Lauren Bishop.

Is now joining.

Jennifer Aviles.

Is now exiting.

Susan and Jennifer, are you there?

Yes. Well, [inaudible 00:00:25].

I'm here.

Okay. All right. I think we're good, Chair.

1. **Roll Call:** Okay. I call this meeting to order February 9th Planning Commission Meeting. I'll call roll. Commissioner Collier?

   Here.

   I'm Eric Heesacker. I'm here. Commissioner Arthur?

   Here.

   Commissioner Nelson?

   Present.

   Commissioner Scherff?
Here.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Here.

Commissioner Aviles?

Here.

We have a quorum. We have a unanimous quorum. We like that.

2. **Introductions**: Any introduction, staff?

Well, we should probably introduce Amber Neece. I don't think she's been to the Planning Commission yet. Amber is our housing and neighborhood specialist who has been with the community development department about four or five months. And so, you'll hear from her later in the agenda.

All right, welcome. We can't wait.

3. **Public Comment**: Okay, public comment. Anybody on the phone, member of the public want to make any comments about anything that is not on tonight's agenda?

We just have the two-

Really?

... commissioners. The others are invited, but not on there.

Oh, thank you very much.

4. **Approval of Minutes**: Okay. Item 4A approval of last meeting's minutes. Does anybody want to amend those minutes or make a motion to approve?

I'll motion to approve the meeting minutes of the last meeting.

Second.

Commissioner Collier makes a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Nelson seconds. All those in favor. Say aye.

Aye.

Anybody opposed? [inaudible 00:02:14]. Anybody abstaining?
MOTION/VOTE
Vice Chair Collier moved, and Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion to approve the minutes from the January 26, 2022, meeting. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

5. Informational Items: Okay. Informational items. Staff, anything in that regard?

   Nope, not tonight.

6. Findings of Fact:

   a. 201-00410-21 ~ Greenfield RV Park Major Site Plan Review. Item 6A, findings of fact for the Greenfield RV Park, a major site plan review. Do we have any questions of staff about that? Anybody want to make a motion?

      I'll make a motion to approve project 201-00410-21. The Greenfield RV Park major site plan review.

      Nelson seconds.

      Commissioner Collier made a motion to approve the findings of fact, seconded by Commissioner Nelson. All those in favor. Say aye.

      Aye.

      Anybody opposed? Anybody abstaining? All right. Those findings of fact are passed.

MOTION/VOTE
Vice Chair Collier moved, and Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion to approve project 201-00410-21, Greenfield RV Park Major Site Plan Review. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

b. 101-00140-21/301-00144-21 ~ Pemberley Meadows Subdivision and Variance. Item 6B, findings of fact for Pemberley Meadows subdivision and variance. Anybody want to make a motion?

      I've got it. On a roll. Project 101-00140-21/301-001442, on the Pemberley Meadows subdivision and variance. I move to approve the findings of fact. Nelson second.
Commissioner Collier made the motion to approve those findings of fact. Commissioner Nelson seconds. All those in favor, say aye.

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Anybody abstentions? All right. 604, we’re rolling right through this.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Vice Chair Collier moved, and Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion to approve project 101-00140-21/301-00144-21, Pemberley Meadows Subdivision and Variance. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

7. **Public Hearing:**

   a. 405-00127-21 ~ Comprehensive Plan Amendments to the Housing Element and Policies, Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment. Item 7A, public hearing, project 405-00127-21, comprehensive plan amendment.

   Lauren Bishop.

   Amendments to-

   Is now exiting.

   ... to the housing element and policies comprehensive plan text amendment staff report. Go ahead, staff.

   Hello? You guys are fast. All right. So, I have here the staff report and the documents for the comprehensive plan amendment to the housing element and policies. So, the goal today is to adopt the 2021 housing needs analysis and buildable land’s inventory as an ancillary document to the Grants Pass comprehensive plan, as well as the text amendments that have been provided in your packet. This relates to the council goals under the housing element plan nine housing element index.

   Would you like me to read that for you? Oh, okay. So, the housing needs analysis has already been approved, but a refresher on what that is, and that’s on page 68 to 101 of your packet. So that was completed in May, of 2021. And that contains the housing needs projection for the next 20 years, the buildable land inventory, the land sufficiency analysis and the findings and recommendations from those.

   Within the policies being proposed today, there are 22 policies that come from the housing needs analysis. You can see those on page 150 of the packet.
Those 22 policies are under four different subsections, their land availability, housing needs, housing affordability and homelessness and funding incentives.

So, part of the background for this, the passage of the Oregon Land Use Planning Act of 1974 established the Land Conservation and Development Commission and the Department of Land Conservation and Development, the act required the Commission to develop and adopt a set of statewide planning goals.

Goal 10 addresses housing in Oregon and provides guidelines for local governments to follow in developing their local comprehensive land use plans and implementing policies. The city completed the housing needs analysis and buildable land inventory with help from the project consultants, 3J Consulting, JET Planning, and the FCS group.

The Housing Advisory had formed a subcommittee of four members who held five meetings with the city’s consultants between October, of 2020 and April, of 2021 to complete the housing needs analysis. There was also a survey asking for citizen input, addressing housing policy and code updates that was set up as an interactive tool on the city website, receiving 84 responses.

The criteria for approval for this and the text amendments are applicable planning goals and guidelines of the state of Oregon. And let me get the page for you on that, so that you can find in the staff report on page 65.

So, we have the applicable planning goals and guidelines of the state of Oregon. So, goal one and goal 10 are both under that. Citizen review and comment was satisfied. Review and comment from effective governmental units and other agencies was satisfied.

A demonstration that any additional need for basic urban services is adequately covered by adopted utility plans and service policies or a proposal for the requisite changes to said utility plans and service policies as a part of the requested comprehensive plan amendment. That was satisfied.

Let me see. Okay. Yeah, so that was satisfied. Additional information as required by the review body, that one was not applicable. We did not get any required information. And in lieu of item two above, demonstration that the plan was adopted in error was also not applicable.

So, our call to action today, the council needs to adopt the HNA by December 31st of 2022. So, our proposed recommendation to recommend approval to the city council of the proposed housing amendments to the comprehensive plan, either as submitted or with revisions recommended by the planning commission. Alternatives are to recommend that city council deny the request or postponement.
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I do want to make one clarification. I think you said Amber, at the beginning that the housing needs analysis has been adopted or approved, I can't remember which word you used.

Approved. So, it's been reviewed and [crosstalk 00:09:16]-

It's been reviewed, right. But I mean, technically changes can be made. So, what Amber has not shown in her PowerPoint, but hit the real highlights, is that 30-page document that you have in your packets that has all the charts and tables. I mean that... Can you change it? Yes, I guess I just wanted to make clear that, I mean, the adoption process is what we're in the middle of.

So, has it been reviewed by you? Has it been reviewed by the council? Yes. Were there any significant concerns or changes at those times? No. However, and now, and we're in the formal adoption process, if there are any concerns or changes, and I'm thinking maybe not so much the housing needs analysis document itself, but the policies.

I mean, we have some pretty stringent guidance coming down from the state about the HNA itself. A lot more latitude when it comes to the policies which, I don't have the page number, Amber had it in there, but so those are local driven and will be what we compare in the future applications against.

And so, I guess I would just draw your attention particularly to that part of the document.

And you can find the policies on page 150 of your packet.

Any questions of staff?

I have a question.

Shoot.

So, the call to action is either to adopt by December 31st, to deny or to postpone. What happens if we miss that deadline?

Well, it's a good question. I guess we would have to look into what the enforcement mechanism is. I don't know exactly. We would have to look into that statute. First and foremost, we're going to get our hand slapped by DLCD. And they're going to call and say, "Hey, did you know you missed your deadline?" And they'll probably say, "You have X number of months to do it," but we certainly don't expect it'll take nine and a half more months to get this through our process.

Yeah. I think I vaguely remember there used to be a different deadline. I think it was June 2022. And it was something about if certain things weren't... If the amendments or if the code had not been updated, a model code would be
implemented. A model code that had already been drafted. Is that a part of this, or is that a part of a different, comprehensive plan amendment issue?

So, what you're referencing is actually the middle housing code update to the development codes, so that's a separate thing altogether.

Got it. Okay. Thank you so much.

For the record. That was Commissioner Aviles asking that question. Also, for the record, I need to back up a little bit. This is a public hearing. And I forgot I have all this mumbo-jumbo to read. So, I did open the public hearing at 6:04, and there's no public here in the chambers. Is anybody from the public out there online?

Since there is not, I'm just going to read this one thing. Are there any conflicts of interest from any of you commissioners, that would preclude you from participating in this hearing? Nobody's saying anything. So, I will dispense with the formalities for now. Commissioner Scherf.

I'm just asking a question. I'm not trying to ruffle feathers here, but if we had one of our members that was on the committee that made this document, should they be sitting on this committee?

Man, isn't that a good question? Director Clark, what do you think of that?

You know, as a legislative matter-

Since it is a public hearing.

... they're really not. Yeah, in quasi-judicial issues where you're talking site specific, that's definitely a concern, but on these kinds of legislative matters, it's really not.

And that was more of an educational question for myself because I [crosstalk 00:13:39] don't understand.

Okay.

And for me too, thanks. But we want to acknowledge and thank Loree for her participation prior to this.

Oh, absolutely. Yes, yes.

Good work, Loree.

Oh, good enough. Can I ask a question?

Please.
Amber, on page 99, well there two pages, a little more of glossary that does not look at all familiar and has at least six items in it that we discussed at various times. And maybe I'm getting mixed up between the middle housing discussion and this. But I remember at least one online one with FCS where we talked a little bit about definitions and these do not reflect either what I think the state is asking for now or the LCDC, or what we agreed to.

And I don't know where these definitions came from. Or else it wasn't covered item by item. The items that I'm objecting to all have to do with definition of family, housing unit or dwelling unit, household multifamily, single family, and single family attached and detached.

And the key one is the definition of family, which we removed from our own code some time ago, I think, where it says, "A group of two or more people, one of whom is the householder related by birth, marriage or adoption and residing together." And it was very clear from direction from the state policy that any requirement for relationships for people to live together was not a requirement.

So, I can't tell you exactly where these definitions have been pulled from, but I can say that generally when we have the glossary, it's related to just this document. So, if this definition was struck from other documents, then that would hold true there, but these would just be applying to this document.

Well, I don't care what they're applying to, I disagree with every one of them, how they're worded.

Commissioner Nelson, you want to shed some light here?

I'm just questioning when the Census Bureau does its census, which is where a lot of this data comes from, they refer to households, which is defined in here as well as families. And I think that's why you see that in here is so it reflects what the Census Bureau is reporting. That's my evaluation.

Back up to the 1980s, the first case was decided in Michigan and Eaton township back in the mid '80s, said according in their finding of the state Supreme Court there was, that based upon the governing bodies like us operating under the Township Act of 1936 or whatever it was, any requirement had to be based upon health, safety and welfare of the populace.

And their finding was for some kind of religious household of six people, that it didn't make any difference on health, safety, and welfare, whether they were related or not. If you could show that you could only have 10 people per bathroom or nine people per bedroom or so much window air required or something that was a measurable relationship to health and safety.

But other than that, that you could not require any relationship type things. And then two or three years later, the Supreme Court of California did the same finding, but their basis was right to association, rights of association. And they ruled out all of these kinds of things on the same basis.
And finally, Oregon I thought, did that this last year, did they not?

I just pulled up the definition. The Census Bureau uses this language, this exact language.

This exact language.

So, I guess what I'm saying is, I think it's necessary to have it in there, while I understand your argument. Otherwise, you're going to have data going to be mixed up, sent to... What is it? The PALU or whatever you guys send it to, and having it not correlates with what's consistent with the census.

Not following that. I understand what you're saying, but I don't see...

What would be your motion or what would you like to do?

Well, I thought what we did in our own code was we reverted to referring to dwelling units, not family housing.

Yeah, that is correct. That is how the Grants Pass development code is worded. That is correct. It is the consultants, FCS Group, who prepared this HNA. I think as Commissioner Nelson stated, probably are defaulting to that for this document, given the guidance from the state of Oregon.

So, we may need to run this up the legal flagpole to see if there're any concerns. I mean, we wouldn't be able to answer tonight whether we can go. If you're proposing to go through the housing needs analysis and strike the word family in its entirety from the document, I think I would recommend the continuance so that we can check on the legal aspect of that.

No, I'm not happy accepting it as it is. And when you say they require this language, who's they?

Me?

Yeah.

Well, no, I'm saying the Census Bureau when they do their census-

Oh, the Census Bureau.

Yes.

Okay, well-

And that's where the data comes from for each community.
Yeah.

And not only the data, I'd be willing to bet that the consultant is given a list of things they have to do when they do the study. An adoption of the exact language of the Census Bureau's definition could be one of those things.

Each community has got-

Commissioner-

... to speak the same language.

... Tokarz-Krauss has their hand up.

I see that. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, go ahead.

The glossary is in reference to the definitions. Can you hear me?

Yes.

It's in reference to the definitions being used throughout the report. The definitions come from, it's somewhere in the beginning, I was trying to reread this again because it cites the Portland State University studies. Because, you have to have a common core when you're doing these statistical analysis.

And those referred to here have referred back to HUD, the Housing and Urban Development. Sorry, I'm pretty plugged up right now. And to Portland, the PSU information as well as census. So, I think they're not defining family other than defining what that one to four unit is that's being used in all the statistical analysis.

It shouldn't be a reference to code or anything. It's just simply in reference to this report and findings. And if that isn't how we're defining family, or how these references are defining family, then I don't know what your basis could possibly be.

You need some sort of a benchmark. And I think that's all that's stating. But then, it says early on in the report, I'm trying to locate.

Well, I hear what you're saying, but if you put it in your code like this, then you are saying that people who live in a single-family residence have to be related.

Mm-mmm (negative).

Yeah, because that's the definition.

[crosstalk 00:22:42], no.
No, no, no, no.

Well, read what it says.

Okay.

Read, household.

Well, household I'm not objecting to household.

Well, they just... so that would be a household if they were not related.

Well, but that's not consistent with the other statements. See even single family up there says, "Designed to be occupied by not more than one family."

Here, I'm looking on page 73 of this report under report organization. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, I think this is what you're talking about. Report organization item VI, glossary, list of key terms used in the housing needs analysis. Please refer to the glossary for a list of terms used in the housing needs analysis. If, that helps us at all here.

Is Jennifer on here still?

Yeah. I'm still here.

Do you recall that document and that discussion where the state was getting rid of the requirements for relationships? Not allowed to, though.

No. I don't remember that. And just to check in and make sure I'm tracking the conversation, so it sounds like an issue for at least Commissioner Arthur, is that the definitions within the housing needs analysis are problematic and, in some way, different from previously agreed upon definitions? Is that the issue at hand?

Yes.

Okay. Okay. Thank you for that. Okay.

Not just previously agreed upon. Not just previously agreed upon, but quite recently stated from, I think it was from LCDC. I'm not sure where we got that direction sometime around mid-year last year, where they finally codified it some way.

So, if we were to adopt this HNA as it is, your concern is that the mix of confusing definitions would lead to other problems?

Yeah, definitely. Like going back to Grant's Pass' old definition of family. That allowed up to, well I think it was up to five related persons and one unrelated domestic servant, was the previous definition.
Well, let's continue on with further questions and analysis. And when we get down to making a decision about what we're going to do about this, Commissioner Arthur can make a motion to continue until staff can get to the bottom of this changing the definitions. That sound okay?

Can I make a motion now?

Sure. Go ahead and make a motion now.

Commissioner Aviles makes a motion to postpone.

Do we need to postpone to a date certain?

Yes.

Do we know when that date certain might be on our schedule?

All depends on-

Postpone to February 23rd?

Do we have room on that agenda?

You do.

Okay.

For what purpose? I guess we just need to know exactly what we need to bring back. The reason for the postponement.

Sure. Well, I'm assuming my reasoning would be that we need a clarification around these definitions and their application in order to kind of make any other decisions. I'm open to this motion not passing and having a discussion, but if it comes back around too, we still have to wait to find out something else. I guess that's why I'm trying to make the motion now. But I'll rescind my motion. That's fine.

Well, what about... I mean, you don't want to discuss anything else? There might be other things people want to bring up.

Oh, yeah. What-

Right.

Nothing else and there might be other things people want to bring up-

Right.
... to know.

I hear that.

Yeah. Okay.

I hear that. Can I rescind my motion?

Sure. Motion rescinded. Do we need any motion at all to keep discussing?

No.

Okay. Any other discussions? Does anybody else have any issues? Commissioner Arthur, do you have any more? Anybody else have any issues, they can jump in here. Commissioner Nelson, go ahead.

Yeah. I had some questions in regards to the assumption of the numbers. It looks like what we're doing is pretty much following status quo. Is that a fair assumption over the last 20 years?

Are you saying meeting the growth needs?

The housing and growth needs.

No. So, the housing needs analysis can only address the growth projection. It cannot address the deficit that exists. So, it is just giving us numbers based off of the growth, and then the demographic numbers and the existing data shows existing data. But when they're talking about their projection, it is just about the growth.

That as I understand. So, when we have the growth that has been continually going on, and we have projections for housing needs that are not meeting that, and that is one of the concerns of the housing needs analysis as I understand, it's moving people out into the rural area where housing is cheaper, which we found previously at my location, increased traffic impacts. And I didn't see any analysis of that or if that's ever been done.

Right. So, that's not within the scope of what the H&A is supposed to do, really.

No. And that's one of the big flaws in these type of growth management programs, which is they're really not evaluating impacts to school, impacts to residential growth in other areas. In other words, you push on the balloon, it's going to go somewhere else. And as a result, what we have here is an analysis saying, we're going to have to have 4,000 additional units, plus or minus, and yet we're not even meeting that currently. And that's what's disturbing is, you do have an evaluation in 10 years, which is a census period, with the possibility of two to three evaluations within that period, whether you're meeting those goals?
For the H&A? We have to reevaluate every eight years.

I saw 10. Am I incorrect on that? And then I saw later in your goals, is that you update the housing needs analysis at least every 10 years, and whenever actual population growth exceeds, growth forecast for three out of five years. So, if population growth in that 10-year period exceeds three out of the five, what then? You're now further behind.

Yeah, that's exactly right word.

Thank you. I like my cheerleading squad. So, I'm not understanding what the heck are we even doing this for? It's meaningless. It doesn't do a dang thing. And I've done these before and they don't do a thing. It pushes on the balloon, it pushes it out into rural areas, it increases traffic impacts that we can't control. And yet they say, "You can't do a thing about it." Myself, I'm personally in favor just voting against it, but I wouldn't do that. It ties your hands, it ties this community's hands, and nobody can do anything. I mean, you can have these housing needs analysis done all you want. What does it accomplish? All we do is increase the price of housing within Grants Pass.

I'm sorry. I got on [inaudible 00:31:04] box there. And so, my question is, can we do this analysis more than checking three out of five years? Can we do it yearly evaluation? And is there a mechanism in which that can then be relay to PSU?

Yes, you can.

Is that the one that has to do it? If we're seeing impacts within the city or we have any way of measuring... Remember I brought up to you, is that the Census Bureau is where the data comes from? Is there a mechanism that we have in place to be able to evaluate within our own community? Are we needing housing needs for low-income, mid-income, and high-income community? I see this community's growing more with the retirement. How are you going to meet your tax-based loads, which is occurring rampantly with retirees?

In my humble opinion, you're raising the issue of lowest common denominator versus ideal. There's nothing that keeps the city of Grants Pass from performing its own housing analysis, nothing.

And that's what I would like.

What we're going through here is complying with a state requirement.

Which does nothing.

Which [Amber 00:32:22] has actually already begun creating some of her own tracking system for the city, just in her first few months here. And I think if I understood you right, what you see is the more helpful document. This is getting us-
As we track yearly, we have a faster ability to respond, and all of this can be appealed to [inaudible 00:32:47] or whatever. I would recommend instead doing update of the housing needs analysis at least every 10 years, and whenever actual population growth exceeds, that we're evaluating every year. Bring it to the planning commissioner or the council.

What page are you on there?

150.

Thank you.

I mean-

Can I say something?

By the time you evaluate, you're already behind the eight ball.

Go ahead, commissioner Arthur.

On page 113 is that basic chart, where baseline housing growth projection. And that number is, as you said, growth, and somewhere in the world, we have this same chart with another column added that adds deficit at this point in time.

And it will continue to be more deficits.

Yeah. I don't know, we went over this so long ago. But I agree with you, that it isn't showing the total need if it isn't accounting for the current deficit on future growths.

I would propose the motion, Mr. Chair. I'm sorry.

Go ahead. Commissioner Nelson.

I would propose a motion that we do a yearly analysis, since we have a staff available person that is capable of giving us some ideas of where are we trending. How are we looking? So that we can make intelligent decisions and look at this in an evaluation that meets our housing needs analysis that's been done by the public for us and can act on it proactively rather than reactively. Sorry. I did that again, didn't I? So, my motion is to do a yearly evaluation that would be under Land Availability 9.2, instead of waiting 10 years.

And you would like that to become a part of this document?

Yes.

And I'll second the motion, all year.
Okay, Commissioner Nelson made this motion for yearly analysis, seconded by Commissioner Collier.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss has her hand up.

Thank you very much for doing that for us commissioner Tokarz. We're going to go ahead and deliberate, right?

Why don't we see Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss' hand?

Yeah. There it is. It's no hand down there.

I don't see a hand.

It's a little hand.

A flashing thing?

No, on the right-hand side. [inaudible 00:35:17].

That's it?

That little hand.

Oh, I see it. Thank you very much. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, go right ahead, please.

I am kind of befuddled. Okay, number one, some of the assumptions are incorrect in and of themselves, pushing out whatever rural homes right now have a median price of $485,000, which is $120,000 more than the urban existing home stock. So, as far as increasing, I don't know, I'm listening to this and thinking, we've lost sight of what the purpose is. This is mandated to be done because quite frankly, not all communities have been doing it, this kind of thing.

Secondly, it is to give us, again, a benchmark or some sort of direction. While most of this data is to me outdated, you look at what we're actually putting into place to help the issue, regardless if the numbers are correct. If we'd have done this in 2007, we would have completely stopped doing anything about it in 2009. Because at that point, everything had fallen off the cliff, and people were leaving in mass. This is all an assumption. Everything here is just an assumption based on expected growth. Statistically, what is it, 1.02%?

I almost feel like... Again, we're picking at [inaudible 00:09:56]. I'm just going to sit back and listen, because I'm thinking we're going off into the weeds here, but as far as the motion to look at our needs analysis annually, I think that's a wonderful idea locally, with local numbers and input by more stakeholders that are currently being consulted. Thank you.
Commissioner Aviles. Go ahead.

Thank you. If we're in deliberations, I'll just share that I'm not entirely sure I followed where folks were going, although I was really trying. Reviewing the report, I'm looking at page 63, and there's just a little piece that I was just going to read out loud. It says, "The purpose of the housing needs analysis is to provide needed analysis and policy guidance to the city in meeting its needs and desires to provide housing opportunities as outlined in the comprehensive plan."

So, if I understood where Commissioner Ward was going, the H&A is important. The H&A informs comprehensive planning. I don't think it's feasible for it to be done as quickly, I think as what I heard yearly. Because it is in part built around census data, which we only get every 10 years, and also the PSU data, which is projections of 20 years. So, that's just my contribution to the deliberation. Thank you.

Thank you. Commissioner Nelson, go ahead.

We have a housing needs analysis. It's currently accepted or not adopted but accepted. And I don't wish to change that, a housing needs assessment. What I am looking at is are we meeting the goals that the housing needs assessment is proposing, or that we have put down for ourselves in our policies? Those-

No, we're not.

I'm sorry. I don't know who that was.

That was Commissioner Aviles.

I thought you were asking a question. I was providing you an answer.

No, I'm responding.

I don't believe we're meeting it.

I was responding to your concern, because I have a feeling that you're feeling that my motion would involve doing a housing needs analysis again, every year. No. I want an ongoing yearly evaluation of where we're headed, and if we're meeting what we have proposed that we would meet.

And I think friendly discussion, it sounds like. This is additive to what we're trying to do. So, I'm in support of the motion. I see some head nodding. I'm ready to move towards a vote on that motion. So, we have a motion and a second. So, if there's more discussion.

We do. And I think there's still more deliberation. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, I see your hand up again.
Yes. We can as a group through various reports provided by the Realtors Association, keep track of what's going on with the housing market, not in as much detail perhaps as this would into. But right now, we have a 1.06 absorption rate. That means that every month, the amount of homes that are at least being listed are being sold. In other words, three to six months, six months being preferred is not being met, and that Jennifer alluded to, we do not have housing available at the prices below-median income at this point in time, and we can see that every month using statistics that are being provided. So, we can keep our finger on the pulse fairly easily, if we include more stakeholders in the discussions. Thank you.

Any more discussion?

We would rather than annual housing or yearly needs analysis, say progress report or something of that kind of wording.

You're suggesting a friendly amendment?

Well, I don't remember exactly what the wording was.

It was yearly analysis.

Okay, let's do this. Let's leave 9.2 as it is, and move 9.3, 9.4, 9.5 down, and incorporate a new 9.6 or wherever you want to do it, as each year, we will evaluate the progress of the housing needs, the progress of what had been done with the housing needs analysis, as well as with the requirements of the code to meet the needs in this community.

And I see Director Clark is shaking his head in concurrence that you can do that. Okay, that's what for the purposes for Jennifer and Ms. Tokarz-Krauss.

Yeah. Because otherwise, you go into housing needs and [inaudible 00:42:20] remove local barriers? We won't know until after 10 years. I mean, we're running behind the eight ball every time on these things. And you've got to stay on it every year to see if you're meeting the goals and objective of your housing needs analysis, as well as what the staff is bringing to you, and what they see as the results on the ground.

So-

But don't we already get that? I feel like the city provides us a document that shows us what's being built in town. If we do this simple math, knowing we're 4,000 units short and only, I don't know, 1,600 units that were single family were built, don't we already know by looking at that, that we're not meeting our goal?

We do, Commissioner Aviles, get an annual permit issuance document, and it tells us how many permits have been let out for what kind of units.
But you don't have any analysis of population changes, school populations, that type of thing.

So, just friendly, if we were all in the same room, we would see Director Clark nodding in concurrence, Jennifer, that this can be done. So, I don't see the pushback. I don't see a concurrence of a pushback that would stop us from supporting this motion. If it says, "Let's take this to the next level", I think we can do it. So, I think it's safe. I think we're safe.

Commissioner Collier, I guess my only pushback is, I'm not sure I understand, and so, that makes me not want to move forward. Maybe it's because I'm remote, maybe I'm missing something, but my pushback is that I'm having a little bit of trouble following just where this is going. I very much appreciate the discussion. I very much appreciate the interest. I feel I need a bit more time to understand everything that's being discussed. That's my only pushback, if that's what is-

So, for Commissioner Nelson, -

... [inaudible 00:44:23].

... if you could reiterate.

The problem I've seen in the past with communities trying to do this, is that you're always behind. And so, you have the state determining that population growth in your community based on information they receive that's late in coming in, then you have communities trying to develop their urban growth boundaries in conjunction with rural areas, behind the eight ball, because they have just got the information. So, they're trying to develop where are we going to develop our housing needs? How are we going to have the infrastructure capability if you're waiting five years or 10 years into the program?

What I'm proposing, is we look at, "Are we needing the goals and objectives that have been put forward in this document each year?" If we're not, if we're having problems meeting that and we're already behind, which we are, then we need to address that with the state. Because you're right, we can't really change anything, it's determined by the state, but at least we have information that we can provide them.

But we can change it. We use this information to change our local comprehensive plan.

I'm sorry, I didn't understand that.

Commissioner Aviles, would you repeat that please?

I was just commenting to Commissioner Ward's comment about not having any kind of ability to change it locally. We do change it locally through the changing of the comprehensive plan.
I believe what Commissioner Nelson is advocating for is a yearly evaluation of whether or not the city is building the housing units that seem to be projected in this housing needs analysis. If we are not keeping track of whether or not we're keeping up with the housing needs analysis, then what good is the analysis?

And what good is changing our comprehensive plan when we don't even have the information to support it.

And I see again, Director Clark nodding that he can do this. I don't put words in your mouth, but that you can do this. Because we talked about it earlier.

We can.

And you would benefit from it.

Yeah.

Okay. So, that's a yes and a yes. And I yield to Commissioner Scherf.

Thank you. This is Commissioner Scherf, and my question is, I think it's going to be a question and a statement. So, we have a new staff member that's on the staff, the city of Grants Pass, that has not been in a position before, not you personally, we actually have not had this position in the city of Grants Pass before, which there is a person, a body, a physical person monitoring this specific topic within the city of Grants Pass, which was never done previous. So, that would lead me to believe that this now, the data that she's collecting on a regular basis, would be implemented within council strategic planning every single year in a more robust and informative way.

So realistically, this person and the city actually hiring this person, is doing exactly what you're alluding to on a more annual basis. Is that some correctness in my statement there?

Just to clarify, so what you are proposing, the tracking of the completing of the housing and the different types and comparing it to this. I have already started doing that on a monthly basis, just to see where we're at with our annual progression.

Well, then you're over performing [crosstalk 00:48:15].

To clarify what my statement is, and thank you for the input, is that you are trying to make a motion to change the policy and objectives 9.2 to add in a yearly analysis. This policy and objectives is outlining recommendations from a study that was done using census data and using statistical data from all over. So, I understand that. I think that's more of a broad-brush strokes here, for that analysis, but I think we've accomplished the goal that you're seeking, is for us to get in front of the horse instead of putting the cart in front of the horse, by even having this certain person on staff now that is doing that.
So, in my mind, I don't see emotion in putting more verbiage into this, because the city's actions over this last five, six months in hiring this person and having this position available, is being a proactive measure to track this, that's my understanding.

Does Commissioner Nelson's motion help to modify it? It sounds like that's what does.

I think it needs to be done.

It doesn't hurt. I don't see the harm in pushing it. That's why I'd like to go-

Plus-

... forward, go to a vote. Go ahead.

Go ahead, Commissioner Nelson.

Think about this, there's going to be a lot of questions as growth continues, as populations continuous. Like I brought up, "What are the impacts to the schools, fire districts? What about police protection? How are we dealing with transportation pluggs in our road systems?" You see, this requires us to use this data, and the data being collected on a yearly basis, to just do a simple, "Let's see if we're doing it right. Is it accomplishing what the H&A said? And are we meeting the goals that we have established?"

Ms. [inaudible 00:23:16] you had your hand up?

Well, I just wanted to add in that the next step with our housing needs analysis is what we're doing now, is moving forward with developing our housing production strategies, which is another grouping to move forward off of this as well. So, this won't be the only thing that we're looking at on how we move forward.

So, we've seen from staff a couple of thumbs up that they can move in this direction, that it's not a lift that sinks them, that it would add to the discussion and help the dialogue. I think we're at a point where I see a number of heads nodding that this doesn't harm us, and actually in fact helps us, and we'll just throw it out there and see if it sticks.

Commission Ward, could you clarify?

My last name is Nelson.

Exactly where you-

I'm adding a new point-

... want to insert-
... under Land Availability.

What page?

Page 150.

150?

One, five, zero.

And that's what this is all hinging on is, "Do we have adequate land availability?" If you're putting in road systems, you need the availability of land for parks. You need land availability, you need land for environmental protection. So, all of this ties together with land availability.

So, we do have a motion on the table for yearly evaluation of progress on the H&A, and we're still deliberating that. Does anyone have anything else they would like to say about this?

Yes. This is Commission Scherf.

Commissioner Scherf, go ahead.

I guess this is a question. Would you want to get verbiage in line 9.2 that defines your yearly analysis a little bit more, so it couldn't be misinterpreted as, "Well, we have to do this humongous housing needs analysis report."

That's why I wanted this separate from that.

Oh, so you don't want to add it to that 9.2? You want to add another line? Okay, perfect. I'd just like to really hone in on that verbiage on that.

I don't want to deal with all new housing needs analysis if we don't need to.

Yeah, exactly. I'm looking at like, if you have a staff, you have a whole dedicated department in city, maybe we have an annual report update. I just didn't want to confuse it with, we're forcing the city to do a whole another needs analysis.

Okay.

So, more of a defined language and an additional item to land availability.

Be proactive rather than reactive.

Okay. I'm on board with that. I think we still need to get the verbiage down pretty much.
I'm on board. I thought we had the verbiage. Did you find anything, Ms. Arthur? Okay.

To see exactly where you were going to insert.

Okay.

Well, his staffs will insert it. I'm sure of it.

Okay. Did you want to reword it? Is that what will satisfy for Commissioner Scherf?

Yeah. Why don't you restate what your additional line would be?

New point would be, that we would do a yearly evaluation, not an analysis, an evaluation of our comprehensive land availability, based upon what the housing study came up with as well as our projected goals that we have given ourselves. So, it's not like we're going to reinvent the housing needs analysis, we're not going to rewrite all the goals and objectives, but we will be able forward onto, and I don't know if you want the council to do this or the-

Be able forward onto, and I don't know if you want the council to do this or the commission to do it.

So, I guess I would ask director Clark, are you able to get this? To capture this?

Yeah. We're following that's no problem. I mean, I think in terms of the body that maybe I think you just... I can see a combination of a housing advisory committee and planning commission doing the actual review. Maybe in more of a work session and then forwarding that to the council. Something like that. I mean, that's just a thought, but if you're wanting to formalize, what does that annual review actually look like?

If I was a city council member, I would want to have some information to me ahead of time each year. So, I can just see that things are flowing as we had predicted, and nothing gives us a hiccup. That's what I would like. I don't necessarily need to change anything or look at, but I want to make sure that we're meeting the goals and objectives the citizens wanted, and that we have accomplished what we put forward for ourselves. And that could be, they do their own review, or they could have us do it for them and make the evaluation and forward it to them.

And the housing commission can do the same thing.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, I see a hand up again.

Yes, I just wanted to, I'm kind of recapitulating it. I didn't get everything he said on his motion, but basically requiring an annual evaluation of the status of the
city's progress towards achievement of attaining the goals established in the 
H&A, is that correct?

Yes

That's great. Yes, thank you.

Commissioner Collier, you're still seconding.

Yes.

Commissioner Collier, you're still seconding. Is there still deliberation on this 
motion?

Director Clark, I see somebody's hand up that's not a part of the commission.

It's mine. I'm part of the commission.

Oh, I'm sorry. It's got your last name as guest and my glasses, I need new 
glasses. I'm sorry, Commissioner Aviles, go right ahead.

Well, I was just going to, if we're still in deliberation. Are we still in deliberation?

Sure.

Okay. As a commission we have yearly goals, yes?

Yes.

We submit goals yearly?

Yeah. Yes, we do.

Okay. Could we make a goal related to the housing needs analysis and this 
request?

Well.

And get it revisited in that way as well?

Sure, we could, but the next goal setting session is next January.

Okay. Thank you.

I think we're ready for a vote.

Any more discussion?
Commissioner Arthur, you're loading your question, no?

Okay. We'll go ahead and take a vote. We have a motion with a second. I'm going to do a roll call vote. I'm voting yes. Commissioner Collier.

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Nelson.

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Yes.

And commissioner Aviles.

Yes.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Vice Chair Collier seconded the motion to change the policy and objectives 9.2 to add in a yearly analysis. The vote resulted as follows:


The motion passed.

Okay. Commissioner Nelson, did I hear rumor that you're going to make another motion here?

No, that was the only thing I was...

Oh, okay. Commissioner Scherf.

Okay, so I'd like to move on to the next section in the policies and objectives. Housing needs number 9.6: verbiages lower and remove local barriers to residential development.

The statement just the way it's worded is more of a goal not a policy. So, I don't understand why it would be listed as a bullet point policy. So...
What page?

What page are you on?

I'm on 150 because realistically that's what we're deliberating and discussing is whether these go into the comprehensive plan. Is that correct?

Which number?

Yeah, you said...

So, I would say 9.6 underneath housing needs, just how it's worded, it seems so broad. It's more of a goal than actually like the column it's under policies. Yes, it says objectives as well, but I would move to strike that.

I would make a motion to strike 9.6 because the verbiage is basically too broad, and I don't think it belongs in that section. It could be doubled up... That verbiage could be added to the goal section of the housing section of comprehensive plans and policies for cheap.

I would support it if you moved it somewhere, but I won't second the motion if you...

Go ahead, Mr. Nelson, I yield.

Clarification. You said you would put it in what the housing goals, right?

No. It's listed under policies, and it basically reads like it's a goal. It should be in the summary of goals. It shouldn't be in... Cause if I'm reading this right, the land availability, the housing needs nine-point blah, blah. Those are policies. That doesn't seem like a policy to me.

Well, none of these really. I mean... Established minimum densities in medium and high-density zones, that's sort of a goal, isn't it?

No, these are more... If you word it correctly it's more of a direction for the planning or the city of Grants Pass staff to implement in... to meet the housing goal. So, that statement just doesn't read as a policy of implementation. I'm saying the wrong word. The way it's worded does not read as a... As basically a policy for the staff to follow. It's just like a goal and it's worded just...

And that's okay.

Basically blatant.

It's okay.

Blatant.
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But here's the problem: the chapter is housing, and the sub chapter leader is, the first one, is goal and that's weird. So, grammatically speaking, it's all kind of off. So, the question, does it do more harm present or absent? I don't think it does harm being present.

I think it does. I think it does harm.

I'm not trying to interrupt, either. I think it does harm because I'm coming at this from a developer standpoint. I'm going to read that and my attorney that I'm bringing to my case is going to basically say that's the biggest hole to put my foot through and I'm going right through it. It is too vague. So, basically what it's going to lead any developer, that could be as savvy as they want to be, it's going to lead them to rip that hole open and basically be overzealous with the zoning laws and our hands are going to be tied. So, I think it's too vague to be in a policy section. That's my statement. That's what's backing my motion to move it.

Do we know where to move it to?

I'd personally like to strike it, but if you want to keep it, I would make a motion to move it up to the goals section.

So, you would just cut and paste that and put it at the bottom of the goal paragraph?

I could care less how it goes in there.

I don't have a problem with that, but Mr. Clark?

Well, we can bring back wording. You don't have to wordsmith it here tonight. If the commission as a whole supports the motion we would, as staff, bring back a revision of the goal statement at the top of page 150 that integrates the basic idea there to lower barriers to residential development. I mean, we would work with that.

You happy?

Okay. So, I will clarify my motion. I make a motion to strike line 9.6 and allow staff to reuse verbiage and idea in the goal section of the housing section nine.

Second.

Okay. Deliberation commissioner Nelson.

I would probably be more comfortable if it was, if we're doing the goal, which is up under nine, housing. One of the things that we do find a problem with housing is a lot of time is barriers. I hear that all the time. So, to simply ignore it I think is a disservice to everybody that's worked on this. So, I would be more conducive if we were to say and lead that and say: evaluate, lowering, and removing barriers.
to residential development. In other words, you're not saying you can do it, but we're evaluating it and that meets that goal. Would you be amenable to...

Well, my motion is to take it from where it's at and put it at the beginning of the section.

And I'm not sure... Why wouldn't we just put all of that up in the beginning?

Because basically you're telling a developer the most vague description of what he can do and he's going to run with that.

But commissioner Nelson is trying to make it less vague. If you just move it, Mr. Scherf, if you just move it, it hasn't made it less vague. If you take a friendly amendment to his motion, then you've clarified it, I think. And I see-

It strengthens my point if you take the vagueness and take it out of the policy section, that's what I'm saying. If you reword it in the same line to where it's more conducive to you guys enforcing it, there's no enforcement behind that. And I'm sure you can totally attest to what I'm trying to the point I'm trying to get here. If it could be word smithed better in the same section to where it's more enforced, then I'm fine with leaving it there. If it's going to stay as the same verbiage, it needs to go out of policies, because it's not defined as a policy.

Any other discussion about this?

So here, if this makes everybody more comfortable, let me redo my motion again. I make a motion that 9.6, the total verbiage, be word-smithed by city staff and presented back to us for further deliberation on the next time around.

Why would we not go take the next step and talk about what Mr. Nelson has offered? The evaluation? The two-part thing. Can you come with that again? It's basically a discussion now between Mr. Nelson and Mr. Scherf. Can Mr. Nelson convince Mr. Scherf that he's got the wording that he likes? Can you do it?

I understand commissioner Scherf's concern. You want to have these things bullet pointed so that they actually show that you're doing something that you can accomplish and measure it. And that's why I said evaluate, because then we're looking at the problem in residential development due to the barriers.

So, we could evaluate the barriers and see what we get as far as information. That's something you would be looking at. Is that, I'm sorry, your name was...

Amber Neek.

Amber Neek.

Miss?
Neek.

Neek, I'm sorry. Miss Neek would be evaluating for us, not only on the yearly basis as we've projected, but also be able then to talk about, are we creating a development problem because we have barriers in place. So, you have an action item. I understand what you're saying. There's no action there.

Yeah.

Evaluate is the verb. Becomes the verb.

Evaluate makes it an action item that she brings that information back.

I like that.

But we're letting staff do the wordsmithing, according to the motion.

But I would defer to staff.

So, to make it more of an action item you would, in layman's terms, basically say evaluate how to lower and remove barriers.

If that's the problem.

Yeah, it is the problem.

Well, I don't know.

There's no action in it and it's underneath the policy's subsection. So, that means if it's a policy it has to be enforceable. There's no enforcement that can back that up because there is no action.

Well, none of these really have enforcement to them.

But they have to be if they're in this section.

These are goals.

No, they're not. The goals is the top section.

Objectives and policies of goals. Okay?

But if it's underneath policies in the comprehensive plan, this is your blueprint for a developer.

And that's why I say...
And the city to work together.

That would create that...

No, this isn't a direct ordinance that says you can only be five feet off your property with a tree.

No, that's the nuances, but this is the overall master plan blueprint. And if there's an open door that somebody can use, they're going to go in for a plan amendment.

I understand what you're saying.

And come in front of us and waste everybody's time.

And I'm fine if you want to let them wordsmith it, but I would prefer that it stay there not go up on top where confusing.

Okay. I will go with the last motion I said is I would like staff to reword section... or bullet point 9.6 to be a more actionable item using the same topic idea.

Well, then we'll second it by encouraging your use of the word evaluation. That's the action word, sounds like, I think you'll be happy when we do that.

Yeah.

And Mr. Scherf is nodding so I think you've got it. I think you're in agreement.

We have a motion with a second. Any discussion? Seeing none I'll do a roll call vote. This motion to make policy 9.6 more enforceable. I'm going to vote yes. Commissioner Collier?

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur.

Yes.

Commissioner Nelson.

Yes.

Commissioner Scherf.

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.
Sure.

And commissioner Aviles.

Yes.

MOTION/VOTE
Commissioner Scherf moved, and Vice Chair Collier seconded the motion to have staff reword bullet point 9.6 to be a more actionable item using the same topic idea. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

All righty. Any other motions? Commissioner Scherf?

I'd like to move on to housing affordability and homeless section.

Page?

The next page. Page 151.

Thank you.

Bullet point 9.18. This first word in that statement is partner with public and private. I am directly opposed to that specific word. I do not think that city should be partnering with any public and private in a financial manner and/or a directive manner. Partner could be defined as differently, such as, to lower barriers, to work in conjunction with. But partnering, I think, is a very strong word and I don't think that meets the goals, not necessarily the goals, that doesn't meet the objective of what a local city government is supposed to do. It's not the city government's job to fund or facilitate these things. It's the community's outreach, but it is the city's objective to or responsibility to work with them.

I just think the word partner is a very strong word and I'd like that changed.

I confer, would be my guess, but commissioner Nelson, go ahead. You had your hand up.

Well, I'm sorry. I was just wondering what's the word you want or if you want to change it, then you need a motion on it. So, what's the word you like?

I'm in discussion right now. I don't know what the word is personally. I'd like to strike it out completely, but I understand the premise. I understand objective of that bullet point 9.18. I believe the word partner is too strong of a word and it insinuates that the city is going to be a financial and a directive partner in these social services, which it should not be.

Commissioner Arthur.
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Especially if you go on to the next sentence, which the example, purchase affordable housing projects, because it's been the policy of Grants Pass not to be in the housing business.

Exactly.

So, the combination of terminology there probably isn’t appropriate.

I have an idea here. We could make a motion for staff to wordsmith this just like we did with the last motion. Commissioner Nelson.

If you don’t like partner is facilitate, which is similar, but not necessarily being part of it. Partner implies that you’re together.

Yes, exactly. I would rather it say simply "work with the public and private and nonprofit".

Okay. So, my motion would be that I make a motion that within housing and affordability and homeless section 9.81 be reword-smithed by city staff and brought back for approval with recommendations that the word partner be struck or replaced. And the explanation, for example, purchase affordable housing projects be completely struck.

Clarification is...

9.18 not 9.81, right?

Thank you. That's what I was just going to say. Thank you. Thank you.

9.18. Sorry. Do I need to repeat that?

Okay.

Do we have a second? I'll second.

Okay. And I have a question to the motion.


When you say delete, for example, the example. Was the example used because of state requirements or is that just somebody wanted to put that in?

That’s not driven by state. Okay.

More discussion of this motion. I'll do a roll call.

Yeah.

Yeah. I don't know that the hand things are working on this, but anyway, if you simply put "the purchase", when you're talking about the, for example, the purchase of affordable housing projects, et cetera, it's much like the reports I get every single week on every other city. Anyway, in this state, it's using words like partner, but they are having groups like we've seen here, Evergreen, all sorts of other groups getting together to do land conservancy, trust, et cetera. So, without stating whom like the city, for example, the purchase of affordable housing projects. That way it's not stating "the city" will purchase because it has as Loree, I believe commissioner Arthur said then the policy not to become the owner of real estate for this purpose, whatever. But anyway, that's my thought.

That's a great suggestion for your designated wordsmith.

Let me reiterate that my motion is to completely strike that. For example, I look at it from a standpoint of this is a policy that should be abided by and followed by the city staff, the city of Grants Pass. So, this is a directive, a direction that is basically saying, for example, the city purchase affordable housing. There would be, the way it's worded, for example, purchase affordable housing is only directed to the city of Grants Pass purchasing affordable housing. I think it's too convoluted and it should just be completely struck. I don't think, again, the city should be in the position where they're financing or land owning anything that has to do with this.

Commissioner Collier.

And because, and it might not have gone through to the people online, commissioners Aviles and Tokarz-Krauss, when commissioner Clark not a yes, this was not something that's driven top down. I would still be in favor of the motion as Mr. Scherf has presented it, striking the entire sentence, because it just seems something that's internally just came out of somewhere. So, I'd like it the way it is.

To you be clear, you're recommending striking the second sentence of 9.18.

Correct.

Okay. And that's your motion?

That's the second half of my motion. The first half of my motion was to reword-smith the first sentence, specifically, targeting the word partner.

If I...

Go ahead, did you want to say something?

Yeah, I was just going to reference another part of this report.
Participants are waiting in the lobby to admit all participants in the lobby, press star two one.

By nonprofit organizations and for-profit entities to provide housing for special needs populations. So, I'm just wondering if this line-item number 14 somehow influenced section 9.18. That's a question, I guess, for the city, maybe.

Where did you read that from? We lost you there for a second.

I was looking at page 128. My screen says 128, one second. Let me see.


Are you reading policy 9.14?

No. I'm reading off of a page numbered 128 at the very top. It says housing needs and I'm looking at item number 14 of it. It is part of the Grants Pass and urbanizing area comprehensive plan.

I think for the rest it's probably 129. There's just a little bit of a pagination difference between the digital... If you have the paper copy, it's page 129 on the bottom and its section housing needs and then number 18.

Yeah, so the language is very similar to what you were looking at down on the nine-point section as well.

Oh, I see. It's the same wording. Yeah. So, it would need to be changed in both places. I wonder if that's true of the others too.

Yeah. I'd actually like the word support better than partner with. You could totally use that from the report section housing needs on page 129 on our packet. Number 14, you could totally use that. The beginning of that sentence, it plays way better because that bullet point that was just pointed it out... It basically defines to me defines that the city as an operating organization is going to help or support a nonprofit organization, but it says nothing about purchase, run, or operate, which that's where my problem comes from.

The identical wording is in 18, just below that.

There it is. There it is again, there's your partner.

So, the policy section that we're looking at is in both sections, because they were pulled from the section. So, again, any of those recommendations of changes in the policy section need to be done on both.

That clears things up a bit for us. So, we have some work to do.
So, with that added input, I think my motion still stands is to throw it back into your guys' court and reword it and bring it back to us.

And we should...

What's important for staff is that our job is to accurately reflect what the commission is looking for. We're not going to reword and wordsmith something other than solely on the basis of what you are talking about here. So, I guess my point is, it's very important that we understand that the commission as a whole supports the basic premise of the motion. If you're going to say, "staff go reword it", then we need to know that there's concurrence amongst all of you with the basic idea that you don't support the idea of the city partnering and you want a softer engagement on behalf of the city for lack of a better term.

So, you would have clarity if we make a motion, get second on it, and it's voted and passed.

As long as everyone's clear with the intent here. Yeah.

So, we do have a motion and a second on the floor for this. Any more discussion?

I would only ask if director Clark is satisfied with the coherence, is that what I'm hearing? That it is coherent because now we've jumped back between pages and pages. You have enough to go on.

Right. Well, I think Amber and I are clear on the fact that we have two sections that mirror each other. We'll definitely work on that. As long as I'm not hearing...

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:21:04]

As long as I'm not hearing any other commissioners say, "Well, I disagree with that premise," then that's fine. You will strike the word partner. We can come up with some other word.

Okay. I'm going to go ahead and call roll on this vote. I'm voting yes. Commissioner Collier?

Yes.

Commissioner Arthur?

Yes.

Commissioner Nelson?

Yes.
Commissioner Scherf?

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Why not?

Commissioner Aviles?

Yes.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss said sure. And Commissioner Aviles, you said...

Yes.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner Scherf moved, and Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion that within housing and affordability and homeless section 9.18 be reword-smithed by city staff and brought back for approval with recommendations that the word partner be struck or replaced. And the explanation, for example, purchase affordable housing projects be completely struck. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

Thank you. Alright. Other concerns? Any other motions? It sounds like now we need a motion to continue to a date certain.

So, I would move that we move... postpone to February-

Continue.

Continue, I said, to February 23rd, for the purposes of paperwork and other things. The glossary definitions.

Commissioner Aviles seconds.

That was Commissioner Aviles second?

Commissioner Aviles does second. Thank you.

All right. Thank you very much. Any discussion on this motion? I will take a roll call vote. I'm voting yes. Commissioner Collier?
Yes. Yes.
Commissioner Arthur?
Yes.
Commissioner Nelson?
Yes.
Commissioner Scherf?
Yes.
Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?
Indeed.
Commissioner Aviles?
Yes.

MOTION/VOTE
Commissioner Scherf moved, and Commissioner Aviles seconded the motion to postpone to February 23rd for the purposes of paperwork and glossary definitions. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Aviles, Tokarz-Krauss, Arthur, Nelson, and Scherf. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

All righty. Next item on the agenda. Thank you, Ms. Neek, you did a great job. Come back and see us anytime.

Sounds like the 23rd.

8. Matters from Commission Members and Staff: Okay. Matters from commission members, and staff, you have a 15-to-20-minute presentation for us.

It may not be that long.

You have a 15 to 20 second presentation for us.

Is that a joke or is it really 20 minutes?

No, it won't be that long, but it kind of depends on the commission as always, but I'm just pulling this up here. This is just the matters from staff, and this has been talked
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about a couple of times and I did not put it on the agenda. There's no action. This is more of an introduction to what you're going to hear formally at your March meeting. And it would help us as we're preparing for that March meeting, just to get some initial feedback from you on this middle housing code. I just got a couple of slides here that are kind of giving you the summary of this, of the middle housing code at a high level. Where is it? There we go. And Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss and Aviles, I don't think you're... You're not seeing the slide right now, are you?

I'm seeing a folder.

Yeah. Well, I don't know. My tech skills are a little below me. I'm not going to be able to move that over. I apologize.

Do you [inaudible 01:25:03] project? Can you... Oh, there we are. Is this not it?

Okay. Well, it's weird. So, the commissioners in the chambers are seeing the slide on the left and the commissioners are seeing the slide on the right. So, I think this will work. We're going to be one behind. So, we've talked about this twice. We are now in the process of doing a public hearing, we're scheduling a public hearing for your first meeting in March, to do a development code update for middle housing. It affects I think, nine chapters. So, it's fairly substantial. We're going to try to get this packet to you two weeks ahead of time so that you have more time with it.

And the purpose of tonight is just to kind of give you that heads up of what it's about because it's been, I think, four months since we had the consultant here to talk to you about it. So, this is all based off of the 2019 Legislative session House bill 2001, basically says the intent here is to bring a broader range of housing into cities. And if you're a city of 25,000 like we are, or more, than you have to follow this. We have to have local zoning codes adopted by July 21. I mean, July 21, July 1st, 2022.

It's all kind of you, you may have seen this slide before, this just shows on the left, you've got traditional single-family housing. Sorry, Commissioner Arthur, I know that word isn't the right... We're trying to move away from that, but planners, it's baked into our vocabulary. And then on the far right, you have your larger multiplexes. What's in between is your duplexes, your triplexes, your quads, cottage housing, a lot of product that was built in the twenties, thirties, forties, and then post World War II kind of tended to go away. After World War II, you started to see, and largely because of the emphasis of the federal government on mortgages, the detached housing type, and much less of these other housing types, kind of in the middle with the cottages, kind of these courtyards and things like that. What's called middle housing is basically saying, "Hey, these are another type that we're kind of, if you're looking for a diversity of housing in your community, Grants Pass is not alone in this. This is probably a weak spot. And so how do we encourage and allow for more of it?"

Well, not only did the state of Oregon say, we're going to allow, we're going to actually mandate that you have to allow those anywhere you allow single family housing. So, Minnesota kind of led the way several years ago, Oregon is one that followed up on that. So, that was the purpose of House bill 2001. We want all these kinds of middle housing to be allowed anywhere you can do a detached product,
regardless of what you're zoning. If you have a zoning that allows for that, then you have to allow these. So, for smaller cities in Oregon, they have to allow duplexes everywhere. But for cities like Grants Pass and larger, you have to not only allow duplexes everywhere, you have to allow triplexes, quadplexes, cottage, town homes, everywhere where there's residential zoning. So, it's a pretty, potentially big change. It doesn't mean that you can't still do one lot with one house, but it does mean that in that zone, the city has to make provisions to ensure that if you wanted to do a triplex on your lot, you can, and the city can't stop you.

So, that means adjusting minimum lot size, that means making clear standards, that means you can't come to the planning commission. If you want to do a quad, you have to allow these kinds of units, this middle housing by right, as a building permit, as though you were coming in for a single-family house, even though it may be a quad. So that means you have to have much more clear instructions if you will, right in the code so that anyone can come in the door upstairs in planning and say, "Here's my application for a fourplex, a quad, a cottage. This is what I want to do." And we process it just like any other building permit, if you were doing a shop or a garage or a deck.

So, you have to have clear and objective standards, you have to make it very clear where they can go, it ties into parking. Here is a summary of all of our zoning districts in the left column. Right now, it shows in black what you can do today, and basically this is what's going to be allowed in the R one, two, all et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Now it does change as you get into the higher density zones takes out. Well, this doesn't show it correctly but we're taking, the emphasis is on the higher density product types, not the lower density. Once you get into the R four and R five, we don't have a lot of R four and R five zone. So, the idea there is to protect it and not allow for single family housing to take up that land.

So, this is a summary table of what you're going to see in your packets here in a couple weeks. This is our matrix and the code that shows what the proposed residential dwelling unit is on the left-hand column. And then if you go across the top, you see the R zones, and then you see the biggest change here. For example, town home, right here, number three, striking out planned unit development, striking out a type 1C, which is public comment and making it a type 1A, which is no public comment. And that goes through for duplexes, that goes through for quadplexes. You see all this P permitted 1A, which is administrative building permit only. So, we wouldn't send a notice to neighbors that says you're going to do a triplex, you're going to do a quad. You just come in for your building permit and you get it.

Will this require an exception to goal one and the statewide goals and policies? That requires-

No, it does not. They address that in the House bill 2001 in the 2019 session.

Thank you.

So that again, this is just kind of a highlight of what you're going to be seeing. It does affect the maximum density a little bit, so this is another change you'll see. The low
density was 3.96. It goes up to 4.35 as far as the max density, just because you’re going to have to bump up that density a little bit. If you're going to allow those other units in there. Duplexes would count as a single unit, cottage units, tripexes, these would be exempt from your maximum density. Again, in order to accommodate this, this is some of the tweaks that need to be made.

The other chart I wanted to show you that you'll want to take a close look at is the lot area. The size of the lot that's required in each zone, or I should say the minimum size that's required. So, all of them drop in size. Once you get over here to the lot area for a quadplex or cottage cluster, those are the same. But then when you come down as you get down to the higher density lots, those stay a little bit bigger. So, if you come in for the R three zone, and you're going to do a quadplex, you have to do 7,000 square foot lots instead of 5,000 square foot lots, just because by the time you get your parking in there and you're landscaping, you're going to need the bigger lot for a quad.

So, anyway, I think that was, I just wanted to, because of the scope of this change, wanted to give you a heads up, it's coming at you, and we have a public hearing. We're going to give you the statute and we're going to give you each of those nine articles that's changing. So hopefully the two weeks, but if there's anything else that you think you could, you would help you in your public hearing now let me know. And of course, we can always talk during those two weeks before your hearing.

And this hearing, is it going to be legislative or quasi-judicial?

Oh, it's legislative.

Thank you very much. Commissioner Nelson?

Just a quick question, in regards to the numbers that you've projected up there and so forth, is that the state requirements that you worked with, or is this something that your staff put together?

No, these are staff. Yeah.

And this is to comply with the state requirements.

Right. And as Commissioner Aviles mentioned earlier, the state does have a model code that they have created, and if Grants Pass fails to adopt by July 1, we would kick in. And it's just not as pertinent. I mean, a lot of this is similar, but we do have latitude locally to set this. So, the specifics numbers there are not coming down from the state.

Commissioner Arthur?

[inaudible 01:36:03] ask about something besides this?

Oh yeah, no, as part of the staff, I just want to give you a heads up.
The subject is urban growth boundary expansion, and I keep noticing, I think nobody on city council, except Rick Riker lived through the UGB expansion, and I keep hearing comments when watching on TV, "Well, we need to expand this, we need to do that." And I think that the council needs a three-minute summary of UGB and what it was and what it accomplished because we established the 10 year or the 20-year boundary and the 50-year reserve already. It's not time or appropriate to do another expansion at this time. And I think they need a little clarification on that. And in either use terminology, like rezone in advance or something like that, it just scares me every time I hear one of them say, "Oh, we need to expand the urban growth boundary." We don't. We already did.

So, I don't know how to get that communicated. We don't have a liaison anymore. And the other thing that keeps coming up on the TV ones are there are a couple of people that are quite concerned about annexation. And I don't think the council as a whole is clear on how annexation relates or doesn't relate in the cases they were asking about. You know, I don't remember which item was before them last week, but it had nothing to do with whether that was the next yet or not. And I think it's time to, I don't know when you will do another charter revision or whatever it is that requires, but that vote years ago, decades ago, that everybody has to vote on every annexation probably needs to be revisited.

Yeah. And there was a Supreme court case that came down last year. That changed that. So, you're right, there would need to be a change to the city's charter to reflect the court case. Yeah.

Okay.

Well, we like this. This is in line with the goal that we submitted to counsel.

Yeah, you're going to like it for about 10 minutes, and this is going to be the downfall of Grants Pass.

Could be.

Middle housing is the worst thing that the state ever came up with because they did not take into account the infrastructure, the burden on the infrastructure, on the smaller cities. We are still a small city. Even though we're over 25,000 people, we're still a small city. This middle housing is horrifying. It's going to burden the city on infrastructure, your tax base is going to go down, so basically you become a total welfare city and you don't have taxes to support anything. So, the first thing that goes away is your police and fire.

Do you think that we have that many projects, that much available land that it's, that there's-?

Everybody is approaching this at the wrong level. You have the state of Oregon has the worst renter laws on the books. So, nobody's going to come to the table and no developer's going to come and say, I'm going to build a big, giant apartment complex for middle income people because I know I can never get rid of them. As soon as
they walk in my door, as soon as I give them a lease, the state of Oregon says that I have to leave them there, and I can't get them out if they don't pay rent. That the first thing. The second thing is it's not affordable housing, it's affordability of housing. So, get some of these people some jobs, there's no infrastructure here and calling-

Do you think I... I'm going back to your first premise. Do you think there's that much available land left to build on within the urban growth boundary that if we do it, it'll start to fall upon itself, see what I mean?

No, I understand that you should increase densities and you should encourage people to develop some more, but then you have to look at it as a whole. What a planner's job is to do is to look at the whole, every cog and wheel that works together, and it all works together. If you don't have the economic base to support the people that are in your city, that means you are going to either be a welfare city or you're going to be a retirement community, and then there's other aspects of economics that can support that. But realistically, when was the last time you had a middle-income industry in the city of Grants Pass? In the eighties when logging was still available. After that spotted owl, everything went down, and it's never come back. You need to be working with the economic developers to get people to come here, to actually give these people a job so they can afford a house. And your affordability on houses is still minuscule to what other states are.

So anyways, I'm sorry if I was on my soapbox, but this, if you want to stand behind and say middle housing is the new wave of the future, no, it's the curse of the future. [crosstalk 01:41:46].

Because people won't live here and the people that are living here are not owning the facilities. So now what happens is you start doing triplexes and quadplexes and those turned into lower income houses, and then basically you don't have people building anymore because people can't pay the rent. They're going to be subsidized. If you don't have people... If you have one piece of property and you have multiple units on it, those units are not paying the property taxes. The owner of the building is. He's only paying for one portion of, so he is not paying for four different, he's not paying four different tax bills. He's paying one, but you've just tripled, quadrupled your density, but you didn't quadruple the tax base. That's what happens when you increase density without actually increasing your tax base. Sorry.

When I said what I said, I meant that this is in line with the goal that we handed to council.

It is, but people really need to see past their nose.

Understood, and I get what you're saying about infrastructure. You start putting triplexes on a lot now instead of a single-family home, there's going to be some, some jam ups.

That's a... I mean, think about parking right now.

Right. Right, I get you.
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It's just, you have to kind of think of everything together and it's really mind boggling to do it, but I can't be a fan of this, this new... And it's forced upon us by the state, which... Fun.

Understood. Thank you for your input, appreciate that. Director Clark, any other matters? [crosstalk 01:43:26]

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss has her hand up.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, go right ahead.

Thank you, Commissioner Aviles. The way I understood the mandate, yes, it does force all these communities that are over the threshold to change their zoning, there is no more single-family zoning, so to speak. What it... I thought there was a provision in there that left it to the community to massage that into its own area. For example, say up on Cook Estates or where you have a hill, it would be impractical to build certain of these multiplexes and so forth, and that was to be left to the localities. Do I have that incorrect? I guess that would go to you, Brad.

I am not aware of that. It doesn't mean it's not buried in there somewhere, but I am not aware of it.

Okay. It was one of the redeeming factors of something that was written really for a metropolitan area, not really for something a community of our size, even though we're included their end. It did come up at the housing summit that they had last year, and then again this year, and that would go to what Commissioner Scherf's concerns are because it was really aimed. This came from a focus on metropolitan areas, mainly Portland. So, but it would just as a matter of opinion, I would agree with Commissioner Scherf in that. Thank you.

Anybody else for the good of the order? I'm going to adjourn the meeting. I swear I will. Okay. We're out of here. Thank you.

Eric Heesacker, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commissioner

2/23/20
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