

# Minutes of the Veneta Planning Commission

## May 5, 2015

Present: James Eagle Eye, Len Goodwin, Kevin Conlin, Calvin Kenney, Lily Rees

Others: Ric Ingham, City Administrator; Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Lisa Garbett, Associate Planner; Darci Henneman, City Recorder, and Linda Boothe

---

### I. Review Agenda

James Eagle Eye opened the Veneta Planning Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the agenda.

### II. Public Comment

#### **Linda Boothe, 25127 Hunter Rd., Veneta, OR**

Ms. Boothe said she appreciates the City's recent Economic Opportunity Analysis (EOA) to attract new business and assist with existing businesses. She said she has been in business in Veneta for about 14 years. In order to pay her mortgages, Oregon Dome rents out shop space. She said she wanted to rent out her office space which is zoned Light/Industrial, to a business that doesn't need street front space. She said it's not allowed in her zone but directly across the street is an office building that rents to a maseuse. She said she's been approached by salons and maseuses to rent space from her but the zoning won't allow it. She asked the Planning Commission to review this.

### III. Review and Discuss Proposed Amendments to the Residential and Housing Element of Veneta Comprehensive Plan and Proposed Amendments to Veneta Land Development Ordinance.

Bork said this is a similar exercise as the Planning Commission went through at the last meeting. She briefly reviewed the proposed changes.

Len Goodwin suggested altering that to say "future growth and attraction of the residential area of Veneta". He said the way it's written sounds like we're a bedroom community.

It was the consensus of the Commission to change "livable" in both places.

It was the consensus of the Commission to remove the term "non-conventional building practices" and "nodal development."

After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission to remove the word "assure" in the new 5 and replace it with "... strive to provide safe, sanitary and affordable housing for all residents".

Len Goodwin suggested we introduce that with some preparatory language that specifically refers to the BLI so it's clear those goals speak as of the date of fact.

Consensus of the Planning Commission to change No. 1 the word "provide" to "encourage" because the City doesn't provide neighborhoods or housing.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to have the following language "we will provide adequate land to meet the 20 year need" only once.

Bork said ODOT has jurisdiction over all our main arterials and impacting an arterial would need to be mitigated. She said this could limit multi-family housing which hasn't been an issue yet.

In response to a question from Lily Rees, Bork said ODOT would require traffic impact studies to make

sure the infrastructure is there to support it. She said they could require turn lanes, or signals, or access from side streets at some point. She said we would write it as a condition in a land use decision.

After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission to strike the second sentence and leave the first to make it not so specific.

Len Goodwin said we should encourage high density development by somehow relating it to other facilities; close to a school, downtown or a retail area. He said language that gives staff and the Commission the ability to say it's good because it's close to and identifies where people congregate.

Kevin Conlin suggested "goods and services".

Len Goodwin said we need to talk about density. That is a valid discussion because we will be touching on those in the future.

Bork said we've always regulated density with the lot sizes but we can have that conversation. She said lot size doesn't work for medium and high density zoning or multi-family housing. She said six to 20 is medium and 20 and above is high density.

Bork said staff can bring back some density examples from other cities.

Len Goodwin said once we permit manufactured parks we can't get rid of them.

It was the consensus of the Commission to combine 11 and 12 to allow higher densities and housing types. City code allows this type of development through the Planned Unit Development process not through a variance.

It was the consensus to remove 16.

After a brief discussion it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to remove 17 and 18.

Bork said she will check with legal to make sure we're not in violation by deleting it.

Based on a suggestion from Bork, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to leaving 20 language in.

It was the consensus of the Planning commission to remove 21 and keep 22.

### Rural Residential

In response to questions from Len Goodwin, Bork said the "Urban Service Boundary" was in the Comp Plan which identified where sewer was available. She said even though everything in the UGB is considered serviceable, that language is still in the Comp Plan but she's not sure how to remove it.

James Eagle Eye suggested that some of it still stands because we have areas that our sewer system doesn't reach.

Bork suggested removing "maintain" and replace it with "allow" so when the time allows, residents will convert to City services.

Len Goodwin said we would be better off permitting rural type development where urban services are not immediately available but until the time that funds and demand make it possible, we would allow the continuance of quasi rural use until there is a need for it. It's important that land is developable.

He said he's troubled by the urban serviceable boundary and suggested the Planning Commission talk about a recognition that pending urban services, rural development can continue.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to allow Rural Residential (RR) development to continue until urban services become available.

James Eagle Eye doesn't want it to sound like we're offering something that we're not prepared to offer. He said he would rather see one acre lots be developed and put in a septic until City services are available.

Bork said current policy doesn't specify if RR can be converted to just Single Family Residential (SFR) or General/Residential (GR) or both.

James Eagle Eye said he remembers language somewhere about converting RR to SFR.

Bork said SFR allows multi-family development through a conditional use process and multi-family development is permitted outright in GR. She said that language is listed twice in the code as a permitted use and as a conditional use. She said the two zones are almost the same. She said if we limited it to SFR, we have the land to meet the multi-family uses.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to allow multi-family development in either zone to give us the most flexibility.

#### Conditional Use Standards

Bork reviewed the standards and said currently its somewhat limiting for multi-family development and she suggested putting a density "not to exceed" amount or limited by multi-family standards, that the density would naturally be reduced, or include a density range with a "not to exceed so many dwelling units per acre". The lowest density for multi-family was 8.1 units per acre but the Heather Glen development is 9.9 dwelling units per acre. Applegate Apartments is 28.8 and Timberline is 15 dwelling units per acre. She felt the Planning Commission would want to look at impacts to the surrounding area, views, solar access, buffering, and height transition standards, etc.

After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to review the density standards.

Bork said she can bring back the previously developed density ranges.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to remove the language that the Planning Commission will review septic tanks since all septic systems are approved by Lane County and not by the City. We review water and sewer if it's hooked up to City services to assure we have adequate supply.

Len Goodwin agreed the language should be removed. He said if we're just talking about water supply and stormwater and sewage disposal, in general, we have more flexibility considering all the alternative impacts.

#### **IV. Other**

Bork said she will bring back Mr. Parker's redline Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) of the Comp Plan for the Planning Commission's review it one last time before the public hearing is held to adopt it.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said she provided Ms. Boothe with the zoning code. She said staff will put the code language on the agenda and address her zoning issue. She said the code allows retail space in conjunction with industrial use and the caretaker use but it doesn't

allow for services.

James Eagle Eye said once they have verbiage we can see how it may play out.

Garbett said the City Engineer gave the School District's Site Plan for Veneta Elementary an incomplete determination based on the stormwater plan. She said they resubmitted the Plan which the Engineer approved. She said the applicant thought it would be approved through staff administratively but due to the traffic circulation, the application should go before the Planning Commission. She said in the future, Veneta Elementary will have their own bus parking area so it's going to change the impacts to surrounding properties. She said neighbors within 300 ft. were sent notices and public comments can be received through May 13<sup>th</sup>.

In response to a question from Lily Rees, Garbett said the tennis courts and the Territorial Rd. access to the two homes east of Veneta Veterinary is owned by the School District. She said those two residents will be required to access their properties from East Broadway.

Bork said the residential properties were originally platted to have access off East Broadway and there is no recorded easements given to those properties to access their homes from the existing street. She said ODOT will require a joint access easement for Veneta Veterinary to also access their building.

Garbett said the impacts to the surrounding properties requires it go before the Planning Commission.

In response to a question from Lily Rees, Bork said a public hearing will not be held but the two property owners have been noticed and have until May 13<sup>th</sup> to submit written comments.

**V. Adjourn**

Chair James Eagle Eye adjourned the Veneta Planning Commission at 8:08 p.m

  
James Eagle Eye, Chairman

ATTEST:

  
Darci Henneman, City Recorder