URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes – January 26, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers

COMMISSIONERS:
Eric Heesacker (Chair)
Mark Collier (Vice Chair)
Loree Arthur
Jennifer Aviles
Susan Tokarz-Krauss
L. Ward Nelson
Clint Scherf
Vacant

City/Staff/Council Liaisons:
Bradley Clark (Director)
Jason Maki (Associate Planner)
Donna Rupp (Associate Planner)
Ryan Nolan (Contract Principal Planner)
Gabby Sinagra (Assistant Planner)

Guests:
Wade Elliott – Assistant Public Works Director
Justin Gerlitz – Gerlitz Engineering Consultants
Bruce Wiznap
Scott White

Roll Call:
Commissioner Arthur.
Here.
I'm Eric. I'm here. Commissioner Scherf.
Here.

Introductions:
Staff, any introductions? I'll take that as a no.

Public Comment:
Item three, public comments. This is an opportunity for the public to address the commission on items not related to a public hearing or action item on the agenda. The intent is to provide information that is pertinent to the city's jurisdiction. Each speaker will be given three minutes to address the commission as one body, not to individuals. The commission may consider items brought up during this time later in our agenda during matters from commission members and staff. Anybody fit that bill?

All right, no one's raising their hands.

Approval of Minutes:
We move on to item 4A, approval of minutes from the last meeting. Do we have a motion? Any amendments? Commissioner Nelson.

Mr. Chair, I would move approval. Although I don't know if we need all the prior dialogue to six o'clock on there.
Do we want to strike it, is that what you're suggesting?

There are some comments that you made, that you may want to keep in there.

That I made that we don't want to keep in there?

No, it's fine.

Okay, so there's a motion to approve the minutes as written. Do I have a second?

Second.

Commissioner Arthur seconds. All those in favor, say aye. Aye.

Aye.

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Any abstentions?

I have to abstain.

Two abstentions. Thank you. Did you guys get the abstentions were Commissioner Aviles and Commissioner Collier.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the minutes from the January 12, 2022, meeting. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Aviles. Absent: None. The motion passed.

Informational Items:
Are there any informational items from staff?

Findings of Fact:

Item six, [inaudible], we don't have any of those.

Continued Deliberation:
  a. 201-00410-21 ~ Greenfield RV Park Major Site Plan Review ~ Staff Report

Item number seven, continued deliberation. Project 20100410-21 Greenfield RV Park, major site plan review. The public hearing on that is closed. It's my understanding staff is going to walk us through a couple of things here and then we can begin deliberations.
So, you've all received the document that I handed out in an email that's the applicant's rebuttal to additional testimony received while the record was left open for an additional seven days, but just for the record, that's now exhibit 31, made part of the official record. So as Chair Heesacker mentioned, this is continued deliberation. The actual public hearing on this site plan review was closed on the 12th. However, based on a request from neighboring property owners, the board left the record open for seven days. An additional comments and testimony were received from concerned property owners and then an additional seven days was provided to the applicant to respond to that. So, no new testimony or information is to be part of a deliberation once the public hearing is closed, but I'll just kind of go through a kind of brief analysis of what we received as far as additional comment.

So again, a reminder, this is property at 420 Northeast Greenfield Road, and it's a major site plan review related to a proposed RV park. So, the city received written comments from 11 neighboring property owners opposing the development. Some of the concerns included concerns about safety, crime, protecting the existing views, describing that it's not an appropriate use for a residential neighborhood, concerns about lengths of stay requesting that they be limited, the historical significance of trees and structures on the site, concerns about traffic congestion, directional signage, and the issue of no turnaround if RVs were to the appropriate entrance, issues of noise, smoke, exhaust, and light, opposition to the specific storage units proposed, concerns about vermin control, a request for a wider buffer and additional or alternate plant materials for that buffer and a concern about using an existing encroachment on county property on the east edge of the site.

Additionally, the city received two petitions, one with 17 signatures and one with 15 opposing the development and one of the petitions specifically asked that the city extend or reopen the public hearing to allow more input from neighbors. So, the applicant responded and as you can see, there are several concessions that they have agreed to add to this development. They've stated that they will work with the city and ODOT to install proper directional signage. They've included in the exhibits, a response from their traffic engineer to some of the comments made by the neighbors. They've also agreed to extend the fence on the north and east side to a total of eight feet and a six-foot-tall fence with lattice on top and to widen the landscape buffer to 10 feet along the north and east property lines.

They've also agreed that they would not allow fire pits at individual RV sites nor generators. They also discussed relocating trash bins away from the property on the north edge and describe that they would use low silhouette lighting that's downward directed and shield all lighting to prevent glare and also added they would have 24-hour maintenance and video security.

So, staff's response to this to help clarify the staff report for the planning commission, as it was indicated in the staff report, we still feel that this is a permitted use in the zone, it's general commercial, and that with the conditions in the staff report, all the criteria have been met. Staff report has been slightly amended following the first hearing in relation to the preexisting encroachment on the east side. That would state that no uses are approved offsite, not, "of," and all buffering or fencing shall be on the owner's property. There was a question from one of the planning commission members specifically about the city's transportation system plan and if any impact from proposed improvements might affect this area. So just to clarify, there's an image showing several future street planned projects. We have tiers of projects. Tier one are projects that in the next 20 years, we believe will be funded and hopefully will be completed. Tier two are projects if we had 150% of our expected funding, we would start to work on, and
tier three are the projects we would start next after we've exhausted all of our funding and gone through the 20-year plan. We have one tier two project, which would connect Greenfield to Hillcrest Drive. Again, that would happen past more than 20 years out if we had 150% of our expected funding, hopefully, and then the tier three project would increase the width of Scenic and Scoville and build those out to, at least these sections, to a full city street.

With the applicant's rebuttal, there are a number of conditions that the planning commission may wish to add to this. That would be an amendment to the staff report, potentially increasing landscape buffer, as they've agreed to along the north and east property edge, prohibiting fire pits, generators at RV sites, some more detailed language about lighting, requiring low silhouette lighting and downward shielded lighting and requiring 24-hour staffing and continued video surveillance. With that, if there are any clarifications that staff can help make, we'd be happy to. Staff recommends that the planning commission approve the major site plan review subject to the amended conditions in the staff report, and then potentially including any additional amendments you'd like to make amendments potentially related to the concessions made by the applicant or others that you feel appropriate based on the criteria.

Thank you, sir. Questions of staff?

I have a question.

Commissioner Collier.

After reading the packet, and the additional comments, and the proposed additional comments, is there any reason to reopen the public hearing to take additional, additional comments?

There has been a request from some neighbors. They have voiced their concerns. Their concerns were the traffic noise, the development next door, so that's a judgment call for the planning commission. If there's something additional you feel you need to determine whether or not it's met the criteria, you could reopen the public hearing, but if you have all the evidence needed to know if it does meet or can meet the criteria, not requiring to reopen the public hearing.

Are you making a motion?

No, because everything that's been mentioned, that I was looking for are the subject matters that were presented in the signatures and the additional comments covered in this and it sounds like they have been, so I'm not moving to or reopen anything.

Okay. Are you, you're making any kind of motion at all? Any other questions for staff? Looks like you're off the hot seat for now. Before we begin deliberations, we do need a motion. Commissioner Nelson.

Excuse me. I would move approval of this project as proposed at this time.

With the extra conditions?
Well, I had a question. You had a mention of the lighting, but I don't want to make the motion yet until I had an opportunity to clarify something he was talking about with the lighting. I guess I do have an additional question.

Go ahead.

When they're talking about the glare from lighting and so forth, if this project or any project was to go forward and they were to add in side streets or even put in roads for a project at this site, would they not have to have lighting?

Additional public city streets or private streets need street lighting. Any lighting that's proposed for commercial development or even residential is required and this staff report includes required to be downward directed, to avoid glaring directly into neighboring properties.

That's what I thought.

It was already conditioned governing kind of onset your own lighting and to answer your question, if they added a street, they would be required to install streetlights.

Well, they have streets to each of these sites and the sites would have what type of lighting?

So, we don't have standards for specific wattage, et cetera for onsite commercial lighting. We would for a public street that would be per specific power standard, so they're proposing that all lighting at the RV space be low silhouette lighting and shielded to prevent glare to other properties.

And that's what we would hold them to on that.

Correct.

Okay. Then I'll just make the motion.

So, are you going to stick with your motion?

Yeah.

Commissioner Collier, do you have a question to staff?

I was to go for the question on generators and how you enforce that because RVs are rolling in and out and in and out, then all of a sudden, somebody fires up a generator and then a neighbor goes, "Well, generators aren't permitted," then they make a phone call. It just seems amorphous.

Commissioner Nelson.

I was thinking that, but I thought, why would anyone fire up a generator where I can plug in my RV? And why would I need a dump station when all I have is each site has its own sewage hookup. I mean, there was one comment about that. Each site's going to have their own sewage hookup plus electrical outlet for lighting or electrical purposes in the RV.
You have a dump station on site for the people that use their toilet in transit.

Once you hook up, you can flush.

Yeah, I know. But when you're driving from point A to get to this place, sometimes they'll use the bathroom on the road and then they'll have to flush their tank before they hook up to their RV site.

Why?

It's just a courtesy in most RV stations?

Oh, I never had problems.

I guess that back to my generator question was how long are you going to let someone run a generator? Who's going to police that?

Well, usually it's written in the RV guidelines when you actually... And the only reason I'm answering these is because I frequent RV parks. Usually, you have a noise ordinance that you have to abide by. Most generators in RVs are shielded and have a decibel range below what you can really hear. If you have electrical hookups, then usually the RV park will have stipulations on between hours X and Y, dusk to dawn on, you can't run that generator even if the power goes out, da, da, da, da, da. So, I think it's written in the rules and regulations of a regular RV park.

I would just offer that the applicant has stated they're willing to make that a condition for any tenant of the RV park, so initially the applicant and the manager would be responsible for that.

More questions? Did you want to clarify your motion please?

I was trying to read the nice language and I lost my place on it. I would move approval as for the site as submitted with the conditions stated in the staff report.

With these four extra conditions up on the screen. Yeah? All right. So now we have a motion, do we have a second?

Second.

Commissioner Collier seconds. Okay. Now we're open for deliberations. Any commissioner questions, statement? All right. We'll move on to a vote. I can take a roll call. Commissioner Collier.

Yes.

Commissioner Nelson.

Yes.
Commissioner Aviles.

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

I'm Eric. I'm voting yes. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Vice Chair Collier seconded the motion to approve 201-00410-21 ~ Greenfield RV Park Major Site Plan Review as submitted with the four extra conditions stated in the staff report. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

The motion passed.

All righty. Thank you very much. We're done with that item. The RV Park has been approved.

**Public Hearing:**

a. 101-00140-21/301-00144-21 ~Pemberley Meadows Subdivision and Variance PC

Staff Report

Next item on the agenda is a new public hearing item numbers 101-00140-21/301-00144-21, Pemberley Meadows subdivision and variances. All right. I should have dug my rules up before. At this time, I will open the public hearing to consider an application filed by... I am never prepared for this. Filed by the applicant, but I'm trying to find the applicant's name. Christo Arnette, and Brad Orton.

Page 137.

Thank you very much. I can't even find my page numbers on here. All right, I'll take your words for it. Thank you very much. Christo Arnette and Brad Orton 2599 and 2603 Williams Highway.

The application is for 10 lot subdivision, but not all 10 lots are being proposed at this time, right?

They are.

They are.

They are, but there's extra ones for the future. They showed a build out plan. [crosstalk] Here you go. Thank you very much. We'll begin the hearing with the staff report followed by a
presentation by the applicant, 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 commission to hear this matter?

Nobody's raising hands. Do any commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Nobody's doing so. Are there any commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received prior to this meeting regarding this application? Nobody's indicating such. In this hearing, the decision of the commission will be based upon specific criteria, which are set forth in the 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 and one will be provided for you. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the council and the parties an opportunity respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal to the land use board of appeals based on that issue. The hearing will now proceed with a report from staff.

Good evening commissioners. My name is Jason Maki, I'm an associate planner here with the city of Grants Pass. Tonight, the project I'm going to be presenting is Pemberley Meadow subdivision and major variances. The project number for the subdivision approval is 10400140-21. And the variance request application number is 3010014421. I just want to kind of take a look back at the timeline of this project and just make you fully aware of how this has evolved. In October of 2017, the applicant requested review of a subdivision and variance request, project numbers listed in the presentation. The application was subsequently approved through a UAPC decision shortly after submission, that was later revised through a minor modification process to allow for an ADU on the existing single-family home that is on one of the lots. Development permit in October of 2018 was issued for that minor modification. There was two development permit extensions requested and approved. Unfortunately, those extensions expired making the application itself expired. The applicant later came in to submit a new application for review in September of last year. Due to some conversations with staff and the applicant, the applicant requested that the hearing be continued to a date uncertain, so you did recently see this on an agenda, but there was no deliberation. At that point, the applicant did submit a revised site plan at the end of last year, and now we're here today to discuss that revision. The applications include three variance requests. One is for cul-de-sac length that exceeds the standard as defined in the development code. The other is for private street standards related to the sidewalk and private street buffering. We'll talk a little bit more in detail about each of those. The subdivision tentative plan, it includes three parcels with a total of 8.62 acres. They are proposing 10 lots as part of the approval for tonight. It does include a future development plan, which we'll talk a little bit more later in the presentation. The zoning of all three lots is R18, which requires a minimum 7,000 square foot. The zoning, the intention of the zoning is single family residential, which is what the applicant is proposing. There is three parcels long east-west orientation lot here with a 25-foot flag lot that takes access off Williams Highway.
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... lot that takes access off Williams Highway, another similar lot just to the north, and then this little, small lot here, which functions as a flag for access. It's actually not to standard for our normal frontage requirement of 20 feet. It's 15 feet and we can go into a little bit more detail about how that relates to the subdivision. This first picture here is looking at the southern
access, the flag that is connected to the south lot. It has a width of 25 feet and the picture on the right is taking a look at the 15-foot wide, small flag lot on the north part of the property.

Just a few details about the site. The Eastern portion of the lots are in a combination of class A and B steep slope. There was a condition in the staff report that the commissioners received calling out the fact that the applicant needs to submit a geotechnical report as part of an A-list condition. Since the issuance of the staff report, staff has received from the applicant a geotechnical report, so staff considers that A-list condition satisfied. There is a GPID canal that runs along the western portion of the property.

They didn't send out the link for the meeting.

Sorry, was there a question for staff on the phone? There is an existing single-family home with ADU on tax lot 900, which is the northern lot. Just wanted to call out the fact that the lots are identified in the master transportation plan for the future construction of Coach Drive. It's a little difficult to get a sense of it here, but this is the area of town that we're talking about. Here's where you can see the dashed line indicates the future construction of Coach Drive.

There are three variance requests. The first is for cul-de-sac length. 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, which these lots are within that district and 250 feet in all other areas, unless a variance is granted by the review body. The new street, including the temporary connection will have an overall length of 650 feet as measured from the curb face on Williams Highway to the center of the Hammerhead turnaround and you can find the applicant's full response on exhibit five, but it's page 163 in your packet. Staff does acknowledge that base development code standards do not address the historic development patterns of the surrounding area or the topography challenges and their impacts on development of the subject site.

The second variance request is we have two classifications for private streets. For private streets that are going to serve up to 10 dwelling units requires a minimum street width of 22 feet with a curb width of four feet. Because of the narrow flag, the applicant is proposing to relocate the sidewalk to the northern flag. There will be a 22-foot portion of street paving on the southern flag with the sidewalk functioning as a pedestrian access onto the northern flag. Again, staff agrees that the base development code standards do not address the specific development patterns of this area.

The third variance request is standard code requires that private streets be buffered five feet from adjacent property lines. Because of the narrow flag and the requirement of the 22-foot wide, there's just not enough width of the flag satisfy those requirements. Similar to the other variance requests, they're all sort of connected or correlated with one another. Staff agrees that base development code standards do not address the historic adjacent development patterns of the subject site.

This is a screenshot of the tentative subdivision plan. These full-size plans can be found at the back of the packet. There's going to be eight smaller, pretty to-standard residential lots to the east and then two larger lots that are going to be proposed for future development, which are indicated as lots three and 10. Then, again, you can see the dashed line indicating the future location of Coach Drive. We don't typically focus heavily on the future development plan approval section of the code, but I will go through a few things just because this is one of the
more significant future development plans that we've received recently for a subdivision. Code section 17.52 states that whenever property is proposed to be partitioned or subdivided and there is potential for additional partitions or subdivisions of the property, in accordance with the provisions of this code, the partition subdivider shall submit a future development plan for approval, which the applicant did provide, which is here. You can see additional lots being proposed both on the north and south parent parcels.

There is some criteria for approval for a future development plan and it states that the proposed future 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. There's also some conditions that the hearing body can require for the approval of a future development plan. And those are stated here. I won't go through each one of them. One of the kind of standout conditions is an A list condition related to the future development plan. Staff is proposing a revision to the staff report, which strikes A list condition 2A which general restricted access to lots three and 10 in accordance with the list of conditions that we saw in the previous slide. Instead, staff is recommending the revision to include the conditions that you see bolded and italicized here.

Jason. Yes. So, I just wanted to point out, this is Brad Clark, so you don't have what Jason is showing up here in your packet. This information came up as a result of communications between staff and the applicant. Justin Gerlitz, the applicant's representative after getting the staff report, talking about the conditions, and then going back and forth. We just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what we have talked about. There's lot of back and forth. I should also point out that we have, I believe, Wade. Are you with us, Wade, on the phone?

Yep. I'm here.

Okay. We have Wade Elliot as the assistant public works director who's on the phone with us tonight as well. There's a lot of crossover when we're talking about extension of Coach going through this property between public works, the transportation plan, and what the development code would require. Frankly, there's two sections in the code that you can take into play with this issue. There's just a lot going on with it, so I think it's an important piece for the commission to spend some time on tonight. I think we need to let the applicant give their full testimony, but what you see on the screen here is a result of a conversation that I had with Justin Gerlitz prior to tonight's hearing that we came to agreement on but wanted to make sure that the commission has the chance to look at this, so maybe you could.

Did we print this slide out for the commission?

No.

Okay. Maybe we can leave that up and also, I can go get you a copy, so you can refer to this as the applicant is giving their testimony, so you can have a chance to look at it further.

Yeah. Actually, that might be a good idea if there's some other folks on the phone. You want to just maybe read those Jason?
So, the revised condition would read, "Submit two copies of a revised future development plan at the community development department indicating the following: as listed in the public work staff report, the applicant will provide a design for Coach Drive where it crosses the development property to ensure it is feasible to construct in the future. Based on the final design location, the applicant will dedicate a future roadway easement across the future right of way, accounting for slope easements if needed. This easement will be non-buildable.

"Subsection B. Pemberley Lane will be extended 20 feet into lot 10 to provide legal frontage for utility services. This extension will utilize the future Coach Drive design to make sure roadway grades and utility stubs are at correct locations. Subsection C. Any single-family home to be constructed on lot three and 10 will be a minimum 140 feet east of the future Coach Drive ride of way per the future development plan. This will preclude construction on future lots, 11 through 12 and 18 through 19.

"Subsection D. If the applicant desires to construct a single-family home on all 10 lots, the existing accessory dwelling unit on lot one will need to be decommissioned. That's related to the fact that the private street can only support up to 10 dwelling units. Subsection E. Coach Drive improvements will be required at the time of building permit for the 11th dwelling unit and or any land division of lot three or 10, essentially moving forward with the future development plan will require the construction of Coach Drive.”

One other revision to the staff report, which is related to the slide previously. In the criteria, it was stated that a condition of approval, it requires an easement for the future Coach Drive right of way. This is an important part of this future development plan, so just to ensure that this is being captured, staff is recommending a revision to include it in the A list. There was a couple of relatively minor typos, I suppose, in the public works memorandum, which are being suggested for revision. The first is 3A related to Grant's Pass Irrigation District. The current condition is explicit in saying that no storm water shall discharge into the irrigation system. After talking with Don Miller, the superintendent, he is agreeable to having some broader language that just says, plans must comply with standards as required by GPID. The second revision is related to sanitary sewers, I think is just a typo. The previous memo said the sewer applicant is proposing to extend public sewer made through private sewer lateral up to the project, but that should read private sewer easement up to the project. Staff is recommending the approval of all three variance requests, as well as the request for the 10-lot subdivision. Kind of threw a lot at you tonight, so if there's any questions for me, I'm happy to go into more detail about the future development plan and how that relates to this project.

Mr. Nelson, just to clarify, Pemberley Lane remains a private road, and so how do we propose Coach Drive goes through? Is that common having two connections? In other words, one going to Williams one now on Coach.

Yeah. So, at the time that Coach Drive has interconnectivity with adjacent right of way, then the current temporary private street section will be abandoned for a pedestrian access.

You're talking about that other one, I guess it's to the south.

Yeah. Let me pull it up here. Until the time that Pemberley Lane has interconnectivity with adjacent right of way, it will be privately maintained, but it's built to a local access standard. So once it has interconnectivity, then the city will take ownership of it.
Okay, because you said it was private, I was getting a little confused there.

Yeah. So, there is this portion to the west that will always remain private-

Ah.

... due to the fact that it's not built to a local access standard, but the section that is built to that standard, once the time comes that there is interconnectivity, then the city will take ownership of it, but until that time it'll be privately maintained.

Other questions to staff?

Do you have the slide to show that whole connection of Coach Drive and how far away the north and south connections are? Because it looks like it'll be quite a while before...

You just passed it.

Yeah. I tried to capture all of it in this shot. To the north here, you can see Curtis Drive and to the south, you can see the existing dead end of Coach Drive.

I thought there was one that was actually transportation plan that showed-

Yeah, it's a little hard to really see more granular. This is the best that we have as indicated on the master transportation.

I know. We've spent a lot of time trying to get all those connected through there off of Williams Highway to have a north-south connector. It's still a long ways away, but it's a good idea to have that dedicated and hold that. There was one other item I thought about. We talked about it a little bit at the time that we approved the pedestrian access being on the northern most east-west. I don't know what you call that. Is it a street or...? The 15-foot wide one.

That was five years ago and since then, there have been several subdivisions that had future road connections, but not immediate ones to provide a second egress from a subdivision in case of wildfire. I'm thinking of the one on F street, particularly where we asked to have an emergency exit provided until such time as there was another way out. I'm wondering if that would serve that purpose. We talked about it a little bit at the time, but since then, we've become a little more concerned about having that. It's not a big, because it's not very far away, but in case there's any blockage or problem with the lower one, it is another choice. I was wondering, is there a vehicle bridge now across the irrigation ditch or not on that northern 15 foot.

I'll defer to the applicant on where they're at in the construction. I'm a little bit more familiar with the southern flag lot.

Right. Well, I know that there's got to be one down there, but I just wondered if there was an old one left from access to that lot one up there.

Yeah. I could speculate, but I'll let the applicant speak to it.
Yeah. Maybe it wouldn't be necessary to have a vehicle exit, but at least a pedestrian escape route, which you have, if you have that being the pedestrian connection. Anyway, Justin can address that.

Other questions to staff? Did I cut you off? Do you have more questions? Marie, no? You're done?

Yeah.

Okay. I have a question. This future development plan that keeps throwing me. I'm looking at it right now and I'm seeing lots 14 and 21. Am I correct in assuming those lots will never be developed because they're so steep?

We do have a lot of homes go on very steep slopes, so with enough engineering, I would say anything's possible. Not being on the building side of things, I would be speculating again, but we have home sites go on very steep slopes.

Okay. Thank you for that. Anybody else, questions of staff? All right, applicant, come on forward and make your presentation please. Name and address, sir. We never see you here, so we like to know those things.

Evening commissioners, Justin Gerlitz, Gerlitz Engineering Consultants, 223 Northeast B Street here on behalf of the applicant tonight for Pemberley Meadow subdivision. I'll get the PowerPoint loaded up here. Here we go.

All right. So, I think maybe only Commissioner Arthur might have been here when we did this project originally. So, this was a project that was approved and actually started construction. I'll go through some details on that when we did the project, but due to various reasons of the applicant, it was delayed and then the approval expired, so we're here tonight to kind of renew that. With that comes a few minor changes more than anything. A lot of that to ensure what Jason was just talking about for future development and making sure that that could happen when the time comes. It is a 10 lot...
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Sure, that that could happen when the time comes. It is a 10-lot subdivision right now, physically square footage-wise, it's big enough for 51 lots, but as Commissioner Heesacker just asked, the upper portion of it, of those larger lots is very, very steep and access would be very difficult to achieve up there without going through other properties above. It is going to be developed with similar homes, probably with a similar builder. The site does have... Excuse me, limited access as mentioned. And that's really one of the reasons that all these different private and public street items have come up tonight.

This is a kind of an overview showing the project, Coach Drive is to the north, Wagon Wheel and stubbed to Coach Drive has actually been built to here, this is an older aerial photo. So, we're two properties away on Coach Drive to the south, and one property away on the north side. My guess is the north property is probably the most likely to develop first because it is kind of a larger subdivision piece, so there is the potential that one project could make that connection. One thing to note in this image here is, Wagon Wheel, which is similar to Allenwood.
to the south, and similar to McKenna Trail, which is in the same vicinity, they were all set up in a similar fashion. So, Coach Drive would eventually be the frontage road, and the connection to the State highway is the temporary connection today.

So, Wagon Wheel as you can see here, has a cul-de-sac bulb right on the highway. Allenwood is exactly the same way further to the south, and I believe both of those subdivisions had conditions that said, at such time Coach Drive connects through those entrances would be closed, which is similar to what we're proposing today. This is just a zoomed in photo. There is an existing home and since more recently, constructive accessory dwelling unit here. There is some small structures on the property, on the south property here that are all going to be removed. And then you can kind of see here that treed area that's really thick up here, is that steeper slope above the property. These are just some site photos, some older site photos, when we did the project originally. You can see here looking up the property, it's mostly undeveloped, up until that tree line, there's just a handful of trees.

This is one of the existing small structures that'll be removed. And then this is just standing up top kind of looking back towards the highway, through the main body of the lots to be developed. As asked by commissioner Heesacker, this is the existing vehicle bridge that goes over the irrigation canal on the 15-foot flag lot. So, that will remain in place, although it won't be used as a primary access for the project. These are some photos of the canal, this is the canal before it was fixed up and improved, it was actually in pretty bad shape when we started this project, a lot of the concrete was cracked and broken. And since then, I'll show you some photos here, it has been improved substantially. This is the 15 foot flagpole from the highway down below, and this is the neighboring property owner's driveway next to it, they kind of parallel one another.

This is standing in that driveway, looking back towards New Hope Road there. And then this is looking the other way down the highway, which all has sidewalk improvements, currently. This is actually a picture from today, very frosty this morning. This shows what improvements have been made there since the project was originally started, that included the subgrade, the rock that was built up to the irrigation crossing, and if we look back here, an irrigation culvert was constructed as part of that project, it's going to have eventually some bridge rails across that for protection, for vehicles and driving in there. You can kind of see some rebars sticking up there, so they just haven't been constructed yet. And then the irrigation canal has been significantly improved, the irrigation district kind of is part of this project, it's kind of their own project as well. Fixed all those broken panels, picked up the actual elevation of the top edge of this thing, which has had some flooding issues in the past, it looks a lot better today.

And this is that temporary private street kind of coming up from the highway into here, and I'd be standing right about where the cul-de-sac is going to go. And this is what some of the grading that occurred up the hill as part of the original construction. As Jason went over, we're kind of focusing on the lower portion of this project right now, most of that's the limitation on this temporary private street of 10 lots. The applicant does have the desire to further develop this as time goes on, but again, we're at the mercy of the neighboring developments occurring, who goes first. So, this is just one of the vital pieces in the middle, and we're really spending some time with the city staff to try to make sure we accomplish the ultimate goal of having that road go through.

This is kind of a zoomed in version down below showing the existing house. So, these are lots, standard for this area, the R1-8 zone, we don't do a lot of R1-8 development these days. So,
these are 7,000 square foot minimum lots, road running down the middle. And as mentioned, the goal here is Pemberley Lane will become a public cul-de-sac street, but because there isn't public access to that cul-de-sac street today, staff would like to have it as a privately maintained street all the way through until such a time, it connects to Coach Drive. So, we're going to be working with the city engineering division to design this, inspect it, just like it's a public road, all the utilities, all the connections. So, when Coach Drive does go through, they'll have all the records associated with the fact that this is a publicly... They can adopt it into their system.

Down here, this is kind of zoomed in version here, you can see we've already constructed the water line from Williams Highway up to the cul-de-sac, we've built that private street road minus paving. There is a public sewer main that's stubbed into that 15 foot flagpole, so the sewer main will continue up that flagpole and into the development. And that'll serve basically everything uphill of this in the future, potentially including the neighboring developments. The cul-de-sac again, street profile, this is the steep slope cul-de-sac section, because we are in the steep slope area. So, it will be constructed to that public standard in its entirety, up to the cul-de-sac bulb. The private street, which is this little piece right here fits in between the flagpole that's there today. It will be constructed to the same standard for a private street for 10 lots, except for that sidewalk that's usually attached to it is being moved over to that 15 foot flagpole.

That flagpole, because there's a sewer main in it, a smaller one, also would be graveled to its full width, the full 15 foot width, and that allows sewer maintenance vehicles to get out there, and potentially if there was an emergency, a vehicle could drive across that bridge and drive down it. These are the same conditions that Jason listed, so I won't spend time going through them, but again, we kind of agreed to a format for those upper lots where we can ensure that that future road could be constructed, and nothing would be constructed in the way of it.

And here are those upper lots right now, so this is how they will sit when they're developed in this first phase. And then we get into the future development plan. Lot numbering is a little confusing on here, we try to renumber them for the future development, which shows that ultimately there'll be a total of 21 lots, we anticipate, when Coach Drive is built and this project developed in its entirety. The owners of this project, we have two owners, are looking to probably develop a single-family home on these larger lots. And as commissioner Heesacker commented, the home will probably be at the base of these lots, and then the hill above will likely just stay forested for the long-term future. This is just a zoomed in version of that. We anticipate this upper portion will probably be a private street once Coach Drive is built, and then Coach Drive will run through here within that easement. As included with most projects, we have a steep slope erosion control plan which is in your packet, this is just an image of that. This hatching here is denser, up here is the steeper area, the hatching down here is what's considered the lower class of steep slope below, which is where the project's happening. Also included is a tree plan, is included with any subdivision showing, we have plenty of trees, plenty are going to remain, and then we'll replant for each new lot development.

I'll zoom back in here just as... in closing, and I think there was a couple questions. One of the corrections Jason, that had been made for the sewer easement, I think it still said private, it's actually going to be a public sewer easement. If we can make that correction. And again, there is a bridge there, commissioner Arthur had asked about the potential secondary access, and yes, there will be a potential secondary access that will remain there as part of the project. Variances, one of the things on these variances that we're requesting tonight, they're very, very specific to this very awkward configuration, that has been there for a very long time. One thing to know that's important though is, the variances that we're requesting now are only for this
temporary access road, this private street that's going in today, once Coach Drive is built and connected up here, this private street will essentially go away, it will remain as just a water maintenance access.

And then when it comes to the length of the street, today, it sounds long, I think it's 600 and some feet, from the very bottom to the very top. Once Coach Drive is connected in here and connected back to this cul-de-sac and this is closed, the length of that cul-de-sac is only I think, 418 feet, which is only 18 feet longer than the actual allowed road length in this area. So, important things to know. Again, one of the important things that are variances, is it the minimum required? Is it based on existing conditions and not conditions that the applicant created? And I think we can show that very clearly here tonight. Overall, we believe the subdivision and development, especially on the south side of town, there's very limited properties available to develop anymore within the UGB, is an important addition.

We are going to be creating nine new lots, with the 10th lot already there, with the house on it. So, traffic will be very limited onto Williams Highway, which has 11,000 cars a day on it, right now. It does provide a very good layout, again, with very good consideration and in coordination with staff, I think we've really set this thing up for what it needs to be for future development, with Coach Drive going through the middle. And with that, we're asking for approval to them, the subdivision associated variances. So happy to take any questions.

Questions to Mr. Gerlitz? Are you raising your hand? Anybody have questions for the applicant? Anybody else going to speak on your behalf?

Only if needed. Not right now.

All right. Looks like you're off the hot seat for now, thank you very much. 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? Sir, come on up to this microphone here. Give us your name and address and you have at least three minutes.

Okay. My name is Bruce Wiznap. I live at 2601 Williams Highway.

Hang on one second, is the red light on the base of the microphone? The other box there, the base of that microphone, is there a red light on?

Yep.

Okay. Thank you very much. Continue on.

I live at 2601 Williams Highway, just to the west of the cul-de-sac.

If you'd like, you can take your mask off [inaudible].

A few things we wanted to talk about, the road prep work was started before the surveying was finished by the surveyor who is, or was the county surveyor, the property line steak was not in yet, and they used the steak that marked something else. It damaged our property, which they have made more or less correct, but the road that they've built, the temporary road coming up off Williams Highway going to the cul-de-sac, that road, the roadbeds are between seven and
nine feet onto our property, there is no retaining wall holding that road in, so the road is continually sloughing down and it's encroaching onto our property. There's water flowing out of their roadbed onto our property, and we've had to dig trench drains, trying to drain the water away from our house. What we're wanting on that side is to have the retaining wall put in and be given a time that that retaining wall we be put there. We were originally told there was going to be a retaining wall there, but since 2017, we've seen nothing, that's enough time to put a retaining wall in.

Also, on the other approval that we had back when we spoke on this originally, we asked for a fence to be put down the middle of the two driveways, their 15 foot driveway and ours is right next to it. As you saw in the pictures, we have an RV parked there, we have our garage right there, and having a public sidewalk going right beside our RV, right beside our garage, they approved and said, yes, it was reasonable for the subdivision to put a fence line in between the two driveways to protect our property from whatever. And I haven't seen anything or heard anything about that, and I wanted that to be brought up. And I think that's about it.

Thank you for your time, sir, much appreciated. Anyone else like to speak in opposition to this project? Same drill, sir. Come on up to the microphone name and address.

Yeah. My name's Scott White. I live at 2627 Williams Highway. I'm just concerned about the road. It just looks like it cut into my property, and I just want to get it surveyed by my own surveyor, which is going to be expensive, but I feel I need to do it. I've had about 20 people tell me; it looks like part of my property was taken for that road. If you can go back to the road view, if you can go pull up the pictures up.

Thanks, Jason.

This way.

Yeah, right there. It looks like they changed the encroachment and everything, and they took about five foot on my property and chopped the corner off right there.

Are we looking at the left photo or the one on the right?

The one on the left.

Okay.

Yeah. Just the survey didn't seem right to me, it always has. I was under the understanding, it wasn't going to happen anymore, the subdivision, so I kind of just let it go. But now, since I got this letter, that's why I'm here. I would've come to the first meeting about this, but they came and surveyed it, and about a week later, they came back and surveyed again, and that's when everything seemed wrong to me. All the property lines run straight right there, and it just goes at an angle. So, that's my concern, I just want to get my own surveying done. Peter Allen was the surveyor and I believe he wasn't correct about what he did on my side there. So, that's it.

Thank you very much for your testimony. Anyone else like to speak in opposition to this project? Does the applicant have any final comments?
Well, I appreciate the neighbors coming to tonight, I'll try to answer a couple questions for them. Timing obviously, the project got stalled for a long time, the applicant's intent is to complete the project, I think this year, is his goal, so hopefully it will happen quickly. These retaining walls that aren't there right now on that public street or the private street portion, will be constructed within the property lines. So, that'll resolve, I think any of the concerns right now of potential encroachments. Property was surveyed by Peter Allen, who's a reputable surveyor in our area, he's county surveyor as well. And so, when this project is plotted, everything will be set, property corners pinned, and we'll make sure that there're no encroachments of any kind, with the roadway onto the adjacent properties.

There is, that the approach that is in front of that development on the left picture, is not aligned with the property lines. One of the things on this project that we're going to do is, we're going to cut that approach out, center it within that current flagpole that's there, where the road's going to be. So, that does kind of skew when you look at that, it appears it's kind of shifted one way and it is actually shifted one way. So, hopefully that helps clarify some questions for the neighbors, and if you have any additional questions, I'm happy to answer them.

Commissioner Arthur, do you have a question?

Well, I'm not sure that it's a question, but I would like to, when we get to the point of making a motion, I'd like to include an amendment to have some kind of egress allowed on that northern, what are we calling that?

I guess the flagpole or sewer easement, over the sewer easement, maybe for reference.

Sewer easement and with a bollard or something for emergency egress. And because it's kind of, I assume, a lower grade wooden bridge, there might have to be some weight limit, or something applied to what would be allowed to go over that. But I think it would be a good precaution, not just for fire, but if for some somebody slid off that culvert down below into the river, into the ditch, nobody could get in and out. I mean, there would be other reasons to be able to use that temporarily for egress. But my question would be, would you see some kind of a requirement as a part of that amendment?

We're basically following the original design on this, with a few minor modifications. So, the original design had a bollard across that driveway.

I thought so.

It is sufficient for a regular vehicle right now, it's not sufficient for a heavy vehicle by any means, a concrete truck or firetruck. And we did have a bollard there, the intention is that's going to be used for pedestrians from the subdivision to get down Williams Highway sidewalk. But the bollard, I think it was removable, if I remember correctly, to where a single vehicle could drive across it. But they are pretty close to one another in the subdivision right now without Coach Drive tucked back by the highway. Fire concerns are always a concern in our area, but in this situation, we're not getting people way, way, way up the hill in particular, maybe one house. It will remain there; we're not taking the bridge out.

So just make it subject to what? Road standard, or how would you word it? Any limitation on it?
Yeah. The bridge isn't sufficient for a road, highway rating is what we typically refer to, or bridge rating. The intention was to keep it primarily just for people to walk across it, pedestrians.

Other questions?

I have one to [inaudible]. So, you had mentioned the retaining wall, that the owner is intending to get that taken care of on behalf of the neighboring property owners, and the first one, I believe you mentioned fencing as well. Is this also intended to be addressed?

Yeah. I know last time we talked to the same neighbor about the project, there was fencing brought up, but then there was also some discussion on his RV, which was mentioned tonight, about difficulty getting in it and out with fencing. So, we could put some fencing down a portion of that, I think that's what we had on the last one was, maybe the upper portion had some fencing coming down for a portion of the driveways, and then the lower portion didn't.

Right. And there's nothing in the information that we have that would address that these... we haven't really gotten to this point. So, in 2017, when this all started and whatnot, obviously some of these issues were brought up then, it was stalled, we're now back at it, and I guess what I'm getting at is that the owner has every intention of accommodating the neighbors to the degree possible here.

Yes, yes. And finishing the project. And I do you understand, if I was a neighbor, the project was going to be built in 2000... I think it was 17, 18, and it didn't, and it's been sitting, I sense that frustration, I would have the frustration, and the full intention is to complete the project and get it done and have everybody fences up, road built, everything paved, and reducing dust and everything else associated with the construction.

It's the wraparound of the two properties.

Yes.

It's the two different lots that makes it a little unique.

Yeah. It's two individual flag lots stacked next to each other. Normally the flagpoles are next to each other, in this case, they're opposing one another. So, I definitely had to get creative and look at short term versus long term needs, for the roadway system.

Yeah. Thank you.

You're welcome.

Anything else for the applicant? Thank you very much.

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:09:04]

[inaudible]. Thank you very much. Staff conclusion. Do you have any final comment, staff?

On the buffering, article 23 is what gives the commission the authority to buffer or not to buffer and it's established really for different uses, where you have commercial next to residential.
Now, as the first application that you had on your agenda tonight, you had determined that there really was a pretty clear conflict between the RV park and the adjacent residential. In this case, you have residential to residential. I think Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss' question was good to kind of present it to the applicant to say, "Are you willing to work with them?" I think from staff's perspective, that probably is the better approach to have the two private parties work that out. Because if you look at article 23, it really doesn't talk about the authority to buffer that. Now I understand the owner's point in terms of having pedestrians walking up and down that easement there and being so close to the RV. I think as you deliberate, just bear that in mind in terms of what the code says.

Questions for staff? Are you sure? I'm going to close the public hearing. I'm not kidding, I'm going to do it. All right. The public hearing is closed. We need to motion so we can deliberate. Whoever is making the motion, be aware. Staff, are we striking condition A-5 that requires the geotechnical report because we received it?

We can do that.

Yes, we do.

I think my thought was, is that just at, it's just set satisfied now, but if it's cleaner or that's what you would like to see, we could strike that as a condition.

All right. Thank you very much. So, as we have done in the past, and it is my belief that if we don't work with the variances first and those don't get approved, then we don't approve the rest of the subdivision. So, is anybody prepared to make a motion for one variance or all three together? It's up to you, Commissioner Nelson.

Well, that's what I was going to ask is last time I thought there was going to be a railroad, but it wasn't. When we can do all three variances at once.

I mean, I guess you could. I mean, technically these-

And if someone objects to that, they could amend or sure not vote for it or take it out.

So, I was going to ask if anybody wanted to pull any one of these three variances for extra discussion.

That would [crosstalk].

Because they're all pretty much related to the same gig. And I agree with you, I think we can do all three at once. So go ahead and make your motion.

My motion is to approve the recommendations from staff in regards to the variance in the cul-de-sac link standards, the private street width standards, and the street section, the design standards.

All right. I think that's a great motion. Thanks. Any of these extra conditions that we want on the report, any of them related to the variances? The A2A, A2E.
And we have to include that in the final motion.

They are not related to the variance.

Okay. So they would be in the final motion, correct?

Yes. Yes.

Okay. So, we have a motion on the table to approve all three variances at once. Do we have a second?

Second, Collier.

Commissioner Collier seconds the motion. Deliberations. All right. I'll do a roll call vote again. Commissioner Collier.

Yes.

Commissioner Nelson.

Yes.

Commissioner Aviles.

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

I'm voting yes. Heesacker votes yes. Tokarz-Krauss?

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

All right. The variance portion of this is out of the way.

MOTION/VOTE
Commissioner Nelson moved, and Vice Chair Collier seconded the motion to approve the recommendations from staff in regards to the variance in the cul-de-sac link standards, the private street width standards, and the street section, the design standards. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.
Do we have a motion for the remainder of the subdivision? Commissioner Nelson, thank you for always doing the motions. I appreciate that.

It's all right. I just like to get the work done. Approve the request for the 10-lot sub to the approval with the conditions A through E as provided by staff tonight. On the record tonight.

Staff with this motion being made, have we nailed down all these extra conditions and all the other things that we discussed with this motion? I just want to make sure we're getting everything covered.

I mean, I think it's important that all the commissioners are clear on the changes that Jason presented. And if you are, then I think that's it. You're going to get the findings of fact back at your next meeting. So, as you know, this isn't technically the final decision. Your final, final isn't until you actually see this all again in writing at the findings of fact. But as long as everyone's comfortable, we will draft those findings based on what Jason presented. So, unless there's any clarifications, then I don't think we have anything more.

Okay. I have one more question. Hang on.

You might want to put A through E up again because we didn't get a copy of that.

Sure. That's a good idea.

And the print was so big.

I can't.

So, staff, I have a question when you get a minute. Ryan, you can probably answer this. Those typos that were noticed in the public works report, do we need to have those typos fixed? Should we make that a part of the motion?

Well, we were just chatting through that a little bit.

Whatever [inaudible]. There was two or three. Speaking.

I think the recommendation would be just a motion that was more broad changes as revisions as proposed by staff.

Could you please reword your motion?

I would recommend approval of the 10 lot subdivision with the conditions of approval with A through E as presented and with the Scribner's corrections as presented by staff.

Great motion. Thank you very much, Commissioner Nelson. Do we have a second?

Collier seconds.

I do. Because those things we talked about that were in the original plan to have the emergency egress on the 15-foot-wide sewer easement, I didn't see anywhere in this set of conditions. I don't think they're there, are they? I think I didn't find them.

You're suggesting a friendly amendment.

Yeah, because it was already seconded. So how do you want to proceed? I make an amendment?

Commissioner Arthur has a friendly amendment to add in a condition that says...

It says that until there is access on Coach Drive, that the 15-foot-wide sewer easement be made accessible for emergency egress. And I don't know whether we need to put a weight limit or anything in.

And not about a Ballard.

Well, that would be the... The Ballard would be the making the emergency access usable.

So, this is a good wrench about the weight on the bridge. How do we say this is emergency ingress, egress for cars that weight blah blah?

Well, 75,000 pounds is typically right in that range, gross GVW to support emergency. And you also don't have, you're not talking about only the ability to carry the weight, but also the width. Because the fire standard is a minimum of 20, and that's only 15. So, the implications would be to rip out the bridge that was depicted up there, the wood, and install probably a concrete culvert or something else that's capable of handling a 70,000 to 75,000 pound vehicle and widening it, which we didn't get into in the public hearing. So that I think, that would require more input from the owner.

That was not my intention to require that level of temporary construction, but just to allow people to escape or get out of their subdivision if the other road is blocked.

So, if you did not use the term emergency vehicle access.

Okay, I see what you mean.

Then that's the... that was your term. So, if you're only talking about pedestrian and a single vehicle, I believe Mr. [inaudible] did refer to the fact that if necessary, a single vehicle, but not emergency vehicle access.

You want to try and reword your friendly amendment?

I don't know. It seems like you need an adjective, but maybe not.
But egress, you're looking mainly for egress for the inhabitants or the occupants there. So minimally, just in the event of an emergency.

So don't use the word emergency.

Well, it's emergency vehicles, I think is the problem. Because those are the vehicles that are of the larger size weight and would be difficult. And you want to make sure that the people living there have the ability to escape an emergency situation and use that as an access way in event of such an event. Using the event lot of times, but anyway. Suggestions on how best to word, minimal wordage.

Can we make an amendment out of that wording?

Thinking.

I guess I would move that. You want to second it? Yes, no?

I'm trying to word something here. Use of the northerly access point for residents of the subdivision to escape any disaster. No use of the word emergency.

And I would move that. Susan, do you want second? Okay.

Sorry. It would be an amendment to the first motion.

Yes, yes. So, you're making a friendly amendment to his first motion. Do you accept this friendly amendment?

No.

He doesn't like it.

And I'll say why. One, is liability issues concern me. We haven't had a hearing in regards to this. So, if you want to postpone and have a hearing on that, then I would think that would be the safest bet. Requiring the project who has not even considered that in their project to be an access point for emergency, or and disaster is probably beyond the scope of what they can provide.

Maybe I'm misunderstanding, but I thought that was discussed earlier, prior to this of course, in like say 2017, of course. Commissioner Arthur being the only one of us here, I thought it was not. I'm seeing the head shaking. Okay. Right now, it's pedestrian only.

Would you accept any kind of amendment there? I think I'm hearing you. If we do anything with this, we're going to have to open a public hearing back up and go notice it.

That's my feeling.

I'm having to agree. So, we're ready to pull your friendly amendment.
Doesn't exist. Doesn't have the support.

I'm not seeing the support for this. Well, he's not willing to accept the friendly amendment, and he would have to reword the motion.

You can make an amendment after the motion has been made. She can make her own amendment to the motion. That's okay. But as far as friendly amendment, I'm not accepting it.

Okay. Are we going to make two votes here then? One on your motion and one on hers?

No.

No. Her amendment is tabled because it does not have support. So, you need to move on with motion that Mr. Nelson has made.

That's not true. She has two courses. She can do the friendly amendment, or she can make an amendment to the motion.

After the motion is voted on, correct?

No.

No.

No. She would make the amended... she can make the amendment motion. If it's a seconded, then that would be voted on. Then we go to the final motion.

That's the way you do it. I don't know.

Try again, please, with the amendment. I crossed mine out. I didn't think we were going to do it.

I'm not quite sure. We discussed it during the hearing, and it was part of the original proposal years ago. So, I'm not sure why it would require a separate hearing.

From my understanding the original proposal was expired and they had to go through the whole brand-new thing, so you're looking at what is today, what was yesterday. It's no longer available. That's the way I'm looking at it. [inaudible] as well as if we're having discussion on this, this plan has gone through all the departments of the city, meaning it's gone through the fire department. And if they have accepted this plan and given their blessing that they have emergency access through the one access to the temporary access to the culvert, then I'm satisfied that there's enough emergency access to this site.

Go ahead and make your amendment.

Okay. My amendment was to include or ensure the use of the northerly sewer easement access to escape any disaster, that the residents would have the ability to do that.

There's the amendment. Do we have a second?
I'll continue to second it.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconds. Here, I need that back. Thank you. So, I'm going to do a roll call vote. This is on the amendment to the motion. Commissioner Collier?

No.

Commissioner Nelson?

No.

Commissioner Aviles.

No.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

I'm Eric, I'm voting no. Commissioner Scherf?

No.

Okay. So that amendment fails.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Arthur moved, and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconded the motion to approve the approval of the 10-lot subdivision with the conditions of approval with A through E as presented and with the Scribner's corrections as presented by staff and to ensure the use of the northerly sewer easement access to escape any disaster. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Commissioners Arthur and Tokarz-Krauss. “NAYS”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Nelson, and Scherf. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

The motion failed.

I know you're going to hate me for this, but could you please state the original motion?

I would move approval with the request for the 10-lot subdivision as conditioned with the items A through E and as to the Scribner corrections provided by staff tonight.

Thank you very much. Commissioner Collier, you're still seconding that?

Sure.
Okay. We got a second. I'll do another vote. Oh, any deliberation over that motion? All right. Roll call vote on the subdivision on the motion on the table. Commissioner Collier?

Yes.

Commission Nelson.

Yes.

Commissioner Aviles?

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur?

Yes.

I'm voting yes. Heesacker votes yes. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf?

Yes.

Thank you very much.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Vice Chair Collier seconded the motion to approve the request for the 10-lot subdivision as conditioned with the items A through E and as to the Scribner corrections provided by staff tonight. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.
The motion passed.

**Matters from Commission Members and Staff:**

Next on the agenda, matters from commission members and staff.

I think from staff's perspective, we had talked a couple of months ago about the middle housing code amendment. It impacts five different articles, I think it is. I think we had indicated tonight, we may present that to you. We're going to be doing that on February 9th at your February 9th meeting, just to give you more time with it. There's a lot to it. And I think it would help the commission, let's put it that way, if we gave it to you ahead of time in a more cohesive so you can look at it and have better rather than just putting. So, we'll put that on your February 9th. A review, more like a workshop, not a hearing of the middle housing code amendment. So, you'll have that your next meeting.

All right. I will also have findings of fact for Pemberley.
Yes.

All righty. Anything else from staff? Commissioner Scherf, do you have anything for us?

No, thank you.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

I just want to remind whoever puts these packets together to make sure that we all have the foldouts. The one I originally received, which was in, I think Commissioner Scherf's, does not have any foldouts in it. And in this case, as you can see, it'd be very helpful. So, I'm sure that was just an oversight, but a reminder.

It's okay. I'm at the kids' table.

So, I have one item here. Commissioner Nelson, thank you so much for making that motion. I just want it straight for the record. I can tell you're getting frustrated. I don't blame you. I would too. So, you're not going to catch me after the meeting. I'll be out of here. Thank you very much. Commissioner Arthur, do you have anything? Commissioner Aviles?

Nothing.

Commissioner Nelson?

Yes, I would, no.

Commissioner Collier?

He's already left, but I was going to commend Mr. [inaudible] for his work on the RV park. It seemed like he went back, readdressed, readdressed, and I just feel good about what he's done.

That's his style. I've seen him do that on another projects.

It works out. My other comment would be, I'd always love to hear from Brad, the status of the future of the BLM parking lot. I'm always curious about how that's going.

Sure. Well, it's engineered. And because of the weather, we just haven't put out the RFP yet. If there's going to be still some rains and whatnot, we just don't want to be digging around too much up there. But the engineering is done for it. We are going to go out to bid to see which kind of contractors want to come into town and build it. But we'll put out that, I think, in March.

So, you think we'll see that this summer?

Oh yeah.

That'd be awesome.
Yeah. No, it's funded, so it'll be built.

No, I just [crosstalk].

You want us to get you a shovel?

Anything else from anyone? Staff, thank you. Good to meeting you tonight. Meeting adjourned. PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [01:30:56]

_______________________________  __________________
Eric Heesacker, Chair          Date

Urban Area Planning Commissioner
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.

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. **PROCEDURE:**

A. An application for a Major Site Plan Review was submitted on December 3, 2021 and deemed complete on December 6, 2021. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.050 of the Development Code.

B. Public notice of the January 12, 2022 hearing of the UAPC was mailed on December 22, 2021 in accordance with Section 2.053 of the GPDC.

C. A public hearing was held on January 12, 2022. The public hearing was closed on January 12, 2022, with the record left open for 7 days to allow additional testimony, the applicant was provided an additional 7 days to rebut any additional testimony. Deliberation was continued to January 26, 2022.

D. A public meeting was held on January 26, 2022. The Planning Commission voted to approve the Major Site Plan Review with a vote of 7-0.

V. **SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:**

A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the original staff report for 201-00410-21 presented at the January 12, 2022 hearing and the revised staff report for 201-00410-21 presented at the January 26, 2022 meeting (including additional testimony and applicant rebuttal as exhibits to the staff report). These reports are attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein.

B. The minutes of the public hearings held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on January 12, 2022 and January 26, 2022, attached as Exhibit “B”, summarize
the oral testimony presented and are incorporated herein.

C. The PowerPoint presentations given by staff on January 12, 2022 and January 26, 2022 are attached as Exhibit “C” and are incorporated herein.

D. The PowerPoint presentation given by the applicant’s representative on January 12, 2022 is attached as Exhibit “D” and incorporated herein.

VI. FINDINGS OF FACT:

The Urban Area Planning Commission found that based upon the testimony given at the public hearings and the staff reports, the proposal meets the criteria in Sections 19.052 and 6.060 of the GPDC based on the reasons stated in the findings included below.

VII. GENERAL FINDINGS OF FACT:

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/cafeteria
- 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.

VIII. 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.

Planning Commission 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.


Planning Commission 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Planning Commission 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. The applicant has agreed to extend the buffer strip to 10’ adjacent to residually developed areas along the north and east property lines, as well as extend the fence height in this area to 8’.

**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.

**Planning Commission 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 east 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. The applicant has agreed to extend the buffer strip to 10’ adjacent to residually developed areas along the north and east property lines, as well as extend the fence height in this area to 8’. The applicant has also agreed to prohibit the use of fire pits and generators at individual RV sites. The applicant has also agreed to provide 24 hour staffing in relation to management of the RV park and to provide continued video surveillance.
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.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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 (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.

Planning Commission 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 comply with all 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.
Criterion (9): Traffic conflicts and hazards are minimized on-site and off-site, as provided in Article 27.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission Response: Not Applicable. The does not include phased development.

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

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

IX. DECISION AND SUMMARY:

The Urban Area Planning Commission APPROVED the request for the development as submitted with the attached amended conditions of approval. The vote for the Major Site Plan review was 7-0 with Commissioners Collier, Nelson, Aviles, Arthur, Heesacker, Tokarz-Krauss, and Scherf in favor.

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 be submitted showing that a 10 foot landscape buffer is applied to the north and east property lines where existing residential uses are present. The revised site plan shall also indicate an 8 foot fence in these areas.

4. 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.

5. 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.

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

7. 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.
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.

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. Additionally, the irrigation service shall be protected by a DC backflow device, which shall be located within ten feet (10’) of the water meter.

RP backflow devise shall be required on all water services as “premises” protection.

DC backflow devices shall be required as “point of use” protection on all water services containing multiple zone irrigation systems.

The applicant shall design, construct and test all new sanitary sewer facilities in conformance with the City’s Sanitary Sewer Standards and Specifications.

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.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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).

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.

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.

10. 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 NE 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.

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. **Lighting at all RV sites shall be low silhouette lighting.**

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 ow 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.

27. **The park shall not allow the use of fire pits or generators at individual RV sites.**
28. The park shall have 24 hour staffing related to management of the park and shall provide continued video surveillance.

X. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION, this 9th day of February 2022.

_________________________________________________________________
Eric Heesacker, Chair
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. 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. 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.

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. PROCEDURE:

   a. An application for a Subdivision Tentative Plan and three Major Variance requests was submitted on December 9, 2021 and deemed complete on December 14, 2021. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.050 of the Development Code.

   b. Public notice of the January 26, 2022 hearing was mailed on January 5, 2022, in accordance with Section 2.053 of the Development Code.

   c. A public hearing was held on January 26, 2022 and the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve the Subdivision Tentative Plan and Major Variance requests with the conditions attached in the Staff Report.

V. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

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

   b. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on January 26, 2022, attached as Exhibit “B”, summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.
c. The PowerPoint given by staff is attached as Exhibit “C”.

d. The PowerPoint given by the applicants representative is attached as Exhibit “D”

e. Two members of the public testified in opposition to the application.

VI. FINDINGS OF FACT:

The Urban Area Planning Commission found that based upon the testimony given at the public hearing and the staff report, the proposal meets the criteria in Sections 6.060 and 17.413 of the Development Code based on the reasons stated in the findings included below.

VII. GENERAL FINDINGS OF FACT

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.

VIII. 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 (G PID). The property owners will need to contact G PID 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.

IX. FINDINGS IN CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

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

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.
**Planning Commission 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.

The Commission acknowledges base development code standards do not address the historic development patterns of the surrounding area 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.

**Planning Commission 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.

**Planning Commission Response: Satisfied.** The Commission 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.

**Planning Commission 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.

**Planning Commission 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.

The Commission agrees base development code standards do not address the historic adjacent development patterns 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.

**Planning Commission 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.

The Commission 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.

**Planning Commission Response: Satisfied.** The Commission 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.

**Planning Commission 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.

**Planning Commission 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.

The Commission agrees base development code standards do not address the historic adjacent development patterns 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.

**Planning Commission 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.

**Planning Commission Response:** Satisfied. The Commission 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.

**Planning Commission 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.
Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

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%.

**Planning Commission 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.

**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.

**Planning Commission 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.

**X. DECISION AND SUMMARY:**

- The Urban Area Planning Commission **APPROVED** the request for the three (3) Major Variance Requests. The vote was 6-0 with Commissioners Heesacker, Nelson, Arthur, Tokarz-Krauss, Collier, and Scherf voting in favor. There is one vacancy on the commission.

- The Urban Area Planning Commission **APPROVED** the request for the ten (10) lot Subdivision with the conditions below. The vote was 6-0 with Commissioners Heesacker, Nelson, Arthur, Tokarz-Krauss, Collier, and Scherf voting in favor. There is one vacancy on the commission.
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.
      a. As listed in the Public Works staff report, the applicant will provide a design for Coach Drive where it crosses the development property to ensure it is feasible to construct in the future. Based on the final design location, the applicant will dedicate a “future roadway easement” across the future right-of-way, accounting for slope easements if needed. This easement will be non-buildable.
      b. Pemberley Lane will be extended 20’ into Lot 10 to provide legal “frontage” for utility services. This extension will utilize the future Coach Drive design to make sure roadway grades and utility stubs are at the correct locations.
      c. Any single-family home to be constructed on Lot 3 & 10 will be a minimum 140’ east of the future Coach Drive right-of-way. Per the future development plan, this will preclude construction on “future” Lots 11-12 and 18-19.
      d. If the applicant desires to construct a single-family home on all 10 lots, the existing Accessory Dwelling Unit on Lot 1 will need to be decommissioned.
      e. Coach Drive improvements will be required at the time of building permit for the 11th dwelling unit and/or any land division of lot 3 or 10.
   f. 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.
   g. Require the termination of the temporary access at such time as Coach Drive connects.
h. 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. 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.

3. 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.

   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.

5. Any septic system shall be properly abandoned in accordance with DEQ guidelines and standards. Submit copies of DEQ permits if applicable.

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

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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. The applicant will be required to dedicate as an easement the future Coach Drive right of way.
b. A fifteen foot (15’) unobstructed and drivable easement centered on the sewer main including access across the canal.

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

d. 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.)

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

12. Meet conditions found in the Public Works Memorandum.

13. Submit a revised “Existing Tree Canopy Cover and Tree Protection Plan” for review and approval by the City’s Urban Forester.

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. The applicant will be required to dedicate as an easement the future Coach Drive right of way.
      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.

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.

XI. **FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION** this 9th day of February, 2022.

________________________________________________

Eric Heesacker, Chair
I. PROPOSAL:

Adopt the 2021 Housing Needs Analysis and Buildable Lands Inventory as an ancillary document to the Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan; and to amend the current Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan Element 9: Housing Element Index.

(See Exhibits 1 & 2.)

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

The passage of the Oregon Land Use Planning Act of 1974 (ORS Chapter 197) established the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). The Act required the Commission to develop and adopt a set of statewide planning goals. Goal 10 addresses housing in Oregon and provides guidelines for local governments to follow in developing their local comprehensive land use plans and implementing policies.

At a minimum, local housing policies must meet the applicable requirements of Goal 10 and the statutes and administrative rules that implement it (ORS 197.270, 197.293, 197.307, and OAR 660-008).\(^1\) Goal 10 requires incorporated cities to complete an inventory of buildable residential lands. Goal 10 also requires cities to encourage the numbers of housing units in price and rent ranges commensurate with the financial capabilities of its households.

Goal 10 defines needed housing types as “all housing on land zoned for residential use or mixed residential and commercial use that is determined to meet the need shown for housing

\(^1\) ORS 197.296 only applies to cities with populations over 25,000.
within an UGB at price ranges and rent levels that are affordable to households within the county with a variety of incomes, including but not limited to households with low incomes, very low incomes and extremely low incomes. ORS 197.303 defines needed housing types:

(a) Housing that includes, but is not limited to, attached and detached single-family housing and multiple family housing for both owner and renter occupancy.

(b) Government assisted housing.2

(c) Mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks as provided in ORS 197.475 to 197.490.

(d) Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single-family residential use that are in addition to lots within designated manufactured dwelling subdivisions.

(e) Housing for farmworkers.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

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

IV. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

The City of Grants Pass last updated its Housing Needs Analysis and Element 9 of its Comprehensive Plan in 2014 as part of the periodic review requirement under state law. Since that time, the city and the region have experienced a historic housing crisis driven by continued population growth and underproduction of housing in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and subsequent recession. Issues of housing equity, affordable housing, and houselessness have grown increasingly important as the deficit of housing access for middle- and lower-income households increases.

The 2021 Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) was developed in compliance with OAR 660 Division 10 (Statewide Planning Goal 10: Housing) and is a technical study that compares projected demand for land for housing to the existing supply of such land. The purpose of the HNA is to provide needed analysis and policy guidance to the city in meeting its needs and desires to provide housing opportunity for all residents, as outlined in Chapter 9 of the Comprehensive Plan, while complying with State housing goals and requirements.

The tasks include examining future population projections and demographic trends to assess Grants Pass housing development potential, projecting household growth and determining short- and long-term demand for residential land. This demand is compared to and inventory of suitable residential land (supply) to assess the sufficiency of immediate and long-term (20 year) supply of residential land in the city.

Proposal Description

Housing Needs Analysis

The Housing Needs Analysis serves as a component and ancillary document of the Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan. It identifies the amount of needed residential land for the next 20 years, and strategies to implement the city’s vision related to housing. It builds on a comprehensive study of the local housing market and future trends and an in-depth review of current local, regional, state, and federal housing requirements, goals, and initiatives. The strategies in the report will help guide future housing policy and land use decisions.

---

2 Government assisted housing can be any housing type listed in ORS 197.303 (a), (c), or (d).
The primary goals in updating the city’s Housing Needs Analysis and amending Chapter 9 Housing of the Comprehensive Plan are threefold:

- Ensuring that the City’s Comprehensive Plan remains a relevant and informative tool for decision makers;
- Complying with Statewide planning Goal 10: Housing and the associated OAR 660 Division 8; and providing needed analysis and information for current and future long-range planning efforts.
- Updating the city’s Buildable Lands Inventory: The Buildable Lands Inventory is a related but distinct analysis that is outlined under OAR 660-038-0060. It requires an assessment of the capacity of land within the city’s Urban Growth Boundary to accommodate forecasted housing and employment needs.

V. APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

**CRITERION (c):** Applicable planning goals and guidelines of the State of Oregon.

**Goal 1, Citizen Involvement:**

**Staff’s Response: Satisfied.** Public involvement has included postings on the City’s website, direct contact with certain community groups and organizations, and face-to-face community events including an open house at city hall. The Hosing Advisory Committee formed a sub-committee of four members who held five meetings with the City’s consultants between October 2020 and April 2021. Additional findings of fact and conclusions of law may be required following public hearings on the subject amendments. Prior to the UAPC public hearing, there is no basis upon which to make any findings or conclusions with respect to the citizen involvement criterion. Public notice of the proposal has been provided. The proposal is scheduled for public hearings and all public comment will be included in the public record for this application.

**Goal 10, Housing:**

**Staff’s Response: Satisfied.** The purpose of the Housing Element is to meet the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 10, OAR 660-008, and ORS 197.296. Specifically, OAR 660-008-0045 sets deadlines for when Oregon cities must complete their Housing Needs analysis. The City of Grants Pass is one of six cities that must adopt its HNA no later than December 31, 2022. Within this policy context, the Housing Element must identify local housing needs and buildable lands. (Note: How the housing needs will be met is addressed through a separate, state-mandated review called the Housing Production Strategy. The City is currently working with consultant ECONorthwest to perform this study, anticipated for completion by early 2023.) The proposed changes in Exhibits 1 and 2 will amend the Housing section of the Comprehensive Plan.

**CRITERION (d):** Citizen review and comment.

**Staff’s Response: Satisfied.** A survey asking for citizen input addressing housing policy and code updates was set up as an interactive tool on the city website. Public response and postings on the website were modest, with about 84 responses. A few key takeaways from that survey were the calling for utilizing existing land and structures more efficiently and increasing density utilizing vertical housing. Following the public hearing all public comments will be made part of the record.
CRITERION (e): Review and comment from affected governmental units and other agencies.

Staff’s Response: Satisfied. The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), and Josephine County were notified of the proposed amendment within the minimum required timeframes. Any comments received will be addressed during the public hearings.

CRITERION (f): A demonstration that any additional need for basic urban services (water, sewer, streets, storm drainage, parks, and fire and police protection) is adequately covered by adopted utility plans and service policies, or a proposal for the requisite changes to said utility plans and service policies as a part of the requested Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Staff’s Response: The Housing Needs Analysis and Buildable Lands Inventory documents are intended to project and identify housing needs through the year 2040. The legislation does not require a detailed analysis of how urban services and other public infrastructure will or will not meet that need. However, the adopted master sewer, water, stormwater, and transportation plans were all modeled on build-out projections of the Urban Growth Boundary using the 2014 Comprehensive Plan land use designations and maximum densities. The estimated number of 4055 dwelling units plus the group housing needs identified in the Housing Needs Analysis will fall within the projected populations in the adopted master plans.

CRITERION (g): Additional information as required by the review body.

Staff’s Response: Not Applicable

CRITERION (h): In lieu of item (2) above, demonstration that the Plan was adopted in error.

Staff’s Response: Not applicable.

VI. RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission RECOMMEND APPROVAL to the City Council of the proposed housing amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

VII. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. Recommend the City Council approve the request:
   1. As submitted; or,
   2. With revisions recommended by the Planning Commission (list):

B. Recommend the City Council deny the request for the following reasons (list):

C. Postponement: Continue item
   1. Indefinitely; or,
   2. To a certain time.
NOTE: The application is a legislative amendment and is not subject to the 120-day limit.

VIII. INDEX TO EXHIBITS

1. Comprehensive Plan text amendments
2. City of Grants Pass Housing Needs Analysis Report, May 2021
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................ iv

Section I. Introduction .................................................................................................... 2
  Oregon Regulatory Requirements .................................................................................. 2
  Methodology .................................................................................................................. 3
  Report Organization ..................................................................................................... 3

Section II. Housing Need Projection ............................................................................... 4
  Population ....................................................................................................................... 4
  Socio-economic Characteristics .................................................................................... 5
  Existing Housing Inventory and Tenancy ....................................................................... 6
  Housing Market Characteristics ..................................................................................... 8
  Housing Needs Scenarios .............................................................................................. 10

Section III. Buildable Land Inventory .......................................................................... 12
  Buildable Land Inventory Methodology ....................................................................... 12
  Residential Land Base .................................................................................................. 12
  Land Classifications ..................................................................................................... 13
  Development Constraints ............................................................................................... 13
  Residential Buildable Land Inventory Results ............................................................... 14
  Land Base ..................................................................................................................... 14
  Constrained Land .......................................................................................................... 14
  Buildable Land After Future Public Facilities ............................................................... 15
  Partially-Vacant Residential Land ................................................................................ 15
  Total Developable Residential Land ............................................................................ 16
  Commercial and Mixed-Use Land Assumptions ........................................................... 17

Section IV. Land Sufficiency Analysis ......................................................................... 23
  Housing Need Forecast ............................................................................................... 23
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is made possible through the sincere input by City of Grants Pass staff and the Advisory Committee. We specifically recognize and appreciate the time and attention dedicated to this work by the following people.

City of Grants Pass
Bradley Clark
Jason Maki
Dennis Lewis
Carolyn Nealon
Jon Brandt

Advisory Committee Members
Doug Walker
Kelly Wessels
Sam Engel
Loree Arthur

Project Consultants
Steve Faust, 3J Consulting
Christina Winberry, 3J Consulting
Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning
Todd Chase, FCS GROUP
Tim Wood, FCS GROUP
Section I. INTRODUCTION

The Grants Pass Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) is intended to serve as a basis for the City of Grants Pass to document new information regarding the city’s buildable land inventory (BLI), population and employment trends, and development policies aimed at providing adequate land within the urban growth boundary (UGB) to handle the next 20 years of population growth.

OREGON REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The passage of the Oregon Land Use Planning Act of 1974 (ORS Chapter 197) established the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). The Act required the Commission to develop and adopt a set of statewide planning goals. Goal 10 addresses housing in Oregon and provides guidelines for local governments to follow in developing their local comprehensive land use plans and implementing policies.

At a minimum, local housing policies must meet the applicable requirements of Goal 10 and the statutes and administrative rules that implement it (ORS 197.295 to 197.314, ORS 197.475 to 197.490, and OAR 600-008). Goal 10 requires incorporated cities to complete an inventory of buildable residential lands. Goal 10 also requires cities to encourage the numbers of housing units in price and rent ranges commensurate with the financial capabilities of its households.

Goal 10 defines needed housing types as “all housing on land zoned for residential use or mixed residential and commercial use that is determined to meet the need shown for housing within an UGB at price ranges and rent levels that are affordable to households within the county with a variety of incomes, including but not limited to households with low incomes, very low incomes and extremely low incomes.” ORS 197.303 defines needed housing types:

(a) Housing that includes, but is not limited to, attached and detached single-family housing and multiple family housing for both owner and renter occupancy.

(b) Government assisted housing.

(c) Mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks as provided in ORS 197.475 to 197.490.

(d) Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single-family residential use that are in addition to lots within designated manufactured dwelling subdivisions.

(e) Housing for farmworkers.

---

1 ORS 197.296 only applies to cities with populations over 25,000.
2 Government assisted housing can be any housing type listed in ORS 197.303 (a), (c), or (d).
METHODOLOGY

A recommended approach to conducting a housing needs analysis is described in *Planning for Residential Growth: A Workbook for Oregon’s Urban Areas*, the Department of Land Conservation and Development’s guidebook on local housing needs studies. As described in the workbook, the specific steps in the housing needs analysis are:

1. Project the number of new housing units needed in the next 20 years.
2. Identify relevant national, state, and local demographic and economic trends and factors that may affect the 20-year projection of structure type mix.
3. Describe the demographic characteristics of the population and, if possible, the housing trends that relate to demand for different types of housing.
4. Determine the types of housing that are likely to be affordable to the projected households based on household income.
5. Determine the needed housing mix and density ranges for each plan designation and the average needed net density for all structure types.
6. Estimate the number of additional needed units by structure type.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report provides the technical basis of findings that support proposed housing policy recommendations and subsequent actions that the city will take to update its Comprehensive Plan and Development Code. Each section of this report provides current data, assumptions and results that comprise all findings and conclusions:

I. Introduction.

II. Housing Need Projection: provides a demographic overview and summary of market trends influencing housing growth in Grants Pass.

III. Buildable Land Inventory: identifies vacant, partially vacant and redevelopable residential land within the Grants Pass UGB, and accounts for constraints to get to a final determination of capacity to meet 20-year needs.

IV. Land Sufficiency Analysis: this section compares expected land demand to vacant land supply to meet housing mix and densities described in the HNA.

V. Findings and Recommendations highlights key findings and draft housing policy recommendations.

VI. Glossary: list of key terms used in the housing needs analysis.

Please refer to the Glossary for a list of terms used in the Housing Needs Analysis.
Section II. HOUSING NEED PROJECTION

This section provides a housing needs forecast for long-range planning purposes. The housing needs forecast represents a 20-year projection from 2020 through year 2040. These technical findings are intended to be consistent with State of Oregon requirements for determining housing needs per Oregon land use planning Goals 10 and 14, OAR Chapter 660, Division 8, and applicable provision of ORS 197.296 to 197.314 and 197.475 to 197.490.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for projecting housing needs within the Grants Pass UGB includes consideration of demographic and socio-economic trends, housing market characteristics and long-range population growth projections.

Regional (Josephine County) and local (City or UGB) population, households, income and market characteristics are described in this memorandum using data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau (Census and American Community Survey), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Oregon Department of Housing and Community Services (OHCS), Portland State University (PSU) and the City of Grants Pass. Where trends or long-range projections are provided by an identified data source, this analysis includes extrapolations or interpolations of the data to arrive at a base year (2020 estimate) and forecast year (2040 projection). The result of this forecast translates population growth into households and households into housing need by dwelling type, tenancy (owner vs. renter) and affordability level.

DEMOGRAPHICS AND SOCIO-ECONOMICS

Population

The City of Grants Pass recorded a record-high population of 37,485 in 2019 (July 1 estimate by PSU). Taking into account residents living outside the City but inside the UGB, the Grants Pass UGB population is currently estimated at 41,691 year-round residents. Since 2000, the population growth rate in the City has outpaced Josephine County (Figure 1).

Long-range population forecasts prepared by PSU anticipate that 9,401 new residents will be added to the Grants Pass UGB over the next 20 years. This equates to a projected annual average growth rate (AGR) of 1.02% for the UGB and less than half of the historic growth rate (see Figure 2).

Figure 1: Population Trends (2000-2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josephine County</td>
<td>75,726</td>
<td>82,713</td>
<td>86,750</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>34,533</td>
<td>37,485</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Population Research Center, Portland State University, April 15, 2020
**Figure 2: Population Projections (2020-2040)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2020-2040 AGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josephine County</td>
<td>88,274</td>
<td>97,807</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass UGB</td>
<td>41,691</td>
<td>51,092</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 estimates. Future forecasts by Population Research Center, Portland State University, June 30, 2018.

**Socio-economic Characteristics**

As indicated in **Figure 3**, about half of the City’s residents had household incomes greater than 80% of median family income ($42,880) for the county, while 18% of households were earning less than $16,080, 30% of county median family income.

**Figure 3: Households by Income Level, 2014-2018**

In comparison with the state and county averages, Grants Pass has a higher share of younger residents. The median age in Grants Pass (38.3) is below the Josephine county and statewide average (**Figure 4**).
EXISTING HOUSING INVENTORY AND TENANCY

Local housing inventory and tenancy patterns shed light on housing conditions and demand preferences. In 2018, there were 16,051 housing units in the City of Grants Pass of which 15,158 units were classified as occupied in 893 units were classified as vacant.

Like most communities, single-family detached housing is the most prevalent housing type representing 67% of the housing stock. The remaining housing inventory in Grants Pass includes multi-family (11%), townhomes and duplexes (17%), and mobile homes (6%), as shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Existing Housing Mix and Tenancy, 2014-2018, City of Grants Pass

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Table B01002)
Tenancy within the city is split fairly evenly between owners and renters. Owner-occupied housing accounts for 48% of the housing inventory while renter-occupied units account for 46% of the inventory. Vacant units accounted for about 6% of the inventory in 2018.

As would be expected, most homeowners reside in single-family detached units (89% of owners) or manufactured homes. Most renters also reside in single-family detached units, followed by single family attached and multifamily units, as indicated in Figures 6 & 7.

**Figure 6: Units by Tenure by Structure Type, 2014-2018, City of Grants Pass**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Other Seasonal &amp; Vacant</th>
<th>All Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>10,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes/Plexes</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (5+ Units)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfg. Home/Other</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,764</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,394</strong></td>
<td><strong>893</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,051</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Tables B25032 and CP04)

**Figure 7: Existing Housing Tenancy, 2014-2018, City of Grants Pass**

Figure 8 displays the most current available data depicting the housing mix by unit type and tenancy for the City of Grants Pass.
HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTICS

To help gauge housing attainability in Grants Pass, the consultant team examined current median family income (MFI) levels using U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines. As indicated in Figure 9, the 2018 median income for Josephine County was $53,600. Using HUD guidelines for upper-middle households earning 80% of the MFI, a 4-person family should be able to afford monthly rents at $1,072 and homes priced at $284,000 (or less). These price and rent levels are generally considered “attainable” to households earning 80% of the local MFI and spending 30% of their annual income on housing.

Figure 8: Existing Housing Mix, City of Grants Pass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Tenure Distribution:</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Total Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes / Plexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi family (5+ units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home/other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2013-2018 5-Year Estimates (Tables B25032 and CP04).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Josephine County Median Family Income Level (2018)*</th>
<th>$53,600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Monthly Rent or Payment (@30% of income level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper (120% or more of MFI)</td>
<td>$1,608 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (80% to 120% of MFI)</td>
<td>$1,072 $1,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (50% to 80% of MFI)</td>
<td>$670 $1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (30% to 50% of MFI)</td>
<td>$402 $670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low (less than 30% of MFI)</td>
<td>$402 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Approximate Attainable Home Price** |     |
| Upper (120% or more of MFI) | $426,000 or more |
| Middle (80% to 120% of MFI) | $284,000 $426,000 |
| Low (50% to 80% of MFI) | $177,000 $284,000 |
| Very Low (30% to 50% of MFI) | $106,000 $177,000 |
| Extremely Low (less than 30% of MFI) | $106,000 or less |

Notes:
* based on Housing and Urban Development thresholds for Josephine County in 2018
Note, this analysis is generally consistent with 4-person household size characteristics.
** assumes 20% down payment on 30-year fixed mortgage at 3.5% interest.
Source: analysis by FCS Group using Housing and Urban Development data.
Grants Pass home values have increased significantly in recent years. As indicated in Figure 10, median home sales prices in Grants Pass increased to $324,000 in October 2020, up 8.9% annually since 2018. In comparison with other cities in Southern Oregon, Grants Pass has relatively higher home prices and recorded the sharpest price increase.

Figure 10: Median Home Sales Price Trends in Selected Markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Oct-18</th>
<th>Oct-19</th>
<th>Oct-20</th>
<th>Annual Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$294,000</td>
<td>$324,000</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>$457,000</td>
<td>$451,000</td>
<td>$469,000</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$223,000</td>
<td>$239,000</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath Falls</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Zillow.com; analysis by FCS 10/28/20

New housing construction permits issued in the City indicate consistent development activity over the past several years. The City issued new residential construction permits at an average rate of 140 per year between 2015 and 2019; with about 79% for single family detached and attached, 14% in duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes, and 7% for multifamily apartments (Figure 11).

Figure 11: Privately-Owned Residential Units Permitted, Grants Pass (2015-2019)

| New Housing Construction Permits, City of Grants Pass, 2010-2019 |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Single-Family Detached | 109   | 125   | 134   | 103   | 80    | 551    |
| 2-unit structures      | 14    | 4     | 22    | 20    | 34    | 94     |
| 3- and 4-unit structures| -    | -     | -     | -     | 3     | 3      |
| 5+ unit Multi-Family   | 50    | -     | -     | -     | -     | 50     |
| Total                  | 173   | 129   | 156   | 126   | 114   | 698    |

Source: SOCDS Building Permits Database, accessed 10/22/2020

| Unincorporated Josephine County, 2015-2019 |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Single-Family Detached                   | 64    | 84    | 94    | 101   | 117   | 460   |
| 2-unit structures                        | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     |
| 3- and 4-unit structures                 | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     |
| 5+ unit Multi-Family                     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     |
| Total                                   | 64    | 84    | 94    | 101   | 117   | 460   |

Source: SOCDS Building Permits Database, accessed 10/22/2020
HOUSING NEEDS SCENARIOS

Summary of Housing Needs

Based on the population projections described earlier and most current household size estimates of 2.39 people per household (estimate held constant into the future), the total net new housing need within the Grants Pass UGB is forecasted to be 4,055 housing units plus 227 people living in group quarters over the next 20 years (see Figure 12). This baseline housing need forecast assumes that the current share of group quarters population (includes people residing in congregate care facilities and housing shelters) and housing vacancy rates remain constant.

Figure 12: Baseline Housing Growth Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020 est.</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass UGB Population</td>
<td>41,691</td>
<td>51,092</td>
<td>9,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Group Quarters (2.7%)</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop in Households</td>
<td>40,572</td>
<td>49,722</td>
<td>9,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Household Size</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (year round)</td>
<td>16,976</td>
<td>20,804</td>
<td>3,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy and Seasonal Housing Assumption</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth-related Housing Demand (dwelling units)</td>
<td>17,983</td>
<td>22,038</td>
<td>4,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Demand by Dwelling Type and Tenancy

This baseline housing need forecast is generally consistent with the observed current mix of housing types throughout Grants Pass and emerging market trends that emphasize demand for townhomes and apartments. Additional housing forecast scenarios may be considered during the planning process to take into account potential new policy objectives, such as:

- Local policies aimed at incentivizing higher density mixed-use development in the downtown area;
- Preferences to accommodate additional middle-income housing and more retirees, which could increase demand beyond the baseline forecast.
- Preferences to provide a wider range of attainable single-family housing, including additional development of townhomes, plexes and manufactured home parks.
- Ability to provide adequate infrastructure (water, sewer and road capacity) to create new planned unit developments or single-family subdivisions within the UGB.
The baseline housing need forecast (shown in Figure 13) assumes that Grants Pass UGB will need to accommodate 4,055 net new dwelling units over the next 20 years (plus people living in group quarters). This baseline scenario anticipates that the housing demand will include approximately:

- 2,502 single-family detached homes (including small lot and standard lot subdivisions);
- 749 townhomes/duplexes (2 to 4 units per structure);
- 442 multifamily units (apartments with 5 or more units per structure);
- 254 manufactured housing units.

In addition, it is anticipated that there will also be demand for about 227 people requiring some form of group quarters housing (such as single room occupancy units, congregate care, in-patient care, etc.). For analysis purposes, we have assumed there to be 2 people per group quarters living unit, which would result in the long-term demand for 114 group quarters dwelling units.

During the HNA planning process local stakeholders indicated that there appears to be an existing housing “shortage” in Grants Pass that has driven rents and home prices to record highs and forced residents to seek housing in outlying areas. Since Oregon statues require HNAs to base future housing needs on projected net new population growth (using forecasts prepared by Portland State University (PSU) Population Research Center), any current market supply gaps cannot be used in HNAs to increase housing forecasts beyond what would be required to address the “official” PSU population growth forecast. Quantifying existing “affordability” gaps in existing housing inventory for a point in time is difficult. However, findings from this report and resulting policy changes are intended to help foster a higher rate of housing production in Grants Pass which eventually would be accounted for in future PSU population growth forecasts. While this approach may not immediately address current housing gaps, we would expect to see housing shortages diminish over time once housing production increases and buildable land inventories and HNAs are updated.
Section III. BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY

In accordance with OAR 660-008-0005 (2), an estimate of buildable land inventory (BLI) within the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) has been created to determine that amount of land available to meet housing needs. The BLI analysis uses the most current Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data provided available for the Grants Pass UGB.

BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY METHODOLOGY

The objective of the residential BLI is to determine the amount of developable land available for future residential housing development within the UGB. The steps taken to perform this analysis are as follows:

1. **Calculate gross acres** by plan designation, including classifications for fully vacant and partially-vacant parcels. This step entails “clipping” all of the tax lots that are bisected by the current UGB to eliminate land outside current UGB from consideration for development at this time. City staff input was provided to provide a level of quality assurance to review output is consistent with OAR 660-008-0005(2).

2. **Calculate gross buildable acres** by plan designation by subtracting land that is constrained from future development, such as existing public right-of-way, parks and open space, steep slopes, and floodplains.

3. **Calculate net buildable acres** by plan designation, by subtracting future public facilities such as roads, schools and parks from gross buildable acres.

4. **Determine total net buildable acres by plan designation** by taking into account potential redevelopment locations and mixed-use development opportunity areas.

The detailed steps used to create the land inventory are described below.

Residential Land Base

The residential land base reflects current Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan land use designations. Properties that are within the residential land base include the following base zone classifications:

**Residential Land Use Classifications**

- Low Density (LR)
- Moderate Density (MR)
- Moderate High Density (HR)
- High Density (HRR)

These classifications have been kept consistent throughout the analysis.
Land Classifications

The next step in the BLI analysis includes classifying each tax lot (parcel) into one of the following categories.

**Vacant land**: Properties with no structures or have buildings with very little value. For purpose of the BLI, residential lands with improvement value less than $10,000 are considered vacant. These lands were also subjected to review using satellite imagery via Google Earth; and if the land is in a committed use such as a parking lot, an assessment has been made to determine if it is to be classified as vacant, part vacant or developed.

**Partially vacant land**: Properties that are occupied by a use (e.g., a home or building structure with value over $10,000) but have enough land to be subdivided without the need for rezoning. This determination is made using tax assessor records and satellite imagery. For lots with existing buildings, it is assumed that ¼ acre (10,890 sq. ft.) is retained by each existing home, and the remainder is included in the part vacant land inventory.

**Vacant Undersized**: Properties that are vacant or part-vacant with less than 3,000 sq. ft. of land area. This category is excluded from the vacant land inventory since these lots are not likely large enough to accommodate new housing units. However, it is possible that some may be suitable for accessory dwelling units (ADUs).

**Developed & Non-Residential Land Base**: Properties unlikely to yield additional residential development for one of two reasons: they possess existing structures at densities that are unlikely to redevelop over the planning period; or they include parcels with Comprehensive Land Use Plan designations that do not permit housing development.

**Public and Constrained (unbuildable) land**: Properties which are regarded as unlikely to be developed because they are restricted by existing uses such as: public parks, schools, ballfields, roads and public right-of-way (ROW); common areas held by Homeowners Associations, cemeteries; and power substations. In cases where public-owned land does not fall into one of the above-mentioned categories and is planned or zoned to allow housing, those tax lots are included in the vacant or part-vacant residential land inventory.

These tax lot classifications were validated using satellite imagery, building permit data, and assessor records. Preliminary results were refined based on City staff and public input received during the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) planning process.

Development Constraints

The BLI methodology for identifying and removing development constraints is consistent with state guidance on buildable land inventories per OAR 660-008-0005(2). By definition, the BLI is intended to include land that is “suitable, available, and necessary for residential uses.”

“Buildable Land” includes residential designated land within the UGB, including vacant, part vacant and land that is likely to be redeveloped; and suitable, available and necessary for residential uses. Public-owned land is generally not considered to be available for residential use unless the underlying zoning permits housing. It should be noted that “available” in this context does not mean that the land is presently on the market. It is assumed in this analysis that such land is expected to come on the market within the 20-year timeframe of this study.

Land is considered to be “suitable for housing development” unless it is:
• Is severely constrained by natural hazards as determined by the Statewide Planning Goal 7;
• Is subject to natural resource protection measures determined under Statewide Planning Goals 5, 6, 15, 16, 17 or 18;
• Has slopes over 25 percent;
• Is within the 100-year flood plain; or
• Cannot be provided or served with public facilities

Based on state guidelines and data provided by the City of Grants Pass, the following constraints have been deducted from the residential lands inventory.

• Land within floodplains. This includes lands in flood-hazard areas (the 100-year floodplain).
• Locally-designated significant wetlands. This includes lands within 50 feet of a wetland.
• Land within Parks and Natural areas that are protected from future development.
• Land with slopes greater than 25%.

RESIDENTIAL BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY RESULTS

Land Base

A summary of the land base by plan designation is provided in Figure 14. The findings indicate that there are 4,640 gross developed acres of residential land and 1,031 acres of gross vacant residential land totaling 5,670 acres zoned for residential uses in Grants Pass.

Figure 14: Residential Land Base, Grants Pass UGB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>3,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>5,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Constrained Land

Before the deduction for future public facilities, the vacant residential land base is adjusted to reflect tax lots which exempt residential development, publicly-owned taxlots, and public right-of-way³, as described previously. Environmental constraints (slopes, floodplains, wetlands, etc.) are removed in

³ Includes right-of-way that is defined as a tax lot in the GIS database, which exempts residential development. This includes most major existing right-of-way which is excluded from the buildable land base.
this step as well. The results summarized in Figure 15 indicate that after accounting for development constraints, the Grants Pass UGB has 480 acres of vacant buildable residential land.

**Figure 15: Unconstrained and Non-Exempt Vacant Land by Plan Designation, Grants Pass UGB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Gross Vacant Land</th>
<th>Exempt Vacant Land</th>
<th>Environmentally Constrained Vacant Non-Exempt Land</th>
<th>Unconstrained Non-Exempt Vacant Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting*

**Buildable Land After Future Public Facilities**

The BLI methodology calculates the residential land base after accounting for the constraints described previously. The findings indicate that out of a total of 5,570 gross acres, 4,640 acres are committed (derived from Figure 14), 260 acres are exempt, and 291 acres are environmentally constrained (derived from Figure 15).

The final deduction to the BLI, includes a 25% allowance for future public facilities and future right-of-way. As indicated below in Figure 16, Grants Pass UGB has a total of 360 vacant unconstrained residential land available over the next 20 years.

**Figure 16: Vacant Buildable Land and Future Public Facilities Allowance, Grants Pass UGB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Unconstrained Non-Exempt Vacant Land</th>
<th>Future Public Facilities Allowance</th>
<th>Total Net Buildable Vacant Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting*

**Partially-Vacant Residential Land**

In addition to vacant land, the BLI also includes a part-vacant land category. As noted above, partially-vacant land includes properties that are occupied by a use (e.g., a home or building structure with value over $10,000) with enough land to be subdivided without the need for rezoning. As shown in Figure 17, after removing environmental constraints and exempt parcels, there are 1,037 part vacant acres that could be subdivided for development. After applying the 25% allowance for future public facilities, 778 acres of part vacant residential land are available for development in Grants Pass.
Total Developable Residential Land

Figure 17: Part Vacant Buildable Land and Future Public Facilities Allowance, Grants Pass UGB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Unconstrained Non-Exempt Part Vacant Land</th>
<th>Future Public Facilities Allowance</th>
<th>Total Net Buildable Part Vacant Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Figure 18: Net Buildable Vacant and Part Vacant Residential Land, Grants Pass UGB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Partially Vacant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Buildable Land by Lot Size

Figures 19 and 20 show vacant and part vacant land broken down by lot size. This is an important consideration given that, for example, a planned unit development yielding dozens of housing units can only occur on a relatively large, contiguous piece of land. The figures below show acreage figures prior to the 25% allowance for public facilities.

Figure 19 indicates that over three quarters of buildable vacant land are on relatively small lots (34% on lots of less than one acre and 44% on lots between 1 and 5 acres). Only two lots have more than 10 acres of vacant developable land.
Figure 19: Vacant Buildable Land by Lot Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;1 acre</th>
<th>&gt;= 1 acre, &lt;5 acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 5 acres, &lt;10 acres</th>
<th>&gt;=10 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Lots</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163.9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>211.0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Figure 20 shows that a similar phenomenon is occurring among part vacant developable land with over 80% of buildable part vacant land on parcels less than 5 acres.

Figure 20: Part Vacant Buildable Land by Lot Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;1 acre</th>
<th>&gt;= 1 acre, &lt;5 acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 5 acres, &lt;10 acres</th>
<th>&gt;=10 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Lots</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>226.8</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>204.5</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372.8</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>473.5</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Figure 19 reflects a map of the net vacant and part vacant residential land in the Grants Pass UGB by plan designation. Part vacant parcels are denoted by a crosshatch overlay. The map also shows the location of environmental constraints. Figures 21-25 show the same data in select quadrants of the city to allow for better legibility.

Commercial and Mixed-Use Land Assumptions

It should be noted that commercial-zoned parcels in Grants Pass are sometimes developed as higher density residential uses. Citywide, about 5.5% of buildable commercial land has developed with a high-density residential component, which includes 57 acres out of a total 1,031 commercial acres. Presently, there are 168.28 vacant, unconstrained, non-exempt commercial acres in the Grants Pass UGB. While it is difficult to project the amount of residential development that is likely to occur on this commercial land, it is reasonable to expect that some of the future apartment demand will be accommodated on land zoned for commercial uses.
Figure 21: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map
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Figure 23: North Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map

Grants Pass Net Vacant and Partially Vacant Residential Land (North)
Figure 24: Central Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map

Grants Pass Net Vacant and Partially Vacant Residential Land (Center)
Figure 25: Central Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map
Section IV. LAND SUFFICIENCY ANALYSIS

This section provides an estimate of residential development capacity (measured in new dwelling units) and an estimate of the ability of the Grants Pass UGB to accommodate needed new housing units for the 2020 to 2040 period, based on the analysis in the housing needs.

A comparison of 20-year residential land needs (demand) is made relative to the residential buildable land inventory. This provides a means of reconciling housing land demand with buildable land supply within the Grants Pass UGB. The evaluation of UGB land requirements to accommodate the planned housing need included three steps.

Step 1 takes into account the forecasted number of dwelling units by housing type, including single family detached, townhomes and plexes, multifamily, and manufactured homes as well as group quarters population (see Section 2).

Step 2 considers the amount of land required to accommodate the future housing demand based on the expected average development density for each general housing type (see Figure 26).

Step 3 includes a comparison (reconciliation) between the land need determined in Step 2 and the residential buildable land inventory presented in Section 3 of the HNA.

HOUSING NEED FORECAST

As discussed in Section II, the forecasted housing mix for Grants Pass includes 4,055 housing units along with 114 group quarters units. This results in net new housing development as follows:

» Single Family Detached: 2,502 dwellings (including standard and small lot single family detached housing)
» Townhomes and Plexes: 749 dwelling units
» Manufactured Homes: 254 dwellings
» Multifamily: 551 dwelling units (includes apartments and condominiums with 5+ units per structure)
» Group Quarters: 114 dwelling units
RESIDENTIAL LAND NEED SUMMARY

The second step in the reconciliation of land needs estimates the amount of net buildable land area required to address the housing growth forecast. This step applies average density assumptions based on Grants Pass local experience (dwellings per acre) to each of the general residential development categories listed in Step 1 to arrive at a total residential land need forecast.

Figure 26: Grants Pass Residential Classifications and Density Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Unit Type</th>
<th>20-Year Dwelling Unit Demand</th>
<th>Applicable Plan Designation</th>
<th>Applicable Local Zones</th>
<th>Allowable Density (gross DU per Ac)</th>
<th>Avg. Development Density (net DU per Ac)</th>
<th>Net Buildable Land Requirement (net acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>R-1-12, R1-10, R-1-8</td>
<td>3.96 to 6.22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes / Plexes</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>R-1-6, R-2</td>
<td>8.71 to 12.44</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured home</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>LR, MR</td>
<td>all of the above</td>
<td>6.22 to 12.44</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>HR, HRR</td>
<td>R-1-6, R-2, R-4-2, R-5</td>
<td>20 to 50</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group quarters (@2 people per unit)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: prior tables; and interpretation of current zoning code and housing development/market conditions.
* Excludes steep slopes and flood zones; includes 25% allowance for public facilities/easements.

UGB SUFFICIENCY ANALYSIS

As shown in Figure 27, the forecasted housing need (4,169 total dwelling units) is expected to require 674 acres of buildable land area. Since the current UGB includes 1,151 acres, we can conclude that there is an overall residential land surplus of 478 acres at this time.

The BLI findings indicate that the existing amount of vacant and part vacant land within the Grants Pass UGB is generally sufficient to accommodate planned 20-year housing needs.

Figure 27: Reconciliation of Residential Land Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Unit Type</th>
<th>Applicable Plan Designation</th>
<th>Net Buildable Land Requirement (net acres)</th>
<th>Net Buildable Land Inventory (net acres)</th>
<th>Net Buildable Land Surplus (net acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes / Plexes</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured home</td>
<td>LR, MR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>HR, HRR</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group quarters (@2 people per unit)</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* analysis assumes these housing types are primarily developed in HR, HRR plan designations.
Section V.  FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Future population growth in Grants Pass over the next 20 years will result in new households that will require additional housing and residential land.

KEY FINDINGS

Key findings of the housing needs analysis are:

- The population of Grants Pass is forecast to grow at 1.02% per year over the next two decades, adding 9,401 new residents.
- Population growth will require the addition of 4,055 new traditional dwelling units over the next 20 years as well as 114 group quarters dwellings.
- About 60% of the future housing need will consist of single family detached housing, 18% will be a mix of townhomes and plexes, 13% will be apartments, 6% will be comprised of manufactured housing and about 3% will be in group quarters such as dorms and congregate care facilities.
- The results of the housing needs analysis indicates that the current UGB is sufficient to accommodate future housing needs.

HOUSING POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

As part of the HNA process, the consultant team met with City staff and the HNA Advisory Committee to discuss potential housing policies that cities throughout Oregon have implemented to address various housing issues, which are summarized in OAR 660-038-0190(5) measures to accommodate needed housing in the UGB.

Grants Pass HNA Policies Draft

Goal: Ensure the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels commensurate with the financial capabilities of Grants Pass households, and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

Policies and Objectives

Land Availability

9.1.  In compliance with ORS 197.296, plan for a 20-year supply of suitable land for Grants Pass to meet housing needs within the existing Urban Growth Boundary. Coordinate with Josephine
County as required by the State Housing Goal to ensure a fair allocation of housing types and densities.

9.2. Update the Housing Needs Analysis at least every 10 years and whenever actual population growth exceeds growth forecasts for three out of five years.

9.3. Revise Comprehensive Plan land use designations and Development Code as needed to meet the housing needs identified in the Housing Needs Analysis.

9.4. Direct development opportunities to vacant or partially vacant land as identified in the Buildable Lands Inventory and Housing Needs Analysis.

9.5. Maintain the Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Overlay Maps and Development Code to provide opportunities for a variety of housing types, densities and locations within the urban growth boundary. (Retains current policy 9.4)

Housing Needs

9.6. Lower or remove local barriers to residential development.

9.7. Streamline land use and development processes to incentivize the timely and efficient development of housing.

9.8. Permit a variety of housing types across all residential zones, including single-family, middle housing, manufactured housing, and multifamily types. Focus on expanding opportunities for housing types which are shown to be related to lower housing costs. (Modifies current policies 9.5 and 9.6)

9.9. Create pre-approved middle housing floorplans to encourage middle housing development.

9.10. Reduce minimum lot sizes in low-density zones to increase the efficiency of single-family and middle housing.

9.11. Establish minimum densities in medium and high-density zones. (Modifies current policy 9.8)

9.12. Increase maximum building height in higher density zones.

9.13. Simplify the permit process to convert single-family units in commercial zones to mid-to-high density multi-dwelling housing. (Modifies current policy 9.8)

9.14. Support efforts by nonprofit organizations and for-profit entities to provide housing for special needs populations. (group quarters, independent living for seniors, assisted living, memory care, mental health facilities, drug and alcohol rehab, etc.).

9.15. Promote and incentivize mixed-use areas to connect households to a variety of transportation options, medical and social services, commercial centers, and recreation amenities.

9.16. Direct funds and program support to rehabilitate existing housing within Grants Pass. (Modifies current policy 9.3)

9.17. Plan infrastructure and utilities to support housing development within the urban growth boundary, especially areas identified as likely for infill development.

Housing Affordability and Homelessness

9.18. Partner with public, private, and nonprofit agencies and organizations to facilitate affordable housing development and maintenance. For example, purchase affordable housing projects with income restricted sunset dates to retain affordability into the future.

9.19. Dedicate City resources to support public and private housing and associated programs/services to community members experiencing homelessness.

9.20. Identify surplus publicly owned properties that could be used for affordable housing and leverage these assets through public-private partnerships and other avenues.
Funding and Incentives

9.21. Implement a variety of incentives to support subsidized, low income and workforce housing. (Modifies current policy 9.13) These incentives may include:
   a. Waiving or deferring fees and system development charges
   b. Adopting or amending criteria for property tax exemptions or freezes
   c. Providing density bonuses with the development of affordable housing
   d. Requiring the lowest off-street parking standards necessary to still meet community needs in order to reduce land used for parking and reduce housing costs
   e. Utilize Multi-Unit limited tax exemption (MULTE) program

9.22. Identify funding sources to increase housing affordability and support subsidized housing programs and infrastructure development. Funding sources may include:
   a. Assessing a construction excise tax
   b. Dedicating a portion of Urban Renewal funding
   c. Implementing Local Improvement Districts
   d. Proceeds from the sale of surplus property
   e. Dedicating a portion of System Development Charges
   f. Short-term rental lodging tax
GLOSSARY

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU): A small living space located on the same lot as a single-family house.

Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI): An assessment of the capacity of land within the city’s Urban Growth Boundary to accommodate forecasted housing and employment needs.

Buildable Residential Land: Includes land that is designated for residential development that is vacant and part-vacant and not constrained by existing buildings or environmental issues.

Constrained land: Land that is unavailable for future net new residential development based on one or more factors, such as environmental protections, public lands, floodplains, or steep slopes.

Cost Burdened: Defined by US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as households who spend over 30% of their income on housing.

Cottages: Small, single-level, detached units, often on their own lots and sometimes clustered around pockets of shared open space. A cottage is typically under 1,000 square feet in footprint.

Density: Defined by the number of housing units on one acre of land.

Development density: Expected number of dwelling units (per acre) based on current zoning designations.

Exempt Land: Land which is unavailable for development based on ownership (e.g. the city owns the land and it is either a park or intended to be a park) or which is otherwise owned by a public entity and is not intended for housing (e.g. land owned by a port, school district, etc.).

Family: A group two or more people (one of whom is the householder) related by birth, marriage, or adoption and residing together.

High Density: Lots with the average density of 12+ dwelling units per acre. Best suited for multifamily housing such as apartments and condos.

Housing Needs Analysis (HNA): The Housing Needs Analysis consists of four distinct reports that analyze the state of housing supply, housing affordability issues and the City's ability to meet projected housing demand going into 2040.

Housing Unit (or Dwelling Unit): A house, an apartment or other group of rooms, or a single room is regarded as a housing unit when it is occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters; that is, when the occupants do not live and eat with any other person in the structure and there is direct access from the outside or common hall.

Household: Consists of all people that occupy a housing unit.

HUD: Acronym for US Department of Housing and Urban Development, the federal agency dedicated to strengthening and supporting the housing market.

Low Density: Lots with the average density of 3-4 dwelling units per acre. Best suited for family housing such as single-family detached homes.
Manufactured Housing: is a type of prefabricated home that is largely assembled of site and then transported to sites of use. The definition of the term in the United States is regulated by federal law (Code of Federal Regulations, 24 CFR 3280): "Manufactured homes are built as dwelling units of at least 320 square feet in size, usually with a permanent chassis to assure the initial and continued transportability of the home. The requirement to have a wheeled chassis permanently attached differentiates "manufactured housing" from other types of prefabricated homes, such as modular homes.

Manufactured Home Park (or manufactured home park): a local zoning designation that is specifically intended to address demand for this housing type. OAR chapter 813, division 007 is adopted to implement section 9, chapter 816, Oregon Laws 2009, and sections 2, 3 and 4, chapter 619, Oregon Laws 2005, as amended by sections 10 to 12, chapter 816, Oregon Laws 2009, and sections 19, and 21, chapter 503, Oregon Laws 2011 for the purpose of regulating manufactured dwelling parks.

Median Family Income (MFI): The median sum of the income of all family members 15 years and older living in the household. Families are groups of two or more people (one of whom is the householder) related by birth, marriage, or adoption and residing together; all such people (including related subfamily members) are considered as members of one family.

Medium Density: Lots with the average density of 6-12 dwelling units per acre. Best suited for small lot housing such as single family attached, townhomes, plexes and cottages.

Mixed Use: Characterized as two or more residential, commercial, cultural, institutional, and/or industrial uses into one combined building or building(s) on the same parcel of land.

Multi-Family Housing: Stacked flats in a single buildings or groups of buildings on a single lot. Parking is shared, and entrance to units is typically accessed through a shared lobby.

Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR): Administrative Rules are created by most agencies and some boards and commissions to implement and interpret their statutory authority (ORS 183.310(9)). Agencies may adopt, amend, repeal or renumber rules, permanently or temporarily. Every OAR uses the same numbering sequence of a three-digit chapter number followed by a three-digit division number and a four-digit rule number. For example, Oregon Administrative Rules, chapter 166, division 500, rule 0020 is cited as OAR 166-500-0020. (oregon.gov)

Part-vacant land: Unconstrained land that has some existing development but can be subdivided to allow for additional residential development.

Plexes and Apartments: Multiple units inside one structure on a single lot. Usually each unit has its own entry.

Seasonal dwellings: These units are intended by the owner to be occupied during only certain seasons of the year. They are not anyone’s usual residence. A seasonal unit may be used in more than one season; for example, for both summer and winter sports. Published counts of seasonal units also include housing units held for occupancy by migratory farm workers. While not currently intended for year-round use, most seasonal units could be used year-round.

Severely Cost Burdened: Defined US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as households who spend over 50% of their income on housing.

Single Family Attached: Dwelling units that are duplexes without a subdividing property line between the two to four housing units. “Attached” duplexes require a single building permit for both
dwelling units. The “attached” units would be addressed with one numerical street address for the overall structure with separate alpha-numeric unit numbers for each dwelling.

**Single Family Detached:** Free standing residential building, unattached, containing separate bathing, kitchen, sanitary, and sleeping facilities designed to be occupied by not more than one family, not including manufactured and mobile homes.

**Townhome (also known as duplexes, rowhouse, etc.):** Attached housing units, each on a separate lot, and each with its own entry from a public or shared street or common area.

**Urban Growth Boundary (UGB):** Under Oregon law, each of the state’s cities and metropolitan areas has created an urban growth boundary around its perimeter – a land use planning line to control urban expansion onto farm and forest lands.

**Vacant housing unit:** A housing unit is vacant if no one is living in it at the time of enumeration unless its occupants are only temporarily absent. Units temporarily occupied at the time of enumeration entirely by people who have a usual residence elsewhere are also classified as vacant.

**Vacant land:** Vacant and part-vacant land identified within the local buildable land inventory that is not developed and unconstrained for future planned residential development.
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HOUSING ELEMENT

9.10 PURPOSE

The purpose of the Housing Element is to meet the requirements of Goal 10, OAR 660-008, and ORS 197.296. Within this policy context, the Housing Element must identify local housing needs. The primary goals of this chapter are to (1) describe characteristics of the existing mix and density of housing in Grants Pass, (2) describe recent residential development trends in the City, (3) evaluate housing affordability, and (4) project future need for housing in Grants Pass. The analysis presented in this chapter is used to evaluate the existing residential land supply within the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary to determine if it is adequate to meet that need based on the projected demand for housing. The methods used for this study generally follow the Planning for Residential Growth guidebook, published by the Oregon Transportation and Growth Management Program (1996).

9.20 FRAMEWORK FOR THE HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS

The passage of the Oregon Land Use Planning Act of 1974 (ORS Chapter 197) established the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). The Act required the Commission to develop and adopt a set of statewide planning goals. Goal 10 addresses housing in Oregon and provides guidelines for local governments to follow in developing their local comprehensive land use plans and implementing policies.

At a minimum, local housing policies must meet the applicable requirements of Goal 10 and the statutes and administrative rules that implement it (ORS 197.295 to 197.314, ORS 197.475 to 197.490, and OAR 600-008).\(^1\) Goal 10 requires incorporated cities to complete an inventory of buildable residential lands. Goal 10 also requires cities to encourage the numbers of housing units in price and rent ranges commensurate with the financial capabilities of its households.

Goal 10 defines needed housing types as “all housing on land zoned for residential use or mixed residential and commercial use that is determined to meet the need shown for housing within an UGB at price ranges and rent levels that are affordable to households within the county with a variety of incomes, including but not limited to households with low incomes, very low incomes and extremely low incomes.” ORS 197.303 defines needed housing types as:

(a) Housing that includes, but is not limited to, attached, and detached single-family housing and multiple family housing for both owner and renter occupancy.

(b) Government assisted housing.\(^2\)

(c) Mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks as provided in ORS 197.475 to 197.490.

(d) Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single-family residential use that are in addition to lots within designated manufactured dwelling subdivisions.

(e) Housing for farmworkers ORS 197.296 defines factors to establish sufficiency of buildable lands within urban growth boundaries to meet projected growth for a 20-year period and requires analysis and

---

1 ORS 197.296 only applies to cities with populations over 25,000.

2 Government assisted housing can be any housing type listed in ORS 197.303 (a), (c), or (d).
determination of residential housing patterns. It applies to cities with populations of 25,000 or more and requires cities to:

- Demonstrate that its comprehensive plan provides sufficient buildable lands within the urban growth boundary established pursuant to statewide planning goals to accommodate estimated housing needs for 20 years (ORS 197.296(2));
- Inventory the supply of buildable lands within the urban growth boundary and determine the housing capacity of the buildable lands (ORS 197.296(3)(a)); and
- Conduct an analysis of housing need by type and density range to determine the number of units and amount of land needed for each needed housing type for the next 20 years (197.296(3)(b)).

Grants Pass meets the population threshold for these statutory requirements. This chapter includes an analysis of housing mix by needed types, residential development trends and patterns, and a projection of needed housing units and land for the next 20 years.

### 9.21 Methods

The housing needs analysis presented in this chapter follows the methodology described in the Planning for Residential Growth: A Workbook for Oregon’s Urban Areas, the Department of Land Conservation and Development’s guidebook on local housing needs studies. As described in the workbook, the specific steps in the housing needs analysis are:

1. Project the number of new housing units needed in the next 20 years.
2. Identify relevant national, state, and local demographic and economic trends and factors that may affect the 20-year projection of structure type mix.
3. Describe the demographic characteristics of the population and, if possible, the housing trends that relate to demand for different types of housing.
4. Determine the types of housing that are likely to be affordable to the projected households based on household income.
5. Determine the needed housing mix and density ranges for each plan designation and the average needed net density for all structure types.
6. Estimate the number of additional needed units by structure type.

### 9.22 Needed housing types

As described above, state policy establishes a framework of needed housing types. As provided in ORS 197.303 and ORS 197.475 to 197.490, needed housing types include (but are not limited to):

- Attached and detached single family housing and multiple-family housing for both owner and renter occupancy
- Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single-family residential use and in manufactured home parks
- Government-assisted housing

Thus, the statutory definition can be interpreted as requiring cities to plan for all types of housing. The definition is general in the sense that it includes variations on single-family and multifamily housing that are common in Grants Pass. The Census reports housing types as “units in structure.” According to the
Census, a structure is defined as “a separate building that either has open spaces on all sides or is separated from other structures by dividing walls that extend from ground to roof.” The Census classifies structures into the following types:

- **1-unit, detached.** This is a 1-unit structure detached from any other house; that is, with open space on all four sides. Such structures are considered detached even if they have an adjoining shed or garage. A 1-family house that contains a business is considered detached as long as the building has open space on all four sides. Mobile homes to which one or more permanent rooms have been added or built also are included.

- **1-unit, attached.** This is a 1-unit structure that has one or more walls extending from ground to roof separating it from adjoining structures. In row houses (sometimes called townhouses), double houses, or houses attached to nonresidential structures, each house is a separate, attached structure if the dividing or common wall goes from ground to roof.

- **2 or more units.** These are units in structures containing 2 or more housing units, further categorized as units in structures with 2, 3 or 4, 5 to 9, 10 to 19, 20 to 49, and 50 or more units.

- **Mobile home.** Both occupied and vacant mobile homes to which no permanent rooms have been added are counted in this category. Mobile homes used only for business purposes or for extra sleeping space and mobile homes for sale on a dealer’s lot, at the factory, or in storage are not counted in the housing inventory.

The Census classifications have specific meanings, but other commonly used terms to describe these housing types include:

- “Single-family dwelling”, without specifying “attached” or “detached” is commonly used to refer to a detached single-family dwelling, which the Census Bureau defines as “one-unit detached.” However, “single-family dwelling” more accurately describes both one-unit detached and one-unit attached units. When used in the tables in this report where the source is the Census Bureau, single-family dwelling includes both detached and attached. A “one-unit detached” dwelling is usually located on an individual lot, but there may be properties that contain multiple one-unit detached structures.

- “Townhouse” refers to a “one-unit attached” structure on an individual lot – or an “attached single-family dwelling.”

- “Multifamily dwelling”, or “apartment” is commonly used to refer to “two or more units” as defined by the Census bureau. Duplex, Triplex, and Fourplex are often used to denote multifamily buildings with two, three, and four units respectively.

---

3 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Summary File 3 Technical Documentation, page B-64

4 The Census does not provide definitions for condominiums or townhouses. Common definitions are:

**Townhouse:** A townhouse is one of a row of homes sharing common walls. Differing from condominiums, townhouse ownership does include individual ownership of the land. There can also be common elements, such as a central courtyard, that would have shared ownership.

**A condominium is one of a group of housing units where each homeowner owns their individual unit space, and all the dwelling share ownership of areas of common use. The individual units normally share walls, but that isn’t a requirement. The main difference in condos and regular single homes is that there is no individual ownership of a plot of land. All the land in the condominium project is owned in common by all the homeowners. Usually, the exterior maintenance is paid for out of homeowner dues collected and managed under strict rules. The exterior walls and roof are insured by the condominium association, while all interior walls and items are insured by the homeowner.** (http://realestate.about.com)
“Condominium” or “condo” only describes the ownership pattern, and not the building type. Most people think of condominiums as apartments within a multi-unit structure; however, condominiums can be any type of structure, whether one-unit detached, one-unit attached, two or more units. Mobile home condominiums also exist, but the Census Bureau doesn’t include these in its count of condominiums.

“Accessory Dwelling” refers to a secondary dwelling on a property that is typically rented out or occupied by extended family. An accessory dwelling may be attached to or detached from the main dwelling.

Housing types do not specify whether a unit is owner-occupied or renter occupied.

The Grants Pass Development Code uses some terms in a slightly different manner than common usage, relating to the site as well as the structure. For example, the definition of “Building Type, Multi-Dwelling” refers to a “structure or complex of structures containing at least three dwelling units in any vertical or horizontal arrangement, located on a lot or development site”. Therefore, three units, whether attached or detached, on one lot, would be considered multi-dwelling for purposes of the Development Code.

There are many names for different types of housing that accommodate a variety of household compositions and living arrangements, which are accommodated within one of the structure-type or group quarters categories defined by the Census Bureau (1-unit attached, 1-unit detached, 2 or more units, mobile home, or group quarters). Examples of these living arrangements include Assisted Living Facilities, Board and Care, Group Homes, Adult Foster Care, Congregate Housing, Independent Living, Supportive Seniors Housing, Cooperatives, Co-Housing, Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities, Commercial Retirement Communities, and Home Health Care.

ORS 197.286 defines government assisted housing as:

“...housing that is financed in whole or part by either a federal or state housing agency or a housing authority as defined in ORS 456.005, or housing that is occupied by a tenant or tenants who benefit from rent supplements or housing vouchers provided by either a federal or state housing agency or a local housing authority.”

Government assisted housing can be any housing type.

9.30 HOUSING NEEDS PROJECTION

This section provides a housing needs forecast for long-range planning purposes. The housing needs forecast represents a 20-year projection from 2020 through year 2040. These technical findings are intended to be consistent with State of Oregon requirements for determining housing needs per Oregon land use planning Goals 10 and 14, OAR Chapter 660, Division 8, and applicable provision of ORS 197.296 to 197.314 and 197.475 to 197.490.

9.31 Methodology

The methodology for projecting housing needs within the Grants Pass UGB includes consideration of demographic and socio-economic trends, housing market characteristics and long-range population growth projections.

Regional (Josephine County) and local (City or UGB) population, households, income and market characteristics are described in this memorandum using data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau (Census and American Community Survey), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD),
Oregon Department of Housing and Community Services (OHCS), Portland State University (PSU) and the City of Grants Pass. Where trends or long-range projections are provided by an identified data source, this analysis includes extrapolations or interpolations of the data to arrive at a base year (2020 estimate) and forecast year (2040 projection). The result of this forecast translates population growth into households and households into housing need by dwelling type, tenancy (owner vs. renter) and affordability level.

9.32 Demographics and Socio-Economics

Population

The City of Grants Pass recorded a record-high population of 37,485 in 2019 (July 1 estimate by PSU). Taking into account residents living outside the city but inside the UGB, the Grants Pass UGB population is currently estimated at 41,691 year-round residents. Since 2000, the population growth rate in the city has outpaced Josephine County (Figure 1).

Long-range population forecasts prepared by PSU anticipate that 9,401 new residents will be added to the Grants Pass UGB over the next 20 years. This equates to a projected annual average growth rate (AGR) of 1.02% for the UGB and less than half of the historic growth rate (see Figure 2).

Figure 1: Population Trends (2000-2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josephine County</td>
<td>75,726</td>
<td>82,713</td>
<td>86,750</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>34,533</td>
<td>37,485</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Population Research Center, Portland State University, April 15, 2020

Figure 2: Population Projections (2020-2040)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2020-2040 AGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josephine County</td>
<td>88,274</td>
<td>97,807</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass UGB</td>
<td>41,691</td>
<td>51,092</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Socio-economic Characteristics

As indicated in Figure 3, about half of the City’s residents had household incomes greater than 80% of median family income ($42,880) for the county, while 18% of households were earning less than $16,080, 30% of county median family income.

Figure 3: Households by Income Level, 2014-2018
In comparison with the state and county averages, Grants Pass has a higher share of younger residents. The median age in Grants Pass (38.3) is below the Josephine County and statewide average (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Median Age, Oregon, Josephine County, Grants Pass, 2014-2018

9.33 Existing Housing Inventory and Tenancy

Local housing inventory and tenancy patterns shed light on housing conditions and demand preferences. In 2018, there were 16,051 housing units in the City of Grants Pass of which 15,158 units were classified as occupied in 893 units were classified as vacant.
Like most communities, single-family detached housing is the most prevalent housing type representing 67% of the housing stock. The remaining housing inventory in Grants Pass includes multi-family (11%), townhomes and duplexes (17%), and mobile homes (6%), as shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Existing Housing Mix and Tenancy, 2014-2018, City of Grants Pass

Tenancy within the city is split fairly evenly between owners and renters. Owner-occupied housing accounts for 48% of the housing inventory while renter-occupied units account for 46% of the inventory. Vacant units accounted for about 6% of the inventory in 2018.

As would be expected, most homeowners reside in single-family detached units (89% of owners) or manufactured homes. Most renters also reside in single-family detached units, followed by single family attached and multifamily units, as indicated in Figures 6 & 7.

Figure 6: Units by Tenure by Structure Type, 2014-2018, City of Grants Pass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owner-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Other Seasonal &amp; Vacant</th>
<th>All Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>10,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes/Plexes</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (5+ Units)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfg. Home/Other</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,764</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,394</strong></td>
<td><strong>893</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,051</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution</strong></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Tables B25032 and CP04)

Figure 7: Existing Housing Tenancy, 2014-2018, City of Grants Pass
Figure 8 displays the most current available data depicting the housing mix by unit type and tenancy for the City of Grants Pass.
9.34 Housing Market Characteristics

To help gauge housing attainability in Grants Pass, the consultant team examined current median family income (MFI) levels using U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines. As indicated in Figure 9, the 2018 median income for Josephine County was $53,600. Using HUD guidelines for upper-middle households earning 80% of the MI, a 4-person family should be able to afford monthly rents at $1,072 and homes priced at $284,000 (or less). These price and rent levels are generally considered “attainable” to households earning 80% of the local MI and spending 30% of their annual income on housing.

Grants Pass home values have increased significantly in recent years. As indicated in Figure 10, median home sales prices in Grants Pass increased to $324,000 in October 2020, up 8.9% annually since 2018. In
comparison with other cities in Southern Oregon, Grants Pass has relatively higher home prices and recorded the sharpest price increase.

**Figure 10: Median Home Sales Price Trends in Selected Markets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-18</th>
<th>Oct-19</th>
<th>Oct-20</th>
<th>Annual Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$294,000</td>
<td>$324,000</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>$457,000</td>
<td>$451,000</td>
<td>$469,000</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$223,000</td>
<td>$239,000</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath Falls</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Zillow.com; analysis by FCS 10/28/20*

New housing construction permits issued in the City indicate consistent development activity over the past several years. The City issued new residential construction permits at an average rate of 140 per year between 2015 and 2019; with about 79% for single family construction (both single family detached and attached), 14% in duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes, and 7% for multifamily apartments (*Figure 11*).

**Figure 11: Privately-Owned Residential Units Permitted, Grants Pass (2015-2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Housing Construction Permits, City of Grants Pass, 2010-2019</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>109 125 134 103 80 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-unit structures</td>
<td>14 4 22 20 34 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- and 4-unit structures</td>
<td>- - - 3 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ unit Multi-Family</td>
<td>50 - - - - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173 129 156 126 114 698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SOCDS Building Permits Database, accessed 10/22/2020*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unincorporated Josephine County, 2015-2019</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>64 84 94 101 117 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-unit structures</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- and 4-unit structures</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ unit Multi-Family</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64 84 94 101 117 460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SOCDS Building Permits Database, accessed 10/22/2020*

**9.35 Housing Needs Scenarios**

Based on the population projections described earlier and most current household size estimates of 2.39 people per household (estimate held constant into the future), the total net new housing need within the Grants Pass UGB is forecasted to be 4,055 housing units plus 227 people living in group quarters over the next 20 years (see *Figure 12*). This *baseline housing need forecast* assumes that the current share of group quarters population (includes people residing in congregate care facilities and housing shelters) and housing vacancy rates remain constant. The City of Grants Pass recorded a record-high population of 37,485 in 2019 (July 1 estimate by PSU). Taking into account residents living outside the City but inside the UGB, the Grants Pass UGB population
is currently estimated at 41,691 year-round residents. Since 2000, the population growth rate in the City has outpaced Josephine County (Figure 1).

Long-range population forecasts prepared by PSU anticipate that 9,401 new residents will be added to the Grants Pass UGB over the next 20 years. This equates to a projected annual average growth rate (AGR) of 1.02% for the UGB and less than half of the historic growth rate (see Figure 2).

**Figure 12: Baseline Housing Growth Projection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2020 est.</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass UGB Population</td>
<td>41,691</td>
<td>51,092</td>
<td>9,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Group Quarters (2.7%)</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop in Households</td>
<td>40,572</td>
<td>49,722</td>
<td>9,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Household Size</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (year round)</td>
<td>16,976</td>
<td>20,804</td>
<td>3,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy and Seasonal Housing Assumption</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth-related Housing Demand (dwelling units)</td>
<td>17,983</td>
<td>22,038</td>
<td>4,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Demand by Dwelling Type and Tenancy**

This baseline housing need forecast is generally consistent with the observed current mix of housing types throughout Grants Pass and emerging market trends that emphasize demand for townhomes and apartments. Additional housing forecast scenarios may be considered during the planning process to take into account potential new policy objectives, such as:

- Local policies aimed at incentivizing higher density mixed-use development in the downtown area.
- Preferences to accommodate additional middle-income housing and more retirees, which could increase demand beyond the baseline forecast.
- Preferences to provide a wider range of attainable single-family housing, including additional development of townhomes, plexes and manufactured home parks.
- Ability to provide adequate infrastructure (water, sewer and road capacity) to create new planned unit developments or single-family subdivisions within the UGB.

**Figure 13: Housing Need by Tenure & Housing Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Total Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Projected 20-Year Need (Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Tenure Distribution:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type Distribution</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Total Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Projected 20-Year Need (Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>2,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes / PLEXES</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi family (5+ units)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home/other</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group quarters (pop) 227

U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Tables B25032 and CP04) & previous tables
The baseline housing need forecast (shown in Figure 13) assumes that Grants Pass UGB will need to accommodate 4,055 net new dwelling units over the next 20 years (plus people living in group quarters). This baseline scenario anticipates that the housing demand will include approximately: 2,502 single-family detached homes (including small lot and standard lot subdivisions); 749 townhomes/duplexes (2 to 4 units per structure); 442 multifamily units (apartments with 5 or more units per structure); and 254 manufactured housing units.

In addition, it is anticipated that there will also be demand for about 227 people requiring some form of group quarters housing (such as single room occupancy units, congregate care, in-patient care, etc.). For analysis purposes, we have assumed there to be 2 people per group quarters living unit, which would result in the long-term demand for 114 group quarters dwelling units. During the HNA planning process local stakeholders indicated that there appears to be an existing housing “shortage” in Grants Pass that has driven rents and home prices to record highs and forced residents to seek housing in outlying areas. Since Oregon statutes require HNAs to base future housing needs on projected net new population growth (using forecasts prepared by Portland State University (PSU) Population Research Center), any current market supply gaps cannot be used in HNAs to increase housing forecasts beyond what would be required to address the “official” PSU population growth forecast. Quantifying existing “affordability” gaps in existing housing inventory for a point in time is difficult. However, findings from this report and resulting policy changes are intended to help foster a higher rate of housing production in Grants Pass which eventually would be accounted for in future PSU population growth forecasts. While this approach may not immediately address current housing gaps, we would expect to see housing shortages diminish over time once housing production increases and buildable land inventories and HNAs are updated.

9.40 BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY

In accordance with OAR 660-008-0005 (2), an estimate of buildable land inventory (BLI) within the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) has been created to determine that amount of land available to meet housing needs. The BLI analysis uses the most current Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data provided available for the Grants Pass UGB.

9.41 Buildable Land Inventory Methodology

The objective of the residential BLI is to determine the amount of developable land available for future residential housing development within the UGB. The steps taken to perform this analysis are as follows:

1. **Calculate gross acres** by plan designation, including classifications for fully vacant and partially vacant parcels. This step entails “clipping” all of the tax lots that are bisected by the current UGB to eliminate land outside current UGB from consideration for development at this time. City staff input was provided to provide a level of quality assurance to review output is consistent with OAR 660-008-0005(2).

2. **Calculate gross buildable acres** by plan designation by subtracting land that is constrained from future development, such as existing public right-of-way, parks and open space, steep slopes, and floodplains.

3. **Calculate net buildable acres** by plan designation, by subtracting future public facilities such as roads, schools and parks from gross buildable acres.

4. **Determine total net buildable acres by plan designation** by taking into account potential redevelopment locations and mixed-use development opportunity areas.

The detailed steps used to create the land inventory are described below.
Residential Land Base

The residential land base reflects current Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan land use designations. Properties that are within the residential land base include the following base zone classifications:

### Residential Land Use Classifications

- Low Density (LR)
- Moderate Density (MR)
- Moderate High Density (HR)
- High Density (HRR)

These classifications have been kept consistent throughout the analysis.

Land Classifications

The next step in the BLI analysis includes classifying each tax lot (parcel) into one of the following categories.

**Vacant land:** Properties with no structures or have buildings with very little value. For purpose of the BLI, residential lands with improvement value less than $10,000 are considered vacant. These lands were also subjected to review using satellite imagery via Google Earth; and if the land is in a committed use such as a parking lot, an assessment has been made to determine if it is to be classified as vacant, part vacant or developed.

**Partially vacant land:** Properties that are occupied by a use (e.g., a home or building structure with value over $10,000) but have enough land to be subdivided without the need for rezoning. This determination is made using tax assessor records and satellite imagery. For lots with existing buildings, it is assumed that ¼ acre (10,890 sq. ft.) is retained by each existing home, and the remainder is included in the part vacant land inventory.

**Vacant Undersized:** Properties that are vacant or part-vacant with less than 3,000 sq. ft. of land area. This category is excluded from the vacant land inventory since these lots are not likely large enough to accommodate new housing units. However, it is possible that some may be suitable for accessory dwelling units (ADUs).

**Developed & Non-Residential Land Base:** Properties unlikely to yield additional residential development for one of two reasons: they possess existing structures at densities that are unlikely to redevelop over the planning period; or they include parcels with Comprehensive Land Use Plan designations that do not permit housing development.

**Public and Constrained (unbuildable) land:** Properties which are regarded as unlikely to be developed because they are restricted by existing uses such as: public parks, schools, ballfields, roads and public right-of-way (ROW); common areas held by Homeowners Associations, cemeteries; and power substations. In cases where public-owned land does not fall into one of the above-mentioned categories and is planned or zoned to allow housing, those tax lots are included in the vacant or part-vacant residential land inventory.

These tax lot classifications were validated using satellite imagery, building permit data, and assessor records. Preliminary results were refined based on City staff and public input received during the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) planning process.
Development Constraints

The BLI methodology for identifying and removing development constraints is consistent with state guidance on buildable land inventories per OAR 660-008-0005(2). By definition, the BLI is intended to include land that is “suitable, available, and necessary for residential uses.”

“Buildable Land” includes residential designated land within the UGB, including vacant, part vacant and land that is likely to be redeveloped; and suitable, available and necessary for residential uses. Public-owned land is generally not considered to be available for residential use unless the underlying zoning permits housing. It should be noted that “available” in this context does not mean that the land is presently on the market. It is assumed in this analysis that such land is expected to come on the market within the 20-year timeframe of this study.

Land is considered to be “suitable for housing development” unless it is:

- Is severely constrained by natural hazards as determined by the Statewide Planning Goal 7;
- Is subject to natural resource protection measures determined under Statewide Planning Goals 5, 6, 15, 16, 17 or 18;
- Has slopes over 25 percent;
- Is within the 100-year flood plain; or
- Cannot be provided or served with public facilities

Based on state guidelines and data provided by the City of Grants Pass, the following constraints have been deducted from the residential lands inventory.

- Land within floodplains. This includes lands in flood-hazard areas (the 100-year floodplain).
- Locally-designated significant wetlands. This includes lands within 50 feet of a wetland.
- Land within Parks and Natural areas that are protected from future development.
- Land with slopes greater than 25%.

9.42 Residential Buildable Land Inventory Results

Land Base

A summary of the land base by plan designation is provided in Figure 14. The findings indicate that there are 4,640 gross developed acres of residential land and 1,031 acres of gross vacant residential land totaling 5,670 acres zoned for residential uses in Grants Pass.
Figure 14: Residential Land Base, Grants Pass UGB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>3,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,640</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,031</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,670</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Constrained Land

Before the deduction for future public facilities, the vacant residential land base is adjusted to reflect tax lots which exempt residential development, publicly owned tax lots, and public right-of-way\(^\text{10}\), as described previously. Environmental constraints (slopes, floodplains, wetlands, etc.) are removed in this step as well. The results summarized in Figure 15 indicate that after accounting for development constraints, the Grants Pass UGB has 480 acres of vacant buildable residential land.

Figure 15: Unconstrained and Non-Exempt Vacant Land by Plan Designation, Grants Pass UGB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Gross Vacant Land</th>
<th>Exempt Vacant Land</th>
<th>Environmentally Constrained Vacant Non-Exempt Land</th>
<th>Unconstrained Non-Exempt Vacant Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,031</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
<td><strong>480</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Buildable Land After Future Public Facilities

The BLI methodology calculates the residential land base after accounting for the constraints described previously. The findings indicate that out of a total of 5,570 gross acres, 4,640 acres are committed (derived from Figure 14), 260 acres are exempt, and 291 acres are environmentally constrained (derived from Figure 15).

The final deduction to the BLI, includes a 25% allowance for future public facilities and future right-of-way. As indicated below in Figure 16, Grants Pass UGB has a total of 360 vacant unconstrained residential land available over the next 20 years.

---

\(^\text{10}\) Includes right-of-way that is defined as a tax lot in the GIS database, which exempts residential development. This includes most major existing right-of-way which is excluded from the buildable land base.
### Partially Vacant Residential Land

In addition to vacant land, the BLI also includes a part-vacant land category. As noted above, partially vacant land includes properties that are occupied by a use (e.g., a home or building structure with value over $10,000) with enough land to be subdivided without the need for rezoning. As shown in Figure 17, after removing environmental constraints and exempt parcels, there are 1,037 part vacant acres that could be subdivided for development. After applying the 25% allowance for future public facilities, 778 acres of part vacant residential land are available for development in Grants Pass.

### Total Developable Residential Land

Figure 18 shows the combination of net developable vacant and part vacant residential lands in the Grants Pass UGB. The Grants Pass UGB has a buildable land inventory of 247 acres of Moderate High Density land (62 vacant and 185 part vacant); 83 acres of High Density land (39 vacant and 44 part vacant); 223 acres of Moderate Density land (54 vacant and 169 part vacant); and 585 acres of Low Density land (205 vacant and 379 part vacant). Conclusions regarding the sufficiency of this buildable land inventory will be drawn in the next chapter.
Figure 18: Net Buildable Vacant and Part Vacant Residential Land, Grants Pass UGB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Partially Vacant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Buildable Land by Lot Size

Figures 19 and 20 show vacant and part vacant land broken down by lot size. This is an important consideration given that, for example, a planned unit development yielding dozens of housing units can only occur on a relatively large, contiguous piece of land. The figures below show average figures prior to the 25% allowance for public facilities.

Figure 19 indicates that over three quarters of buildable vacant land are on relatively small lots (34% on lots of less than one acre and 44% on lots between 1 and 5 acres). Only two lots have more than 10 acres of vacant developable land.

Figure 19: Vacant Buildable Land by Lot Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;1 acre</th>
<th>&gt;= 1 acre, &lt;5 acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 5 acres, &lt;10 acres</th>
<th>&gt;=10 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Lots</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163.9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>211.0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Figure 20 shows that a similar phenomenon is occurring among part vacant developable land with over 80% of buildable part vacant land on parcels less than 5 acres.

Figure 20: Part Vacant Buildable Land by Lot Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;1 acre</th>
<th>&gt;= 1 acre, &lt;5 acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 5 acres, &lt;10 acres</th>
<th>&gt;=10 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Lots</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>226.8</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>204.5</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372.8</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>473.5</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Figure 19 reflects a map of the net vacant and part vacant residential land in the Grants Pass UGB by plan designation. Part vacant parcels are denoted by a crosshatch overlay. The map also shows the location of environmental constraints. Figures 21-25 show the same data in select quadrants of the city to allow for better legibility.
Commercial and Mixed-Use Land Assumptions

It should be noted that commercial-zoned parcels in Grants Pass are sometimes developed as higher density residential uses. Citywide, about 5.5% of buildable commercial land has developed with a high-density residential component, which includes 57 acres out of a total 1,031 commercial acres. Presently, there are 168.28 vacant, unconstrained, non-exempt commercial acres in the Grants Pass UGB. While it is difficult to project the amount of residential development that is likely to occur on this commercial land, it is reasonable to expect that some of the future apartment demand will be accommodated on land zoned for commercial uses.
Figure 21: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map

Grants Pass Net Vacant and Partially Vacant Residential Land
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Figure 22: Southwest Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map

Grants Pass Net Vacant and Partially Vacant Residential Land (Southwest)
Figure 23: North Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map

Grants Pass Net Vacant and Partially Vacant Residential Land (North)
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Figure 24: Central Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map
Figure 25: Central Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory Map

9.50 LAND SUFFICIENCY ANALYSIS
This section provides an estimate of residential development capacity (measured in new dwelling units) and an estimate of the ability of the Grants Pass UGB to accommodate needed new housing units for the 2020 to 2040 period, based on the analysis in the housing needs.

A comparison of 20-year residential land needs (demand) is made relative to the residential buildable land inventory. This provides a means of reconciling housing land demand with buildable land supply within the Grants Pass UGB. The evaluation of UGB land requirements to accommodate the planned housing need included three steps.

Step 1 takes into account the forecasted number of dwelling units by housing type, including single family detached, townhomes and plexes, multifamily, and manufactured homes as well as group quarters population (see Section 9.4).

Step 2 considers the amount of land required to accommodate the future housing demand based on the expected average development density for each general housing type (see Figure 26).

Step 3 includes a comparison (reconciliation) between the land need determined in Step 2 and the residential buildable land inventory presented in Section 9.5.

9.51 Housing Need Forecast

As discussed in Section 9.4, the forecasted housing mix for Grants Pass includes 4,055 housing units along with 114 group quarters units. This results in net new housing development as follows:

» Single Family Detached: 2,502 dwellings (including standard and small lot single family detached housing)

» Townhomes and Plexes: 749 dwelling units

» Manufactured Homes: 254 dwellings

» Multifamily: 551 dwelling units (includes apartments and condominiums with 5+ units per structure)

» Group Quarters: 114 dwelling units

9.52 Residential Land Need summary

The second step in the reconciliation of land needs estimates the amount of net buildable land area required to address the housing growth forecast. This step applies average density assumptions based on Grants Pass local experience (dwellings per acre) to each of the general residential development categories listed in Step 1 to arrive at a total residential land need forecast.
Figure 26: Grants Pass Residential Classifications and Density Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Unit Type</th>
<th>20-Year Dwelling Unit Demand</th>
<th>Applicable Plan Designation</th>
<th>Applicable Local Zones</th>
<th>Allowable Density (gross DU per Ac)</th>
<th>Avg. Development Density (net DU per Ac)</th>
<th>Net Buildable Land Requirement (net acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>R-1-12, R1-10, R-1-8</td>
<td>3.96 to 6.22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes / Plexes</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>R-1-6, R-2</td>
<td>8.71 to 12.44</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>LR, MR</td>
<td>all of the above</td>
<td>6.22 to 12.44</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>HR, HRR</td>
<td>R-1-6, R-2, R-4-2, R-5</td>
<td>20 to 50</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group quarters (@2 people per unit)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: prior tables; and interpretation of current zoning code and housing development/market conditions.

* Excludes steep slopes and floodzones; includes 25% allowance for public facilities/easements

9.53 UGB Sufficiency Analysis

As shown in Figure 27, the forecasted housing need (4,169 total dwelling units) is expected to require 674 acres of buildable land area. Since the current UGB includes 1,151 acres, we can conclude that there is an overall residential land surplus of 478 acres at this time.

The BLI findings indicate that the existing amount of vacant and part vacant land within the Grants Pass UGB is generally sufficient to accommodate planned 20-year housing needs.

Figure 27: Reconciliation of Residential Land Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Unit Type</th>
<th>Applicable Plan Designation</th>
<th>Net Buildable Land Requirement (net acres)</th>
<th>Net Buildable Land Inventory (net acres)</th>
<th>Net Buildable Land Surplus (net acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes / Plexes</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td>LR, MR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>HR, HRR</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group quarters (@2 people per unit)</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* analysis assumes these housing types are primarily developed in HR, HRR plan designations.
9.60 FINDINGS

- The population of Grants Pass is forecast to grow at 1.02% per year over the next two decades, adding 9,401 new residents.

- Population growth will require the addition of 4,055 new traditional dwelling units over the next 20 years as well as 114 group quarters dwellings.

- About 60% of the future housing need will consist of single family detached housing, 18% will be a mix of townhomes and plexes, 13% will be apartments, 6% will be comprised of manufactured housing and about 3% will be in group quarters such as dorms and congregate care facilities.

- The results of the housing needs analysis indicates that the current UGB is sufficient to accommodate future housing needs.

9.61 Housing Policy Goals

As part of the HNA process, the consultant team met with City staff and the HNA Advisory Committee to discuss potential housing policies that cities throughout Oregon have implemented to address various housing issues, which are summarized in OAR 660-038-0190(5) measures to accommodate needed housing in the UGB.

Grants Pass HNA Policies and Objectives

Goal: Ensure the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels commensurate with the financial capabilities of Grants Pass households, and allow for flexibility of housing location, type, and density.

Land Availability

1. In compliance with ORS 197.296, plan for a 20-year supply of suitable land for Grants Pass to meet housing needs within the existing Urban Growth Boundary. Coordinate with Josephine County as required by the State Housing Goal to ensure a fair allocation of housing types and densities.

2. Update the Housing Needs Analysis at least every 10 years and whenever actual population growth exceeds growth forecasts for three out of five years.

3. Revise Comprehensive Plan land use designations and Development Code as needed to meet the housing needs identified in the Housing Needs Analysis.

4. Direct development opportunities to vacant or partially vacant land as identified in the Buildable Lands Inventory and Housing Needs Analysis.

5. Maintain the Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Overlay Maps and Development Code to provide opportunities for a variety of housing types, densities, and locations within the urban growth boundary.
Housing Needs

6. Lower or remove local barriers to residential development.
7. Streamline land use and development processes to incentivize the timely and efficient development of housing.
8. Permit a variety of housing types across all residential zones, including single-family, middle housing, manufactured housing, and multifamily types. Focus on expanding opportunities for housing types which are shown to be related to lower housing costs.
9. Create pre-approved middle housing floorplans to encourage middle housing development.
10. Reduce minimum lot sizes in low-density zones to increase the efficiency of single-family and middle housing.
11. Establish minimum densities in medium and high-density zones.
12. Increase maximum building height in higher density zones.
13. Simplify the permit process to convert single-family units in commercial zones to mid-to-high density multi-dwelling housing.
14. Support efforts by nonprofit organizations and for-profit entities to provide housing for special needs populations. (Group quarters, independent living for seniors, assisted living, memory care, mental health facilities, drug and alcohol rehab, etc.).
15. Promote and incentivize mixed-use areas to connect households to a variety of transportation options, medical and social services, commercial centers, and recreation amenities.
16. Direct funds and program support to rehabilitate existing housing within Grants Pass.
17. Plan infrastructure and utilities to support housing development within the urban growth boundary, especially areas identified as likely for infill development.

Housing Affordability and Homelessness

18. Partner with public, private, and nonprofit agencies and organizations to facilitate affordable housing development and maintenance. For example, purchase affordable housing projects with income restricted sunset dates to retain affordability into the future.
19. Dedicate City resources to support public and private housing and associated programs/services to community members experiencing homelessness.
20. Identify surplus publicly owned properties that could be used for affordable housing and leverage these assets through public-private partnerships and other avenues.

Funding and Incentives

21. Implement a variety of incentives to support subsidized, low income and workforce housing. These incentives may include:
   a. Waiving or deferring fees and system development charges
   b. Adopting or amending criteria for property tax exemptions or freezes
   c. Providing density bonuses with the development of affordable housing
   d. Requiring the lowest off-street parking standards necessary to still meet community needs in order to reduce land used for parking and reduce housing costs
   e. Utilize Multi-Unit limited tax exemption (MULTE) program
22. Identify funding sources to increase housing affordability and support subsidized housing programs and infrastructure development. Funding sources may include:
   a. Assessing a construction excise tax
b. Dedicating a portion of Urban Renewal funding  
c. Implementing Local Improvement Districts  
d. Proceeds from the sale of surplus property  
e. Dedicating a portion of System Development Charges  
f. Short-term rental lodging tax
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1. LOCATION

. Note

The Data Base portion of the Comprehensive Plan describes the location of Grants Pass relative to the amenities that make the City an enjoyable and desirable place in which to live. In addition, the geography of the City is presented at the local, state and regional level.

No policies result from the findings made.
2. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

. Goal

To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the ongoing involvement of citizens in all phases of the land use planning process.

. Policies

2.1 Land Use actions shall be reviewed as provided in the Development Code, with the degree of public participation fitting the extent of impact of the proposed land use action, as provided in Policy 13.1.2 of the Plan. The Development Code shall include provisions for adequate, timely and informed review, including notices bearing complete and easily understood information needed by the general public to make an informed opinion.

2.2 Where a land use issue or action may have an impact upon a particular neighborhood, ward or special interest group, or may affect large numbers of Urban Growth Boundary residents and property owners, special workshop sessions shall be held to assure access by affected citizens to all phases of the land use decision making process.

2.3 The Council shall adopt a Citizen Involvement Program to assure adequate citizen involvement in land use issues and actions. The program shall contain provisions for communications between citizens and elected or appointed officials, assistance for the provision and interpretation of technical information, mechanisms for responding to individual citizen input, and financial support.

2.4 The citizen involvement program shall include a Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC) composed of representatives of the City Council, Planning Commission, standing committees and citizens at large. The responsibilities of the citizen involvement committee shall be to assist in the development of the citizen involvement program, to assist in implementing the program, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the program annually.

2.5 The citizen involvement program shall contain procedures for the establishment and change of the program and committee, standards for review of the program, and explicit provisions for the general charge and specific tasks of the citizen advisory committee.
3.0 SCENIC, ROGUE RIVER, HISTORIC AND NATURAL RESOURCES

. Goal

To conserve, restore and enhance the area's scenic river, historic and natural resource.

. Policies

. Scenic

3.1 The City and County will explore the creation of a scenic route and major gateway overlay designation on the UGB land use map. The scenic overlay will be used to determine those major arterial routes through, and major entrances to, the city of Grants Pass and the urbanizing area frequented by the traveling public, where special landscaping or other scenic enhancement is appropriate.

3.2 The City will work cooperatively with the County seeking to jointly review, and appropriately control, large-scale development or disruptive uses on lands visible from the city and under County jurisdiction.

3.3 The City will work to preserve and enhance the scenic views of Caveman Bridge through the following actions:

A. Working cooperatively with the Oregon Department of Transportation, trees in the 6th Street right-of-way within 100 feet of the bridge will be preserved and replanted (as necessary); and

B. Trees in Riverside Park near the bridge will be preserved and replanted (as necessary).

3.4 The City will develop new and enhance existing viewpoints of Caveman Bridge.

3.5 The City will continue to maintain and enhance existing parks and open spaces.

3.6 The City will continue to add new parks and open spaces following guidance in the Parks Master Plan.

. Rogue River

3.7 The City shall recognize the Rogue River as the most significant natural and economic resource. Further, the City shall recognize the development opportunities of the river by the institution of "Riverfront Tourist Commercial Zones". These special commercial zones found in scenario 4 of the RRP and located at either existing or proposed bridges, would provide for development standards as well as
provide specific allowable uses for each Riverfront Tourist Commercial Area. It is highly desirable that the new zoning allow for mixed use development (residential, commercial, retail, office); however, due to the limited space available, uses which either require or depend on a river location shall be higher priority.

3.8 The city shall recognize the river as the predominant visual feature in the community by the institution of a "Scenic Overlay Zone", to occur along the entire length of the river within the urban growth boundary; the width of the zone should correspond to the width of the River Corridor. This zone shall include:

- The creation of a design review board which would review all projects within the overlay zone for their design aesthetics and compatibility with the environmental setting.

- The creation of design guidelines to be utilized by the proposed design review board as well as by staff and other discretionary commissions.

- The creation of public viewpoints in the locations as designated in the RRP

3.9 In conjunction with the above policy and policies under the Fish, Wildlife and Natural Resource Section of this element, the city shall institute the necessary ordinances for the protection and restoration of the riparian and wetland habitats along the river. This new ordinance must address the removal of river vegetation, the erosion of the riverbank, the allowable recreational uses of the waterway and the potential impact on aquatic and terrestrial wildlife.

3.10 In concert with policies 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7, the city shall develop a bicycle and pedestrian trails system. This system may link the proposed Riverfront Tourist Commercial Zones as well as provide linkage to the downtown and other community trails system. Further, the city may provide access to the river's edge at areas designated in the RRP and other suitable areas.

The above trails and access points shall be acquired by the city either through easements, development conditions and (or) direct public purchase.

3.11 Within twelve months of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the City shall establish an Urban Area Historical Buildings and Sites Commission, whose primary function is to facilitate the preservation, conservation, restoration, rehabilitation or upkeep of historic buildings, structures and historical areas within the City of Grants Pass, and advise the City Council in land use actions affecting historic structures, sites and areas.

3.12 Within sixteen months of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the Development Code shall include a process of designation and review for structures, sites and areas considered indicative of the City's historical heritage, which will assist participating
property owners in qualifying for federal, state or local financial assistance programs.

Fish, Wildlife and Natural Resources

3.13 The City and County shall coordinate development policies with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to prevent the degradation of aquatic habitats, recognizing the role these habitats play in the area's economic well-being.

3.14 The City and County shall act to conserve and enhance the quality and character of the Rogue River and its tributary streams, protecting streamside vegetation and discouraging the channelization, diking and filling of stream channels.

Locally significant wetlands mapped in the Local Wetlands Inventory shall be protected by buffers, appropriate to their identified class and function, to preserve habitat and protect and enhance water quality.

Aggregate

3.15 The aggregate resource site located in the southwest subarea opposite the City's sewage treatment plant shall be utilized. Seasons and methods of operation may be regulated to lessen impact upon the surrounding area.

General

3.16 Within sixteen months of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the Development Code shall act to facilitate these Scenic, Rogue River, Historic and Natural Resource policies, and shall contain a balanced mix of positive incentives (Which may include economic incentives, density transfer, clustering, planned unit developments, density incentive, rapid review procedures, clear and measurable standards, etc.), as well as exactive requirements (which may include mandatory reviews, dedication, easement or development requirements, etc.), as needed to assure the realization of these policies.
4. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE QUALITY

- **Goal**
  To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the area.

- **Policies**

4.1 The City and County shall affect air quality by:

(a) coordinating the maintenance of air quality with the State Clean Air Implementation Plan.

(b) cooperating with the State Department of Environmental Quality, the County Health Department, organizations and individuals for the ongoing monitoring of air pollutants in the UGB airshed.

(c) continuing and augmenting the program of paving unpaved roadways within the UGB, including alleys.

4.2 The City and County shall:

(a) evaluate the need for a local noise ordinance utilizing DEQ Noise Control Regulations and Model Noise Ordinance within 16 months of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

(b) coordinate land use planning with the DEQ Noise Control Regulations, especially the regulations for industry and commerce.

(c) locate noise sensitive land uses, such as residential, away from noise sources wherever possible.

(d) explore the requirement of noise abatement measures in residential developments that are located adjacent to noise sources such as highways, major streets, railroads, industrial and commercial areas.

4.3 The City and County shall affect water quality by:

(a) coordinating land use activities with the State Department of Environmental Quality River Basin Plan, the 208 Water Quality Plan and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit requirements. ¹If waterways within the city are declared water-quality limited by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, the City will work with DEQ to develop an appropriate pollutant load reduction strategy implementation plan in response to a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) determination developed for the watershed.
(b) encouraging the development of land that minimizes the area of impervious surface and/or provides for storm-water retention. Runoff that cannot be infiltrated shall be managed so that (a) the peak flow of the receiving stream is not significantly increased and (b) water quality is maintained.

(c) maintaining all public parking lots and streets in as litter-free and chemical-free condition as possible, and encouraging private owners to maintain parking lots and driveways in as litter-free and chemical-free condition as possible.

(d) increasing the hydraulic capacity of the City's wastewater treatment plant.

(e) identifying improperly abandoned groundwater wells in the UGB area, requiring that the wells be properly capped or sealed, and continuing to monitor the salt intrusion into wells in use.

(f) regulating site planning for new development and construction to better control drainage and erosion and to reduce and retain stormwater runoff and protect water quality.

(g) regulating the location of permitted uses that may have higher than ordinary impacts on water quality, particularly those that generate, store, or use hazardous waste or materials.

(h) increasing public awareness of techniques and practices private individuals can employ to correct water quality and quantity problems.

(i) regulating the cutting of trees and encouraging the reforestation and revegetation of appropriate trees in the city.

4.4 The City and County shall affect land quality by:

(a) coordinating the disposal of solid waste with the Josephine County Solid Waste Management Plan.

(b) evaluating the long term needs for sludge disposal and considering alternatives to liquid land application.

4.5 The City and County shall address the environment's carrying capacity by:

(a) complying with applicable state and federal environmental protection standards.

(b) so managing urban development and environmental protection that irreversible damage to the quality of the environment is avoided.
5. **NATURAL HAZARDS**

### Goal

To reduce the risk of loss of life and damage to property both private and public, due to natural hazards.

### Policies

#### 5.1 Geologic, Slope, Soils and Erosion Hazard

5.1.1 The city and county shall place a slope hazard overlay designation on the UGB land use map. The slope hazard overlay shall be used to determine areas within the boundary with slopes greater than 15%.

5.1.2 The Development Code shall contain standards for development related to the degree of hazard from slope and soil type. The soils classification of the U.S. Soils Conservation Service shall be used as a general guide only for determining hazard areas. The Development Code shall provide methods to modify the required development standards as a result of more precise and site-specific slope and soil characteristics information.

5.1.3 Within 18 months of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the Development Code shall provide definitive guidelines for the routing and design of roads in steep areas to minimize environmental damage, maintain natural drainage patterns, and conform to the general topography.

5.1.4 The Development Code shall act to facilitate these slope and soils hazard policies, and shall include a balanced mix of positive incentives (which may include density transfers, clustering, administrative appeal from requirements based on more precise information, etc.), as well as exactive requirements (which may include density reduction, development requirements, etc.).

5.1.5 Development on hillsides shall not endanger life and property or land and aquatic resources determined to be environmentally significant.

5.1.6 On tree-covered hillsides, development shall be designed to preserve as many trees and as much natural vegetation as possible.

5.1.7 The City shall require certain land disturbing activities associated with construction and improvements to employ erosion control prevention to control stream sedimentation.

5.1.8 Standards for hillside protection will require use of construction techniques that reduce sediment transport and peak storm flows by minimizing erosion and surface water runoff.
5.2        Flood Hazard

5.2.1 The city and county shall maintain an active involvement in the National Flood Insurance Program.

5.2.2 The city and county shall place a flood hazard overlay designation on the UGB Land Use Map. The flood hazard overlay shall be used to determine areas within the Boundary subject to flood hazard in accordance with the Grants Pass and Josephine County Flood Insurance Studies, pursuant to the National Flood Insurance Program.

5.2.3 The Development Code shall regulate development within the 100-year floodplain and floodway as required to maintain participation in the National Flood Insurance Program.

5.2.4 The Development Code shall provide for methods to determine and appeal the location of the 100-year floodplain and floodway boundaries when there appears to be discrepancies between official mapped boundaries and actual field conditions.

5.2.5 The Development Code shall act to encourage the use or provision of areas suitable for storm water retention, detention, and infiltration, such as wetlands, grassed waterways, seasonal ponds and woodlands.

5.2.6 The city and county shall ensure that all new utilities and public facilities that locate within or pass through the 100-year flood plain do not result in increases in flood levels. Public water systems shall be designed to minimize or eliminate infiltration of flood waters, and public sewer systems shall be designed to minimize or eliminate discharges or infiltration.

5.2.7 The Development Code shall act to facilitate these flood hazard policies, and shall include a balanced mix of positive incentives (which may include density transfers, rapid review procedures, open space credits, etc.), as well as exactive requirements (which may include dedication or easement requirements, development requirements, etc.).

5.2.8 The city and county shall actively participate with Jackson County and other affected agencies in developing strategies to reduce and manage flooding and flood hazard areas.

5.3        Wildfire Hazard

5.3.1 Within 18 months of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the Development Code shall act to encourage reduction of fuel concentrations and the construction of fire breaks, which may include utilizing fire resistant or less flammable vegetation, construction of water sources, construction of roads suitable for use by emergency equipment, and provision of loop road systems for residential areas in hilly terrain.
6. **POPULATION**

. **Goal**

To base decisions regarding the population to be accommodated within the UGB for the 20 year planning period upon (a) sound, current and accurate demographic and economic data, (b) population projection models that reflect conditions and trends of the area and region, and (c) the desired growth policy of the citizenry and property owners of the planning area.

. **Policies**

6.1. Planning for the Urban Growth Boundary for the 20-year period from 2007-2027 shall be based on growth at a 2.2% growth rate from a year 2007 population of 37,460 to a year 2027 population of 57,888.

6.2 Sufficient lands capable of full urbanization shall be provided within the Boundary to ensure an adequate choice in the market place for the projected population.

6.3 The City and County shall actively participate in the ten year and five year census efforts of the Federal government.

6.4 The City and County shall ensure a continuous stream of current land-use and development data from all agencies affecting land-use and development within the Boundary, and shall provide for the electronically enhanced storage, retrieval and analysis of this data.

6.5 The City Manager shall prepare an annual report to the Urban Area Planning Commission, the City Council, the Board of County Commissioners and other appropriate Boards and Commissions on the location, type, and degree of development within the Boundary. The annual report shall include information on the cost and availability of various housing types and densities, on the addition to or depletion of the capacity of basic urban services (water, sewer, storm drainage, streets and parks), and the adequacy of serviced, buildable lands for each land use type shown on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.

These yearly reports and analyses shall be used by the City and County to guide revisions to the Comprehensive Plan.
7. RECREATION, PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

. Goal

To provide for the Recreation and Park and Open Space needs of the residents of and visitors to the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary area. The provisions shall: ensure the availability of sufficient open spaces for all areas of the UGB; meet the recreational needs of all age groups and types of recreation activities; locate open spaces in a manner that shall protect and enhance natural resources, and minimize hazard to life and property.

. Policies

. General

7.1 The City and County shall act to respect and conserve the natural resources in the area, to protect and enhance the quality and usefulness of the Rogue River, and to recognize that natural beauty is of great significance to the future of the area.

7.2 The City and County should act to increase the variety and number of public and private recreation opportunities and leisure time activities in the area.

7.3 Recreation sites shall be obtained by the City and County when possible so that these open spaces will be preserved for the future, in accord with an adopted Park Plan. Parks development should proceed as needed in order to increase and enhance recreational opportunities in the area.

7.4 Community appearance is a major concern and should be a subject of a major effort in the area. With visitor income as a primary source of future economic growth and development, beauty becomes a matter of basic economic significance. Street tree planting and landscaping, sign regulation and building improvement and painting programs should all be utilized to improve the environment.

. River Parks

7.5 The City shall design parks which meet the recreational needs of the community, protect the significant natural features, minimize environmental deterioration, and where possible, serve as stormwater detention and treatment facilities.

7.6 The City and County shall act to protect and enhance all recreation activities, public and private, utilizing the Rogue River resource, while at the same time avoiding detriment to the resource itself, with its many special and unique qualities.

7.7 The regional River Parks in and adjacent to the Urban Growth Boundary (such as Schroeder, Riverside and Pierce) should be enhanced as river oriented parks. Schroeder and Riverside may also function as neighborhood or community parks,
provided that great care is taken to preserve the basic river orientation and natural character of these river parks.

7.8 In accordance with an adopted Park Plan, the City and County should review the potential of the development of a riverside trail or greenway linking Riverside, Tussing and Schroeder Parks, with an additional tie to the County Fairgrounds via Tussing Park.

. School Parks

7.9 The City, County and School Districts should continue to cooperate in the full utilization of the School Park concept, which may include the joint acquisition, development, utilization and maintenance of educational and recreational facilities. The School Park concept should be utilized to realize larger and more usable sites as well as more cost effective utilization than possible with single-use facilities.

7.10 The City, County and School Districts should continue to maintain communications adequate to assure that adjacent schools and parks are appropriately acquired, designed and managed in order to maximize the utility of school grounds and parks to both school children and the general public. The City and County shall pursue an agreement with the school districts, such that the City and County would be consulted prior to and during the design of proposed school facilities, and would have first opportunity to purchase school district grounds and facilities within the UGB for park purposes should such grounds or facilities be offered for sale.

7.11 Neighborhood Parks should be located adjacent to elementary schools, and Community Parks adjacent to middle schools or high schools, whenever possible, and shall be developed as School Parks insofar as practicable. Elementary school sites should be enhanced as neighborhood park facilities wherever adjacent grounds are not available. Potential School Park sites shall be carefully designed both to meet recreation needs and to minimize any impacts disruptive to residential neighborhoods. Where significant natural features are present, there may be needs for different adjacent park types, such as Allen Creek Community Park adjacent to Allendale Elementary School due to the location along the creek.

7.12 Neighborhood parks are particularly needed and their acquisition and development should be pursued, especially in underserved areas as described in the Comprehensive Park and Recreation Master Plan.

. Greenways and Trails

7.13 The City and County, in cooperation with School Districts, Grants Pass Irrigation District, utilities and other public and semi-public agencies shall continue to explore the acquisition and development of a greenway and trail network that would connect designated natural resource and recreation sites within, adjacent to and near the UGB.
. Fairgrounds

7.14 The County Fairgrounds is an especially valuable asset to the people of the community. The City, County and Fair Board shall take care to preserve the fairgrounds for recreation activity, to protect the site from the encroachment of other public uses which may detract from its basic function, and shall act to enhance and extend the recreational capacity of the site. The City and County shall cooperate with the Fair Board to develop a Master Plan for the development of the County Fairgrounds.

. Park and Recreation Plan

7.15 The City and County shall develop, adopt, maintain, and update a Park and Recreation Plan for the Urban Growth Boundary area. Such a Park Plan shall:

(a) determine the number, size and approximate location of park and recreation facilities, greenways and trails deemed necessary to serve the expected population within the Urban Growth Boundary and establish standards and service levels for various park types;

(b) base the facilities determination on a thorough analysis of all types of City and County recreation activities, using and correlating available preference and use data;

(c) utilize organized input from all segments of the community;

(d) recommend implementation and financing strategies for acquiring, developing and maintaining needed park and recreation facilities;

(e) provide continuity with the Park Plans of 1960, 1967, 1969, and 1984 as adopted by City and County, and as followed through by acquisition, expansion and development;

(f) determine the areas of greatest facility need;

(g) assess existing recreation supply and demand, and plan for a balance of needed leisure services, based upon a reasonable balance of service provision and cost sharing by governmental, commercial and private sources.
7.16 The Development Code and city ordinances shall act to facilitate these park, recreation and open space policies, and shall contain a balanced mix of positive incentives (which may include density transfers, density incentives, rapid review procedures, etc.), as well as exactive requirements (which may include dedication or easement requirements, system charges, development requirements, etc.), as needed to assure the realization of these policies.

7.17 The City and County should consider a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) as a tool to help plan for timely and adequate acquisition and development of park and recreation facilities prioritized in the adopted Park and Recreation Plan.

7.18 The City and County shall explore the provision of incentives for park, open space and greenway dedication.

7.19 The 2010 Comprehensive Park and Recreation Master Plan provides more specific Goals (Chapter 2) and Policies and Strategies (Chapter 5) to meet park and recreation needs for the next 20 years. The plan also contains updated database information including a Park and Facility Inventory and Needs Assessment.
8. **ECONOMY**

. **Goal**

To improve, expand, diversify and stabilize the economic base of the community.

. **Policies**

8.1 The City and County shall endeavor to improve, expand, diversify and stabilize the economic base of the community:

(a) by encouraging the location and development of environmentally sound economic activities within the Urban Growth Boundary which meet the occupational and employment needs of area residents, particularly the unemployed and under-employed.

(b) by giving high priority to the extension of full urban services to designated industrial areas of the Urban Growth Boundary in the Capital Improvement Program.

(c) by encouraging and providing support to non-profit economic development organizations and groups which seek to improve employment opportunities within the Urban Growth Boundary.

(d) by insuring that an adequate quality and quantity of industrial land is available, properly zoned and serviced.

(e) by protecting existing and planned commercial and industrial areas from the intrusion of incompatible land uses through land use regulation.

(f) by providing for a timely, efficient, clear and objective development review process.

(g) by applying for state and federal grants which can be used for extension of public facilities to industrial areas or direct financial assistance to new or expanding industries.

8.2 The City and County shall continue to improve their working relationship with each other and with other governmental bodies so as to improve the community’s ability to accommodate growth.

8.3 The City and County shall encourage educational and occupational training programs, and make selective resources of the City and County available to public and private agencies for such training programs.
8.4 The acquisition and development of park and recreation facilities, as well as the conservation of natural resources and open space, shall be considered a vital part of the economic development and economic well being of the area, the region and the State, and appropriate efforts shall be made to keep both recreation development and natural resource conservation abreast of growth.

8.5 The implementing ordinances shall act to facilitate these economic policies, and shall contain a balanced mix of positive incentives (which may include rapid review procedure, clear and measurable standards of development, subsidized service extension, etc.), as well as exactive requirements (which may include dedication or easement requirements, system changes, development requirements, etc.), as needed to assure realization of these policies.

8.6 The City and County shall encourage industrial development within the Urban Growth Boundary and the North Valley Industrial Park by:

(a) working with economic development organization and the property owners involved to encourage development of the remaining acres in the Caveman Industrial Park.

(b) providing City water service and fire suppression and prevention services to Josephine County's 85 acre North Valley Industrial Park, and encouraging full development of this park.

(c) completing a facility plan and implementation strategy for the East Grants Pass Industrial area, which will include the extension of Agness Avenue across the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks, and the extension of water along "N" Street and Agness Avenue.

(d) working with economic development organizations and the landowners in the East Grants Pass, industrial area to market their properties in a unified and cooperative manner.

(e) providing City water services south of the Rogue River to the "Redwood Plaza" industrial area.

8.7 (a) The City and County will encourage commercial development at major commercial nodes, which includes the East Grants Pass area around the existing Grants Pass Shopping Center; the Redwood Commercial Triangle South of the Rogue River area and the Downtown area. The City will also encourage infill commercial and office development along Sixth and Seventh Streets, and in the North City commercial area.

(b) In addition, convenience shopping area will be developed in the future in the Redwood area and the Southeast area of Grants Pass. The Rogue River Highway will continue to be used as a commercial strip.
8.8 The City shall assist in maintaining the Downtown commercial area as a vital business and office district by:

(a) following the adopted Downtown Improvement Program, giving high priority to Downtown Improvement projects in its Capital Improvement Program.

(b) making every reasonable effort to involve Downtown property owners and merchants in any improvement projects and proposals regarding the Downtown, and all proposals shall be subject to thorough public discussion before approval by the Council.

(c) providing support to the Towne Center Association in order that they may continue to carry out the "Oregon Main Street Program", which focuses on improvements to the area of organization, promotions, design and economic restructuring.

(d) evaluating the potential for, and provide where possible, long term revenue sources for Downtown improvement, both for the Towne Center organization and for public capital improvements.

(e) encouraging private building owners to maintain and improve their buildings.

(f) improving the efficiency with which the public uses both the off and on-street parking systems.

(g) zoning the Downtown area "Central Business District" which allows building to the property line and does not require any landscaping or off-street parking requirements.

(h) providing zoning designations that allow the eventual build up of residential densities immediately surrounding the Downtown area.

(i) requesting the State Department of Transportation to reconstruct Sixth and Seventh Streets, and to assist in the construction of a new synchronized signal system on Sixth and Seventh Streets.

(j) implementing the Old City Hall/Fire Station plan for improvements and use of those buildings.

Tourism

8.9 The City shall promote tourism, as significant element in the local economy by:
(a) utilizing a portion of the transient room tax for visitors and convention promotion services.

(b) creating a financial mechanism and completing landscaping and sign improvements to the North Interchange area.

(c) supporting the Centennial Commission's efforts toward activities drawing tourists to the area.
9. HOUSING

. Goal

Ensure the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels commensurate with the financial capabilities of Grants Pass households, and allow for flexibility of housing location, type, and density.

. Policies and Objectives

Land Availability

9.1. In compliance with ORS 197.296, plan for a 20-year supply of suitable land for Grants Pass to meet housing needs within the existing Urban Growth Boundary. Coordinate with Josephine County as required by the State Housing Goal to ensure a fair allocation of housing types and densities.

9.2. Update the Housing Needs Analysis at least every 10 years and whenever actual population growth exceeds growth forecasts for three out of five years.

9.3. Revise Comprehensive Plan land use designations and Development Code as needed to meet the housing needs identified in the Housing Needs Analysis.

9.4. Direct development opportunities to vacant or partially vacant land as identified in the Buildable Lands Inventory and Housing Needs Analysis.

9.5. Maintain the Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Overlay Maps and Development Code to provide opportunities for a variety of housing types, densities, and locations within the urban growth boundary.

Housing Needs

9.6. Lower or remove local barriers to residential development.

9.7. Streamline land use and development processes to incentivize the timely and efficient development of housing.

9.8. Permit a variety of housing types across all residential zones, including single-family, middle housing, manufactured housing, and multifamily types. Focus on expanding opportunities for housing types which are shown to be related to lower housing costs.

9.9. Create pre-approved middle housing floorplans to encourage middle housing development.

9.10. Reduce minimum lot sizes in low-density zones to increase the efficiency of single-family and middle housing.

9.11. Establish minimum densities in medium and high-density zones.

9.12. Increase maximum building height in higher density zones.

9.13. Simplify the permit process to convert single-family units in commercial zones to mid-to-high density multi-dwelling housing.

9.14. Support efforts by nonprofit organizations and for-profit entities to provide housing for special needs populations. (Group quarters, independent living for seniors, assisted living, memory care, mental health facilities, drug and alcohol rehab, etc.).
9.15. Promote and incentivize mixed-use areas to connect households to a variety of transportation options, medical and social services, commercial centers, and recreation amenities.

9.16. Direct funds and program support to rehabilitate existing housing within Grants Pass.

9.17. Plan infrastructure and utilities to support housing development within the urban growth boundary, especially areas identified as likely for infill development.

**Housing Affordability and Homelessness**

9.18. Partner with public, private, and nonprofit agencies and organizations to facilitate affordable housing development and maintenance. For example, purchase affordable housing projects with income restricted sunset dates to retain affordability into the future.

9.19. Dedicate City resources to support public and private housing and associated programs/services to community members experiencing homelessness.

9.20. Identify surplus publicly owned properties that could be used for affordable housing and leverage these assets through public-private partnerships and other avenues.

**Funding and Incentives**

9.21. Implement a variety of incentives to support subsidized, low income and workforce housing. These incentives may include:
   a. Waiving or deferring fees and system development charges
   b. Adopting or amending criteria for property tax exemptions or freezes
   c. Providing density bonuses with the development of affordable housing
   d. Requiring the lowest off-street parking standards necessary to still meet community needs in order to reduce land used for parking and reduce housing costs
   e. Utilize Multi-Unit limited tax exemption (MULTE) program

9.22. Identify funding sources to increase housing affordability and support subsidized housing programs and infrastructure development. Funding sources may include:
   a. Assessing a construction excise tax
   b. Dedicating a portion of Urban Renewal funding
   c. Implementing Local Improvement Districts
   d. Proceeds from the sale of surplus property
   e. Dedicating a portion of System Development Charges
   f. Short-term rental lodging tax
10. PUBLIC FACILITIES & SERVICES

. Goal
To provide needed facilities and services for the Urban Growth Boundary area in a timely, orderly, efficient, economic and coordinated manner.

. Policies

10.1 General Service Policies

10.1.1 Urban levels of development shall require urban levels of service, as defined by the Implementing Ordinances.

10.1.2 Those who benefit most from the extension of urban services shall be those who pay most of the cost of service extension. Citizens in the developed areas with a full range of services already provided should pay little if any of the costs of extending urban services. Various techniques should be utilized to mitigate the economic impact of service extension to those residents in developing areas who already provide certain of their own services, and to mitigate the economic impact of service extension to those persons on fixed and/or low incomes.

10.1.3 Services shall be provided in an orderly and economic manner. Services provided at public expense should be provided first to those areas most heavily committed to urban development and those areas most actively developing, before extension to less committed areas or to those areas less actively developing. The extension of services with similar physical and/or programmatic requirements should be coordinated where economies will result. The involvement of the private sector is essential in the provision of services, and will determine to a great extent the timing, location and financing means of service extensions.

10.1.4 The division of lands and development of property within the Urban Growth Boundary shall be in accordance with the phased provision of urban services, as provided in the Implementing Ordinances. The type, location and phasing of public facilities and services shall be used by the City and County in a coordinated fashion as factors to direct urban expansion, and to implement land use policies.

10.1.5 Neither the City nor the County shall create special districts within the Urban Growth Boundary for the provision of water, sewer, storm drainage or street improvement services, unless approved by both parties and managed by either the City Council or the Board of County Commissioners. Overlapping and competing layers of political control of the provision of services shall be discouraged.

10.1.6 Services shall be resource effective. Services shall not be extended past the carrying capacity of the resource base of that service, and shall utilize the resource in the most effective way practicable.
10.1.7 The City and County recognize that the provision of necessary services to accommodate the projected growth and land use allocations is a mutual responsibility. The City and County will continue to cooperate with other and with the private sector in the development and use of financial mechanisms and programs that are effective, efficient and equitable. The County recognizes its need to develop new techniques and resources for financing urban level public facilities.

10.1.8 The City and County will develop, adopt and maintain Capital Improvement Programs to meet the needs of the service area. These programs will be used as a guide in the decision making process regarding the expenditures of local public funds on capital projects as well as seeking State and Federal funds.

10.2 Water Service Policies

10.2.1 The City and County shall follow the adopted Water Facilities Plan for the Urban Growth Boundary area when extending and improving water service. Key factors to be utilized in growth management include:

(a) the number, size, location and approximate costs of water treatment, storage and distribution facilities deemed necessary to serve the expected population within the Urban Growth Boundary;

(b) water sources and treatment and distribution modes;

(c) continued input from all segments of the community;

(d) implementation and financing strategies for acquiring, developing and maintaining needed water treatment, storage and distribution; and

(e) determination of the areas of greatest need, including techniques of funding and prioritization for these areas of need.

10.2.2 The City and County shall maintain a continuously updated computerized model of the municipal distribution system. This model shall be available for use at cost by public agencies and private organizations in order to determine questions of service capacity, improvement requirements and improvement cost.

10.2.3 The City and County shall adopt an official Water Facilities Plan Map, showing the location, size and type of existing and future water treatment, storage and distribution facilities called for by the Water Facilities Plan, and such map shall be keyed to the computerized model of the distribution system.

10.2.4 The Development Code shall facilitate these water service policies, and shall contain a balanced mix of positive incentives (which may include density transfers, density bonuses, rapid review procedures, etc.) as well as exactive requirements (which may include dedication or easement requirements, system charges, development
requirements, etc.) as needed to assure the realization of these policies.

10.2.5 The City and County shall maintain a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) which shall include timely and adequate funding to realize the development of facilities required by the Water Facilities Plan, and shown on the Water Facilities Plan Map.

10.2.6 The Water Facilities Plan shall be reviewed and updated periodically as necessary, with major revisions at five year intervals.

10.2.7 Urban level development shall require a public water system, or shall meet requirements of interim development standards as provided by the Implementing Ordinances. Interim Development Standards shall allow development to proceed in a timely and economical manner, prior to full public water system extension, provided the requirements of public safety, health and welfare are met, and the future extension of the public water system is safeguarded.

10.3 Sewer Service Policies

10.3.1 The City and County shall follow adopted Sanitary Sewer Facility and Management Plans for the Redwood, Fruitdale-Harbeck and City service districts, including all parts of the Urban Growth Boundary area. The Sanitary Sewer Facility and Management Plans:

(a) determine the number, size, location and approximate costs of sanitary sewer facilities and improvements deemed necessary to serve the expected population within the Urban Growth Boundary;

(b) base the facilities and improvements determination upon a thorough analysis of the Urban Growth Boundary service districts, including present treatment plan capacity, treatment levels and Department of Environmental Quality requirements, collection system age, construction and function, and infiltration and inflow characteristics of the system;

(c) recommend implementation and financing strategies for acquiring, developing and maintaining needed sanitary sewage facilities;

(d) demonstrate continuity with past sanitary sewer plans, as adopted and developed by the City and County;

(e) provide for adequate coordination between the City and County as needed in the expansion and maintenance of the sewer service districts;

(f) determine the areas of highest priority.

10.3.2 The City and County shall maintain an official Sanitary Sewer Facilities Plan Map, showing the location, size and type of existing and future collection and treatment
facilities called for by the Sanitary Sewer Facilities and Management Plan. The map shall also show Service District boundaries.

10.3.3 The Development Code and Development Standards shall act to facilitate these sanitary sewer service policies, and shall contain a balanced mix of positive incentives (which may include density transfers, public funding of oversized lines, rapid review procedures, etc.) as well as exactive requirements (which may include dedication or easement requirements, system charges, development requirements, etc.) as needed to assure the realization of these policies.

10.3.4 The City and County shall maintain a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) which shall include timely and adequate funding to realize the development of facilities required by the adopted Sanitary Sewer Facility and Management Plans, and as shown on the Sewer Facilities Plan Map.

10.3.5 The Sanitary Sewer Facility and Management Plans shall be reviewed and updated periodically as necessary, with major revisions at five year intervals. The revisions to the Sanitary Sewer Facilities and Management Plans shall be used as a basis for revising these policies.

10.3.6 The City and County shall encourage sanitary sewer design that minimizes the cost of sanitary service extensions, and that minimizes the cost of maintaining such extensions.

10.3.7 Urban level development shall require a public sanitary sewer system, or shall meet the requirements of interim development standards as provided by the Implementing Ordinances. Interim development standards shall allow development to proceed in a timely and economical manner, prior to full extension of the sanitary sewer system, provided the requirements of public safety, health and welfare are met.

10.4 Storm Drain Service Policies

10.4.1 The City and County shall follow the adopted Master Storm Drainage Facilities and Management Plan for the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary area when extending the improving drainage service. Key factors to be utilized in growth management include:

(a) the number, size, location and approximate costs of storm drainage facilities and improvements deemed necessary to serve the expected population within the Urban Growth Boundary;

(b) the analysis of the UGB drainage basins, using generally accepted runoff projection techniques, including appropriate computer modeling, if possible;

(c) implementation and financing strategies for acquiring, developing and maintaining needed storm drainage facilities;
(d) maintaining continuity with past drainage plans, as adopted and developed by the City and County; and

(e) determination of the areas of highest priority, including techniques of funding and prioritization for these high priority areas.

10.4.2 The City and County shall adopt an official Storm Drainage Facility Map showing the location, size and type of existing and future storm drainage facilities called for by the Storm Drainage Plan. The Storm Drainage Map shall be used to determine service district jurisdiction, and the location of future storm drainage facilities and improvements.

10.4.3 The Development Code shall act to facilitate these storm drainage policies, and shall contain a balanced mix of positive incentives (which may include density transfers, public funding of oversized lines, rapid review procedures, etc.), as well as exactive requirements, system charges, development requirements, etc.), as needed to assure the realization of these policies.

10.4.4 The City and County shall develop a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) within 12 months of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, which program shall include timely and adequate funding to realize the development of facilities required by the adopted Storm Drainage Plan, and shown on the Storm Drainage Facilities Map.

10.4.5 The Storm Drain Plan shall be reviewed and updated, and revised if necessary, at one year intervals, with major revisions at five year intervals. The revisions to the Storm Drain Plan shall be used as a basis for revising these policies.

10.4.6 The City and County working with the Grants Pass Irrigation District shall explore an agreement that will ensure that the storm drainage use of, and the necessary repairs, improvements and maintenance of the irrigation canal system, are made in a manner consistent with the Storm Drain Plan, and in a timely and cost-effective manner.

10.4.7 The City and County shall encourage storm drainage design that minimizes storm water runoff, including retention, detention, and infiltration areas or facilities, use of vegetative open space, and the preservation of natural waterways.

10.4.8 The City and County shall coordinate the provision of storm drain facilities with the provision of open space called for by the Park Facilities Plan, wherever possible, and to the extent practicable. This coordination shall include retaining drainage channels as close as possible to their natural state, and the use of plan materials and maintenance techniques in storm water retention.

10.4.9 Urban level development shall require urban levels of storm drainage, as provided in the Implementing Ordinances. Interim Development Standards shall allow development to proceed in a timely and economical manner, prior to full extension
and development of the storm drain system, provided the requirements of public safety, health and welfare are met.

10.5 Solid Waste Service Policies

10.5.1 The City and County shall encourage the collection of solid waste within the Boundary area by private, commercial collection services.

10.5.2 The City and County Agreements with the commercial franchise service managing the solid waste landfill at the Merlin site shall include measures to successfully reduce leachate produced at the landfill site, such as uphill trenching and draining, and importation of suitable topsoil to reduce erosion and promote revegetation.

10.5.3 Within 16 months of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the City and County shall adopt a Solid Waste Management Implementation Plan, including relevant sections of the Solid Waste Management Plan (1975), which plan shall include:

(a) an ongoing assessment of landfill disposal techniques, with provisions for correction of those techniques as required.

(b) a yearly estimate of landfill capacity and the rates of solid waste generation, including all areas within the landfill site service district as well as the UGB area, and an estimate of when landfill site capacity will be reached.

(c) a recommendation of financing strategies for adequately maintaining and preparing the landfill site, as well as providing for alternative methods of solid waste disposal.

10.6 Police Protection Service Policies

10.6.1 Urban levels of development shall require urban levels of police protection. As the urbanizing area converts from rural to urban levels and intensities of land use over time, police protection should be increased to meet the increased service need.

10.6.2 The City and County shall explore an agreement establishing responsibility for the provision of police protection services within the Urban Growth Boundary over time. This agreement shall consider the costs and benefits of various methods of providing police protection, and shall include financing techniques to mitigate the costs of increased service.

10.7 Fire Protection Service Policies

10.7.1 Municipal water systems shall provide water at fire flow capacities.
10.7.2 Urban levels of development shall require urban levels of fire protection as stipulated by the Implementing Ordinances. The minimum urban level of fire protection for fully developed residential, commercial and industrial areas shall be that qualifying for the insurance underwriters relative classification rating of 5. Provision of fire protection should be phased over time as urban level development proceed without a minimum of a Class 8 rating, nor shall commercial industrial development proceed without a minimum of a Class 9 rating.

10.7.3 The City and County shall explore an agreement establishing responsibility for the provisions of fire protection services within the Urban Growth Boundary area over time. This agreement shall consider the costs and benefits of various methods of providing fire protection, and shall include financing techniques to mitigate the costs of increased service.

10.8 Health Services

10.8.1 Health services should be provided by the private sector. The City and County shall encourage the provision of health services in appropriate locations throughout the Boundary area.

10.9 School Service Policies

10.9.1 The City and County shall maintain an open, ongoing dialogue with the School Districts in a manner that will facilitate the planning efforts of all agencies.

10.9.2 The City and County shall notify the respective School Districts of all residential land use actions within that district in a timely and complete manner, and make development data available to the districts on a regular basis.

10.9.3 The School Districts shall be notified in a timely manner regarding revisions and updates to the Comprehensive Plan that may affect the Districts, and shall be encourage to participate in the revision process.
12. ENERGY CONSERVATION

. **Goal**

To promote the wise and efficient use of all forms of energy.

. **Policies**

12.1 The City and County shall make energy conservation and waste reduction a regular practice in purchasing, operating and maintaining its buildings, vehicles, equipment and facilities such as sewer, water, street, lights, as well as take advantage of renewable energy resource opportunities.

12.2 The City and County shall encourage our residents and businesses to take action to conserve energy and use renewable energy resources. Our efforts shall be coordinated with those of utilities, state and federal agencies, and other organizations.

12.3 Within 12 months the City and County shall revise all land development standards to provide and protect solar access, remove obstacles to energy efficient design, and require energy efficient development when ownership is to be transferred to the City or County upon completion such as water, sewer, and streets.

12.4 The City and County shall encourage efforts within the County for the use of solar, geothermal, wind, hydro, biomass resources and alcohol fuel.

12.5 Within 12 months the City and County shall encourage energy-efficient construction by:

(a) establishing procedures and standards in the Development Code that benefit and protect solar access for the active and passive use of solar energy in new development.

(b) providing incentives in the Development Code for residential developments which implement energy conservation and direct application renewable resource design criteria such as solar orientation, passive space heating, vegetative shading for cooling, and solar access covenants, etc.

(c) providing incentives in the Development Code for residential developments that can demonstrate energy efficient construction which exceed building code requirements.

(d) encouraging power companies and lending institutions to provide incentives for energy efficient construction and the utilization of alternate energy resources and systems.
(e) encouraging programs of other agencies providing for retrofit energy systems and energy conservation techniques.

12.6 The City and County shall pursue a more energy-efficient urban form by:

(a) locating higher densities in close proximity to major streets, potential public transit locations, the central business district, shopping and employment centers, schools and parks.

(b) establishing the transportation network in Developing areas around the "superblock concept", reducing travel time to major traffic ways, providing open space, recreation areas and commercial activity in close proximity to residences, and providing an internal greenway pedestrian and bikeway system increasing non-vehicular transportation.

(c) encouraging infill development within Established and Developing areas of the Urban Growth Boundary.
ELEMENT 13. LAND USE

13.1. Purpose and Intent
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13.3. Areas of Mutual Concern
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13. LAND USE

. Goal

To provide a vision of the future through maps and policies that shall guide and inform the land use decisions of the present, in such a manner that:

(a) identifies rural lands and separates these lands from urbanizable lands,

(b) provides for an orderly economic and efficient transition from rural to urban land use,

(c) does not exceed the carrying capacity of the area's air, land and water resource,

(d) is responsive to the wishes of the citizens and property owners of the planning area, and

(e) provides adequate amounts of industrial, commercial and residential lands to meet growth needs over the planning period.

. Policies

13.1 Purpose and Intent

13.1.1 Data Base Purpose

The Data Base of the Comprehensive Plan depicts the geologic, geographic, physical, historical, economic and social patterns and relationships of the Grants Pass area. The goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan represent the conscious choices of the Grants Pass community for the future growth and evolution of the area, based upon these patterns and relationships.

13.1.2 Findings, Goals and Policies Purpose:

The adopted Comprehensive Plan is the official statement of the City of Grants Pass which sets forth its policies concerning the future development of the community.

(a) The "Goals" are broad statements of philosophy that describe the desires of the people of the community for the future of the community. The Goals are the ends towards which land use activity is to be directed, and to which policies give operating principles, plans and courses of action.

(b) The "Policies" are plans or definite course of action selected from among all alternatives to guide and determine present and future decisions. Policies are intended to be mandatory and directional, to carry out the Goals, and to serve
as the basis for specific implementation measure, including land use ordinances, resolutions, and permits.

(c) "Findings" tie the goals and policies to the Data Base in a clear, demonstrative and rational manner.

(d) The Comprehensive Plan is the controlling land use instrument for the City; all development regulations and related actions by the City shall conform to the Comprehensive Plan.

13.1.3 **Land Use Map Purpose:**

The Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map is a key tool of the Comprehensive Plan, designating the most appropriate use for all real property within the Urban Growth Boundary. The designated land uses are based upon the goals, policies, findings and database of the Comprehensive Plan.

13.2 **Land Use Map**

13.2.1 **Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map:**

The City and County shall adopt a Land use Map as part of this Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map shall:

(a) designate the highest and best land use for all portions of the Urban Growth Boundary area, on a parcel-by-parcel basis.

(b) guide and direct changes to the Zoning Map.

(c) meet the demonstrated need during the planning period for residential, commercial, industrial, and public lands as determined by the Comprehensive Plan.

13.2.2 **Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations:**

The Land Use Map shall include the following land uses, whose designation are summarized below. Densities may be increased above those specified through incentives and measures provided in the Development Code.

- **Low Density Residential:** maximum densities of up to 6.22 dwelling units per acre. (Allows Zoning Map Designations of R-1-12, R-1-10, R-1-8)

- **Moderate Density Residential:** maximum densities of up to 12.44 dwelling units per acre. (Allows Zoning Designations of R-1-6, R-2)
- **Moderate-High Density Residential**: maximum densities of up to 20 dwelling units per acre. Location limited to immediate proximity of Downtown, or the shopping centers in East Grants Pass and the Redwood Interchange, and other areas adjacent to nodes of existing or planned supporting commercial use; employment centers, community and recreation facilities, arterial and collector streets, and/or transit centers to support higher densities while reducing travel demand and maximizing opportunities for alternate modes of transportation. (Allows Zoning Map Designation of R-3 (R-3-1) and R-3-2).

- **High Density Residential**: maximum densities of up to 50 dwelling units per acre. Location limited to immediate proximity of Downtown, shopping centers in East Grants Pass and the Redwood Interchange, and other areas adjacent to nodes of existing or planned supporting commercial use; employment centers, community and recreation facilities, arterial and collector streets, and/or transit centers to support higher densities while reducing travel demand and maximizing opportunities for alternate modes of transportation. (Allows Zoning Map Designation of R-4 (R-4-1), R-4-2, and R-5).

Unless a separate professional office designation is created, areas which are suitable for professional uses, but not for higher residential densities, may also be considered for this designation. However, at the time of designation, the review body should consider some restrictions of higher density residential development until adequate adjacent supporting uses and facilities are planned or provided. Options for establishing restrictions may include, but are not limited to, the use of a Development Agreement restricting use or intensity of use.

- **Office Residential**: provides for office uses where more intensive retail uses may not be suitable, but the primary purpose is to preserve lands for office uses as the primary uses, rather than residential uses as specified in the R-4 zones, where there is a need to maintain those lands for residential use or residential mixed-use. However, if office use is provided as a primary use, residential use is also permitted and encouraged as a secondary use on the same site.

- **Neighborhood Commercial**: provides for small retail and service businesses in residential areas. Limited to maximum area of 20,000 square feet of contiguous land. (Allows Zoning Map Designation of NC, Neighborhood Commercial)

- **General Commercial**: provides for all commercial and professional uses, excepting those requiring on-site manufacture or assembly. Development standards according to adjacent uses and development. (Allows Zoning Map Designation of GC (GC-1) and GC-2, General Commercial)

- **Central Business District**: mixed use District, provides the retail, professional office, and high rise residential core for the City and urbanizing area, and encourages concentrated development. (Allows Zoning Map Designation of CBD, Central Business District)
- **Riverfront Tourist Commercial**: provide for and promote special tourist commercial uses adjacent to the Rogue River where either existing or proposed bridges are located. Uses appropriate to the RTC districts would either need to be located adjacent to the river for their existence or utilize the river's scenic quality for economic development. In addition to providing economic opportunity for the City of Grants Pass, these ordinances will preserve the scenic quality wetland habitat and promote river related recreation. (Allows RTC-I, RTC-II, and RTC-III)

- **Business Park**: mixed use District, provides for light industrial and commercial uses, allows retail sales as accessory use to light industrial and wholesale uses. (Allows Zoning Map Designation of BP, Business Park)

- **Industrial Park**: Industrial Park in campus-like setting, allowing only those industries meeting high performance standards. (Allowing Zoning Map Designation of IP, Industrial Park)

- **Industrial**: provides for those industrial uses with heavier impacts upon their surroundings and need for outdoor functions. Performance standards required, with graduated buffering requirements keyed to adjacent uses. This district shall not include retail commercial (other than service commercial) or other uses incompatible with heavy industry. (Allows Zoning Map Designation of I, Industrial)

**NOTE**: A more generalized designation of ‘Employment’ for Industrial Lands may be applied prior to determination of Indoor or Outdoor Industrial plan designations and zoning. This designation is not intended to allow for retail use or zones that could develop as either retail or industrial.

### 13.2.3 Plan Map/Zoning Map

The land use designation on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map shall be deemed to encompass the Zoning Districts of the Development Code according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Ordinance Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Designation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>R-1-12, R-1-10, R-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Density</td>
<td>R-1-6, R-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High Density</td>
<td>R-3 (R-3-1), R-3-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>R-4 (R-4-1), R-4-2, R-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Designation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office Residential OR
Neighborhood Commercial NC
General Commercial GC (GC-1), GC-2
Central Business District CBD
Riverfront Tourist Commercial RTC-I, RTC-II, RTC-III

Industrial Designation: Allows:

- Business Park BP
- Industrial Park IP
- Industrial I

13.2.4 Other Maps

The Development Code shall include a Zoning Map, that shall include Special Purpose District Maps and Utility Maps, which maps and their criteria and standards shall meet the following basic functions:

(a) The Zoning Map shall show currently permitted land uses on a parcel-by-parcel basis, and shall serve as a basis for determining the taxable value of any given parcel. The Zoning Map may show a less intensive land use than shown on the Land Use Map if within the same general category of land use (e.g. R-1-6 in a MR Land Use District).

(b) The Special Purpose District Maps and Standards shall determine which special development standards and review procedures, if any, apply to any given development proposal.

(c) The Utility Maps, together with the Development Standards, shall determine the existing and future location of basic services, (water, sewer, streets, storm drainage, and parks), and shall determine which special development standards, if any, apply to any given development proposal.

13.2.5 Special Purpose Districts

Special Purpose Districts shall be adopted to include at least the following. Other Special Purpose Districts may also be established.

(a) **Slope Hazard**: delineating areas of slope hazard due to combinations of steep topography and unstable soil, whose primary function is to allocate densities and development standards appropriate to the degree of hazard.

(b) **Flood Hazard**: delineating areas of flood hazard, whose primary function is to determine location and standards of development appropriate to the degree of hazard.
(c) **Historic**: delineating areas of historic value to the community, whose primary function is to encourage viable and economic use of historic areas while conserving and enhancing the area's historic resources.

(d) **Medical Overlay District**: delineating areas around former and current hospital sites to provide for nearby medical uses and development standards needed for medical facilities within the Grants Pass community. It allows siting of medical uses surrounding a core hospital. It is designed to provide the type of environment suitable for development of medical services and related activities, while reducing the conflicts between uses through appropriate designs.

(e) **Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA)**: delineating area designated by the Economic Recovery Review Council (ERRC) in accordance with applicable state law in which an applicant can request Expedited Industrial Site Plan Review procedures.

13.2.6 **Development Code and Map Criteria**

The Development Code shall set forth the criteria, standards and procedures for inclusion within and development of real property of a given Land Use District, Zone, Major Classification district, and Special Purpose District.

13.3 **Areas of Mutual Concern**

13.3.1 **Identification:**

As appropriate, the City and County shall identify any "areas and items of mutual concern" which may extend beyond the Urban Growth Boundary.

13.3.2 **Procedures for Review:**

When so designated, the City and County shall establish procedures for notification and review for those areas and items of mutual concern identified.

13.4 **Development Procedures**

13.4.1 **Procedure Types:**

The Development Code shall separate land use procedures from land use criteria and development standards. Land use procedures shall be stratified according to the degree of discretionary judgment required, and the magnitude of the impacts of the proposal on the adjacent properties and the community as a whole, as follows:

13.4.2 **Expedite Minor Review:**

The Development code shall establish procedures for the development review
process which expedite minor development proposals through administrative review, with provisions for public review upon appeal.

13.4.3 Streamline Review Process:

The Development Code procedures shall act to streamline the land development process and eliminate unnecessary delays, and shall contain standards and procedures for land-use actions that are clear, objective and non-arbitrary.

13.5 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

13.5.1 Provision for Amendments:

The Comprehensive Plan is not an inflexible document. It is intended to be responsive to changes in community condition and the attitude. In order to permit such flexibility, and at the same time maintain the integrity of the Comprehensive Plan, it is necessary to amend the Plan from time to time without frustrating its basic purpose.

(a) In order to maintain the validity of community decision-making, the Data Base must be continuously updated, and the implications for decision-making that result from changing data and changing community attitudes should be widely disseminated and discussed.

(b) Goals, Policies, and Findings will require changing over time, as the community changes. Linkage must be maintained between policy and the data base, all land use maps, and the implementing ordinances.

(c) From time to time, the Land Use Map may need to be amended, and yet still maintain the correct linkages to the goals, policies, findings and data base, as well as retaining internal consistency.

13.5.2 Minor and Major Amendments:

The City and County shall mutually revise the Comprehensive Plan from time to time, making both minor and major amendments.

(a) Data Base: Revisions to the Data Base shall be Minor Amendments and shall proceed administratively as follows:

1. Upon special update and analysis requested by the City Manager or City Council;

2. Upon receipt of area or regional data, studies and analyses by other public or semi-public agencies;
3. Upon verification of site specific or area specific studies and analyses performed by the private sector;

4. Continuously as initiated by the Director; and

5. As a part of the City Manager's Annual Development Report.

(b) Findings, Goals and Policies: Amendments to Findings, Goals and Policies shall be either minor or major amendments as follows:

1. Minor amendments, involving minor changes to findings and policies only, at one year intervals upon receipt of the City Manager's Annual Development Report for that year.

2. Major amendments, involving major changes to findings, goal and policies at five year intervals, two years after the decennial census and quintennial counts taken by the US Census Bureau, upon receipt of the City Manager's Annual Development Report for that year.

(c) Land Use Map: Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan land Use Map shall be either minor or major amendments, as follows:

1. Minor amendments, consisting of quasi-judicial review of land use for one parcel or a group of parcels, shall be considered at any time, using the City Manager's Annual Development Report as a guide to the need for and appropriateness of such minor amendments.

2. Major amendments, consisting of legislative review of overall patterns of land use within a neighborhood, subarea, or area, or within the City or Urban Growth Boundary as a whole, scheduled at five year intervals, two years following the decennial census and quintennial counts taken by the US Bureau of the Census, using new Census data as a guide to the need and appropriateness of such major amendments.

(d) Notwithstanding (b) and (c) above, minor or major amendments, may be considered at any time upon the mutual consent of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners, using the latest Annual Development Report and revisions to the data base as a guide to the need and appropriateness of such revisions.

13.5.3 Initiating Amendments.

Comprehensive Plan amendments may be initiated as follows:

(a) A petition submitted by residents or property owners within the Urban
Growth Boundary.

(b) The Planning Commission.

(c) The City Council.

(d) The Board of County Commissioners.

13.5.4 Criteria for the Amendment:

For amending the findings, goals, policies and Land Use Maps of the Comprehensive Plan, the City Council and Board of county commissioners shall base their conclusions upon, and adopt findings in consideration of, all the following criteria:

(a) consistency with other findings, goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan.

(b) A change in circumstances, validated by and supported by the data base or proposed changes to the data base, which would necessitate a change in findings, goals and policies.

(c) Applicable planning goals and guidelines of the State of Oregon.

(d) Citizen review and comment.

(e) Review and comment from affected governmental units and other agencies.

(f) A demonstration that any additional need for basic urban services (water, sewer, streets, storm drainage, parks, and fire and police protection) is adequately covered by adopted utility plans and service policies, or a proposal for the requisite changes to said utility plans and service policies as a part of the requested Comprehensive Plan amendment.

(g) Additional information as required by the review body.

(h) In lieu of item (b) above, demonstration that the Plan as originally adopted was in error.

13.5.5 Joint Review.

Amendments to the Findings, Goals, Policies, and Land Use Maps of the Comprehensive Plan shall be made either jointly by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners or after mutual review of proposed revisions and assurance of compatibility by both the Council and Board. The procedure for joint review shall be provided in Policy 13.9.
13.6 Urban Growth Boundary Amendments

13.6.1 Urban Growth Boundary Purpose and Intent:

The Urban Growth Boundary of the City and County, as adopted and amended, shall:

(a) identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land;

(b) provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural land uses to urban land uses;

(c) allow for the orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services as needed to accommodate urban development;

(d) contain future urban development within the geographical limits of the Boundary; and

(e) be considered as part of one body with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and acted upon in the manner provided for in the Comprehensive Plan.

13.6.2 Boundary Amendments:

The City and County shall mutually amend the Urban Growth Boundary from time to time, making both minor and major amendments.

(a) Minor amendments, involving only the inclusion or exclusion of lands, shall be considered annually, using the City Manager's Annual Development Report as a guide to the need for and appropriateness of such minor amendments.

(b) Major amendments, involving major changes in the data base, goals and policies, in addition to the inclusion and exclusion of lands, shall be considered at five year intervals, two years following the decennial census and quintennial counts taken by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, using new Census data as a guide to the need and appropriateness of such major amendments.

(c) Notwithstanding (a) and (b) above, either minor or major amendments may be considered at any time upon the mutual consent of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners using the latest Annual Development Report and revisions to the data base as a guide to the need and appropriateness of such amendments.

13.6.3 Criteria for Inclusion

For including real property within the Urban Growth Boundary, the City Council and
Board of County Commissioners shall base their conclusion upon and adopt findings in consideration of the following criteria, as relevant to each inclusion:

(a) The proposed inclusion meets applicable planning goals and guidelines, Statutes, and Administrative Rules of the State of Oregon.

(b) Inclusion of lands within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) shall be consistent with the review process and land priority inclusion criteria specified in state law (ORS 197.298, OAR 660-024-0060, and OAR 660-21-0060). When Urban Reserves have been adopted, lands within adopted Urban Reserves shall be the first priority for inclusion within the UGB, consistent with state law.

When lands within adopted Urban Reserves are proposed for inclusion in the UGB, the land use shall be consistent with any adopted land use plans and policies for the Urban Reserve areas, and there shall be demonstrated need to include the lands in the UGB, consistent with state law and the Comprehensive Plan.

(c) The proposed inclusion is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

(d) The applicant has demonstrated need to meet population growth requirement:

1. as defined by residential, commercial, industrial, public, and semi-public land requirements determined by the Comprehensive Plan, as best met by the proposal versus other available alternatives; or

2. as defined by a need to meet the land use requirements of a given area, sub-area or neighborhood of the Boundary, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies for that area, sub-area, or neighborhood.

(e) The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed inclusion recognized the development patterns endorsed by the Comprehensive Plan.

(f) Except for lands included within an Urban Reserve in accordance with the provisions of Section 13.7 and applicable state law, lands proposed for inclusion in the UGB shall not have farm resource zoning, whether Exclusive Farm Use (EFU), Farm Resource (FR), or equivalent, unless:

1. The lands are necessary for industrial use, and will be designated only for traded-sector industrial uses, and

2. The inclusion is consistent with the priority requirements of ORS 197.298 and OAR 660-024-0060, and
3. In addition to the above priorities in statute and administrative rule, if lands with either EFU or FR zoning designations on the Josephine County Zoning Map could meet the need, priority shall be given to lands in the FR zone over those in the EFU zone.

(g) The proposed inclusions are contiguous to the Urban Growth Boundary.

(h) The proposed inclusion can be provided with the full range of basic urban services in an economical manner.

(i) Allow for citizen review and comment.

(j) Allow for review and comment by affected governmental units and other agencies.

(k) If properties included within the Boundary, the zoning of the included property shall be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map for the Urban Growth Boundary.

13.6.4 Criteria for Exclusion (Removal):

For excluding (removing) real property from the Urban Growth Boundary previously included, the City Council and Board of County Commissioners shall base their conclusions upon, and adopt findings in consideration of, the following criteria, as relevant to each exclusion:

(a) The proposed exclusion is consistent with the Planning Goals and Guidelines of the State of Oregon.

(b) The proposed exclusion is consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

(c) The applicant has demonstrated that the need for residential, commercial, industrial, public and semi-public lands, as determined by the Comprehensive Plan, will not be significantly affected by the exclusion.

(d) The proposed exclusion is not partitioned or developed to urban levels. Urban levels are evidenced by partitioning or residential development of more than one dwelling unit per acre; by basic urban services of sanitary sewer and/or water systems available to the area; by developed industrial, commercial and institutional uses, or lands designated for those uses; and by the availability of sanitary sewer service or public water service to the area.

(e) The proposed exclusion is agricultural land capable of supporting a commercial agricultural enterprise.
(f) The proposed exclusion is contiguous to the Boundary, and will not leave islands within the Urban Growth Boundary; also, the exclusion area represents a reasonable geographical exclusion in shape, does not preclude services to other lands within the Urban Growth Boundary, and does not constitute a disruption to a neighborhood.

(g) The proposed exclusion cannot be provided with a full range of urban services in an economical manner.

(h) Allow for citizen review and comment.

(i) Allow for review and comment by affected governmental units and other agencies.

(j) If property is excluded from the Boundary, the zoning of the excluded property shall be consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, except that where sanitary sewer service and/or public water service is available to the property, the zoning of the excluded property shall be Suburban Residential. Urban level zones shall be contained within the Urban Growth Boundary.

13.6.5 Initiation of Revision:

(a) Revisions to the Urban Growth Boundary may be initiated by:

1. A petition submitted by property owners or their authorized agents.

2. The Planning Commission.

3. The City Council.

4. The Board of County Commissioners.

(b) Signed Petition shall include either:

A petition signed by all property owners requesting inclusion or exclusion, or a petition signed by property owners requesting inclusion or exclusion within a designated area shown on an assessors map, such that the signatures represent more than half the property owners of more than half the property with more than half the assessed value of the total property shown within the designated area.

13.6.6 Joint Review:

(a) Inclusions or exclusions of real property to the Urban Growth Boundary shall be made jointly by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners.
The procedure for joint review shall be as provided in Policy 13.9.

13.7 Urban Reserves

13.7.1 Urban Reserves

Urban Reserves may be adopted or amended jointly by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners in accordance with the criteria and procedures specified in Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS 195.137-195.145) and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 660 Division 21).

The review shall be a Type V procedure with a joint decision by the City Council and Josephine County Board of Commissioners as specified in Section 2.070 of the Development Code and Section 13.9 below. However, any action which requires review “In the Manner of Periodic Review” rather than as a “Post-Acknowledgment Plan Amendment” as specified in Oregon Revised Statutes and Oregon Administrative Rules shall be subject to the jurisdiction and review of the Land Conservation and Development Commission in accordance with the provisions specified in the applicable statues and administrative rules. As specified in the applicable law, these decisions are not appealable to the Land Use Board of Appeals, and the noticing shall reflect the applicable procedures and requirements rather than those specified in the Development Code that reference appeals to the Land Use Board of Appeals.

13.8 Urban Area Planning Commission

13.8.1 Urban Area Planning Commission.

A single Planning Commission, designated the "Urban Area Planning Commission", shall be appointed to serve the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary area, both inside and outside the City limits.


13.9 City/County Joint Review Procedure

13.9.1 Joint Review. Except as otherwise provided by Intergovernmental Agreement, joint review as provided in this section by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners shall be required for amendment and revision to the following items:

(a) Comprehensive Plan Data Base.

(b) Comprehensive Plan Findings, Goals and Policies.

(c) Comp Plan Land Use Map.
(d) Urban Growth Boundary.

(e) Urban Reserves.

(f) Mutually adopted Service and Utility Plans.

13.9.2 Data Base Joint Review.

(a) All administrative revisions to the Data Base shall be summarized annually, and placed in both the City Manager's and the County Planning Department's annual Development Reports, together with implication for policy making that may result from the Data Base revisions, including proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code.

(b) Revisions to the Data Base occurring during the year prior to the Annual Development Report that are significant enough to warrant reconsideration of Comprehensive Plan and Development Code policies, requirements and maps shall be forwarded to the City Manager for City Council consideration and to the Board Chairman for Board of County Commissioners consideration.

(c) The City Council and Board of County Commissioners shall review all Data Base revisions in an administrative action at a public meeting, and shall determine at the time of such review whether to initiate an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan or the Development Code as a result of the revisions to the Data Base. The procedure for amendment action so initiated shall be as provided in this Element.

(d) Governing Body Review may be joint, or may be separate. In either case, the revisions to the Data Base must be found to be consistent by both Council and Board.

13.9.3 Finding/Goal/Policy, Land Use Map, UGB, Urban Reserves, Other Joint Review.

(a) Request for Review. When amending the Comprehensive Plan Findings, Goals, Policies and Land Use Map, the Urban Growth Boundary, the Urban Reserves, or jointly adopted service or utility plans, the jurisdiction initiating action shall notify the other jurisdiction at least 35 days prior to the initial hearing on the matter before the Urban Area Planning Commission, Utility Commission or governing body, as appropriate.

(b) Reply and Comment. At least 10 days prior to the initial hearing, the noticed jurisdiction shall reply, as follows:

1. no comment.
2. comment, with request that the originating jurisdiction conclude the matter.

3. comment, with request for a joint hearing on the matter.

(c) **Notice.** Notice for the joint hearing shall be as provided in the ordinances of the initiating jurisdiction as follows:

1. For Council initiated items, as provided in the Development code, Section 2.060, Type IV Procedure.

2. For Board initiated items, as provided in the appropriate implementing ordinance.

(d) **Hearing Procedure.** Hearing procedure shall be as provided in the ordinances of the initiating jurisdiction as follows:

1. for Council initiated items, as provided in the Development Code, Section 9, Legislative Hearing Guidelines.

2. for Board initiated items, as provided in the Land Use Hearing Rules.

(e) **Governing Body Review.** Following recommendation by the Urban Area Planning Commission, and joint workshops and hearings as appropriate by the governing bodies, the Council and Board shall take joint action on the amendment, as follows:

1. Concur in the amendment action, which for Data Base inclusions, Land Use Map, Urban Growth Boundary, Urban Reserves, or Service and Utility Plan Maps shall mean identical material adopted by both jurisdictions, and for Data Base Supplemental Material, Findings, Goals, and Policies, and Service and Utility Plan Policies, shall mean consistent material adopted by both jurisdictions. Upon concurrence, the amendment shall go forward.

2. Do not concur and call for a rehearing within 45 days. Such rehearing shall be noticed and conducted as provided in Sections 13.9.3(c) and 13.9.3(d) above.

3. Do not concur, and call for a mediated resolution of the matter within 45 days. A mediator acceptable to both parties shall be named within 10 days, and the costs of mediation, if any, shall be shared equally by the Council and Board. The Urban Area Planning Commission may serve as mediator. The mediated proposal shall be presented jointly to Board and Council in a noticed public meeting as provided in
Sections 13.9.3(c) and 13.9.3(d) above.

4. Should the governing bodies fail to concur, as defined in Section 13.9.3(e) (1), at the conclusion of the rehearing or upon presentation of the mediated proposal, the Amendment shall not go forward.
**Type I Procedure**

Objective decisions.

Little, if any, discretion required.

Because of minimal or no effect on others, public participation is provided simply by noticing nearby property owners and reviewing their submitted written testimony.

No public hearing held.

Director of Community Development, or his designee, takes action.

Appeal by Type III procedure.

**Type II Procedure**

Objective decisions.

Moderate discretion required.

Application of the standards may require knowing of some effect upon others.

Nearby property owners invited to respond to a tentative decision.

Director of Community Development holds meeting, takes action.

Lack of agreement escalates process to Type III procedure.

**Type III Procedure**

Complex or subjective decisions.

Discretion required. Delegated quasi-judicial actions required.

Possible significant effect on some persons or broad effect on a number of persons.

In addition to applicant, others affected are invited to hearing to present initial information.

Hearings Officer or Planning Commission holds public hearing, takes action.

Appeal by Type IV procedure.

**Type IV Procedure**

Complex or subjective decisions.

Great deal of discretion required. Quasi-judicial or legislative actions required.

Possible significant effect on some persons or broad effect on a number of persons.

In addition to applicant, others affected are invited to hearing to present initial information.

Planning Commission holds public hearing and makes recommendation. City Council or Board of County Commissioners, or both acting jointly, holds public hearing, takes action.

Appeal to LCDC or LUBA.