

JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
SISTERS CITY COUNCIL
520 E. CASCADE AVENUE
JUNE 23, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chris Frye	Mayor
Nancy Connolly	Council President
David Asson	Councilor
Amy Burgstahler	Councilor
Andrea Blum	Councilor

STAFF PRESENT:

Rick Allen	City Manager
Paul Bertagna	PW Director
Joe O'Neill	Finance Officer
Patrick Davenport	CDD Director
Kathy Nelson	City Recorder

PLANNING COMMISSION:

Bob Wright	Commissioner
Jeff Seymour	Commissioner
Jack Nagle	Commissioner
Roger Detweiler	Commissioner

PLANNING COMMISSION ABSENT:

David Gentry	Planning Commission Chair
Daryl Tewalt	Commissioner
Tim Clem	Commissioner

The workshop was called to order by Mayor Frye at 5:35 p.m.

1. Joint Workshop with Sisters Planning Commission

Mayor Frye thanked the Planning Commissioners for attending. He announced the workshop was to review the Development Code text amendments the Planning Commission was proposing and provide opportunity for the Council and Planning Commission to discuss the recommendations.

Director Davenport added he was looking for directions from the Council as to which items could go directly to a public hearing, which items the Council would like the Planning Commission to revisit and which items needed a Council workshop scheduled to provide additional time to discuss the matter.

- Chapter 4.6: Cluster Developments

Director Davenport explained the current code text was not conducive to attracting cottage style development as it was too complicated onerous for the developer. The proposed revisions would include allowing cluster development in an existing or new development with a master plan anywhere in the Residential District, provide a density bonus up to 25%, stipulate a maximum dwelling size of 1,250 square feet, and the elimination of a required community building.

Commissioner Wright stated it was important to realize the concept was not to be used for in-fill projects and the Planning Commission was still working on that issue. **Commissioner Detweiler** noted while he was in favor of the concept, it was important to recognize that these types of development would not, for the most part, be providing affordable housing. **Director Davenport** stated the model could be used in some instances to provide affordable housing units.

JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
SISTERS CITY COUNCIL
520 E. CASCADE AVENUE
JUNE 23, 2016

Commissioner Wright stated one needed to realize the design of cluster development was a concept that focused less on vehicles and more on community areas. **Commissioner Seymour** stated in some cases parking for all the units might be clustered in one main area apart from the housing units. He stated not all units would have attached garages. The **Council** and **Planning Commission** agreed that, in general, people did not like to park on the street and not producing a model with parking of some type could impact the marketability of the units.

Councilor Blum asked for confirmation the developments would have a homeowners association (HOA's) and **Director Davenport** replied they would. He stated each development would be a minimum of four units. **City Manager Allen** stated that HOA that were too small often failed as there were an insufficient number of homeowners to serve on the board and the HOA was unable to collect enough in dues to do what needed to be done. The **Council** requested the Planning Commission take the matter to a public hearing but give some additional thought on the issue of parking.

- Chapter 4.1: Types of Applications and Reviews
 - Section 4.1.700: General Provisions Application Requirement

Director Davenport stated new language would be added to state the reviewing agency would be able, if it determined it was necessary, to require an impact study and stipulate which aspects of the impact study were needed.

- Section 4.1.800: Appeals

Director Davenport explained this was a new section that provided for any approved land use application under appeal to have the clock stop on the expiration date until the appeal process was completed. He noted it would not apply to any current land use decisions under appeal. **Council** requested staff have legal staff review the provision to make certain the start and stop dates for the expiration period were clearly defined.

- Chapter 4.3: Land Divisions and Lot Line Adjustments
 - Section 4.3.400: Approval Process

Director Davenport explained the proposed language would state a tentative subdivision plat would become permanently vested when 25% of the lots had been recorded. He explained the developer, once that condition was met, would no longer need to continue to request extensions. It would also remove the language that allowed extension to be combined with the original approval date to exceed four years for a single phased development and six years for subsequent phases within a multiple phased development. Language would be added to state that through a Type III application process the Planning Commission would be authorized to consider restarting the time to expiry of entitlements for a major modification to an existing tentative plat. In these cases the applicant would be required to submit evidence as to why the additional time should be granted and that adjacent properties would not have additional impacts as a result of the extension of time.

- Chapter 4.5: Master Planned Developments
 - Section 4.5.800: Approval Durations, Extensions and Amendments

Director Davenport explained language would be added that for previously approved development applications the Community Development Director would determine what defined ‘*significant infrastructure improvements*’ for a Type II decision or the Director could request the Planning Commission make the determination as a Type III decision. In new development applications the conditions of approval would provide clear and reasonable standards to determine when the development had sufficient infrastructure improvements to permanently vest the master plan. In a Type II decision process it would also allow the Planning Commission authorization to consider restarting the time to expiry of entitlements for a major modification to the existing master plan. In these cases the applicant would be required to submit evidence as to why the additional time should be granted and that adjacent properties would not have additional impacts as a result of the extension of time. **Commissioner Seymour** stated this would allow the Community Development Director or Planning Commission to make certain the developer had made a commitment to the project.

The **Council** requested staff have legal staff review the process to make certain it was clear and enforceable.

- Chapter 4.2: Site Plan Review
 - Section 4.2.200: Applicability

Director Davenport explained language would be added to stipulate that if an alteration to an existing structure increased the existing floor plan by 25% or less of the existing floor plan and did not exceed 500 square feet of area, the improvement could, as determined by staff, be exempted from a formal site plan review.

- Chapter 2.15: Special Provisions
 - Section 2.15.900: Temporary Uses

Director Davenport explained the definition for temporary uses would be amended to ‘a use occurring for more than three days and less than 181 consecutive days.’ It would also provide a definition for transient use stating it was a short term use with a duration of no more than three days and did not involve the construction of any structure that required a building permit.

Director Davenport stated language would be added to stipulate all temporary uses would be required to obtain approval of a site plan in accordance with the Development Code Section 4.2 Site Plan Review. Once the site plan was approved, the resulting entitlements could be used repeatedly to accommodate future temporary uses on the same parcel if the temporary uses were sufficiently described in the approved site plan. The site plan review process and temporary use permit would be able to be processed and approved concurrently. Language would also stipulate a necessity to meet all applicable Municipal Code and County Health and Sanitation requirements.

JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
SISTERS CITY COUNCIL
520 E. CASCADE AVENUE
JUNE 23, 2016

Mayor Frye stated he thought the Council had repealed temporary uses altogether when it had previously discussed transient merchants. Other **Council** members agreed. **City Recorder Nelson** stated she would review minutes to find any conversations related to the issue of temporary use permits. **Mayor Frye** stated he felt it was important to look to other thematic towns to see how they addressed the issue of temporary use permits. The **Council** and **Planning Commission** discussed the issue of food carts noting there were many individuals in favor of and many individuals against food carts within the city. **Mayor Frye** requested the Planning Commission tackle the issue of food carts, review it thoroughly and solicit input from the community.

○ Section 2.15.2200: Public Art

Director Davenport stated language would be edited to require Council approval of public art.

○ Section 2.15.2700: Vacation Rental Units

Director Davenport stated new language regarding vehicle parking was being added to stipulate vehicles owned by rental occupants must park on the subject property or in the public right of way. Recreational vehicles and travel trailers would be required to park in the driveway and not in the public right of way.

Councilor Blum stated clusters of vacation rentals could become an issue, especially as it relates to density. She stated vacation rentals took homes from the pool of those that might otherwise be long-term rentals or provide affordable housing. **Commissioner Seymour** noted there were no regulations for long term rentals either. He stated the Planning Commission had concluded it was not the City's place to tell a homeowner how they could use their property. **Commissioner Nagle** stated he felt the City should get ahead of the issue. **Councilor Connolly** agreed she was concerned with the issue of density with vacation rentals.

City Manager Allen stated in listening to the conversation he felt some of the issues discussed were subjects that would require a workshop for just the specific topic such as food carts, parking for cottage development and vacation rentals.

○ Proposed New Section 2.15.2800: Mobile Food Units

Director Davenport stated a definition for mobile food units, or food carts had been added.

● Chapter 2.16: Airport District

Director Davenport stated the proposed changes to the Chapter on the Airport District were new to both the Planning Commission and Council.

○ 2.16.100: Purpose

Director Davenport stated a new purpose statement was proposed that would allow for some expanded uses at the airport such as lodging and residential units to accommodate pilots, airport employees and employees of co-located businesses. **City Manager Allen** recommended the Planning Commission review the proposed changes carefully since allowing housing for employees

JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
SISTERS CITY COUNCIL
520 E. CASCADE AVENUE
JUNE 23, 2016

on the property could change the airport into more of a residential neighborhood as opposed to an airport. The **Planning Commission** and **Council** agreed the topic needed more in-depth review.

In wrapping up the meeting, the **Council** agreed the public hearing for cluster development could move forward if the issue of vehicle parking was given another look, process related text amendments should undergo an additional legal review, there should be a robust public process related to food carts and the issue of vacation rentals further studied. **Mayor Frye** thanked the Commissioners for their time and insights.

Commissioner Detweiler stated he wanted to bring up the issue of affordable housing and how it was being addressed. He noted it had been discussed by both the Planning Commission and Council, there had been some specific bench marks set from the 2010 housing study, a Housing Policy Board had been created that was not yet operational and some funds had been set aside. He stated even so, he was disappointed in the lack of progress to date. **Mayor Frye** replied he was also disappointed in the length of time it had taken but noted progress was being made. He stated the Council had met with the City of Bend's affordable housing manager Jim Long, \$50,000 had been budgeted for the upcoming fiscal year to use towards affordable housing, and the City was working with Tom Kemper from Housing Works on a project to build an affordable housing apartment complex.

Commissioner Detweiler stated he was also concerned that minutes from meetings were not being completed for approval in a timely fashion. He stated he did not feel it was a personnel issue but rather a lack of resources committed by the City to make the minutes a priority. **Mayor Frye** stated the transfer of the building permit process to the County, would free up some additional time for staff to work on minutes. **City Recorder Nelson** stated she was very behind in minutes but the recordings were available on the City's website.

2. Other Business

Due to a lack of time, there was no *Other Business*.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.


Kathy Nelson, City Recorder


Chris Frye, Mayor