



City Planning Commission Workshop Minutes
Thursday, January 21, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.
City Hall Council Chambers, 520 E. Cascade Avenue, Sisters, OR 97759

Commissioners Present: David Gentry, Jeff Seymour, Roger Detweiler, Jack Nagel, Daryl Tewalt, Bob Wright

City Staff: Patrick Davenport, Community Development Director, Darcy Reed, Associate Planner, Carol Jenkins, Planning Technician

- I. CALL TO ORDER
Chairman opened the public hearing at 3:00 p.m.
- II. VISITOR COMMUNICATION - None
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None
- IV. PUBLIC HEARING – None
- V. WORKSHOP –
 - a. Review Draft Housing Needs Analysis and Affordable Housing Policy recommendations (Chapter 4 – 2016 Urbanization Study)
 - b. Review: 2016 City Parks Master Plan (Update to 2011 Plan)
 - c. Continue discussion of future Development Code revisions
 1. Mobile Food Units
 2. Vacation Rentals
 3. Temporary Uses

Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission perform a review of the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) and Affordable Housing policy recommendations, receive public input and forward comments or recommendations to the City Council.

The Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) is intended to be Chapter 4 of a more expansive 2016 Urbanization Study. In turn, the 2016 Urbanization Study is intended to support an update to our Comprehensive Plan.

The Affordable Housing Working Group has reviewed this document during multiple meetings in 2015 and on January 14, 2016. The City Council is scheduled to review this document during a workshop on 02/04/16 and approve the document on 02/11/16.

Staff stated that the task is to make some recommendations on policies that support Affordable Housing and incentivizing Affordable Housing. A City Council goal was to update the

Comprehensive Plan and they would like this done by the end of this year. In order to get this done, Chapter 4 is part of the Urbanization Study, and to accomplish this by the end of the year is a lot of work. Staff stated that this will be done in-house by staff and not hiring consultants in the future if at all. There will be additional workshops during this process just to let the Planning Commission know as staff moves forward.

The Commission asked if there are any ground rules that absolutely need to be followed and what are they for DLCDC to approve this.

Staff stated that there is the Oregon Administrative Statute (OAS) that set out the rules on what the local government needs to consider, procedures, etc. DLCDC has a condensed version for smaller cities to do a shorter outlook, but do a lot less analyses and in-depth look at things. Staff has asked if DLCDC would come and do a presentation, or at least prepare a brief primer on what needs to be done in order to do this.

The Commission discussed Affordable Housing numbers, policies, construction updates, projects that are on board and the projects that are moving forward.

Staff presented Chapter 4 of the Affordable Housing Needs Analysis outlining the Purpose, Background, Definition, Need for Affordable Housing, HUD Requirements, Recent Accomplishments, Housing Needs Analysis, Population, Vacancy Rates, and Forecast on New Housing Units 2015-2035, National Housing Trends Summary, State Demographic Trends, Difference between Dwellings Avg. Recent Sales and AMI Derived Mortgage, Conclusions to support Affordable Housing Policies, Proposed General Policy Recommendations to Support Affordable Housing and City Charter Reference to Affordable Housing.

The Commission discussed affordable housing, average homes prices, return on investments, building/construction costs, lower cost housing, median incomes, service workers, commuting for work, salaries supporting mortgages and taxes, full-time employment, financing, economic opportunities, attracting employers to town, etc.

Staff discussed different options with Deschutes County to help the City – and one of them to consider is by reducing fees for building permit reviews that have to do with Affordable Housing Units that are defined. Now, the City and Deschutes County share the building permit fees by 62 percent the County, and 38 percent the City. The County needs to reciprocate to make this work and be effective. It is something to consider when discussing waiving fees, etc.

Staff discussed recent accomplishments with the Affordable Housing and stated that there is now a Development Code reference for that in Special Provisions – Chapter 2.15.800; approved Accessory Dwelling Units; Density and Height Bonuses; Downtown Commercial was allowed (not formal) but mixed-use versions; standalone Residential Development in the Downtown Commercial; Cluster Development Code was added; rear yard setbacks; Vacation Rentals - Housing Stock; Second Homes; Owners vs. Renters; Census Data / Dwelling Units; Housing Stock; and Expanding the UGB to accommodate new housing needs; construction permit data; various entitlements, and the US Forest Service Property.

The Commission discussed Accessory Dwelling Units, density, setbacks, variances, data sources, dwelling units by types, percent of total units, construction methods and costs, accessor's data from Deschutes County, gross density and apartment complexes.

Staff discussed the Patterson property off McKenzie Highway – 13 acres across from the ranch and zoned Multi-Family Residential – density mid-range around 14 units an acre yielding about 183 units. Staff discussed the Forest Service property – 47 total acres, zoned Public Facility, it has a Comprehensive Plan designation for some mixed-use development and an East Portal discussion.

The Commission discussed the Forest Service property and made suggestions to staff at this time. Staff discussed the Downtown Commercial zone – 254 units - Black Butte Crossing which has been expired, but previously entitled. It does allow for residential development, however, there are no minimum or maximum density – single family standalone on Adams Ave. west of Fir St.; apartments, mixed-use elsewhere with no density requirements, etc. A discussion took place pertaining to the possibility of different uses moving forward.

A discussion took place regarding expanding the UGB, Affordable Housing, new housing units, land costs, available land, inventory, Comprehensive Plan designations, Form Based Codes, DLCDC parameters and zoning, etc.

Staff discussed Village of Cold Springs/Hayden Homes and their entitlements having 164 single family attached and 109 apartment units. Also discussed is the density (8-9 units an acre), 273 units as a whole that they were originally entitled to.

The Commission discussed Hayden's entitlements and neighborhood concerns, density, location, buffering, and whether or not these different options are attainable for them to move forward.

Staff presented the Buildable Lands Inventory explaining Adams Street and the Downtown Commercial zone and that the analysis needs to be revised, etc. Staff addressed the newer projects being proposed which are much more-dense than the older developments.

Staff discussed the Affordable Living Facilities (ALF) building permits and the LUBA appeal process going on at this time. Also discussed were the vacancy rates forecasted for new units – 167 include the 140+ (ALF) units, but staff has been advised to count the group quarters that are actually on the ground right now. This process will change the dwelling units needed annually when going through the exercise. The DLCDC and Portland State University projected numbers over the next 20 years minus the group quarters – 2.08 is the average household size at this time.

Staff discussed the National Housing Trend Summary, State Demographic Trends, Population by Ages, US Census Data, populations as of 2315, wages, rentals, 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI), percent of income/cost burden, Accessor's Records, real market values, survey's taken, numbers of dwelling units, recent sales of dwelling units, additional units needed by structure type, multi-family dwelling units, percentage of distribution, zoning districts/what is allowed and not allowed, mid-range densities, higher density apartment buildings, policies and outcomes, transient room taxes, etc.

A discussion of the Parks Master Plan will be the next step but it will not be an in-depth review. The goal is to get it forwarded out to the City Council and the conclusions to support the affordable housing policies. The 2010 Housing Plan is in place, number of accounts that could change as assumptions change, and what can be done to require or incentivize affordable housing units, etc.

A discussion took place regarding affordable housing, permits including re-zoning, master plans, subdivision plans, partitions, building permits, etc. It does not account for annexation and there is the ability to require reasonable affordable housing requirements during the annexation process. A fee schedule needs to be looked at providing discounted fees, lower cost market rate housing such as apartments and higher density multi-family.

A discussion took place regarding a housing policy board and all of the requirements for this position whether it be in-house or an outside position – in-city versus out-of-city. There would need to be one member of the Planning Commission to be on the board, a City Council liaison, a mix of people to represent the demographics of the community with expertise, and a staff member to run the meeting. This would require an Ordinance to form this policy board.

The Commission discussed the Housing Trust Fund and the removal of the surcharge as directed by the City Attorney. Also discussed were transient room taxes, the general and reserve funds, transfer fees, real estate development, reducing fees, lower incomes, affordable housing, budget concerns, assessed values, incentivizing apartments, housing costs, multi-family and apartments, developing a source, etc. Some program options for incentivizing are the building permit and development plan review fee payments – for building permit fees – A/H is for affordable housing and M/R is market rate.

The Commission discussed at what level of discount for building permit fees for affordable housing – 100 percent, 75 percent, 50 percent, etc. This would be for either single family or multi-family housing, and the housing units could be manufactured, apartments, single family attached, single family detached, duplexes, etc. A discussion took place regarding development review fees, building permits fees, and all costs associated with each. It was decided that a 50 percent discount on all development review fees for affordable housing. On apartments for market rate could be a 25 percent discount for apartments, two, three, and four-plexes for an incentive. For SDC's on water, sewer, parks, and transportation, the Planning Commission were not in favor of a discount on fees for affordable housing.

A discussion on affordability, profit versus non-profit, 50 years of affordability requirements on affordable housing, a City Charter discussion and possible revisions regarding the affordable housing requirements, etc.

A discussion on the Development Code, Chapter 2.15.800 – Applicability, Density Bonus, Height Bonus, and the 2010 Housing Plan recommendations.

Parks Master Plan Working Draft – The City Parks Advisory Board has been working on this Plan Chapter by Chapter and working very hard on it. They have a 99 percent complete document at this point. It is now up to the Planning Commission to give their input and this is basically updating what has recently happened, to note the accomplishments, and to come up with a revised Park System Development charge fee.

A discussion took place regarding inventories based on park types, mini-neighborhood communities, special purpose, the number of acres, and names of the developed park land. Also discussed were the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) categorized by the different parks, parks revenue and funding summary, residential buildable lands inventory, and the adoption of a new Park SDC fee. The purpose of the plan is an update to the 2011 plan which is supposed to be a 20-year plan, but still want to update this plan within the next five years.

A discussion on population growth rates, acreage, parks inventory, trails, Whychus Creek Open Space, the East Portal, Park Trails, SPRD facilities, School District facilities, National Forest Land, notable HOA Open Space, private versus public parks, platted lots, grants, land acquisitions, and undeveloped park lands. Also, discussed were the Operations and Maintenance of the parks, Capital Facilities Inventory – value of capital equipment, Level of Service ranking, National Trends, Priorities I, II, and III, and the Needs Analysis, etc. It was recommended to add ensuring Comprehensive Plan policies and Development Code regulations to play their fair share to meet the future Level of Service.

A discussion by staff and the Planning Commission took place regarding the increase in the SDC's. Staff stated that in the tables in Chapter 7 and trying to prove why the SDC's should be increased, and seeing the long term 2020/2025 as illustrative and not saying 'yes' that is what it is going to be when we actually get to that year, but when circling back it proves that if the City continues to do all of these projects and the City goes stagnate and didn't grow – at a certain year, the City would need more money because all of the improvements that need to be done, the City can't afford to do them. This is not set in stone, it is more illustrative to the future.

A discussion about the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with projects, priorities, lodging, SDC's, SDC's by the different jurisdictions, SDC credits, resources, Campgrounds, existing and future parks, land donations, runway protection zone, mini-storage, two parcel acquisition, funding sources, bonds and levy's, partnerships, land trusts, open space, amenities, distillery, undeveloped right-of-way, lodging units, goals, objectives and tasks.

Mobile Food Units – Continue discussing options for potential Development Code revisions pertaining to Mobile Food Units and forward to the City Council. During the December 17, 2015 workshop, the Planning Commission discussed several issues associated with MFU's and began to develop recommendations for revisions to the Development Code.

A comment was made about examples given to the Planning Commission where the City of Sandy was the most simple and straight forward.

The questions staff asked the Planning Commission is if they want Mobile Food Units operating within the City. The Planning Commission stated "yes".

If the new MFU's should continue to be permitted, how should they be regulated?

- Specific zoning district with specific designation of Mobile Food Units
- Allow new MFU's in the Downtown Commercial and Highway Commercial Districts
- Match Oregon Department of Health's nomenclature and standards

Staff is requesting the Planning Commission to continue discussing the following issues and provide:

Special Provisions:

- Permitted on vacant parcels or just parcels with existing development;
- Allow clusters (pods) of MFU's or single units – Pods are acceptable;
- Site Plan review requirements: requirements for MFU's on vacant property, paved area of service, paved parking, restroom/hand washing, permanent facilities required or portable facilities allowed, requirements on developed property, Western Frontier Architectural Design Theme applicability.

Other recommendations:

Once the City Council provides input on the Planning Commission recommendations, staff will return this issue to the Planning Commission for a formal public hearing if directed.

Vacation Rentals:

Action Requested: Discuss options for directions on potential Development Code revisions pertaining to Vacation Rentals and forward recommendations to the City Council.

A discussion was held regarding vehicles that must be parked on the rental property not in the public right-of-way. An example was used for Shady Cove with the exception of 3, 7, 9, and under General No. 1. It was recommended to not have spacing standards. Staff stated that they will come back with a draft section of what it would look like as it fits in the Code. It will go to the City Council and then come back to the Planning Commission.

Temporary Uses:

Action Requested: Discuss options for potential Development Code revisions pertaining to Temporary Uses and forward recommendations to the City Council.

Staff asked the Planning Commission if they felt it was necessary to have a Site Plan Review for these types of permits and what should be required on these Temporary Uses. An example is if someone wanted to sell pumpkins at a gas station parking lot as seasonal items, etc. Staff stated they would like to have the Development Code require a modified Site Plan to show exactly where a Temporary Use can go.

The Commission asked what types of fees are they looking at. Staff stated that a modified Site Plan would be 25 percent of the original fee. This could entitle them to rotating Temporary Uses, and knowing where that spot is going to be, but they could come and go as they find these vendors. This could be applicable to everyone, but need to know how to treat it on vacant parcels as well. Also, the Site Plan Review would further specify how the Temporary Uses are regulated.

The Commission inquired with staff as to what is the intent of the Temporary Uses and the different types of uses. Staff stated that this is a very big issue and they will come back with a variety of different Code options regarding Temporary Uses and their regulations.

VI. OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS

Staff stated that next month the Commission will be reviewing the Site Plan for the new Dairy Queen and a public hearing for the Text Amendments. Staff stated that the only reason that Dairy Queen is coming before the Commission is because it has a drive-thru.

VII. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary