So, I'm getting a lot of head nods from staff and commission, so I think we can start a couple minutes early. I don't see anyone opposed.

So, it's 5:58. I'll go ahead and open up the meeting.

1. **Roll:** First, we'll take roll. Chair Heesacker is out. He expects to be back at the next meeting. Commissioner Nelson.

   Present.

   Commissioner Aviles.

   Here.

   Commissioner Arthur.

   Here.

   Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

   Here.

   My name's Mark Collier. I'm your Vice Chair, acting Chair. I'm here. Commissioner Scherf.

   Here.

   Final position is vacant.

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

3. **Public Comment:** Public comment is an opportunity for the public to address the commission on items not related to the public hearing or action item. The intent is to provide information that is pertinent to the city's jurisdiction. Is anyone here to talk on anything that is not on the agenda? We'll just move forward.
4. **Approval of Minutes:** Approval of the minutes for February 23rd, 2022. Do I have a motion?
   I would move approval.
   Do I have a second?
   Tokarz-Krauss seconds.
   Tokarz-Krauss seconds. Take a roll. Commissioner Nelson.
   Abstain.
   Commissioner Aviles.
   [inaudible 00:01:39]
   Commissioner Arthur.
   Yes.
   Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.
   Yes.
   I'm Collier. I'm voting yes. Commissioner Scherf.
   Yes.

   **MOTION/VOTE**
   Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconded the motion to approve the minutes from the February 23, 2022, meeting. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: Commissioner Nelson. Absent: Chair Heesacker.
   The motion passed.

   Approve of the minutes.

5. **Informational Items:**
   Informational items. Nothing.

6. **Findings of Fact:**
   Nelson moves approval of the findings of facts.
   Arthur second.
Commissioner Arthur seconds. State the role again from top to bottom. Commissioner Nelson.

Yes.

Commissioner Aviles.

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

All your votes: yes. Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

Findings of fact is approved.

**MOTION/VOTE**


None. Abstain: None. Absent: Chair Heesacker.

The motion passed.

b. 405-00128-22 ~ Development Code Text Amendment: Amendment to Article 12 ~ Minimum Residential Density ~ Type IV

For the next item. Development code text amendment for article 12. Minimum residential density for type four. Do I have a motion?

I would move approval of the change in the development code. Do I have a second?

Arthur second.

Great. I'll take the roll. Commissioner Nelson.

Yes.

Commissioner Aviles.

Yes.
Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

All your votes: aye. Commissioner Scherf.

No.

Okay. Consistent with your last vote. So that passes.

MOTION/VOTE

The motion passed.

7. Public Hearing:
   a. 405-00127-21 ~ HNA Comp Plan Amendment PC ~ Continued.

Moving to the public hearing, we're going to move item B, the Housing needs analysis comp plan amendment, that was continued. We'll reopen the public hearing and continue. Staff.

Already on? Good evening, everybody. I'm here before you for the third time. And we are talking about, I provided background information for the definitions of family, out of the zoning codes. And so, the information that was requested last meeting was the request for more information on House Bill 2583, that did instruct local governments to strike the definitions of family out of developmental zoning codes. And that can be found on the summary that was provided on page 132 in your packet. So that provided some of the background as to why the state of Oregon had removed definitions of family, in order to prevent occupancy standards being discriminatory against people who are unrelated in housing. So, on top of that, I did go ahead and provide samples of the comprehensive plan policy for the housing element, as well as the text amendments for the housing element, where we did replace the word family in that aspect with unit. And I believe that's good to open it up for your discussion.

I think you did an excellent job on it. I would hope at some point the figures would be updated to match. But since they're 2019, it might be good to wait until the 2020 statistics are actually available and redo those figures. I think it's well done.

Commissioner Nelson.

Yeah, I don't want to rain on anybody's parade. I found unit to be confusing, because when I think of a unit, I'm thinking of a structure. Whereas we're talking about entities, which are different than structures.
So, when we get into housing, unit is just each unit. So, each apartment in a building would be a separate unit. So, it is pretty cohesive with the verbiage that housing professionals tend to use if they're not using single family, multifamily. And even if they are, they do break it down into units.

So, I'm reading here that census classification has specific meanings, but other commonly used terms to describe these housing types include single. And then you made a unit dwelling, without specifying attached or detached, is commonly used to refer to a detached single unit dwelling. Which the census bureau defines as one unit detached. However, a single unit... I mean, I was going through that, and I said, that's confusing.

So, I did some research. And two communities are going through the same battle. One has already completed it. I found that my old Bellingham is in the midst of it, trying to define family in a different verbiage or turn terminology than what's currently being done. They have not completed that process. But I found that St Paul has passed a new requirement, calling it household, and household is six or fewer adults. And they scratched out "together with". And continued, "and minor children in their care living together in a dwelling unit". So, then it's defined as what's in that unit.

So, we have moved to household in terms of the actual family makeup or household makeup. But when we're talking about the structure itself, that's where we're pulling in the word unit, as opposed to calling it a single-family dwelling, we can call it a single unit dwelling, and that way it doesn't get confusing.

So where would the definition then be for the what's in that unit?

So, there is a definition under ORS 9.100. And that is defined as, dwelling unit means a structure or the part of the structure that is used as a home residence or sleeping place by one person who maintains a household or by two or more persons who maintain a common household dwelling unit, regarding a person who rents a space for a manufactured dwelling or recreational vehicle, or regarding a person who rents moorage space for a floating home, as defined in ORS 830.700, but does not rent the home, means the space rented and not the manufactured dwelling, recreational vehicle or floating home itself.

So, it really just comes down to the actual living unit space.

All right. I understand where you're trying to go with this. Did this go through legal?

Which part?

Terminology, "unit".

The Oregon bill did, yes. But in terms of this specific plan...

So, is this terminology...?

It's cohesive with what Oregon...
Oregon uses?

Yes.

Okay. Good luck.

Anyone else?

Oh, I had one more.

Okay.

You still have family in the graphs and charts.

Yes. So those ones are going to be difficult to remove because those graphs and charts are based off of census data. And we had spoken last time about how the census still was utilizing the difference between family and households, so we were not able to pull those out. But as Loree had spoken of, when they go ahead and update the 2020 data, and so on forward, it should not be showing that anymore. It will be leaning towards the household and the unit verbiage.

Well, that's where it was confusing me, because then it refers to household, through the census.

Yeah. So, the census at the time is counting household and family as separate. So, you can have of a separate household income average from the family income average. And you're right, it does get confusing. And moving forward, it sounds like the census is pulling away and sticking just with household.

So, we're not going to copy the census, but copy Oregon?

Sounds like the census is following suit with what Oregon has been.

So, when we try to determine housing needs or housing problems, we're going to talk about units. And are we going to then convert household incomes, household transportation needs, et cetera to units? Or are we going to copy the census and use the household?

So again, household is talking about the actual people.

Right.

And then unit is the structure. So, it would still be the household needs. And then the unit would be just the structure, the type of structure. Is it a single unit structure? Is it multi-unit structure? So, they're two separate things.

Okay, thank you.

Nobody else? So, are we good? We have a motion, findings of fact? Are we good?
You don't have findings of fact.
This was educational only.
Oh, that's right.
Yeah, this is your hearing. So, yeah.
So, I have provided the samples where we did replace that verbiage. If you wanted to go ahead and approve that today, or if you wanted changes to those. Alternatively, we have the old samples that didn't have those changed. So, if we didn't like those and wanted to keep with what we had before.
I move that we approve this portion of the comprehensive plan, as it's been updated.
Tokarz-Krauss seconds.
We have a second. Any discussion?
If I could, Chair, technically, you're recommending approval onto the city council. Just to be clear.
Okay. I'll call the role. Commissioner Nelson.
Yes.
Commissioner Aviles.
[inaudible 00:12:22].
Commissioner Arthur.
Yes.
Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.
Yes.
All yours: aye. Commissioner Scherf.
Yeah.
Okay. Carries.
Thank you.
MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Arthur moved and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconded the motion to approve this portion of the comprehensive plan, as it's been updated. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Scherf, and Nelson. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Chair Heesacker.

The motion passed.

(silence)

b. 104-00146-22 ~ Buckmaster Subdivision PC Staff Report ~ Staff Report Okay. So, at this time, we'll open the public hearing to consider the application, is item 104-00146-22, Buckmaster subdivision staff report.

(silence)

It's 49, yep.

Application is for a proposed division of tax lots, ranging from 5,000 to 8,400 square feet. Proposed subdivision is served off of Leonard Road, and to include a creation of Buckmaster Drive. So, we'll begin the public hearing with the staff report, followed by presentation by the applicant, statements by persons in favor of the applications, statements by persons in opposition to the application, and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicant and staff. After that has occurred, public comment portion will be closed. The matter will be discussed and acted upon by council.

Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the council to hear this matter? Seeing none. Do any commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing, declare a potential conflict of interest? Seeing none. Prior ex parte contacts by commissioners. Any commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received prior to the meeting, regarding the application? Seeing none. This hearing, the decision of the commission will be based upon specific criteria set forth in development code. Testimony will apply in the case noted in staff report. If you'd like a copy of the report, please request, and request by the development director. It is important to remember, if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the commission and parties and opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal to the land use board of appeals. Staff report.

Chair Collier, for the record, my name is Ryan Nolan. I'm a contract planner from Rogue Valley Council of Governments. And I assist with land use actions at the city of Grants Pass.

So as the chair stated, this is a request for a subdivision off of Leonard Road. So, in your packet, you have the full staff report, which has reviewed all criteria for subdivisions, and addressed those in findings and have proposed conditions if you choose to approve this. You also have the complete application, which includes the large copy site plans. And also includes a traffic impact analysis, a brief summary of that, input from the city's traffic engineer regarding that impact analysis, comments from the Public Works department and Public Safety department. As well as comments received from neighboring property owners, including the school district and a neighbor to the south, which we'll talk about as
we go through this. So, I'm going to try to do a brief review of the application and staff report. And remind you that the full details of each criterion are found in the staff report.

So just so you can see where this is, this is on Leonard Road, across from Redwood Elementary School, near the Public Safety station there on Leonard Road. This property is within the urban growth boundary, kind of at the edge of the urban growth boundary. And recently underwent a zone change, where you made a recommendation which was approved by the city council, changing it from rural zoning RR5 to city zoning of R2. It's two tax lots, as you can see. It's largely an undeveloped grassy field that has had cattle on it, hay operations, et cetera, over the past.

Just a street view, looking west down Leonard Road. You can see, other than fencing, it's just a grassy field area with irrigation serving it. This is directly across from the elementary school. Go to the other edge of the property and look east. Again, you can see what it currently looks like. It's gently sloping away from Leonard Road. Essentially one tree, no identified natural features except for some identified wetlands, which the applicant has submitted a report to Department of State Lands. And they have determined that they approve their delineation report and will require a permit as part of the ongoing project. There's looking at it from the sky. You can see that it's close to the intersection of Darnell and Leonard Road.

So, the subdivision tentative plan includes a request to approve 54 lots. As I said, it's located in the urban growth boundary. Since 2014, the comprehensive plan designation has been moderate density residential. The zone change approved in November of 2021 changed the zoning from RR5 to R2, which is a moderate density, residential zoning with minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. There are two lots, for a total of 10.5 acres. The subdivision is proposed in three phases. Again, as I said, it's gently sloping from Leonard Road towards the river to the north. There are delineated wetlands, that they will deal with, in the northwest corner of the property. And there is Grants Past Irrigation District infrastructure, and they do serve the property currently, so the applicant will need to work with them.

This is the tentative subdivision plat, which shows Leonard Road. There will be four proposed public streets, which meet local through street design standards. Which will be Buckmaster Drive, Stony Creek Road, Green Pasture Lane, and Stillwater Lane. Those would all be public streets built to city standards. They are proposed with temporary dead ends that could allow for future connectivity. Due to the short stub dead ends, these meet fire apparatus access turnout standards, so fire trucks would be able to turn around at these intersections, in order to get into within 125 feet of any proposed structure that would be built on the lots in the future.

There's also a private street, Deer Meadow Lane, which would provide access to some of the internal lots. Again, this will be required to meet private street standards and be required to have a maintenance agreement. Similarly, up in the Northwest corner, there's a tract A, which is proposed for a storm water detention site and to preserve wetlands. This will also require a maintenance agreement that's submitted, showing that they have a plan to maintain this area so that it can continue to handle, in perpetuity, storm runoff from this development. This development will require extension of water in Leonard Road. It'll be connecting to an existing sewer through an easement on the northeast side. Again, all the streets are designed to meet city street standards and Oregon fire code standards.
The dead ends would provide, potentially, efficient connectivity for future development and future development of utilities in those public right of ways.

So, the criteria that we're looking at are found in section 17.413. And again, all of those are reviewed and analyzed in the full staff report. It's staff's opinion that the plan conforms to the lot dimension standards in article 12 and the base lot standards of section 17.510. They're all large enough and have enough width and street front to meet the base lot standards. Each lot is 5,000 square feet or larger, ranging from 5,000 square feet to 8,472 square feet. And all of the proposed lots exceed the 50-foot width requirement for an R2 lot. It's a Public Works and staff opinion that the street design is compliant with city standards, and also that the utility standards are going to be met with their utility plan, or can be, with the proposed conditions of approval. Also, none of the lots proposed are large enough for redevelopment or re-division. So, there's no future division plan or future development plan required as part of this.

So, I'm going to point out three significant conditions of approval. One is quite significant. According to Oregon fire code, no development over 30 residential dwelling units may be permitted with only one fire access road. The proposed development would eventually have 54 developable lots. So, one condition would be that 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. So, the applicant can speak to how they would address that, as they move forward with development. Number two, the applicant shall submit evidence of a continued maintenance plan for the proposed private street. And number three, the applicant shall submit a stormwater operations and maintenance agreement to the city, for review and approval, covering the area posed for the storm water detention. There is a lengthy list of conditions, but these are three that are unique to this site. Most of the others are standard subdivision conditions that you see in other subdivisions.

So, there were some important comments received. Many of those are in the packet. However, I would like to approach the dais and hand out additional comments that were received. There's one additional comment from the neighbor to the south, and then some comments received from Redwood Elementary School and from Grants Pass School District Seven. So, there are three additional exhibits and then a response from Public Works. So, I'll approach you to hand out these. And they would be exhibits 12 through 15, for the record.

(silence)

I think I'm confusing which town I'm in. This is the property to the east, the neighbor, not the south. So, the first additional exhibit, number 12. The neighboring property owner to the east has expressed concerns related to street design. And that's in relation to existing development on his property. There are two streets stubbed out for potential future connection to his property. He's concerned about existing development on his site that may prohibit efficient connection to the proposed street design. It's the city's opinion that the street standards are being met by this proposal. If the applicant and the engineer for the applicant are willing to work with him, the city would be open to slight revisions to this. And maybe the applicant can speak to if there's any intention on their part to redesign the street standard. Another issue is that there's some been some expressed concern about traffic issues related to the school. We'll get to a response from Public Works on that. So
again, this property owner is here and can speak, and the applicant can speak, to address some of those concerns.

And then you have exhibits 13 and 14, very similar letters from Redwood Elementary School and Grants Pass School District Seven, mainly voicing concern related to traffic adjacent to the school. There're some concerns about, the frontage along Leonard Road is not improved. And this is potentially an issue related to high traffic volumes at school drop off and pickup times, and pedestrian safety.

So, in relation and response to these specific comments, mostly related to traffic, but also utility extension, Public Works has a response in exhibit 15. I guess I'll read that for the record.

So, from the Public Works assistant director, it says, in response to the concerns raised by school district seven and the applicant's neighbor, while we were concerned with safe pedestrian access, Public Works does not believe that the applicant should be required to install sidewalk, from the eastern edge of their development to Harvest Drive, along another property's frontage. These improvements are not consistent with the development code, nor the historical precedents set by previous developer projects. Applicants are generally only responsible for the improvements fronting their development, unless mitigation is required, following a study such as the TIA (Traffic Impact Analysis). Leonard Road is in the transportation system plan to be upgraded to collector standards, which will include sidewalks, and should be a city project in the future. The city is also actively creating a Safe Routes to School master plan for future grant opportunities. Sidewalks along Leonard Road will certainly be a part of future grant opportunities.

In general, developers are responsible for mitigating the impacts to the public utility systems, not to necessarily fix nearby preexisting issues. It's not the responsibility of a developer to plan future street connections on adjacent property unless there's an adopted local street connection plan. I think this question is best answered by planning. School district seven is concerned that the new development will adversely affect the traffic near the school. However, the number of expected trips created from this development will have little effect on the area. This is illustrated in the traffic impact analysis created by Sando Engineering, and reviewed from Mr. Ripplinger, the city's traffic engineer. The traffic near this development and school has been functioning poorly for years due to an influx in passenger vehicles accessing the school. It should not be the developer's responsibility to mitigate a preexisting condition. However, item number 10 in the Traffic Impact Analysis review letter states that the development should install a center turn lane as part of their collector street frontage improvements, and Public Works agrees. We also believe that moving the access point for the subdivision to the Western portion of the development would help safety and congestion in the area, but we can't require it.

So, from planning, to speak a little bit to that Public Works comment, this specific property does not have any identified future streets in our transportation system plan. If we did, we could require them to locate these streets where our transportation system plan indicates they'll be in the future. So, without an adopted street plan saying where they are going to be located, as long as their meeting the connectivity standards, block length standards, etc., their proposal meets our adopted criteria. So, with that, I'm sure that the neighbor will have some comments for you. And I hope that the applicant can speak to address some of these issues. So, there is definitely some room for discussion, but with the
proposed conditions of approval, staff feels that this application meets the criteria found in our previously adopted development code. And we recommend that the planning commission approve the tentative plan for Buckmaster subdivision with the conditions listed in the staff report, based on the criteria found in section 17.413. And with that, I'd be happy to try to address any questions that the planning commission may have, Chair Collier.

Okay, thank you. Questions?

Could you show us where this street connection is, where we can see the whole picture? Have you got anything there that would depict that?

Where the future, the street that the neighbor is concerned about?

Yeah, we were talking about the section that connects to, I forgot the name of it already, the next street crossing. What the letters are talking about. The street crossing and sidewalk.

Okay. Let's see. So, you can see it a little bit on this side. So just east of the property, down to the public safety station, the road is fully improved. So, at this southwest Harvest intersection, at the center of that screen, you can see that there is curb, gutter, sidewalk, and planter strip one lot to the west. Then the curb, gutter and sidewalk stops. There's a neighboring tax lot right here, that will not have curb, gutter, and sidewalk. And then the Buckmaster subdivision will be required to extend the asphalt to half of a 60-foot-wide street. So, they're responsible for 30 feet. Which would be one travel lane, half of a center turn lane, a bicycle lane, curb, gutter, sidewalk, a planter strip, and then sidewalk. So that's kind of, the concern is that there's going to be a section that doesn't have sidewalk, that some kids, that the school side won't have full curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Though, there is an asphalt pedestrian path, but that there will be a missing link right here. That's part of that discussion about, should there be a sidewalk continued, to tie into other existing sidewalk.

Keep your cursor going. Show us where that crossing is. [crosstalk 00:32:22] close up on. Right there.

Well, let's see. So, there is a pedestrian cross crosswalk right here, which is just to the east of the neighbor's property. And so right now, there's going to be one lot, in between that section of sidewalk, that's not complete.

Other questions? Commissioner Aviles.

So, to the exhibits that were added and to some of the concerns around safe crosswalks, given that the project is in phases, do some of these concerns apply now? Or would some come up when phase two or three are being built? There are specific lots that are being built in phase one. [crosstalk 00:33:26]

Leonard Road is early in the phasing process, so not full Leonard Road frontage in phase one, but most of the Leonard Road frontage, I think is. So, I'm trying to remember which lots phase one are. Let's see.
Okay. I'll let the applicant address that a little bit more, but the full Leonard Road frontage would not be approved in the first phase, but by the end of the third phase, all street improvements would have to be completed.

Anyone else? Ready for the applicant.

Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you, staff, for that report. For identification, I'm Rick Reiger, Planning and Research Services, representing the applicant Michael Masters, here tonight, on the Buckmaster subdivision. And I'll just summarize, I'm not going to say everything that's been previously presented, but I'd just like to summarize the different criteria under section 17.410, [on the tentative plans 00:35:03] [crosstalk 00:35:03] for the subdivision.

We've met all the requirements for 54 lots, streets, and city standards. The section is outside the flood zone. It's also, it's been stated, gently sloping land with pasture, and it's vacant. Under section 17.413, end of plan criteria, all the lot sizes are 5,000 square feet or larger. The street layout is to city standards and the wetlands have been designated to be part of lot 39, in that Northwest corner. Cuts and fills will be addressed in the construction drawings, and it may include a vertical alignment with Leonard Road. When Leonard Road and Buckmaster come together, there may be some cut and fills in that location, determined by the engineer. Infrastructure. It will have city water, city sewer, city storm drain and utilities. This application complies with the comprehensive plan development code, state, and federal laws.

Under section 17.416, phasing, we're proposing the three phases. First phase will be along the top section, and that will be in the first 24 months. And then progressing down will be second phase for 18 months. And the last phase will be the frontage along Leonard Road, and the west lots as well. For a total phasing period of 60 months. One of the questions that was asked was on the side sidewalks. I believe our engineer will indicate when Buckmaster Road is constructed, then the sidewalk on lots one and two in the southeast corner will have a sidewalk constructed at that time. The sidewalks west of that will be constructed probably in the third phase.

And also, under section 22.630, solar, each lot, when it's developed, will have a site plan indicating where trees will be planted, also to protect potential for solar development of each lot. Attachments in your report include a letter from division state lands on wetlands. They have approved the study that was done for this project. And they say, when the permit is issued, it will be valid for five years. The traffic study was also done, and that's also been confirmed by the city traffic engineer, that meets all standards and that there are no additional impacts. This application also complies to the master transportation plan. And one of the conditions that was mentioned, if the development exceeds 30 lots, would be to put a 15-foot easement along the east line of lot 46 in that Southwest corner. And that would allow fire access for emergency purposes.

And that concludes my presentation at this point. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Questions for the applicant? Commissioner Scherf.
I don't know if this is too far down the road, but what I'm looking at is the T1 exhibit on the engineering plans. This is basically laying out the lots and then there's a square footage. I'm assuming that's each lot's square footage that's listed in there. And then there's some dash lines that are listing the building envelopes. My concern is, some of the side lots, like say example, lot 1, 4, 7, where they've got dual frontages, they look a little skinny. Did you guys propose to the city, any variances on those side setbacks for those lots that ended up a little bit skinny?

I will let the applicant respond on that.

Okay.

Thank you.

Anyone else? Okay.

(silence)

Are you complete, applicant?

Hi, Michael Masters, the applicant. I'm looking at those dotted lines. I don't think they're actually accurate, because my understanding of the code is, you have to have a 20-foot setback from the front yard. And then on a side street, when you're on a corner lot, it's a 10-foot setback on the side yard. So, I think the lots are actually big enough to build a single family in there.

Okay.

Yeah, just one of those mistakes the guy drew.

Yeah, that's just one of those things you're concerned about when you're looking three steps ahead of time, you want to make sure. I know corner lots are really bad because you have the double street frontage there.

Yeah.

Just want to make sure that you end up with a buildable, you can put a house on it. I hear you. When you said that, I looked at it. I went, wait a minute, I never thought of that. And then I looked at it and go, wait a minute, when you're on a corner lot, then you have only one front yard setback standard. And then the other streets have a 10-foot side yard setback on another street. So, we can fit a single family in there, and that's pretty much what I'm going to do.

Perfect.

I think we can make it all work. And as far as, I've talked a lot with several of the neighbors and I've told them, I've expressed my openness to work with him. I expect the window for me to engineer this project and have plans ready to submit to the city is going to take three to four months. So hopefully, that's enough time for him to get with his engineer and us to
collaborate. I want to work with him, I want to be a neighbor. We're going to end up sharing some utilities at some point, so I've always told Dustin, who's the neighbor to the east, that it's in my interest to work with him and I intend to. I don't know how to put a condition on that for me, but I mean, people that know me, I've been around a long time, I usually do what I say. And I don't think it's in my interest to promise him something I can't do. So that's, again, we probably have to tweak the plan a little bit once the engineer and the neighbor gets together. And what he's proposed to me, doesn't look like it really material impacts any of my lots and if it helps his project in the future, I'm happy to do it. And like I said, I don't want to change my application, but I'll have my engineer work with you.

Any other questions for me?

I'm good, thanks.

Okay, thank you.

You've got one more.

Oh, Commissioner Nelson.

Yeah. I was just looking at your proposal and I see how that school district would have some concern with the street coming right out into where people are going to park their cars. I know elementary schools are notorious with parents dropping off and picking up kids and lining up on the street. Is there any solution to that issue?

Yeah, I've been speaking with Dustin about that. As soon as I heard that there might be some grant money available, I talked to Rick and I said, is there money out there? We'd like to maybe see if we can get some grant money. I'd contribute some money towards those extra sidewalks. And he said he'd contribute some money. My kids went from kindergarten all the way through to Redwood School. I live in the neighborhood; I walk that street every day. I understand. So, I didn't want to foot the whole bill, but if he's willing to put some money into it and if there is actually grant money available in some kind of transportation plan, I think we can do it, even though it's not required. I don't know what it's going to cost. I mean, it was just raised essentially to me today, in this email. And I asked him, how much frontage is it? I have no idea what this is going to cost. And he I said, let's work together and try and figure it out. So, I'd like to not make it a condition, but I would like to work with him and see if we can do it, because he wants those sidewalks in front of him.

I'm sorry, I wasn't concerned about the sidewalk as much as the street entrance off of Leonard Road. They had asked if that could be moved further to the west.

I don't know why it was designed the way it was. I'd have to let my engineer comment on that. It wasn't a requirement, in the staff report, that he address it. So, I told him there was no need to come, because he would’ve had to drive from Klamath Falls.

Right.
So again, I heard the staff say that they had some room to tweak the plan. And so why don't we just have the engineer try and work with staff, and the engineering at city, to try and address this as best we can. I think probably the issue is, we have the 150 feet for the turnaround, and if we go too long, then we got another issue. So, I have to let the engineer and the experts design that out and come up with the answer. Because half the time, I just say, if you guys say it works, then I'll do it. You know? And so, if the engineer says that he can come up with a solution that works for everybody, then that's what I'm open to. Because it doesn't matter to me where the street in entrance goes, but I think there was a lot of thought put into it. And I'd like to have him address that with the staff. I think what I heard was, they were saying they thought it'd be a good idea, but they weren't going to require it. So, I'd like to have the engineer revisit that when we submit the plans. Because this is just a tentative plan. We'll have a full set of engineering that basically takes a lot of collaboration with city engineering department, to get those plans turned in. I wish I could give you a better answer right now.

Yeah. Just from my expertise, looking at this, your lot five and six or pigeonholing that entrance. So basically, the whole lot layout has had some thought, and that Buckmaster is specifically located kind of with this lot layout. So, it would kind of be a full lot reconfiguration to move that entrance. So, I see where the challenges would be.

Yeah. Again, if there's a discussion about a bulb for a cul-de-sac in the future, I said I'm willing to dedicate some frontage if it helps him, as long as I don't lose a lot or over it.

Yeah.

Any other comments or questions? Okay, thank you. Are you finished?

Sorry, I'm done.

Okay. So, at this point, we'll take public comment. Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of the application? Seeing none. Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition? I did?

Step on up then.

Well, I don't have a comment point for that. You're in the middle, but you'd like to speak. Okay.

Is that roadkill?

I don't know. Go ahead. If you'll give us your name, you're just from the county, is fine. We don't do the red-light thing, but you want to push the button and speak into the microphone. We generally give three minutes.

Push a button? I don't know.

No, you're good.

All right. Well, my name is Dustin Smith. And actually, Ryan, I know if you can go to the view that has my property next door. I'm the property owner to the east of the
development. And just so you know, I've worked in construction for 20 years. I was a project executive. So, I'm very familiar with this process. Like I said, I'm not opposed. I know that the entitlement is here and bought the property knowing that I was in the urban growth zone, and it was going to happen. A little earlier than I'd like, but whatever. And so, it's kind of got me thinking about, okay, what are we going to do with our property in the future? And how does it connect and all that? So, I almost want to think of it at this point as, maybe we're phase four. Right? My kids are still in school and don't want to do anything to the property until they're done with school. But my goal is just, at this point, is to ensure that this development, which does have these road stubs onto our property, is done in a way that works for our property, for a future development. Maybe it's, because youngest graduates in six years, that makes sense to do it then.

So basically, looks like the Northeast road stub from the property works okay. I submitted an email and there's a little sketch in there, probably in the packet. And the Southeast road stub, unfortunately has a little bit of a conflict with where it enters our property. We're actually not even finaled on a pool that we just installed last year. Our house was built 1998. It's a nice big house, where I live in it. There was someone who lived in it for 50 years or whatever. We have a guest house, so it was really two residences kind of like that, that we'd like to keep.

And so, then we could see, on our property, there's kind of a U-shape development that could occur around our existing residents. And so, I just wanted to make sure that, that road stub would work for us. So, I talked to Justin Gerlitz, who's a friend of mine, engineer. I showed Michael, he came over and we talked about the development. And I kind of showed him, hey, maybe this is a plan. I talked to Ryan Nolan. I guess that stub might need to be modified to allow for future lot development on the south part of our property. And I think it's in everybody's best interest, for the future, to make that work. Again, ideally, if you looked at this as one subdivision, including our property. I mean, that's the way I look at it. Because once those road stubs are in, it kind of says, hey, this is what's going to happen in the future.

So, my request. After talking with Ryan, he said, hey, try to make a specific request. I couldn't do engineering in a matter of days or whatever. But the request is basically that, there's some sort of condition of approval that says, hey, that southeast road stub, can we have the applicant have their engineer kind of make it work, so that we can put what I think is four lots, in the future, on the south part of our property. Without having to require the demolition of our pool or our house or whatever. So that's the specific request that I have.

And what did you come up with?

What's that?

Where do we sit?

He doesn't have one.

So, I wrote in the email that I sent to Ryan, the request for the approval. And Michael's already agreed. I think that it's feasible. I just, as a property owner adjacent to this development, I was actually a little bit, not shocked, but just frustrated with the reality that the code that Ryan is asked to go by doesn't take into account the neighboring properties.
I guess it would be another request of mine, that the commission maybe look at that and require a future development plan or some sort of look at the adjacent properties, and where are those road stubs are going, and how does that work for the future development of the adjacent properties? In this condition, we're in the urban growth zone. I actually have a traffic study that encouraged to do the rezoning sooner rather than later.

So, I'm probably in the best position, not like a lot of owners here just saying, hey, no development, it's not going to happen and never going to happen, or whatever. I'm just saying, hey, it's going to happen, I know it's going to happen. Now is the time to make sure that this works for us. One example of this idea of looking at future connectivity or future development of adjacent properties, for mine, the example would be that the tentative plan is 14 lots would go onto my property. So, this idea of egress is an issue. And you would have 54 lots on the subject property, but eventually, that same access point to Leonard Road would serve an additional 14 lots to my property. And so that's why it's kind of like, I would say, hey, let's look at this as a whole future subdivision. How is it all going to work down the road? And in this case, like I'm saying, it's probably going to be five or six years down the road that we would pull the trigger and make it happen.

The last thing, just wanted to say is that we talked about the frontage issue. Actually, I think two more things. The frontage issue, and like I talked about with Michael. And I was PTA president at the Redwood School last year. I know the principal and know her concerns, and deal with the traffic on a daily basis. I think it'd be great to get the frontage in. Told him that, at some point, if I develop my property, I'm going to have to pay for that. Would be willing to participate in that. Or like you said, if there's grants, and if there's a way to make that happen, they could make the school happy. I think the development would be served well. The students would have a lot safer access to the school. Specific too, I talked to Mrs. Moony, the principal. And the idea of having a second crosswalk is something that they kind of frown upon in the district. From like staffing, and then just also, kind of having the kids spread out and everything else. So, they'd like to funnel everybody into one crosswalk.

So, the last thing is regarding that access road that you were questioning. I call them access road, but the Buckmaster Drive. And Ryan, there's a picture, actually, one of the first pictures you showed. From the east property line, there's a turn lane that's entering the school from the east. But on the west side of the school, it's actually, that turn lane starts and it has two double yellow lines. And I just paced it off, and it's about 165 feet from the subject property's east property line.

Right there, that last one that you just had up. So, you can see where that comes together. So, I think that your issue too, is where, as far as where that road goes, that coordination is, there's already this existing kind of start of a turn lane. And it's 165 feet over, is where that ends. Currently, the plan has the road a little bit closer. So, it just needs to, I don't know about how that gets engineered and everything, but that's kind of the issue there.

So, you're saying... I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

No, go ahead.

Right here is the west side? That's west?
Looking west, so that's the east property line.

This is currently, Buckmaster Road would be somewhere in here?

Probably closer to the telephone pole.

Right in here?

So, I think there's a conflict with the existing terminus of that turn lane, that just needs to be engineered. If it stays where it's at, that just needs to be addressed. Obviously, the request from the principal in the district was, hey, if you can push it further down, that would be great for traffic. I felt like, if there wasn't frontage put in, that a crosswalk could be put in there for access. But again, talking to Mrs. Moony, that's something they don't like to see, is to have the two crosswalks.

Thank you.

Thank you.

So now, is there anyone that would like to speak in opposition to the application?

My name is Christian Macklovich. I live on South River Road. I'm not opposed to this. The density bothers me a bit. It looks like private roads are being put in to maybe squeeze in a couple like extra houses. 54 houses on 10 acres, in your backyard, is awful lot. I know we need houses; things need to grow. But boy, 5,000 square foot minimum in your backyard. If you go to a few of the other developments, if you look at the driveways of the streets. Trailers, RVs, there's no place to park stuff. Big drawback. The Redwood area, I moved out here 20 years ago when it was nice, open, and that's the feel of the redwoods. Anyone who's grown up there knows that. And understand, we have to develop, and we need the houses, but five to an acre is an awful lot. And unfortunately, I missed the zoning meeting and was unable to speak at that. I'm a little late now, but if somehow, we could, a little less dense. Four to an acre. Five's awful tight. But that's all I have.

Thank you. Is there anyone else who'd like to speak in opposition to the application?

[inaudible 00:57:59].

Come on a way up.

I was just curious. This water retention pond or filter system. When is that going to be installed? Is that the beginning of the construction?

So, we can give you an answer after, if you just state your question, we can't go back and forth. But we'll get to your answer once you're done. Go ahead and ask all your questions and then we can answer it.

The other one is, now they flood irrigate that, is this retention area above elevation? We're down towards the river, so all that run off is coming. And are there going to be DIs in this, that go, is all the water going to be filtered?
All right. I don't know what a DI is.

Drain inlet.

Okay.

You know, in a road, and the water pours down it.

Okay. And what other questions do you have?

Other than that, I might [inaudible 00:59:06] 54 units, fire, and land, they'll all burn. We paid for one [acre 00:59:16] lot with one resident. And this, I missed the zoning, and this is the second time I've been downzoned, so this value in my property is going to drop because of this. So, okay, that's it.


I'd like to respond to some of the questions that have been asked. You can look at your exhibit, on lot two, in response to Dustin Smith, that's an 8,000 square foot lot. So, there is the ability to adjust where that intersection or the continuation of the road will go into his property.

What exhibit are you looking at?

This one here, which would be exhibit D or T1. It's on your large map. Okay? So, I don't see that's a problem. In fact, it's to our advantage to work, as the applicant, Michael Masters has stated, it's to our advantage to work with him because we want the road system to work properly. What I'm trying to confirm is that we have the ability to work with him because of the large size of that lot, so it's not a problem. Also, in the northwest corner, track A, that's the wetlands. The storm drainage will have to go in at the very beginning of any development of the property, so that the wetlands will be developed. And if you've done a wetland plan before, any drainage that currently comes off the property now, cannot exceed that in the future. So, there will be mitigated drainage plan, and that it will not see what currently the flow is now for water. When you talk about filtering, one advantage of wetlands, wetlands does natural filtering. So would be also an advantage.

Those are the comments I wanted to make at this point. If there's any other questions, I'd be happy to answer them. Thank you.

Anyone else in opposition? Anyone I missed? Okay. At this point, we'll close the public hearing and bring it to the commission. Actually, do we need staff for final comments? Yeah, we do. Okay, sorry, haven't closed anything.

Just a few follow up comments on some of the issues raised. So, it sounds like Mr. Smith, just to clarify, kind of did have a specific request. Which was that Stony Creek Road, the stub to the east be engineered to allow a standard cul-de-sac bulb to be constructed between the proposed terminus and the existing improvements on his property at 3130 Leonard Road. As staff, I can't identify a code set that would allow us to require that, but it sounds like the applicant may be open to working with him to accomplish that. If the applicant was open to a condition of something like that, you could add it as a condition.
But if he didn't agree to it, I don't see a code section that allows you to require the road to be altered based on an existing house and pool, even though it makes very good sense to the neighbor, I don't see in our code that section. So, there was one comment.

Just to speak to the neighbor’s concern about density, that's of course understandable when you live in what is currently kind of a rural area. But again, that's in lots of work through the city in 2014, that was designated at this comprehensive designation so that it could be as small as 5,000 square foot lot. So that's a decision that was made with the comp plan designation, reinforced with the zoning change.

And then I think the applicant addressed the stormwater concerns that Mr. Garvin had.

So, with that, those are just a few staff comments. If there's any final staff questions before the hearing is closed, I'd be happy to try to answer those for the planning commission.

Questions for staff? Mr. Nelson.

I had a question on the Buckmaster Lane. As it comes out, if I was turning to the left, looking and it appears to me that there is a deviation on the traffic going to the east. And then there's an open spot. Is that a turn lane on Leonard Road?

There's a very small section, essentially improved, in front of the fire station, that has a turn lane. As Leonard Road is built out to a collector standard and widened, there will be a center turn lane. So, this applicant will be required to improve the frontage. And potentially, dedicate a small section of right of way, that's to be determined by their surveyor, to meet that standard. So that as it's built out, it will have a center turn lane. But right now, the only section that does in this area is a small section, basically right at the southwest Harvest Drive intersection.

So how would they turn left, then? They come out; they would have to go across whatever this partial lane is?

If you came out of Buckmaster Road, which would be about here, and you're going to turn left...

You had picture of it earlier. I'm just trying to figure out where that, remember, you said the telephone pole right here?

So, it's going to be somewhere here, but this street, this is going to be quite a bit wider. So, this will be altered when their full improvements are made along this frontage. So, this asphalt's going to extend.

Okay. Because that seemed confusing to me, because you'd have to cross over that. But if there was going to be, if that's a turn lane, I don't know what that D is, but...

So, from the center line of Leonard Road, they're going to be improving 30 feet, which is significantly wider than this half is currently.

Then that would then be able to be put in as a turn lane?
Correct. As part of this, I assume the turn lane will extend, and eventually will continue all the way down.

Anything else? Last chance. Okay. We're going to close the public portion of the commission, for consideration. Anybody? Comments, questions, concerns? Commissioner Nelson.

I'm going to put the motion on the table to move approval, the Buckmaster subdivision, with the conditions laid out by our staff. I believe there was three conditions. Is that correct, Ryan? Oh, is it's a lot more? Oh, there was also? So, is fine just to say, "as conditioned in the staff report"? Clear as mud.

So, we have a motion to approve.

Second.

Seconded by Commissioner Scherf. Discussion.

Well, I have something to say.

Commissioner Arthur.

I can understand the wish to keep it rural and not have a high density, and so on. But five lots per acre is pretty shallow. At the time that we did the urban growth boundary, starting in 2006, it took us eight years to get done with it. The state, clear back at the beginning, was insisting on a minimum everywhere, for anything, of at least eight units per acre. And it was a struggle to even get there. So, I think at this point, that getting the 54 lots is a very good idea for the housing that we need.

Anyone else? Don't all speak at once. Commissioner Nelson.

One of the conditions I was reading in there was with fire protection, and I was a little confused by that. Could someone explain that to me? As far as the development.

The Oregon fire code specifically prohibits development of more than 30 single family dwelling units without either two fire access roads to access it for ingress in the egress, or fire suppression in each home. So, you could put sprinklers in all 54 homes and not have a second road, or you put in a second road, and you can have more than 30 units.

So, are they looking at, phase three, doing the second road?

I believe that's the applicant's intent that they would do two phases. And then prior to phase three, complete a secondary urgency access.

But we don't have any idea where that would go?

They could do that with approval from the fire marshal, through an easement across one of the tax lots.

Okay, that was the one down in 46 and 45.
That was their proposal tonight.

All right, now I'm clear. I'm sorry, thank you.

Anyone else? Last chance. Okay. We have first and a second. So, call the roll. Commissioner Nelson.

Yes.

Commissioner Aviles.

[inaudible 01:09:36]

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

Commissioner Collier votes aye. Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

The motion passes.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Scherf seconded the motion to approve the Buckmaster subdivision, with the conditions laid out by our staff in the staff report. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Scherf, and Nelson. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Chair Heesacker.

The motion passed.

Okay. That's everything.

Thank you for coming. One of the things that I've noticed is, there's been a lot of success in discussion by opponents and proponents, outside after the meeting. So, if you'd like to stick around, I see a lot of success, in my experience in the last two years, after the meeting. I think you might have an answer for your wetland question.

Matters from commission members and staff? How's everybody? Good? That's all I got.

Are you going down the line? [crosstalk 01:10:36]

No, I'm going, whoever raises their hand.

I had a couple of notes. One was, I guess it's a good idea every few years, to sit down and read the comprehensive plan that you haven't looked at, except in little snippets, in a
long time. There was one thing I had a question about, and I didn't read everything carefully, but I did kind of skim through. And that was section a little ways into our portion, that discussed the citizen advisory councils. And I probably should look up exactly what it was. Page 135 was the note. When I skimmed down through that, the citizen involvement program, and I thought they were making some changes on it, but I haven't seen any state stuff on it. Some decades ago, maybe, the UAPC was told by the city council that we are the body responsible for administering the citizen involvement program, and we're supposed to be making the year report on the progress on that. And we haven't done that for years and years. So, I don't know whether the whole thing actually vanished or what, but I'd almost forgotten about it until I read this page.

I was reading that too, and I wondered, hmm, are we doing any of this? Yeah, so I get it. Well originally, there were 19 citizen advisory councils in the county. And the purpose of them was, primarily, for land use issues. They were geographical entities. And the city has fulfilled its requirement by having, I don't know what you'd call it, subject or topical ones, by having historic district and parks, and different kinds of citizen advisory councils, not the geographic ones. And almost all of the other ones have died, as far as I know, except for the one in Wilderville and possibly, somebody said there might be something left in Murphy, and the north valley had a little active group that was more like a homeowner's group. But I just thought it might be good to mention, because somewhere on the books, we are the responsible body for making that happen.

Does that have any traction with anyone else? Okay. You got another point?

Yes. Is it possible for us to get a list of contact information for everybody on the UAPC? It used to be out on the website, but it's not now. And I know we're not supposed to be discussing business matters on that, but when something comes up like a thing with Eric, it'd be nice to know where to send a card or make a call, or something.

So, we of course do have a roster. And I think we generally, for the city committees and commissions, haven't been putting member addresses and phone numbers out there for the public. I mean, we of course, at city staff, have that. But, certainly up to the commission members, if you would like to have that, we can make the roster available to each of you. Recognizing, as you said, Commissioner, that you have some limitations on when you can communicate with each other.

I think I got one. When, at the beginning, you say, here's everyone else. Here's your email address and their phone number. Usually when something changes, the other committees, at least parks and rec, and bikeways, hand that out. And I think I do have one somewhere.

I don't know if I was scolded for saying what I did when I announced that Eric had a stroke. I wasn't in error because he actually put it on Facebook. So that's when I relayed it to each of you. It happened about two hours before the meeting two weeks ago. And he's been posting updates to Facebook, just two updates. But that was how he communicated to the world.

He called me right beforehand. But he shifted from hospital up here to the hospital in Medford. And after that, it was mostly on Facebook that we got ahold of him. Then I did
ask you, he thanked us for the flowers. And then I said, hey, you bet. And then I had to call the Brad and say, yo, who sent him flowers? Because I didn't. So apparently, somebody sent him flowers and they named it after us. So, if he thanks you for the flowers, you just head nod and, "yep". So apparently, someone from the city sent him flowers, and he appreciates it. You'll see him hopefully in two weeks, but also, he's got a presence at the Grower's Market. His son's down there, he's got a booth down there. So that's about the only way to get ahold of him, is via email. We've all got each other's email address. And if he wanted the phone number, I think city admin has given it out before, phone numbers. So, it's up to you, if you wanted.

Well, I just wondered when it changed. Because for years, all the information was published on the website, and it was easy to get for everybody.

Yeah, I don't want mine on the website.

[inaudible 01:16:21]

But we have given it to individual members. No, I don't see anyone saying, I want my phone number public. I don't want mine. But I can give you his number if you want it. Anything else?

I just want to make doubly sure. I mean, having been out there as a public, like, President of the Association of Realtors, there are a lot of nut cakes who want to track you down and take your time. That, I don't want, but you're willing to give it out to anybody on the commission. But just not, I don't want it public. Of course, I can look up all of yours because I'm a realtor. So anyway, just saying.

Anything else? Brad, Ryan, anybody? Going once. Okay, we're adjourn. Thank you very much.
I. PROPOSAL:

The application is for a Major Site Plan Review to allow the development of a vacant lot with a single story 4,598 square foot Rogue Credit Union branch with three (3) drive thru PTM’s. The applicant also requests a Major Variance to the access standards outlined in Section 27.121(h) in the Grants Pass Development Code and be allowed to have two (2) two-way entries/exits from Union Avenue. The lot is currently vacant and bordered by Union Avenue to the south, Redwood Highway to the north, a recently constructed carwash to the east, and a vacant lot to the west. Frontage improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk, and all major utilities are currently in place.

The property is located at 340 Union Avenue in the GC zoning district and is subject to the Commercial Design Standards as listed in Article 20 of the Grants Pass Development Code (GPDC). The property is also located in the Medical Overlay District. No additional requirements for development will be imposed as part of this District. The applicant’s site plan and parking plan are attached (see Exhibit 3). The proposed branch will require roughly half of the site leaving the remainder available for future development.
II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Review procedures are provided in the Grants Pass Development Code (GPDC) §2.020 and Schedule 2-1. Major Variances are a Type III procedure requiring a hearing before the Urban Area Planning Commission (UAPC).

This decision shall be based upon the criteria contained in Sections 19.052 and 6.060 of the Development Code.

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 decision was mailed, on a form provided by the Director.

IV. BACKGROUND

A. Characteristics of the Property:

1. Land Use Designation:
   a. Comprehensive Plan: General Commercial
   b. Zone District: General Commercial (GC)
   c. Special Purpose District: Medical Overlay
      Grants Pass Irrigation District (GPID)

2. Size: 1.79 acres

3. Frontage: Union Avenue (Collector)
   Redwood Highway (State Highway)

4. Access: Union Avenue

5. Existing Public Utilities:
   a. Water: 16-inch main in Union Avenue
      8-inch main in Redwood Hwy
   b. Sewer: 12-inch main in Union Avenue
      8-inch main in Redwood Hwy
   b. Storm: 18-inch main in Union Avenue
      12-inch main in Redwood Hwy

6. Topography: Flat

7. Natural Hazards: None identified
8. Natural Resources: None identified

9. Existing Land Use:
   a. Subject Parcel: Vacant (GC)
   b. Surrounding:
      West: Vacant (GC)
      East: Carwash (GC)
      South: Union Avenue (Collector)
      North: Redwood Hwy (State Highway)

B. Discussion:

The property is located at 340 Union Avenue and is within the GC zoning district. The site is currently undeveloped and vacant. The application is for a Major Site Plan Review to allow the construction of a new single story 4,598 square foot Rogue Credit Union branch with three (3) drive thru PTM’s. According to the applicant, the proposed project will require roughly half of the site leaving the remainder available for future development.

As part of the Future Development Plan, the applicant has indicated a proposed optional property line, as part of a potential Partition. The proposed configuration would not comply with water and sewer requirements outlined in the Public Works Staff Report (See Exhibit 5).

Section 27.121(h) of the GPDC restricts the number of accesses onto Arterials and Collectors. Union Avenue is classified as a Collector. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow for two (2) two-way entries/exits from Union Avenue to more safely serve the credit union clientele, in particular, the customers using the drive thru PTM stations.

There are two AFD’s (AFD 5227 & 5228) associated with the project site. Fees for 340 Union Avenue total $47,471.41. These payments would be triggered if the lot is developed in such a manner as to share parking or other above ground facilities or structures with Tax Lot 1700 directly or through another lot.

The subject property has curb, gutter, sidewalk and access to all city utilities along Union Avenue. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the sidewalks along Union Avenue. It is indicated on the applicant’s site plan that they intend to match the existing sidewalk configuration of five (5) feet with five (5) foot planter strips, however this configuration does not adhere to the current standards of the GPDC. As conditioned below, the applicant shall conform to the requirements outlined in the Public Works Staff Report and install a 6-foot sidewalk with 7.5-foot planter strips (See Exhibit 5).

According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, the proposed 4,598 square foot building classified as a use of Drive-in Bank is expected to generate approximately 400 average daily trips and 80 p.m. peak hour trips. A traffic impact analysis was required for this application because the combined uses at the site generate 25 or more PM peak hour trips.
The applicant is subject to meeting the commercial design standards of Article 20. The applicant has elected the standard architectural review procedure. As conditioned below, the application will be in compliance with the requirements of Article 20.

V. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA

A. Major Variance

6.060. Criteria for Variances

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

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

Staff Response: Not Satisfied. The property and request do not meet this criterion above. The applicant requests a variance from the access standards outlined in Article 27.321(h) which restricts the number of permitted accesses onto Arterial and Collector streets. The applicant is requesting to have two accesses from Union Avenue, classified as a Collector. The applicant submitted a Transportation Impact Analysis and the City Traffic Engineer, John Replinger provided comment stating, “The site plan should be revised to provide for a single access to Union Avenue.”

The applicant, in the submitted burden of proof statement, has provided the following arguments that address this criterion:

➢ The land to the west of the proposed project is vacant and as such there is not a secondary access driveway for the proposed project to tie into on the west. In addition, it is unknown if/when development might occur on this parcel and if so, if there would be a driveway that our proposed project could tie into. Allowing the proposed western driveway guarantees a connection to the property to the west.

➢ The property to the east (existing carwash) is developed with an existing driveway to Union Avenue. However, the existing driveway was not designed to allow for future development to the west to tie into it. Access to our proposed project from the carwash site would require driving through the carwash pay station.

➢ The western driveway of the proposed project is designed to allow for future development from the west to tie into it. A proposed cross access location is shown on the proposed site plan.

➢ The Traffic Impact Analysis finds no issues with two driveways from the proposed development onto Union Avenue.
(2) The variance is the minimum necessary to address the special or unique physical circumstances related to the subject site.

**Staff Response:** **Satisfied.** The property and request meet criterion (2) above.

The applicant, in the submitted burden of proof statement, has provided the following arguments that address this criterion:

- The proposed credit union drive thru will see significant vehicular traffic. This is in addition to the traffic created by those parking and walking into the facility. This traffic is more than a typical office use and therefore, having a clear, direct way in and out of the property is essential. Having two, two-way entries/exits achieves this goal.

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

**Staff Response:** **Not Satisfied.** The request does not meet criterion (3) above as the applicant has failed to demonstrate how the variance could benefit users of the transportation system or what potential negative impacts there may be on the development of the adjacent uses.

The applicant, in the submitted burden of proof statement, has provided the following in support of this criterion:

- Two driveways provide a more direct, less congested way in and out of the proposed site rather than just one driveway.
- A secondary driveway provides access for future development to the west.

(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 result of a property line adjustment or land division approval previously granted to the applicant.

**Staff Response:** **Satisfied.** The request meets this criterion above as the need for the variance is not a result of a previously approved property line adjustment or land division granted to the applicant.

The applicant, in the submitted burden of proof statement, has provided the following arguments that address this criterion:

- The variance request is not a result of a lot line adjustment, land division, or any other self-imposed property configuration previously granted to the applicant.
- The variance request is not self-imposed but is rather a condition of the type of permitted uses proposed for the site. Drive thru banks/credit unions generate a significant amount of traffic.
B. MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW:

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

Criterion (1): Complies with applicable development standards: Base standards of zoning district, special development standards, residential development standards, or standards as previously approved under the provisions of an optional development plan or other approved permit.

Staff Response: Satisfied. The subject property is approximately 1.79 acres in size and is located in the GC zoning district. Professional Offices are a primary use in this zoning district per Schedule 12-2. The proposed plan is for the construction of a 4,598 sq. ft. Rogue Credit Union branch with three (3) drive thru PTM’s. The use as proposed is allowed within the GC zoning district and is therefore consistent with the base standards of the zoning district.

Property line setbacks per Schedule 12-9 for General Commercial zoned lots are 10 feet for the front, exterior side, and exterior rear yards. There are no setbacks for rear and side yards. The proposed development fronts both Union Avenue (Collector) and Redwood Highway (State Highway). A 10-foot setback will be required for each of those frontages. The applicant’s submitted site plan indicates these requirements are met. Maximum height per Schedule 12-10 in the GC zone is 35 feet and the proposed building is approximately 23 feet high. The proposed plan meets all of these base development standards.

Commercial Design Standards

The applicant proposes to build a 4,598 square foot Rogue Credit Union branch with three drive-thru PTM’s. New retail construction in the GC zone is subject to Article 20 commercial design standards per Section 20.220(3).

The proposed structure is 92 feet in length on the north and south sides and 60 feet in length on the east and west sides. The south side, which faces Union Avenue, will provide the entrance to the building. The building is 23 feet in height.

The submitted plans require review for Sections 20.405 (Architectural Standards – Building Entrances), 20.410 (Architectural Standards – Windows and Glass Doors in Exterior Walls), 20.420 (Massing and Detailing) 20.450 (Use of Parapets), and 20.460 Cornice Treatments and Eave Lines as follows:

20.405 Building Entrances. Per Section 20.405(2) buildings shall have sheltering elements to provide protection from the weather at public entrances that are at least five (5) feet deep. Submitted plans meet this criteria.

20.410 Windows and Glass Doors in Exterior Walls. Subsection 3, requires that buildings 18 feet or taller must meet all of the following standards:

The ground floors (under 18 feet) which are visible from a public right of way, pedestrian path, on-site circulation area or adjoining property, shall have windows and/or glass
doors a minimum of 3 feet tall, including the area between 3 and 6 feet above the ground, for at least 25% of the width of the elevation. All four elevations are visible and must meet this requirement. Submitted plans indicate:

**North Elevation:** Coverage of windows and/or glass doors must be 25% of 92 feet = 23 feet of coverage. Submitted plan indicates 24 feet of coverage. Meets standards.

**West Elevation:** Coverage of windows and/or glass doors must be 25% of 60 feet = 15 feet of coverage. Submitted plan indicates 31 feet of coverage. Meets standards.

**South Elevation:** Coverage of windows and/or glass doors must be 25% of 92 feet = 23 feet of coverage. Submitted plan indicates 40 feet of coverage. Meets standards.

**East Elevation:** Coverage of windows and/or glass doors must be 25% of 60 feet = 15 feet of coverage. Submitted plan indicates 20 feet of coverage. Meets standards.

20.420 Massing and detailing. Submitted plans indicate a flat roof with a parapet encircling the building. A flat roof building shall have a horizontal or vertical change in the wall plane at the cornice line at least every 50 feet, at least 18” in height or 3 feet in depth and 12 feet wide, in accordance with Section 20.423(2). This criteria applies to all four elevations.

**Per Section 20.423(2),** all four elevations must meet this criteria. Submitted plans indicate that all four elevations meet this criteria.

20.450 Use of Parapets. Per Section 20.450(1), a building with a flat roof shall have a parapet that extends above the roof plane. The parapet shall wrap around all sides of the flat roof, except for the side that faces a service drive, service corridor, service courtyard or alley. The parapet height shall meet the requirements of Article 23 for screening of rooftop mechanical equipment. Submitted plans meet these criteria.

20.460 Cornice Treatments and Eave Lines. Per Section 20.460(2), a building with a flat roof shall have a decorative three-dimensional cornice along the top of each wall. The height of the cornice shall be a minimum of 5% of the building height but no less than 8 inches. The depth of the cornice shall be at least 25% of the cornice height, but a 2-part cornice shall not be less than 4-inches deep. Cornices less than 18 inches high shall be composed of at least 2 elements. Submitted plans meet these standards. The cornice height is approximately 1-foot tall, is composed of 2 elements, and is approximately 6-inches deep.

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

**Staff Response:** Satisfied with conditions.

**Traffic Plan:** The property has frontage along Union Avenue and Redwood Highway. Access to the property is provided by an existing approach from Union Avenue. The applicant proposes two (2) two-way driveways from Union Avenue to provide a more direct, less congested way in and out of the proposed site rather than just one driveway.

The applicant has provided a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) as required by Section 27.121(3) as the proposal is projected to generate more than twenty-five (25) PM peak hour trips. The City Traffic Engineer, John Replinger, has reviewed the TIA and provided comment (**Exhibit 6**) stating the TIA, as submitted, provides an adequate basis
to assess the impacts of the proposed development. The TIA provided an analysis of peak AM and PM trips at the following intersections:

- Redwood Highway/Ringuette Street
- Ringuette Street/Union Avenue
- Union Avenue/SW Ramsey Street
- Williams Highway/Union Avenue
- Two proposed site accesses on Union Avenue

The TIA found the proposed project will generate 45 AM peak hour trips and 96 PM peak hour trips. The applicant’s TIA does not provide an estimate of weekday trips. Replinger, using the same source as the applicant, calculated 459 weekday trips, and concurred with the applicant’s engineer that:

“...no mitigation is required for operational or safety issues. I concur with the engineer’s conclusion that traffic operations at study area intersections meet standards with the development or are otherwise acceptable; storage for queuing is adequate; sight distance is adequate; and that there are no safety concerns requiring attention in connection with this development.”

“The obvious flaw in the application relates to site access and additional, future development on the site. The application materials suggest that there will ultimately be a future building on the south part of the site. Even if one ignores this potential expansion and additional development of the site, the applicant proposes two access driveways to Union Avenue rather than one as prescribed by Article 27.121. The applicant provides no justification or analysis for the extra access.”

“I recommend that the applicant resubmit a site plan with access meeting the requirements of Article 27.”

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) have provided comment (Exhibit 7) requesting the applicant obtain written approval from ODOT for any signage visible from Redwood Highway. As a condition of approval, the applicant will need to obtain a misc./utility permit prior to any disturbance within the State right-of-way (ROW) and must provide drainage calculations showing the proposal will not adversely affect State facilities for review and approval by ODOT. The applicant shall contact Julee Scruggs at Julee.y.scruggs@odot.state.or.us or 541-864-8811 to discuss permits.

As conditioned below, the applicant is required to provide a ten (10) foot City Utility Easement (CUE). The applicant shall provide a legal description and map of the CUE and the recorded easement to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of a Development Permit.

**Water and Sewer Plan:** Existing water and sewer utility mains are located in the frontages of both Union Avenue and Redwood Highway. The applicant proposes connecting to the existing mains along Union Avenue and running the water and sewer laterals through the eastern proposed driveway access. Public Works has provided comment (Exhibit 5) requesting the applicant locate meter boxes and install sewer laterals to avoid driveways and roof drains. In addition, Public Works has also stated if the “optional property line” indicated on the applicant’s future development plan that splits the lot in half is used, it would not comply with the sanitary sewer or water
requirements outlined in the report. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised utility plan and future development plan that meets the requirements of the Public Works Staff Report.

**Storm Drain Plan:** As a condition of approval:

a. The applicant is required to provide detention/calculations which limit/verify the storm water runoff 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). The Applicant’s Engineer shall submit a storm water report which demonstrates how the proposed development satisfies this condition.

b. Meet all applicable conditions in the Public Works Staff Report (*Exhibit 5*).

**Bicycle Plan:** There are painted/striped bike lanes along the Union Avenue frontage that meet the standards of Schedule 27-3.

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

**Criterion (3):** Complies with all other applicable provisions of this Code, including off-street parking, landscaping, buffering and screening, signage, environmental standards, and Special Purpose District standards.

**Staff Response:** Satisfied with conditions.

**Parking:** Per Section 25.031 off street parking is required for new buildings. Per Section 25.033, all areas used for parking, driveways and maneuvering of vehicles shall have durable and dustless surfaces such as asphalt, concrete or pervious surfacing materials. The submitted site plan meets this design standard.

Per Section 25.033(5) all parking areas for this development shall provide a curb of not less than six (6) inches in height along the perimeter. The submitted site plan meets this design standard.

In accordance with Section 25.033(1), parking space dimensions must be 8 ½ feet by 20 feet. Per Section 25.031(11), not more than 25% of the total parking spaces in a parking lot may be designated for compact cars. Minimum dimensions for compact cars shall be 8 ½ feet by 16 feet. Such spaces shall be signed and/or the space painted with the words “Compact Car Only.” Minimum aisle dimensions for the parking lot shall be 22 feet. The submitted parking lot plan meets these design standards.

Per Section 25.033(6) all parking stalls fronting a sidewalk shall provide a secured wheel bumper not less than six (6) inches in height and not less than six feet in length, to be set back from the front of the stall a minimum of 2.5 feet. The submitted site plan meets this design standard.

The Development Code specifies four parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft of gross floor area for professional office uses (Section 25.042(6)(e)).

Total number of parking spaces required is 20. Submitted site plan indicates 35 spaces and meets the design standards of Section 25.033.
In accordance with Section 25.060 of the GPDC, General Institutional, Commercial and Industrial uses require one (1) Type 3 bicycle space per 10,000 square feet of building space (Section 25.062 and Schedule 25-2 of the GPDC). Based on the current proposal this would require one (1) Type 3 bicycle parking spaces. Required bicycle parking facilities shall be located no further than fifty feet from a public entrance. Per Schedule 25-2, fifty (50) percent of all Type 3 bicycle parking facilities must be covered, exclusive of the first two. The applicant’s submitted site plan indicates in the legend the provision of one (1) Type 1 bicycle parking space, however the GPDC requires a Type 3 space. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan indicating the provision of a Type 3 bicycle parking space that meets the design standards of Section 25.064.

Landscaping: Per Section 23.032(2), a 10 ft. landscaped front yard setback from both Union Avenue and Redwood Highway is required. Required front and exterior yards shall be landscaped, and building setbacks shall be maintained, according to the Type B Concept sketch and Schedule 23-2.

Minimum landscape requirements per 1,000 square feet of required front or exterior yard:

a. Three (3) trees at least eight (8) feet in height, one and one-half (1½ ) inch caliper measured three (3) feet from the base;
b. Five (5) 5-gallon and ten (10) one-gallon shrubs or accent plants;
c. Remaining area treated with attractive living ground cover. Coverage with shrubs and living groundcover shall be at least 50% upon installation and 80% after 3 years.

Front yard landscaping along Union Avenue does not meet the requirements of five (5) trees, eight (8) 5-gallon shrubs, seventeen (17) 1-gallon shrubs and groundcover. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan indicating the above requirements are met.

Exterior yard landscaping along Redwood Highway does not meet the requirements of six (6) trees, ten (10) 5-gallon shrubs, twenty (20) one-gallon shrubs, and groundcover. In addition, it is indicated on the applicant’s site plan that the parking lot area intrudes into the required 10-foot landscaping area. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan indicating the above requirements are met and that a 10-foot landscaped area is provided along the entirety of the Redwood Highway frontage.

Per Section 23.042(2)(c), as a condition of approval size of existing trees to be kept or removed must be indicated on the landscape plan.

Parking lot landscaping must meet criteria outlined in Section 23.035. The submitted landscape plan meets all but one criteria outlined in Section 23.035(3)(b) pertaining to appropriate tree species. The City’s Urban Forester has provided comment (See Exhibit 9) stating the species listed for the parking lot (Acer ginnala and Zelkova serrata) are not appropriate. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan indicating the requirements for 23.035 are met and an appropriate species of Parking Lot tree has been chosen (See tree list in Section 23.076 in the GPDC).
Landscaping adjacent to the building is required based on Section 23.035(4). Where the building does not abut a landscaped yard or public sidewalk, beds or planters at least 5 feet deep shall be incorporated adjacent to the building. This requirement applies to all sides of the building.

The south and east elevations must have at least 30% of the length in landscape beds, as there is a sidewalk present. The submitted landscape plan meets this criteria.

The north and west elevations must have beds along the entire face of the building as there are no sidewalks present. The submitted landscape plan meets this criteria.

Per Section 23.035(4)(d), minimum landscape requirements per 1,000 sq. ft. of required planter, or any portion thereof, shall be the following:

a. Ten (10) five-gallon and twenty (20) one-gallon shrubs or accent plants
b. Remaining area treated with attractive living ground-cover as defined in Article 30. Coverage with shrubs and living ground-cover shall be at least 50% upon installation and 100% after 2 years.

Submitted plans do not meet the requirements of Section 23.035(4)(d). As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan indicating these requirements are met.

Submitted landscape plans must meet the requirements of Section 23.041. Per the Urban Forester Comments (Exhibit 9) items 1 and 3 pertaining to identification and location of all existing trees and indication of general drainage flow with arrows are missing from the applicant’s submittal. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan including the required information from Section 23.041.

Per Section 23.052(c), the landscape plan shall provide specifications for topsoil, including depth, organic matter requirements, limits to sand, clay, and gravel and other requirements designed to ensure the health and vitality of required landscaping. The applicant did not include this information as part of their submittal. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan including the above information.

Per Section 23.042 an irrigation plan is required as part of the applicant’s submittal. In accordance with Section 23.042(1), the irrigation plan must provide the location of connection to the public water main and location of stub-outs to separate landscape areas. The Urban Forester has commented this requirement is missing as part of the applicant’s submittal (Exhibit 9). As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised irrigation plan that satisfies the above requirement.

**Buffering and Screening:** No buffering requirements apply to this proposal.

Any refuse container or disposal area shall be screened from view by placement of a solid wood fence or masonry wall from five (5) to eight (8) feet in height. The applicant’s submitted site plan indicates these requirements are met.

**Signage:** The application proposes two 35 square foot signs to be located on the north and south building elevations as well as a monument sign along the Redwood Highway.
frontage. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) provided comment (Exhibit 7) requesting the applicant obtain written approval from ODOT for any signage visible from Redwood Highway. Signage at the proposed locations will be reviewed under a separate sign permit application.

Environmental Standards: The project as proposed will not adversely impact air or water quality.

Special Purpose District Standards: The property is located in the Medical Overlay District. No additional requirements for development will be imposed as part of this District.

The proposed project is located within the Grants Pass Irrigation District. GPID has requested that the applicant contact the District at (541) 476-2582, regarding any additional comments.

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. The property is located in the GC zoning district, which allows the proposed use upon approval by the Director of Community Development. However, because the proposal includes a Major Variance, the matter requires review by the Planning Commission.

Potential conflicts are typically mitigated through the base development standards for the zoning district and adherence to the required conditions of approval. In this case, the applicant is requesting a variance from the access standards outlined in Section 27.121(h) and proposes to utilize two (2) two-way driveways to serve the property.

The applicant contends that the proposed credit union drive thru will see significant vehicular traffic that is more than a typical office use and therefore, having two clear, direct ways in and out of the property is essential. The applicant also contends that the Traffic Impact Analysis they submitted as part of their proposal found no issues with two driveways from the proposed development onto Union Avenue.

As a condition of approval, the applicant will conform to the decision made by the UAPC on whether the request for the variance regarding two (2) entries/exits is approved, approved with conditions, or denied. If denied the applicant shall submit a revised site plan indicating one access to Union Avenue.

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. As noted previously, public water and sewer utility services are available to the site.

As conditioned below, the applicant shall conform with all requirements outlined in the Public Works Staff Report (Exhibit 5).
**Criterion (6):** Provision of public facilities and services to the site will not cause service delivery shortages to existing development.

**Staff Response: Satisfied.** As noted in Criterion 5 above, City utility services are available to the property and the proposed development will not affect utility services for any of the adjacent parcels.

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

**Staff Response: Satisfied.** No natural features or significant resources have been identified on this site that would require special attention or preservation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions.** To mitigate impacts of the location of the addition, the applicant proposes to retain the oversized Type D-1 zone buffer that is currently in place along the west property line to provide screening for the adjacent residential uses. This buffer is heavily vegetated and approximately 9.4 feet in width as compared to the required 3-foot landscape buffer.

- a) **Areas of land use conflict:** The proposed development will not cause new land use conflicts. As addressed in Criterion 2, the TIA analysis by the City Transportation Engineer indicated no mitigation is required for operational or safety issues.

- b) **Setbacks:** The proposed structure meets the setback requirements.

- c) **Building Size and Design:** The proposed building is depicted as a single-story 4,598 sq. ft. Rogue Credit Union branch with three (3) drive-thru PTMs. The building is subject to the architectural feature standards contained in Article 20. Any alteration to the existing plans must be submitted with the building plans.
d) **Signs:** The application proposes two 35 square foot signs to be located on the north and south building elevations in addition to a monument sign along the Redwood Highway frontage. Signage at this location will be reviewed under a separate sign permit application.

e) **Lighting:** Lighting will not glare on adjacent development. **As a condition of approval,** any proposed lighting shall be included on the amended site plan. All lighting shall be downlit and unobtrusive.

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

**Staff Response:** **Satisfied with conditions.** The applicant has provided a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) as required by Section 27.121(3) as the proposal is projected to generate more than twenty-five (25) PM peak hour trips. City Traffic Engineer John Replinger provided comment concurring with the engineer’s conclusion that traffic operations at study area intersections meet standards with the development or are otherwise acceptable. The applicant has requested a variance to be allowed two (2) two-way entries/exits along the Union Avenue frontage. Replinger provided comment recommending the applicant re-submit a site plan with access meeting the requirements of Article 27.

**As a condition of approval,** the applicant will conform to the decision made by the UAPC on whether the request for the variance regarding two (2) entries/exits is approved, approved with conditions, or denied. If denied the applicant shall submit a revised site plan indicating one access to Union Avenue.

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

**Staff Response:** **Not Applicable.** The request does not include phased development.

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

**Staff Response:** **Satisfied.** Landscaping, existing and proposed are adequate for the use.

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

**Staff Response:** **Satisfied.** The submitted site plan illustrates compliance with this criterion. Compliance with applicable standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act will be verified through the Building Permit process.

**Criterion (13):** If the property contains nonconforming use or development to remain, the application and the Review Body’s decision shall also be consistent with the provisions of Article 15, including any additional standards, relief from the Code, or conditions imposed.
Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. The subject property is considered legal non-conforming with regards to the width of the sidewalks. The current sidewalk configuration measures at five (5) feet with five (5) foot planter strips. Schedule 27-3 of the GPDC requires Collector streets to provide six (6) foot sidewalks with 7.5 foot planter strips. As conditioned below, the applicant shall conform with the above requirements and those outlined in the Public Works Staff Report (Exhibit 5) in order to bring the sidewalk configuration up to full conformance.

VI. RECOMMENDATION:

- Staff recommends the Planning Commission **DENY** the request for a Major Variance.
- Staff recommends the Planning Commission **APPROVE** the request for a Major Site Plan Review.

Conditions of Approval:

A. The following shall be accomplished within eighteen months of the date this report is signed, prior to issuance of a Development Permit otherwise, the approval shall expire. (NOTE: A development permit is required prior to commencement of grading or construction).

1. Submit one (1) set and an electronic file (pdf) of a revised site plan reflecting the following items:
   a. A revised utility plan and future development plan that meets the requirements of the Public Works Staff Report (Exhibit 5).
   b. An updated landscaping plan meeting all conditions listed in Criterion 3, including information on front and exterior yard landscaping, existing trees, parking lot landscaping, required landscaping adjacent to building, specifications for topsoil, and indication of general drainage flow.
   c. A revised site plan indicating the provision of a Type 3 bicycle parking space that meets the design standards of Section 25.064.
   d. Lighting details indicating the proposed lighting shall not glare on adjacent developments. Location must be confirmed.
   e. Required ROW dedication, if necessary.

2. Submit a final, engineer's signed and sealed TIA with appendices.

3. Complete Landscaping Requirements for the project as proposed:
   a. Front Yard/Exterior Yard Landscaping shall include:
      i. Union Avenue
         (a) Five (5) trees, eight (8) 5-gallon shrubs, and seventeen (17) 1-gallon shrubs.
         (b) Remaining area treated with living ground-cover, as defined in Article 30. Coverage with shrubs and living ground-cover shall be at least 50% upon installation and 80% after 3 years.
      ii. Redwood Highway
(a) Six (6) trees, ten (10) 5-gallon shrubs, and twenty (20) 1-gallon shrubs.
(b) Remaining area treated with living ground-cover, as defined in Article 30. Coverage with shrubs and living ground-cover shall be at least 50% upon installation and 80% after 3 years.

b. Landscaping Adjacent to the Building:
   i. Minimum landscaping per 1,000 sq. ft. of required planter, or any portion thereof, shall be the following:
      (a) Ten (10) 5-gallon and twenty (20) 1-gallon shrubs.
      (b) Remaining area treated with attractive living ground-cover as defined in Article 30. Coverage with shrubs and living ground-cover shall be at least 50% upon installation and 100% after 2 years.

c. Irrigation plan requirements for the project as proposed:
   i. Location of connection to the public water main and location of stub-outs to separate landscape areas;
   ii. Identification of the type of irrigation system to be used, the location of irrigation facilities, and coverage to be achieved by the irrigation system, and
   iii. An accompanying letter from the designer of the landscape plan stating that the design of the proposed irrigation system can provide irrigation sufficient for the health and survival of the tree and plant species identified in the landscape plan.

4. Upon approval of the revised site plan, provide six (6) copies and a pdf of the following to the City Engineering Division for review and approval:
   a. An engineered drainage plan, including detention calculations and detention plan with details for drainage swales and detention basins or proof that the existing configuration meets requirements.
   b. A grading plan, if applicable. **Note:** A grading permit is required prior to any grading on site.
   c. A detailed Utility Plan reflecting the following, as required by Public Works:
      i. Show the location of water and sewer laterals serving all development on site.
         (a) The applicant will be required to provide the appropriately sized lateral or laterals, pursuant to the Oregon Plumbing Code.
         (b) Any proposed sewer laterals shall be tapped into the sewer main line.
ii. Show the location of any existing laterals to be properly abandoned or those that will be used will require a TV inspection.

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

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

v. The location of public water meters. All public water meters shall be located only within the public right-of-way and outside of the driveway approaches. Any water services located within the commercial driveways shall be properly abandoned.

vi. All “premises” backflow prevention devices shall be located within 10 feet behind each public water meter.

d. A signed Developer Installed Agreement for plan check and engineering inspection services.

5. Obtain an encroachment permit from the City prior to any work within the right of way, including landscaping, removal or installation of trees, installation of drive approaches or sidewalks, or installation of utilities.

6. Obtain a misc./utility permit prior to any disturbance within the State ROW and provide drainage calculations showing the proposal will not adversely affect State facilities for review and approval by ODOT. The applicant shall contact Julee Scruggs at julee.y.scruggs@odot.state.or.us or (541) 864-8811 to discuss permits.

7. The applicant shall provide evidence of the existing on-site storm detention meeting storm drain requirements, or how a new configuration will meet storm drain requirements outlined in the public works comments (Exhibit 4).

8. Meet all applicable Public Safety requirements (Exhibit 6), including meeting water supply for the building fire flow requirement listed in OFC B105. In no case shall the required fire flow be reduced by 50%. Where:

   a. 4,598 square feet type V-B = 1,750 gpm @ 20 psi for 2 hours
   b. Required Fire Flow: 1,750 gpm @ 20 psi

9. A request for a new address for the Rogue Credit Union building must be submitted and approved prior to submitting building plans.

10. Provide a ten (10) foot City Utility Easement (CUE) along all frontages. The applicant shall provide a legal description and map of the CUE and the recorded easement to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of a Development Permit.
11. The applicant shall conform to the decision made by the UAPC on whether the request for the variance regarding two (2) entries/exits is approved, approved with conditions, or denied. If denied the applicant shall submit a revised site plan indicating one access to Union Avenue.

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

1. Pay all System Development Charges including, but not limited to, water, sewer, parks and transportation and storm drain (Exhibit 10).

2. Submit construction documents to the Building Division for their review and approval to determine compliance with all Building, Fire and Life Safety, and adopted Oregon Structural Specialty Code requirements. Building plans shall be consistent with the approved site plan. The plans must be prepared by an Oregon-licensed design professional.

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

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

2. Install at least one (1) covered Type 3 bicycle parking space

3. Install landscaping according to approved plans.

4. Maintain vegetation throughout the year.

5. Any refuse container or disposal area shall be screened from view by placement of a solid wood fence or masonry wall from five (5) to eight (8) feet in height. Trash containers shall be stored behind the fenced area as indicated on the site plan.


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

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

9. An RP backflow device shall be required as “premises” protection on all domestic water services.
10. A DC backflow device shall be required as “point of use” protection on any water service with a multiple zone irrigation system. A DC backflow device shall be required as “premises” protection on any irrigation only service.

11. All “premises” backflow devices shall be located within 10 feet of the public water service.

12. All utilities shall be placed underground.

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

14. A sign permit is required prior to installation of any signs, temporary or permanent.

15. Pay all inspection fees incurred by the Engineering and Utility Divisions Exhibit 11, as well as all City bills due.

VII. INDEX TO EXHIBITS:

1. Location Map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Site Plan and Narrative
4. Applicant's Submitted Elevations
5. Public Works Staff Report
6. TIA review by City Traffic Engineer
7. ODOT comments
8. Public Safety Staff Report
9. Urban Forester comments
10. System Development Charges Brochure
11. Planning Fee Schedule
12. Land Use Decision & Hearing Schedule
13. Engineering Fees
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CITY OF GRANTS PASS
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101 Northwest "A" Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526
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Web: www.grantspassoregon.gov

DISCLAIMER: The Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data made available on this map are developed and maintained by the City of Grants Pass and Josephine County. Every reasonable effort has been made to assure the accuracy of the maps and associated data.
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PROJECT INFORMATION

PROPOSAL:

**MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW:** A development of a vacant lot with a single story, 4,598 square foot Rogue Credit Union branch and drive thru PTM’s. This proposal is a Major Site Plan Review requiring a Type I-C – Director’s Decision and subject to Grants Pass Development Code (GPDC) section 19.052 Approval Criteria.

**ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS REVIEW:** The proposed project is subject to Article 20 architectural standards. Applicant requests a “Standard Review”.

**VARIANCE REQUEST:** The proposed development requests (2), two-way entries/exits from Union Avenue. This request will require a variance subject to the Approval Criteria in GPDC Section 6.060 – Criteria for Variance.

ADDRESS & LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

**OWNER:** Rogue Credit Union
1370 Center Drive
Medford, OR 97501
541.622.7622

**ARCHITECT:** KSW Architects, Attn: Matt Small
66 Water Street, Suite 101
Ashland, OR 97520
541.488.8200 ext. 15

**LAND USE PLANNING:** KSW Architects, Attn: Matt Small
66 Water Street, Suite 101
Ashland, OR 97520
541.488.8200 ext. 15

**PROJECT LANDSCAPE DESIGNER:** Madara Design Inc
2994 Wells Fargo Road
Central Point, OR 97502
541.664.7055

**LAND USE DISTRICT:** General Commercial (GC), Medical Overlay District

**URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY:** Inside Grants Pass UGB

**SITE ADDRESS:** 340 Union Avenue, Grants Pass, OR 97526

**MAP:** 36-05-19-CA TAX LOT 1500

**ACREAGE:** 1.79
PROPOSED OCCUPANCY TYPE: Business (B)

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION TYPE: V-B

FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM: YES

BUILDING AREA: 4,598 s.f.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Floor</td>
<td>4,598 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,598 s.f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOT COVERAGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area (s.f.)</th>
<th>Coverage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>1.79 Acres</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint:</td>
<td>4,598 s.f.</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Paving/Sidewalks Area:</td>
<td>40,275 s.f.</td>
<td>(52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Landscaped Area:</td>
<td>13,537 s.f.</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped (possible future development) Area:</td>
<td>19,650 s.f.</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPLICABLE ORDINANCES:

City of Grants Pass Land Development Code
2019 Oregon Structural Specialty Code

ADJACENT ZONING/USE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTH:</th>
<th>(N/A) Redwood Highway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST:</td>
<td>General Commercial (GC)/Drive thru Carwash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH:</td>
<td>(N/A) Union Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST:</td>
<td>General Commercial (GC)/Vacant Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT SITE:</td>
<td>General Commercial (GC)/Vacant Lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a single story, +/-4,600 square foot credit union building and drive through PTM station. The PTM drive through will have (3) PTM stations covered by one canopy and (1) uncovered bypass lane. The building and PTM canopy design will be very similar to other RCU branches constructed throughout southern Oregon. The Rogue Credit Union has developed a palette of exterior materials and colors that is a significant piece of their marketing and branding. This palette is evident in all of their recently constructed projects throughout southern Oregon. The exterior material palette will include red brick, ACM panels, sheet metal coping and storefront window/door systems. Please refer to the attached renderings and drawings. The PTM canopy design will match the design of the building, using the same material palette.

The site is vacant and bordered by Union Avenue to the south, the Redwood Highway to the north, a recently constructed carwash to the east and a vacant lot to the west. The proposed branch will require roughly half of the site leaving the remainder available for future development. The nature and timing of the future development is currently unknown.

The Applicant requests a “Standard Review” for the architectural design standards (Article 20).

The Applicant is requesting (2), two-way entries/exits from Union Avenue to more safely serve the credit union clientele, in particular, the customers using the drive thru PTM stations. The western driveway is proposed as a possible shared driveway with future development of the property to the west of the proposed credit union.
SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

GPDC Section 19.070 – Submittal Requirements

Section 19.072(2) – Major Site Plan Map

Documents conforming to and addressing all relevant items are included with this submittal.

Section 19.072(3) – Elevation Drawings

Documents conforming to and addressing all relevant items are included with this submittal.
FINDINGS OF FACT

The following information has been provided by the applicant to help the Planning Staff, Planning Commission and neighbors better understand the proposed project. In addition, the required findings of fact have been provided to ensure the proposed project meets the Site Design & Use Standards as outlined in the City of Grants Pass Land Development Code.

For clarity reasons, the following documentation has been formatted in “outline” form with the City approval criteria noted in BOLD font and the applicant’s response in regular font. Also, there are several responses that are repeated in order to ensure that the findings of fact are complete. Where appropriate numbering follows the sited L.U.O.

APPROVAL CRITERIA

GPDC Section 19.050 – Major Site Plan Review

Section 19.052 – Criteria for Approval

19.052(1):

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

This project complies with all applicable development standards for the General Commercial (GC) zoning district. See Site Plan included.

19.052(2):

Complies with applicable elements of the Comprehensive Plan, including Traffic Plan, Water Plan, Sewer Plan, Storm Drainage Plan, Bicycle Plan, and Park Plan.

This project complies with the current Comprehensive Plan. See Site Plan included.

19.052(3):

Complies with all other applicable provisions of this Code, including off street parking, landscaping, buffering and screening, signage, environmental standards, and Special Purpose District standards.

This project complies with all other applicable provisions of the GPDC, including provisions set forth in the Medical Overlay District (a Special Purpose District). See Site Plan included.
19.052(4):

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

There are no potential land use conflicts associated with this development.

19.052(5):

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

Adequate basic urban services are currently available for the development of this project.

19.052(6):

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

There is not an existing development on the proposed site. Services are adequate to serve the proposed site.

19.052(7):

To the extent possible, identified significant resources, such as intermittent and perennial creeks, stands of pine, fir and oak trees, wildlife habitats, historic sites, and prominent land features have been preserved and designed City of Grants Pass Development Code Article 19: Last Rev. 8/18/21 Page 19-6 into the project. Alternatives shall be considered, and the proposal shall represent the most effective design to preserve these resources.

There are no significant resources located on the proposed site.
19.052(8):

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

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

There are no areas of land use conflict.

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

The building has been located on the site to front the Redwood Highway like the existing project to the east of the proposed project which also fronts Redwood Highway.

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

The proposed credit union is compatible with the existing, adjacent developments, including other bank branches and another credit union.

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

There are (2) monument signs proposed for the site. One located at an entry from Union Avenue and a second located along and visible from Redwood Highway. Neither sign will block the view of existing signs and will be sized to meet codes.

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

Proposed parking lot/site lighting will not detrimentally impact adjacent properties or passing motorists. A site lighting plan and photometrics for the proposed fixtures can be provided as desired.
19.052(9):

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

The proposal is designed to avoid traffic conflicts and meets the criteria set forth in Article 27 with the following requested exception:

27.121(11)(h)(i):

Direct access to arterial streets and collector streets shall be City of Grants Pass Development Code Article 27: Last Rev. 8/1/18 Page 27-8 avoided wherever practical. An encroachment permit to allow private direct access onto an arterial street shall be granted by the City Engineer only after all other reasonable options are explored. The number of access points on arterial and collector streets shall be minimized whenever possible through the use of driveways common to more than one development and through interior circulation design to further this requirement. Any public or private road approach onto a state facility must be consistent with the spacing and permit standards of the Access Management Oregon Administrative Rule 734-051.

- Direct access from the proposed project to Union Avenue is necessary given the limited development in the immediate area and limited alternative access ways onto Union Avenue. Currently, there is one access on the adjacent development to the east, however, the configuration of this existing driveway is one way at portions of the drive and is incompatible with our proposed development.

- The adjacent parcel to the west is vacant and the layout of future development is undetermined.

- A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) has been completed for the proposed project and concluded that direct access onto Union Avenue would have no adverse effects. See attached TIA.

27.121(11)(h)(iv):

Each parcel shall be allowed no more than one direct access driveway, regardless of the size of the property or the linear feet of frontage, unless a variance is granted by the review body based on a traffic analysis report and the criteria in Article 6.

- The Applicant requests a variance to allow two access driveways onto Union Avenue. See variance request as part of these findings of fact.
• A critical component of the proposed credit union is the drive thru PTM stations. Drive thru PTMs generate a significant amount of vehicular traffic requiring direct and efficient vehicular circulation. The current design does exactly that, allowing for easy in and out flow. The two access points minimizes potential conflicts with traffic entering and exiting from just one access point. It also eliminates the need to travel through parking areas, another area of potential conflict.

• The second access driveway is designed to accommodate future development of the property to the west. A possible location for this cross access is shown on the proposed site plan.

• A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) has been completed for the proposed project and concluded that direct access onto Union Avenue would have no adverse effects. See attached TIA.

19.052(10):
If phased development, each phase contains adequate provisions of services, facilities, access, off-street parking, and landscaping.

The proposed project is one phase. However, there is the potential for the future development of the portion of the site fronting Union Avenue. The proposed Site Plan demonstrates a possible future development showing adequate space for the on site requirements such as parking, landscaping, etc.

19.052(11):
There are adequate provisions for maintenance of open space and other common areas.

The landscaped areas are designed to allow for easy access and maintenance.

19.052(12):
Internal circulation is accommodated for commercial, institutional and office park uses with walkways and bikeways as provided in Article 27.

Pedestrian and bicycle pathways are provided connecting the proposed building with Union Avenue and the sidewalk along Union Avenue.
19.052(13):

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

The property does not contain existing nonconforming uses or development scheduled to remain.
GPDC Section 20.400 – Architectural Standards

Section 20.405 – Building Entrances

20.405(1):

When a building abuts a public sidewalk or exterior front or side landscaped front yard, it is recommended, but not required, that at least one public or main entrance should be oriented to the public sidewalk, as well as the primary public parking area, so the entrance abuts the public sidewalk or landscaped front yard with a direct pedestrian path to the public sidewalk. See Figure 20-14.

The main entrance into the building and the primary parking area are oriented to the front yard and Union Avenue.

20.405(2):

Buildings shall have sheltering elements to provide protection from the weather at primary or public entrances. Sheltering elements shall provide a covered area at least five feet deep.

A 5′-6″ deep canopy is provided.

Section 20.410 – Windows and Glass Doors in Exterior Walls

20.410(1):

Windows and glass doors required by this section shall be sufficiently transparent as to give an indication of interior space and activity. Mirrored glass and similar treatments do not meet this requirement. Note: It is recommended that no screening, fence or other device that blocks visibility should be present between the required wall openings and the public route.

The specified glass storefront is standard, clear glazing with no tinting and/or mirroring applied. There are no fences/screens obscuring visibility between the wall openings and the public route.
20.410(2):

Building Less Than 18 Feet Tall or Ground Floor of Multi-Story Building. Except as provided in Subsection (6), all building elevations less than 18 feet in height at the top of the exterior wall, which are longer than 25 feet, which are visible from a public right-of-way, pedestrian path, on-site parking or circulation area, or adjoining property shall contain windows and/or glass doors a minimum of 3 feet tall, including the area between 3 feet and 6 feet above the exterior ground surface, for at least 25% of the width of the elevation. Except as provided in Subsection (6), there shall City of Grants Pass Development Code Article 20: Last Rev. 11/12/14 Page 20-25 not be wall sections longer than 100 feet without glass doors and/or windows. See Figure 20-15.

South Elevation: The proposed storefront windows and doors are all taller than the required 3’-0”. The proposed glazing is 46.6% of the width of the elevation. See included Exterior Elevations.

North Elevation: The proposed storefront windows and doors are all taller than the required 3’-0”. The proposed glazing is 27% of the width of the elevation. See included Exterior Elevations.

East Elevation: The proposed storefront windows and doors are all taller than the required 3’-0”. The proposed glazing is 37.7% of the width of the elevation. See included Exterior Elevations.

West Elevation: The proposed storefront windows and doors are all taller than the required 3’-0”. The proposed glazing is 57% of the width of the elevation. See included Exterior Elevations.

Section 20.422 – Overall Building Length of More Than 50 Feet

20.422(1)(b):

A flat roof building shall have a horizontal or vertical change in the wall plane at the cornice line at least every 50 feet in accordance with Section 20.423(2), or shall provide articulation of the building face up to 100 feet in accordance with Section 20.425. These requirements for the entire elevation may be met by using either alternative for different building segments.

South Elevation: Proposed design complies with standard. A proposed metal panel entry element with an attached canopy provides vertical and horizontal relief meeting the minimum 50’-0” requirement. In addition, aluminum sunshades are proposed at the storefront openings. See included Floor Plan and Exterior Elevations.
North Elevation: Proposed design complies with standard. The design includes vertical and horizontal relief. See included Floor Plan and Exterior Elevations.

20.422(2):

Horizontal and vertical offsets required in this section shall relate to the overall design and organization of the structure, its entrances, door and window treatments, and interior functions. Features shall be designed to emphasize building entrances.

The proposed design complies. See included Floor Plan and exterior Elevations.

20.422(3):

Offsets should be grouped and organized in a manner to provide variation in scale and massing rather than providing a series of identical repeating masses.

The proposed design complies. See included Floor Plan and exterior Elevations.

Section 20.423 – Change in Massing at Maximum 50 Feet

20.423(2):

For a Building with a Flat Roof. No wall plane shall be more than 50 feet in length without a horizontal or vertical break in the cornice line at least 18 inches in height or 3 feet in depth and at least 12 feet wide. The feature shall be one of the following.

(a): Horizontal Offset in Wall Plane. The feature may include a horizontal offset in the wall plane. The offset feature shall be a minimum of 75% of the wall height, but no less than 12 feet tall and at least 3 feet deep. With a stepped wall plane, the individual change in wall plane need not be 12 feet wide, but the offset from the wall plane, or combination of offsets, shall not return to the original wall plane closer than 12 feet from the initial offset. The feature may be an offset in the wall plane enclosing interior area, or it may cover an exterior area, either supported on columns or a wall extension.

North Elevation: Proposed design complies with standard. There are two horizontal offsets, each exceeding 3′-0” in depth and 75% of the main wall plane height. See included Floor Plan and Exterior Elevations.
(b): Vertical Offset in Cornice Line. The feature may include a vertical offset in the cornice line at least 18 inches tall. With a stepped cornice line, the individual change in cornice line need not be 12 feet wide, but the offset, or combination of offsets, shall not return to the original cornice line closer than 12 feet from the initial offset. The transition in cornice height shall meet the requirements of Section 20.470 for transition in parapet height.

South Elevation: Proposed design complies with standard. The main entry element includes a vertical offset exceeding the required 18” and is roughly 21’-0” wide.

(c): Grouping, Variation, and Combination of Features. Grouping, variation, and combination of features are desirable to avoid repetition of offsets of identical size and shape.

South Elevation: Proposed design complies with standard. Proposed offset features are not repetitive and are designed to accentuate the main entry.

North Elevation: Proposed design complies with standard. Proposed offset features are not repetitive.
GPDC Section 23.030 – Landscape and Buffering Development Standards

Section 23.032 – Type B: Commercial and Indoor Industrial Front and Exterior Yards

23.032(1) – (5):

The following landscape standards shall apply to commercial and indoor industrial uses in residential, commercial, and indoor industrial zones; and to residential uses in commercial and indoor industrial zones.

This project complies with all applicable Commercial Landscape Requirements. See included Landscape Plan.

Section 23.035 – Type E: Parking Lot Landscaping and Screening

23.035:

All parking lots, which for purposes of this Section shall include areas of vehicle maneuvering, parking and loading, shall be landscaped and screened according to the appropriate concept sketch and criteria, as follows:

This project complies with all applicable Parking Lot Landscaping and Screening. See included Landscape Plan.

Section 23.036 – Type F: Other Screening

23.036(1):

Refuse Container Screen. Except for single family detached dwellings, any refuse container or disposal area shall be screened from view by placement of a solid wood fence or masonry wall from five to eight feet in height. All refuse materials shall be contained within the refuse area.

This project complies with standard. A 5’-1” brick clad trash enclosure with metal a metal gate is proposed. See included Trash Enclosure plans.
23.036(4):

Mechanical Equipment. Development subject to the commercial design standards of Article 20 shall comply with the provisions of this Subsection.

(d): It shall be located on the roof and screened from public ground level view with a rooftop equipment screen set back from the exterior wall, at least 6 inches taller than the equipment, with materials, colors, and detailing similar to the primary building materials and design.

This project complies with standard. A perforated, corrugated metal screen is proposed to shield view of the roof mounted HVAC equipment.
GPDC Section 6.060 – Criteria for Variance

6.060(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.

- Adjacent Development: The land to the west of the proposed project is vacant and as such there is not a secondary access driveway for the proposed project to tie into on the west. In addition, it is unknown if/when development might occur on this parcel and if so, if there would be a driveway that our proposed project could tie into. Allowing the proposed western driveway guarantees a connection to the property to the west.

- Adjacent Development: The property to the east (existing carwash) is developed with an existing driveway to Union Avenue. However, the existing driveway was not designed to allow for future development to the west to tie into it. Access to our proposed project from the carwash site would require driving through the carwash pay station.

- Adjacent Development: The western driveway of the proposed project is designed to allow for future development from the west to tie into it. A proposed cross access location is shown on the proposed site plan.

- The Traffic Impact Analysis finds no issues with two driveways from the proposed development onto Union Avenue.

6.060(2):

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

Unique Physical Circumstances: The proposed credit union drive thru will see significant vehicular traffic. This is in addition to the traffic created by those parking and walking into the facility. This traffic is more than a typical office use and therefore, having a clear, direct way in and out of the property is essential. Having two, two-way entries/exits achieves this goal.
6.060(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.

Benefits to this project include:
- Two driveways provide a more direct, less congested way in and out of the proposed site rather than just one driveway,
- A secondary driveway provides access for future development to the west.

6.060(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 result of a property line adjustment or land division approval previously granted to the applicant.

The variance request is not a result of a lot line adjustment, land division or any other self-imposed property configuration previously granted to the applicant.

The variance request is not self-imposed but is rather a condition of the type of permitted use proposed for the site. Drive thru banks/credit unions generate a significant amount of traffic.
ATTACHMENT A

The following drawings are included with this submittal:

• Architectural Site Plan
• Architectural Floor Plan
• Architectural Exterior Elevations
• Architectural 3-D Colored Renderings
• Trash Enclosure Plans
• Landscape Site Plan
• Civil Grading Plan
• Civil Storm Water Drainage/Detention Plan
• Civil Erosion Control Plan
• Existing Carwash Site Plan (property to the east of proposed project)
• Survey

ATTACHMENT B

A Traffic Impact Analysis is included with this submittal.

ATTACHMENT C

Landscape Confirmation of Irrigation Performance Letter

Prepared and Respectfully Submitted by:

Matthew J. Small, Principal Architect
KSW Architects

02.14.2022
Date
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. Union Avenue. Classification – Collector Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required half street right-of-way equals 36 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: Driveway approach, 7.5 foot planter strip, and 6 foot sidewalk.
      iii. Public Works defers to the City of Grants Pass Traffic Engineer on the necessity of the extra access from Union Avenue.
   b. Redwood Highway. Classification – State Highway
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The applicant shall contact ODOT to determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: Street and frontage improvements and access within right-of-way shall be determined per ODOT standards. Verify with ODOT for confirmation of access and street improvements.

3. Storm Drainage:
   a. 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.
   b. Design the development to not alter off-site existing drainage patterns.
   c. 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.
   d. Design erosion and sediment control measures.

4. Sanitary Sewers:
   a. Project specific requirements: If the “optional property line”, which would split the lot in half, is used it would not comply with (b) below.
   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: If the “optional property line”, which would split the lot in half, is used it would not comply with (b) below.
   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. Locate backflow devices as determined by the Public Works Staff.

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 16, 2022

Gabby Sinagra
City of Grants Pass
101 NW A Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS – ROGUE CREDIT UNION

Dear Gabby:

In response to your request, I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) submitted in support of the proposed Rogue Credit Union. The TIA was prepared under the direction of Kelly Sandow, PE of Sandow Engineering. The TIA is dated December 14, 2021.

The proposed development is located at 340 Union Avenue. It is proposed to occupy a portion of the currently vacant parcel, which totals 1.79 acres. The parcel is on the north side of Union Avenue between the intersections of Union Avenue with Ringuette Street and SW Ramsey Avenue. The proposed development consists of a 4572 square foot building and 3 drive-up service windows.

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:

   - Redwood Highway/Ringuette Street
   - Ringuette Street/Union Avenue
   - Union Avenue/SW Ramsey Street
   - Williams Highway/Union Avenue
   - Two proposed site accesses on Union Avenue
The analysis area is appropriate and covers the key intersections impacted by the proposed development.

2. **Traffic Counts.** The AM and PM peak hour traffic counts were conducted in November 2021. The traffic volumes were adjusted to account for seasonal variations. Citing counts from the Oregon Department of Transportation, the engineer indicates that traffic counts have returned to pre-pandemic levels and no further adjustments are required. The traffic counts and adjustments appear reasonable.

3. **Trip Generation.** The engineer estimated trip generation for the credit union using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ *Trip Generation Manual*. The engineer used the rates for a drive-in bank, ITE land use code 912. The engineer calculated the facility will generate 45 AM peak hour trips and 96 PM peak hour trips. The TIA does not provide an estimate of weekday trips; using the same source, I calculated 459 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 5 percent would go to and from the north on Highway 199; 30 percent would travel to and from the west on Highway 199; 6 percent would travel to and from the south on Ringuette; 18 percent would go to and from the south on the Williams Highway; 7 percent would travel to and from the east on Harbeck; and 34 percent would travel to and from the north on Highway 99. The traffic was split between the two proposed site driveways on Union 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. The calculated growth rate was 0.7 percent annually, which the engineer rounded up to an annual growth rate of 1 percent. The assumptions used to develop background volumes for the analysis appear reasonable.

6. **Analysis.** Traffic volumes were calculated for the intersections described in #1, above. The analysis was conducted for 2021 existing conditions; 2022 background
conditions; 2022 conditions with the development; 2027 background conditions; and 2017 conditions with the development of the credit union facility. The analysis addressed the AM and PM peak hours.

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

According to the TIA, the intersection of the Redwood Highway and Ringuette Street currently meets ODOT’s v/c standard during AM peak hour but fails to meet the standard during the PM peak hour. Due to background traffic growth, the performance of the intersection is predicted to deteriorate. The v/c ratio during the PM peak hour is predicted to be 0.97 in 2027 without the development and 0.98 with the development. As explained by the engineer, “The development trips will result in the v/c increasing 0.01. As per Oregon Highway Plan Action 1F, a v/c increase of less than 0.03 is considered insignificant when considering mitigation. Therefore, mitigation [at the Redwood Highway/Ringuette intersection] is not required for this project.” I concur with this conclusion.

The TIA indicates that all other study area intersections meet the applicable performance standards for the AM and PM peak hours under the existing, 2022 background, 2022 build, 2027 background, and 2027 build conditions. The TIA indicates that both proposed site access locations will operate at LOS B, easily meeting applicable standards.

The TIA also provides an analysis of queuing at the study area intersections. The engineer concludes that “the addition of development traffic does not substantially increase the queuing conditions at the studied intersections.” I concur.

Excepting the intersection of the Redwood Highway and Ringuette Street, discussed above, the engineer shows that traffic operations at the study area intersections will 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 in the vicinity of the site for years 2019 through 2019. During this five-year period, 24 crashes were reported at the Redwood Highway/Ringuette Street intersection; 13 at Ringuette
Street/Union Avenue; none at Union Avenue/Ramsey Street; and 10 at Williams Highway/Union Avenue. The calculated crash rate for all four intersections is low; all fall below the critical crash rate, so no further analysis or mitigation is needed.

There is no reason to believe that the proposed development will disproportionately affect safety in the study area.

8. Site Plan and Access. The TIA and site plan illustrate a proposed access plan involving two access points to Union Avenue and a potential access to the Redwood Highway. The third access is apparently envisioned as an access intended to serve a “future building” in the north part of the site near the Redwood Highway.

The proposed access is problematic for several reasons. The Oregon Department of Transportation pre-ap notes recommend removal of the proposed access to Redwood Highway and that the applicant take access from Union Avenue. Adding an access to the highway is not consistent with policy of either the state or the city. Article 27.121 of the Grants Pass code is clear that the access should be taken from the lower classification of street when there is more than one option. Furthermore, it is clear from the code that the “access points to a public street shall be the minimum necessary to provide reasonable access....”

The TIA simply assumes there will be two access points on Union Avenue. The TIA indicates that the two proposed driveways will function acceptably, but there is no justification or explanation as to why two are proposed or how this could benefit users of the transportation system.

The applicant appears to have given little thought to the transportation impact of constructing a second building on north part of the site. Since access to the Redwood Highway is highly unlikely, the applicant should consider how traffic generated by the potential building will be accommodated in the site layout and access to be constructed in connection with the credit union building, drive-through service windows, parking lots and aisles.

The site plan should be revised to provide for a single access to Union Avenue and for full development of the site.

9. Sight Distance. The engineer assessed sight distance on Union Avenue for both proposed access points. The engineer measured sight distance to be in excess of
335 feet, the distance associated with 30 mph, the posted speed of the road. She concluded that the available sight distance was adequate and met intersection sight distance and stopping sight distance.

10. Turn Lanes. TIA notes that Union Avenue at this location features a two-way, center, left-turn lane that provides for left turns into the site.

11. Conclusions and Recommendations. The engineer concludes that the proposal does not cause intersection operations to deteriorate below adopted performance standards at any of the study area intersections. Adequate queue storage is available at all locations. The engineer concludes that no mitigation is required. 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 credit union building. The applicant’s traffic engineer uses appropriate methods and accurately describes her analysis of traffic operations. I concur with the applicant’s engineer that no mitigation is required for operational or safety issues. I concur with the engineer’s conclusion that traffic operations at study area intersections meet standards with the development or are otherwise acceptable; storage for queuing is adequate; sight distance is adequate; and that there are no safety concerns requiring attention.

The obvious flaw in the application relates to site access and additional, future development on the north part of the site. The application materials suggest that there will ultimately be a future building on the north part of the site and that access would be provided to the Redwood Highway. As described above, access to the Redwood Highway is highly unlikely.

Even if one ignores this potential expansion and additional development of the site, the applicant proposes two access driveways to Union Avenue rather than one as prescribed by Article 27.121. The applicant provides no justification or analysis for the extra access.

I recommend the applicant resubmit a site plan with access meeting the requirements of Article 27.
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
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Gabby Sinagra
City of Grants Pass
101 NW A Street
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In response to your request, I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) submitted in support of the proposed Rogue Credit Union. The TIA was prepared under the direction of Kelly Sandow, PE of Sandow Engineering. The TIA is dated December 14, 2021.

The proposed development is located at 340 Union Avenue. It is proposed to occupy a portion of the currently vacant parcel, which totals 1.79 acres. The parcel is on the north side of Union Avenue between the intersections of Union Avenue with Ringuette Street and SW Ramsey Avenue. The proposed development consists of a 4572 square foot building and 3 drive-up service windows.

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.
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- Union Avenue/SW Ramsey Street
- Williams Highway/Union Avenue
- Two proposed site accesses on Union Avenue
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2. **Traffic Counts.** The AM and PM peak hour traffic counts were conducted in November 2021. The traffic volumes were adjusted to account for seasonal variations. Citing counts from the Oregon Department of Transportation, the engineer indicates that traffic counts have returned to pre-pandemic levels and no further adjustments are required. The traffic counts and adjustments appear reasonable.

3. **Trip Generation.** The engineer estimated trip generation for the credit union using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ *Trip Generation Manual*. The engineer used the rates for a drive-in bank, ITE land use code 912. The engineer calculated the facility will generate 45 AM peak hour trips and 96 PM peak hour trips. The TIA does not provide an estimate of weekday trips; using the same source, I calculated 459 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 5 percent would go to and from the north on Highway 199; 30 percent would travel to and from the west on Highway 199; 6 percent would travel to and from the south on Ringuette; 18 percent would go to and from the south on the Williams Highway; 7 percent would travel to and from the east on Harbeck; and 34 percent would travel to and from the north on Highway 99. The traffic was split between the two proposed site driveways on Union 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. The calculated growth rate was 0.7 percent annually, which the engineer rounded up to an annual growth rate of 1 percent. The assumptions used to develop background volumes for the analysis appear reasonable.

6. **Analysis.** Traffic volumes were calculated for the intersections described in #1, above. The analysis was conducted for 2021 existing conditions; 2022 background
conditions; 2022 conditions with the development; 2027 background conditions; and 2017 conditions with the development of the credit union facility. The analysis addressed the AM and PM peak hours.

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

According to the TIA, the intersection of the Redwood Highway and Ringuette Street currently meets ODOT’s v/c standard during AM peak hour but fails to meet the standard during the PM peak hour. Due to background traffic growth, the performance of the intersection is predicted to deteriorate. The v/c ratio during the PM peak hour is predicted to be 0.97 in 2027 without the development and 0.98 with the development. As explained by the engineer, “The development trips will result in the v/c increasing 0.01. As per Oregon Highway Plan Action 1F, a v/c increase of less than 0.03 is considered insignificant when considering mitigation. Therefore, mitigation [at the Redwood Highway/Ringuette intersection] is not required for this project.” I concur with this conclusion.

The TIA indicates that all other study area intersections meet the applicable performance standards for the AM and PM peak hours under the existing, 2022 background, 2022 build, 2027 background, and 2027 build conditions. The TIA indicates that both proposed site access locations will operate at LOS B, easily meeting applicable standards.

The TIA also provides an analysis of queuing at the study area intersections. The engineer concludes that “the addition of development traffic does not substantially increase the queuing conditions at the studied intersections.” I concur.

Excepting the intersection of the Redwood Highway and Ringuette Street, discussed above, the engineer shows that traffic operations at the study area intersections will 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 in the vicinity of the site for years 2019 through 2019. During this five-year period, 24 crashes were reported at the Redwood Highway/Ringuette Street intersection; 13 at Ringuette
Street/Union Avenue; none at Union Avenue/Ramsey Street; and 10 at Williams Highway/Union Avenue. The calculated crash rate for all four intersections is low; all fall below the critical crash rate, so no further analysis or mitigation is needed.

There is no reason to believe that the proposed development will disproportionately affect safety in the study area.

8. **Site Plan and Access.** The TIA and site plan illustrate a proposed access plan involving two access points to Union Avenue and a potential access to the Redwood Highway. The third access is apparently envisioned as an access intended to serve a “future building” in the north part of the site near the Redwood Highway.

The proposed access is problematic for several reasons. The Oregon Department of Transportation pre-ap notes recommend removal of the proposed access to Redwood Highway and that the applicant take access from Union Avenue. Adding an access to the highway is not consistent with policy of either the state or the city. Article 27.121 of the Grants Pass code is clear that the access should be taken from the lower classification of street when there is more than one option. Furthermore, it is clear from the code that the “access points to a public street shall be the minimum necessary to provide reasonable access....”

The TIA simply assumes there will be two access points on Union Avenue. The TIA indicates that the two proposed driveways will function acceptably, but there is no justification or explanation as to why two are proposed or how this could benefit users of the transportation system.

The applicant appears to have given little thought to the transportation impact of constructing a second building on north part of the site. Since access to the Redwood Highway is highly unlikely, the applicant should consider how traffic generated by the potential building will be accommodated in the site layout and access to be constructed in connection with the credit union building, drive-through service windows, parking lots and aisles.

The site plan should be revised to provide for a single access to Union Avenue and for full development of the site.

9. **Sight Distance.** The engineer assessed sight distance on Union Avenue for both proposed access points. The engineer measured sight distance to be in excess of
335 feet, the distance associated with 30 mph, the posted speed of the road. She concluded that the available sight distance was adequate and met intersection sight distance and stopping sight distance.

10. **Turn Lanes.** TIA notes that Union Avenue at this location features a two-way, center, left-turn lane that provides for left turns into the site.

11. **Conclusions and Recommendations.** The engineer concludes that the proposal does not cause intersection operations to deteriorate below adopted performance standards at any of the study area intersections. Adequate queue storage is available at all locations. The engineer concludes that no mitigation is required. 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 credit union building. The applicant’s traffic engineer uses appropriate methods and accurately describes her analysis of traffic operations. I concur with the applicant’s engineer that no mitigation is required for operational or safety issues. I concur with the engineer’s conclusion that traffic operations at study area intersections meet standards with the development or are otherwise acceptable; storage for queuing is adequate; sight distance is adequate; and that there are no safety concerns requiring attention.

The obvious flaw in the application relates to site access and additional, future development on the north part of the site. The application materials suggest that there will ultimately be a future building on the north part of the site and that access would be provided to the Redwood Highway. As described above, access to the Redwood Highway is highly unlikely.

Even if one ignores this potential expansion and additional development of the site, the applicant proposes two access driveways to Union Avenue rather than one as prescribed by Article 27.121. The applicant provides no justification or analysis for the extra access.

I recommend the applicant resubmit a site plan with access meeting the requirements of Article 27.
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 Pass\22\CreditUnionTIA021622
Hi Carolyn & Gabby, please find ODOT comments below in advance of the upcoming UAPC hearing:

I. ODOT supports the revised site plan taking access on Union Avenue rather than Redwood Highway. ODOT would not support direct access to Redwood Highway.

II. The applicant should be required to obtain written approval ODOT for any signage visible from Redwood Highway.

III. The applicant will need to obtain a misc./utility permit prior to any disturbance within the State ROW.

IV. The applicant needs to provide drainage calculations showing the proposal will not adversely affect State facilities for review and approval by ODOT.

Please direct the applicant to contact Julee Scruggs at Julee.Y.Scruggs@odot.state.or.us or 541.864.8811 to discuss permits.


Best regards,
Micah

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

From: Carolyn Nealon <CNealon@grantspassoregon.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 11:37 AM
To: Wade Elliott <welliott@grantspassoregon.gov>; Lance Baker <LBaker@grantspassoregon.gov>; Craig Kuhnert <ckuhnert@grantspassoregon.gov>; Shelly Stichter <sstickter@grantspassoregon.gov>; Joe Hyatt
Comments:

1. Fire Department access must be provided to within 150 feet of all portions of buildings. [OFC 503.1.1]

2. 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. [OFC 506.1.1]

3. KNOX Box on the building is required for afterhours access before final fire signoff. Contact the Fire Prevention Division for the required form. [OFC 506.1]

4. If building is required to have a Fire Department Connection, a locking KNOX FDC Caps required before final signoff. Contact the Fire Prevention Division for the required form. [OFC 912.4.1]

5. If the building does not meet the excluding requirements of OFC 510, the building shall be provided with Emergency Responder Radio Coverage as provided in OFC 510 & Appendix J. [OFC 510.1 (4)]

6. 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%.
   - 4,598 square feet type V-B = 1,750 gpm @ 20 psi for 2 hours
   - Required Fire Flow: 1750 gpm @ 20 psi
   - 50% reduction is allowed for NFPA 13 Sprinkler System .5 X 1750 = 875 gpm @ 20 psi, however, Minimum Standard is 1,000 gpm for 2 hours.

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

a. Required Hydrants and Spacing: 1 hydrant with average spacing on 500 feet and minimum distance of 250 feet from any point on frontage to hydrant.

Existing Hydrant WDHY 821 will meet this requirement.

Submitted By: Michael Meyer, Fire Inspector
## Requirements for Major Site Plan Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.052(7)</td>
<td>To the extent possible, identified significant resources, such as intermittent and perennial creeks, stands of pine, fir and oak trees, wildlife habitats, historic sites, and prominent land features have been preserved and designed into the project. Alternatives shall be considered and the proposal shall represent the most effective design to preserve these resources.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Requirements for Tentative Plan, Development Permit, and Final Plat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.032(2)(a)</td>
<td>Required front and exterior yards shall be landscaped, and building setbacks shall be maintained, according to the Type B Concept Sketch and Schedule 23-2. Minimum landscape requirements per 1000 square feet of a required front or exterior yard, or any portion thereof, shall be the following: Three trees at least eight feet in height, and one and one-half inches in caliper measured three feet from the base. Select from street tree list, Section 23.076, and plant within 10 feet of the right-of-way as per Type B Concept Sketch. Trees may be offset to permit signs in the Landscape Yard. Trees shall be kept trimmed of branches up to 14’ from base five years following planting. Any sign on the property shall be in compliance with the sign requirements for the use in residential zones as established in Title 9, Chapter 9.21, Sign Standards, of the City of Grants Pass Municipal Code.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.032(5)</td>
<td>Approved plant materials installed in the area between the curb and the sidewalk may be used in meeting the landscaping requirements for front and exterior yards.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.041</td>
<td>Landscape Plan</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Ensure that the Landscape Plan includes all requirements from 23.041, 23.052(2), 23.052(3)(b), and 23.052(3)(c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(1)</td>
<td>Identification and location of all existing trees over 8” in diameter as measured 3' from ground level, with notations indicating whether they are to be removed or utilized in the development. Clusters of trees may be noted in approximate locations.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(2)</td>
<td>Existing and finished grades, with sections showing cut and fill for areas to be excavated below soils containing organic matter.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Landscape plan contains information regarding grading and soil backfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(3)</td>
<td>Indication of general drainage flow with arrows, and location of all surface drains and subsurface drain ways.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(4)</td>
<td>Location of all required yards, screening and buffering areas, easements, and public rights-of-way, building foundations or pads, parking areas, walkways and other impervious surfaces, and all access ways and private streets.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(5)</td>
<td>A schedule showing the % of impervious surface, landscaped area, and recreation open space, as a % of usable site area.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(6)</td>
<td>Plant material, including identity and spacing, using both symbol and schedule if necessary.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.041(7)</td>
<td>Typical sections at building mass, planters in paved areas, landscape strips 10’ in width or less, and landscaped berms, showing excavation, topsoil fill, finished grade, plant materials and irrigation.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Current section in Landscape Plan shows tree bed to be dug deeper than root ball. The International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) and American National Standards Institute (ANSI) call for tree beds to be no deeper than root balls. Trees planted too deep will significantly increase likelihood of premature tree mortality. Appropriate details and specifications can be sourced online from the ISA and ANSI A300 Part 6 (Planting and Transplanting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(2)(a)</td>
<td>The applicant shall provide methods for the protection of existing plant material to remain during the construction process. The plants to be saved shall be shown on the Landscape Plan or the Concept Plan and the method of protection shall be noted on the landscape plans. Example: Areas not to be disturbed can be temporarily fenced, as in snow fencing which can be placed around individual trees.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Are any trees being preserved? There are existing right-of-way and private trees. (If right-of-way trees are going to be removed, a tree permit is required, see notes below for Municipal Code Title 10 requirements).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;If any trees (including trees in the right-of-way) are to be preserved, this section and its requirements must be addressed in the Landscape Plan.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;For tree protection methods and specifications, you can reference:&lt;br&gt;• ANSI A300 Part 5 (Site Planning, Site Development); and&lt;br&gt;ISA Best Management Practices – Managing Trees During Construction, Second Edition (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(2)(b)</td>
<td>Existing trees shall not have construction occur within the drip line, where possible. Trees to be saved shall be kept free from trunk abrasion or soil compaction during construction. The landscape plan shall provide for the location and variety of replacement trees in case of the subsequent death of existing trees.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>If any trees (including trees in the right-of-way) are to be preserved, this section and its requirements must be addressed in the Landscape Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(3)(a)</td>
<td>Areas for required landscaping shall not be used as a waste dump or fill during the construction process. All waste material shall be removed from such areas prior to the application of topsoil.</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>Ensure that all persons involved in construction are aware of this requirement. Violation of this requirement may lead to the decline of plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(3)(b)</td>
<td>Soils devoid of organic materials shall not be utilized as topsoil for required landscape areas. Where such areas have been excavated to soil levels containing no organic material, the landscape plan shall provide for further non-organic soils removal and replacement with topsoil.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(3)(c)</td>
<td>The landscape plan shall provide specifications for topsoil, including depth, organic matter requirements, limits to sand, clay, and gravel and other requirements designed to ensure the health and vitality of required landscaping.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Ensure that the topsoil specifications (e.g. limits to sand, clay, gravel, pH) are appropriate for required landscaping. These limits must be provided in the Landscape Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042</td>
<td>Irrigation Plan</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Ensure that the Irrigation Plan includes all requirements from 23.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042(1)</td>
<td>Location of connection to the public water main and location of stub-outs to separate landscape areas.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042(2)</td>
<td>Identification of the type of irrigation system to be used, the location of irrigation facilities, and coverage to be achieved by the irrigation system.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.042(3)</td>
<td>An accompanying letter from the designer of the landscape plan stating that the design of the proposed irrigation system can provide irrigation sufficient for the health and survival of the tree and plant species specified in the landscape plan.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>See 23.042(2) for information relevant to this letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.051(1)</td>
<td>Except single family residences and duplexes, all development shall provide an automatic underground irrigation system.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.052(1)</td>
<td>All landscaping materials and irrigation shall be installed according to approved plans.</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.071</td>
<td><strong>Street Trees.</strong> All development fronting on public or private streets approved following the adoption date of this Code shall be required to plant street trees in accordance with the following standards. Street trees to be planted shall be chosen from the recommended list of street trees found in Section 23.076 below. Approval for the planting of alternate species may be given by the Director.</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.072</td>
<td>Location for Street Trees. Street trees shall be located outside of street right-of-way except in cases where there is a designated planting strip in the right-of-way, and as specified in requirements and restrictions in Section 23.030 and Section 27.313.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.073</td>
<td>Spacing, Placement, and Pruning of Street Trees.</td>
<td>Insufficient/ Unclear</td>
<td>New street trees must be at least 10 feet from storm drains, water lines, and sewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01.500(D)</td>
<td><strong>Muni Code</strong> 10.01.500 The Manager shall develop reasonable standards for the planting, maintenance and removal of trees to carry out the purposes of this ordinance. These standards will apply to trees within Grants Pass city limits on public or semi-public land. These standards may be amended as the need arises, by the Manager. The standards shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (D) Utility clearances including, but not limited to, sewers, storm drains, curbs, sidewalks, driveway aprons, streets, power or telephone lines, fire hydrants and water meters.</td>
<td>Right-of-way trees must not be planted where the base of their trunks are less than 10 feet from water meters, sewer lines, storm drains, or fire hydrants.</td>
<td>Here, street tree is proposed to be less than 10 feet from storm drain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01.400 (Muni Code)</td>
<td>No person shall plant, set out, prune, root prune, remove, cut above ground, kill, or otherwise disturb any tree on public or semi-public property without first filing an application for, and procuring, a Public Tree Permit from the City Manager. The person receiving the permit shall abide by the standards adopted pursuant to Section 10.01.500.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>If trees are removed from the public right-of-way along Union Avenue, a Tree Removal Permit is required. To find the application, please visit: <a href="https://www.grantspassoregon.gov/789/Tree-Permits">https://www.grantspassoregon.gov/789/Tree-Permits</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01.900(1) (Muni Code)</td>
<td>It shall be unlawful for any person to engage in the business, occupation or profession of pruning, treating or removing trees in public or semi-public areas within the City limits of Grants Pass without being certified by the International Society of Arboriculture, and without first obtaining liability insurance. Liability insurance requirements shall be set forth by resolution.</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Trees in the public right-of-way can only be removed from prequalified and certified arborists who obtain a Tree Removal Permit from the City. The Tree Removal Permit contains a list of the arborists who meet this requirement. <a href="https://www.grantspassoregon.gov/789/Tree-Permits">https://www.grantspassoregon.gov/789/Tree-Permits</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.074</td>
<td>Replacement of Street Trees. Existing street trees removed by development projects shall be replaced by the developer with those from the approved street tree list. The replacement trees shall be of size and species similar to the trees that are being removed, unless alternatives are approved by the Director. All replacement trees shall be a minimum of 1-3/4 inch caliper.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Lot Requirements (if applicable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)</td>
<td>Landscape Standards. Parking lot landscaping shall be provided at the ratio of 1 tree and 16 square feet landscaping per ten parking spaces, in order to create a canopy effect. Trees and landscaping shall be installed as follows and as shown in the Type E-2 Concept Sketch.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(a)</td>
<td>Landscaping shall be designed so there are no more than 5 parking spaces between any parking space and a tree. See Figure 23-1.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(b)</td>
<td>The tree species shall be an appropriate large canopied shade tree, and shall be selected from the street tree list to avoid root damage to pavement and utilities, and damage from droppings to parked cars and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Species listed for parking lot (Acer ginnala ‘Flame’ and Zelkova serrata ‘City Sprite’) are not appropriate. See tree list of Section 23.076. Look for “PT” in the Comments column for “Parking Lot” species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(c)</td>
<td>The tree shall be planted in a landscaped area such that the tree bole is at least 2 feet from any curb or paved area.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(e)</td>
<td>Landscaped areas shall be evenly distributed throughout the parking area and parking perimeter at the required ratio.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.035(3)(f)</td>
<td>Landscaped end islands shall be provided at the end of parking rows. End islands shall be a minimum of 6 feet wide to the inside of curb at a point adjacent to the midpoint of the adjoining parking space. When there are unique site constraints, the Director may authorize minor modifications to this requirement, provided equivalent landscaping is provided. See Figure 23-2.</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Storm Drain System**

Storm Water and Open Space SDC’s were adopted by the City Council on February 4, 2004. Storm Water SDC’s apply to all lands within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

The Storm Water and Open Space SDC’s are an incurred charge for the planning, acquisition and capital development of facilities to accommodate and control storm water runoff, directly associated open space, and water quality control facilities to clean surface water runoff prior to return to natural surface water conveyances.

Storm Water SDC’s are due and payable upon issuance of a building permit for any new construction or expansion which creates additional residential units and any construction which expands or remodels a business building which includes an increase in impervious surface of 25% or more.

The Storm Water and Open Space Plan SDC for residential and commercial development is $0.284 per square foot of impervious surface.

---

**Who to contact at Community Development:**

Our Planning Division can assist you with questions on Storm Drain, Parks and Transportation SDC’s.

Our Building Permit Technician can assist you with Water and Sewer SDC questions and estimates.


***NEW ONLINE FEE ESTIMATOR***

[https://gpweb.grantspassoregon.gov/EnerGov_Prod/SelfService/#/estimate](https://gpweb.grantspassoregon.gov/EnerGov_Prod/SelfService/#/estimate)

---

**What are SDCs?**

The City of Grants Pass is committed to providing quality services to our community. As our community grows, old systems need to be updated and new systems must be built. System Development Charges are one way to fund those improvements.

System Development Charges (SDCs) are fees imposed upon new and expanding development within the City of Grants Pass and the urbanizing area that connects to or otherwise will use City services of the water system, sanitary sewer system, parks, streets and storm drainage.

The objective of SDCs is to charge new users an equitable share of the cost of services and to pay for improvements necessary as a result of increased development and demand on the City’s infrastructure.

---

**SDC Fee Adoption & Adjustments**

On July 17, 1991 the City of Grants Pass adopted an ordinance allowing the creation of system development charges. SDCs are now in place to fund the Water, Sewer, Parks, Storm Drain and Transportation Systems.

On January 2, 2002, the Council adopted a resolution establishing Cost of Living (COLA) Adjustments for SDCs.

---

**For further assistance...**

If you would like more information on System Development Charges call (541) 450-6060.
Water System

The Water SDC was first adopted by the City Council on August 21, 1991 and last amended on February 5, 2020. This fee is charged and payable for development at the time of permit to connect to the water system.

The method of calculating the Water SDC for residential development is based on dwelling and water meter size, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small (&lt;= 1,700 sf)</th>
<th>3/4&quot; Meter</th>
<th>$2,863.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$7,158.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$14,317.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard (1,701—2,900 sf)</th>
<th>3/4&quot; Meter</th>
<th>$4,210.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$10,527.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$21,054.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large (&gt;2,900 sf)</th>
<th>3/4&quot; Meter</th>
<th>$5,769.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$14,422.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$28,845.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Duplexes, Multi-Family & ADU’s, multiply the base fee by an additional 0.64 per unit to calculate the SDC amount. If individual water meters are requested for each unit, a full additional base fee would apply for each water meter requested.

The method of calculating the Water SDC for non-residential development for all Water Pressure Zone service areas are as follows:

(based on water meter size)

| 1" Meter | $10,527.47 |
| 1.5" Meter | $21,054.93 |
| 2" Meter | $33,687.89 |
| 3" Meter | $63,164.80 |
| 4" Meter | $105,274.67 |
| 6" Meter | $210,549.33 |

Water meter size required for your project can vary and is site specific. Please contact our office for actual cost for your connection.

Sewer System

The Sewer SDC was first adopted by the City Council on October 19, 1994 and last amended on February 5, 2020. The Sewer SDC is charged and payable for development at the time of permit to connect to the sewer system.

Sewer SDCs for residential use are based on dwelling size as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Family (SF) or Manufactured Home:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (&lt;= 1,700 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (1,701—2,900 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (&gt;2,900 sf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duplex (1.64 sf amount based on dwelling size):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (&lt;= 1,700 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (1,701—2,900 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (&gt;2,900 sf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triplex (2.28 sf amount based on dwelling size):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (&lt;= 1,700 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (1,701—2,900 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (&gt;2,900 sf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sewer SDCs for commercial, public and quasi-public development are determined by the number of fixture units and strength of discharge. A worksheet is available to estimate the sewer SDC for individual projects or you may use the City’s online fee estimator located at: https://gpweb.grantspassoregon.gov/EnerGov_Prod/SelfService/#/estimate

Transportation

The Transportation SDC was adopted by the City Council on September 15, 1999. The Transportation SDC helps to pay for the expansion and capital development of the transportation system to accommodate and control motorized vehicular traffic, pedestrian traffic, and bicycle traffic.

In September 2011, the City Council adopted Ordinance 5546 which identifies the method of calculating the SDC’s to be based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Report. Trips are calculated based on the Land Use and Title that best fits the Development as interpreted by the City. If the ITE Trip Generation Report includes multiple measures that can be used to determine average daily trip generation including area, the measure of square footage (area) will be used. The Director may consider an alternative trip calculation when a report is supplied by a licensed traffic engineer and said alternative is reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

The Transportation SDC is due and payable at the time of building permit issuance for construction.

The City Council adopted Resolution 15-6338 to establish the current Transportation SDC trip rate. This rate is a 30% reduction from the previous rate.

In certain cases, a credit may be applied towards the Transportation SDC for previous uses on the development of the park, trail and open space system. The Transportation Engineer may consider an alternative trip calculation when a report is supplied by a licensed traffic engineer and said alternative is reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

Below is an example using the $125.77/trip rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Family Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category: Single-family (9.57 trips/unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 unit x 9.57 trips/unit x $125.77/trip = $1,203.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parks

The City of Grants Pass has adopted two SDCs for Parks.

The Parkland Acquisition SDC was adopted by the City Council on June 30, 1997. The SDC pays for the purchase of parkland, trails, and open space for the parks and recreation master plan.

On December 18, 2006 the City Council adopted a Park Development SDC effective June 1, 2007. This SDC will help fund capital improvements and development of the park, trail and open space system.

Parks SDCs are due and payable upon issuance of a building permit for:

- Any new construction or expansion which creates additional residential units;
- Any construction which creates a new business building or enlarges a business building;
- Issuance of the first manufactured home placement permit granted upon an individual building lot.

The Parks SDCs for residential development is based on the number of units:

| Parkland Acquisition | $521.93 per residence |
| Park Development | $419.23 per residence |

Total per unit $941.16

The Parks SDCs for non-residential development is based upon the number of provided parking spaces built to serve the development.

| Parkland Acquisition | $47.79 per new parking space built |
| Park Development | $37.32 per new parking space built |

Total per parking space $85.10

The City Council adopted Resolution 15-6338 to establish the current Parks SDC rates. These rates are a 30% reduction from the previous rates.

See other side for Storm Drain SDC Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing (Major) 4 or more</td>
<td>$126.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing (Minor) 3 or under</td>
<td>$63.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation (upon request)</td>
<td>$975.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal of Sign Code</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal of Type I</td>
<td>$487.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal of Type II, Type III, or System Development Charge</td>
<td>$1,124.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive &amp; Zone Map Amendment</td>
<td>$2,438.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Uses</td>
<td>$1,219.18 Plus $30.66/1,000 sq.ft. plus HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Joint Review</td>
<td>$163.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation of Historic Landmark Amendment</td>
<td>$790.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Permit</td>
<td>$236.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited Land Division</td>
<td>$3,480.59 plus $23.69/lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Letters (for Land Use Decisions and Development Permits)</td>
<td>$111.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Plain Review</td>
<td>$308.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Charge (HC)</td>
<td>$459.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Buildings &amp; Sites Review</td>
<td>$229.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Occupation (Major)</td>
<td>$1,042.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Occupation (Minor)</td>
<td>$61.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Code by Director</td>
<td>$229.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Compatibility Statement (LUCS)</td>
<td>$63.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Conforming Use Development Code</td>
<td>$1,277.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Review Procedure for Type I-EX, I-AU, or I-A</td>
<td>$351.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitions</td>
<td>$2,032.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Parking</td>
<td>$459.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Unit Developments (Final Plat)</td>
<td>$1,042.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Unit Developments (Preliminary)</td>
<td>$1,042.23 plus $59.92/lot or du plus HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Application</td>
<td>$407.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Line Adjustment</td>
<td>$684.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Line Vacation</td>
<td>$351.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remand from Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA)</td>
<td>$813.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Service and Annexation Agreements</td>
<td>$105.90 plus $105.90/lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-notice Fee</td>
<td>$225.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise/Remove Deferred Development Agreement</td>
<td>$526.70 plus $209.00/lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Café Permit requests that do not include reconstruction, alteration - other than approved barriers, tables, chairs, and accoutrements - or any other destruction or modification of the public right of way, including the sidewalk.</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>$112.86 plus $2.40/s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review - Major Modification</td>
<td>$459.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review - Minor Modification</td>
<td>$113.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review (Major)</td>
<td>$2,462.64 plus $32.05/1000 s.f. or $59.92/du plus HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review (Minor)</td>
<td>$815.11 plus $32.05/1000 s.f. or $59.92/du plus HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Access Permit</td>
<td>$813.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose District Amendment</td>
<td>$2,046.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name Change</td>
<td>$418.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision (Final Plat)</td>
<td>$1,042.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision (Tentative Plan)</td>
<td>$2,032.36 plus $59.92/lot plus HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Amendment</td>
<td>$1,971.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Growth Boundary Amendment</td>
<td>$2,899.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (Major and Minor)</td>
<td>$1,586.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone Map Amendment</td>
<td>$2,046.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App Rec'd by 10 a.m. (1) on</td>
<td>Site Plan Review Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/21</td>
<td>01/11/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/22</td>
<td>01/18/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/14/22</td>
<td>01/25/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/22</td>
<td>02/01/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>02/08/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/22</td>
<td>02/15/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/22</td>
<td>02/22/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/22</td>
<td>03/01/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/22</td>
<td>03/08/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/22</td>
<td>03/15/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/22</td>
<td>03/22/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/22</td>
<td>03/29/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/22</td>
<td>04/05/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/22</td>
<td>04/12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/22</td>
<td>04/19/22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Incomplete applications may be delayed.
(2) Except Type I-D Procedures
ADDITION

Engineering charges were adopted by the City Council on September 7, 2011. Hourly billing was eliminated and a fixed rate fee schedule for all charges was enacted. For more specific information, please refer to Resolution No. 5850.

ENGINEERING CHARGES FOR SERVICES ARE BASED ON THE FOLLOWING:

Developer Installed Projects:
The following fees will be assessed and collected for all Developer Installed Projects: Plan Review Fee, Encroachment Permit Fee, Grading Permit Fee, Inspection Services Fee and GIS Fee.

The Plan Review Fee consists of a $594.26 base fee + $62.51 per lot. This fee will be paid in full at the time of plan submittal.

The Encroachment Permit Fee is a flat fee of $77.89 and will be paid in full and the permit issued prior to the start of construction.

The Grading Permit Fee is determined by the quantity of soil being excavated and/or deposited. This fee will be paid in full and the permit issued prior to the start of construction. Fees are calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Volume</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 cubic yards (CY) or less</td>
<td>$ 78.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100 (CY)</td>
<td>$ 116.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 1,000 (CY)</td>
<td>Base Fee $129.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 – 10,000 (CY)</td>
<td>Base Fee $262.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,001 – 100,000 (CY) Base Fee $526.81
100,001 (CY) or more Base Fee $1,058.96
Each Additional 10,000 (CY) $62.11 / 10,000 (CY)

The Inspection Services Fee will be based on the estimated construction costs (to be provided by the developer’s engineer before approved construction drawings are submitted to Engineering). Fees will be collected prior to the pre-construction meeting and start of construction and before issuance of the Development Permit by Planning.

The following table applies for all projects requiring inspection for public facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Const. Cost</th>
<th>Service Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or less</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 or more</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public facilities include all City owned and operated public waterlines, storm drain lines, wastewater lines, streets and signals. It also includes appurtenances for all of the above such as fire hydrants, manholes, and signage. Private developments will be required to provide the City with the estimated costs for the public facilities. The City will check the estimated costs to ensure they are consistent with current industry construction standards prior to requiring payment for inspection charges.

Geographical Information System (GIS) Fee
Per City of Grants Pass Resolution No. 5935 adopted April 18, 2012, a 5% GIS Fee will be added to the Inspection Services Fee calculated from the Valuation Form and paid at the time that the Inspection Services Fee is collected.

Encroachment Permit Only:
When an engineering plan review of the proposed improvements is not required, a base fee of $77.89 plus the following charges apply for the applicable items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encroachment Item</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavation (100 sq ft or less) (ea)</td>
<td>$ 24.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation (101-1000 sq ft) (ea)</td>
<td>$103.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation (1001-3000 sq ft) (ea)</td>
<td>$209.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation &gt; 3001 sq ft (ea)</td>
<td>$262.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Approach (per sq ft)</td>
<td>$  0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk (per sq ft)</td>
<td>$  0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement (per sq ft)</td>
<td>$  0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Gutter (per sq ft)</td>
<td>$  0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhole or Catch Basins (ea)</td>
<td>$262.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hydrant (ea)</td>
<td>$394.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encroachment Item</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Benches (ea)</td>
<td>$ 24.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Survey Counts (ea)</td>
<td>$156.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Blanket (ea)</td>
<td>$ 96.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree/Stump Removal (ea)</td>
<td>$ 24.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit Material in ROW (ea)</td>
<td>$ 48.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb/Gutter (per lf)</td>
<td>$  0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drain (per lf)</td>
<td>$  1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Laterals (per lf)</td>
<td>$  1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Laterals (per lf)</td>
<td>$  1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences (ea)</td>
<td>$ 62.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls less than 3’ in height (ea)</td>
<td>$ 62.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls more than 3’ in height (ea)</td>
<td>$ 62.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ $1.59/sf of wall area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grading Permit Only:

The following permit charges apply for all projects either filling, grading or removing soil:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Volume</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 cubic yards (CY) or less</td>
<td>$  78.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100 (CY)</td>
<td>$ 116.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 1,000 (CY)</td>
<td>Base Fee $129.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 – 10,000 (CY)</td>
<td>Base Fee $262.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 – 100,000 (CY)</td>
<td>Base Fee $526.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 (CY) or more</td>
<td>Base Fee $1,058.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Additional 10,000 (CY)</td>
<td>$62.11 / 10,000 (CY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plat Check Charges:

Plat Check Charges are required to be paid in full upon application for final plat.

The following table applies for all surveying charges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partitions</td>
<td>$164.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Line Adjustments</td>
<td>$153.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision, Pre-Monumented</td>
<td>$333.01 + $30.66/lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision, Post-Monumented</td>
<td>$501.60 + $47.37/lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>$586.60 + $47.37/unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. PROPOSAL:

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

(See Exhibits 1 & 2.)

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

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

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

---

1 ORS 197.296 only applies to cities with populations over 25,000.
Goal 10 defines needed housing types as “all housing on land zoned for residential use or mixed residential and commercial use that is determined to meet the need shown for housing within an UGB at price ranges and rent levels that are affordable to households within the county with a variety of incomes, including but not limited to households with low incomes, very low incomes and extremely low incomes.” ORS 197.303 defines needed housing types:

(a) Housing that includes, but is not limited to, attached and detached single-family housing and multiple family housing for both owner and renter occupancy.
(b) Government assisted housing.\(^2\)
(c) Mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks as provided in ORS 197.475 to 197.490.
(d) Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single-family residential use that are in addition to lots within designated manufactured dwelling subdivisions.
(e) Housing for farmworkers.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

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

IV. PROCEDURE:

A. An application for Amendments to the Housing Element and Policies to the Comprehensive Plan was submitted on December 22, 2021 and deemed complete on December 22, 2021. The application was processed in accordance with Section 4.103 of the Development Code.

B. Notice of the proposed amendment was sent to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on December 23, 2021, in accordance with ORS 197.610 and OAR Chapter 660-Division 18.

C. Notice of the proposed amendment was sent to Josephine County on December 23, 2021, in accordance with ORS 197.610 and OAR Chapter 660-Division 18.

D. A public hearing was held by the UAPC on February 9, 2022, to consider the proposal and make a recommendation to City Council. The UAPC made a recommendation of continuance to a later date with the following requested corrections:

1. The motion to change the policy and objectives 9.2 to add in a yearly analysis.
2. The motion to have staff reword bullet point 9.6 to be a more actionable item using the same topic idea.
3. The motion that within housing and affordability and homelessness section 9.18 be reword-smithed by city staff and brought back for approval with recommendations that the word partner be struck or replaced. And the explanation, for example, purchase affordable housing projects be completely struck.

\(^2\) Government assisted housing can be any housing type listed in ORS 197.303 (a), (c), or (d).
E. A public hearing was held by the UAPC on February 23, 2022, to consider the proposal corrections and make a recommendation to City Council. The UAPC made a recommendation of continuance to a later date with the following requested correction
   1. Provide background information on House Bill 2583 that struck local definitions of “family” out of zoning codes.

F. A public hearing was held by the UAPC on March 9, 2022, to consider the proposal corrections and make a recommendation to City Council. The UAPC made a recommendation of approval with corrections to the city council.

V. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the February 2, 2022 Staff Report and its exhibits, which is attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein.

B. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on February 9, 2022, February 23, 2022 and March 9, 2022, attached as Exhibit “B, C, and D”, summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.

C. The changes to the Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments requested by the UAPC on February 9, 2022 are attached as Exhibit “E”

D. The Changes to the Comprehensive Plan Policies requested by the UAPC on February 9, 2022 are attached as Exhibit “F”

E. The changes to the Housing Needs Analysis requested by the UAPC on February 9, 2022 are attached as Exhibit “G”

F. The changes to the Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments requested by the UAPC on February 23, 2022 are attached as Exhibit “H”

G. The Changes to the Comprehensive Plan Policies requested by the UAPC on February 23, 2022 are attached as Exhibit “I”

H. The PowerPoint given by staff on February 9, 2022 is attached as Exhibit “J”.

VI. FINDINGS OF FACT:

The Urban Area Planning Commission found that based upon the testimony given at the public hearing and the staff report, the proposal meets the criteria found in the Comprehensive Plan Policy 13.5.4 based on the reasons stated in the findings included below.
VII. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

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

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

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

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

The primary goals in updating the city’s Housing Needs Analysis and amending Chapter 9 Housing of the Comprehensive Plan are threefold:

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

VIII. APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

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

Goal 1, Citizen Involvement:
Staff’s Response: Satisfied. Public involvement has included postings on the City’s website, direct contact with certain community groups and organizations, and face-to-face community events including an open house at city hall. The Housing Advisory Committee formed a sub-committee of four members who held five meetings with the City’s consultants between October 2020 and April 2021. Additional findings of fact and conclusions of law may be required following public hearings on the subject amendments. Prior to the UAPC public hearing, there is no basis upon which to make any findings or conclusions with respect to the citizen involvement criterion. Public notice of the proposal has been provided. The proposal is scheduled for public hearings and all public comment will be included in the public record for this application.

Goal 10, Housing:

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

CRITERION (b): Citizen review and comment.

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

CRITERION (c): Review and comment from affected governmental units and other agencies.

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

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

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

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

**Staff's Response:** Not Applicable

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

**Staff's Response:** Not applicable.

**IX. RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**X. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

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

**NOTE:** The application is a legislative amendment and is not subject to the 120-day limit.

**XI. INDEX TO EXHIBITS**

1. Comprehensive Plan text amendments
2. Comprehensive Plan Policy Amendments
# CITY OF GRANTS PASS

## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICY INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Citizen Involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scenic, Rogue River, Historic and Natural Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Environmental Resources Quality</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Natural Hazards</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Population</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recreation, Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Economy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Housing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Public Facilities and Services</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Transportation (replaced by the Grants Pass Urban Area Master Transportation Plan adopted December 1997, not included in this document)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Energy Conservation</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Land Use</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. LOCATION

   Note

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

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

. Goal

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

. Policies

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

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

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

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

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

. **Goal**

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

. **Policies**

. **Scenic**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

. **Rogue River**

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

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

- The creation of a design review board which would review all projects within the overlay zone for their design aesthetics and compatibility with the environmental setting.
- The creation of design guidelines to be utilized by the proposed design review board as well as by staff and other discretionary commissions.
- The creation of public viewpoints in the locations as designated in the RRP.

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

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

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

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

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

.  **Fish, Wildlife and Natural Resources**

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

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

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

.  **Aggregate**

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

.  **General**

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

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

. **Policies**
4.1 The City and County shall affect air quality by:

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

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

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

4.2 The City and County shall:

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

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

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

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

4.3 The City and County shall affect water quality by:

   (a) coordinating land use activities with the State Department of Environmental Quality River Basin Plan, the 208 Water Quality Plan and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit requirements. If 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. ¹Runoff 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) ¹regulating 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) ¹regulating 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) ¹increasing public awareness of techniques and practices private individuals can employ to correct water quality and quantity problems.

(i) ¹regulating the cutting of trees and encouraging the reforestation and revegetation of appropriate trees in the city.

4.4 The City and County shall affect land quality by:

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

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

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

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

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

. **Goal**

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

. **Policies**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.3 Wildfire Hazard

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

. **Goal**

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

. **Policies**

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

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

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

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

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

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

. Goal

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

. Policies

. General

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

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

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

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

. River Parks

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

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

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

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

School Parks

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

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

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

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

Greenways and Trails

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

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

Park and Recreation Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

(f) determine the areas of greatest facility need;

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

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.

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

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

. **Goal**

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

. **Policies**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.7  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.

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. Evaluate and address 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-muti-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. Support 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>

Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan Policies            Last Revision: 4/7/21
Office Residential OR
Neighborhood Commercial NC
General Commercial GC (GC-1), GC-2
Central Business District CBD
Riverfront Tourist Commercial RTC-I, RTC-II, RTC-III

Industrial Designation:

Allows:

Business Park BP
Industrial Park IP
Industrial I

13.2.4 Other Maps

The Development Code shall include a Zoning Map, that shall include Special Purpose District Maps and Utility Maps, which maps and their criteria and standards shall meet the following basic functions:

(a) The Zoning Map shall show currently permitted land uses on a parcel-by-parcel basis, and shall serve as a basis for determining the taxable value of any given parcel. The Zoning Map may show a less intensive land use than shown on the Land Use Map if within the same general category of land use (e.g. R-1-6 in a MR Land Use District).

(b) The Special Purpose District Maps and Standards shall determine which special development standards and review procedures, if any, apply to any given development proposal.

(c) The Utility Maps, together with the Development Standards, shall determine the existing and future location of basic services, (water, sewer, streets, storm drainage, and parks), and shall determine which special development standards, if any, apply to any given development proposal.

13.2.5 Special Purpose Districts

Special Purpose Districts shall be adopted to include at least the following. Other Special Purpose Districts may also be established.

(a) **Slope Hazard:** delineating areas of slope hazard due to combinations of steep topography and unstable soil, whose primary function is to allocate densities and development standards appropriate to the degree of hazard.

(b) **Flood Hazard:** delineating areas of flood hazard, whose primary function is to determine location and standards of development appropriate to the degree of hazard.
(c) **Historic:** delineating areas of historic value to the community, whose primary function is to encourage viable and economic use of historic areas while conserving and enhancing the area's historic resources.

(d) **Medical Overlay District:** delineating areas around former and current hospital sites to provide for nearby medical uses and development standards needed for medical facilities within the Grants Pass community. It allows siting of medical uses surrounding a core hospital. It is designed to provide the type of environment suitable for development of medical services and related activities, while reducing the conflicts between uses through appropriate designs.

(e) **Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA):** delineating area designated by the Economic Recovery Review Council (ERRC) in accordance with applicable state law in which an applicant can request Expedited Industrial Site Plan Review procedures.

13.2.6 Development Code and Map Criteria
The Development Code shall set forth the criteria, standards and procedures for inclusion within and development of real property of a given Land Use District, Zone, Major Classification district, and Special Purpose District.

13.3 Areas of Mutual Concern

13.3.1 Identification:

As appropriate, the City and County shall identify any "areas and items of mutual concern" which may extend beyond the Urban Growth Boundary.

13.3.2 Procedures for Review:

When so designated, the City and County shall establish procedures for notification and review for those areas and items of mutual concern identified.

13.4 Development Procedures

13.4.1 Procedure Types:

The Development Code shall separate land use procedures from land use criteria and development standards. Land use procedures shall be stratified according to the degree of discretionary judgment required, and the magnitude of the impacts of the proposal on the adjacent properties and the community as a whole, as follows:

13.4.2 Expedite Minor Review:

The Development code shall establish procedures for the development review
process which expedite minor development proposals through administrative review, with provisions for public review upon appeal.

13.4.3 Streamline Review Process:

The Development Code procedures shall act to streamline the land development process and eliminate unnecessary delays, and shall contain standards and procedures for land-use actions that are clear, objective and non-arbitrary.

13.5 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

13.5.1 Provision for Amendments:

The Comprehensive Plan is not an inflexible document. It is intended to be responsive to changes in community condition and the attitude. In order to permit such flexibility, and at the same time maintain the integrity of the Comprehensive Plan, it is necessary to amend the Plan from time to time without frustrating its basic purpose.

(a) In order to maintain the validity of community decision-making, the Data Base must be continuously updated, and the implications for decision-making that result from changing data and changing community attitudes should be widely disseminated and discussed.

(b) Goals, Policies, and Findings will require changing over time, as the community changes. Linkage must be maintained between policy and the data base, all land use maps, and the implementing ordinances.

(c) From time to time, the Land Use Map may need to be amended, and yet still maintain the correct linkages to the goals, policies, findings and data base, as well as retaining internal consistency.

13.5.2 Minor and Major Amendments:

The City and County shall mutually revise the Comprehensive Plan from time to time, making both minor and major amendments.

(a) Data Base: Revisions to the Data Base shall be Minor Amendments and shall proceed administratively as follows:

1. Upon special update and analysis requested by the City Manager or City Council;

2. Upon receipt of area or regional data, studies and analyses by other public or semi-public agencies;
3. Upon verification of site specific or area specific studies and analyses performed by the private sector;

4. Continuously as initiated by the Director; and

5. As a part of the City Manager's Annual Development Report.

(b) Findings, Goals and Policies: Amendments to Findings, Goals and Policies shall be either minor or major amendments as follows:

1. Minor amendments, involving minor changes to findings and policies only, at one year intervals upon receipt of the City Manager's Annual Development Report for that year.

2. Major amendments, involving major changes to findings, goal and policies at five year intervals, two years after the decennial census and quintennial counts taken by the US Census Bureau, upon receipt of the City Manager's Annual Development Report for that year.

(c) Land Use Map: Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan land Use Map shall be either minor or major amendments, as follows:

1. Minor amendments, consisting of quasi-judicial review of land use for one parcel or a group of parcels, shall be considered at any time, using the City Manager's Annual Development Report as a guide to the need for and appropriateness of such minor amendments.

2. Major amendments, consisting of legislative review of overall patterns of land use within a neighborhood, subarea, or area, or within the City or Urban Growth Boundary as a whole, scheduled at five year intervals, two years following the decennial census and quintennial counts taken by the US Bureau of the Census, using new Census data as a guide to the need and appropriateness of such major amendments.

(d) Notwithstanding (b) and (c) above, minor or major amendments, may be considered at any time upon the mutual consent of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners, using the latest Annual Development Report and revisions to the data base as a guide to the need and appropriateness of such revisions.

13.5.3 Initiating Amendments.

Comprehensive Plan amendments may be initiated as follows:

(a) A petition submitted by residents or property owners within the Urban
Growth Boundary.

(b) The Planning Commission.

(c) The City Council.

(d) The Board of County Commissioners.

13.5.4 Criteria for the Amendment:

For amending the findings, goals, policies and Land Use 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 statues and administrative rules. As specified in the applicable law, these decisions are not appealable to the Land Use Board of Appeals, and the noticing shall reflect the applicable procedures and requirements rather than those specified in the Development Code that reference appeals to the Land Use Board of Appeals.

13.8 Urban Area Planning Commission

13.8.1 Urban Area Planning Commission.

A single Planning Commission, designated the "Urban Area Planning Commission", shall be appointed to serve the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary area, both inside and outside the City limits.


13.9 City/County Joint Review Procedure

13.9.1 Joint Review. Except as otherwise provided by Intergovernmental Agreement, joint review as provided in this section by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners shall be required for amendment and revision to the following items:

(a) Comprehensive Plan Data Base.

(b) Comprehensive Plan Findings, Goals and Policies.

(c) Comp Plan Land Use Map.
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type I Procedure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Type II Procedure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective decisions.</td>
<td>Objective decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little, if any, discretion required.</td>
<td>Moderate discretion required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of minimal or no effect on others, public participation is provided simply by noticing nearby property owners and reviewing their submitted written testimony.</td>
<td>Application of the standards may require knowing of some effect upon others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No public hearing held.</td>
<td>Nearby property owners invited to respond to a tentative decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Community Development, or his designee, takes action.</td>
<td>Director of Community Development holds meeting, takes action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal by Type III procedure.</td>
<td>Lack of agreement escalates process to Type III procedure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type III Procedure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Type IV Procedure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex or subjective decisions.</td>
<td>Complex or subjective decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretion required. Delegated quasi-judicial actions required.</td>
<td>Great deal of discretion required. Quasi-judicial or legislative actions required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible significant effect on some persons or broad effect on a number of persons.</td>
<td>Possible significant effect on some persons or broad effect on a number of persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to applicant, others affected are invited to hearing to present initial information.</td>
<td>In addition to applicant, others affected are invited to hearing to present initial information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings Officer or Planning Commission holds public hearing, takes action.</td>
<td>Planning Commission holds public hearing and makes recommendation. City Council or Board of County Commissioners, or both acting jointly, holds public hearing, takes action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal by Type IV procedure.</td>
<td>Appeal to LCDC or LUBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HOUSING ELEMENT

9.10 PURPOSE

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

9.20 FRAMEWORK FOR THE HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS

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

At a minimum, local housing policies must meet the applicable requirements of Goal 10 and the statutes and administrative rules that implement it (ORS 197.295 to 197.314, ORS 197.475 to 197.490, and OAR 600-008). 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 unit housing for both owner and renter occupancy.

(b) Government assisted housing.

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

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

(e) Housing for farmworkers 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- *unitfamily* housing for both owner and renter occupancy
- Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single- *unitfamily* 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-unit* and multi- *unitfamily* 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.4

- **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-unit 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),
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>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>AGR</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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Josephine County</th>
<th>Grants Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Table B01002)

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

**Distribution**

| Distribution | 48% | 46% | 6% | 100% |

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

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

To help gauge housing attainability in Grants Pass, the consultant team examined current median family income (MFI) levels using U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines. As indicated in Figure 9, the 2018 median income for Josephine County was $53,600. Using HUD guidelines for upper-middle households earning 80% of the MI, a 4-person 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 MI and spending 30% of their annual income on housing.

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 (≥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>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Attainable Home Price**</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
Note, this analysis is generally consistent with 4-person household size characteristics.
** assumes 20% down payment on 30-year fixed mortgage at 3.5% interest.
Source: analysis by FCS Group using Housing and Urban Development data.

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

Figure 10: Median Home Sales Price Trends in Selected Markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</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>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Unincorporated Josephine County, 2015-2019

|                                                               | 64    | 84    | 94    | 101   | 117   | 460     |

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% 5.6%</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></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-unit 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>Rent-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>746</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/other</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group quarters (pop) 227

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

In addition, it is anticipated that there will also be demand for about 227 people requiring some form of group quarters housing (such as single room occupancy units, congregate care, in-patient care, etc.). For analysis purposes, we have assumed there to be 2 people per group quarters living unit, which would result in the long-term demand for 114 group quarters dwelling units. During the HNA planning process, local stakeholders indicated that there appears to be an existing housing “shortage” in Grants Pass that has driven rents and home prices to record highs and forced residents to seek housing in outlying areas. Since Oregon 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 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 ¾ 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\(^5\), 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>Unconstrained Non-Exempt Vacant Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Buildable Land After Future Public Facilities

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

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

---

\(^5\) 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.
Partially Vacant Residential Land

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

Total Developable Residential Land

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

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

Source: Grants Pass Buildable Land Inventory; 3J Consulting

Buildable Land by Lot Size

Figures 19 and 20 show vacant and part vacant land broken down by lot size. This is an important consideration given that, for example, a planned unit development yielding dozens of housing units can only occur on a relatively large, contiguous piece of land. The figures below show areal 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>&lt;1 acre Acres</th>
<th>&lt;1 acre Lots</th>
<th>&gt;= 1 acre &lt;5 acres Acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 1 acre &lt;5 acres Lots</th>
<th>&gt;= 5 acres &lt;10 acres Acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 5 acres &lt;10 acres Lots</th>
<th>&gt;=10 acres Acres</th>
<th>&gt;=10 acres Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163.9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>211.0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.5</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>&lt;1 acre Acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 1 acre &lt;5 acres Acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 1 acre &lt;5 acres Lots</th>
<th>&gt;= 5 acres &lt;10 acres Acres</th>
<th>&gt;= 5 acres &lt;10 acres Lots</th>
<th>&gt;=10 acres Acres</th>
<th>&gt;=10 acres Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>226.8</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>204.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372.8</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>473.5</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>140.7</td>
<td>21</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
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.

### 9.51 Housing Need Forecast

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

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

### 9.52 Residential Land Need Summary

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

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

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

9.53 UGB Sufficiency Analysis

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

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

Figure 27: Reconciliation of Residential Land Need

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

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

- The population of Grants Pass is forecast to grow at 1.02% per year over the next two decades, adding 9,401 new residents.
- Population growth will require the addition of 4,055 new traditional dwelling units over the next 20 years as well as 114 group quarters dwellings.
- About 60% of the future housing need will consist of single family detached housing, 18% will be a mix of townhomes andplexes, 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. Support 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
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. 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. PROCEDURE:

A. An application for a subdivision was received on January 28, 2022 and deemed complete on February 3, 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 16, 2022 in accordance with Section 2.043 of the Development Code.

C. A public hearing was held on March 9, 2022.

D. The decision was made on March 9, 2022 with the Hearings Officer approving the submitted application with the conditions listed in the staff report.

VI. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the original staff report presented at the March 9, 2022 hearing and attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein.

B. The PowerPoint Presentation provide by staff at the March 9, 2022 public hearing is attached as Exhibit “B” and incorporated herein.

C. The minutes of the public hearing held on March 9, 2022, attached as Exhibit “C”, summarize the oral testimony presented and are incorporated herein.
VII. FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

VIII. GENERAL FINDINGS OF FACT:

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
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.

IX. 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.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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 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 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 shall be met.

The applicant has provided a complete Traffic Impact Analysis. The report has been reviewed by the City Traffic Engineer, who provided a review. 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 Dannielle 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.

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

**Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions.** 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.

**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.

**Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions.**

The applicant submitted a “tree plan” document. 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.

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%.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

X. DECISION AND SUMMARY:

The Urban Area Planning Commission APPROVED the request for the fifty-four (54) lot Subdivision with the conditions below. The vote was 6-0 with Commissioners Collier, Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss, Aviles, Scherf and Arthur voting in favor. Chair Heesacker was absent. There is one vacancy on the commission.

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.

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.

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.


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.

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.

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 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.


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.
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.

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.

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.

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.


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%.

XI. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this 23rd day of March, 2022.

________________________________________________
Eric Heesacker, Chair