress and egress across both access ways. The access easement over the multi-use path shall run in perpetuity, the access easement over the private street shall extinguish at such time as it is closed to vehicular traffic (when Coach Drive connects.)

12. Obtain an NPDES permit from the Department of Environmental Quality. Submit a copy of the approved permit to the Community Development Department.

13. Meet conditions found in the Public Works Memorandum, see Exhibit 6.

14. Submit a revised “Existing Tree Canopy Cover and Tree Protection Plan” for review and approval by the City’s Urban Forester, see Exhibit 7.

**B. The following must occur prior to Final Plat approval:**

1. Submit final copy of approved CC&R’s and future development plan to the Community Development Department indicating the following:

   a. Restricting access to lots 3 and 10 to future development and land division.

   b. Restricting the total number of dwelling units to ten (10) units, until such time that Coach Drive has interconnectivity to other public right of way.

   c. Require the termination of the temporary access at such time as Coach Drive connects.
d. Obligates the owners of the resultant parcels of the Subdivision to common
maintenance of Tract A, pedestrian pathway, and all streets until interconnection
to adjacent public street completed.

2. Submit recorded copies for all associated easements or indicate them on the Final
Plat including:
   a. A fifteen foot (15’) unobstructed and drivable easement centered on the sewer
      main including access across the canal.
   b. A twenty foot (20’) unobstructed and drivable easement centered on the water
      main through tract A.
   c. An easement shall be granted to the general public for ingress and egress across
      both access ways. The access easement over the multi-use path shall run in
      perpetuity, the access easement over the private street shall extinguish at such
time as it is closed to vehicular traffic (when Coach Drive connects).

3. The applicant shall submit for review and approval by the City’s Urban Forester a
   “Tree Re-vegetation Plan”:
   a. Location of trees or groups of trees remaining on site post development as
      related to new lot lines.
   b. A tree planting plan identifying general locations of where new trees will be
      planted and include the height, caliper and species of trees recommended to be
      planted.
   c. The percentage of tree canopy proposed to be re-established. The calculation
      shall be based upon the type of trees to be planted and number of trees needed
      per lot, and shall meet the conditions of tentative plan approval.
   d. Demonstration of efforts to promote diversity of tree species.
   e. The Tree Re-vegetation Plan shall be recorded along with the final plat/plan.

4. Provide a land division guarantee issued by a title company.

5. Separate sewer and water services are required for each lot. Private sewer and
   water lines shall not cross other lots.

6. Pay a Tree Deposit in the amount of $500 per lot.

7. If individual lots were graded as part of the grading permit for the subdivision, provide
   a map of those lots with new building pads and include the dimensions of the area
   graded.

8. All adjacent streets shall be swept regularly during construction.

9. Power, telephone, cable television and natural gas lines shall be installed
   underground and within the 10 foot City Utility Easements.

10. Pay all engineering inspection fees due.

11. Install sidewalk and planter strips in accordance with the approved tentative plan.
12. Properly abandon any existing wells and provide evidence of proper abandonment to the Community Development Department.

13. Meet Conditions found in the Public Works Memorandum, see *Exhibit 6*.

14. Submit a final plat, including future development plan, in accordance with Section 17.422 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code. Incorporate any modifications or conditions required as part of tentative approval. A professional land surveyor must survey the subdivision. A plat check by the City Surveyor and payment of appropriate fees is required. Failure to comply with this condition will nullify the approval of the Tentative Plat. Include the following on the plat:

After all signatures are obtained, the plat, future development plan, and CC&R’s must be recorded with the Josephine County Recorder within 30 days. The subdivider shall file one print of the recorded plat with the Community Development Department. Failure to do so will nullify plat approval.

**C. The following shall be accomplished at the time of development of individual lots in the subdivision:**

1. Payment of all System Development Charges due; including, but not limited to, water, storm, sewer, parks and transportation.

2. Development of lots shall be in accordance with solar standards.

3. The existing or new property owner may be reimbursed for installation of trees, in accordance with the Tree Revegetation Plan, after demonstrating the actual amount spent in the purchase and installation of trees on the lot.

4. Each lot shall have separate utility services.

5. All utilities shall be placed underground.

6. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.

7. Install landscaping in accordance Section 23.031 of the GPDC.

8. Submit lot drainage plans for approval on all building plans.

9. Developed or undeveloped building lots will need to be maintained for weed and grass control throughout the year.

10. 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.

11. Gravel driveway approaches and other erosion and track out control measures shall be in place during construction of individual lots.

12. Prior to occupancy, driveways and parking and maneuvering areas shall be paved in accordance with the requirements of the Development Code.
VIII. 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.

IX. INDEX TO EXHIBITS:

1. Location Map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Tentative Plan
4. Future Development Plan
5. Applicant’s Narrative and criteria responses
6. Public Works Memorandum
7. Urban Forester Comments
8. Public Safety Comments
### Table 1: Tentative New Private Street Inlet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>7,507 SF</th>
<th>120.64%</th>
<th>Zone: GC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>7,836 SF</td>
<td>120.30%</td>
<td>Zone: GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>137.91 SF</td>
<td>144.50%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>120.48 SF</td>
<td>120.48%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>20.01 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>19.99 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>19.99 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>120.48 SF</td>
<td>120.48%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Temporary Public Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>7,507 SF</th>
<th>120.64%</th>
<th>Zone: GC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>7,836 SF</td>
<td>120.30%</td>
<td>Zone: GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>137.91 SF</td>
<td>144.50%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>120.48 SF</td>
<td>120.48%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>20.01 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>19.99 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>19.99 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>120.48 SF</td>
<td>120.48%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Planned street connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>7,507 SF</th>
<th>120.64%</th>
<th>Zone: GC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>7,836 SF</td>
<td>120.30%</td>
<td>Zone: GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>137.91 SF</td>
<td>144.50%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>120.48 SF</td>
<td>120.48%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>20.01 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>19.99 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>19.99 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>120.48 SF</td>
<td>120.48%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Proposed storm drains/inlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>7,507 SF</th>
<th>120.64%</th>
<th>Zone: GC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>7,836 SF</td>
<td>120.30%</td>
<td>Zone: GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>137.91 SF</td>
<td>144.50%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>120.48 SF</td>
<td>120.48%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>20.01 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>19.99 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>19.99 SF</td>
<td>19.99%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>120.48 SF</td>
<td>120.48%</td>
<td>Zone: R-1-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEYED NOTES:
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE REMOVED (TYPICAL)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO REMAIN (TYPICAL)
TREES WITHIN BOUNDARY TO REMAIN BUT REMOVED AS NECESSARY FOR DEVELOPMENT (TREE RETENTION CALCS BASED ON ALL TREES WITHIN BOUNDARY REMAINING)

12'' W
12'' SD
21'' SD
8'' SS

SCALE: 1" = 60'
**KEYED NOTES:**

- SLOPES 15% - 35% (TYPICAL)
- SLOPES OVER 35% OUTSIDE OF DEVELOPMENT AREA (TYPICAL)
- INSTALL SEDIMENT FENCING BELOW CONSTRUCTION AREA PER OSD#RD1040
- INSTALL BIOFILTER BAG CHECK DAMS AS NECESSARY ALONG DITCH PER OSD#RD1015
- INSTALL ORANGE SAFETY FENCING AROUND PROPOSED DETENTION POND TO PREVENT COMPACTION DURING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES
- INSTALL INLET PROTECTION FOR PER OSD#RD1015
- INSTALL CONCRETE WASH OUT AREA PER OSD#RD1070 (FLEXIBLE LOCATION)

**EXISTING SOILS/GEOLOGY:**

Per the Josephine County Soil Survey and our experience in this area, the site contains decomposed granite and weathered fractured granite soils (Clawson Sandy Loam, Holland Sandy Loam, Siskiyou gravelly sandy loam). Large rock/bedrock is typically not present near the existing ground surface where construction will take place.

**EXISTING HYDROLOGY:**

In the steeper areas, groundwater is usually not present. In the flatter areas, perched water can often be found at 6'-8' depths during the rainy season. Surface water currently sheets across the site to either the existing natural drainage/swale or the Grants Pass Irrigation District Canal. Proposed drainage will follow existing drainage patterns.

**PROPOSED SITE GRADING:**

The proposed improvements (roadway, utilities, house pads) will follow the existing grades and no significant cuts/fills are anticipated. Individual house pads will have minor cuts/fills and small retaining walls will likely be constructed between property lines (4'-6' wall heights).

**CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE:**

All work will be completed outside of the rainy season (between April 15th and October 15th).

**SITE SUITABILITY:**

In our professional opinion, the site soils and existing slopes are suitable for the proposed development with careful grading and implementation of erosion control measures.
Tentative Plan Submittal – Pemberley Meadows Subdivision and Major Variance (Revision 1)

Attached is the tentative plan application submittal and associated variance requests for a 10-lot residential subdivision located at 2599/2603 Williams Highway. This project will split the three existing parcels totaling 8.27 acres into 10 single family lots while providing a layout that accounts for surrounding development patterns, future development potential, the irrigation canals, steep slopes, and access restrictions until future master planned roadways are constructed.

The project was previously approved on 10/25/17 in its same general configuration under project #104-001122-17 and #301-00120-17. This was followed by a minor modification in 10/18 for the addition of an accessory dwelling unit on the existing home.

A development permit was issued on 10/15/18 and the infrastructure has been partially constructed to date. This includes grading throughout, installation of a new water main from Williams Highway to the proposed cul-de-sac, construction of a box culvert over the irrigation canal, and franchise utility conduits. Two development permit extensions were approved for the project, but the land use application expired on 4/15/21 based on personal reasons and conditions related to the pandemic.

Based on the work completed to date, the applicant is requesting reapproval of the project with only minor changes to a few of the proposed lot lines. This has been done to address concerns from the City regarding future development options. All previously approved construction documents and public infrastructure design will remain unchanged except for minor utility service, driveway approach, and lot line adjustments.

Existing Conditions

The site is currently developed with two single family homes (one of which will remain) and several accessory structures that will be removed. There is currently a developed approach off Williams Highway for proposed access that will be converted into a temporary private street approach as further described below. The existing approach and associated flag lot to the house located on Lot 1 will be converted into a pedestrian pathway and sewer easement. The lower portion of the property (below the Allen Creek Irrigation lateral) is lightly treed with sloping terrain. The upper portion of the site is heavily treed with relatively steep terrain. A large portion of the property is located within the Steep Slope Hazard District.

Water and sewer mains are available in Williams Highway and an 8” sewer main extension has already been stubbed into the property to serve this development. The upper portion of the site drains to a large natural swale which is picked up by the Grants Pass Irrigation (GPID) canal to the west. The central portion of the site drains over the surface directly to the GPID canal. The lower portion of the property (flag lot/pole) drains directly to Williams Highway.
Proposed Conditions

The property will be developed into 10 single family lots, reserving future development potential for Lots 1, 3 & 10 (see Future Development Plan). Due to the existing steep terrain and current access limitations, access is proposed through a new “temporary” private street connection that connects to the long-term cul-de-sac street (see Access section below).

Based on existing utility locations and grades, an 8” sewer main extension will be constructed to serve all of the new lots and future development area. This main will be extended off the existing 8” stub that is located on Tax Lot 2200 (flagpole) until it bisects the cul-de-sac street. A new 8” water main extension will be constructed off the existing water main in Williams Highway and will run within the cul-de-sac street (a portion of this has been installed from the Highway to the proposed cul-de-sac).

Storm drainage will follow existing drainage patterns and discharge to the irrigation canal (above the bridge) and to the existing ODOT storm system (below the bridge). Due to capacity limitations with the irrigation canal, storm water runoff from this development will be detained to pre-existing conditions. Other franchise utilities will run along new City utility easements and connect to the existing infrastructure currently in place. Due to the existing flagpole configuration, these easements will run within the temporary private street connection up to the main body of the lot. The existing power pole within the new cul-de-sac bulb will be relocated outside of the new public street.

Access

Access is the most limiting factor of the subdivision based on the current property configuration and surrounding conditions. The flag lot/pole (Tax Lot 2200) located between the existing irrigation canal and Williams Highway is only 15’ in width and due to this, it is not adequate for a roadway. Instead, this 15’ section will be used as a pedestrian connection to Williams Highway, sewer easement, and power easement. The existing vehicular bridge will remain and be retrofitted as needed for pedestrian use/safety.

A temporary private roadway section will be extended across the 25’ flagpole on Tax Lot 2400 to serve the cul-de-sac street. A new concrete box culvert was recently constructed across the irrigation canal for this purpose. Although this street section is not standard for a public road, it does match the Development Code 22’ width used on a private street serving up to 10 development lots (with relocated sidewalk). This temporary street configuration has also been used twice before in a shorter configuration on Allenwood Drive and Wagon Wheel Drive to the south for very similar reasons (long/narrow development lots and no immediate connectivity to Coach Drive at Curtis Drive).

In the future, Coach Drive is master planned to extend across a portion of Lots 3 & 10 to Wagon Wheel Drive and Curtis Drive (sections of this road have already been built to the south). When this occurs, we are anticipating that temporary private street access serving the cul-de-sac street will be abandoned and converted to a pedestrian pathway/utility access route with bollards and the development will alternatively connect to the new City street (Coach Drive). At that time, the cul-de-sac street section will be adopted into the City’s public street inventory and they will take over long term maintenance.
Subdivision Criteria

Below are the Development Code criteria for a subdivision, followed by our formal responses. The review body shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the request based on the following criteria:

1) The plan conforms to the lot dimension standards of Article 12, the base lot standards of Section 17.510, and the requirement of any applicable overlay district.

Response: The plan conforms to the lot standards in Article 12 and 17 and there is adequate building pad area for each lot as shown on the tentative plan. All lots meet the minimum width and lot size required in the R-1-8 zone.

2) When required, the proposed future development plan allows the properties to be efficiently further developed, partitioned, or subdivided as efficiently as possible under existing circumstances, in accordance with the requirements for typical permitted uses in the applicable zone and comprehensive plan district, and in conjunction with other development in the neighborhood.

Response: See the attached Future Development Plan for the proposed long term development configuration. This layout allows for full development up to the base of the steep slope area on the easterly portion of the property and accommodates the future extension of Coach Drive.

3) When one is required or proposed, the street layout conforms to the applicable requirements of the adopted street plans, meets the requirements of Article 27 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency, and environmental compatibility.

Response: The proposed street layout within the development meets the requirements of Article 27. By accommodating for the future extension of Coach Drive, the development also meets the requirements of the transportation master plan. The temporary private roadway connection between Williams Highway and the cul-de-sac length is being addressed under a major variance as part of this application.

4) The proposed utility plan conforms to the applicable requirements of adopted utility plans, the requirements of Article 28 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency, and environmental compatibility.

Response: The proposed utility plan meets the requirements of Article 28 and includes a public 8” sewer and 8” water main extension from Williams Highway into the development. Upon further development of the subdivision and construction of Coach Drive, the utilities can be extended to the north/south property lines within the future public right-of-way.

5) The tentative plan allows for the preservation of establishment of natural features or the preservation of historic features of the property, and allows access to solar energy to the extent possible under existing circumstances including
a. Providing the necessary information to complete the tree chart identified in Section 11.041
b. No cuts shall result in retaining walls greater than 15 feet high in a single wall from the finish grade or create any un-retained slopes greater than 100%.
c. No fills may result in a retaining wall within the required setback from a property not included in the development plan greater than six (6) feet in height from the finish grade nor create any un-retained slopes greater than 100%.

Response: The proposed layout will preserve as many trees as possible as shown on the attached Tree Plan and due to the forested nature of the lot, the site will contain well over the minimum amount. No other natural or historic features are present. No large cuts/fills are anticipated based on existing grades and only minor retaining walls will be required between lots.

6) The plan complies with applicable portions of the Comprehensive Plan, this Code, and state and federal laws.

Response: The plan complies with all applicable standards and laws with exception to the Major Variance requests below.

Private Street Length, Buffering, and Temporary Street Section Variance Request

Due to the existing development limitations stated above, we are requesting a variance to Development Code Section 27.123(1)(f), Section 27.123(12)(b) and Section 27.123(14) for the extension of Pemberley Lane.

Based on the existing flag lot widths at Williams Highway, the “temporary” section of Pemberley Lane must be narrowed to 22’ of pavement with curbs (only) to fit within the 25’ flag lot. The 4’ sidewalk that would normally be required adjacent to this private street section is being relocated to the north flag lot for pedestrian access to Williams Highway, which requires a variance to the private street standards listed under Section 27.123(12)(b). In the future when Coach Drive is extended to the east side of the development, this temporary section of roadway will be converted to a pedestrian/utility easement (only) and bollards will be placed at the connection to the cul-de-sac bulb to prevent vehicular traffic to/from Williams Highway.

Also due to the narrow flag lot width, is the request to eliminate the 5’ buffer normally required under Section 27.134(14) along the temporary private street access. This is being mitigated by the installation of taller bridge rails and the fact that this access is only temporary until Coach Drive is extended to the property in the future.

In addition, the new street, including the temporary connection, will have an overall length of 650’ as measured from the curb face on Williams Highway to the center of the hammerhead turnaround. Since Section 27.123(1)(f) limits the length of a cul-de-sac street to 400’ within the Steep Slope Development Area, a variance to this standard is required. One thing to note about Pemberley Lane is that in future when Coach Drive is constructed, it will nearly meet the 400’ maximum length standard (418’ as measured from the future Coach Drive right-of-way to the start of the cul-de-sac bulb).
Variance Criteria

Previously granted variances shall not be considered to have established a precedent. The review body may approve, or approve with conditions, a variance upon finding that it meets all the following criteria:

(A) Qualifying Condition. The applicant shall demonstrate that the following elements are present to qualify for a variance.

1) The variance is necessary because the subject code provision does not account for special or unique physical circumstances of the subject site, such as topography, natural features, adjacent development, or similar circumstances. A legal lot determination may be sufficient evidence of a hardship for purposes of approving a variance.

Response: The lots being developed have a unique access constraint since they have two flag poles out to Williams Highway, one of which is too narrow for any type of roadway access and another that is only wide enough to accommodate a modified street section without the adjacent sidewalk and buffer strip. In addition, the master transportation plan shows a north/south extension of Coach Drive across the property which will require participation from other adjoining properties before it is constructed.

Also, the steep slopes that are present on the east end of the development that abut previously developed County residential lands preclude any access in this area.

2) The variance is the minimum necessary to address the special or unique physical circumstances related to the subject site.

Response: As stated above, the variances being requested still create the equivalent of a private street section that is allowed in the code for up to 10 lots. In addition, the over length cul-de-sac street variance applies primarily to the current configuration that includes the temporary connection to Williams Highway. Once Coach Drive is constructed in the future, Pemberley Lane will be 418’ long once connected to the future road which is very close to the 400’ allowable length.

3) The proposal’s benefits will be greater than any negative impacts on the development of the adjacent uses and will further the purpose and intent of this ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan of the City.

Response: The proposal develops the internal portion of the property to the standards allowed in this zoning district and provides future development opportunities for this property and adjacent properties by accommodating the future location of Coach Drive. By allowing the short/modified temporary public roadway section between Williams Highway and the cul-de-sac bulb, it allows a higher density to be obtained for the overall development which is more in line with the Comprehensive Plan and adjacent zoning in this area.

4) The need for the variance is not self-imposed by the applicant or property owner. For example, the variance request does not arise as a result of a property line adjustment or land division approval previously granted to the applicant.
Response: Not Applicable. The variance is being requested due to existing property configurations and access restrictions that have been in place long before they were purchased by the current owners. The master transportation plan established the long-term roadway configuration which is driving the need for a temporary/modified connection to Williams Highway.

This is similar to the highway approaches to Allenwood Drive, Wagon Wheel Drive, and McKenna Trail just south of this project which will all be closed off/reconfigured when Coach Drive is extended to these developments in the future.

Future Development Plan

A future development plan has been prepared to address future subdividing of Lots 3 & 10 (both of which are over 2.5 acres meeting criteria under Section 17.544) along with adjacent properties in the local vicinity. Based on existing development patterns and steep terrain, the applicant has shown a reasonable alignment of Coach Drive between Wagon Wheel Drive and Curtis Drive which will allow construction of the master planned roadway in the future. There will likely be some slight variability on the final road location depending on the adjacent development patterns.

Tree Retention/ESC/Steep Slope Development Plan

As required for the application, we have prepared a tree retention, erosion control, and steep slope development plan showing the approximate location of existing trees to be removed and those that will remain as part of the subdivision development. Due to the large property size and limited development area (due to steep slopes/drainage ways), a large percentage of existing trees will remain even after future development of the property.

Summary

Overall, we feel that this development proposal accommodates the existing site constraints while working with challenging access restrictions and future development requirements. Although code variances are required, they generally apply to the “temporary” street connection to Williams Highway and not the long-term master development plan for this area.

We look forward to receiving your initial feedback and working with you through the updated planning/development process. Since the construction is well underway the applicant should be able to efficiently create additional housing in this area to help with the significant shortage we are currently experiencing in our community.
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. Williams Highway. Classification – State Highway
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location, verify with ODOT for the required right of way and for confirmation of access to highway for the proposed 10 lots.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: Reconstruct driveway approaches in conformance with current pedestrian access standards
   b. Pemberly Lane. Classification – Local Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required full street right-of-way equals 40 feet, per Hillside Standards for local streets, per 27.123(11)(a).
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 24 feet paving width curb to curb, curb & gutter, four foot sidewalk.
      iii. Grants Pass Public Works will not maintain street until it has contiguous access with other existing public streets.
   c. Temporary Access. Classification – Private Street
      The applicant is proposing a temporary access of 22 foot paving width curb to curb with a 5’ sidewalk in another location for pedestrian access. Per 27.123(14), the street shall be kept a minimum of 5 feet from the abutting property line of a developed neighboring residential property. The Applicant has asked for a variance for this rule of 5 feet due to existing property lines.
   d. Coach Drive. Classification – Local Collector
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required full street right-of-way equals 46 feet.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: None required at this time.

3. Storm Drainage:
   a. Project specific requirements: No stormwater shall discharge into the irrigation system, per agreement between the City and Irrigation District.
   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: Applicant is proposing to extend public sewer main through private sewer lateral up to project.
   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. Project specific requirements: Per Water Standard 203.1.5, water mains are not allowed in private streets unless they are to be used to supply flows to fire hydrants required by the Grants Pass Public Safety Dept. or to provide interconnectivity to waterlines in adjacent streets as required by the Director.
   b. Design all new water facilities in conformance with the City’s Water Standards and Specifications.
   c. 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.
   d. 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:**
   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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1.8</td>
<td># of New Lots</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Pemberley Meadows Subdivision Plan currently addressed in submitted narrative and answers to Section 23.052(2)(a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.052(7)</td>
<td>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 essential tree groups, have been preserved and managed.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Alternatives shall be considered and the proposal shall represent the most effective design to preserve these resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.040(1)</td>
<td>Aerial photo or graphic depicting existing percentage of tree canopy on the site.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Overlay of the proposed plan on aerial photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.040(3)</td>
<td>Estimated amount of tree canopy on the site.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Current percentage of tree canopy on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.040(4)</td>
<td>Approximate location of trees or groups of trees to be retained.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Overlay of the proposed plan on aerial photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.041</td>
<td></td>
<td>In order to satisfy Tentative Plan criteria, the applicant shall complete the chart below to show how the proposed development will maintain and/or re-establish tree canopy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.050</td>
<td>Existing tree canopy cover and Tree Protection Plan submitted by a Tree Professional for review and approval.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Ensure that the Tree Protection Plan submitted is done by a Tree Professional as defined in Article 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.050(1)</td>
<td>Aerial photo or graphic depicting existing percentage of tree canopy on the site.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Overlay of the proposed plan on aerial photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.050(2)</td>
<td>Location and percent of dominant and co-dominant tree canopy to remain during construction.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Overlay of the proposed plan on aerial photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.050(3)</td>
<td>Indicate how trees or groups of trees will be marked in the field to distinguish them as protected during construction/grading.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Type of protection to be placed around the trees at the drip line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.050(4)</td>
<td>Type of protection to be placed around the trees at the drip line.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>This requirement aligns directly with the requirements of section 23.052(2)(a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.050(5)</td>
<td>Outlining narrative of the plan to maintain and/or re-establish tree canopy.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Currently addressed in submitted narrative and answers to Section 23.052(2)(a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Code Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.060(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Re-vegetation Plan submitted for review and approval by a Tree Professional.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.060(1)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of trees or groups of trees remaining on site post development as related to new lot lines.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.060(1)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tree planting plan identifying general locations of where new trees will be planted and include the height, caliper and species of trees recommended to be planted.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.060(1)(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The percentage of tree canopy proposed to be re-established. The calculation shall be based upon the type of trees to be planted and number needed per lot.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.060(1)(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of efforts to promote diversity of tree species.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.060(1)(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tree Re-vegetation Plan shall be recorded along with the final plat/plan.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.060(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Deposit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope Hazard District Applicable Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.130(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of existing trees or groups of trees to be removed.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.031(2)(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved plant materials installed in the rear between the curb and the sidewalk may be used in meeting the landscaping requirements for front and rear yards.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Due to retained canopy meeting/exceeding the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required. Although retained canopy will meet/exceed the required percentages of Article 11, front yard trees are still required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 7

Exhibit 7 displays the slope hazard areas on the property. There are two classes of slope steepness: Class A (15% to 25%) and Class B (greater than 25%). Slope hazard areas are divided into two classes: Stop Hazards Class A, 15% to 25%, and Stop Hazards Class B, greater than 25%. Both properties contain slope hazard areas. A stop hazard area is applicable to both properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.041</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>Missing</td>
<td>Ensure that all persons involved in construction and development are aware of this requirement. Inspection of the Landscape Plan may lead to the declaration of plans. Violation of this requirement may lead to the declaration of plans. Ensure that all persons involved in construction are aware of this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(2)(a)</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, and the method of protection shall be noted on the landscape plan. 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>If any trees (including those in the right-of-way) are to be preserved, 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 landfill.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Ensure that all persons involved in construction and development are aware of this requirement. Violation of this requirement may lead to the declaration of plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these protection methods and specifications, you can refer to:
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A300 Part 6 (Site Planning, Site Development); and

Appropriate details and specifications can be sourced online from the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). The landscape plan shall provide for the location and variety of replacement trees in case of the subsequent death of any trees (including those in the right-of-way) that are to be preserved. This section and its requirements must be addressed in the Landscape Plan. If any trees (including those in the right-of-way) that are to be preserved are to be preserved, this section and its requirements must be addressed in the Landscape Plan.
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.

Ensure that the topsoil specifications (e.g., limits to sand, clay, gravel, and other) are appropriate for required landscaping. These limits must be provided in the landscape plan. 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 is required.

All landscaping materials and irrigation shall be installed according to approved plans.

Exhibit 7

For information relevant to this letter, see 23.042(2) for information relevant to this letter.
Possible

Utility alternative relocation to within a city right of way.
Site Plan Review #2

Date of Review: December 21, 2021
Permit Numbers: 104-00140-21 & 301-00144-21
Map/Tax Lot: 36-05-30-CC Tax Lots 900, 1000 & 1100
Address of Project: 2599 & 2603 Williams Hwy
Planner: Jason Maki

Comments:

**NO PARKING:** Parking on emergency access roads shall be as follows (OFC D103.6.1-2):

- 20-26 feet road width – no parking on either side of roadway
- Greater than 26 feet road width – parking is allowed on one side
- Greater than 32 feet road width – parking is not restricted

  a. Private Street to be posted “No Parking Fire Lane” both sides.
  b. Hammerhead & Cul-De-Sac turnaround to be labeled “No Parking Fire Lane” both sides.

**GPDC 27.123(1)(e) & OFC 503.2.**

**NO PARKING SIGNS:**
Signs shall read “NO PARKING - FIRE LANE” and shall be installed with a clear space above grade level of 7 feet. Signs shall be 12 inches wide by 18 inches high and shall have red letters on a white reflective background. (OFC D103.6)

1. Fire Department Access Roads shall be provided to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior wall of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. (OFC 503.1.1) Fire apparatus access roads shall be of an all-weather surface that is easily distinguishable from the surrounding area and is capable of supporting not less than 12,500 pounds point load (wheel load) and 75,000 pounds live load (gross vehicle weight). Documentation from a registered engineer that the final construction is in accordance with approved plans or the requirements of the Fire Code may be requested. (OFC 503.2.3) The inside turning radius and outside turning radius shall not be less than 28 feet and 48 feet respectively, measured from the same center point. (OFC 503.2.4 & D103.3)

2. Extend water mains and provide for interconnection for fire suppression water supply. Hydrants shall be spaced no further than 500 feet between hydrants. Maximum distance from any point on a street or road frontage to a hydrant shall not exceed 250 feet. Spacing shall decrease for structures having a fire flow greater than 1750 GPM. OFC C105 & Table C105.1 Fire Hydrants shall have the ability to deliver 1000 gallons per minute at a minimum of 20 psi for 2 hours.

3. Structures over 3600 square feet will require demonstration of additional fire flow or fire sprinkler system. OFC B105.2.

4. Unable to determine Fire Flow; no building dimensions given.

5. Fire hydrant location and distribution will be determined using OFC Appendix C. In no case shall hydrant spacing exceed 500 feet nor more than 75 feet from a required FDC. [OFC C105.1.1] Fire Hydrants shall have the ability to deliver 1000 gallons per minute at a minimum of 20 psi for 2 hours.

6. **DEAD ENDS AND ROADS IN EXCESS OF 150 FEET (TURNAROUNDS):** Dead end fire apparatus access roads or roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved turnaround. Diagrams of approved turnarounds are shown below: (OFC 503.2.5 & Figure D103.1) *Ensure cul-de-sac and Hammerhead radii and dimensions conform.*

Submitted By: Michael Meyer, Fire Inspector