... one. You have chosen to admit all.

Say leave off [inaudible 00:00:44] I made the mistake of reading all the way through to the definitions. Again, that's disastrous. I read clear to the end.

All right. 6:00. April 13th, 6:00 PM. I'm going to call this meeting to order and start with a roll call.

1. Roll:
Commissioner Nelson.

Present.

Commissioner Aviles.

Present, and I am attending via Teams. Yeah. Hey, everyone.

Thank you for your sacrifice. We appreciate you being here. Commissioner Arthur.

Here.

Commissioner Scherf.

Here.

Commissioner Collier.

Here.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss. Commissioner Coulter.

Here.

And I'm Eric Heesacker. I'm here.
2. Introductions:

Staff, any introductions?

We have none.

3. Public Comment:

Public comment. Item three in the agenda. This is an opportunity for the public to address the Commission on items not related to a public hearing or action item. The intent is to provide information that is pertinent to the city's jurisdiction. Each speaker will be given three minutes to address the Commission as one body, not to individuals. The Commission may consider items brought up during this time later in our agenda during matters from Commission members and staff. Anybody here for that purpose? Nobody is.

4. Approval of Minutes:

a. March 23, 2022

We'll move on to item four A, approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Do we have a motion to approve or a motion to amend? Commissioner Nelson?

Mr. Chair, I move approval of the minutes from March 23rd meeting.

Is there a second?

Second. Collier.

Commissioner Nelson moves to approve the minutes. Commissioner Collier seconds the motion. All those in favor, say aye.

Aye.

Anyone opposed? Anyone abstaining.

Abstain.

Commissioner Aviles abstains.

Commissioner Scherf and Aviles abstain from approval of the minutes.

MOTION/VOTE

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

The motion passed.

5. Informational Items:

Item number five, informational items. Is that in the right place on the agenda? Seems like I've seen...
Yeah, elsewhere before.

It is if you want it there.

We'll work for tonight.

You can change it wherever you'd like, but yeah, you generally don't have any. I think it's just, if there's some kind of special events or trainings or sometimes, we'll announce that there.

Thank you very much.

Because it happened too often, especially during COVID.

6. Findings of Fact:
Item six, findings of fact. We don't have any.

7. Public Hearing:
a. 201-00417-22/301-00149-22 ~ Rogue Credit Union ~ Union Avenue Major Site Plan & Major Variance Review ~ Staff Report ~ Continued
   Item seven A, we have a public hearing that we have continued from the last meeting. I'm not going to reread all the mumbo jumbo. I don't need to, do I? On if we're continuing. All right. So, I guess we're going to let staff take this away.

   All right. Good evening, everybody. Let's hop right into it. So, at our last hearing, you guys will remember, we discussed a proposed Rogue Credit Union branch over on 340 Union Avenue. They had requested a variance to the access standards outlined in Article 27 and be allowed to have the two two-way entries and exits off Union Avenue. A motion was made during the March 23rd hearing during deliberation of the application, which denied that variance request. It was due to safety concerns, as well as the recommendations from our city traffic engineer, John Replinger. The applicant's request for approval of the major site plan review to allow the development of that vacant lot with the Rogue Credit Union and the three drive-through personal teller machines was continued to today's hearing.

   So, we have an amended variance request, as well as a site plan on April 5th, 2022. The applicant submitted a revised site plan indicating two access scenarios for you to review tonight, and you can reference those on page 114 and 115 of your packet. The applicant is now requesting to reopen the public hearing concerning the variance requests for the two accesses off of Union Avenue under the included revisions that address the concerns of the UAPC and the comments that were made from John Replinger. So, they provided two scenarios for you to consider. Once again, that's page 113 to 115 in the packet. So, here, option A, they're proposing still two accesses, but they've changed one of the accesses on the Western side to be a one-way driveway into the site and a one-way driveway exiting the site onto Union Avenue. The exit over on the Eastern side is designed with both right and left turn lanes.

   The applicant has also provided more comment from their traffic engineer, Kelly Sendall, that has addressed the safety and the operational concerns with this approach, and she has deemed that there weren't any concerns, and it should function efficiently, as well as
safely. The option B is really just aligned with Article 27. And so, it's the one approach off of Union, and that includes a two-way access, including one entry lane, a left hand turning exiting lane, and a right hand turning exiting lane. Some revisions to the staff report that I've included for tonight, you'll remember that we had some discussions on this in the last hearing. One of those discussions pertained to bicycle parking.

In my staff report, I had calculated due to the lack of a floor plan with the appropriate square footage that they were going to be required to have a type three bicycle parking space. Since then, on April 5th, they've given me a revised floor plan indicating the appropriate square footage that meets the exemptions under Section 25.0351. So, with these submitted revisions, the requirement has now been reduced to one type one bicycle parking space. Sidewalks. So, after reviewing the public works conditions to widen the sidewalk and do that seven and a half foot planter strip, and I believe it was the six foot sidewalk, the applicant has proposed to no longer modify or redo the sidewalk configuration and keep the existing five foot. So, since they are no longer proposing any modifications to the Union Avenue right of way, the existing nonconforming sidewalk configuration can remain, and they have indicated this change on the revised site plan.

There was also the request to move the city utility easement requirement from the A list to the B list. The impact of this revision is that now they can get their development permit without providing the recorded copies to the Community Development Department of the CUE. So, after looking at the revisions, staff recommends that you approve the revised major variance application. And we also recommend the approval of the request for the major site plan review to allow the development of that vacant lot with the Rogue Credit Union as proposed and the three drive through personal towing machines.

Any questions for staff?

Mr. Chair, I should have added that a technicality at the beginning, you actually closed the public hearing for the variance since your last meeting. In order to review this item tonight, you would actually need to reopen the variance public hearing. You left the public hearing open for the site plan. So, you're good there, but since there is still a potential for the commission to decide on the variance, I mean, you can discuss that amongst yourselves. If you don't choose to reopen the public hearing for the variants, then the only option up here is the single approach. So, if you want to consider both of the options that Gabby just presented, you would actually need to reopen the public hearing for the variance.

And what will this reopening of the hearing cost mean, in terms of reading all this stuff? Do I read it all over again?

Yes.

Are we going to have... Yeah.

You actually should have had a findings of fact, too, because that actually was closed as a denial.
Right, and the City Attorney reviewed with staff there, a decision of this body is not final until you actually vote on findings of fact. So, in his opinion, you haven't made a final decision on the variance because you haven't approved any findings of fact.

We should have actually had a findings of fact.

Now, we can hear you.

Folks deny anyway, actually, if we went by.

Right, just you got to have to get up to the microphone.

We should have actually had a findings of fact, if you go by the book, as a quote.

That's correct. If you just look at the variance by itself, that's correct.

Yes.

But you have a companion application right now.

Option B is not a variance or a variance. It actually would just be part of the site plan.

Right.

Right. Okay.

All right. So, all I have to do is say we're going to reopen the public hearing, read all the mumbo jumbo for Ward Nelson, at least, and for the record. Okay. I get it. So, opening the hearing. At this time, I will open the public hearing to consider the variance portion of this application, and I'm going to read off the project number. Is the variance, is that the one that starts with 201 or 301?

Three.

So, this is for project 301-00149-22, Rogue Credit Union, Union Avenue major site plan, and major variance review. As I said, the public hearing is being reopened for purposes of us re-entertaining a variance. We have begun the hearing already with the staff report. We will follow with a presentation by the applicant momentarily after I read all this, then we'll take statements from the public. Are you two ladies here to speak about the Rogue Valley Credit Union? And so, it looks like it'll go a little quicker.

Objections to the jurisdiction. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Commission to hear this matter? Nobody is. Abstentions, conflicts of interest. Do any of the Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Prior ex parte contacts by Commissioners. Are there any Commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received since our last meeting regarding this application? Nobody's indicating.
So, in this hearing, the decision of the Commission will be based upon specific criteria, which are set forth in the development code. All testimony which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. If you would like a copy of the report, please write that on a note to staff here, and one will be provided. It is important to remember if you failed to base an issue with enough detail to afford the Commission and the parties and opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal to the land use board of appeals based on that issue. The hearing now, we already had our staff report. As I asked, are there any questions of staff? The public hearing is now reopened. We're on the record. Alrighty. Applicant, would you please come forward to make your presentation? Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Matt Small. I'm with KSW Architects, 66 Water Street, Suite 101, Ashland. I really don't have anything to add to the staff report. I just want to make myself available to any questions. I think the revised site plans meet the concerns that you had at our last hearing regarding safety. My hope is that the traffic report from our traffic engineer is adequate and really don't have much to add.

Questions of the applicant, anybody? Thank you very much, sir.

I do.


On the plan we now have, I'm just curious. You cut down the east side to one lane entry, but then you continue that one lane, half of the way to the parking lot. I was just wondering if there was some reason for making that narrow for such a long distance. I'm just thinking of cars coming in that want to go to the parking lot, not sit in the queue for the mobile things.

The design was to support traffic coming in and any future traffic to that parking lot. That's why it gets a little wider there.

Well, I'm not asking why it's wider. I'm asking why it's narrow.

Let me grab my site plan. I will have it right in front of you, if you don't mind.

I can also pull it up.

Yeah, that would help.

Yeah.

So, the question is, why is it narrower?

Yeah. I realize you cut it down to one lane entrance.

Right.

But not everybody coming in is headed straight down to the back. Some of them want to get into the parking area and it's hard for me to estimate. You haven't given us any
information about what you're queuing length is there. How many cars you're accommodating?

So, we have people coming in from the east entrance, and as you travel north into the side, it widens...

Eventually.

At the future access to the parking, there's also the ability for people, it's hard to describe, but people traveling. Do you have your little... Yeah, the pointer.

There you go.

Sorry about that.

I got one. I got it right here on the screen.

So, you're talking about this area right here. Am I correct?

I'm not seeing them.

Yes, right there. So, we have the potential of people coming in the future, coming this way, and wanting in to get into this parking lot.

Coming which?

So, that is why if this development occurs, they'll have access. Let's say they miss their turn, they come around. They can come back in. That's why it's wider there.

I'm not following that at all.

I don't know if I...

The first site plan was for a dual entrance, two dual entrances two-way traffic.

I know.

The new site plan is for a dual entrance and a single one-way entrance. So, that's why it's skinny at the beginning, and it widens at the end because you don't want to promote two-way traffic. You want to...

Well, I understand. I'm not objecting to it being one right where you turn. But if you follow all these little arrows going back and forth, I don't see, if you really look at them, how it's going to work real well. I mean, as I said, first of all, we were not given the information about how many cars, how long that queue would be given the distance.

Which queue are you talking about?

I'm talking about the one waiting in line to get to the car... What do you call them?
To get into here?

Huh? Yeah.

Into the drive-through?

Right.

There's enough... There's one car, so just to here is probably close to eight to 10. If they have that much business, they'll be happy.

Queuing space times three. So, you could have 24, 25 cars waiting before you've even impeded this access into that side of the parking lot. Does that make sense?

Yeah, it would've helped to have a little more information on that, but then you've got these arrows going both ways in both lanes. The one the driveway across in front of the building, you have an arrow going out.

Right here.

Against the flow of traffic. I can't even see the...

So, the idea here is someone goes through the ATM. They realize that they have more things to do with the branch, so they can pull in here and park and walk in.

No, I'm talking about the inbound.

Right here. Is that what you're talking about?

I'm not seeing the here. I can't see what you're pointing at. I need a better pointer.

I'm sorry. Maybe I'm...

Can you see that one?

Oh, there. Now, I can see it.

Yeah. He's down.

I'm not talking... Yeah, I'm talking about...

Yeah, that's where he is.

The section between the two rows of parking go up father.

Right here?

No.

Right here.
Stay in the inbound lane. Stay in the inbound lane. Now, up. Another inch and you've got an arrow coming out.

These two arrows...

Oh, you're talking about...

She's talking about these two arrows right here.

Right there. Yeah.

So, the traffic in here and the traffic in here is two-way traffic.

Why?

Because as I said, someone comes through, they forgot something, they need to, they can pull in here, and...

Well, you're talking about in the parking area. I'm talking about the inbound road right there.

I understood, but now...

So, why is it omni direction, by directional right there is what she's asking.

Yeah, I get it. I'm trying to understand. I guess it could also... I don't know.

Is that what you're saying?

Somebody coming in has got turn left.

I guess if you have a two two-way traffic here, you're going to need two-way traffic out here.

Why?

So, I have an explanation.

Because if you're going this way and you thought you had to stop, but you decide you didn't have to, you're going to have to pull in back out and go out this way.

I can't tell what this way is. I don't know. Okay. Yeah.

Okay. This is the one-way...

Right.

You're asking why it opens up here?
No, that's fine. I'm not asking that.

It's right here.

Right there. That's spot.

So, that's why this is lighter [inaudible 00:22:07].

Well, to my mind, that's part of the entrance. You're talking about one-way traffic flow, one way in and one way out.

But there's also a future site there that they're accommodating. It's right on the site.

That's beyond that point.

There's a future site.

That's past that point.

Well, that would be a discussion for the site plan, not the variance.

Correct.

It would be what?

Say that again. She didn't hear that.

That would be a discussion for the site plan, not the variance.

Tony, real quick and short. Tony Workman.

You guys hear that? Everybody to hear that? Okay. So, we shouldn't really be discussing it until we go to a site plan, at least that part.

So, to her point on the arrow, if, for instance, all those what Matt said, if they come around through the ATMs and they decide they need to go in the branch. And so, if they were to pull in left into that parking area and all those parking spots were completely full, they would need to pull through that area to get back to the other parking. So, they would...

Why? Why couldn't they just go the way they came in to get to the next row?

Why are we telling them how to [inaudible 00:23:23]?

Well, I'd like to see that that one-way stays one-way. That was the point of having it one-way.

I think the issue is regarding one-way is right here. That's the safety issue.

Yeah.
It's really not much of a safety issue up here as I see it. It's right here.

Well, and we'll talk about it in 10 minutes. Fine.

I'm sorry?

I said, we'll talk about it on site plan then.

Okay. Any other questions?

Commissioner Aviles, I'm not meaning to ignore you. If you have a question pipe in, please.

No, I don't have a question. I couldn't see whatever people were pointing at or showing, but I think I could follow it because I do have the staff's report up, which shows the map, as well. But no, I had no comment. Thank you for checking in.

Anything else for the applicant. You may have a seat, sir. Thank you very much.

Thank you.

So, I'm going to go ahead and close the public hearing for the variance at this point. All right. Public hearing is closed. We need a motion so that we can begin discussing the variance for these access points. Oh, Commissioner Nelson.

I'm sorry. For the sake of discussion, I'm going to move the site plan for A, which I believe is the one we have up there now or the variance that we have up there now. Thank you.

To approve. A, that one.

Moving to approve.

Moving to approve.

We have a second.

I second.

All right. Commissioner Nelson moved for approval of the variance. It's been seconded by Commissioner Collier and Commissioner Scherf. Any discussion?

No discussion.

Okay. We'll take a roll call vote. Approving of the variance. Commissioner Nelson.

Aye.

Commissioner Aviles.
Yes.
Commissioner Arthur.
Yes.
Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.
Yes.
Mister Collier.
Yes.
Commissioner Scherf.
Yes.
Commissioner Coulter.
Yes.

And I'm Heesacker, I'm voting yes.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Scherf seconded the motion to approve the Rogue Credit Union ~ Union Avenue Major Variance Review. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Coulter, Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss, Scherf, and Arthur. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None.
Absent: None.
The motion passed.

Okay. Now, we can entertain the site plan review. When I closed the hearing, I did say we're closing it for the variance. Do I need to reopen this for the site plan review?

The site plan's already open.

Great. Great. We've had our staff report. Applicant, would you like to say anything about the site plan review?

Okay then. I will go ahead and close the public hearing for the site plan review. Do we have a motion?

I would move approval of the site plan.

Commissioner Nelson approves or makes a motion to approve the site plan review. Is there a second?

Second.
Commissioner Coulter seconds. Any discussion? Commissioner Arthur?

I still have concern about the way they're showing the traffic flow around those islands, and I'll tell you why. I had a roommate many years ago. Did a master's degree on a Ford plan creating for the first time, the animated flow of a production line in an auto building plant. And if you did that on this drawing, you'd have cars coming two lanes in and somebody coming around going the opposite way towards somebody trying to get to the parking and the same thing at the other end of that row. They're showing two way at the other end of the row, and there might be an occasional circumstance where somebody had to go around and come back or change their mind, but they can always stay with the flow and go around themselves. The one out of 120 cases, rather than having it at both ends of that aisle have two-way traffic. It just doesn't...

I just envision exactly how that would look in the animated traffic diagram. The flow would be ridiculous, and that's why I'm concerned about that particular part. It works just fine, keeping everything northbound one-way and everything southbound one-way on the two main roads.

So, your concern here is with the arrows that we're seeing on the site plan.

Yeah.

And if these arrows are transferred out there to the pavement, there could be some sort of confusion. So, I'm understanding what you're getting at. And I'm wondering if we need to place a condition, just thinking out loud here. Should we have two arrows here both pointing in that would prevent people from trying to do this maneuver. Is that your concern?

And there's nothing... If they did what he said and came around and had to park and go in, they're not going to go out that way. They're going to go back the way they came from and continue out the outbound road.

That arrow was...

Huh? Yeah. Both of them at each end, at the west end also. The wrong way one.

Hang on a second. Commissioner Coulter, you had your hand up first.

Yeah. I inclined to agree with Commissioner Arthur. I think that does constitute confusion there and potential for fender benders. I think I'm swayed by the fact that that would become the exception of somebody needing to go the other direction. Again, even then, even more so, because it would become the exception. People are not going to be expecting somebody to be coming the other direction. So, I'm inclined, for safety purposes, that all be one way there.

On both ends?

Yeah.

Yes. Yep.

Commissioner Scherf, you had your hand up.
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Yeah. Brad, is there an ordinance or statute that we can use to delegate the internal traffic flow?
Because to my mind, I can't think of anything, so-

I don't think we have to, if we think we're compelled to think it's a significant-

But you're-

... safety issue from the perspective of, not necessarily bad crashes, but a safety issue-

But as a governing board, wouldn't we have to have a statute or a code to stand on to argue.

No. Well-

Because we're a governing board, we're not an opinionated board.

Well, we do have leeway and-

Okay. I'm just asking because I don't understand how we're arguing this if there's not a code or
statute that we can stand up.

Yeah. It would be I think ideal, but I do still think we have leeway-

Okay.

... to make that as a condition of approval. We can't use the past as a pattern to justify it, but I
can say, historically, we have done that before.

Commissioner Collier.

I'm inclined to go with Commissioner Scherf's question to Mr. Clark to find out, do we have code
background, I'd like to hear that answered, to tell a guy how to handle his internal parking? I
think our concern is the east and west entrance and departures, and I think it ends there, unless
you tell me there's a code that goes beyond this. I don't want to be over prescriptive with telling
a guy how he's got to mark up his parking lot, beyond what's already written. So, I'm
uncomfortable with this, because we're looking at this at on an 8 x 11 page, and he's got
hundreds of yards that some professional has already set this to motion, and I'm not really
comfortable at telling him, "Nope, we're going to rediagram your parking lot." So, I'd like to have
that question opened to Mr. Clark.

Well, are we not supposed to look at the whole site plan then?

That's my question.

So, the authority of this board to make site plan decisions is 100% based on the 13 criterion that
are in Article 19. 100%, those criterion are the only basis on which you can make your decision.
Now, there's a lot of criterion there. In terms of Commissioner Scherf's question, the only
specific language in the code about traffic movement is one-way and two-way, and it does talk
about if you have one-way movement on an off-street parking lot, you have to have X amount of
width, we can look that up, and if you have two-way traffic, you can have X amount of width. That's all it is, is just the width of the aisle, which they meet. So, you would, at that point, have to start looking at Criterion 9, which states, "Traffic conflicts and hazards are minimized on- and off-site." That's the language in Criteria 9, "Traffic conflicts and hazards are minimized on- and off-site." If you were to change what the applicant has proposed, you would have to have a very specific reason and probably some data as to why you find Criteria 9 is not met.

Because at this point, staff is looking at it and said, "Criteria 9 is met." The Commission has to say why Criteria 9 is not met, so that's the discussion that you're having. You can get there potentially, but you do need to have some specific information.

Commissioner Nelson.

So, I'm looking at this as I don't have enough information to make a decision to go with one-ways. They have already outlined this, and you have correct, with the traffic report. So, anything that does happen in the future at this property is the property owner's domain, correct, liability-wise?

Correct, yeah.

Commissioner Arthur.

Well, I personally think that nobody even looked at those arrows when they did this redrawing, they only looked out at the street. So, it's not in a big, intentional thing that they really went through the whole traffic flow every possible way, I think it's an oversight. I don't know. It's clearly not workable, or it's potentially hazardous.

I would argue that from a professional standpoint, since we have documentation within our report from a traffic engineer within the city and a private traffic engineer for the applicant that yes, they have looked at it. That's what professionals do. Your statement is more of a hearsay, and I can't put any latitude behind that. So, I would say that I have to have confidence that these professionals have looked at that. So, I don't agree with your statement.

May I ask a question

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, go right ahead, please.

Just like with anything, I believe that they looked at this and they planned this, and that one perceived potential problem, which is perceived and it is potential, could be corrected if it is, in fact, a problem down the road and they have the latitude to do that. Am I not correct in that? Therefore, if this meets, in my mind, the criteria set forth for it, with the warning that there may be a potential hazard in the future, that they would simply look to that and if it does occur, they would, obviously, have an obligation to their clients and to the public to correct it. So, I'm inclined to respect what Commissioner Arthur has brought forth, but to bring this up as something that they will, they being the credit union, would need to deal with down the road should it actually occur, should the potentiality become a fact.

Anyone else? Commission Aviles.
Yeah. I just wanted to comment that in regards to the parking lot and the parking flow, it's actually a plan that I've seen around town. I can think of a couple of businesses that have parking layouts similar to this, where there's that long outlying lane and then parking in between. I think the parking lot over near Beacon and... Can't think of the... It's just that main intersection as you're getting onto the freeway, but the Carl's Jr. Restaurant that's in that shopping corner, I think has a very similar parking layout, just in terms of various lanes of traffic and parking in between. And so, I agree that while the safety issue is a concern, I don't see it as something that should hold up this process, given that, as indicated by the applicant, there is a risk and liability that he's already aware of and needs to take precautions around himself. I just wanted to point out that this parking lot looks very familiar to several parking lots that are already in and around town, so that was just all I wanted to add.

Miss Aviles, you said Carl's Jr. Did you mean the In-N-Out up there on Morgan?

I didn't, but that, I guess, is another example, where it has that long boomerang shape with the long lane, but then the parking in the middle. I was actually thinking of the actual Carl's Jr. opposite of the Starbucks and the Panda Express at that intersection where there's just lots of fast food and drive-throughs, but that parking lot's very similar. And then, it actually extends to more parking for MOD Pizza and the other restaurants that are in that little section of town. Does that help with where I'm speaking of?

Yes, thank you very much. Anyone else want to say anything, because here I go? What I'm hearing here is it would not be impossible, but maybe a leaping of our authority to condition the site plan as we're discussing, but maybe just leave a warning for the applicant, here's my little dot up here, maybe it would behoove you to extend this double width landscape planter at least to this point. Maybe put a sign here for traffic heading south, "Do not enter." I think that's what you're hearing, is that this body is warning you that might be a good tactic for you to employ. Alrighty. That's all I'm going to say.

Yeah, I wasn't concerned about that portion at all. I'm just concerned about somebody coming down to the right in the first aisle by the building, and turning right against the incoming traffic to get around to the next lane to go out. I don't know why they'd do that, they can go in and they can go back out the way they came. But it's set up right now that that could happen at both ends, where you have the arrow going the wrong way.

Understood. And the applicant is hearing our discussion. Any more on this particular issue, because I have two things that I want to ask here? Do we need to ensure that there is some kind of recorded easement for this property to the west, somewhere along in here, or do we leave it to the good graces of the applicant to go ahead and do that of their own volition?

If they do intend to do a shared access with the other parcel, then that would be something that they would have to do prior to the issuance of a development permit, I believe.

It's a future condition.

It's a future condition. It's not being proposed right now and the other lot is not being accessed, so I think that would be something that would be conditioned in a future context.

Look at my dot up here, for this portion of this property? Or from when this parcel-
Oh, oh. Are you talking about the future building there?

Actually, I am talking about the parcel, too.

Yeah, the cross-access. Yeah, they would need to obtain a shared access agreement. Brad, feel free to correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the language would probably be something like, "If the applicant in the future desires to share access with the neighboring tax lot, a shared access agreement will need to be obtained and recorded."

Understood. And that would be up to the two property owners, not for us to condition at this hearing?

No, sir. That's not my understanding.

Understood. Thank you. That was my first point.

It is on page 50.

Okay.

It's Condition 17.

Oh, thank you very much. All right. My next point, throughout the staff report, I saw in several places when discussing the variants layout that this access... I don't like the wording and I'm being nitpicky here, it kept being referred to as two-way, and that was confusing for me as I was reading. I'm thinking, "What can we use as a better term here?" The only word I could come up with is bidirectional, and if nobody else thinks this is an issue, I'm going to let it go. This is not something I'm going to fall on the sword and die from.

I don't see the issue.

Okay, no issue with that. I am done talking any more discussion? Do we have a motion for the site plan review?

I thought I made it.

Did you make it already? All right. So, we do have a motion on the table that's been seconded to approve the site plan. I'm going to do a roll call vote. Commissioner Nelson?

Yes.

Commissioner Aviles?

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur?
Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Yes.

Commissioner Collier?

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf?

Yes.

Commissioner Coulter?

Yes.

And I am voting yes.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Commissioner Coulter seconded the motion to approve the Rogue Credit Union ~ Union Avenue Major Site Plan. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Coulter, Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss, Scherf, and Arthur. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

The motion passed.

All righty. Thank you for very much, applicant, for your time and driving all the way over here in this bad weather. We appreciate it.

b. 405-00129-22 ~ Middle Housing Code Text Amendment CC ~ Staff Report

Next item is Item 7b, Middle Housing Code Text Amendment. This is a different kind of hearing. I forget the terms for them, legislative. This one's legislative, right? All right. I'm going to open the hearing. At this time, I will open the public hearing to consider project 405-00129-22 Middle Housing Code Text Amendment. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by public comment, and then the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the commission. Objections to jurisdiction, is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Commission to consider this matter?

I don't think you need all that. Do you?

I do need to read all this, yes.

Yes.

Really, for legislative?
Yep.

It's a different one.

Conflicts of interest, do any Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Nobody's indicating so. In this hearing, the decision of the Commission will be based upon specific criteria. All testimony and evidence must be directed towards those criteria. The criteria which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the Commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals based on the issue. We will now begin the hearing with a staff report. Director Clark, the floor is yours.

Thank you, Chair. So, there's a lot of material in your packets for this hearing tonight. I'm going to try to break it down as best as I can. I will say upfront that depending on how the Commission feels when we get to the last couple of articles, where we get into the design issues, where you really start getting into more of the technicalities, like what you just talked about in this prior hearing in terms of parking and traffic movement and design issues, that if... I'll just throw this out there ahead of time so you can be thinking about it in your minds. You may want to consider a second meeting. Now, as you may have read in here, we do have ordinance statutes that do require that the City of Grants Pass adopts HB 2001 by June 30th. We can still meet that if you have one continuance, but I do think it would be tight to do it at your next meeting, so we'd probably have to do it next week. I know that's a lot to ask for you as volunteers, but just be thinking about that.

I actually don't have a lot of slides on those sections, so we'll just have to be referring to your hard copy packets. But let me just go through a little background here and introduce it for the record. So, this is a proposed Development Code Text Amendment that impacts 10 different articles or chapters in the Grants Pass Development Code, and this is all relating to House Bill 2001. So, this is legislation that was passed in 2019 at the Oregon Legislature. There was quite a bit in that bill, but the crux of it is that it requires local governments throughout the state of Oregon to allow housing of multiple types wherever you allow single-family development housing. It is sometimes referred to as the Middle Housing Bill. It basically requires these five types that I've got in bold here, these housing types, duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, cottage clusters, and town homes, those are specifically called out in the 2019 legislation. All of those five have to be permitted uses on any lot or parcel that's zoned for residential use that allows for detached single-family dwelling.

Well, currently in Grants Pass, you can do single-family dwellings on any lot that has an R in front of it, Residential. So, that means it affects pretty much all residentially zoned parcels and land in Grants Pass. The main intent of the legislation, if you go back to some of the committees and what the Department of Land Conservation and Development is saying, is to remove unreasonable costs and delays to the development of middle housing, again, middle housing referring to those five bold types up there, and to ensure a clear and objective process and standards for those as... Single-family, as well, single dwellings, but also those others, so that there's no question if you want to develop a quadplex, here's the process, here's the steps you go through, and they want there to be no really unreasonable, is the term, cost or delays in building those types of
housing, just like now with single dwellings. Most people know if you want to build a single house on a single lot, you just come into the department, you pull your permit, and you go and you build it.

You know you're not going to have to go through a lot of steps or review to do that. They want that same expectation for all the other types of middle housing. There was model code that the state created to help cities with this process. They basically said, "Cities, you can update your own code, or you can use our model code." A lot of the same languages is in there, but we, obviously, chose to update our own code rather than rely on the state's model code. If we don't adopt by June 30th, the model code kicks in until such time as we do adopt our own code. I just wanted to throw this in there just so you can see at a high level where all the R zoning, this is the entire urban growth boundary for the city. Pretty much anything that's this yellowish or orangeish color that's got the R in front of it, is what we're talking about. It's a substantial percentage, it's 63 and 65% of the land area within the urban growth boundary.

DLCD, they awarded us a Technical Assistance Grant to help go through the housing needs analysis, which you already had your hearing on. Well, this was done all at the same time. The three consultants that we had helping us out is 3J, FCS Group and Jet Planning, those were the three consultants. Elizabeth Decker is the sole proprietor of Jet Planning, and her whole focus on this consultancy was just the Middle Housing Code update, so that was where she focused. There was a subcommittee of the Housing Advisory Committee that was formed in 2020 to review all these materials as the consultants were drafting them and going through them. These four individuals here, they're all Housing Advisory Committee members, were on that subcommittee, so you do have Commissioner Arthur, who was one of those four. In terms of public notification and discussion about this ordinance change, this just a shot of what the public notice looked like, but we did have some other opportunities for the public to hear about it.

There was the 2021 severe rent burden form that was actually held before you last year in February, this concept was presented at that point. And then, we've also had the city website and there's city hall public notice. Also, on March 28th, we did an email blast to about 1,400 local builders and developers, that's an email list that we in Community Development have tracked over the years. So, we did send a notice out to them, since this does impact the Building and Development Community, but then there's also the April 1st Daily Courier legal notice was put out. So, as I said, there's 10 different articles that this Development Code Text Amendment applies to. I'll just go quickly through what some of the highlights are on those, and there's more detail in your packet. Article 2 is very simple, there's just one minor edit to strike a comparison to a higher procedure type, that's on page 2-8. Article 12 changes are pretty substantive, so we'll spend some time going through this.

I already mentioned this first bullet, there's these 10 R districts, all those yellow and orange ones that I showed you a minute ago, that were single detached dwellings today, are permitted either outright or through a planned unit development. So, all of those zones, R-1 12 all the way up through R-5, need to allow for all five types of middle housing under this legislation. So, the edits allow those. And then, in the R-42 and the R-5, single units and duplex, are now prohibited. That's a provision that is allowed for in the statute for those high density zones, you can still do the triplexes and above. So, here's a shot from the amendments that are in your packet. I just wanted to walk through this
so you're really clear on what you're approving, or reviewing, or denying, or whatever tonight. So, starting here this first number one. So, currently it says just detached, that's the only word there. As you come across a top here, you have all the R zones. So, under this, this is the R-3-2, you can see where single detached dwellings were a planned unit development.

Well, that planned unit development is now stricken as an option in those R-3-2, R-4-2, and R-5.

Are you on page 182 in our packet?

Yes.

Thank you.

Yes. Thank you for that. Accessory dwelling units, those are just shown now to also be allowed as secondary uses in the R-3, R-4, and R-5 zones. The detached, that line is stricken just because it's covered underneath number one above. As you move down, the next one is stricken, as well. The new number three, that is now called just townhouse. So, basically, townhouses are now covered under here, and you'll see that they're all P-I-A, that's Permitted Type 1a. So, that's saying that where before it was maybe a Type 2 or it was a planned unit development, those are now just allowed outright. Duplexes, that's now new number four. They are now shown as being permitted in the first two columns, whereas before it was a planning, a development or a Type II hearing, so those now you can just do them straight out building permit. Triplexes, number five, again, those are allowed. P is permitted, one is administrative. And then, the quadplex is the same thing in all of those zones. Number seven, this is just changing under multi-dwellings where it used to say 3, it's now 5.

So, that's changing the definition, which we actually already changed before, this is just a correction. So, multi-dwellings are five units or above. Those are a completely different process, and this code doesn't really just doesn't speak to those. Number 9 and 10 are the cottage developments. So, these are your single standalone, usually smaller units that are in groups. Those are also permitted as the Type 1as in all of those residential zones. A couple other changes to Article 12. The footnote on page 12-17, that's actually referring to the page number on the code itself, not the PDF packet. We probably should have put that in there. That allows a conversion of a single dwelling to a duplex in zones where new residential uses are not permitted. So, that's again, aligning with the statute, which says you're basically allowing duplexes wherever you allow single family, in terms of the conversion. Section 12.140, so this strikes the detailed calculation for net density and just refers to the minimum lot area. So, we're going to get to that in just a second, but how you actually would calculate the density of a new project is changed by this.

It also exempts all middle housing from the maximum density thresholds. Again, something that the statute requires us to do. If you stuck with the maximum density in the R-1-10 zone, for example, which is fairly low density, and you kept the maximum density in there and you did a fourplex, on one lot, you would already exceed the maximum density. So, you can't do that under this legislation, you have to allow the fourplexes, which means, basically, you're not going to look at those in terms of maximum density. That just won't apply anymore. And then, Section 1215-2, there's just
some miscellaneous edits to align the lot requirements there. This 12-5, again, we're still in article 12, a lot of changes related to the lot sizes and the lot widths that are required. If you go on this tall first row header here, you'll see that it's changing the lot areas to, for single family detached or duplex. Then there's two new columns for triplexes and quadplexes that we didn't ever have before. So when we're talking about lot requirements, we have two entirely new categories to address how triplexes and fourplexes and cottage developments, how do you calculate the minimum lot area for those? So those are two brand new columns. Today, looking again at just this first column. If you go into the R-1-12 zone, it's an 11,000 square foot minimum, that got changed to 10,000. So it's reduced. R-1-10 goes from a 9,000 square foot to an 8,000 square foot minimum. The R-1-8 goes from seven to six. The R-1-6 goes from 5,500 square feet to 4,500 square feet. The R-2 goes from 5,000 square feet to 3,500. The R-3 goes from 5,000 to 2,500, same with the R-3-2. Then there's no minimum lot size for single family detach or duplex in those two high density zones. And then you can see for yourself in terms of what the lot area is for the triplexes and the quads. I guess I wanted to point that out because this isn't saying you can just go and cram them all in there in your property.

You're still going to have to meet minimum lot area for a quadplex, if you choose to do that, and a triplex. You're still going to have to meet these minimum lots sizes when you're doing your development. So those are the big changes to 12. Article 13, this is the special purpose district. There's just a couple of minor edits here, to strike the reference to the single homes and refer to residential structures. Those are equivalent terms really now. Article 15, this is nonconforming use and development. There's a few things here we should probably talk about. Because basically if you have an existing lot and you have a house that's nonconforming, today you want to change that to a higher intensity use, you got to jump through several hoops. This is saying that if you convert a single dwelling to a multi-dwelling with two to four units, that's not going to be defined as greater impact. Today, we would call that greater impact. If you have a single dwelling and you want to come in and change it to three units, we would say, that's a greater impact. You got to bring your whole property into conformance with the code. This is saying, that's not considered a greater impact now. Because again, the intent of this legislation was to say, okay, a triplex should be allowed wherever a single family is allowed. So you're just creating that level playing field. That's a fairly significant change.

It also does not trigger some other nonconforming code requirements. I didn't go into all those there. It does allow for the expansion of existing single dwellings that don't meet height or setback to convert to middle housing, as long as it doesn't increase the nonconformity. Just some legalese terms that basically says, if you come in and let's say, you're, you're supposed to have a five-foot setback from your property line ... from your house to your property line, you're supposed to have five feet. And you live in a house that was built 50 years ago, and you only have three feet. Well, that's technically a nonconforming situation. If you bring in another permit to bring in say another unit on that property, this is saying, you can't increase the nonconformity. Meaning, you can't go to two feet. But as long as you still have that three-foot setback, then you're good. Or as long as you don't go above the height, then you're good. You still have to work within the boundaries but you can expand that single dwelling to include middle housing products without having to go through some of the steps that you do now. 17, this is the article that talks about dividing lots, creating partitions, creating subdivisions. The one I wanted
to point out here is that second bullet. I guess it's technically the second red bullet, 17.311 and 17.402.

This is submittal requirements for partitions. So this adds a new proposed use requirement where you have to show the type of future use in the partition. So if you're coming into the city and you're proposing to divide your land, today we're not saying that you need to tell us what type of product you're going to do on that lot. What this is getting at is, if you are going to propose triplexes on that new lot in the future, then there's minimum lot sizes that go with triplexes, which are different than the minimum lot sizes which go with the duplexes. We don't think this is something that we're going to be hard and fast. I mean, if you're going to change your mind, you can. But from the planning standpoint, at the beginning of your subdivision process, we think this will actually help in terms of laying out the subdivision. Because if your intent is to do duplexes and triplexes, then it could change some things. Now you could still go through your subdivision process and get your lot approved. And somebody in five years could come back and say, "Well, I want to do a quadplex on this." This isn't saying they can't do that in five years.

But it is saying, at the front end when you're laying it out and designing, we want to try to, at the best of our ability, lay it out in such a way that you're going to be able to meet all the codes. The main one here really has to do with the street access, because if you're doing a private street to access your development, today it only has to be 22 feet wide. Well, that private street can only serve up to 10 units. So if you come in and you add an 11th unit or 12th unit, you're going to have to widen that street to meet minimum width standards, 36 feet. So from 22 feet to 36 feet is a big difference and if you don't know that at the front end when you're laying out your lots, it could really hurt you at the back end. So that's really the purpose with that. Article 18, this is the plan unit development section. Not really anything too substantial here. It just adds duplexes, town homes, cottages, and multi dwellings to say that they're allowed residential uses in a PUD. That's, just clarifying the statute language, it does add new land use data descriptions related to middle housing.

So, if you're coming in with a plan development, it asks for a little bit more data on what that middle housing is and what it's going to look like in your PUD. Then it takes out all of the cottage development section right now, that cottage developments are PUDs but under the legislation, they can't be a PUD. So we took all of the cottage development stuff that's currently in article 18 and moved it to article 22. Article 19, this is site plan review. Again, really not a lot of changes here. The significant piece is that it adds all middle housing types as being exempt from separate site plan review process. I don't know if you're able to follow along here, I'm trying to reference the section numbers. But 19.021, today it says that the only thing that's exempt from going through site plan review is the single dwellings. Now you're exempt from going through site plan review for the town homes, cottages, triplexes quadplexes. They're all administrative and at staff level. There's a new land use data description there. Then 18.300. No, actually I already read that, didn't I?

Yeah.

Okay. So now we're at the point where there's three articles left that are a part of this application, 22, 25 and 30. 30 is definitions. If you look at your article 30, you see that we
added basically verbatim what the Oregon statute says for these land use types. We put those in our article 30 definitions. 22 is dealing with the design and the layout, particularly related to townhouse projects, because we didn't have a lot of information in our code now related to that. 25 is dealing with parking and how you would manage parking related to these units. I apologize, they don't have detailed slides on those. If you feel comfortable as a Commission reviewing those, if you already did review them and you want to talk about them tonight, we can. But this is where I was referring to at the beginning. That because of the substance in here, if you want to have more time to think it over and talk about it next week, we could set a special meeting for that. That's really what I have for you. There's really in terms of cost implication from the CD’s standpoint ... which is what this is getting at. Is there any cost implication to the taxpayer or to the city itself? There's not really. I mean, our general fund covers our staff time to make these edits and present them to you and to the City Council.

There's probably another 15 hours or something of time to do that. So that's the cost implication. And then your Council ... Well, I'm sorry. I left Council. It should be Commission's discretion on this in terms of how to move it ahead. I did put in my staff report the timeline that we're dealing with. We do need to make sure that we get this to the Council fairly soon. You're going to have to make your findings of fact and review all that. But that's again where we're at in terms of your comfort level. And if you want to set up another meeting or if you're comfortable moving ahead tonight with your discussion ... but it is a public hearing too. So, I just wanted to remind you of that, Chair.

Any questions of staff right now? Commissioner Nelson.

Yes. Mr. Clark, the question I had is, it sounds to me we have two choices. One is accepting this with modifications or approve this, or on June 30 the state has a modified code that would be put into place?

Right.

Am I understanding you, correct? So, one way or the other it's going to be one or the other.

That's correct. Yeah. You don't have to recommend approval of this to the Council. If you don't, the model code would kick in on July 1st. We have until June 30, quote unquote, large cities in Oregon, which are 25,000 population and above, are all subject to the same rules that we're talking about tonight. Yeah. The model code does have some graphics and things like that. It's laid out differently just because it's not following our code article structure. But we can certainly get that to you if you want to see that, because that's what would happen. Yeah. That would kick in on July 1st.

Anyone else? Mr. Scherf.

Just to clarify, Brad. We are making a recommendation or not making a recommendation to Council, but the Council wouldn't hold up their decision for us. Judicially, why is this? Is there a reason why they would not vote this in without our recommendation?

Would the Council vote it in without a recommendation?
Yeah.

I don't think they can. Code says that you have to give them a recommendation of some type.

Okay. I got a couple of more questions. Anybody have questions? Because I've got a list of them.

Anyone else? Commissioner Aviles.

No, I'm fine. Thank you.

Commissioner Scherf, go right ahead.

Okay. One thing I do want to point out is, when you do increase density within all of your developable area, there is a direct impact to infrastructure. Increased density has a direct impact to the cost of building. Also increased density increases SDC fees. Was there anything in the code that addressed relief on any SDC fees?

I did include what's called a Goal 10 analysis in the staff report. Goal 10 in Oregon, you do have to look at anything really related to affordability. If your code is going to impact residential development at all, you have to do this analysis. So I did do that. I don't know if it's to the degree that you would find as an engineer satisfactory. But we basically said, the Council has said because the Public Works Department relies on SDCs for over 20% of the revenue to do new capital projects, they did not want to waive SDCs.

And that leads into my line of ... I'm just making sure everybody's asking the right questions. It sounds like you guys did your research on that. I'll definitely review what you put in the report. One question I just need for clarification is, you said there was ... I don't remember what article it was. But the statement was, no maximum densities can be enforced. Can you go into that a little bit more and what article was that in? I missed it.

That's in 12.

Okay. Can you explain that one more time?

Sure. I'm trying to find the page number here so everybody can take a look at it. It's 12-21.

It's at page 194.

Thank you. Yeah, 194. So you can look on page 194. You'll see that table there in the middle, maximum residential density, and then you've got the zones. And then today it just shows the 3.96, 4.84, 6.22. Those are basically the new maximum densities for those zones, based on lot size. Then down below the following exceptions to maximum net residential density. Duplexes count as single dwellings. Triplexes are exempt from maximum density. Townhouses exempt from maximum density and cottage clusters exempt from maximum density. The point there was just that if you use the minimum lot size and you do the maximum density calculation that we have up here right now, you're
going to exceed the maximum density much of the time. So you still have to meet the minimum lot size but in terms of calculating density ... which is only a few times honestly, that really is important. But that's exempting it out for those.

So, it's basically to allow for these increased densities per the lot size. But there is the small chance that you could meet the minimum lot size for that zoning and put a higher density than for example the 4.35. So, you could end up putting seven units on there, if you meet the lot criteria and all the other restrictions such as setbacks and-

Right.

... landscaping and stuff like that. Okay. That explains it a little bit more. There was one other question I had, sorry. Article 19, you said that all middle housing is exempt. So basically the middle housing is the idea that we're going to put in all these multiple houses and allow them to be developed on a single family or an R-zoning. But then you made a statement saying that all middle housing is exempt from site plan reviews. Meaning for example if somebody put a triplex together, we would never see it, no matter what?

Correct. Yeah.

So, there would be no public hearing. There would be no UAPC governing board reviewing it?

Or hearings.

Nothing.

Yeah. There is a site plan review on ... We don't call it that but there is a review with your building permit. So one of the planners when they come in, I mean, they're still going to review it. But it doesn't require them to come in before their building permit with that. Because right now you have to come in, get your site plan review and then do your building permit. So, this is basically shrinking the timeframe by a month or more.

Shrinking the timeframe but disallowing the public any input.

Correct. There is not going to be public notification. Just like for the single house today, we don't notify the neighbors that you're going to come in and put-

No, correct. But the multifamily house is way different from a single family house. But the neighborhood's public would not be informed. It will not go through a public hearing. I'm just stating that over and over because I think people need to realize that. Was there significant changes in article 25 to the parking? I didn't actually read the text, but was there a decrease in parking requirements for the higher densities?

There is some changes there. I did summarize those in the staff report that I sent out. It might be a little easier just to look at that, at least to start out with. That's on page six of the staff report, minimum parking requirements. So the parking ratios currently set minimum off-street parking based on the number of bedrooms. The proposed code includes ratios for middle housing at one space per unit. So the bedroom ratios, they are
retained but there's some simplifications there. We can talk about that if we want to go into that. But basically, it does set middle housing at one space per unit.

Per unit. But when you are talking about middle housing, you're saying that a duplex, which is basically two ...

That's two.

... but it's considered as one unit in parking calcs now, right?

No. Well, for parking counts, that's still going to be considered two spaces because there's two units there.

Okay. I misunderstood because you made a comment earlier saying that duplexes were now considered a single family unit. So, it'd be one unit.

Yeah. Thank you for that. From a density standpoint, they're considered one.

Okay. But not from a parking?

But not from a parking. Yeah.

Okay. We don't want to cripple our town with over exuberate parking since we already have a problem with that. Okay. I think that's all the questions I had at this point. Thank you.

Commissioner Coulter.

This is just a curiosity question. It doesn't have any bearing on how we make our decision so you can ask why I'm discussing it. But it's more of a curiosity. Isn't it, I want to say Bend, that's pushing back on this legislation? I'm not sure if there is a court case in place. It makes me wonder if there's going to be down the road more changes or we go backwards a little bit again. I don't know if you've heard anything about that or not.

I have not.

I read about it. I don't know how factual it was. It was one article. I think it was Bend that was doing some pushback. It was to the point, Commissioner Scherf was bringing up that this will not allow public to have a lot of the input it does today. So just curious.

No, I'm sorry. I don't know what that is.

You haven't heard anything then-

I haven't.

... from the state level? Okay. Thanks.

I might just add that there's a curate report that I get that's put together by the Oregon Association of Realtors and their lobbyists and so forth. They do put out what each
governing body is working on every week or whatever. And that is something that was, I think the Bend ... I can't remember if it was even Sisters or city councils. Because the legislative body has literally crammed this down every community's throats, defining the 25,000 as large cities. So basically you have to do it. I mean, it just doesn't matter. The thing he's pointed out, Commissioner Scherf, about the density and the impacts and whatnot, it just doesn't matter because they're addressing this one ball. So there may be a legislative adjustment if a court case is brought to bear, but not to my knowledge has it happened yet. But it has been brought up in several of the different ... not just Bend, in several of the communities that were thrown into this designation of a large city. So, if that helps, it's being discussed elsewhere but that is one of the areas.

So, before I forget, I had a question dovetailing Commissioner Scherf's digging into this and Commissioner Scherf, thank you for that. Appreciate it. So the model code has been written, at least the Oregon legislature has adopted it. Does the model code include this decrease of public input that Commissioner Scherf noted?

It does.

And if this Commission and Council does not make a decision by June 30th, we're going to be using that model code regardless?

Correct.

Depending on a how these court cases might play out, et cetera, et cetera. Commissioner Aviles, do you have anything?

I don't. Thank you.

Anyone else have questions? Commissioner Nelson?

A follow-up on the discussion on the parking on page 346. I was confused just by this so I just wanted ... maybe it's the language that we have here. It says multi-dwellings, studio and one-bedroom dwelling unit is one space per dwelling unit. Two-bedroom dwelling units ... so now you got plural. I'm thinking, two bedrooms are allowed one and a half spaces. Is that correct?

They're not allowed. They were mandatory.

Okay. So two bedroom, you're not talking ... before you said the dwelling unit, like a duplex, one dwelling unit, two dwelling units. Now this says two bedroom. Is it two bedrooms? Is each one a dwelling unit?

No, you're in section F.

That's what it reads to me.

Yeah. I can see where you're going with that. Section F is titled multi-dwellings, which by definition is five or more in a single structure.
Okay, so that's confusing with the bedroom thing going on there. I'm thinking my house, I've got about 12 spaces I can have outside now.

But that's a typical definition when you're talking about multi-housing. It basically is, they do try to work the density as occupancy on a number of bedrooms. So it's different when you're talking about a single family house. They don't really-

I would agree with you if it just said three or more bedroom in a dwelling unit.

Yeah. Well, I think they put units as plural to work with a triplex. Because you have one building but you have three units inside of it. Then if one unit is a two bedroom, one unit is a three bedroom and so forth ... it's familiar code to me because I deal with it every single day. But I think that's my explanation why they use the word plural.

Okay. I was just getting clarification.

It really is, you come in probably when you have 20 or more. So a lot of times in those larger complexes, you'll have say five one-bedroom units, 10 two-bedroom units and five three bedroom units, all in one apartment complex. So if you break it down that way, that apartment complex of 20 units, say five of them are one bedroom. So they're going to be calculated at one parking space for those, if they only have one bedroom. But if they have two bedrooms, then you're going to have to provide one-and-a-half spaces for those. So, you're going to just add all these up, and then you're going to get to the total number of required parking spaces.

So, explain the single family.

Up above?

Yeah. Three or more bedroom dwelling units. Now, isn't the single family a dwelling unit?

That's a good point. That actually probably should be changed to just say two or fewer bedrooms, and strike dwelling units. Yeah, yeah.

Yeah, because dwelling units is more or less terminology with the multifamily stuff.

Right. Yeah, that's actually a good catch.

I can't put in more parking out on the street?

Commissioner Scherf, you wanted to say something else?

Yeah, I had made some notes and I missed something. In Article 18, which is basically, Article 18 deals with PUDs, Planned Unit Development, planned community developments. You said they removed the whole cottage development, was removed from that. So basically, I'm just trying to clarify in my mind, so that takes it as ... so if somebody comes to you guys with a cottage-style development, it doesn't have to go through that planned community development, it's just going to go through just a single-family house?
Right.

It's more of a clarification question.

Exactly.

Okay, okay. So cottage developments, they don't have a specific section in the code? Basically, it's just going to be considered a single-family?

No, there is a section, and it's now in Article 22.

Oh, okay, okay, okay. Okay, I missed that.

There are standards for them.

Yeah, because then, there's going to be spacing and density. Okay, okay.

Yeah, yeah. And a lot of that's the same that you saw in there, we just moved it. But no, they're specific. Open space, distance from your parking to the unit, because a lot of times, you don't have parking in those cottages right in front of your unit. You have to walk to a common parking space, yeah.

Okay, perfect. I'll end it up with one statement here. I do understand that if this code that you guys have worked hard to modify and update is not accepted at a certain date, then the state standard code would be in place. You did make a statement until we had got our code in place, so is there still a secondary time period if we had to hash out some extra details, that if we got this code approved and happy with everybody, say July 1st, we could default back to ours? Or is, once we take on the state standard, then there's no way back? You made a statement in there that we could, so I just want to make sure-

Yeah, no, and my understanding, and I didn't get Augustus, the city attorney, to confirm this for me, but my understanding is that if we don't have ours in place, July 1, the model code from the state is going to kick in. But then if we get ours in place on August 1st, then it reverts back.

Okay, okay. So it's not a solid door that's going to close. We still have to get our ducks in a row and stuff like that?

Yeah.

Okay. With that, I'll end with a statement. The state has put a model code. The state has regulated that we, as a mid-size larger city, has to modify and adopt the premise of their code, and modify our code. The statement I want to say again is, modify our code. So we still have the latitude to make this as prevalent to our local community as we possibly can. I just wanted y'all to keep that in mind, and tonight, I'm not ready to vote on this, so whenever ready, I would actually motion to continue this, because there's a lot more reading, I have to do.

Well, I will call on you for a motion when we get there. Thanks, and thanks again for digging into this. You've given me faith in myself. When you started talking, I thought in
my head, "I bet he’s going to go to the public facilities portion of this," and you went right to it, because you enlightened me to that concern several months ago here when we were deliberating something else, and that was my first thought, that the housing is going to get way out in front of our public facilities really fast.

So along with that, and what Commissioner Scherf was just talking about, I know sometimes, we Commissioners don't always hear this, but sometimes, you get direction from Council, and that direction is, make sure the Planning Commission does A, B and C. Have you heard such a thing regarding this code modification? Are they expecting something from us tonight?

No, we have not had this conversation at the Council, other than an update from the consultants several months ago, where the consultants were at a Council Workshop, and we gave a high-level overview of this material, and it was just, they understood it's going to go through the Commission. But there is no direction, and there's been no recent conversations at the Council level about that.

Okay, and the only thing that Augustus has told you is that August 1st, we'd better have something if we want it, or we're stuck with the model code for quite some time.

Well, no, no. That was just me throwing out a date tonight. He did not say August 1st. The question that Commissioner Scherf asked was, if we don't have it adopted here at Grant Pass by July 1, or June 30 actually, are we stuck? That's what I [inaudible 01:36:06]. Are we stuck with the model code forever? And my answer to that was, no, I don't think we are. If we come back and we amend ours, then-

We can drop the model code.

Okay.

Yeah, I was just trying to get clarification that we're not under adverse stress to-

We don't need to continue this.

Second-guess ourselves and do something that we're not comfortable with.

Right, and meet again tomorrow night. I get you.

We can brewery, though.

May I ask a question?

Sure, just let me make one more statement. Are you guys all aware that we have a new city attorney? Because I don't know [inaudible 01:36:42]. Okay, sorry about that. Yes, ma'am, go right ahead.

If we do not have our own in place by June 30th, we have put through all of this work and whatever for this proposed code, ours isn't supplanted temporarily, perhaps, by
something already written, which is a heck of a lot of work. It just doesn't pop into our codes overnight. So I would suggest that we get on it, because I personally am not going to be putting ... I know we have to get this done. We've had some great recommendations here. We do need to read what's given us to read, and give the information that we've been given some due diligence, but if we allow the state's model code to go into effect, we then have to reverse it or amend our code, reverse that. It's not just as simple as just, "Oh, let's just push it aside," so do keep that in mind. It's a lot of work that has to happen, because that code needs to be in place on July 1st. So I'd love to be someone working for the city [inaudible 01:38:02]. Anyway, just saying.

Thank you very much. Commissioner Arthur?

I have a couple dozen items that I found going through this, because I haven't gone through page by page in a long time, through those development code sections. There's only one that concerned me, that has to do with the middle housing. We used to keep, we meaning you guys, used to keep a running list of things that we ran across that need to be fixed somewhere in the thing, like a definition that sends you to a section that isn't there, that kind of thing, and several other issues having to do with not having enough office classifications to handle the big problem with the call center, crowding and parking, that kind of thing.

But this one, the only one that really affected this was what was happening with the general commercial zone, because if I understand how, you've said it in here in the report, we not only will now be stuck with having single-family house in the general commercial zone, but all of the others too, and we've had a many-year goal of not using general commercial land for residential purposes. We got caught on that subdivision behind Albertson's, the Allen Creek area there, where that whole acreage was turned into houses that had been designated for general commercial, and general commercial was pretty scarce the farther out you go.

And I thought that somebody somewhere was making some effort to no longer allow new residential in general commercial, except maybe the vertical housing or something like that, with the mixed use, with apartments above businesses, or something like that. And I guess that's my one concern here, is that we've expanded the access to use up general commercial land for housing. Am I wrong in that? That's correct in that?

You are not correct in the sense that, the city did adopt a code change that prohibited single dwellings and duplexes in the general commercial, that you recommended approval in-

Yeah, because I thought-

In August of last year, and the Council approved it in October of last year?

Where does the show in the code, then?

It's possible that ... So here, the screen that I've got up here, the slide that I'm showing right now, if you look at the general commercial column here, and then you look at the detached single dwelling, it's a dash, which means that it's not allowed. So of the packet, this is going to be 182. 182.
Oh, okay. Yeah, so if you look at, was that the fourth or fifth row down, number one, detached single-family? And you go across to general commercial. It used to be allowed, as you pointed out, Commissioner. You used to be able to do the single-family housing in the general commercial, but this is showing that it's prohibited now.

Yeah, we changed that.

So, you changed that a while ago, yeah. And then the same thing with duplex, if you go down to number four, which used to be number six, about halfway down the page, it's duplex. And you go over, and so you see that in the GC, there's a dash.

Okay, so in your report on that, it said it was adopted in 2021, now prohibits new single-family detached duplexes and manufactured homes in the GC zone, in order to preserve commercial zone. However, for all single-family detached dwellings that were built in the GC zone prior to that, they will be subject to the terms of this middle housing code update and will be allowed to construct the five additional housing types permitted.

Right, and that's kind of an interpretation, to be honest with you. I think that it would be difficult to argue the other way, but you certainly could, as a Commission, if you want to go down that road. All I'm saying there is, we have all these single-family subdivisions that are in the general commercial zone today. There's hundreds, hundreds of units, and that's just saying that we're basically treating them as though they are zoned residential, because they were permitted, at one point, to be allowed.

And now, even though we changed our code in October to say that we're not allowing any new single units or duplexes in the general commercial, we still have hundreds that are there today from before October of '21. So what do you do with all those? If you were to say they can't come through and be allowed duplexes, then it seems to go against the intent of this legislation.

If you go on down the column there, on the general commercial one, what is that telling us? I don't know what all of those abbreviations mean. [inaudible 01:44:40].

The S, are you talking about ... I've got [crosstalk 01:44:45], the S is a secondary use.

Yeah, the PIA and [CNS 01:44:50], I see.

Yeah, that's just saying that you can do an accessory dwelling unit as a secondary use in the general commercial zone if you already have a single-family house there. If you keep going down, the P1C, that's the townhouse line, the townhouse row. So that's saying that townhouses are permitted in the general commercial.

Okay.

Commissioner Aviles, do you have anything for us?

No, I'm good. Thank you for asking.
Ma’am, you’ve been sitting here a long time, very patient. Is there something that you want to address? Go on up to the podium right there, give us your name and address, please, and go right ahead.

[inaudible 01:45:46].

Clint, could you help her with the-

[crosstalk 01:45:50].

Is it on?

To the right, to the right.

[inaudible 01:45:57].

Okay. So I am ... That’s fine.

You’re good?

I’m fine.

Okay, just trying to help.

Thank you, sir.

My name is Julia [Ryden 01:46:10]. I lived in this town for 27 years. Recently moved over to Central Point because I needed to be nearer my daughter. So my current address is 5646 [Gebhard 01:46:25] Road in Central Point. I would like to be added to the developer list that you notify, and my comment here, I serve on the board of Southern Oregon Rental Owners Association, and we have been watching the legislature get more and more eager to provide more housing, and less and less accommodating to people who are trying to build that housing, by making these very large, general plans.

So, I am very excited that you guys are working on doing it specifically for Grants Pass, because I think Grants Pass is a lovely town. I own property here still, and I would like you guys to continue to keep it being a lovely town. That means that’s kind of against my own interest, because I do have some vacant land that I would like to develop. It’s very hard to develop and pay for it under your current zoning rules the way they are. I’ve already had Gerlitz Engineering draw up a preliminary idea of what I can do under the current rules. So, I was willing to go ahead with it and take the risk, but this makes it easier for me if you change these rules.

But I would like to say that in Planning, I would like to see you take into account future types of things. For example, geothermal ground heat, heat pumps, electric charging stations at ... If I put in multi-unit on my little piece of land, I think that requiring the owner to at least allow for charging stations for those tenants is a good idea, and to make that somewhat a part of the planning. So that was my thoughts as I listen to what you guys have to say. I’m very pleased to be here and hear what you have to say, and we have a
board meeting tomorrow, so I'm taking all this to the board meeting at SOROA, so thank you very much.

Thank you for waiting and being so patient. We appreciate that.

Ma'am, did you add your email to the list? I'm sorry, I'm over here.

[inaudible 01:50:04].

Okay. We'll get you on.

So, at this point, we need a motion.

[inaudible 01:50:17]. Yeah, I-

Commissioner Scherf, go right ahead.

Please acknowledge me. Be like my kid. Okay, I'd like to make a motion for continuance on this. I definitely need some more time to digest, and I have a couple areas that I would like to recommend changes. I would like to work on my wording, so I make a motion for continuance of this.

To a date certain.

To a date certain. Do we got to pick a date certain here? Okay, and you were alluding to, it's probably going to be a special meeting?

Well, I was, but I ...

Do we have the latitude to do this on our next ...

I was just looking at that. I think you could, so you're two weeks out. So, if that's your next one, is two weeks-

27th.

27th, yeah.

Okay, we have a motion to continue until the 27th, leave the hearing open until then. Commissioner Nelson, go right ahead.

I think it's an important issue that we're working on, and I may be out of town, so if I have concerns or questions, could I submit that?

Yeah, yeah. As Commissioner Coulter said, you can. You can send it to me, and I can send it around to all the others.

You can also attend remotely.

I'll be on vacation.
So, do we have a second to Commissioner Scherf's motion?

I'll second it, Collier.

Collier seconds. All right, we'll take a roll call vote. Commissioner Nelson?

Aye.

Commissioner Aviles?

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Sure.

Vice-Chair Collier?

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf?

Yes.

Commissioner Coulter?

Yes.

And I'm voting yes also. Item is continued.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Scherf moved, and Vice Chair Collier seconded the motion to leave the hearing open for the Middle Housing Code Text Amendment until the April 27th meeting. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Coulter, Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss, Scherf, and Arthur. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

Thank you again for coming, ma'am. That was very nice of you to wait for us to ... We're kind of long-winded up here sometimes. We appreciate that. Thank you.

8. Matters from Commission Members and Staff: a. Allenwood Surplus Property Discussion. Item 8A, Matters from Commission Members and Staff, Allenwood surplus property discussion. So that item, I just wanted to make you aware, there's about a nine-acre parcel that's on Williams Highway. It's not quite to the big curve before you get to the golf course on the left.
Before that, but not much before that, on the right side, the city has a surplus piece of property there. It's about nine acres, and that's one of the pieces that the Council is considering for opening up as an RFP for some other type of development, rather than just holding onto it as parkland, which it was secured originally as parkland.

There's about a acre and a half to two acres of wetlands on that nine acres, that most likely would not be included in a future sale. But in terms of potential use for that and how that moves ahead, the Council's going to be talking about that in about a week and a half, two weeks. If you have any concerns, ideas, suggestions that you want to pass on to Council for their workshop, in terms of as they're talking about that surplus property and whether or not it's wise to let it go, you prefer not to let it go, you want to see some other type of use on there.

Right now, I think it's ... I should've brought that. I think it's R-1-8. It's lower-density area, and there's really not much high-density out that way at all. You might just retain the zoning, bump it up. If you rezoned it, you're going to [inaudible 01:54:39] to spot zone, so I don't think that's probably going to happen. But anyway, I wanted the Commission to be aware that that discussion is ongoing, and you can either send them directly to councilmayor@grantspassoregon.gov, or you can send it to me, and I can get it to them.

Thank you very much. Commissioner Aviles, do you have anything for us?

No, I don't. Thank you.

Thank you for attending remotely. We appreciate that. Anyone else have anything they want to say to the Commission?

I'd like the address, or tax lot, or whatever, of the property you're referring to, because I can somewhat envision it.

Okay, thank you. Yep, let me send that out to everybody.

So that piece of property that he's talking about was actually discussed when I was in Council many, many, many, many years ago, and that was one of the bucket lists to get out to the public. It does have challenges because of the wetland, but you're talking about separating that out, but then it has challenges on access to it, because you cannot access it from Williams Highway. You have to access it back off Allenwood, right? And then there's-

I think that's true, but I-

There'd be some traffic impact that might be a little hairy on that aspect too, but it's a beautiful piece of property that would be great for medium-to-higher density.

Is that the green space off Williams Highway, basically?

Yep.

That's the one they're thinking of?
Yeah, when you neck down to two lanes, and then you go into that little bit of a dip, and you look off to the right, it's that whole big ... And it actually wraps around behind those three developments, or three single-family houses when you go back up the hill. It's a big piece of property. The bottom belly of it is the wetlands, but it does have challenges on getting into it, because the access road would have some significant traffic impact if we put a more medium-to-high density in there, but it's a great place to be developed.

Maybe a-

And there's no option of retaining it as parkland?

Well, it's certainly an option.

Since that was what it was purchased for.

It was, yeah.

What a strange thought. Yeah, okay.

Maybe a good place for a racino. Too early?

Very funny [inaudible 01:56:54].

Anyone else? Anyone else have anything?

Anything else we can do to kill employment in this area, let's do it. No, that area is quite gorgeous, and I'd like to take further look at that, because I live out in that area. And the traffic, and the school, all of it, with everything that we're talking about, of course, there's going to be ramifications, and not going to be so easy to get around anymore, and it isn't easy now. And we are a small town, even though we've been designated as a larger town, so growth is necessary, well-planned growth is essential, so there's my little, whatever.

That's why we're here, to manage growth, efficient growth. Yes, sir, Commissioner Nelson?

Just a point of business here is that, the speaking was Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, which she was in attendance, that you didn't mention that she'd come in.

Oh, thank you very much. Yes, Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss was just three or four minutes late. She was here in attendance for this meeting. We had every member here, right, with Commissioner Aviles attending remotely?
[inaudible 01:58:15].

Good job, Commissioners. Appreciate your time. Meeting adjourned.

Thanks, [inaudible 01:58:20].

____________________________________________________________________

Eric Heesacker, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commissioner

____________________________________________________________________

Date
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 approaches from Union Avenue, (one (1) one-way entry on the eastern side of the parcel and a two-way exit on the western side of the parcel). 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. 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.

A. PROCEDURE:

I. An application for a Subdivision Tentative Plan was submitted on February 14, 2022, and deemed complete on February 16, 2022 following the submittal of a Major Variance. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.050 of the Development Code.

II. Public notice of the March 23, 2022, hearing was mailed on March 2, 2022, in accordance with Section 2.053 of the Development Code.

III. A public hearing was held on March 23, 2022, and the Planning Commission voted unanimously to deny the Major Variance request and continue the Subdivision Tentative Plan to a time and date certain. The continued hearing for the Subdivision Tentative Plan was held on April 13, 2022, at which time the applicant presented a revised variance request for the Planning Commission to consider. The Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve the revised Major Variance request and the Subdivision Tentative Plan.

B. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

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

II. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on March 23, 2022 and April 13, 2022, attached as Exhibit “B”, summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.

III. The PowerPoint given by staff is attached as Exhibit “C”.

201-00417-22 & 301-00149-22~ Major SPR/Major Variance
Rogue Credit Union ~ Union Avenue ~ Type III UAPC ~ Findings of Fact
IV. Due to revisions requested by the applicant, the original staff report was revised which is attached as Exhibit D and incorporated herein.

C. GENERAL FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

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)
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.

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. After reviewing the Public Works conditions to widen the sidewalk configuration along Union Avenue, the applicant has chosen to retain the existing 5-foot sidewalk configuration. As no modifications are proposed to the Union Avenue public right-of-way, the nonconforming sidewalk width can remain in place.

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. FINDINGS IN 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.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The applicant has submitted a revised site plan proposing a new scenario for the UAPC to consider. 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 has revised the two-access proposal to now be a one-way access on the eastern side of the parcel as well as a two-way exit on the west side of the parcel with separate left and right turn lanes. 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 has since provided a new site plan with a modified proposal for the two accesses off Union. The applicant’s Traffic Engineer, Kelly Sandow, has reviewed the scenario and provided comment. Both Staff and Public Works have reviewed the revised access proposal and recommend approval of the request.

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. The applicant’s Traffic Engineer, Kelly Sandow, has reviewed the revised two access proposal and has commented that, “The proposed access revision to enter in only for the east access and exit only for the west access operates safely and efficiently as proposed.”
(2) The variance is the minimum necessary to address the special or unique physical circumstances related to the subject site.

**Planning Commission 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.

**Planning Commission Response: Satisfied.** The request satisfies criterion 3 as the applicant has revised their access proposal based on the concerns presented by the UAPC and has provided additional comment from their Traffic Engineer, Kelly Sandow, on the safety and efficiency of the proposal.

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.
- The applicant’s Traffic Engineer, Kelly Sandow, has reviewed the revised two access proposal and has commented that, “The proposed access revision to enter in only for the east access and exit only for the west access operates safely and efficiently as proposed.”

(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.

**Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.


Planning Commission 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 proposed 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 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 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 Building 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 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.

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.

Planning Commission 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). The applicant has submitted a revised floor plan indicating the portions of the square footage of the proposed building which meet the exemptions provided for under Section 25.035(1), reducing the requirement to one (1) Type 1 Bicycle Parking space as indicated on the applicant's site plan.

**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 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, 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. 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 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.

**Planning Commission 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 shall conform to the decision made by the UAPC in regard to access off Union Avenue, indicate the approved access on a revised site plan, and shall construct the approved approach to meet the width standards of Schedule 27-3.**

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

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

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

**Planning Commission Response:** **Satisfied.** 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 shall conform to the decision made by the UAPC in regard to access off Union Avenue, indicate the approved access on a revised site plan, and shall construct the approved approach to meet the width standards of Schedule 27-3.**

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

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

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

**Planning Commission 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.
Planning Commission 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.

Planning Commission 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.

VI. DECISION AND SUMMARY:

- The Urban Area Planning Commission APPROVED the request for the Major Variance Request for two (2) one-way entries/exits off Union Avenue. The vote was 8-0 with Commissioners Heesacker, Nelson, Aviles, Arthur, Tokarz-Krauss, Collier, Scherf, and Coulter voting in favor. None were absent.
- The Urban Area Planning Commission APPROVED the request for the twenty-five (25) lot Subdivision with the conditions below. The vote was 8-0 with Commissioners Heesacker, Nelson, Aviles, Arthur, Tokarz-Krauss, Collier, Scherf, and Coulter voting in favor. None were absent.

Conditions of Approval:

I. 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.
   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 one (1) Type 1 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. 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.
8. Meet all applicable Public Safety requirements, 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. The applicant shall conform to the decision made by the UAPC in regard to access off Union Avenue, indicate the approved access on a revised site plan, and shall construct the approved approach to meet the width standards of Schedule 27-3.

II. 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.

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.

3. 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 Building Permit.

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) Type 1 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, as well as all City bills due.

16. Upon development of the adjacent parcel to the West of the subject property, the applicant shall obtain a cross access agreement with Tax Lot 1600 that provides for shared vehicular access across both parcels to Union Ave. This condition must be recorded in the form of a deed restriction against the subject parcel prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

VII. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this 27th day of April, 2022.

________________________________________________
Eric Heesacker, Chair
I. PROPOSAL:

The applicant proposes the division of Tax Lots 521 and 600 into 25 separate lots (Tentative Subdivision) ranging in size from 7,269 sq.ft. to 15,848 sq.ft. with one parcel as large as 69,224 sq. ft. as seen in Exhibit 3. The proposed subdivision will be served off of SE Allenwood and SE Coach Drive and includes the creation of Flicker Drive, Greyhawk Drive (both proposed as local access streets), and Redtail Hawk Lane (private street). The applicant proposes to extend SE Coach Drive north through the property and stubbed to the property to the north. Half street improvements of Greyhawk Drive to City Standards will also be part of the development.

The applicant is proposing the subdivision to be completed in two phases. Phase one proposes to complete lots 1-10 with the partial extension of SE Coach Drive and Flicker Drive. Phase two proposes to complete lots 11-25, complete the extension of Flicker Drive, construct Greyhawk Drive and Redtail Hawk Ln, and continue the extension of SE Coach Drive to stub to the north property line.

A 13,645 square foot lot in the northwest corner is proposed as tract ‘A’ (unbuildable) to accommodate storm water detention.

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

III. CRITERIA:

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

IV. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Section 10.050, City of Grants Pass Development Code, provides for an appeal of the Urban Area Planning Commission’s decision to the City Council. An appeal application, statement of grounds, and fee must be submitted within twelve (12) calendar days of the Urban Area Planning Commission’s written decision.

V. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

A. Characteristics of the Property:

1. Land Use Designation:
   a. Comprehensive Plan: Low Density Residential
   b. Zoning District: Residential, R-1-8
   c. Special Purpose District: Steep Slope, GPID

2. Size:
   TL 521: 1.29 acres
   TL 600: 7.05 acres

3. Frontage & Access:
   TL 521: SE Allenwood Drive (Local Street)
   TL 600: SE Coach Drive (Local Collector Street)

4. Public Utilities:
   a. Existing Utilities:
      i. Water: 8” main in Allenwood Drive
              12” main in Coach Drive
      ii. Sewer: 8” main in Allenwood Drive
                8” main in Coach Drive
      iii. Storm: 12” main in Coach Drive
                12-inch main in Allenwood Drive
5. Topography: Steep Slope (15-25%)

6. Natural Hazards: None noted

7. Natural Resources: None identified

8. Existing Land Use:
   a. Subject Parcel(s): Both parcels are partially developed with a residential home and several outbuildings.
   b. Surrounding: North: Residential
                      East: Residential
                      South: Residential
                      West: Residential

B. Background:

The application is to request approval for a 25-lot residential Subdivision. The proposed development consists of two parcels 1.29 acres (TL 521) and 7.05 acres (TL 600) located in the R-1-8 zoning district. The lots range in size from 7,269 – 69,224 square feet.

The developer is proposing to split the subdivision into two project phases. Phase I will consist of Lots 1-10, partial extension of Coach Drive, partial construction of SE Flicker Drive, and frontage improvements along Allenwood Drive. Phase II will include Lots 11-25, further extension of Coach Drive to stub out along the adjacent northern property, construction of the proposed private street (Redtail Hawk Ln), construction of SE Greyhawk Drive, and completion of SE Flicker Drive.

The proposed name for the Subdivision is “Leson Subdivision.” The applicant has approval from Josephine County for the proposed subdivision name (Exhibit 7). Tax Lot 521 has frontage along Allenwood Drive which is classified as a Local Street. Tax Lot 600 has frontage along SE Coach Drive which is classified as a Local Collector. SE Coach Drive is currently stubbed to the frontage of Tax Lot 600. As part of the applicant’s submitted Tentative Site Plan, the future development plan indicates the extension of SE Coach Drive where it would connect to the platted SE Coach Drive further north of the proposed development (Exhibit 4).

The subject property is part of an Advance Finance District (#04-50000047). However, the AFD has expired and no payment is due. The subject property is also part of a Deferred Development Agreement (#04-5000004) for street improvements on Coach Drive for a distance of approximately 20 feet. Improvements to Coach Drive would be required at the time of development.

The proposed use matches code 210 (Detached Single-Family Homes) in the Institute of Transportation of Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual. The new proposed twenty-five
(25) units are not expected to generate more than 500 Average Daily Trips or 25 P.M. Peak Hour Trips, therefore a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) is not required.

The applicant submitted a narrative addressing the Subdivision criteria (Exhibit 6).

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 two phases of development with an unspecified timeline for completion.

VI. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

A. SUBDIVISION

Section 17.413 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code states that the review body shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the request based upon the following criteria:

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. All lots meet the minimum width and lot size requirements of the R-1-8 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 no proposed through lots (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. The tentative plan appears to meet the minimum curb radius but this will be verified at the time of Final Plat.

There are two flag lots proposed as part of this development (Lots 1 and 6). The applicant contends that existing street patterns and the existing location of homes on the property have required some flag lots to be proposed in order to efficiently layout proposed building lots within the constraints of the property lines. Flag lots are subject to the requirements of Section 17.520.

Portions of the proposed lots are in the Steep Slope Hazard Area. Section 13.100 of the GPDC will apply to development of the lots located in those portions of Steep Slope
Hazard Area. In accordance with Section 13.121 a steep slope development report is due at the time of land use application. The applicant did not provide a steep slope development at the time of their submittal. As a condition of approval, a steep slope development report covering any lots located within the Steep Slope Hazard Area will be required prior to the issuance of a Development Permit for the subdivision.

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. 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-1-8 zone, it would need to be at least 14,000 sf in size. The largest proposed lot is 69,224 sf (Lot 17) with another lot as large as 15,848 sf (Lot 6), so a future development plan is required.

The applicant has submitted a future development plan and contends that while Lots 6 and 17 are large enough to be subdivided in the future, they contain existing structures with the structure size, location, and topography of each lot preventing large scale future development. Per the Director’s discretion, staff accepts that Lot 6 cannot be further divided due to the shape of the lot and the existing structure located on it. However, staff will require a future development plan for Lot 17 as the lot is over eight times the size of the minimum lot size required by the R-1-8 zone. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a future development plan for Lot 17 that meets the requirements of Section 17.542.

A future street plan is required with a tentative subdivision plan when the future development plan would affect the creation of streets on properties adjacent to the property being planned, other than streets already planned on the Street Plan. The applicant proposes the future extension of SE Coach Drive to connect to the platted SE Coach Drive further north of the proposed development. The applicant has also indicated the extension of the newly proposed Flicker Drive to connect to Erin Drive, therefore a future street plan is required.

The applicant has not provided a future street plan as part of their submittal. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall provide a future street plan that meets the requirements of Section 17.552. Said future street plan must meet dimensions of SE Coach Drive to verify the right-of-way widths on the Leson parcel and the adjacent parcel align.

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with Conditions. Section 27.051 requires new development to conform with and provide for the extension and construction of streets in
conformance with Article 27. As a condition of approval, all conditions in the Public Works Staff report regarding public street improvements (see Exhibit 9) shall be met.

The development proposes two new streets (Flicker Drive and Greyhawk Drive) to be City Local Streets. Both streets shall be constructed to meet all standards found in Article 27. As a condition of approval, all conditions in the Public Works Staff report regarding public street improvements (see Exhibit 9) shall be met.

The tentative plan proposes Greyhawk Drive as a half street. In conformance with Section 27.121(8), half streets, while generally not acceptable, may be approved where reasonably essential to the development, when in conformity with the other requirements of these standards, and when it will be practical to require the dedication of the other half street when the adjoining property is developed. Whenever an existing half street is adjacent to land to be developed, the remaining half of the street shall be dedicated either by Final Plat or through deed acceptance and shall be developed in compliance with the standards of this Code. It is indicated on Sheet T2 of the applicant’s tentative plan that the street cross section for Coach Drive, “Road A, B, and C” intends to utilize a five (5) foot sidewalk and five (5) foot planter strip. The applicant has not provided a legend for which streets on the tentative plan Road A, B, or C refer to. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan that clearly labels which roads Road A, B, and C are referencing. In addition, per the Public Works Staff report, Coach Drive will require a five (5) foot sidewalk with seven and a half (7.5) foot planter strips; Flicker Drive and Greyhawk Drive will require five (5) foot sidewalks with five and a half (5.5) foot planter strips. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall conform with all requirements outlined in the Public Works Staff report and provide a revised site plan indicating the required sidewalk and planter strip configurations.

The proposed Tentative Subdivision plan also proposes to create a private street, Redtail Hawk Lane. The private street is proposed to serve Lots 13-16 and is approximately 300 feet in length. In recognition of Section 27.122(3), the applicant proposes to construct Redtail Hawk Lane as a dead-end street. Dead-end streets shall be limited unless impractical due to constraints outlined in Section 27.122(5). As the area where the private street is proposed is in the Steep Slope Hazard Area, the applicant meets the constraints in Section 27.122(5). In steep slope areas, a cul-de-sac or dead-end street may not exceed 400 feet in length. The applicant’s submitted site plan indicates this requirement is met.

Per Section 27.123(12)(a), private streets serving four dwelling units or less may use a minimum 20-foot street with no curbs, planter strips, or sidewalks required. The Tentative Plan complies with these standards as the number of lots proposed to take access off of the private street does not exceed four. Note that future development will not allow more than four dwelling units to take access off of the private street. The proposed tentative plan shows Redtail Hawk Lane abutting Lot 17. In conformance with Section 27.123(14), in those cases where a proposed street abuts a developed neighboring residential property, the street itself shall be kept a minimum of 5-feet from the abutting property line. As a condition of approval, all conditions in the Public Works Staff report regarding street improvements (see Exhibit 9) shall be met.

The majority of Tax Lot 600 is in the Steep Slope Hazard Area. Per Section 27.123(11), there are separate standards for streets within the Steep Slope Hazard Area. In addition,
in accordance with Section 27.121(11)(d), driveways in the steep slope hazard area must not exceed 18%. For driveways longer than 50 feet, the transition between the street and driveway must allow a City Fire truck to enter the driveway without contacting the undercarriage.

The applicant has indicated an existing gravel driveway located on Tax Lot 521 that spans across Lots 1, 2, and 4 on the Tentative Subdivision Plan. There is an additional driveway configuration spanning across Tax Lot 600 that provides access to the existing residence. It is unclear on Sheet T2 of the applicant’s tentative plan whether either of the existing driveways will be utilized as part of the development, abandoned, or relocated. If the applicant desires to keep the existing driveways as part of the proposed development, then as a condition of approval, the applicant shall provide a shared access agreement for the driveway on Tax Lot 521 with Lots 1, 2, and 4. The driveway configuration spanning across Tax Lot 600 will need to be abandoned or relocated as it does not meet the driveway separation standards outlined for Private Streets in a Director’s Interpretation from June 23, 2017. In accordance with Section 25.033(3), all parking, driveways, and maneuvering of vehicles shall have durable and dustless surfaces composed of one of the following:

a. Asphalt
b. Concrete
c. Pervious surfacing materials such as concrete, grasscrete, or paved tire strips

It is indicated on the applicant’s site plan that the existing driveways are composed of gravel. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall either pave the existing driveways in conformance with the standards outlined in Section 25.033(3) or provide a revised site plan that indicates the driveways will be abandoned.

As conditioned below, all conditions outlined in the Public Safety Staff report shall be met (Exhibit 8).

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

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

The proposed utility plan will provide utility service to all of the lots within the proposed development. Public water and sewer already exist within the Coach Drive stub and Allenwood Drive. The applicant proposes to extend the existing utilities in the Coach Drive stub as well as provide extensions for the proposed Flicker and Greyhawk Drives.

The applicant proposes an 8-inch sanitary sewer main to be located in a 20-foot wide public, unobstructed, and drivable easement centered on the sewer main within Redtail Hawk Lane. Per the Public Works Staff Report, the applicant shall extend the 20-foot sanitary sewer easement into Lot 16 and manholes shall be installed on all terminating sewer mains that are 200 feet or longer.
The applicant proposes to locate water meters to service Lots 13-16 in the Flicker Drive right-of-way with service lines running to each lot within private easements. The Water Distribution Superintendent has provided comment that Lots 13-16 are located at the top end of the NH2 pressure zone making it likely that the applicant will need to speak with a plumber regarding a booster pump setup for their parcel.

A storm water detention pond is proposed on Tract A of the applicant’s site plan. All stormwater detention areas must be privately maintained.

An existing GPIP irrigation ditch exists on the property and the applicant proposes to pipe the ditch as part of the development. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall contact GPIP to discuss any change to GPIP infrastructure.

As a condition of approval, the applicant shall record all proposed utility easements on the final plat.

A 10-foot City Utility Easement (CUE) is required along all lot frontages. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan indicating the provision of a CUE on all proposed lots.

As a condition of approval, the applicant shall comply with all conditions found in the Public Works Staff Report attached as Exhibit 9.

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

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with Conditions.

The applicant submitted a “tree plan” document included in Exhibit 5 which does not meet all conditions outlined in Sections 11.040 and 11.041. The criteria outlined in Sections 11.040 and 11.041 applies to each lot proposed within the development. The applicant submitted a canopy chart that applies to the overall development and does not provide the required information of number of trees needed per lot nor the percentage of tree canopy to be maintained or re-established per lot. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall submit a revised tree plan which satisfies the criteria outlined in Sections 11.040 and 11.041.

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 25 percent to 30 percent coverage requirement.

As a condition of approval, the applicant shall pay a tree deposit of $500 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.

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

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. The site contains slopes. 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 88% of the proposed lots exceed 80 feet in their north-south dimension the proposed tentative plan meets solar lot design standards.

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

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

As conditioned below, the applicant shall be required to obtain a demolition permit for any structures to be removed.

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 and discuss any proposed changes to GPID infrastructure.

VII. RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission APPROVE the request for the phased Leson Subdivision for a twenty-five (25) lot subdivision with the conditions listed.

**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. Submit four (4) copies of the revised tentative plan to the Community Development Department indicating the following:
   a. A future development plan that meets the requirements of Section 17.452.
   b. A future street plan that meets the requirements of Section 17.552.
   c. A revised tree plan which satisfies the criteria outlined in Sections 11.040 and 11.041.
   d. Relocation or abandonment of the existing driveway configuration on Tax Lot 600.
   e. Paving of the existing gravel driveways or reflect their abandonment.
   f. A 10-foot City Utility Easement on all proposed lots.
   g. Legend on sheet T2 providing reference to what Roads A, B, and C are referring to as well as revised street cross sections that comply with the Public Works Staff report.

2. Provide all requirement submittals and meet standards found in the Public Works Comments and Public Safety Comments (see Exhibits 8 and 9).

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

4. Provide a Steep Slope Development Report that meets the requirements of Section 13.121.

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 and Public Safety Comments (see Exhibits 8 and 9).

2. Pay a tree deposit of $500 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 recorded copies of a shared access agreement with Lots 1, 2, and 4 if the existing gravel driveway is to be utilized.

4. Separate sewer and water services are required for each lot. Private sewer and water lines shall not cross other lots unless a private utility easement is established. The applicant shall create and then provide recorded copies of all private utility easements.

5. 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.
6. 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 25 percent to 30 percent coverage requirement.

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

8. 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).

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

10. 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.

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

12. Pay all engineering inspection fees due.

13. Coordinate with the Streets Department to confirm that all required signage and street lights are installed at the proper locations.

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

15. All water services on existing public water lines shall be installed by the City of Grants Pass Water Distribution Crews. All encroachment fees related to the installation of water services shall be the responsibility of the developer.

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

17. Comply with Grants Pass Irrigation District requirements.

18. Submit a letter from the Responsible Engineer stating that he/she supervised the grading and construction for the entire parcel and individual lots and the grading and construction was completed according to approved plans.

19. 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.
20. After all signatures are obtained, the plat must be recorded with the Josephine County Recorder within 30 days. The subdivider shall file on print of the recorded plat with the 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. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.

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

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

5. Payment of all System Development Charges due; including, but not limited to, water, storm, sewer, parks and transportation (see Exhibit 10).


7. 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.

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

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

10. Driveways shall be in compliance with Section 27.121(11) and cannot exceed 18% grade.

11. Each lot shall have separate utility services.

12. All utilities shall be placed underground.

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

14. Submit lot drainage plans for approval on all building plans.
15. Developed or undeveloped building lots will need to be maintained for weed and grass control throughout the year.

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

17. 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 and Public Safety Comments (see *Exhibits 8 and 9*).

   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 and Public Safety Comments (see *Exhibits 8 and 9*).

   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 $500 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 which displays percent coverage per lot in conformance with the required 25 percent to 30 percent coverage requirement.

   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. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.

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

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

5. Payment of all System Development Charges due; including, but not limited to, water, storm, sewer, parks and transportation (see Exhibit 10).


7. 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.

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

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

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

11. Each lot shall have separate utility services.

12. All utilities shall be placed underground.

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

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

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

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

17. 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%.

VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. Approve the request

   1. as submitted.
   2. with the conditions stated in the staff report.
   3. with the conditions stated in the staff report as modified by the Planning Commission (list):

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

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

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

IX. INDEX TO EXHIBITS:

1. Location Map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Tentative Plan
4. Future Development Plan
5. Tree Revegetation Plan
6. Applicant’s Submitted Narrative
7. Subdivision Plat Name Approval
8. City of Grants Pass Public Safety Comments
9. City of Grants Pass Public Works Comments
10. System Development Charges Brochure
BURDEN OF PROOF
STATEMENT FOR APPLICATION FOR
LESON SUBDIVISION APPROVAL
GRANTS PASS, OREGON

Applicant: Donn & Karen Leson
2881 SE Coach Drive
Grants Pass, OR 97527
Phone: (541) 450-0443

Owner: Same as Applicant

Representatives: Rhine-Cross Group, LLC
112 N 5th Street, Suite 200
PO Box 909
Klamath Falls, OR 97601
Phone: (541) 851-9405

Location: The property is located north of SE Allenwood Drive and east of
Williams Highway on the south side of Grants Pass, OR.

Address: 2881 SE Coach Drive

Reference Parcel No.: Tax Lots 521 & 600 Map # 36-05-31BB

Comp. Plan Designation: Residential

Zoning Designation: R1-8 – Moderate Density Residential

Property Size: ±8.3 Acres

Proposal: Subdivision application for 25 single family residential lots ranging in
size from 7638 sq.ft. to 69,224 sq.ft.

Date: January, 2022

RECEIVED
MAR 18 2022
CITY OF GRANTS PASS
PROJECT OVERVIEW & DESCRIPTION

The applicant intends to develop the site in accordance with Article 12 and 17 of the Grants Pass Municipal Code (GPMC). The development will be named Leson Subdivision, being developed in 2 separate phases. A master plan showing the proposed street layout and the underlying zoning of the proposed development will be provided with the application.

The property is located within the Urban Growth Boundary on the south side of Grants Pass, Oregon. The site is bounded to the south and west by be developed residential property being parts of Cathedral Heights Subdivision including the 1st and 2nd Additions. To the East is larger residentially zoned property outside of the urban growth boundary within the jurisdiction of Josephine County. To the north is undeveloped residential property within the City of Grants Pass. This property will be provided a stub road by extending SE Coach Drive to the property boundary with the planned connection to SE Coach Drive to the north. The site is surrounded by single family development and is therefore irrevocably committed to similar use.

The site enjoys direct access to SE Coach Drive, leading to SE Allenwood Drive connection to the Williams Highway. The property is currently partially developed with two residential homes and several outbuildings including sheds and barns. The property consists of two separate legal tax lots. Fire protection services are provided by the Grants Pass Fire District. The site is located within the Grants Pass service area for water service, sanitary sewerage service, and storm water management. Other utilities readily available are power, telephone, and cable TV all existing within the right of way of SE Coach Drive.

The site consists of Holland sandy loam (#42 C & D), and Siskiyou gravelly sandy loam (#71F0), with hydrologic soil classification C & B. The site is currently partially developed, with a mix of trees, weeds and grasses covering the areas. The site is "located" on Panel No. 41033C – 0525E of the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for Josephine County. The property is outside of all Zone A mapped flood areas.

The subject property is currently designated as R1-8 zoning within the Moderate Density Residential by the Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is proposing a subdivision master plan with approximately 25 lots ranging in size from 7638 sq.ft. to 69,224 sq.ft.

This application for a Land Subdivision is subject to both City and State criteria and standards and is processed by the City administratively and is reviewed by the Planning Commission, pursuant to Grants Pass Municipal Code. Accordingly, the applicant shall address all of the applicable criteria and standards of the Grants Pass Municipal code that pertain to these requests. As required by the City’s land subdivision review process and by the State, the applicant shall also address the applicable criteria and standards of the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) and the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), particularly the elements of these State rules and statutes that apply to subdividing land.
1. Article 17 – Lots and Creation of Lots

17.413 Criteria for Tentative Subdivision Plan Approval. The review body shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the request, based upon the following criteria:

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

**Response:** All lots meet or exceed the minimum lot size of 7000 sq.ft. size and minimum 65 ft width for the R1-8 zoning. The applicant is proposing to keep a larger lot with the existing main home on the property where existing topography will limit its future development potential.

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

**Response:** All of the property owned by the applicant is included in the tentative subdivision plat. There are two lots planned within the development that are large enough to be subdivided in the future. However, these two lots contain the two existing structures, with the structure size, location, and topography of each lot preventing large scale future development. The proposed project is bounded to the south and west by be developed residential property being parts of the Cathedral Heights Subdivision including the 1st and 2nd Additions. To the East is larger residential properties that are outside of the urban growth boundary with topography that generally prevents small lot subdivision development. To the north of the property is undeveloped residentially zoned property. A future development plan of the northerly adjacent property is included with this development plan that shows the future extension of SE Coach Drive to connect to the stub road platted to the north.

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

**Response:** The street pattern for this property is mostly determined by existing platted local streets and topography of the property. The platted SE Coach Drive will be extended north through the property and stubbed to the property to the north. SE Coach Drive will eventually extend north and connect to the platted SE Coach Drive further north of this development. This roadway extension is shown on the future development plan.
(4) The proposed utility plan conforms to the applicable requirements of adopted utility plans, the requirements of Article 28 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency, and environmental compatibility.

Response: The proposed utility plan will provide utility service to all of the lots within the proposed development. Public sewer and water already exist within SE Coach Drive, and will be extended onsite. An existing GPID irrigation ditch exists on the property and will be piped as part of the development.

(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:

Response: The proposed development does not contain established natural features or historic features. All roof tops will be available for solar energy installation; however, the applicant is not proposing such use at this time. See Solar Lot Standard Note on the tentative plat for more discussion on this subject.

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

Response: The property is mostly vacant, with multiple trees existing mainly on the northern and eastern portions of the property. All trees within the development areas will be removed for construction of the streets and homes. The trees on proposed lots 6 and 17, as well as the open space Tract A will be retained. Additionally, the trees located on the south and west boundaries of the development will be retained to the greatest extent possible to provide a buffer to the existing residential developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing % of Canopy Cover</th>
<th>% of Exist. Canopy Cover</th>
<th>Target % Based on Zoning District</th>
<th>Total % of Canopy Cover Proposed Post Development Per Lot</th>
<th># of Trees Planted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Development</td>
<td>To Remain Post Development</td>
<td>25-35% (R1-8)</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>± 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Response: The development site is moderately sloping, therefore cuts and fills are not expected to exceed 5-10 feet. The steeper slopes are located on lot 17 which already contains a single-family home and driveway. No retaining walls are proposed other than potential landscape walls less than 6’ in height. Cut fill slopes will not exceed 2:1 or 50%.

(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 lopes which are greater than 100%.
Response: The development site is moderately sloping, therefore cuts and fills are not expected to exceed 5-10 feet. The steeper slopes are located on lot 17 which already contains a single-family home and driveway. No retaining walls are proposed other than potential landscape walls less than 6' in height. Cut fill slopes will not exceed 2:1 or 50%.

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

Response: With the submittal of the tentative subdivision plan and this burden of proof, the applicant is demonstrating compliance with all applicable Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan, Development Code requirements, and state and federal laws.

17.510 Base Lot Standards: All new lots shall conform to the provision of Article 12, other applicable sections of this Code, and the following standards:

Response: All lots meet or exceed the minimum lot size of 7000 sq.ft. size and minimum 65 ft width for the R1-8 zoning. The applicant is proposing two lots larger than twice the minimum size which contain the existing two single family homes.

17.511 Lot Width to Depth Ratio. Lot depth shall not exceed four times lot width. This standard may be exceeded where a portion of a lot is located within the floodway and the portion outside of the floodway cannot be further divided.

Response: No lots within the proposed development have depths that exceed four times the lot width. The proposed development is not within a floodway or flood plain.

17.512 Buildable Lots. The lot arrangement shall be such that there will be no foreseeable difficulties, by reason of topography or other conditions, in securing development permits or building permits for typical permitted uses allowed in that zone in compliance with this Code, with the exception of properties designated for open space use.

Response: The subject property is moderately sloping and the applicant does not foresee difficulty in constructing the proposed single-family residences.

17.513 Through Lots. Lots that have frontage on more than one street, except corner lots, shall be avoided except where necessary to provide separation of residential developments from streets of collector and arterial street status or to overcome specific disadvantages of topography and/or orientation.

Response: The proposed lot layout does not create any through lots between public streets. Access to all of the lots will be limited to the proposed local and private streets.

17.514 Side Property Lines. As far as practical the side property lines of a lot shall run at right angles to the street upon which it faces, except that on a curved street the side property line shall be radial to the curve.
Response: All proposed property side lines are perpendicular to the streets to the greatest extent possible.

17.515 Curved Property Line at Street Intersections. At all street intersections, an arc along the property line shall be established to allow construction of standard curb and sidewalk wholly within the right-of-way.

Response: Curved property lines at each street intersection are included in the lot layout that is demonstrated on the Tentative Plat.

17.516 Commercial Properties. Any modification to a commercial property through a property line vacation, property line adjustment, partition, or subdivision shall address the following:

(a) The applicant has demonstrated the property configuration does not preclude development in accordance with Article 20, including the building orientation standards.

(b) The applicant has demonstrated the property configuration meets public street block length and perimeter standards of Articles 17 and 27, and has provided right-of-way and public street and pedestrian way improvements as necessary to meet these standards.

(c) The applicant has provided, or revised as necessary, vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle easements on and between properties to meet the connectivity requirements of Article 27.

(d) When required by the Director, the applicant has provided a conceptual site plan to demonstrate the property configuration will enable development in compliance with the provisions of this Code.

(e) Conditions relating to the issues in this section may be imposed as part of the decision as may be necessary to enable future coordinated development of the properties in accordance with the provisions of this Code.

Response: The development property does not contain any commercial zoning; therefore, the above requirements do not apply to this property.

17.520 Flag lots. No flag lot shall be approved by the review body unless the following requirements are met:

(a) A street cannot reasonable or practically be created to serve the properties.

Response: There are two flag lots proposed on the development (lots 1 & 6) to ensure each lot has the minimum street frontage allowed by code. The applicant has tried to minimize the use of flag lots within the proposed development. However existing street patterns and existing location of homes on the property have required some flag lots to be proposed to efficiently layout proposed building lots within the constraints of the property lines.
(b) The flag pole shall be at least the minimum width allowed in the appropriate zone. The maximum length for a flag pole shall be twice the width of the lot, or twice the length of the lot, whichever is less.

Response: Each flag lots meets the minimum width allowed in R1-8 zone and the flag pole lengths are less than twice the width of each lot.

(c) The flag pole shall be designed such that a driveway meeting the standards of Section 27.121(8) could be constructed within the flag pole, unless an alternative access is provided by easement. The access shall not encroach upon or cross a live stream, ravine, irrigation ditch, or similar topographic feature without provision of an adequate structure, fill, or culvert to provide access for emergency vehicles. Any such required structure shall be constructed prior to final plat or plan approval. The review body may require the structure to be certified by a registered engineer as meeting this standard.

Response: Each flag lot stem is a minimum of 20’ wide and will allow a driveway to be constructed by the home builder. None of the proposed flag lots cross a stream, ditch, or ravine.

(d) Flag lots shall not be created off minimum access streets.

Response: The flag lots are proposed from the wider full width private road.

(e) Not more than two abutting flag poles are permitted.

Response: No more than two abutting flag lots are proposed.

2. Article 12 – Zoning Districts


(1) The maximum number of dwelling units (du) allowable under either Base Development Standards or Alternative Development Options shall be determined according to the following formula:

Total Site (Acres) - dedicated public right of way (acres) = Useable Site (Acres) x maximum density allowed by zone (du/acre) = Maximum Dwelling Units allowed on site (round to whole number by dropping all fractions).

(2) Using the Base Development Standards, the minimum lot size, the particulars of site layout and topography, and the access requirements may result in yielding less than the allowable maximum dwelling units for any given proposal. In this case, the most restrictive requirement shall govern.
(3) The maximum density for any given zone is not subject to increase using the variance process or the subdivision process. The maximum density for any given zone may be increased only by using the PUD process, small lot allowance, or density incentives as provided in this Code.

(4) The maximum net density for all residential zones shall be as given in the following schedule. Net density in Schedule 12-4 generally corresponds to the following calculation: Divide the area in an acre (43,460 square feet) by the minimum area per dwelling unit (du) from Column 3 in Schedule 12-5. For example, in the R-2 zone: 43,560 sq ft / 3,500 sq ft minimum land area per dwelling / = 12.44 du/acre.

However, the maximum density measurement of dwellings/acre in Schedule 12-4 provides guidance for other provisions of this code intended to provide greater flexibility for unique site conditions and other issues, such as small lot allowances, cluster lots, and Planned Unit Developments (PUDs).

Response: The density is calculated by taking the total developable area (8.31 acres) and subtracting the area for street right of ways (1.35 acres) which equals 6.97 acres. Then taking the total developable area (6.97 acres) x 6.22 du/acre (R1-8 zone maximum density) = maximum dwelling units (43 units). The applicant is proposing 25 single family residential lots and therefore the maximum density will be 3.59 du/acre, meeting this code requirement.


In order to ensure an adequate supply of sites zoned for different housing types at appropriate locations, some residential zones have minimum density requirements. Zones with minimum density requirements are designated on the zoning map with an “M” suffix following the name of the zoning district. This allows ‘legacy’ zones to continue to be subject to the original standards, while most newly zoned properties will meet the newer requirements.

Response: The subject property is zoned R1-8 and not R1-8M, therefore the minimum density does not apply.

12.150 Residential Base Development Standards

12.151 Purpose. The purpose of this Section is to provide the Base Development Standards for all residential uses, including lot size, lot dimension, setbacks, structure height and lot access.
12.152 Lot Requirements

(1) Minimum lot requirements shall be as given in Schedule 12-5, except as specified in Section 12.152(2)(d) for zero-lot line development for attached housing or as otherwise specified in Subsection (2).

Response: All lots meet or exceed the minimum lot size of 7000 sq.ft. and minimum 65 ft width for the R1-8 zoning.
3. Chapter 660: Land Conservation & Development Department

(A) Division 3: Procedure For Review & Approval Of Compliance Acknowledgment Request

Response: The Land Conservation & Development Commission granted acknowledgement of the City of Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan, pursuant to the process outlined under this OAR Section. Therefore, the applicant’s request for a Land Subdivision is being made within a jurisdiction that possesses an acknowledged Comprehensive Plan.

(B) Division 12: Transportation Planning

(i) 660-012-0060 — Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:

Response: The proposed land subdivision will not significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility.

(C) Division 15: Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines

(ii) 660-15-0000(1), Goal 1 — Citizen Involvement

To develop a citizen involvement program that ensures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

Response: The applicant is working through the City of Grants Pass process to apply for the proposed subdivision as regulated by the City’s development code. As such, notice of the application will be sent to neighboring property owners, printed in a newspaper of general circulation in Grants Pass for two consecutive days not less than 20 days prior to the hearing and posted on site. Review of the proposed subdivision shall undergo a Planning Commission hearing at the discretion of the planning staff. The mailed notices, posted notice, printed notice, and hearing will provide sufficient opportunities for citizens of Grants Pass to comment on the proposal.

(iii) 660-15-0000(2), Goal 2 — Land Use Planning

To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decision and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.
City, County, State and Federal Agencies and special district plans and actions related to land use shall be consistent with the Comprehensive Plans of cities and counties and regional plans adopted under ORS Chapter 268.

**Response:** Through the submittal of this application, along with all of the accompanying information, the applicant is demonstrating and justifying that the proposed land subdivision is in conformance with all applicable standards of the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code.

(iv) 660-15-0000(3), Goal 3 — Agricultural Lands

To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.

**Response:** This property is not zoned Agricultural; therefore, this section is not applicable.

(v) 660-15-0000(4), Oregon Land Use Planning Goal 4 — Forest Lands

To conserve forest lands by maintaining the forest land base and to protect the state's forest economy by making possible economically efficient forest practices that assure the continuous growing and harvesting of forest tree species as the leading use on forest land consistent with sound management of soil, air, water, and fish and wildlife resources and to provide for recreational opportunities and agriculture.

Forest lands are those lands acknowledged as forest lands as of the date of adoption of this goal amendment. Where a plan is not acknowledged or a plan amendment involving forest lands is proposed, forest land shall include lands which are suitable for commercial forest uses including adjacent or nearby lands which are necessary to permit forest operations or practices and other forested lands that maintain soil, air, water and fish and wildlife resources.

(a) Guidelines

B. Implementation

1. Before forest land is changed to another use, the productive capacity of the land in each use should be considered and evaluated.

**Response:** This property is not zoned forestry; therefore, this section is not applicable.

(vi) 660-15-0000(5), Goal 5 — Open Space, Scenic, and Historic Areas and Natural Resources

To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.

**Response:** The site proposed for the land subdivision does not exhibit any historic resources or wetland potential. Therefore, the encouragement of the protection and management of significant resources in mutual cooperation with appropriate Federal or State agencies will be accomplished with this development.

(vii) 660-15-0000(6), Goal 6 — Air, Water and Land Resources Quality
To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.

Response: If the City approves this application, the site would subsequently be developed into residential lots for single family dwellings. The development of this site would only include enough site disturbance to build a single-family dwelling on each lot. Once home construction is complete, trees and other vegetation would be landscaped by homeowners and allowed to grow indefinitely, thereby continuously improving air quality.

(viii) 660-15-0000(7), Goal 7 — Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards

To protect people and property from natural hazards.

Response: The site is not located within a fire hazard area; existing vegetation is grass and weeds and the property is currently being used as a property management office and also one residential home. The site is located within the Grants Pass Fire District.

(ix) 660-15-0000(8), Goal 8 — Recreational Needs

To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

Response: The proposed subdivision is not seeking to develop the site as one that would meet the recreational needs of Grants Pass. The subject site enjoys close access to the Rogue River and associated parks.

(x) 660-15-0000(9), Goal 9 — Economic Development

To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.

Response: The approval of the land subdivision application for residential uses would expand and increase the productivity from several existing industries and firms. First, it would utilize several components of the development, construction and building industries and trades through site development work, home construction and ongoing home improvement. Second, it would create additional residents / consumers within the area that would utilize the many firms and industries that provide residents with the many goods and services that are typically demanded by residents of the area.

(xi) 60-15-0000(10), Goal 10 — Housing

To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state.

(b) Guidelines

A. Planning

1. In addition to inventories of buildable lands, housing elements of a comprehensive plan should, at a minimum, include:

   (1) a comparison of the distribution of the existing population by income with the distribution of available housing units by cost;
(2) a determination of vacancy rates, both overall and at varying rent ranges and cost levels;

(3) a determination of expected housing demand at varying rent ranges and cost levels;

(4) allowance for a variety of densities and types of residences in each community; and

**Response:** Approval of this subdivision request will allow the development of approximately 25 single family home sites meeting the increasing demand in the City of Grants Pass for residential homes.

(xii) 660-15-0000(11), Goal 11 — Public Facilities and Services

To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

**Response:** The individual lots will be served by city sewer and water facilities. The properties will receive additional public services from Grants Pass Fire District; Grants Pass Police Department; Josephine County social services programs; applicable school district(s); applicable waste collection services; and applicable ambulance / medical facilities and services. No new public facilities or services are proposed as part of this application as these services are already in place.

(xiii) 660-15-0000(12), Goal 12 — Transportation

To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system. A transportation plan shall:

(9) Conform with local and regional comprehensive land use plans. Each plan shall include a provision for transportation as a key facility.

**Response:** Approval of this request would lead to development of single-family residential homes as allowed by the existing underlying city zoning.

(xiv) 660-15-0000(13), Goal 13 — Energy Conservation

Land and uses developed on the land shall be managed and controlled so as to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based upon sound economic principles.

**Response:** If the site is developed into a subdivision, new homes on the property shall be constructed pursuant to the energy efficient standards that are required by the current edition of the International Building Code (IBC). Electric utilities shall be installed underground, thereby minimizing the need for repair and replacement of electric energy infrastructure.

Technological strides continue to be made in the solar energy and the ground source heating and cooling field that will continue to make these alternatives more attractive each year. There are tax rebates and incentives available for such systems that will also help to persuade homeowners to the advantages of such technologies.
(xv) 660-15-0000(14), Goal 14 — Urbanization

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

(c) Single-Family Dwellings in Exception Areas

Notwithstanding the other provisions of this goal, the commission may by rule provide that this goal does not prohibit the development and use of one single-family dwelling on a lot or parcel that:

(a) Was lawfully created;
(b) Lies outside any acknowledged urban growth boundary or unincorporated community boundary;
(c) Is within an area for which an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 or 4 has been acknowledged; and
(d) Is planned and zoned primarily for residential use.

Response: If the proposed land subdivision is approved, the site would be developed into single family dwellings as allowed by the underlying City zoning. The subdivision will be legally created through the platting process, and utilities will be installed and extended to each new lot.

(xvi) Statewide Planning Goals 15 – 19 do not apply to the City of Grants Pass.

(D) Division 18: Plan & Land Use Regulation Amendment Review Rule

(xvii) 660-018-0005 — Purpose

This division is intended to implement provisions of ORS 197.610 through 197.625. The overall purpose is to carry out the state policies outlined in ORS 197.010 and Or Laws 2003, Chapter 800, Section 17(2).

Response: OAR 660-018 provides the requirements for notices, timelines, appeal procedures and other items relating to Land Use applications. It is understood that the process, submittal requirements, procedure, appeal options, timelines, etc., of the proposed application, is subject to all of the applicable definitions, criteria, standards, etc., that are outlined in this Division. Further, the applicant will work with City Staff to assure that all procedures are properly followed.
ORS Chapter 92 – Subdivisions and Partitions

92.014 Approval of city or county required for specified divisions of land. (1) A person may not create a street or road for the purpose of subdividing or partitioning an area or tract of land without the approval of the city or county having jurisdiction over the area or tract of land to be subdivided or partitioned.

(2) Notwithstanding ORS 92.175, an instrument dedicating land to public use may not be accepted for recording in this state unless the instrument bears the approval of the city or county authorized by law to accept the dedication.

Response: This application for a land subdivision meets the requirements of ORS 92.014 if the applicant receives approval from the City of Grants Pass.

92.040 Application for approval of subdivision or partition; tentative plan; applicability of local government laws. (1) Before a plat of any subdivision or partition subject to review under ORS 92.044 may be made and recorded, the person proposing the subdivision or partition or authorized agent or representative of the person shall make an application in writing to the county or city having jurisdiction under ORS 92.042 for approval of the proposed subdivision or partition in accordance with procedures established by the applicable ordinance or regulation adopted under ORS 92.044. Each such application shall be accompanied by a tentative plan showing the general design of the proposed subdivision or partition. No plat for any proposed subdivision or partition may be considered for approval by a city or county until the tentative plan for the proposed subdivision or partition has been approved by the city or county.

Response: The applicant has included a tentative plan map with the land subdivision application for review to the City of Grants Pass. The final plat map for this subdivision will not be recorded until tentative plan approval is obtained from the City.

92.050 Requirements of survey and plat of subdivision and partition.

(1) A person shall not submit a plat of a subdivision or partition for record, until all the requirements of ORS 209.250 and the plat requirements of the subdivision or partition have been met.

(2) The survey for the plat of the subdivision or partition shall be done in a manner to achieve sufficient accuracy that measurements may be taken between monuments within one-tenth of a foot or one ten-thousandth of the distance shown on the subdivision or partition plat, whichever is greater.

(3) The survey and plat of the subdivision or partition shall be made by a registered professional land surveyor.

(4) The plat of the subdivision or partition shall be of sufficient scale and lettering size, approved by the county surveyor, so that:

(a) The survey and mathematical information and all other details are clearly and legibly shown on the plat.
(b) Each lot or parcel is numbered consecutively.
(c) The lengths and courses of the boundaries of each lot or parcel are shown on the plat.
(d) Each street is named and shown on the plat.
(5) The locations and descriptions of all monuments found or set must be carefully recorded upon all plats and the proper courses and distances of all boundary lines, conforming to the surveyor’s certificate, must be shown.
(6) The location, dimensions and purpose of all recorded and proposed public and private easements must be shown on the subdivision or partition plat along with the county clerk’s recording reference if the easement has been recorded by the county clerk. Private easements become effective upon the recording of the plat.
(7) The area of each lot or parcel must be shown on the subdivision or partition plat.
(8) In addition to showing bearings in degrees, minutes and seconds and distances in feet and hundredths of a foot, the following curve information must be shown on the subdivision or partition plat either on the face of the map or in a separate table:
   (a) Arc length;
   (b) Chord length;
   (c) Chord bearing;
   (d) Radius; and
   (e) Central angle.
(9) A city or county may not require that a final subdivision, condominium or partition plat show graphically or by notation on the final plat any information or requirement that is or may be subject to administrative change or variance by a city or county or any other information unless authorized by the county surveyor. [Amended by 1955 c.756 §10; 1983 c.309 §3; 1989 c.772 §8; 1991 c.763 §10; 1993 c.702 §3; 1995 c.382 §4; 1997 c.489 §2; 1999 c.1018 §1; 2005 c.399 §5]

Response: The applicant has retained the services of Rhine-Cross Group, LLC to prepare the Tentative Subdivision Plan and application for the land subdivision. The final plat map will be prepared by an Oregon Registered Land Surveyor in accordance with ORS 92.050 should the applicant receive tentative plan approval from the City. The subdivision will be monumented in accordance with ORS 92.060.

92.075 Declaration required to subdivide or partition property; contents.

(1) In order to subdivide or partition any property, the declarant shall include on the face of the subdivision or partition plat, if a partition plat is required, a declaration, taken before a notary public or other person authorized by law to administer oaths, stating that the declarant has caused the subdivision or partition plat to be prepared and the property subdivided or partitioned in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. Any dedication of land to public purposes or any public or private easements created, or any other restriction made, shall be stated in the declaration.

(2) If the declarant is not the fee owner of the property, the fee owner and the vendor under any instrument of sale shall also execute the declaration for the purpose of consenting to the property being subdivided or partitioned.
(3) If the subdivision or partition plat contains any dedication or donation of land to public purposes, the holder of any mortgage or trust deed shall also execute the declaration for the purpose of consenting to the property being submitted to the provisions of this chapter.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (1) to (3) of this section, the fee owner, vendor or the mortgage or trust deed holder may record an affidavit consenting to the declaration of property being subdivided or partitioned and to any dedication or donation of property to public purposes. The affidavit must indicate the recorded document by which the interest in the property was acquired and all information required by ORS 93.410 to 93.530 and must be recorded in deed records at the same time as the subdivision or partition plat. The county clerk shall note the recording information of the affidavit on the original and any exact copies of the subdivision or partition plat. [1991 c.763 §3; 1995 c.382 §8; 2005 c.399 §9]

Response: The final plat map will be prepared by an Oregon Registered Land Surveyor and will contain a declaration, taken before a notary public, stating the requirements of ORS 92.075

92.080 Preparation of plat.
Norwithstanding ORS 205.232 and 205.234, all plats subdividing or partitioning land in a county in this state, dedications of streets or roads or public parks and squares and other writings made a part of the subdivision or partition plats offered for record in a county in this state must be made on material that is 18 inches by 24 inches in size with an additional three-inch binding edge on the left side when required by the county clerk or the county surveyor, that is suitable for binding and copying purposes, and that has the characteristics of strength and permanency required by the county clerk and county surveyor. All signatures on the original subdivision or partition plat must be in archival quality black ink. The subdivision or partition plat must be of a scale required by the county surveyor. The lettering of the approvals, the declaration, the surveyor's certificate and all other information must be of a size or type to be clearly legible, but the information may not come nearer an edge of the sheet than one inch. The subdivision or partition plat may be placed on as many sheets as necessary, but a face sheet and an index page must be included for subdivision or partition plats placed upon three or more sheets. [Amended by 1995 c.125 §1; 1973 c.696 §15; 1985 c.582 §1; 1989 c.772 §12; 1991 c.763 §14; 1993 c.321 §6; 1993 c.702 §5; 1997 c.489 §5; 1999 c.710 §3; 2005 c.399 §10]

Response: The final plat map will be prepared by an Oregon Registered Land Surveyor and will be on approved material 18"X24" in size with all the requirements of ORS 92.080.

92.095 Payment of taxes, interest or penalties before subdivision or partition plat recorded.
(1) A subdivision or partition plat may not be recorded unless all ad valorem taxes have been paid, including additional taxes, interest and penalties imposed on land disqualified for any special assessment and all special assessments, fees or other charges required by law to be placed upon the tax roll that have become a lien upon the land or that will become a lien during the tax year.

(2) After July 1, and before the certification under ORS 311.105 of any year, the subdivider or partitioner shall:
(a) If the exact amount of taxes, penalties, special assessments, fees and charges can be computed by the assessor, pay the amount to the tax collector. The assessor is authorized to levy and the tax collector is authorized to collect the amount.
(b) If the assessor is unable to compute the amount at the time, either:
(A) Pay the amount estimated by the assessor to be needed to pay the taxes, penalties, special assessments, fees and other charges to become due; or
(B) Deposit with the tax collector a bond or irrevocable letter of credit with a good and sufficient undertaking in an amount the assessor considers adequate to ensure payment of the taxes to become due. The bond or irrevocable letter of credit amount may not exceed twice the amount of the previous year's taxes, special assessments, fees and other charges upon the land.

(3) Taxes paid or for which security is given under subsection (2)(a) or (b) of this section are entitled to the discount provided by ORS 311.505.

(4) ORS 311.370 applies to all taxes levied and collected under subsection (2) of this section, except that any deficiency constitutes a personal debt against the person subdividing or partitioning the land and not a lien against the land and must be collected as provided by law for the collection of personal property taxes.

(5) If a subdivision or partition plat is recorded, any additional taxes, interest or penalties imposed upon land disqualified for any special assessment become a lien upon the land on the day before the plat was recorded.

Response: If the applicant receives approval from the City of Grants Pass for the land subdivision, all ad valorem taxes shall be paid prior to recording the final plat.

92.100 Approval of plat by city or county surveyor; procedures; approval by county assessor and county governing body; fees.

(1)(a) Except as provided in subsection (4) of this section, before a subdivision or partition plat that covers land within the corporate limits of a city may be recorded, the county surveyor must approve the plat.

(b) Notwithstanding ORS 92.170, the governing body of the city may, by resolution or order, designate the city surveyor to serve in lieu of the county surveyor or, with concurrence of the county surveyor, a contract surveyor to act as city surveyor.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (4) of this section, if the land is outside the corporate limits of any city, the subdivision or partition plat must be approved by the county surveyor before it is recorded.

(d) All subdivision plats must also be approved by the county assessor and the governing body of the county in which the property is located before recording.

(e) Notwithstanding paragraph (d) of this subsection, a county may provide by ordinance for the approval of subdivision plats by:

(A) The county assessor; and
(B)(i) The chairperson of the governing body of the county;
(ii) The vice chairperson of the governing body of the county; or
(iii) A person designated in lieu of the chairperson or vice chairperson.

(f)(A) A partition plat is subject only to the approval of the city or county surveyor unless:
(i) The partition plat includes a dedication of land for public road purposes; or
(ii) Provided otherwise by ordinance of the governing body.

(B) The city or county surveyor shall review the partition plat only for compliance with the survey-related provisions of ORS 92.010 to 92.192 and 209.250.

(2) Before approving the subdivision plat as required by this section, the county surveyor shall check the subdivision site and the subdivision plat and shall take measurements and make
computations and other determinations necessary to determine that the subdivision plat complies with the survey-related provisions of ORS 92.010 to 92.192 and 209.250 and with survey-related requirements established pursuant to an ordinance or resolution passed by the governing body of the controlling city or county.

(3) Before approving the partition plat as required by this section, the county surveyor shall check the partition plat and make computations and other determinations that the partition plat complies with the survey-related provisions of ORS 92.010 to 92.192 and 209.250 and with the survey-related requirements established pursuant to an ordinance or resolution by the governing body of the controlling city or county.

(4) Before a subdivision or partition plat prepared by the county surveyor in a private capacity may be recorded, the plat must be approved in accordance with subsection (2) or (3) of this section, whichever is applicable, by the surveyor of a county other than the county in which the land is located and who has been designated by the county surveyor.

(5) For performing the service described:
   (a) In subsection (2) of this section, the county surveyor shall collect from the subdivider or declarant a fee of $100 plus $5 for each lot contained in the subdivision. The governing body of a city or county may establish a higher fee by resolution or order.
   (b) In subsection (3) of this section, the county surveyor shall collect from the partitioner or declarant a fee to be established by the governing body.
   (c) In subsection (4) of this section, the designated county surveyor shall collect the applicable subdivision or partition plat check fee, and any travel expenses incurred, as established by the designated county surveyor's board of commissioners. The subdivision or partition plat check fee and other expenses must be paid by the subdivider, partitioner or declarant prior to approval of the subdivision or partition plat by the designated county surveyor.

(6) Nothing in this section prohibits a city, county or special district from requiring engineering review and approval of a subdivision plat to ensure compliance with state and local subdivision requirements that relate to matters other than survey adequacy.

(7) Granting approval or withholding approval of a final subdivision or partition plat under this section by the county surveyor, the county assessor or the governing body of a city or county, or a designee of the governing body, is not a land use decision or a limited land use decision, as defined in ORS 197.015.

Response: The final plat map will be prepared by an Oregon Registered Land Surveyor and will be submitted to the City and the Josephine County Surveyor for review and approval. All fees required by the County Surveyor will be paid by applicant. The plat map will be recorded by Josephine County after all required jurisdictional signatures and approvals have been obtained in accordance with ORS 92.100.
ORS Chapter 197 – Comprehensive Land Use Planning Coordination

4. Comprehensive Planning Responsibilities

(J) 197.175 — Cities’ and counties’ planning responsibilities; rules on incorporations; compliance with goals.

(1) Cities and counties shall exercise their planning and zoning responsibilities, including, but not limited to, a city or special district boundary change which shall mean the annexation of unincorporated territory by a city, the incorporation of a new city and the formation or change of organization of or annexation to any special district authorized by ORS 198.705 to 198.955, 199.410 to 199.534 or 451.010 to 451.620, in accordance with ORS chapters 195, 196 and 197 and the goals approved under ORS chapters 195, 196 and 197. The Land Conservation and Development Commission shall adopt rules clarifying how the goals apply to the incorporation of a new city. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 15, chapter 827, Oregon Laws 1983, the rules shall take effect upon adoption by the commission. The applicability of rules promulgated under this section to the incorporation of cities prior to August 9, 1983, shall be determined under the laws of this state.

Response: It is understood that in the review of this proposed land subdivision, the City of Grants Pass is required to abide by the applicable planning responsibilities and compliance with the goals in the manner that is outlined above.

(2) Pursuant to ORS chapters 195, 196 and 197, each city and county in this state shall:

(a) Prepare, adopt, amend and revise comprehensive plans in compliance with goals approved by the commission;

(b) Enact land use regulations to implement their comprehensive plans;

(c) If its comprehensive plan and land use regulations have not been acknowledged by the commission, make land use decisions and limited land use decisions in compliance with the goals;

(d) If its comprehensive plan and land use regulations have been acknowledged by the commission, make land use decisions and limited land use decisions in compliance with the acknowledged plan and land use regulations; and

(e) Make land use decisions and limited land use decisions subject to an unacknowledged amendment to a comprehensive plan or land use regulation in compliance with those land use goals applicable to the amendment.

Response: The City of Grants Pass possesses an acknowledged Comprehensive Plan that is in compliance with the Statewide Goals. It has also adopted land use regulations through the Grants Pass Development Code. The city makes land use decisions and limited land use decisions in compliance with its Plan and the Development Code. In turn, the City’s land use decision on the proposed land subdivision must be in compliance with its Plan and the Development Code.
5. **Goals Compliance**

(E) 197.250 — Compliance with goals required.

*Except as otherwise provided in ORS 197.245, all comprehensive plans and land use regulations adopted by a local government to carry out those comprehensive plans and all plans, programs, rules or regulations affecting land use adopted by a state agency or special district shall be in compliance with the goals within one year after the date those goals are approved by the Land Conservation and Development Commission.*

**Response:** The City of Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan and Development Code — along with all plans, programs, rules or regulations affecting land use that are adopted by a State agency or special district — are in compliance with the Statewide Goals. In turn, the City’s decision on the proposed land subdivision must be in compliance with the Statewide Goals.

(F) 197.251 — Compliance acknowledgment; commission review; rules; limited acknowledgment; compliance schedule.

(1) Upon the request of a local government, the Land Conservation and Development Commission shall by order grant, deny or continue acknowledgment of compliance of comprehensive plan and land use regulations with the goals. A commission order granting, denying or continuing acknowledgment shall be entered within 90 days of the date of the request by the local government unless the commission finds that due to extenuating circumstances a period of time greater than 90 days is required.

**Response:** The Land Conservation & Development Commission granted acknowledgement of the City of Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan, pursuant to the process outlined under this Section. Therefore, the applicant’s request for a land subdivision is being made within a jurisdiction that possesses an acknowledged Comprehensive Plan. In turn, the City’s decision on the proposed land subdivision must be in compliance with the City’s acknowledged Comprehensive Plan.

6. **Enforcement Of Planning Requirements**

(G) 197.340 — Weight given to goals in planning practice; regional diversity and needs.

(1) The Land Conservation and Development Commission, the Department of Land Conservation and Development, other state agencies and local governments shall give the goals equal weight in any matter in which the goals are required to be applied.

**Response:** The applicant has addressed and provided findings that pertain to all 19 goals, each of which has been weighed equally. Goals 1 through 2 and 5 through 14 apply directly to this proposal. Goal 3 and 4 do not apply to this proposal because the subject property is not designated as Agricultural or Forestry. Goal 15 does not apply because the subject property does not impact the Willamette River Greenway. Goals 16 through 19 do not apply because the subject property is not located within a coastal community and does not exhibit any of the natural coastal features or environments that
are addressed by these Goals. In turn, the City’s review and decision on the proposed land subdivision must apply each Goal equally.

(2) The commission and the department shall consider and recognize regional diversity and differences in regional needs when making or reviewing a land use decision or otherwise applying the goals.

Response: It is understood that DLCD, and if necessary LCDC, shall consider and recognize regional diversity and differences in regional needs, such as those peculiar to the City of Grants Pass and the area of the subject property, when reviewing the City’s land use decision on the proposed land subdivision and applying the Goals in its review.
Subdivision and Condominium Plat Name Review and Approval Request Form

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

PROPOSED NAME: Leson Subdivision

ALTERNATE NAME: ____________________________

Map and Tax Lot Number(s): 36 . 05 . 31 BB 000600-00 and 000521-00

Site Address: No situs address has been assigned at this time

Location: City of Grants Pass ☑ City of Cave Junction ☐ Josephine County ☐

Owner/Applicant/Organization Name: Donald J or Karin Leson

Signature of Owner/Applicant: ____________________________ Date: 02-18-2022

Contact Phone: (541)-851-9405 Email: marc@rc-grp.com

Property Owner’s Name, Address, Phone & Email: Donald J and Karin Leson

2881 Coach Dr., Grants Pass, OR 97527

(541)-450-0443

Surveyor/Engineer Name, Address, Phone & Email: Rhine-Cross Group, LLC / Marc Cross

112 N 5th St, Suite 200, Klamath Falls, OR 97601

(541)-851-9405 marc@rc-grp.com

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

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

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

Approved Plat Name: Leson Subdivision

Josephine County Surveyor: ____________________________ Date: 3/4/2022

Date Fee Rec’d: 3/2/22 Check #/Date: #2793 / 2/22/22 Cash: Rcpt. Number: 954161

(County Surveyor Use Only)
Site Plan Review

Date of Review: March 29, 2022
Permit Number: 104-00147-22
Map/Tax Lot: 36-05-31-BB Lot 600
Address of Project: 2881 Coach Dr & 1134 SE Allenwood Dr

Planner: Sinagra

Comments:

1. 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: Hydrants with average spacing of 500 feet.

2. NO PARKING: Parking on emergency access roads shall be as follows (OFC D103.6.1-2):
   • 20-25 feet road width – no parking on either side of roadway
   • 26-32 feet road width – parking is allowed on one side
   • Greater than 32 feet road width – parking is not restricted

   o Private Street to be posted “No Parking Fire Lane” both sides.
   o Public Street to be posted “No Parking Fire Lane” on one side.

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

Submitted By: Joseph Hyatt, Fire Marshal

---

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. Coach Drive. Classification – Local Collector
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required full street right-of-way equals 60 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 34 foot full street width, curb/gutter, driveway approaches, 7.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.
   b. SE Flicker Drive. Classification – Local Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required half street right-of-way equals 50 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 28 foot full street width, curb/gutter, driveway approach, 5.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.
   c. SE Greyhawk Drive. Classification – Local Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required half street right-of-way equals 25 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: Provide two standard-width travel lanes (20 foot width) per section 27.110 (1) (b), curb/gutter, driveway approach, 5.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.
   d. SE Redtail Hawk Lane. Classification – Private Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: None. See 27.123 (12) (b).
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 20 foot street width with no curbs, planter strips or sidewalks required.

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:
      i. The Applicant shall abandon any existing septic system per DEQ standards.
      ii. Manholes shall be installed on all terminating sewer mains that are 200 feet or longer per 203.4.4 of the City’s Sanitary Sewer Standards.
      iii. The Applicant shall extend the 20 foot sanitary sewer easement into Lot 16.
   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: The site is in the GPID, therefore the Applicant is required to install Reduce Pressure Backflow devices. Any wells not in use for residences shall be abandoned per the City’s Water Standards.
   b. Design all new water facilities in conformance with the City’s Water Standards and Specifications.
   c. Design all service meters in the serviced property’s improved adjacent Right of Way. Service meters will not be allowed in easements. Wherever possible, install all service meters in the sidewalk per GP274. Do not install service closer than 5 feet to a front property corner. Locate meter boxes to avoid driveways and roof drains. Install water service lines in a straight line perpendicular to the waterline from the service meter. Install service line taps to not have less than 2 feet of separation between each other. Do not install a service tap in a main closer than 18” to a joint or fitting.
   d. Determine the water service and meter size. The aforementioned determination is not required for single-family residential units, where a 5/8” x 3/4” meter per GP274 each unit shall be standard. Furnish and install meters 3” and above. The City will furnish and install all meters smaller than 3”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. **Public Utilities:**
   a. Place underground all utility facilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines and other wires, street lighting and communication and cable television services.
   b. If none exists, dedicate a City utility easement (C.U.E.) across the frontages of the development in conformance with the requirements of the public utility companies.
This brochure is intended to be used as a **guideline only** for estimating System Development Charges as a part of total project costs. Actual costs for your project may differ due to site specific requirements.

It does not include information on other fees which may be due including Planning Review Fees, Engineering Fees, Building Permit Fees, Water and Sewer Connection Fees, Reimbursement District Fees and Business Licenses.

Please contact the Community Development office at (541) 450-6060 for information on SDC’s specific to your project and information on other potential costs.

**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.


---

**Skyline Development CHARGES**

**Fees Effective**
January 01, 2022 through December 31, 2022

**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.

---

**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.

---

**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.

---

**SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES**

---

**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](https://gpweb.grantspassoregon.gov/

EnerGov_Prod/SelfService/#estimate

---

**Community Development office is located at:**

101 NW “A” Street
Upstairs, Room 202
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526
(541) 450-6060

Open 8am – 5pm Monday – Friday

Building Counter Hours 8am – 10am M – F
(Submittal Hours 8am – 10am & 2pm – 4pm M – F)

Planning Counter Hours 8am – 5pm M – F

---

EXHIBIT 10
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:

- **Small (<= 1,700 sf)**
  - 3/4" Meter: $2,574.57
  - 1" Meter: $3,159.17
  - 1.5" Meter: $3,743.77

- **Standard (1,701—2,900 sf)**
  - 3/4" Meter: $3,028.66
  - 1" Meter: $3,513.26
  - 1.5" Meter: $4,097.86

- **Large (>2,900 sf)**
  - 3/4" Meter: $3,672.75
  - 1" Meter: $4,157.35
  - 1.5" Meter: $4,641.95

For Duplexes, Multi-Family & ADU’s, multiply the base fee by an additional 0.64 per unit to calculate the 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:

- **Single Family (SF) or Manufactured Home**:
  - Small (<= 1,700 sf): $2,530.61
  - Standard (1,701—2,900 sf): $3,044.61
  - Large (>2,900 sf): $3,558.61

- **Duplex**
  - (x1.64 of SF amount based on dwelling size):
    - Small (<= 1,700 sf): $3,720.10
    - Standard (1,701—2,900 sf): $4,234.10
    - Large (>2,900 sf): $4,748.10

- **Triplex**
  - (x2.28 of SF amount based on dwelling size):
    - Small (<= 1,700 sf): $4,610.60
    - Standard (1,701—2,900 sf): $5,124.60
    - Large (>2,900 sf): $5,638.60

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/SellService#/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.

In certain cases, a credit may be applied towards the Transportation SDC for previous uses on the site. Please contact City Planning for an estimate of the Transportation SDC’s for your project.

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

- **Single Family Residence**
  - Category: Single-family (9.57 trips/unit)
  - 1 unit x 9.57 trips/unit x $125.77/trip = $1,203.62

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 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 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 site. Please contact City Planning for an estimate of the Transportation SDC’s for your project.

**See other side for Storm Drain SDC Information**
I. PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for a Tentative Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Subdivision to create five (5) single dwelling units on lots ranging in size from 5,375 – 5,486 square feet (see Exhibit 3). All five (5) lots are larger than the 5,000 square foot minimum of the R-3-2 zone and the development density does not exceed the maximum density of 20 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is also proposing to construct a 216 foot private street with a hammerhead turn around.

The applicant is pursuing a PUD application as opposed to a standard subdivision application due to the single detached housing type being proposed. Per Schedule 12-2 of the Grants Pass Development Code, single detached dwelling unit housing types are only an allowed land use in the R-3-2 zone under a PUD approval.

II. AUTHORITY:

Section 2.040, Schedule 2-1, and Section 18.033 of the City of Grants Pass 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:

When a PUD request involves subdividing land, subdivision review shall be based upon the criteria for a subdivision listed in Section 17.413, except subsection (1) relating to lot dimension and base lot standards.

The Planning Commission shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the request, based on the criteria in Sections 17.413 and 18.043 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 and fee must be submitted within twelve (12) calendar days of the date the written decision is mailed.

V. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

A. Characteristics of the Property:

1. Land Use Designation:
   a. Comprehensive Plan: Moderate-High Density Residential
   b. Zone District: R-3-2
   c. Special Purpose District: None

2. Size: 0.61 acres

3. Frontage: Carnahan Drive (City Local) and proposed new private street.

4. Access: Carnahan Drive (City Local) and proposed new private street.

5. Public Utilities:
   a. Existing Utilities:
      i. Water: 12-inch main in Rouge River Highway ~ 670 feet north
      ii. Sewer: 8-inch main in Carnahan Drive
      iii. Storm Drain: Open ditch along Carnahan Drive.
   b. Proposed Utilities:
      i. Water: Main extension in Carnahan Drive, and into proposed new private street.
      ii. Sewer: Main extension in proposed new private street.
      iii. Storm Drain: Design to meet Public Works Comments, see Exhibit 5.
6. Topography: Relatively flat.

7. Natural Hazards: None

8. Natural Resources: None

9. Existing Land Use:
   a. Subject Parcel: Previous residential use, currently vacant. Existing well and pump house remain in the lot.
   b. Surrounding: Residential (R-3-2) development abuts all sides of parcel.

B. Background:

The applicant proposes to develop a five (5) lot subdivision for single detached dwelling units as a PUD on 0.61 acres in the Moderate-High Density residential zoning district (R-3-2). Access for lots 2-5 will be from a proposed private street.

A new private street is proposed for access off Carnahan Drive to Lots 2-5. A private street serving four dwelling units or less may use a minimum 20-foot street with no curbs, planter strips or sidewalks required. If such street is over 150 feet in length, a cul-de-sac or hammerhead turn-around must be provided that meets the standards of the Fire Department. Submitted application indicates the street is designed to be 20 feet wide. The Fire Department will allow for this with “No Parking” signs installed on both sides of the street and a turnaround for emergency access. As a condition of approval, applicant shall install “No Parking” signs on both sides of the street.

The site previously contained a single-family home and multiple small buildings/sheds that have been removed. Currently, the site is undeveloped except for a well which is covered by a small well house. The property is surrounded primarily by existing low-density single detached dwelling units. Along both the north and south property lines there are small irrigation channels that were previously abandoned. There is also a small storm drainage/irrigation channel running along the western property line within the Carnahan drive right of way. An existing sewer main runs along the full frontage of the property. The site is very flat and consists of mainly grass, with some brush along the property lines and two trees in the southwest corner of the property. All vegetation, with exception of a few trees and the east vegetation screen are proposed to be removed for the project.

As part of the growth management planning for the 2013-2033 planning period, a Zoning Transition Overlay district was formed. The new district identified the subject parcel as changing from R-1-10 to R-3-2. Effective upon adoption of the updated Transportation System Plan (TSP), which happened in November of 2021, the overlay zoning designated on the Overlay District map became the new base zoning for the subject property. Staff has reviewed this application under the standards of the R-3-2 zoning district.

No public comment has been received at the time of this staff report.
VI. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA

A. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

Section 18.043 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): Development of any remaining contiguous property under the same ownership can be accomplished as provided in this Code.

Staff Response: Not Applicable.
No further division of the proposed lots is possible upon construction of the new homes and there is no common ownership of contiguous properties.

CRITERION (2): Adjoining land under separate ownership can either be developed or be provided access that will allow its development in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.

Staff Response: Satisfied.
All adjoining land is developed with either a City local access street or existing residential development. No additional/future access is required.

CRITERION (3): The proposed street plan affords the most economic, safe, efficient and least environmentally damaging circulation of traffic possible under existing circumstances.

Staff Response: Satisfied with Conditions.
The proposed development will require half street improvements in front of Lot 1 along the Carnahan Drive frontage. For Public Works comments see Exhibit 5.

The proposed private street serving four (4) of the lots is being placed along the north property line. The Carnahan Drive frontage will be improved to local street standards (28’ half street section) along the property frontage. This will include a new private street approach and separate approach for Lot 1.

The proposed private street is proposed to be built to serve lots 2 - 5. Per Section 27.123(12) a private street serving four dwelling units or less may use a minimum 20-foot street with no curbs, planter strips or sidewalks required. If such street is over 150 feet in length, a cul-de-sac or hammerhead turn-around must be provided that meets the standards of the Public Safety Department. The submitted application indicates the street is designed to be 20 feet wide and is proposing a hammerhead turnaround.

Per Fire Department comments (Exhibit 4), a street between 20 and 25 feet wide must be marked with “No Parking” signs on both sides of the road. As a condition of approval, “No Parking” signs will be installed by the Applicant on the new private street based on the approved width of the private street. Cul-de-sacs over 150 in length must provide a turnaround. The proposed plan indicates a “hammerhead” type turnaround between Lots 3 and 4.
The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual 10th edition (Category 210, Single Family Detached) was used to calculate the estimated traffic from the site. The proposal is projected to generate 9.57 Average Daily Trips (ADT) and 0.99 p.m. peak hour trips per residential unit, for a total of 47.85 (9.57 x 5) ADT and 4.65 (0.99 x 5) p.m. peak hour trips. These numbers do not exceed the thresholds set forth in Section 27.121(3)(a) of 25 peak hour trips and 500 ADT. A Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) will not be required.

As a condition of approval, a 10-foot CUE serving Lots 1-5 will be dedicated on final plat.

Sidewalk design for all public streets shall meet Public Sidewalk Design Standards listed in Section 27.313.


Staff Response: UAPC Decision.

The purpose of the Planned Unit Development process in Section 18.012 of the Development Code is as follows:

1. To provide an alternate development process and alternate development standards to the Base Development and Lot Standards set forth in Articles 12 and 17 of this Code and embodied in much of the established areas of the City.

2. To encourage land use and development based upon the unique physical opportunities and constraints of each particular site, so that the outdoor living environment becomes an integral rather than an incidental feature of the design, and the overall appearance and livability of the community is enhanced.

3. To encourage diversity in building types, site arrangement and ownership of real property.

4. To encourage the greatest economic use of the land, and to lower unit development costs, in exchange for better use of open space, more recreational facilities, and greater resource conservation than possible using the Base Standards of this Code.

5. To provide a development product which is equal to or superior to that possible under the Base Standards of this Code.

6. To recognize the need to protect and buffer dissimilar development in the established districts, and to set a good precedent for future development in developing districts.

The applicant is pursuing a PUD approval as opposed to a standard subdivision approval due to the housing type being proposed. Under Schedule 12-2 of the Grants Pass Development Code, single detached dwelling unit housing types can only be approved through a PUD review. To receive approval, the development must achieve at least one of the purpose statements, as interpreted by the UAPC. The applicant has provided a response to this criterion, see Exhibit 3. After the public hearing closcs, the Urban Area
Planning Commission will need to deliberate the merits and consider whether the proposal meets the purpose of the PUD process.

The applicant is responsible for addressing all regulations pertaining to the Planned Communities Act (ORS 94.785). In addition, all relevant information regarding the homeowner’s association and residential responsibility within the development shall be provided for review and approval and then duly recorded with the final plat.

CRITERION (5): The project results in an equal or superior product than would have resulted from following the Base Development Standards of the applicable Zoning District, as provided in Article 12 of this Code, or the Base Lot Standards of Land Divisions, as provided in Article 17 of this Code.

Staff Response: UAPC Decision.
The proposal meets all the Base Lot Standards of Articles 12 and 17, including lot size and lot dimensions. However, the housing type being proposed (single detached dwelling unit) is not an allowed use in the zone except under the approval of a Planned Unit Development.

The R-3-2 zoning district requires, at a minimum, a duplex housing type on a lot in order to be approved at the staff level, in conformance with Schedule 12-2.

The applicant has provided a response to this criterion (see page 8 of Exhibit 3). The Urban Area Planning Commission will need to consider whether the proposal results in an equal or superior product than would have resulted from following the Base Development Standards of the applicable Zoning District. Based upon the building elevation submitted with the application (see page 13 of Exhibit 3), there is no evidence provided to date that the housing product will be superior to any other dwelling unit built under a standard subdivision. The other “product” to consider is the subdivision itself and whether the lot design, common areas, streets, landscaping, or other features of the layout are superior as a PUD compared to a standard subdivision. Purpose statement #2 under Criterion 4 above gives the example of an “outdoor living environment” that enhances the appearance and livability of the community. No such open space or added design feature is being proposed under the PUD application.

CRITERION (6): The proposal results in a balanced exchange: for the developer, flexible development standards, maximum land utilization and alternate ownership options; for the Community, greater preservation of natural features and natural resources, greater proportions of useable open space and recreation facilities; for both, a greater opportunity for housing at all income levels.

Staff Response: UAPC Decision.
By modifying the base development standards of Schedule 12-2, the development will be able to develop a single detached dwelling unit on each of the five (5) new lots created as part of the proposed subdivision.

The applicant has provided a response to this criterion. (See page 9 of Exhibit 3). They state the product will “create more affordable housing options.” The Urban Area Planning Commission will need to consider whether the proposal meets the intent of Criterion 6. Staff recommends the applicant present additional evidence to support their statement that the housing being proposed will create more affordable housing options.
CRITERION (7): Potential impacts to adjoining properties have been adequately mitigated through site design and attached development conditions. These conditions include the following protections:

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

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

(c) No fills may result in a retaining wall within the required setback from a property not included in the development plan greater than 6 feet in height from the finish grade nor create any retained slopes greater than 100%.

Staff Response: Satisfied.

(a) The applicant has provided a tree chart that indicates current existing canopy of 10.7% (2,936 sq. ft.), with a reduction to 17% (18,319 sq.ft.) canopy cover after development of the site. In the R-3-2 zone, 15-20% coverage is required. The plan indicates an additional eight (8) Schedule D trees (1,000 sq. ft. canopy) and three (3) Schedule C trees (700 sq. ft. canopy) to be planted for an additional canopy of 3,900 sq.ft. The additional canopy combines with the remaining 250 sq ft for a total of 4,150 sq. ft. which is 15.1% coverage.

Per Section 23.031 the minimum requirements for 1,000 sq. ft. of required front yard landscaping includes:

i. One tree at least six feet in height and one inch in caliper measured three feet from the base.

ii. Four one gallon shrubs.

iii. Remaining area treated with ground cover at least 50% upon installation and 90% after 3 years.

(b)/(c) The site is relatively flat, and no cuts or fills are proposed for this development.

CRITERION (8): All utilities, access ways, open space and recreation areas not dedicated to the public are owned and maintained by a Homeowners' Association or other acceptable private legal entity with the responsibility for and capability of adequate maintenance and care of such facilities, to the satisfaction of the City Attorney and City Engineer.

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions.
The private water laterals within the private street and private street maintenance are the responsibility of a private homeowner's association.
All common areas including the private street and private utilities will be maintained by the development’s HOA. This includes landscape and irrigation maintenance of the planter strip adjacent to the private street.

As a condition of approval, the proper documents describing how the association will be responsible for maintenance of these amenities shall be submitted for review and approval. It is required by state law that these provisions be addressed through filing of documents in accordance with the Planned Communities Act.

CRITERION (9): The applicant has demonstrated the ability to finance the project through final completion.

Staff Response: Satisfied.
The applicant has indicated in the submitted narrative that funding has either been obtained or received initial financing approval for the project from their lender and intends to complete the project in reasonable time frame as shown below:

- Planning Submittal: 3/18/22
- Planning Commission Hearing: 4/27/22
- Obtain Phase 1 Development Permit: 6/8/22
- Complete Final Plat: 8/22/22
- Full Project Buildout: 5/1/23

For a concurrent application for a PUD request involving subdividing of land, the decision for the PUD shall be based on the PUD criteria and the decision for the subdivision map itself shall be based on the criteria for a subdivision, except for standards of 17.510 if these base lot standards are to be modified by the PUD conditions.

B. SECTION 17.413. SUBDIVISION TENTATIVE PLAN CRITERIA

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with PUD Approval.
The plan conforms to the lot standards in Article 12 and 17. There is adequate building pad area for each lot as shown on the tentative site/building plan.

Development of the single detached dwelling unit housing types being proposed can be developed under a PUD, assuming the PUD criteria are met.

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

Staff Response: Not Applicable.
No further division of the proposed lots is possible after construction of the new homes.
CRITERION (3): When one is required or proposed, the street layout conforms to the applicable requirements of the adopted street plans, meets the requirements of Article 27 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency and environmental compatibility.

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions.
The proposed street layout follows previously established development patterns, meets the private street requirements of Article 27, and is compatible with the surrounding area.

As a condition of approval, the applicant shall meet conditions found in the Fire Safety Memorandum (see Exhibit 4)

As a condition of approval, the applicant shall meet conditions found in the Public Works Memorandum (see Exhibit 5)

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

Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions.
The Public Works Department provided comments in the Public Works Memorandum (Exhibit 5), which lists the full set of conditions, including:

Additional utility conditions:

- All required streetlights shall be purchased by the developer and maintained by the HOA. Section 27.121(16)(a) outlines that streetlights are to be provided at each intersection and where a cul-de-sac dead-end is greater than 150 ft. from the nearest lighted intersection.

- As a condition of approval, a streetlight must be installed at the intersection of Carnahan Drive and the proposed private street, as well as, at the end of the private street.

- As a condition of approval, "No Parking/Fire Lane" signs shall be posted on both sides of the private street per Oregon Fire Code D103.6. This section states that roads 20-26 ft. in width shall be posted on both sides as a fire lane. "No Parking/Fire Lane" signs shall have a minimum dimension of 12 inches wide by 18 inches high and have red letters on a white reflective background.

- Dedicate a 20 foot sewer easement on the Private street.

- Dedicate a 10 foot City Utility Easement along all right of ways as reflected on the tentative plan.

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

(a) Providing the necessary information to complete the tree chart identified in Section 11.041.
Staff Response: Satisfied with conditions. See PUD Criterion 7.

As a condition of approval, the applicant will also be required to submit a $300 Tree Deposit per lot prior to Final Plat approval, as required under Section 11.060(2). Per Section 11.070(2), a tree deposit waiver is available for dominant or co-dominant trees that are retained. See Article 11 of the Development Code for waiver request requirements.

As a condition of approval, applicant is also required to submit a Tree Protection Plan submitted by a Tree Professional for review and approval as outlined in Section 11.050.

(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%.

Staff Response: Satisfied. No cuts are planned.

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

Staff Response: Satisfied. No fills are planned.

Solar setback requirements of Section 22.630 are met as all proposed lots have a north-south dimension that is at least 80 feet long, resulting in 100% of the lots meeting the required standards.

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

Staff Response: UAPC Decision. See PUD Criterion 4.

VII. RECOMMENDATION:

No formal staff recommendation is being made at this time. As noted above, the applicant is asked to provide additional information related to PUD Criterion 4, 5, and 6. In order to approve either the Tentative Subdivision or PUD as submitted, the UAPC must determine that all nine (9) PUD criterion are met. Staff recommends the UAPC consider both the written evidence presented in the application as well as any new evidence presented during the public hearing. If the PUD application is approved, the Subdivision can be approved as is. If the PUD application is not approved, the Subdivision cannot be approved as currently designed because the private street is too narrow to accommodate two (2) dwelling units per lot.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

A. The following must be accomplished within 24 months of the Planning Commission’s decision per Section 17.415 and prior to issuance of a Development Permit. The Director may, upon written request by the applicant, grant up to two extensions of the expiration date of six months each. (Note: A Development
Permit is required in order to obtain a grading permit.:

1. Submit two (2) copies and a pdf of the revised tentative plan with the following:
   a. Revised Landscape plan with irrigation requirements and individual lot landscaping.
   b. Location of No Parking/Fire Lane Signs.

2. Submit to the County Assessor’s office an application for the proposed name of the private street. Submit approved name(s) to Community Development Department.

3. Provide a letter from the Responsible Engineer who will be supervising the construction of the subdivision. The Responsible Engineer will be required to submit a letter at final plat application verifying that he/she supervised the grading and construction for the entire parcel and individual lots and that the grading and construction was completed according to approved plans.

   If the responsible engineer proposes to delegate any of these responsibilities, the arrangement shall be approved in writing by the City Engineering Division prior to issuance of a Development Permit.

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

5. Obtain an encroachment permit for any work conducted in the Carnahan Drive right of way.

6. Submit four (4) copies of civil drawings with appropriate review fees (see Exhibit 7) to the City Engineering Division for review and approval:
   a. Provide a grading plan and receive a grading permit prior to any earthwork. Include the creation of building pads in the grading plan if completed as part of the construction of the subdivision. If building pads are created as part of the grading of the subdivision, then a map showing the extent of the grading will be required at the time of final plat.
   b. Provide an erosion control and dust control plan for the subdivision.
c. Present engineered construction drawings stamped by a registered Engineer, including plans and profiles if necessary, that detail the proposed improvements to the City Engineering Division for review and approval.

For Street Improvements:

i. Show private street improvements.

ii. Identify Mailbox locations.

iii. Developer will paint 20 ft. yellow setbacks at the corners and paint white stop bar at stop sign.

iv. City will install the required street name sign, and “stop” sign (if required) and will bill developer for all costs.

v. Any other signs, including the required “No Parking/Fire Lane” on both sides will be the responsibility of the developer to purchase and install.

vi. City curb, gutter, driveway approaches, sidewalk and planter strip shall be installed along Molly Lane frontage in accordance with 27.311 and 27.313.

vii. Provide storm drain calculations demonstrating detention which limits the storm water run-off from new impervious areas to not exceed .65 cfs per acre for the proposed area of development during a 25-year storm event (Reference Master Storm Drainage Facilities and Management Plan – May 1982).

7. The installation of a private street, storm drain, sewer laterals across tax lots, private streetlights, and Sign a Developer Installed Agreement for Public Improvements.

8. Provide the City with a copy of an ongoing maintenance agreement for all private infrastructure including: private street, private storm drain, private sewer laterals, private water service lines, and private street signs, and any other utility and infrastructure improvements that will cross property lines or be used jointly by all lots in this newly created subdivision but will not be owned or maintained by the City.

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

1. Provide a copy of the Home Owners Association Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and Restrictive Covenants and Conditions for review and approval by the City Attorney and City Engineer. Among other provisions, include provisions for:

   a. Maintenance of street lights if not taken care of by PP&L
   b. Maintenance of common areas on individual lots
   c. Maintenance of private water laterals and paving of the private streets

2. Pay a $300 tree deposit per lot.
3. Separate sewer and water services are required for each lot. Private sewer and water lines shall not cross other lots, except within a dedicated recorded utility easement.

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

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

6. 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.

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

7. Install sidewalk and planter strip on frontage of Carnahan Drive.

8. Private street must be developed to private street standards in conformance with Section 27.123(12).

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

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

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

12. Pay all engineering inspection fees due as shown in Exhibit 7.

13. Submit a letter from the Responsible Engineer stating that he/she supervised the grading and construction for the entire parcel and individual lots and the grading and construction was completed according to approved plans.

14. All water services on existing public water lines shall be installed by City of Grants Pass Water Distribution Crews. All encroachment fees related to the installation of water services shall be the responsibility of the developer.

15. Complete installation of the public utility services as reflected on the approved utility plans.
C. 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. Submit addressing request application and pay all associated fees.

2. Payment of all System Development Charges due; including, but not limited to, water, storm, sewer, parks and transportation. (See Exhibit 8).

3. Each lot shall have separate utility services.

4. All utilities shall be placed underground.

5. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.

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

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

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

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

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

11. Fire flow for buildings may not exceed 1500fpm (3600 square feet type V-b) without providing additional fire hydrant at end of the private street or other construction feature approved by the building official. (Oregon Fire Code Table B105.2, Table C105.1.)

VIII. URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. Approve the request
   1. As submitted.
   2. With the conditions stated in the staff report.
   3. With the conditions stated in the staff report as modified by the Planning Commission (list):

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

C. Postponement: Continue item to a time certain.

NOTE: State law requires that a decision be made on the application within 120 days of when the application was deemed complete. That date is July 20, 2022.
IX. INDEX TO EXHIBITS:

1. Location Map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Application and Tentative Plan
4. Public Safety Comments
5. Public Works Comments
6. Engineering Application
7. Engineering Fee Schedule
8. SDC Brochure
Property Address: 1637 Carnahan Drive
Grants Pass, OR 97527

Assessor’s Map & Tax Lot:
36 - 05 - 21 - CC Tax Lot(s) 6200

Zoning: R-3-2

City: X UGB: 

Project Type: (Please check all applicable)
☐ Site Plan
☐ Standard Architectural Review
☐ Discretionary Arch. Review
☐ Special Concept Plan
☐ Partition
☐ Property Line Adjustment
☐ Property Line Vacation
☐ Planned Unit Development
☐ Subdivision
☐ Final Subdivision or PUD Plat
☐ Variance
☐ Comp Plan/Zone Map Amendment
☐ Text Amendment
☐ Pre-Application
☐ Appeal / Sign Code Appeal
☐ Other:

Size of Project (# of units, lots, sq. ft., etc):
0.61 acres, 5 lots

Attachments:
☐ (8) Folded Maps/Site Plan to scale
☐ (1) 8 1/2 x 11” reduced copy of site plan
☐ Electronic copy
☐ Written Narrative/Response to Criteria
☐ Power of Attorney
☐ Service Agreement
☐ Architectural Features
☐ Other:

Description of Request
(include name of project and proposed uses):
Kickin’ Cattle Company Planned Community
5-lot residential development

Property Owner: P Squared, Inc.
Address: PO Box 326
Grants Pass, OR 97526
Phone: 541-660-0679
Email: paul@psquaredinc.us
Applicant: Same
Address:
Phone:
Email:

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

Engineer/Applicant:
Justin Gerlitz, P.E.
Address: 223 NE B Street, Grants Pass, OR 97526
Phone: 541-244-2617
Email: justin@gerlitzengineering.com

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

(Signature of owner or Attorney-in-Fact) 3/14/2022

Date

(For Office Use)
Date Application Received: 3-17-22
Date Application Complete: 3-22-22
Pre-App required? Y N Pre-App #: 021-00401-21
Fees Paid: $1801.65 Initials: CN
File Number(s): 105-00106-22
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Subdivision and Condominium Plat Name Review and Approval Request Form

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

PROPOSED NAME: Kickin' Cattle Company Planned Community

ALTERNATE NAME:

Map and Tax Lot Number(s): 36 - 05 - 21 CC 6200

Site Address: 1637 Carnahan Drive

Location: City of Grants Pass [x] City of Cave Junction [ ] Josephine County [ ]

Owner/Applicant/Organization Name: Paul M Hurlbut - P Squared, Inc.

Signature of Owner/Applicant: [Signature]

Contact Phone: 541-660-0679

Property Owner's Name, Address, Phone & Email:
P Squared, Inc.
PO Box 326
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Surveyor/Engineer Name, Address, Phone & Email:
Gerlitz Engineering Consultants - Justin Gerlitz, P.E.
223 NE "B" Street, Grants Pass, OR 97526
541-244-2617
justin@gerlitzengineering.com

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

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

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

Approved Plat Name: Kickin' Cattle Company Planned Community

Josephine County Surveyor: [Signature] Date: 3/22/2022

Date Fee Rec’d: 3/15/22 Check #: 1249 / 3/13/22 Cash: Rcpt. Number: 954-180

Revised 09/16/2020

EXHIBIT 3

PAGE 2 OF 13
KICKIN’ CATTLE COMPANY PLANNED COMMUNITY
Preliminary Planned Unit Development Application Submittal

GEC
GERLITZ ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS
223 NE “B” Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526
541-244-2617
www.gerlitzengineering.com

Date Prepared:
3/13/22

Prepared For:
Grants Pass Community Development Dept.
101 NW “A” Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Prepared By:
Justin Gerlitz, PE

Owner/Applicant:
P Squared, Inc.
PO Box 325
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Project Address:
1637 Carnahan Drive
Grants Pass, OR 97527

Tax Map:
36S-05W-21-CC, TL 6200

RECEIVED
MAR 17 2022
CITY OF GRANTS PASS
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Tentative Planned Unit Development Submittal Narrative

Attached is the pre-application submittal for a 5-lot residential planned unit development (PUD) project located at 1637 Carnahan drive. This proposal will split the existing 0.61-acre parcel into 5 residential lots. A new private street will be created for access and new utility improvements will be constructed within the existing roadway.

Existing Conditions

The site previously contained a single-family home and multiple small buildings/sheds that have been removed. Currently, the site is undeveloped except for a well which is covered by a small well house. The property is surrounded by similar low-density single-family homes. Along both the north and south property lines there are small irrigation channels that were previously abandoned. There is also a small storm drainage/irrigation channel running along the western property line within the Carnahan drive right of way.

There are no formal street frontage improvements anywhere on Carnahan Drive and this is one of the last parcels to be developed. An existing sewer main and overhead power/cable TV run along the west side of the road. A gas line runs along the east shoulder. There is a power/utility pole at the northwest corner of the property that previously provided service to the house that was removed. There are two mailbox clusters in the Carnahan drive right of way near the southwest property corner that will be relocated as part of the project.

The site is very flat and consists of mainly grass, with some brush along the property lines and two trees in the southwest corner of the property. All vegetation, with exception of a few trees and the east vegetation screen, will likely be removed for the project.

Proposed conditions

The parcel will be split into 5 residential lots and will be completed in a single project phase. Access for lots 2-5, is proposed through a new 20’ private street extending from Carnahan drive. Lot 1 will take access directly from the existing roadway (local City street) which will be improved to local street standards along the PUD frontage. A hammerhead fire department turnaround is proposed near the end of the new street per City standards.

A public water main will be extended from Rogue River Highway within the Carnahan Drive right-of-way to the south property line. A new sewer main will be extended into the new private street to serve all the lots. A storm drainage ditch is being proposed just north of the private street within the 5’ roadway setback. Storm runoff from the 5 proposed single-family homes will be piped underground to a proposed catch basin where it will be detained before entering the existing storm drain ditch running along Carnahan drive.

Due to the level terrain, no major cuts/fills will be required for the new roadway and future home sites. Therefore, no retaining walls will be required.
Tree Retention

As required for the application, we have prepared a tree retention plan showing the approximate location of trees and shrubs to be planted after construction of the individual units (see Exhibit “B”). Most of the existing trees will be removed to allow construction of the new homes. As shown, new trees will be planted to meet City standards for the individual lots and total canopy requirements.

Traffic

Per the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual, the proposed units (Residential Planned Unit Development – Use 270) will generate 7.38 average daily weekday trips (ADT) and 0.72 peak PM hour trips per dwelling. This equates to 37 ADT and 3.6 peak hour trips. Since this is less than the 500 ADT and 25 PM peak hour trip count that triggers the need for a traffic impact analysis, none is required for this project.

Architectural

All homes within the development will be constructed to the same general size and character. Attached is an example of a typical architectural elevation that will be utilized for the project (see Exhibit “D”).

Subdivision Criteria

Below are the Development Code – Article 17.413 criteria for a subdivision, followed by our formal responses. The review body shall approve; approve with conditions; or deny the request based on the following criteria:

1) The plan conforms to the lot dimension standards of Article 12, the base lot standards of Section 17.510, and the requirement of any applicable overlay district.
   
   Response: The plan conforms to the lot standards in Article 12 and 17. There is adequate building pad area for each lot as shown on the tentative site/lot development plan.

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

   Response: No further division of the proposed lots is possible after construction of the new homes and roadway infrastructure. Access to future development surrounding the project is accommodated by the existing road layout.

3) When one is required or proposed, the street layout conforms to the applicable requirements of the adopted street plans, meets the requirements of Article 27 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency, and environmental compatibility.
Response: The proposed street layout follows previously established development patterns, meets the half street improvement and private street requirements of Article 27, and is compatible with the surrounding area. The new private street maintains a 5’ setback to the residential property, does not exceed the maximum length, and provides an adequate emergency turnaround between Lots 3 & 4. Adequate public right-of-way is being dedicated to accommodate the new curb, gutter and sidewalk.

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

Response: The proposed utility plan, which includes an extension of the existing 8” water main from Rogue River Highway to the south side of the development, meets the requirements of Article 28. This includes an extension of the existing public 8” sewer main to serve the new lots and a new storm drain/detention system within the new street. A 10’ City Utility Easement is being dedicated along all roadway frontages for installation of franchise utilities that currently exist in Carnahan Drive.

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

Response: A tree plan has been prepared as part of the application to demonstrate compliance with the City’s tree retention/reestablishment standards. Most of the existing vegetation will be removed to accommodate the proposed homesites and street, with exception to a few small trees and the vegetation along the east property line which will remain.

No other natural or historic features are present. No cuts will result in retaining walls over 15’ or slopes greater than 100%.

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

Response: The plan complies will all applicable standards and laws and follows the standards in the Development Code.
Planned Unit Development Criteria

Below are the Development Code – Article 18.043 criteria for a Planned Unit Development, followed by our formal responses. The review body shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the request, based upon the following criteria:

1) Development of any remaining contiguous property under the same ownership can be accomplished as provided in this Code.

Response: No further division of the proposed lots is possible after construction of the new homes and roadway infrastructure.

2) Adjoining land under separate ownership can either be developed or be provided access that will allow its development in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.

Response: All surrounding land is currently developed and has direct access to existing streets for any future development possibilities.

3) The proposed street plan affords the most economic, safe, efficient, and least environmentally damaging circulation of traffic possible under existing circumstances.

Response: The proposed private street serving four of the lots is being placed on the north property line to avoid the existing buildings that are very close to the south property line. This includes the required residential setback and a 20’ paved asphalt section that meets Article 27 requirements.

The Carnahan Drive frontage will be improved to local street standards (28’ half street section) along the property frontage. This will include a new private street approach and separate approach for Lot 1.

4) The Preliminary Plan complies with applicable portions of the Comprehensive Plan, this Code, and State and Federal laws.

Response: The plan complies with all applicable standards and laws and reflects the comments received during the pre-application review process.

5) The project results in an equal or superior product than would have resulted from following the Base Development Standards of the applicable Zoning District, as provided in Article 12 of this Code, or the Base Lot Standards of Land Divisions, as provided in Article 17 of this Code.

Response: Due to a very recent change in the property zoning (R-1-10 to R-3-2) under the adoption of the City’s overlay zones, the applicant must use the PUD process to allow construction of single-family homes on the parcel. This allows the project to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood, which is primarily low density single-family homes, while increasing density over the previous zoning designation.
6) The proposal results in a balanced exchange: for the developer, flexible development standards, maximum land utilization and alternate ownership options; for the Community, greater preservation of natural features and natural resources, greater proportions of useable open space and recreation facilities; or other community benefit for both, a greater opportunity for housing at all income levels.

Response: By modifying the base development standards, the development can create higher density single-family housing which is similar in character to the surrounding development patterns. Since this area has always been under the R-1-10 zoning designation until a few months ago, most of it contains low-density single-family homes. By developing the property as proposed, it will create more affordable housing options for this area.

7) Potential impacts to adjoining properties have been adequately mitigated through site design and attached development conditions. These conditions include the following protections:
   a. Providing the necessary information to complete the tree chart identified in Section 11.401.
   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 that are greater than 100%.
   c. No fills may result in a retaining wall within the required setback from a property not included in the development plan greater than 6 feet in height from the finish grade nor create any retained slopes greater than 100%.

Response: No significant impacts to adjoining properties are anticipated based on existing development patterns, road locations, and the proposed private street/lot layout.

A tree plan has been prepared as part of the application to demonstrate compliance with the City’s tree retention/reestablishment standards.

8) All utilities, access ways, open space and recreation areas not dedicated to the public are owned and maintained by a Homeowners' Association or other acceptable private legal entity with the responsibility for and capability of adequate maintenance and care of such facilities, to the satisfaction of the City Attorney and City Engineer.

Response: All common areas including the private street and private utilities will be maintained by the development's HOA. This includes landscape maintenance of the planter strip adjacent to the private street.

9) The applicant has demonstrated the ability to finance the project through final completion.

Response: The applicant has funding and/or has obtained initial approval for the project from their lender and intends to complete the project in a reasonable time frame as shown below.
Proposed Phasing/Development Schedule

As required, we have prepared the following conceptual development schedule for the project starting with the planning application and finishing will full project buildout. The project will be completed in a single development phase as follows:

- Planning Submittal: 3/18/22
- Planning Commission Hearing: 4/27/22
- Obtain Phase 1 Development Permit: 6/8/22
- Complete Final Plat: 8/22/22
- Full Project Buildout: 5/1/23

Summary

Overall, this development will be a nice addition to the area and will blend well with surrounding low density development patterns. It creates an efficient lot layout and through careful house plan selection, will create an attractive neighborhood that blends with the surrounding homes. We look forward to working with you through the planning and construction process.
Site Plan Review

Date of Review: March 29, 2022
Map/Tax Lot: 23-05-21-CC Lot 6200
Address of Project: 1637 Carnahan Dr
Planner: Maki

Permit Number: 105-00106-22

Comments:
1. **NO PARKING**: Parking on emergency access roads shall be as follows (OFC D103.6.1-2):
   - 20-25 feet road width – no parking on either side of roadway
   - 26-32 feet road width – parking is allowed on one side
   - Greater than 32 feet road width – parking is not restricted
     - *Private Street to be posted “No Parking Fire Lane” both sides.*
     - *Required Hammerhead turnaround to be posted “No Parking Fire Lane”.*

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

Submitted By: Joseph Hyatt, Fire Marshal

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. Carnahan Drive. Classification – Local Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: The required half street right-of-way equals 25 feet. The Applicant’s Surveyor shall determine if any additional right-of-way dedication is required at the subject location.
      ii. Required Street Improvements: Curb/gutter, driveway approach, 5.5 foot planter strip, and 5 foot sidewalk.
      iii. Per section 27.121 (11) (e) it is recommended that the driveway access for all lots shall be from the new private street.
      iv. Installation of streetlight on the corner of the private street and Carnahan Dr.
   b. Private Street. Classification – Private Street
      i. Required Right-of-Way dedication: None. See 27.123 (12) (b).
      ii. Required Street Improvements: 22 foot street width with a curb, 4 foot sidewalk along one side, and driveway approach for each lot.

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

4. Sanitary Sewers:
   a. Project specific requirements: Extend the 20 foot sewer easement into Lot 5.
   b. Design a minimum of one service lateral for each lot. Avoid installing service laterals in driveways. All service lines shall be located in the serviced property’s adjacent right-of-way and installed in a straight-line perpendicular to the Sewer Main.
   c. Connect the new development to public sewer and do not use septic systems unless exempted by section 28.071 (1).
d. Design all new sanitary sewer facilities in conformance with the City’s Sanitary Sewer Standards and Specifications.

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

5. Water System:
   a. Project specific requirements: Extend water main the full frontage of the property to City Standards and properly abandon any wells.
   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 at a distance less than 2 feet of separation between each other. Do not install a service tap in a main closer than 18” to a joint or fitting.
   d. Determine the water service and meter size. The aforementioned determination is not required for single-family residential units, where a 5/8'' x 3/4'' meter per GP274 each unit shall be standard. Furnish and install meters 3” and above. The City will furnish and install all meters smaller than 3”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Public Utilities:
   a. Place underground all utility facilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines and other wires, street lighting and communication and cable television services.
   b. If none exists, dedicate a City utility easement (C.U.E.) across the frontages of the development in conformance with the requirements of the public utility companies.
ENGINEERING PLAN REVIEW
SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS & APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPER INSTALLED IMPROVEMENTS

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS:

Before submitting civil construction drawings for review by the Engineering Division, you must complete the Land Use Decision Process, if applicable. (However, if the proposed public improvement is not based on a Land Use Decision please contact the Engineering Division directly for staff input prior to beginning design and then proceed to “Plan Review Submittals”.)

Listed below are the steps you must complete through the Planning Department prior to submitting civil construction plans to the Engineering Division for review. (These are general in nature. Please refer to Article 3 in the Grants Pass Development code for complete details at: http://www.grantspassoregon.gov/221/Development-Code.)

- Pre-Application Conference
- Submittal of Formal Application Materials
- Determination of Procedure Type
- Application Completeness and Processing Timeline
- Referral and Review of Complete Application
- Decision or Recommendation
- Appeal Process

Once you receive the final decision from the Planning Department (either in the form of a Director’s Decision for Type 1 Procedure or in the form of Findings of Fact for Types 2-5 Procedures) and the conditions require your development to install public improvements, you can submit your construction plans to the Engineering Division for review.

Plan Review Submittals:
Listed below are the items required for a complete plan review submittal:

1st Plan Review Submittal:
- Completed and signed application (attached)
- Complete number of sets of 24 x 36 civil construction plans (see below)
- Storm Drainage Calculations by Oregon Professional Engineer
- Copy of Approved Site Plan or Tentative Plat (whichever is applicable)
- Copy of the Staff Report or Findings of Fact issued by the Planning Department (whichever is applicable)
- Plan Review Fee
- Geo Tech Report (if applicable)
- Traffic Impact Mitigation (if applicable)
- ODOT Permit (if applicable)
- Josephine County Public Works Permit (if applicable)
- NPDES Permit (if applicable)
- DSL Permit (if applicable)
- DEQ Permit (if applicable)
2nd Plan Review submittal and/or each Subsequent Review until approved:

- One copy of revised 24 x 36 civil plans including any additional sheets signed and stamped by the Registered Engineer
- City review redlines
- One copy of any revised report signed and stamped by a registered engineer
- Any report or permit that was not available during the 1st plan review
- Signed & notarized Developer Installed Agreement. (Engineering Division to provide agreement with return of 1st review. Developer to provide with 2nd Plan Review Submittal.)
- Estimated Public Infrastructure Costs (must be submitted & approved prior to City approval of construction plans)
- Any outstanding fees (see below – must be paid prior to the start of construction)

Plan Review Timeframes:

Plan review submittals will be logged in and out by the Engineering Department Support Technician and reviewed for completeness by the Engineering Technician in accordance with the above checklists. If the submittal is incomplete, it will be immediately rejected and returned without review. If the submittal is complete, it will be routed for City staff and outside agencies review. Staff review times are listed below:

1st Plan Review: 2 weeks from date of complete submittal

2nd & Subsequent Plan Reviews: 1 week from the date of complete submittal

Number of Sets:

Submitted plans shall be 24 x 36 civil plans; signed and stamped by a Registered Professional Engineer with the State of Oregon designed in accordance with the staff report or findings of fact (if applicable), current City of Grants Pass Standard Drawings and Specifications (https://www.grantspassoregon.gov/283/Standard-Drawings), and Oregon Standard Specifications for Construction, current edition.

The number of sets of plans required for submittal to the City of Grants Engineering Division is as follows:

1st Plan Review:

- Fireline
- Commercial
- State Highway is Involved
- Josephine County is Involved
- GPID is Involved

Minimum 6 sets and add additional sets if the following apply:

- Add additional set
- Add additional set
- Add additional set
- Add additional set
- Add additional set

2nd & Subsequent Reviews

1 revised set plus City redline drawings

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

**Plan review fee:** $594.26 base fee + $62.51 per lot.

**Encroachment Permit Fee:** Flat fee of $77.89

**Grading Permit Fee:** This fee is determined by the quantity of soil being excavated and/or deposited and is 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 – 10,000 (cy)</td>
<td>$262.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 – 100,000 (cy)</td>
<td>Base Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 (cy) or more</td>
<td>Base Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Additional 10,000 (cy)</td>
<td>$62.11/10,000 (cy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inspection Services Fee:** This fee is based on the estimated public infrastructure improvements, installed complete (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 fee is calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Est. 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</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geographical Information System (GIS) Fee:** Per City of Grants Pass Resolution No. 5935, adopted April 18, 2012, a GIS fee has been added. This fee is calculated as follows:

 Estimated Public Infrastructure Cost x Service Charge = Inspection Services Fee  
 Inspection Services Fee x 5% = GIS Fee

**Construction Drawing Approval:**

Upon completion of the plan review process, Developer’s engineer must submit final plans to the City for a two step signature process.
Step 1: The City will sign-off for approval of City jurisdiction public infrastructure improvements. The Developer’s engineer will then take the final plans to be signed-off by other agencies (i.e. GPID, Power, Gas, Phone, Cable, ODOT, Josephine County Public Works, etc.).

Step 2: After the Developer’s Engineer receives sign-offs from the other agencies, the final plans must then be resubmitted to the City to be signed-off for Approval of Construction. Developer’s Engineer shall provide three (3) sets of approved plans prior to start of construction. (Please note: The sign-off for approval of construction does not constitute approval to start construction).

Construction Drawing As-buils:

“As-built” construction drawings with a signed and dated “Project Certification” on the front page must be submitted electronically to the Engineering Department prior to Final Plat approval, issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or final inspection, which ever is applicable. The Project Certification shall state the following:

“I hereby certify that this project was constructed to the lines, grade and section as shown on these plans and that all materials and workmanship are in conformance with the plans and applicable specifications.”

Pre-Construction Meeting:

The pre-construction meeting will not be held until the following items are complete:

- Issuance of Development Permit
- Issuance of Other Outside Agency Permits (i.e. ODOT, JoCoPW, NPDES, DSL/Corp etc.)
- Payment & Issuance of Encroachment Permit
- Payment & Issuance of Grading Permit
- Payment of Inspection Services Fee
- Payment of the GIS Fee

Once the above items are complete a pre-construction meeting will be scheduled prior to the start of construction by the Engineering Department Support Technician with the following parties:

- Developer
- Developer’s Engineer
- Developer’s Surveyor
- Power, Phone, Gas, Cable, GPID
- Contractor
- Engineer Technician
- Public Works

Once the above items are complete and the pre-construction meeting is held construction may begin.
CONSTRUCTION PLANS DESIGN CHECKLIST

The requirements referred to on this checklist can be found in the City of Grants Pass Standard Drawings and Specifications.

General Requirements for submitted Construction Plans

- Registered Oregon Professional Engineer stamp and signature
- Storm drainage calculations by Oregon professional engineer.
- Owner or fiduciary will be responsible for obtaining approvals (signatures in the signature block) from other agencies (I.e., power, telephone, gas, cable, etc.), prior to the City authorizing construction to proceed.

Items to be shown or specified on the plans:

— Title Block:
  - Locate in lower right-hand corner or right side of each sheet with all applicable agencies.
  - Project title (Subdivision, Partition, etc.)
  - Project Engineer/Surveyor (Name, address, telephone)
  - Project Engineer’s Stamp
  - Project Owner/Developer (Name, address, telephone)
  - Project location (Township, Range, Section, Quarter)
  - Project description (Street, sanitary sewer, water main, storm drain, etc.)
  - Street Name
  - Drawn by______, Designed by______, Checked by______.
  - Date.
  - Scale (Horizontal and vertical).
  - Revisions block.
  - Sheet______ of_______
— North arrow.
— Basis of bearing: with ties to two Geodetic Control Points.
— Basis of elevation: on a true datum.
— TBM’s with elevations, locations and descriptions.
— Right-of-way survey monuments that shall be set as part of the project.
— Right-of-way survey monuments found.
— Right-of-way width on Plan View.
— Street width on Plan View.
— Vicinity map, on front page.
— Property Owner’s names and Assessor’s map and tax lot numbers.
— Curve Data: (If applicable)
  - Construction centerline.
  - Right-of-way centerline (If different than construction centerline).
  - Street intersection radii.
  - Right-of-way intersection radii.
  - Cul-de-sac radius and returns: Finish surface and right-of-way.
— Typical Road Section: (If applicable)
  - State road classification.
  - Subgrade specifications.
  - Base course specifications.
  - Leveling course specifications.
- Surfacing specifications.
  - Curb and gutter and sidewalk specifications.
  - Utility locations (i.e., power, gas, telephone, etc.)
- Centerline profile, showing both existing ground and finished grade. Ditch line grades in areas not requiring curb and gutter, including profile and section of intercepting ditches. Submit cross sections at 50-foot intervals, at critical sections and as required by Engineering Department of the City of Grants Pass.
- Erosion sediment control measures and slope design consistent with a report submitted by a qualified professional engineer or geotechnical engineer if any cut or fill exceeds 4 feet in height; grading on slopes of 15% or greater; or grading granitic soils.
- Special drainage ditches, drainage structures, culverts & bridges.
- Private storm drain systems; notify property owner to obtain plumbing permit, follow plumbing code and have system inspected by plumbing inspector.
- Storm Sewers and Sanitary Sewer:
  - Size.
  - Material type and gauge or class of pipe.
  - Coating, if applicable.
  - Manholes
  - Invert elevations/grades
  - Slope grades
- Water Lines:
  - Size.
  - Material type and gauge or class of pipe
  - Coating, if applicable.
  - Slope grades.
  - All fittings and appurtenances. (Values, size, type)
- Traffic regulatory and warning sign plan; also showing pass/no pass zones.
- General notes and notes for each public improvement being installed.
- Show street plugs, if applicable.
- Road approach and driveway locations and details.
- Trees to be removed and replaced.
- Retaining wall specifications.
- Identify "no cut" streets, if applicable.
- Public improvements to cover full frontage of property.
- Installation of public improvements shall be within right-of-way
- Identify wells to be abandoned.
- Identify sewer/water mains to be abandoned.
- Sewer/water services shall not cross property lines.
- Private sewer/water service laterals will require a plumbing permit.
- Construction accesses to be rocked.
- Standard drawings and details.
- Agency approval block, front page.
- Show all easements on plans. (These must be recorded prior to C of O unless on plat)
- Show striping plan, if applicable.
- Show traffic mitigation improvements.

- "As-builts" shall have a signed and dated "Project Certification" on the front page stating the following:

  "I hereby certify that this project was constructed to the lines, grade and section as shown on these plans and that all materials and workmanship are in conformance with the plans and applicable specifications."
# ENGINEERING PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION

## PRIMARY CONTACT INFORMATION:
- **Name:**
- **Address:**
- **City/State/Zip:**
- **Phone:**
- **Email:**

## PROJECT INFORMATION:
- **Development Name:**
- **Subdivision Name:**
- **Map/Tax Lot #:**
- **Project Address:**
- **Estimated Construction Costs:**
  - Attach Backup Details

## Additional Parties:
- **Owner/Address/Phone:**
- **Developer/Address/Phone:**
- **Design Engineer/Address/Phone:**

## Description of Project:

## Additional Jurisdictions:
- **(Mark "X" to all that apply)**
  - JoCoPW: □
  - ODOT: □
  - DSL/Corp: □
  - DEQ: □
  - GPID: □
  - Other: □

### Contractor/Contact Information

All work within public rights-of-ways must be performed by licensed prequalified contractors per Chapter 9.37 of the Grants Pass Municipal Code, at [http://www.grantspassoregon.gov/316/Municipal-Codes건立], then select Title 9.

Please list the licensed contractors you will be using on this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor/Company Name</th>
<th>License Number</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Business License</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Owner/Applicant:

I verify that the information presented on this application is true to the best of my knowledge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## For Engineering Use Only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Completed By &amp; Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Review Application</td>
<td>1st Review</td>
<td>Approve Site Plan</td>
<td>Sign Off Signatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete # of sets of plans</td>
<td>2nd Review</td>
<td>Approved Tent. Plat</td>
<td>Const. Dwg. Appvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Calcs</td>
<td>3rd Review</td>
<td>Staff Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Site Plan</td>
<td>4th Review</td>
<td>Findings of Fact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Tent. Plat</td>
<td>Sign Off Signatures</td>
<td>Permits/Documents/Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Report</td>
<td>Const. Dwg. Appvd</td>
<td>Plan Review Fee</td>
<td>DIA Signed/Recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Tech Report</td>
<td>DIA Signed/Recorded</td>
<td>Estimated Construction Costs</td>
<td>Develop Permit Issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impact Analysis</td>
<td>DIA Signed/Recorded</td>
<td>Geo Tech Report</td>
<td>Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Permit</td>
<td>DIA Signed/Recorded</td>
<td>Traffic Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine County Permit</td>
<td>DIA Signed/Recorded</td>
<td>ODOT Permit</td>
<td>Permit No.: Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>DIA Signed/Recorded</td>
<td>Josephine County Permit</td>
<td>Permit No.: Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSL Permit</td>
<td>DIA Signed/Recorded</td>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>Date Paid:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSL Permit</td>
<td>DIA Signed/Recorded</td>
<td>DSL Permit</td>
<td>Date Held:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Permits/Documents/Fees:
- **Enc Permit Issued/Pd:** Permit No.: Date:
- **Grading Pmt Issued/Pd:** Permit No.: Date:
- **Inspection Fee:** Date Paid:
- **GIS Fee:** Date Paid:
- **Precon Mtg Held:** Date Held:

**EXHIBIT**

**PAGE____OF____**
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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $30.66/lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision, Post-Monumented</td>
<td>$501.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $47.37/lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>$586.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $47.37/unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>Less than 100 (CY)</td>
<td>$ 78.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 1,000 (CY)</td>
<td>$116.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 - 10,000 (CY)</td>
<td>Base Fee $129.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 100,000 (CY)</td>
<td>Base Fee $526.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,001 - 100,000 (CY) Base Fee $526.81

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>
This brochure is intended to be used as a guideline only for estimating System Development Charges as a part of total project costs. Actual costs for your project may differ due to site specific requirements.

It does not include information on other fees which may be due including Planning Review Fees, Engineering Fees, Building Permit Fees, Water and Sewer Connection Fees, Reimbursement District Fees and Business Licenses.

Please contact the Community Development office at (541) 450-6060 for information on SDC’s specific to your project and information on other potential costs.

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.

Visit our website at:
http://www.grantspassoregon.gov

***NEW ONLINE FEE ESTIMATOR***
https://goweb.grantspassoregon.gov/EnerGov_Prod/SelfService/estimate

Community Development office is located at:
101 NW "A" Street
Upstairs, Room 202
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526
(541) 450-6060

Open 8am – 5pm Monday – Friday

Building Hours 8am – 10am M – F
(9am – 10am M – F)

Planning Hours 8am – 5pm M – F

---

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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard (1,701—2,900 sf)</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$4,210.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$10,527.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$5,769.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$14,422.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$26,845.26</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 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water meter size</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$10,527.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$21,054.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$33,687.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$63,164.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$105,274.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&quot; Meter</td>
<td>$210,549.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (&lt;=1,700 sf)</td>
<td>$2,630.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (1,701—2,900 sf)</td>
<td>$3,868.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (&gt;2,900 sf)</td>
<td>$5,299.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duplex</th>
<th>Fee (per $1,046 based on dwelling size):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>$4,314.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>$6,344.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$8,691.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triplex</th>
<th>Fee (per $2.28 based on dwelling size):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>$5,997.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>$8,820.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$12,083.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sewer SDCs for commercial, public and quasi-public development are determined by the number of fixture units and square footage. Each fixture unit is charged a fee equal to the number of fixture units and square footage. 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://www.cityofgrantspass.com/Departments/Utilities/StormDrainRateEstimator.

Transportation

The Transportation SDC was adopted by the City Council on September 15, 1999. The Transportation SDC helps to provide 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 20% reduction from the previous rate.

In certain cases, a credit may be applied towards the Transportation SDC for previous uses on the site. Please contact the City Planning for an estimate of the Transportation SDC for your project.

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

**Simple Family Residence**

Category: Single-family (9.57 trips/unit)

1 unit x 9.57 trips/unit x $125.77/trip = $1,203.62

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 or
- Any construction which creates a new business building or enlarges a business building or
- Issuance of the first manufactured home placement permit granted upon a logical building lot.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKLAND ACQUISITION</th>
<th>$131.39 per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$41.36 per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total per unit** $205.96

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKLAND ACQUISITION</th>
<th>$47.79 per space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$55.14 per space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total per parking space** $58.94

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
MEMORANDUM

To: Urban Area Planning Commission
From: Bradley Clark, Community Development Director
Date: April 21, 2022
Re: Middle Housing Code Update – Master Utility Plans

On April 13, 2022, the Commission continued the public hearing for the Middle Housing Code Update (HB2001 - Application #405-00129-22). The primary reason for continuance was to provide commissioners additional time to review and digest the proposed code amendments, which are extensive and affect 10 different Articles in the Development Code. Another noted reason was to consider potential impacts that may result from the increased residential density on the City’s public infrastructure. To assist you in your decision-making, attached are selected sections from Council-adopted master plans for sewer, water, stormwater and transportation. These provide a summary of the land use assumptions that were made when these utility plans were written. (Full versions of these documents are available on the City’s web site. Go to www.grantspassoregon.gov then to City Hall > Master Plans.)

In staff’s view, it is not feasible to accurately project the number of new dwelling units that will be constructed in Grants Pass as a result of the HB2001 legislation. There are too many uncertainties and complex factors at play to make such projections (e.g. market conditions, topography, lending/construction interest rates, street capacity). For decades, middle housing types have been a permitted land use in the city limits in several zoning districts but has only resulted in a small fraction of the total number of dwelling units built. It is reasonable to expect that expanding the number of acres and zoning districts where middle housing types can be built will result in an increase to the number of building permits. However, since HB2001 does not change or address building code standards, traffic generation/impact, landscaping or related development requirements for middle housing, the cost and financing of these housing types remains similar to pre-HB2001 conditions.

It is the Commission’s role and responsibility to assess all aspects of the proposed code changes and ensure the required criteria for a code amendment are met to your satisfaction before making a formal recommendation to the City Council.

end
INTRODUCTION AND SERVICE AREA CHARACTERISTICS

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the objectives of this Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (CSMP), and a brief overview of the City of Grants Pass (City’s) wastewater collection system. A list of abbreviations is provided at the end of this chapter to assist the reader in understanding the information presented in the Plan.

1.2 OBJECTIVE

The City’s last CSMP was completed in 2004. A number of the recommended collection system improvements from the 2004 Plan have been implemented. Additionally, the City expanded and adopted new Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and Urban Reserve Area (URA) in 2014. This update shall document changes since the last plan and provide a review of current planning, management, operations, and maintenance of the City’s collection system. Additionally, this plan shall:

1. Evaluate the capacity of the existing sanitary collection system during peak wet weather flows under existing and future projected growth conditions,
2. Develop feasible alternatives to correct these deficiencies, and plan the infrastructure that will serve future development, and
3. Provide the City with a capital improvement program (CIP) that they can implement for a reliable wastewater collection system to serve the anticipated population in the service area.

The scope of this Master Plan update included the following main tasks:

- Policy & Criteria Review;
- Flow Projections;
- Condition of Existing Assets;
- Collection System Analysis;
- Capital Project Development; and
- Master Plan Preparation.

The selected planning years for this evaluation include the current year (2015), the short-term planning year (2025), and the long-term planning year (2035). The Plan also evaluates build-out conditions of the City.
1.3 BACKGROUND

The City of Grants Pass is located in the Rogue River Valley in the Klamath Mountain Range of Oregon. The City owns, maintains, and operates gravity wastewater pipelines and pump stations within their service area of approximately 8,522 acres and a population of 44,500¹. The City collects wastewater from residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial customers within the service area.

The City's wastewater system consists of 23 drainage basins and 5 pump stations. Wastewater is collected and conveyed to the City's Water Restoration Plant (WRP), where it is measured and recorded daily by a dedicated meter.

The current land use assumptions in this CSMP are based on data from the City's Geographical Information System (GIS). Future land use assumptions were based on the City's Comprehensive Plan and projected future developments per the City's planning department.

1.3.1 Wastewater Service Area

Figure 1.1 illustrates the City's existing sewer service area, Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), Study Area, and Urban Reserves.

The existing sewer service area shows the extent of the area that is currently served by the sewer collection system. The UGB was updated and expanded in 2014 by the City and is shown in Figure 1.1. The Study Area includes existing sewer service area and future areas that are anticipated to be added to the City's existing service area in the 20-year planning horizon of this CSMP. The Study Area basically follows the UGB boundary and incorporates the Redwood Sanitary Sewer Service District (RSSSD).

The Study Area comprises of the following historic collection systems:

- The City of Grants Pass sewer collection system,
- Fruitdale - Harbeck collection system,
- Redwood Sanitary Sewer Service District (RSSSD), and
- Several expansion areas such as the area located North of Interstate 5 (I-5) or the Spalding area.

Management of the RSSSD was transferred to the City in approximately 2000, and a petition was approved in 2010 to dissolve the Fruitdale-Harbeck system and make it a part of the City’s collection system. Further, RSSSD was dissolved in 2013 and the area is now simply served by the City without a separate District. The area north of I-5 and the industrial Spalding area were included as part of the UGB expansion in 2014 and flows from the area will be addressed in this CSMP.

The combined collection system discharges to the City’s Water Restoration Plant (WRP), located centrally within the City and adjacent to the Rogue River.

The City adopted five urban reserve areas outside of the Study Area in 2014 as illustrated in 2014. Development and analysis of the urban reserve areas will be presented in a separate appendix of this CSMP (Appendix A).

### 1.3.2 Land Use

Land use information is an integral component in estimating the amount of wastewater generated within any City. The type of land use in an area will affect the volume of the wastewater generated. Additionally, the service area is typically comprised of both sewered and unsewered areas: Sewered areas contribute flow to the collection system, while unsewered areas are vacant or undeveloped land and do not currently contribute flow to the collection system. The following section describes the land use assumptions for the existing sewer service area and Study Area.

#### 1.3.2.1 Existing Service Area Land Use

The existing land use is presented in Figure 1.2. Of the City’s total existing service area of 8,522 acres, approximately 4,857 acres is sewered (i.e, contribute flows to the sewer system) and 3,669 acres are unsewered (vacant, undeveloped, right of ways, canals, etc.). Table 1.1 provides a summary of the land use zoning categories and acreages for the existing service area. The City’s service area serves the population within the existing City limits (inside UGB) and a portion of the County that lies outside the UGB (Redwood service area).

Of the total service area (sewered and unsewered), the largest land use category is residential, which accounts for approximately 5,438 acres, or approximately 64 percent of total acreage. Commercial, business, and office space make up approximately 1,273 acres, or 15 percent of the total. Industrial makes up approximately 265 acres, or 3 percent of the total. Streets and canals make up approximately 1,538 acres, or 18 percent, and open space makes up 14 acres, or 0.2 percent of the total acreage; streets and canals and open space are considered unsewered areas.

#### 1.3.2.2 Future Service Area Land Use

The future service area land use is presented in Figure 1.3 and corresponds to the adopted Comprehensive Land use Plan. The future service area includes build-out of the entire Study Area which includes the existing service area and UGB. Therefore, the future sewered service area includes existing sewered service area, infill of existing unsewered areas, and additional areas within the Study Area. Table 1.2 provides land use summary the Study Area. Approximately 1,370 acres will be added to the existing service area to make the future build-out service area of 9,892 acres. Land use data for the Urban Reserve areas is shown in Appendix A.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Area (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of Total Service Area (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside UGB Boundary (within Existing Sewer Service Area)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>147.7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>661.8</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-10</td>
<td>Residential - Low Density</td>
<td>223.2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-12</td>
<td>Residential - Low Density</td>
<td>363.4</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-6</td>
<td>Residential - Moderate Density</td>
<td>366.9</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-8</td>
<td>Residential - Low Density</td>
<td>1,293.2</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Residential - Moderate Density</td>
<td>574.1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>Residential - High Density</td>
<td>557.5</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Residential - High-Rise Density</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Rural Commercial</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Rural Industrial</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>Rural Residential 1 Acre</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR2.5</td>
<td>Rural Residential 2.5 Acre</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR5</td>
<td>Rural Residential 5 Acre</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC-1</td>
<td>Riverfront Tourist Commercial</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC-2</td>
<td>Riverfront Tourist Commercial</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC-3</td>
<td>Riverfront Tourist Commercial</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant, underdeveloped</td>
<td>2,001.9</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside UGB Boundary (within Existing Sewer Service Area)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>Rural Residential 1 Acre</td>
<td>291.5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR2.5</td>
<td>Rural Residential 2.5 Acre</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR5</td>
<td>Rural Residential 5 Acre</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant, underdeveloped</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right of ways, streets, canals</td>
<td>1,534.4</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,522.3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 1.2  
**Future Land Use Summary (Study Area)**
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**City of Grants Pass**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Category (Inside UGB Boundary (within Study Area))</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Area (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of Total Service Area (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>340.1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business Park</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Employment Area</td>
<td>220.6</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>943.9</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>High-Density Residential</td>
<td>794.3</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>High-Rise Residential</td>
<td>392.3</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>275.4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>3,078.1</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Moderate-Density Residential</td>
<td>1,365.6</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Riverfront Tourist Commercial</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Category (Outside UGB Boundary (within Study Area))</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Area (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of Total Service Area (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>Rural Residential 1 Acre</td>
<td>371.3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR5</td>
<td>Rural Residential 5 Acre</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right of ways, streets, canals</td>
<td>1,851.3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,892.4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1.4 REPORT ORGANIZATION

The CSMP report contains six chapters, followed by appendices that provide supporting documentation for the information presented. The chapters are briefly described below:

**Chapter 1 – Introduction and Service Area Characteristics.** This chapter presents the background information for this Master Plan and the objectives of the study.

**Chapter 2 – Policies & Criteria.** This chapter presents the policies for ownership, operations, and maintenance of the collection system. It also reviews the criteria for evaluating the wastewater collection system.

**Chapter 3 – Flow Projections.** This chapter reviews historical wastewater flows and presents the methodology for average and peak flow projections. These flow projections are used throughout the rest of the CSMP for evaluating future conditions.
SECTION 2
WATER REQUIREMENTS

This section presents existing and projected future water demands for the City of Grants Pass’s (City’s) water service area.

Service Area

The water service area is the specific area within which direct water service is currently available. For cities that provide water service to their residents, the area is typically the city limits and can be expected to grow in the future as property is annexed within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and as the UGB is expanded. A description of the existing and future service area boundaries used for the analyses follows. Service area boundaries are illustrated on Figure 2-1 at the end of this section.

Existing

The City’s existing water service area includes all existing water customers within the Grants Pass city limits and a small area of unincorporated Josephine County five miles north of the City between Merlin and Interstate 5 referred to as the North Valley. A number of developed properties within the city limits are supplied drinking water by private groundwater wells and do not receive City water. These properties are not included in the existing service area.

Future

The future water service area includes the entire area within the city limits and UGB as well as North Valley. Future North Valley customers are described in more detail later in this section. For the purposes of this Water Distribution System Master Plan (WDSMP) it is assumed that existing developed properties within the UGB which are supplied by private wells will not be included in the water system service area through the 20-year planning horizon. These properties are assumed to connect to the City water system beyond the 20-year planning horizon and are included in the future service area at saturation development. These assumptions regarding private well customers facilitate long-term planning for future water system capacity. They are not intended to establish a City policy for these customers. For this analysis, it is assumed that all new development within the UGB will receive City water service.

Future water service expansion areas are divided between existing and proposed future pressure zones based on ground elevations and a service pressure range of 35 to 80 pounds per square inch (psi). Grants Pass’s existing and proposed future pressure zones are illustrated on Figure 2-2 at the end of this section and discussed in further detail in Section 4.
Planning Period

The planning period for this WDSMP is 20 years, through the year 2036, consistent with Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) requirements for Water System Master Plans (OAR 333-061). Although not required for regulatory approval, water demand projections are also provided for a 30-year window consistent with the City’s comprehensive planning process.

Some planning and facility sizing efforts within this WDSMP will use estimates of water demands at saturation development. Saturation development occurs when all the vacant, developable land within the planning area has been developed to the maximum zoning density with some practical allowance for in-fill of existing developed properties. For the purposes of this WDSMP, saturation development is assumed to occur at 30 years. Typically, if substantial water system improvements are required beyond the 20-year planning period in order to accommodate water demands at saturation development, staging is recommended for facilities where incremental expansion is feasible and practical.

Current Water Demand

Water demand refers to all water required by the system including residential, commercial, industrial and institutional uses. Demands are described using three water usemetrics, average daily demand (ADD), maximum day demand (MDD) and peak hour demand (PHD), in gallons per unit of time such as gallons per day (gpd) or million gallons per day (mgd). ADD is the total annual water volume used system-wide divided by 365 days per year. MDD is the largest 24-hour water volume for a given year. In western Oregon, MDD usually occurs each year between July 1st and September 30th. This timeframe is referred to as the peak season. PHD is estimated as the largest hour of demand on the maximum water use day.

Water demand can be calculated using either water consumption or water production data. Water consumption data is taken from the City’s customer billing records and includes all revenue metered uses. Water production is measured as the water supplied to the distribution system from the City’s Water Treatment Plant (WTP) plus the water volume supplied from distribution storage. Water production includes unaccounted-for water including water loss and unmetered, non-revenue uses, such as, hydrant flushing.

For the purposes of this WDSMP, water production data is used to calculate total water demand in order to account for unmetered water uses. 2014 customer consumption and billing records are used to distribute demands throughout the water system hydraulic model, discussed in Section 4, and to estimate water demand distribution among the City’s pressure zones.

The historical ratios of MDD:ADD and PHD:MDD are used to estimate future maximum day and peak hour demands. Based on historical system-wide demands, the ratio of MDD:ADD is approximately 2.1. The ratio of PHD:MDD is approximately 1.7 consistent with similar regional water providers. Due to inconsistent or unavailable historical flow data
from the City’s other constant pressure pump stations, the ratio of PHD:MDD is estimated based on historical flow data from the New Hope Pump Station. Table 2-1 summarizes the City’s current system-wide water demand based on water production data.

Table 2-1
Current Water Demand Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ADD (mgd)</th>
<th>MDD (mgd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>11.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water Demand by Pressure Zone

As described in Section 1, water systems are divided into pressure zones in order to provide adequate service pressure to customers at different elevations. Each pressure zone is served by specific facilities, such as, reservoirs or pump stations and related piping which supply pressure to customers. In order to assess the adequacy of these facilities, it is necessary to estimate demand in each pressure zone. Current water demand based on WTP production and stored water volume data presented in Table 2-1 is distributed between the City’s pressure zones based on metered water consumption from 2014 billing records. Current water demand by pressure zone is summarized in Table 2-2.
Table 2-2
Current (2014) Water Demand by Pressure Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure Zone</th>
<th>ADD (mgd)</th>
<th>MDD (mgd)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>69.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2HK</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2HT</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MW</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NH</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>9.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MW</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3WX</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4\</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4LR</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1. Pressure zone 4 demands include small demand for Zone 3B along Beacon Drive which is served through a PRV from Hefley Pump Station.

Water Consumption by Customer Type

Current water consumption by rate class or customer type from the City’s billing records is used to correlate water demand to land use type for future demand projections. The City’s water utility billing records maintain five rate classes; Residential, Multifamily, Commercial, Public and Residential Planned Unit Development (PUD). PUD customers serve several homes from a single master meter connection to City distribution mains. Current water consumption by rate class is based on 2014 City water billing data as illustrated in Figure 2-3.

In addition to the rate class, the City also uses a service type indicator which is either domestic water service, irrigation service or standby. Standby meters are intended to be used only in an emergency. Grants Pass’s irrigation consumption serves both residential and non-residential properties. The total water consumption for all service types is used to estimate future water demands by customer type.
Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs)

The Grants Pass water system serves single-family residential customers as well as commercial customers and multifamily housing developments. Single-family residential water services generally have a consistent daily and seasonal pattern of water use or demand. Water demands for multifamily residences, commercial and industrial users may vary from service to service depending on the density of multifamily developments or the type of commercial enterprise. In order to establish a common measure of water demand growth for all customer types, the water needs of non-residential and multifamily residential customers are represented by comparing their water use volume to the average single-family residential unit water use. The number of single-family residential units that could be served by the water demand of these other types of customers is referred to as a number of “equivalent residential units” (ERUs).

ERUs differ from actual metered water service connections in that they relate all water customers to an equivalent number of representative single-family residential customers based on typical annual consumption. ERUs calculated here are specific to estimating future water demand and are not the same as dwelling units used in housing studies or comprehensive planning to forecast future population.
Average Daily Water Demand per ERU

ADD per ERU is calculated from City billing records as the 2014 average daily consumption by single-family residential customers divided by the number of single-family residential meter records. As previously discussed, average daily consumption reflects both domestic and irrigation water use. Current ADD per ERU is approximately 322 gallons per day (gpd/ERU) as summarized in Table 2-3. For the purposes of this analysis, ADD per ERU is assumed to remain constant in the future.

### Table 2-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Residential Water Consumption (gallons)</th>
<th>919,861,976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Consumption ADD (gallons)</td>
<td>2,520,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Single-Family Residential Customers</td>
<td>7,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADD per ERU (gpd/ERU)</strong></td>
<td><strong>322</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
1. Residential consumption and number of customers includes all meters with 2014 billing records and a rate class of “R” excluding PUDs and condominium developments with common open space.

Planned Unit Developments

Although many of the customers served through PUD master meters are residing in developments of single-family attached or detached homes like condominiums and mobile home parks, the water consumption of these developments more closely resembles customers in the Multifamily water rate class. Existing Grants Pass PUDs incorporate common green space or community facilities which are served by the City water system similar to existing multifamily developments within the City. For the purposes of this analysis, water consumption by customers in PUDs and condominiums are included in the Multifamily customer type.

ERUs per Acre

Future ADD projections are based on the anticipated number of ERUs per acre for each land use category and the number of developable acres in each category from the City’s Comprehensive Plan 2014 Update. Single-family residential ERUs per acre are estimated based on the average demand per acre for existing residential customers in the Low Density and Moderate Density Residential land use categories.

ERUs per acre for multifamily, PUD and non-residential developments in the City’s water service area are estimated based on 2014 water billing records for existing customers, parcel area associated with each of these billing records and a demand per ERU of 322 gpd. Estimated ERUs per acre are summarized in Table 2-4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Designation and City Zoning</th>
<th>ERUs per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>LR: R-1-12, R-1-10, R-1-8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>MR: R-1-6, R-2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiFamily (PUD)</td>
<td>Moderate-High and High Density Residential (HR &amp; HRR): R-3, R-3-1, R-3-2, R-4, R-4-1, R-4-2, R-5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (NC), River Tourist Commercial (RTC), General Commercial (GC), Central Business District (CBD)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Industrial)</td>
<td>Business Park (BP), Industrial Park (IP), Industrial (I)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Water Demand Projections**

Estimates of future growth and related water demand are developed using the best available information for the City’s service area including geographic information system (GIS) data, the Population Research Center’s (PRC’s) June 2015 *Coordinated Population Forecast for Josephine County*, buildable lands inventory from the City’s *Comprehensive Plan 2014 Update* and current water demand data presented earlier in this section. Future system-wide water demands are forecast at 10-years, 20-years and at saturation development. For the purposes of this WDSMP, saturation development is assumed to occur at 30 years.

Estimated water demands at saturation development are used to size recommended transmission and distribution improvements to accommodate ultimate capacity needs. Future MDD is projected from estimated future ADD based on the current average ratio of MDD:ADD, also referred to as a peaking factor. From current water demand data shown in **Table 2-1**, the MDD:ADD peaking factor for the Grants Pass system is approximately 2.1. Future PHD is similarly projected from future MDD, the PHD:MDD peaking factor is approximately 1.7.
Forecast demands are allocated to existing and proposed future pressure zones based on the ground elevations in water service expansion areas and a service pressure range of 35 to 80 psi. Existing and proposed pressure zone boundaries for the study area are illustrated on **Figure 2-2** at the end of this section. Projected demands are summarized in **Table 2-7** at the end of this section.

**Within UGB**

**10-Year Water Demand Projection**

Water demand at 10 years is forecast based on anticipated growth rates for the Grants Pass UGB published in the PRC's *June 2015 Population Forecast for Josephine County*. As shown in **Figure 2-3**, the majority of water use within the City's service area is by residential customers thus short-term water demand growth may be reasonably estimated based on projected population growth rates.

The PRC's *June 2015 Population Forecast for Josephine County* shows a projected annual average growth rate of 1.5 percent for the Grants Pass UGB through 2035. Projected 10-year water demands are assumed to be distributed to existing pressure zones based on the percentage of existing demand in each zone as presented in **Table 2-2**.

**20-Year and Saturation (30-Year) Water Demand Projections**

The Grants Pass *Comprehensive Plan 2014 Update* Figure 5-2 includes an inventory of developable acreage within the UGB and Urban Reserve Areas (URA) for residential and non-residential land use categories at 20 and 30 years. Water demand growth at 20 years and saturation development (30 years) is projected based on this developable acreage and the ERUs per acre presented in **Table 2-3**. Projected 20- and 30-year water demands are distributed to existing and proposed future pressure zones based on GIS mapping of buildable lands, the 2014 UGB expansion and URAs.

**Private Well Customers**

It is assumed that residents within the UGB currently served by private wells or small private water systems will continue to receive water outside the City system through 20 years. All new development within the UGB is assumed to be served by the City water system with no newly developed properties being served by private wells. Water demand forecasts at saturation development (30 years) assume that all existing private customers will be connected to the City water system.

These assumptions regarding private well customers facilitate long-term planning for future water system capacity, they are not intended to establish a City policy for these potential customers. Water demands for residents currently served by private wells and water systems are estimated based on the number of ERUs per acre for each development type as shown in **Table 2-3**. Existing developed properties within the City's water service area that are not
currently served by the City's water system are estimated to contribute approximately 1.3 mgd to average daily demands at saturation development.

**Rogue Community College**

Rogue Community College’s (RCC) 80-acre Redwood Campus is located in the southwestern corner of the Grants Pass UGB. The campus is currently supplied through a private water distribution system with a dedicated groundwater source, treatment and finished water storage reservoirs. RCC’s Redwood Campus includes approximately 30 developed acres including one and two-story classroom buildings, a gymnasium, irrigated sports fields and café.

For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that RCC may receive water service from the City within the 30-year planning horizon. Potential RCC water demand is estimated as 30 acres at approximately 6.0 ERUs per acre consistent with average demand per acre for existing commercial development in Grants Pass.

**North Valley**

The City currently serves three groups of customers within the North Valley water service area:

1. North Valley Industrial Area (NVIA)
2. Merlin Landfill area
3. Paradise Ranch

It is anticipated that the City will continue to serve existing customers and some growth in these three areas as well as a portion of the 2014 UGB expansion north of the existing North Valley Reservoir.

**NVIA**

The NVIA was the catalyst for construction of Reservoir 15 by Josephine County and creation of the North Valley Pressure Zone when the City assumed ownership and management of the reservoir. The ultimate ADD for the NVIA’s 90-acre water service area was estimated at 40,000 gpd (0.04 mgd) in the 1982 *NVIA Water and Wastewater Analysis Phase 1*. This build-out estimate is based on approximately 80 acres of industrial development at approximately 500 gpd/acre (1.6 ERUs/acre). The remaining 10 acres are assumed to be devoted to right-of-way consistent with existing roadways within the NVIA.

The 1982 study assumed future industrial development in this area would have low water demand characteristics. Current billing records for customers in the NVIA indicate ADD/acre is well below 500 gpd/acre. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that NVIA ADD will increase by a total of 0.01 mgd in 10-years, 0.02 mgd in 20-years and reach an ultimate demand of 0.04 mgd at 30-years consistent with the 1982 study.
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2.0 STUDY AREA
This section discusses the study area and its physical characteristics. Also discussed are pertinent land use and planning criteria.

2.1 STUDY AREA
The study area is comprised of the areas within the City limits, the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), and additional area outside of these two boundaries where stormwater runoff collects before it drains into the City's storm system. The City's UGB (UGB & Urban Reserve) is made up of 9,992 acres of land. Adding outside drainage areas brings the total study area to approximately 27,000 acres. Figure 1 in Appendix A illustrates the City limits, the UGB, and the study area.

2.2 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
The physical environment of the study area includes climate, soil characteristics, and topography.

2.2.1 Climate
Grants Pass lies within the Rogue River Valley, which has a relatively mild climate characterized by cool, wet winters and hot, dry summers. A summary of climate data for Grants Pass is shown in Table 2.1.

| Table 2-1: Climatological Data (1893-2015) - Grants Pass, Oregon |
|------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                        | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July |
| Precipitation (in)     | 5.45| 4.17| 3.27| 1.86| 1.40| 0.75| 0.25 |
| Snowfall (in)          | 2.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    |
| High Temperature (F)   | 47.2| 54.1| 60.4| 67.1| 74.3| 81.3| 89.9 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Annual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation (in)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>30.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowfall (in)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Temperature (F)</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source of data: Western Regional Climate Center

2.2.2 Soils
In general, soils within the study area are primarily sandy loam, mixed in with other types of loam. Slopes vary from 0 to 60 percent. Soils data from the area was obtained from the NRCS website. A soils map and listing of soils within the study area can be found in Figure 2 in Appendix A. Soils characteristics pertinent to this study include both slope, depth to groundwater, and runoff infiltration capacities. Sandy loam soils will generally soak up more runoff than high clay soils.
2.2.3 Topography
Grants Pass is divided by the Rogue River, which runs from the east to the west across the study area. The highest elevations are on the far north side and far south side. Surrounding hills are significantly steeper than downtown areas. Ground elevations in the study area range from a low of approximately 860 feet above mean sea level near the Rogue River, to approximately 1790 feet above mean sea level near the northeastern boundary of the study area. The overland slopes in the City typically average 2.6%. The study area topography is shown in Figure 3 in Appendix A.

2.3 STORMWATER BASINS
Stormwater from the study area generally drains into six receiving streams: Jones Creek, Skunk Creek, Gilbert Creek, Fruitdale Creek, Allen Creek, and Sand Creek. All water eventually drains to the Rogue River. The storm systems that drain to each of these receiving streams is delineated in Figure 4 in Appendix A, and the approximate percentages of the study area draining to each are summarized in Table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jones Creek</th>
<th>Skunk Creek</th>
<th>Gilbert Creek</th>
<th>Fruitdale Creek</th>
<th>Allen Creek</th>
<th>Sand Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 LAND USE
The City of Grants Pass includes lands designated as open, commercial, industrial, public right-of-way (e.g. transportation roadways), and residential. Existing land use for the study area is shown in Figure 1 in Appendix A. It is anticipated that future development will not substantially increase stormwater peak runoff rates since the recommended policy within the study area requires post-development runoff rates to be limited to pre-existing conditions.

2.5 UGB STATUS
The City of Grants Pass expanded their UGB in November 2014. A report from the City suggests there could be 60,564 total residents in the existing and expanded UGB by 2050. The figures in Appendix A of this report reflect the new UGB.
Impacts of Growth

The TSP mobility targets are described in detail in Section 3.

Figure 4-11 maps the summary v/c (state highway) and LOS (city street) mobility scores indicating which intersections are either under capacity, approach capacity or at or over capacity within the study area.

Signaled Intersections

The following signaled intersections do not meet the TSP mobility target under existing peak hour traffic conditions.

- OR 99 (southbound, 6th Street) and ‘M’ Street—‘M’ Street is classified as a Minor Arterial and links residential neighborhoods on either sides of Highway 99 to the Grants Pass city center. “M” Street is the only continuous, east-west arterial between the Rogue River and the Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad. This is the only intersection in the Grants Pass study area with a v/c ratio exceeding 1.00.
- US 199 and Ringuette Street—US 199 is a principal arterial and serves as a primary east-west route in Grants Pass. In addition to providing connections to OR 99, OR 238, and I-5, nearly all traffic traveling east-west south of the river in Grants Pass must make use of US 199. Ringuette serves as a major access and egress for the Asante Medical Center and commercial development.
- US 199 and ‘E’ Street—At its intersection with US 199, ‘E’ Street is classified as a principal arterial. E Street serves as a major east-west connection, north of and parallel to the railroad. It represents a higher speed and higher capacity alternative to the neighborhood routes it parallels and provides access to most of the big box stores in Grants Pass as well as to I-5 and OR 238 via US 199.
- US 199 and Hwy 238—This is the intersection of two state routes, which serve as the major east-west and north-south corridors in Grants Pass. Limited river crossings and the lack of practical alternatives for east-west travel south of the river in Grants Pass means that high volumes of traffic are routed through this intersection.

Vehicle Safety Evaluation

Figure 4-10 maps the location of recent vehicle crashes within the Grants Pass urban area.

In general, the highest densities of vehicle crashes are observed along routes with higher volumes and/or higher speeds. Areas with the highest density of vehicle crashes include:

- OR 99, especially near the interchange with I-5 and between A Street and US 199
- US 199, especially between Allen Creek Road and OR 99, Between Parkdale Drive and ‘M’ Street, and between ‘E’ Street and Terry Lane
- City streets in the vicinity of the downtown core

Volume 3, Technical Memorandum #4 (Existing Conditions) includes a detailed summary of the causes of vehicle and prevailing environmental and driver characteristics in the Grants Pass urban area during the 2010-2015 period. This analysis includes a review of intersection crash history, intersection crash rates, and ODOT Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) data.

Growth Forecasts

Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts

The City of Grants Pass incorporates the official population forecasts for year 2040 prepared by the Population Research Center at Portland State University (PSU). As shown in Figure 4-12, by 2040 there are slightly more than 57,500 people estimated living within the Grants Pass urban area. PSU's base year is 2015. These population forecasts reflect an annual average growth rate of about 1.43%.

Grants Pass Oregon Small Urban Model Outputs

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has developed and refined an Oregon Small Urban Model (OSUM) for the Grants Pass urban area. The Grants Pass OSUM base year is 2010 and planning horizon is 2040, and was used as the base model resource for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), completed in 2017.
Future housing, a surrogate of population, and employment forecasts are included in the OSUM Travel Model, as summarized in Figure 4-13.

The higher rate of growth in housing units (when compared to population growth) is an indicator of a more elderly population and smaller family size in Grants Pass over the next 20 plus year. The rate of growth in employment is much lower than housing, averaging about 0.75% per year, see Figure 4-14.

Figure 4-15 and Figure 4-16 illustrate the net new housing and employment growth, respectively, by transportation analysis zone (TAZ) within the urban area. As shown, the majority of new housing growth is located in the southwest and southeast area of Grants Pass, with some continued housing development growth west of Highland Avenue in northwest, and some modest growth north of I-5. Employment growth is centralized in the north OR 99 corridor, in the central eastside commercial and industrial areas, and along US 199 west of OR 99.


**Impacts of Growth**

**Figure 4-15: Net New Housing Growth (2010-2040)**
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Figure 4-16: Net New Employment Growth (2010-2040)
Impacts of Growth

Future Traffic Conditions

Base Year – 2010

Figure 4-17 maps the PM peak hour traffic volumes in the Grants Pass UGB for base year 2010. The highest traffic volumes are observed on I-5 and the State Highways. Significant traffic volumes are also observed on City arterials including ‘E’ Street, ‘F’ Street, ‘G’ Street, ‘M’ Street, Bridge Street, Redwood Avenue, and Cloverlawn Drive. The OR 99 and US 199 river crossings represent the highest link volumes within the UGB. A total of approximately 3,300 and 3,900 vehicles travel northbound and southbound, respectively across these river crossings during the PM peak hour.

Figure 4-18 maps the volume to capacity (v/c) ratios for the links in the Grants Pass OSUM during the PM peak hour. The map identifies a few locations where traffic volumes approach or exceed capacity in at least one direction:

- The river crossings for both OR 99 and US 199
- US 199 between Parkdale Drive and Terry Lane
- US 199 between the ‘Y’ and Willow Lane
- Redwood Avenue between US 199 and Dowell Road
- Bridge/‘M’ Street between Pine Street and 7th Street
- ‘G’ Street between Booth Street and Westholm Avenue
- Parkdale Drive

The locations noted in the bullets above correspond to critical routes in Grants Pass’ street network where there are not easily accessible alternatives. Crossing the Rogue River within the Grants Pass UGB requires use of either OR 99 or US 199. US 199 must be used by motorists traveling east-west south of the river and provides connection to major City arterials and I-5. Bridge/‘M’ Street and ‘G’ Street (into ‘E’ and ‘F’ Streets) represent the only continuous east-west connections that pass through City center – one on each side of the railroad tracks.

Future Planning Horizon – 2040 (No-Build)

Figure 4-19 maps the PM peak hour (or design hour) traffic volumes for streets in the Grants Pass UGB for the planning horizon year, 2040. Similar to the PM peak hour traffic volumes for 2010 (shown in Figure 4-17), the highest traffic volumes are seen on I-5, the State highways, and a number of key City arterials, including ‘E’ Street, ‘F’ Street, ‘G’ Street, ‘M’ Street, Bridge Street, Redwood Avenue, and Cloverlawn Drive.

The highest levels of traffic growth from 2010 to 2040 are found in the following locations:

State Highways

- I-5
- US 199, especially between ‘M’ Street and Willow Lane
- OR 99, especially between Morgan Lane and US 199
- OR 238, especially north of Harbeck Road

City Streets

- ‘A’ Street, west of OR 99
- ‘G’ Street
- ‘E’ and ‘F’ Streets, east of OR 99
- ‘M’ and ‘N’ Streets east of US 199
- Cloverlawn Drive
- Willow Lane
- Dowell Road

The above City routes provide access from OR 99 and US 199 to some of the areas of Grants Pass for which the highest growth in households are projected on the periphery of the UGB.