

URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

January 25, 2017 – 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 Loree Arthur, David Kellenbeck, Lois MacMillan, Blair McIntire, Dan McVay and Vice Chair Jim Coulter were present. Commissioner Robert Wiegand was absent. Also present and representing the City was Parks & Community Development Director Lora Glover and City Council Liaison Barry Eames.

2. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

3. CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. **MINUTES: December 14, 2016 – Correction noted:** Chair Fitzgerald stated the word “long” was left out on page 3, 5th bullet. Sentence should be “Chair Fitzgerald asked if Lora could look into how long it takes to get verbatim minutes if someone were to request them.
- b. **FINDINGS OF FACT: None**

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner MacMillan and commissioner McVay seconded the motion to approve the consent agenda with minutes as corrected December 14, 2016. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Commissioners Arthur, Coulter, Fitzgerald, Kellenbeck, MacMillan, McIntire, McVay. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Wiegand.

The motion passed.

Chair Fitzgerald introduced the new Council liaison, Barry Eames.

- 4. PUBLIC HEARINGS: 104-00106-16 and 201-00137-16 ~ Valley Lights Subdivision Tentative Plan, Planned Unit Development (PUD) & Major Site Plan Review Staff Report.**

- Chair Fitzgerald stated, at this time I will open the public hearing to consider Application 104-00106-16 and 201-00137-16 for Valley Lights Subdivision Tentative Plan, Planned Unit Development (PUD) & Major Site Plan Review Staff Report. 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 applies in this case is 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.
- PCD Director Lora Glover gave the staff report. She stated the applicant representative has asked to continue this matter until March 22 based on the recommendation to deny the PUD portion of the application. Applicant wants to maximize the density of the site which would create a large open space, then clustering the homes down. Suggestion from staff is to separate the PUD and reduce the number of lots to 16, which had already been approved by this Commission. She assisted the applicant with suggestions such as connectivity, the open space and an opportunity for an Auxiliary Dwelling Unit (ADU) to develop some of the single-family lots. He needs to submit the items that have been called out by staff and resubmit in March.
- Chair Fitzgerald read an email from the applicant requesting and extension to March 22 waiving the 120 day rule.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner MacMillan and Commissioner Kellenbeck seconded the motion to approve the continuance for 104-00106-16 and 201-00137-16 ~ Valley Lights Subdivision Tentative Plan, Planned Unit Development (PUD) & Major Site Plan Review to a date certain of March 22, 2017, extending the 120 day deadline.

The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Commissioners Arthur, Coulter, Fitzgerald, Kellenbeck, MacMillan, McIntire, McVay.

“NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Wiegand.

The motion passed.

Commissioner Fitzgerald recognized audience member, Ninea, who was present and doing class work for District 7.

5. OTHER ITEMS/STAFF DISCUSSION:

a. Staff Updates – Discussion

- PCD Director Glover updated the Commission on the recent Strategic Planning session. One of the more popular items was for housing, which was number 5 of the top 1; “Provide sufficient affordable housing opportunities for a variety of resident’s needs.
- PCD Director Lora Glover noted there will be a memorandum from Tom Schauer that will go to the City Council regarding developing a Housing Committee. Commissioner MacMillan asked what UCAN is. It is the United Community Action Network which may be a good organization to have participate in the Housing Committee.
- Chair Fitzgerald asked about the HUD consultant that presented at a previous meeting in which she stated that didn’t have to abide by zoning. He asked for clarification of that. PVD Director Glover said they would have to abide by the same rules and the consultant may have misspoke about that. She noted that she cannot answer that question.
- Commissioner MacMillan asked about Criterion Six. PCD Director Glover read the definition of the criteria; “The Proposal results in a

balanced exchange for the developer, flexible development standards, maximum land utilization, alternate ownership options for the community, greater preservation of the natural features and natural resources, greater proportions of useable open space and recreation facilities or other community benefit for both a greater opportunity for housing at all income levels". Commissioner MacMillan asked for examples of a balanced exchange that clearly met the criteria. There was discussion about the PUDs Grants Pass currently has such as Heatherwood PUD, Scenic Bayou PUD which had some environmental issues that couldn't be changed but has the preservation of natural features and natural resources and the Charbonneau development off N Street by Riverside Elementary School which has the option for alternative ownership. PUDs are not overly common for Grants Pass. PUDs have more of cluster housing with greater open space which is a benefit use for that open space. Commissioner Arthur mentioned the development up on F Street (Forest Hills), where they kept the canyon open, as a good example. There is some confusion on balanced exchange. Regarding the proposed application, Lora feels where the PUD units will be located, at lots 1 and 16, will help fulfill some of that much needed housing as well as open space needs and feels the balance will be explained when the application comes back in March. Connectivity will be explained with the proposed pedestrian path between Valley View and Pleasant View will be a nice public benefit.

- Chair Fitzgerald mentioned open space that is unusable is likely because they can't build on it. The open canyon at Forest Hills acts as a buffer too. It's not a balanced exchange if they use a 30% slope and call that open space. It doesn't function. This Commission has the right to ask for the balanced exchange. PCD Director Glover said they would have to explain why it doesn't meet the criteria if they were to move forward with an appeal of the decision. They noted the nice gazebo with the path that leads to the river on one of the PUDs that they feel was a great use of open space.

6. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

a. Updates/discussion

- Commissioner McVay mentioned a packet item on page 9, section C. The paragraph deals with construction in winter months. He asked if that was still being enforced because he drives by a lot of construction areas that are in progress. Chair Fitzgerald mentioned it depends on the slope. They have to be careful if it is a steep slope area and only a certain amount of developments that fall into that.
- Commissioner MacMillan asked for clarification about a sentence on page 9, on Conditions, under Staff Response Satisfied with Conditions under Criteria for Retaining Wall, sentence that reads, "Instead of a 50% slope limitation, development may now occur on 100% slopes. PCD Director Glover stated this is a change that was made on the Code several years back about how much of a cut could be made for the grading permit. There was discussion of relation of the slopes with the retaining walls.
- Commissioner Coulter noted on page 8, first paragraph, last sentence states 1.24%. It should actually be 12.4%. Also on page 14, first paragraph, same issue. Should be 12.4%.


7. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Fitzgerald adjourned the meeting at 6:35 pm

Next Meeting: January 11, 2017



Gerard Fitzgerald, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commission



Date

These minutes were prepared by Donna Anderson, City Administration Department