



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
May 28, 2019 at 6:30 pm
Banks City Hall, Banks, OR
MEETING MINUTES**

Chair Darrah called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm. The proceedings were recorded in digital format.

ROLL CALL

Present were Philip Darrah, Katherine Brown, Tammie Buck, Chris Zechmann

Excused: Jeremy Bench, Sam Van Dyke

Attending: Jolynn Becker, City Manager; Stacey Goldstein, City Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of minutes from the April 30, 2019 meeting.

Commissioner Zechmann moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes from April 30, 2019 as presented. Commissioner Buck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT – There was none.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – There were none.

WORK SESSION

2. Review of Code Audit Packet

City Planner Goldstein presented the Zoning/Development Code Audit, the first phase of the Code rewrite project, which had been a City Council goal for about four years. Several matters prompted the need for the Code update, including the newly adopted City plans, including the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and Urban Design Plan (Vision 2037 Plan); new legislation regarding requirements for city zoning codes; and new economic development opportunities suggested in the Competitive Analysis. She noted the outreach done to stakeholders to identify key issues in the Code and reviewed the changes to be made to the Code, which were described in Staff's memorandum. Key modifications included a complete structural overhaul of the Code to improve flow and provide ease of use; a comprehensive site plan review process, especially for residential uses, to align with new State statutes; creating and adopting more comprehensive residential, commercial and industrial design standards; establishing a clear and objective review process; changes to the residential zone standards to allow for a wider range of development options; updates to the Code's Definitions Section; updating parking and access standards; adding special

use standards and tree removal and mitigation standards; adding requirements that developers meet with neighborhood residents prior to land use submittals; and a review existing land use review procedures to ensure standards exist for the reasonable review and participation of land use applications by the City, applicants, and the public. The Code writing work would begin in July or August

- She clarified new design residential standards would likely be applied to larger dwellings, such as triplexes, quads, and multi-family attached townhomes, which had the potential for more visual impact, variations in lot placement, impacts to pedestrians, etc. As clear and objective standards, the design standards would be detailed and specific. The other review track would have guidelines with softer language to allow developers discretion on how to meet the standard.
 - She agreed more detailed standards would make it easier to fast track requests and possibly reduce the number of variances requested. Developing the design standards would also involve a lot of public process and input from the community.

City Planner Goldstein also highlighted several key issues referencing a copy of the existing Code with her added comments describing specific areas with issues. Key comments and responses to Commissioners' questions were as follows

- Section 151.020 Establishment of Districts and Subdistricts. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) application allowed a unique or different design in exchange for some public benefit when a development did not meet the underlying zone. Arbor Village II was a PUD
- Section 151.040 Permitted Land Uses in Residential Zoning Districts. Though the City had several residential districts, it did not have a full range of housing options. Staff had received policy direction from Council for larger lots from 10,000 to 15,000 sq ft, and the current low density, single-family lot standard was 7,000 sq ft to 9,000 sq ft. However, if downzoning took place to create larger lots, the number of units lost would have to be added elsewhere in the city to meet the housing target. Those units could include various housing types, including multi-family.
- While changes were needed to comply with State Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) regulations, accessory structures, not dwelling units, would be addressed and the Code could address different setback requirements for temporary and permanent structures. The City should be careful not to overregulate accessory structures.
- The City had a Historic Resource Overlay Zone, but no designated historic structures. Discussion would address whether to keep the overlay with consideration given to applicable State law and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The City's zoning maps showed Log Cabin Park as "H", but it was in a residential zone.
 - While SHPO would decide whether a structure was officially designated historic, [42:35] the City could also likely determine whether a structure was historic and to what degree. The owner must be a part of the process as well.
 - City Hall should be considered as a historic structure and other structures as well.
- Section 151.066 Parking in Residential Zones. Much of this language belonged in Public Works Design Standards because it was technical in nature. Parking and loading standards needed to be revisited.
 - Parking standards applied to homeowner's association (HOA) areas because they were on City streets and involved public rights-of-way, so City Code applied. Consideration should be given to encourage flexible or shared parking requirements to provide land area for development of open space or other land uses.
 - Parking requirements needed to be considered carefully because they could discourage development, especially given the city's existing buildings and infill lots.
 - Parking was often related to the design allowed in a neighborhood or commercial area. Well-designed neighborhoods did not have parking problems and did not have single garages that people used for storage and parked elsewhere. Commercial buildings were designed with parking nearby. The way the City created its design standards would make a big difference in whether there was a parking problem. If the community wanted a cute, pedestrian-friendly business district, vertical parking structures should be considered,

rather than spreading parking out horizontally with limited land available. A City parking structure would enable the City to make money from parking fees.

- Shared parking areas was another option; rather than each business being required to have its own specific parking spaces, parking areas and spaces could be shared, especially when business hours were offset. Property owners with vacant or idle land could be encouraged to temporarily lease the space as a designated off-street parking area until the land was developed in the future.
- Banks did not want to send the message that no businesses would work here because no parking would be a negative for businesses coming in. The burden was somewhat on the City to come up with some creative ideas, so people could see options were available for businesses.
- Parking would likely be the biggest discussion item with the community when working to update the Code.
- The consultant would create a work program and likely break the Code into modules for review, but it would depend upon the State, and the contractual items between the consultant and the City.
- Updating the Code would set the stage for the city to be ready for development. The Code was based on what was important to the community; it was not created or changed without public involvement and outreach.

BUILDING PERMIT REVIEWS – INFORMATION ONLY – None

VERBAL STAFF REPORTS AND UPDATES

3. Planning Project Updates – There were none.

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Buck stated she could not attend the next Planning Commission meeting.

City Manager Becker agreed to update on the recent City Council public hearing after the Commission meeting.

ADJOURN: The Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by:


Stacey Goldstein, City Planner