

URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

January 13, 2016 – 6:00 P.M.

Council Chambers

1. ROLL CALL:

The Urban Area Planning Commission met in regular session on the above date with Chair Gerard Fitzgerald presiding. Commissioners Lois MacMillan, Loree Arthur, David Kellenbeck, Dan McVay, and Robert Wiegand were present. Vice Chair Jim Coulter and Commissioner Blair McIntire were absent. Also present and representing the City was Parks & Community Development (hereafter: PCD) Director Lora Glover, Senior Planner Tom Schauer, Senior Planner Joe Slaughter, and Associate Planner Justin Gindleperger. City Council Liaison Rick Riker was present as well.

2. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

3. CONSENT AGENDA:

a. MINUTES: December 9, 2015

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner MacMillan moved and Commissioner Kellenbeck seconded the motion to approve the minutes from December 9, 2015 as submitted. The vote resulted as follows:

“AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald and Vice Chair Coulter and Commissioners MacMillan, Kellenbeck, McIntire, Arthur, and McVay. **“NAYS”:** None. **Abstain:** Commissioner Arthur.

Absent: Vice Chair Jim Coulter and Commissioner Blair McIntire.

The motion passed.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

a. 15-40500004 – Development Code Text Amendment Historic District Design Guidelines, Article 13 - Special Purpose Districts

Chair Fitzgerald stated, at this time I will open the public hearing to consider Application 15-40500004 – Development Code Text Amendment Historic District Design Guidelines, Article 13 – Special Purpose Districts. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant, statements by persons in favor of the application, statements by

persons in opposition to the application, and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicant and staff. After that has occurred, the public comment portion will be closed and the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the Commission. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Commission to consider this matter? Seeing none do any Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Seeing none are there any Commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received prior to this meeting regarding this application? Seeing none in this hearing the decision of the Commission will be based on specific criteria which are set forth in the development code. All testimony which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. If you would like a copy of the staff report please let us know and we will try and get you one. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the Commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue you'll not be able to appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals based on that issue. The hearing will now proceed with a report from staff.

- Proposing to add Historic Design Guidelines to Article 13 for Historic Review. Proposed text amendment would cover guidelines for exterior improvements including direction for color, signage, lighting, roofing and building materials. It will also cover guidelines for new construction within the Historic District.
- Proposed guidelines will streamline the review process. Exterior improvements will be handled in a similar manner to existing building permit processes. Once submitted, improvements will be reviewed at the administrative level by staff. New construction will be reviewed at a Director level with a comment period.
- Guidelines will be drafted by the HBSC, Historic Buildings and Sites Commission, and will provide a consistent standard that will apply to all landmarks within City limits and all buildings within the Historic District.
- With the existing process any proposed improvement and new construction project is put before the HBSC, which only meets once a month, the proposed process will improve timeframes for any project that meets the design guidelines put in place by the HBSC.
- No changes will be made for the processes put in place for improvements and construction that fall outside of the design guidelines or the demolition of a historic landmark or demolition of a building within the Historic District.

- Proposed guidelines will improve timeframes for citizens requesting approval for improvements falling within the guidelines and provide consistency and flexibility for owners.
- In the case of an appeal to a Director's discussion the appeal would be taken directly to City Council.
- The question of why sandblasting was not allowed was raised; it was explained that it was to preserve the integrity of the historic brick.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner MacMillan seconded the motion to recommend the City Councilors to approve the Development Code Text Amendment Historic District Design Guidelines. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Fitzgerald and Commissioners MacMillan, Kellenbeck, Arthur, and McVay. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Jim Coulter and Commissioner Blaire McIntire. The motion passed.

b. 15-40300001 – Parks and Community Development Department Annexation May 2016 Staff Report

- The UAPC will not be providing any recommendation on this matter, however the City is using this meeting as a forum to provide opportunities for additional public comments before the matter is brought to City Council.
- A public notice was mailed out informing the public that a Council Meeting would be held concerning the Annexation as well as informing the public of the UAPC meeting. There was also a notice placed with the newspaper. The notice included four areas, 18 tax lots, and just less than 80 acres.
- Annexation is a type 4-A procedure that typically goes only to Council with the decision being based on sections 5.02 and 5.03 in the Development Code.
- Exhibit 4.1 was added to the record showing consent for Annexation was given by Mervin Spaulding for the five properties in area one.
- The proposal is based on a potential plan to form an Urban Renewal District. The proposed Annexation will allow additional industrial properties to be included in the benefits of the Urban Renewal District.

- In order to meet the deadlines for the May ballot all decisions will need to be made by Council on February 3, 2016.
- Additional information has come in with landowners giving consent or not giving consent for Annexation. At the time of this meeting it will be recommended that Area One will be included, Area Two will be revised and then included, and Areas Three and Four will be excluded.
- Recommended to have Council place this measure on the May 7th ballot.

5. ITEMS FROM STAFF:

- Lora will give an update of the Strategic Planning Meeting on the next meeting to be held on January 27, 2016.

6. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

- Commissioner Arthur would like to invite Council Member Lovelace to attend again in the future.
- Commissioner MacMillan recommended have Council reestablish a community leadership program to foster community involvement and support of public officials.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Fitzgerald adjourned the meeting at 6:51 P.M.

Gerard Fitzgerald, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commission

Date

These minutes were prepared by Carlie Paulsen, Administration Department, City of Grants Pass.

**CITY OF GRANTS PASS
PARKS & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**DEVELOPMENT CODE TEXT AMENDMENT
HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES
ARTICLE 13 ~ SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICTS**

FINDINGS OF FACT - URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Procedure Type:	Type IV: Planning Commission Recommendation and City Council Decision
Project Number:	15-40500004
Project Type:	Development Code Text Amendment
Applicant:	City of Grants Pass
Planner Assigned:	Justin Gindlesperger
Application Received:	November 23, 2015
Application Complete:	November 27, 2015
Date of Staff Report:	January 6, 2016
Date of UAPC Hearing:	January 13, 2016
Date of UPAC Findings of Fact:	January 27, 2016

I. PROPOSAL:

Development Code Text Amendment to provide design guidelines for exterior improvements to structures within the Historic District. The proposed amendment provides administrative review and approval for improvements that conform to the design guidelines.

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Section 4.102 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code provides that the Director, Planning Commission or City Council may initiate a text amendment. The amendment has been initiated by the Director.

Section 2.062 authorizes the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council and authorize the City Council to make a final decision on an application for a Development Code Text Amendment, pursuant to the requirements of a Type IV procedure.

The text of the Development Code may be recommended for amendment and amended provided the criteria in Section 4.103 of the Development Code are met.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Section 10.060 provides the City Council's final decision to be appealed to the State Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) as provided in state statutes. A notice of intent to appeal must be filed with LUBA within 21 days of the Council's written decision.

IV. PROCEDURE:

- A. An application for a Development Code text amendment was submitted on November 23, 2015 and deemed complete on November 26, 2015. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.060 of the Development Code.
- B. Notice of the proposed amendment and the January 13, 2016 public hearing was mailed to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on November 23, 2015, in accordance with ORS 197.610 and OAR Chapter 660, Division 18.
- C. Public notice of the January 13, 2016 public hearing was published on the City of Grants Pass website on December 23, 2015, in accordance with Sections 2.053 and 2.063 of the Development Code.
- D. Public notice of the January 13, 2016 public hearing was published in the newspapers on January 6, 2016, in accordance with Sections 2.053 and 2.063 of the Development Code.

V. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

- A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the staff report, which is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein.
- B. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on January 13, 2016, which are attached as Exhibit "B", summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby adopted and incorporated herein.
- C. The staff PowerPoint Presentation given at the January 13, 2016 public hearing is attached as Exhibit "C" and incorporated herein.

VI. GENERAL FINDINGS - BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

The review procedure for all exterior alterations to structures within the downtown Historic District and local Landmark structures require a Type III, Historic Buildings and Sites Commission (HBSC) Decision. The HBSC drafted the design guidelines to maintain consistent standards for exterior details that include signage, color and materials while providing flexibility to property owners for exterior improvements.

For signage and exterior alterations that comply with the design guidelines, the proposed amendment provides an administrative review and approval. New construction within the Historic District that complies with the design guidelines will follow the Type I-C, Director's Decision process.

Property owners may propose exterior alterations, signage and new construction that do not comply with the design guidelines. For any improvement or alteration that does not follow the proposed guidelines, the application will follow the Type III, HBSC Decision process. Proposed demolition of a structure within the Historic District or an existing Landmark will follow the Type III, HBSC Decision process.

VII. FINDINGS IN CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

The text of the Development Code may be recommended for amendment and amended provided that all of the following criteria of Section 4.103 of the Development Code are met.

CRITERION 1: The proposed amendment is consistent with the purpose of the subject section and article.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendments are consistent with the purpose of Article 13 and provide consistent standards for exterior details and alterations within the Historic District and to Landmark structures. For any exterior alteration or signage that complies with the historic review design guidelines, the proposal will provide administrative review and approval procedure. The amendment also provides direction for new construction within the Historic District. New construction within the Historic District that complies with the design guidelines will follow the Type I-C, Director's Decision process.

For any improvement or alteration that does not follow the proposed guidelines, the application will follow the Type III, HBSC Decision process. Proposed demolition of a structure within the Historic District or an existing Landmark will follow the Type III, HBSC Decision process.

CRITERION 2: The proposed amendment is consistent with other provisions of this code.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposed text amendments will streamline the process for signage and exterior alterations that comply with the historic review design guidelines. These changes will not substantially change the code and the revised Sections will remain consistent with other provisions of the code.

CRITERION 3: The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and most effectively carries out those goals and policies of all alternatives considered.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposed changes are consistent with Element 13, Land Use, of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendments attempt to streamline the review process and provide procedures for land use actions that are clear, objective and non-arbitrary, pursuant to 13.4.2 and 13.4.3 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Most Effective Alternative

The alternative to approving the proposal is to retain the existing process for review and approval of signage, exterior alterations and new construction within the Historic District and alterations to Landmarks. The proposed amendments more effectively carry out the goals and policies stated above.

CRITERION 4: The proposed amendment is consistent with the functions, capacities, and performance standards of transportation facilities identified in the Master Transportation Plan.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendment is not expected to affect the functions, capacities, or performance standards of transportation facilities identified in the Master Transportation Plan (MTP).

VIII. RECOMMENDATION:

The Urban Area Planning Commission recommends that the City Council **APPROVE** the proposed Development Code text amendments, as presented in the staff report.

IX. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this 27th day of January, 2016.

Gerard Fitzgerald, Chair