



City Planning Commission Minutes  
Thursday, April 21, 2016 – 4:00 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

Commissioners Absent: Tim Clem

City Staff: Patrick Davenport, Community Development Director, Darcy Reed, Associate Planner, Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER

*Chairman Gentry* opened the workshop at 4:00 p.m.

II. VISITOR COMMUNICATION - None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

V. WORKSHOP:

*Director Davenport* gave a brief summary of things going on in the Planning Department to-date. He stated that there is a Site Plan being processed for Suzi Zeitner - Glass Works; Melvin's Fir Street Market is doing an expansion; Beacham Clocks is doing an expansion; Sisters Eagle Airport and related activities; future code changes; urbanization study and sent out a request for a quote (RFQ) for professional assistance to finish that study off, possible expanding the UGB; updating the Comprehensive Plan; integrating language from the soon to be adopted City Parks Master Plan; recent adopted Wastewater System Plan; Water System Update, and the Transportation System Plan update.

*Chairman Gentry* stated that he has volunteered to be the representative for the Transportation System Plan (TSP) update.

The other permanent representative needed will be for the Housing Policy Advisory Board where the City is currently recruiting memberships.

*Commissioner Wright* volunteered, but stated that this position would need to be appointed by the Mayor. There was some discussion on this volunteer position so the Commission decided to address it at a later date.

*Director Davenport* stated that there will be one (1) City Council liaison, and a member of an organization that does affordable housing (Habitat, Housing Works, and Pacific Crest), a market

rate builder in the area, and two (2) citizens preferably inside of Sisters. There can be up to three (3) outside of the City limits and the Board will meet at least quarterly and no more than monthly.

*Director Davenport* stated that the final design is being done on the Roundabout and the ROW Acquisition is going on. They will start construction this fall. They want to get it done before the tourist season starts next year around May. It will be the second roundabout on the State highway system in Oregon – the other one is in Astoria. There will be some public art (center piece) where the Planning Commission could sit in on the conversation when it begins.

*Director Davenport* discussed the Kuivato project (Dutch Pacific Properties) where it is enabling a takedown parcel of Phase I, three (3) lots – one would be a remnant, one is to host the first dozen, and the third parcel would be the future City Park at the well site – it is .73 acres. It was discussed to have a Community Garden or four (4) pickle ball courts. The land is currently Dutch Pacific and zoned Sun Ranch Residential.

A. Continue discussion of future Development Code Revisions

- Expirations for entitlements under appeal
- Vesting criteria and extensions to expirations of land use entitlements
- Temporary Uses
- Mobile Food Units
- Vacation Rentals
- Site Plan Review
- Cluster/Cottage Developments

*Director Davenport* discussed the Expiration of Entitlements and the time clock time to expire. If there is an appeal, the time clock will stop and pause – it doesn't restart. It could go all the way to the Supreme Court and take up to a year and a half, etc. This will take care of someone trying to run out the clock in a relatively short time to expiry.

*Vice Chairman Seymour* asked if this is approved – what kind of liability the City would hold. *Director Davenport* stated that this is a process change and the Text Amendment could be appealed as well. He stated that they were advised that it is ok to get this in, it affects anything that is being appealed and running the time out – it goes into effect and it would affect McKenzie Meadows.

*Vice Chairman Seymour* asked if the Commission were to adopt it at this particular time, what if any, liability does the City bear as a result of changing the Code seeing as how all of this has gone, and does it open up the City to legal issues by changing the rules midstream.

*Director Davenport* stated that this is a process change, but this Text Amendment could be appealed.

*Vice Chairman Seymour* asked if this text change were to occur, would it apply to McKenzie Meadows. He stated that he sees this as being very tricky, but does see the benefit of it long term. Under the current circumstances, he's not sure that the City should expose themselves like this.

*Director Davenport* stated that as far as he knows – yes. He stated that they have been advised that this is ok to get this in and that it affects anything that is being appealed and they are running the time out – this goes into effect and it effects McKenzie Meadows.

*Director Davenport* has received direction to continue working on addressing various concerns regarding several sections within the Development Code.

The Planning Commission and staff discussed the current appeals, fast tracking some items that could be more beneficial, and the possibility of inserting language such as “Land Use applications initiated after the Text Amendment becomes effective”..... that way everything else is grandfathered in. There is a good purpose for this.

*Director Davenport* stated that staff is looking at fall or late summer before these Text Amendments are going to be adopted. That process with McKenzie Meadows will be relatively settled by then. They are about to take off on another appeal and that will come back probably early June.

*Director Davenport* requests that the Planning Commission review and discuss the proposed text amendments and offer consensus-based recommendations for edits. The Dark Skies section of the Code continues to be reviewed at the working group level.

*Director Davenport* stated that these potential Development Code revisions and any others added to the list will be returned to the Planning Commission to be discussed in a subsequent workshop. Once the Planning Commission has reached a consensus on these revisions and any new revisions, staff will forward the proposal to the City Council to review in a workshop format, prior to formal authorization of formal text amendment application.

*Director Davenport* discussed adding a new subsection for Appeals:

Section 4.1.800 –

Appeals: Add a new subsection:

*Director Davenport* stated that the appeal of an approved land use application stays the expiration date of the approved entitlement until such time as the appeal process is completed.

Chapter 4.5 – Master Planned Developments

4.5.800 – Approval Durations, Extensions, and Amendments

*Director Davenport* stated that there have been some challenges on Approval Durations and Extensions and how they work in practice. He stated that they have been working on how these Approval Durations last and the problems they have faced. He discussed the current Code for Approval Durations and what does significant infrastructure improvements mean.

*Commissioner Wright* suggested to take out the words ‘significant improvements’, etc.

*Director Davenport* stated if those words were stricken, and if you haven’t done anything – it expires, but if you’ve done something – then, it is good once they have started.

*Commissioner Wright* addressed Master Plans and how it is broke up into different phases and doing it over a number of years, etc. Maybe by adding phases or something related to phases and addressing that might be a thought.

*Commissioner Nagel* asked if there was anything now that says that a 3-4-5 part development that they have to complete any of it other than the first phase or part of the first phase.

*Commissioner Tewalt* stated that right now it just says 'significant'.

*Vice Chairman Seymour* stated that maybe the word 'significant' should be addressed and what that actually means. That is a big term and looking at it at a simplicity standpoint – identify the word that means basically the “bulk” of the infrastructure. He stated that the wording in “red” reads to him that if it is not done, it goes back to the Community Development Director, he takes a look at it and makes a decision. If that doesn't work – then, it goes to the Planning Commission. There is City staff that can make those types of decisions on behalf of the people and is not necessarily a bad way to go. It gives the applicant and the staff a little more leverage and they are able to listen to what may be going on if the market changes, etc.

*Commissioner Tewalt* stated that they could appeal it back to the Planning Commission if they didn't like staff's decision.

*Planner Reed* stated that for public improvements that are tied with a subdivision plan in a multi-phase development, you get up to two (2) years for each phase. On the previous discussion and it is tied to the first phase and the first phase took two years – you would have up to two (2) years to complete if all of Phase I and all the public improvements had to be installed.

The Commission and staff discussed the Hayden Homes (Village of Cold Springs) Master Plan and that they have half of it completely built out. That is significant infrastructure and that Master Plan is good forever until they change it again.

*Commissioner Wright* stated that there has been a 'For Sale' sign on the other half and they have expressed the fact that they don't' build apartments and multi-family and that could sit there forever and nothing happens. He asked about the Urban Growth Boundary changes, etc. and asked what can be done since there is no real pressing issue because nothing is happening. He asked how long a Master Plan can survive and how long can the one out at Cold Springs last.

*Director Davenport* stated that on one side you have people that are investing in a neighborhood and buying a home and doing their due diligence of saying, 'what is this neighborhood going to look like when it's done'. They say, 'ok I'm going to spend my money and buy a home right here because I like what is going to happen in the future around me'. And then, there are the other people that don't do that and just move in.

*Director Davenport* stated that part of this is to have something that stands the test of time to where people invest and re-invest and some predictability about what is coming and if something changes then they can hear about it. This is just giving some predictability for the existing neighborhood folks.

*Director Davenport* addressed Commissioner Wrights question on how long can a Master Plan survive and he stated that on this particular one the way it is currently read – these significant infrastructure improvements are completed and it is good forever as it is currently.

A discussion took place regarding the Urban Growth Boundary, Comprehensive Plan changes, the definition and understanding significant infrastructure improvements, being vested and intent of the developer, the various developments and vacant lots, Master Plans and Major Modifications, multi-family and discussing units per acre, residential zoning, re-zoning, density, phasing and timeframes, restarting the time to expiry of entitlements for a Master Plan, appeals, economics, property taxes, recording of lots, tentative versus final plats, evidence and impacts, burdens on applicants, regional labor costs, financing and demand, and providing clear and reasonable standards when vested.

#### Chapter 4.3 – Land Divisions and Lot Line Adjustments

##### 4.3.400 – Approval Process

*Director Davenport* addressed the Preliminary Plat Approval Period – Multi-Phased Developments stating that a tentative subdivision plat becomes permanently vested with 25 percent of the lots have been recorded. He discussed the Type III application process, expiry of entitlements, impacts to the adjacent properties that will not be increased as a result of the extension of time to expiration.

##### Temporary Uses – Definition

*Director Davenport* stated that overall intent of the Temporary Uses is not to address the weekend events that happen where transient merchants come to town, set up on Friday evening and pull out on Sunday evening. It is not to require any of that to go on, but if it is more than three (3) days and less than 181. The less than 181 was already in there and part of a definition of 180 consecutive days. There is a period of time not requiring these Temporary Use Permits (TUP) for weekend events. Staff worked on this and added a Transient Use which meets with the Municipal Code about the three (3) day rule.

*Commissioner Tewalt* asked if the same people could come back every weekend for every event.

*Director Davenport* stated yes and it is “consecutive for the three (3) days” – an example would be the Farmers Market where they pull in on Friday and pull out on Sunday.

*Commissioner Nagel* asked if there was a ruling that it had to be setback 100 feet from the highway. He asked if this was to anything specific that would happen on the highway to cause that.

*Director Davenport* stated that is in the Municipal Code now and off of Cascade that it has to be set back essentially a half a block – and their setup (Farmers Market) has to be in the back of Barclay Park. He stated that the gravel lot by the Sno-Cap was one of the main thoughts. It is ok to set up a band and any tables for people to sit around, but doesn’t include selling of anything.

*Director Davenport* discussed Temporary Uses on a property and that staff is asking for a requirement of a Site Plan in accordance with 4.2 that has the exact list of what to consider –

some do not apply in all cases, but staff is hoping on Temporary Uses that there is a space on the property to temporarily occupy with access, etc. and that Site Plan can be used repeatedly as long as that Temporary Use goes right back into the same place and they occupy that same spot.

A discussion took place regarding the Temporary Use and if a new use goes into the main building and the use being more intense. They discussed parking, the different uses, vendors, violation process, cost for the permits, etc.

A brief discussion took place regarding the Kiosk on Cascade Street by Leavitt's Western Wear and what the intent might be since it has been vacant for so long.

#### Temporary Sale Offices, Model Homes or Construction Building and Trailers

*Director Davenport* stated staff wanted to: Add "exceptions for seasonal sales, etc.

#### Chapter 2.15 – Special Provisions

2.15.1900 – Temporary Uses

2.15.2800 – Mobile Food Units

2.15.2700 – Vacation Rental Housing Units

#### Chapter 4.2 – Site Plan Review

4.2.200 – Applicability

*Director Davenport* stated that they are adding to 4.2.200 Applicability –

The activity structurally alters the exterior of a structure, building or property by more than 25 percent of the existing floor area up to an area not to exceed 1,000 square feet of additional area.

#### 2.15.2800 – Special Provisions

Mobile Food Units

*Director Davenport* stated this is under Special Provisions and adding a new section 2.15.2800 for Mobile Food Units. He stated that the definition is taken right out of the State's definition for what they use for Mobile Food Units. He said that these food carts can be used as the old fashioned food cart pulling or pushing them down the street, sidewalk, etc. He said that the City does not allow sales from the public right-of-way.

The Commission stated that it looks good and they have gone through this numerous times before. They stated that there is not the demand for the food carts like they are in the Bend area, or Downtown Portland.

*Director Davenport* stated that this requires a Site Plan and it was not quite clear with Eurosports and the same thing with the Temporary Use. Once the Site Plan is in place, the idea is to have these mobile units that can come and go – October comes and the season is over, then, May comes around and they want to come back in the same location and reoccupy that same spot or maybe another unit.

A brief discussion took place regarding Marijuana and that it was voted against a couple of years ago. There was a referendum to allow medical marijuana but it failed. In the Municipal Code for Business License issuances – the City cannot issue a business license that is contrary to Federal law - whatever the business is the City cannot approve it.

*Commissioner Wright* asked about Table 2.4.1 where the Commission talked about the potential Light Industrial area as allowing Mobile Food Units except for having them in the Downtown Commercial.

*Planner Reed* stated now that it's being brought up – what about the Airport and if someone wanted to have a taco truck go out there if there are going to be 50 employees out there, etc. and why not have one in a big employee based area.

*Director Davenport* addressed the different locations for potential Mobile Food Units. He stated that restaurants are allowed in the North Sisters Business Park. He discussed the Western Theme and requiring it on the Mobile Food Units.

#### 2.15.2700 – Vacation Rental Housing Units

*Director Davenport* addressed Vehicle Parking and said that vehicles owned by rental occupants must be parked on the subject property or on the public right-of-way. Recreational vehicles or travel trailers must be parked in the driveway of the subject property and not on the public right-of-way. He stated that a person cannot stay in the RV when rolling into the driveway of the Vacation Rental. RV's are not an approved dwelling type and cannot stay in them permanently.

*Planner Reed* stated that there are Occupancy Standards from the Building Department and the Fire Department and that controls it by limiting the number of bedrooms and a certain number of people staying there.

The Commission was good with the Vacation Rentals discussion.

#### Chapter 4.2 – Site Plan Review

##### 4.2.200 – Applicability

*Director Davenport* stated that staff has run into some challenges for some very small projects such as Melvin's, Beacham Clocks, Smokehouse Meats, etc. All of these businesses were doing very small additions and the way the current Code reads – if you alter the exterior of the structure, a Site Plan is required. If you are doing 10 square feet of a bump out for a storage room, a Site Plan is required as well as a building permit. If you alter your structure by more than 25 percent of the existing floor area up to an area not to exceed 1,000 square feet of additional area, then, you need to do a Site Plan – if you have a Site Plan then, you need to do a Modification. If the Site Plan is already on file – modify the Site Plan to take care of the very small addition. He stated that he doesn't want to require someone to do a Site Plan for a very small addition.

A discussion on the businesses that applied for additions to their buildings, and if parking and setbacks were reviewed, etc. *Planner Reed* stated that the plans are reviewed for parking and setbacks. She stated that in the Code staff could put something to read – existing buildings that do not exceed a certain square footage, if the alteration is more than 25 percent, etc. Or to

capture the other scenario – if existing buildings that are greater than 2,000 square feet any addition by this percent requires a Site Plan Review.

A discussion took place regarding the percentage of the building to require a Site Plan Review. *Director Davenport* stated that he would do some rewording and get back to the Commission at a later time.

#### Chapter 4.6 – Residential Cluster Development – Definition

*Director Davenport* stated that in the packet is a full rewrite of the existing Chapter 4.6 and also addressed the current Chapter as well.

*Director Davenport* introduced Peter Hall’s representative and stated that she will be filling in for Mr. Hall tonight.

Kathy Austin – Architect

*Ms. Austin* stated that she contacted Mr. Hall regarding his property. She stated that her background is in affordable housing, very small homes on small lots. She stated that she gave examples to the Commission of Cottage type housing that she has done. She has worked with builders and developers for 25 years and thought she could help from her perspective, the designers, and developers of what might be helpful or hurtful in the context, and has worked with Mr. Hall to make suggestions on the changes, etc.

*Director Davenport* stated that the current Code was revised in November, 2014 and a full rewrite of the same Code which follows the same format except it has additional emphasis on Cluster Developments. He discussed the design features, layout, access and physical dwellings people are going to live in, store their gear and park their cars. He stated that a Cluster Development is a style of development – smaller lots, smaller homes, and preserving more open space. A cottage is a physical structure with terms that are interchangeable.

*Director Davenport* stated that staff would like to look at some big picture things on what we want to do to get this Code that is usable and makes sense for Sisters. The current Code has requirements in some places that are very restrictive and some just don’t make sense, etc. He asked for the Commission to give some thought to this and stated that we cannot move forward with what we have right now. No one has used it, no one has developed with it, and that is one indication that it is not working.

*Commissioner Wright* discussed in-fill where large enough lots someone could do in-fill development using Cottage type developments. He said that is part of the reason why Cottage Developments are being considered by people because of the in-fill type areas.

*Ms. Austin* made the suggestion of adjusting the minimum number to two (2) cottages and have open space on a 5,000 square foot lot for instance. She said it would be more doable for a private individual to do that, not an enormous amount of construction, and it could be beneficial to those two (2) small homes as long as they are meeting all of the setbacks and considerations to the properties around them. That was one of the suggestions made so that they could do in-fill.

*Planner Reed* stated that she recalls in Chapter 2.2 for Residential that Accessory Dwelling units are not counted in the 'density' right now. She stated that Accessory Dwelling units are capped at 800 square feet or 50 percent of the main dwelling. She said she wanted to throw that out because density is a factor here. She gave an example of someone having a single-family home with extra room to build an accessory dwelling unit – detached in the backyard. Right now, it is not counted in the density anywhere in the Residential Districts. She said that she wasn't sure about the Multi-Family.

*Commissioner Nagel* stated that it is his understanding that Accessory Dwelling units are not allowed in the Cluster Development and wanted clarification on this.

*Director Davenport* stated that in the current Code, Accessory Dwelling units are not permitted in Cottage Developments.

*Planner Reed* explained that if there was a 5000 square foot lot that they could potentially build in the MFR and build a single-family house on a 4500 square foot lot. That house can cover up to 60 percent of the lot coverage. The Accessory Dwelling unit if someone chose to build one, and if there was enough room for setbacks, would not count towards the density and would still have that one (1) unit on the property. If talking now about having two (2) cottages, is that the same as having a big single-family and a small ADU in the back, etc.

*Ms. Austin* stated that the cottage sizes are restricted compared to a regular single-family home so the intention is to not have one primary and secondary, but to have two (2) cottages.

*Commissioner Wright* stated that the intent is to try and build communities and one of the primary focuses of cottages. He said they can be communities with younger people, communities with more senior people, etc. He stated that in this particular one, part of that community was requiring a community center which most developers take an exception to because there would need to be a lot of cottages to make it worthwhile. The concept was developing a community and with an accessory dwelling – he feels it is losing the concept of community.

*Planner Reed* stated that more so if this is going to happen is in-fill and how that affects the density of the area that has existing development nearby and on 8000 square foot lots, etc. If trying to put more small lots into an in-fill area and looking at density for bigger projects that have not been developed out yet – understanding the community concept, but keeping a balance with density as far as in-fill.

*Commissioner Wright* stated that with cottages, the property with the accessory dwelling has to be a separate subdivided lot in ownership not a part of the other concept – home ownership rather than a rental, etc.

*Commissioner Tewalt* addressed the Habitat property where there are three (3) little cottage type homes where they are all attached with three addresses and one regular single family dwelling and he stated that it seems to work.

*Ms. Austin* stated that she has done some Habitat homes and their model is often a duplex so that it looks like the larger homes around them and they fit in pretty well that way. It is also less

expensive because of not siding two sides and actually a good model for them, but they are usually a 2-3 bedroom home.

*Commissioner Wright* stated that as an example what he would call a typical Cottage type development would be to the north of where the Hotel is going to be located. If looking at that, those are actually condos, but they take on the characteristics of a Cluster development concept, but a Cottage development would actually have properties around them – personal property doing whatever they chose to do in them. They are private properties, but the way the garages are located relative to, the ease of being able to move through the area, and the open space are all the concept we are trying to do.

*Commissioner Tewalt* asked Ms. Austin to give a typical size of a cottage, etc.

*Ms. Austin* stated that you can do anything from 800-1250 square feet depending if it is a 1-story or a 2-story, a 1-bedroom, a 2-bedroom, 3-bedroom having some variety addressing the needs. They could do a carport, have garages, and she agrees that with the overall look as being described, but you can still have duplexes and still be individual cottages with a zero lot line – they call them duets in some places, but could do that or standalone houses. She said that what the City is going for is to have a common area where people can gather in, etc. Regarding budget costs by having a community building, it works if it is a non-profit apartment housing project and to have a community building, but it is too expensive to be able to amortize that cost across all of the units.

*Director Davenport* stated that in the current Code, it states that you need to have six (6) or more units to have a community building. He stated that is all the Code has related to community buildings. He gave examples of different uses for a community building and possible requirements associated with one.

*Ms. Austin* discussed this with Mr. Hall and stated that it should be up to the developer's option to do it if they want to do it. It should not be precluded she agrees, but it shouldn't be required.

*Director Davenport* stated that it is required to have three (3) recreational amenities right now for a Master Plan residential development – picnic shelter, BBQ's, court sports, etc. and if someone proposed a community infrastructure as part of a cottage – this could satisfy a larger requirement if there was a 100-unit Master Plan development that requires three (3) recreational amenities. This could be satisfied in a larger project. In this particular project with Clear Pine, it could provide some sort of an amenity when having a small cottage such as a picnic shelter, etc.

*Ms. Austin* stated that Mr. Hall is intending to have in his park area some amenities that could be shared by the whole community. The cottages are going to be adjacent to that park area so he was hoping to meet those requirements in that way. She said that he didn't want to design this specifically for just one person, but making it required is a tough one.

*Commissioner Wright* stated that right now, it is being discussed as the minimum of two cottages and the maximum of 12 cottages per development.

*Ms. Austin* asked for clarification and if there is a need for a maximum number and stated that personally, she feels it is too restrictive. She asked what if there were 13 – would it need to be turned down.

*Commissioner Tewalt* stated that the only reason you would restrict it is because you wouldn't want to potentially erode a whole bunch of single family dwellings – residential property and take away too much of that.

*Director Davenport* discussed Rolling Horse Meadows and if they wanted to do something different than what they have right now and what happens in every community, eventually, the land cost, the land value becomes much higher than the actual dwelling. He discussed the properties, sizes of the lots, septic systems before the sewer, removal of the homes in time, etc.

*Ms. Austin* stated that maybe if it is part of a Master Plan like Clear Pine there is an option of looking at it being more, but have a standard cut-off, and an option if it is part of an overall Master Plan to do something more because of dealing with a larger undeveloped area as opposed to in-fill.

*Commissioner Wright* stated that the intention would be to have another chapter on in-fill and in talking about Cluster housing of which Cottage development is one focus, in-fill would be another one, and it could be two (2) to three (3) different sub-categories to suffice for in-fill. There could be another section if you are in an existing in-fill area in a neighborhood and put different restrictions on it.

*Director Davenport* stated that in 'Applicability' - this is where you can spell out where and what this applies to and what type of land and types of situations to apply this to, etc.

*Director Davenport* asked if it would be better to throw something out and say there is a whole new package to work with, or look at the current Code and is it better for the decision makers to see what is being changed in the current Code – making changes, some significantly, or is it better to change what we have, or do a whole new section – get rid of the text and write a whole new thing.

*Ms. Austin* stated that when talking with Mr. Hall – there is a difference between the Cottages then just Cluster because the intent for Cluster isn't necessarily to increase the density or the affordability. It is to avoid sensitive lands and close to the houses to save open space. The difference with the Cottages is that you are trying to increase the density to provide more affordability and need a greater density to do that. The way the Cluster was written is that it wasn't changing the density – it was taking everything and moving it off some sensitive land. That is not going to meet the need for in-fill or affordability because you need to increase the density in order to do that and make it enticing for a building to want to do it. She stated that for any developer wanting to do the Cottages, it has to make sense financially and by doing greater density because they are smaller, can't sell them for as much, and the cost is about the same.

*Commissioner Wright* addressed individual ownership of the property, and the smaller lots arranged in a way that offers privacy, etc. Then, there is a percentage of all the lots that would be left open for a common area – that is the concept of Cluster.

The Commission discussed Cottage Housing related to accessory dwellings that are non-permitted in Cottage Housing developments, density and minimum lot areas, square footages of the homes, lot coverages and floor areas, number of cottages/units, common areas, garden areas, open space, specific standards and guidelines, land costs, in-fill lots, Cluster concept versus Cottage which has more affordability and higher density, percentage of open space, historic structures, height limits and roof pitch, lighting for shaded areas, solar setbacks, private ownership space, CCR restrictions (maintain common area), 1-2 story home, loft areas, staircases, etc.

The Commission agreed to keep #4 on page 9 –

*The total floor square footage of each cottage shall not exceed either 1.5 times the area of the main level or twelve hundred fifty (1250) square feet, whichever is less.*

The Commission discussed yards and setbacks, front yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks, side yard setbacks, interior separation, exceptions from standard yard, setback and interior separation requirements, required open space/common space for Cottage Clusters, parking, and locations.

*Ms. Austin* gave a visual of the cottage setbacks, common areas, front porches, public and private areas, walkways, landscaping, fencing, lot coverages, density, and averages on odd shaped lots, common lot lines, garages, common parking, duplexes and triplexes, single-family, building costs, and Fire Department requirements.

*Director Davenport* stated that for Applicability – general theme and common ground by allowing increased density in the residential, number of units per acre, 8 dwelling units an acre max now, and possibility allowing up to 10-12 – 5 for every two units. 2,000 square foot lot (12 units) plus 50 percent which is 3,000 per house at 3,000 into 45,000 square feet an acre is a density of 15 – maximum density of 15. There needs to be infrastructure, roads, parking, community garden, etc. Maximum dwelling size – 1250 maximum, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor can't be more than 50 percent of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor for a total of 1250 square foot. Offsite parking – community cluster parking, handling ownership, Homeowners Association, garages, and rules.

*Ms. Austin* stated that she discussed this with Mr. Hall and Mr. Hall's lawyer said that if the garages could be deed restricted to the house that it goes with that would work. He also suggested that if there is a garage then, increase the common space by the amount of the garage.

*Commissioner Tewalt* stated that it makes sense because if there is a 2-car garage or a carport – regardless, that would need to be given back somewhere else in the open space.

*Ms. Austin* stated that the sketch she proposed didn't have an attached garage, but a separate garage. The others did have an attached garage, and that was part of the 2,000 square feet when it was attached, but detached it was in addition. She stated that what Mr. Hall was thinking is that the garages would be located in the common space, but whatever room they take up, to add more onto the common space so not losing the common space.

*Commissioner Wright* asked Ms. Austin if the garage is attached to the house if it could it be 2000 square foot for the house plus a garage.

*Ms. Austin* stated that if it is an attached garage, it could be located on that 2000 square foot lot. She said that is only the minimum size, but would want to have some of the parking separate so that it's a cuter cottage and not just seeing a bunch of garages.

*Commissioner Nagel* asked what happens to these garages when the people want to turn them into a recreation room or another bedroom.

*Ms. Austin* stated that will be part of the CC&R's for them to enforce.

There was a consensus on the 5-foot side yard setbacks. *Commissioner Wright* stated that the minimum setback average 10-feet, but at no point less than 4-feet in the front yard.

*Director Davenport* stated that hopefully this will be wrapped up by next month and have a good draft to get out there.

Setbacks, heights with various roof pitches, 60 percent versus 40 percent lot coverage – consensus was 60 percent. Exceptions were discussed and complications with certain things such as uncovered porches, steps, enclosed porches except for a front yard setback, significance of trees with definition, etc.

*Director Davenport* asked the Commission if they would like to meet again at 4:00 pm to work on the changes and spend four hours on just these changes to get it right and then, get it off to the City Council for approval.

*Director Davenport* stated that *Commissioner Wright* offered to be the Housing Board Representative for the City.

*B. Open/ongoing discussions and studies – Tabled until next month.*

- Transportation System Plan: 2015 Update – RFP issued
- City Housing Policy Advisory Board
- Urbanization Study and Comprehensive Plan update
- Future Development Code Revisions:
  - Form Based Codes
  - Buffering requirements
  - Table of Uses Conversion to NAICS format

VI. OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS - None

VII. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary