

URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes – March 10, 2021 at 6:00 P.M.
Council Chambers

COMMISSIONERS:

Jim Coulter (Chair) – Absent
Eric Heesacker (Vice Chair)
Loree Arthur
Jennifer Aviles
Mark Collier
Susan Tokarz-Krauss
L. Ward Nelson
Clint Scherf – Absent

City/Staff/Council Liaisons:

Bradley Clark, (CD Director)
Jason Maki (Assistant Planner)
Donna Rupp (Associate Planner)
Ryan Nolan (Contract Principal Planner)
Dennis Lewis (Contract Senior Planner)

Guests:

All right, I'm going to go ahead and start this meeting. This is Vice-Chair Heesacker in the place of Chairman Coulter. And I got 18:03 on my computer and the clock here in the chamber says 18:05. We will start with roll call. I know Commissioner Aviles is here and has asked me to go ahead, same thing with Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss,

Commissioner Arthur?

Here.

Commissioner Collier?

Also here.

Commissioner Nelson?

Present.

Commissioner Scherf, appears to be absent. As I said, I'm Vice-Chair Heesacker and nobody is online, there are no introductions to be made, the chambers are empty except for the six of us is. I'll go ahead and read public comment, 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 pertinent to the City's Jurisdiction, each speaker of which there are none will be given three minutes to address the Commission, as one body, not individuals.

No public is here, no public comment. Item number four, approval of minutes. Does anybody want to make a motion of minutes.

Moves approval of the minutes from the last meeting.

Second.

Moved by Commissioner Nelson, seconded by Commissioner Collier. Minutes for the last meeting... all those in favor, say aye. [crosstalk 00:02:48] Anybody opposed? Any abstentions? minutes from last meeting, pass.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Collier seconded the motion to approve the February 24, 2021 minutes, as submitted. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Vice Chair Heesacker and Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Collier, Tokarz-Krauss and Nelson. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Chair Coulter and Commissioner Scherf. The motion passed.

Findings of fact from last minute, project 402-00107-20, Comprehensive Plan Amendment. That would have been pages four to 18 of your packet or I will just leave it at that, I think saying the project number will suffice. Yes.

I would move approval of findings.

Commissioner Nelson moves approval on Findings of Fact, Is there a second?

Call your second.

Permission to call your second, any discussion? all those in favor of passing the findings, signify by saying aye. [crosstalk 00:03:37] Anybody opposed? Any abstentions? Motion passes, it would appear five to nothing.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Collier seconded the motion to approve the Findings of Fact for 402-00107-20 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Vice Chair Heesacker and Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Collier, Tokarz-Krauss and Nelson. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Chair Coulter and Commissioner Scherf. The motion passed.

Next item, public hearing 40500123-21, Multi-Family solar and I have a blurb to read. At this time, I will open the public hearing to consider this item, for the Multi-family Solar Standards. We will begin the hearing with the staff report, followed by public comment and as of now, there is none. And then the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the Commission. Objections to jurisdiction? Is there anyone present? That's not a Commissioner, who wishes to challenge the authority of Commission to consider this matter? No, there is not. Abstentions? Any conflicts of interest? Do any Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest?

Nobody is speaking up, I will explain the criteria in this hearing for this legislative item. 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's important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the Commission and the parties, an opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals based on the issue. The hearing has been opened at this time, we will begin with the staff report. Director Clark, please proceed.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-chair. Did you say Commissioner Aviles is...

Commissioner Aviles is here, she said she was going to step out and to please start.

Okay, I didn't know if that was here physically or in the...okay. I just was looking online and I got it.

Thank you for checking on that.

So I will go ahead and give, kind of a brief overview. I'm going to make the assumption though, that the Commission members have had a chance to look through this. This is one of those, you almost have to be kind of semi-nerdy to actually get into this particular one. It gets pretty detailed probably for those of you that haven't been on the Commission long, there's a lot there. And just a reminder, because this is legislative, the 120 day rule that the state has doesn't apply in this type of hearing. So that, means you have the freedom to continue to keep the hearing open. If you feel that there are other issues, that either you want more information on, or you think certain members of the Grants Pass community, want information on you can direct staff to do that or to take it to those.

With that being said, the basic subject in summary is here on the slide and we're talking about amending three different articles in the development code. So the first one is 12, the other one's 19 and 22. This is really kind of coming from the Oregon Revised Statute 197. There's an exhibit that I put into the packet tonight, that has the full wording on that statute. And it has to do with needed housing and essentially saying all types of housing have to be at all income levels, have to be available in a community in Oregon. If you're 2,500 or above in population and it goes on to say that if with that housing, you're going to set rules, they have to be clear and objective. And they also have to have provisions that essentially don't provide a barrier to the development of any housing, a reasonable barrier.

Those need to be addressed, they need to be clear and if you're going to set standards, they need to be very spelled out in the code and there can't be any ambiguity. So the Grants pass code, was fared reasonably well on that front. But in 2017, the opinion of folks at that time... I know Commissioner Arthur was here at that time, was that there should be some work done on that. And so that's when the Siegel planning was hired to kind of take a look at the City Of Grants Pass Code, do kind of an audit and look and see, are we in fact, okay, on this requirement in the statute that says you have to have clear and objective standards. The focus on that one was really on Multi-family Housing to make, to sort of help streamline that a little bit, so that you didn't have to go through as much of a process to get Multi-family Housing developed in Grants Pass. So this does quite a bit more specific standards related to multi dwellings, but it also relates to others.

This slide, I think I just covered. So in terms of the first article that we're talking about, article 12, this was actually not part of Siegel Planning's review, but it has been discussed often on for several years. And this deals with the general commercial zone, and as this has shown on the screen this GC and GC two, which is the city zoning where retail, some really light manufacturing and other things that is allowed. Today, you can do single single-family housing, you can do duplex, you can do attached two units, a townhouse type product and duplexes all are permitted in the General Commercial Zone. That is unusual, it has at this point taken up about 16% of our General Commercial Land. And typically in zoning, if somebody comes to you and says, I want to create new commercial land, or I want to zone Commercial Land and especially General Commercial, it can often present a challenge.

And so given that our Buildable Lands Inventory said, you as a City in the next 20 to 30 years, you actually are going to be slightly short on your supply of General Commercial Land. The

point of this proposal, is to help to protect that land and keep it there so that if you do want to come in with some kind of Commercial Enterprise, there's land zoned for you already, and it's not being taken up by Single-family Housing. So that's really kind of the crux of what this one is attempting to do, so this is what's shown here. This screen just shows that Manufactured Housing, single on an individual lot also would be removed as a permitted use, that's what that P stands for, P as secondary.

So that would be removed and the General Commercial Zone, you could still do manufactured housing parks but not on a General Commercial Lot and just plop a manufactured home. And then finally, the residential accessory, this added footnote basically says, if you already have a Single-family house in a Commercial Zone, you can do an accessory dwelling unit. Those are permitted outright. This is the City; all of this red hatched area is all the General Commercial. We've got about 934 acres of it, about 780 has already developed out 20 acres is either pretty constrained or is not really build able. That's 134 acres that are vacant, that's an older number. And that's because our comprehensive plan in this section hasn't been updated for that long. We have less than that today, we have about 145 acres of all of this General Commercial that's built out today with either Single-family housing, duplexes, or manufactured homes. So those would all stay, they will all be continued to be permitted uses. You can do all the regular maintenance and routine things you can do as though you were in a residential zone.

This is just a sample out on Rogue River highway, again this East West corridor, you've got all the red, that's General Commercial. You can see all the yellow is Single-family dwellings. The pink is some duplexes, and then we have blue is manufactured housing. So it just kind of demonstrates an area that kind of has a concentration of this.

So that, is really the essence of what article 12 changes are doing. Article 19 is getting into the process of how multi-family dwelling projects and single family dwelling projects are approved. The exemptions are there, single dwellings, duplex dwellings, 80 use, and ordinary maintenance. They don't have to go through kind of this separate site plan review, which means you can do it faster.

19 has a few other changes in there, it changes the composition of the Site Plan Review Committee. It updates that to basically reflect what the City has been doing for a while. 19.032 increases the number of residential projects that qualify for that Minor Site Plan Review. Again, that's bringing us more into compliance with the State Statute because these can be done more streamlined, these residential projects. And then another section there, it sets requires Major Site Plan Review, if you're doing waivers or variants. So if you come in with a 10 unit project, for example, and you have to have a height variance, or you have to have a setback variance, or you're asking from some other waiver, you are still going to have to go through the typical review process. So if you can meet all the standards, basically, they're not going to come to you or this body or to the City Council. It'll just be at staff level and streamline those.

These are the changes, more sections of 22. So when we're talking about Multi-dwelling Standards, we are talking about five or more, we're not talking about fourplexes or triplexes. Those don't have to comply with the open space and some of the other landscaping standards that you see in there, but anything fiber above those projects would, and they do today. This makes it more clear, and it actually reduces it a little bit in terms of the open space requirements.

These are the four areas that the code talks about open space, landscaping, parking Site access, building mass and facade design. Those are kind of the four main areas that are changed under this proposal. This just kind of is added in the code, kind of as a graphic to kind of give some more definition, shows that private open space would be kind of that area, a deck or a patio on an apartment that would have some fencing. And then you have the common open space, which would be available to all parties within that development, not to the public in general but to those that are in that development. And it defines that it does require the 30% of the Gross Area be designated and permanent reserved as common open space.

That may sound a lot, but that number does include required landscaping. So if you're on a street frontage, you've got that landscaping strip there that can actually count up to 50% of the site, you could count as part of those landscape buffers. The table at the bottom, there is just kind of one of the examples, 22.1 of what some of the specific dimensions that are added into this code amendments. So if you have five to 10 dwelling units in your project, you have to have a minimum open space of 500 square feet. If you have 11 to 2,750, and if you have more than 20 units, you would have to have a thousand square feet of open space, plus 250 for every 20 units.

So again, this is trying to spell out very specifically, so that if you come in and you meet this that you're going to get approved. There's no going to a public hearing and wondering if you will go through that. So it streamlines that minimum, horizontal dimensions are there maximum with, that's just an example of a table. There are others building articulation, it doesn't change a lot. We currently have some design standards for multi-family dwellings but it does add some requirements there.

We can talk more about that if the Commission wants to, and finally, the code change does also remove 100% of the solar standards. So as I mentioned in the staff report, these solar standards were something that you saw a lot in communities around in the eighties as an attempt to increase efficiency, energy efficiency, particularly after the seventies energy crisis. There's about 15 to 20 pages I think of very specific criteria on meeting setbacks on that North South dimension, so that you can provide for the solar efficiency. There haven't been very many variances surprisingly to that, it does allow for some waivers of that, so some of those have been handled at staff level. But the recommendation from the consultant was to, just because of the increased energy efficiencies in the codes today as well as to get more of an infill community, and we don't have as much Greenfield development just going out and bill where you can kind of factor this in easier.

They recommended that we, take it out. So at this point, there's not a replacement to go with a simpler version of the, if the Commission wants, we can do more research on that. It does just eliminate it. The final change in the code, brings us into compliance with a state statute from 2019, which says that if you have an accessory dwelling unit, you as a local government cannot require a new off street parking space for that unit. So currently we do require that this brings us into compliance with the state statute, which says you have to eliminate that.

And finally, here's the criteria for any Zone Development Code at the Text Amendment. You have to meet these four criteria, those are outlined in the staff report and staff found that this proposal does meet those. So again, you can take all of this public testimony tonight, you can deliberate, and as I said, at the beginning, you can either continue. If you have questions or want more research, we're happy to do that or you can recommend to the City Council to either approve or deny.

Any questions staff?

Commissioner Nelson.

On page 21, I was confused by number two, which says the new provisions for an alternative approval process for Residential Development, with the criteria that are not clear and objective consistent with the ORS or are clear.

This is a number two on page 21?

Yeah, I don't understand what the negative is about.

Actually it is worded correctly, but it's saying that if you come in with a proposal for a development that doesn't have, it's not consistent with the clear and objective standards, then it sets, it sets a new process. So, you would have to go through the public hearing process for an applicant,

If there was not clear and objective, because the code or S is defining what we need to do.

Correct.

Which is to make clear and objective requirements. I don't know, just reads funny. I don't think it has any bearing because we're not on that, but it just reads funny.

Actually, I see what you mean. I think what that was trying to say is that if you come in with an application that doesn't meet the clear and objective criteria, or it's not consistent with those, then this amendment. But you're right, it doesn't really read that way.

Oh, I got more of a go.

You have more? Go ahead.

So my understanding is Oregon state law requires that we have a clear and objective code, correct? And when I look at per se, I also like to read the laws, but you look at their laws and they use words such as clear and objective, which is standards. Does that have meaning or definition in the Oregon code?

The word standards?

Clear and objective. I mean, I understand objective, but one person being clear on something doesn't mean, another person will be clear. Just as I wasn't on your...

Right.

And so how do they define that? I'm curious.

I'm not aware that the ORS defines the word clear, it is possible that it does. We didn't find you...

So, when you rewrote did you look at this as more of just making it possibly as objective as possible? And that you put down as much as you thought that would make it clear?

Correct, right.

And so, they also state that it cannot have an effect either on themselves or cumulatively for discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay. How do you determine unreasonable?

Right now, That's going to be at the end of the day done through the courts. I mean, when you're writing definitions in Sony and ordinances and codes you can rely on the Webster definition as you're sort of standby, but if you're going to beat something different than that, or you want to go more detailed and that's when you have to define it.

Well, that's what sort of triggered when we're talking about affordable housing, which I don't think there's a City in the nation that has it. But that would be what triggers, what is unreasonable or reasonable to me. It's all I have for now, thank you.

Anyone else with questions for staff.

Thank you. On page 21, it indicates that articles 12, 19 and 22 were proposed for changes. Were there any other proposed amendments to be changed that just aren't included or weren't moved forward?

No.

Okay.

Nope, those are the three, there are a number of other parts of the Development Code that definitely need to be changed. But this particular one just focused on this issue of clear and objective standards for housing. We didn't see any other sections of the code that really were under the fill under that topic.

Okay, thank you.

Mr. Nelson.

In addition, you have taken out everything on Solar Panels but you s maintain a variance, or is it just automatic that anyone that wants to put Solar Panels in Kian?

Yeah, this doesn't take out solar panels, per se. It's taking out the section of the code that says you have to, build your housing in such a way that you're not going to keep somebody else, that's a neighbor of yours from being able to effectively get up to 80% of that access to the sun. This Isn't saying you can't do solar panels, this has nothing to do with that.

What would be the process for permitting a Solar Panel?

Sorry?

How would they get a permit for the solar panels?

That's just a straight building permit

Straight Building Permit. So I live on a hill and I'm going to put Solar Panels in someone else's above me or in a different direction and it reflects into my windows. Does that matter?

Correct. No. I mean this is basically eliminating any responsibility for you as a developer or your neighbors from keeping you from having that access.

Just curious, have you ever had complaints that?

Well, I mean, I'm such a short timer in the year and a half. I've been here now, but it's certainly possible that I don't know...

Solar panels glaring in my eyes, it was offensive, but I don't know how somebody would feel about that if they were a neighbor and they were looking down on a roof.

This is good ranch, do we turn it over to code enforcement? Is it nuisance? I just see it coming up sometime in the future.

Yeah, I mean there is a section of the code that says you can't cause glare to the public right of way, or to neighboring properties. I suppose that would cover it, it's not specific to solar panels. It's just general environmental constraint that says you can't cause glare, so it's an interesting question. I've not heard that complaint.

Commissioner Arthur, go right ahead.

On page 110 of our section 22, 730 says accessory dwelling units are exempt from residential density standards. Would that be true if we start putting in minimum density kinds of requirements that we don't have now?

Well, we would want to discuss that. I mean, don't think this would probably change. I've never seen a community that has added ADU's (Accessory Dwelling Units) into the density requirements. They're truly accessory meaning even though technically yes, it does add a unit because it's on a lot that it wasn't already approved for whatever house, it's an accessory to that house, so it doesn't get added into the density. I mean, that's pretty standard practice, I mean we could. I'm not aware of any rule that says we can't in the minimum density discussions, is that what you're referring to?

Yeah, I don't remember discussing that issue in the minimum density discussions. I agree that you probably couldn't go backwards and say, okay, now you all have to build ADU's to meet the new minimum density, but it seems it should be calculated in as a density.

To help reach that minimum 60% or whatever number it is.

Yeah, but we haven't really been through the density discussions yet, I don't think. What p is that? 22732 way down at the end. It says fire escapes or exterior stairs for access to an attached upper level, accessory dwelling shall not be located on the front. And I thought we had

some discussion about that, about allowing entrances to be on the front, on the accessory. Am I misremembering?

You mean a prior planning Commission had that decision?

No, probably in the AJC, I suspect. I can't remember where we discussed it but...

You do recognize this is not talking about stairs to an upper unit on the ADU itself, it's talking about on the front of the primary dwelling. So if you're....

How do we see that it's primary?

The last line of Roman numeral...

It will not be located on the front of the dwelling?

You have a primary dwelling with two stories, and you want to convert that second story to an accessory dwelling unit. This is saying you couldn't put the stairs that access that accessory dwelling on the front of your house. They would have to be on the side or the rear.

This can be pretty ridiculous because that the 611A street there, the big yellow and green one across from Holland hall has the apartment upstairs on the right-hand side, on the West side of the building. And there's a back stair that would meet this, but it enters into the bedroom of the apartment because the living areas on the front side, I mean kind of an odd requirement.

Or a new dwelling, because that's a non-conforming use. Pre-Existing the one you're referring to, correct?

Pardon me?

The yellow house you're referring to course existing, non-Conforming use part of a situation. So you're just talking about a brand new construction meeting this standard, correct?

Is this referring only to new construction?

It would only apply to new. Yes, if you already have a structure that has the stairs on the front and it's going to be legal non-conforming, it could stay. This would only apply for a new building permit.

Wait, that's not obvious to me.

Collier.

Because when it goes through the ways you can get an accessory dwelling, obviously one of them is converting an existing building into [inaudible 00:34:35]

Yeah, the conversion would make it a new construction, basically a conversion of something pre-existing to meet current code would fall under the current code limitations that takes next step, I assume.

Right, right.

Then on the next page on 112 may never happen, but those couple of lots that I see every week around town where you have a great big lot with a little house at the back end of it where you might build a primary house, the way this is worded. And I don't know where the text accompanies this particular drawing, the maximum 1000 square foot footprint shall not be larger than the footprint of the primary dwelling. But if you're proposing to make that the ADU and the primary to be new instruction, at what point does that switch occur?

So you're saying if you have a thousand square foot or less ADU and you were to build...

No, a house on a big lot and you want to build a primary dwelling and make that the ADU.

You could certainly do that.

So you just rename it, right?

Right, and I think that's why we were proposing to just get rid of this whole thing. it doesn't seem to really...

This whole drawing?

Just got that big red X through it.

That's what I was wondering. Yeah, it seemed a bit confusing and it doesn't really add. All that's already addressed in the text.

So the minimum six feet between the dwellings has also been changed?

Yeah, fire requires 10, unless you're doing some additional firewall protection. If you went with two or three hour firewall or something like that, but for standard, you would have to do 10 foot separation.

Anything else, Commissioner Arthur?

I don't think so.

Does anyone else have any questions?

Yes, sir.

What's a long monotonous wall?

[crosstalk 00:37:27] Is that term in this code? I think that terminology is in article 20, isn't it?

It's for the multiplexes, it's page 76. Billings with long monotonous exterior walls shall be avoided. [crosstalk 00:38:08]

Any other Commission numbers want to answer that?

One of the problems I have is, it's hard to get affordable housing when you keep adding on rules that don't make any sense. And that's why I worry about with this type of language being used when you're trying to develop property, straight lines is easier to develop than jagged aesthetically pleasing. Builders have squares, it's easy to make.

Can I just say something, actually what you're saying now it goes back to... I'm sorry, in my humble opinion, clear and objective standards. The whole idea is to get away from subjective. So that's exactly kind of...or as 197.307 speaks to the clear and objective standards. It is just to try to get away from the terms that lead one to their own subjective analysis of what you mean? So I am just commenting, I looked it up. I had to laugh, monotonous and legal terms. They called it brain numbing. So I don't know, that's a little subjective as well.

Yeah, that is under the guidelines section. I didn't really call that out when I was talking earlier, but there are guidelines and standards. The guidelines are all intended to kind of say, here's the goal.

Wouldn't it be better to just say the need to have aesthetically pleasing exterior's or I don't know, leave it out entirely?

Commissioner Aviles has a question.

So when it talks about shall be avoided, is there a difference between shall and should.

There is, shall mandatory.

Shall is mandatory, okay. Verses should, would not be mandatory? Or both are mandatory.

Should is not mandatory.

It's not mandatory, okay.

I'll change it to should, huh?

Well, as a guideline, that's actually not a bad idea because the guidelines are intended to provide the goal, not set the specific standard. So that is actually not a bad idea.

That you can't define. So I would move to strike shall and replace it with should.

Thank you, Commissioner.

Sounds like it makes it more flexible.

It would. Just my definition, shall is objective and should is subjective. So variable.

I agree, but flexibility is what you...if you're going to get affordable housing, you got to be somewhat flexible. Frankly, I think the only way to get the affordable housing is if you have the supply of housing available, that all elements of the high market can get their properties.

There are a lot of variables to the supply chain right now, it has increased the cost of costs to do anything. I'm personally trying to do one to get out there as an affordable housing option and I can't.

Did I get a second on that motion? I wonder.

I'll give him a second.

Shall to should.

Discussion.

What do you think, Director Clark?

Sorry?

Change that shall to should, are we good with that?

It is not my motion, I'm good.

Okay, we'll go with that for now. Anybody else have any questions for staff?

On page 105, but it's not in the red line stuff. I don't know whether we're only discussing changes or what's new, what's different.

Well, it's anything in here.

But that list of all units shall include at least three of the features on any building, any street facing elevation. I don't know. Well, one thing that strikes me as in the examples we've seen, they tend to be Portland type high density front steps on the sidewalk, kind of thing. That's not probably very realistic for being built here, maybe that new development downtown or something. I don't know, it's hard to envision the three in, in that combined. My question had to do with the next with three, the design of front building elevations may not be repeated on more than four consecutive units. I don't know. It just seems, you could be inviting a real hodgepodge of appearances. I can't imagine what the outcome might be, but it might not be good.

It's interesting because I think to escape the conforming features the bland. I'll call it California type subdivisions, where every home is cookie cutter, every home is the same. And this gives you, or every building, I should say, this gives you options of which of the three to select. So it does avoid that kind of forming, you know what I mean? That the very bland one after the other, but not to make it too outside the box, a purple house or yellow what I mean? The different colors, but it gives you at least a little bit of individuality in the building of these homes. But I find that this gives you some diversity, but pretty much what we've been making approvals based upon.

I would just add that this section has been here for many years. I've not heard any complaints about that because it does give you almost any house without really even giving it much design attention, is going to be able to meet this. I would say the majority that come in certainly that F roof eaves with a minimum projection of 12 inches, that's very simple to me. It almost every house is going to meet that one. The attached garage, the lap siding, I mean you only have to have three. So that, would do it. So in terms of mixing it up and I think, and then section three is just saying, you couldn't choose the exact same three design features and put them more than four in a row, you're going to have to mix something up, to give some diversity on the street appeal.

There is just incidentally on four B, there's a typo.

What? I can't believe it.

Yeah, Compulsive English teacher,

That four B that's an example of how this is trying to get...

I'm just trying to say, you might want to lean up...

Where's the typo?

It is just after the underlined part. It says A4LL, I think. But should be saying "all prints."

Yeah, that's actually striking out the capital A and then putting a small a.

Oh, is that what it's doing?

Whatever.

Not to be nitpicky, but that is following a period. So either you remove the period and put the capital A, just because that's not going to change anything.

Any other questions?

No, I just think you got to try them out because we don't know who's going to be coming in, having problems, meeting some of these things. And we may need variants that may need changes to avoid variances later, but I can't tell that ahead of time.

So before, I close the public hearing. I'm sorry, I meant to catch you before you sat down, would you please check and make sure that nobody is online.

We do not have anyone that has joined online.

Thank you sir, appreciate that. Does anybody have a problem with me closing the public hearing? All right, I am closing this public hearing. Is there any discussion, any motions anyone wants to make? The only change I recorded, was changing the shall to should in section 201051AAAI5. Did anybody else note any other changes? And If you're going to be making a

motion, please remember we're recommending that this be passed on to Council for their approval.

I'll second that.

That sounded like a motion to me. Okay, I will go ahead and make the motion. I know Chair Coulter doesn't like this, but my meeting tonight. So I will move that, we recommend the Council approval of these text amendments. With the change we recommended the word shall to should in section 221051AIII is there a second?

Beautiful, second.

Commissioner Collier second, so we have a motion on the table. If you're in favor of the motion, please say, aye. [crosstalk 00:49:38] Anybody opposed? Anybody wanting to abstain motion? Motion passes, please take this forward to Council for their approval, Director Clark.

MOTION/VOTE

Vice Chair Heesacker moved and Commissioner Collier seconded the motion to recommend that Council approve the text amendments to the 405-00123-21 Multi Family Solar Standards, with a recommend change recommended of the word "shall" to "should" in section 221051AIII. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Vice Chair Heesacker and Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Collier, Tokarz-Krauss and Nelson. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Chair Coulter and Commissioner Scherf. The motion passed.

All right, next item on the agenda. Matter from Commission members and staff. Staff, we'll start with you or do you want me to give you a break while you right there?

Oh, that would be great. Okay.

Tokarz-Krauss, do you have anything you would like to bring up?

I do not.

Commissioner Arthur?

I guess we do have another meeting, before the meetings on March 30th. Do you want to say something about those at the end, Brad? So, that everybody's aware of them?

Yeah, I was just curious how proposals with ordinances to amend the development code come to UAPC. And I asked that because this one is in front of us based on the Segal reporting. And we've talked about it before, but the econ Northwest proposed the minimum density changes. So I'm just curious, how can we get that topic before us? This topic came before us based on some of the information that has come from either the outreach or surveys or contracts or whatever you guys are doing to get this information, I'm just curious, how can we get that in front of us, knowing that it has to go through us to do anything at all. But I was just curious.

Yeah, no, it's a good point. There is four ways that a development code text amendment can get started. And that is by emotion of this Commission, by the City Council , by somebody, a private party pain and an application fee and actually bringing it to the City or by staff. So it's always a matter of balancing, just timing in terms of preparing the materials. But if there's anything, I mean, this Commission can make a motion which would get sent to the City Council. And that can happen separate from any other applications that are before you. And then that motion gets put on to the City Council, regular Wednesday night meetings that they have, and that gets read. And then they typically would talk about whether they agree that it's a priority. And then we would be directed to kind of start preparing the materials. Does that answer your question?

Yes, that does answer my question. And then I was just curious because the presentation that was emailed to us from planner Maki information on it, but it looks prepared for hack. And so I was just confused as to why the City would make a presentation for Hack, knowing that it's the UAPC that has to actually do anything on it. So I just was like, how do we do get what Hack got? How do we get that here? At least just for discussion. Because there's a lot, I don't understand about that.

And I'd to have an opportunity to ask those questions and I don't know where I'm supposed to do that. And I've been asking about this for a while and I know that we have a schedule with things that are timed. So I understand that it might have to wait. And I definitely am not looking to add busy work onto City staff duties, but I don't think it's busy work. It was a finding from something that we spent money on asking about. So I'm just wanting to explore that or any other kind of code amendment that has been recommended for change, like the ones we heard today. So thank you for that.

Anything else? Commissioner Aviles?

No, thank you.

Commissioner Nelson, do you have anything?

Nothing, thank you.

Commissioner Collier? Staff?

So just to clarify on that point think Jason Maki emailed that housing advisory committee presentation, I think last week or the week before. We can make a special presentation to UAPC on that. I think the reason that it hadn't gotten in and that would not be able to become code without coming to you. I think in this case since the Housing Advisory Committee has been charged by the Council to look at housing issues that's why that kind of started there. But anything that changes the code, is going to come to you. So it's just whether or not if you want it before, it becomes a Public Hearing tonight, a formal public hearing, we can do it almost in a workshop setting for you as well.

So that, is not a problem. In terms of the 30th, yes, we did put out on our website and we've sent some emails to people that have expressed an interest in housing on March 30th. There's a forum on the final presentation of the housing needs analysis, the buildable lands, inventory and middle housing. So that, forum will be similar to the January forum where we have online participation available through the MS teams. Or you can come here with a maximum of 25

people unless the governor's codes change between now and then on Coronavirus. But that's planned and that we'll have our consultant who's focused on the middle housing. Kind of, she's going to probably have quite a bit on that night to talk about that.

What time?

Six o'clock on March 30th.

So what happens if there's more than four of us at that? What do we have to do? Leave or how does that work forum issues?

Yeah, I would have to notice it up as a Planning Commission meeting if more than four of you were going to attend.

Does anyone plan on attending?

Well, first off, I'm not sure that's true. If you are attending and listening and not participating, I don't think it's a problem

Well, if you have a quorum.

A quorum is if you have to take a vote.

Yeah, I think the City Attorneys...

I'm not going to worry about that, I'm probably wouldn't attend.

Go ahead, Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

I was just going to say that the realtor body has long been held that we've tried to have just the three Commissioners and this is something that's been real on several times, you get two of them in a room, whether it's at my house or somewhere else, it constitutes a public meeting. And that follows that same bent. [crosstalk 00:56:52] If you say hello or you have to go to the bathroom, that is considered a discussion. It has come up several times and I just have to personally, I've been subjected to it at least 17 times, guaranteed just for having a fundraiser and having more than two Commissioners there at the same, time they've had to stagger.

Remember we can't even email four or more of us.

I noticed I don't get any from you.

So I'll ask again, does anyone plan on attending?

What day of the week is this?

Tuesday.

Tuesday, I'm going to say, I don't know.

I'll definitely verify that I'm with the City attorney. In terms of our rules, we're under the same statutes as the County Commissioners are, so I think it's the same.

Director Clark, anything else for help?

That's all I had, thanks. Okay.

I'm the last one and I have a whole bunch of nothing. So does anybody else want to say anything? Okay, we are adjourned. Next meeting March 24th.

Meeting adjourned: 7:00 pm.

Next meeting: March 24, 2021



Eric Heesacker, Vice Chair
Urban Area Planning Commissioner



Date

Minutes transcribed by www.rev.com and given a cursory review/edit by Julia Wright, City of Grants Pass Administration.