1. **Roll Call:** The chairman is not here tonight. He had to call out an emergency, he's sick, so I'm going to do my best to get through this. It is 6:00 so I'll open the meeting with roll call. My name is Mark Collier. I'll be acting chair. I'm the vice chair. I'm here. Commissioner Aviles?

Present.

Commissioner Nelson is away on vacation. Commissioner Arthur?

Here.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Here.

Commissioner Scherf?

Here.

So, we have a quorum.

2. **Introductions:** Any introductions necessary? No.

3. **Public Comment:** As a public comment, it looks like everybody in the audience is a player for tonight, so I don't need to read that. Okay? It's a guess.

4. **Approval of Minutes:** Approval of the minutes for February 9th. Do I have a motion?

I move to approve the minutes from February 9th.

[inaudible 00:01:11].

Commissioner Scherf?

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

And Commissioner Collier. I approve as well.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss moved, and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the minutes from the February 9, 2022, meeting. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Chair Heesacker and Commissioner Nelson. The motion passed.

5. **Informational items**: I have none here. Okay.

6. **Findings and Fact**: So, I guess we're going to go and we're going to move item C because it's a continuation to the top of the agenda and then we'll follow with A and B.

405-00127-21~ Comprehensive Plan Amendment: Amendments to the Housing Element and Policies, Comprehensive Plan Text amendment ~ Staff Report ~ Continued: So, for item C, 405-00127-21, Comprehensive Plan Amendment. We'll have Ms. Amber.

Yes. Hello everybody. Good evening. So this one, fairly straightforward. We had some requests last meeting for some changes to the comprehensive plan text amendments that were presented. Item one, we had requested ... Let's see. Motion to change the policy and objectives on 9.2, which you can find in your packet. [inaudible 00:02:27] 93. Thank you very much. Primarily on page 93. Actually, I'm seeing it on page 94 in my packet. Might be 93 or 94.

Well, it starts on 93.

Yeah, it starts on 93. So we had the request to add in the yearly analysis, so we added in to complete an annual evaluation of progress on the housing needs.
analysis goals and growth targets. Item two was to have staff reword bullet point 9.6, which is now 9.7. We removed... We added the word evaluate and address and removed lower or remove. Now, this was the one that had been discussed to potentially move to its own section for goals, but after speaking with the consultant, just really wasn't feasible to make its own section for goals when the sections are housing policies, goals, and objectives. So that's why we ended up rewording it to be more enforceable with the evaluate and address.

Item three was to reword policy 9.18, which is now 9.19. We removed the words partner with and replaced it with at the word support and removed the example in that policy there. And item four was discussing the word family in the glossary of the housing needs analysis and its uses in other descriptions as well. So we have added into that glossary, which is on the very last page of your packet, a header for that going over that the term family in this glossary is used exclusively to define data points referenced throughout this report, and it does not apply to local policy making apart from the data analyzed and included in this report. And that is the only place that the glossary exists currently. Do we have any discussion on those changes that were made?

I'm not at all satisfied with how that plays out here because I sent to you the terminology that the census actually uses, and as nearly as I could tell, and I wasn't able to get verification back from the RVCOG statistics person today, family is only used in their analysis categories about groups of people. When they get down to the buildings, they call them one unit structures, two or more unit structures, mobile homes, and all other types of units. They're not using family and multi-family and single-family. So it doesn't apply. It isn't required by the census as nearly as I can tell to use that terminology. It's confusing.

So, I believe you're correct with the building types and the census. I did an initial look through after you sent me that email. It looked like I couldn't really find anywhere where they used family for building types.

Right.

Seems like that did get pulled from just the general terminology that gets used with programs like HUD, tax credit and whatnot. They still use those multi-family terminologies. But if you wanted to propose a change.

I think it would be better to go with what the census uses. Dwelling units or the structural terms. And I'm not sure that HUD and all of them, if they still use those, will be doing that very long.

So, my suggestion would be to have the commission make a recommendation, if the rest of you agree and you get to a majority on that. I think what would be required is we probably have that term family... I don't know if we were able to calculate, but probably over 100 times in the comprehensive plan. So what we would do is go through... We would need a suggestion from the commission as to what you would like in place of that term and then we would go into the comprehensive plan and do a
replace on that term throughout the plan. The development code, we believe, is already corrected.

We already did that.

So, we're just talking about the comprehensive plan now and the housing needs analysis that's in front of you.

Just to be clear, for the housing needs analysis, we wouldn't be able to change the income family definitions or the family grouping definitions, just the unit definition.

I'm not quarreling with the family definition. I'm quarreling with applying it calling a house some kind of family [crosstalk 00:08:01].

Right. So we're talking about the unit related family in the housing needs analysis, and then for the rest of the comp plan, taking family out.

Right. Right. We just wanted you to be aware of what change would need to happen by doing that.

Well, I know that because we did that with the development code. That was huge. Yeah.

So, Mr. Chair, my suggestion would just be to take a vote on that, and if everybody agrees, then staff will go back and make those changes and you would want to continue again so that you could see exactly all those edits, I think would probably be the best approach.

So, do we need to stop it right now or do we continue the discussion with anything else before we make this motion? Or does that motion stand alone? If the motion stands alone, then Loree, can you put it in words?

The other thing was that I felt the housing unit or dwelling unit definition was pretty clumsy and I wondered where that came from. It's almost too specific to fit all the circumstances that they call non-family housing in the census.

Which definition was it?

The one that... Okay. Housing unit or dwelling unit. A house, apartment or other group of rooms or a single room is regarded as a housing unit when it's occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. That is when occupants do not live and eat with any other person in the structure and there is direct access from the outside or common hall. That last might work, but I'm pretty sure that the part about don't live and eat with any other person because there are a lot of housing and combinations in cooperative housing and so on where there may be some couples and singles occupying the same building. And I'm pretty sure a couple of them live together and eat together and it's just an odd specification.
So, I think what they're trying to do is define it so that if you have a duplex, you might get together and have a meal with those people, but you're not buying groceries together. They're trying to define that there is one household per unit. And so when you get into multiple households per unit, they start looking at is this group quarters, and so that's where they're trying to differentiate that.

There's a whole range out there that's not group quarters, nor is it duplex kind of thing. I suppose you can leave it as it is at the moment, but I think you might run into problems. I've never seen that particular definition.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

I was just going to say FCS, the group that was contracted to assist with this analysis, they... I was just curious. They assisted with at least 18 others within the state of Oregon. I get accurate report that tells who's working on what, and that did not seem to be an issue with those particular areas. I realized we're unique, but I think it might be just common terminology based on the information given, and it's consistent, so if we do make these changes, you're allowed.

What is it that's the common terminology?

Most all of the language coming from where they've assisted. So it's like family, any number of things. For housing and urban development, for example, they utilize family. I mean, there's just a whole lot of ways that term is used. I'm just throwing that out there for food for thought.

Commissioner Scherf.

I just need clarification because I'm kind of confused now. So the page in here that says glossary is an excerpt out of the Grants Pass Housing Needs Analysis done by FCS Group. Is that correct?

Correct. And that is only being added as ancillary document to the comprehensive plan.

I just don't understand why we're arguing about their report if it's done by them. If these definitions... If this glossary is within our comprehensive plan, I think then we'd have the latitude to change it, but if this glossary comes out of their report, we don't have the latitude to change it, so it's kind of a waste of time to argue it. That's my personal opinion.

I would tend to agree with that point. Do we need to go back to the first one, the definition of family? Do you want to resolve that first before we go into the second part of the glossary definition?

I don't think there's any quarrel about the definition of family.

Well, we do have to make a motion so that... She has a lot of work to do.
So it sounds like we're wanting to possibly change the terminology used for family without, throughout the comprehensive plan to unit. Was that what we thought maybe?

So that the buildings are not described with the word family.

Right. So like multi-unit building or single unit.

The way they are in the development code.

So that's one item, stands alone, and you can do that. Staff can do that. There's no problem. Okay. So that's solved. So now we're going back to the other one and then Commissioner Scherf does have the question, where did this glossary document come from? Did it come from outside of the comprehensive plan or the housing analysis? Is that correct? It did?

The glossary comes from the housing needs analysis and FCS Group did work on that. Yes.

Did we have the discretion to change that?

We do have contact with them. That's how we were able to get this current note that we had added into it. So yes, we can reach out and make some slight changes, but only to the extent that it wouldn't harm being able to consume the data. And so if the data was collected under certain terminology, we do need to keep it that way, which is why we opted for the disclaimer in this instance.

Are you satisfied with the disclaimer? Sounds like you would be because you wrote it.

I am, yes.

Okay.

So just to be clear, I think what we're talking about is not changing the housing needs analysis itself, but the terms that are in the comprehensive plan, which are the policies that you see prior to that. That comprehensive plan is the city of Grants Pass. We take full ownership over that. So that's... And there is many terms. The term family is used throughout the comprehensive plan, like I said, probably well over 100 times to refer to structures, single-family housing, multi-family housing. So that, I think, is what's on the table. If the rest of the commission agrees, we can go through the comprehensive plan and change that, but we would keep that red note that's at the top of page 98 as part of the housing needs analysis.

Needs analysis.

Okay. Commissioner Scherf.

So just for clarification again, the comprehensive plan utilizes the same glossary terminology as the development code. Correct or incorrect?

Incorrect. Yeah.
Okay. So then you have an issue because the comprehensive plan uses different words for different terminology, but you are satisfied with the development code glossary terms and tech.

Yes.

Okay. And again, clarification, I was kind of spinning in circles here going, I don't know where we're going with this. I do understand what you're saying. So I think now we're back to the point of you are not comfortable with the word family within the comprehensive plan as it's used currently?

I don't know that I've seen it as its used currently.

Well, we can give you two examples.

Yeah.

So if you turn to page 95.

Yeah. I've got them marked here.

Yeah. And on page 95, the policy number 9, permit a variety of housing types across all residential zones including single-family, middle housing, manufactured, and multi-family. That's just one example. And then if you go to number 11, reduced minimum lot sizes, et cetera, et cetera, efficiency of single-family. Those are examples. And those are throughout the whole comprehensive plan. What you're looking at here is just the housing policies from the comprehensive plan, but the comp plan is 400 pages long.

Yeah.

So that... Yeah.

So let me get this straight. So within the development code, you do no use single-family?

That is correct.

What do you use?

The term for the multi-family is multi-dwelling complex.

Wow.

And the term for the single, I think, is just... Is it single detached? [crosstalk 00:18:26]. I think it's just single detached or it might be single detached unit in some places.

I don't have any other words. I'm baffled.

So does this mean we could get behind commissioner Arthur?
I would like to make a motion to... I would like to make a motion that we accept the changes that have been presented for section 9.6, 9.7, 9.19 only. That's just the terminologies that have been presented for us excluding the secondary conversation here.

So then your items one, two, and three. Is that what it is?

Correct.

That would help us get started. Do we have a second?

I second. Tokarz-Krauss seconds.

Discussion? No discussion. We'll take a roll call. Commissioner Aviles?

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Callier votes aye, so that's four. Okay. So that's done. Commissioner Scherf.

I would make a motion that we continue the discussion of the terminology used for the definition of family to a date certain next time because I think it needs more research and I think if you're posing a problem with that definition, I think you need to come back with something that needs to be changed, that you'll be comfortable with changing.

Do we have ready access to the legislation that was passed last year forbidding using family as a consideration in the land use things?

We can get that.

I couldn't find a copy. I don't know.

Motion. Do you want to continue it? [crosstalk 00:20:59].

Or define it. [crosstalk 00:21:03].

Second.
Well, are we on any kind of time? This is legislative. Is there any...

The housing needs analysis has to be adopted by December 31st.

Okay. Yeah.

So I've made a motion to continue this conversation further about the terminology, quote quote, the word family. Looking for a second.

Tokarz-Krauss seconds.

Any discussion? None. Take a roll call. I'll just go around the room back and forth this way this time. Commissioner Collier. I'll say aye. Commissioner Arthur.

Aye.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Aye.

Commissioner Scherf.

Aye.

Commissioner Aviles.

Aye.

So just for clarification, what staff will do prior to your next meeting is bring you the legislation that talks about family that was passed the last legislative session. We can get that and then give you a sample, if you will, of what the terms are that are in the development code and maybe what are used in a couple of other city codes, and then you'll take the discussion from there. Does that work?

No. Can you run a... Is the comprehensive plan one document that you could do a find and it'll say there's 97 of them or...

It sounds like this is almost housekeeping if it's already in the development code. Is it almost housekeeping?

It sounds like that. We're just making it cohesive with the terminology already used in other codes.

Okay.

Okay. So we'll close that item, correct? And move over to the public hearing item A, 103-00144-22/301001. The SCR properties on Southeast North... Southeast N Street. Page 45.
Yeah. This is a quasi-judicial statement that there for you, Chair.

So at this time, I open the public hearing and consider the application filed by SCR Properties with the major variance. Yeah, I know. This type two hearing. Engineer is Bob Hart Consulting, and the applicant is Daniel Charbonneau. Begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation of the applicant's statements by persons in favor for the application, statements by persons in opposition to the application, and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicant and the staff. After that has occurred, public comment portion will be closed and the matter will be discussed and acted on by the commission.

Yeah. There should be a...

Okay. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the commission to hear the matter? Seeing none. Abstentions, conflict of interest, any commissioners wish to abstain from participating in the hearing or declare potential conflict of interest? Seeing none. Prior to ex parte, are there any commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contact, biases, or other ex parte information they received prior to the meeting regarding the application? Seeing none.

Thank you. My name is Donna Rupp. I'm an Associate Planner in the Community Development Department. This is for the SCR Properties tentative partition plan with the major variants. The location of this property is on Southeast N Street. It's about 300 feet or so west of where Agnes crosses the railroad tracks and then curves to the west and becomes Southeast N Street. It is zoned R32 within city limits. The applicants have already applied for a private street name. That's what you see here on this slide. So the background on this. This goes back a couple of years, actually. Different projects. This application is for a two lot partition with a major variance project. The project began in 2020, where they received approval to build one fourplex on the parcel with a second one to be built in the future, and now they have applied for a two lot partition to allow each fourplex to be located on individual lots.

The application includes the construction of a new private street to meet access and frontage requirements outlined in Article 27 of the Grants Pass Development Code, and that's where we get into needing the variance. This is in your packet [inaudible 00:27:07]. This one, I did not write down the page number for you. Might be easier to see on the screen anyhow because it's much larger. It's in your packet on page 71. This diagram. Went out there today and took a few photos to give you an idea of the layout. Turn on the little pointer here. So right here is the fourplex that's nearly completed. You can see it here behind the fence. The original plan in 2020 was then to build another fourplex on the one parcel. The application is requesting that this one parcel be split into two along this line. And in order to meet frontage requirements, to put in a private street that will provide access back to parcel two.

This is the photo taken right on the sidewalk here. I guess I didn't get the arrow quite in the right place, but right on the sidewalk. And then this is taken of the fourplex from approximately at this angle, just to give you a lay of the land, so to speak. Initially in the application, if you've had time to review your packet, the applicant requested two variances with the... There was a surveying error based on not calculating for a right of way, and it reduced the front yard setback from 20 feet to 15 for the newly built fourplex. But with this application, Southeast N Street now becomes the exterior side yard rather than the front yard, so with a private street here, this fourplex now needs 20 feet from here, which it has, and only needs 10 feet to Southeast N Street. So that
variance one, that request actually becomes moot because Southeast N Street is now the exterior side yard. It only needs 10 feet. It has 15. Okay?

Variance two is really at the heart of the matter. Per section 27.123, subsection 14, when a new private street abuts an existing residential development, the new street must be located five feet away from the property line and a sidewalk may be placed in that buffer. The intent of that is so that no one has a street right in their backyard, right? That's the intent of that section. You can see here is the existing develop. There's a big lot back here, Tax Lot 501, that has a house on it, but the house again is way back here. So this road here is what is considered the existing development, and on that basis, the applicant has requested that five feet be reduced down to two feet. This is a better close up of the variance two details. In that two feet, they're going to include drainage. Here's the survey marker here. At the angle, it's kind of hard to tell, but this tree is actually on the neighbor's property. So the property line goes where right down next to here.

And as you'll see in your packet on pages 47 to 48, the staff find that criteria is satisfied as outlined in the packet. And on this one, we recommend that UAPC approve the request for a major variance, for an adjustment to the setback of a new private street from five feet to two feet. The partition request, we have all the criteria that is shown within your packet, and Article 12 for residential lots require 5,000 square feet, however, 2178 square feet per dwelling unit. So when you do the math on that, you come out to each parcel needing at least 8,712 square feet to build a fourplex on it, and both parcels surpass that minimum. They meet all the other lot requirements for a partition for the development code. We did have to look at the landscaping and the tree chart as a listed in criterion five, and the landscaping for the existing, not quite finished fourplex at the front, was submitted with the intent that the rest of this would be landscaped.

It's a little difficult to read this, but they're proposing eight Norwegian Maples in 15 gallon size although there's only five drawn on here. But eight is what's approved, and that will provide plenty of canopy coverage on this lot as well as the new submittal in page 70 of your packet, which you should be able to read all the little notes on that. I checked it. It's pretty legible in your packet, where the requirement is 15 percent required coverage and doing the math on the number of trees, their mature canopy size, the area of the circles compared to the square footage of the lot. We get about a 27 percent coverage. So that totally meets. The approval is based on the landscaping that was approved in 201341-20 and that major site plan review, that being installed as well as was proposed for parcel two. So all of their criteria for the partition request are met with conditions listed in the staff report within your packet on pages 49 to 51.

And again, staff recommends that UAPC approve the request for a two lot partition with the conditions listed. So a call to action on this would be to approve the request for the major variance as submitted or as modified or deny the request based on specific criteria and continue the item to a date in time certain with the deadline being May 14th. And as far as the two lot petition approve is submitted, approve is submitted with conditions listed in the staff report as modified, deny or continue again the same deadline date of May 14th.

Questions for staff.

I'm a little confused. Is the variance required to get the partition or do you get the partition first and then the variance for...
They have to be done at the same time.

Well, you have to...

Because the street design, to create parcel two, you have to have frontage on a street. You couldn't just divide it off and just have a driveway. So the private street is required.

Still have to make one motion before the other.

And the applicants are here if you have questions for them as well.

Commissioner Scherf.

So question for staff. So the adjacent on the plan here, the adjacent residence to the west is... On the plan it's labeled as a gravel drive. Is that a flag lot or is that an access easement to a rear parcel?

That's a flag lot. That's part of their property.

So that's why we're at this point because I was just looking at, making sure that if it was an access easement or it was a flag lot. So that's why you're at that. Okay. That was the only question I had.

Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

So the motion would be to simultaneously approve? Or did... That way so that it...

Oh no. You... First, you have to have applicant testimony.

Right.

But then you would...

Right.

You would definitely need two different motions. The variance needs to be done first.

Okay. I'm just clarifying really because that's what I think Commissioner Arthur was trying to get to. Okay. Thank you.

Okay.

More questions for staff? No. Presentation applicant?

Right here.
For the record, my name is Bob Hart, Land Use Consultant. Land use consultants serving Southern Oregon. I was called in to help with this project, so I was part of the larger project that's located a little bit further to the west in Sequoia Village. So this is a same developer that did that is doing this. We could not do it as a PUD because there was not sufficient area to have common area in additional amenities. This project presented somewhat of a complication, and I think it's easiest to follow when you take this exhibit in your packet. We have the subject property and a driveway that is in a flag lot directly to the west. If we did exactly what the code says, we would have to place the sidewalk on the west hand side and then the driving surface on the easterly side toward the structures, which would make the sidewalk in between two driving surfaces, the driveway on the adjacent parcel and the private street on the subject parcel.

We didn't think that would be a safe situation of having driving surface traffic on both sides of this isolated sidewalk, so we looked at what could we try and do, and the variance we felt is the best option here that would create a safer situation, still preserve the 20 foot setback between the street and the structures, and meet all the other requirements of the code. As you see in your packet, there's also a little deviation at the front corner where it comes right off of N Street. To explain that little wiggle there, there is a major utility pole there using high intensity voltage, so we can't move that in an easy manner. So we bypassed, went around that, and then we moved over within two feet of the property lines, so we still had area for our drainage to get everything out to N Street. So we felt that this was the best solution to a difficult situation. We split it because as we see, financing now is more difficult.

So we wanted to be able to split it in and split the project, that we don't have to income the whole thing, and we can do it as two separate structures. We felt this is the best situation to try and bring the housing as quick as we could to market. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Commissioner Aviles.

Thank you. So just looking at the map that's on page 69 of the packet, it shows parcel one and it shows the proposed private street.

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

And this, it may not be material, but maybe even just my curiosity, does the proposed private street not extend a parcel two because that's not currently in development or would that happen later?

The private street for technical purposes ends at the operation or parcel two where it begins. From then, it's a driveway to the parking spaces. As soon as we get this approved, then we will come in with our request for the building permit to start the second fourplex.

Okay. Thank you.

So it just changes from private street to driveway. We had to go across the front lot parcel one to get to parcel two, and that's the termination of the private street.
Got it. Thank you.

Good question. Is there any more?

Thank you very much.

When it's a statement by persons in opposition to the application. Doesn't look like anyone. Opportunity for additional comments by the applicant or staff. Seeing none. Okay. I guess we close the public comment portion of this and ready to proceed to a discussion. Commissioner Scherf.

My question, if I don't see any discussion, I'd like to move on to a motion. Do we have to motion these separately? Okay. I would like to make a motion to approve the variances as... or the variance. We're down to one variance, correct? The variance as listed within the staff report.

Tokarz-Krauss seconds.


Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

Commissioner Aviles.

Yes.

Motion passes. Can I have another motion? Commissioner Scherf.

I'd like to make a motion to approve the partition as labeled and described within the staff report.

Tokarz-Krauss seconds.


Yes.

Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.
Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.


Get her done. Bye, Daniel.

I guess we're ready to go. [crosstalk 00:44:21]. Yeah. Oh, at this time, open to public hearing to consider a type four planning commission recommendation city council decision. Staff assigned is Mr. Maki. We'll begin the hearing with a staff report followed by public comment. The matter will be discussed and acted upon by the commission. Anyone present wishes to challenge the authority of the commission in the matter? Seeing none. Any commissioners wish to abstain from participating in the hearing or declare conflict of any interest? Seeing none. Explanation criteria of the hearing, the recommendation of the commission to the council will be based on specific criteria. All testimony evidence must be directed toward direct criteria. Criteria will apply in this case and is noted in staff report. Waiver, raise it or lose it. It's important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal the city council. Doesn't look like there's anyone even here, so I guess we're ready to go.

Yes. Thank you. Good evening, commissioners. The topic we're going to be discussing tonight is a minimum residential density development code amendment, specifically section 12.145 of the Grants Pass Development Code. And for the record, the project number we're going to be discussing is 4050012822. So just a little bit of background. This is a discussion that has been taking place over several years. Starting in spring of 2019, the housing advisory committee, also known as AJC, discussed minimum density zoning as a potential tool for the city to add and to increase the supply of units. And then in fall of 2019, the housing advisory committee agreed to add action 2.4 to their housing action plan, which was to develop minimum density zones in parallel with density transfers added to draft HAC Work Plan as a recommended action.

At the beginning of 2020, the housing advisory committee presented the housing action plan to city council and city council acknowledged the HAC work plan. And then moving to October of 2020, the HAC included minimum density, adopting a minimum density standard in its list of top 10 priorities for 2021, and the housing advisory committee, excuse me, did pass a motion to recommend to city council that they adopt a minimum density standard in the development code, which would be 60 percent of max density in the R31 and R41 zones. And then in May of 2021, city council reviewed the HAC motion during a workshop session, and during that workshop session, the council requested additional research to consider minimum densities above 60 percent to develop some language around exceptions to meeting minimum density and to provide examples of built projects that achieve 60 percent of minimum density or above.

So council, our staff followed up with some of that research, and then in August 30th of 2021, city... During a city council workshop, council discussed the requested research and council gave direction to proceed with a 60 percent minimum density code amendment, requested...
review of draft ordinance prior to planning commission public hearing. So just some general information around the purpose and goals of a minimum density ordinance. A minimum density standard helps to accomplish the housing goals of the Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan, including policy 9.4, which is variety of housing types, and 9.8, need for rental units and multi-family. And just as a little bit of a coincidence, although it hasn't been formally adopted, the earlier discussion tonight, the revised comprehensive plan does include a new bullet point, which is to establish minimum densities in medium and high density zones. So what we're discussing tonight is in line with that comprehensive code amendment.

It ensures in areas with high levels of public service and infrastructure that service capacity is used to its greatest extent, achieve more efficient use of available residential lands and meet intended housing production goals, and helps to increase the diversity of housing types available within the city. Here's a couple bullet points from the 2021 housing needs analysis just to illustrate the fact that the proposed code amendment is in line with this document as well. But the population of Grants Pass is forecasted to grow at just slightly over one percent per year over the next two decades, adding the need for... Or adding 9,401 new residents. Population growth will require the addition of just over 4,000 new traditional dwelling units over the next 20 years plus 114 group quarter dwellings. About 60 percent of the future housing need will consist of single-family detached housing. 18 percent will be a mix of town homes and plexes. 13 percent will be apartments. Six percent will be manufactured housing and three percent in group quarters.

So just drilling down a little bit now into the development code, Article 12, which is the article we're looking at, does give some purpose statements to describe the intent of the zoning districts, and tonight we're looking at the R3 and R4 districts. So as you can see on the slide here, the purpose of the R3 districts is to encourage, accommodate, maintain, and protect a suitable environment for residential living at moderate high densities. Maximum densities in these zones are typically representative of two story housing such as attached or multi-family. And similar statement for the R4 zoning districts. The purpose of the R4 districts is to encourage, accommodate, maintain, protect a suitable environment for residential living at higher densities and for professional uses that typically support residential areas such as professional offices, et cetera. Maximum densities in these districts are typically representative of three story housing such as attached or multi-family.

So currently the development code does include a section related to minimum residential density standards, describes the intent of the section. Part of the issue is that the schedule, Schedule 12-4B that defines what the minimum density is for a specific zone, is essentially zero. There is no minimum density that needs to be met. So as an example, single-family home can be built on any lot in any zone. You will notice this M designation. We'll talk about that a little bit later in the presentation, but there are no M designated zoned lots within the city, so it doesn't apply to any lot within the city. So just to sort of summarize the main points of the code amendment, the amendment would change one existing section of Article 12, which is section 12.145. It would create one new section in Article 12, the newly created 12.146, and it would amend Schedule 12-4B, the table we looked at in the prior slide. And just as a reference. Page 85 in your packet is the proposed draft language.

These are just getting a little bit more specific, but still summarizing what the changes are that you see in that edited draft. New residential development in the R31, R32, R41, and R42 zoning districts is required to achieve at least 60 percent of the maximum density for the zone, and a
site that is nonconforming in minimum density may not move further out of conformance with the minimum density standard. Units may be added, which bring the site closer to conformance without coming all the way into conformance as part of a phase project that demonstrates the minimum density will be achieved. All lands in the R31, R32, R41, and R42 zones are required to demonstrate compliance with the minimum density requirements of the base zone at the time of land division application unless modified through a land unit development.

And staff proposes to delete the current M suffix, which allows a minimum density standard to be used with any zone. Again, it just goes back to the fact that we don't have any M designated zoning within the city. And my understanding is there's no intention to have any, any time soon. And there is just one little addition to section 12.145 subsection two that would include flood hazard areas would be subtracted from the total area of the lot to determine what the minimum lot standard would be.

Hey, Jason, just let me interrupt you there. We were just looking at that here of the staff table and that, I don't think, is correct. We would... Because our code actually allows for development in flood hazard areas, so I mean, if you allow for development of a flood hazard area, then it should be... It shouldn't be exempted out. I mean, that should be part of it. So the flood way, which is basically the channel of the river or the channel of Gilbert Creek, et cetera, et cetera, now that should be exempted out, but not the 100 year floodplain. You can develop in the 100 year. So thanks to Donna, she's actually our floodplain coordinator, for catching that. So that would... If you chose to move this tonight, we would need to actually not include that particular phrase.

And one thing. It does also refer to stream banks under this number two. It's on page 86 in the packet. So within stream banks and [inaudible 00:56:50] setbacks, again, that term is really hard to define for us, so that would be replaced with flood ways because that's completely defined within the development code and then just strike the flood hazard area.

Yeah. So we may be able to talk about this towards the end, but so we would be editing one phrase that's existing and not adding one proposed.

Yeah. Okay.

And here's the proposed amendment to Schedule 12-4B. As you can see, staff is proposing to strike the reference to the M designations and to add the 60 percent of the max density as the minimum required density for the appropriate zones. And just as a reference, Schedule 12-4A is what establishes max density, so these are the numbers here that we're just taking 60 percent of those numbers, which becomes the minimum density in the previous slide. And there is a proposed addition of a section, again, 12.146. The first part of that is an exemption statement, which basically says that all lots less than 10,000 square feet are exempt from meeting the minimum density requirements. And for lots greater 10,000 square feet, there's an exception process. I'll just go ahead and read this out to you.

A development on a building site that is 10,000 square feet or larger, if the applicant can demonstrate by means of a detailed site plan that the site is so constrained that the proportional share of the required minimum density cannot be provided and still meet all of the development standards in the underlying zone, an exception may be granted. For development on a building site that is 10,000 square feet or larger, if the applicant can demonstrate... Well, maybe that's...
just a little bit of a repeat there. To be granted in exception to subsection one above, the applicant must demonstrate that the maximum number of residential units are being provided while complying with all applicable development standards in the underlying zone.

There is nothing in this section which precludes an applicant from applying for a variance to these standards as governed by Article 6. And if a property is occupied by a single dwelling as of the date of this ordinance is adopted, the dwelling can be enlarged, reconstructed, or replaced in the event of a natural hazard without having to meet the minimum density requirements. And just to give a specific recent example of how this might relate to a project, I have a little bit of a subdivision comparison. So Highland Meadows is an 11 lot subdivision that is developed with single-family homes and Evergreen Manor is a similarly sized subdivision, 11 lots, each lot developed with a duplex. And as you can see from this table, again, same zone, similar size, similar max density.

If a 60 percent minimum density standard was required, they'd be pretty similar for both developments. Same number of lots. In the case of Highland Meadows, the developer built 11 units, and in the case of Evergreen Manor, the developer constructed 22 units. Highland Meadows would not meet up a 60 percent minimum density standard and Evergreen Manor would meet that standard. So to better align with the intent and purpose of these zoning districts, the code amendment would lend itself to developers needing to meet the standard that's described in the example of Evergreen Manor. Just to give you a sense of the total impact of this to the lots that would be impacted by this development code amendment, here is a map. As you can see, the different shaded areas relate to different zones.

Is that map available on your website, on the Grounds Pass website?

It is, but it'll show all zones. So what I did here is I removed the colors for any other zone. It just helps you sort of see the zones we're talking about. But our zoning map is available. And I can send this out if anybody is interested in seeing this exact particular map. And just again, looking at high-level impact, during council discussion, there was some talk about how this change would relate to lots that have the potential to be to developed as opposed to lots that are already built out, so this is staff's attempt to quantify the total number of lots and acreage that are likely to be developed in the future, and we did that by identifying all of the lots with assessed value less than 10,000, which we would classify as being vacant, and then lots with less than 50 percent value, which we would describe as being under-improved, and then the total number of lots and total number of acres within those zones.

So because the exemption includes language that would exempt lots less than 10,000, this table makes an attempt to get a sense of how many lots within the total number of lots fit that description. So as you can see, a big... A significant portion of the lots within each zone are less than 10,000 square feet. And there was also some discussion for a typical multi-family development, multi-dwelling unit complex, typically we'd be looking at lots of over one acre, so you can kind of get a sense in this column here of how many lots are within each zone that are over one acre in size, likely the lots most significantly impacted by this code amendment. And so the planning commission's call to action recommend approval by the city council as submitted or with revisions recommended by the UAPC, recommend city council deny the requests and list the reasons, or postpone and continue to a date certain. And just so we're all aware, that 120 day deadline, or maybe there's not a 120? Okay. So pending any questions, that's my presentation.
Commissioner Aviles.

Thank you. Just a quick question. So in terms of the minimum density proposal, it applies to R3 and R4. Why not R2?

There was quite a bit of discussion, both at the housing advisory committee level and the city council level, and ultimately council directed staff to move forward with a development code amendment that did not include R2.

You could listen to the workshops to get a better sense for that, commissioner. At a high level, I think one of the reasons was the sheer acreage involved. There’s a lot more acreage that is zoned R2 when you add it in there, so I mean, you could argue that both ways. You could say, "Well, that's more acreage, so that means potentially more density." On the other side, this is a pretty significant change for the city and that could potentially be done later, but I think one of the thoughts was let's start with those zones that are intended for the higher level of density. The R2 is right at that borderline between kind of medium and high. I mean, it's really intended more for single dwellings than it is for multi volumes if you look at the purpose statement. So those are just a couple of thoughts.

Other questions. Commissioner Scherf.

Okay. So basically the prime example, if we go back to the heart of this discussion, the prime example is taking a subdivision and... Or your example that a minimum density would be required is taking a subdivision, and it's in not allowing somebody to do decent size single-family dwellings with open space per individual and basically doubling up the units by putting duplexes on these to increase that density. I just, to the heart of this, I think minimum density goes completely against section 9.7 in the comprehensive plan that we just agreed upon in taking away local barriers to development. My argument for that would be basically if you're forcing developers to increase the density purposely, then that's putting another barrier to that local jurisdiction, to that local zoning, which goes against your comprehensive plan, which was just agreed upon.

So I don't know if that was a lot of forethought in that. I understand that you're trying to get a little bit more duplexes and plexes in. I'm just not seeing... I don't know. I don't know how to finish that conversation. My second question would be minimum density requirements is just going to the root of the utilized density on that property and does not preclude or does not diminish the other restrictions on that zoning, meaning the utility requirements, the parking requirements, and so forth. It's just actually just trying to force a utilization of 60 percent of the allowable. Is that correct?

I guess I don't completely understand.

So if you're forcing somebody to use a minimum density in that area, is there any concessions decreased in the amount of parking required or is that still density based within those other development code regulations?

Not anything directly. I don't think there would be anything indirectly that I can think of, but nothing in this section that would offer a concession, for example.
And I'm trying to preclude that. I don't want to offer a concession because I guess basically what you're trying to do is try to make sure that your infrastructure is growing with the amount of density. If you're forcing a minimum density requirement, I wouldn't want any other concessions for decreasing the amount of required parking, the amount of any other development code.

Yeah. I'm just kind of thinking off the top of my head here. I suppose through the exemption request process, an applicant could make some sort of argument around needing to meet other standards, but again, no direct language that would give any sort of other concession for any other required standard of the code.

Perfect. Thank you. That's what I wanted to make sure. I don't have any other questions.


I did want to make sure that you provide a copy of the map. I find it helpful because where you had put the R3 and R4 zoning highlighted, what I found online showed such an insufficient amount. These numbers, in addition to the map that you've laid out here, give very reasonable... In fact, I think this fits what we've been mandated legislatively to do, and that's get those numbers up without... Well, it doesn't say this legislatively, but allows for a more dense use of the lands that we have. If that also had R2 on it, you'd have a... That thing would light up like crazy and we wouldn't be able to, as a locality, I feel, blend this in in a way that fits our particular community. So I, again, find that helpful. It helps me feel more comfortable with what's being presented here and the goals that it's seeking to achieve. Thank you. I think we would all want the map if you could send that to all of us.

Well, I think based upon Clint's comment that the item that's missing for perspective is how much did we take in with the urban growth boundary expansion? And I can't even... So many numbers, I don't even remember what it was now. I know what we went... We still are under 16 square miles, which is one percent of the county for the people who were alarmed about covering the whole county with houses. But I think it would be good to just have, and I know we've had tons of numbers like this, but to tell us what the R1s and 2s are so you can say, "Okay, we're taking away," in Clint's terminology, "We're putting a barrier on 1,100 acres requiring them to be more dense." But how many are left that aren't required to do that just for perspective? And I don't remember what that number is now. The lot.

Commissioner Scherf.

So to clarify what my statement was against... To clarify my definition of barriers is if you force a developer to build more infrastructure, more houses within to build more density within a piece of property, you're also forcing that developer to outlay more money to upgrade and follow the infrastructure behind it. So that is a barrier. That's an increased cost within that piece of property. Secondly, I wanted to know, there was, and I just need a little clarification because my brain might have glossed over when you were talking about... You were talking about if a property didn't meet the minimum density, there was an avenue for an exemption, or... Would that avenue include basically going through a variance or PAD style and going through a public hearing or have you guys defined that?

It would be a director's decision.
So it would only be a staff level decision.

Correct.

Okay.

Anyone else?

I know we've been around on that infrastructure issue before, but I still can't see how density doesn't decrease the need for infrastructure because you're not stretching streets and sewer lines and everything way out beyond that small piece of property.

Easy way to explain it.

Hm?

Easy way to explain it.

Okay.

You have one hose to your garden. You put in four tomato plants. You need four sprinklers for those four tomato plants. You have one hose to that. You double your garden the next year, same plot of land. You put 12 tomato plants on there. You need 12 sprinklers. Does that small hose that you, last year, watered four tomato plants with have the capacity to water 12 tomato plants the next year? So basically if you increase the amount of houses, you increase the amount of toilets, you increase the amount of water pressure needed, so if the infrastructure going to that residence, residential area, is not big enough, doesn't have enough capacity, that's what I'm talking about. So if you increase the density, you still have to have infrastructure to follow behind it. So when does that become the burden of the city versus the burden of the developer? As a burden of the developer, that is a barrier for him to develop because that's an added cost to them.

And that might be a question. My guidance for taking this seat was to keep those comments headed towards staff. And to that end, we did ask staff to say, "Okay, what's going to be the overall impact?" So could we address that question for staff? What would be the... because as I understand it, that you've looked at this.

Yes. Generally speaking, all master plans, sewer, water, assume capacity at the max density level, which goes back to this chart. So the plans are assuming that lots in these zoning designations are going to be built out to 100 percent of max density, which is very rare that it happens. So the 60 percent would be less than the assumed density of the master plans.

In full transparency to Commissioner Scherf's point, the current master sewer, water, storm water, and transportation plans, so we have those as our four main master plans that address pipe size, that address street width, that address the capacity to handle all the storm water runoff, I mean, those were all adopted generally around 2015, 16. The transportation system plan we've just adopted last year. But a lot of emphasis was put on the new growth areas. So you see on that map, there's a lot of R3 and R4. That's closer in to the core of the city, which
would have been... The infrastructure would have been built sometimes 40, 50 years ago. Now, some of that infrastructure, again, just trying to put everything on the table here tonight, is not necessarily at that pipe size, for example. I mean, we're talking about all kinds of infrastructure to handle.

I think the confidence level increases, though, when you, when you look at the distribution. So if you're talking about one 30 unit multiplex being put, say, up off of Highland maybe where there's some older pipes, now it is possible that a 70 unit, 100 unit, 120, may trigger some need to up-size. That is possible. And that is typically going to be the cost of the developer to up-size if that's where they want to build. We have not, in this proposal, gone to that level of detail to say, "Well, on this parcel, a 100 unit project is going to trigger this up-size, which triggers this much cost." That's a major analysis. We did not do that. But we do still feel comfortable that looking at a broad scale where these are targeted, the infrastructure is there. And as Jason said, the master sewer, all those plans were designed at the maximum, which we're not even close to the maximum density on the vast majority. So that's...

So with that in mind, you're satisfied that this is a workable tool for you.

For the city. I mean, we put these applications out there in large part because they get driven by elected officials. So I mean, this is where... This was a strategic plan item, so we're just... We're kind of following the directions that were given by the city council here.

And that's what I'm very comfortable... I'm very thrilled that you actually gave that analysis because I feel that one of my jobs is to make sure to ask as many questions as possible to make sure that we are all thinking about the whole picture, not just doing a knee jerk reaction that's going to last through the end of the day. And again, you're five years down the road and we're going, "Well, we don't have that multimillion dollar coffer to extend that sewer out to there where we told them they had to build 120 units." So I'm just here to ask those questions to make sure that we're all looking at every aspect, every corner of the box.

Absolutely.

Commissioner Aviles.

Thank you. It's part of a discussion with the commissioner, not to staff. Can I? Oh, okay. So just speaking to the metaphor about the hose and four plants versus the hose and more plants. So with your comments, am I to understand that things were built with a bigger hose that are being underutilized and then therefore are able to manage at a higher capacity should the densities be increased? Did I follow that right? Is that what you...

You did. Yes.

Okay. Okay.

Yes.

Thank you.
So there's lots of 12 inch sewer lines out there that are well underutilized.

All I can... In my head, you said Highland Avenue, and all I can see is collapsing Orangeburg pipe. That goes back to, again, a builder assuming that risk with a profit motive in mind, and it is one of those things. So anyway, thank you.

Do we have consensus?

I would like to, if I could, just... Sorry to cut you off there, Chair. Just mention two things. Just to clarify, with the recently agreed to be adopted comp plan, there is a specific policy goal, 9.6.12, which is the specific language is established minimum densities in medium and high density zones, so I do think it aligns with a very specific policy goal of the new comp plan amendment. And then just to touch on something that you mentioned, commissioner Arthur, I just want to clarify with everybody, everything you have seen tonight does not include the urban growth boundary rezoning project, so there will be areas of town that transition into city zoning once the urban growth boundary rezoning project is complete that will have some of these zoning designations. So at that time, you'll see more areas identified on this map that will be subject to the minimum of density standard.

Do we have a motion? Unless you want to spend the night here.

Sorry, Chair. I guess you should close the hearing.

Yeah. If there's no more discussion, we can close the hearing on the item.

I hereby move that we approve the development code text amendment as presented with... Go ahead.

With edits, do I need to be specific as to what they are with edits as recommended by staff?

Regarding the flood way.

Specifically the flood way or plain designation.

I think you had two edits setbacks. Okay. I'm getting a thumbs of up from the chair that he knows the two edits. We'll see him. Okay. We have a motion with two edits and a second by Commissioner Aviles. Discussion. And seeing Commissioner Scherf.

Sorry, I still have one more question. If you impose minimum densities as laid out in these code changes, are those subject to running a PUD on an R3 or an R4 zone?

I don't know if we can... We closed the hearing.

I know.

Yeah. So that's discussion. We have to come to that.

I'll withdraw the question.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

Commissioner... That's a yes. Commissioner Scherf.

No.

Commissioner Aviles.

Yes.

Okay. That's four in favor, one opposed. It means the motion carries. Do we need a reason?

I don't like to have... I don't like the fact that there's not an avenue for a developer to come up with lot hardships. I mean, you said it was staff approval, but I just kind of see that it's not... I don't see an easy avenue out of it, and then again, I'm going to go back to I think you're imposing... You're self-imposing more barriers on development in the area. So that's my excuse.


I think we're good.

Okay. I guess we'll adjourn the meeting at 7:26. [crosstalk 01:26:23].

____________________________________  __________________

Eric Heesacker, Chair          Date

Urban Area Planning Commissioner
I. PROPOSAL:

The application is to request approval for a 2-lot residential Partition with Major Variance to address a survey error creating a 5-foot deficit in the front yard setback for the 4-plex on Parcel 1 and the setback distance of the private street from the adjoining lot line. The property is located in the R-3-2 zoning district. The applicant’s tentative plan and narrative are attached. The property is 0.48 acres and is currently developed with one residential 4-plex.

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Review procedures are provided in the Grants Pass Development Code (GPDC) §2.020 and Schedule 2-1. While a Partition requires a Type I-C procedure, the additional
request for a Major Variance initiates a Type III procedure requiring a hearing before the Urban Area Planning Commission (UAPC).

The decision on a Partition must be based on the criteria provided in Section 17.312. A decision on a Major Variance must be based on the criteria provided in Section 6.060.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Section 10.050 of the GPDC, provides the procedure 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 the decision is mailed. The decision will not become final until the period for filing a local appeal has expired.

IV. PROCEDURE:

A. An application for a 2-Lot Partition and Major Variance was received on January 13, 2022 and deemed complete on January 14, 2022. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.020 of the Development Code.

B. Public notice of the Type III hearing was mailed on February 2, 2022 in accordance with Section 2.053 of the Development Code.

C. A public hearing was held on February 23, 2022.

D. The decision was made on February 23, 2022 with the UAPC approving the submitted application with the conditions listed in the staff report.

V. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the original staff report presented at the February 23, 2022 hearing and attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein.

B. The minutes of the public hearing held on February 23, 2022, attached as Exhibit “B”, summarize the oral testimony presented and are incorporated herein.

C. The presentation given by staff at the February 23, 2022 public hearing is attached as Exhibit “C”, and incorporated herein.

VI. FINDINGS OF FACT:

The UAPC found that based upon the testimony given at the public hearing and the staff report, the proposal meets the criteria in Sections 17.312 and 6.060 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: Moderate-High Density Residential (HR)
   b) Zone District: R-3-2
   c) Overlay Districts: None

2) Size: 0.48 acres

3) Frontage & Access: SE N Street - Arterial
   SE Peters James Ln. (Proposed private street)

4) Existing Public Utilities:
   a) Water: 12-inch water main in SE N St.
   b) Sewer: 12-inch main in SE N St.
   c) Storm: Curb, gutter, sidewalk in SE N St.
   Detention pond on Parcel 1, scaled for both parcels

5) Topography: Relatively flat

6) Natural Hazards: None

7) Existing Land Use:
   a) Subject Parcel: Residential 4-plex
   b) Surrounding: BP to the north and east; Moderate-High Density
                   residential to the south and west.

B. Discussion:

The application is to request approval for a 2-lot residential Partition with Major Variance
to address a survey error creating a 5-foot deficit in the front yard setback for the 4-plex
on Parcel 1 and the setback distance of the private street from the adjoining lot line. The
private street will provide access and frontage for Parcel 2. The property is located in the
R-3-2 zoning district. The property is 0.48 acres and is currently developed with one
newly built residential 4-plex. See submitted application and narrative.

The partition request meets lot size, dimension, access and frontage with the new
private street as submitted. The two variance requests address setback issues, with one
being resolved with the private street when permitted.

Variance #1
The major site plan review for the newly built 4-plex (201-00341-20) requested approval
to build one 4-plex immediately, and one in the future on the same parcel. That project
had not proposed a private street, hence SE N street was designated as the “front yard”
for the 4-plex that was ultimately built. The front yard setback is 20 feet for the R-3-2
residential zone, however a surveying mistake was discovered after the 4-plex
foundation was poured, showing that the front yard setback from SE N Street was actually 15 feet instead of 20. This application proposes a new private street in front of the newly built 4-plex, meaning that the setback from SE N Street would become the exterior side yard, with the required setback being 10 feet for an exterior side yard in this zone. Approval of this application, including the new private street, will negate the need for a variance as requested by the applicant to allow for a 15 feet front yard setback from SE N Street instead of the required 20 feet; because SE N Street will no longer be the front yard.

Variance #2
The second variance request is regarding private street design as stated in Section 27.123(14), where a new private street which abuts an existing developed residential property must be located 5 feet away from the property line; a sidewalk may be placed at the property line within this 5’ buffer. The applicant requests relief from this requirement as the abutting property is the driveway “pole” of a flag lot, with the proposed residential units being across the street. The design required by the Development Code would create a “floating” sidewalk removed from the residences, and with traffic on either side of it. The applicant proposes to have a 25’ wide paved road, with 2 feet unpaved next to the western property line for the drainage system and 4 feet of sidewalk in front of the 4-plex on Parcel 1, for a total of 31 feet of easement for access to Parcel 2. Only Variance #2 will be addressed in the conformance with applicable criteria section below.

VIII. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

A. MAJOR VARIANCE - #2

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.

Qualifying Condition. The applicant shall demonstrate that the following elements are present to qualify for a Variance.

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.

UAPC Response: Satisfied. The existing development to the west and abutting the proposed new private street is a driveway “pole” of a flag lot. This creates the special circumstance and the request for the variance private street design as stated in Section 27.123(14), where a new private street which abuts an existing developed residential property must be located 5 feet away from the property line; a sidewalk may be placed at the property line within this 5 ft. buffer. The variance requests to change the 5 ft. requirement to 2 ft. The private street will not be near any residential structures and will not impact the existing development.
CRITERION (2): The Variance is the minimum necessary to address the special or unique physical circumstances related to the subject site.

UAPC Response: Satisfied. The variance is the minimum necessary to allow residential development. The applicant proposes to move the sidewalk to the east in front of the residences, rather than across the street.

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.

UAPC Response: Satisfied. The variance does not request any further modifications beyond the reduced buffer between the private street and the existing development. The proposal will remain in compliance with all other base development standards outlined in Section 12.150 of the GPDC. The variance will allow for new development opportunities in the City as well as provide the benefit of additional residential development in this area. No negative impacts are evident from this variance request.

In the Public Works comments the city engineer states: “The proposed street does not keep a minimum of 5 foot separation from the abutting property line per 27.123 (14); and the Applicant is requesting a variance. The proposed variance does not appear to increase a risk to traffic safety.”

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.

UAPC Response: Satisfied. The applicant has applied for a partition with this variance. The request for the private street design variance is due to the existing development of a flag lot abutting the private street, rather than the partition itself.

B. PARTITION

Section 17.312 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code states that the Director 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.

UAPC Response: Satisfied. Article 12 of the GPDC requires a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet, and 2,178 square feet per dwelling unit. With a 4-plex built on Parcel 1 and another proposed for Parcel 2, each parcel requires a minimum of 8,712 square feet. Both proposed parcels surpass the minimum requirements with Parcel 1 at 10,932 and Parcel 2 at 10,144 square feet if the application is approved. The minimum lot width of 50 feet for properties in the R-3-2 zoning district is also met.

In accordance with the requirements of Section 17.510 of the GPDC, the proposed lots do not exceed the lot width to depth ratio. The side property lines run at right angles to the street where possible, and each parcel, meets the minimum 20 feet of frontage to a public/private right-of-way in accordance with Section 27.200.
Criterion (2): When required, the proposed future development plan allows the properties to be efficiently further developed, 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.

UAPC Response: Satisfied. Further development of the parcels in the proposed partition is not feasible.

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.

UAPC Response: Satisfied with conditions. The applicant has proposed access off SE N Street onto a newly created private street that is 94.24 feet long and 25 feet wide.

Per Public Works comments, a curb and 4 foot sidewalk along one side are required per Section 27.123(12)(b). Submitted plan indicates curb and sidewalk.

Public Works comments states “The proposed variance does not appear to increase risk to traffic safety.”

As a condition of approval: With the approval of the variance requested above, the private street shall meet all other standards outlined in Section 27.123, including:

Per Section 27.123(12)(d), the private street shall be owned and maintained by the property owner using the street for access. As a condition of approval, the City shall require legal assurances for the continued maintenance of private streets, such as a recorded maintenance agreement.

In accordance with a June 23, 2017 Director’s Interpretation on Intersection Spacing, a private street serving four (4) dwelling units or less, shall be subject to meeting the driveway separation standards as listed in 27.121(11). These standards require a five (5) foot separation between drives. The applicant’s submitted site plan meets these requirements.

Curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements already exist on SE N Street. Any work on the existing driveway and installing the new private street could impact the existing infrastructure, which shall be repaired by the developer. As a condition of approval, existing curb, gutter, and sidewalk shall be repaired after street development as outlined in the Public Works staff report as needed.

Per Public Safety comments, the street will require “No Parking Fire Lane” signs on both sides, which will need to be indicated on the revised tentative plan. The submitted plan does not indicate a turnaround, as one is not required for street length under 150 feet. As a condition of approval, revised tentative plan will indicate type and location of “No Parking Fire Lane” signs.

In accordance with Section 25.031(9), for all land divisions, any existing parking and maneuvering areas to remain on the property shall be surfaced in accordance with the provisions of the GPDC prior to final plat approval. As a condition of approval, all existing drivable area shall be paved.
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.

UAPC Response: Satisfied with conditions. As a condition of approval, final utility plans shall meet all Public Works requirements, including the following:

Water: All public water meters shall be located within the public rights of way of SE N Street. Water laterals must not cross neighboring parcels. The developer shall be responsible for all encroachment fees related to the installation of water services on existing water lines.

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.

The installation of RP and DC backflow devices shall be installed wherever required by the Utilities Division.

All private wells and septic systems shall be properly abandoned. Applicant has submitted proof of abandonment of well.

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

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

Storm water: 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). Design for the collection of on-site storm runoff and discharge to City approved downstream drainage facilities.

It should be noted that the detention pond constructed next to SE N Street was designed for the entire lot prior to partition. As a condition of approval, applicant must confirm with Public Works that the existing detention pond meets requirements for both parcels.

Design and install erosion and sediment control measures.

Utilities: All new utilities must be placed underground and a ten-foot wide City Utility Easement shall be dedicated to the City adjacent to all rights-of-way. Any changes, including relocation, to the existing overhead transmission lines along the parcel will be required to be placed underground.

Criterion (5): The tentative plan allows for the preservation or establishment of natural features or the preservation of historic features of the property, 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%.

**UAPC Response: Satisfied with conditions.**

(a) The applicant has submitted a Tree Canopy chart that meets canopy coverage criteria for the zone.

No significant cuts, fills, or retaining walls will be necessary to construct the proposed improvements.

As a condition of approval, the applicant must pay a Tree Deposit of $400 for Parcel 2 prior to Final Plat approval in accordance with Section 11.060(2) of the GPDC. Parcel 1 has an approved landscape plan based on the major site plan approval for 201-00341-20.

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

**UAPC 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 a condition of approval, the applicant will be required to submit a letter from the engineer responsible for supervising the construction of the Partition per Section 17.321(6).

IX. **DEcision and Summary:**

The Planning Commission **APPROVED** the request for the Major Variance.

The Planning Commission **APPROVED** the request for the 2-Lot Partition with the conditions listed below.

**Conditions of Approval:**

A. The following must be accomplished within 24 months of the UAPC decision per Section 17.415 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 two (2) sets (along with a plan check fee) and an electronic file (pdf) of a revised tentative plan prepared by a registered surveyor or similar professional, to the Planning Division, reflecting the items listed in Section 17.312, in addition to the following:
a. Indicate location of “No Parking Fire Lane” signs on Private street.

2. Submit addressing request to Community Development with fee.

3. Provide a letter from the Responsible Engineer who will be supervising the construction of the project. The Responsible Engineer will be required to submit a letter at final plat application verifying that he/she supervised the grading and construction for the entire parcel and individual lots and that the grading and construction was completed according to approved plans. If the responsible engineer proposes to delegate any of these responsibilities, the arrangement shall be approved in writing by the City Engineering Division prior to issuance of a Development Permit.

4. Obtain an encroachment permit, and any other necessary permits for any work conducted in the right of way.

5. Submit a utility plan meeting the requirements of the Public Works Memorandum and reflecting separate sewer and water laterals for each lot. Include the following:
   a. RP backflow device as “premises” protection on water service (existing or new).
   b. DC backflow device as “point of use” protection on all water services containing multiple zone irrigation systems.
   c. All public water services shall be located within the public right of way.
   d. Water services on existing water mains shall be installed by City crews.
   e. Provide utility plans for all private franchises including PPL, Qwest and Avista. Show all pedestals and boxes to be installed. (This is to verify utilities can be installed within dedicated City Utility Easements).

6. Submit four (4) copies of civil engineering drawings and an electronic file (pdf) with appropriate review fees to the City Engineering Division for review and approval:
   a. Provide a grading plan and receive a grading permit prior to any earthwork. Include the creation of building pads in the grading plan if completed as part of the construction of the partition. If building pads are created as part of the grading of the partition, then a map showing the extent of the grading will be required at the time of final plat.
   b. Provide an erosion control and dust control plan for the partition.
   c. Present engineered construction drawings stamped by a registered Engineer, including plans and profiles if necessary, that detail the proposed improvements to the City Engineering Division for review and approval.
   d. Provide storm drain calculations demonstrating detention which limits the storm water run-off from new impervious areas 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).
B: The following must occur prior to Final Plat approval:

1. For any existing buildings to be demolished and removed, applicant must obtain required demolition permits and asbestos abatement.

2. The City requires legal assurances for the continued maintenance of private streets, such as a recorded maintenance agreement.

3. Separate sewer and water services are required for each lot. Private sewer and water lines shall not cross other lots, except within a dedicated recorded utility easement.

4. Any existing private laterals reutilized by the new development shall be TV inspected prior to reuse. All defects discovered during the TV inspection shall be corrected prior to reuse by the new development.

5. Properly abandon any existing wells and septic tanks and provide evidence of proper abandonment, if necessary.

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

7. Substantially complete all construction items:
   a. Secure for any remaining construction items in accordance with City Standards.
   b. Submit a one-year maintenance guarantee.
   c. Submit as-built drawings of all public improvements or secure for them in accordance with City policy.

8. Repair all curb, gutter and sidewalk disturbances as indicated in Public Works Comments.

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

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

11. Street name sign and “stop” signs shall be paid for by the developer and installed by the City. All other signs and markings including, “no parking/fire lane”, “sidewalk ends signs”, painting curbs at 20 ft. setback at intersections for no parking, 10 ft. of yellow each side of hydrant and a white stop bar at the stop signs are to be completed by the developer.

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

13. Pay all engineering inspection fees due.

14. Submit a letter from the Responsible Engineer stating that he/she supervised the grading and construction for the entire parcel and individual lots and the grading and construction was completed according to approved plans.
15. All water services on existing public water lines shall be installed by City of Grants Pass Water Distribution Crews. All encroachment fees related to the installation of water services shall be the responsibility of the developer.

16. Complete installation of the public utility services as reflected on the approved utility plans.

17. Coordinate with the Streets Department to confirm that all required signage and streetlights are installed at the proper locations.

18. Meet all Public Safety requirements.

19. Pay a tree deposit of $400 for Parcel 2. Parcel 1 has an approved landscape plan based the major site plan approval for 201-00341-20.

20. Pay all City fees.

21. Submit for major addressing and pay associated fees prior to submitting for individual building permits.

22. Submit a final plat in accordance with Section 17.321 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 partition. 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:

   a. Dedication of a 10-ft. CUE along the full public street frontage, if needed.

   b. Dedication of a 20-ft. CUE, if necessary, for storm drain and/or sewer.

After all signatures are obtained, the plat must be recorded with the Josephine County Recorder within 30 days. The developer 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:

Note: The following conditions are not all-inclusive and are provided for the information of the applicant.

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

2. Each lot shall have separate utility services.

3. All utilities shall be placed underground.

4. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.

5. Install landscaping in accordance with the approved landscape plan.
6. Submit lot drainage plans for approval on all building plans.
7. Developed or undeveloped building lots shall be maintained for weed and grass control throughout the year.
8. Provide addresses visible from the public right-of-way.
9. Gravel driveway approaches and other erosion and track out control measures shall be in place during construction of individual lots.
10. Lighting shall not glare into neighboring residential properties.
11. Meet all Public Safety requirements based on size of structures.
12. Prior to occupancy, driveways and parking and maneuvering areas shall be paved in accordance with the requirements of the Development Code.
13. Building permits issued shall comply with solar standards listed in Section 22.620.

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

__________________________________________
Eric Heesacker, Chair
I. PROPOSAL:

The proposal is an ordinance amending Article 12 (Zoning Districts) of the Grants Pass Development Code. If approved, the amendment would require development in the R-3 (R-3-1), R-3-2, R-4 (R-4-1), and R-4-2 zoning districts meet minimum density standards, including a requirement to build to at least 60% of the maximum density on a per site basis.

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Section 4.102 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code provides that the Director, Planning Commission, or City Council may initiate a text amendment application. These amendments have been initiated by the Director of Community Development.

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

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

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

IV. **PROCEDURE:**

A. An application for a Development Code Text Amendment to Article 12 was submitted on January 4, 2022 and deemed complete on January 4, 2022. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.060 of the Development Code.

B. Public notice of the February 23, 2022 hearing was posted on February 2, 2022 and published in the newspaper of record on February 11, 2022, in accordance with Section 2.053 of the Development Code.

C. A public hearing was held by the UAPC on February 23, 2022, to consider the proposal and make a recommendation to City Council. The UAPC made a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed amendment.

V. **SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:**

A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the February 16, 2022 UAPC staff report and its exhibits, which are attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein.

B. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on February 23, 2022, attached as Exhibit “B”, summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.

C. The PowerPoint given by staff at the February 23, 2022 meeting is attached as Exhibit “C”.

D. The revised draft code amendment reflecting the Urban Area Planning Commission recommendation to replace “stream banks” with “floodways”, and to remove “flood hazard areas” from Section 12.145(2).

VI. **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The Urban Area Planning Commission found that, based upon the testimony given at the public hearing, the staff report, and a subsequent Memorandum from the Community Development Director dated May 20, 2021, the proposal meets the criteria in Section 4.103 of the Development Code based on the reasons stated in the findings included below.
VII. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

Timeline:

- The Housing Advisory Committee adopted a 2021 priority to move towards establishing minimum density requirements to increase the supply of housing. This was based on the goal to preserve moderate to high density residential zones for density's greater than single family homes.
- In March 2021, the Housing Advisory Committee motioned to recommend that City Council consider a potential Development Code text amendment that would establish minimum residential density standards in the R-3-1 and R-4-1 zones, including a requirement to build to at least 60% of the maximum density on a per site basis.
- Staff and the Chair of the Housing Advisory Committee presented the motion with a presentation to Council during a workshop session in March of 2021. Council continued the discussion with direction for staff to follow up with more information.
- After deliberation by Council at the second workshop in September of 2021, staff was directed to draft a proposed development code amendment requiring minimum residential density standards in the R-3 (R-3-1), R-3-2, R-4 (R-4-1), and R-4-2 zoning districts.
- At the time of this report a proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment is being considered which would add a housing policy directly related to this proposed Development Code amendment. The proposed Comprehensive plan policy is below:
  o 9.11. Establish minimum densities in medium and high-density zones
- To date, public notification of the potential text amendment has occurred through Council workshop, Housing Advisory Committee, and Urban Area Planning Commission agenda items. One land developer spoke in opposition and staff received an email from a land developer in opposition to the concept of minimum densities.

Proposed Development Code Amendment:

Marked-up Development Code text amendments being proposed:

1. The amendment in Article 12 (Section 12.145) is a change to Minimum Residential Density requirements, which as proposed states: In accordance with the standards below and the exceptions in Section 12.146, new residential development in the R-3, R-3-2, R-4 and R-4-2 zoning districts is required to achieve at least 60 percent of the maximum density for the zone, per Schedule 12-4a.
2. The amendment to Schedule 12-4b is a change to the table which defines the zoning districts that will be required to meet minimum residential density standards
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>Minimum Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density (LR)</td>
<td>R-1-12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1-10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1-8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Density (MR)</td>
<td>R-1-6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High Density (HR)</td>
<td>R-3 (R-3-1)</td>
<td>10.46 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3-2</td>
<td>12.00 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3M (R-3-1M)</td>
<td>12.44 du/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3-2M</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density (HRR)</td>
<td>R-4 (R-4-1)</td>
<td>20.88 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-4-2</td>
<td>20.88 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-4M (R-4-1M)</td>
<td>20 du/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-4-2M</td>
<td>20 du/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-5M</td>
<td>20 du/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The amendment adds a new section to Article 12 (Section 12.146). The addition of Section 12.146 would provide exemptions and exceptions to the minimum residential density standards provided certain requirements are met. The proposed exemption and exception language is below:

Exemption: Development on a building site less than 10,000 square feet that is in existence prior to the date this ordinance is adopted is exempt from minimum density requirements.

Exceptions: The Director is authorized to grant an exception to the minimum residential density requirements in Section 12.145 by means of a Type I procedure, as governed by Section 2.030 as follows:

(1) For development on a building site that is 10,000 square feet or larger, if the applicant can demonstrate by means of a detailed site plan that the site is so constrained that the proportional share of the required minimum density cannot be provided and still meet all of the development standards in the underlying zone, an exception may be granted.
(2) To be granted an exception to Subsection 1 above, the applicant must demonstrate that the maximum number of residential units are being provided while complying with all applicable development standards in the underlying zone. There is nothing in this section which precludes an applicant from applying for a Variance to these standards, as governed by Article 6.

(3) If a property is occupied by a single dwelling as of the date this ordinance is adopted, the dwelling can be enlarged, reconstructed, or replaced in the event of a natural hazard, without having to meet the minimum density requirements.

The effect of the proposed amendment is that new development in the R-3 (R-3-1), R-3-2, R-4 (R-4-1), and R-4-2 residential zoning districts will be subject to meeting minimum residential density standards.

VIII. FINDINGS IN CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

The text of the Development Code may be amended provided all of the criteria of Section 4.103 of the Development Code are satisfied.

SECTION 4.103:

CRITERION 1: The proposed amendment is consistent with the purpose of the subject sections and articles.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendment is consistent with both the purpose and intent of the article affected by this proposal. The purpose of Article 12 is to establish land use review procedures, stratify land use review procedures according to the degree of discretionary judgment required and the extent of public participation appropriate, and to relate the type of the procedure to the degree of impact of the proposed development. The proposed amendment in this application does not change this purpose statement.

The proposed amendment reflects the purpose of the zoning districts affected, which are as follows:

R-3 Districts. The purpose of the R-3 (R-3-1) and R-3-2 Districts is to encourage, accommodate, maintain, and protect a suitable environment for residential living at moderate-high densities. Maximum densities in these districts are typically representative of 2-story housing such as attached or multi-family.

R-4 (R-4-1), R-4-2, and R-5 Districts. The purpose of the R-4 (R-4-1), R-4-2, and R-5 Districts is to encourage, accommodate, maintain and protect a suitable environment for residential living at higher densities, and for professional uses that typically support residential areas; such as professional offices; hospitals,
clinics and other suitable uses, but only in a manner designed to support and protect residential livability. Maximum densities in these districts are typically representative of 3-story housing such as attached or multi-family.

More specifically the following purpose statement of Section 12.145 is in line with the proposed amendment: "In order to ensure an adequate supply of sites zoned for different housing types at appropriate locations, some residential zones have minimum density requirements”.

**CRITERION 2:** The proposed amendment is consistent with other provisions of this code, including the purpose statement found in Section 22.010 of the Grants Pass Development Code. Section 22.010 applies to the future structures built under this ordinance proposal but does not directly affect the review of the minimum residential density standards.

**Planning Commission Response: Satisfied.** The Commission finds that the purposes of the Development Code remain intact.

**CRITERION 3:** The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and most effectively carry out those goals and policies of all alternatives considered.

**Planning Commission Response: Satisfied.** The proposed amendment is found to be consistent with Element 9, Housing, of the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the policy goal for housing encourages the provision of adequate numbers of housing units within the Urban Growth Boundary at price ranges and rent levels commensurate with the financial capabilities of area households, and to allow for flexibility of housing type, density, location and design. The proposed amendment assures the Development Code and Comprehensive Plan are in agreement and consistent.

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

**Planning Commission Response: Satisfied.** Though future growth in the R-3 (R-3-1), R-3-2, R-4 (R-4-1), and R-4-2 zones is expected to be higher under the proposed amendment when compared to historical residential density levels in Grants Pass and this will have impacts on some intersections and the functions of the transportation system, however it is still found to be consistent with the adopted TSP.

The Grants Pass Transportation System Plan Technical Memorandum, page 3, states the TSP assumed a growth rate of 2.94% annual growth in units, reaching 34,230 units in 2040. This figure assumes maximum densities would be constructed, which is far below historical and projected development levels and below the 60% rate required in the proposed ordinance.
IX. **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Urban Area Planning Commission RECOMMENDS APPROVAL of the request to amend the Development Code. The vote was 4-1 with Commissioners Collier, Arthur, Tokarz-Krauss, and Aviles voting in favor. Commissioner Scherf voted in opposition. Commissioner Heesacker and Nelson were absent. There is one vacancy on the Commission.

X. **FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**

this 9th day of March, 2022.

________________________________________________

Eric Heesacker, Chair
Determining Minimum Residential Density

In order to ensure an adequate supply of sites zoned for different multi-unit housing types at appropriate locations and to help accomplish housing goals of the Comprehensive Plan, some two residential zones have minimum density requirements. Zones designated on the zoning map with an “M” suffix following the name of the zoning district. This allows ‘legacy’ zones to continue to be subject to the original standards, while most newly zoned properties will meet the newer requirements. In accordance with the standards below and the exceptions in Section 12.146, new residential development in the R-3, R-3-2, R-4 and R-4-2 zoning districts is required to achieve at least 60 percent of the maximum density for the zone, per Schedule 12-4a.

This designation is typically applied only in higher density residential zones. Minimum lot sizes in lower density zones will typically achieve zoned densities with detached housing types. However, in higher density zones, densities will only be achieved with attached and multi-dwelling housing types. Rather than implementing these provisions by prohibiting certain lower-density housing types in higher-density residential zones, this approach allows flexibility. Minimum densities on a site can be met in more than one way: by a single housing type on a lot, each built at the same average density, or by a mix of different housing types where some are at higher density and some are at lower density, resulting in the same average density. A site that is nonconforming in minimum density may not move further out of conformance with the minimum density standard. However, units may be added to the site which bring the site closer to conformance without coming all the way into conformance as part of a phased project that demonstrates the minimum density will be achieved.

(1) In a zone with a minimum density requirement designated with an “M” suffix following the name of the zoning district, development shall meet the minimum density provisions of this section, as provided in Schedule 12-4b. All land divisions in the R-3 and R-4 zones are required to demonstrate compliance with the minimum density requirements of the base zone at the time of land division application, unless modified through a Planned Unit Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>Minimum Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density (LR)</td>
<td>R-1-12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1-10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1-8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Density (MR)</td>
<td>R-1-6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Level</td>
<td>Zoning Designation</td>
<td>Minimum Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High Density (HR)</td>
<td>R-3 (R-3-1)</td>
<td>10.46 du/acre N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3 (R-3-1M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3-2</td>
<td>12.00 du/acre N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3-2M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3M (R-3-1M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density (HRR)</td>
<td>R-4 (R-4-1)</td>
<td>20.88 du/acre N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-4-2</td>
<td>20.88 du/acre N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-4M (R-4-1M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-4-2M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-5M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Deductions for Natural Features. In calculating minimum density requirements, site area within stream banks, floodways, and riparian setbacks, wetlands and wetland buffers, flood hazard areas, and slopes over 25% may be deducted from the site acreage before measuring minimum density.

(3) Deductions for Public Dedications. Land dedicated as public right-of-way or public open space as part of a development may be deducted from the site acreage before measuring minimum density.

(4) Deductions for Mixed-Use. In a zone with minimum density requirements, when residential development is part of a mixed-use development together with uses such as office and commercial use, the minimum density requirement may be reduced as follows:

(a) Vertical mixed use: Lower-floor non-residential use areas may be calculated as if they had the same number of dwelling units as the residential use on the floor above.

(b) Horizontal mixed use on same site: An equivalent deduction to Subsection (1) may be made for horizontal mixed-use on the same site, as would apply if the same mix of uses were configured as vertical mixed use. For example, two 2-story buildings of the same size, where one is a 2-story residential building and the other is a 2-story office building would qualify for the same deduction as two 2-story buildings with residential above commercial.

(c) Through a Planned Unit Development, similar deductions may be made as for horizontal mixed-use if the resulting development is on separate sites and the resulting development is consistent with the purpose of the deductions.

12.146 Exemptions and Exceptions to Minimum Residential Density Requirements

EXHIBIT “D”

Page 45
Exemption: Development on a building site less than 10,000 square feet that is in existence prior to the date this ordinance is adopted is exempt from minimum density requirements.

Exceptions: The Director is authorized to grant an exception to the minimum residential density requirements in Section 12.145 by means of a Type I procedure, as governed by Section 2.030 as follows:

1. For development on a building site that is 10,000 square feet or larger, if the applicant can demonstrate by means of a detailed site plan that the site is so constrained that the proportional share of the required minimum density cannot be provided and still meet all of the development standards in the underlying zone, an exception may be granted.

2. To be granted an exception to Subsection 1 above, the applicant must demonstrate that the maximum number of residential units are being provided while complying with all applicable development standards in the underlying zone. There is nothing in this section which precludes an applicant from applying for a Variance to these standards, as governed by Article 6.

3. If a property is occupied by a single dwelling as of the date this ordinance is adopted, the dwelling can be enlarged, reconstructed, or replaced in the event of a natural hazard, without having to meet the minimum density requirements.
CITY OF GRANTS PASS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

BUCKMASTER SUBDIVISION 54-LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION
STAFF REPORT

Procedure Type: Type III: Planning Commission's Decision
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Owner(s): Buckmaster Subdivision LLC
Applicant: Michael Masters
Representative: Rick Riker
Property Address: 3322 Leonard Road
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Planner Assigned: Ryan Nolan
Application Date: January 28, 2022
Application Complete: February 3, 2022
Date of Staff Report: March 2, 2022
Hearing Date: March 9, 2022
120 Day Deadline: June 3, 2022

I. PROPOSAL:

The applicant proposes the division of Tax Lots 500 and 502 into 54 separate lots (Tentative Subdivision) ranging in size from 5,000 sq.ft. to 8,472 sq.ft. as seen in Exhibit 3. The proposed subdivision will be served off of Leonard Road and include the creation of Buckmaster Drive, Stoney Creek Road, Stillwater Lane, and Green Pasture Lane (all proposed local access streets to be built to City Standard), and Deer Meadow Lane (private street), half street improvement of Leonard Road to City Standards will also be part of the development.

The property was rezoned from rural zoning to urban zoning through a Zone Map Amendment approved by the City Council. The applicant is proposing the subdivision to be completed in three phases. Phase one proposes to complete lots 7-24 over a 24 month period, phase two proposes to complete lots 1-6 and 25-31 over an 18 month period, and phase three is proposed to complete lots 32-54 over an 18 month period for a total period of 60 months (or 5 years).

A 19,270 square foot area in the northwest corner is proposed as tract ‘A’ to accommodate preserved wetlands and storm water detention.

II. AUTHORITY:

Pursuant to Section 2.052, a Type III decision shall be processed by the Urban Area Planning Commission and include a publicly held and noticed hearing. Sections 2.050 & 7.040, and
Schedule 2-1 of the Development Code, authorize the Urban Area Planning Commission to consider the request and make a decision to approve, approve with conditions, or deny.

III. CRITERIA:

The decision for the tentative subdivision plan must be based on the criteria contained in Section 17.413 of the Development Code.

IV. 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 application, statement of grounds, and fee must be submitted within twelve (12) calendar days of the Urban Area Planning Commission's written decision.

V. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

A. Characteristics of the Property:

1. Land Use Designation:
   a. Comprehensive Plan: Moderate High Density Residential
   b. Zoning District: Residential, R-2
   c. Special Purpose District: Delineated Wetlands, GPID

2. Size: 10.5 acres

3. Frontage: Leonard Road (County Collector)

4. Access: All future driveways shall be from internal roads, no direct access on Leonard Road for private driveways

5. Public Utilities:
   a. Existing Utilities:
      i. Water: 12" main approximately 278 feet east in Leonard Road
      ii. Sewer: 8" main east of site in Leonard Road
         8" main in SW Tater Way on the northeast side of site
      iii. Storm: Open ditches on the south and west sides, also to northeast of the site
6. Topography: Gently sloping to the Northwest

7. Natural Hazards: None noted

8. Natural Resources: Wetland

9. Existing Land Use:
   a. Subject Parcel: Undeveloped
   b. Surrounding: North: Residential
                  East: Residential
                  South: School, Residential
                  West: Residential

B. Background:

On November 17, 2021, the City Council approved a request to change the zoning of the subject property from Rural Residential – 5 acres to R-2 urban zoning.

The property owner to the east of the subject site submitted comment requesting that the applicant design the street and utility system for Buckmaster Subdivision to efficiently accommodate the potential future development of his property. As the Buckmaster Subdivision street and utility plan meets the design standards of the City's Development Code and City Standards for construction, the applicant has meet the requirements of development. Streets are stubbed to the east edge of the development in conformance with the block length and connectivity standards of the City. Further utility (water, sewer, and storm) main lines will be extended in adjacent and new streets as required by City Code.

C. Phased Development:

When an applicant desires to record and develop a subdivision plat in phases, then the approving body may authorize a time for the submittal of the final plat and development of various phases. The time period may exceed eighteen months but in no case shall the total time period for all phases exceed five years without resubmission of the tentative plan for review and approval. Each phase so platted and developed shall conform to the applicable requirements of this Code. Phases platted after eighteen months are subject to modifications in accordance with any changes in the Comprehensive Plan or implementing regulations (Section 17.416). The applicant is proposing three phases of development with a total time period for all phases of five years.

VI. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

A. SUBDIVISION

Section 17.413 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): The plan conforms to the lot dimension standards of Article 12, the base lot standards of Section 17.510, and the requirements of any applicable overlay district.

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. All lots meet the minimum width and lot size requirements of the R-2 zone. No lots exceed the maximum lot width to depth ratios (Section 17.511), lots are arranged such that there will be no difficulties in obtaining building permits for typical permitted uses (Section 17.512), there are several proposed through lots which are proposed in order to efficiently develop the lot (Section 17.513), and side property lines run at right angles to the street it faces (Section 17.514).

Section 17.515 requires all street intersections to provide an arc along the property line to allow construction of standard curb and sidewalk wholly within the right-of-way. Section 27.121(5)(c) requires a curb radius of not less than 20 feet at local street intersections.

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

Staff Response: Not Applicable. A future development plan is required whenever a property is proposed to be subdivided and there is the potential for additional division of the property in the future (Section 17.541). For a lot to be dividable in the R-2 it would need to be at least 10,000 sf in size. The largest proposed lot is 8,472 sf, so no future development plan is required.

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with Conditions. Section 27.051 requires new development to conform with and provide for the extension and construction of streets in conformance with Article 27. The proposed Tentative Subdivision plan has frontage along Leonard Road (County Collector Street) which does not currently meet standards found in Article 27. As a condition of approval, all conditions in the Public Works Staff report regarding public street improvements (see Exhibit 6) shall be met.

The development proposes four new streets (Buckmaster Drive, Stoney Creek Road, Greenpasture Lane, and Stillwater Lane) to be City Local Streets. All four streets shall be constructed to meet all standards found in Article 27. As a condition of approval, all conditions in the Public Works Staff report regarding public street improvements (see Exhibit 6) shall be met.

The proposed Tentative Subdivision plan also proposes to create a private street, Deer Meadow Lane. The private street is proposed with 22 feet in paved access width with curb, gutter, and sidewalk on one side. Per Section 12.123(12)(b), private streets of 22 feet in width with curb and a four foot sidewalk along one side may serve up to ten
dwelling units. The Tentative Plan complies with these standards as the number of lots proposed to take access off of the private street does not exceed ten. Note that future development will not allow more than ten dwelling units to take access off of the private street. As a condition of approval, all conditions in the Public Works Staff report regarding street improvements (see Exhibit 6) shall be met.

The applicant has provided a complete Traffic Impact Analysis (see Exhibit 4 for a summary). The report has been reviewed by the City Traffic Engineer, who provided a review (see Exhibit 7). The City Traffic Engineer found that the Traffic Impact Analysis addresses city requirements for analysis of the impacts of the proposed development. He went on to state that he concurs with the applicant's engineer that no mitigation is required for operational or safety issues. He concurs with the engineer's conclusion that storage for queuing is adequate and that there are no safety concerns requiring attention. Further he concurs with the engineer's conclusion that mitigation at the intersection of Redwood Avenue and Darnielle Lane/Hubbard Lane beyond that specified in connection with the middle school is not required. The City Traffic Engineer did recommend that frontage improvements along Leonard Road be constructed to match collector street standards in the City's Transportation System Plan. The applicant is proposing frontage improvements along Leonard Road in conformance with collector street standards.

Leonard Road is a County roadway, any work completed in Leonard Road will require a permit from Josephine County prior to commencement of construction. See Exhibit 11 for County Comments.

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with Conditions. All land use and development within the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary, as described in Section 28.013 shall extend basic urban services along the full length of all portions of the subject property fronting a public right-of-way consistent with the requirements of Article 28.

Runoff from the proposed development is proposed to be collected and detained in tract 'A'. The developer shall provide for ongoing maintenance of this area under a maintenance agreement/CC&R's. As conditioned below, the applicant will be required to provide a copy a Declaration of Covenants and a Storm Water Operations and Maintenance Agreement to the City for review and approval covering the area proposed for the storm water detention. The documents shall indicate the private party responsible for maintenance, and the scope and frequency of the maintenance required for the drainage facility.

As a condition of approval, the applicant shall comply with all conditions found in the Public Works Staff Report attached as Exhibit 6.

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.

Staff Response: Satisfied with Conditions.

The applicant submitted a "tree plan" document included in Exhibit 3. The submittal includes a submittal requirement required per Section 11.040 at the time of submittal of a Tentative Plan. In addition, the plan meets the criteria of an Existing Tree Canopy Cover and Tree Protection Plan in conformance with Section 11.050.

The applicant included a Tree Re-vegetation Plan which did not meet all conditions in Section 11.060. As a condition of approval, prior to recording of the Final Plat, the applicant must submit a "Tree Re-vegetation Plan", prepared by a Tree Professional, in accordance with Section 11.060 which displays percent coverage per lot in conformance with the required 15 percent to 20 percent coverage requirement.

As a condition of approval, the applicant shall pay a tree deposit of $300 per lot in compliance with Section 11.060(2). The money will be available for future installation trees in accordance with the Tree Re-vegetation Plan and other standards found in Section 11.060(2).

As a condition of approval, all future building permits shall reflect the Tree-Revegetation Plan.

As noted in the application, the project site contains some areas of delineated wetlands. These wetlands were delineated and approved by the Department of State Lands through the Oregon Wetland Determination Report WD# 2021-0304 (see Exhibit 8).

Per the applicant’s submittal, the applicant is working with the Oregon Department of State Lands, Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) to mitigate wetland loss. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall provide a copy of approved wetland mitigation permits prior to the granting of a development permit. This applies to all phases of development.

(b) No cuts shall result in retaining walls greater than 15 feet high in a single wall from the finish grade or create any un-retained slopes greater than 100%.

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. The site is mildly sloping. As a condition of approval, the above standards 5(b) and 5(c) must be adhered to during future development.

Solar lot design standards apply to all proposed subdivisions in residential zones per Section 22.631. Solar lot standards found in Section 22.632 requires that 80% of the proposed lots have a north-south dimension of at least 80. As 85% of the proposed lots
exceed 80 feet in their north-south dimension the proposed tentative plan meets solar lot design standards.

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

**Staff Response: Satisfied with Conditions.** With the submittal of the Tentative Subdivision plan and the burden of proof, the applicant is demonstrating compliance with all applicable Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan, Development Code requirements, and state and federal laws given the conditions of approval stated below.

The project parcels will need to enter into Service and Annexation Agreements prior to issuance of a development permit.

The project site is located within the Grants Pass Irrigation District. **As a condition of approval,** the applicant shall contact Grants Pass Irrigation District and comply with all associated requirements.

Oregon Fire Code requires that development of one or two family dwellings where the number of dwelling units exceeds 30 shall be provided with two separate and approved fire department access roads, and shall meet the requirements of OFC D 104.3 & D107.1. As the applicant proposes a 54 lot subdivision with one access point approval will require conditions related to the allowed number of dwellings to be built. **As conditioned below,** the applicant shall submit a revised tentative plan showing a second approved fire apparatus access road, or showing that sprinklers would be provided in every home for fire protection. In addition, **as conditioned below,** the number of homes permitted to be built in the subdivision will be limited to 30 until a second fire apparatus access road is provided or fire sprinkler systems are installed in each home.

**VII. RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission **APPROVE** the request for the phased Buckmaster Subdivision a fifty-four (54) lot subdivision.

**Subdivision Conditions of Approval:**

**A.** Phase I - 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. Provide all requirement submittals and meet standards found in the Public Works Comments, Public Safety Comments, and Josephine County Comments (see Exhibit 5, 6, 11).
2. Provide a copy of all approved wetland mitigation permits from DSL, ACOE, ODEQ, and/or any other agency with jurisdiction prior to the granting of a development permit.

3. Contact Grants Pass Irrigation District and comply with all requirements.


B. Phase I - The following must occur prior to Final Plat approval:

1. Provide all requirement submittals and meet standards found in the Public Works Comments, Public Safety Comments, and Josephine County Comments (see Exhibit 5, 6, 11).

2. Pay a tree deposit of $300 per lot in compliance with Section 11.060(2). The money will be available for future installation trees in accordance with the Tree Re-vegetation Plan and other standards found in Section 11.060(2).

3. Provide a Declaration of Covenants and a Storm Water Operations and Maintenance Agreement to the City for review and approval covering the area proposed for the storm water detention. The documents shall indicate the private party responsible for maintenance, and the scope and frequency of the maintenance required for the drainage facility.

4. Submit a Tree Re-vegetation Plan, prepared by a Tree Professional, in accordance with Section 11.060.

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

6. Development of all streets in Phase I shall be made by the applicant prior to the submission of the Final Plan or by an agreement to secure the future construction of the streets in accordance with City requirements per Section 27.110(4).

7. Street names and traffic control signs shall be installed by the City Engineer Section 27.121(14) and Section 27.121(15).

8. The applicant shall submit evidence of an easement and legal assurances for the continued maintenance of any private street as required in Section 27.123(12)(d).

9. 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.

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

11. Pay all engineering inspection fees due.
12. Submit a final plat 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.

13. After all signatures are obtained, the plat must be recorded with the Josephine County Recorder within 30 days. The subdivider shall file one print of the recorded plat with the Parks and Community Development Department. Failure to do so will nullify plat approval.

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

Note: The following conditions are not all-inclusive and are provided for the information of the applicant.

1. Future Development of lots shall comply with adopted City standards at time a future submittal is deemed complete. Standards at time of a future submittals deeming of condition shall override any of the below conditions.

2. Future Development will be limited to 30 homes within the subdivision until such time as a second approved fire apparatus access road is provided, or until such time as fire suppression/sprinkler systems are provided in each home.

3. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.

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

5. All future development shall reflect the Tree-Revegetation Plan.

6. Payment of all System Development Charges due; including, but not limited to, water, storm, sewer, parks and transportation (see Exhibit 9).


8. During Construction on new development sites that are without paved surfaces the developer shall take appropriate measures to suppress the dust, primarily by wetting the travel surfaces, in and around, the construction site in accordance with Section 24.253.

9. Each lot shall conform to Article 25; Parking and Loading Standards

10. Prior to occupancy, driveways and parking and maneuvering areas shall be paved in accordance with the requirements of the Development Code.
11. Driveways shall be in compliance with Section 27.121(11).

12. Each lot shall have separate utility services.

13. All utilities shall be placed underground.

14. Install landscaping in accordance with the approved landscape plan (Section 23.031 - Residential Front Yard).

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

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

17. Provide addresses visible from the public right-of-way.

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

18. 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%. And 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%.

D. Phase II - The following must be accomplished within 18 months of the issuance of Development Permit. The Director may, upon written request by the applicant, grant up to two extensions of the expiration date of six months each.

1. Provide all requirement submittals and meet standards found in the Public Works Comments, Public Safety Comments, and Josephine County Comments (see Exhibit 5, 6, and 11).

2. Provide a copy of all approved wetland mitigation permits from DSL, ACOE, ODEQ, and/or any other agency with jurisdiction prior to the granting of a development permit.

3. Contact Grants Pass Irrigation District and comply with all requirements.

E. Phase II - The following must occur prior to Final Plat approval:

1. Provide all requirement submittals and meet standards found in the Public Works Comments, Public Safety Comments, and Josephine County Comments (see Exhibit 5, 6, and 11).

2. Provide a Declaration of Covenants and a Storm Water Operations and Maintenance Agreement to the City for review and approval covering the area proposed for the storm water detention. The documents shall indicate the
private party responsible for maintenance, and the scope and frequency of the maintenance required for the drainage facility.

3. Pay a tree deposit of $300 per lot in compliance with Section 11.060(2). The money will be available for future installation trees in accordance with the Tree Re-vegetation Plan and other standards found in Section 11.060(2).

4. Submit a Tree Re-vegetation Plan, prepared by a Tree Professional, in accordance with Section 11.060.

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

6. Street names and traffic control signs shall be installed by the City Engineer Section 27.121(14) and Section 27.121(15).

7. The applicant shall submit evidence of an the continued maintenance of all private streets as required in Section 27.123(12)(d).

8. 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.

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

10. Pay all engineering inspection fees due.

11. Submit a final plat 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.

12. After all signatures are obtained, the plat must be recorded with the Josephine County Recorder within 30 days. The subdivider shall file one print of the recorded plat with the Parks and Community Development Department. Failure to do so will nullify plat approval.

F. Phase II - The following shall be accomplished at the time of development of individual lots in the subdivision:

Note: The following conditions are not all-inclusive and are provided for the information of the applicant.

1. Future Development of lots shall comply with adopted City standards at time a future submittal is deemed complete. Standards at time of a future submittals deeming of condition shall override any of the below conditions.
2. Future Development will be limited to 30 homes within the subdivision until such time as a second approved fire apparatus access road is provided, or until such time as fire suppression/sprinkler systems are provided in each home.

3. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.

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

5. All future development shall reflect the Tree-Revegetation Plan.

6. Payment of all System Development Charges due; including, but not limited to, water, storm, sewer, parks and transportation (see Exhibit 9).


8. During Construction on new development sites that are without paved surfaces the developer shall take appropriate measures to suppress the dust, primarily by wetting the travel surfaces, in and around, the construction site in accordance with Section 24.253.

9. Each lot shall conform to Article 25; Parking and Loading Standards

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

11. Driveways shall be in compliance with Section 27.121(11).

12. Each lot shall have separate utility services.

13. All utilities shall be placed underground.

14. Install landscaping in accordance with the approved landscape plan (Section 23.031 ~ Residential Front Yard).

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

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

17. Provide addresses visible from the public right-of-way.

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

19. 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%. And 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%.

G. **Phase III - The following must be accomplished within 18 months of the issuance of Development Permit. The Director may, upon written request by the applicant, grant up to two extensions of the expiration date of six months each.**

1. Provide all requirement submittals and meet standards found in the Public Works Comments, Public Safety Comments, and Josephine County Comments (see *Exhibit 5, 6, and 11*).

2. Provide a copy of all approved wetland mitigation permits from DSL, ACOE, ODEQ, and/or any other agency with jurisdiction prior to the granting of a development permit.

3. Contact Grants Pass Irrigation District and comply with all requirements.

H. **Phase III - The following must occur prior to Final Plat approval:**

1. Provide all requirement submittals and meet standards found in the Public Works Comments, Public Safety Comments, and Josephine County Comments (see *Exhibit 5, 6, and 11*).

2. Provide a Declaration of Covenants and a Storm Water Operations and Maintenance Agreement to the City for review and approval covering the area proposed for the storm water detention. The documents shall indicate the private party responsible for maintenance, and the scope and frequency of the maintenance required for the drainage facility.

3. Pay a tree deposit of $300 per lot in compliance with Section 11.060(2). The money will be available for future installation trees in accordance with the Tree Re-vegetation Plan and other standards found in Section 11.060(2).

4. Submit a Tree Re-vegetation Plan, prepared by a Tree Professional, in accordance with Section 11.060.

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

6. Development of Strawberry Lane shall be made by the applicant prior to the submission of the Final Plan or by an agreement to secure the future construction of the streets in accordance with City requirements per Section 27.110(4).

7. Street names and traffic control signs shall be installed by the City Engineer Section 27.121(14) and Section 27.121(15).
8. The applicant shall submit evidence of an easement and legal assurances for the continued maintenance of Strawberry Lane as required in Section 27.123(12)(d).

9. 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.

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

11. Pay all engineering inspection fees due.

12. Submit a final plat 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.

1. After all signatures are obtained, the plat must be recorded with the Josephine County Recorder within 30 days. The subdivider shall file one print of the recorded plat with the Parks and Community Development Department. Failure to do so will nullify plat approval.

I. Phase III - The following shall be accomplished at the time of development of individual lots in the subdivision:

Note: The following conditions are not all-inclusive and are provided for the information of the applicant.

1. Future Development of lots shall comply with adopted City standards at time a future submittal is deemed complete. Standards at time of a future submittals deeming of condition shall override any of the below conditions.

2. Future Development will be limited to 30 homes within the subdivision until such time as a second approved fire apparatus access road is provided, or until such time as fire suppression/sprinkler systems are provided in each home.

3. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.

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

5. All future development shall reflect the Tree-Revegetation Plan.

6. Payment of all System Development Charges due; including, but not limited to, water, storm, sewer, parks and transportation (see Exhibit 9).

8. During Construction on new development sites that are without paved surfaces the developer shall take appropriate measures to suppress the dust, primarily by wetting the travel surfaces, in and around, the construction site in accordance with Section 24.253.

9. Each lot shall conform to Article 25; Parking and Loading Standards

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

11. Driveways shall be in compliance with Section 27.121(11).

12. Each lot shall have separate utility services.

13. All utilities shall be placed underground.

14. Install landscaping in accordance with the approved landscape plan (Section 23.031 ~ Residential Front Yard).

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

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

17. Provide addresses visible from the public right-of-way.

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

19. 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%. And 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%.
VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. Approve the request
   1. as submitted.
   2. with the conditions stated in the staff report.
   3. with the conditions stated in the staff report as modified by the Hearings Officer (list):

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

C. Postponement: Continue item
   1. indefinitely.
   2. to a time certain.

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

IX. INDEX TO EXHIBITS:

1. Location Map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Applicant Submittal
4. Traffic Impact Analysis Summary
5. City of Grants Pass Public Safety Comments
6. City of Grants Pass Public Works Comments
7. City Traffic Engineer Comments
8. Oregon Wetland Determination Report WD# 2021-0304
9. System Development Charges Brochure
10. Dustin Smith Comments (neighbor to east)
11. Josephine County Comments
## Property Address:
3322 Leonard Road

### Assessor's Map & Tax Lot:

- 36 06 22 AA Tax Lot(s) 500, 502
- - - - Tax Lot(s)

### Zoning:
R-2

### Project Type:
- Site Plan
- Standard Architectural Review
- Discretionary Arch. Review
- Special Concept Plan

### Project Size:

- City: [ ]
- UGB: [ ]

### Authorized Representative (if different from applicant):
- Rick Riker, Planning & Research Services
- Address: 560 NE F Street Ste A PMB #224, GP 97526
- Phone: 541-679-7333
- Email: rjrker@charter.net

### Surveyor or Engineer (if applicable):
- Marc Cross, Rhine-Cross Engineering
- Address: PO Box 909, Klamath Falls, OR 97601
- Phone: 541-851-9405
- Email: marc@rc-grp.com

### Description of Request

(Include name of project and proposed uses):
- Buckmaster Tentative Plan for 54 lots on 10.5 acres
to be used for single family residences, on lots
of 5,000 sq. ft. or larger. Phased development.

---

### RECEIVED

- Jan 28, 2022

### CITY OF GRANTS PASS

---

### EXHIBIT A

Application
Subdivision and Condominium Plat Name Review and Approval Request Form

This form must be submitted to the Josephine County Surveyor for subdivision and condominium plat name review and approval. This document may be submitted by email in PDF file format. A processing fee of $95 must be paid upon review form submittal.

PROPOSED NAME: BUCKMASTER SUBDIVISION

ALTERNATE NAME:

Map and Tax Lot Number(s): 36-6-22- AA  1250 500

Site Address: 3322 LEONARD RD.

Location: City of Grants Pass X City of Cave Junction ___ Josephine County ___

Owner/Applicant/Organization Name: RICK RIGGS

Signature of Owner/Applicant: __________________________ Date: 1/31/2022

Contact Phone: 541-479-7323 Email: RTRIGGS@CHAPARIS.NET

Property Owner’s Name, Address, Phone & Email: MICHAEL MASTERS

BUCKMASTER SUBD LLC

PO BOX

GRANTS PASS OR 97526

MASTERSM@GMAIL.COM.

Surveyor/Engineer Name, Address, Phone & Email: RHINE-CROSS CINN

PO BOX 967

KUMMERT HILLS OR 97601

MADHINE. RE-GRIN.COM.

This plat name will be reserved for a period of two years from approval date, after which it will automatically expire. Submittal of this form is requested as a result of Oregon Revised Statutes (2019), Chapters 92.090 (1) and 100.105 (5) & (6) which state:

*ORS 92.090 Approval of subdivision plat names; requisites for approval of tentative subdivision or partition plan or plat. (1) Subdivision plat names shall be subject to the approval of the county surveyor or, in the case where there is no county surveyor, the county assessor. No tentative subdivision plan or subdivision plat of a subdivision shall be approved which bears a name similar to or pronounced the same as the name of any other subdivision in the same county, unless the land platted in contiguous to and platted by the same party that platted the subdivision bearing that name or unless the party files and records the consent of the party that platted the contiguous subdivision bearing that name.

*ORS 100.105 Contents of declaration; property name; variable property description. (5) The name of the property shall include the word “condominium” or “condominiums” or the words “a condominium.” (6) A condominium may not bear a name which is the same as or deceptively similar to the name of any other condominium located in the same county.

PLAT NAME APPROVED: "Buckmaster Subdivision"

Josephine County Surveyor: RICK ADAMS

Date: 2/2/2022

Date Fee Paid: 1/31/22 Check No: 5360 Cash: 95

Invoice Number: 480724

JoCo Surveyor Plat Name Review-Approval Form.docx

Revised 09/31/2020
MEMO

TO: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, CITY OF GRANTS PASS
FROM: RICK RIKER, CONSULTANT

RE: 3322 LEONARD ROAD
     TENTATIVE PLAN - BUCKMASTER

DATE: 28 JANUARY 2022

Enclosed is a formal application for a tentative plan for Buckmaster Subdivision, for 54 lots on the subject property.

The following is enclosed:

- Check for $5727.86 and the package includes:

  A  Planning Application
  B  Narrative & Table of Contents
  C  Criteria
  D  Subdivision Tentative Plan T1
  E  Utilities Plan Map - T2
  F  Tree Plan Map - T2
  G  Contours & Aerial Photo
  H  Large Assessor’s Map & Ownership
  I  Wetlands Information
  J  Flood Map
  K  Zoning Map
  L  Residences in the Area
  M  Phasing Proposal
  N  Traffic Information
  O  Street Map
  P  Photos
  Q  Other

- One 8 x 11 copy of the Tentative Plan
- Five 11 x 17 copies of the Tentative Plan
- Two 11 x 17 copies of the Utility Plan
- One full copy of the TIA for John Replinger

Do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or need additional material.

Thank you.
BUCKMASTER Subdivision
TENTATIVE PLAN

Zoning: R-2
Comprehensive Plan: MR
Size of Project: 10.5 Acres

Legal: 36-06-22-AA TL 500, 502
Location: 3322 Leonard Road

Owner: Buckmaster Subdivision LLC.
Post Office 1030
Grants Pass, Oregon 97528

Applicant: Michael Masters, Re/Max
1830 NE 7th Street, Suite #101
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526
Tele: 541-650-8006
e-mail: mastersmgrantspass@gmail.com

Engineer: Marc Cross,
Rhine-Cross Engineering
112 No. 5th Street, Suite #200
Post Office Box 909
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601
Tele: 541-851-9405
e-mail: marc@rc-grp.com

JANUARY 2022

Consultant: Rick Riker
Planning & Research Services
560 NE F ST, STE A, PMB #224
Grants Pass, OR 97526
Tele: 541-479-7333
e-mail: rriker@charter.net

CITY OF GRANTS PASS

RECEIVED
JAN 28 2022
TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBITS

A  Planning Application
B  Narrative & Table of Contents
C  Criteria
D  Subdivision Tentative Plan T1
E  Utilities Plan Map - T2
F  Tree Plan Map - T2
G  Contours & Aerial Photo
H  Large Assessor's Map & Ownership
I  Wetlands Information
J  Flood Map
K  Zoning Map
L  Residences in the Area
M  Phasing Proposal
N  Traffic Information
O  Street Map
P  Photos
Q  Other
NARRATIVE

BUCKMASTER - Tentative Plan

Owner: Buckmaster Subdivision LLC
Applicant: Michael Masters
Location: 3322 Leonard Road
Zoning: R-2
Legal: 36-06-22-AA TL 500, 502

Process: This process involves a formal application to the Urban Area Planning Commission to review the tentative plan. The applicant is proposing up to 54 lots of around 5,000 to 8,000 plus sq. ft. That meets the R-2 zoning minimum size of 5,000 sq. ft., to be used for single family dwellings. There are seven lots of 7,000 sq. ft. or larger. The applicant has indicated no plans for duplex development, so this development will match and compliment the existing neighborhood. The proposal will include new internal roads to city standards, and an extension of city water, city sewer, and internal storm drainage. Exhibits D, E and F.

Zone Change: The property is designated Comprehensive Plan MR- Moderate Density with the Grants Pass City Council approving R-2 zoning on November 3, 2021. Exhibit K.

Potential: This is a proposal for a 54 lot subdivision
47 Lots of 5000 sq. ft. to 6980 sq. feet.
7 Lots of 7,000 sq. ft. or more.

Leonard Road: Leonard Road is a collector road that has a capacity to handle 10,000 ADT (Average Daily Trips). The additional cars from this development would not exceed the capacity and standard for that road. Since this development involves city density, a statement has been included that documents that the development does not exceed the capacity of the road systems in this area. Exhibit O.

Traffic: A special study has been completed by Kelly Sandow, P.E., which confirms that the development of 54 lots does not require further mitigation. Exhibit N.

Intersection: There will be one new intersection with Leonard Road. Buckmaster Drive, that is about 800 feet from the closest intersection to the east being Harvest Drive. Exhibits D & H.

Driveways: All future driveways will be from the internal roads, with none directly on Leonard Road.

Wetlands: The owners had a wetland consultant onboard that has completed a detailed wetland study, and they have received approval of their study from the Department of State Lands. Exhibit I.
Storm Drainage: The storm drainage will be directed towards the wetlands in the northwest corner. The wetlands have been delineated by the consultant and the study confirmed by DSL (Division of State Lands.) Exhibit I. This wetland may include an orifice installed in a small berm to regulate the outflow of storm drainage so it does not exceed the current flow rate offsite. Exhibits D & I.

GPID: The site has water rights with GPID, and that usage and easements will be coordinated with GPID.

Lot Size: The entire holding consists of 10.5 acres. The tentative plan includes 47 lots of 5,000 to 6900 sq. ft. and 7 lots of 7000 sq. ft or larger. The proposal is for single family dwellings.

Water: City water will need to be extended from the east in Leonard Road. The entire subdivision will be served by city water and a stub in the northeast corner for future road extension.

Sewer: Sewer will be provided within the subdivision exiting in the northeast corner to an existing sewer easement. Exhibit E & H. The project engineer will determine and coordinate with the city and state for proper permits if required for grading and fill that may allow for a better gravity flow sewer design and system.

Existing: The site is vacant with mostly open field grass. See Aerial Photo Exhibit G

Phasing: Due to the number of lots, phasing will be used to insure that the development may proceed without interruption or the requirement for extensions. Three phases are proposed with Phase I - 24 months, Phase II - 18 months, Phase III - 18 months, for a total of 60 months.

Hazards:

| Wetlands - See comments above concerning designated wetlands. |
| Natural - It is not noted for protection for a natural habitat. |
| Flood - None. There is considerable distance and elevation from the Rogue River, thereby this site is outside any flood hazard area. Exhibit J |
| Steep Slope - None. |
| Riparian - Riparian Setback - None. |

Buckmaster - Tentative Plan
CRITERIA

CITY OF GRANTS PASS - DEVELOPMENT CODE

SECTION 17.410 - TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION PLANS:

SECTION 17.411 Submittal Requirements.

The applicant shall submit eight (8) copies of a tentative plan and any supporting materials to the Director. The following shall be included:

(1) Plan: No smaller than 8 1/2 inches x 11 inches and legible with north arrow, scale (an engineering scale appropriate to the area involved and sufficient to show detail of the plan and related data, such as 1 inch : 30 feet, 1 inch : 50 feet, 1 inch : 100 feet, or less), and date of preparation.

Response: Complies. The tentative plan is 11 x 17 to scale and contains the applicable data.

(2) Location: Location by street address and assessor's map and tax lot number.

Response: Complies. This application includes the legal tax lot information.

(3) Vicinity map: A vicinity sketch shall be shown on the plan at a small scale (i.e., 1 inch : 400 feet) showing all existing and adjacent subdivisions, streets, property lines of acreage properties, names of the recorded owners of properties adjoining the land to be divided and between it and the nearest existing or proposed public street, adjacent railroad rights-of-way, and adjacent political subdivisions.

Response: Complies. Exhibits D & H show a vicinity map.

(4) Names: Name, address and telephone number of each of the following: property owner(s), sub-divider, and preparer of the plan.

Response: Complies. The tentative plan has shown this information. Exhibit D.

(5) Lot Dimensions: Existing and proposed lot lines and their dimensions, and lot size in square feet or acres.1
Response: Complies. The tentative plan has shown a lot number for each parcel, their width and depth, and the square footage.

(6) Lot numbers or letters: Lot numbers or letters for each lot.

Response: Complies. The tentative plan has shown lot numbers for each parcel.

(7) Streets and Sidewalks, Existing: Names, rights-of-way locations and widths, curb locations, sidewalk locations, vehicular access points, public or private status, and any recorded reservations or restrictions.

Response: Complies. The engineer has provided this detail on the tentative plan with 5 ft. sidewalks on each side of the new roads. Exhibit D & E.

(8) Streets and Sidewalks, Proposed: Names, rights-of-way locations and widths, curb locations, pavement widths, sidewalk locations, street lights, vehicular access points, public or private status, any recorded reservations or restrictions, approximate radii of curves, grades, and typical cross-sections showing all utility improvements proposed within the street right-of-way and adjacent easements at such scale to clearly show the details thereof.

Response: Will comply. The final plat will include engineered drawings that depict the grade, cross sections, and locations of items with pertinent detail from the engineer. Names have been given to each road, to be confirmed with Josephine County later in the review process.

(9) Easements: The location, dimensions and purpose of all recorded and proposed public and private easements.

Response: Complies. The tentative plan shows an easement along the east property line. New easements will be designated where needed for the appropriate service.

(10) Utilities: Location and size of all existing and proposed storm drains and other drainage ways; sewer mains, laterals, septic tank leach fields, or other facilities; water mains, laterals, fire hydrants, wells or other facilities; irrigation facilities or other pertinent utilities.

Response: Complies. The tentative plan and accompanying exhibits depict the location of the wetlands, no wells, no septic, and no other facilities on-site, as the parcel is vacant. With the approval of the tentative plan the engineer will then create construction drawings to include the details on the road grade, proposed storm drains and other drainage ways, sewer mains, electrical location,
natural gas (if any), the sewer and laterals, other facilities, water mains, new fire hydrants, irrigation facilities or other pertinent utilities.

(11) Natural Features: Location and extent of streams, rivers, their high banks, wetlands, and any required setbacks

Response: Complies. The only natural feature on this site is a wetland. This is depicted on the tentative plan (Exhibit D). A detailed on-site analysis was completed by a wetland consultant with a subsequent approval by DSL. Exhibit I.

(12) Flood Areas: Location of floodplain and floodway.

Response: Complies. Not applicable. This site is above the 100 and 500 year flood plain of the Rogue River. Exhibit J.

(13) Slope: Topographic contour lines having the following minimum intervals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Site Slope</th>
<th>Contour Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5 percent</td>
<td>2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 15 percent</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 percent or more</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slope hazard areas shall be indicated as follows:

| Slopes 15% to 25% | light shading |
| Slopes exceeding 25% | heavy shading |

Response: Complies. Exhibit G shows contour intervals for this site, and it has less than a three percent slope.

A Tentative Grading Plan indicating cuts, fills, and retaining walls.

Response: Complies. The gentle sloping land will have minimal cuts and fills or small retaining walls if needed. Buckmaster Drive may include about a four foot fill for about 50 feet at the intersection with Leonard Road, to achieve the proper vertical road alignment, and this will be designed to meet the code by the engineer.
(14) Slope Hazard District: If the property is located within the Slope Hazard District see Section 13.120 for additional submittal requirements.

Response: Complies. Not applicable as it outside the Slope Hazard District with gentle sloping land.

(15) Submittal an existing Tree Plan (required for all developments even those outside of the Slope Hazard District) in accordance with Section 11.040.

Response: Complies. There are no trees on this site. A Tree Plan has been included as Exhibit F. Trees will be planted in accordance with the landscape plan for each site, but careful coordination will be needed to avoid compromising the ability for solar access which will become more essential in the coming years.

(16) Districts: The designated zoning district, special purpose district, and any zoning district boundary, special purpose district boundary, political subdivision boundary, or the Urban Growth Boundary that are adjacent to or that divide the property.

Response: Complies. This site is within the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary and only the land directly to the east has the potential to be divided in the future with a zone change. That owner asked to be included in the recent zone change, but that request was not made known until after this site was in the midst of active zone change hearings. Exhibits H, L & K.

(17) Existing Uses: Location and outline of existing buildings and structures with distances in feet to new subdivision lines created by the proposed subdivision and an indication if they are to be removed prior to final platting.

Response: Complies. The site is vacant of structures.

(18) Future Development Plan: A future development plan shall be submitted for the property being subdivided in accordance with Section 17.540.

Response: Complies. Not applicable. The entire site is proposed for development with no land left vacant.

(19) Future Street Plan: A future street plan shall be submitted in accordance with Section 17.550.

Response: Complies. The tentative plan may need to show street plug/access control for the extension of future streets: a) two in the northeast corner; b) one in the
southeast corner; and c) one in the northwest corner. See Exhibits D and O.

(20) Signatures: A signature by the property owner or stamp of a registered land surveyor that guarantees that all information shown on the plan is accurate and correct, and the applicant accepts responsibility for same.

Response: Complies. The owners have signed the application form. The tentative plan was prepared by a licensed surveyor/engineer. That information is accurate and complete to the best of everyone's knowledge, and they accept responsibility for same. It must be noted that to stamp the "plan is accurate" could be premature, as such a comment is reserved for the engineered drawings and the actual survey of the property for the final plat. Exhibit D.

(21) Title: The proposed name and the title "Tentative Plan".

Response: Complies. The title 'Tentative Plan' is shown. Exhibit D.

(22) Dedication: locations of all areas to be dedicated or reserved for public use, with the purpose, condition, or limitations of such reservations clearly indicated.

Response: Complies. The areas to be dedicated to the city are shown on the tentative plan which includes four new public streets, and potential dedication on Leonard Road if necessary. No reservations or limitations are necessary, except for street plugs/access control strips on the future road connections off of this site from the new roads.

(23) Deed Restrictions: Previously recorded and proposed deed restrictions.

Response: Complies. The developer has indicated that there will be no deed restrictions on the lots, as he plans to develop all of the sites himself. There will be a road maintenance agreement concerning the private road, to ensure proper maintenance is performed, and the document will be provided with the final plat.

(24) Phasing: If the subdivision will be platted in phases, indicate the lots to be included in each phase, all street, utility, and other improvements to be constructed in conjunction with each phase, and proposed timing for each phase.

Response: The subdivision is being discussed regarding the layout for three phases, as the developer wishes to build
more than 12 homes a year. It appears the first phase would be in the northern part of the site as that would allow for proper connection for the storm drainage and public sewer. The sewer and city water in the private street will require easements or other arrangements with the City Of Grants Pass. Exhibit D and M.

(25) Solar Lot Design Standard: Documentation shall be provided indicating compliance with Section 22.630 of this Code.

Response: Complies in the future. The east west design of the majority of the roads allows for ideal solar access for the new homes, and the north-south roads can include roof alignment for solar. The engineer has commented (Exhibit D TI) that compliance for the solar standards will include setbacks and tree heights to accommodate solar. The conditions of approval might state "Prior to the issuance of the Development Permit for each parcel, a parcel specific Solar Lot Design shall be submitted and approved." This design will reflect the home location in relation to the setbacks, the house alignment and height, the roof design and proposed tall or short tree locations. The combination will show the different elements for each individual lot, and confirm that solar access will be preserved.

(26) Watermaster compliance: If groundwater is proposed as a source of water for the subdivision, and the subdivision is located in a designated area of groundwater availability concern, the applicant shall submit a certificate of compliance with applicable groundwater testing ordinances.

Response: Complies. Not applicable as this development will not utilize groundwater but water from the City of Grants Pass.

(27) The City Engineer may require a traffic analysis, as per Section 27.121(3), for any new development to determine the development's potential impact on the existing transportation system. At a minimum, the impact of development on transportation facility performance shall be mitigated to the standards set forth in Section 27.121(2).

Response: Complies. The traffic engineer has provided a traffic study that states the total number of 54 lots for single family use, will not affect the function of the roads and intersections that serve this area. Exhibit N.

SECTION 17.412 REFEERAL FOR REVIEW:

The Director shall distribute copies of the tentative plan to such agencies as would have an interest in reviewing the plan, which may include:
(1) Applicable School District.

(2) Applicable Citizen Participation Committee.

(3) Grants Pass Irrigation District.

(4) Affected Governmental Agencies and Other Special Districts.

(5) Affected Public and Private Utilities.

(6) Applicable Site Plan Review Committee.

(7) Department of Environmental Quality.

(8) Josephine County Public Works Department.

(9) Oregon State Highway Division.

(10) Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

(11) Others, as determined by Director.

Response: This application will be distributed by Community Development as stated above to the relevant agencies.

SECTION 17.413 CRITERIA FOR TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION APPROVAL:

The review body shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the request, based upon the following criteria:

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

Response: Complies. This tentative plan includes lot sizes of around 5,000 sq. ft. to over 7,000 sq. ft. The basic lot standards on lot width, size, and depth have been met. There is no overlay district.

(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.

Response: Complies. The entire site is proposed for development with 54 lots with no vacant land remaining for
additional development. The only vacant portion is in the northwest corner that will be dedicated to wetlands. Provision has been made in the northeast corner for future road extension to the north, potentially to South River Road and/or Darnielie Lane. Exhibit D and H.

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

Response: Complies. There is only one connection to Leonard Road with access being located on the eastern half of the property, on the south property line. The subdivision will include new roads built to city residential standards with an upgrade of the north half of Leonard Road to the city standards with curb, gutter sidewalk. The internal road systems will include curb, gutter and sidewalks. See Exhibit D, H and E. The latter is depicting the road profiles.

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

Response: Complies. The tentative plan shows a concept layout for the utilities to include water, sewer, storm drain, electrical, and potential natural gas and cable. Exhibits D, E and F.

(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.

Response: Complies. The site is devoid of any trees as the property has been traditionally used for the grazing of cattle for over 50 years. Exhibit F & G.

(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%.

Response: Complies. The site has no steep slopes and the cuts and fill if needed will be minimal. The
contour map shows the gentle slope for the subject property. Exhibit G.

(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%.

Response: Not Applicable. The site has moderate slopes and any grading will be moderate, with the real potential segment being the new road intersection with Leonard Road. To obtain the proper vertical road design one may see some fill of around four feet.

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

Response: Complies. The Comprehensive Plan is Moderate Density (MR) and the zoning is R-2. The tentative plan acknowledges those requires with the proposed design of 5,000 plus sq. ft. lots. Exhibits D & K. The development will comply with the pertinent code requirements, plus applicable state and federal laws.

SECTION 17.416 PHASED DEVELOPMENT:

When an applicant desires to record and develop a subdivision plat in phases, then the approving body may authorize a time for the submittal of the final plat and development of various phases. The time period may exceed eighteen months but in no case shall the total time period for all phases exceed five years without resubmission of the tentative plan for review and approval. Each phase so platted and developed shall conform to the applicable requirements of this Code. Phases platted after eighteen months are subject to modifications in accordance with any changes in the Comprehensive Plan or implementing regulations.

Response: There will be three phases for a total of 60 months, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Lots</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7-24</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1-6, 25-31</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>32-54</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 22.630 - SOLAR

Response: Complies. The east-west design of the majority of the roads allows for ideal solar access with north-south aligned parcels. This presents the opportunity for roof alignment for maximum solar with the south facing roofs. An approved solar layout will be furnished with detail for the building permit of each individual lot. Exhibit D.
October 12, 2021

Bruce Buckmaster
14095 East Evans Creek Road
Rogue River, OR 97537

Re: WD # 2021-0304 Approved
Wetland Delineation Report for 3322 Leonard Road
Josephine County; T36S R6W S22A TLs 500, 503, and Leonard Road ROW (Portion)

Dear Bruce Buckmaster:

The Department of State Lands has reviewed the wetland delineation report prepared
by Schott & Associates, Inc. for the site referenced above. Please note that the study
area includes only a portion of Leonard Road right of way (see the attached maps).
Based upon the information presented in the report and additional information submitted
upon request, we concur with the wetland and waterway boundaries as mapped in
revised Figures 6a and 6b of the report. Please replace all copies of the preliminary
wetland maps with these final Department-approved maps.

Within the study area, one wetland, (totaling approximately 0.05 acre), 2 active irrigation
ditches (Ditches 2 and 3), and one abandoned irrigation ditch (Ditch 1) were identified.
The wetland is subject to the permit requirements of the state Removal-Fill Law. Under
current regulations, a state permit is required for cumulative fill or annual excavation of
50 cubic yards or more in wetlands or below the ordinary high-water line (OHWL) of
waterways (or the 2-year recurrence interval flood elevation if OHWL cannot be
determined). The active irrigation ditches and abandoned irrigation ditch are not state
jurisdictional, per OAR 141-085-0515 (9) and (8), respectively.

This concurrence is for purposes of the state Removal-Fill Law only. We recommend
that you attach a copy of this concurrence letter to any subsequent state permit
application to speed application review. Federal, other state agencies, or local permit
requirements may apply as well. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will determine
jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, which may require submittal of a complete
Wetland Delineation Report.

Please be advised that state law establishes a preference for avoidance of wetland
impacts. Because measures to avoid and minimize wetland impacts may include
reconfiguring parcel layout and size or development design, we recommend that you
work with Department staff on appropriate site design before completing the city or
county land use approval process.

EXHIBIT I
Wetlands
This concurrence is based on information provided to the agency. The jurisdictional determination is valid for five years from the date of this letter unless new information necessitates a revision. Circumstances under which the Department may change a determination are found in OAR 141-090-0045 (available on our web site or upon request). In addition, laws enacted by the legislature and/or rules adopted by the Department may result in a change in jurisdiction; individuals and applicants are subject to the regulations that are in effect at the time of the removal-fill activity or complete permit application. The applicant, landowner, or agent may submit a request for reconsideration of this determination in writing within six months of the date of this letter.

Thank you for having the site evaluated. If you have any questions, please contact the Jurisdiction Coordinator for Josephine County, Lynne McAllister, at (503) 986-5300.

Sincerely,

Peter Ryan, SPWS
Aquatic Resource Specialist

Enclosures

ec: Jodi Reed, Schott & Associates, Inc.
Kim Biafora, Schott & Associates, Inc.
Grants Pass Planning Department
Josephine County Planning Department
Anita Andazola, Corps of Engineers
Lauren Brown, PWS, DSL
Jevra Brown, DSL
WETLAND DELINEATION / DETERMINATION REPORT COVER FORM

Fully completed and signed report cover forms and applicable fees are required before report review timelines are initiated by the Department of State Lands. Make checks payable to the Oregon Department of State Lands. To pay fees by credit card, go online at: https://apps.oregon.gov/DSL/EPF/program?Key4.

Attach this completed and signed form to the front of an unbound report or include a hard copy with a digital version (single PDF file of the report cover form and report, minimum 300 dpi resolution) and submit to: Oregon Department of State Lands, 775 Summer Street NE, Suite 100, Salem, OR 97301-1279. A single PDF of the completed cover form and report may be e-mailed to: Wetland_Delineation@dsl.state.or.us. For submittal of PDF files larger than 10 MB, e-mail DSL instructions on how to access the file from your ftp or other file sharing website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact and Authorization Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Applicant ✔ Owner Name, Firm and Address: Bruce Buckmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14095 East Evans Creek Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue River, OR 97537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Authorized Legal Agent, Name and Address (if different):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business phone #: (541) 582-1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone #: (optional):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I, either own the property described below or have legal authority to allow access to the property. I authorize the Department to access the property for the purpose of confirming the information in the report. I have prior notification to the primary contact.

Typed/Printed Name: Bruce G. Buckmaster Signature: [Signature]

[Date] Special instructions regarding site access:

Project and Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: 3322 Leonard Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use: Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Map #: 360222AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Lot(s): 500 &amp; 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use separate sheet for additional tax and location information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Latitude: 42.430361
Longitude: -123.352359

decimal degree - centroid of site or start & end points of linear project

Waterway: River Mile:

Wetland Delineation Information

Wetland Consultant Name, Firm and Address:
Schott & Associates, Inc.
Attn: Jodi Reed & Kim Biafore
PO Box 589
Aurora, Oregon 97002

Phone #: (503) 676-6007
Mobile phone #: (if applicable)
E-mail: Jodi@schottandassociates.com
Kim@schottandassociates.com

The information and conclusions on this form and in the attached report are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Consultant Signature: [Signature] Date: 5/30/2021

Primary Contact for report review and site access is ☑ Consultant ☐ Applicant/Owner ☐ Authorized Agent

Wetland/Waters Present? ☐ Yes ☑ No Study Area size: 10.5 Total Wetland Acreage: 0.0500

Check Applicable Boxes Below

☐ R-F permit application submitted
☐ R-F permit application submitted
☐ Fee payment submitted $
☐ Resubmittal of rejected report ($100)
☐ EFSC/ODEE Proj. Mgr. ☑ Request for Reassurance. See eligibility criteria. (no fee)
☐ Wetland restoration/enhancement project (not mitigation)
☐ Previous delineation/application on parcel
☐ If known, previous DSL # ☑ LWI shows wetlands or waters on parcel
☐ Wetland ID code

For Office Use Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLS Reviewer:</th>
<th>Fee Paid Date:</th>
<th>DLS WD #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLS Reviewer:</td>
<td>Fee Paid Date:</td>
<td>DLS WD #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date Delineation Received: __/__/___ Scanned: ☐ Electronic: ☑ DLS App. #

March 2018
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Figure 1. Location Map

Leonard Road Project Site: S&A # 2860

Data Source: ESRI, 2021; Josephine County GIS Dept, 2021

Date: 9/20/2021

SCHOTT & ASSOCIATES, Inc.

Exhibit 3
Figure 2. Josephine County Tax Map - 360622AA

Leonard Road Project Site: S&A # 2860

Exhibit 3
Mapping Method and Precision Statement: The mapped areas were based on vegetation, soils, and hydrology data gathered in the field by Schott & Associates. The sample plots and feature boundaries were recorded with a Trimble Geo XT handheld unit and post-processed to a <= 3 foot accuracy. The GPS data were then imported into ArcGIS software to produce maps. The study site boundary was sourced from Josephine County tax lot maps.

Date: 9/20/2021

Data Source: ESRI, 2021; Josephine County GIS Dept, 2021; DOGAMI, 2012

Figure 6a. Wetland Delineation Map - Overview

Leonard Road Project Site: S&A # 2860
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Page 91
Mapping Method and Precision Statement: The mapped areas were based on vegetation, soils, and hydrology data gathered in the field by Schott & Associates. The sample plots and feature boundaries were recorded with a Trimble Geo XT hand-held unit and post-processed to a <= 3-foot accuracy. The GPS data were then imported into ArcGIS software to produce maps. The study site boundary was sourced from Josephine County tax lot maps.

Date: 9/20/2021
Data Source: ESRI, 2021; Josephine County GIS Dept, 2021; DOGAMI, 2012

Figure 6b. Wetland Delineation Map - Detail
Leonard Road Project Site: S&A # 2860

Exhibit 3
PHASING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Lots</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Lots 7-24</td>
<td>24 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Lots 1-6, 25-31</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Lots 32-54</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT M
Phasing

Exhibit 3
Traffic Impact Analysis

BUCKMASTER SUBDIVISION

Grants Pass, Oregon
January 21, 2022

Kelly Sandow PE

SANDOW ENGINEERING
160 Madison Street, Suite A
Eugene Oregon 97402
541.513.3376
sandowengineering.com
project # 5943
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides the Traffic Impact Analysis and findings prepared for a proposed 54-unit Single Family Residential subdivision in Grants Pass, Oregon. The subject site is located at 3322 Leonard Rd at Tax Lots 500 and 502 of Assessor's Map 36S-06W-22AA. The 10.5-acre site is currently vacant and zoned R-2.

As this site is undeveloped and on unimproved roadway frontage, no formal access to the site exists. The proposed access to the site is a public street connection located at almost the middle point of the Leonard Rd frontage.

The analysis evaluates the transportation impacts per the City of Grants Pass and ODOT criteria, evaluating adjacent roadway and intersection operations with the addition of development traffic for the year of completion and a 5-year future analysis.

FINDINGS

The following report recommendations are based on the information and analysis documented in this report.

- The addition of development trips does not trigger intersection mitigation.
- The addition of development trips does not increase queuing conditions at the study area intersections.
- The site accesses will operate safely and efficiently for all modes of travel.
- The site will have safe and adequate access for pedestrians and bicycles to and within the site.
NO PARKING: Parking on emergency access roads shall be as follows (OFC D103.6.1-2):
- 20-25 feet road width - no parking on either side of roadway
  - 26-32 feet road width = parking is allowed on one side
- Greater than 32 feet road width = parking is not restricted
  - Private Street to be posted “No Parking Fire Lane” on one side.

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

1. Development of one or two family dwellings where the number of dwelling units exceeds 30 shall be provided with two separate an approved fire department access roads, and shall meet the requirements of OFC D104.3. & D107.1.

ADDITIONAL ACCESS ROADS - MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS: Projects having more than 100 dwelling units shall be provided with two separate and approved fire apparatus access roads. Exception: Projects having up to 200 dwelling units may have a single approved fire apparatus access road when all buildings, including nonresidential occupancies, are equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with sections 903.3.1.1, 903.3.1.2.
- Not Required for the current site plan review.

2. Private Street phase to be posted “No Parking Fire Lane” on one side. GPDC 27.123(1)(e) & OFC 503.2. NOTE: Temporary turnarounds required if the roads and streets are paved & constructed in phases. See Figures at item # 8.

3. Fire Department Access Roads shall be provided to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior wall of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. (OFC 503.1.1) Fire apparatus access roads shall be of an all-weather surface that is easily distinguishable from the surrounding area and capable of supporting not less than 12,500 pounds point load (wheel load) and 75,000 pounds live load (gross vehicle weight). Documentation from a registered engineer that the final construction is in accordance with

Grants Pass Department of Public Safety
101 NW A St.
Grants Pass, OR 97526
541-450-6204

approved plans or the requirements of the Fire Code may be requested. (OFC 503.2.3) The inside turning radius and outside turning radius shall not be less than 28 feet and 48 feet respectively, measured from the same center point. (OFC 503.2.4 & D103.3)

4. Fire Department access required. Minimum access width 20' and may not be obstructed. OFC 503.2 & 503.4. Where gates are secured, an approved lock (KNOX box) is to be installed in an approved location. 506.1.1.

5. Extend water mains and provide for interconnection for fire suppression water supply. Hydrants shall be spaced an average of 500 feet between hydrants. Maximum distance from any point on a street or road frontage to a hydrant shall not exceed 250 feet. Spacing shall decrease for structures having a fire flow greater than 1750 GPM. OFC C105 & Table C105.1 Fire Hydrants shall have the ability to deliver 1000 gallons per minute at a minimum of 20 psi for 2 hours.

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

7. Water supply will be determined using the building fire flow requirement listed in OFC B105. Lacking sufficient information to determine fire flow, the most restrictive will be provided and may be reduced on provided specific building construction and use. In no case shall the required fire flow be reduced by 50%.
   a. No building dimensions given, unable to calculate fire flow.

8. **DEAD ENDS AND ROADS IN EXCESS OF 150 FEET (TURNAROUNDS):** Dead end fire apparatus access roads or roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved turnaround. Diagrams of approved turnarounds are shown below: (OFC 503.2.5 & Figure D103.1)

![Diagram of dead end roads](image)

Submitted By: Michael Meyer, Fire Inspector


Exhibit 5
Public Works Staff Report

To: Planning Division, City of Grants Pass  Date: February 15, 2022

From: Matthew Scott, Thornton Engineering

Project Name: Buckmaster Subdivision
Address: 3322 Leonard Road
Map and Tax Lot: 36-06-22-AA, Taxlots 500 and 502
File: 104-00146-22

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

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

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

2. Streets:
   a. Leonard Road. Classification – Collector Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required half street right-of-way equals 30 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 16 foot half-street width, 5 foot bicycle lane, curb/gutter, 7.5 foot planter strip, and 6 foot sidewalk.
   b. Stoney Creek Road. Classification – Local Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required full street right-of-way equals 50 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 28 foot street width, curb/gutter, driveway approach, 5.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.
   c. Green Pasture Lane. Classification – Local Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required full street right-of-way equals 50 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 28 foot street width, curb/gutter, driveway approach, 5.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.
   d. Stillwater Lane. Classification – Local Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required full street right-of-way equals 50 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 28 foot street width, curb/gutter, driveway approach, 5.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.
   e. Buckmaster Drive. Classification – Local Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required full street right-of-way equals 50 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 28 foot street width, curb/gutter, driveway approach, 5.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.
   f. Deer Meadow Lane. Classification – Private Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: None.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 22 foot street width, curb, and 4 foot sidewalk along one side.

3. Storm Drainage:
   a. Project specific requirements: The Applicant shall meet all City Standards for discharging stormwater to wetlands. The wetland stretches outside of the urban growth boundary and is subjected to Oregon Drainage Law.
b. All new, and substantially reconstructed, developments shall limit the storm water run-off from the development site to not exceed .65 cfs per acre during a 25-year storm event (Reference Master Storm Drainage Facilities and Management Plan – May 1982). The Applicant’s Engineer shall submit a storm water report which demonstrates how the proposed development satisfies this condition. Partially redeveloped sites shall apply the above condition to new impervious areas only, if the City Engineer determines that applying this condition to the entire site is not feasible.

c. Design the development to not alter off-site existing drainage patterns.

d. Design for the collection of on-site storm runoff and discharge to City approved downstream drainage facilities. Provide a storm drain extension from downstream facilities to the project.

e. Design erosion and sediment control measures.

4. **Sanitary Sewers:**

   a. Project specific requirements:

      i. Provide 20’ sanitary sewer easement for the proposed sanitary sewer main within Deer Meadow Lane or if the stormwater is sharing the easement with the sanitary sewer main, a 30’ sewer easement is required for the additional utilities.

      ii. The Applicant shall acquire any utility easement/access rights to extend the 8” sanitary sewer main from River Road to service the proposed subdivision.

      iii. Sewer mains over 199’ in length require a dead-end manhole.

      iv. Abandon any existing septic systems to DEQ Standards.

   b. Design a minimum of one service lateral for each lot. Avoid installing service laterals in driveways. All service lines shall be located in the serviced property’s adjacent right-of-way and installed in a straight-line perpendicular to the Sewer Main.

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

   d. Design all new sanitary sewer facilities in conformance with the City’s Sanitary Sewer Standards and Specifications.

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

5. **Water System:**

   a. Project specific requirements: Extend 12” water main within Leonard Road to the extent of the street frontage. Reduce pressure backflow assembly is required or the applicant shall provide documentation of buyout with GPID prior to building.

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

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

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

B. Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit:
The Applicant shall substantially complete all construction items specified in A above.

C. Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Completion:
The Applicant shall substantially complete all construction items specified in A above, and perform the following:

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

2. Streets:
   Sweep all adjacent streets regularly during construction.

3. Storm Drainage:
   Maintain erosion and sediment control measures until disturbed areas are re-established.

4. Sanitary Sewers:
   a. Test all new sewer facilities in conformance with the City’s Water Standards and Specifications.
   b. Abandon all un-used sewer laterals in conformance with City Sewer Standards.
   c. Provide a mini-tv inspection video of existing laterals planned for use to the Wastewater Collections Division.

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

6. Public Utilities:
   a. Place underground all utility facilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines and other wires, street lighting and communication and cable television services.
   b. If none exists, dedicate a City utility easement (C.U.E.) across the frontages of the development in conformance with the requirements of the public utility companies.
February 7, 2022

Mr. Ryan Nolan
City of Grants Pass
101 NW A Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS – BUCKMASTER SUBDIVISION

Dear Ryan:

In response to your request, I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) submitted in support of the proposed Buckmaster Subdivision. The TIA was prepared under the direction of Kelly Sandow, PE of Sandow Engineering. The TIA is dated January 21, 2022.

The proposed 10.5-acre subdivision is on the north side of Leonard Road west of SW Harvest Drive and east of S River Road. The development is proposed to have lots for 54 single-family dwelling units.

Overall

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

Comments

1. Study Area. The city code requires analysis of intersections where the impact of the proposal causes an increase of 25 or more trips during either the AM or PM peak hour.

   To assess the impacts on the street system, the TIA provides an analysis during the AM and PM peak hours of the following intersections:

   - Leonard Rd and Darnielle Lane
   - Redwood Ave and Darnielle Lane/Hubbard Lane
   - Site access at Leonard Road
The analysis area is appropriate and covers the key intersections impacted by the proposed development.

2. Traffic Counts. This analysis utilized traffic counts conducted in April 2021 and counts for the recently adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP). AM and PM peak hour volumes were developed from these sources. The traffic volumes were adjusted to account for seasonal variations. In addition, the counts were adjusted to account for reduced volumes due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The traffic counts and adjustments appear reasonable.

3. Trip Generation. The engineer estimated trip generation for the subdivision using trip generation equations from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Trip Generation Manual. The engineer used the rates for single-family dwellings, ITE land use code 210. The engineer calculated the subdivision will generate 43 AM peak hour trips and 56 PM peak hour trips. The TIA did not provide an estimate of weekday trips. Using the ITE trip rate, I calculated 509 weekday trips. The trip generation estimates appear reasonable.

4. Trip Distribution. The TIA presents information on trip distribution. Trip distribution was based on existing travel patterns and logical assumptions about trip origins and destinations. The engineer assumes approximately 20 percent would travel to and from the east on Leonard Road; 40 percent would travel to and from the south on Darnielle Lane to Hwy 199; and 40 percent would travel to and from the east on Redwood Avenue. The trip distribution seems reasonable.

5. Traffic Growth. The TIA accounts for traffic growth by using the predicted growth from the Transportation System Plan (TSP). The calculated growth rate of 0.7 percent was rounded up to a 1 percent annual growth rate. The TIA also specifically accounted for the relocation of the Grants Pass Middle School and its associated traffic. Note that the application for the Grants Pass Middle School has not yet been submitted so the inclusion of middle school traffic is not required for the analysis. The 2023 and 2028 background volumes used in the analysis appear reasonable.

6. Analysis. Traffic volumes were calculated for the intersections described in #1, above. The analysis was conducted for exiting 2021 conditions; 2023 background volumes; 2023 conditions with the subdivision; 2028 background volumes; and 2028 conditions with the subdivision.
The calculated intersection level of service (LOS) was provided to assess operations relative to the city's intersection LOS standard.

According to the TIA, the site access and the two study area intersections meet the applicable performance standards during the PM peak hour under the existing, 2023 background, 2023 build, 2028 background and 2028 build conditions. The TIA indicates that the site access and the intersection of Leonard Road and Darnielle Lane meet the applicable performance standard during the AM peak hour as well. The TIA indicates that the intersection of Redwood Avenue and Darnielle Lane/Hubbard Lane is calculated to operate at LOS F with long delays on the minor street approach during the AM peak hour under future conditions with the addition of the middle school and the subdivision.

The engineer provides additional analysis of the Redwood Avenue and Darnielle Lane/Hubbard Lane and demonstrates that the deterioration in performance (LOS F during the AM peak hour) for 2023 and 2028 can be attributed to the relocation of the middle school. The engineer concludes that without the middle school, both intersections would meet the LOS D performance standard during the AM and PM peak periods. The engineer concludes that the mitigation proposed for this intersection (conversion to all-way stop-control) in connection with the middle school will be adequate to mitigate for expected traffic increases and that no additional mitigation needs to be implemented for this subdivision.

The TIA also provides an analysis of queuing at the study area intersections. With the development, queues will not be significantly different from those encountered under the background conditions. Queue storage capacity is adequate at all locations.

The engineer concludes that mitigation beyond that planned for the middle school is not required to meet operational standards during the AM and PM peak hours and concludes that no off-site mitigation is required for this development proposal. I concur with this conclusion.

7. Crash Information. The TIA provides information on crashes at the key study area intersections for years 2015 through 2019. During this five-year period, no crashes were reported at the intersection of Leonard Road and Darnielle Lane. Four crashes were reported at the intersection of Redwood Avenue and Darnielle Lane/Hubbard Lane. For both intersections, the calculated crash rate is low and
falls below the critical rate for similar intersections. The engineer concluded that low crash rate does not trigger a need for mitigation for safety issues. I concur.

8. **Site Plan and Access.** According to the TIA and the tentative subdivision plan, the principal access will be a single intersection with Leonard Road. Two stub streets are shown extending to the north boundary of the subdivision and two stub streets extend to the east boundary. The site plan and access appear reasonable.

9. **Sight Distance.** The engineer did not measure sight distance at the proposed access to Leonard Road. Since the terrain is flat and the road is straight, it is likely that adequate sight distance at the intersection with Leonard Road is available.

10. **Turn Lanes.** The TIA does not include a specific analysis of the need for a left-turn lane on Leonard Road at the site access. Since the Transportation System Plan’s design standard for a collector road, which includes Leonard Road, provides for a center turn lane, the absence of this analysis is not a critical omission. A center turn lane should be provided in connection with frontage improvements to match the standards prescribed in the TSP.

11. **Conclusions and Recommendations.** The engineer concludes that the proposal does not require mitigation for intersection operations beyond that already planned at the intersection of Redwood Avenue and Darnelle Lane/Hubbard Lane in connection with the relocation of the Grants Pass Middle School. The engineer concludes that queuing will not be significantly changed by the development; that the site access will be safe and efficient for all modes; and that development will have safe and adequate access for pedestrians and bicycles to and within the site. I concur with these conclusions and recommendations.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

I find that the TIA addresses city requirements for analysis of the impacts of the proposed development. The applicant’s traffic engineer uses appropriate methods and accurately describes her analysis of traffic operations. I concur with the applicant’s engineer that no mitigation is required for operational or safety issues. I concur with the engineer’s conclusion that storage for queuing is adequate and that there are no safety concerns requiring attention. I concur with the engineer’s conclusion that mitigation at the intersection of Redwood Avenue and Darnelle Lane/Hubbard Lane beyond that specified in connection with the middle school is not required.
I recommend that frontage improvements along Leonard Road be constructed to match the collector street standards prescribed in the TSP.

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

Sincerely,

John Replinger, PE
Principal

Grants Pass2022\BuckmasterTIA020722
October 12, 2021

Bruce Buckmaster
14095 East Evans Creek Road
Rogue River, OR 97537

Re: WD # 2021-0304 Approved
Wetland Delineation Report for 3322 Leonard Road
Josephine County; T36S R6W S22AA TLs 500, 503, and Leonard Road ROW (Portion)

Dear Bruce Buckmaster:

The Department of State Lands has reviewed the wetland delineation report prepared by Schott & Associates, Inc. for the site referenced above. Please note that the study area includes only a portion of Leonard Road right of way (see the attached maps). Based upon the information presented in the report and additional information submitted upon request, we concur with the wetland and waterway boundaries as mapped in revised Figures 6a and 6b of the report. Please replace all copies of the preliminary wetland maps with these final Department-approved maps.

Within the study area, one wetland, (totaling approximately 0.05 acre), 2 active irrigation ditches (Ditches 2 and 3), and one abandoned irrigation ditch (Ditch 1) were identified. The wetland is subject to the permit requirements of the state Removal-Fill Law. Under current regulations, a state permit is required for cumulative fill or annual excavation of 50 cubic yards or more in wetlands or below the ordinary high-water line (OHWL) of waterways (or the 2-year recurrence interval flood elevation if OHWL cannot be determined). The active irrigation ditches and abandoned irrigation ditch are not state jurisdictional, per OAR 141-085-0515 (9) and (8), respectively.

This concurrence is for purposes of the state Removal-Fill Law only. We recommend that you attach a copy of this concurrence letter to any subsequent state permit application to speed application review. Federal, other state agencies, or local permit requirements may apply as well. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will determine jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, which may require submittal of a complete Wetland Delineation Report.

Please be advised that state law establishes a preference for avoidance of wetland impacts. Because measures to avoid and minimize wetland impacts may include reconfiguring parcel layout and size or development design, we recommend that you work with Department staff on appropriate site design before completing the city or county land use approval process.

Kate Brown
Governor

Sheria Fagan
Secretary of State

Tobias Read
State Treasurer
This concurrence is based on information provided to the agency. The jurisdictional determination is valid for five years from the date of this letter unless new information necessitates a revision. Circumstances under which the Department may change a determination are found in OAR 141-090-0045 (available on our web site or upon request). In addition, laws enacted by the legislature and/or rules adopted by the Department may result in a change in jurisdiction; individuals and applicants are subject to the regulations that are in effect at the time of the removal-fill activity or complete permit application. The applicant, landowner, or agent may submit a request for reconsideration of this determination in writing within six months of the date of this letter.

Thank you for having the site evaluated. If you have any questions, please contact the Jurisdiction Coordinator for Josephine County, Lynne McAllister, at (503) 986-5300.

Sincerely,

Peter Ryan, SPWS
Aquatic Resource Specialist

Enclosures

c: Jodi Reed, Schott & Associates, Inc.
Kim Biafora, Schott & Associates, Inc.
Grants Pass Planning Department
Josephine County Planning Department
Anita Andazola, Corps of Engineers
Lauren Brown, PWS, DSL
Jevra Brown, DSL
**WETLAND DELINEATION / DETERMINATION REPORT COVER FORM**

Fully completed and signed report cover forms and applicable fees are required before report review timelines are initiated by the Department of State Lands. Make checks payable to the Oregon Department of State Lands. To pay fees by credit card, go online at: [https://apps.oregon.gov/DSL/EFSP/program?es=1].

Attach this completed and signed form to the front of an unbound report or include a hard copy with a digital version (single PDF file of the report cover form and report, minimum 300 dpi resolution) and submit to: Oregon Department of State Lands, 775 Summer Street NE, Suite 100, Salem, OR 97301-1279. A single PDF of the completed cover form and report may be e-mailed to: Wetland_Delineation@dsl.state.or.us. For submittal of PDF files larger than 10 MB, e-mail DSL instructions on how to access the file from your tip or other file sharing website.

**Contact and Authorization Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Owner Name, Firm and Address: Bruce Buckmaster 14085 East Evans Creek Road Rogue River, OR 97577</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business phone #: (541) 582-1392 Mobile phone #: (optional) E-mail:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Legal Agent, Name and Address (if different):</td>
<td>Business phone #: Mobile phone #: (optional) E-mail:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I either own the property described below or I have legal authority to allow access to the property. I authorize the Department to access the property for the purpose of confirming the information in the report, after prior notification to the primary contact.

**Typed/Printed Name:** Bruce G. Buckmaster **Signature:**

**Date:**

Special instructions regarding site access:

**Project and Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>3322 Leonard Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latitude:</td>
<td>42.430981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude:</td>
<td>-123.392369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Use:** Residential

| Tax Map #: | 360622AA |
| Tax Lot(s): | 500 & 502 |
| Tax Map #: |

**Project Street Address (or other descriptive location):** 3322 Leonard Road

| City: | Grants Pass |
| County: | Josephine |

**Waterway:** River Mile:

**Wetland Delineation Information**

| Wetland Consultant Name, Firm and Address: Schott & Associates, Inc. Attn: Jodi Reed & Kim Blalora PO Box 589 Aurora, Oregon 97002 |
| Phone #: | (503) 678-6007 |
| Mobile phone #: | (if applicable) |
| E-mail: | Jodi@schottandassociates.com Kim@schottandassociates.com |

The information and conclusions on this form and in the attached report are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

**Consultant Signature:** [Signature] **Date:** 5/26/2021

**Primary Contact for report review and site access is:** Consultant

**Wetland/Waters Present?** Yes No Study Area size: 10.5

**Check Applicable Boxes Below**

- [ ] R-F permit application submitted
- [ ] Fee payment submitted $ ___
- [ ] Mitigation bank site
- [ ] Resubmittal of rejected report ($100)
- [ ] EFSC/ODEE Proj. Mgr: ___
- [ ] Request for Reissuance. See eligibility criteria. (no fee)
- [ ] Wetland restoration/enhancement project (not mitigation)
- [ ] DSL # ___ Expiration date ___
- [ ] Check if known, previous DSL # ___
- [ ] LWI shows wetlands or waters on parcel
- [ ] Wetland ID code

**For Office Use Only**

- [ ] DSL Reviewer: ___
- [ ] Fee Paid Date: ___
- [ ] DSL WD #: ___
- [ ] Date Delineation Received: ___
- [ ] Scanned: [ ] Electronic: [ ] DSL App #: ___

March 2018
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Figure 1. Location Map

Leonard Road Project Site: S&A # 2860

Data Source: ESRI, 2021; Josephine County GIS Dept, 2021

Date: 9/20/2021

SCHOTT & ASSOCIATES, Inc.
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Figure 2. Josephine County Tax Map - 360622AA
Leonard Road Project Site: S&A # 2860

Date: 9/20/2021
Data Source: ESRI, 2021; Josephine County GIS Dept, 2021

SCHOTT & ASSOCIATES, Inc.
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Mapping Method and Precision Statement: The mapped areas were based on vegetation, soils, and hydrology data gathered in the field by Schott & Associates. The sample plots and feature boundaries were recorded with a Trimble Geo XT hand-held unit and post-processed to a <= 3 foot accuracy. The GPS data were then imported into ArcGIS software to produce maps. The study site boundary was sourced from Josephine County tax lot maps.

Date: 9/20/2021

Data Source: ESRI, 2021; Josephine County GIS Dept, 2021; DOGAMI, 2012

Figure 6a. Wetland Delineation Map - Overview

Leonard Road Project Site: S&A # 2860
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Mapping Method and Precision Statement: The mapped areas were based on vegetation, soils, and hydrology data gathered in the field by Schott & Associates. The sample plots and feature boundaries were recorded with a Trimble Geo XT hand-held unit and post-processed to a ≤ 3 foot accuracy. The GPS data were then imported into ArcGIS software to produce maps. The study site boundary was sourced from Josephine County tax lot maps.

Date: 9/20/2021
Data Source: ESRI, 2021; Josephine County GIS Dept, 2021; DOGAMI, 2012

DSL WD # 2021-0304
Approval Issued 10/12/2021
Approval Expires 10/12/2026

Leonard Road Project Site: S&A # 2860

Figure 6b. Wetland Delineation Map - Detail
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December 31, 2022

For Further Assistance...

SDGs are crucial for the development of sustainable communities and societies. They provide a framework for action that can help address some of the most pressing challenges facing our planet. In order to achieve the goals set by the United Nations, it is essential that everyone, from individuals to governments, takes responsibility for implementing them.

---

What are SDGs?

System Development Charges (SDC) are fees charged for the development of a new residential or commercial property. These fees are used to cover the costs associated with the development of infrastructure, such as roads, sewers, and utilities.

---

Storm Drain System

---
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Transportation System

Sewer System

Water System
Ryan Nolan

From: Dustin Smith <dustiny77@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 9:58 AM
To: Ryan Nolan
Subject: 3322 Leonard Road Buckmaster Subdivision Site Plan Review Comments

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

Mr. Nolan:

This is Dustin Smith at 3130 Leonard Road. I have spoken to Michael Masters, developer of the proposed Buckmaster subdivision adjacent to our property, and he showed me his preliminary site plan. The proposed plan provides two street stubs to our property for future development that, if planned properly, will be mutually beneficial. However, if not planned properly, could leave my property in a disastrous position for future development. As you begin the review process I would like to ask some questions and make some comments and requests to hopefully create a plan that will allow for the successful development of the Buckmaster subdivision and the future successful development of 3130 Leonard Road.

My request is that the approved Buckmaster subdivision plan include a feasible future development plan for 3130 Leonard Road, including all necessary engineering, review, and approval by the city.

Just for some background, our current thinking is to hold off on developing our property until our kids are older and moved on. But since the land next door is being developed now, we have spent some time preparing our own preliminary site plan to start the coordination. Since we have a wonderful home here we would plan on maintaining about one acre around existing residence, which would leave about 3 acres available for development. I will send a separate email with some sketches showing a 14 lot site plan using the proposed street stubs from the Buckmaster plan. Justin Gerlitz looked at my initial plan and provided some off the cuff comments and a back of the napkin sketch as well. I’ve shared both sketches with Michael Masters as well.

Please consider the following:

1. **NE road stub:** The proposed road stub to the North end of our property appears to work well for us to add onto later and create 8 lots on a culdesac plus 2 flag lots for a total of 10 off that street.

2. **SE Road Stub:** The proposed road stub on the South end of our property looks like it will require some modification to ensure that we can properly use it to add 4 lots on that side. Basically it’s aimed right for our recently installed pool. My idea was that it could be turned into a half street and slide right by, but Justin Gerlitz said that code requirements may not allow that and he proposed slightly curving the road into lot 7 with a tear drop culdesac. His sketch shows 4 flag-like lots could be achieved. However, this is very preliminary because the sketch only assumes the approximate location of our pool and fence line.
3. **Egress:** Because of the adjacency and access issues to Leonard I request that the Buckmaster Site Plan review also consider the future development of 3130 Leonard Rd. as a complete subdivision. For example, access to and egress from 3130 Leonard's future development will be through the Buckmaster subdivision. Therefore the city should consider the potential future total number of lots for calculating the number of entry/exit points required from Leonard Road. Currently that would be 54 plus 14 = 68. I want to avoid being told years from now during our site plan review that we can't simply "add on" and must install a new access/egress point or a traffic light somewhere, effectively dooming the development feasibility of such a small project.

4. **Utilities:** Similar to item 3, the street and utility stubs to 3130 Leonard Road essentially determine its future development capacity. Utility stubs to 3130 Leonard Road should be in locations, elevations, and sizes adequate for its future development. Specific engineering attention should be paid to the Sewer elevations at the SE stub.

5. **Leonard Frontage:** I assume a sidewalk will be required for the Buckmaster development along 3130 Leonard frontage to access the cross walk to the school. Because there is a significant grade change along Leonard Road at our property I would assume that grading would be required onto our property. I have heard that, about five years ago, the county was considering cutting the vertical curve on Leonard Road for safety reasons, which if completed would mitigate this issue. This needs to be coordinated.

6. **GPID:** We flood irrigate our field from the irrigation box to the West of our driveway and the irrigation ditch along Leonard road. Should the Buckmaster development require the installation of a sidewalk on the North side of Leonard Road at the front of our property, how will the GPID irrigation box and ditch be dealt with? The Buckmaster development will need to plan for and coordinate the diversion of flood irrigation from 3130 Leonard until its future development. It would seem that a simple swale along the East and North property lines would suffice.

7. **Air Quality Management:** Unfortunately for us the prevailing winds here are from the West. Any and all dust or debris from grading and construction of the Buckmaster development will come our way. What are the requirements for mitigating airborne dust and debris from leaving the construction site?

8. **20’ Easement:** The plan shows an open space for an easement along the East property line. How will this area be finished? It could be a nice walking path, especially with the school being right across the street.

Again, I respectfully request that all aspects for connectivity and feasible future development of 3130 Leonard Road be engineered and approved concurrent with the Buckmaster review and approval. This should include lot layouts with decisions for variances if necessary.

I would be happy to meet with you and your team to collaborate on successful outcomes.

Respectfully,

Dustin Smith
DATE: 3/03/2022

TO: RYAN NOLAN: CITY OF GRANTS PASS

FROM: NEIL BURGESS: JOSEPHINE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

RE: BUCKMASTER SUBDIVISION APPLICATION COMMENTS

NOTE: The Applicant is encouraged to meet with Josephine County Public Works to discuss any concerns regarding the following comments.

1) A Road Approach Permit is required for access connection to Leonard Road.

2) Submittal of a complete application shall include a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by a professional engineer registered in the State of Oregon showing the impact that the proposed development has on safety and mobility out to a 20-year horizon.

3) All public improvements required by Josephine County shall be designed and constructed per the current Josephine County Public Works Design and Construction Standards and Specifications.

4) Prior to commencing construction, road construction drawings and specifications that have been prepared by an Oregon registered professional engineer shall be submitted to Josephine County Public Works for approval.

5) The applicant shall remit a Development Construction Plan Review Fee and a Development Construction Inspection Fee to Josephine County Public Works.

6) Prior to approval of the road construction drawings, the developer shall enter into a General Project Agreement with Public Works.

7) Prior to commencing construction, the applicant shall submit storm drainage drawings and calculations by an Oregon registered professional engineer for Public Works approval. The calculations portion shall include a narrative addressing appropriate regulations. Also included shall be copies of any materials, such as charts or graphs, which were used or referenced in calculations. The submittal must show adequate capacity of the proposed and existing system during the 25-year/24-hour storm event. The "proposed and existing system" is defined as extending through the first offsite drainage facility and shall then continue either: (1) one-quarter mile downstream from the project site, or (2) until the new contribution is less than 10% of the total flow, whichever

Exhibit 11
is less. All submittals, including calculations, shall be stamped and signed by an Oregon registered professional engineer.

8) As-built Mylar and electronic road construction plans shall be submitted to Public Works for approval.

9) All property corners adjacent to public right-of-way shall be marked with Carsonite markers indicating right-of-way width. All survey monuments located in paved areas shall be located within a monument box.
TRACT 'A'

STILLWATER LN

DEER MEADOW LN

STONEY CREEK RD

LEONARD RD

BUCKMASTER DR

20' EASEMENT

TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION PLAN
JANUARY 2022

REVISIONS:

DRAWN BY:   TDC

CHK'D BY:  MDC

ENGINEERING - SURVEYING - PLANNING

UTILITY NOTES:

1. POINT OF CONNECTION TO PUBLIC SANITARY SEWER IN EXISTING EASEMENT WHICH LEADS TO S RIVER RD WITH APPROXIMATELY 960 FT OF OFFSITE SEWER MAIN REQUIRED.

2. POINT OF CONNECTION TO PUBLIC WATER MAIN WITHIN LEONARD RD WITH APPROXIMATELY 280 FT OF OFFSITE WATERMAIN REQUIRED.

3. PROPOSED DETENTION AREA TO BE LOCATED ON PRIVATE PROPERTY, FINAL PIPE SIZING AND STORMWATER REPORT SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE FINAL ENGINEERING DRAWINGS.

4. PROPOSED 8" SANITARY SEWER MAIN TO BE LOCATED IN 20' WIDE PUBLIC UNOBSTRUCTED AND DRIVABLE EASEMENT CENTERED ON THE SEWER MAIN WITHIN THE PRIVATE ROAD.

5. PROPOSED WATER METERS TO SERVICE LOTS 25-27 LOCATED ALONG PUBLIC ROAD WITH SERVICE LINES RUN TO EACH LOT WITHIN PRIVATE EASEMENTS.

6. PROPOSED WATER METERS TO SERVICE LOTS 28-31 LOCATED ALONG PUBLIC ROAD WITH SERVICE LINES RUN TO EACH LOT WITHIN PRIVATE EASEMENTS.

GRADED NOTE:
MEMORANDUM

To: Urban Area Planning Commission
From: Amber Neeck, Housing and Neighborhood Specialist
Date: March 9, 2022
Re: Amendment to Comprehensive Plan Housing Element

As discussed in the Urban Area Planning Commission (UAPC) meeting on February 23, 2022, the commission has made the following request for information regarding amendments to the Comprehensive Plan text amendments:

1) Provide background information on House Bill 2583 that struck local definitions of “family” out of zoning codes.

Item 1

Staff has provided documentation for House Bill 2583 (Exhibit A) which passed in May of 2021, and a sample edit of the Comprehensive plan text amendments to Element 9: Housing (Exhibit B), and Comprehensive Plan Policy section for element 9: Housing (Exhibit C) that replaces the term “family” to be more cohesive with the adopted terms used in the development.

(end)
HB 2583 A STAFF MEASURE SUMMARY

Carrier: Sen. Anderson

Senate Committee On Housing and Development

Action Date: 04/22/21
Action: Do pass the A-Eng bill.
Vote: 4-1-0-0
Yea: 4-1-0-0
Nays: 1 - Linthicum
Fiscal: Has minimal fiscal impact
Revenue: No revenue impact
Prepared By: Devin Edwards, LPRO Analyst
Meeting Dates: 4/20, 4/22

WHAT THE MEASURE DOES:
Prohibits local governments from establishing or enforcing maximum occupancy limits in residential dwellings based on familial or nonfamilial relationships among occupants.

ISSUES DISCUSSED:
- Impact on short-term rentals
- Occupancy standards based on square footage or number of bedrooms
- Local government regulatory authority
- Health and safety regulations
- Building code regulations

EFFECT OF AMENDMENT:
No amendment.

BACKGROUND:
Local housing ordinances that prevent family members from living together are unconstitutional. Many cities impose occupancy limits instead based on the number of unrelated people who live together in a single dwelling unit, whether rented or owner-occupied, regardless of the size of the dwelling or its square footage. In some cities, people living together who are related by blood, marriage, domestic partnership, or guardianship are not subject to the same occupancy limits as unmarried couples, roommates, and other common living arrangements.

House Bill 2583 A prohibits local governments from establishing or enforcing maximum occupancy limits in residential dwellings based on familial or nonfamilial relationships among occupants.
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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.

Historic

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**

17.5 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.

7.9 School Parks

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 exaction 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**

8.1 **Goal**

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

8.1 **Policies**

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 an 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.

9.5.9.6. Complete an annual evaluation of progress on the Housing Needs Analysis goals and growth targets.

**Housing Needs**

9.6.9.7. Lower or remove local barriers to residential development.

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

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

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

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

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


9.14, 9.15. 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.).

9.15-9.16. Promote and incentivize mixed-use areas to connect households to a variety of transportation options, medical and social services, commercial centers, and recreation amenities.

9.16-9.17. Direct funds and program support to rehabilitate existing housing within Grants Pass.

9.17-9.18. 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**

9.18-9.19. 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.

9.19-9.20. Dedicate City resources to support public and private housing and associated programs/services to community members experiencing homelessness.

9.20-9.21. 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**

9.21-9.22. 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

9.22-9.23. 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
13.2. Land Use Map
13.3. Areas of Mutual Concern
13.4. Development Procedures
13.5. Comprehensive Plan Amendments
13.6. Urban Growth Boundary Amendments
13.7. Urban Reserves
13.8. Urban Area Planning Commission
13.9. City/County Joint Review Procedure
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 data base 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 used 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 note 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>Urban Area Zoning Ordinance Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Designation:</td>
<td>Allows:</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>Commercial Designation:</td>
<td>Allows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industrial Designation: Allows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Park</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Map 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 statutes 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.
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.
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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). 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 unit housing and multi-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 unit 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 (ORS 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 unit 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 multi-family 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-unit 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-unit dwelling**, without specifying “attached” or “detached” is commonly used to refer to a detached single-family-unit dwelling, which the Census Bureau defines as “one-unit detached.” However, “single-family-unit 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-unit 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 Multi-unit 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-multi-unit 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 unit detached housing is the most prevalent housing type representing 67% of the housing stock. The remaining housing inventory in Grants Pass includes multifamily unit (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 unit detached units (89% of owners) or manufactured homes. Most renters also reside in single-family unit detached units, followed by single unit family attached and multi-unit family dwellings 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>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</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>Multifamily (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>7,784</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,394</strong></td>
<td><strong>893</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,051</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution: 48% Owner-Occupied, 46% Renter-Occupied, 6% Vacant, 100% All Dwelling Units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Table 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.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Tables B25032 & CP 04)
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 MFI, a 4-person household 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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes / Plexes</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi family (5+ units)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfg. home/other</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Figure 9: Grants Pass Affordable Housing Analysis

<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 (at 30% of income level)</td>
<td>Lower-end</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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (50% to 80% of MFI)</td>
<td>$670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (30% to 50% of MFI)</td>
<td>$402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low (less than 30% of MFI)</td>
<td>$402 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate affordable home price**:

<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 (at 30% of income level)</td>
<td>Lower-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper (120% or more of MFI)</td>
<td>$426,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (80% to 120% of MFI)</td>
<td>$284,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (50% to 80% of MFI)</td>
<td>$177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (30% to 50% of MFI)</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low (less than 30% of MFI)</td>
<td>$106,000 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* based on Housing and Urban Development thresholds for Josephine County in 2018

** 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></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-unit construction (both single family-unit detached and attached), 14% in duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes, and 7% for multi-family 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>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-unit structures</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- and 4-unit structures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ unit Multi-Family</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Unincorporated Josephine County, 2015-2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unincorporated Josephine County, 2015-2019</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>64</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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64</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></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-unit 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 housing subdivisions within the UGB.

Figure 13: Housing Need by Tenure & Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Housing Tenure Distribution:</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Type Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>Mfg. home/subdivision</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 (Table 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-unit family detached homes (including small lot and standard lot subdivisions); 749 townhomes/duplexes (2 to 4 units per structure); 442 multi-unit family dwellings (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 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.

### 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>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 tax lots, and public right-of-way, 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 Land</th>
<th>Non-Exempt Vacant 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>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>360</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.

---

5 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.
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.

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

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><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>360</strong></td>
<td><strong>778</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,138</strong></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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>163.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>211.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>372.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>769</strong></td>
<td><strong>473.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></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
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)
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, multi-family, 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.

### 9.5.1 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 Unit Family Detached:** 2,502 dwellings (including standard and small lot single detached housing)
- **Townhomes and Plexes:** 749 dwelling units
- **Manufactured Homes:** 254 dwellings
- **Multi-family:** 551 dwelling units (includes apartments and condominiums with 5+ units per structure)
- **Group Quarters:** 114 dwelling units

### 9.5.2 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, R-1-10, R-1-8</td>
<td>3.96 to 6.22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes / Plexes Manufactured home</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></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>varies</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
<td>478</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 Manufactured home</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured home</td>
<td>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 unit 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.
6. Complete an annual evaluation of progress on the Housing Needs Analysis goals and growth targets.
Housing Needs

6-7. Evaluate and address lower or remove local barriers to residential development.

7-8. Streamline land use and development processes to incentivize the timely and efficient development of housing.

8-9. Permit a variety of housing types across all residential zones, including single-unit family, middle housing, manufactured housing, and multi-unit family types. Focus on expanding opportunities for housing types which are shown to be related to lower housing costs.

9-10. Create pre-approved middle housing floorplans to encourage middle housing development.

10-11. Reduce minimum lot sizes in low-density zones to increase the efficiency of single-unit family and middle housing.

11-12. Establish minimum densities in medium and high-density zones.

12-13. Increase maximum building height in higher density zones.

13-14. Simplify the permit process to convert single-unit family dwelling units in commercial zones to mid-to-high density multi-dwelling housing.

14-15. 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.).

15-16. Promote and incentivize mixed-use areas to connect households to a variety of transportation options, medical and social services, commercial centers, and recreation amenities.

16-17. Direct funds and program support to rehabilitate existing housing within Grants Pass.

17-18. 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

18-19. 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.

19-20. Dedicate City resources to support public and private housing and associated programs/services to community members experiencing homelessness.

20-21. 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

21-22. 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

22-23. 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