

Minutes of the Veneta Planning Commission

January 7, 2014

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

Absent: Kevin Conlin

Others: Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Lisa Garbett, Associate Planner; and Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder

I. Review Agenda

James Eagle Eye called the Veneta Planning Commission to order at 7:02 p.m.

II. Public Comment

Daniel Philips and John Philips are members of Boy Scout Troop 2054. They attended tonight's meeting in order to receive a merit badge for citizenship.

The Planning Commission thanked them for attending tonight's meeting.

III. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: Calvin Kenney made a motion to approve the December 3, 2013 minutes. Len Goodwin seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 4-0.

IV. Land Use Approval Extension Requests: S-3-07 (Bolton Hill Ranch I) and S-1-08 (Bolton Hill Ranch Estate 1st Addition)

Bork said on behalf of the applicant, ATR Land LLC, Phil Velie made the second and final request to extend the extension for the Bolton Hill Ranch estates. She said no code provisions or site conditions have changed since the last extension request was made. Staff is recommending a one year extension for the Bolton Hill Ranch Estates to January 4, 2015 with the condition construction drawings conform to the City's current Stormwater Quality Standards at that time.

MOTION: Len Goodwin made a motion to approve a one year extension for Bolton Hill Ranch I with the new expiration date of January 4, 2015 and with the condition final construction drawings will be in conformance with the City's current Stormwater Quality Standards. Lily Rees seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 4-0.

V. Discussion and Recommendation on Housing Mix to Include in Housing Need Analysis

Bork included in her memo several housing mix scenarios for Veneta over the next 20 years. These scenarios are based on the housing mix the Planning Commission reviewed as part of the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) from the 2007-2011 American Community Survey average for Veneta. She said the memo also included the housing needs estimate that was previously approved by the Planning Commission. That calculation resulted in 2,120 units that Veneta will need to meet its future population needs. That total number of units will be spread over different housing types which translates into the needed number of acres for the plan designations. She summarized a likely scenario and assumed single family dwellings will be the most common type of housing needs for Veneta. She said we are attracting family households and households with children. She said the older population choosing to purchase homes, is another indicator we will need a higher number of single family homes. She said what may cause multi-family housing to increase is the increase in non-family households. This is the fastest growing household type. Also with the aging population, some may choose to downsize to multi-family. She said there's a potential that no new mobile homes parks will be created due to the cost of land. She said the housing mix scenarios did not reflect group quarter populations. She said some land is required to identify as residential care facilities. She said based on past trends we would need three

and a half acres to accommodate the group quarter population or group care facilities which are allowed in all residential zones. Bork said in any scenario, the most land we will ever need for low density residential is 298 acres and 55 acres for medium density residential. She said we have a surplus of residential acreage in each plan designation; 349 acres for low density and rural residential combined and 127.8 acres for medium density.

In response to a question from Calvin Kenney, Bork said the scenarios are based on an averaged 20 year assumption. She said if we built-out the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) those additional units would be the housing mix. It wouldn't be the current and the new, just the new units we're adding.

In response to a question James Eagle Eye, Bork said she would like the Planning Commission to recommend a housing mix either by consensus or by vote.

Calvin Kenney said the scenario one makes the most sense to him and he felt it would be in their best interest to plot out the largest acreage.

James Eagle Eye said scenario one gives us the single-family and multi-family but still leaves the option of a possible mobile home park.

In response to a question from Calvin Kenney, Bork said 43 is the number of units per lot but a total of 43 mobile units or homes in some kind of Mobile Home Park.

Lily Rees said she would like to look at the attraction of duplexes as an affordable type of housing. She said scenarios 1 and 2 do not include duplexes but scenario 3 increases from 10 to 21.

Len Goodwin said scenario 3 suggested an increase of single-family attached. If we are looking at 20 year scenario, it is altogether possible that we may see more development in single-family attached. He said in reality, the marginal difference in needed land is quite small with either scenario 1, 2 or 3 and it seems we could easily accommodate any of the scenarios without a great amount of concern. He felt there is a great deal of flexibility to select a scenario but not conclude or suggest that scenario becomes too rigid. He said somewhere between scenario 1 and 3 is likely where we'll end up.

James Eagle Eye said we need to make sure we keep as much flexibility as possible for whatever the future brings.

Lily Rees said and also to try to influence what we'd like to see happen.

Len Goodwin said part of that is the assumption about mobile home parks. He said if we want to discourage the increased number of mobile home parks we make the assumption that we're not going to have any more. That doesn't mean we won't have any more but it makes a clear statement that as a City we don't want to have substantial increases in mobile home parks. That could be a very plausible position to take.

Bork said we can change the percentages of the scenarios. She said Veneta allows all of these housing types in the code so if we're short land and we needed to increase multi-family, we could change the code to make that allowance. She said we allow town homes, manufactured homes, and duplexes so whatever mix we take we will be able to achieve that goal.

Len Goodwin said none of these suggest the need for an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion to meet the residential land needs. He said the most critical question is whether or not we need to expand the UGB. He wondered what Commissioners think about a conclusion in this Comprehensive Plan update that we need no residential expansion of the UGB. In the context of regulations that won't be adopted for another year about the potential for a safe harbor expansion in the future. He said in a way he felt the City's assumption now should assume the greatest need for land that we can justifiably assume so that within the next five years, if the regulations are adopted, and we have the opportunity for

a safe harbor expansion, we aren't in a position where we've already said we have more than enough room to meet our UGB needs. He said its pure speculation but it seems like one thing to do would be to pick the scenario that utilizes the maximum amount of available land so that in the event it becomes an issue, after the regulations are adopted, we have protected ourselves.

In response to a question from Bork, Len Goodwin said he's concerned DLCD at that point will say "you had all this land in excess, why do you want to a safe harbor now".

Len Goodwin said scenario 1, 2, and 3 certainly hit that target and he felt it's important to assume there would be no decrease in single-family residential housing.

All Planning Commissioners agreed.

Bork said eliminating a housing type altogether may raise a red flag with DLCD and they may question the methodology. She said scenario 1 has a little bit of everything.

In response to a question from Calvin Kenney, Bork said manufactured homes and mobile homes are the same. She said both would go in a park. She said what's counted as single family are homes on individual lots so a mobile encompasses a park.

Lily Rees suggested modifying scenario 3; reducing multi-family from 12% to 10% and use that 2% for mobile home parks. She said single-family dwelling, single family attached, and duplex percentages would stay the same that way we wouldn't eliminate any type of housing.

Len Goodwin said scenario 3 with that change might accommodate the City the best.

In response to a question from Bork, James Eagle Eye confirmed the Planning Commission agreed to move forward with scenario 3 with the following adjustments: reduce multi-family to 10%, move that 2% to mobile home parks, leave single-family dwellings at 84%, single family attached at 3%, and duplexes at 1%.

VI. Comments from Planning Commission on Residential Buildable Lands Inventory and Housing Needs Analysis Report Discussion and Recommendation on Housing Mix to include in Housing Need Analysis

Bork said staff will present findings and recommendations from the Planning Commission on Residential Buildable Lands Inventory and Housing Needs Analysis to the City Council at the January 13, 2014 meeting.

VII. Discussion/Comments on Draft Infill and Redevelopment portion of the Residential Buildable Lands Inventory

Staff provided the Planning Commission with the draft Infill and Redevelopment Chapter of the Residential Buildable Lands Inventory. Garbett said the summary of results lists total buildable acres and included 51 units but infill acres should not be added to buildable land totals. She said instead the 51 units of infill will be removed from the needed unit's figure of 2,130 acres. She said residential infill was considered for residential lots with an existing residence and were large enough to divide. Staff determined what lots had further potential for development. She said a model was developed to determine how many infill lots could be created in the next 20 year period. She said the results revealed that we have an average of 2.53 potential lots per year or 51 residential lots over the next two decades. Garbett said staff reviewed redevelopment potential. She said based on the GIS data and unused properties, the City has approximately 4.78 redevelop able acres.

Bork said the 4.78 acres will be added to the inventory.

Garbett said redevelopment acres would be added to the Buildable Land Inventory and the infill units would be subtracted.

Len Goodwin said the infill acreage is a fixed number.

Bork said we can't predict the infill acreage. She said we're not adding the acreage to the inventory for redevelopment we're just accounting for it in the analysis.

Garbett asked the Planning Commissioners if they had any questions.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said staff didn't consider the cost of redevelopment verses Greenfield development in the analysis.

Len Goodwin said demolition is less likely in residential development than in commercial development. He said some demolition or reconfiguration of the land is less likely to occur because the redevelopable land is generally located in an area less suited for high end development. Also it's likely lower cost housing would be built on it so it makes the cost of redevelopment higher than Greenfield development. He asked why take it out of the inventory?

In response to a question from Bork, Len Goodwin said we're only talking about 4.78 acres assigned to redevelopment. He felt it wasn't worth the effort to prepare a detailed analysis to justify it. He said it seems staff could make a professional judgment that less than 4.78 acres would actually be realized. He said since we're not expanding, why take it out.

Bork provided a map of the redevelopable potential lots and why they have remained that way. She said redevelopment is very unlikely or non-existent.

Calvin Kenney said some of the lots are very impractical.

Bork said if the Planning Commission is interested, a finding could be included to address redevelopment would likely not happen on those lots and could be looked at with more detail.

Len Goodwin said staff could make a finding based on the location and situation of the lots, there is no significant likelihood of redevelopment within the plan horizon.

Staff said they would add a finding to reflect this.

VIII. Discussion and Recommendation on potential modification to existing off-street parking requirements within the downtown core

Garbett said at the December meeting, Planning Commissioners requested that staff research current off-street parking requirements for the City of Veneta and other comparable jurisdictions within their downtown core. Staff provided options for amending the Veneta Land Development Ordinance No. 493, Section 5.20, Off-Street Parking Requirements. Option 1 would exempt off-street parking requirements within the Broadway Commercial zone. Option 2 would partially exempt off-street parking requirements within the same zone. Garbett said the average lot size in Broadway Commercial zone is a little over 10,000 sq. ft. She said there is concern that the current off-street parking standards could limit future development. If a developer wanted to locate in the downtown walkable core, parking would likely be too expensive. She said there is a little flex in that the City offers shared parking and on-street in lieu of off-street parking.

Len Goodwin said he isn't sure if there is a concern about on-street parking in the downtown area particularly in this zone.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Ingham said there is a large vacant building which doesn't

have much on-site parking. He said requiring any future development downtown allows for very little on-site parking and to require on-site parking would make development cost prohibitive. He said currently, the only downtown business on Broadway are the hardware store, a hair salon, and two taverns.

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Bork said the Crazy Al's Tavern owns the gravel parking lot across the street from the tavern.

Bork said an option for the redevelopment of the Moose Lodge building would be to issue a variance to give staff an idea of how it will play out. She said we have some good flexibility to where they may not need a variance but one difficulty is that our development code doesn't assign off-street parking for all uses. Which is a good thing because it allows the developer to bring traffic data to the City that supports their desired level of parking that suits their business needs rather than the City assigning parking requirements.

James Eagle Eye said we need to be careful that as more gets built out we do have adequate parking and we don't rely solely on on-street parking unless it's deemed adequate.

Bork said the table Garbett developed on the existing code (Section 5.20.11) allows the Planning Commission to reduce parking requirements by 50%. Bork said Section 5.20.11 is a supplemental provision and would require a site plan process and not a variance process.

James Eagle Eye said there's not a lot of parking in that area and if we're trying to make this a pedestrian friendly area, how much parking should there be.

Len Goodwin said we could be very lucky to not have enough parking in the downtown area. He said we have on-street parking on the side roads. He said off-street parking in a downtown area is almost counter intuitive. It really doesn't suit the purpose of a downtown area.

Lily Rees said looking at the senior center and maybe building senior apartments, we need to look at our core audience and who do we expect to be using the area. She said if we have an older population, will there be a need for handicap access but she doesn't know what the requirements are.

Bork said the ADA requires a certain amount of parking based on a minimum number of spaces.

Lily Rees said we need to make sure we meet the minimum handicap spaces.

Ingham said we would love to have a parking problem but we need to decide what we want to do to encourage development.

James Eagle Eye said most downtown areas have some kind of a public parking lot or structure.

Bork said in order to encourage development in the downtown area, we may want to consider creating a quicker review process to allow some standards in the code. She said this would allow staff to make some reductions in the parking without approval from the Planning Commission or we could keep it the way it is and everything goes through the Planning Commission. She said there's so many variables.

Len Goodwin said the problem is eventually a developer will come in that needs the entire lot for their development and can't provide for their own parking. He's concerned that we're overthinking this. He doesn't think we'll have a parking problem in the downtown core for a long time. He said if we encourage the development now by eliminating or reducing the parking standards, we'll get the synergy to get the downtown area moving and then we can look at providing public off-street parking. He is very reluctant to leave the off-street standards the way they are now which would force the Planning Commission to make ad hoc decisions.

In response to a question from Lily Rees, Bork said for every 25 spaces, one handicap space is

required. She said we could require the parking standards to include a minimum of handicap spaces based on development.

In response to a question from Calvin Kenney, Bork said parking is based on per square footage of the building.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Lily Rees said we could only require a level of handicap spaces but not require other parking. She said it's hard to know if this would be a hardship for a business or a benefit. She said she's not sure if requiring a handicap spot would be a deterrent or an asset to a business.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said she's not sure what kind of issue it creates to require off street handicap parking and it could get tricky for redevelopment. She said for example, the Broadway New and Used Store provided a handicap parking spot on the back side of the building in order to meet ADA standards. She said it's tricky to provide an accessible entrance to a handicap space.

Ingham said even if we reduce the parking standards down to a bare minimum we still need to meet the ADA accessibility. He said there's no way to get around the ADA requirements.

In response to a question from Calvin Kenney, Bork said the applicant will be submitting something within the next six weeks.

James Eagle Eye said this application will fall within the current code which may give us an idea of how much flexibility we really have with our current code.

Bork said this will give us something to work with.

Ingham said planning staff is open to reducing the parking standards to help encourage development but the application is opening our eyes to the appropriate level of reduction.

Len Goodwin said we don't have an agreement of how much to reduce the parking standards but it was the consensus of the Planning Commission that the City needs to reduce the burden of off-street parking for downtown development. He said parking is expensive and accommodating stormwater treatment is also an issue.

Bork said staff is open to reducing the off-street parking requirements. She said the upcoming application may assist with formulating new code that enables staff to find a way to write it more flexible. She said she will collect examples from other cities.

Len Goodwin suggested staff look at the basis and methodology the City of Eugene uses to establish on-street handicap parking.

Bork said that's a good option as long as all properties can be accessed.

IX. Adjourn

Chair James Eagle Eye adjourned the Veneta Planning Commission to order at 8:07 p.m.


James Eagle Eye, Chairman

ATTEST:


Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder